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Empowering Social Work Faculty: Alternative Paradigms for Teaching and Learning
Mari Ann Graham

ABSTRACT. Based upon the emergence of alternative paradigms both inside and outside of social work education, four paradigms representing the most traditional to the most radical are presented. Each paradigm is discussed in terms of its ontological and epistemological assumptions as well as other pedagogical issues including role of the teacher, methods of evaluation and course structure. Educators are urged to use these paradigms to better understand legitimate differences between faculty, to become more conscious and deliberate in their choice of methods, to identify areas of incongruence, and to push themselves and the profession towards philosophies and methods most congruent with social work values and ethics. [Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-342-6678. E-mail address: getinfo@haworth.com]

For real education to take place, both subjects must participate together in creating the curriculum of instruction. . . . With a new approach to education no “one” teaches anyone, no “one” educates anyone, and no “one” frees anyone. . . . And further, I can understand why it is so dangerous and threatening to those interested in maintaining the status quo.

—Enrique Rodriguez, student
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As early as 1916 Dewey criticized traditional teaching methods as "telling," and Bruner (1958) used the term "passionless classroom" to describe the traditional teaching/learning environment. Others have commented on the way students have been alienated by traditional teaching methods calling them "outsiders" (Shaunessy, 1977) and "travelers in a strange land" (Rose, 1989). Perhaps the most well known leader in the movement to empower both learners and teachers is Paulo Freire whose works (1973, 1978, 1985) continue to inspire other contemporary leaders in educational pedagogy like Shor (1987, 1993) and Brookfield (1990).

In a creative partnership between a local college and a middle school, Mercado (1993) discusses the elements of a collaborative pedagogy that includes, among other things, the use of learning portfolios, an emphasis on critical, reflective dialogue, and what she calls the "centrality of caring"—being there, being real, being open, and being fair.

Dittrner et al. (1993) articulate the paradigm shift in education as a shift to a "constructivist/developmental" perspective. They maintain that learners construct their own knowledge and teachers who hope to help them do this (rather than be in their way) need to change their instructional emphases and processes. This is in stark contrast to the traditional notion that teachers have the knowledge and it is their task to transmit it to the unknowing students. What may be even more startling to some is that Dittrner et al. are referring to elementary and secondary educational pedagogy, not to the field of adult learning where such ideas have been around for some time (Knowles, 1978). They list eleven principles associated with what they call a constructivist paradigm and identify a range of possible indicators of each. These principles and indicators are readily transferable to college teaching also.

Interestingly, a parallel movement has been occurring in the world of business and business education as well. Managers are now taught that they must create an atmosphere that promotes autonomy, personal responsibility, continuous learning, and the ability to change as organizational needs change. This is in contrast to the bureaucratic management teachings of the '50s and '60s which emphasized the authority of the manager, coercion (when necessary), rigid adherence to policies and procedures in the name of equity, and efficiency at all costs. But Shulman (1991) and others (Luechauer, 1992; Conger, 1989; Block, 1987) are critical of business faculty who are, in effect, telling their students, "Do as I say, not as I do." Business faculty, it is alleged, create a paradox for their students in that the faculty "espouse virtues of empowerment while simultaneously implementing procedures and conducting class in a bureaucratic fashion" (Luechauer, 1992, 10).
In a similar vein, social work educators are being challenged to have their teaching processes more closely mirror the helping processes they endeavor to teach their students. Dore (1993) maintains that social work education, like social work practice, should start where the client (student) is, move at the student's pace, involve the student in a mutual process of goal setting and contracting, and facilitate student growth and change. This analogy suggests that the teaching role parallels the practitioner role. The practitioner (teacher) should model for the client (student) those skills and behaviors considered healthy or appropriate, in this case learning skills and behaviors.

But this criticism of social work education is hardly new. Nearly twenty years ago, Brigham (1977) linked Freire's empowerment model with social work education in the United States. He affirmed that empowerment was not a set of gimmicks or techniques, but rather a "whole stance" towards education that presumes the following:

1. Learners are subjects, not objects.
2. The traditional vertical teacher-student pattern needs to be changed to a horizontal dialogue about a world to be transformed, a world in which people create their own reality.
3. It is necessary to try to achieve a unity of theory and practice.
4. Education is not, cannot be neutral.
5. Content and process are and ought to be strongly related.

He further suggested that even the word "teacher" should be debunked, in favor of the title, "facilitator," which more aptly describes the empowering instructor role. He also recommended that faculty negotiate assignments within the parameters of a general course outline and course objectives.

Brown, Katz and Walden (1976) proposed what some might consider a radical innovation in teaching field and practice courses that exemplifies this paradigm shift. In their pilot course which integrated practice and field courses, knowledge was presented as the students needed to know it, not specified in advance. The instructors relied on an inductive, experiential learning process rather than the traditional deductive model which focuses on mastery of predetermined content. This model allowed for the "mutual" setting of goals, on-going evaluation, and planning for future tasks which some would argue are more congruent with social work values of mutuality and self-determination. Admittedly, the authors acknowledged that the course offered more depth than breadth, to which one of their
students replied, “Students don’t cover everything in a fixed curriculum either.”

Social work faculty in other countries are also involved in this paradigm shift. In a British university, Jackson and Taylor (1991) introduced the “enquiry and action learning model” which in their words makes the teaching process more congruent with core social work values. Their approach facilitates self-directed, collaborative learning, and builds on the students’ diverse abilities and skills. Similarly, Coulshed (1993) discusses the merits and limitations of case-based enquiry along with the need to balance current forces in social work education that appear to be preoccupied with content to the neglect of educational process. Lee (1989) sums it up best when she says, social work skills can and should be translated into the teaching process in the classroom so that content and process can be one...

THE PURPOSES OF ALTERNATIVE TEACHING/LEARNING PARADIGMS

Guba (1990) identifies four research paradigms, each with differing assumptions about the nature of reality (ontology), how we know what we know (epistemology), and the research practices that follow logically from these assumptions. These four paradigms are a useful starting point for understanding various approaches to teaching and learning as well. The point of presenting these four paradigms in this form is not to claim the superiority of one over another, but to help social worker educators understand how and why people who seemingly agree on certain basic tenets of practice or teaching can have such differing methods. In this way, these four paradigms are offered as a way of appreciating and affirming the genuine, legitimate differences that exist among us in teaching style, preference for certain methods, etc.

Beyond this affirmation of differences, there is yet another aim. While no paradigm is inherently right or wrong, better or worse than another, some paradigmatic views may be more congruent with some aspects of our teaching than others. Some assumptions may make more sense in some areas of the curriculum than others, and some teaching methodologies are clearly more consistent with some ontological or epistemological assumptions than others. Social work educators may not always be aware of the assumptions that they make about teaching and learning. Like other educators, they may need assistance in identifying areas of incongruence,
so that they can modify their behaviors as they see fit. The presentation of several paradigms presents a theoretical framework which can assist educators in becoming more conscious and deliberate in their selection of teaching/learning methods.

Alternative paradigms for teaching and learning are, therefore, presented to achieve the following four purposes:

1. To better understand and affirm the legitimate differences in teaching styles that exist among social work faculty.
2. To assist social work educators in becoming more aware of the assumptions they make relative to their teaching/learning process.
3. To assist social work educators in identifying any areas of incongruence between their particular teaching philosophy and methods so that they can become more authentic teachers.
4. To help social work educators become more deliberate in their choice of methods for the purpose of nudging themselves and the profession itself toward methods that are most congruent with social work values and ethics.

Each of the four paradigms presented are first described in terms of their basic assumptions regarding the nature of reality and knowledge. Each includes identification of the primary emphasis of teaching, the essence of education, the roles of teacher and learner, primary teaching methods, and evaluation methods. After each paradigm is presented, a discussion follows which suggests how social work educators might use these paradigms to inform their teaching. A summary chart of the paradigms is included at the end of the paper (see Appendix).

**POSITIVIST TEACHING/LEARNING PARADIGM**

The positivist teacher believes that objective (value-free) reality does exist. Furthermore, this objective reality can for the most part be known and understood. Reality, in this view, is driven by unchanging laws or principles of nature. To comprehend reality, one must understand these basic laws or principles.

It follows logically from this perspective that there are certain objective (value-free) "facts" that can be known and subsequently taught. In terms of teaching a course, for example, these "facts" can not only be known, but also specified in advance. These "facts" or content areas should be specified in advance and taught by those who know them (expert/teach-
ers) to those who don't (nonexperts/students). There is a clear distinction between the teacher and the student based on what each knows. Similarly, there is a clear distinction between the teaching process which has to do with how the teacher transmits content, and the learning process which has to do with how the student acquires the content.

The primary emphasis is on the transmission and acquisition of "facts" (information, content). The essence of education is indoctrination or inculcation of the student via the transmission of information. A student is educated when she can demonstrate knowledge of the "facts."

The role of the teacher is that of expert persuader or disseminator of information. Good teachers know the "facts," are able to transmit them in interesting, relevant ways, and are thorough in their explanations. Their primary teaching methods are the assignment of student readings and supporting lectures. They may supplement lectures with other objective presentations of facts (documentaries, charts, graphs). Student assignments tend to be objective and "fact-oriented."

Primary methods of evaluation include objective (value-free) tests or other written assignments which can be objectively evaluated. If oral assignments are used, there are clear, objective criteria for evaluation. Letter grades are generally based on some numerical system since these are deemed objective and fair to everyone.

The responsibility for course structure is the sole responsibility of the teacher. Generally, the structure of the course is laid out in advance, since the desired content can be specified in advance, and since there is a limited amount of time to cover the desired material. Student assignments, tests, readings and grading procedures are routinely specified in advance, often on the first day of class.

POSTPOSITIVIST TEACHING/LEARNING PARADIGM

Like the positivist, the postpositivist teacher believes that some objective (value-free) reality exists, but unlike the positivist, believes that it cannot be fully understood or apprehended. Reality cannot be fully apprehended because the natural laws that govern reality cannot be completely understood.

Therefore, there are some objective "facts" which can be known and specified in advance, and some that can't. Since not all objective "facts" can be known, specified, or taught by even the most expert or knowledgeable postpositivist teachers allow for some input from students. Student input is allowed to accommodate for teacher limitations in being able to fully know or specify the "facts."
While there is a distinction between the teacher and the learner, there is also some acknowledgement that the teacher learns from students, and that students are not “empty vessels.” The chief emphasis in teaching is on the acquisition of “facts” (content) with some attention to the process that is created by student input. The essence of education isn’t inculcation or indoctrination, but rather the benign transmission of information.

The role of the postpositivist teacher is an expert persuader or disseminator of information. Like the positivist teacher, the postpositivist organizes and prioritizes the “facts” so that they may be disseminated as efficiently as possible. Additionally, postpositivist teachers must acknowledge the subjective dimensions of their content, and their own limitations.

Primary teaching methods still include assigned readings and lectures, but the postpositivist also uses some class discussion to accommodate the subjective dimensions of the topic. Primary evaluation methods include objective testing and assignments, but the postpositivist is apt to include some subjective assignments (subjective essays on particular topics, for example) to address those subjective areas of course content. Letter grades are generally based on some numerical formula, averaging in any subjective assignments along with the objective ones to determine the final grade.

The course structure is still the sole responsibility of the instructor and is generally laid out in advance. Assignments, readings, tests, and grading procedures are generally specified well in advance, but with some willingness to modify these expectations based on relevant student input.

**CRITICAL TEACHING/LEARNING PARADIGM**

In this paradigm, objective reality may exist, but even if it does, it is very difficult to specify or fully comprehend it given the subjectivity of experience. Therefore, there are no objective (value-free) “facts.” All information is value laden and whether explicitly stated or not, conveys certain values.

All teachers, it follows, either consciously or unconsciously expose and impose certain values on students. Therefore, education is never neutral. It is inherently a political act.

The chief emphasis in teaching is on the transformation of the learner via a concientization process. This higher consciousness is not the result of inculcation or indoctrination (as with the positivist), but is the result of a mental/psychological awakening that is aroused by a personal encounter with the material or substantive issues of the course. The essence of education is therefore not found in information, but in dialogue, critical
discourse, even argument, since these are ways of personally encountering the material.

The distinctions between teacher and learner and between the teaching and learning processes are less clear in this paradigm. The dialectical nature of dialogue makes teaching and learning a multi-directional or circular process, rather than a linear one. Students teach and teachers learn as well as vice versa. Moreover, this dialectic between teacher and learner is purposeful, not merely coincidental.

The role of the teacher in this paradigm is to ask good questions and raise the consciousness of students. Good questions are those that expose the subjective value dimensions of the subject and engage students in a process of clarifying their own value stance toward the material. The primary teaching methods used are a Socratic form of questioning which results in discussions, debates, and values clarification exercises. Other techniques which facilitate exploration and personal encounter with the material such as De Maria’s (1992) contradiction-based learning strategy, radical analysis, and polemic storytelling are examples of additional methods that would fit this paradigm. Lectures would be used sparingly, if at all. Readings are still used, but the purpose is different. Rather than transmit information, readings create a common reference point that is used to facilitate dialogue among and between students and teacher.

Primary methods of evaluation would include more subjective evaluations based on ability to critically defend one’s point of view, evidence of raised consciousness, and/or expenditure of energy and effort. Grades tend to be negotiated with students since it is difficult to set objective standards with this paradigmatic view.

Course structure as well as assignments and grading procedures may be negotiated with students and/or determined by the instructor. The assumptions of this paradigm require that the instructor make student input an important variable in the course design. Therefore, input from students on these matters is something more than peripheral “tinkering” with the instructor’s plan for the course.

CONSTRUCTIVIST TEACHING/LEARNING PARADIGM

According to constructivist teachers, objective reality does not exist, only multiple, subjective constructions of it. Constructions of reality are socially and experientially based, and therefore, depend wholly on the persons who hold them. It is obvious, then, that according to this perspective, there are no objective (value-free) “facts.” Since there are no objec-
They bring their knowledge and experience to the table in order to engage students in a process of mutual discovery of truth. The distinction between the teacher and the learner in this paradigm is even more blurred since both are teaching and learning in this process of mutual discovery.

Both teaching and learning are seen as constructivist processes. Learners construct their view of reality and their choices in relation to it; they examine their value judgments and the political implications of their choices. Teachers simultaneously make the same constructions as the learners (revising them with continued life experiences and student input) while also attempting to construct a course with full awareness of the constructivist process.

The essence of education isn’t information or dialogue, but rather, a constructivist or creative process. The aim of education is to help students construct (create) their own realities based on both the content and process of the course. The role of the teacher is to simply facilitate this constructivist (creative) process.

Primary teaching methods include the use of metaphor and other symbolic methods of communication that enhance creative thinking. Discussions, interactive media, music, drama, and literature may all be used to assist students in the creation (and re-creations) of their own realities. The difference between the critical paradigm and this one is subtle. In the constructivist paradigm, the learner’s task is to create it, not merely become aware of it or explicate it.

Evaluation procedures are mutually determined by teacher and learners. Evaluations are highly subjective in nature, based on relative standards rather than absolute ones. Instructors would be most likely to evaluate a student’s progress over time as opposed to using an arbitrary standard to judge all students.

Course structure is the joint responsibility of teacher and learners. The entire course structure cannot be specified in advance with any precision, due to the creative nature of the process. Assignments, readings, tests are negotiated and evolve as student constructs evolve. In short, the course structure evolves as the teaching/learning process evolves.

**DISCUSSION AND APPLICATION**

These paradigms have been presented in somewhat polarized form from what might be considered the most conservative (positivist) to the most radical (constructivist). How can such a typology be useful?
First, it seems likely that educators will find themselves in more than one paradigm based on some of their assumptions or teaching methodologies. This initial revelation may be quite surprising to some, and perhaps significant. Perhaps some teachers who perceived themselves as more traditional may discover a particular critical or constructivist bent. Perhaps, too, some who thought themselves more “radical” may discover more traditional or positivist inclinations. Faculty may even discover that they have differing pedagogical preferences depending on the type of course taught. Each of these realizations are hopefully the starting point for more critical self-awareness.

Educators are urged to “pin themselves down” to one (or at most two) paradigm(s) for purposes of disciplined reflection. Use course structure, primary evaluation methods and primary teaching methods as the principal determinants of your teaching/learning paradigm. Then, walking backwards from structure and methods, stop at each juncture (role of the teacher, essence of education . . . general ontology) and ask yourself a few questions. Am I uncomfortable with this role (or concept or philosophy) or am I uncomfortable with my ability to implement it? Or both? If it is the role (or concept), what about it makes me uncomfortable? What specific misgivings do I have about it? And if it is in the implementation, what barriers prevent me from implementing this? What can I do to bring about more internal congruence? What programmatic changes need to take place to bring about more congruence?

This inductive exercise in which you began with the particulars and work your way back to the general will hopefully do several things. It will stimulate you to think about your teaching pedagogy in a deeper way. Many educators aren’t conscious of their own ontological or epistemological assumptions most of the time, let alone how these impact their teaching day to day. To become more conscious of these, and get an intuitive sense of the connections between what you do and why you do it, is valuable in and of itself.

Secondly, as incongruities or overlaps between paradigms become apparent, this conceptual framework provides you with choices. Someone who uses primarily postpositivist methods, for example, may decide to try a few more critical methods to see if this paradigm “fits.” There may be a good number of “closet” critical and/or constructivist social work educators who have kept their “preference” hidden due to the dominant positivist or postpositivist orientation of their department. Just knowing that there are others like you (critical mass) may be an occasion for “coming out.”

Or, you might discover that those critical methods are the ones that have always been the most difficult for you, precisely because they are outside
of your ontological assumptions. But you did them because you thought you were supposed to do them to appease the critical/constructivist types. In which case, you might consciously and quite deliberately decide to stop using those methods because they don’t fit who you are (your paradigm) in favor of teaching more authentically.

As important as personal authenticity and congruence are, there is also the matter of congruence with professional values and ethics. Here is where using these paradigms in a self-reflective way can help us push ourselves and/or the profession. While neither of these four paradigms is intrinsically better or worse than the others, social work educators have the complex task of deciding which teaching methods best “fit” the subject matter and the subjects themselves, i.e., the students. The extent to which these paradigms represent changes in our culture, and more specifically in how social work students approach their own learning, cannot be underestimated without consequence. There may be good reason for faculty to stretch themselves beyond what is currently comfortable in an effort to stay abreast of changing student needs.

This “stretch” may be needed in either direction depending on student needs. A personal illustration may help clarify this point. Upon moving to another region of the country, I found myself needing to move from a more critical paradigm (my preference) to a postpositivist one in order to accommodate the needs of traditional-aged undergraduate students who were either unprepared or too threatened by a critical approach. At the same time, I needed to move towards a more constructivist approach with graduate students who, by virtue of their age and experience, seemed quite eager to function from that paradigm. The variables—geographic region, age of student, experiential base of student, type of course, teacher preference—all need to be taken into account.

Finally, there are obvious structural barriers for moving in the direction of the critical and constructivist paradigms, which some might consider most consistent with social work values and ethics. While our profession may support in theory the values of these paradigms, the structure and expectations associated with the accreditation and reaffirmation processes appear to preclude critical or constructivist approaches to teaching and learning. For example, programs are required to submit syllabi in which faculty specify not only the content areas to be covered in advance, but also corresponding readings and assignments. This leaves little room for the critical or constructivist teacher whose philosophy requires that students are involved in more than a superficial way with course structure. Some might also maintain that the movement
towards professionalization with its emphasis on licensure and standards presumes a positivist or postpositivist ontology of professional education.

Whether this current bias is inherent in the structures or processes themselves, or whether it merely reflects current limitations in conceptualization or implementation, remains to be seen. Perhaps, too, this issue is yet another manifestation of the dilemmas associated with shifting paradigms. Paradigms change slowly and with great difficulty. Often those in the margins of change pay the highest prices for bringing new visions (paradigms) to the masses. So be it in social work education as well.
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### APPENDIX. Alternative Paradigms for Teaching and Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category (genres)</th>
<th>Positivist Paradigm</th>
<th>Postpositivist Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective (value-free) reality exists; can be known and understood.</strong></td>
<td>Objective reality exists; it cannot be fully understood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality is governed by natural laws that do not change.</td>
<td>The natural laws that govern reality cannot be fully understood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There are objective facts (content) which can be known and specified in advance.</strong></td>
<td>There are some objective facts (content) which can be known and specified in advance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These facts need to be taught by people who know them (teachers) to those who don't (students).</td>
<td>Not all objective facts can be specified or taught by the experts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear distinction between teacher and learner, and between teaching and learning processes.</td>
<td>Need to allow student input to accommodate teacher limitations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief emphasis is on the transmission and acquisition of facts (content).</td>
<td>Fairly clear distinction between teacher and learner, but some acknowledgement that teachers can learn from students and that students are not &quot;empty vessels.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inculcation or indoctrination via transmission of information.</td>
<td>Chief emphasis is on the transmission and acquisition of the facts (content).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benign transmission of information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Paradigm</th>
<th>Constructivist Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective reality may exist; it cannot be fully understood.</td>
<td>Objective reality does not exist, only multiple constructions of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The natural laws that govern reality cannot be completely understood.</td>
<td>Constructions are experientially based and depend on the persons who hold them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no objective (value-free) content. Teachers consciously (or unconsciously) impose their values on students. Education is never neutral; it is inherently a political act. Less clear distinction between teacher and learner. The dialectical nature of the process makes teaching and learning a multi-directional or circular process rather than a linear one.</td>
<td>There is no objective (value-free) content. Teachers are catalysts and bring their knowledge and experience to engage students in a mutual process of discovery. No clear distinction between teacher and learner, and teaching and learning processes. Both teaching and learning are constructivist processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Teacher</td>
<td>Positivist Paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert persuader or disseminator of information.</td>
<td>Organize and prioritize content; disseminate as efficiently as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Teaching Methods</td>
<td>Lectures, readings, objective “fact-orientated” assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Evaluation Methods</td>
<td>Objective tests or other written assignments which can be graded objectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important to treat everyone alike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Structure</td>
<td>Sole responsibility of teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of course laid out in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignments, tests, readings and grading procedures specified in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Paradigm</td>
<td>Constructivist Paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ask critical questions.</strong></td>
<td>Be aware of the constructivist, creative process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Be keenly aware of the value dimensions, so he can assist students in becoming aware.</strong></td>
<td>Evaluate student's progress over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raise awareness.</strong></td>
<td>Structure is joint responsibility of teacher and learners. Structure evolves as the teaching/learning process evolves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socratic, circular questioning that results in discussions, debate, and values clarification exercises.</strong></td>
<td>Structure is post determined by students and teacher. Evaluation is based on constructed creative techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lectures used sparingly, if at all.</strong></td>
<td>Subjunctive evaluation based on standards. Evaluation determined by students and teacher. Evaluate over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More subjective evaluation based on evidence of raised consciousness, expenditure of effort? Important to treat students as individuals.</strong></td>
<td>Evidence of raised consciousness, expenditure of effort? Important to treat students as individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjective evaluation based on standards. Evaluation determined by students and teacher. Evaluate over time.</strong></td>
<td>Evidence of raised consciousness, expenditure of effort? Important to treat students as individuals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure may be negotiated with students and/or determined by teacher. Assignments, readings, and other evaluation procedures may be negotiated with students.