THE LECTURE-VERSUS-CASE CONTROVERSY: ITS PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION

Kavous Ardalan, Marist Collage

Abstract

Any adequate comparison between the lecture and the case instructional methodologies necessarily requires a comparison of their underlying philosophies. This is based on the premise that foundational philosophies or worldviews underlie educational philosophies, and each educational philosophy favors a certain instructional methodology. The paper, therefore, starts with the discussion of how any foundational philosophy or worldview can be positioned on a continuum formed by four basic worldviews or paradigms: functionalist, interpretive, radical humanist, and radical structuralist. Then, it discusses the major educational philosophies and their correspondence with these paradigms, namely: realism, idealism and pragmatism, reconstructionism, and Marxism. It notes that each educational philosophy favors a certain instructional methodology and when any instructional methods are utilized, they are used within the bounds of the same educational philosophy. It emphasizes that the comparison between the lecture and the case instructional methodologies translates into the comparison between their underlying philosophies. However, the paper warns that the comparison of philosophies is self-defeating since each philosophy is coherent and consistent, based on its underlying set of assumptions, and that there does not exist an independent point of reference to be used for evaluation. That is, the existing lecture-versus-case controversy lacks context, depth, and foundation. The paper proposes paradigm diversity.

INTRODUCTION

Any adequate comparison between the lecture and the case instructional methodologies necessarily requires a comparison of their underlying philosophies. This is based on the premise that foundational philosophies or worldviews underlie educational philosophies, and each educational philosophy favors a certain instructional methodology. Therefore, the comparison between the lecture and the case instructional methodologies translates into the comparison between their underlying philosophies. However, the paper warns that the comparison of philosophies is self-defeating since each philosophy is coherent and consistent, based on its underlying set of assumptions, and that there does not exist an independent point of reference to be used for evaluation.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II discusses how any foundational philosophy or worldview can be positioned on a continuum formed by four basic worldviews or paradigms: functionalist, interpretive, radical humanist, and radical structuralist. Section III discusses the major educational philosophies and their correspondence with these paradigms, namely: realism, idealism and pragmatism,

reconstructionism, and Marxism. Section IV notes that each educational philosophy favors a certain instructional methodology and when any instructional methods are utilized, they are used within the bounds of the same educational philosophy. It warns that the existing lecture-versus-case controversy lacks context, depth, and foundation. Section V proposes paradigm diversity.

FOUNDATIONAL PHILOSOPHIES OR PARADIGMS{ TC \l2 "}

Any adequate analysis of the role of foundational philosophies or worldviews in educational philosophy must recognize the assumptions that underwrite a given foundational philosophy or worldview. Educational philosophy can usefully be conceived in terms of four key worldviews or paradigms: functionalist, interpretive, radical humanist, and radical structuralist. The four paradigms are founded upon mutually exclusive views of the social world. Each generates educational philosophies, instructional methodologies, theories, concepts, and analytical tools which are different from those of other paradigms.

In order to understand a new paradigm, a theorist should be fully aware of the assumptions upon which his or her own paradigm is based. Moreover, to understand a new paradigm one has to explore it from within, since the concepts in one paradigm cannot easily be interpreted in terms of those of another. No attempt should be made to criticize or evaluate a paradigm from the outside. This is self-defeating since it is based on a separate paradigm. All four paradigms can be easily criticized and ruined in this way.

Based on Burrell and Morgan (1979), each educational philosophy can be related to one of the four broad worldviews or paradigms. These adhere to different sets of fundamental assumptions about the nature of social science and the nature of society. Assumptions with respect to the nature of social science translate into the assumptions about ontology, epistemology, human nature, and methodology. Assumptions about ontology are assumptions which concern the very essence of the phenomena under investigation. The second set of assumptions is related to epistemology. These are assumptions about the nature of knowledge - about how one might go about understanding the world, and communicate such knowledge to others. The third set of assumptions is concerned with human nature and, in particular, the relationship between human beings and their environment. The fourth set of assumptions is concerned with methodology, the way in which one attempts to investigate and obtain knowledge about the social world.

The four paradigms are based on different assumptions about the nature of social science (i.e., the objective-subjective dimension), and the nature of society (i.e., the dimension of regulation-radical change), as in Exhibit 1. This can be used as both a classificatory device, or more importantly, as an analytical tool.

The Functionalist Paradigm{ TC \l3 "}

In Exhibit 1, the functionalist paradigm occupies the southeast quadrant. Schools of thought within this paradigm can be located on the objective-subjective continuum. From right to left they are: Objectivism, Social System Theory, Integrative Theory, Interactionism, and Social Action Theory.

The functionalist paradigm assumes that society has a concrete existence and follows certain order. These assumptions lead to the existence of an objective and value-free social science which can produce true explanatory and predictive knowledge of the reality "out there." It assumes that scientific theories can be assessed objectively by reference to empirical evidence. Scientists do not see any roles for themselves within the phenomenon which they analyze through the rigor and technique of the scientific method. It attributes independence to the observer from the observed. That is, an ability to observe "what is" without affecting it. It assumes there are universal standards of science, which determine what constitutes an adequate explanation of what is observed. It assumes there are external rules and regulations governing the external world. The goal of scientists is to find orders that prevail within a phenomenon.

The functionalist paradigm seeks to provide rational explanations of social affairs and to generate regulative sociology. It emphasizes the importance of understanding order, equilibrium, and stability in society and the way in which these can be maintained. It is concerned with the regulation and control of social affairs.

The rationality that underlies functionalist science is used to explain society. Science provides the basis for structuring and ordering the social world, similar to the structure and order in the natural world. The methods of natural science are used to generate explanations of the social world.

Functionalists are individualists. That is, the properties of the aggregate are determined by the properties of its units.

Functionalists' approach to social science is rooted in the tradition of positivism. It assumes that the social world is concrete, meaning it can be identified, studied, and measured through approaches derived from the natural sciences.

Functionalists believe that the positivist methods, which have triumphed in natural sciences, should prevail in social sciences, as well. In addition, the functionalist paradigm has become dominant in academic sociology and education. The world of education is treated as a place of concrete reality, characterized by uniformities and regularities which can be understood and explained in terms of causes and effects. Given these assumptions, the individual is regarded as taking on a passive role; his or her behavior is being determined by the environment.

The Interpretive Paradigm{ TC \l3 "}

In Exhibit 1, the interpretive paradigm occupies the southwest quadrant. Schools of thought within this paradigm can be located on the objective-subjective continuum. From left to right they are: Solipsism, Phenomenology, Phenomenological Sociology, and Hermeneutics.

The interpretive paradigm assumes that social reality is the result of the subjective interpretations of individuals. It sees the social world as a process which is created by individuals. Social reality, insofar as it exists outside the consciousness of any individual, is regarded as being a network of assumptions and intersubjectively shared meanings. This assumption leads to the belief that there are shared multiple realities which are sustained and changed. Researchers recognize their role within the phenomenon under investigation. Their frame of reference is one of participant, as opposed to observer. The goal of the interpretive researchers is to find the orders that prevail within the phenomenon under consideration; however, they are not objective.

The interpretive paradigm is concerned with understanding the world as it is, at the level of subjective experience. It seeks explanations within the realm of individual consciousness and subjectivity.

Interpretive sociologists seek to understand the source of social reality. They often delve into the depth of human consciousness and subjectivity in their quest for the meanings in social life.

The interpretive paradigm believes human values affect the process of scientific enquiry. That is, the frame of reference of the scientific observer determines the way in which scientific knowledge is obtained. Moreover, in cultural sciences the subject matter is spiritual in nature and human beings are perceived as free. An understanding of their lives and actions can be obtained by the intuition of the total wholes.

Cultural phenomena are seen as the external manifestations of inner experience. The cultural sciences, therefore, need to apply analytical methods based on "understanding;" through which the scientist can seek to understand human beings, their minds, their feelings, and the way these are expressed in their outward actions. The notion of "understanding" is a defining characteristic of all theories located within this paradigm.

The interpretive paradigm believes that science is based on "taken for granted" assumptions; and, like any other social practice, must be understood within a specific context. Scientific knowledge is socially constructed and socially sustained; its significance and meaning can only be understood within its immediate social context.

The interpretive paradigm regards functionalist education theorists as belonging to a small and self-sustaining community, which believes that education and educational institutions exist in a concrete world. They theorize about concepts which have little significance to people outside the community which practices educational theory, and the limited community which educational theorists may attempt to serve.

Interpretive researchers emphasize that the social world is no more than the subjective construction of individual human beings who create and sustain a social world of intersubjectively shared meaning, which is in a continuous process of reaffirmation or change. Therefore, there are no universally valid rules of education. Interpretive education research enables scientists to examine aggregate behavior together with ethical, cultural, political, and social issues.

The Radical Humanist Paradigm{ TC \l3 "}

In Exhibit 1, the radical humanist paradigm occupies the northwest quadrant. Schools of thought within this paradigm can be located on the objective-subjective continuum. From left to right they are: Solipsism, French Existentialism, Anarchistic Individualism, and Critical Theory.

The radical humanist paradigm assumes that reality is socially created and sustained. It provides critiques of the status quo. It tends to view society as anti-human. It views the process of reality creation as feeding back on itself; such that individuals and society are prevented from reaching their highest possible potential. That is, the consciousness of human beings is dominated by the ideological superstructures of the social system, which results in their alienation or false

consciousness. This, in turn, prevents true human fulfillment. The social theorist regards the orders that prevail in society as instruments of ideological domination.

The major concern for theorists is with the way the ideological domination occurs and with finding ways in which human beings can release themselves from constraints which existing social arrangements place upon realization of their full potential. They seek to change the social world through a change in consciousness.

Radical humanists believe that everything must be grasped as a whole, because the whole dominates the parts in an all-embracing sense. Moreover, they believe that truth is historically specific, relative to a given set of circumstances, so that one should not search for the generalizations of the laws of motion of societies.

Radical humanists emphasize that purposive rationality, logic of science, positive functions of technology, and neutrality of language are political and repressive in nature. Radical humanist theorists intend to demolish this structure. They aim to show the role that science, ideology, technology, language, and other aspects of the superstructure play in sustaining and developing the system of power and domination, within the totality of the social formation. Their function is to influence the consciousness of human beings for eventual emancipation and formation of alternative social formations.

The focus of radical humanists upon the "superstructural" aspects of society reflects their attempt to move away from the economism of orthodox Marxism and to emphasize the Hegelian dialectics. It is through the dialectic that the objective and subjective aspects of social life interact. The superstructure of society is believed to be the medium through which the consciousness of human beings is controlled and molded to fit the requirements of the social formation as a whole.

The Radical Structuralist Paradigm{ TC \l3 "}

In Exhibit 1, the radical structuralist paradigm occupies the northeast quadrant. Schools of thought within this paradigm can be located on the objective-subjective continuum. From right to left they are: Russian Social Theory, Conflict Theory, and Contemporary Mediterranean Marxism.

The radical structuralist paradigm assumes that reality is objective and concrete. Scientists do not see any roles for themselves in the phenomenon under investigation. They use scientific methods to find the order that prevails in the phenomenon. This paradigm also views society as a potentially dominating force.

For radical structuralists, an understanding of classes is essential for understanding the nature of knowledge. They argue that all knowledge is class specific. That is, it is determined by the place one occupies in the productive process. They believe that knowledge is more than a reflection of the material world in thought. It is determined by one's relation to that reality. Since different classes occupy different positions in the process of material transformation, there are different kinds of knowledge. Hence class knowledge is produced by and for classes, and exists in a struggle for domination. Knowledge is thus ideological. That is, it formulates views of reality and solves problems from class points of view.

Radical structuralists do not believe that it is possible to verify knowledge in an absolute sense through comparison with socially neutral theories or data. Rather, they emphasize that there is the possibility of producing a "correct" knowledge from a class standpoint. They argue that the dominated class, as opposed to the dominant

class, is uniquely positioned to obtain an objectively "correct" knowledge of social reality and its contradictions. It is the class with the most direct and widest access to the process of material transformation that ultimately produces and reproduces that reality.

Radical structuralists' analysis indicates that the social scientist, as a producer of class-based knowledge, is a part of the class struggle.

Radical structuralists believe truth is the whole and emphasize the need to understand the social order as a totality rather than as a collection of small truths about various parts and aspects of society. The empiricists are seen as relying almost exclusively upon a number of seemingly disparate, data-packed, problem-centered studies. Such studies, therefore, are irrelevant exercises in mathematical methods.

This paradigm is based on four central notions. First, there is the notion of totality. All theories in this paradigm address the total social formation. This notion emphasizes that the parts dialectically reflect the totality, and the totality dialectically reflects the parts.

Second, there is the notion of structure. The focus is upon the configurations of social relationships, called structures, which are treated as persistent and enduring concrete facilities.

The third notion is that of contradiction. Structures, or social formations, contain contradictory and antagonistic relationships within them which act as seeds of their own decay.

The fourth notion is that of crisis. Contradictions within a given totality reach a point at which they can no longer be contained. The resulting political and economic crises indicate the point of transformation from one totality to another, in which one set of structures is replaced by another of a fundamentally different nature.

EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHIES { TC \l2 "}

Any philosophy of education is the application of a foundational philosophy to educational problems. The practice of education, in turn, leads to the refinement of philosophical ideas. The philosophy of education becomes important when educators recognize the need for thinking clearly about what they are doing and to see what they are doing in the larger context of society. Educational philosophy is not only a basis for generating educational ideas, but also a basis for how to provide the desired instruction, i.e., instructional methodology.

Section II discussed how any foundational philosophy or worldview can be positioned on a continuum formed by four basic paradigms: functionalist, interpretive, radical humanist, and radical structuralist. This section discusses the major educational philosophies.[1] These major educational philosophies are broad and do not occupy a point on the objective-subjective continuum in Exhibit 1. Rather, they occupy a range in that exhibit. This is in the same spirit as the foundational philosophies and their location in Exhibit 1. In the same vein, the intermediate educational philosophies are not discussed here.[2]

This section also makes clear the correspondence of the educational philosophies with the four basic paradigms, namely: realism, idealism and pragmatism, reconstructionism, and Marxism, respectively. Realism lies in the functionalist quadrant in Exhibit 1 and is located on the right-hand extreme on the objective-subjective continuum. Idealism is located in the interpretive quadrant in

Exhibit 1 and is located on the left-hand extreme on the objective-subjective continuum. Pragmatism lies in the interpretive quadrant, but to the right of idealism. Reconstructionism lies in the radical humanist quadrant in Exhibit 1 and belongs to the same position on the objective-subjective continuum as pragmatism. Marxism lies in the radical structuralist quadrant in Exhibit 1 and belongs to the right-hand extreme on the objective-subjective continuum.

This section also makes an initial clarification that each educational philosophy favors a certain instructional methodology. This point will be further elaborated in the next section.

Realism and Education{ TC \l3 "}

Realists strongly promote the study of science and the scientific method.[3] They believe that knowledge of the world is needed for humankind's proper use of it for his or her survival. The idea of survival has important implications for education. It places self-preservation as the primary aim of education.

Realists maintain that knowing the world requires an understanding of facts and classifying the knowledge obtained about them. Schools should teach essential facts about the universe and the method of arriving at facts. Realists place enormous emphasis upon critical reason based on observation and experimentation.

Realists emphasize the practical side of education. Their concept of "practical" includes education for moral and character development, where moral education is founded on knowledge itself. Realists' essentials and the practicalities of education lead themselves further. They proceed from matter to idea, from imperfection to perfection, and all to the good life.

Realists promote the education which is primarily technical and leads to specialization. The idea of specialization is the natural outcome of the efforts to refine and establish definitive scientific knowledge. The expansion of our knowledge can be accomplished by many people, each one working on a small component of knowledge.

Realists support the lecture methodology and other formalized methodologies of teaching. They maintain that such objectives as self-realization can best occur when the learner is knowledgeable about the external world. Consequently, the learner must be exposed to the facts, and the lecture method can be an efficient, organized, and orderly way to accomplish this. Realists insist that any method used should be characterized by the integrity which comes from systematic, organized, and dependable knowledge.

Realists consider the role of the teacher in the educational process to be of primary importance. The teacher presents material in a way which is systematic and organized. He or she promotes the idea that there are clearly defined criteria making judgement about art, economics, politics, and education. For example, in education there are certain objective criteria to judge whether particular educational activities are worthwhile, such as type of material presented, how it is organized, whether or not it suits the psychological make-up of the learner, whether the delivery system is suitable, and whether it achieves the desired results.

Realists expect that institutions of higher education turn out teaching specialists who are knowledgeable, and who can serve as role models for their students. Realists place a lower priority on the personality and character of the teacher

than they do on the effectiveness of the teacher to impart knowledge about the world that the learner can use.

Realism results in practices with five formal steps of learning: preparation, presentation, association, systematization-generalization, and application. This is due to the realists' desire for precision and order. These desires are found in such school practices as ringing bells, set time periods for study, departmentalization, daily lesson plans, course scheduling, increasing specialization in curriculum, pre-packaged curriculum materials, and line-staff forms of administrative organization.

Idealism and Education{ TC \l3 "}

Idealists believe that truth cannot be found in the world of matter because it is an ever-changing world.[4] Truth can be attained in the world of ideas, which are of substantial value and endurance, if not perfect and eternal.

Idealists believe that the aim of education should be the search for wisdom and true ideas. This leads to the development of mind and requires character development, as the search for truth demands personal discipline and steadfast character.

The concept of "self" lies at the center of idealistic metaphysics and, therefore, at the center of idealistic education. Self is the prime reality of individual experience and, hence, education becomes primarily concerned with self-realization. Idealists view self in the context of society and the totality of existence.

Idealists believe that human development and education stand in a dialectical relationship with respect to each other. Education is the process of a learner growing into the likeness of a universe of mind, i.e., an infinite ideal. Idealists view the student as one who has enormous potential for both moral and cognitive growth. The teacher guides the immature learner toward the infinite. To guide the student, the teacher should possess the necessary knowledge and personal qualities. Idealists favor a more philosophically-oriented teacher.

Idealists favor holistic curriculums. Idealists stress that a proper education includes study of classical writings, art, and science. The aim is to teach students to think and to demonstrate creative and critical thinking. Idealists believe that much of the great literature of the past is relevant to contemporary problems since many of these problems have been debated extensively by great philosophers and thinkers.

Idealists believe that the best method of learning is dialectic. The dialectic is a process in which ideas are put into battle against each other with the more substantial ideas enduring in the discussion. Essentially, it is a matter of disputation and only if ideas emerge victorious there is some reason for believing in them. It is a way of looking at both sides of the question and allowing the truth to emerge. Through this critical method of thinking, individuals can develop their ideas in ways that achieve syntheses and develop universal concepts. Idealists have a high regard for the inner powers of human beings, such as intuition. They believe that dialectic is the proper tool for stimulating intuition.

Idealists favor discussion-oriented learning methodologies. They might use the lecture method, but it is viewed more as a means of stimulating thought than merely passing on information. Idealists also utilize other methods like projects, supplemental activities, library research, and artwork.

Self-realization is an important aim of education and, therefore, idealists stress the importance of self-activity in education. Idealists believe that true learning

occurs only within the individual self. The teacher cannot get inside a learner's mind, but he or she can provide materials and activities which influence learning. It is the response of the learners to these materials and activities that constitutes real education. This action is personal and private, therefore, all education is self-education. The teacher cannot always be present when learning occurs. Therefore, he or she stimulates the student such that the student continues to learn even when the teacher is absent.

Pragmatism and Education{ TC \l3 "}

Pragmatism seeks out the processes which work best to achieve desirable ends.[5] Pragmatism examines traditional ways of thinking and doing to reconstruct approaches to life more in line with contemporary conditions.

Pragmatists stress that educational aims grow out of existing conditions. They are tentative and flexible, at least in the beginning. People - parents, students, and citizens - are the ones who have educational aims, and not the process of education.

Pragmatists point out that the philosophy of education is the formation of proper mental and moral attitudes to be used in tackling contemporary problems. When social life changes, the educational program must be reconstructed to meet the change.

For pragmatists, the process of education is fulfilled only when the student really understands why he or she does things. School fosters habits of thought, invention, and initiative which assist the individual in growing in the desired direction. School is a place where the other environments which the student encounters - the family environment, the religious environment, the work environment, and others - are combined into a meaningful whole.

Pragmatists do not view education as preparation for life, but as life itself. The lives of learners are important to them. Thus, educators should be aware of the background, interests, and motivations of the learners. Pragmatists believe that educators should also look at learners in terms of their cognitive, physical, emotional, and all their other factors. Pragmatists maintain that individuals should be educated as social beings, capable of participating in and directing their social affairs.

Pragmatists champion a diversified and integrated curriculum. It is composed of both process and content, but it is not fixed or an end in itself. Pragmatists recommend developing a "core" approach to curriculum. Learners can select an area of concentration or "core" for a period of study such that all other subject areas revolve around it. Learners are capable of knowing the general operating principles of nature and social conditions, which serve as general guides for participation.

Pragmatists believe that life is ever-changing and there is a constant need for improvement. Therefore, pragmatic education is based on experimental method which realizes that there are no fixed or absolute conclusions. The students learn the process of discovery and self-sufficiency as much as the facts which are uncovered. One of the approaches suggested by pragmatic educators is the project approach to learning. Students cooperate in pursuing the goals of the project. Projects are decided by group discussion with the teacher as moderator. Pragmatists favor the use of case methodology in class.

Pragmatists adhere to action-oriented education. They suggest an activity-oriented core approach. School can arrange for students to reconstruct past events and life situations in order to better appreciate the difficulties involved in a given actual situation. Learners become involved with the fundamentals of knowledge in a practical and applied way so that the usefulness of knowledge becomes more apparent to them. This approach demonstrates the relationship of various disciplines, shows the wholeness of knowledge, and helps learners to utilize such a knowledge in novel and creative ways when tackling problems.

Pragmatism is closely linked with reconstructionism in education in some aspects.[6] However, pragmatists are often critical of the excesses of reconstructionism.

Reconstructionism and Education{ TC \l3 "}

Reconstructionists believe that society is in need of constant reconstruction or change in order to adequately deal with social problems to make life better than it is.[7]

Reconstructionists stress that education and schools should be viewed in the much wider societal context. Radical changes in education cannot occur without radical changes in the structure of society itself. Educational reform follows social reforms and rarely, if ever, precedes or causes it. Therefore, an educator must be both an educator and a social activist.

Reconstructionists believe in the ideals of world community, brotherhood, and democracy. Schools should promote these ideals through curricular, administrative, and instructional practices. Schools cannot be expected to reconstruct society by themselves, but by the adoption of these ideals, they can serve as models for the rest of society.

Reconstructionists are critical of the teaching methods presently used at all levels of education. These methods promote traditional values and attitudes underlying the status quo and reinforce resistance to change. For instance, where teachers are viewed as dispensers of knowledge and students as passive recipients of knowledge, students uncritically accept whatever is presented. This results in producing students who think in the same way and who are uncritical of society, the economy, and the political structure.

Reconstructionists hold that teachers should begin by focusing on critical social issues not usually found in textbooks or discussed in schools. Teachers must become critical, analytical, and discriminating in judgement. They should encourage similar development in students. Reconstructionists believe that such a development in class can be brought about by the discussion methodology, including the case methodology. In this way, teachers help develop democratic approaches to social problems by enabling students to deal with social life intelligently. In fact, democratic procedures should be utilized on every level of schooling. This implies that students play an active part in the formulation of all objectives, methods, and curricula used in the educational process.

Reconstructionists' favored curriculum is a modification of the core plan advocated by pragmatists. The core may be viewed as the central theme of the school. The core is complemented by related activities such as discussion groups, field experience, content and skill studies, and vocational studies. Finally, there is the synthesizing and unifying capacity. The reconstructionists' curriculum draws the people of the community together in common studies and it extends from the school

into the wider community. Thus, it has the capacity to help bring about cultural transformation because of the dynamic relationship between school and society.

Reconstructionists believe that curriculum should be action-oriented by engaging students in projects such as collecting funds for worthy causes, informing the citizenry about social problems, and engaging in petition and protests. Reconstructionists favor students' participation in society, where they can both learn and apply what they learn. A curriculum which engages students in some social activity can produce far more learning than any sterile lecture in a classroom.

Reconstructionists favor a world curriculum which is future-oriented. They encourage reading the literature of other nations that deals with issues on a worldwide basis. They recommend teachers to be internationally oriented and humanitarian in their outlook.

Marxism and Education{ TC \l3 "}

Marxists find the definition of education which limits the term to the school system as too narrow since it leaves out the learning which Marxists regard as fundamental.[8] They see the world as it is in order to change it. Therefore, they regard education as those processes which contribute to the formation and changing of a person's consciousness and character. Consciousness is based on the worldview, and character involves how a person behaves in relation to that worldview and society. In this, Marxists not only combine education and socialization, but also impart to them the necessary critical perspective in the light of Marxist goals. By imparting such perspectives in class, Marxists favor the lecture methodology.

Marxists agree that the most obvious agent of education is the school. However, they doubt whether the really important learning takes place there. Other agents include the family, youth organizations, peer groups, work, the mass media, religious institutions, trade unions, political parties, and armed forces. These educative agents are classified as socializing agents. Work is the most important socializing agent for those who perform it.

Marxists' vision of communism as a period when man becomes increasingly self-conscious and self-determining has important implications for education. This performs both as a criterion for judging current efforts and as a guide for setting aims and methods. Communism is the movement that abolishes the present state of affairs, including the activities of both teacher and students throughout the process. In fact, the relationship is dialectical: a change of social circumstances is required to establish a proper system of education, and a proper system of education is required to bring about a change of social circumstances. This implies that the major concern of education should be moral-political; the development of the socialist consciousness.

Marxists are careful about the ideology an individual adopts. School is the crucial agency within which the conflict of class values is worked out. The ruling class ideology consciously or unconsciously permeates the school system. It is a reflection of the interests of the dominant class, but is also accepted by wide sections of other classes.

Marxists define education in conjunction with productive labor: mental education, bodily education, and technological training. The combination of paid productive labor, mental education, bodily exercise, and polytechnic training will raise the working class far above the level of the higher and middle classes.

109

Polytechnic training is a cognitive activity centered on an interaction of human and non-human nature. The combination of productive labor and mental education is primarily social, an interaction of one human with another human. Marxists see working together on a meaningful task as potentially humanizing. The young, brought up to take their place in the great work of social production, learn to play their part. Moreover, it is obvious that the fact of the collective working group being composed of individuals of both sexes and all ages, must necessarily, under suitable conditions, become a source of humane development.

Marxists' concepts of the relationship of the proletariat and permanent revolution have profound implications for education. Democracy can only be learned through the practice of democracy, and this must apply to schools as well as to all other sectors of society. The rotation of positions of responsibility and control is essential if people are to learn to exercise power. The spread of information in open government and the discussion of matters before policies are formulated are considered as constituting both education and execution. The performance of ordinary, manual labor by government and industrial leaders is an essential educational process, but the converse, government and management by the masses, is also essential if society is to become really classless.

THE LECTURE-VERSUS-CASE CONTROVERSY{ TC \l3 "}
This section discusses the implications of the previous two sections with respect to the lecture-versus-case controversy. For this purpose, this section brings major aspects of the previous two section to the forefront, elaborates on their connections and implications for instructional methodologies, contrasts instructional methodology and instructional method by way of an example of the case method, and discusses their implications with respect to the lecture-versus-case controversy.

The previous two sections, in essence, have shown that foundational philosophies or worldviews underlie educational philosophies, and each educational philosophy favors a certain instructional methodology. More specifically, Section II discussed how any foundational philosophy or worldview can be positioned on a continuum formed by four basic worldviews or paradigms: functionalist, interpretive, radical humanist, and radical structuralist. For the purposes of this section, it is necessary to emphasize that these four worldviews or paradigms are very broad and basic in the sense that they fill in the whole spectrum in Exhibit 1. Moreover, the formation of the objective-subjective continuum, in Exhibit1, is based on the nature of the reality that these foundational philosophies address. In other words, as one moves from the objective to the subjective end of the spectrum, the nature of reality addressed by respective worldviews changes from being objective to being subjective, i.e., from being fixed and concrete to being socially constructed and ever-changing.

Section III discussed the major educational philosophies and noted their correspondence with the four basic paradigms, namely: realism, idealism and pragmatism, reconstructionism, and Marxism, respectively. It also noted that each educational philosophy favors a certain instructional methodology. In other words, as one moves from the objective to the subjective end of the spectrum in Exhibit 1, the in-class instructional methodology favored changes from totally having a lecture orientation to completely having a discussion orientation, e.g., a case orientation.

In fact, for the realist, whose position on the objective-subjective continuum in Exhibit 1 is to the far right, the teacher is a guide. The real world exists, and the teacher is responsible for introducing the student to it. To do this he or she uses lectures, demonstrations, and sensory experiences. The teacher does not do it in a random or haphazard way; he or she must not only introduce the students to nature, but also show them its regularities.

At the other extreme on the objective-subjective continuum in Exhibit 1:

> Where truth is relative, where reality is probabilistic, and where structural relationships are contingent, teaching and learning are most effectively accomplished through discussion rather than exploration. With intrinsically complex phenomena and the limited usefulness of simple theoretical relationships, little of value can be communicated directly from teacher to student. The learning process must emphasize the development of understanding, judgement, and even intuition.
>
> Discussion teaching requires a major change in an instructor's role and classroom responsibilities. Traditional teaching, and the lecture mode with which it is so often associated, gives primacy to the instructor. Classroom activity derives from the teacher's presentation of subject matter and follows his or her class plan. The student's role is clearly subordinate. (Christensen and Hansen, 1989, p. 20)

In short, as one moves from the objective to the subjective end of the continuum in Exhibit 1 the nature of reality viewed changes and along with it the foundational philosophy, its corresponding educational philosophy, and its instructional methodology.[9] That is, a move from lecture methodology to discussion methodology, e.g., case methodology.

Next, this section shows that the way that an instructional method[10] is used depends on the user's instructional methodology, which, in turn, depends on the corresponding educational philosophy and foundational philosophy. This, in the final analysis, depends on the nature of reality that it addresses.

More specifically, this section considers the case method, which is an instructional method. It shows that different instructional methodologies use the case method differently and use different types of cases. In this connection, this section looks at Dooley and Skinner (1977) and Reynolds (1978). The former categorizes alternative approaches utilized in the case method. The latter categorizes alternative types of cases used.

Dooley and Skinner (1977) identify,[11] among other things, two extreme case teaching approaches which correspond to the two extreme positions on the objective-subjective continuum in Exhibit 1. More specifically, their "One Extreme" corresponds to the subjective extreme in Exhibit 1, and their "The Other Extreme" corresponds to the objective extreme in Exhibit 1:

One Extreme

The range of pedagogic philosophies employed in the case method is bounded, on the one hand, by the belief that learning is a self-acquired process. This is the philosophy that contends, in the words of Charles Gragg: "Wisdom can't be told." The student learns what he or she wants to learn and is ready to learn; the student must take full responsibility for his or her own learning. Any external elements - such as books, instructors, texts, principles, the articulated wisdom of others, - can help or hurt the learning process, depending largely on whether the student is receptive to them, and perceives them as useful. But each individual can learn only at his or her own pace, in his or her own way, and according to his or her own needs.

The professor who subscribes to these assumptions believes that in a case discussion the instructor, at best, can help as a classroom traffic officer, keeping everyone from talking at once, reporting/recording the flow of analysis and conclusions. At worst, the instructor can be a foreign, intrusive, divisive element. The instructor can interfere in the learning process - can fall into the trap of assuming an understanding of what the student wants to learn and is ready to learn. But since all students are "on different tracks," the instructor inevitably gets in the way of many of them. When the professor says, "I'm going to help," he or she begins to deny the student some part of the responsibility for learning, creating student dependency instead of self-development.

According to this philosophy an instructor can offer modest assistance to students as they undergo an intensely personalized experience; the instructor who attempts to play an active role inevitably will impede, perhaps even destroy, the learning process for at least some percentage of the class. Responsibility cannot be shared. Either the student accepts the responsibility for his or her own learning, or goes to the other extreme of saying: "Here I am, instructor. Educate me."

{ TC \l2 "}

The Other Extreme{ TC \l2 "}

At the other extreme is the pedagogic philosophy that the instructor is the decisive element in the learning process, that the instructor's knowledge and wisdom place him or her on "center stage," that the ultimate responsibility for making sure that the class is "effective," that "students learn something," is the instructor's. People of this persuasion believe that for the professor to play other than a dominant role, to take refuge in questions when there are answers, to act as if his or her experience, judgement and insights are not superior to those of the students, is to prevent the teaching process and the basic tenets of professorial responsibility. Wisdom can be told, and the professor should do the telling. "That's what professors are paid to do."

Time is viewed as precious. The instructor's job is to make sure maximum imparting of knowledge is achieved in the time available. When leading case discussions, the professor must maintain control, identify, and then lead students through the important aspects of a case, without letting time be wasted in fruitless arguments between uninformed and inexperienced students who have not yet learned to approach problems systematically, rigorously and efficiently. Letting students "muddle around" and master concepts themselves perhaps may be appropriate for occasional, brief intervals, but a little of this is sufficient. The instructor then must impart knowledge efficiently by showing students how to approach and handle the topic correctly. The professor constantly must make clear where he or she stands, and impart continuous feedback as to whether each student who speaks is right or wrong, and why. The instructor instructs. The student absorbs. (pp. 283-284)

The other case teaching approaches which Dooley and Skinner (1977) list, in their Table 2, correspond in the same order to the intermediate points on the objective-subjective continuum in Exhibit 1.

In a similar fashion, it can be seen that Reynolds' (1978) categorization of types of cases[12] corresponds to alternative positions on the objective-subjective continuum in Exhibit 1. To see this, one needs to recall that the objective-subjective continuum in Exhibit 1 is the representation of alternative foundational philosophies and their corresponding educational philosophies, which in turn are reflected in their corresponding instructional methodologies, which require corresponding teaching materials. For instance, positions on the far right-hand side on the objective-subjective continuum in Exhibit 1 require "fact-based, problem-oriented, directed cases." Whereas positions on the far left-hand side on the objective-subjective continuum in Exhibit 1 require "qualitative, discussion-oriented, non-directed, open-ended cases." Reynolds (1978) states:

The teacher who plans to leave two-thirds of the class time to the students should choose a case which allows for enough student analysis and interpretation to use that time effectively. The instructor who plans to use a case as the basis for a lecture should choose one which does not start too many trains of thought in diverse directions; the student whose analysis has suggested issues of social responsibility is not likely to sit still for a lecture on cost minimization. (pp. 130-131)

The other case types which Reynolds (1978) lists, in his Table 1, correspond in the same order to the intermediate points on the objective-subjective continuum in Exhibit 1.

The foregoing discussion noted that foundational philosophies or worldviews underlie educational philosophies, and each educational philosophy favors a certain instructional methodology and when any instructional methods are utilized, they are

used within the bounds of the same educational philosophy and foundational philosophy.

It should be now clear that the mere comparison of the lecture method and the case method in the abstract is non-productive, since, as was noted above in the example of the case method, the case method, as any other method, can be used within the bounds of totally different educational philosophies and foundational philosophies. Consequently, the comparison of lecture with case, if it needs to be done at all, should take place within the appropriate context, rather than in the abstract. Based on the discussion above, an appropriate context for the comparison of lecture with case, is their respective educational philosophies and foundational philosophies. In such a context, one compares instructional methodologies, rather than instructional methods. An instructional methodology is almost uniquely determined by its underlying educational philosophy and foundational philosophy.

For instance, realism is located on the far right-hand side of the continuum in Exhibit 1, which implies a certain educational philosophy, which in turn implies a certain instructional methodology, which strongly adheres to the lecture method as the main mode of instruction in class. On the other hand, idealism and pragmatism are located close to the far left-hand side of the continuum in Exhibit 1, which imply certain educational philosophies, which in turn imply certain instructional methodologies, which adhere to the discussion method, including the case method, as the main mode of instruction in class.

In this way, the comparison between the lecture and the case instructional methodologies translates into the comparison between their underlying philosophies. However, comparison of foundational philosophies is self-defeating since each foundational philosophy or paradigm is formed by a coherent set of thoughts based on a set of assumptions. Therefore, each foundational philosophy or paradigm can only be explored from within, since the concepts in one paradigm cannot easily be interpreted in terms of those of another. No attempt should be made to criticize or evaluate a paradigm from the outside. This is self-defeating since it is based on a separate paradigm. All four paradigms can be easily criticized and ruined in this way.

Moreover, there does not exist an independent point of reference to be used for evaluation. Any attempt to evaluate or judge the significance of different philosophies may be framed by assumptions or presuppositions that have no *a priori* claim to supremacy over those of other evaluative stances.

The foregoing implies that the existing lecture-versus-case controversy lacks context, depth, and foundation. It lacks context because the comparison is done in the abstract without reference to any specific paradigmatic context. It lacks depth because it looks at the surface and sees the signs rather than looking deep down and seeing the foundational philosophies. It lacks foundation because there does not exist a neutral frame of reference for such a comparison.

CONCLUSION{ TC \l3 "}

This paper proposes paradigm diversity and emphasizes its principles, implications, and requirements. Its view is that each paradigm can benefit from contributions by the other paradigms. This would entail fundamental changes in current perspectives held by the two sides involved in the lecture-versus-case debate.

Paradigm diversity is based on the idea that each foundational philosophy or paradigm is formed by a coherent and consistent set of thoughts based on a set of assumptions. Each foundational philosophy implies an educational philosophy and an instructional methodology. More than one instructional methodology is available to be used in class. Any single instructional methodology is incapable of having characteristics of an ideal instructional methodology with all of its complexities.

It is almost impossible to find foundational solution to the problem of comparing specific instructional methodologies. Educators are encouraged to explore what is possible by identifying untapped possibilities. By comparing a favored instructional methodology in relation to others, the nature, strengths, and limitations of the favored approach become evident. By understanding what others do, educators are able to understand what they are not doing. This leads to the development and refinement of the favored instructional methodology. The concern is not about deciding which instructional methodology is best, or with substituting one for another. The concern is about the merits of diversity, which seeks to enrich education rather than constrain it, through a search for an optimum way of doing diverse teaching.

There is no unique evaluative perspective for assessing instructional methodologies generated by different foundational philosophies. Therefore, it becomes necessary to get beyond the idea that instructional methodology can be evaluated in an absolute way.

Different instructional methodologies provide different instructional methods and use them in specific ways. Some may be supporting a traditional view, others saying something new. In this way, they are treated as being tentative rather than absolute.

All instructional methodologies have something to contribute. The interaction among them may lead to synthesis, compromise, consensus, transformation, polarization, or simply clarification and improved understanding of differences. Such interaction, which is based on differences of viewpoints, is not concerned with reaching consensus or an end point that establishes a foundational truth. On the contrary, it is concerned with learning from the process itself, and to encourage the interaction to continue so long as disagreement lasts. Likewise, it is not concerned with producing uniformity, but promoting improved diversity.

Paradigm diversity is based on the idea that teaching is a creative process and that there are many ways of teaching. This approach leads to the development of teaching in many different, and sometimes contradictory, directions such that new ways of teaching will emerge. The number of ways of generating new ways of teaching is bounded only by the ingenuity of educators in inventing new approaches.

Paradigm diversity reorients the role of the educator and places responsibility for the conduct and consequences of teaching directly with him or her. Each educator examines the nature of his or her activity to choose an appropriate approach and develops a capacity to observe and question what he or she is doing, and takes responsibility for making intelligent choices that are open to realize the many potential types of teaching.

To implement paradigm diversity, some fundamental changes need to be directed to the way the lecture-versus-case debate is presently viewed. The most fundamental change is to understand the multifaceted nature of education as a

phenomenon. An understanding of paradigms provides a valuable means for exploring the nature of the phenomenon being investigated. Furthermore, an understanding of other paradigms provides an invaluable basis for recognizing what one is doing.

ENDNOTES

[1] For the basic literature on diverse views see Barrow and Woods (1989), Ellis, Cogan, and Howey (1991), Noddings (1995), Ozmon and Craver (1998), Sadovnik, Semel, and Cookson (1994), and Winch and Gingell (1999).

[2] For the more advanced literature on diverse views see Barrow and White (1993), Cahn (1996), Chambliss (1996), Gutek (1996), Kimball and Orrill (1995), Marples (1999), Power (1995), and Rorty (1998).

[3] See, for example, Cromer (1997) and Schrag (1995).

[4] See, for example, Freedman (1996) and Hancock (1999).

[5] See, for example, Hickman and Alexander (1998) and Orrill (1999).

[6] They both certainly agree with the philosophy of John Dewey.

[7] See, for example, Larochelle, Bednarz, and Garrison (1998) and Popkewitz and Fendler (1999).

[8] See, for example, Brosio (1998) and McLaren (1998).

[9] Similarly, Morgan (1983) elaborately and extensively shows how different worldviews along the objective-subjective continuum in Exhibit 1 underlie different research methodologies.

[10] The difference between "instructional method" and "instructional methodology" should be kept in mind. The former refers to a tool, whereas the latter signifies an approach, an orientation, and a way of thinking about how to generate and apply respective instructional methods.

[11] Dooley and Skinner's (1977) Table 2 is replicated in Appendix 1 for the reader's convenience.

[12] Reynolds' (1978) Table 1 is reproduced in Appendix 2 for the reader's convenience.

REFERENCES{ TC \l "}

Barrow, Robin and Patricia White, 1993, *Beyond Liberal Education: Essays in Honor of Paul H. Hirst*, (eds.), Routledge.

Barrow, Robin and Ronald Woods, 1989, *An Introduction to Philosophy of Education*, Routledge.

Brosio, Richard A., 1998, "The Continuing Correspondence Between Political Economy and Schooling: Telling the News," *Journal of Thought*, 33(3), Fall, 85-105.

Burrell, Gibson, and Gareth Morgan, 1979, *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*, Gower Publishing Company Limited, Hants, England.

Cahn, Steven M., 1996, *Classic and Contemporary Readings in the Philosophy of Education*, (ed.), McGraw-Hill College Division.

Chambliss, J.J., 1996, *Philosophy of Education: An Encyclopedia*, (ed.), Garland Publishers.

Christensen, C. Roland, and Abby J. Hansen, 1989, *Teaching and the Case Method: Text, Cases, and Readings*, Harvard Business School, Boston, Massachusetts.

Cromer, Alan H., 1997, *Connected Knowledge: Science, Philosophy, and Education*, Oxford University Press.

Dooley, Arch R., and Wickham Skinner, 1977, "Casing Casemethod Methods," *Academy of Management Review*, April, 277-289.

Ellis, Arthur K., John J. Cogan, and Kenneth R. Howey, 1991, *Introduction to the Foundations of Education*, Prentice Hall.

Freedman, James O., 1996, *Idealism and Liberal Education*, University of Michigan Press.

Gragg, Charles I., 1954, "Because Wisdom Can't Be Told," in *The Case Method at the Harvard Business School*, Malcolm P. McNair (Ed.), McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York.

Gutek, Gerald Lee, 1996, *Philosophical and Ideological Perspectives on Education*, Allyn & Bacon.

Hancock, Ralph C., 1999, *America, the West, and Liberal Education*, (ed.), Rowman & Littlefield.

Hickman, Larry and Thomas M. Alexander, 1998, *The Essential Dewey: Pragmatism, Education, Democracy*, (eds.), Indiana University Press.

Kimball, Bruce A. and Robert Orrill, 1995, *The Condition of American Liberal Education: Pragmatism and a Changing Tradition*, (eds.), College Entrance Examination Board.

Larochelle, Marie, Nadine Bednarz, and Jim Garrison, (1998), *Constructivism and Education*, (eds.), Cambridge University Press.

Marples, Roger, 1999, *The Aims of Education*, (ed.), Routledge.

McLaren, Peter, 1998, "Revolutionary Pedagogy in Post-Revolutionary Times: Rethinking the Political Economy of Critical Education," *Educational Theory*, 48(4), Fall, 431-462.

Morgan, Gareth, 1983, *Beyond Method: Strategies for Social Research*, Sage Publications, Beverley Hills.

Noddings, Nel, 1995, *Philosophy of Education*, Westview Press.

Orrill, Robert, 1999, *Education and Democracy: Re-Imaging Liberal Learning in America*, (ed.), College Entrance Examination Board.

Ozmon, Howard A. and Samuel M. Craver, 1998, *Philosophical Foundations of Education*, Prentice Hall.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. and Lynn Fendler, (1999), *Critical Theories in Education: Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics*, (eds.), Routledge.

Power, Edward J., 1995, *Educational Philosophy: A History from the Ancient World to Modern America*, Garland Publishers.

Reynolds, John I., 1978, "There's Method in Cases," *Academy of Management Review*, January, pp. 129-133.

Rorty, Amelie Oksenberg, 1998, *Philosophers on Education: Historical Perspectives*, (ed.), Routledge.

Sadovnik, Alan R., Susan Semel, and Peter Cookson, 1994, *Exploring Education: An Introduction to the Foundations of Education*, Allyn & Bacon.

Schrag, Francis, 1995, *Back to Basics: Fundamental Educational Questions Reexamined*, Jossey-Bass Education Series.

Winch, Christopher and John Gingell, 1999, *Key Concepts in the Philosophy of Education*, Routledge.