What is the Integral in Integral Education?
From Progressive Pedagogy to Integral Pedagogy

Tom Murray

Abstract: Integrally-informed educational approaches have much in common with progressive (including reform, alternative, holistic, and transformative) approaches, and share many of the same values. One function of the integral approach is to provide an overarching model within which to coordinate different progressive methods. Though integral adds much more than that, descriptions of integral education sometimes sound like progressive educational principles recast with new terminology. This essay attempts to clarify what the integral approach adds over and above progressive educational theories. After an overview of progressive pedagogical principles, the integral approach is discussed in terms of integral as a model, a method, a community, and a developmental stage. Integral as a type of consciousness or developmental level is elaborated upon as consisting of construct-awareness, ego-awareness, relational-awareness, and system-awareness, all important to the educational process. Finally, challenges and support systems for realizing integral education are discussed.

Keywords: alternative education, education, pedagogy, integral education, progressive education, second-tier.

Introduction

Education is everything. We don't need little changes, we need gigantic revolutionary changes. Schools should be palaces. Competition for the best teachers should be fierce. They should be getting six-figure salaries. Schools should be incredibly expensive for government and absolutely free of charge for its citizens, just like national defense. That is my position. I just haven't figured out how to do it yet.
(Aaron Sorokin, The West Wing)

Education is a private matter between the person and the world of knowledge and experience, and has little to do with school or college.
(Lillian Smith)

"Integral" means many things to many people, and the same is true for "Integral Education." In one sense, integral has become a generic attractor for progressive (or reform or alternative) educational theories of all flavors. For educational practitioners and scholars, any particular school of educational thought may feel constraining and bound to a particular model or founder. The integral approach can embrace (and support a critical evaluation of) most of the values and deep principles embodied in progressive thought, and is thus not only compatible with them but offers a generous and welcoming meta-container. The integral model situates progressive educational ideas within a larger transdisciplinary web of ideas about culture, psychology, philosophy, science, etc., and also cleans up some shortcomings. Any particular theory can fit

comfortably within the integral camp and have the elbow room to grow – and to play (not take itself too seriously). Likewise, the community (communities) of people who are drawn to integral theory seem to be "on board" with the key assumptions of progressive pedagogies, and, more importantly, seem to be more likely than not to embody what these theories are pointing toward.

Many who have been inspired by a variety of particular progressive pedagogies find their way to the comforting and energizing umbrella of "integral," which supports what they have in common and provides space and perspective on where they differ. Clearly "integral education" is more than the sum of these various theories (or the overlap among them). But it is not always clear exactly what "integral" has to add over and above these other theories. If you ask someone interested in the integral approach to education to describe it the response may not sound very differentiated from other progressive approaches, or it might be a description of other theories peppered with an "integralized" vocabulary, or repackaged in an AQAL model. When the integral approach to education is described in this "old wine in new bottles" fashion, as I have heard it described, especially by those enthusiastic and new to it, its legitimacy in the eyes of experienced educational practitioners, administrators, and theorists is jeopardized.[1] Therefore I think that it is important that those of us who write about or teach integrally-informed pedagogy are able to clearly differentiate it from existing progressive models, and articulate the "value added."

"Integral" can be seen as pointing to four things: a (meta-) *model* or framework (a system of concepts for interpreting the world), a *methodology* (a set of injunctions or principles for inquiring about the world), a *community* (the embodied group or groups of people using integral models and methods), and/or a set of skills or *capacities* (a developmental stage that points past modern and post-modern cultural perspectives, and past formal operational modes of thinking). In this article I will address each of these perspectives on what being integral means, in the context of education.

The central audience for this article are practicing educators and those who work with educators (such as administrators, curriculum designers, educational tool designers, and those who teach teachers) who are using or interested in integral approaches. The article may also be useful for integrally-aware readers in training, coaching, leadership, and other fields involved in intentional learning. My overall goal is to help us clarify, to ourselves and to others unfamiliar with integral theory, who we are, where we come from, and where we seem to be going as "integral educators." I start with a birds-eye overview of key principles of progressive pedagogies, then describe what the integral approach adds to these in terms of a model, a

---

[1] For about 20 years I have participated in instructional technology R&D that applies new learning and cognitive theories to advanced computer learning environments. I have also taught graduate classes and facilitated teacher training workshops that explicitly use constructivist, inquiry-based, and other progressive pedagogies. My entry into the integral theory community about five years ago was motivated by interests in philosophy and systems approaches to the social sciences, not by education per se. I eventually connected with educators drawn to integral theory, and found that for some of them integral theory had been their primary doorway into the wider world of progressive pedagogies. The things that excited them the most about this new "integral" approach can turn out to be principles that are well-established (nothing novel) within progressive educational communities.

methodology, a consciousness, and a community. I discuss integral community in the context of responding to the challenges of realizing the visions of integral education. Along the way I will try to illustrate some elements of the integral approach by applying it "in situ" in my analysis. I assume that the reader has at least a passing familiarity with Ken Wilber's Integral Theory and the AQAL and Spiral Dynamics models (see Wilber, 2006, 2000; Beck & Cowan, 1996).

Integral + Education: Background

Though it is a new/emerging field, much has been written already on integral approaches to education. "Integrative Learning and Action: A Call to Wholeness" (edited by Awbrey, Dana, Miller, Robinson, Ryan, & Scott, 2006) focuses on how aspects of spirituality and "new ways of knowing" can be integrated into education. "Integral Education: Exploring Multiple Perspectives in the Classroom" (edited by Esbjörn-Hargens, Reams, & Gunnlaugson, in press) focuses on higher education and also takes various perspectives on the field as a whole. "Integral Education in Action" (edited by Dea, in preparation) is designed as a more practical (less academic) treatment aimed at practicing K-12 educators. Each of these books contains material that originally began as published articles in journals, conference proceedings, and other venues, so there have been several dozen papers in the field (Moltz, in press, gives an overview of related research studies to date).

For the interested reader, the chapter topics in these books include the theoretical and pragmatic roots of integral approaches to education (Esbjörn-Hargens et al.), case study reports of using integral approaches (all three books), specific advice for the K-12 teacher (Dea, in preparation), and a diversity of theoretical perspectives on integral education (Esbjörn-Hargens et al.).

This article contributes to this evolving inquiry by trying to clarify what integrally informed approaches to education add over and above progressive approaches, as no publication to date has had that specific focus.

Progressive Pedagogies

The mind is not a vessel to be filled, but a fire to be kindled.
(Plutarch, On Listening to Lectures)

Education is an admirable thing, but it is well to remember from time to time that nothing that is worth knowing can be taught.
(Oscar Wilde)

Education, therefore, is a process of living and not a preparation for future living.
(John Dewey, My Pedagogic Creed)

I will start by summarizing what I mean by "progressive" (or reform or alternative) pedagogies and educational approaches.[2] The term is mean to include the works of thinkers such as John Dewy, Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, Rudolf Steiner, Paulo Freire, John Holt, Ivan Illich, Parker Palmer, Maria Montessori, Jerome Bruner, Jack Mezirow, and Howard Gardner, who developed alternative pedagogical theories in response to the perceived deficiencies of traditional institutional education, theories of learning, and social knowledge creation modalities. The theories and models coming out of these educational leaders include constructivism, Montessori schools, Reggio-Emilio schools, Waldorf education, transformative learning, un/de-schooling, and situated learning. It is not my goal here to compare or contrast each of these, but to point to what they share in a general sense, and how one can approach their totality and their differences as a system.

Below I list a number of categories of pedagogical methods, which are each elaborated upon in the Appendix.[3]

- Holism
- Multiple intelligences
- Creativity
- Individuality
- Constructivism
- Developmentalism
- Zone of proximal development
- Meta-learning
- Adaptivity/differentiation
- Learning by doing
- Empowerment and liberation
- Situated learning
- The ethical classroom
- Transformative education
- Community/service-based learning
- Lifelong learning and emergence
- Teacher presence and embodiment
- Participatory curriculum development and research

---

[2] I will use the terms progressive (or integral) "method," "approach," "theory," "principles," "world view," and "pedagogy" rather interchangeably in this article. They all point to more or less the same thing, highlighting different aspects of the thing. (I use the term "framework" only for Wilber's theory.)

[3] Though I personally agree with the importance of all of the principles and value-orientations listed, and even though many of the descriptions in the Appendix are written in prescriptive prose, it is not my intention in this essay to promote or prescribe any of them. In fact, like most educational principles, conclusive empirical proof of the efficacy of these progressive principles does not exist. Though many studies exist and some lend significant support, others are inconclusive or counter-supportive, and "the jury is still out" in terms of having abundant empirical proof. (Alas, this is true of almost every theory in education, therapy, economics, etc. – putting social science theories to work must happen with a humility befitting their limitations.)

The descriptions of these progressive approaches (see Appendix) comprise *theories* of learning (claims about scientific truths), prescriptive *practices*, and educational *values* (claims about how people should act and be treated).[4] Most progressive pedagogical models emphasize a handful of the above principles and values and are compatible with most of the others. While the Appendix simply lists these approaches with an explanation for each, I considered including an analysis that would compare and contrast them and categorize them into themes, but decided against this. Each of these principles points to an entire literature of inter-referencing papers and an entire community of practitioners and scholars, complete with journals and conference meetings. Further, each theory has become the central construct for a world of real practice. Since implementing theories into real educational contexts tends to require fleshing out a wide range of universally encountered concerns, in practice the full articulations of each of these approaches has much overlap with the others.

These progressive approaches cover a wide range of concerns echoed in integral theories:

– Addressing the many aspects of being human: body/mind/emotion/spirit;
– Including multiple holonic orders: the individual, aspects/parts of the individual, the classroom, the wider community and society;
– Allowing for multiple ways of knowing: in terms of "quadrants"– subjective, objective, intersubjective; and types – multiple intelligences, and so-called masculine and feminine modalities;
– Giving full attention to both internal realities (values, visions, feeling, motivations, relationships) and external realities (measurement, action, physical health, educational infrastructure);
– Seeing knowledge in terms of the coordination of perspectives (including critical approaches to knowledge and power, epistemic or meta-knowledge, and dialogic approaches).

As we will see later, though the above illustrates a significant overlap and compatibility between integral and progressive approaches, there are things the integral approach adds (for instance, except for a few exceptions, progressive approaches do not incorporate principles from modern theories of dynamic systems, adult development, or cultural evolution).

If you are a progressive-thinking individual you may find the list of progressive approaches quite appealing and bemoan the fact that public education is so far from these ideals.[5] If you are

---

[4] I do not bother to try to differentiate truth claims from value claims here, though doing so is important in its own right (see Stein, 2008).

[5] The progressive educational principles, models, and value-orientations were developed in a social and cultural context that was critical of mainstream institutional forms of education. In the mirror image of each of the principles is a pointer to some elements of traditional education seen as detrimental, such as: knowledge presented as fragmented bits or in disciplinary silos, inadequately connected to real life practice and concerns; cognitively impoverished metaphors for learning such as the "pipe line" model; rout memorization, teaching to the test, and standardized curricula; hierarchical and oppressive forms of personal and institutional relationships; capitalistic, materialistic, and bureaucratic educational systems (see Feldman, 2008).

a teacher you may be thinking: "how the heck can any one person learn all of those principles – much less *practice* them?"

We will address the challenges of learning progressive (and integral) methods in the last Section, but here we can say that any teacher skilled in progressive pedagogical methods will be implementing a bit of this and a bit of that, and have familiarized themselves with a few but not all of these principles. The massive interconnectedness of these principles means that a skilled teacher might be working in alignment with many of these principles implicitly, as a matter of intuition more than explicit theory-application. It also means that a teacher in training can assimilate the gist of many of the principles simultaneously through mentoring with a skilled practitioner. This is not to say that a full understanding does not come from traditional academic-style study of the theories, from reading texts, taking advanced study classes, and attending conferences. Also, as we will note later, understanding and using progressive vs. traditional modalities (as well as integral modalities) assumes a certain set of developmental competencies.

Where's the "Integral?"

A main theme of this essay is that nothing in the progressive pedagogies listed above points to the uniquely "integral" part of integral education (or what integral theory brings to education). Above I said that integral can be understood as a (meta) model or framework, a methodology, a community, and/or a stage or phase of human development. Below I will explore each of these perspectives on what is integral about integral education.[6]

The section on models will focus on AQAL. The section on methods will mention "methodological pluralism," but also point to epistemic sophistication, and will be illustrated in the succeeding section using polarity mapping methods to coordinate the system of pedagogical principles. The section on integral consciousness includes discussions of second tier developmental capacities and integral consciousness as a state or way of being in the classroom. Then models of cultural and meme evolution are discussed, in part to related traditional, modern, progressive, and integral idea and value systems, and also to warn against the dangers of overusing such models. Finally, I discuss the difficulties in learning/teaching integral pedagogies and integral consciousness, and mention integral communities of practice in this context.

AQAL: A Framework That Transcends and Includes Progressive Pedagogical Principles

> …*Education forms the common mind. Just as the twig is bent, the tree's inclined.*
> (Alexander Pope, Moral Essays, 1735)

---

[6] It is worth noting that while Ken Wilber's Integral Theory (capitalized here) with its AQAL model is by far the most well known and influential integral model, there are many who identify their work with "integral" (not capitalized) who do not primarily base their work on Wilber's work. By integral theory, model, or approach I usually mean the body of work being developed in the greater community of integral theory and practice.

I think people are starved for a truly holistic and genuinely integral approach to the world—in psychology, in spirituality, in politics, in education…[Alternative] education in this country is at a crucial turning point. For several decades the counter-cultural and "new paradigm" thinkers imagined, with good reason, that they were fighting a lonely battle against conventional education. But in the last five years or so, everything has profoundly changed. Mainstream institutions…are now quite open to integral studies…
(Ken Wilber, from Shambhala Publication's "Interview with Ken Wilber")

For many readers "Integral" is, if not synonymous with Ken Wilber's work, strongly identified with it. Though Wilber's work consistently and brilliantly points to postformal, dialectical, metasystematic, and even (I hesitate to use a term so overused in the integral community that its meaning is ambiguous) "non-dual" ways of perceiving the world, Wilber has chosen to frame or package his ideas in terms of a formal-looking model with seemingly precise categories. His AQAL model, which includes the Four Quadrants (or 8 Zones), 8 Developmental Stages or Levels, 3 primary States, and a variety of Types of human capacities, should be familiar to most readers (see Wilber, 2006, for a description). (I assume that Wilber and his associates choose to foreground such a model because its benefits in allowing integral theory to "stick" with wider audience, and appear applicable to a larger range of domains, outweighs the problems (mentioned later) of using formal structures to promote postformal ways of knowing.)

AQAL is a meta-model that can hold within it the full set of progressive education principles, allow them to be compared, and set them in a larger meta-theoretical context. It can be the "kitchen sink" into which all of these ideas are thrown, and, more than being merely a conceptual container, it organizes them and clarifies core elements. Some of the listed principles focus on the understanding and development of internal mental, emotional, or spiritual capacities (the upper left quadrant); some prioritize collaborative, community, or ethical elements (lower left); some emphasize in-the-world action, the creation of artifacts, or physical embodiment (upper right quadrant); and others highlight the systemic factors in classrooms, the institutions of education, or social and political realities (lower right quadrant).[7]

Integral theory explains the massive overlap among the principles. In real systems (including people, groups, and societies) all four quadrants interact. In fact they are four sides of the same coin (if a coin could have 4 sides). The I, We, It, and Its of a system arise and develop simultaneously (they "tetra-emerge"). The four-quadrant model (and Wilber's eight zones or primordial perspectives) can be used as a diagnostic tool for assessing whether there are missing components in an educational situation.

AQAL's exploration of states vs. stages helps teachers in thinking about how to design experiences that induce states of mind that support learning. AQAL's elaboration of distinct lines

---

[7] One could describe the major insights of the integral approach in terms of two elements. The first is a deeper appreciation for and understanding of the *interior dimensions* of reality which have been neglected in many aspects of modernity. The second is in bringing the rigor of systems theory to holistic and transdisciplinary approaches. Systems theory brings insights about *structural complexity*, as in the understanding of systems as nested holons and with co-arising interior, exterior, individual, and collective components; and it adds insights about *dynamic complexity*, which includes the evolutionary and developmental perspectives so central to the integral approach.

and levels of development, types of intelligence, and states of mind (or consciousness) together incorporate the intuitions articulated in theories of multiple intelligences and the holistic approaches to mind, body, emotion, and spirit. This helps the educator avoid over-emphasizing any particular learning modality or pedagogical theory. In a later Section I examine the merits of evolutionary, developmental, and systems-theory approaches, which are central to AQAL and all integral approaches.

Upper Left (I)	**Upper Right (It)**
Educational Experiences	*Educational Behavior*
Contemplative Critical Somatic	Skillful Practical Active
Lower Left (You, We)	**Lower Right (Its)**
Educational Culture	*Educational Systems*
Connective Perspectival Ethical	Ecological Social Global

Figure 1. Esbjörn-Hargens' Twelve Commitments of Integral Education

As an example of how the AQAL map can illuminate and organize educational themes, consider Sean Esbjörn-Hargens' (2007) table of "Twelve Commitments of Integral Education." It illustrates what he calls the "essential dimensions of an integral approach to education" by situating a mind, body, and spirit element in each of AQAL's four quadrants. The table describes twelve "forms of engagement…modes of interaction [and/or] ways of knowing the world."

Integral Methodology: Perspectives, Knowledge Building, and Dialog

Education is the journey from cocksure arrogance to thoughtful uncertainty.
(Kevin Huenison)

Education would be much more effective if its purpose were to ensure that by the time they leave school every student should know how much they don't know, and be imbued with a lifelong desire to know it.
(William Haley)

The AQAL model is as limited as it is powerful – in fact some of its limitations are *because* it is so powerful. It can trick one into thinking that it represents an accurate picture of reality when in fact, like all models, it is one interpretation of reality, presenting one way to categorize the elements of one's experience and understanding. When one tries to use it in complex real-life situations one sees that surrounding its clear and insight-producing distinctions are grey areas, square pegs one is forcing into round holes, and a diversity of opinions about the exact meaning

and implication of the model's categories (these difficulties come unavoidably with any conceptual system). Wilber entreats us not to "confuse the map for the territory," yet assuming that reality reflects our constructs instead of the other way around is an ingrained human tendency difficult to avoid.

The integral approach (as articulated by Wilber and many others) provides something deeper than a categorical framework within which to neatly organize one's untidy reality: it suggests a certain attitude for how one can approach knowing, conceptualizing, and theorizing. It suggests not so much what *is* true about the world but *how* people can work together to discover what is most true, just, and useful in a particular context (i.e., it includes an epistemology as well as an ontology). This method or way of thinking is not as well-defined as the AQAL model, so the description of it will be something we circle around and weave through, rather than a crisp diagram of a model.

There is an increasing acknowledgement that in the modern context education should involve not only the learning of "content," i.e. information and specific skills, but also the learning of more general ("higher order") skills and knowledge. Among these are "learning how to learn," i.e. self-directed learning that reflects upon what one should be learning and how the learning process is going, and "epistemic" (or meta-) knowledge, i.e. some understanding of how knowledge is arrived at and the limitations of knowledge (Schoenfeld, 1985; Mayer, 1998). The integral approach requires this type of meta-level perspective on knowledge, method, learning, and doing.

The relevant modern (or postmodern) insights about knowledge include:

− *Complexity.* Many aspects of the world are highly complex. We need concepts from systems theory (such as co-evolution, chaos, non-linearity, and self-organization) to understand (1) the world in general; and (2) educational and learning processes in particular (Reigeluth, 2008).

− *Meta-perspectives.* For citizens to address the complex problems of modern society, educators must help learners develop higher level skills such as meta-cognition (thinking about thinking), meta-knowledge (knowledge about the nature and limitations of knowledge), meta-learning (learning how to learn), meta-dialog (dialog about how we engage in dialog). (See more in Murray, 2008.)

− *Knowledge as personal.* Knowledge, understanding, and "truths" are, at least in most instances, constrained by the world view, experiences, biases, perspective, developmental level, etc. of the speaker and listener (Polanyi, 1962).

− *Multi-methdology.* Different methods of observing (or inquiry or experimentation) lead to different conclusions or claims. Different disciplines tend to use different methodologies, leading to different conclusions about a phenomena. Each of these conclusions can be seen as valid perspectives on a complex reality, as opposed to opposing camps battling for the truth (Norgaard, 1989).

– *Indeterminism.* Terms, concepts, rules, models and theories all have a certain degree of "indeterminacy," i.e. fuzziness, uncertainty, or ambiguity in their meaning (Murray, 2006). It is often important to pay attention to the grey areas at the boundaries of seemingly precise categories or rules (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Mervis & Rosch, 1981).

– *Negotiation, ethics, and power.* Knowledge is constructed, or "negotiated," via communicative processes situated in authentic contexts. Truth-finding is an evolutionary process requiring dialog (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Habermas, 1998). Knowledge also has important moral/ethical aspects (Habermas, 1999; Kögler, 1992). The quality of knowledge building outcomes can depend on how carefully the knowledge building process pays attention to elements such as freedom, equality, empathy, sincerity, inclusivity, reciprocity, integrity and mutual regard.

How does a learner, "knowledge worker," or educator deal with the added levels of complexity and indeterminacy that come when she begins to acknowledge these insights? An additional set of methods are needed.

All of the insights listed above fall into what one could call a post-modern or progressive understanding and world view. As mentioned above, what I am listing under progressive blends into what I am calling an integral level (– as one example of the "indeterminacy" involved in creating categories). What constitutes the difference? For me, *progressive* involves identifying and describing the problems with traditional modes, leading to a critical attitude that is suspect of all claims and perspectives. It involve a discerning analysis about the nature of the problem(s), but for dealing productively with the problem it gives only vague advice or ends with acceptance or despair that things are so complex, unknowable, subjective, etc. An *integral* perspective, while not pretending to any easy or complete fix, does more to understand the nature of complexity itself, the nature of indeterminacy itself, and the nature of subjectivity itself, and is able to use this higher level of understanding to improve upon the situation.

If every perspective is like a lens or filter which distorts perception and inference, then we can correct for these distortions *to the extent* that we understand something about the lens or filter itself (turning subject into object, as Kegan frames it). At the integral level one is not only learning and using a set of pedagogies, but adopting a critical (and "appreciative") meta-perspective on those pedagogies. One is also noticing how one's *self* (including one's values and assumptions) fits into the system of teacher-applying-pedagogy-within-an-educational-system.

Returning to the theme of integral as a method or practice, many integral-level methods have been suggested for dealing with the issues (insights or problems) listed above. I will describe a few approaches:

Methodological Pluralism. There are many types of perspectives on any situation, and getting a usable handle on something requires looking at it from multiple angles. Wilber has said "everyone is right," to indicate that all sincere perspectives and modes of inquiry, while fallible and limited, have something valid to offer. This "methodological pluralism" (Wilber, 2005; Murray, 2008; Norgaard, 1989; and see Feyerabend, 1975) is a multi-

methodological approach to scientific inquiry.[8] It includes a more precise understanding of the appropriate application of a range of methodologies (including objective scientific methods, subjective phenomenological methods, and intersubjective hermeneutic methods), the types of knowledge claims that each method can and can't make, and the relationships and synergies between them for mixed-method approaches.

Indeterminacy analysis. One can do more than simply acknowledge that concepts, models, and theories have limitations and involve fuzzy (or subjective or context relative) meanings. When one proposes a model, makes a claim, and uses a concept one can analyze how it degrades at its fuzzy boundaries. For example, if one uses the concepts like "holon" or "sentient" or "progressive" to construct clear categories, rules, or models, one can explain (even if parenthetically) how the claim changes under different possible interpretations of the central categories. This could include mentioning examples far from the central meanings (see Murray, 2006).

Polarity mapping is one method for dealing with the polarities, paradoxes, and dynamic nonlinearities found in everyday decision making. It is described and used in the next Section. (See also Murray et al., 2008 "Tools for Dealing with Uncertainty, Ambiguity, and Paradox.")

Methods related to ethical factors. Many processes exist for dialog and decision making that incorporate and value the inclusion of multiple voices and perspectives – to list them is beyond our scope here. Also, many knowledge building or inquiry methods contain both critical/analytical elements and dialogical/ethical elements. Elbow (2008) advocates balancing critical thinking ("the doubting game") with systematic or methodological believing ("the believing game"). He points out how critical thinking is often used as a tool to defend one's cherished beliefs, and suggests that we earn the right to doubt only after making an effort to enter into the other's world view (a skill also called "cognitive empathy"). Gaining a distance on one's strongly held beliefs is an exercise (exorcise?) involving ego. If one delves further into it, this also involves dealing with shadow elements. The integral community is familiar with many methods for gaining perspective on and loosening the grip of ego (for example contemplative practices) and shedding light on shadow elements (for example see the 3-2-1 Shadow Process in Wilber, Patten, Leonard, & Morelli, 2008).

There is space here to give only the few above examples of methods that are compatible with or implied by the integral approach to knowledge and education. The main point is that an integral approach should include methodological ways to deal with the problems in knowledge, indeterminacy, power, etc. noted above. Such methods should value and systematically incorporate multiple subjective, objective, and intersubjective perspectives.

---

[8] The AQAL model also describes a methodology called "Integral Methodological Pluralism" which basically advocates that a robust inquiry into a phenomena will include all or most of "eight primordial perspectives" based on the four quadrants (Wilber, 2006). Esbjörn-Hargens (2007) includes a description of applying the eight perspectives to educational research.

In the Fourth Grade?

The above descriptions may sound rather sophisticated, esoteric and philosophical. Indeed, as we will discuss later, fully working at an integral level requires a certain level of developmental skills. However, even though these skills mature later in life, they begin to develop early in life, and educators can do much to nurture this developmental process at all ages and stages. Let us briefly consider at how the philosophically rich issues and methods mentioned above can be simplified and brought into a fourth grade classroom. Imagine that the students are working collaboratively to research what to do on a school trip to Washington D.C. They gather information from diverse sources and have facilitated classroom discussions to decide upon (1) what is the case (e.g. how much gas will cost) and (2) what should be done (e.g. whether to stay at a campground or hotel).

If the activity is facilitated well, students can be learning: that knowledge is complex and perspectival; that knowledge has subjective (what I think), objective (what Wikipedia says), and intersubjective (what we all agree upon) facets; that words and rules may not have one single meaning and can be interpreted differently in different contexts; that biases and assumptions are hidden in beliefs and preferences; and that it takes a triangulation of different perspectives and inquiry methods to arrive at an adequate understanding or solution. It is not hard to imagine a teacher fashioning simplistic forms of Integral Methodological Pluralism, Polarity Mapping, contemplative practices, the Believing Game, and even indeterminacy analysis that apply to this age group.

Three Ways to Use Integral (or Progressive) Methods

I will mention three levels at which one can apply integral (or progressive) methods and models. First, one can teach them *explicitly*. That is, the students know that they are learning and using, for example, "the AQAL model" or "systems theory" or "the Believing Game." Second, teachers can learn these methods and models and use them *implicitly*. They can bring their knowledge of integral (or progressive) methods and models to bear in designing and running educational activities without explicitly mentioning these models or methods to students. In this case *teacher educators* would be facilitating teachers in learning these methods and models. Third, administrators, curriculum designers, or teacher educators can use integral (or progressive) methods and models to design the materials or environment that teachers work within.[9] Here teachers (and secondarily students) are benefiting from these methods and models without necessarily having learned them. These three levels are possible when teaching young learners, adults, and also for teaching teachers.

The point here is that integral (or progressive) methods and models can have a strong impact even if the student, or teacher, is not aware that they are being used. As we discuss later, integral is as much a type of consciousness or awareness as it is a set of models or methods. An integral

---

[9] In addition, we can differentiate methods and models that were *designed* through integral consciousness from those that require integral consciousness to *understand* and adopt. It takes a higher level of development to conceive of and design a professional development program for, for example, constructivist pedagogy, than the level of development required to understand and implement constructivism in a classroom.

learning environment might have an indefinable but recognizable look and feel, or texture of breadth and depth. It has been argued that people who work or learn under the implicit umbrella of a world view, milieu, approach, or type of consciousness will implicitly assimilate some of that world view or consciousness. I propose that when students or teachers are immersed in curricular, social, or administrative environments that are integrally informed, that the seeds of integral consciousness are being planted and nurtured.

Returning to the list of 18 progressive pedagogies mentioned above, we can see that integral suggests a way to deliberate *about* these approaches. Though up to now I have emphasized the overlap and compatibility of these principles, there are real differences among these principles. Next I will illustrate one of the methods mentioned above: Polarity Mapping. It will also serve as an example of an aspect of integral *consciousness* (covered in the following Section), incorporating skill in dealing with complexity and apparent paradox.

Progressive Pedagogies as a Dynamic System of Principles

I believe that school makes complete fools of our young men, because they see and hear nothing of ordinary life there.
(Petronius, Satyricon)

[Public education is] the single most important element in the maintenance of a democratic system...The better the citizenry as a whole are educated, the wider and more sensible public participation, debate and social mobility will be...The most difficult and the most valuable is a well-educated populace.
(John Ralston Saul, Doubter's Companion: A Dictionary of Aggressive Common Sense)

The difficulty is the perception that [one is] dealing with a problem that can be solved by choosing either one or the other...fear of getting stuck in the opposite pole gets you stuck in your own pole...paradoxically, opposition becomes a resource.
(Barry Johnson, Polarity Management)

We already applied an integral sort of methodology above when we focused on utilizing the grains of truth in each principle ("they are all right"), mentioned how they tended to mutually support each other, and saw them as a complex system or dense meshwork of co-defining ideas. We can continue by shifting focus from the commonalities to the *differences*. Each principle emphasizes a particular theoretical perspective or value – they are ideals. Over-emphasizing any one principle or value may cause another to be minimized. Practical applications require tradeoffs and balancing acts. We can use "polarity mapping" (see *Polarity Management*, Johnson, 1996) to explore this situation. Here are some of the polarities or dialectical tensions within our set of progressive pedagogies:

- *Self-determination vs. helpful hierarchy*. There is a polarity between student empowerment and discovery vs. the need for teachers to skillfully employ guidance, limitations, expertise, and leadership. Traditional schools often underestimate learners' abilities to self-steer their learning experiences, but how far into the background does the teacher step?

– *Individual freedom vs. group needs*. There is a polarity between methods that focus on the individual student (meeting her needs, giving her a voice, supporting her autonomy, respecting her complex personal history) vs. methods that emphasize the group, the community, and caring about the needs of others. Sometimes a student's needs must go unmet for the greater good of the class. But at what level does that approach become oppressive?

– *Equality vs. special treatment*. There is a polarity between the desire to treat all students equally vs. the fact that students have a range of capacities and motivations. Should the most capable and motivated students be given extra resources? Should the most underprivileged students be given extra resources? If yes to both, where does this leave the middle?

– *Support vs. challenge*. There is a polarity between acknowledging the wonderfulness of every impulse and creative product that a student produces, supporting self-esteem and learning enjoyment, vs. the benefits of challenging him by providing cognitive or emotional disequilibrium. When and how does one tell a student that he is wrong, needs improvement, or is not stepping up to his potential?

– *Creativity vs. rigor*. There is a polarity between supporting creativity, play, and intuition, vs. teaching logic, critical thinking, rigor, and discernment. Both can be taught, but in any given activity or course one may be highlighted at the expense of the other.

– *Process vs. product*. Progressive pedagogy stresses learning to learn, higher order thinking skills, and the importance of good problem solving reasoning over getting the right answer. But usable knowledge must include some amount of "facts" and memorized procedures; real world performance often needs the "right" or "best" solution. How should education balance these poles?

– *Change vs. stability*. Progressive pedagogy values adaptation, dynamic flow, and customization. Yet to some degree people flourish when they are given clear stable constraints, rules, and/or boundaries. How predictable should the classroom experience, including teacher expectations, be for students?

– *Cognitive (mind) vs. social and affective (heart)*. Developing wisdom includes developing capacities of both heart and mind, and their skillful interpenetration. But in designing curriculum or activities priorities must often be made to focusing primarily on content and cognitive skills vs. social/emotional skills. In addition the educator must decide how these priorities influence her methods of evaluation, grading, and feedback (e.g. what type of evaluation and feedback to give to the student who tries hard and is a good team player, yet fails to grasp key subject matter concepts).

Now, in many situations the dichotomies described above are imaginary in the sense that the human needs that seem to be in conflict are in fact not, and there is an elegant solution that can satisfy both sides. However, these polarities are also real, in that real life decisions will often unavoidably benefit one side of the equation at the cost of the other. The perennial advice around

such polarities is true: that practical application involves balance and compromise, and a forswearing of ideology and dogmas, even progressive dogmas. Postformal, integral, or "dialectical" consciousness can take us a bit further still. (Note that the above polarities are *within* the set of progressive pedagogies. As we discuss later, there are additional polarities to be mapped/managed/balanced when we include a full spectrum of traditional, modern, progressive, and integral pedagogies).

As described in polarity mapping theory, opposing poles of some situations are interdependent and mutually defining, rather than either/or choices or opposite ends of a spectrum (Johnson, 1996). Effective learning environments need change *and* stability, creativity *and* rigor, support *and* challenge, etc. Moreover, real systems are dynamic, so that a working solution at one point it time may not apply later. Let us say a teacher correctly evaluates a situation and decides to move in the direction of supporting more creativity (vs. rigor). After they begin to do so they will not know how *far* to go in that direction until they have gone a bit *too* far and the downsides of creativity and the importance of rigor start to come alive. Even if they find a perfect balance, when they move on to the next topic in the curriculum, or accept that additional student who just moved into town, or when the warm winds of spring start to blow through the winterized classroom windows, the appropriate balance point will shift.[10]

The solution is the development of a "dialectical intelligence" that is capable of constant (or frequent) assessment and awareness of the situation and flexible adaptation (Basseches, 1984). This includes an understanding of the dynamic tensions between the polarities and a perception of the whole as a dynamic system. This skill is one element of what we are calling "integral consciousness" or "second tier capacity."

Integral Consciousness

To teach is to touch the heart and impel it to action.
(Louis Sullivan, Kindergarten Chats and Other Writings)

We teach who we are…Good teaching comes from good people.
(Parker Palmer, The Courage to Teach)

Like progressive pedagogies, the integral approach has some roots in the Human Potential Movement (and in Humanism more broadly; see Hampson, in press). Both approaches (a) value multiple "lines" of human capacities and needs, (b) acknowledge how each person has a unique set of them, and (c) speak to the possibility of more fully realizing these capacities and needs. Yet unlike most of the progressive pedagogies, the integral approach draws heavily from both developmental theories and transpersonal psychology (with some clear exceptions indicated in the descriptions in the Appendix). From developmental theories we gain an appreciation not only of the abilities and limitations of *students* according to their developmental profiles, but we also

---

[10] In addition, just introducing a pedagogical change will affect the classroom system in unpredictable ways. A teacher takes a measurement of the class, compares it to some goal, sets a bearing in some direction and implements the change. But as soon as the change is implemented the landscape changes and both the measurement and the bearing are uncertain (in a type of social Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle; and see Reigeluth, 2008).

gain an appreciation of the developmental requirements that the integral approach places upon *teachers* (in general, and upon oneself). From transpersonal psychology and its humanist and spiritualist threads (including "transformational learning"), we gain a valuing of the psychological and spiritual wholeness and adeptness of the individual teacher (which is itself developmental).

As mentioned in the introduction "integral" points to a capacity (a level of skill development also called Second Tier by Wilber, and closely related to Kegan's Fifth Order Consciousness) as well as a model and a methodology. In fact the most complete or appropriate application of the integral models and methods described above *requires* a certain developmental capacity.

Progressive teacher educators tend to realize that learning new methods requires personalized mentoring, patience, and the trial and error of extended practice. But still they are often befuddled by the difficulty some have in learning progressive methods. They may attribute it to a stylistic bent, or a learning (or communication) personality type, or cognitive type, or a deficit in "the system." However, though they have some appreciation of how constructivist and developmental principles apply to children, there is usually a lack of appreciation for the importance of (and limitations imposed by) adult development (along cognitive, epistemological, dialectical, social, and self lines). Thus, in strongly emphasizing adult developmental and transformational themes, the integral approach has much to add to progressive approaches. In this section I will describe some characteristics of integral or second tier consciousness as this developmental level applies to education. In a later section I will discuss more about the challenges in supporting practicing educators to develop this type of awareness.

Caveats Regarding Developmental Lines and Levels.

Before going further I need to back up and offer some caveats about the constructs of developmental "lines" and "levels" (or stages), constructs which appear prominently within the integral community. Both are approximate constructs that only roughly point to the complex phenomena that is human capacity and development. For example, even though for explanatory purposes I refer to Traditional, Progressive, and Integral pedagogies, these categories are fuzzy, and many of the principles indicated in our list of progressive methods reach well up into integral.

Regarding lines, some theorists hold that the sorts of developmental lines discussed in integral theory are largely artificial constructs, and that human skills/capacities do not form along neatly differentiated lines.[11] We speak, for example, of dialectical, emotional, epistemological, social,

---

[11] Kurt Fischer, a leading developmental theorist, claims that skills develop (both genetically/phylogenetically and developmentally/ontogenetically) in response to the demands of real life task situations. He claims that "the skill level that a person displays…cannot be considered independently of the context in which that skill is assessed" [and also the context in which it was learned and the task the skill is meant to address] (Fischer & Farrar, 1987, p. 647). Some primitive human skills such as those dealing with reproduction, eating, and territory, seem to operate fairly independently of each other because the task situations or life-needs they address are relatively independent as well. Very specific and independent tasks also give rise to well-defined skills. But complex human social tasks/contexts such as teaching, communication, parenting, and leadership have massively overlapping characteristics such that

ego, and moral developmental "lines," but the capacities referred to have significant overlap, the distinctions being necessary evils to facilitate collective inquiry into the phenomena.

Regarding levels, though research shows that development tends to progress in waves (rather than linear progressions) that involve sub-stages of horizontal differentiation or accommodation followed by sub-stages of synthesis, generalization, or integration, these are observed rigorously only in tracking specific skills.[12] More encompassing levels like those referred to in Spiral Dynamics or Kegan's Orders of Consciousness contain many interacting skills (or lines), each developed at its own level, so assigning one single level to an individual is, though sometimes useful, also problematic. I will say more about the limitations of cultural value meme levels in a later section.

Give all of these caveats, the concept of general levels of development has significant explanatory and theoretical power. Just as it is useful to speak of traditional vs. progressive worldviews and ways of knowing, the concept of integral or second tier capacity points in a general way to an important territory of human capacity.

Aspects of Integral Consciousness

So what *is* this Integral Consciousness or Second Tier Capacity, and how does it relate to education?[13] Though there is no concise definition of these terms, the literature points to several aspects of this broadly defined stage of development.

Developmentalists have found that learning involves not only the accumulation and coordination of knowledge and skills, but a progression of qualitatively different relationships to, and capacities for, learning and meaning making. There exists a plethora of developmental models mapping various interrelated sets of developmental capacities (Wilber, 2000b compares some of them, as does Harris, 2002). I will draw from Robert Kegan's model, focusing on his "Fifth Order Consciousness," which has significant overlap with the concept of second tier thinking, and was derived from empirical studies.

Kegan (1994) describes five such "orders of consciousness." The progressive/alternative/reform/holistic pedagogies mentioned in this article are associated with Kegan's Fourth Order (and reach into his Fifth Order). Integral approaches are more centrally Fifth Order. Applied to the domain of education, learners at Kegan's Fourth Order are "self-directed" (or self-authoring, co-creative) learners who can examine themselves and their culture,

---

the skills developed to meet these needs should be expected to be equally interdependent and difficult to separate.

[12] These sub-stages also involve a dialectical oscillation between stable comfortable states and states of un-constituting and reconstituting disequilibrium.

[13] Steve McIntosh has published a book titled "Integral Consciousness" (2007). Though the book makes important contributions in several areas, I will not use it in this discussion because its use of "consciousness" is more about what one believes and values than about human skills and capacities. For McIntosh integral consciousness about an "integral worldview…a way of seeing and living [arising] from an enlarged set of values framed by an expanded understanding of cultural evolution" (p. 12). This sense of being integral is discussed more in my Section on "Cultural Evolution."

develop critical thinking and individual initiative, and take responsibility for their learning and productivity (p. 303). At full Fourth Order consciousness, individuals will have mastered skills such as these and, in the process, are likely to become advocates of such skills and be identified with them, believing that this level of skill is superior to others. Typically they will have practiced and identified with one or a small number of progressive schools of thought (from the many listed in the Appendix).

At Kegan's Fifth Order individuals begin to reflect upon whole belief systems, even their own Fourth Order beliefs, as limited and indeterminate systems. They begin to dis-identify with any particular belief system, and experience themselves as embodying a variety of evolving belief systems, surfacing in different contexts. Questions of "who am I" "what do I believe" "what is true" and "what is right" cease to have one best or optimal answer ("it depends!"). Rather than responding to situations by looking for optimal or "win-win solutions" (a Fourth Order approach), Fifth Order individuals see themselves as co-evolving constituents of each situation, and expect a problem situation or dilemma to transform *them* (they may continue to search for an adequate solution or approach to a problem—each developmental level transcends *and includes* prior ones, as Wilber notes).

Wilber and Beck & Cowan describe this "second tier" level of development as one in which individuals develop a working understanding of the developmental process itself and see the value of all developmental levels (all world-view systems) as coexisting within themselves (and others).

Kegan's model maps the interweaving development among cognitive (it), interpersonal (we) and intrapersonal (I) capacities.[14] Cook-Grueter's (2000) developmental framework describes second tier capacities called construct-awareness and ego-awareness, which are closely related to Kegan's cognitive and intrapersonal lines. In addition, Wilber's AQAL theory posits a systemic "its" perspective (or quadrant) in addition to the objective (it), intersubjective (we), and subjective (I) perspectives. Thus, I propose the following model for integral (or second tier) consciousness:[15]

  – *Construct* aware (cognitive; "It" dimension),
  – *Systems* aware ("Its" dimension; also a cognitive capacity, but reflecting on systems and networks of relationships as opposed to mental constructs),
  – *Ego* aware (self/ego/will and being/spirit/essence; "I" dimension), and
  – *Relationally* aware (emotional/social/ethical/interpersonal intelligence; "We" dimension).

---

[14] Also, though each developmental line influences the others at all levels, it would seem that at higher levels they become more blended or merged. There are clear implications for ego/will development implied in cognitive and emotional/social development at higher levels. Both coming to grips with the limitations of one's mind and opening to wider circles of compassion work to moderate the overactive ego.

[15] This four part model is offered as a rhetorical aid rather than a theoretical model—it covers the range of capacities I will refer to better than the other models cited. Being systems-aware is not strictly about Wilber's 4th quadrant, it is about perceiving systemic and meta-systemic relationships within and between all aspects (and all quadrants) of a situation.

I will only briefly describe each of these capacities here. Both the construct-aware and the systems-aware capacities are cognitively oriented and will be lumped together in much of what follows. One way to describe the cognitive skill spectrum is that it comprises a movement further and further away from linear black-and-white thinking, toward more sophisticated and nuanced modes of reasoning. This includes a deeper understanding or wider perspective on the function of language and thought itself. The developmental literature mentions three overlapping skills that, described below, can help understand second tier cognitive development.

Construct-awareness (Cook-Greuter, 2005) is basically what was described above as a flexible approach to the uncertainties, ambiguities, and paradoxes of concepts, language, and knowledge (it is closely related to what has been called dialectical intelligence (Basseches, 1984) and epistemic wisdom (Murray, 2008)). It is needed for integral-level methodologies such as the polarity mapping method described above. Cook-Greuter describes it as "becoming aware of the profound splits and paradoxes inherent in rational though [in which] good and evil, life and death, beauty and ugliness may now appear as two sides of the same coin."[16] *Metasystematic reasoning* refers to an ability to flexibly coordinate multiple whole systems of ideas (Commons & Richards, 1984; Ross, 2005). It is "meta"-systematic because it goes beyond the capacity to conceptualize and work systematically with ideas and within a system of ideas, to being able to move among and perceive reality through (or by coordinating) multiple systems of ideas. *Vision logic* refers to the ability to use forms of reasoning that are beyond formal logic and systematic thought (Feuerstein on Gebser, 1987). This includes reasoning *about* logic and its limitations, and also flexibly and intentionally tapping into more intuitive, unconscious, or "gestalt" ways of thinking (Keat's called it "negative capability").

Ego-awareness is easier to explain using non-technical language (Kegan's model highlights ego development and Cook-Greuter's model focuses on ego development). Cook-Grueter (2005) describes it thus: "This is the first time in development that the ego becomes transparent to itself. Final knowledge about the self or anything else is seen as illusive and unattainable through effort and reason because all conscious thought, all cognition is recognized as constructed and, therefore, split off from the underlying, cohesive, non-dual truth." Social/emotional "intelligence" is a significant aspect of integral consciousness, and in this model is implied as part of both ego-awareness and relational awareness.[17] *Relational awareness* will be explored more in the next section.

Being an Integral Teacher

Embodying integral consciousness may not be as mysterious, sophisticated, or esoteric as it sounds. This inner capacity is touched when a teacher finds herself in a bit of a "pickle" in the

---

[16] Construct awareness also calls one to become "post-metaphysical" and avoid the "myth of the given" by loosening the grip that concepts, ideals, and models hold over one when one oversimplifies and distorts one's perception of reality to make it fit those concepts, ideals, or models. Integral consciousness includes coming to understand how one's own mind works, and perceiving one's thought patterns, beliefs, and shadow material as objects of awareness and inquiry.

[17] Kegan & Lahey (2009) and Goleman (2006) discuss the critical importance of social/emotional intelligence in real life situations, and how cognitive and social/emotional intelligences inter-penetrate and inter-depend.

classroom, for example, when two students are unable to work well together, and she is about to respond in her usual way, but then decides to pause, becomes quite inside and asks "OK, what is really called for here? What is the best for this class and for me right now?" – and then receives a quiet but sure insight about this social and interpersonal system that comes with that "aha!" sense of relief and confidence about what to do. This level of development also involves a way of being "with the flow" of life in which one can be consistently committed to concepts, values, and relationships, but also be able to gently and cleanly let go, listen deeply, and adapt when reality does not meet one's expectations or desires.

As the above indicates, higher levels of personal development point not only to sophisticated or "higher" capacities, but to increased *depth of being* (related to ego-awareness). This involves being in touch with deep sources of self-knowing, intuition, empathy, compassion, and presence that is associated with wisdom and transpersonal modes of awareness. Otto Scharmer (2007) suggests that when one releases one's cognitive preconceptions and emotional attachments and settles into a state of open awareness and presence, one can unleash powerful potentials for creativity and growth.

The development toward these forms of wisdom involves an increasing ability to step outside of oneself and one's emotions, biases, and attachments. Such development along the "self" or "ego" line is implicated in all ethical/moral systems (including religions). It is not difficult to appreciate the importance of being able to put one's ego aside and have some sort of objective perspective on it when operating in a classroom, parent-teacher conference, or teachers' lounge. (For a more in-depth treatment of integral consciousness as a way of being in the classroom, see Chapters by Willow Dea and John Gruber in Dea, in preparation.)

This picture of integral consciousness is as much about a teacher's *state* while in the classroom as her *stage* of development. But finding consistent access to such states and understanding how to make the most of them implies a certain developmental stage. These states/stages of higher wisdom imply a certain ease, generosity, and humility that is usually developed in the course of life's challenges, as indicated in the following section.

Regular Old Consciousness

An obvious question is: "how does an educator interested in self-development move toward these capacities we are calling integral consciousness?" Later I mention the suggestions being investigated in the integral community, but here I will say something about a state we could call "regular old consciousness." So-called "integral consciousness" and related advanced levels of skill and states of awareness might be great to have, but with all of us there is much to be gained by noting what keeps us from being "normally" aware, alive, and intelligent in the classroom. Think about those days when you are relaxed and confident, enjoying your work, feeling connected to students and peers, knowing that your thinking is not clouded by emotional reactions, exhaustion, distractions, or worries. Gosh, that sounds good, doesn't it?

First, we can say that achieving a more sustained and sustainable degree of this "normal for a good day" (NFAGD) consciousness is more important and more achievable in the classroom context than working toward anything that sounds highly developed, super-sophisticated, or

spiritually advanced.[18] Second, sustaining NFAGD consciousness is both a prerequisite for developing higher level capacities, and also implicates many of the same methods of practice. So working on sustained NFAGD consciousness is in many ways being on the exact same path as developing integral or second-tier capacities. Human development is a pretty natural process, as well as a very gradual one. It requires adequate *support*, which includes just minimizing the stuff that gets in the way of NFAGD, and sufficient *challenge*, which practicing educators don't have to worry about having – what could be more challenging than teaching?

Working on NFAGD consciousness is in part about horizontal development, leaning more deeply and consistently into existing skills, and in part about the work of healing, remediating, or tuning prior developmental levels.

Cultural Evolution and Individual Development

I have argued that blame, scolding, and punishment in public schools…can be successfully defended. Students have a duty to learn, and can be held responsible for violating whatever rules, policies, or instructions are enforced to ensure that they do so.
(Charles Howell - Education, Punishment, and Responsibility)

No use to shout at them to pay attention. If the situations, the materials, the problems before the child do not interest him, his attention will slip off to what does interest him, and no amount of exhortation of threats will bring it back.
(John Holt)

A bad teacher punishes, a poor teacher complains, an average teacher explains, a good teacher teaches, a great teacher inspires.
(H. Narasimhaiah)

I have described the integral approach in terms of both models and methods, and have noted that in a very general sense embodying the integral approach requires a certain developmental level of consciousness or capacity in several interrelated areas (including cognitive, relational, and ego). Integral theories point not only to a particular developmental level but also address developmental processes across an individual's life. They also strongly refer to the evolution of human capacities, values, and world-views (or cultural memes) through history. As this focus on individual development and cultural evolution is strong in integral approaches and is rarely seen in progressive approaches, I will go into it in a bit more detail in this section.

There are dozens of theories of human development and cultural evolution that integral theorists draw upon, and, in assuming the reader has some familiarity with one or more of them, my goal here is not to describe any of these in detail, but to summarize some of the main

---

[18] Discussion in the integral community tends to highlight vertical development (through successive stages), but there is also a high value placed on horizontal development. Development can not be rushed. Developmental theorists advise teachers and learners that at each developmental step individuals need plenty of time and practice to assimilate new skills and expand their scope to of application.

principles they share in noting what integral theory has to add over progressive educational approaches.[19]

In the prior Section I described development in terms of three general threads of development: cognitive, ego (/self/will), and relational (emotional/social/ethical/interpersonal). Here, as a way to further clarify integral consciousness, I will describe the developmental path as is passes from traditional/conventional through progressive into integral/second tier. We will see how each of these three threads has a particular character related to reflective understanding and humility.

Development as a Path Through Disequilibrium and Humility

In the *cognitive* domain, one develops the capacity to understand increasingly complex situations, perceiving more subtle patterns, more diverse alternatives, and more abstract concepts. But at some point understanding becomes limited to how well one understands the instrument of understanding, the mind itself, including the fallible nature of concepts and generalities and the many ways that reason is unavoidably biased (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Wittgenstein, 1953; Murray, 2006). At first this leads to a profound dissonance as the foundations of certainty in knowing are shaken. Eventually one comes to an acceptance and appreciation of the limitations of one's knowing, and in so doing develops the skills in uncertainty, ambiguity, and paradox mentioned above.

In the *relational* domain, development progresses in several ways: an increasing awareness of one's emotional state and how it affects one's thinking; a deeper skill in empathy (and the imaginative capacity to put ourselves in another's shoes); and a widening understanding of the vulnerability-imbued interdependencies of social interactions. As this happens, the sphere of who one identifies with and has compassion for extends ever further out, allowing for, for example, compassion for one's "enemies" or those living lifestyles very distant from and different than one's own. This leads to a second form of profound dissonance. As one opens to the pain and suffering of wider circles of relationship, one can become over-sensitized and immobilized in situations that require difficult choices and compromises. Eventually one develops the emotional resilience and wisdom to make choices for the good of the whole (or the highest good, as one estimates it) even though a decision will cause some to experience pain or discomfort. One also develops the wisdom to (partially) discern how one's own assumptions or projections onto a situation cloud how one perceives the experience of others (that is, one's own unresolved psychological issues can lead one to draw faulty conclusions that others are suffering or are not suffering). This type of development focuses and purifies social and ethical actions.

---

[19] Except for the application of theories of childhood development (and the general understanding that learners construct their knowledge) there is scant application of the insights of evolutionary and developmental theories to the pedagogical principles generally accepted by progressive educators (in the Appendix). The notion that evolutionary or developmental history adds significantly to an understanding of the human condition seems obvious to integralists but it is only in the last century or two that the concept has found roots, and it is still a long way from being fully appreciated (Pinker, 1997). Some psychologists, scientists, and philosophers are still developing elaborate theories of how and why phenomena such as learning, motivation, or socio-political forces in educational systems operate without acknowledging that these phenomena owe much to evolutionary and developmental forces.

In the domain of *ego* development progresses from impulsivity through compliance with social conventions, and then into self-authoring where one increasingly becomes the master of one's beliefs, values, goals, body, and relationships. But again, at some point a dissonance is reached. One can only exercise so much control over one's life, one's body, and even one's thought processes and beliefs. One becomes awake to the profound levels of chaos and vulnerability in life – seeing that aspect of oneself that is like the small boat tossed by the waves or currents of forces large and unfathomable. One may imagine those forces to be random, impersonal, or divine, but in any case they are beyond knowing and control. On the other side of this dissonance is a will that comes from a deeper place of "knowing without knowing." It is a place that is more like listening than thinking or planning (though thinking and planning also happen), from which one taps or feels into a deep intuitive source.

These three general lines of development (cognitive, self and relational) have similar paths (though an individual might develop along each of them at a different rate). They all pass through egocentric/pre-conventional and ethnocentric/conventional/traditional phases to a more mature phase, but then, if development continues, must pass through an uncomfortable disequilibrium before emerging on the other side with an integral or second-tier type of flexibility.[20] For all three lines the transition out of the dissonance phase has an aspect of humility – a way of perceiving and coming to peace with one's limitations (and with life's inscrutabilities, paradoxes, and mysteries).

Having this perspective on development can allow teachers and teacher educators to shepherd learners through the difficult transitions on the way to second tier skillfulness.

Development of Skills vs. Values

The parallels between how individuals develop and how cultures or societies seem to develop is so striking that a number of theorists (including Wilber, Kegan, Torbert, Beck & Cowan, and Gebser) see individual development as recapitulating cultural evolution. There seems to be definite (but hard to capture precisely or empirically) relationships between the *capacities and skills* that individuals have (along cognitive, relational, self, and other lines) and the *values and world views* that they adopt. That is, the depth and complexity with which one can understand self, others, things, and systems (and thus their flexibility and adequacy in responding to life situations) has some influence upon what one is aware of and values. So in the integral literature we see terms like Traditional, Modern, Postmodern, and Integral along side with preconventional, conventional, and post-conventional; and ego-centric, ethnocentric, and world-centric.

These constructs can be applied (or misapplied) to students, parents, peers, administrators, local communities, and institutions. The menagerie of evolutionary/developmental terms not only describes different (but, again, overlapping) *skills and capacities*, but also describes an evolution of *values and worldviews*, each system mixing skills vs. values to a different degree. Though conflating skills and value development is somewhat problematic (see Stein, 2008), it has explanatory power, so we will proceeding with due caution.

---

[20] In fact there are sub-stages of disequilibrium that mark the transitions from any level to the next, but we ignore that here to focus on a particular manifestation of disequilibrium.

Caveats on Inferring Individual Development from Cultural Values

Wilber's AQAL model and the Spiral Dynamics model include the familiar color-coded developmental levels (e.g., red, blue, orange, green, and yellow value-memes representing ego-centric, traditionalist/ethno-centric, modern techno-achievement-oriented, post-modern/progressive, and early integral. These culturally scaled systems are able to emerge historically only when enough individuals in a given society reach a certain level of individual development (along cognitive, relational, and/or self lines). But once these cultural modes are established individuals at *any* level of development might find themselves attracted to them, often for differing reasons.

For example, if one encounters a student, colleague, or parent whose value system is predominantly progressive, one cannot use that fact to make a reliable estimate of their developmental level. There are ego-centrics drawn to the progressive culture because of its promiscuity and ethno-centric progressives who hold onto progressive beliefs with the fervor of a religion. Therefore I suggest not using the Spiral Dynamics model (or similar ones) to judge developmental level or capacity (or be extremely cautious in doing so).

It is best to think of individuals as having some degree of capacity in a *range* of developmental levels (Beck & Cowan, 1996 p. 63). Though some levels (Kegan calls them "meaning making structures") predominate in a person, individuals tend to function at different levels depending on the context. It is more difficult to access higher levels of development in situations that are more novel, complex, or emotionally challenging. The same individual can display a wide variety of developmental levels—in stressful vs. non stressful situations; and in groups that embody awareness and support vs. groups that reinforce developmentally inferior mindsets. In a sufficiently nonthreatening, familiar, and supporting context it is easy to imagine even a 12 year old showing the precursors so many second tier skills, such as: realizing that they have a bias about a subject and trying to step outside their ego and worldview to enter into another worldview (ego-awareness); or engaging in a polarity mapping analysis of a situation (construct-awareness).

All of this is not to ignore the real challenges and imperatives of human development, but to suggest that the seeds of integral consciousness can be planted and nurtured much earlier than might be thought. As implied above, applying and deepening these skills is often more limited by emotional and social factors than cognitive ones.

Transcending and Including the Traditional and Progressive

As noted by Wilber and others, many who advocate progressive (or post-modern) principles seem to be at war with the developmentally prior mind-sets called traditional/conventional and modern. We say that Green has a problem with Blue and Orange. The integral or second tier perspective allows one to understand the deep value of all levels and world views.[21] As I have

---

[21] The thrust of the "integral movement" (if I might call it such) is to help more people (especially people in leadership roles including teachers) transition from a progressive ("green meme" or Kegan's Fourth Order) stage into an integral (or Fifth Order) one. The overall thrust is to support all humans of all levels to thrive at their current level and, when that level is not meeting their needs, transition to a higher one;

indicated above, some progressive modalities were developed in reaction to the excesses of traditional value orientations, but all too often in progressive classrooms (or policies) the pendulum swings too far. The section on mapping the polarities of progressive educational principles implies that traditional/conservative (and "modern") values are as important as progressive and integral ones – it is a matter of maintaining the right dynamic balance.

As practicing teachers know all too well, on the playing field of the real classroom traditional values such as basic skills, memorization, respect, self-control, loyalty, conformity, responsibility, and accountability, etc. are essential (as are modernist values such as efficiency, achievement, measurable standards, and resource accumulation; and pre-conventional/egocentric values such as self-protection and enjoyment).[22] The integral approach can help teachers *integrate* what progressive models prescribe with the realities of the classroom. It also helps teachers *understand* how particular students, classrooms, and even communities, have developmental differences that require very different pedagogical approaches. And it can help teachers empathize and *communicate* more effectively with students, principals, parents, etc. who have value systems different than one's own.

From Being There to Getting There: Pathways and Communities for Integral Educators

I am of the opinion that my life belongs to the community, and as long as I live it is my privilege to do for it whatever I can.
George Bernard Shaw

There can be no vulnerability without risk; there can be no community without vulnerability; there can be no peace, and ultimately no life, without community.
M. Scott Peck

To recap, integral models and methods can help practitioners coordinate a panoply of progressive pedagogical principles and can help them re-evaluate the importance of good old traditional and modernist pedagogical principles and values. The integral approach also adds meta-perspectives that can be used to more adequately and systematically address the values and goals behind progressive pedagogies. Adopting integral pedagogies involves not just the application of methods, but new ways of thinking (and meaning-making and being) that we are calling integral consciousness. I have also described how embodying integral or second tier capacity is part of a developmental journey. Now we ask: How does an educator step onto and develop along this path, and/or help others do so? What difficulties is one likely to encounter and what support strategies are available?

A full answer to these questions is beyond the scope of this essay, and because integral education is a very new domain of inquiry, these questions are still in early stages of being

---

however, the programs and rhetoric of most integralists indicates that the main audience are those at levels just below and above the second tier or integral threshold.

[22] And see Kegan, 1994, p. 57 on fundamentalist vs. humanist and developmental vs. non-developmental educational approaches.

explored by practitioners and scholars. In my brief comments I will start by addressing the challenges faced. Do you want the good news or the bad news first? —OK, I'll start with the bad news.

But first I should be clear in stating that, though I have been involved in progressive education and teacher training, have been part of the integral theory community, and have personally used integral approaches in teaching and learning, I have very little experience training others to use integral approaches and pedagogies in their work as educators (or leaders). Thus my comments here come from my analysis of what other intrepid explorers have reported, as well as my own intuitions about using integral approaches. See the references cited below for case studies and lessons learned firsthand in the trenches.

OK, now on to the bad news. Second tier consciousness is rare—and learning integral level pedagogical methods and teaching with integral consciousness is difficult. In fact, just moving from traditional to progressive pedagogical approaches is challenging. For most practitioners it requires teaching in ways that were not experienced in one's years of formal education. Kegan (1994, p. 274) in discussing trying to support the Fourth Order self-authoring/co-creative word view, notes how the literature "reflects a goodly amount of frustration, disappointment, surprise, and even, at times, disdain toward the large numbers of adult students who have difficulty achieving or who do not achieve these [skills]."

Above I mentioned the phases of humility-inducing disequilibrium that await those on developmental paths. Harris notes about supporting the adoption of second tier capacities:

> learning to reflect on and alter one's perspectives and behaviors can arouse feeling of fear, loss, guilt, anxiety, and anger. These emotions, if sufficiently strong, can elicit counterproductive defenses that block further learning. [Educators] lack strategies to help people manage the emotional distress when the old order is shaken… (Harris, 2002, p. 19)

(She follows by saying that "developmental theory offers a perspective that may help address this gap).

Supporting an integral (or progressive) approach is not just a matter of introducing new methods (Fosnot, 1996). Practitioners with stable progressive (or conventional) world-views may find it extremely difficult to "grok" or appreciate many integral (or progressive) educational principles, much less learn and adopt them (and see Steckler & Torbert in press; Gunnlaugson in press). Empirical evidence indicates that only a small percentage of people are at an integral or second tier developmental level (about 1/2 to 5% depending on how it is defined) (Wilber, 2006).

In addition, the classroom and institutional *logistics* of new liberating instructional approaches can be complex and can meet with resistance from peers, parents, and administrators.[23] During

---

[23] Kegan notes that "the distinguishing feature of contemporary culture is that for the first time in human history, *three* mentalities [i.e., orders of consciousness] exist side by side in the adult population" (1994 p. 303).

those frustrating days in the educational trenches one begins to appreciate the deceptive allure of the traditional hierarchical one-size-fits-all "factory model" of learning!

Now for the good news, or at least some glimmers of hope. Actually I have been offering these glimmers of hope throughout the essay:

1. I noted how the integral approach could be used at the systemic level (administration or curriculum design), implicitly at the classroom level (using but not teaching about integral concepts), and explicitly (teaching integral ideas). So many can benefit while not explicitly learning about in integral approach.

2. Though it may be rare to find individuals with a developmental center of gravity at second tier, the skills and capacities of second tier begin to show up much sooner, and can be modeled and nurtured. I hinted at how integral pedagogical principles could be brought into a fourth grade activity of planning for a school trip.

3. I described how an individual can exhibit a wide range of developmental mind-sets depending on the level of stress, support, and developmental scaffolding of the context and group they are in. It may be difficult to advance a person's developmental level per-se, but it may be much easier to create contexts that allow learners' existing integral skills to flourish and expand.

4. I have described the integral approach as including models, methods, and capacities (skills or consciousness). *Models* must be explicitly learned. *Methods* are more powerful when explicitly learned but they can be learned somewhat through informal modeling and practice, where an approach or world-view is passed on through apprenticeship or even "osmosis" (unconscious learning). Integral *consciousness* is even more susceptible to being passed on informally through witnessing of and participation in contexts that embody it.

5. I described how educational practitioners could cultivate *states* and personal practices that support NFAGD (normal for a good day) consciousness, which, when it becomes connected with deep inner listening and cognitive empathy in the classroom, creates horizontal development and directly supports some aspects of the vertical development into integral consciousness.

The integral approach to education has many facets. It can involve using models like AQAL and methods like Integral Methodological Pluralism to support a metasystematic understanding of many pedagogies or of the multiple systems one is embedded in as a teacher. But these facets are for the cognitively oriented among us—those who like theories and abstractions and big-picture models (I must count myself among them). But the integral approach also involves a consciousness with "softer" facets, such as ego-awareness, construct-awareness, relational-awareness, and vision-logic that are really just ways of describing a type of wisdom—a wisdom just as likely to be observed in people who speak simply, don't display scholarly linguistic skills, and have no taste for abstract models.

I will share a story as a further illustration of item 2 above. Recently I was spending time with a 7 year old girl and her 5 year old brother who are close friends of my family. We were on an outing and watching two older children about 20 feet from us doing tricks on bicycles. The girl was observing with the keen eyes of an ethnographer. The boy wondered aloud about how they did those tricks, and where they got their bicycles. Since the older children seemed quite safe, I suggested that he could go over and ask them, and that I could help. Unsurprisingly, he felt too shy to do so and said "you do it." I asked "are you feeling too shy to ask them?" and he nodded, and again said "you ask them." I said I did not really want to do so by myself, and that perhaps I was feeling shy also.

Upon a moment's reflection I added: "I could help you find out, but actually I'm not very curious about it. It's like there is a part of me that gets curious and a part of me that gets shy, and when the curious part feels stronger inside than the shy part, then I might go over and ask someone something, but right now the curious part is not very strong and the shy part is medium strong." I was trying to teach something in that moment, and was actually saying it for the benefit of the girl, who is a bit precocious. Appropriate to his age, the boy was not particularly interested by this observation, but I could see that the girl was taking it in, absorbing it like a sponge.

I don't have a follow-up story illustrating how she assimilated it, but I would not be surprised if she began to work with this concept of having different parts of oneself that are in a constant state of negotiation and balancing. Even though the ego-awareness skill of disembedding from one's thinking enough to reflect on multiple inner "voices" is a second tier skill that many adults do not seem to have (especially in the contexts we think they need it the most!), the story illustrates that people can begin to learn such skills quite early in life.

So even though a small percentage (1/2% to 5%) of adults are centered at the integral developmental levels, the percentage of people who have a readiness to begin to develop some of the second tier skills is much larger (perhaps 25% of the population, probably at least 50% of teachers). There is much that the average teacher can gain from working with integral principles, including a more systemic and flexible understanding of classroom and institutional dynamics, a deeper more flexible understanding of thinking, learning, communication, and knowledge in general, and, as indicated above, a greater ability to coordinate and utilize a range of progressive pedagogies. They can also be supported in gaining a more flexible perspective on themselves and their teaching.

At the level of classroom activity, curriculum, and school system design and administration, the developmental and systems-level insights of the integral approach addresses how belief and value systems become stabilized and resistant to change through communicative processes and social structures. These insights can support sustainable transformation in classroom, school, family, and community systems (whereas an over-simplified grasp of these human systems, which can occur when progressive methods do not include integral level insights, can lead to solutions that cause more harm than good).

Communities of and for Integral Educators

To repeat our questions: "How does an educator step onto and develop along this path, and/or help others do so? What difficulties is one likely to encounter and what support strategies are available?" Above I described challenges and reasons for hope about the general question of helping educators (and their students) acquire and/or use what the integral approach has to offer. Next I address the question of what an educator (or teacher trainer) can do personally.

First let's state the obvious advice, the unsurprising basics that bear repeating: apply the attention and effort required to take good care of yourself—body, mind, and spirit. Balance high expectations that energize, with sufficient doses of compassion and acceptance for what is—with your students *and* yourself. Keep learning to deepen and broaden your understanding of yourself and your professional work.

Easy, yes? You may be thinking: "do you have *any idea* how busy a teacher's life is??" Eating well, exercising, getting enough social/emotional contact and R&R to "stay sane"—not to mention any sort of contemplative practice—seem hardly the norm for the average teacher. Verily, our social structures, from the expectations and compensation levels set up by educational institutions, to the cultural materialism and work ethic that keeps citizens on their daily tread mills, do not support this type of self-care and growth, especially for educational professionals. But you would not be reading an essay like this if you were not interested in stretching outside the status quo. So one additional crucial thing on the common list of suggestions is to build in community and peer support for your efforts.

As mentioned, there are communities of learning/practice associated with most of the progressive pedagogies in our list.[24] One "value added" of integrally-informed communities of learning/practice is that they explicitly value whole-self (mind/body/emotions/spirit; interior-I, exterior-it, relational-we, and systems-its) approaches to personal and professional development, and have developed methods and workshops toward this end. For example, see material on Integral Life Practice (Wilber et al., 2008). Many localities have integral salons or MeetUp groups.

---

[24] A look at the web site for the American Educational Research Association (the "world's most prominent international professional organization," with 25,000 members and holding an annual conferences attended by thousands), shows that among its 163 Special Interest Groups are many focusing on progressive topics, including: Action Research; Conflict Resolution; Confucianism, Taoism, and Education; Constructivist Theory; Cooperative Learning; Critical Educators for Social Justice; Ecological and Environmental Education; Holistic Education; Leadership for Social Justice; Multicultural/Multiethnic Education; Multiple Intelligences; Peace Education; Postcolonial Studies; Queer Studies; Service-Learning & Experiential Education; Social and Emotional Learning; Spirituality & Education. There are also a few that align with topics central to the integral community, for example: Chaos & Complexity Theories and Systems Thinking in Education. Surprisingly few mention developmental issues. Only one (Adulthood and Aging) mentions adult development, and three others mention developmental studies (Early Education and Child Development; Rasch Measurement; Constructivist Theory, Research, and Practice).

The integral approach, unlike approaches used in most other learning communities, contains an explicit inquiry into psychological growth and healing, and into contemplative practices (for example, the 3-2-1 Shadow Process and Big Mind voice dialog, Wilber et al., 2008). These are tools that can help clear away the psychological detritus that stands between one and the clear and easy states of mind implied by NFAGD consciousness, and the deeper states and stages implied in integral consciousness.

Though the integral movement has deepened and widened significantly in recent years, communities and programs supporting integral education are far from plentiful. Though a number of organizations exist that help professionals understand and use specific integral models, particularly AQAL, there are far fewer systematized opportunities to develop integral methodological skills or integral consciousness. For more information check out the websites for the Integral Institute, JFKU's Integral Studies Degree Program, Fielding Graduate University's Integral Studies Certificate Program, the California Institute of Integral Studies, Next Step Integral, and Pacific Integral (and see O'Fallon, in press, and Esbjörn-Hargens, in press, describing some of these programs).

Conclusions

Don't worry that children never listen to you. Worry that they are always watching you.
(Robert Fulghum)

Live as if you were to die tomorrow. Learn as if you were to live forever.
(Gandhi)

This essay has explored what the integral approach has to offer above and beyond progressive (or alternative, or reform) educational theories, principles, and values. We began with a kitchen-sink overview of progressive pedagogical principles and values. Educators who associate themselves with a subset of these principles and values and are wondering how to understand them as a whole, struggling with how to deal with the dialectical tensions among them and between them and traditional pedagogies, or intuiting that there may be a higher perspective, are likely to find something of value in an integral approach and integral community.

The "value added" by the integral approach was described in terms of integral as a *model*, a *method*, a developmental *stage*, and a *community*. The AQAL model was discussed as the most popular integral model being used, and I gave an example of its skilled application. I suggested that, though AQAL is useful and powerful, employing integral methods and consciousness is more important than using any particular model. I elaborated on the primary principles that integral emphasizes that progressive approaches do not: the development of human capacities and evolution of human meaning making (or world view) systems. The teacher with an integral perspective on human development will serve as a stronger facilitator of progressive (and integral and traditional) pedagogies. Successfully applying integral models and methods requires a type of consciousness or meaning making capacity, and I described "integral consciousness" in terms of higher levels of *construct*-awareness, *ego*-awareness, *relational* awareness, and *systems*-awareness.

In this paper I attempted to illustrate some aspects of integral methodology and consciousness in the presentation itself. I tried to open the reader to the full complexity and dynamism of educational systems. As a sort of construct awareness I described models, constructs, or principle without indicating "correct or best" ones, and allowed for the inherent complexity, uncertainty, ambiguity, and paradox (or seemingly opposite polarities) of the educational domain. I presented constructs and categories as perspectival, fuzzy-boundaried, strongly interdependent, or co-defining. I coaxed an awareness of the limits of the AQAL model, of theories of cultural/meme evolution, and of the constructs of Lines and Levels. I spoke to the challenges of supporting human development and the drawbacks of over-emphasizing it. My analysis addressed the system levels of student, teacher/classroom, and administrator/curriculum designer/teacher educator. At times I tried to explicitly insert myself as author into the picture, reflecting upon possible limitations of my perspective.

In the article I describe numerous elements of the integral approach—it is not a simple picture. Realizing a vision of integral education involves, as is only appropriate for an integral vision, a complex but dynamically flexibly and intuitively presenced process of engaging self, others, artifacts, bodies, and socio-cultural systems. I explored some of the challenges in learning and teaching the integral approach. Though these challenges are substantial, and though the integral approach is a complex thing with man "moving parts," I also argued that the seeds of integral consciousness and methodology can be planted and nurtured in many ways, and gave examples allowing for a good deal of hope in our efforts to create more integrally informed and integrally alive educational environments.

In addition to what is gained, something may also be lost in taking the integral approach. While it coordinates many different progressive principles, it does not (at least in my reading) specialize or deeply describe any. It may be best for some to adopt an integral approach only *after* being mentored and immersed deeply in one (or several) specific progressive methods.

I mentioned several integral level pedagogical approaches in the Section on integral methodology, but one might still ask: *What does integral pedagogy, or an integrally informed classroom, actually look like?* What uniquely integral methods would we see being used there? One could point to a specific method or model used to anchor an integrally informed classroom. For example, students may be systematically investigating the world from each of Wilber's 8 perspectival Zones. But that would be overly constraining our vision. An integral curriculum would be so much more than that, and would actually include, most of the 20 or so principles listed as progressive pedagogies. In fact, a teacher who has a sophisticated grasp of progressive pedagogy, who has never heard of integral theory, would probably be observed to intuitively be employing most or all of the 8 Zones. (Of course, an integral approach can help one better understand what one is doing and transfer their wisdom to others.)

What I would like to propose for this historical moment in integral pedagogy's evolution is that the integral approach points not so much to a new set of methods, but to a way (or ways) of coordinating, integrating, practicing, and embodying already existing specific methods, mostly from progressive approaches, but also including traditional (and "modernist") approaches, as appropriate. Integral looks and feels like progressive methods applied with wisdom and "adequatio," with an ego-aware and construct-aware consciousness.

I have purposely avoided trying to define "integral" in this paper (I do give it a shot in Murray, 2006). For me integral is an emerging wave of human capacity, difficult or impossible to define but still tangible and recognizable. It is a form of human understanding and skillfulness that takes the insights about the human condition, the critiques of existing systems and mores, and the experiential openings in human capacity that we associate with the progressive and New Age movements, and adds new levels of rigor, reflective self-and-system understanding, and hope to the possibilities of improving the human condition.

In the domain of education, the integral approach is not just a new set of beliefs about teaching and learning, it also indicates new ways of being in the classroom and making meaning of the educational process. In this sense, it is not a theory to be taught but a pointer to a naturally occurring next wave of human capacities. These capacities are desperately needed to meet the complex and urgent problems of the times. For many educators then, what is of ultimate concern is helping learners, global citizens and future citizens, move vibrantly toward developing these capacities.

References

Argyris, C. (1985). *Action science, concepts, methods, and skills for research and intervention.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. www.actiondesign.com.

Awbrey, S. M, Dana, D., Miller, V. W., Robinson, P., Ryan, M. M. & Scott, D. K. (Eds.) (2006). *Integrative learning and action: A call to wholeness (studies in education and spirituality).* New York: Peter Lang.

Banathy, B. H. (1992). Comprehensive systems design in education: Building a design culture in education. *Educational Technology*, 22(3), 33-35.

Bassesches, M. (1984). *Dialectical thinking and adult development.* New Jersey: Ablex Publishing.

Beck, D. E. & Cowan, C. C. (1996). *Spiral dynamics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd.

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research for educators: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Brown, J.S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32-42.

Bruner, J. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Newman, S. E. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the craft of reading, writing, and mathematics. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser (pp. 453-494). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Commons, M. L. & Richards, F. A. (1984). A general model of stage theory. In M. L. Commons, F. A. Richards & C. Armon (Eds.), *Beyond formal operations: Late adolescent and adult cognitive development,*(pp. 120-141). New York: Praeger.

Cook-Greuter, S. R. (2000). Mature ego development: A gateway to ego transcendence. *Journal of Adult Development*, 7(4), 227-240.

Cook-Grueter (2005). Ego Development: Nine levels of increasing embrace. Available at www.cook-greuter.com.

Davis, N. T., Genc, E., & Aydeniz, M. (2006). Fostering continuous improvement and learning through peer assessment: Part of an integral model of assessment. Accepted to *Educational Assessment.*

Dea, W. (Ed.) (in preparation). *Integral education in action.*

DeBono, E. (1970). *Lateral thinking; A textbook to creativity.* London: Ward Lock Educational Ltd.

Dewey, J. (1926). *Democracy and education.* Plain Label Books. http://www.cafepress.com/7391

Elbow, P. (2005). Bringing the rhetoric of assent and the believing game together – And into the classroom. *College English*, March 2005.

Elbow, P. (2008). The Believing Game or Methodological Believing. Conference Presentation available at http://works.bepress.com/peter_elbow.

Esbjörn-Hargens, S. (2005). Integral education by design: How integral theory informs teaching, learning, and curriculum in a graduate program. *ReVision*, *28*(3), p. 21-29.

Esbjörn-Hargens, S. (2007). Integral teacher, integral students, integral classroom: Applying integral theory to education. *AQAL: Journal of Integral Theory and Practice*, *2*(2), 72-103.

Esbjörn-Hargens, S. (in press). Integral theory in service of integral education: Illustrations from on online graduate program. In S. Esbjörn-Hargens, J. Reams, & O. Gunnlaugson (Eds.) *Integral Education.*

Esbjörn-Hargens, S. Reams, J. & Gunnlaugson, O. (Eds.) (in press). *Integral education: Exploring multiple perspectives in the classroom.*

Ewert, G. D. (1991). Habermas and education: A comprehensive overview of the influence of Habermas in educational literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *61*(3), 345-378.

Feldman, L. (2008). The transformative and adaptive potential of integral pedagogy on the secondary educational level. *Paper presented at Biannual Integral Theory Conference*, John F. Kennedy University. Pleasant Hill, CA.

Feldman, A. & Minstrell, J. (2000). Action research as a research methodology for the study of teaching and learning of science. In A. Kelley & R. Lesh (Eds), *Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education*, pp. 429-455, Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ.

Feuerstein, G. (1987). *Structures of consciousness: The genius of Jean Gebser*. Santa Rosa, CA: Integral Publishing.

Feyerabend, P. (1975). Against method: Outline of an anarchistic theory of knowledge. London: Humanities Press.

Fischer, K. (1980). A theory of cognitive development: The control and construction of hierarchies of skills. *Psychological Review*, *87*(6), 477-531.

Fischer, K. W. & Farrar, M. J. (1987). Generalizations about generalizations: How a theory of skill development explains both generality and specificity. *International Journal of Psychology*, *2,* 643-677.

Fosnot, C. T. (Ed.) (1996). *Constructivism. theory, perspectives, and practice*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Freiri, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. NY: Continuum Publishing Company.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: Tthe theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Glasersfeld, E. von (1995). *Radical constructivism: A way of knowing and learning*. London: Falmer Press.

Goleman, G. (2006). *Social Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Gunnlaugson, O. (2004). Toward an integral education for the ecozoic era: A case study in transforming the global learning community of Holma College of Integral Studies, Sweden. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 2(4). p. 313–35.

Gunnlaugson, O. (in press). Reexamining and Integral Approach to Education. In S. Esbjörn-Hargens, J. Reams, & O. Gunnlaugson (Eds.) *Integral Education*.

Habermas, J. (1998). *Between Facts and Norms* (W. Rehg, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1999). *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hampson, G. (in press). Western-Islamic and Native American genealogies of integral education. In S. Esbjörn-Hargens, J. Reams, & O. Gunnlaugson (Eds.) *Integral Education.*

Harris, C. (2002). *The experience of support for transformative learning*. Harvard Graduate School of Education Dissertation.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. NY: Routledge.

Illich, I. (1975). *Tools for conviviality*. London: Fontana.

Johnson, B. (1996). *Polarity management: Identifying and managing unsolvable problems*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press.

Kögler, H. H. (1992). *The power of dialog: Critical hermeneutics after Gadamer and Foucault*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kegan, R. & Lahey, L.L (2009). *Immunity to Change: How to Overcome It and Unlock the Potential in Yourself and Your Organization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*. New York, NY: Basic Books/Perseus Books Group.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Mayer, R. (1998). Cognitive, metacognitive, and motivational aspects of problems solving. *Instructional Science,* vol. 26, p. 49-63.

McIntosh, S. (2007). *Integral Consciousness and the Future of Evolution*. St. Paul, MN: Paragon House.

Mervis, B. & Rosch, E. (1981). Categories of natural objects. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 32. p. 89-115.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Moltz, M (in press). Contemporary integral education research: A transnational and transparadigmatic overview. In S. Esbjörn-Hargens, J. Reams, & O. Gunnlaugson (Eds.) *Integral Education*.

Montessori, M. (1965). *Dr. Montessori's own handbook*. New York: Schocken Books Inc.

Murray, T. (2006). Collaborative knowledge building and integral theory: On perspectives, uncertainty, and mutual regard. *Integral Review*, *2,.* 210-268.

Murray, T. (2008). Exploring Epistemic wisdom: Ethical and practical implications of integral theory and methodological pluralism for collaboration and knowledge-building. Paper presented at *Biannual Integral Theory Conference*, John F. Kennedy University. Pleasant Hill, CA.

Murray, T., & Arroyo, I. (2002). Toward measuring and maintaining the zone of proximal development in adaptive instructional systems. Cerri, Gouarderes & Paraguacu (Eds.) *Intelligent Tutoring Systems: 6th International Conference, ITS 2000* (pp. 749-758). Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Murray, T., Ross, S. & Inglis, J. (2008). "Tools for Dealing with Uncertainty, Ambiguity, and Paradox: Reflective Methods for Group Development." Workshop Presentation given at National Conference on Dialog and Deliberation, Austin, TX, August 2008. Workshop Notes/Handouts available at http://perspegrity.com/papers.html.

Norgaard, R.B., 1989. "The case for methodological pluralism." *Ecological Economics*, Elsevier, vol. 1(1), pp. 37-57, February.

O'Fallon, T. (in press). Grounding integral theory in the field of experience. In S. Esbjörn-Hargens, J. Reams, & O. Gunnlaugson (Eds.) *Integral Education*.

Palmer, P. (1998). *Courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Piaget, J. (1972). *The principles of genetic epistemology*. Basic Books, NY.

Pinker, S. (1997). *How the mind works*. NY: Norton.

Polya, G. (1973). *How to solve it.* Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Polanyi, M. (1962). *Personal Knowledge Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reigeluth, C.M. (2008). Chaos theory and the sciences of complexity: Foundations for transforming education. In B. Despres (Ed.), *Systems Thinkers in Action: A Field Guide for Effective Change Leadership in Education*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Robinson, K. (2001). *Out of our minds: Learning to be creative*. Oxford: Capstone Publ.

Rosenberg, M. (1999). *Non-violent communication: A language of compassion*. Encinitas, CA: Puddledancer Press.

Ross, S. (2005). Toward An integral process theory of human dynamics: Dancing the universal tango. *Integral Review*, *1*(1) 64-84.

Scharmer. O. (2007). *Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges*. Cambridge, MA: Society for Organizational Learning, Inc.

Schoenfeld, A. H. (1985). Metacognitive and epistemological issues in mathematical understanding. In E. Silver (Ed.), *Teaching and learning mathematical problem solving* (pp. 361-380). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.

Steckler, E. & Torbert, W. (in press). A "developmental action inquiry" approach to teaching first-, second-, and third-person action research methods. In S. Esbjörn-Hargens, J. Reams, & O. Gunnlaugson (Eds.) *Integral Education*.

Stein, Z. (2008). Intuitions of altitude: Researching the conditions for the possibility of developmental assessment. Paper presented at *Biannual Integral Theory Conference*, John F. Kennedy University. Pleasant Hill, CA.

Steiner, R. (1965). *The education of the child in light of anthroposophy*. London: Rudolf Steiner Press.

Tomlinson, C. A (1995). *How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms*. Alexandra, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Torbert, B. & Associates (2004). *Action inquiry: The secret of timely and transforming leadership.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wilber, K. (2000). *Sex, ecology, spirituality (in collected works of Ken Wilber, Vol. 6)*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Press.

Wilber, K. (2005). *Kosmos II: Excerpt B from Volume 2 of the kosmos trilogy*. Available at wilber.shambhala.com.

Wilber, K. (2006). *Integral spirituality*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Press.

Wilber, K., Patten, T., Leonard, A., Morelli, M. (2008). *Integral life practice: A 21st-century blueprint for physical health, emotional balance, mental clarity, and spiritual awakening*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Press.

Winne, P. H. (2001). Self-regulated learning viewed from models of information processing. In B. J. Zimmerman and D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives*, (pp. 153-189). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). Philosophical investigations (3rd ed.). (Anscombe, Trans.). New York, NY: Macmillan Company.

Thomas J. Murray *is an independent scholar, consultant, and research scientist in the areas of Cognitive Tools, Adaptive Computer Learning Environments, Online Collaboration, Ethics, and Knowledge Engineering. His research and teaching work are primarily at* <u>Hampshire College</u> *(Schools of Cognitive Science and Natural Science) and the* <u>University of Massachusetts</u> *(Adjunct Faculty member of the* <u>School of Education</u> *and R&D in the* <u>Computer Science Department</u> *and the* <u>Center for Knowledge Communication</u>*.) He is currently an independent consultant working on projects with several organizations. Recent interests and work on aspects of the Perspegrity project include, on the practical side: supporting higher quality communication, collaboration, and decision making in online communities (see Perspegrity project), and on the theoretical side: studies in areas of applied philosophy, related to "epistemological indeterminacy" and cognitive tools supporting metacognition and ethics-oriented reflective dialog. Murray has degrees in educational technology (Ed.D., MEd), computer science (MS), and physics (BS). He is on the editorial review boards of two international journals, the* <u>International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education</u>*, and at* <u>Integral Review</u> *as an Associate Editor.*
Email: <u>tmurray@cs.umass.edu</u>

Appendix – An Overview of Progressive Pedagogies

I assume that the reader is familiar with a handful of progressive educational models, assumptions, and value-orientations, and give only a brief summary below. Even though they seem like separate principles, each one has significant overlap with many others, as there are many ways to "cut up the pie" that constitutes the common appreciation of progressive pedagogy. In real world application the lines between these principles blur significantly.

- *Holism:* An acknowledgement and appreciation of the "whole person" or "whole child" – mind, body, heart, spirit, and community are all interconnected and important. Artistic expression, bodily movement and health, spontaneity and fun, interaction with the natural

world, and service are as important to creating good citizens and realizing students' full potential, as is the learning of "content." The physical arrangement of the classroom, what a student had for breakfast, and whether he has caring parents seeing him out the door, all affect his learning and engagement.

– *Multiple intelligences:* All forms of intelligence should be acknowledged and nurtured; and each student may have her own path to learning due to some of these lines of development or styles of learning being stronger than others. (Gardener, 1983)

– *Creativity:* Success in the world, especially the complex modern world, requires creativity ("lateral" thinking, "right-brained" thinking). This includes considering multiple hypotheses, or alternative solutions, or perspectives, and not committing rigidly to any one too quickly. Nurturing creativity requires bracketing the logical mind and opening to other forms of "intelligence" (deBono, 1970; Polya, 1973; Robinson, 2001).

– *Individuality and human potential:* Each person has a unique set of capabilities and potentials, and something unique to offer the classroom and the world. Learners should be treated and respected as unique individuals.

– *Constructivism:* Each person constructs their knowledge in a unique way, depending on their prior knowledge, preconceptions, and experiences. Meaning making is idiosyncratic and personal. Instruction must move beyond the "pipeline" theory of learning that assumes that if curriculum could only be organized and presented skillfully enough, the result will be that one learning path will fit all students. (von Glasersfeld, 1995; Collins et al., 1989)

– *Developmentalism:* Learning happens through natural processes such as integration and differentiation, or assimilation and accommodation, or horizontal and hierarchical learning (depending on the theory). This puts limits on the speed of learning (it can't be pushed too fast) and the order of learning (some concepts and skills necessarily come before others). (Piaget, 1972; Fischer & Farrar, 1987; Commons & Richards, 1984)

– *ZPD:* Instruction should aim for that 'zone of proximal development' that has the right balance of support and challenge to avoid the extremes of boredom and being overwhelmed (Vygotsky, 1987; Murray & Arroyo, 2002).

– *Meta-learning:* In today's dynamic world one needs to "learn how to learn." One also needs to think about thinking (metacognition), and understand the nature and limits of knowing (i.e., have epistemic knowledge). Education should strengthen the learner's ability to monitor, reflect upon, and adjust problem solving processes and outcomes on the fly. (Schoenfeld, 1985; Winne, 2001; Kegan, 1994).

– *Adaptivity/individualization/differentiation:* The content, style, and speed of curriculum should allow for, adapt to, and/or differ for the various types of individual differences noted above. This can be done by dynamically steering the instructional path to respond to individual student needs, and/or by immersing learners in open-ended environments that support many paths (Tomlinson, 1995).

- *Learning by doing*, case-based learning, situated learning, discovery learning and inquiry learning: Progressive theories say that learning activities need to be authentic, rich, or realistic enough to engage student motivation and allow for transfer to real life problems. Taking guesses and making mistakes are seen as normal, inevitable, and positive. Learning that comes from real engagement and curiosity is far superior in depth and longevity to rote memorization or cramming for a test. One learns by designing and building things, playing and getting our hands dirty, and trial and error.

- *Situated learning:* Most authentic learning happens in social contexts, and often through apprenticeship or mentoring relationships. The social fabric and dynamics of the learning context are critical success factors. Collaborative learning is beneficial, as are peer learning and peer tutoring. One learns by showing, explaining to, questioning, arguing with, negotiating with, teaching, and helping others. Social and emotional intelligence are as important to learning as intellect. (Brown et al., 1989; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vygotsky, 1978).

- *Empowerment and liberation.* Education happens largely through institutions that perpetuate habits of disempowerment, oppression, conformity, orthodoxy, and life alienating thought forms. (Freire, 1970; Illich, 1975; Rosenberg, 1999; Ewert on Habermas, 1991; Dewey, 1926; hooks, 1994). Education should be designed to support the ideals of freedom, equality, self-determination, justice, and open mindedness that enable democratic society. Students can be given more choice and power over what and how they learn; they can be supported in acquiring the skills of dialog and conflict resolution. Teachers can relinquish some control and reveal their areas of ignorance and uncertainty; they can be "guides on the side" rather than "sages on the stage."

- *The ethical classroom.* If the classroom is a learning laboratory for life, then it should support things like compassion, caring, respect, empathy, and dialog; and it can model quality relationships and community building. (Palmer, 1998; Elbow, 2008)

- *Transformative education.* Some focus on education as a vehicle for spiritual growth, the flowering of human potential, and/or the evolution of human meaning-making capacity (or action-logics, see Torbert, 2004). They suggest that the classroom can support contemplative, transpersonal, and transformative experiences. (Mezirow, 1991; Steiner, 1965)

- *Community/service-based learning.* Community-base and service-based learning are strongly situated and have ethical implications. Connecting schooling more tightly with family, community, and society has clear benefits for students and allows learning through doing to directly benefit the larger whole. It engages multiple intelligences and modalities, and gives students a sense of empowerment and purpose.

- *Lifelong learning and emergence.* We never stop learning, or at least need not stop. This is true because of the constantly changing social and technological landscape. And it is also true from the perspective of human potential and emergence. Expertise, wisdom,

leadership, and innovation are continually deepening skills developed over years of adult life.

– *Teacher presence and embodiment.* Of critical importance is how teachers and other leaders embody and model the qualities they intend to teach and support. This highlights the critical and too-neglected fact that educational reform requires significant investment in teacher training. In addition, the deep qualities of compassion, presence, metacognitive reflection, and mind/body/emotion/spirit integration cannot be "taught" in a teacher training classroom. Teachers and leaders are called to engage in personal transformative practices of emotional healing and self-realization, and also to risk a deeper authenticity and transparency in the classroom.

– *Participatory/action-based curriculum development and research.* At the graduate level teachers in training begin to become engaged in tasks such as curriculum development and research. Here (and in other contexts) progressive pedagogies are combined with progressive methodologies such as action research (Argyris, 1985; Feldman & Minstrell, 2000), user-participatory design (Barnathy, 1992), qualitative, interdisciplinary and mixed-method research (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Patton, 1980).