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“After all, what would be the value of the passion for knowledge if it resulted only in a certain amount of knowledgeableness and not, in one way or another and to the extent possible, in the knower’s straying afield of [them]selves? There are times in life when the question of knowing if one can think differently than one thinks, and perceive differently than one sees, is absolutely necessary if one is to go on looking and reflecting at all.”

-- Michel Foucault

Introduction

Where, indeed, can one to learn how to think and perceive differently? Certainly, education in some of its contemporary "alternative" expressions offers students ways to "stray afield" of their own embeddedness in particular modes of being and knowing. These alternative approaches provide important ways to transcend the prison of a life not reflected upon. Yet education in its conventional manifestations also cultivates important capacities for thinking and perceiving anew. Moreover, conventional education encompasses and preserves the ground from which tradition itself springs, providing the practices by which the status quo guarantees its persistence into the next generation. Thus, both conventional and alternative educational approaches offer something of value to those who want to avoid “knowledgeableness” and foster inquiry that changes the knower. And yet adherents to these two approaches are often wary of one another! How can educators artfully integrate the best of conventional and alternative approaches to education: honoring each and yet transcending the limits of both? This article explores that question in the context of one approach to integral education inspired by the Integral Approach developed by Ken Wilber.
Historical Roots

There are a number of substantive approaches to alternative education that find expression in the schools of today, including those informed by the metaphysical perspectives of philosopher-sages like Rudolph Steiner, Alfred North Whitehead, Jiddu Krishnamurti, and Sri Aurobindo. There are also a growing number of schools along the entire spectrum of education (from elementary school programs to doctorate degrees) that provide various expressions of alternative education in action. These approaches are often referred to as “holistic” and are associated with the educational approaches of individuals like John Dewey and Maria Montessori. Lastly, there are the “transformative learning” approaches connected to the research of Jack Mezirow.

Because they include many aspects of an individual (e.g., emotional, moral, interpersonal, and spiritual) and culture (ecological, global, etc.), “alternative,” “holistic,” and “transformative education” are often contrasted with the more “mainstream,” “conventional,” or “traditional” forms of education, which tend to focus on the acquisition of knowledge, development of cognitive skills and individual achievement. This division in educational approaches has many sources and a long history (Crain 2000, Forbes 2003, Miller 1997). However, for the scope of this article I would like to focus on two representative figures associated with each approach. This division between traditional and alternative approaches to education can be traced back in part to the different worldviews of child development advanced by John Locke in 17th century England and J. Jacques Rousseau in 18th century France.

Locke saw children as an expression of Original Sin, and felt they needed strict discipline by way of associations, repetition, imitation, rewards, and punishment. He believed children’s minds were a tabula rasa and that the child’s growth was determined by external causes from the environment or society. Locke felt it was important to instruct children in order to instill the values of democracy. In other words, children needed to be taught. His first book, published in 1690, Essay concerning Human Understanding, established him as the father of empiricism in philosophy and
learning theory in psychology and had an enormous impact on how education was conceived of in England and later in the United States.

Rousseau, in contrast, provided the opposite view of children and education. He saw children as the expression of innate purity, and believed they needed supportive contexts for their talents and other various capacities to flourish. Rousseau viewed children as noble savages whose growth was determined by internal causes of development (i.e., nature’s plan). He felt it was important to protect children from the pressures of society and to let them discover themselves free of these pressures. His books *The Social Contract* and *Emile*, both published in 1762, established him as one of the founders of the Romantic movement in philosophy and developmental approaches in psychology. It is interesting to note that he is one of the first to present a four-stage developmental model with invariant stages. Rousseau’s educational philosophy and view of human development has continually been a source of inspiration for the alternative education movement, ever since its inception in the 1960s and 70s counterculture.

These competing visions of education are not only grounded in different understandings of child development but come from entirely different worldviews (Miller 1997). Robert Kegan (1994), a developmental psychologist at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, refers to these two distinct educational philosophies as “Back to Basics” and the “Whole Child” respectively. Kegan characterizes the curricular vision of Back to Basics as “fundamentalist” and the Whole Child as “humanist”. He also points out that either approach can be approached from a developmental or nondevelopmental understanding. His point being that a developmental approach, one that connects with students at their growing edge, is what is most important regardless of whether it is a back to basics or a whole child approach.

**Three Kinds of Education: Conventional, Alternative, & Integral**

Both mainstream and holistic approaches towards education have much to recommend them. Thus, it is unfortunate that most alternative education pit themselves against traditional education, often overlooking the strengths of
traditional models and failing to see their own holistic blind spots. Likewise, mainstream education often views itself immune to any insights coming from the holistic approaches and refuses to admit its own limits. Consequently, we are left with two fragmented, partial approaches—each equally incapable of providing a meta-perspective on education. What is needed is an educational approach that honors the strengths and limits of both mainstream and alternative educational approaches and is therefore more capable of situating these general philosophies and the programs that embody them into a fair and more comprehensive framework.

Over the last decade more integral approaches have begun to emerge at all levels of education. In this article, I will focus on a particular approach to integral education by providing examples from a graduate program in Integral Psychology. This unique approach to integral education is based on *Integral Theory*. Integral Theory is a post-metaphysical approach to knowledge synthesis that is based on the AQAL (all-quadrant, all-level) framework, its five elements, and Integral Methodological Pluralism (IMP) (Wilber, 2000e, 2003, forthcoming). Integral Theory provides a comprehensive means of integrating the four dimension-perspectives of objectivity, interobjectivity, subjectivity, and intersubjectivity (and their respective levels of complexity) with the major methodological families (e.g., phenomenology, empiricism, structuralism, hermeneutics, systems theory...) in such a way that avoids postulating pre-existing ontological structures. In other words, Integral Theory is interested in the participatory relationship through which multiple ways of knowing the myriad dimensions of reality occurs through various methods of inquiry. When applied to education, this Integral approach is designed to offer an effective means to combine the best of both conventional and alternative approaches in a particular form of Integral Education.

A central goal of this article is to outline in Part 1 how the five elements of Integral Theory can provide a useful and comprehensive approach to Integral Education. To accomplish this I will outline four aspects of each element, for a total of twenty, and demonstrate how they can inform Integral Education through supporting the development of integral teachers and students alike. Then, in Part 2 I will depict the possibilities of Integral Education by drawing on examples from the
Masters of Arts in Integral Psychology (IP) program at John F. Kennedy University that is explicitly based on Integral Theory. This article will serve as an invitation to other educators and students to explore how elements of Integral Theory might support their own efforts towards embracing more inclusive, comprehensive, and integral education. The breadth of Integral Theory can benefit any approach to education by inspiring educators to reflect critically on missing elements of their curricula and expanding the pedagogical modalities in their repertoire. Even a partial implementation of ideas from Integral Theory can result in educational experiences that allow students and teachers to see and feel more of reality in the classroom.

Integral Theory

Today’s academia is characterized by disciplinary turf wars and clashes between traditional, modern, and postmodern perspectives. In response Integral Theory offers a framework that is the result of over thirty years of cross-cultural and postdisciplinary scholarship and application (Wilber 1999a-d, 2000a-f). “As a result of its applicability across, within, and between disciplinary boundaries, Integral Theory has been widely embraced by individuals associated with a variety of fields, including: art, business, ecology, medicine, consciousness studies, religion, criminology, psychology, healthcare, nursing, politics, and sustainability to name a few.”

Often represented by the acronym AQAL, Integral Theory’s signature phrase “all-quadrants, all-levels” is shorthand for the multiple aspects of reality recognized in an Integral approach (Wilber 1995, 2003). There are at least five recurring elements that comprise an Integral approach: quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types. These five components represent the basic patterns of reality that recur in multiple contexts. To exclude an element in any inquiry or exploration is to settle for a less comprehensive understanding or a reduced participatory engagement with reality. In contrast, by including these basic elements, an Integral practitioner ensures that he or she is considering the main aspects of any phenomena: all-quadrants, all-levels, all-lines, all-states, and all-types.

The first element, all-quadrants, refers to the basic perspectives an individual can take on reality: the interior and exterior of individuals and collectives, which is
often summarized as the following four dimensions: experience (“I”; subjectivity), culture (“You/We”; intersubjectivity), behavior (“It”; objectivity), and systems (“Its”; interobjectivity) (Wilber 1995, 1997). Each of these perspective-dimensions is irreducible, and has its own validity claim (i.e., truthfulness, justness, truth, and functional fit) and mode of investigation (see Figure 1). The quadrants provide a particularly helpful lens for educators to understand their own role in the classroom. For example, if you are a teacher, you have the “I” of your perceived embodied self, the “We” of the intersubjective relationships between yourself and the students, the “It” of your own actions and behaviors in class as well as the activities you have students engage in, and the “Its” of the educational system with its rules, regulations, policies, and institutional dynamics.

![Figure 1. Some Aspects of the Four Quadrants](image)

The next four elements of the Integral model arise in each of the four quadrants: all-levels refers to the occurrence of complexity within each dimension (e.g., the levels of physical complexity achieved by evolution in the behavior quadrant); all-lines refers to
the various distinct capacities that develop through each of these levels of complexity (e.g., the developmental capacities of cognition, emotions, and morality in the experience quadrant); \textit{all-states} refers to the temporary occurrence of any aspect of reality within the four quadrants (e.g., the occurrence of weather states in the systems quadrant); and \textit{all-types} refers to the variety of styles that aspects of reality assume in various domains (e.g., types of festivals in the cultural quadrant).

Because each element is understood to be part of each and every moment, Integral Theory claims that if an approach to education excludes any of these components, it falls short of a truly integral approach. Integral Theory assigns no ontological or epistemological priority to any of these elements because they co-arise and “tetra-mesh” simultaneously. As a result they can be considered equally primordial. While Integral Theory provides a particular way of including these five elements, it recognizes that other approaches to education can achieve this without adhering explicitly to the AQAL model.

**PART 1: Twenty Aspects of Integral Education**

The Integral model provides an effective template to design pedagogy, classroom activities, evaluations, courses and curriculum. Drawing on the five elements of quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types, an instructor can be sure to include more essential aspects of educational space than most current approaches. These elements can be used to generate an Integral analysis so that instructors can quickly assess themselves, their students, and current courses more effectively. But just what, exactly, does Integral Education and instruction consist of?

One answer to this question is that, Integral Education and instruction includes all four quadrants of the AQAL framework, four general levels of developmental altitude in each quadrant, four lines of psychological development, four states of awareness, and four general typology approaches to learners – one per each quadrant. By drawing on at least four distinctions within each element you provide yourself with an even number of check-points to ensure that you are staying in contact with a manageable amount of irreducible aspects of reality. Admittedly, this is an ambitious template. While it is ambitious, there are a growing number of
educational programs like those in the Integral Studies department at JFKU that are striving to successfully included and apply these 20 aspects (four kinds of each of the five elements). The point here is not that the inclusion of more aspects is necessarily better. In other words, the goal is not to be totalistic but rather Integral in the face of practical judgment and limits given your educational context. The value of the 20 aspects for education is that they provide you with a quick way of scanning the AQAL matrix to see what additional elements you might include in your pedagogy, design, evaluation, and so on. At the very least, an Integral educator should be cognizant of all 20 and then use their own discretion of how to include them. The point is less about including everything and more about being aware of what you are not including.

Once all of these aspects are covered, Integral approaches to education can continue to expand and incorporate other aspects and dimensions as is appropriate for each context, such as types of religions or cultural lines of development. Of course, further distinctions within all the elements are encouraged and can be incorporated into various educational settings. These 20 aspects can be applied to the teacher, the students, and the classroom. For the purposes of this article, I will only provide a brief overview of these 20 aspects in order to give you a sense of the potential of this framework. In the Part 2 I will illustrate some of the ways the Integral Psychology program at JFKU works with these aspects.

Quadrants

Using the first element of quadrants, an Integral approach to education recognizes that any educational moment contains four irreducible dimensions: educational behaviors, such as reading, writing, lecturing, and sitting in chairs; educational experiences, such as imagination, emotional reactions, intuitions, thoughts, and insights; educational cultures, such as what is appropriate to say in class, shared meaning between students and faculty, and group values; and educational systems, such as financial aid structures, program curriculum, grading rubrics, and school policies. Each of these four dimensions are always present whether a teacher is preparing lessons at home, students are chatting in the hall, or the school is closed for the holidays. By recognizing that every moment in the classroom (or connected to it)
contains these four dimensions, you, as a teacher or student, can begin to consciously interact with these aspects for a deeper communion with reality and a fuller capacity for responsiveness.

Within each dimension, Integral Education recognizes that there are at least three broad levels of complexity that can be loosely correlated with body, mind, and spirit (see Figure 3). For example, within educational experiences, a teacher can give an assignment that invites students into 1) exploring the felt-experience of their bodies, 2) engaging a theory with their critical mind, or 3) noticing the ever-present Witness of their own awareness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Left (I)</th>
<th>Upper Right (It)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Experiences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Educational Behavior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemplative</td>
<td>Skillful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Left (You, We)</th>
<th>Lower Right (Its)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Culture</strong></td>
<td><strong>Educational Systems</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connective</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectival</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Twelve Commitments of Integral Education

These twelve commitments serve as a summary of the essential dimensions of an Integral approach to education. These twelve components can also be reframed as forms of engagement. In other words, not only can these twelve aspects represent the essential goals of a course or program (e.g., to be ethical, to be ecological, to be
practical), but they can be seen as the various modes of interaction and ways of knowing the world. For example, as a teacher or student, you can ask, “In what ways does my course support ___________” (insert each of the twelve ways of knowing in Figure 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Left (I)</th>
<th>Upper Right (It)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Educational Experiences</em></td>
<td><em>Educational Behavior</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemplative Inquiry</td>
<td>Skillful Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reflection</td>
<td>Practical Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic Knowing</td>
<td>Active Observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Left (You, We)</th>
<th>Lower Right (Its)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Educational Culture</em></td>
<td><em>Educational Systems</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Participation</td>
<td>Global Dynamism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectival Embrace</td>
<td>Social Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connective Encounters</td>
<td>Ecological Flourishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. The Twelve Ways of Knowing

Clearly, certain situations or courses might require an emphasis on some of these over others. However, any educator or student can quickly assess the Integral value of their course by scanning it to see what is being left out or underemphasized. Consequently, this Integral understanding can provide a quick and clear way of identifying what needs to be included in more depth and detail.

Each of these ways of knowing transcends and includes the terms listed below in their respective quadrant (see Figure 4). Thus, Integral Education can be
summarized as an approach that is accomplished through the four commitments of: Integral Action, Integral Inquiry, Integral Participation, and Integral Dynamism (see Figure 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Left (I)</th>
<th>Upper Right (It)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Educational Experiences</em></td>
<td><em>Educational Behavior</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral Inquiry</td>
<td>Integral Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Left (You, We)</th>
<th>Lower Right (Its)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Educational Culture</em></td>
<td><em>Educational Systems</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral Participation</td>
<td>Integral Dynamism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Four Commitments of Integral Education

In other words, Integral Education is a commitment to continually engage in action in the world as skillfully as possible; inquiry into one’s interior space along the entire spectrum of experience; participate compassionately with others; and support the health and dynamism of global systems.

**Levels**

In Integral Theory, levels can refer to either the general altitude of development across multiple lines or specific levels within a given line. In the context of the 20 aspects of Integral Education, levels refers to four general levels of altitude that occur in each of the quadrants. Using Wilber’s (2006) color spectrum these are: amber, orange, green, and turquoise. Other altitudes are important but given that these are the most common levels they receive particular focus here. These four levels are associated with the four most prevalent worldviews: traditional, modern,
postmodern, and integral. Each of these worldviews has its own preferred behaviors, experiences, culture, and systems.

Thus, Integrally Education includes these four levels and their correlates in all four quadrants as they occur within the teacher, the students, and the classroom. For example, a teacher might commonly have teal-integral experiences of inhabiting multiple perspectives, live in a small town embedded in a amber-traditional culture and teach in an orange-modern school system, where she is expected to perform orange-modern educational behaviors (lecture for most of the class, give multiple choice tests, etc.). A detailed description of these levels in the context of education (i.e., traditional educational experiences, modern educational experiences, etc.) is beyond the scope of this article. However, I want to provide at least one example that focuses on the value of recognizing these four general levels in students’ experience.

It is important for Integral educators to continually ask themselves how to teach in a way that could help their students transform vertically toward post-rational modes of being. According to Kegan (1994), in his book *In Over Our Heads*, there are five developmental levels or “orders of consciousness” that define how a person knows the world or constructs reality. The first three levels are similar to those found in today’s child and adolescent development texts: 1st order (ages 2-6 yrs), 2nd order (6-teens), and socialized or 3rd order (teens and beyond). Most adults (>80%) in developed nations reach at least the conformist or 3rd order of consciousness, where a person is able to internalize a value system, understand and respect the needs of others, and think abstractly.

In addition to the three commonly accepted stages or orders of consciousness development, Kegan research demonstrates the existence of two others—4th and 5th order. At the autonomous or 4th order of consciousness, a person becomes "self-authoring"—that is, they become capable of constructing their own value systems as opposed to operating within the value systems given to them by their culture, family, or place of work. At an integral or 5th order, they begin to bring together and synthesize many different value systems into coherent and meaningful wholes. Kegan (1994) correlates the 3rd, 4th, and 5th orders of consciousness with traditional, modern, postmodern, and integral experiences, cultures, behaviors, and systems.
This is extremely important for Integral Education because it means that even if a teacher is at the 4\textsuperscript{th} or 5\textsuperscript{th} order of consciousness, many of their students will be transitioning between 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 4\textsuperscript{th} order.\textsuperscript{xvi} Not to mention that Integral content generally demands a 5\textsuperscript{th} order of consciousness in order to be fully grasped both conceptually and in an embodied way. An important question that emerges is, how do we as educators work creatively with this situation and avoid placing students in over their heads? By creating an Integral classroom, teachers can support and challenge their students to develop beyond their 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 4\textsuperscript{th} order selves in order to more fully experience and embody 5\textsuperscript{th} order integral capacities.

**Lines**

Since Howard Gardner (1983) published *Frames of Mind*, the notion of multiple intelligences has received a lot of interest in the context of education. In Integral Theory, multiple intelligences that are known to demonstrate vertical growth are called developmental lines. There are over a dozen developmental lines that have been researched.\textsuperscript{xvii} While there are lines of development in all the quadrants, there are at least four main developmental lines within an individual’s interior that Integral Education should take into consideration: cognitive, emotional, moral, and kinesthetic.\textsuperscript{xviii} Each of these four capacities of an individual’s self-system allows them to grasp a different aspect of reality:

- **Cognitive Line**: grasp of the (inter)objective realm, including sensory input, perspective taking, and interconnections between phenomena.
- **Emotional Line**: grasp of the subjective realm, including feelings and impulses, internal sensations, and phenomenological awareness.
- **Moral Line**: grasp of the intersubjective realm, including interpersonal obligations and responsibility, duty, and compassion.
- **Kinesthetic Line**: grasp of the somatic and physical realm, including physical sensations, hand-eye coordination, and bodily movement.

By developing these four capacities we serve ourselves in multiple ways and provide an ongoing integrative process between essential components of the self-
There are many ways, as I will demonstrate below, that these four aspects of the self-system can be exercised and honored in education. Other important lines that can be included in education include the interpersonal, spiritual, aesthetic, psychosexual, and self-identity lines.

**States**

Numerous states of embodiment, consciousness, and awareness occur within the educational context. Teachers and students often experience such ordinary and non-ordinary states as insight, confusion, joy, presence, hurt, clarity, embarrassment, fatigue, hunger, and so on. It is important to be aware of the occurrence states and the role they play in and out of the classroom. By working actively with various states, the transformative space of the classroom can be increased dramatically. There are at least four main categories of natural states of consciousness that are acknowledged and included in Integral Education. The first three are those states associated with waking, dreaming, and deep sleep: gross-waking states that take physical reality as its object; subtle-dream states that take the subtle realm as its object; causal-formless states that take vast openness as its object. The fourth category is witnessing states, which can take any state as its object and witness it (see Table 1).

- **Gross-waking states** such as the experience of the world through the five senses, and physical impulses and sensations.
- **Subtle-dream states** such as visualizations, imagination, reverie, dreams, emotions, images, and the experience of intellectual luminosity.
- **Causal-formless states** such as formlessness, certain types of spaciousness, vast openness, creativity, and the experience of emptiness (*shunyata*).
- **Witnessing states** such as the capacity for unbroken attention (gross), lucid dreaming (subtle), or formless absorption (causal).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Four Major States of Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

xxiv There are many ways, as I will demonstrate below, that these four aspects of the self-system can be exercised and honored in education. Other important lines that can be included in education include the interpersonal, spiritual, aesthetic, psychosexual, and self-identity lines.
According to Integral Theory, each of these interior states has an exterior body associated with it. For example, a dreaming state is connected to the subtle body. Thus, by including these various states, an Integral educator is also including the major bodies that the esoteric traditions recognize and work with. Integral Education also takes the position that ever-present Nondual awareness is the ground of all states (and stages). These various states (and their accompanying bodies) can be included in numerous ways in education through various exercises and practices (e.g., body-based meditations and movement exercises), homework assignments (e.g., journaling about one’s experiences while doing some chi gong exercises), and group activities (e.g., t’ai chi or yoga).

**Types**

There are many types of learners and various cartographies that map their learning styles. These typologies range from well-documented gender differences, to the equally popular triad of visual, auditory, kinesthetic/tactile learners, which can be expanded into the five sensory representational systems of neurolinguistic programming (NLP), to the sophisticated nine type personality system of the Enneagram, or the sixteen Myers-Briggs personalities. While awareness of all these and the many other documented approaches to learning can enrich education. Integral Education recognizes at least one main category of learning styles per quadrant: sensory styles of learning in the Upper-Right quadrant (e.g., NLP); personality styles of learning in the Upper-Left quadrant (e.g., the Enneagram); gender styles of learning in the Lower-Left quadrant (i.e., masculine or feminine); and preferred narrative styles of writing in the Lower-Right quadrant (e.g., first-, second, and third-person narrative structures of communicating such as personal response paper, storytelling, and academic prose respectively). (See Figure 7.)
By being aware of and including these basic categories of learning types, educators dramatically increase their capacity to be aware of their own type strengths and weaknesses in each of these areas, to be more effective in the classroom through well-designed activities, and to be more responsive to students and their diverse needs. In short, by applying the AQAL framework and its five elements as outlined above, educators can become more Integrally-informed in their practice, in turn better serving the transformation of themselves, their students and schools.
PART 2: Integral Education in Action

The Integral model facilitates the ability to engage in any topic of study, any dialog, any experience, more intelligently. By intelligently, I mean in a more nuanced and deeper fashion. In one sense, the model is a beam of light, that has allowed me to see much further into the future and past, which, in turn, is in service of my richer understanding and experience of the present moment. In another sense, the model is a framework that represents our best understanding of how it all fits together. Even though the model itself is true but partial, it makes intellectual as well as intuitive sense. This is what is important for me. It doesn’t require blind faith to operate, and it doesn’t require a complete understanding to begin to experience it.

-- Chris Lindquist (3rd Year IP Student)

Over the last decade, there have been a number of milestones in the application of Integral Theory to develop Integral Education. In 1995 integral theorist Ken Wilber (1995) published his groundbreaking 800-page tome Sex, Ecology, Spirituality, which ushered in the “all-quadrant, all-level,” Integral approach. Shortly after its publication, individuals began applying the AQAL model to many fields and disciplines, including education. The Integral model provided these educators with a viable way of bringing together the best aspects of both conventional and alternative approaches, as well as highlighting the limits of each. No longer was there a need to choose between mainstream or holistic education programs or to try and assemble piece-meal aspects of both. The AQAL model provided a comprehensive and effective way to create an Integral Education.

As will be discussed more below, one of the more substantial applications of Integral Theory to education began in the summer of 2002, when founding members of the Integral Institute (Vernice Solimar, Ray Greenleaf, and myself) established an accredited Master of Arts degree in Integral Psychology at John F. Kennedy University (JFKU) in Pleasant Hill, California. This program is part of the Integral Studies Department at JFKU, which also contains a Holistic Health Education Program and a Consciousness and Transformative Studies Program. Both of these programs also draw on Integral Theory to inform their curricula, individual courses, evaluation, and pedagogy. Also beginning in the Fall of 2006 JFKU will offer a Master of Arts in
Integral Theory online in partnership with Integral Institute. Consequently, JFKU is a pioneer in Integral Education by providing an entire department with four programs applying the principles of Integral Theory in various ways. The Integral programs at JFKU are designed for turquoise students – just as grade school is for red through amber students, high school is for amber to orange students, and college is for orange to teal students. For students who enter the program they will need at least a turquoise level of cognitive development to do well in the program. The program helps to both “pull” students up and to help stabilize them at turquoise.

Integral Education attempts to combine the best of traditional approaches with the insights of alternative ones. It provides both academic rigor that develops the rational mind for critical inquiry and connects students to their preverbal bodies and transpersonal Spirit through experiential and collaborative inquiry. Whereas conventional approaches tend to emphasize the objective dimension of empirical science and rationality, and holistic approaches tend to highlight both the subjective dimension of expression and self-inquiry, and the intersubjective dimension of collaboration and meaning-making, an Integral approach includes and values all three dimensions: objective, subjective, and intersubjective.**

In fact, one of the key principles of Integral Education is the recognition that these three dimensions can be seen in how the teacher, the students, and the classroom all co-arise and develop/transform together. If one of these components of the educational space receives substantially less attention than the others, then a teacher’s attempts at an Integral Education will fall short of the AQAL integral ideal. Integral teachers should strive to simultaneously attend to: 1) their own subjectivity and “vertical” transformation through such practices as self-inquiry, meditation, shadow work, and embodied exercises; 2) the intersubjectivity they share with their students through such practices as reflective dialogue, collaborative exercises, perspective taking, and providing presence while others speak; and 3) their classroom through such practices as arrangement of seats/tables, use of space, structure of each class, opening windows, use of visual aids and handouts, assignments, and length of breaks. This third dimension is extremely important as it secures the actual space of communicative exchange. In some ways this is the most important component – often...
sorely overlooked – because if you do not help students be present to the actual exchange of signifiers they are not going to learn the signifieds.

Thus teachers aspiring to the Integral model proposed here should recurrently attend to these three dimensions: opening oneself to being continually shaped as an Integral teacher (the I); supporting and challenging students to be Integral students (the We); and recreating class structures into an Integral classroom (the It/s). Each of these three spheres has the capacity for vertical development. Teachers (and students) can individually develop worldcentric and post-rational capacities within multiple lines of psychological development (cognitive, emotional, interpersonal, moral, kinesthetic, etc.). Students in a course or program create a culture—a “we” space—that can also develop along a continuum from egocentric narcissism (e.g., “We are not going to do what the teacher says!”) to ethnocentric herd mentalities (e.g., “We will do what the teacher expects or what our parents/friends think we should do.”) to expressions of worldcentric perspectivalism (e.g., “We will keep many perspectives in mind and do what serves ours and others’ own growth within multiple dimensions.”). Classroom structures can also develop along a spectrum that supports and correlates with the vertical transformation of individuals and the group. On one end of the spectrum, you have authoritarian structures (e.g., rigid rules, teachers with unilateral power, and teachers serving as expert), and on the other end you have Torbert’s (1991) liberating structures that support group-reflectivity through multiple feedback loops. You can have an Integral classroom but lack Integral students; you can be an Integral teacher but not have an Integral classroom, and so on. Thus, Integral teachers aspire to coordinate and attend to all three, which in turn helps create the conditions of a dynamic, transformative space for all.

This triadic approach is relevant to education in myriad contexts, and is currently being applied to every level of education from kindergarten to graduate school. As a way of illustrating in more detail what an Integral approach to education consists of, I will now examine Integral Education in light of the five elements of Integral Theory, providing concrete examples of what an Integral teacher can be aware of in cultivating Integral students and creating an Integral classroom. As mentioned above, there are many ways to include these five elements, what follows
will serve merely as an illustration, not a paradigmatic example. Also, the inclusion of these five elements is scaleable and therefore can be as simple and straightforward or as complex, ambitious, and detailed as one likes. In fact, this scalability is what makes the Integral model so successful – it is extremely adaptable to various contexts.

The experience at JFKU has shown many of its teachers and students how the Integral model provides an effective template to design pedagogy, classroom activities, evaluations, courses, and curriculum. Drawing on the five elements of quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types, an instructor can be sure to include more essential aspects of educational space than most current approaches. In order to illustrate one model of Integral Education I will now focus on four aspects of the Integral Psychology program at JFKU.

**Integral Awareness Practice**

*Indeed, I have witnessed in myself and in classmates a profound unfolding of human potential, precisely because the Integral Psychology program has taken to heart Integral Theory’s call to yoga or practice. Both inside and outside of the classroom, students are encouraged to engage in self-inquiry, embodied reading, reflective dialogue, shadow work, multiple perspective taking, daily meditation, and so on. The result of such Integral Awareness Practice is not perfection but rather increasingly healthy and whole human beings, individuals capable of effecting positive change in the world.*

-- Jordan Luftig (3rd year IP student)

One defining characteristic of Integral Education is its emphasis on transformative practices that connect the five elements of Integral Theory to people’s lived experience, direct awareness, and embodied presence. Both teachers and students can engage in a variety of practices to exercise, strengthen, and cultivate their own Integral awareness. Every moment in and out of class can be used to deepen one’s own embodiment and transformation.

The following ten practices are ones that I use in my courses at JFKU to support the development of Integral Awareness in myself and my students. Students are expected to work with these in every class as well as at home. Class time is often set
aside to hear about people’s experiences with the practices and to give additional instructions on them. These ten practices interface with the five elements in numerous ways as should be obvious by the context.

- **Embodied Reading**: When you read the weekly assignments, read with your whole body (i.e., all three: gross, subtle, and causal). Be attentive to somatic states, presence, reactions, and your desire to read more or to not read at all.

- **Engaged Reading**: When you read the weekly assignments, read with your whole mind (i.e., all four major states). Be attentive to what excites you. Take notes, underline, identify questions, and outline key points/arguments.

- **Presence**: When you are listening to others speak, be present and fully attentive; when others speak, do not use it as a chance to collapse into your own world. Remain open to the mystery of the person talking. Feel your body, open your heart, and clear your mind.

- **Reflective Dialogue**: When you want to speak, reflect on how your contribution will deepen the conversation. Do not just talk to make a point or to have your cool idea heard. Be willing to not raise your hand and be willing to raise it. Notice how long you talk.

- **Shadow Work**: Be aware of your tendency towards projection, splitting things into “all good” and “all bad,” and other defenses such as rationalization and intellectualizing.

- **Inquiry**: Continually inquire into your own experience and be reflective of how you are contracted and/or open.
• **Perspective Taking:** Be open to perspectives, especially those that seem problematic or challenge your own. Take as many perspectives as you can, seeing the truth context of each.

• **Self-authorship:** Notice how you are often concerned with what people think of you, what the “rules” are, how to fit in, and so on. Continually embrace opportunities to strengthen your capacity to self-author and be autonomous in a non-egocentric way.

• **Witnessing:** Be aware of the part of your awareness that is absolutely free from contraction and is always witnessing everything that arises in each moment.

• **Daily Meditation:** Engage in some form of spiritual practice on a regular basis (e.g., breath counting, prayer, body scans, vipassana, yoga, visualization).

These ten practices serve to make the Integral Psychology program at JFKU transformational for teachers, students, and the classroom. These practices inevitably bring teachers and students into direct contact with the four perspective-dimensions of the quadrants, various levels of their own awareness-embodiment, various developmental lines/capacities, numerous states of being, and the many types of learning that are conducive to their own growth. In other words, these practices help to create Integral teachers, Integral students, and an Integral classroom.

**The Integral Mirror**

*This is my sixth quarter at JFKU and each of those quarters has included classes required by the IP program. Almost all the classes in the program encourage applying new knowledge and insights to one’s personal growing edge. Very often my studies caused me to bump up against the many ways I was, and am, closed to some experiences. Each class tries to provide me with tools to increase my openness and willingness to bring awareness to those areas of my life.*

-- Lola McCrary (2nd year IP student)
Another way I include the five elements of the Integral model at JFKU is through what I call the “Integral Mirror.” The Integral Mirror is a self-reflection assignment of twenty questions (see below) that I have students fill out towards the end of a course. They take the questions home and have up to three hours to complete them. While each question deserves several pages of response, it is their task to reflect on each question and then provide a succinct response with illustrative examples. They are instructed that each question can be answered in as little as 2-3 sentences and no more than 8-10. It is explained that they should not feel compelled to share anything they do not want to and are told that anything shared will be received in confidentiality.

The goal of the Integral Mirror is to allow students an opportunity to reflect on the many aspects of themselves that have been engaged over the duration of our time together in the course. It also has the effect of allowing students to see more clearly the areas of their life that they want to give more attention to. During the year a student will often respond to these questions several times in different courses. This structure allows students to track aspects of their own development in multiple dimensions throughout their three years in the program. Students are encouraged to keep copies of each Integral Mirror they complete in a binder so they can easily track where their growing edge is.

The twenty questions are divided into two parts. The first part asks questions associated with each element and the second part asks questions related to the various Integral Awareness Practices discussed above.

**Part 1: The Five Elements**

**Quadrants**

1. How has your relationship to your interior changed (e.g., bodily sensations, emotional experience, thoughts)?
2. How has your relationship to your physical (or energetic) body changed (e.g., diet, exercise, movement, health, chi)?
3. How have your relationships with other people changed (e.g., friends, family, colleagues, boss)?
4. How has your relationship to social and natural systems changed (e.g., money, housing, work environment, ecology)?

**Levels**
5. In what ways have you noticed that you adhere with social norms or fall into groupthink, peer pressure, and convention?
6. In what ways have you noticed that you are able to have clear and healthy boundaries and do what you know is best for you?
7. In what ways have you noticed that you are able to hold various types of paradox and track multiple aspects of a complex situation?

**Lines**
8. How has your capacity to take more perspectives increased?
9. How has your ability to interact with others increased?
10. How has your sense of moral obligation to others widened?
11. How has your experience of your emotions deepened?

**States**
12. In what ways has your day-to-day experience of reality changed?
13. In what ways has your relationship to dreams, the imagination, intellectual luminosity, or visualization changed?
14. In what ways has your relationship to the timeless Now or Presence changed?

**Types**
15. How have you become more aware of your personality (Enneagram, Myers-Briggs, introvert or extrovert, etc.)?
16. How have you manifested masculine and feminine energies, dynamics, tendencies?

**Part 2: Integral Awareness Practices**
17. Please describe your participation with Embodied & Engaged Reading.
18. Please describe your embodiment of Presence while others speak.
19. Please describe your participation with Reflective Dialogue.
20. Please describe your efforts at doing Shadow Work.
While these questions are powerful by themselves, their potency is increased by the fact that they are presented within the context of an Integral curriculum. For my next illustrative example of the Integral model applied, I will present the structure of the Integral Psychology curriculum at JFKU.

**An Integral Curriculum**

*The curriculum and the scholar-practitioner culture in the Integral Psychology program provide a transformational cauldron, resulting in a dramatic expansion of the perspectives I have access to, and am encouraged to take in my life and studies. It seems that on a weekly basis I am gaining intellectual structures alongside experiential ways of being that continually expose new ways I can observe and be in the world. Alongside the process of exploring new perspectives and ways of being, I am continually in wonder of the ways I am becoming present to previously unconscious filters, beliefs and patterned ways of being in the world.*

-- John Scheunhage (1st year IP student)

There are a number of ways that the Integral Psychology Program at John F. Kennedy uses the five elements in the curriculum design. As part of the curriculum, students can take a course that focuses on each of the elements: quadrants (Integral Psychology A), levels (Human Development), lines (Integral Psychology B), states (Nonordinary States of Consciousness or Neuropsychology), and types (Enneagram). Also, there is a two part mixed research course (Integral Research A & B) that uses Integral Methodological Pluralism to complete a research project over two quarters. In this course, students pick a topic and then acquire data on that topic using six different methods, two from first-person (Phenomenology and Structuralism), second-person (Hermeneutics and Ethnomethodology), and third-person methodologies (Empiricism and Systems Theory).

Also, the core curriculum is based on the four quadrants in order to ensure that students are exposed to major schools of psychology that specialize in each of those dimensions (see Figure 8). It is important to keep in mind that while specific courses might be associated with a particular quadrant, all of the courses are contextualized by the four quadrants. For example, even though neuropsychology as a
field is primarily focused on individual physiology and behavior (UR), it is taught in the Integral Psychology program in such a way that explores the experiential correlates to neurons (UL), intersubjective influence on neuronal development (LL), and evolutionary perspectives on neural networks (LR). In other words, the course does not just focus on the Upper Right aspects of neuropsychology but explores neuropsychology from all four quadrants. Also, many schools of psychology innately touch on several quadrants such as Somatic Psychology’s exploration of both phenomenological and physical aspects of the body. Nevertheless, even these kinds of orientations, as well as various orientations within a field, tend to specialize in one of the quadrants. Thus, the placement of courses in Figure 8 are representative and are not to be seen as exclusive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Left (I)</th>
<th>Upper Right (It)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enneagram</td>
<td>Neuropsychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>Psychobiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality and Psychotherapy</td>
<td>Science of Consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Dreams</td>
<td>Cognitive Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic Psychology</td>
<td>Integral Yoga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Left (You, We)</th>
<th>Lower Right (Its)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Dynamics</td>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersubjectivity</td>
<td>Planetary Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archetypal Psychology</td>
<td>Evolutionary Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object-Relations Theory</td>
<td>Organizational Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Sample Courses in the Integral Psychology Program at JFKU
In addition to using the four quadrants to organize the entire curriculum (e.g., Figure 8) or entire courses (e.g., neuropsychology), I also use them to organize individual classes within a course. The four quadrants help me decide which activities and assignments to combine each week to ensure that I am covering most of the bases and providing a pedagogically rich learning environment. For example, I often start out with a 10-20 minute meditation focusing on the Upper-Left quadrant of an individual’s direct experience. These are often body-focused, heart-focused, and/or spiritual in nature. I also do movement exercises and sensory awareness meditations (the Upper-Right quadrant), as well as explore intersubjective connections and dynamics (the Lower-Left quadrant). Then I usually give a 30-45 minute lecture with Q & A (the Lower-Left quadrant) that deals with the reading assignments and topic of the week (the Lower-Right quadrant). We then take a 15-minute break and do small group collaboration and/or student presentations when we return (the Lower-Left quadrant). A number of courses use journaling homework to help connect the course material to students lives (the Upper-Left quadrant).

**Integral Journaling**

*Journaling in the context of the four dimensions of human development was a compassionate way of holding one’s feet to the fire. It was a necessary, helpful, and enlightening experience. It was the time and place to actively and personally engage the four quadrants of the Integral model.*

*Necessary in that it laid the groundwork for all subsequent experience for me. It suggested that we are always experiencing each subject form all these angles and illustrated the power of grasping the depth and complexity of the Integral lens. The journaling process is helpful in that it actively facilitates personal evolution in an integral way through the process of bringing awareness to the multi-dimensionality of life.*

-- Chris Lindquist (3rd Year IP Student)

In addition, various assignments are used to explore the four quadrants, such as keeping a journal and each week writing entries that explore the course content and their own experience in relationship to each quadrant. As an illustration of this kind
of assignment, here is a part of my syllabus for the Human Development course that all incoming students take their first fall quarter.

**The Four Dimensions of Development Journal**

You will need to purchase a 100-page journal or notebook that can be divided into 4 sections each with about 25 pages. Or you can choose to type up each assignment and just keep them together with a paperclip.

The purpose of this journal writing is multilayered. It is meant to support your own inquiry as you are engaging with developmental theories, which can activate various psychological structures. Tracking your own reactions and experiences as they arise will help you to integrate these experiences and clarify how your own history shapes your interests and biases. The journal is also intended to aid you in developing some basic capacities for becoming a grounded researcher, such as observational and methodological skills as well as provide an opportunity for questioning and building theory from an experiential and theoretical vantage point. Below are some guidelines for the kinds of entries to include in each section:

**Experiences of Development**

- particular reactions and feelings arising in response to the content of the readings.
- observations about various experiences (sensory, emotional, cognitive) arising as you are engaging in this material.
- dreams, images, hunches, emerging memories.
- how particular areas of your life are being affected by the class content?
Cultures of Development

- questions that arise as you go through various readings and explore different theories, perspectives, and approaches to development.
- critique of the various articles/chapters and issues being raised through class.
- reflections on cultural, ethical, and philosophical understandings of development.
- your own philosophy/theory building.

Behaviors of Development

- observations of self and others that confirm or challenge developmental theories.
- logistical issues for setting up and performing observations.
- how do you plan on going about your observations?
- develop an observation criteria based on the theories you want to apply and challenge.
- descriptions of and reflections on the setting of your observations.
- general reflections and thoughts on developmental behavior.

Systems of Development

- observations and reflections of how different systems (legal, ecological, economic, political, educational) support or prevent development.
- what patterns do you recognize or identify?
- which particular issues are presented in your data?
- how do the perceived patterns of behavior relate to particular theories?
- what do you notice that is not covered by a theory?
Year after year, this ongoing assignment has proven extremely valuable for students by helping them connect to and integrate the material into their own lives. It also serves as the foundation for the final paper they do for the course. As the above examples illustrate, there are many ways the quadrants and other elements can be used to foster the growth of Integral teachers, supporting and challenging Integral students, and creating an Integral classroom.

**Seven Commitments of Integral Education**

With its many elements and distinctions Integral Theory helps to create a multidimensional learning environment that brings us into a fuller engagement with the major aspects of reality and allows a variety of ways of knowing and being. Drawing on Integral Theory, Integral Education emphasizes a number of points.

1. The best components of both conventional and alternative approaches to education can be integrated into a fuller, wider, deeper, more transformative educational space that is Integral in its curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation, and methods of inquiry. The AQAL model is a helpful and a comprehensive framework capable of accomplishing this task.

2. The teacher, the students, and the classroom can engage transformative processes through various practices of awareness, interaction, and organization. It is of utmost importance that the teacher continually engage in his or her own transformative practices, such as meditation and shadow work, in order to better stabilize post-rational modes of being and knowing.

3. The educational space has four irreducible dimensions that are all equally important and must be included in multiple ways: subjective experience, objective behavior, intersubjective culture, and interobjective systems.

4. Each of these four dimensions has depth and complexity that develops over time; this development can be facilitated. In particular, Integral
teachers need to monitor how they are meeting their students where they are developmentally and not placing them in over their heads.

5. It is crucial to attend to the multiple developmental lines in teachers as well as students. This involves understanding the complex relationship between the capacity to take multiple perspectives (the cognitive line), to interact in meaningful ways with others (the interpersonal line), and to engage in worldcentric ethical action (the moral line).

6. Teachers must recognize and work creatively with the many natural and non-ordinary states of embodiment and awareness that they and their students cycle through both in the classroom and in daily life in response to class content and activities. The more that teachers can support students in accessing various gross, subtle, causal, and witnessing states, the more fluid they will be in their own embodied awareness.

7. Because there are many types of learners and dimensions of learning, an educator needs to work with multiple typologies in order to provide the most responsive and effective educational space. Key typological categories to use include: the five senses, gender, personality, and preferred narrative style (i.e., first-, second-, and third-person).

These seven commitments represent a coherent Integral foundation upon which additional insights, understandings, and distinctions can be placed. In summary, Integral Education emerges from a commitment to continually: engage in action in the world as skillfully as possible; inquire into one’s interior space along the entire spectrum of experience; participate compassionately with others; and support the health and dynamism of global systems.
Conclusion: Integral By Design

In this article I have discussed how Integral teachers can use the five elements to transform themselves, serve their students, and create multidimensional curriculum. I have shown how Integral students at JFKU use ten transformative practices in and out of the classroom as well as how they use the five elements to deepen their own journey of self discovery and unfolding. I have provided an example of how the four quadrants can be used in Integral Journaling. I also have used the five elements to organize the curriculum and create Integral classrooms within the Integral Psychology program at JFKU where I have been Program Director since 2004. In summary, I hope I have been successful in explicating how the five elements of Integral Theory serve to create a uniquely comprehensive and dynamic approach to education; one that creates Integral teachers, students, and classrooms.

Certainly, educators who would like to take a step toward education that better serves the transformation of themselves, their students, and the planet should consider expanding their teaching repertoire and learning practices to include the modalities informed by Integral Theory described in this article. A careful incremental approach toward re-thinking and re-feeling curriculum in Integral terms needs to honor the unique context in which each educator plies her trade, of course, and thus the wholesale implementation of Integral Theory across the board will be possible only for the self-chosen few. This description of how Integral Theory’s comprehensive ideas and formulas translate into practice itself has been offered as an example of Integral Praxis. I hope you now have a better grasp of some of the strategies involved and challenges to be faced when trying to implement Integral Theory’s elements in the real world in real time. By showcasing a living example of a program that is Integral by design I hope to have contributed to the broader discourse on integral education. This article has been put forth as an invitation for educators to “stray afield” more often into new ways of thinking and perceiving; reflecting on the transformation of teachers, students, and classrooms.
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My aim in providing this contrast between Locke and Rousseau is not to simplify the complex history of education nor to reify a longstanding dualism within education but rather it is to illustrate two of the more pronounced historical currents within education.

Similarly, Ken Wilber (1995) refers to these respectively as “Growth to Goodness” versus “Return to Goodness.” However, he does uses these labels in a slightly different way, with “Growth to Goodness” referring to developmental approaches that avoid the pre/trans fallacy (Wilber, 1997) and “Return to Goodness” referring to approaches that commit the pre/trans fallacy. Also for Wilber, and Integral Theory in general one of the problems with the phrase “whole child” is that it is misleading because a whole preconventional child is quite a different matter than a whole conventional child.

Unless otherwise noted by context I will use “Integral Education” synonymously with “AQAL Education” differentiating it from the many approaches that sometimes identify themselves as “integral” but in fact often, in my experience, leave out too much to seriously be considered integral (i.e., all inclusive or comprehensive) in a general sense or Integral (i.e., AQAL) in a particular sense. These holistic-integral approaches are usually established in reaction to the limits of conventional approaches and are great at pointing out what those mainstream approaches leave out but simultaneously reject much of what they have to offer. Integral educators Jorge Ferrer, Marina Romero, and Ramon Albereda (2005) identify three approaches to integral education: mind-centered (e.g., approaches that take an integral intellectual approach to their curriculum), bricolage (e.g., approaches that include experiential components in a more traditional setting or in a mind-centered integral setting), and participatory (e.g., approaches that engage all human dimensions at every stage of the educational process). I am in substantial agreement with Ferrer et al. (2005) that the bulk of current approaches to education that identify themselves as “integral” are of the bricolage type and therefore deceptive because they “can create the false impression that one is actually engaged in integral learning simply because of the relative attention paid to other dimensions of the person—especially in contrast to traditional mind-centered education.” (p. 312). To this taxonomy I would like to add AQAL (e.g., approaches that use Integral Theory as a guiding framework for pedagogy, inquiry process, curriculum...
study, evaluation, and methodology). AQAL approaches to education build on Ferrer et al’s (2005) participatory vision by providing a comprehensive meta-framework that can more effectively accomplish their goals of integrating “the horizontal and vertical dimensions of integral education” (p. 313). However, it should be noted that Ferrer et al might disagree with this position, asserting that the AQAL framework constrains the participatory commitments of their approach. While a thorough exploration of the differences between a participatory and AQAL approach to education is beyond the scope of this article I would like to note that Integral Theory’s post-metaphysical position honors and expands Ferrer’s (1999) participatory vision. I believe that the Integral model is much more fluid and dynamic than is often recognized by educators including Ferrer et al. In fact, to some extent Ferrer et al (2005) approach to participatory education can be seen as an expression of the Integral approach I am advancing herein (see footnote 14).

The Integral model is postdisciplinary in that it can be used successfully in the context of disciplinary (e.g., helping to integrate various schools of psychology into Integral Psychology), multidisciplinary (e.g., helping to investigate ecological phenomena from multiple disciplines), interdisciplinary (e.g., helping to apply methods from political science to psychological investigation), and transdisciplinary (e.g., helping numerous disciplines and their methodologies interface through a content-free framework) approaches.

Integral Theory has been applied to a plethora of fields including: Medicine (Astin & Astin, 2002; Schlitz, Amorok, & Micozzi, 2004); Future Studies (Slaughter, 2001); Intersubjectivity (Hargens, 2001); Criminology (Gibbs, Giever, & Pober, 2000); Music Therapy (Bonde, 2001); Politics (Wilpert, 2001); and Sustainable Development (Hochachka, 2005; Hargens, 2002). As evidenced by these examples, Integral Theory has a wide range of applicability across divergent fields of inquiry. For additional examples consult AQAL: Journal of Integral Theory and Practice (www.aqaljournal.org) and Integral University (www.integraluniversity.org), where over 25 centers (e.g., Integral Art, Integral Medicine, Integral Science, and Integral Religious Studies) are devoted to exploring Integral approaches in their respective disciplines.

The quadrants can represent both the basic perspectives any individual can take on something (this is called a quadrivium—four views) and as the basic dimensions of an individual. So while artifacts such as a tables and chairs do not have all four quadrants (dimensions) they can be looked at from the four quadrants (perspectives).

Within Integral Theory, “levels” are most commonly used to refer to either the general altitude of complexity in any of the quadrants or as specific levels within various lines of development. The context will indicate the usage.

For an understanding of this co-arising see Wilber’s (2001, 2003, forthcoming) most recent work on post-metaphysics and Integral Methodological Pluralism.

For example, while Ferrer et al’s (2005) article on integral transformative education is not directly inspired by Integral Theory it does represent a compatible version of Integral Education by including the five elements of the AQAL model. Ferrer et al accomplishes this by including: quadrants through their discussion of the horizontal dimension of education, levels through their discussion of the vertical dimension of human complexity, lines through their discussion of the various developmental capacities of students and teachers (“interpersonal skills,” “emotional skills” etc), states through their inclusion of “special states of consciousness” (p. 308), and types through their discussion of masculine and feminine principles in education. This article is a great example of how one can accomplish Integral education without having to draw explicitly on Integral Theory or its framework. Likewise, Ferrer et al’s example illustrates that the five elements of Integral Theory can be basic (and intuitive) aspects of any approach that is committed to being integral. What Integral Theory provides is an explicit way of both including these elements into any approach and an explicit way of understanding the many complex ways these elements relate to each other. Thus, one does not have to subscribe to the AQAL model or all its tenets to accomplish the kind of integral education Integral Theory is committed to achieving. However, there are unique benefits and features afforded integral education that draws explicitly on Integral Theory.

Note the order of these terms within each quadrant is done so concentrically with the first level of complexity being closest to the center of the diagram and the third and most complex level, which transcends and includes the previous ones, is farthest away from the center. Also, some of the terms used at one level of complexity can be used to describe all the levels. For example, social in the LR can
be used to describe all three levels in the LR. It is also worth noting that here I am using “somatic” to refer to the endoceptual level of felt meaning associated with typhonic existence and not centauric awareness. See Wilber (2000f) *Integral Psychology* (p. 244 fn 14).

xvi Integral Dynamism can also be referred to as “Integral Networking.”

xvii Here turquoise is be used to include teal.

xviii Kegan (1994) points out that when an individual is at any level (e.g., 3rd order) 50% of their meaning making will issue from that order of consciousness and 25% from both the level below and above.

xix See Wilber (2000f) *Integral Psychology*

xx Based on current research (see Wilber 2000f) Integral Theory posits a necessary but not sufficient relationship between several developmental lines. In particular, the cognitive line has been demonstrated to lead the interpersonal line, which in turn has been shown to lead the moral line. This also makes logical sense. For example, one has to be able to hold something in awareness (cognitive line) before they can hold it in relationship to another person (interpersonal line). And the capacity to hold that object in relationship to another person is necessary before one can hold that relationship within a moral context (moral line).

xxi Note that each of these four lines can serve as the basis of judgments too.

xxii Of particular importance in Integral Theory is the self-identity or ego-development line and it’s capacity for post-ego-autonomous development. See Cook-Greuter (1999, 2002).

xxiii It is interesting to note that while the dream state can exist without the gross state (e.g., in a dream you are not seeing the gross sensorimotor world) you can have a dream state occur while in the waking state (e.g., having mental thoughts and insights while sitting in a classroom looking at the teacher up at the blackboard.). This is also the case with casual states (e.g., being overcome with creativity while working on an art project).


xxv Other recognized approaches to learning style include Kolb’s (1984) learning style model, Herrmann’s (1990) analysis of Brain Dominance, and Felder and Silverman’s (1988) approach.

xxvi Articles on Integral Theory and education include: A. Astin, 2000; R. M. Fisher in press; Gunnlaugson, 2004, 2005; Lauzon, 1998. Also, it is worth noting that in October 2002 R. Michael Fisher began a monthly newsletter on Integral Education and Pedagogy that ran for seven months. Michael Fisher’s newsletters can be found at [www.feareducation.com](http://www.feareducation.com) They contain many important ideas and explorations of crucial issues in Integral Education.

xxvii Also noteworthy in the history of Integral Education is that on July 20th - 22nd of 2000, the Integral Institute, which was founded in 1998, hosted its first meeting on Integral Education. This gathering brought together 50 educators who had been using Integral Theory in their departments, programs, classrooms, and courses.

xxviii For simplicity I am using “objectivity” to represent both the UR quadrant of objectivity and the LR quadrant of interobjectivity.

xxix Integral Theory points out that it is also very important to integrate prerational dimensions of oneself. See Kegan (1994) and Cook-Greuter (2002) for a more detailed presentation of the general levels of adult development.

xxx See Gebser (1984) for an overview of cultural development.

xxxi There are currently a number of other schools from elementary to high schools that are informed by Integral Theory. In Mt. Airy, Maryland, Jamie Wheal, the Director of the Misty Mountain Montessori Education Center, is exploring an Integral approach to Montessori education. He is expanding the Right-Hand quadrant focus of traditional Montessori programs (i.e., cognitive development in relationship to social and environmental factors) to include more Left-Hand quadrant elements, often associated with Waldorf schools (e.g., imaginal, creative/artistic, explorative, and cultural dimensions). In Tucson, Arizona there is El Pueblo Integral, a small K-12 school that combines Integral Theory with Paulo Freire’s approach to education. Nearby in Phoenix, Arizona is the Metropolitan Arts Institute, a college prep charter high school that combines Integral Theory with Howard Gardner’s research on multiple intelligences and student learning styles. In addition, there are many undergraduate university courses throughout the world that teach Integral Theory or apply Integral Theory to some context such
as art, ecology, or writing. And at the graduate level there are the three programs at JFKU discussed in this article.

JFKU consists of five schools: Law, Liberal Arts, Professional Psychology, Management, and Holistic Studies. Within the School of Holistic Studies there are a number of departments, including the Integral Studies Department (ISD). The Integral Studies Department, as mentioned before, has three programs: Holistic Health Education, Integral Psychology, and Consciousness and Transformative Studies. The entire Integral Studies Department and its three programs are informed by and, in many ways, built around Integral Theory. Of these three programs, the Integral Psychology program is the one that most explicitly uses the Integral model to create Integral classrooms.