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Teaching Integratively

Five Dimensions of Transformation

Roben Torosyan

A better-informed person is not necessarily a better-educated person. [Perhaps] the twenty-first century needs a new kind of learning and a new kind of leader to help us. [We need to] focus not just on the buildup of more knowledge but also on the fashioning of new relationships to the knowledge we already have.

—Kegan & Lahey, 2000, p. 234

Introduction

I teach to transform myself, others, and the world, and to realize I cannot change things. Many educators face related paradoxes. The word comes from the Greek para- for “beyond” and dokein for “to think”—literally “beyond thinking.” On one hand, for example, learners struggle with written grammar. But they also struggle to express themselves deeply, a skill which often requires deliberately ignoring errors and the internal critic.

While educational theories help educators develop such dualing competencies, it can be overwhelming for us, let alone for our learners, to reconcile these often contradictory demands. As the epigraph above suggests, everyone needs to not only see relationships, but to form different relationships to what they see. To that end, this chapter first describes big picture conceptions of knowledge, then shows five overarching patterns that cross many domains of learning. After providing a caveat about the risk of such grand narratives, I offer some pathways for classroom application, in terms of (a) our curriculum or content, and (b) our pedagogy or methods.
Background: Interdisciplinary, Integrative, and Integral Education.

Big Picture Conceptions

Since my teens, I have had a fantasy of organizing all of knowledge. I also loved the arts. When I got to college, I initially wanted to pursue architecture, the mother of the arts and sciences. I started by taking civil engineering prerequisites for architecture, but soon became part of that lower half of class that fell below the class average of a C. I eventually changed majors to art history, and there found inspiration in big ideas. I saw a lecture by Kirk Varnedoe that drew on the late nineteenth century novella Flatland (Abbott, 1884/2002) as a metaphor for the process of "going meta," or getting above any phenomenon. In the 1990s several revolutions in perspective occurred, from art to physics to literature, denoting a zeitgeist or spirit of the times that used an especially reflective kind of thinking.

Such big shifts, I learned, were part of larger patterns of thinking throughout the disciplines and daily life. In 1990, I came across a "Roots of Knowing" (Hussey, 1988) approach to education, proposed by Rachel M. Lauer, a former chief psychologist for the New York City schools who had founded a "thinking and learning center" at Pace University. I later worked with Lauer for five years while writing my doctoral dissertation at Teachers College on her learning-centered methods for encouraging consciousness development (Toroyan, 2000).

Lauer argued, for instance, that most thinking involves a cyclical "PEDA process" of perception, evaluation, decision-making and action (Lauer, 1971, 1983, 1996-97). Others suggested similar cycles. Schon claimed that we interpret experiences "through our repertoires of values, knowledge, theories, and practices that [we] bring to the experiences" (Zeichner & Liston, 1996, p. 16). Using such "applicative systems," we spiral from appreciation to action to reappraisal. For learning to then be transformative, as Jack Mezirow (1991) argued, learners need to "understand more clearly the reasons for their problems and the action options open to them so that they can improve the quality of their decision making." (p. 203).

As Lauer further showed, thought and action are filtered through an epistemology or way of knowing that conveys an often unconscious set of assumptions about what is true, real, or powerful, or how things work (Lauer, 1996-97). Development in such a worldview happens (and fails to happen) in individuals as well as across society from ancient times to the modern and postmodern revolutions. As Michel Foucault (1972/1994) postulated, "In any given culture and at any given moment," things operate according to a characteristic "episteme," a mode that "defines the conditions of possibility of all knowledge, whether expressed in a theory or silently invested in a practice" (p. 168). A sequence of development of mindsets (Sternson, 1972; Bois, 1970) unfolds on the part of whole cultures or epochs. In Kieran Egan's view (in Olson & Torrance, 1996), students recapitulate the discoveries that constitute their cultural history.

Teaching Integratively

To surface such patterns, teachers should, in Lauer's argument, help learners focus on the underlying "universal meta-concepts" or "metaconcepts" (Lauer, 1996-97, p. 387) behind each worldview. After much practice applying these "meta" themes, learners gradually clarify their own thinking and free it up. Ideally, they "finally grasp the whole orientation, the grand theme of knowing implied in each episteme" (Lauer, 1996-97, p. 378). These epistememes are less empirically demonstrable than a heuristic or tool for understanding and solving problems of life.

To promote such a meta-view of the landscape of learning, some courses introduce many disciplines at once (see Fig. 6, Box A, next page). Related courses have evolved nationally; although few draw on the 70 years of scholarship streams in "integrative" learning. Work in "integrative education," called such as early as the 1940s (Reiser, 1958), has continued in research on student development and the process of personal maturation (Baxter-Magolda, 2004), explicit attention to crossing disciplines in interdisciplinary studies (Klein, 1990), and transformative learning's focus on the process of reframing problems and orientations (Mezirow, 2000). Meanwhile, outside of education, other professions have evolved related movements, from "integrative medicine" and its appreciation of complementary and alternative spiritual and emotional practices (Snyderman & Weil, 2003) to "integrated design" for sustainable development of neighborhoods (Engel-Yan, Kennedy, Saitz, & Pressnail, 2005) to an "integrative systems" approach to aircraft engine design (Sosa, Eppinger, & Rowles, 2005).

Across another broad range of work are several big picture conceptions of nature, knowledge, and events. In psychology, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (2003) famously elucidated the main metaphors people live by, such as argument is war or time is money. In organizational development, Gareth Morgan (2007) showed images people have of the workplace, such as a well-oiled, if bureaucratic, machine, an adaptive organism, or a self-organizing brain. In the sciences and beyond, biologist Tyler Volk (1995) worked out a number of "meta-patterns" or universal principles of organization, such as "binary," "cycle," and "break," while Edward O. Wilson (1998) sought "consilience," a unity of knowledge to integrate the arts and sciences. In history, David Christian (2004) described big timelines moving from "many worlds" to "few worlds" to "one world," in both natural history and human evolution, and John Lewis Gaddis (2002) asked historians to step back and widen their view of the landscape of the past. Each such conception went "meta" or got above other theories.

According to the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U), three related "new academy reforms" are now influencing mainstream higher education in the United States: (1) intellectual skills across the curriculum, (2) social responsibility and civic engagement, and (3) "integrative learning" (Schneider, 2005, p.11). When the AAC&U published a monograph on integrative learning (Huber & Hutchings, 2004) and held its first ever conference on the subject in 2005, it marked a watershed moment—as faculty focused explicitly on integration for the first time across much of mainstream higher education. Meanwhile, others
Common to this work is a desire to help people “integrate their learning across contexts and over time” (Huber & Hutchings, 2004, p. 1). Intellectually, “integrative learning” comes from a collective desire, as Boyer (1990) famously suggested, to promote “discovery and creativity, integrating and interpreting knowledge from different disciplines, applying knowledge through real-world engagements, or teaching students and communicating with the public” (summarized by Huber & Hutchings, 2004, pp. 1–2). To that integrative end, psychologists and philosophers have proposed overarching frameworks with distinct parallels.

Parallels Across Frameworks

Developmental theorists propose discrete stages of complexity and sophistication—typically three to six phases, positions, orders, or ways of knowing. As one compares their stage descriptions (see Fig. 7, next page), overall parallels appear. Most schemes begin with a level of sensory knowing (Lauer, 1971; Torosyan, 2000), an impulsive order of mind (Kegan, 1994), focused on instinct, the bodily senses, or sexuality (Wilber, 2000, 2001). In this first sensory dimension, which I term “1-D,” sensation and play dictate life. Infants center on vitality and aliveness. Adults experience strong instincts and desires, including sexual impulses.

Eventually, however, development involves managing such sensations. With concrete operations (2-D categorical), children learn to use symbols and language (Piaget, 1929/1997). Moving to the right in the table, then, the second dimension steps back from and builds upon the prior one, just as a two-dimensional line extends one-dimensional points into a series. A child, for example, one day sees that a shorter beaker has as much liquid as a taller, thinner one. As Jean Piaget (1929/1997) showed, the child “assimilates” experience through an existing lens, but after enough new experience, “accommodates” or switches lenses—in this example achieving “conservation,” the ability to see how things are the same despite changing physical appearances. Such skill in remembering and understanding, the first two of Benjamin Bloom’s taxonomy (adapted in Richlin, 2008), are needed at all ages. For example, professors expect learners to discern basic patterns, whether to notice an artwork’s contrasts and juxtapositions, create a chemical reaction that will produce a specific result, or mathematically model economic behavior given interacting variables. Across these instances, what matters are not simply senescent observations (1-D) but structures (2-D) for such observations, and the conventions valued by society (Wilber, 2000, 2001).

The liability of such thinking, however, is that one thinks only in concrete, about dualistic dichotomies of only two attributes or options at once. People often see knowledge as “received” or “mastered” (Baxter-Magolda, 1992, 2004), or as something absolute and held by external authorities. When William Perry (1968/1999) interviewed Harvard undergraduates, for instance, he found that first

have encouraged “integral” education (Ferrer, Romero, & Albrecht, 2005, current volume; Torosyan et al., 2004; Wilber, 2001), and aimed beyond mostly intellectual or emotional connections, to also link body, mind, and spirit (Ausbrey, 2006; Blaie & Caine, 1995), while correcting a commonly imbalanced focus on either mental life alone, or turning the mind off entirely.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Torossian, Lauer</th>
<th>1-D Sensory</th>
<th>2-D Categorical: sort and standardize sensations</th>
<th>3-D Relational: research, theorize and test categories</th>
<th>4-D Meta-reflective: transform framework used to research and theorize</th>
<th>5-D Integrative: unify subject and object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloom's taxonomy</td>
<td>Remember: Recall terms and ideas</td>
<td>Understand: Group meaning</td>
<td>Apply: Use learning in new situations</td>
<td>Analyze: See patterns, compare and contrast</td>
<td>Evaluate: Assess evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piaget's stages</td>
<td>Sensorimotor: see objects</td>
<td>Preoperational: use symbols and language</td>
<td>Concrete operations: concrete operations</td>
<td>Formal operations: formal operations</td>
<td>Post-operational: post-operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry's positions</td>
<td>Dualism: &quot;just the facts, ma'am&quot;</td>
<td>Multiplicity: &quot;pick an opinion, any opinion&quot;</td>
<td>Relativism: &quot;bullshit&quot; to play &quot;teachers' games&quot;</td>
<td>Commitment within relativism: choose and mix paradigms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxton-Magnold's ways of knowing</td>
<td>Absolute: knowledge is received (women) or mastered (men)</td>
<td>Transitional: women dialogue; men debate</td>
<td>Independent: females gain voice but value exchange; males value own thinking</td>
<td>Intersubjective: share responsibility for constructing others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Kegan's orders of consciousness | Impulsive: subject to impulses, perceptions | Imperial: attend to individual's needs, interests, desires | Interpersonal: attend to interpersonal relationships and mutuality | Institutional: attend to relationships, subject to individual's authorship, identity and ideology | Inter-individuals: attend to authorship or ideology, subject to inter-penetrability of self-systems |
| Wilber's quadrants and levels | Magical-anamistic: preconventional, premodern, body, instinct, sensation, "me" | Mythic-conventional: symbol, power, civilization, culture, self-protective, conformist | Rational-scientific: conventional rules; modern; formal, empirical study, mind, ethnocentric/"us" | Pluralistic: postconventional, postmodern, intersubjective, meta-systemic | Integral: spirit, global, transcendent, interconnection, "all of us" |

Figure 7. Parallels Across Frameworks
year students want, as Craig Nelson put it, "just the facts, mam' and expect to memorize them (just) long enough to pass the exam" (Nelson, 1999, p. 170). To get beyond seeing only right or wrong distinctions, see shades of gray, and discern what facts are relevant to any particular situation, people move to what Perry (1968/1999) termed "multiplicity" (3-D relational), where earners acknowledge opinion and uncertainty, and see truth as determined not just by outside authorities, but personally. As Piaget (1929/1997) showed, children eventually use abstract reasoning, the scientific method, and systematic thinking. College students apply and analyze, in Bloom's taxonomy, when they learn how, for example, an artwork's juxtapositions depend on its context, a chemical reaction may produce unforeseen or indeterminate results, or economic models shift dynamically as assumptions shift. In each example, one needs to tolerate ambiguity in interpretations, see fluid relations and consider multiple attributes at the same time. Otherwise, principles can become ossified. One classroom exercise, literally bringing fruit to the discussion, helps get beyond text alone to a felt sense of the flexibility demanded by this mindset (see Fig. 8, Box B).

In response to such a relational world, learners often conclude that nothing can be known or that all opinions are equal, retreating into relativism (Perry, 1968/1999). Nelson (1999) called this the "Baskin Robbins" mode where learners pick opinions the way you "pick a flavor, any flavor" of ice cream, "based on feelings or intuition, not on reasoned analysis" (p. 171). Often one does so to escape the quite understandable pain of having to decide between competing "goods"—choices that seem equally good. When one decides (from the Latin decidere, literally "to cut off"), one inevitably cedes something, or gives up an option. But as Bloom's taxonomy recommends, life requires that people not only recall info (2-D), and analyze it (3-D), but eventually move to make such decisions, "evaluate" them, and ultimately construct their own connections (4-D) as well.

To be truly changed by learning, then, is to treat experience not as "information" but as "transformation" (Mezirow et al., 2000). As Lev Vygotsky argued, development requires not just 2-D "accumulation of knowledge" or a 3-D "sequence of stages like Piaget's" (Egan, 1997, p. 514), but the 4-D "transformation of forms of mediation" (Wertsch, in Egan, 1997, p. 514). When Robert Kegan (Mezirow et al., 2000) asks "What form transforms?" he suggests that the vessel itself must change, creating a new 4-D framing or mindset.

Seeking such change, educators are often frustrated at learners who depend on authority (3-D) rather than self-direct their own actions (4-D). But, as Kegan argues:

Can we fault them for feeling whole when we like their work, incomplete when we don't? It's just that the self they're directing is not the one we're hoping for at that moment. They're directing the self that sees alignment not the one that self-authors. (Lecture, November 18, 2006)

Only when learners eventually achieve "commitment within relativism" (Perry, 1968/1999), do they assume that they share responsibility not simply for entertaining perspectives but for actively constructing knowledge. Such "capacity of learners" to internally define their own beliefs, identity, and relationships (Baxter-Magolda, 2001, p. xvi) amounts to what Kegan (1994) termed "self-authorship," relating ways of reasoning as the entire table above relates frameworks to each other.

Most of these frameworks, however, focus on a cognitive, an emotional, or a spiritual emphasis—rarely integrating all such dimensions. In response, integral theorist Ken Wilber describes four perspectives and their associated methodologies or areas of focus: (1) the subjective (the "I"), (2) objective or behavioral ("It"), (3) intersubjective or cultural ("We"), and (4) interobjective, social or systems ("Us") (Wilber, 2000). Others emphasize "nested world contexts" (O'Sullivan & Taylor, 2004, p. 14) or what Wilber, borrowing the term from Koestler, terms "holons." Every issue differs according to the scale of our focus, ranging from the human intrapsychic, interpersonal, or group community (Lauer, 1996-97), to empirical.

**Box B: Classroom Application: When is a Lime Not a Lime?**

In one classroom exercise, my mentor Rachel Lauer put three objects out on the table: a fresh lime, another lime that was old and rotting, and a blackened, dried lump. She wrote on the board, "When is a lime not a lime?" Conventionally, in a categorical (2-D) view, we think we know a lime when we see one, and at some point the aging object cannot rightly be called a lime. But when we try and discern exactly what that point is, we find the object is itself always changing, just as every object and concept changes. That is why general semantics, the study of how language transforms thinking, recommends we "index" people and things (Hayakawa, 1978), to say, for example, not simply "Roben thought X" but "Roben thinking at 6:35 p.m. on this day on that trail thought X." By specifying time, place and circumstances, I acknowledge that the name of things depends on the interaction of surroundings and situations (3-D). The activity also symbolized how, at root, everything is always already in a process of evolving flux and transformation. That process is one of the cross-disciplinary "meta-concepts" (Lauer, 1996-97) that constitute 3-D relational thinking.

**Figure 8. Classroom Application: When Is a Lime Not a Lime?**
microscopic, macroscopic, or ecosystem levels. But in addition to where we focus, it matters how we do so—ideally using what Wilber (2000) calls magic, mythic, rational, pluralistic, and integral approaches. While may not be entirely accurate to map Wilber’s levels in strict correlation with the other frameworks above, he seeks to unify all five dimensions (1-D through 5-D). Of course, such unifying attempts run the risk of being simplistic, as narratives often do.

The Problem with Grand Narratives

The final belief is to believe in a fiction, which you know to be a fiction, there being nothing else. The exquisite truth is to know that it is a fiction and that you believe in it willingly.

—Wallace Stevens, 1957/1989, p. 189

Every story smooths over differences and forces facts to fit an overarching framework (literally to “arch over” or dominate the domain of understanding). So too with every unifying theory: Give a person a hammer, and everything can become a nail—pegged with a label. A “theory of everything” (Hawking, 2002; Toroyan, 2001; Wilber, 2001) thus necessarily essentializes—in so doing it risks telling a story that reduces the world’s complexity to a deceptively monolithic simplicity. Postmodern critical theorist Jean Francois Lyotard (1984) famously endorsed a skeptical “incredulity toward such meta-narratives,” those grand claims to reach a perspective above it all. For no attempt to transcend limits is ever total, pure, or complete.

When, for example, I label five developmental mindsets, I reduce reality to a few categories, and thus fall prey to categorical labeling, itself one of my developmental stages. Often I also find myself looking for the “right” way to either write efficiently, teach well, or achieve the most enlightened critical stance on my own view of enlightenment. Yet developmental dimensions help. They make me aware of just those kind of tendencies to act impulsively, categorize, relate or reflect, where such patterns come from, why they are understandable, and why they are not: all easy to combat—in my own mind at least in those of others. After all, I still personally fall back to simpler developmental dimensions, all the time.

But, equally important, “higher” dimensions are not reified entities, or superior at all times, places, and circumstances. Moral theorist Lawrence Kohlberg (Kohlberg & Mayer, 1972), for example, first proposed “Development as the Aim of Education,” suggesting that teaching should improve people’s ability to solve problems and act morally. But if we view such progress as linear, we forget that different strengths and capacities are needed at different times.

Rather than take developmental dimensions to be a hierarchy, or see progress as strictly linear, I envision development as iterative, cyclical, and spiraling, as do integral theorists. As I grow personally, then, I always return close to where I begin, although forever different. Thus the integrative framework I propose is less an essentialized, monolithic statement of anyone's thinking, and more a heuristic reference tool (Laue, 1996–97) for reasoning. My instrument is necessarily blunt and imprecise, for I am not observing neutrally but actively contributing to what I observe, but it helps me to uncover assumptions and diversify ways of being.

Yet even my attempt to use a framework and qualify its limits is fraught with a problem of language and reason: One cannot fully get out of the way one frames things, even to describe that framing. As Surber (1998) puts it, “any attempt to theorize culture objectively is already informed by its own cultural prejudices and becomes destabilized and self-undermining in the very process by which it attempts to conduct its critique” (p. 183). In philosophy, such a criticism comes from post-structuralist and post-modernist discourse, where the task is “not . . . to propose yet another theoretical discourse but rather to force . . . existing cultural discourses to show themselves” (Surber, 1998, p. 183). I want to similarly surface ideologies, but also organize them into a few succinct frameworks for workability and ease of recall.

Such narratives, however, also risk subsuming everything to their structures. With a debt to Foucault, Minnich (2005) shows that the way many “meaning systems deal with being disrupted” (p. 5), is to “realign themselves to neutralize, absorb, and/or recast challenges as mere additions, thereby maintaining themselves at base just as they were” (p. 5). To avoid maintaining my assumptions just as they are, I must use such systems iteratively. As Stevens suggests in the epigram above, then, I consider my framework fictional, as it at once uses empirical data and is made up by me as I go. Yet I choose to believe in a fictional picture, remaining aware of its limits, skeptical, and nevertheless action-oriented at the same time.

Pathways and Pitfalls for What We Teach, and How

Rather than see recall of foundational content, making of conceptual connections, and developing process or skill competencies as separate, we should unite these diverse dimensions (Fink, 2003; Weimer, 2002). The very content we teach should be more than either subject matter (2-D) or connections (3-D) alone, but connected content, and content-rich connections (4-D). To teach integratively, then, is to facilitate experiences that help develop a mobility of mind along all five dimensions—sensory (1-D), experiential (2-D), relational (3-D), meta-reflexive (4-D), and integrative (5-D).

Each dimension, however, has limits, and each strength has distinct liabilities (see Fig. 9, next page). Rather than propose another hierarchy, I use Laue’s (1996–97) five stages and re-label them dimensions, using a spatial metaphor for living and learning. As physicists attest, we need 1-D lines to create a plane, 2-D planes to make 3-D space, interpenetrating dimensions to make the 4-D curvature of space-time,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key operations</th>
<th>1-D Sensory</th>
<th>2-D Categorical</th>
<th>3-D Relational</th>
<th>4-D Meta-reflexive</th>
<th>5-D Integrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense, feel, intuit</td>
<td>Sort, standardize</td>
<td>Research, theorize, relate</td>
<td>Transform frameworks used to research and theorize</td>
<td>Consciously unify separation of subject &amp; object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways provided</td>
<td>Alive to external and inner data</td>
<td>Achieve order, structure</td>
<td>Adjust theory, notice perspective</td>
<td>Step back from framework behind how one changes</td>
<td>Integrate body, mind, spirit; transcend language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitfalls risked</td>
<td>Assume only one's own feelings are justified; seek only immediate gratification</td>
<td>Force facts to fit theory; presume others are wrong</td>
<td>Snuck in framework behind how one changes theory</td>
<td>Limited by language; create separation</td>
<td>Limited clarity, distinctness, or closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One takes as an object for consideration</td>
<td>Observations, impulses, intuitions</td>
<td>Assumptions used to achieve order</td>
<td>Frameworks behind adjusting of theory</td>
<td>Intervening language used to step back from framework</td>
<td>Blurring of people, systems, boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One is subject to</td>
<td>Observations, impulses, intuitions</td>
<td>Assumptions used to achieve order</td>
<td>Frameworks behind adjusting of theory</td>
<td>Intervening language used to step back from framework</td>
<td>Blurring of people, systems, boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Five Dimensions of Thinking, Learning, and Living
content requires another step to shift the very way things are known (4-D). In my
view, for example, modern art began to intrigue me precisely because it reframed
what "art" itself could mean. Abstract expressionist views that splashes of paint
did not have to represent anything, because art was not a predefined thing but a
revelative process determined by artists and viewers alike. Most exciting to me, a
urinal was declared art, simply because it could be.

In philosophy, content can highlight the virtue of play and Ayn Rand's valuing
of selflessness (1-D), or mind-body dualism, ideals, and Immanuel Kant's notion of
law in the categorical imperative (2-D). Philosophy also explores empiricism, and
the difference between an observed fact and an inference or generalization from
such an observation, and the relational ethic of care (3-D). Meta-reflexive content
includes Thomas Kuhn's paradigm shift, the influence of language and power, and
decomposing the very ways we use empiricism or relational ethics (4-D). Beyond
finding cognitive dissonance (3-D and 4-D), Taoism, Sri Aurobindo and work in
mindfulness finds an indivisible wholeness (5-D).

In psychology and other social sciences, people learn to make observations (1-D), categorize such facts to label disorders (2-D),
and make a differential diagnosis by weighing numerous and sometimes conflicting
indicators (3-D). In critical psychology, the very acts of psychologizing are questioned,
just as positivist psychology aims beyond pathologies to instead highlight produc-
tive life (4-D). Integral psychology further brings back a return of consciousness
and spirit (5-D) to understanding human surviving and thriving (Wilber, 2001). Besides
such spanning of content across dimensions, however, our methods should also
employ multiple learning styles (Richlin, 2006), as follows.

Pedagogical Process: Methods of Teaching and Learning

Activities, assignments, as well as how we think about our teaching, can draw
variously on play, structuring, making connections, thinking about overall thinking
patterns, and bringing it all together (see Fig. 11, next page).

Of special relevance to integral educators may be the 4-D and 5-D use of
various methods. I have students write haiku, for example, to capture their own
insights in ways that transcend literal 3-D language or 4-D reflection, and use more
indirect (5-D) communication instead. To make classroom discussion transforma-
tive, I have students "sayback" (Elbow & Belanoff, 2000) what they understand,
and check whether they grasp an opposing view (4-D) to the other's satisfaction
(Torosyan, 2004-05). But further, they can listen for not just words or even intent
(4-D), but hidden messages and deeper meanings, and simply resonate with others
(5-D). After I participated, for example, in a training program on group dynamics
facilitation, I noticed patterns of my own (4-D) like needing approval and leaping
to respond to triggers or painful emotions (Torosyan, 2008). I also use perceptual
devices that trick the eye to have students experience (5-D) and not simply relate
(3-D) or reflect upon (4-D) a change in how they actually see things.
One writing exercise shows 4-D self-assessment in action. In my modern philosophy course, my students often arrive skeptical of the subject’s relevance and why they must take the requirement. To motivate their interest, I have them write a “Hundred Questions” to begin with what most drives their own inquisitiveness (see Fig. 12, Box C).

Another way to integrate dimensions is to break assignments into steps, each appealing to different pathways and overcoming different pitfalls of the dimensions. Early on in my philosophy course, for instance, I have my students write a letter...

---

**Box C: Classroom Application: One Hundred Questions**

**Instruction:** To begin, make a list of a hundred “power questions” (Gelb, 1998) that are important to you. As Gelb describes:

Include any question as long as you deem it significant, from “How can I save money?” or “How can I have more fun?” to “What is the purpose of my existence?” and “How can I best serve the Creator?” Do the entire list in one sitting. Write quickly; ignore spelling, grammar, or redundancy (recurring questions help show emerging themes). The first 20 or so will be “off the top of your head.” In the next 30 or 40, themes often begin to emerge. And, in the second half of the list you may discover unexpected but profound material (Gelb, 1998, p. 59).

Afterward, read about my experience (in Gelb, 2002), list a few common themes from your list, then rank 10 questions most significant to you, with the most important first. Describe any unexpected discoveries, and connect to at least one of the 12 big questions in the text. Post online. Then reply to a post that has no replies, saying what the post makes you think about.

**Outcome:** Pushing for quantity over quality, the structure overcomes nervousness about competence in philosophy, and instead encourages playful (1-D) curiosity. Categorizing themes holds a mirror up to one’s own thinking (4-D), and clarifies often unspoken philosophical values (2-D). Selecting a few top questions forces learners to link disparate interests and prioritize them (3-D). When learners share their goals and why they matter, many end up resonating (5-D) with me or other readers about deeply personal and powerful experiences. For example, one teenaged student described losing a younger brother to a terminal disease, another was surprised to realize his parents were human beings, and another struggled to manage a personal financial crisis.
to a novice who has never studied the subject. They do so through three to four drafts, so they can receive feedback from others before submitting the last one to me (see Fig. 13, Box D).

The very way I (and my students) do reflection depends on the dimensions used. In one course I taught, for example, an initially resistant student used 4-D reflection on his own behaviors by creating a personal project to improve his time management skills. But in the process, I likewise had 4-D realizations about how I unintentionally invited mimicry from him, making it unclear how much he was really transformed (Toroyan, 2007–2008). When my student reported sympathizing with people, for example, his awkward language revealed I may have influenced him to simply parrot back my repeated emphasis on empathy.

**Box D: Classroom Application: Letter to a Novice**

**Instructions:** First draft: Write a letter to a friend who knows nothing about modern philosophy, explaining one of our 12 big questions, with an example. Free write: No stopping, no correcting. As Joan Didion said, “First draft: Don’t get it right, get it done.” Bring three copies to hear what resonated with others. **Outcomes:** This draft usually gets writers excited and playing freely (1-D), just getting ideas out of the mind and into concrete words (2-D). Second Draft: Revise and Rethink: Read, then list, “What haven’t I said yet” writing from your first felt sense (Fulwiler & Hayakawa, 2007; Sondra Perl in Elbow & Belanoff, 2003). Then outline after the fact, reorganize, and check it against samples and comments I posted. This draft should look very different from your first. **Outcomes:** Students get to see early writing not as a static product (2-D) but instead as a fluid process of reorganization (3-D) and reflection on their own points of view (4-D). Finally, it moves the student to commit to some order and sequence (2-D). **Third Draft:** Edit & Self-Assess. Cut to 350 words max. and self-assess the following: (a) Clarity: Use action verbs, cuts unneeded words, uses correct grammar, and uses logical organization (2-D). (b) Fundamentals (1/3): Use a primary source, and address the actual friend’s interest. (c) Analysis (1/3): Questions (yours and others), and clarifies your own personal philosophy and values. **Outcomes:** This stage practically forces healthy conformity to high standards (2-D). At the same time, the self-caring helps internalize a sense of one’s own strengths and weaknesses (4-D). Students found the assignment “more personal” and said things like, “it forced me to cut out the b.s. I was surprised to see how much other students could rip apart my paper, but it was very helpful in the end.”

Figure 13. Classroom Application: Letter to a Novice

Teaching integratively also means attending to the rhythms of learning. For instance, I build trust in early sessions, need to rejuvenate their energies at midterm and later, and provide closure towards the end. To punctuate two reflective moments, at midterm and at final, I have students look back at all their work and specify what they learned (see Fig. 14, Box E).

Each dimension, then, includes pathways of simpler ones, and discards pitfalls—in both curriculum and instruction. And yet, to use a simpler dimension well often requires abandoning aspects of more complex dimensions. So, for instance, if I want to play one of Bach’s Goldberg Variations and simply enjoy the pianistic process, I do well to rid myself of reflective self-consciousness. To improve, however, I need to slow down and examine sections meticulously. Similarly, actors often say of a performance that they were truly “in it” at precisely those times where they lost sense of performing and were simply being another person. Yet developing that presence and self-possession usually takes years of acting lessons and disciplined practice to make conscious efforts eventually unconscious and simply habit or informed intuition.

In sum, I find the use of five dimensions helpful to tell what it means for our learners to do well—whether at knowing things, doing things like critical thinking or problem solving, or valuing and caring about the world differently. Such a rich diversity of modalities can not only help my students learn but inform how I teach and how I live outside of professional life. Just as our daily lives involve a whole range of capacities, then, our teaching can range from impulsive fun, to orderly structures and reliance on ethical principles, to adapting plans to where students are, to critical self-reflection on our actions, to experiencing an integrative oneness—of learning and not learning, transforming and failing to transform, even of love.

**Box E: Classroom Application: Midterm/Final Integrative Portfolio Reflection**

**Instructions:** Review your own progress (on goals from start of term or midterm) and show: How your philosophical thinking has changed since the start of term; How you make connections to other subjects; and to personal, professional, and civic lives; and what you want to remember to be thinking about philosophically a year from now. Quote your own writing, and peer feedback, to demonstrate how you learned. Limit to 250 words max., excluding quotes of self or others. Self-rate against: (a) Reflectiveness with which you ask big questions, seek answers, and analyze and critically evaluate assumptions, and (b) Specificity with which you apply insights to improve your thinking, problem solving or decisions, learn from mistakes, and change behavior to reach your goals.

Figure 14. Classroom Application: Midterm/Final Integrative Portfolio Reflection
If we integrate dimensions, we use all three modes Fink (2003) described as vital to significant learning experiences (doing, observing, simulated), information and ideas (primary/secundary, accessing them in-class, out-of-class, online), finally, by shifting dimensions even more freely, I hope other educators find too ined thought, but renew and revalue our own practices, to integrate thinking and feeling, heart and soul, while accepting with grace whatever it is that we cannot change.
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Preface

The crisis of our times, as we see it, is at root a failure of the human imagination and chronically entrenched hermeneutical patterns. Proactive educators feel the current call to relevance in their practice, to claim in the classroom and curriculum the power of human communities to forge a better, more sustainable, and just world. Yet all too easily, the project of connection and integration glossed under "integral education" ends up putting "old mind in new bottles." Without new thinking based on deep dialogue, the integral project can generate new dogmas, new taxonomies, new ideological schisms that merely replicate, rather than intervene in the turf wars and real wars that embody the cultural pathologies of late modernity.

We note that despite millennial efforts to leave the older dysfunctional patterns of minding behind and mature into truly integral patterns of life, these chronically entrenched ego-mental patterns continue to dominate all aspects of our lives—including our institutions and the educational practices of cultural reproduction that occur within them. So one focal theme is to bring this impasse out into the open—to articulate and disclose the extent to which such ego-mental patterns of minding continue to dominate our lives today and impede, repress, block, and marginalize genuine attempts to enter Holistic Rational Space for the advancement of our human condition at all levels.

In this chapter, a philosopher and a linguist explore integral education as the confluence of the rivers of reason and grace. They present in dialogic form a notation for indicating the deeper integral logic that underlies and makes possible the
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