Integral Correctional Education
PART 1: INTRODUCTION

Thom Gehring and Margaret Puffer

This article is part one of an overview of Integral Correctional Education. It briefly introduces salient aspects of the field of correctional education, defines correctional education, introduces the Integral model, and outlines the historical periods of correctional education practice. A discussion of some core principles of correctional education is followed by some problems that afflict inmate students, correctional educators, and the communities they serve. The article ends by suggesting that these problems might be solved if governments recognized that—despite the public safety concerns they have generated—prisoners are still people. This humanistic solution can be embedded within an Integral approach to correctional education. In addition to supporting such humanistic solutions, the Integral approach also results in less partial, more efficient, and less costly solutions to identified problems. Interested readers can explore the next article in this series.

Definition of Correctional Education

Correctional education is the education of confined students in residential confinement institutions—juvenile facilities and adult prisons. It is closely allied with alternative education and the related field of prison reform, and is relatively eclectic. For example, correctional schools often include programming in adult basic education, vocational education, special education, cultural and social education or life skills, and postsecondary education. Yet there are various views about exactly what correctional education is or should be. The remainder of this section briefly presents these views.

There are three definitions of correctional education: (1) program-based, (2) situational, and (3) inherent to instruction for confined learners. Each definition is logical and coherent and suggests that the field has unique emphases; stage 1 represents the least mature understanding, stage 3 the most advanced. The premise of each definition is that correctional education is the education of learners in confinement institutions.

The first definition maintains that correctional education is an institutional program, and functions much like any other institutional program—the kitchen, the business office, the chaplaincy, institutional industries, etc. Supporters of this program-based definition sometimes discuss "corrections education" instead of "correctional education." This slight spelling difference reflects a profound difference in meaning. The word "corrections" describes services provided by the agency that manages the institutions, while "correctional" describes anything that takes place within the institution (sometimes education is provided by an outside agency). Austin MacCormick, the founder of the modern correctional education movement, deliberately applied the term "correctional," which is also the name of the Correctional Education Association and the *Journal of Correctional Education*. MacCormick's term stuck.

The second is the situational definition—it holds that correctional education is education that takes place in a correctional institution. This implies that correctional education is no different from other fields of education, except that it is conducted within the walls or within the compound. Supporters of this definition identify professionally with the disciplines related to correctional education (English, elementary education, carpentry, etc.), rather than with the field of correctional education itself.

The inherent definition of correctional education applies structured learning/teaching strategies that interrupt asocial, nonsocial, or antisocial behavior and foster social learning and growth. This is the only definition that rests on the *correct*ional dimension of the field. Adherents believe correctional education is an intervention strategy that helps people who want to "turn their lives around" or correct their behavior.

The inherent definition represents the possibility of social aspiration for populations that have traditionally not had or used equal access to educational opportunity, and of people who have lived in conflict with their communities. This definition suggests that all institutional programs must bend to the priority of preparing students for successful community life. It also suggests

that a more inclusive or comprehensive approach is needed to prepare them to attain their aspirations.

The Integral Model

Philosopher Ken Wilber has taken an enormous amount of cross-cultural research and created what is called Integral Theory or the AQAL model. Integral means inclusive, comprehensive, and indicative of the "big picture." An Integral approach begins by acknowledging four of the most basic perspectives available to any individual: the interior and exterior of the individual and collective: intentional (subjective), behavioral (objective), cultural (intersubjective), and social (interobjective), or what can be summarized respectively as the pronouns "I," "It," "We," and "Its."

Advocates of the Integral approach therefore make a special effort to acknowledge and include as many perspectives as possible. They assume that all views have some *partial* claim on the truth, or they would have no proponents. Further, each element of the truth can be viewed through the four basic perspectives (the four quadrants), which in turn can be integrated with developmental levels, lines of growth, states of consciousness, and types of personalities. Therefore, a comprehensive Integral view would consist of "all-quadrants, all-levels, all-lines, all-states, and all-types," which is often signified as AQAL. However, for the purpose of these three articles, our attention will be directed especially to quadrants and levels.

The Quadrants

The quadrants are the most basic perspectives we can take when looking at any event. They are the interior and exterior of the individual and collective. So, "I" represents the interior of an individual (designated as the Upper-Left quadrant), while "It" is the exterior of an individual (designated as the Upper Right). And likewise "We" is the interior of a collective (designated as the Lower-Left quadrant) and "Its" is the exterior of a collective (designated as the Lower Right).

Each quadrant can be identified by its placement: Upper Left (UL), Upper Right (UR), Lower Left (LL), and Lower Right (LR). The UL quadrant (interior-individual) represents feelings and interpretations. The UR (exterior-individual) represents things that can easily be measured—it is behavioral and empirical. The LR (exterior-collective) represents the socioeconomic, political, institutional, legal, and overall relationships within systems. The LL (interior-collective) represents shared meaning, cultural, religious, and philosophical understandings between people.

In addition, each quadrant represents an aspect of reality known by what Habermas has termed a "validity claim:" an inherent criterion to help identify whether the things associated most directly with that quadrant are indeed true within that quadrant. The validity claim for the UL intentional quadrant is truthfulness. Our understanding of subjective realities depends on self-reports; the only test of such information is whether the person is being truthful. The validity claim for the UR behavioral quadrant is objective truth, according to the empirical, scientific meaning of the term. The validity claim for the LR social quadrant is functional fit—for example, the extent to which a socioeconomic organization fits with social experiences and professed aspirations. The validity claim of the LL cultural quadrant is justice or the extent to which group experiences are consistent with the group's moral and legal parameters. (We might also note that "social" indicates infrastructure: exterior buildings, transportation and information systems, land use, and so forth. "Culture," on the other hand, denotes value-oriented worldspaces: interior morés, shared expectations, perceived constraints, and so forth.) When all of this is combined into a single chart, the result is shown in figure 1.

Upper Left (UL)	Upper Right (UR)
INTERIOR–INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTIVE/INTENTIONAL/"I" Validity Claim: Truthfulness	EXTERIOR–INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVE/BEHAVIORAL/"It" Validity Claim: Truth
INTERIOR–COLLECTIVE INTERSUBJECTIVE/ CULTURAL/"We" Validity Claim: Justness	EXTERIOR–COLLECTIVE INTEROBJECTIVE/SOCIAL/"Its" Validity Claim: Functional Fit
Lower Left (LL)	Lower Right (LR)

Figure 1. The Four Quadrants

Consistent with the Integral emphasis, the quadrants are all connected—the quadrant structure encourages us to be inclusive, to see interconnections. Another way of expressing this principle is to acknowledge that all exteriors (things and processes) have an interior, and everything in the universe is part of a whole. Subatomic particles are parts of atoms, which are parts of molecules, which are parts of cells, which are parts of organs, which are parts of organisms, etc. One way of recognizing these interconnections—to recognize that each thing exists by itself, and is also part of a larger thing—is to acknowledge that our placement of things in the respective quadrants is really just to facilitate consideration of it. There is a difference between the quadrant map and the actual territory; we want to use the quadrants to tease out relationships that otherwise might have gone unnoticed, but the system is not intended to replace reality. In fact, the Integral map is actually a performance of the territory. In other words, the map is not of a reality "out there," but rather highlights aspects of one's own awareness and the perspectives one can take (and what those various perspectives disclose). Having identified these caveats, a little time directed to illustrate the quadrants will demonstrate their usefulness to correctional educators.

INTENTIONAL Rationale for the Work	BEHAVIORAL Classroom Instruction
CULTURAL Professional Identity	SOCIAL Administration

Figure 2. Domains of Correctional Education

In figure 2, the rationale for the work is portrayed as an intentional (UL) phenomenon. Correctional education is uniquely concerned with rationale—a situation that should be expected whenever people are removed from their families and normal settings. They tend to focus on the need to understand what happened to them and why. Working in confined settings also prompts many staff to look for the meaning in their everyday practice. This combined inmate and staff effect tends to make prisons and juvenile facilities places where many people are more concerned about why things happened to them than what actually happened. For example, a person who is stabbed in a prison might fixate on why it happened. This rationale-oriented emphasis is one of the factors that make correctional education a unique field of education.

Every field of education has a unique emphasis: *special education* is teaching/learning strategy oriented; *elementary education* is socialization-oriented; *secondary education* is qualifications-oriented; *vocational education* is skills/competencies-oriented. The emphasis of *correctional education* is the search for meaning or rationale, but it is also an eclectic discipline: in addition to its own emphasis, correctional education contains the other emphases of related fields.

The behavioral (UR) quadrant is the domain of classroom instruction. This is the arena that should be the core of our daily work, where teacher expectations—goals and objectives—interact

with and help shape student learning. Under this heading, we associate curriculum, classroom logistics, activities, and interactions.

The social (LR) quadrant is the reality of the socioeconomic system; its validity claim is "functional fit." It is about resources, both human and material, and is reflected most concisely in the budget, the province of administration. Many correctional educators focus mostly on funds assigned to equip and stock their classrooms—this is an accurate but partial view. Correctional educators themselves are essential resources (denoted "personnel" in budgets), as are the physical plant in which they teach and the furniture that occupies those spaces (capital outlay), the procedures by which students come to and leave their classes, and the services of volunteer tutors.

The cultural (LL) quadrant is associated with professional identity. In this domain, we consider professional networking, such as that which occurs through Correctional Education Association conferences, contact with persons at other locations who provide similar services, and the reading and writing of professional journals such as the *Journal of Correctional Education*. Many correctional educators report that the most difficult aspect of their work is resource inadequacy, but evidence suggests it is actually professional isolation that exacerbates most of the problems experienced by education providers in this most difficult setting. For example, most of us never encountered a person with a degree in the field of correctional education rather than a related field; most correctional educators do not know the authors or titles of the field's definitive books. Even if we encountered it, many of us would not recognize a program that is consistent with the great themes of correctional education. As a group, correctional educators tend to be poorly prepared for the work, and this condemns us to reinventing the wheel whenever we are challenged by a problem that impacts teaching and learning.

There are a number of issues that practitioners must address when they put student learning at the center of their professional lives: the problem of criminals with job skills and the different

emphases of education in the local schools and confined settings. In addition, there are concerns that often intervene to make teaching and learning difficult in the confinement setting. Correctional education resources are frequently diverted to non-education priorities; institutional educators tend not to be prepared through useful preservice for their work in correctional education (so they have no concept of the history of the field, no tools to solve the intense problems they face daily); and the correctional setting is typically staffed with personnel who have an anti-education disposition (or who are not sure that education for inmates can or should be provided).

All these concerns can be placed in the quadrants. Thus, thinking about the quadrants as representing the four domains of the field can facilitate clarity about correctional education: rationale for the work (intentional or UL), instruction (behavioral or UR), administration (social or LR), and professional identity (cultural or LL). The next two articles will help us sort out concepts associated with the quadrants and thus provide a framework for three different but related perspectives on the same work: those of correctional teachers, students, and administrators. However, our current focus will continue to be a brief summary of correctional education concerns about teaching and learning.

When Student Learning Is Not a Priority

Not all correctional education experiences are helpful. Most institutional school programs are administered by jailers, not educators. Qualified educators often are not in charge of key educational decisions. Central among these are decisions about the school curriculum, spending funds that are earmarked for educational purposes, and the hiring and firing of education personnel. Although a minority of institutional education programs are structured like real schools—with qualified educators making these decisions—most merely look like real schools.

For example, many institutional education programs only have vocational courses that are needed to manage the facility: auto repair (to maintain state cars), welding (to do institutional maintenance), culinary arts (to staff the kitchen), and so forth. Even the academic programs reflect the warden's ideology toward education: emphasis on the elementary grades, with few secondary courses (the GED is often the only route to secondary completion) and no postsecondary programs at all. The schoolrooms are often remote from each other and use an assortment of facilities not designed for teaching and learning, a sign that education is not prioritized (broom closets, corridors, shower rooms, with standardized testing in noisy dining areas). Additionally, a standard problem in many facilities is that the institutional superintendent can use the funds assigned to education for other purposes—a new parking lot, overtime for correctional officers, new uniforms, etc.

Many institutions have far fewer teachers assigned than are shown in the budget, with the personnel costs "rolled up" and diverted to other priorities. Inmates' time in school is subject to interruptions by almost any institutional employee who needs the inmate to work in a shop or come to sign papers or be briefed on some new regulation.

Most institutions have several educational programs; only a few have full, well-rounded school programs. Yet most inmates can be transferred at any time to another facility in the system, regardless of the educational programs offered there. In summary, continuity of inmate student learning is almost never an institutional priority, and correctional systems are reluctant to conceptualize transfer systems that would help students complete the education programs they are able to start.

Almost no correctional educators were professionally prepared to work in correctional education, nor do they have access to the literature of the field of correctional education. As a result, they have to "reinvent the wheel" whenever they encounter a classroom problem. A symptom of this is that many correctional teachers do not apply a student-centered approach in their classrooms.

Rather, they apply a curriculum or teacher-centered approach. Drill sheets frequently are used as a procedure to make it appear that individualized learning is being pursued. Teachers are confused about the attributes of a good school program, alienated from colleagues in the local schools and colleges and therefore vulnerable to anti-education institutional influences.

Unfortunately, the combined sentiments of various groups contribute to the institutional anti-education hostility. This is fueled by: (a) many correctional officers, who frequently express the view that education is nothing more than an attempt to "coddle" criminals (which is not true—learning is hard work); (b) inmates themselves, who were typically turned off by the education they received as children; and (c) institutional managers, whose priority has to be public safety and the health of the inmates and staff. In brief, prisons were not designed as schools, and few people are sure whether they can, or should, function as schools.

A Remedy Not Often Considered

The problems that afflict correctional education appear myriad and complex. However, many of these problems are driven by misperceptions. For example, most of the structural problems could be satisfactorily addressed if governments, decision-makers, and communities recognized that prisoners are people, despite the problems they caused prior to their incarceration.[1] This concept was articulated during the 1950s by Kenyon Scudder, the reform warden at a large and innovative West Coast prison without walls—the title of his book was *Prisoners Are People*.

This changed attitude would bring an array of present practices into question. If prisoners are people, should not institutional schools be organized like other schools, with educators in charge of curriculum, the education budget, and educational personnel decisions? Should not continuity of student learning be built into these "inside" schools, as it is in the local schools in our communities? Should not teachers be prepared for the special challenges they meet in the workplace? Should not prison teachers be good people, instead of merely loyal to the

institutional superintendent—and should not they be able and willing to help confined students become engaged in learning? Should not an effective, efficient, humane, and cost effective system be implemented?

To answer all these questions affirmatively, requires only that citizen voters, decision-makers, and correctional educators approach their work in an inclusive way, through a more effective, compassionate, and comprehensive—an Integral—approach to correctional education. Anything less will merely perpetuate the abuses already experienced, and endanger the public safety that results from the unchecked cycle of crime.

Endnotes

[1] How individuals perceive criminals depends on the developmental level of the perceiver. Preconventional, conventional, and postconventional levels of development perceive criminals in markedly different ways. Stress and fear can also invite regression in one's developmental "center of gravity." Here the stereotypes and fear generated by media coverage of the "anonymous criminal" are of little service and often serve to escalate the public's fear.

REFERENCES

Scudder, Kenyon (1952). *Prisoners are people*. New York: Doubleday.

THOM GEHRING is a Co-Director of the Integral Correctional Education Center at Integral Institute and a Co-Director of a Correctional Education Association Special Interest Group. He has been a correctional educator since 1972, in New Jersey, Virginia, New York, California, and worked in other systems as a consultant. He has served as a teacher, counselor, researcher, administrator, and professor. He manages the Core courses of the Masters of Arts degree, with emphases in education at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB). Thom directs the Center for the Study of Correctional Education at CSUSB, Along with his wife, Dr. Carolyn Eggleston.

MARGARET PUFFER is also a Co-Director of the Integral Correctional Education Center at Integral Institute. With 17 years of experience, Margaret is a teacher in the Alternative and Correctional Schools unit of the Orange County, California Department of Education. She establishes and implements collaborative education programs between parole agents, community-based organizations, and county agencies in Southern California to promote successful community transition and employment for youthful parolees. Margaret is past president of the Tri-County Correctional Education Association (Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, CA); a senior fellow of the Center for the Study of Correctional Education at California State University, San Bernardino; and a board member for the National Institute for Correctional Education at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Integral Correctional Education
PART 2: THE FOUR QUADRANTS APPLIED

Thom Gehring and Margaret Puffer

This is the second of two articles that introduce the Integral model and demonstrate its application to the field of correctional education. The first article established a context by defining correctional education, the four quadrants of Integral Theory, and illustrated how applying the quadrants might engage the major aspects of correctional education in a more compassionate and cost-effective manner. This article will build on the underlying assumptions and theoretical foundations presented in the first. The current purpose is to show how the quadrants can be applied specifically for teachers, students, and administrator/supervisors. In addition, it will elaborate on the concept of reductionism, and anchor it to the most salient problem that constrains the work of teaching and learning in the institutional setting—"good old boys and girls" (anti-education obstructionists).

Review

The earlier article introduced and explained three definitions of correctional education: (a) program-based, (b) situational, and (c) inherent. The program-based definition holds that correctional education is merely a type of institutional program; the situational definition proclaims that correctional education is merely education offered within the institution; the inherent definition holds that, since most inmates were criminals prior to incarceration, there is something—usually an attitude or a condition—that should be corrected. "Integral" was explained as an inclusive approach to help ensure that the whole of an issue is not represented as merely one of its parts.

Developmental Sequences

Everything in the universe is part of something else, without negating either the part or the whole—the universe is structured in nested hierarchies. In this case, nested means included

within something larger. For example, subatomic particles are parts of atoms, which are parts of molecules, which can be parts of cells, and so forth.

Likewise, humans grow and develop through nested hierarchies. The Integral approach connects Western psychology's view with higher or "spiritual" development. Western psychology stretches roughly from the most basic levels to ego development, and Eastern psychology begins at approximately the ego and proceeds through higher levels that can be summarized for our current purposes as the spiritual. However, everyone starts at square one in development; no stages can be skipped.

There are many sequences or trajectories of human development. Two of the most popular trajectories for correctional educators were designed by Abraham Maslow and by Lawrence Kohlberg.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs generally posits that individuals must secure lower-level needs before ascending to higher-level needs. Basic needs such as food, shelter, and belonging must be ensured before needs such as self-esteem, self-actualization, or self-transcendence can emerge. For example, it is difficult to focus on one's studies if one is uncertain when one will eat again, or whether there will be safe shelter to sleep in that evening. Maslow's work helps explain many features of life in confinement.

Kohlberg's sequence depicts the development of morality. Although Kohlberg reported primarily from data on boys and men, subsequent researchers found that the general alignment of his stages apply to girls and women. They found that masculine concerns tend to focus on systems of political rights (Kohlberg was the recognized leader in this area), and feminine concerns tend to focus on systems of nurture or care (Carol Gilligan was the recognized leader in this area). Despite these differences, both Gilligan and Kohlberg reported that the same three or four stages of moral development have been found to apply universally.

Correctional educators usually find great merit in the Kohlberg/Gilligan sequence of human development. Malcolm X, for example, had three careers that corresponded to the moral levels. His first career was as an egocentric criminal, Malcolm Little. When he was incarcerated and became a militant member of the Nation of Islam he changed his name to Malcolm X. During this militant career his concerns shifted from himself (egocentric or preconventional) to those of "his people" (ethnocentric or conventional). After Malcolm X's pilgrimage to Mecca, he acquired a third career, this one marked by new concerns for all humanity, regardless of their situation. He thus moved to the third level, called universal citizenship (worldcentric or postconventional).

These three levels—egocentric, ethnocentric, and worldcentric—mark the general unfolding of moral development. Correctional educators find Maslow's hierarchy of needs and the Kohlberg/Gilligan sequence of moral development useful because they mark out the terrain that we wish inmate students to pursue when they are ready. That is why correctional educators frequently remark that they take students where they find them and bring them along to the extent they are able and willing to go.

Nevertheless, all this should not be confused with a "blaming the victim" orientation. Most institutional teachers are keenly aware that other causes of crime are operational, in addition to the immaturity of criminals. For example, the odds of engaging in crime are exacerbated when children live in poverty settings where their developmental needs have been neglected: in violent neighborhoods with drugs all around and a neglected educational infrastructure, where they go to sleep without being sure if they will be awakened to be raped or beaten. These are environmental factors that can foster crime. Most correctional educators are alert to environmental influences in student lives. However, they feel unable to address those concerns in a meaningful way.

By contrast, correctional teachers do know that they can impact students' ability to navigate through life's problems more successfully and equip them with skills required to live decently in

community. In other words, correctional educators are unable to transform our entire society, but they are able and willing to help individuals develop skills that will help them stop committing crime, stop recidivating, and live as good community members. In general, these are the core meanings that correctional educators take from the needs and moral sequences of human development, as articulated by Wilber and the researchers whose work he reports (in this case, Maslow, Kohlberg, and Gilligan). These theories help us conceptualize our approach to student learning.

Student Learning as the Foundation of Classroom Practice

Three closely related issues that tend to make correctional education a unique field of education can be organized under the following headings: (a) the criminal plumber problem, (b) different priorities than traditional schools, and (c) the transformational imperative. These issues are introduced below.

The Criminal Plumber Problem

Criminologist Vernon Fox advised that "if one teaches a criminal to be a plumber, then the result must be a criminal plumber."[1] In Canada, this is discussed as the problem of criminals with job skills. Austin MacCormick reported that it is possible for a man to carry a Ph.D. and a kit of burglar's tools at the same time. The problem is that, while education is usually associated with progress toward living decently in community, it cannot ensure that result. Many assume that, since the mere accoutrements of education may not turn a criminal's life around, criminals should be systematically denied educational opportunity. This anti-education sentiment flies in the face of everyday logic.

The whole point of correctional education is that criminality and recidivism are, in part, attributes of immaturity—as introduced in the narrative about needs and moral development above. Keen observers report that most inmates behave as though they were "late bloomers,"

slow to mature. As a rule they do not lack intelligence, though they have often become embittered learners as a result of previous failures in the local schools. Therefore, one of the central roles of the correctional teacher is to be available with a repertoire of learning activities tailored to meet the identified needs of most incarcerates, to assist in their schooling when they mature to the point that they are ready to improve their lives.

Typically this happens when the inmate lives past a certain age—for example, on his 23rd birthday. After a life of violence, characterized by the need to coerce or manipulate others for his livelihood, most criminals expect to die early like most of the people they have known. At the shock of reaching an unexpected age and still seeming to have years ahead, the average criminal pauses to consider the mess he has made of things. The most accurate predictor of criminality and incarceration is not race or even socio-economic status; it is gender (that is why this paragraph applies masculine pronouns). The second most accurate predictor of crime is age: after age 30 the incidence of criminal activity diminishes sharply.

These patterns are available for anyone who cares to review the record and they fit precisely with the "late bloomer" theory of crime and incarceration. In short, education by itself cannot determine that a person will refrain from criminality, but it is almost always associated with the process of turning one's life around. Prisoners need access to education when they make that momentous life decision. It is therefore in the interest of neighborhood safety that a quality education infrastructure should be available, tailored to meet their needs when they are ready.

Different Priorities than Traditional Schools

This leads directly to questions about the attributes of an institutional education program that will best serve inmate (and community) needs. Certainly, a sterile replication of the schooling that led to their embittered status would be inappropriate. Indeed, many hold that these students originally became criminals because they failed in—or were failed by—the local schools. So

most confined students need something useful but quite different from the schools they experienced earlier in their lives.

Correctional educators often remark that the established priorities of the traditional, local schools are precisely the opposite of what is needed for confined students. The formula that drives local schools—"knowledge, skills, and attitudes"—was forged during a time when teachers assumed that students were properly socialized, that they would grow into good community members (with families, jobs, and values to foster a decent life). Obviously, those assumptions did not apply for these students.

Therefore, correctional educators seek to replace the "knowledge, skills, and attitudes" approach with one tailored for confined student needs: "attitudes, skills, and knowledge." It is generally held by both correctional teachers and students that it is more important to live a crime-free life than to know how to diagram a sentence; more important to have a marketable skill than to perform algebra; and more important to respect others than to be well versed in the plays of Shakespeare. If knowledge of the parts of a sentence, algebra, or Shakespeare will result in an improved self-esteem and an enhanced pattern of social interaction, then indeed those content areas should be pursued in the institutional classroom. However, the clear priority for most confined learners focuses on the need to be assigned to the free community, to stop living in a cage.

The Transformational Imperative

Stated yet again, the principle of living decently in community is known as the "transformational imperative." Just as Louis Armstrong sang in that old Duke Ellington song ("It don't mean a thing if it ain't got that swing"), adherents of the transformational imperative maintain, "It don't mean a thing if it ain't transformational." According to this view the burden of being assigned to live in a cage is so intense, and of such compelling magnitude, that the purpose of one's life is systematically adjusted: the incarcerate's priority is "to get out." Since it is not likely that the

whole of society will be improved so that mankind's brutality will suddenly reverse and all children have opportunities to live in the upper reaches of Maslow's hierarchy, the inmate's only route for positive change is to transform oneself, to become a more social person.

Correctional educators sometimes note that the inmates in their classes were never anti-social in any sense, never opposed to society. If they were, they would have plotted to burn hospitals and churches, blow up schools and factories, and kill social leaders. The persons committed to our juvenile facilities and adult prisons never fit into this category. Terrorists do not fit that category either. Terrorists commit their crimes because they are social advocates, and they plan their crimes with others in a social way. Most inmates are social: they are concerned about the people they left behind and about government. For example, confined students are often (a) "news junkies," eager for newspapers and broadcasts, or (b) filled with remorse for what they did, and eager to "give something back" to their communities.

Instead of being anti-social, most inmates are nonsocial or asocial. They only intermittently accessed programs that foster social living (local schools, community organizations, religious institutions, vocational programs). Indeed, some correctional educators report that students actually tend to be latently pro-social. That implies that their participation in the institutional education program is exactly the right activity to access when they realize that they must improve their lives. Education is the most pro-social program in America.

Whenever inmates reflect on their lives and take stock of their condition, as they tend to do "inside," they inevitably decide to "learn their way" out of a cell and back into the free community. How else can they do this, except by acquiring the basic and marketable skills that they missed during their earlier careers as children? In the course of their studies, they inevitably learn how to live new lives, with respect and dignity instead of crime and coercion. Therefore, an institutional correctional education program that is fashioned to meet these identified inmate needs also meets the public need for law-abiding citizens.

The Quadrants: An Institutional Context

Our first example will be to see some of the everyday implications of residential confinement institutions. For simplicity, we will consider juvenile facilities and adult prisons as one category (prisons) within a larger category of human institutions, the congregate shop or family substitute institutions. (They are called family substitute institutions in this case because they accomplish parts of what was primordially accomplished through clans, tribes, and other extended family units.) Figure 1 addresses some congregate shops and the quadrants allow us to suggest something that most correctional educators already understand: some people go to universities to learn community expectations and some people go to prison.

Intentional Monasteries/Drug Programs	Behavioral Laboratories/ Museums/Archives
Cultural Schools/Colleges/ Universities	Social Factories/Farms/ Offices/Prisons

Figure 1. Some Congregate Shops

Figure 1 illustrates the quadrant criteria discussed in the first article. For example, the congregate shops mentioned in each quadrant correspond with the inherent substance of that quadrant. The UL intentional quadrant represents individual interior subjectivity, so monasteries and drug treatment programs can be represented there for our current purpose. The UR behavioral quadrant represents individual exteriors—empirical data that can be measured, such as would be done in laboratories, museums, and archives. The LR social quadrant displays collective exteriors as in the socioeconomic infrastructure: factories, farms, offices, prisons, etc. To the LL

cultural quadrant we assign interior collective patterns that can be assimilated through schools, colleges, and universities.

Figure 1 also addresses a point mentioned in the first article and by many observers of correctional education: the central problem is that inmates are treated as objects rather than subjects—*flatland*. In other words, part of the problem is that society has not recognized that prisoners are people.

Instead of recognizing prisoners as members of a culture (LL), with inherent rights and privileges, they are treated as socio-economic assets to be exploited. Prisoners are strangers because they are disenfranchised. This is the same orientation that until recently prevailed among men about women (who were perceived as owned and denied legal status) and the proprietary orientation directed toward slaves by slave owners. A similar and current situation is when we acknowledge that inmates are known not by their names but by their assigned inmate numbers.

Once prisons were established as congregate shops, great competition arose about whose institutional management plan was best. Holl's 1971 literature review was based on a useful review of 19th century New York programs that was first circulated at the 1910 International Prison Congress. That review posited three systems of prison management which, for sake of the current narrative, can be labeled Auburn, Reformatory and New Penology.[2] If we add the Pennsylvania system, which predated Auburn, the result is a complete list of four systems, which is summarized in figure 2.

In figure 2, the Pennsylvania system is in the UL intentional quadrant, which corresponds to the placement of monasteries in figure 1. Pennsylvania institutions were managed like solitary confinement; prisoners had access to a Bible and some craft work. Osborne's summary of this introspection-oriented (monk-like) system was that it was designed to "make men think right," an aspiration for how inmates would develop subjectively.[3] The Reformatory system is

associated with the UR behavioral quadrant because it used extensive empirical/behavioral data through application of progressive housing, indeterminate sentences, and parole to prepare inmates for a true challenge—future success in the real world.

Intentional Pennsylvania "Make men think right"	Behavioral Reformatory "Prepare for real world success"
Cultural New Penology "Our standard is citizenship"	Social Auburn "Make men act right"

Figure 2. 19th Century Prison Management Systems in Quadrants

Auburn's system is associated with the LR social quadrant because its main program was a highly regimented, factory-style discipline (see figure 1 above). Osborne reported that the purpose of this factory-oriented approach was to "make men act right," and be part of a functional whole.[4] Finally, the New Penology emerged and was quickly covered up because it introduced democracy into closed confinement institutions. Based on community membership, this model aspired to help develop better citizens; Osborne's summary was "our standard is citizenship."[5] Although correctional educators advocated each of these systems during their respective heydays, opportunities for meaningful educational programming were realized in the following order (from least to most): Pennsylvania, Auburn, Reformatory, and New Penology.

Prisons as we know them today were an American invention; they emerged after the American Revolution. By contrast, figure 3 in the following section is about institutions today. It shows the rather traditional content of correctional education programs.

Applying the Quadrants

The perspectives offered by the four quadrants are easy to master once one has applied it to address a few problems. Its purpose is to gain greater clarity about pertinent issues. In this section, we will apply the quadrants to three rather non-controversial issues in order to show the model and its attributes, thereby helping readers ease into this seemingly new system. The first example will be about correctional education curricula, and the following three examples will apply the quadrants to the work of teachers, students, and education administrators.

Intentional Moral development, values clarification, motivational content, life planning	Behavioral Basic literacy and numeracy, community resources, current events, math and science
Cultural Multicultural studies, the arts, crafts, cultural education, humanities content	Social Vocational education, pre- release, health, social education, social sciences

Figure 3. Correctional Learning Content

Close review of the placements of these curriculum components (figure 3) shows that they are associated with the same quadrant principles discussed in reference to figures 1 and 2. Many additional details can be extrapolated about the work of correctional educators by applying the quadrants perspective.

The Teacher's Perspective

When all the ground rules in the previous sections are applied, mapping the quadrants of the teacher's perspective on the work of correctional education can be informative. Figure 4 shows how the four quadrants can be used to concisely portray those themes, and provides examples of specific everyday issues shown in a quadrant display.

Intentional **Teacher's Rationale** Examples: Develop self-awareness; Sustain a high level of energy over a prolonged period, even in a setting which can be harsh.	Behavioral **Teaching Activities** Examples: Implement strategies to stimulate interest in learning and growth; Retain and expand know- ledge in relevant content areas.
Cultural **Professional School of Thought** Examples: Establish meaningful goals, and plan in a way that promotes success; Relate well with others; Associate daily experiences with the themes of correctional education.	Social **Educational Administration** Examples: Assume a responsible, Action-oriented, professional role; Manage, produce, and solicit resources effectively.

Figure 4. The Teacher Perspectives in Quadrants

Figure 4 engages language very similar to figure 3, but adjusted to the teacher's perspective. Similarly figure 5 adjusts this content for the student's perspective.

Intentional Reason for Enrollment	Behavioral Learning Activities
Cultural Identification as a Student	Social Resources to Support Learning

Figure 5. The Student Perspectives in Quadrants

One dimension of the student perspective should be emphasized; whenever inmates identify as students, rather than as criminals or prisoners, substantial progress has been achieved.

The Administrator's Perspective

There are at least two important implications of figure 6. First, the diagram expresses aspirations for how educational administration is supposed to function. "Good old boys" (and girls) have intervened in the noble profession of correctional education, exacerbating all the impacts of institutional constraints and the problems of the institutional anti-education bias. Figure 6 shows how correctional education administration can and should function—actual practice is at best uneven and intermittent. This accrues from the combined facts that (a) prison schools tend not to be real schools (they are operated according to different principles), and (b) inmates are not recognized as people (they are perceived as objects rather than subjects).

Intentional Rationale for Being Engaged as an Education Administrator	Behavioral Support for Classroom Teaching and Learning
Cultural Support for Teacher Development	Social Budgetary Support for Teaching and Learning

Figure 6. The Education Administrator Perspectives in Quadrants

Second, figure 6 implies that the real function of education administration should be to support classroom instruction. The real priority of administrators should be to support teachers in their work of classroom instruction and to establish a school climate conducive to learning. This priority is consistent with a principle identified in the first article: that the priority of correctional education should be and must be student learning. There is no acceptable alternative to this emphasis; real schools prioritize student learning. Any other configuration of priorities, overt or covert, is a perversion.

Stated alternatively, when the priority of the institutional school is not student learning, then learning becomes an accident. Of course, everyone rejoices when students learn. But when learning is not the priority it is reduced to a mere accident rather than the underlying, driving purpose. What other purpose besides learning could a school program have? In correctional education many and sundry purposes have dominated: loyalty to the boss, a desired promotion, a more appropriate salary, etc.

Even institutional security is a flawed priority for the school program. If teachers and other education personnel emphasize security over learning, then only the same flawed, accidental result can occur. This does not imply that institutional security should not always be practiced, or that teachers are not part of the overall institutional security team. Rather, it merely suggests that the purpose of education, regardless of setting, has to be education (teaching and learning). Any other orientation represents an assault on the aspiration for equality of educational opportunity. This is precisely why the "prisoners are people" concept introduced in Part 1 is so important.

Anyone who suggests that correctional education functions as it is supposed to is either poorly informed or deceitful. An aspect of this problem is related to what Integral Theory identifies as "reductionism."

Beyond Reductionism

"Quadrant reductionism," according to Wilber, is understood as an emphasis of one or more quadrants at the expense or denial of the others. Wilber reported that many systems neglect interiors and focus on exteriors, usually because exteriors are easily measured and fit neatly into data cells on standard reports. This is known as subtle reductionism, which is frequently associated with the systems approach. Correctional educators are directly familiar with this pattern, which happens whenever school program success is measured only by student completions, recidivism statistics, enrollment, attendance, or dollars saved.

Even the standards by which schools are accredited and evaluated are only indirectly concerned with student learning. Those standards address safety measures, facility architecture, paper trail documentation, schedules and floor plans, etc. It is entirely possible to have a school gain high praise as a bastion of appropriate procedures and timetables, yet be staffed entirely by personnel who share the anti-education bias, devoted merely to pleasing a good old boy administrator who is ideologically opposed to anything that might possibly threaten the boss. In this situation,

learning is reduced to an encyclopedic array of variables that are indirectly related to student gains in attitudes, skills, and knowledge.

This is quadrant reductionism, which occurs when interiors are neglected and exteriors treated as if they were the only things that matter. Since anything that would be anchored to the Left-Hand interior quadrants is not acknowledged, those things are either ignored or established as superficial correlates in the Right-Hand exterior quadrants. The accreditation example in the previous paragraph fits in this category.

In addition to subtle reductionism (reducing interiors to interobjective "Its"), there is also gross reductionism: reducing interiors and interobjective dimensions to their individual objective correlates. There are several ideological camps that have earned reputations for gross reductionism. Each camp is a problem to correctional educators because closed confinement institutions tend to exacerbate all of life's problems, especially when populated by immature persons. The real problem for correctional educators is that gross reductionism sometimes appears attractive to the staff just before they experience stress burnout, because it appears to promise simple solutions to complex problems.

Wilber's analysis of reductionism highlights the broad problem that many people avoid discussing. It is true that the modern West has done remarkably well from an historical perspective in producing things as a result of this reductionistic approach. Nevertheless, many people experience a terrible lack of emotional and spiritual fulfillment in the face of such reductionism. This is summarized in the term "materialistic," and is often associated with our emphasis on science and technology. It seems anomalous that interiority should be ignored when material needs are satisfied. Correctional educators regularly discuss this concern in their remarks about the appeal of gangs and drugs.

Summary

This article, building on the general principles introduced in Part 1, began by highlighting the way developmental research has and can inform correctional education. Then, it used the four quadrants to elucidate the key perspectives of correctional education, namely those of correctional teachers, students, and education administrators. Furthermore, the notion of "flatland" was introduced, as well as its effect on the field of correctional education.

The authors hope these brief explanations will open new perspectives for interested correctional education practitioners. If your experiences with the Integral model are parallel to ours, it will confirm many of your insights about your daily work and its connections to the larger world. As examples, it was suggested that (a) student learning should be the "glue" that unites students, teachers, and administrators in real, effective schools; (b) most institutional schools do not function like real schools precisely because they do not prioritize student learning; and (c) a root cause of these concerns is that students have been dehumanized, reduced from subjects to objects as a result of flatland. Many people understand these concepts long before reading an article like this, but the Integral map helps to make these concepts more evident. As a result, an "all-quadrant, all-level" (AQAL) approach can be an invaluable tool for examining our work in the discipline of correctional education.

Endnotes

[1] Roberts, *Sourcebook on prison education,* 1971, p. 129

[2] Holl, *Juvenile reform in the progressive era: William George and the Junior Republic movement,* 1971, p. 223

[3] Osborne, *Society and prisons: Some suggestions for a new penology*, 1975/1916, pp. 185-186

[4] Osborne, *Society and prisons: Some suggestions for a new penology*, 1975/1916, pp. 185-186

[5] George, *The Junior Republic: Its history and ideals*, 1909, pp. x-xi

George, William (1909). *The Junior Republic: Its history and ideals*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

Holl, Jack M. (1971). *Juvenile reform in the progressive era: William George and the Junior Republic movement.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Osborne, Thomas Mott (1975). *Society and prisons: Some suggestions for a new penology.* Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith. (Original work published 1916)

Roberts, Albert (1971). *Sourcebook on prison education*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

THOM GEHRING is Co-Director of the Integral Correctional Education Center at Integral Institute and a Co-Director of a Correctional Education Association Special Interest Group. He has been a correctional educator since 1972, in New Jersey, Virginia, New York, California, and worked in other systems as a consultant. He has served as a teacher, counselor, researcher, administrator, and professor. He manages the Core courses that are in the masters of arts degree, with emphases in education at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB). Thom directs the Center for the Study of Correctional Education at CSUSB, Along with his wife, Dr. Carolyn Eggleston.

MARGARET PUFFER is also a Co-Director of the Integral Correctional Education Center at Integral Institute. With 17 years of experience, Margaret is a teacher in the Alternative and Correctional Schools unit of the Orange County, California Department of Education. She establishes and implements collaborative education programs between parole agents, community-based organizations, and county agencies in Southern California to promote successful community transition and employment for youthful parolees. Margaret is past president of the Tri-County Correctional Education Association (Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, CA), a senior fellow of the Center for the Study of Correctional Education at California State University, San Bernardino, and a board member for the National Institute for Correctional Education at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.