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Abstract

This paper outlines core concepts in Jungian psychology that are applicable to education, reviews the literature on education and Jungian psychology including some that would be considered post-Jungian as they built on his theories, provides analysis of how some of these ideas such as transference and individual education are already being used in education. Gifted children and generalization to the wider educational context are also discussed.
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Jungian Analytical Psychology and Education

Because the current political climate surrounding education erodes arts funding and calls for focusing education into factories that churn out science and technology workers, we need the insights of Jungian psychology and the post-Jungian schools of thought in education more than ever. During the early to mid-twentieth century when Jung was writing, educators were not in touch with the psychology of their students and the effects of the teacher on the students (Jung, 1954/1991). Classrooms and classwork focused more on memorization of facts and less on the context behind them; there were accepted interpretations of literature and clear right and wrong answers. The rich world of the imagination was not available to most students, and bright, imaginative, gifted students like Jung were drowning in such an environment that did not speak to their souls.

We are on the verge of seeing education return to that path as arts funding is reduced and questions arise about whether curricula should even contain the liberal arts. History professor Gordon-Reed responded to this environment by changing the context saying, “The question of whether our government should promote science and technology or the liberal arts in higher education is not an either-or proposition, although the current emphasis on preparing young Americans for STEM-related fields can make it seem that way” (Gordon-Reed, 2013, para 1). She explained that employers desire well-rounded students and that education should prepare students for their whole careers, not just for that first job. Gordon-Reed also claimed that the liberal arts prepare a well-rounded student. Horsey in the Seattle Business magazine also advocated for the arts as he discussed how Steve Jobs from Apple computers “lived at the intersection of art and technology. He earned billions of dollars, but the real aim of his life was
simply to find satisfaction creating revolutionary tools that combined the best science with the highest esthetic” (2013, para 1).

Jung said, “From the living fountain of instinct flows everything that is creative; hence the unconscious is not merely conditioned by history, but is the very source of the creative impulse. “ (Jung, 1934, p. 157). The unconscious mind is that of which we are not aware and symbol is the term, name, or picture that may be familiar in daily life that possesses specific connotations in addition to its conventional and obvious meaning. Symbol is the language of the unconscious (Jung, 1934) and the arts are full of symbol, therefore the arts give people access to the language to reach their unconscious, that space where Jobs’ and all genius works and creativity emerges.

While providing insight into the value of the arts in education is one application of Jungian psychology in education, there are many others which address inclusivity and deeper understanding of students who are often marginalized by current systems of education that focus on the group at the expense of the individual. Schools most often measure student achievement with standardized test scores, grades, or other teacher evaluations. Researchers measure student success through empirical methods with the researcher desiring reproducible and reliable methods and programs that produce results that can be generalized to other populations. Even with all the safeguards of human subjects protocols designed to prevent research bias, these models of research consistently avoid the individual differences in outliers because those differences confuse the data. It is precisely this space of individual difference that Jung’s analytical psychology and his other theories address, because while there is a collective nature to the unconscious, each individual has their own ways of processing information and inputs that come into the unconscious mind through the conscious mind.
This paper will outline the core concepts in Jungian psychology that are applicable to education, review the literature on education and Jungian psychology including some who would be considered post-Jungian as they built on his theories, and finally discuss how some of these ideas are already being used in education and how they could be applied more widely.
JUNGIAN ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Background: Core Concepts of Jungian Psychology

At the heart of analytical psychology is the unconscious, that part of our mind we are not aware of that plays an enormous role in how we move consciously in the world (Jung, 1964). According to Jung (1964), the symbol is the language that speaks to the unconscious mind and helps bridge the gap between the conscious and unconscious. Without that bridge, the unconscious can often act unpredictably and complexes can arise. In educational settings, there is also transference that happens between teacher and student at an unconscious level and if teachers are not aware of this, then additional problems can occur. Awareness of the processes that affect the psyche can add a depth in awareness of how students learn, why they do or say seemingly odd things, and how the teacher affects all of this. In addition, while the process of Jungian psychoanalysis itself is not currently applicable to education, Jung (1964) believed it to be the most direct path of transformation for individuals. Understanding of the analysis process could yield future insights into more direct ways individual transformation could manifest in the classroom. Even though most of his work focused on adults, primarily as a way to differentiate himself from the work of his predecessor Sigmund Freud, Jung did discuss his thoughts on education and the effects of the education on the psyche.

Jungian Approach to Symbol

In Jungian psychology, a symbol is defined as a term, name, or picture that may be familiar in daily life, yet it possesses specific connotations in addition to its conventional and obvious meaning which implies something vague, unknown, and hidden from us (Jung, 1964). Symbols are used to represent concepts that we cannot define or fully comprehend and this is a reason why symbols are seen in all forms of mythology and religion since it also attempts to explain experiences like birth, death, and personal growth which we cannot fully describe with
language. There will always be a need for symbols because we primarily interact with the world through our senses and, by their nature, the senses limit perception, therefore man can never fully comprehend or understand anything. However, there are perceptions that we do not absorb with our conscious mind, yet they are perceived by our unconscious mind and may come to us in dreams.

Dreams and dream symbolism are at the core of Jungian analysis because dreams are often the key to understanding the unconscious parts of our personality that rule complexes (Jung, 1964). A complex is a repressed emotional theme that can cause psychological disturbances or the symptoms of a neurosis. The ideas that we deal with in our waking life are not as precise as we think and the emotional significance can often become subliminal, which means that they pass into the unconscious. As we move through life, we can become dissociated and lose touch with our identity. Our moods can control us and we may become unreasonable and unable to recall facts as a result of these complexes. Dreams offer a way to communicate with our unconscious and understand more about ourselves in order to heal the complexes and become whole again. Jungian dream analysis differs from Freudian dream analysis in that the latter focuses on free association that begins with the dream and the former focuses on the content and structure of the dream itself. Therefore Jungian analysts will often coax the dreamer to come back to the dream and ask about what the dream says.

In our conscious life, we so often strip the emotional context out of ideas that we rarely respond to them anymore (Jung, 1964). Strongly emotional ideas are used in speech, but void of the emotional context, they rarely make an impression. The symbolism of dream language has so much psychic energy that we are forced to pay attention. According to Jung, “the more that consciousness is influenced by prejudices, errors, fantasies, and infantile wishes, the more
existing gap will widen into a neurotic dissociation and lead to an artificial life far removed from healthy instincts, nature, and truth” (Jung, 1964, p. 34). The function of our dreams is to produce dream material that brings our psyche back to equilibrium. Our dreams come from a spirit that is not quite human, but instead a breath of nature. Sometimes they are predictive and announce certain situations long before they appear due to the fact that many crises in our lives have a long unconscious history and we move toward them without awareness of the dangers that are accumulating. The powerful effects of the unconscious can be seen in neurotics where the unconscious contents of the mind behave as if they were conscious and they can never be sure whether thought, speech, or action is conscious or not. It is this aspect of neuroticism that makes doctors dismiss statements of neurotic patients as lies. A simpler form is seen in forgetting, where certain conscious ideas lose their specific energy because one’s attention has been deflected. In both cases the conscious ideas have not disappeared and the unconscious has taken note of them even if the conscious is not aware. Both forgetfulness and accusations of telling fantastical stories are behaviors often seen in children and, if we look to Jungian ideas of the unconscious mind and the symbolic world of dreams, there may be more to the story than most adults see. Like the doctors with the neurotics, many adults have been conditioned to dismiss these elements of childhood as lies. But what if these “lies” are simply ways that the child’s unconscious is communicating?

**Jungian Analysis**

Unlike in Freudian psychology, dream analysis in Jungian psychology cannot be done with a reference book where symbols are looked up, because no dream symbol can be separated from the individual that dreams it. Subliminal communication to the unconscious is an individual process with individual context and therefore deciphering the language of the unconscious is a
unique process tailored to the individual (Stein, 1982). To Jungian analysts, the individual is the only reality and the further we move away from the individual towards abstract ideas about people, the more likely we are to make mistakes in interpretation. Dream symbols are manifestations of a psyche beyond the control of the conscious mind and instincts influence the activity of consciousness through dreams, intuitions, and impulses. Each case has to be approached as a new one and the analyst must learn the language of the individual patient.

While the meaning of symbols in dreams is highly individual, there are common collections of recurring symbols called motifs like falling, flying, being persecuted by dangerous animals or hostile men, nakedness in public places, and running hard and getting nowhere that often appear in the dreams of many individuals (Stein, 1982). Dream analysis is not really a technique that can be learned and applied according to the rules as it is a dialectical exchange between two personalities, the analyst and the analysand. Freud (1910) described the psyche as having three parts: the id which is the instinctual nature, the superego which is the conscience, and the ego which tries to balance between the id and the superego. The ego is the conscious mind and the part that attempts to be rational and creates defenses for other parts. Jungian analysis strips away the rigid structures of the ego and its defenses and the therapeutic effects of this process result from increasing the personal awareness of the whole self (Stein, 1982).

There are four stages to analysis: confession, elucidation, education and transformation (Stein, 1982). While all four must occur, the order in which they occur does not need to be sequential. During confession, the analysand reveals life experiences and conscious attitudes, while elucidation brings the analyst in who presents repressed unconscious material for the analysand to reflect upon. Elucidation can be quite painful for the analysand who may not be willing or ready to face the repressed material from the unconscious, because there are reasons
why the conscious mind represses. During education, the analyst takes the role of a teacher or guide and provides information on how to integrate the previously repressed unconscious information. These recommendations may take the form of books, plays, and movies; one key aspect of all recommendations is that they are specifically tailored to the individual analysand. These three steps of analysis have common aims of alleviating shame and guilt so that normal ego functioning can occur, filling in the sometimes traumatic and painful pieces of experience in order to gain perspective and take back projections. The steps also balance attitudes to improve psychological functions by integrating energies that had previously been locked away in the unconscious. All of these steps lead to the final step of transformation, which can only happen if there is trust between analysand and analyst. To facilitate the deep change or transformation, analysts work to build a deep bridge between ego-consciousness and unconsciousness. Transformation requires being open to the less rational, more ambiguous, and mysterious sides of the personality. Methods like active imagination, sand play, movement therapy, and art are often used in conjunction with dream analysis to open up access to the unconscious. As a result, the transformed personality feels both new and old, enlarged yet deeply familiar.

**Jungian View of Education**

Analytical psychology differs from experimental psychology in that it does not attempt to isolate individual functions (sense functions, emotional phenomena, thought-processes, etc.) and then subject them to experimental conditions for the purposes of investigation. It is more concerned with the total manifestation of the psyche as a natural phenomenon - a highly complex structure, therefore even though critical examination may be able to divide it up into simpler component complexes. … We doctors are forced, for the sake of
our patients, to treat obscure complaints which are hard or impossible to understand, sometimes with inadequate and therefore doubtful means, and to summon up the necessary courage and right feeling of responsibility. We have, for professional reasons, to tackle the darkest and most desperate problems of the soul, conscious all the time of the possible consequences of a false step (Jung, 1954/1991, p. 91-92).

Educational psychology relies heavily on experimental psychology and has contributed much understanding to the value of education. However, the foundation of experimental psychology is that which can be observed, and so the effects of the unconscious which cannot be observed are left out. Jung (1964) thought that the role of the unconscious was critical to the development of humans, and by omission of the unconscious, which cannot be observed, there will always be children who fall outside of the knowledge and programs that are developed by experimental psychology. Analytical psychology offers something different and a way to reach those forgotten students, the highly individual ones. While the classroom itself focuses on the many, looking at the application of Jungian thought in the classroom can open doors to understanding how to reach those children within the educational system.

“Children are intensely interested in all the sensuously perceptible things going on around them. … What could be more probable than the child still has the valuations and makes no bones about showing them, before civilization spreads like a pall over his primitive thinking” (Jung, 1954/1991, p.12)? Jung did not favor the education system of his time and often wrote about the negative effects that well-meaning and indoctrinated teachers had on taking the imagination away from children. Jungian analysis is an activity that works in dyads, not the classroom, and many potential neuroses were attributed to the effects of the education system on students. As Jung was interested in the individual, he did not write much about how to improve education.
However, many of his ideas provide the basis for concepts that could be very useful in the classroom.

One such insight is the nature of misbehaving children, which he discusses in the case of a young child named Anna (Jung, 1954/1991).

Indeed they attributed far too little significance at first to the child’s spontaneous utterances. In this they were only doing what all official education does. We do not usually listen to children at any stage of their careers. … Behind resistances there always lies a question, a conflict, of which we hear soon enough at another time and on another occasion. But usually we forget to connect the thing heard with the resistances (Jung, 1954/1991, p.14).

Despite the advances in child-centered education, there are still obstacles to really listening to the children in the classroom. Cox (2014) spoke to this issue as she introduced a series of articles in the first 2014 issue of The New Educator that focus on how to be better listeners to children.

According to Jung, there is always something underneath the resistance from a child. He described Anna’s response as sublimation, “We see here an energetic attempt being made to sublimate fear into a desire for knowledge, which strikes us as decidedly premature at this age. … For if one forces sublimation at this age one is only strengthening a neurosis” (Jung, 1954/1991, p. 34). In a similar way, if teachers try to force children along a path, it can lead to strengthening the neurosis.

Jung (1954/1991) recommended that adults accept that the child’s fantasy stories are true for the child because forcing them to accept them as not true could stunt further development of the child. Instead, further insight into the psychic atmosphere at home is recommended since children often reflect the complexes of the parents buried in their unconscious, of which the
strongest effects come from the lives that the parents had not lived and the things they have always retreated from. This force is incredibly powerful and both psychotherapy and education alone have a hard time trying to heal the child of these influences. Jung thought that archetypes, the symbols that can vary a great deal in detail without losing their basic pattern and are often common across people and cultures, rule the preconscious soul of the child and this is why childhood issues continue to loom large even in the lives of adults. Again and again we see adults unintentionally thrusting their unfulfilled illusions and ambitions on to the child and forcing the child into roles and experiences that don’t really fit those of a child. Given this knowledge, counselors or school psychologists can develop training programs in schools for teachers and other personnel to help understand the nature of children and that their issues with authority may come from the home.

Jung did not see a direct application of his analysis methods to education, instead he thought that analytical psychology dealt with a system of thought and method (Jung, 1954/1991). Both thought and method are not generally known, so their applicability to educational problems is not easily demonstrated. Training in analytical psychology is traditionally done in dyads and takes years to complete (Stein, 1982). Teachers are trained to be educators and work in the classroom, not to examine the psyche of their students. A basic knowledge of psychology is important in today’s schools and every teacher education program requires at least one course in educational psychology to ensure that teachers are aware of the basics.

What Jungian psychology can offer is a return to taking a look at the parents as a source of difficulties in the child (Jung, 1954/1991). Modern schools tend to shy away from this perspective today, thinking it antiquated and in opposition to the idea of the child as an individual, but this view is blind to the reality of the influence of parents on the child in the same
way it was during Jung’s time. “One is often tempted to interpret children who are peculiar, obstinate, disobedient, or difficult to handle as especially individual or self-willed. This is a mistake. … Almost without exception we discover in the parents the only valid reasons for the child’s difficulties” (Jung, 1954/1991, p. 54).

In school, teachers act as substitute for a parent and teachers should be consciously aware of this (Jung, 1954/1991). Acting out against the teacher is often a substitute of acting out against the parent. Because the child naturally projects the parent image on the teacher, the teacher must realize that she influences the child through her personality as well as the curriculum. According to Jung teaching methods are less important than the relationship between teacher and student in academic success. The educator should know that talk and discipline lead nowhere, that what counts is example. So much educational research ignores this component of the personal relationship in schools when they try to simplify academic success to correct application of teaching methods.

“We need not concern ourselves so much with the amount of specific information a child takes away with him from school; the thing of vital importance is that the school should succeed in freeing the young man from unconscious identity with his family, and should make him properly conscious of himself. Without this consciousness he will never know what he really wants, but will always remain dependent and imitative, with the feeling of being misunderstood and suppressed” (Jung, 1954/1991, p. 56-57).

While teachers should not be practicing analytical psychology in the classroom, a deeper understand of their role as parent substitute and how classroom interaction and their personal relationships with each student contribute to the psychological development of the child could change the quality of interactions. “The best way for the educator to educate others is for the
educator himself to be educated, and that he should first try out on himself the psychological profundities he has learnt from text-books” (Jung, 1954/1991, p. 132).

Knowledge of the role of teachers as parent substitute could also shape the current practices of large classroom sizes and new teachers every year, instead favoring a system that fosters close, longer term relationships between teachers and students which allows room for more influence of teachers on the child’s development.

“To analyse children is a most difficult and delicate task. The conditions under which we have to work are altogether different from those governing the analysis of grown-ups. The child has a special psychology” (Jung, 1954/1991, p. 74). As mentioned earlier, Jung saw the child’s psychology interwoven and reflective of the parent’s psychology, which played out in school settings with the teacher as substitute for the parent of the same gender. “The human being must be adapted on two fronts, firstly to external life - profession, family, society-and secondly to the vital demands of its own nature. Neglect of the one or the other imperative leads to illness” (Jung, 1954/1991, p. 92). Current educational reform and programs focus on observable markers in the child’s life like test scores, extracurricular activities, friendships and relationships. Consequently, a whole other arena of reform related to the inner life of students and their own nature lies dormant. Since we do not have methods to measure this aside from self-reporting, there needs to be much more research in this area. Neuropsychology offers ways to measure impulses in the brain and can perhaps offer a gateway to the inner lives of children and adults. Researchers like Devinsky (1997) and Mauro (2006) are looking at the neurological link between the conscious and unconscious minds. While this research is in its infancy, further research along these lines could open up observable ways to report on what is going on in the unconscious.

Jung 1954/1991 described three different types of education:
1. Education Through Example

2. Collective Education

3. Individual Education

Education through example is the oldest and most effective form of education since it happens unconsciously as the student observes and then mimics what she sees. For example, a young child learns to talk by watching the parents talk or learns how to walk by watching the people around them walk.

Collective education is education according to rules, principles, and methods that encourages conformity through the pressure or example of the crowd. This is the method employed in most schools and Jung believed that it can lead to insecurity in matters where individual judgment must be used. However, collective education is necessary because we live in a world with other people and must have collective norms.

With individual education all rules, methods, principles, and systems are in service to bringing out the individuality of the student. Jung (1954/1991) believed that all children who resist collective education require individual education; this includes children with special needs as well as those with special aptitudes and one-sided natures like math geniuses and other gifted children. Individual education requires more information about the student including a thorough knowledge of the child’s home life and psychological history. Since most environmental influences are unconscious and we can only correct the conscious, then the unconscious must be brought to the conscious level and the best way to do this is through analysis and interpretation of dreams.

While many children do benefit from collective education as demonstrated by the success rate of children learning basic skills such as math and reading in the classroom, there are those
who do not. This where Jungian thought can bring a fresh perspective to the discussion on modern education with the tendency to put special needs and gifted children into the collective education environment. Individual education in our school system has not focused on what the schools can do outside of the home. Regulations within current school systems limit teacher access to the home environment of their students and teachers have little influence or insight into how their students interact with individual psychotherapy. The parents must navigate this complex world for their unique children and they often are not prepared for this. Therefore, many children who could benefit from individual education slip through the cracks. A shift in how we deal with those students who need individual education and greater partnerships between teachers, parents, and therapists could help make a difference.
Early Views on Jungian Theory and Education

The early literature on Jung’s analytical psychology laments the fact that these rich concepts are often ignored or not realized enough to have an impact on education. For many years, every now and then researchers like Henderson (1956) and Shaker (1982) would delve into the world of Jung and question why these applicable theories never caught on and then nothing else happened.

Henderson (1956) commented on how Jung’s analytical psychology had not yet had an impact on education and he attributed that to the fact that most of Jung’s work centered around adults as well as the inherent complexity of analytical psychology in comparison with Freud’s psychoanalysis (Freud, 1910) and Adler’s individual psychology (Adler, 1929). Henderson reviews Jung’s three types of education and thought that the archetypal hero’s journey is how Jungian thought could contribute significantly to educational sociology of his time. The hero’s journey is a pattern of story that outlines the typical adventure of the person, or hero, who leaves their group, tribe, or civilization and returns after achieving great deeds on behalf of the group. Campbell (1949/1968) had already written of the hero’s journey in the field of literature and comparative religion and later popularized it through a television series on PBS in the 1980’s (Campbell, et al., 1988). Henderson also thought that the concept of the shadow self, which had been formerly attributed to the external devil in religion, was a useful concept in the education of children of the time who were grappling with the evils of Nazism and totalitarianism. The quiet nature of Jung’s inward focus and meaning was viewed as more useful than the concept of existentialism, which started with a sense of disorientation and confusion when faced with a meaningless or absurd world (Solomon, 1974). Other aspects that Jung brings to education are a spiritual component and a spiritual foundation by bringing attention to the self as the archetype.
of spirit and the hero’s journey that occurs as a student moves through the education system in breaking away from parents and moving into individuation and adulthood. Practical implications of analytical psychology include cultivation of balance in many arenas. Teacher education could involve training teachers to have a well-balanced personality themselves by developing their own harmonious family relationships, warm emotional life, priorities in social allegiances, and a spiritual awareness. Henderson also suggested multi-disciplinary approaches to education and research situations that touch on education by example, collective education, and individual education. All of these could heal our culture with a greater awareness of the value of different approaches.

In the 1980s, the influence of analytical psychology was still unrealized in education when Paul Shaker (1982) discussed the topic. Shaker thought that the politics of academia, the nature of the theories, and a theme of heroic materialism during his time prevented Jung’s works from catching on. Academia was described by Shaker as formal and intolerant and compared it to authoritarian Marxism, which created distance and prevented awareness of the truths that could be applied to the problem of the existing social order. Though Jung saw himself as an empiricist (as cited in Shaker, 1982), his work is focused on the symbol, which must be interpreted through intuitive reasoning. The nature of intuitive reasoning is hard for empiricists to grasp. The heroic materialism referred to an ego consciousness that looks at the world as either/or dichotomies. To the empirical researchers, Jung’s quest to heal the whole patient and the inclusion of a spiritual component led to a vision of him as a mystic, which was at odds with common thought at the time. His thinking around the powers of the unconscious over free will opposed a culture that elevated the individual. Developmental psychologists like Piaget (1959) and Rousseau (1783) theorized that development ended after adolescence. Many educators have
an interest in the development of personality and the stage theories offer simple stages that
encompass most children which allow educators to apply generalities while analytical
psychology has a more individual approach to the development of personality. Other styles of
consciousness are required to understand the nature of the individual unconscious. The nature of
complexes adds another level of individuality to the development of the ego.

There are areas that Shaker (1982) saw slipping into educational discourse like the
Jungian four functions of the psyche: thinking, feeling, sensing, intuition. These functions
provided a tool to help understand learners and the ways to communicate with them as
individuals. He also thought that an understanding of the unconscious could add another level to
the questions of readiness, retention, and transfer. Greater understanding of gifted learners could
contribute to methods in educating them. According to Shaker, the theme in analytical
psychology of the quest for self-realization can bring unity and clarity to motivation theory. The
self has an intrinsic goal-like quality and urge to realize that goal, both of which are rooted in the
unconscious, not dependent on participation of the consciousness. Such information would be
valuable to the educator who could help guide the student toward their individual destiny.

Attempting to understand the learner’s motives could lead to greater understanding of behavior
and greater understanding if viewed as a search for meaning. Current education looked towards
platitudes and concepts of reinforcement in order to get desired outcomes.

Shaker (1982) thought that Jung’s ideas would appeal to those working towards a
reconceptualization of schooling. Analytical psychology cannot be applied on the surface of a
system, instead it must be allowed to penetrate to the depths of the system and change it. The
search for meaning in Jungian terms can make use of many different types of learning and ways
of looking at information. Educators who embrace these different ways of learning and
investigation can support the individual’s search for meaning and process of individuation. “Jung, as a psychologist, attempted in his work to bring into the sphere of science what has, since prehistory, been the preserve of poets, priests, philosophers, and the like” (Shaker, 1982, p. 248). Success in reforming the educational system by supporting the process of individuation brings heightened consciousness as a societal goal.
Modern Views on Jungian Theory and Education

Since the early 2000’s though, it seems like there is a whole generation of researchers who are interested in bringing Jungian thought back into the classroom. These academics who grew up with the influence of increased use of Jungian type theory with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator developed Katherine Briggs and daughter Isabel Briggs Myers, depth psychologists like James Hillman (1975), and literature professors in popular culture like Joseph Campbell and his Power of Myth series (Campbell, et al., 1988). Therefore for them the language of Jung is no longer as foreign as it used to be, and has become more accessible in psychology as well as education. Researchers like Main (2008), Rowland (2009), Romanyszyn (2012), and Semetsky (2012) have begun diving more into the process of individuation from Jungian psycholoanalysis and the health of the soul.

The soul of education was the focus of Susan Rowland’s 2009 article on Jung as she saw the world of education in the midst of an identity crisis as higher education moved towards providing degree education primarily as a means to acquire skills for employment and changed the landscape. Rowland examined Jung’s three types of education and posited that to Jung education means coming to terms with one’s unconscious in a social context. Individuation is a process for both individuals and societies. “What is required is a revolution in consciousness that re-aligns the social ego, as well as the individual ego, with nature envisioned as animated, as having voices, creativity, autonomy, and ethical claims” (Rowland, 2009, p. 11). Rowland worked to reconfigure the apparent dichotomy between education for the individual and the masses and by extension between education for utility and education to transform consciousness. For example, the humanities can transform our consciousness, address the learning goals of both the individual and the group, and provide interpersonal job skills since we must relate to one
another. Jung’s (1954/1991) ideas of the psyche emphasize the individual within society and how education cannot divorce the individual learning from the social context in which learning occurs and the individual must live. Rowland offered a practical example of this by discussing the soul-healing nature of reading and discussing a Jane Austen’s *Mansfield Park* novel in class. While reading itself is an individual activity, discussing in class and learning how the characters relate to one another also provides collective learning in how to deal with different situations in life. By combining several different learning outcomes into a single activity, one can combat the modern tendency to separate and narrowly define desirable outcomes without looking at education as a whole. The classroom must include the psyche and therefore Jung’s teaching helps us avoid exclusion of the soul from education.

Jung argued that the formal schooling during his time only provides half of education (Jung, 1954/1991), and the other half comes through the personality of the teacher who guides the child into the larger world by expanding upon the training that the parents have done, thus providing continuity. This other half happens unconsciously and is the subject of a 2012 article by Main. She outlines how Jung’s models of psychological development are non-linear and non-progressive because of one’s continuous and cyclical relationship with the collective unconscious of each individual and all of humanity. She spends a lot of time arguing that children are not passive during this unconscious learning. This argument is really irrelevant since Jung never stated that it was passive, simply that it did not exist in the conscious mind. However, she seems to be on to something when she describes this process as a collaborative effort between the teacher and the child since the same teacher affects each child in a different way. The nature of each individual child shapes the influence of the teacher during this unconscious education process.
How then does one improve the quality of an unconscious education that does not include variables that can be consciously manipulated? It relies on the teacher’s role in the student’s unconscious and this process is unobservable, non-assessable, and unmanageable. Jung himself offers no advice on this, however Main (2012) inferred that Jung suggests that children trust their own nature and search for answers to their own questions in the outer world since they inherit their inner problems from their parents. A complementary relationship between the formal system of education and the human relationships between teacher and student could add another dimension to how success in education and the student’s experience are assessed through looking at the long-term effects of education. In this manner the quality of each student-teacher relationship itself is assessed rather than individual assessments of the teacher and each student. It may not directly relate to conscious education, but offer another understanding of this dimension of education. In addition, unconscious education can be applied to any educational context and is inclusive of marginalized groups. Overall though, the benefits of unconscious education are psychological and have the potential to expand understanding and value of the meaning and quality of different forms of education.

The topic of Jung and inclusive education was addressed by Semestsky in her 2012 article where she introduces eight papers from the USA, Australia, and the UK that link Jung’s analytical psychology and educational theory by exploring the four Jungian functions: intuition, sensing, thinking, and feeling. These papers described how Jungian functions are used in education for both academics and practitioners. Noddings & Shore (1984) initially looked at Jung’s intuitive function and changed the discussion of Jungian thought by asserting the educational value of Jungian theory as well as the therapeutic value. Noddings (2006) later compared Jungian thought to the Socratic principle ‘Know thyself’ as both are often forgotten,
crucial to education, and instrumental in helping students and teachers to know themselves as individuals when applied. Jung (1954/1991) himself was an advocate of individual education as opposed to collective education. Both Noddings (2006) and Semetsky (2012) thought individual education would bring more inclusivity to education because with individual education, all rules, methods, principles, and systems must be subordinated to the one purpose of bringing out the specific individuality of the pupil. This brings inherent ethical considerations and the often ignored principle of wholeness for all people involved in the educational process.

Romanushyn (2012) noted that a lot of educational practices tend to forget who the student is in favor of the character who comes to the classroom and students tend to do the same thing with their teachers. The character here is a one-dimensional representation of the teacher rather than a multi-dimensional view of the whole person that is the teacher as an individual. Here he invokes the Jungian concept of transference and the ways that analyst and patient interact not merely at the conscious level, but also at the unconscious level. This dynamic plays out in the classroom as well. Another analogy for the separation between people and their roles is separating the actor from their part on stage at the theater. Romanushyn described the classroom as a theater where characters meet and both the theater and the classrooms are places where one is led into other worlds of possibility. He bemoaned the tendency of education to indoctrinate and how insisting on single, right answers to questions often causes imagination to be lost.

Romanushyn described a third world in education, somewhere between the first world of sense, what we can see, touch, and feel with our senses, and the second world of intellect, where we think about things and process information. Philosopher Henry Corbin (1969) calls this third world “imaginal”, and Jung (1964) described it as the landscape of the psyche where there is space for Jung’s feeling function to be explored through imagination. Without that, the
classroom can become “disembodied and disconnected from a feeling and passionate connection to his/her words” (Romanyshyn, 2012, p.101). Unfortunately, teaching is often reduced to a narrow profession where one teaches merely skills that can be observed, quantified, measured, and organized within a limited set of standards. Teachers can disconnect from their unconscious and through the Jungian process of transference, there is the potential for unrealized complexes to be passed on to the students. Because of this, educators have an ethical obligation to take this level of complexity of the unconscious into consideration to make space for who the educator and students are and not simply what happens in the classroom.

Both Jung and Romanyshyn asserted that the classroom is not the therapy room and practical application of analytic psychotherapy is out of the question for the average teacher. Psychoanalytic principles are not to be applied directly in the classroom, but the educator needs to understand so that the complex dynamics of an unconscious life are not played out in the classroom. “Educating the other has to begin with and continue to be educating oneself (Romanyshyn, 2012, p. 103).” One critical piece of that is understanding the effect of one’s own complexes. “No investigator, however unprejudiced and objective he is, can afford to disregard his own complexes, for they enjoy the same autonomy as those of other people. As a matter of fact, he cannot disregard them because they do not disregard him. Complexes are very much a part of the psychological constitution, which is the most absolutely prejudiced thing in every individual. His constitution will therefore inexorably decide what psychological view a given observer will have. Herein lies the unavoidable limitation of psychological observation: its validity is contingent upon the personal equation of the observer (Jung, 1934, p. 8). Romanyshyn applied this to education by changing the term from investigator/observer to educator. The first step in making a place for the unconscious in the classroom is to learn how to listen to the other,
thereby ensuring that there is a space for the opening of perspective it brings. Symbol is the bridge between the conscious and unconscious in Jungian psychology, therefore the logical next step would be to make space for symbolic ways of knowing in addition to the empirical ways of knowing through the use of imagination.

Semetsky and Delpach-Ramey (2012) looked at the links between the theories of Deleuze (1995) and Jung by examining the role of the unconscious. Given the influence of Deleuze on educational theory, the authors wanted to examine the unconscious in the context of education. They first criticized recent efforts towards turning education into a business and means of churning out bureaucrats. Semetsky and Delpach-Ramey then asserted that both Jung and Deleuze were interested in the process of individuation and human development as a method of learning from experience. Jung clearly asserted that education was not simply school learning and did not disappear once the child has grown up, instead it is a life-long process in which both unconscious and conscious aspects of life are integrated completely (Jung, 1954). The language of communication between the conscious and unconscious is symbol. While Deleuze thought that the unconscious only existed in the public (social, political, world-historical) sphere, Jung acknowledged both the value of the unconscious in individual psychotherapy as well as the collective spheres that connect us with one another.

However, both Deleuze and Jung had similar concepts of the transcendental nature of the unconscious through a collective unconscious and common experiences and images. Deleuze described one piece of this landscape as effects that are not simply personal feelings, but a collective experience that could be transformed and live beyond the single person. Just as Jungian archetypes live in the collective unconscious of every individual and embody how these concepts play out in the mythologies and folktales of the world, Deleuze called the archetypes
the ‘proper names of history’ and they served the same function. This collective set of experiences, emotions, and symbols common to us all comes into play with learning because we build upon these common blocks when learning something new. Deleuze described the multiple and varying parameters of the unconscious as what creates the innovations that lead to new relationships and result in learning.

Experience is the heart of education for Deleuze and experiential learning is how new meaning is created. Jung’s thinking was similar to Deleuze’s with the unconscious forcing us to learn and individuate and become more ourselves. Both philosophies looked towards the future and described the constant process of creating something new, hitting on the Augustinian paradox which questions how one can desire what one does not know (Augustine, 1991). The collective nature of the unconscious occurs because the desire for learning, or inner gnosis, is a core part of the unconscious.

Deleuze built on Jung’s view of the unconscious in terms of problems and expanded on this by describing the transcendental experiences within the unconscious, where one grapples with an infinite series of problems and the psychic life is organized around questions. Both approaches moved beyond the tendency to explain complex concepts in terms of the opposition between only two conflicting ideas as found in the dualism of many religions as well as the theories of Freud and many others. According to Deleuze, apparent opposites are reconciled within the unconscious, resulting in a new understanding that transcends the previous concepts. Applicability of this in the sphere of traditional education is to take the teacher’s self-education and look at it more as how to make the teacher properly conscious of him or herself rather than looking at self-education through the lens of contemporary professional development. Taking time with oneself to examine the deep psychological experiences that emerge as a normal part of
life can develop a more whole personality within the teacher, who is then more qualified to relate with students at the unconscious level.

The literature referenced in this section demonstrates increased depth in the understanding and drive to push Jungian thought and depth psychology into education. Some of these more radical ideas that bring in more of the language of spirituality and health of the soul may, in time, make some of the core Jungian concepts seem more commonplace and less risky to introduce into the education system. Compared to the language of the depth psychologists steeped in mythology, spirituality, and addressing the soul of the world, in the future Jungian core concepts could seem tame. Neuropsychological research into the unconscious, focus on the individual and the concept of unconscious transference between teacher and student, as well as increased inclusivity by bringing in the language of symbol into the classroom, could also open up new pathways for research in this area.
Application of Jungian Theory to Education

There are many potential applications of analytical psychology to education and some possibilities are discussed here. While some applications are already being used as outlined previously, others require further research, case studies, and new methods of data collection to determine parameters and effectiveness.

Jungian Type

Jungian types are the functions through which the conscious mind can comprehend reality (Jung, 1964). There are four such types: sensation, intuition, thinking and feeling. These types are often used in personality typing and since learning styles are a part of teacher training, they fit into the different types of learning. This personality assessment is one way that Jungian psychology has made its way into teacher training and education in general. Jungian types are also the basis of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator often used in career assessment. However, one important key point about them that is not as prevalent is that while the type is dominant in conscious learning (i.e. thinking), the other type (i.e. feeling) is repressed and characterizes the unconscious learning. Just as the use of symbol is needed to communicate between the conscious and unconscious, symbol allows the student to communicate between the two types of learning.

Incorrect Context of Symbol

In Jungian psychoanalysis and the many case studies that Jung offers, suggested the power of symbol in the unconscious which manifests itself in many unpredictable ways (Jung, 1966). While transference can occur through the unconscious between two people in relationship (for example, teacher and student or child and parent) it can also happen with symbols themselves. People will know there is something wrong and attach it to the wrong symbol in the conscious world, even if there is evidence to prove otherwise. Knowledge of this type of
incorrect context of symbol could be useful in the classroom where students are often afraid of tests or teachers or PE class and the fear may appear irrational. Jung recommended that practitioners should believe the patient and understand that what they say is true in some way, though the context in which it is presented may not be appropriate in the conscious world. This is because the unconscious understanding is informing the conscious experience of the student, and believing the seemingly irrational fear prevents a complex from forming. In the classroom and other learning situations, students who present seemingly absurd reasoning are often accused of lying. By following Jung’s example and his case studies, those children are to be believed and one can find ways to explore in what context the absurdity may be true. This represents a change where the teacher must focus on the whole experience of the child’s learning instead of the desire to correct perceived misunderstanding or lying in the child.

Awareness of Transference From Teacher to Student

Another concept core to Jung and of which much of the literature calls for more awareness is the unconscious transference that happens between teacher and student. This transference is the same process that happens between parent and child, therefore the teacher is in the place of the parent in the classroom. (Jung, 1954/1991). K-12 teacher education programs often include one or two classes in educational psychology that are primarily focused on the developmental stages of the students and designed to help future teachers gain an understanding of what their students are capable of at certain ages, physically, cognitively, and emotionally. College and university professors and graduate students who teach are often not even aware about the psychology of their own students. Little to nothing is really taught regarding the emotional state of the teacher. Many teachers are then thrust into the classroom without a lot of support for the emotional ups and downs of running a classroom.
Through the lens of Jungian transference, all of these unconscious complexes have the potential to reach the student, depending on how receptive the student’s unconscious is to the signals sent from the teacher. Larrivee (2012) describes how teachers today are more stressed out than ever and are falling prey to the destructive effects of burnout and stress. Greater support for teachers and an understanding that the emotional and psychic health of teachers is critical to the success of students could only help the emotional climate of the classroom and increase retention of teachers in the field.

**Increased Inclusivity in Education**

Most classrooms and educational research are targeted at group psychology and reaching as many students as possible with a program or intervention. Outliers are ignored as one looks at the majority of a population. Even when typically underserved populations are the focus of a study or program, there are still individuals who slip through the cracks while the focus is on norms and the majority of that underserved populations. Given limited funding and the desire to reach as many as possible in education and research, this approach makes sense. However, teachers and administrators lament the problem cases of students they just do not know how to reach.

Popular culture loves to tell the story of the rogue teacher who used unconventional methods to reach these types of students in films like *Stand and Deliver* (1988) and *Dead Poets Society* (1989), and while the methods of those teachers are unlikely to be generalized, there is a kernel of promise there. Teachers who bring in poetry, which is rich with symbol that communicates between the conscious and unconscious, and teachers who bring with them a strong conscious and unconscious belief that their students can do anything communicate these things to their students and reach the unconscious. Further research can be done on teachers,
their backgrounds, and how what lies in the unconscious contribute to classroom effectiveness. How many of us have had the uninspired teacher or the teacher who just simply relied on the same techniques for years? Both may have used the exact same curriculum and same technique, but with different effects. While both have a detrimental effect on learning, the uninspired teacher can take away our love of learning while the repetitive teacher is simply boring. Much of this is chalked up to personality or another unmeasurable characteristic, but Jung offers us a window into what it might be. Even though the world of the unconscious is not quantitatively measurable, there are qualitative ways to take this into consideration and conduct research. By reaching these students on the margin and speaking to their unconscious in new and innovate ways, we can increase the inclusivity in education for many students with special needs.
Practical Application Through Montessori Education

There practical methods to reach the goal of individual education and supporting the individuation process. Maria Montessori developed a method of childhood learning called “The Montessori Method” while working with low-income families in the San Lorenzo district in Rome (Montessori, 1912/1964). While she developed her style before Jung’s theories were published, many of the practical teaching methods of the Montessori classroom are harmonious with an environment supportive of the development of the whole child (Montessori, 1912/1964). There are many ways that Montessori incorporates key Jungian concepts into the Montessori classroom, and the beauty of a Montessori classroom is how well the students learn to regulate their own learning.

The Montessori classroom occurs in the “prepared environment”, a calm, ordered space where children work on activities of their own choice at their own pace. They experience a combination of freedom and self-discipline in a place especially designed to meet their developmental needs (Montessori, 1912/1964). According to The American Montessori Society (2014), the core elements of a Montessori classroom are:

- Mixed age classrooms (classrooms for children ages 2½ or 3 to 6 years old are the most common)
- Student choice of activity from within a prescribed range of options
- Uninterrupted blocks of work time, ideally three hours
- A constructivist or "discovery" model, where students learn concepts from working with materials, rather than by direct instruction
- Specialized educational materials developed by Montessori and her collaborators
- Freedom of movement within the classroom
A trained Montessori teacher

Freedom of movement, student choice of activity, and the discovery model rather than direct instruction allow students to explore learning as their conscious or unconscious minds take them. All of these methods open the door to imagination, which allows the student to access the unconscious as well as the conscious. In addition, the Montessori teacher training focuses on more than just the traditional content areas and a little bit of child psychology. The focus of training is integration of the whole child. When problems are discovered, many Montessori educators work with parents and the children to discover the source of the disruptions. While the concept of transference is not directly discussed, Montessori teachers are trained to know that what goes on in the home affects the classroom as well as what happens in the classroom affects the home. Parents of children in Montessori schools are encouraged to develop and explore this awareness early on with their children.

Fisher (1912) documents her own research as a Montessori parent and the first thing she notices is how absorbed the children are in their work, so much so that they do not look up when visitors enter the classroom. They were focused on their work and their own pursuits as was the teacher and both knew that the other was there if they needed them. Here we see the transference of parent to teacher in play and how the well-adjusted teacher was reflected in the well-adjusted children. Later she engaged in a discussion with a teacher on whether or not she should have tucked the napkin in around the child’s chin while eating soup since he was a mess, but the teacher knew that her role was not to be the mother and pass on any judgment around the task. Instead, the teacher was there to facilitate the learning of the student.

In the Montessori classroom, we see individual learning at work. That is what it is, a real home for children, where everything is arranged for their best interests, where the
furniture is the right size for them, where there are no adult occupations going on to be interrupted and hindered by the mere presence of the children, where there are no rules made solely to facilitate life for grown-ups, where children, without incurring the reproach (expressed or tacit) of disturbing their elders, can freely and joyously, and if they please, noisily, develop themselves by action from morning to night. With the removal by this simple means of most of the occasions for friction in the life of little children, it is amazing to see how few, how negligibly few occasions there are for naughtiness. The great question of discipline which so absorbs us all, solves itself, melts into thin air, becomes non-existent. Each child gives himself the severest sort of self-discipline by his interest in his various undertakings. He learns self-control as a by-product of his healthy absorption in some fascinating pursuit, or as a result of his imitation of older children (Fisher, 1912, p. 12).

However, while Montessori education does an excellent job of training teachers, the nature of education means that transference also happens at home with the parents. There are instances where the parents may not be willing to engage with educators about what is going on at home and the influence it may have in the classroom. The children of these parents often do not do well in the Montessori environment and may leave. As a result, this model can lack inclusivity and create a new set of outlier students who fall through the cracks. Yet, despite these potential pitfalls, the Montessori classroom does make large strides in providing the kind of inclusive educational environment with awareness of the effects of transference and a space where individual education can happen.
The Gifted Child

While Jung did not comment much on the education of the average child, he had a lot to say about exceptional children and dedicated a whole chapter in *The Development of Personality* to the gifted child. “About education in general and school education in particular the doctor has little to say from the standpoint of his science, as that is hardly his business. But on the education of difficult or otherwise exceptional children he has an important word to add” (Jung, 1954/1991, p. 131). He points out the critical distinctions in the gifted child who may not always display their gifts in all areas of learning, instead they may come across as slovenly, indolent, or badly behaved. Gifts are not always evenly distributed, and genius in one area may be accompanied by regression in another. “From external observation alone it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the gifted child from a mental defective” (Jung, 1954/1991, p.137). He also calls attention to the need for humility to be taught to gifted children because gifts often contribute to an inflated sense of self as a result of the expectation that others around them will always treat them as exceptional. According to Jung, the gifted child often requires individual education because collective education seeks to level out and make the student uniform. Many gifted children will resist collective education and all those who successfully resist collective education require individual education.

Reynolds and Piirto (2005) built on this by calling for bringing the soul back into the field of talent development and giftedness through depth psychology. One must remain conscious of archetypes whether or not one understands them because they are a part of nature, just as man is, and cutting one off from these primordial images of life is akin to living in a prison (Jung, 1959). However, psychologies that include archetypes are still unknown in the field of talent development and giftedness; instead the field is dominated by clinical, behavioral,
developmental, and psychologies of learning styles and intelligences. The connection with the ideas addressed in depth psychology is only found in advanced studies of philosophy, literature, and clinical psychology. What depth psychology offers to gifted education is awareness that the ego consciousness is not always in control, instead the unconscious plays a major role. The work of Hillman (1975) pushes the collective and spiritual natures of Jung’s description of the unconscious by equating archetypes with God and using the term “soul” instead of personal collective unconscious. Depth psychology is an extension of Jungian psychology that focuses on the care of the soul, and Hillman (1975) asserted that it is not science, it is poetry. Reynolds and Piirto asserted that the deepest root of education is “educare,” which led out from lesser meanings and connectedness to greater ones. Campbell (1968) described this as the space where naïve shallowness leads to the deep experience of being alive.

With regards to gifted children, depth psychology has the potential to increase the capacity to understand and respect the psychological experiences of the gifted and talented. In addition, depth psychology could allow for greater awareness of the mystery of exceptionality in people outside of test-driven definitions of gifted and talented. An understanding of the nature of genius and the madness that comes with creativity is essential to understanding the gifted and talented. By looking at education as care of the soul, we can also bring the presence of awareness of death and the power of love back into teaching and learning. A realization that creating directing, and maintaining programs for the development of talent comes from the cultural work is called “eldering”, a term coined by the Quakers to describe the spiritual training of their young adults who were to become elders (Wood, 1988). Core to this process is acknowledgement that the student has a soul and needs to move through rites of passage such as baptism, Bar Mitzvah, and a wedding to mark life events like birth, coming of age, and marriage to ease the journey
from the world of childhood to the world of adult relationships. The higher orders of consciousness (i.e., contemplation, reflection, intuition, dreaming, and social justice) all come with a soul-based curriculum rooted in a capacity for depth and complexity. Awareness of where progress is disrupted and breaks down is also critical to this type of work.

Application of this perspective involves ensuring that students have access to and work with stories, myths, books, and people that are reflected in their lives and can put them in touch with the archetypal way. For example, one can integrate the symbolic teaching tools of the gothic cathedrals or literature by authors such as Rousseau, Voltaire, and Baudelaire. All of these examples are rich with symbol and speak to the soul through the language of the unconscious. Looking at psychological processes through the lens of depth psychology to see the underlying patterns, myths, and archetypes can provide insight into the darker parts of life and the nature of genius that often affect gifted and talented students. Such students require the poetic view of depth psychology in order to develop the imagination, sense of play, and deep understanding of the child’s own images and dreams. Often, parents will push gifted children into high achievement without respect for the child’s own dreams, resulting in Achievement by Proxy Distortion Syndrome which causes long-term psychological damage. To combat this, depth psychology can reach these students through the intuitive preference overwhelmingly exhibited by so many of them. Through greater understanding of giftedness with depth psychology, teachers can reach the inner truth and souls of gifted students. Teachers can benefit from an appreciation of its mystery, richness, and individuality through inclusion of poetry, archetypes, symbols, and depths.

Individual education is where Jungian thought can bring a fresh perspective to the discussion on modern education with the tendency to put special needs and gifted children into
the collective education environment. However, not all gifted children require all aspects of individual education. While many gifted children thrive in the student-led Montessori environment, since all gifts are not equal there are many other gifted children do not (Wessling, 2010). Depth psychology with its focus on “educare” of the soul of the child offers an avenue not yet explored in research and a potential for a more generalized approach of individual education for gifted students.
Conclusion

There are several recognized and potential benefits to including Jungian analytical psychology in the realm of education. Through qualitative research there is potential for many future avenues for exploring the mysteries in the education of individuals that cannot be readily observed and quantitatively measured. The recent flurry of research and discussion around this topic by researchers like Romanyshyn (2012), Main (2012), Dobson (2008), Jones (2008), Semetsky (2012) and others is encouraging. The current educational climate which threatens to take music, art, and literature out of school calls out for a discussion of Jung-based depth psychology and its call for “educare”, where we as a society take on responsibility for educating the souls of our world.

Montessori’s (1912/1964) focus on carefully trained teachers and freedom to discover and explore learning in a carefully controlled environment, called the “prepared environment” in Montessori education. This environment offers an intriguing place to start for models of education that acknowledge unconscious transference between teacher and student and the freedom to explore symbol and learning at their own pace and through their own understanding as individuals or within groups as the student’s learning requires. Awareness of forces that lie beneath the surface and are not immediately visible and observable in education opens the door to a whole new frontier of educational research and methods to explore problems that experimental research and group-based programs have not been able to touch.

However, awareness of the role of the unconscious in education can remind all in education that each child is an individual and needs to be treated as such. The simplest way to teach individuation and access to the unconscious is through the arts because they open the door to imagination and are rich with symbol, the language of the unconscious. Exposure to literature,
art, music, and imagination can open up space for different kinds of learning that cannot be measured with traditional assessments. The arts encourage us to relate to one another in non-verbal ways as we play a piece of music together or share a story. Society wants and needs healthy individuals who are not slaves to psychological complexes that manifest in the conscious world. Regular conversation with our unconscious through the symbols found in the arts helps us explore who we are and access the archetypal patterns that bind our societies together.

To return to the educational climate of Jung’s time with rote memorization and strict order may produce more skilled workers in the STEM sciences in the short run, but long-term it would be a step backwards as the psychological health of our students would decline. In our climate of inclusivity and desire for many differently-abled students to learn together, we need the arts and their symbols. Innovation and creativity require imagination and freedom, both of which can be found in the many different forms of the arts. An understanding of Jung’s analytical psychology simply reminds us that this type of learning is crucial to education of individual souls that are future workers, innovators, parents, and caregivers in our society.
**Future Directions**

More studies and data collection in this area is critical to future research and direction. Continued research into the unconscious via neuropsychology is needed to develop new methods of measurement. In addition, several quantitative studies can be developed in order to test these concepts and ideas in the classroom and provide evidence on viability.

Another direction to take here is parent education rather than the traditional classroom. While many of the ideas presented here are difficult to implement in the classroom, they may be more applicable to parents. The care of the soul of the child is often the realm of spiritual education and that direction is usually set by the parents. Awareness of these concepts can help with children who are in need of individual education.
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