

Anna Walczak
University of Lodz

Creation of Pedagogical Knowledge from the Perspective of the Archetypal Dimension of Masculinity and Femininity

Subject is all something.
M. Merleau-Ponty

Unconsciousness as a forgotten dimension of the creation of pedagogical knowledge

If you consider that, on the one hand, knowledge is supposed to offer orientation in pedagogical activities and to orient these activities, and, on the other hand, that it is some kind of experience gained in communication (dialogue, constituted in QA dialectics), then it can be viewed in three aspects. Firstly, it is the knowledge about ourselves and about the world, the knowledge thanks to which we “somehow” understand ourselves and the world – we “somehow” understand the pedagogical world and the subjects present in this world. Therefore, it can be defined as anthropological knowledge. Secondly, it is the knowledge which comprises our approach to the pedagogical world and its subjects, establishing its meaning. This would be axiological and teleological knowledge, with its sources rooted in questions like “Why?”, “What for?”, and “What way?”. The above two aspects of pedagogical knowledge together produce the third kind of knowledge which I am going to call “contemplative knowledge”, which builds in the process of practice and the contemplation of practice¹. Pedagogical knowledge is also practical knowledge, because it is the knowledge “functioning in practice”. How can this be understood? Most of all, it is a knowledge referring to the area of extra- and inter-personal activities, which are the essence of any pedagogical activity². Practical pedagogical knowledge does not

¹ Cf. R. Kwaśnica, *Wprowadzenie do myślenia o nauczycielu* [Introduction to Thinking about the Teacher], [in:] *Pedagogika. Podręcznik akademicki* [Pedagogy. Academic Script], Z. Kwiecieński and B. Śliwowski [eds.], vol. II, PWN, Warszawa 2007; A. Walczak, *Od refleksji do bycia refleksyjnym pedagogiem* [From Contemplation to Being a Contemplative Pedagogue], [in:] *Ibid. Spotkanie z wychowankiem. Ku tożsamości ipse pedagoga* [A Meeting with the Alumnus. Towards the Pedagogue's Ipse Identity], Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź 2011.

² This aspect of pedagogical knowledge refers both to the knowledge created by, still dichotomously presented, so called pedagogues-practitioners, and also by pedagogues-theoreticians, only

reflect the pedagogical knowledge existing outside of it. Its practicality reveals and generates new qualities: the principles and meanings of its reality.

A three-aspect pedagogical knowledge can be treated as a paradigm of pedagogical activity. Then it would be a tool for noticing/learning/understanding/interpreting/producing pedagogical reality³.

I am interested in how pedagogical knowledge can be produced in the course of pedagogical practice and for its own sake. Therefore, I do not use such terms as acquiring or attaining knowledge, or even its discovering or substantiating. Knowledge given, which takes on the form of "reasoned" knowledge, is like the human world is given to humans: tame, i.e. also arbitrary⁴. It is usually knowledge dealing with substantiating pedagogical reality, the "real" one as well as the postulated one. It is based on the procedures of reason, or more precisely on the mind *aka* intellect, i.e. the conscious part of the human psyche which generates the adjustment approach. The mind, which we will call – following Alina Motycka – "a certain skill and also a certain approach", in the Western culture is a well-known instrument ensuring the reliability and sense of reality in which we participate. This is why knowledge is often associated with the work of the human mind as specifically a human ability. Motycka says:

Such an ability, comprises the ability of conceptual thinking (abstracting, i.e. obtaining a concept), judging (i.e. obtaining judgements), controlled thinking (i.e. the ability to have a discourse), argumentative, explanatory, justifying reasoning; proving (i.e. demonstrative thinking); it is also the ability of receiving and processing material supplied by the senses⁵.

Therefore, creating knowledge is not a free act, because its creators are not free of themselves. They are constrained by their own process of creating knowledge, on the one hand, by their mind with its rules and procedures which control this process and which depend on the human will⁶, on the other hand, by the uncon-

because in both cases it may be treated in the aspect of a produced text, which communicates "something" to "someone". This means that pedagogical knowledge is created in the medium of communication, and sustains, changes, creates this communication, etc.

³ Cf. T. Kuhn, [*The Essential Tension. Selected Studies in Scientific tradition and Change*], The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London 1977. It should be pointed out here that besides relations and similarities between the knowledge of the pedagogical reality and the pedagogical reality itself there are differences which can evoke tensions between them. This issue, however, is not the subject matter of this article.

⁴ A. Motycka, *Rozum i intuicja w nauce. Zbiór rozpraw i szkiców filozoficznych* [Wisdom and Intuition in Science. The Collection of Philosophical Treatises and Sketches], Eneteia, Warszawa 2005, p. 102.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 102

⁶ Cf. In his *Philosophy of Expression* Giorgio Colli writes about the mind as a reply to the dependence of human expression as follows: "The mind was born as a specific complementation, whose justification is something hidden, something external, which cannot be regained, but only pointed to by a 'discourse'. And then there comes an illusion that the mind is a purpose in itself. There emerges a new perspective and a new expression, the obedience towards structure and regulation of fate continues, which primarily was merely some auxiliary tool". *Idem*, after H. Buczyńska-Garewicz, *Prawda i złudzenie. Eseje o myśleniu* [Truth and Illusion. Essays on Thinking], Universitas, Kraków 2008, p. 297.

scious⁷. Neither of these factors – neither the mind as a disposition of the conscious part of the human psyche, nor the unconscious combined with the conscious – is an empty vessel gradually filling up in the process of individual experience. Following Kant's thinking, both the mind and the psyche, which cannot be reduced to this mind solely, contain certain a priori categories. *In the psyche*, the correlate of a priori categories of the mind "are unconscious dispositions which every man inherits, and does not gain by their own experience"⁸.

In this article, out of the concepts of unconsciousness – present in philosophy and psychology⁹ – I refer to the one conceived by Carl Gustav Jung¹⁰. It is related to such subcomponents of his theory as the concept of the collective unconscious¹¹, archetypes, psychological types and their functions, personality development, with its most important process of individuation, and the concept of the unity of opposites, as well as synchronicity. According to Jung – and later in post-Jungian psychological concepts, hence in all directions of depth psychology – the unconscious together with the conscious are integral forces stimulating the individual psyche. This means that the psyche cannot be identified with the conscious. Jung argues that [...] "the psyche is, in fact, the only immediate experience of life and existence. It is, in fact, the only immediate experience we can have and the sine qua

⁷ As representatives of the Polish psychology of culture underline, the implications of the psychology of unconsciousness in the area of the philosophy of education, the knowledge of culture (although theories of S. Hall, J. Campbell, E. Neumann, or J. Hillman ought to be mentioned at this place), theology, as well as in sociology, religious studies or the psychology of religion (apart from the studies of C. G. Jung, J. Rudin, A. Moreno, or E. Drewermann), in the psychology of language (F. Lacan), and, we must add, also in pedagogy (besides, e.g. the concepts of Bernie Neville implemented into the Polish background) are rather a concept of the future. Z.W. Dudek, A. Pankalla, *Psychologia kultury. Doświadczenia graniczne i transkulturowe*, [Psychology of Culture. Liminal and Trans-cultural Experience], Eneteia, Warszawa 2005. According to Jung, however, as Kazimierz Pajor writes: "an important criterion of the scholarly approach is if a given field is able to open itself to cognition of the whole reality. This thesis is of particular importance in psychology which 'has to take into consideration what is irrational' [...] Irrationality is not identical with unreality, and may mean, for instance, the specificity of subconscious processes [...]". *Idem, Śladami Junga* [Following Jung], Eneteia, Warszawa 2006, p. 181. I believe that this comment also refers to pedagogy.

⁸ K. Pajor, *Psychologia archetypów Junga*, [Psychology of Jung's Archetypes], Eneteia, Warszawa 2007, p. 158.

⁹ Cf. B. Dobroczyński, *Ciemna strona psychiki* [Dark Side of the Psyche], Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków 1994; *Nieświadomość jako Kategoria Filozoficzna* [Unconsciousness as a Philosophical Category], A. Motycka, W. Wrzosek (eds.), IFIS PAN, Warszawa 2000.

¹⁰ As K. Pajor writes: "The Jungian concept of unconsciousness is unique, reaching far beyond the Freudian model, and covers the whole of the development of the human spirit as such". *Idem, Psychologia archetypów Junga...* [Psychology of Jung's Archetypes], p. 21.

¹¹ In Jungian psychology it is impossible to talk about man, and forget about culture. As Zenon Waldemar Dudek writes: "In order to test relations between psychic processes with culture, it must be assumed that the psyche possesses specific 'receptors' and 'activators' of the phenomena of culture". These are the archetypes, expressing the fundamental dimensions of mental, social, and spiritual lives. *Idem, Psychologia integralna Junga* [Jung's Integral Psychology]. Eneteia, Warszawa 2006, p. 141. The existence of archetypes is not dependent on the individual, on the individual's temporary existence, although on the other hand it is the *psyche* which constitutes the requirement of existence in a given cultural reality. "Collective unconsciousness is – to a certain extent – a kind of phylogenetic treasury in which all that man has continuously experienced over millennia, has become a heritage of each individual". K. Pajor, *Psychologia archetypów Junga* [Psychology of Jung's Archetypes], p. 172.

non of the subjective reality of the world"¹². However, what we do not experience directly is the unconscious psyche, and this is why we cannot explore it directly. We only explore its indications. The psychological processes of unconsciousness can be explored only indirectly, i.e. through the effects they evoke. Unconsciousness is not so much accessible in consciousness as it is manifested through it. However, it is an odd manifestation, because as Jung says, "*Whatever we have to say about the unconscious is what the conscious mind says about it, and this is so because its language is acausal, timeless and alogical*"¹³. And it is not a language we get accustomed to, or rather it is not a language which would be regarded as valid in the rationalized world, where the intellect comes down to the mind with its functions already well-known from cognitive psychology. Language and unconscious thinking are intuitive, spontaneous, instinctive, oriented – therefore they are largely independent of the will, unlike the language and conscious thinking, dominated by the principles of the mind's logic, which are ruled by selection, and [...] "selection demands direction. But direction requires the exclusion of everything irrelevant. This is bound to make the conscious orientation one-sided"¹⁴. Unconsciousness, however, is as alive as consciousness, and therefore unconscious perception – so essential in creating knowledge – is characterized by activity highly developed intellectually, whose effect "comes spontaneously and independently rather than automatically" as compared to consciousness¹⁵. The difference between consciousness and unconsciousness lies not only in the way of their functioning, but their content and their tendencies as well.

This paper is not supposed to be the glorification of Jung's thought, neither do I take a critical stance towards it. Referring to it, I want rather to point out one more of the possible perspectives in discovering pedagogical reality, its understanding and interpretation, and determining the directions of its changes. Nowadays, while conducting inquiries, not only on the humanities – like it or not – we come across Jung. He has as many supporters and followers as he has critics. In a nutshell, someone whose interests – excuse the banality of speech – oscillate around man, his personality and his relation with culture, cannot be indifferent to his analytical and integral psychology.

However, some comment would be in order at this point. In contemporary psychology, his perspective – which takes into account the psyche and the fact that humans have souls, and that the development of what is usually defined as personality arises out of the development of the spirit – turns out to be controversial. This is individuation understood – briefly speaking – as a process of the

¹² C. G. Jung, *Symbols of Transformation. An Analysis of the Prelude to a Case of Schizophrenia*, [in:] H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, W. McGuire (eds.), *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 5) Bollingen Series XX. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1976.

¹³ C. G. Jung, *Analytical Psychology, Its Theory and Practice*, [in:] *The Tavistock Lectures, Lecture 1*, Vintage Books, a Division of Random House, New York, p. 6

¹⁴ C. G. Jung, *Psychological Types*, [in:] H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, W. McGuire (eds.) *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 6), Bollingen Series XX. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1976, p. 419.

¹⁵ K. Pajor, *Psychologia archetypów...* [Psychology of Archetypes...], p. 165.

development of the individual self by going beyond the individual ego towards fulfilling oneself as a human being; in this process consciousness is both its part and its specific condition¹⁶. Connecting this conception with the vision of culture – for some researchers – very often takes the aspects of reductionism. This thought is dominated by psychologism¹⁷. On the one hand, it is hardly surprising, as it is

only the way of thinking coming from the mental trait of the individual, interpreting social phenomena as aspects or derivatives of the psyche, those favourably disposed will say. Psychologism, however, is sometimes a ‘nothing but’ attitude, nothing but the psyche – will say the indignant cultural studies researchers¹⁸.

In Jung’s conception, the reference of culture to man and man to culture does not stop on the surface of phenomena. The conception of the collective unconscious archetypes is the entrance to the deepest areas of culture, and therefore the entrance into the human “inside”, because it was based on the analysis of cultural phenomena and content reflected in the human psyche. For Jung, these archetypes reveal the dark side of human nature, and also they are creative tendencies towards the integration of the psyche. Man remained a creation of culture determined not only by its social aspects and his own consciousness, but also by unaware meanings. At this point, we can speak of the essentialism of Jung’s theory, at the same time pointing out its irrationalism and idealism. And so the conception of the collective unconscious archetypes would be the conception of certain significances – permanent, constant and existing under the surface of reality – which after all play the role of models in individual and cultural development. Jungian thinking, however, does not go in the causal direction (as Freudian does), but theological: it is oriented toward the future and finalisation. For Jung clearly said that it was his mission to lead what is unconscious to consciousness, to indicate the confrontation and dialogue between them, which are not only possible but necessary in individual development (leading to individuation) and cultural development.

Jung’s theory is saturated with a psychobiographical element: some may even think it is “diary-like”, and therefore lacks objectivity¹⁹. His peculiar style was also

¹⁶ Consciousness may also block the process. For Jung, however, it was not consciousness itself which plays a key role in the total process of individuation, but its relation to unconsciousness. It is an extremely important assumption for the discussed problems in this article.

¹⁷ Jung dissociated himself from psychologising the ego, even more so that the ego itself is not of a subjective nature – it is a certain whole, the identity and individuality of which is just emerging. It is also not the crowning of the spiritual development, but a requirement of all its higher forms.

¹⁸ A. Pankalla, *O spotkaniu kwadratu z kulą. Jung po polsku* [On the Meeting Between the Square and the Sphere. Jung in Polish], [in:] *Fenomen Junga. Dzieło. Inspiracje. Współczesność* [Jung’s Phenomenon. Works. Inspirations. The Present], K. Maurin, A. Motycka (eds.), Eneteia, Warszawa 2002, p. 219.

¹⁹ Cf. F. McLynn, *Carl Gustav Jung: a Biography*, St. Martin’s Griffin, New York 1996. K. Pajor says about the above-mentioned Jung’s biography as follows: “Many books devoted to Jung constitute a reliable presentation of the person and his psychology; however, there are plenty of books where the authors were satisfied with superficiality, producing or adopting from others various erroneous views about Jung and his psychology. A thorough biography of Jung written by Frank McLynn,

criticized, and as a consequence his theory was not considered scientific²⁰. Another problem – stressed in polemics and criticism of his thought – can be the mythic, and for some also the metaphysical, character of the conception of culture and personality and their symbiosis. Jung, combining numerous fields into one, analysed phenomena which are usually considered not worth academic interest. They include such things as alchemy, occultism, astrology, as well as magic and parapsychology. He studied Eastern philosophy, the religions of ancient Europe, the Gnostic texts of early Christianity, as well as mythological texts from the cradle of Western culture. He went on anthropological tours of America and Africa. However, his contribution to modern anthropology and psychology is often reduced to the category of esoteric gnosis, and he himself is described as some kind of possessed prophet²¹. He, however, considered himself an empiricist, although this empiricism is also criticized for a lack of respect for science²². He wrote:

It is certainly remarkable that my critics, with few exceptions, ignore the fact that, as a doctor and scientist, I proceed from facts which everyone is at liberty to verify. Instead, they criticize me as if I were a philosopher, or a Gnostic with pretensions to supernatural knowledge. As a philosopher and speculating heretic I am, of course, easy prey. This is probably the reason why people prefer to ignore the facts I have discovered [...]²³.

What should also be mentioned is the language of Jung's theory, which has an effect on its perception. It is often a language not only allusive, but also ambiguous (or multivalued), which some regard as devoid of precision. For example, some terms used to define the self are considered to be mutually exclusive. The self, which for Jung is the central archetype of the psyche's order and oriented toward this order, is also defined – according to Zofia Rosińska who cites J. Redfearn – as:

which has just been translated into Polish, is the best example. We can feel the lightness of writing of the author; however, that is all we can say [...] I would be pleased to call it a 'critical biography' had it deserved that name. Perhaps McLynn had such aspirations; however, the thing he achieved has nothing in common with the scientifically-critical monograph, from which one would expect in-depth analyses and publishing original opinions of the critically-assessed author. McLynn, however, refers to Jung's opinions, and, frequently, instead of quoting Jung's statements, he gives his own interpretations. In this way he criticises the Jung he has created himself" – K. Pajor, *Śladami Junga* [Following Jung], pp. 9–10. A critical review of another book about Jung's theory, written by Richard Noll, *The Jung Cult. Origins of a Charismatic Movement* was written by Mirosław Piróg. *Idem, Jung in the Eyes of a Critic*, [in]: *Fenomen Junga. Dzieło. Inspiracje. Współczesność* [Jung's Phenomenon. Works. Inspirations. The Present...], pp. 35–43.

²⁰ Sigmund Freud was also frequently accused of triviality and a non-scientific approach, and a trace amount of impact on philosophy and the academic sciences, particularly when the contact with his psychology was superficial and full of prejudice. Cf. P. Dybel, *Okruchy psychoanalizy. Między teorią Freuda i poststrukturalizmem* [Scraps of Psychoanalysis. Between Freud's Theory and Post-structuralism], Universitas, Kraków 2009.

²¹ Cf. articles in periodicals *Czwarty wymiar* and *Nie z tej Ziemi* [The 4th Dimension and Not From this Earth].

²² I am not getting involved in a discussion encompassing the "scientific approach" in science. The reader may find relevant literature concerning the issue of the contemporary philosophy of science.

²³ C.G. Jung, after G. Wehr, *Portrait of Jung: an Illustrated Biography*, transl. W.A. Hargreaves. Herder and Herder, New York 1971.

- a cosmic unity, understood as in the Eastern concepts, where it means the unity with all phenomena, both animate and inanimate;
- the totality of the individual;
- an experience of wholeness;
- primeval forces, organizing elements, outside the conscious 'I';
- the organizing centre of the unconscious;
- emerging parts of the unconscious self²⁴.

However, there is no doubt that Jung earned his place in the psychological and psychotherapeutic trends which are oriented toward human potential, human creative activity and the human spiritual dimension. Some of his conceptions, e.g. the conception of psychological types, archetypes and collective unconsciousness, introduce new perspectives in the analyses of culture, and allow for (or even force) the reinterpretation of culture-forming processes²⁵. Both Freud's psychoanalysis and Jung's analytical and integral psychology are not only a psychological theory; they had an enormous impact on the 20th-century humanities. Introducing a new discourse on man and culture, they both continue to inspire it – also by their criticism.

Unconsciousness and common knowledge as the archaeology of pedagogical knowledge

Taking into consideration the unity of consciousness and unconsciousness in individual development of the psyche, I point out – after Alina Motycka – a significant role of the idea in creating knowledge. It will mean that creating knowledge is mediated in the idea as something not directly perceptible, visible and cognizable, but is not quite free²⁶. The idea is vague and indistinct, but it is prior to creating knowledge of the world, and it lies in the very essence of knowledge in the way that decides about its structuralisation and function, as well as its boundaries²⁷. It is

²⁴ Z. Rosińska, *Jaźń i poczucie sensu* [Self and the Feeling of Sense], [in:] *Fenomen Junga. Dzieło. Inspiracje. Współczesność* [Jung's Phenomenon. Works. Inspirations. The Present...], p. 101.

²⁵ It is worth mentioning here that Jung is also presented as a disciple of Sigmund Freud, and as one of the dissidents of the psychoanalytic movement. As a consequence, this may result in the opposition; you either opt for Jung, or for Freud. However, we may discover traces of continuation or complementarity. Z. W. Dudek writes: "going in his deliberations towards the examination of myths, symbols, religion, and culture, Jung added to psychological claims his 'broadening' concepts (active imagination and the method of amplification besides the method of free associations, collective unconsciousness beside Freudian individual unconsciousness, archetypes beside complexes, etc.)". On the other hand, however, it can be stated that it is due to Jung and his criticism of Freudian psychoanalysis, and then thanks to his cultural studies that Freud in his writings took up the topics which combine psychology and culture, publishing works like *Totem and Taboo*, *Civilisation and its Discontents*. Z. W. Dudek, *Freudowska i Jungowska psychologia kultury – konflikt i dialog* [Freudian and Jungian Psychology of Culture – Conflict and Dialogue], [in:] *Fenomen Junga. Dzieło. Inspiracje. Współczesność* [Jung's Phenomenon. Works. Inspirations. The Present...], p. 200.

²⁶ A. Motycka, *Rozum i intuicja w nauce* [Wisdom and Intuition in Science], pp. 111–124, 156–157; *Eadem*, *Człowiek wewnątrzny a epistème. Zbiór rozpraw i szkiców filozoficznych o nauce*, [Internal Man and Epistème. Collection of Philosophical Treatises and Sketches on Education], Warszawa 2010, pp. 34–41.

²⁷ See: Comparing Giorgio Colli's philosophy of expression in her essay under the characteristic title *Kto mówi?* [Who is Talking?], Hanna Buczyńska-Garewicz writes: "In what is present, visible and

the idea that decides about the choice of ways of seeing and understanding the world available to man. The idea as such – referring to the psychology of Jungian archetypes, more of which further on – besides images and symbols is the archetypal conception, which both throughout the course of history and in individual life can take various forms of rationalizing its content²⁸. Archetypal contents “are fundamental for any mental act, all our views – even scientific ones – and which considerably influence them”²⁹. Therefore, they are elements of the collective unconsciousness that “fight their way” to individual unconsciousness. Taking into consideration the importance of the personality factor in the process of creating knowledge, the factor connected not only with the rational sphere but irrational as well, it is the archetypal idea as the active archetype that directs the creation of knowledge and influences it. It is the idea that gives order and form to the material of consciousness, and thus the manifestations of rationality³⁰.

What is intriguing in creating pedagogical knowledge is not where the creators of pedagogical knowledge draw the material for it – from what idea regarded here as a conception – but how they get to the idea or rather from what area of their personality such an idea “appeals” to them.

The fundamental source of human knowledge of the world we live in is – argues Krystyna Ablewicz – “people’s popular existing in the world, or rather popular understanding of the world”³¹. “Popular existing in the world” can be defined as knowledge in a broader sense – as it is understood by Janusz Gnitecki, for example. Then knowledge could be defined as [...] “any set of information, views and beliefs attributed with cognitive and/or practical value. In this perspective, knowledge can refer to many different types of rationality and go beyond scientific knowledge”³². The

tangible lies thus an allusion to the invisible, absent and intangible. [...] The world as a demonstration, shining and glistening on its surface, hides in its inside unknown and elusive reality, simultaneously conditioning all the possible external emergence [...]”. *Idem, Prawda i złudzenie* [Truth and Illusion...], pp. 285–291.

²⁸ Cf. C. G. Jung, *Archetypy i symbole. Pisma wybrane* [Archetypes and Symbols. Selected writings], Czytelnik, Warszawa 1967 [Polish compilation – no corresponding publication in English]; *Idem, O naturze kobiety* [On the Nature of Women], Wydawnictwo Brama – Książnica Włóczęgów i Uczonych, Poznań 1992 [Polish compilation – no corresponding publication in English]; *Idem, Symbols of Transformation*, [in:] H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, W. McGuire (eds.) *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 5); *Idem, Psychological Types*, [in:] H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, W. McGuire (ed.), *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 6); K. Pajor, *Psychologia archetypów Junga...* [Jung’s Psychology of Archetypes...]; M. Piróg, *Indywidualność a archetypy* [Individuality and Archetypes]; *ALBO albo. Problemy psychologii kultury* [EITHER or. Problems of the Psychology of Culture] 2001, No. 3, *Archetypes*.

²⁹ C. G. Jung, *The Transformation Symbolism in the Mass*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1955–1963.

³⁰ A. Walczak, *(Samo)świadomość vel (samo)wiedza Ja-aksjologicznego pedagoga* [(Self)consciousness or (self)knowledge of the Self-axiological Pedagogue], [in:] *Idem, Spotkanie z wychowankiem* [Meeting With an Alumnus...].

³¹ K. Ablewicz, *Teoretyczne i metodologiczne podstawy pedagogiki antropologicznej. Studium sytuacji wychowawczej* [Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of Anthropological Pedagogy. A Study of the Educational Situation], Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 2003, p. 37. *Colloquial being in the world* means for me a *real being* in Heidegger’s sense of the word, as it was worded by Marcin Potępa. *Idem, Fenomen faktycznego życia. Martin Heidegger* [The Phenomenon of Actual Life. Martin Heidegger], Genesis, Warszawa 2004.

³² J. Gnitecki, *Wstęp do ogólnej metodologii badań w naukach pedagogicznych* [Introduction to General Methodology of Research in the Pedagogical Sciences], vol. II, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, Poznań

popular understanding of the world is overlapped by knowledge in the narrower sense, i.e. scientific knowledge (understood in different ways within individual sciences, as well as in the philosophy of science). Scientific knowledge seems to be the creation of the human mind, usually identified with reason, about which I wrote earlier – except that in the process of creating this kind of knowledge, the factors that decide about the whole of man can no longer be eliminated. After all, man's thinking cannot be reduced to thinking that is solely logical – it can be, at the most, the effect of thinking from various “types of rationality”, if at this point it is still legitimate to use the term “rationality”. I assume that creating pedagogical knowledge builds on top of popular knowledge, connected with “actual life”, and contains it in itself, despite the fact that it frequently keeps a rationalized distance. It is a knowledge “speaking” from the unconsciousness of the individual psyche, therefore being also significant in the process of creating pedagogical knowledge in a narrower sense.

In summary here, pedagogical knowledge – not the one coming from books, but practical – is not created randomly and beyond any principles of epistemology and methodology, most often acquired during university studies. But it is more than that: the personality factor is also important. The cognitive aspect is still a key element in creating pedagogical knowledge; however, the importance of the personal factor in this process, which becomes a key issue in this article, also results from adopting the assumption on wiping out the subject-object relation, expressed by the division of the cognitive area into the cognitive subject and recognized object³³. The empowerment of the object of cognition means its construction in the process of its recognition (as well as its understanding) by the recognizing subject, without which the object itself cannot be imagined outside the subject-object relation. Being a pedagogue, you exist in the pedagogical world (whether it is a classically defined dichotomous world of theory or practice – it does not matter much) – you are inside it. In other words, being an element of created pedagogical knowledge, you cannot locate yourself outside of yourself. Therefore knowledge, being created by man, acquires his traits – it is constructed in complex cultural relations, because it is the main place where he stays and determines himself, which means it is constructed in the context of gender and its roles, class, race, language and other social contexts. Creating pedagogical knowledge is also creating “knowledge for us” – who create this knowledge. Through this knowledge we give significance to our experience, which in essence is the form of our presenting ourselves HOW we ARE WHO we are. In this sense, peda-

2006, p. 17. Cf. “The first thing that appears when we begin to analyse our common knowledge is that some of it is derivative, while some is primitive; that is to say, there is some that we only believe because of something else from which it has been inferred in some sense, though not necessarily in a strict logical sense, while other parts are believed on their own account, without the support of any outside evidence”. B. Russell, *Nasza wiedza o świecie zewnętrznym* [Our Knowledge of the External World], Routledge, New York and London 2002.

³³ Cf. the qualitative approach to methodology of research, e.g. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, N.K. Denzin, Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), 3rd edn., Sage, London 2005; D. Kubinowski, *Jakościowe badania pedagogiczne. Filozofia – Metodologia – Ewaluacja* [Qualitative Pedagogical Research. Philosophy – Methodology – Evaluation], Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin 2010.

gogical knowledge has its structure, although it in itself can also be an incoherence of representations. Therefore, the created pedagogical knowledge is a certain supplement to the reality of pedagogical activities – it is their source, but at the same time it is born together with them. This is why it was earlier defined as a supporting tool in being a pedagogue, for it is always somebody's knowledge and for someone. Its usefulness consists in the basic function of the purposefulness of its creation – being present in pedagogical reality requires the participant to grasp the sense of “presenting” this reality. It is not an independent value, its value is revealed due to the need to make one's own activities sensible, even if in the end one notes they are pointless. Only knowledge acquired, tamed, and applied in practice has its sense through the pedagogue's personality.

Irrationality/unconsciousness is a structural element of creating pedagogical knowledge also when this knowledge is recognized and adopted from the arsenal of available pedagogical theories. Therefore a question arises about the quality of irrationality in the process of creating pedagogical knowledge. And here I see the possibility of combining the issue that interests me with the issues of both the Jungian archetype psychology and the post-Jungian psychology³⁴. The fact that you are a pedagogue because you ponder on yourself and what you do, does not tell you yet “what kind” of pedagogue you are. You may think about yourself but that does not mean that you think from the depth of yourself. Or you may think about yourself, but the depth of yourself has an effect on this thinking anyway. The motives of thought movement can be different, and the movement itself thinks too. Therefore I want to show a possible relation between the archetypal dimension of masculinity and femininity in the development of the individual psyche and the kind, structure and function of possessed and created pedagogical knowledge³⁵.

Anima and Animus as archetypal dimensions of femininity and masculinity – positive aspect

The Jungian concept of archetypes assumes the existence of a structure within the collective unconsciousness responsible for “the occurrence of a definite imaginary material”³⁶. Archetypes are these structures; they used to be described as the

³⁴ Why Jung's and post-Jung's psychology? I find the answers in Z. W. Dudek's words: “Jung's concepts [...] belong to the pioneers, and they particularly belong to the theory discussing the hereditary, archetypal dimensions of femininity and masculinity (the archetype of Anima in men, and Animus in women). They preceded academic psychology by at least half a century in their global view of femininity and masculinity as dimensions of personality, consciousness, unconsciousness, social attitudes and cultural identity”. *Idem, Pleć psychologiczna, wzorzec kultury i duchowość* [Psychological Gender, Standard and Spirituality], [in:] *ALBO. Problemy psychologii kultury* [EITHER or. Problems of the Psychology of Culture] 2007, No. 2, *Civilisation and Gender*, p. 63.

³⁵ K. Pajor writes about Jung's view about cognition: “[...] **substantiality of thinking or cognition** is not related to physical facts, but **constitutes a psychological issue**, i.e. it is conditioned by temperament”. *Idem, Psychologia archetypów...* [Psychology of Archetypes...], p. 161 [marked by A. W.].

³⁶ K. Pajor, *Śladami Junga...* [Following Jung...], p. 186.

universal dominants of the collective unconsciousness which “break through the individual consciousness even against its own will formed by tradition”³⁷.

[Between] the structures of collective unconsciousness and human experience as such there occurs mutual conditioning, i.e. on the one hand, gained and repeated many a time experiences which constitute the source and the beginning of primeval images, and on the other hand – archetypes, as formulated by human experience, primeval forms of human encounters and experience which must have a fundamental impact on human experience³⁸.

Archetypes are the psychodynamic forces of unconsciousness which, “breaking through the consciousness”, organise, make sense, and standardize experience at the level of individual consciousness and in the social and cultural dimension³⁹. Jung classified the Shade, the Animus, the Anima, the Great Mother, the Wise Old Man, and the Self as the fundamental archetypes that can be observed in various cultures, eras, and in the development of the individual *psyche*. Accepting the Jungian assumption that every human is somehow bisexual – meaning his/her *psyche* contains both masculinity and femininity – we are going to focus in this paper on the characteristic features of the Animus and the Anima as those which besides biological and psychological gender, determine a so-called archetypal (cultural) gender⁴⁰.

The Anima and Animus are treated as a fundamental pair of the oppositions in the development of the individual *psyche*, which is a personification of the masculine and feminine unconsciousness⁴¹. I am going to pay particular attention to the displaying of the immature forms of Anima assimilation – the feminine element within man – and Animus – the masculine element within woman, assuming that they exert the impact on creating pedagogical knowledge.

³⁷ Z.W. Dudek, *Archetypowe wzorce w rozwoju indywidualnej psyche* [Archetypal Patterns in the Development of Individual Psyche], [in:] *ALBO. Problemy psychologii kultury* [EITHER or. Problems of the Psychology of Culture] 2005, No. 4: *Inteligencja archetypów. Typy, stereotypy, symbole* [Intelligence of Archetypes. Types, Stereotypes, Symbols], p. 25. Jung writes: “The archetype would thus be, to borrow from Kant, the *noumenon* of the *image* which intuition perceives and, in perceiving, creates” – C. G. Jung, *Psychological Types...*, p. 446.

³⁸ K. Pajor, *Psychologia archetypów Junga* [Psychology of Archetypes]..., p. 156.

³⁹ Jung compared archetypes to invisible directors who direct the show from the backstage. In culture they manifest themselves in the form of symbols. See eg. A Walczak, *O symbolu w kulturze i jego rozumieniu* [On the Symbol in Culture and Its Understanding], [in:] *Kultura i wychowanie* [Culture and Upbringing] 2011, No 1, pp. 87–101.

⁴⁰ Z.W. Dudek writes: “What is currently described as a socio-cultural gender-related kind can be understood as cultural gender – male or female, conditioned by the innate, archetypal structure of the psyche which is expressed in a natural way also in culture”. *Idem*, *Pleć psychiczna...* [Psychological Gender...], p. 63. In the Jungian and post-Jungian psychology of gender it extends over sexual (non-erotic) aspects. It is the type of thinking about gender that is free of pan-sexuality.

⁴¹ Jung’s psychology is defined by the name of integral psychology, based on the assumption of the hypothesis of the oneness of the world, where everything is related to everything else. Also, the human psyche functions upon the opposition principle which may remain in a dynamic balance, razing one another or compensating. Jung specified the following pairs of discords: awareness-unawareness, extroversion-introversion, feeling-thinking, intuition-perception, and spirit-matter. Thus opposition is not a state of total exclusion, “these are rather – as K. Pajor writes – disparate psychological tendencies or modes of functioning of the psyche in diversified spheres”. *Idem*, *Psychologia archetypów Junga...* [Jung’s Psychology of Archetypes...], p. 188.

The archetypal features of unconsciousness in the form of the Anima and the Animus, besides the features acquired in the individual development by consciousness (biological factors, masculine and feminine roles and cultural principles, feminine and masculine orientation of consciousness) define the psychological gender and resultant identity⁴². Archetypal gender, usually unrealized, has the opposite sign than the consciousness of the gender, both biological and psychological. On the other hand, it complements the one-sided direction of the conscious gender orientation (the female or male *ego*). Archetypal gender has an enormous share in the process of constructing the internal personality of the individual woman or man, and has an effect on their functioning in culture, including their relations resulting from their social roles, matriarchal and patriarchal tendencies in social relations and in interpersonal relations⁴³. It also decides about the possibility of confronting the sexual identity with the values carried by the opposite gender. It has a fundamental impact on human experience – “[...] on specific behaviour, unconscious reactions and spontaneous life choices whose hidden sense becomes understandable after some longer time”⁴⁴.

The Animus and Anima as archetypes can be a source of development, providing knowledge and archetypal experience, or may become the reason for *ego* disintegration. Androgenisation of gender roles is decisive for the mature gender identity, i.e. the substitution of gender roles polarisation by the continuum; and, consequently, this unification of these opposites becomes an element of the process of individuation (Jung’s creation of the spirit). This means the understanding of gender as the complementary coexistence of the masculine and feminine elements, complementing the dimensions of the individual *psyche*⁴⁵. The point is the mutual affiliation not only of polar dimensions (masculinity and femininity), but the diversity of their manifestation. Thus, it is not an identification upon the “sameness” principle. If we discuss here the “sameness”, however, it is only within the concept of understanding the “unity” as an extracting power and transgressing towards something else than what is defined by the perspective of the biological, psychological, and socio-cultural standard of the gender – just transgressing towards something else, which is at the same time something primal. The acceptance of the opposite element and the awareness of its share in the dynamic relation of the opposition in the unity of the functioning psyche allows us to experience deeply our own personality as a woman or a man, and the values contributed

⁴² Cf. four contemporary patterns of masculinity, according to R. Moore and D. Gillette: the King, the Warrior, the Lover, the Magician, and four contemporary patterns of femininity according to T. Wolff (Jung’s co-worker), “modernised” by Pia Skogemann: the Mother, the Hetaira, the Amazon, and the Medium. Z. W. Dudek, *Podstawy psychologii Junga. Od psychologii głębi do psychologii integralnej* [Basics of Jung’s Psychology. From Depth Psychology to Integral Psychology], Eneteia, Warszawa 2006, , pp. 268–271.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 258.

⁴⁵ E. Badinter, after: P. Gębala, *Schematy i transgresja płci* [Schemes and Transgression of Gender], [in:] *ALBO albo. Problemy psychologii kultury* [EITHER or. Problems of the Psychology of Culture] 2007, No. 2, *Cywilizacja i płeć* [Civilisation and Gender], p. 15.

to the experience by the opposite gender⁴⁶. A manifestation of the development and maturity of the awareness of the gender is also the awareness of the possibility of carrying out the dialogue between the opposite, the ability in certain situations, if the need be, to choose a behaviour characteristic of a given pole⁴⁷. This maintaining of the dialogue is important not only in the daily situations, but particularly in the decisive moments, which may include critical experience. The very recognition of the opposite pole “[...] gives a chance for drawing attention of “self” to what [...] includes – the unknown, but authentic and precious”⁴⁸. The well assimilated Anima in men and Animus in women are the guides around the labyrinth of their unconsciousness. They allow for the unconscious, symbolic, intuitive and emotional communication with the opposite sex, which as a result translates into psychological independence in the man-woman relations and the capability of partnership relations. They complement and activate the emotional power and maturity in men (the capability of empathy and the ability to express emotions) and inspire the intellectual and task-related independence in women (determination and resourcefulness). They are the source of mental balance in extreme, arousing existential anxiety situations. Summing up: we can single out the following features typical of a person with the androgenic identity – the high integration of the feminine and masculine dimension irrespective of the person’s gender, the capability of quick adaptation under new conditions, the integration of numerous axionormative options, good social adaptation, maintaining control over one’s own life, low level of anxiety, self-confidence, and the adequacy of demonstrating male or female traits depending on the situation. The main principle defining the androgyny and its functional meaning in contemporary culture was defined by Przemysław Gębała as “[...] striving after the social behaviour being free of gender features corresponding to the cultural scheme, so that they could be carried out, irrespective of biological conditioning”⁴⁹.

Polarisation of the Anima and Animus archetype

In the process of the assimilation of the Anima in men, and the Animus in women we can differentiate the characteristic aspects of attitudes towards the op-

⁴⁶ C.G. Jung, *Archetypy i symbole...* [Archetypes and Symbols...], Cf. footnote 28; Z.W. Dudek, *Podstawy psychologii Junga...* [Basics of Jung’s Psychology...], pp.260–267; P. Gębała, *Schematy i transgresja płci...* [Schemes and Transgression of Gender...], pp. 22–23; Z. Krzak, *Tezeusz w labiryncie* [Theseus in the Labyrinth], Ossolineum, Wrocław 1989; P. Skogemann, *Kobiecość w rozwoju* [Feminine Gender Development], Eneteia, Warszawa 2003; O. Vedfelt, *Kobiecość w mężczyźnie. Psychologia współczesnego mężczyzny* [Femininity in Man. The Psychology of Modern Man], Eneteia, Warszawa 2004.

⁴⁷ Z.W. Dudek gives an example of adjusting a specific type of attitude and behaviour from the range of the opposite spectrum to a given situation: “[...] excessive tolerance from emotional reasons, ‘feeling sorry for someone’ does not bring appropriate effects, whereas cold logics and suspending one’s feelings disillusion the immature mentality of a child and suggest the importance of the case”. *Idem, Podstawy psychologii Junga...* [Basics of Jung’s Psychology...], p. 188.

⁴⁸ *Idem, Psychologia integralna Junga...* [Jung’s Integral Psychology...], p. 158.

⁴⁹ P. Gębała, *Schematy i transgresja płci...* [Schemes and Transgression of Gender...], p. 23.

posite pole which speak about their polarisation⁵⁰. The first one is polar opposition (unconsciousness of one pole). The unconscious archetype is subject to the mechanism of rejection. As a result, there occurs the ignoring of people with opposite features, intolerance towards their presence, and in the case of a contact with them – aggression, hatred and rejection, which may be typical of a general tendency for domination to emerge. It is a state of alienation from the archetype, it is a state of the lost or broken ties with it. Alienation from the Anima is characteristic of a one-sided masculine type of a man, negatively (defensively or aggressively) disposed towards the feminine sphere (the tough guy, macho, the cult of masculinity, power, and authority). This man often isolates himself from women or treats them instrumentally. He often fights them. In life, he often skips the role of art, beauty, gentleness, poetry, entertainment, and leisure. Alienation from the Animus, in turn, is typical of a one-sided feminine type of a woman. Their most typical features are: poor sense of individuality and independence, avoidance of mental diversification and mature feminine roles, surrendering to children as a mother, a weak, naïve, blind attitude towards partners, and imitation of famous figures with superficial personalities. However, the male and female consciousness may oscillate around the pole of the opposite tendencies of one's own biological and psychological gender. Then in the case of men, this polarisation “in extreme situations is an element of the mental effeminacy of a man, and the state of dependence from women [...]” which results in the state of internal inertia, a changeable disposition and sentimentalism, and in some cases – theatrical behaviour. And in the case of women we find “an excessive integration of the feminine ego with the Animus archetype which leads to forming a masculine type of a woman, i.e. dominating, competing relentlessly with a man [...]”⁵¹. Such a woman is characterised by egotism and emotional coldness, in her contacts with men she is not free of prejudice and insinuations, and indulges in criticism addressed against “feminine women”, maintaining at the same time, however, certainty concerning her own opinions. This results from her extreme independence from the stereotypical image of the psychological features and social roles, and also cultural influences, of a weaker, yet fair sex – which often makes her a lonely woman.

We may also mention a one-pole integration, accompanied by low awareness of the opposite pole. This insufficient recognition is of the opposite pole and/or a renouncement of the, frequently hurt, mental function related to a given pole. In the second case, balancing between the poles is accompanied by the attenuation of the opposite pole. The opposite pole renounced from consciousness is a source of the so called complexes, phobias, low self-esteem, defence mechanisms, avoid-

⁵⁰ Z.W. Dudek, *Psychologia integralna Junga...* [Jung's Integral Psychology...], pp. 156–159, 217–229; *Idem*, *Podstawy psychologii Junga...* [Basics of Jung's Psychology...], pp. 185–189, 267–274; P. Gębala, *Schematy i transgresja płci...* [Schemes and Transgression of Gender...], pp. 17–21; C.G. Jung, *Archetypy i symbole* [Archetypes and symbols], cf. footnote 28, pp. 69–83; *Idem*, *O naturze kobiety...* [On the Nature of Women...], cf. footnote 28.

⁵¹ Z.W. Dudek, *Podstawy psychologii Junga...* [Basics of Jung's Psychology...], pp. 269 and 266.

ance of changes, helplessness, uncertainty, and general mental tension. As a result, there may occur the strengthening of defence mechanisms, such as rationalisation, denial, and avoidance.

The third possible attitude is formed on the basis of the conflict of the opposites (confrontation of the poles). In this case the unconscious image of the Animus in the woman and Anima in the man may be in conflict with the pattern which they consciously choose⁵². Only strong personalities, leaning on their strong *ego*, may survive the dilemma between the two relatively activated poles, while balancing between the opposites. "The conflict between the oppositions acts as mobilising, inspiring, and developing factors. They encourage the awareness of the importance of the poles"⁵³. Otherwise, people with the selective or fragmentary assimilation of the opposite pole are unable to function in various, alternative environments, as they lack the possibility of alternative behaviour, which is highly influenced by the informed choice. Thus their behaviour is characterised by subservience towards various people or situations, or isolation from them.

Cognitive function of the Anima and Animus

The Animus and the Anima like the other archetypes, as "living centres of not only unconsciousness but the whole psyche, constitute a coherent psychic system, playing all the significant functions within it"⁵⁴. Besides the integration function and thus related compensation function, common to all the archetypes described by Jung, the Anima and Animus perform a cognitive and prospective (anticipatory) function, i.e. they determine perception, cognition, and orientation in the world. They are targeted most of all at the goal of the experience instead of its cause, which in turn results from the logical functioning of consciousness. They are primary conditions of all the cognition and its factors upon which the creation of all the knowledge is based (pedagogical knowledge included). However, being a significant element of a subjective factor, they can dominate over the cognition. In this paragraph I am going to focus mainly on the presentation of the cognitive function, trying at the same time to characterise the knowledge of the "eternal boy" – *puer aeternus* – and the "eternal girl" – *puella aeterna* as an example of the polarisation of the male and female dimensions, created and sustained by the contemporary Western culture. At this point we should make a comment, referring to K. Pajor's opinion:

⁵² Z.W. Dudek presents an example of the *ego* being in conflict with its adversities as a bipolar behaviour of a woman suffering from the conflict between the Animus present in her, and her feminine part. He says: "Her intellectual, objective behaviour at work vs. her emotional behaviour among friends or at home may be an example here. To a certain extent it is a beneficial solution, if a family situation requires mainly objectivism, and, habitually, an emotional approach is being triggered, maintaining control decreases. And vice versa, when at work one has to keep the emotional attitude, a stiff intellectual approach proves useless if not ridiculous". *Idem, Podstawy psychologii Junga* [Basics of Jung's Psychology...], p. 187.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

⁵⁴ K. Pajor, *Psychologia archetypów Junga...* [Psychology of Jung's Archetypes...], p. 161.

“functioning of the archetypes as living organs of the psyche occurs comprehensively, i.e. their impact takes place simultaneously in various ways and on various levels”⁵⁵. Therefore, we should consider their functions together and in reference to the other archetypes. This, however, is not the subject of the paragraph.

The archetype activity in the cognitive process results from their own initiative and is based upon organising of the subject of experience, which follows “strict patterns, primary images which they constitute themselves”, and as an effect the subject gets a definite form⁵⁶. As a motif of organising the subject of experience in themselves, they are also recognizable as they represent themselves inside them. The archetypes as a subjective factor in the cognitive process signify the sense of the subject of the cognition which one identifies through them and fixes, although primarily (and usually only there) it occurs in the area of unconsciousness.

I suggest a thesis that the knowledge of the world and of oneself is sought for and created due to the “adjustment to one’s needs”, resulting from the polarisation of masculine and feminine patterns (or from the continuum – androgyny). I will try to show it by a brief characterisation of the “eternal boy” (*puer aeternus*) and the “eternal girl” (*puella aeterna*) in their negative aspect and the gender, and primarily from the perspective of the purpose of creating knowledge. Before I do that, I shall briefly discuss the criterion of the selection of the polarisation of the polar dimensions of femininity and masculinity. I will refer here to the well-known position in the psychology of culture inspired by Jungian psychology which says that the forms of expression of the male and female gender, described as poorly diversified (which are formed by the “hindrance in the development of certain personality fragments in the ‘premature’ stage”) by the contemporary Western culture, constitute quite characteristic dimensions of masculinity and femininity⁵⁷.

The “eternal boy” is motivated by the so called “positive psychology”, as he treats what is easy, convenient, and nice as positive. This is accompanied by some wishful thinking, which could be formulated in the following way: “one can think or imagine something, and it will come true” or “everything will be fine”. He is

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 159. Cf. Dan McAdams, for whom identity may be defined in the narrative category, because starting with adolescence, everyone becomes a biographer of one’s own Ego. McAdams believes that one’s main motive becomes significant in the narration of man; this motive can be compared to the dominating motive in the person’s life. It determines a thematic line, it is “a skeleton” or its “general structure”. It creates a thematic line (thematic lines) which together with the complexity of narration joins together the following categories: nuclear episodes, images, ideological background and generative scripts. For the contents discussed in this article, besides the dominating motive of narration, thematic lines seem to be important. They concentrate around the motive of intimacy, i.e. striving after closeness, warmth, maintaining relations, and the motive of power – striving after being strong, exerting impact on one’s environment, expansion, and conquering. D.P. McAdams, *Biography, Narrative, and Lives: An Introduction*, [in:] *Journal of Personality* 1988, No 56 (1); D.P. McAdams, *The Story We Live By – Personal Myths and the Making of the Self*, The Guilford Press, New York 1993; U. Tokarska, *W poszukiwaniu jedności i celu. Wybrane techniki narracyjne* [In Search of Unity and Goal. Selected Narrative Techniques], [in:] *Wybrane zagadnienia z psychologii osobowości* [Selected Issues of Personality Psychology], A. Gałdowa (ed.), Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 1999, pp. 181–187.

⁵⁷ Z. W. Dudek, *Płeć psychologiczna...* [Psychological Gender...], p. 67.

also characterised by the lack of precision in thinking and actions, as well as initiating defence mechanisms in his thinking, thanks to which he feels good. In awkward situations, the "eternal boy" says to himself: "I can always put off what is not going as I hoped or does not fit my needs". He often adds "until later" however, he never stipulates the time for this, as he usually fails to find suitable conditions to carry out what is not "as he had hoped" and does not fit his needs. The problems with hypothetical and perspective thinking in the centre of which he does not occupy a significant place translates into the conviction that the mistakes he made, because they were not planned for ("so it happened", "so it just went"), will be amended by other people or circumstances. He often feels misunderstood, therefore he pampers himself even more as a creator of "positive" thinking. If he suffers from the impossibility of expressing his position or when he is exposed to criticism, he displays a lot of juvenile aggression, sorrow, and resentment. Summing up: his knowledge about himself and the world is characterised by the egocentric self that gives them meaning. It is the knowledge in which he can mirror himself as "me perfect". It is the knowledge which he uses as a "tool" in the interpersonal contacts projected by himself. And then the adult man, "bearing a feature of the eternal boy, maintains the child's spiritual features (androginia), at the same time operating an instrumental thinking of the adult, thanks to which he can control others, evoking extreme emotions, and manipulate the group"⁵⁸. On the other hand, it is also a permanently developing knowledge, so it is unspecified to a large extent at every stage. While creating it, the "eternal boy" leaves to himself a large amount of "creative" interpretation translated into practice. It is also the knowledge in which he finds the justification for wishful and positive (naïve) thinking about what he is participating in, starting with personal life, up to the professional and social one. There is no room for the precision of "his own consequences". He fails to take the responsibility for the quality of his knowledge, because he does not perceive it as a harmful intervention into the reality in which he himself participates. On the other hand, in his own opinion, the consequences of applying responsibility in reality lie within the scope of subjective and extra-subjective "external factors".

The "eternal girl" believes in her marvelousness and uniqueness. Therefore the significance she ascribes to her body, sexuality, intelligence, creativity, family and work is raised to the rank of an ideal and special mission. She treats the care she takes of a child or any other person in need as an exceptional task, though she fails to see its/their specificity or identity ("My child will be extraordinary, it is my pride"). This is why in her personal and family life, but also in her professional one, her actions are based on egocentrism. In the created knowledge of herself and of the world around her, she is looking for the justification of her position, but also the justification of her uniqueness as compared to others ("I do things the others don't"). She also often looks for such a knowledge, the possession and development of which

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

ensures the development of her uniqueness, her career path included. This is the knowledge through which she is able to realise a perfect image of her own self, and which confirms that image. This is the knowledge which, for instance, emphasises her work as a special mission. If she is a mother or a female pedagogue, her knowledge is utilised for “taming” a child’s potential into a form desired by her – she searches for directives in the knowledge how to turn the childish idol into a God.

From the perspective of depth psychology, you cannot choose your gender freely. We are conditioned to a large extent by the biologically-psychological sphere of influence, the conscious scope of socio-cultural life in a form of hidden and disclosed patterns, but also by the unconsciousness which is connected with the depth layer of the culture in which the individual used to live and is living. This, in turn, is a living symbolic matter, which is then crowned with what is becoming a material and immaterial element of Bauman’s “factory of permanence”⁵⁹. The images of the culture as the factory of the human meaning of life, thus as a factory of permanence, are subject to changes. In the contemporary culture of the West – the area of numerous transgressions, the distinctive and extreme, most diversified as far as gender is concerned – female and male patterns are no longer promoted; patterns like those identified by Ole Vedfelt of “father’s son” (the masculine type of a man) or “mother’s daughter” (female type of a woman)⁶⁰. Intermediate forms come to the fore: “mother’s son” (feminine type of a man) and “father’s daughter” (masculine type of a woman) with various levels of the polarisation of masculine and feminine features, down to the polarisation in the opposite direction to one’s biological gender, but also figures described briefly above as the “eternal boy” and the “eternal girl”. As Z. W. Dudek writes:

From the perspective of the psychology of culture [...] in the transforming civilisation, individuals with the features of the eternal boy and the eternal girl, and the representatives of the mixed psychological gender – the mother’s son and the father’s daughter (androgenic persons) – occupy higher positions. Such persons participate directly in cultural transformations, and their psyche undergoes a dramatic initiation process related to the cultural community, spiritual subculture, of the whole generation. [...] If a civilisation spends a lot of energy on gender equality, takes care of the rights of homosexual individuals, it means that it is looking for new patterns of identity, an important element of which is a dimension of masculinity and femininity⁶¹.

Conclusions

How do we learn what is an intentional subject of our cognition (both that directed by others and that directed by a specific man)? Well – referring to Martin Heidegger – we cannot learn about what is the subject of cognition (i.e. acquire

⁵⁹ Z. Bauman, *Mortality, Immortality and Other Life Strategies*, Polity Press, Oxford 1992.

⁶⁰ O. Vedfelt, *Kobiecość w mężczyźnie...* [Femininity in Man...], cf. footnote 46.

⁶¹ Z. W. Dudek, *Płeć psychologiczna...* [Psychological Gender...], pp. 71–72.

knowledge about it) in isolation from the knowledge about the subject itself. On the other hand, it is impossible to know something and at the same time disregard what this knowledge concerns. The above statements would indicate that the process of creating knowledge takes place in the conscious sphere. Here I want to refer to the view of depth psychology presented in this article, which stresses an active participation of unconsciousness in all the processes of human individual existence, as well as in cultural processes. At the same time, if we do not know something at the consciousness level, then we cannot disregard it, because this mental operation is assigned to the conscious sphere. This does not mean, however, that in the created knowledge, the factor of the unconscious relation to what is its subject does not break through. Let me note – paraphrasing M. Heidegger’s philosophical assumptions – that knowledge is both an unconscious and a conscious attitude to its subject. An open question remains “What is its subject?”. In creating knowledge there is a dominating principle about its certainty which becomes its basis in general and testifies to its justification (even if the justification itself is temporary). As it is widely assumed, the certainty of knowledge is not determined by its subject, but by “whether and how something is certain, rather than by what the thing which is certain is”⁶². The created knowledge is certain for the creator himself when it shows him the reality as the one that matches the reality. However, it is only one of the conceptions of the certainty of knowledge we know consisting in the adequacy of knowledge and its subject. According to Heidegger, true knowledge is knowledge that discovers. And here comes the precondition for discovery: a priori interest. What is the subject of discovery must also be the object’s subject of interest. Since it is impossible to get to reality separated from knowledge, hence what the object’s knowledge is like, affects the way of getting there and discovering what its subject is. However, if a thing was supposed to show itself to knowledge as it is, then knowledge should be the one discovering. Coming from this, the Heideggerian perspective, it can be noted that the archetypal dimensions of femininity and masculinity – being the forces of the psyche and originally existing in the unconscious sphere – are what hides behind what is disclosed, i.e. behind human consciousness. It is important for the contents of archetypes – as foundations of the psyche, actively participating in creating knowledge – to get into consciousness and influence the process: generate knowledge to its more mature forms. This is possible when the contact is made and kept between human real – actual – experience and archetypal conditions of this experience. We are therefore talking about the activation of self-consciousness of being a being in the actual Being – at this point drawing a parallel to the conception of Being and being in Heidegger’s philosophy – whose experience is conditioned. Let me add here – conditioned by archetypes. The very awareness of this does not signify the authenticity of being a being – it occurs rather than belongs to dailiness (which also does not mean that it does not happen in dai-

⁶² On the creation of knowledge in Heidegger’s approach, see: K. Michalski, *Zrozumieć przemijanie* [To Understand Passing Away], Kronos, Warszawa 2011, p. 66. I refer the Reader also to the work of Heidegger himself and his perspective on truth-aletheia.

liness, but dailiness it is not). It is necessary to look at the very knowledge where it is important how certain something is as the knowledge created on the basis of discovering what is certain. What is certain is also what hides behind what is disclosed – therefore behind what is certain in creating knowledge, there are archetypes that are certain in the way we ourselves are a priori interested in them, i.e. in the way we are open to the happening truth of our existence.

Pedagogical knowledge, which cannot be reduced to methodological knowledge in a sense that it provides pedagogues with instructions, is the knowledge created by them, even if it is knowledge adopted by them and by their consent (unconscious rather than conscious) determining their actions. They create it in the sense that they support its reasonableness with their action – they also preserve it by contemplating it. It is the knowledge they have about themselves and about the purposefulness of pedagogical activities, as well as about their instrumentarium. But this knowledge – methodically studying its own subject (i.e. themselves too) – is always completed by itself as the knowledge being a phenomenon of “truth in primeval meaning”⁶³. The other side of knowledge eludes being presented as if from the outside – it is interwoven with the human being and the essence of his life so much that it cannot be observed from the distance. It lives its own life and only thanks to thinking – or thanks to consciousness – is it possible to participate in it. But it is possible by participation in primeval knowledge to obscure its nature (the polarisation of archetypes). This means that pedagogical knowledge is not only co-constituted by the pedagogue’s personality element, but it is also the source of this knowledge through the alive sphere of the unconsciousness getting through to consciousness.

If the teacher/pedagogue is to be a “transformative intellectual”, as suggested by emancipation and critical pedagogy, an ally of weaker social groups and a direct translator between humans and a complex social and cultural world – an assistant in critical understanding of this world – it seems important how his cultural gender identity develops, which is anchored in this world from the perspective of roles connected with gender category. I would like to stress, however, that “getting through” to unconscious reserves of one’s pedagogical knowledge only through “outside” knowledge about it cannot become an imposed obligation (in which sense we should doubt anyway from the ethical point of view)⁶⁴. Taking a “rosy perspective” off the pedagogue and coming back to “pedagogical earth”, let me say that not everybody feels the need for having knowledge about themselves – the one described above, i.e. the one that leads to the path of personality development and the one that is an element of this path. At this point I am inclined to agree with Jung’s opinion, cited by K. Pajor: “‘a higher level of consciousness’ will be achieved only by those who ‘are destined and have a calling, meaning ability and drive for higher diversity’”⁶⁵.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

⁶⁴ A. Walczak, *W kierunku estetyki jako sztuki odsłaniania i tworzenia pedagogicznego etosu* [Towards Aesthetics as the Art of Unveiling and Creating Pedagogical Ethos], [in:] *Spotkanie z wychowankiem...* [Meeting with an Alumnus...].

⁶⁵ Jung, after K. Pajor, *Śladami Junga...* [Following Jung...], p. 114. Taking into consideration the consciousness in reaching the full knowledge – the true knowledge, I can see the parallel between

The “tangible” reality of pedagogical activities, which can be seen and understood from the perspective of phenomenological-hermeneutic-dialectic theories (and/or rationally explained – by means of available, well-known, preferred, etc. pedagogical theories) – is overlapped by the reality of the pedagogue’s knowledge which is determined by, inter alia, their archetypal gender – a degree (level?) of the assimilation of masculine and feminine traits in the development of the individual psyche. However, this “overlapping” is rather specific, because it determines and defines the understanding and explaining the reality of pedagogical activities rather than being its additional element, some kind of surplus, or some kind of decorative element, no matter whether it matches or not the whole. According to Jungian and post-Jungian psychology, it is the “actual” reality, because symbolic activities (they are where unconsciousness is displayed) overlap the layer of visible activities in inter- and intra-personal relations, which are the essence of pedagogical activities. The former are present in every pedagogical activity, the latter – at least when we think about a “good” pedagogue – should be present too.

Because archetypal models of the development of the pedagogue’s individual psyche (e.g. different forms of assimilation of the Anima and Animus) are activities “from the depth”, then in actual extra- and intra-personal relations, being traces of unconsciousness, they are difficult to decipher. It means that their veiled form of manifestation (although observed in specific behaviours) does not give unambiguous conclusions when interpreted. This is the more so in that “problems” with the assimilation of the Anima and Animus can be confirmed by the rituals of domination, for example, or rather submission and submissiveness (also in the sphere of “symbolic violence”) in interpersonal relations (culturally, often taken for granted because of simply being a man or a woman)⁶⁶. We can hazard a guess that pedagogues whose assimilation of the Anima and Animus archetypes takes the form of polarisation, in the sphere of pedagogical activities need something that would be the compensation of this (usually unconsciously, because their activities are unintelligible even to themselves). Therefore, rites of resistance – stressed by critical pedagogy – are justified or unjustified in the sphere of pedagogical activities. On the other hand, as regards the “maturity” of the rites of resistance, those which fit into transgressiveness making its way to emancipation (in a broad sense), I assume

Jung’s words and Heidegger’s thinking approach, as discussed by K. Michalski: “[...] thinking does not exist for its own sake, but each time it is ‘an answer’ to ‘the call’ of being – or to say it in a less abstract way: thinking is a response to a certain need, not ‘human’ though, but the need of the truth itself. Or in other words: thinking has a deliberate structure, and it is thinking by nature due to the manifestation of existence. [...] it includes the moment of unfulfillment, secrecy – and this initiates its happening”. *Idem, Zrozumieć przemijanie* [To Understand Passing Away], pp. 115–116. Therefore, the purpose of thinking is discovering the problem rather than solving it. Cf. M. Heidegger, *Co znaczy myśleć?* [What Is Called Thinking?], [in:] *Filozofia Współczesna* [Contemporary Philosophy], J. Tischner (ed.), Instytut Teologiczny Księży Misjonarzy, Kraków 1989; A. Walczak, *Od myśli do myślenia dialogicznego pedagoga* [From Thought to the Dialogical Thinking of the Pedagogue], [in:] *Idem, Spotkanie z wychowankiem...* [Meeting with an alumnus...].

⁶⁶ Unaware of their sexual traits, teachers/pedagogues are present at schools, which following Foucault’s knowledge-power principle accept on “the surface” certain rites of resistance; however, from “the inside” they support the tradition, which only strengthens this resistance.

they depend on the “maturity” of the unconscious dimension of pedagogues’ masculinity and femininity (androgynousness, but also constructive traits of the “eternal boy” and the “eternal girl”, “mother’s son” and “father’s daughter”).

Adopting the hypothesis that polarized forms of the assimilation of archetypal masculine and feminine dimensions in the development of the pedagogue’s individual psyche can prevent or hinder entering the road to critical consciousness, to meta-discursive understanding of one’s own pedagogical activities, some questions opening the horizon of possible qualitative studies are:

- What are ritual indications of the unassimilated masculine and feminine element in the sphere of pedagogical activities?

- What and by whom, in the structure of pedagogical institutions, is “hidden” (compensated) and how?

- What are cultural strategies supporting polarized forms of the archetypal dimensions of masculinity and femininity in creating pedagogical knowledge (e.g. of higher education)?

We create and have pedagogical knowledge the same way we think. And we think from the perspective of what we are. In no way can we go beyond this whole and see it from the outside. Pedagogical knowledge created “in the area of practice and for practice” may be incoherent, language inexpressible, uncertain and unrealistic – yet it will always be the knowledge of a particular holder. Therefore, outlining a possible research perspective, it is important to consider:

- in what context of life experience pedagogical knowledge is created;

- in what language, or rather what languages, it is created;

- what is its “hidden programme” and what has been “hidden” in it;

- what happens with knowledge if it is characterized by “concealedness” in the form of the polarisation of the archetypal dimensions of masculinity and femininity.

These are only some of the possible research problems that seem obvious when you think about expanding the understanding of the sources of creating pedagogical knowledge by their discovery from the perspective of archetypal models in the development of the individual psyche. On the other hand, the subject of research outlined in this way offers the possibility of critical thinking in determining and understanding these sources of pedagogical knowledge for the creator of this knowledge and the types of relations the creator establishes with himself and others.

I can also see a possible use of the theory of archetypes in the pedagogical theory not only as the issue of expanding the language used to describe selected pedagogical issues, but as issues of practical solutions, e.g. in the diagnosis of the profile of the pedagogue’s personality according to the archetypal dimension of masculinity and femininity in their culture-bound conditions.

Although we all steer our own vessels, there is no doubt that we do not learn the art of navigating alone. We are helped by nature, as well as other people “somehow” experienced in this art. Therefore, it is reasonable to end the whole argument with a key question, which is quite simple (but usually simple things are the most difficult in life and to live through): How in the process of education, and

then in a job, to support pedagogues in reaching their own sphere of archetypal dimensions of masculinity and femininity, so that the pedagogical knowledge they create would be the knowledge revealing to them the sense of action – the disclosed one and hidden, but not before enlightenment?

Summary

Creation of pedagogical knowledge from the perspective of the archetypal dimensions of femininity and masculinity

This article mostly focuses on answering the question: “Who creates what knowledge in pedagogical practice?”. In search of an answer to this question it was assumed that there existed a relationship between the archetypal dimension of femininity and masculinity in the development of the individual *psyche* and the type, structure and function of the pedagogical knowledge created, which involves the following aspects: it is always anthropological, axiological, and teleological knowledge, and knowledge which “works in practice”. The archetypal gender of those creating pedagogical knowledge, according to Jungian and post-Jungian psychology – is rooted in the unconsciousness – as real as the consciousness with which the process of knowledge creation is usually associated. The method of assimilating feminine and masculine features of the individual *psyche* development forms a deep layer of pedagogical knowledge with overlaps on the tangible reality of pedagogical actions – on the extra- and inter-personal relations (as well as on intrapersonal ones). The assimilation complexities – usually set in cultural patterns – may consolidate ritual in the area of pedagogical actions – e.g. rituals of submission and submissiveness. The article also presents a hypothesis saying that immature forms of archetypal assimilations of femininity and masculinity prevent or restrict the entry to the road towards a critical consciousness of those creating pedagogical knowledge. In conclusions, it was proposed that empirical studies should include the areas determined by the main subject matter presented in the article.

English translation: Anna Moroz-Darska

Tłumaczenie sfinansowano ze środków Ministerstwa Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego na podstawie umowy nr 661/P-DUN/2018 z dnia 13 lipca 2018 roku w ramach realizacji zadania 1 – stworzenie anglojęzycznych wersji wydawanych publikacji w 2018 roku.

The translation was financed with funds made available by the Ministry of Finance and Higher Education under contract No. 661/P-DUN/2018 of 13 July 2018 as a part of the execution of task 1: the creation of English-language versions of the issued publications in 2018.