# Critically Questioning the Discourse of Transformative Learning Theory

## Ilhan Kucukaydin[1] and Patricia Cranton[1]

## Abstract

In this article, the authors critically examine the way discourse enters into and becomes embedded in transformative learning theory, especially from the extrarational or depth psychology perspective. The authors begin by providing an overview of how transformative learning theory has developed in diverse directions, including the extrarational approach. In this latter perspective, concepts from depth psychology tend to be used to describe transformative learning, without there being a critical analysis or a common understanding of the meaning of these concepts. By treating knowledge about transformative learning as practical knowledge (from the perspective of Habermas's framework), the authors are able to critically question the knowledge claims inherent in the discourse within the extrarational approach to transformative learning theory development.

## Keywords

transformative learning, Habermas, Mezirow, discourse, extrarational approach to transformative learning

In this article, we examine the way in which discourse, concepts, and language enter into transformative learning theory, especially within the extrarational perspective. First, we briefly review transformative learning theory and the various alternative perspectives that have developed since the inception of the theory, including an overview of the extrarational perspective on transformative learning. We determine that the integration of psychic structures from depth psychology, including Jungian psychology, has not been critically analyzed in relation to teaching and learning and that there may

[1]Penn State University, Middletown, PA, USA

**Corresponding Author:**
Ilhan Kucukaydin, School of Behavioral Sciences and Education, Penn State University, W331J Olmsted, 777 West Harrisburg Pike, Middletown, PA 17057, USA

not be a common understanding of the meaning of these concepts. If we view knowledge about transformative learning as practical knowledge based on Habermas's (1972) framework, we can use this understanding to critically analyze knowledge claims within the extrarational approach to transformative learning theory. It is possible that the current epistemological crisis accounts for this situation in that there is often no consensus about the validity and legitimacy of knowledge and there is no space to question the validity of knowledge claims. Finally, we close with questions that researchers, theorists, and scholars of transformative learning might want to consider in relation to the use of Jungian concepts and terminology within transformative learning theory.

## Transformative Learning: A Theory-in-Progress

Transformative learning theory came to prominence with the work of Jack Mezirow (1975). It has "attracted researchers and practitioners from a wide variety of theoretical persuasions and practice settings, yet it is a complicated idea that offers considerable theoretical, practical, and ethical challenges" (Dirkx, 1998, p. 1). Following the publication of Mezirow's (1991) comprehensive description of the theory, scholars critiqued and elaborated on the theory, leading to theoretical development in a variety of directions. Dirkx suggests four different lenses that have arisen for examining transformative learning theory: Daloz's (1999) developmental approach, Freire's (1972) emancipatory approach, Boyd's (1989) extrarational approach, and Mezirow's (1991) rational approach. Other writers propose different taxonomies of transformative learning, but they contain essentially the same kinds of categorizations (Cranton, 2006; Taylor, 2007). In this article, we are primarily interested in the extrarational perspective, which pursues the least known facets of adult learning, such as feeling, imagination, intuition, and dreams.

Since the rise of enlightenment philosophy, particularly Cartesian dualism, the noncognitive elements of learning, such as feeling, imagination, intuition, and dreams, have been anathema to Western epistemology, in which mind and body are separated and seen as utterly distinct (Kincheloe, 2004). This disengagement of mind and body, according to Cartesian dualism, was necessary to minimize the human factors of perception and subjectivity in an attempt to discover natural and social laws. For example, logical positivism did not recognize any emotional or affective propositions as meaningful because they cannot be reduced to factual propositions and defined with numerical data. However, this dualism, or more particularly the importance of our mind and reason in the process of knowing, is also crucial to our understanding of the world and should not be neglected.

The role of emotions in adult learning has a long history in adult education. The early radical educators who fought against injustice, oppression, and the oppression and poverty of working people approached their goal of self-actualization for all with passion (see, e.g., Coady, 1939). Among the humanists who influenced the field in the 1960s, Rogers (1969) stands out as having informed Knowles (1980). In recent years,

theorists and researchers have been drawing on the work of Heron (1992) in their work on transformative learning. Adult educators have been paying attention to the emotional facets of learning in higher education, online learning, the workplace, and nonformal settings (Dirkx, 2008). Emotions significantly affect our learning both in terms of enhancing learning and in inhibiting learning. For example, anxiety could obstruct learning in one situation (math anxiety) and in another situation motivate a person to learn. Incorporating emotions, feelings, intuition, and imagination has led to a more holistic understanding of transformative learning (Dirkx, 2008; Dirkx, Mezirow, & Cranton, 2006).

The extrarational approach to understanding adult learning was initiated by Boyd (1989, 1991) and Boyd and Myers (1988), who examined transformations of individuals in small groups from a Jungian psychoanalytical perspective. Even though Freud and Erik Erikson had an impact on Boyd's earlier works, Carl Jung's depth psychology played a significant role in Boyd's formulation of his view of transformation (Dirkx, 2000b). In a discussion of the contrast between the contributions of critical social theory and analytical depth psychology, Scott (1997) points out that Jung proposed an expanded notion of the unconscious, one that includes "not only the personal unconscious recognized by Freud but also the collective unconscious or objective psyche" (p. 43). In this respect, Jung's thinking is unique. Jungian psychic structure is the backbone of Boyd's perspective—he uses unconscious elements such as shadow, anima, and animus to explore how individuals understand their experiences and perceptions. Boyd describes people as going through a natural process of dialogue with their psychic structure and with its elements.

## Searching for Evidence of Critical Analysis

The concepts related to psychic structures elude clear definition and are often used in different ways by different scholars or by the same scholar on different occasions. Boyd and Myers (1988), for example, suggest that the central goal of transformative learning is to "liberate the individual from personal unconscious content and reifications of cultural norms and patterns" (p. 264). Socialization patterns exist within the unconscious and remain there until the ego takes control of them. The role of the unconscious is central to Boyd and Myers's understanding of transformation. In his earlier writing, Dirkx (1987) uses consciousness development, occurring in identifiable phases, to describe transformative learning. He sees it as a movement toward more rational ways of solving problems and a decline in "magical and mythical modes of thought" (p. 2). Later, Dirkx writes,

> I focus more on that shadow inner world, that part of our being that shows up in seemingly disjointed, fragmentary, and difficult to understand dreams, of spontaneous fantasies that often break through to consciousness in the middle of carefully orchestrated conversation, deep feelings and emotions that erupt into our waking lives. (Dirkx et al., 2006, p. 126)

In addition to a lack of clarity and consistency in the use of psychic structure concepts, there tends to be little explanation of how the concepts contribute to our understanding of learning in general and transformative learning specifically.

We decided, therefore, to search the literature for any analysis or justification of the use of psychic structures in theorizing about adult learning. We examined the following journals for the years indicated: *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 1997 to 2008; *International Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 1999 to 2008; *Journal of Transformative Education*, 2003 to 2008; *Adult Learning,* 1990 to 2008; and *Adult Education Quarterly,* 1996 to 2008. We browsed AERC proceedings from 1993 to 2008. We looked at the literature outside adult education, including the *Journal of Jungian Theory and Practice*, 1999 to 2008; *American Journal of Psychoanalysis,* 1995 to 2008; and *International Review of Education*, 1955 to 2008. We found one article written by Henderson and published in 1956 in the *International Review of Education* that discussed Jungian psychology and its significance for education. Henderson bases his argument on a comparison of Jungian thought and other psychoanalysts' thoughts, such as Freud's and Adler's. Henderson first argues that Jungian thought is unique in that it mainly focuses on adulthood, the *second half of life*, rather than childhood. Second, he claims that educational elements are more distinct in Jung's theory than in the others' theories. Finally, he argues that in Jung's theory educational implications are "more challenging and far reaching than those of Psycho-Analysis or Individual Psychology" (Henderson, 1956, p. 368). Our search did not yield any articles that comprehensively argued for the relevance of depth psychology and psychic structures in adult education theory and practice.

We did find several articles on the extrarational approach to transformative learning in relation to Jungian psychology. However, none of them critically examined the relationship between adult education and Jungian theory or the contribution that Jungian psychology can make to adult education. Rather, the authors uncritically reinforced the trend to use Jungian concepts. We could not find any article, for example, similar to one that Bingham (2002) wrote where he examined psychoanalytic insights in Freire's works, in which terms such as domination, submission, unconscious, guilt, alienation, sadism, masochism, internalization, and necrophilia are used in various ways. Bingham also established that Freire's work was inspired heavily by the works of Eric Fromm, Herbert Marcuse, and Franz Fannon. Most important, he chose only one of those concepts, the problem of authority, to scrutinize; if he had tried to examine all the concepts, he would have had to make sweeping claims.

We know from our literature search that the integration of Jungian theory into transformative learning theory has not been critically examined. Now, we briefly examine how the integration has been handled, if not critically. Scholars have introduced the extrarational approach into the literature as a missing element in the theory. Boyd and Myers (1988) are clear about their fundamental assumptions about Jungian individuation, psychic structure, and transformative education. Kovan and Dirkx (2003) claim that transformative learning theory relies heavily on cognition and reason; however, it understates the role of active involvement of emotions, feelings, and imagination within

transformative learning. In addition, Dirkx (2000a) critiques the common rhetoric of transformative learning that implies a necessity of extraordinary events or "aha!" moments in transformative learning. Dirkx claims that for transformative learning to take place, these kinds of big moments, events, and traumas are not necessary, but rather transformative learning can be the product of ordinary and everyday experiences.

Scholars working from this perspective suggest an inherently emotional and imaginal process, grounded in the premises and assumptions of a Jungian psychoanalytical framework. They see individuation as a form of transformative learning based in part on a dialogue between the conscious and the unconscious, a dialogue among the anima–animus, shadow, and archetypes, using images and symbols. Individuation is defined as an ongoing and lifelong process in which adults differentiate their sense of self from the collective of humanity and simultaneously integrate their sense of self with the collective in such a way that their position in the collective is more consciously articulated. Via this dialogue, we "come to better understand our shadow, become aware of our animus or anima (masculine or feminine soul), realize the influence of archetypes on the self, and start to see how we engage in projection" (Cranton & Roy, 2003, p. 91).

Dirkx (2006) anticipated that the extrarational approach could be objected to on several accounts. He wrote,

> Some might argue that such a perspective has no place in these educational contexts; that the view being offered here is highly personal, private, and best kept out of the classroom. . . . To my way of thinking, learning and making sense of what we are studying and our lives involves the personal. How can it not involve the person? (p. 7)

Elsewhere in a dialogue with Mezirow (Dirkx et al., 2006), Dirkx states,

> Now this idea of an *inner world* and its exploration might seem a bit mystical and vague. But we all sense, at varying levels, that we have private lives, personal dimensions of our being that carry on apart from the buzzing cacophony of what is happening around us. Our senses of these inner worlds also reflect varying levels of our awareness of them. On one hand, we often hold very personal and private thoughts, beliefs, and values that we allow only a few, if any, others to know about. (p. 126)

However, in our literature search we did not find any critical examination pertinent to these issues. We felt confident that there is a lack of discussion in the field of adult education and particularly transformative learning about the significance and relevance of Jungian theory and its concepts. To problematize the current attempts to integrate Jungian concepts into transformative learning theory, two types of issues need to be raised. The first is about the medium and how knowledge and information are presented in this medium that affect readers' trust, perception, understanding, and

learning. The second is the current epistemological crisis, which has created a kind of ambiguity in which almost all points of view appear to be seen as equally valid and legitimate and remain unquestioned.

## Theorizing the Gap in the Literature

There are several possible reasons for the lack of critical questioning of the nature of the discourse in the extrarational approach to transformative learning. Here, we discuss two possibilities: the legitimization of words and concepts through frequent use and the nature of the current educational epistemology.

### *Legitimating Through Use*

One of the first reasons why transformative learning writers have not been critical of the words and concepts used in the extrarational approach is rooted in their commonality. When a set of terms or concepts, or a certain vocabulary begins to be commonly used in a field, this terminology usage poses some epistemological and methodological challenges, one of which is how people read and perceive terms. Perhaps because reading is generally emphasized as a core skill for the acquisition of information, not for analyzing, most people read texts without analyzing (Huckin, 1997) and tend to take the terms, concepts, and ideas for granted. For example, Roustang (1984) argues that "since psychoanalytic discourse has become so familiar we hold it to be the discourse of self-evident truth" (p. 928). In other words, people tend to read without critical questioning.

When the words and concepts frequently appear in the scholarly literature, they are perceived to be legitimate because of the procedures and checks (such as peer reviewing, scientific objectivity, and validity) associated with these media. Therefore, we, adult educators, value critical reading of a text, in which we could and should read the world as well (Freire, 1972). Critical reading requires various sets of skills, such as being able to see underlying assumptions, being able to read between the lines, and being able to examine the text's position, its medium, its ways of conveying messages, and its word selection.

When terms and their meanings are uncertain, metaphorical, or mythical, such as those in Jungian theory, people are more likely to interpret and understand them in different ways. For example, some people might read the term *unconscious* as a metaphor rather than as a fact, or they may rarely think about its Freudian, Adlerian, or Jungian meaning unless the text is strictly related to a certain school or theory. Another example is the term *symbols*, which can be understood in relation to their literal meaning in daily life. But symbols can also be associated with dreams, in which they appear as encrypted meaning-components of our unconscious and need to be decrypted (interpreted) by a therapist. From another perspective, symbols can be reduced to sexuality (mostly repressed), as occurs in Freudian psychology. In Jungian terminology, symbols are even vaguer; they are indicative of, among other things, archetypes that are constituted in the

structure of the collective unconscious. When a reader encounters these terms, he or she could adopt, use, or take them for granted, and finally reproduce them. In short, although the attempts to bring Jung's ideas into the field of adult education should be applauded and the interdisciplinary efforts along these lines should be recognized, a good foundation of Jung, his theory, and his terminology should first be established so that the development of transformative learning theory can be advanced in a scholarly fashion. This need not involve a deep study of Jung's prolific writings; there are many good and clear texts written by Jungian analysts that stay true to Jung's work (e.g., see Hollis, 2001; Sharp, 2001). There are also readily available video clips, films, and other resources, though readers should check the credibility of the producers of such resources. Without this, scholars and practitioners may develop their own interpretations based on a limited knowledge of Jung, which could run counter to the meaningful development of transformative learning theory.

Next, we examine the current epistemological crisis, which might be one of the factors in embracing a theory without questioning.

## Current Educational Epistemology

The second reason why extrarational approaches have not received scrutiny may be rooted in the broader intellectual context. Epistemological problems are multifaceted; even though they are mainly concerned with the nature of knowledge, they are also strongly intermeshed with other philosophical problems such as those in ontology, science, politics, and aesthetics. Arner (1972) divided epistemology into three areas represented by three general questions; these questions are related to the nature of knowledge, the limits of it, and the sources of our knowledge. Attempts to answer these questions have created several trends within philosophy, science, and education, such as positivism, realism, relativism, eclecticism, and antimethod. The core of all these epistemological problems is the unreliability of human perception (Levering, 2006). Because our perception is subjective, this has always been seen as both a theoretical and a methodological issue in the social and natural sciences. In the extrarational approach to transformative learning, the concepts that are brought in to describe the learning process (e.g., the unconscious, the shadow, soul, myth, and metaphor) are already elusive and difficult to define or describe.

The nature of the current educational epistemology has been influenced by many decades of debates over issues such as realism versus relativism, and the effects of postmodern and post-structuralist viewpoints. These debates have been conducted in such a way as to make it very difficult to critique or question the significance or legitimacy of knowledge claims. Excessive support and enthusiasm toward the postmodernist and crude relativist stands in educational academia (such as Bagnall, 1994; Edwards & Usher, 2000, 2001; Leicester, 2000; Peters, 2000; Usher & Edwards, 1994) have led to a form of intellectual bewilderment and stasis. We want to invite transformative learning scholars to examine the epistemological significance of their work in the light of the current epistemological context. The current, perhaps subtle, relativist

posture of educational academia is one of the factors that inhibit scholars from questioning knowledge claims such as those that arise within the extrarational perspective of transformative learning theory. The debates between various schools, theories, and philosophies, including the postmodernist and post-structuralist, have not led to consensus or a useful conclusion. In fact, scholars are not even clear on what to do about the knowledge developed in postmodern conditions. For example, although Blake (1996) believes that these conditions stimulate educational theory and research, he also calls educators and scholars "to decide whether [the postmodern challenge] is to be celebrated or deplored, promoted or resisted" (p. 43). Cole, Hill, and Rikowski (1997) claim that this postmodernist approach to educational theory and research "is inadequate as a basis for rethinking educational theory and for forging a radical educational politics" (p. 187). They suggest going further than resistance because, for them, postmodernism is "a theoretical virus which paralyses progressive thought, politics and practice" (p. 187). This debate left behind a legacy of deconstruction, multiplicity of truths, uncertainty, vague assumptions, presumptions, and a critique-free zone in which there is a hesitancy to examine any knowledge claim.

The extrarational approach to transformative learning exists in this ambiguous atmosphere. Writers and theorists have taken Jungian theory and its relevance to transformative learning for granted, without critical examination of this position. Scholars in the field need to elaborate, explain, support, and defend the premises of the extrarational approach to transformative learning within an epistemological framework. They need to clarify its knowledge claim. Subjectivity is no longer seen as an epistemological or methodological problem. Educators and scholars have started valuing subjective perceptions and meaning in relation to knowledge. Grounding a theory in or defining a reality based on this subjectivity creates a problem when, for example, scholars consciously or unconsciously treat their subjective findings as if they are generalizable, universal, reliable, and legitimate. If someone claims that he or she experienced transformation through "soul work," we can accept that this is the case for this person. But when it is worded this way, for example, "*When approached through soul*, *adult learning puts us in touch with the archetypal nature of our being" (Dirkx, 1998, ¶ 11)*, the experience has been generalized without the reader necessarily knowing what the archetypal nature of our being is and on what basis it can be related to "adult learning." It needs to be possible to question any knowledge claim and its validity. This gives us the ability to discriminate between what is knowledge and what is not, what is speculation and what is not. The integration of subjective concepts into the extrarational approach to transformative learning has not been critically examined, in part because the language of psychic structures has become a common language and in part because of the general shift in educational epistemology toward an acceptance of subjective and relativist descriptions of learning.

## Critical Appraisal of the Extrarational Perspective

Building on the apparent lack of critical analysis of the extrarational approach, we offer here a possible framework for further critique. Adult education theory, in general,

embraces all three types of knowledge as described by Habermas (1972)—instrumental, practical, and emancipatory—and allows for idiosyncratic personal views as long as individuals are willing to engage in debate to clarify and provide evidence for their views. In adult education, and especially in transformative learning theory, Habermas's work has long been used as a way of understanding types of knowledge (Mezirow, 1991). We now turn to an exploration of the different kinds of knowledge that form the foundation for transformative learning theory, and then we look at our concerns and questions with the following concepts in mind: the extrarational approach as practical knowledge and mutual understanding as a goal. We hold that Habermas's framework, which is already well established in our field (via Mezirow, 1991), provides a useful tool for further analysis of extrarational concepts in transformative learning theory.

As Habermas (1972) notes, practical knowledge is socially constructed, subjective, and acquired through discourse among communities of well-informed people. It is validated by consensus in communities of knowledgeable individuals (including a community of theorists or scholars in a discipline such as adult education). Practical knowledge is limited by its subjectivity and the danger that it is constructed by groups and communities that do not come to an informed consensus or use persuasion and coercion rather than carefully weighing evidence. Because people tend to reify practical knowledge, accepting it as true without questioning its underlying assumptions, it is important to emphasize that any practical knowledge claim is a cognitive claim. Therefore, it differs from ethical or normative claims, whose truthfulness cannot be questioned. In other words, a knowledge claim claims to explain or interpret a phenomenon (e.g., learning cannot be noncognitive) even though the phenomenon that is under investigation is deeply involved with noncognitive processes.

The extrarational approach to transformative learning falls in the domain of practical knowledge, as outlined by Habermas (1972), since it is based on interpretation and its goal is to help us understand ourselves, others, and our social world. In other words, its knowledge claim, like other practical knowledge claims, is related to the explanation of social phenomena such as learning. For Habermas (1979), any explanation of social phenomena is accomplished through the use of language because words, concepts, and terms are intimately related to social life, in which both language and knowledge are formed. Therefore, the explanation of any social phenomenon is an interpretation based on a prior understanding of the object of the knowledge (Scott, 1978). Even though this interpretation is in a relative or subjective knowledge form, it should also be dependent on "linguistically established intersubjectivity" (Habermas, 1979, p. 116). By intersubjectivity, Habermas refers to a communal texture (shared values and norms that are formed through communication) of the society. The society's or community's language is one of the main ingredients of this texture, and it provides a basis for the members to rationally understand each other. This rationality also serves to create a sense of mutual understanding.

In practical knowledge, including extrarational knowledge, where mutual understanding is central, we are not concerned about whether knowledge is true or not; we are rather concerned about how a community comes to agree on something. There are certain conditions that need to be met in order to attain this communication. For

example, a knowledge claim has to be rational, knowable, and understandable by the members of the community. Mutual understanding or communication is still only possible through an "ideal speech situation," which is a domination-free interaction. For Habermas, such ideal speech situations give rise to a rationally founded consensus, based on a functional view of everyday language use, that what we say is "true, right and sincere" (Harkin, 1998, p. 434). Those who propose the integration of extrarational concepts and psychic structures into transformative learning have the obligation to create and use a functional language in a way that their knowledge claim would be true, right, and sincere. This means that we should be able to criticize any knowledge claim and that it should also be understood by others (the hearer). However, scholars of the extrarational approach make various assertions that potentially challenge our ability of knowing and agreeing on its knowledge claim. As we have discussed earlier, readers may not be able to understand and agree on the knowledge claims underlying concepts such as consciousness, the unconscious, and the collective unconscious. The extrarational approach has the goal of helping us understand ourselves, others, and our social world so that we can foster and experience transformation. The challenge is that the connection to reality seems to be symbolic or mythical.

The kind of knowledge that is constitutive with images not only is subjective, but also only the individual agent could have access to its truthfulness. Hence, there is no doubt that this kind of knowledge claim's validity, truthfulness, and sincerity should be open to critique and questioning (Habermas, 1981). It begs for a rational, in-depth explanation that is comprehensible and leads to a mutual understanding within the education community to maintain the viability of the knowledge claim. Beyond its assertions, the extrarational approach is composed of mythical and symbolic concepts, such as shadows, archetypes, and anima–animus. These concepts pose challenges in reaching a mutual understanding and consensus; they are not only not knowable, but also any attempt at explanation either uses another unknown or has to require an unconditional acceptance of postulation that requires that the subject accept some propositions as self-evident. This is axiomatic deductive logic that allows us only to derive an inevitable conclusion from the supposedly true premises and does not allow us to go beyond the very first general statement. To illustrate, the Jungian concepts of anima–animus are postulations. In other words, we have to accept that women host animus images before we begin to understand what the psychic structure is. A similar critique to the extrarational approach has come from Newman (2012) By citing the philosopher A. J. Ayer, Newman claims that any statement that cannot be verified as true or false is "literally senseless" (p. 13). Therefore, the mythical and symbolic nature of Jungian theory creates a problematic knowledge claim.

According to Habermas (1981), mythical, symbolic, and dogmatic knowledge and their worldviews are closed systems; they are incompatible with rational discourse, and they lack reflexivity. Reflexivity is involved with questioning, revising, and critiquing any knowledge claim. It "brings the unconscious, taken-for-granted, habitual ways of thinking and reasoning to the surface for ideology critique and reconstruction in such a manner that the cognitive processes and self-formative processes merge" (Street, 1992, p. 96). Lack of reflexivity in any given knowledge claim, therefore,

tends to be a dogmatic and mythical worldview. Uncritiqued and unexamined knowledge claims serve to form a false consciousness that is circumscribed by dogma and error (Habermas, 1973, as cited in Street, 1992, p. 96). Therefore, because dogmatic or metaphysical propositions are not open to revision and questioning, they inevitably hinder the development of knowledge. Because the extrarational approach puts mythical, symbolic, and dogmatic concepts and postulations in the center of its theory and because its logic is axiomatic, it creates a closed system of knowledge; it does not provide any space for a critical reflexivity or critical questioning. Therefore, its knowledge claim's validity inevitably becomes doubtful.

## Conclusion

Knowledge about transformative learning has been constructed by a community of scholars working to explain how adults experience a deep shift in perspective that leads them to better justified and more open frames of reference. As we have seen from the application of Habermasian understandings of knowledge to the theory, knowledge about transformative learning is practical in nature, and as such, it is subjective. If we accept this, then the validity of knowledge about transformative learning needs to be based on critical meaning making through discourse. In embracing Jungian psychic structures as a way of understanding transformation, we have neglected to engage in critical meaning making through discourse.

Yet there are many questions that we can readily bring to our discussions of extrarational knowledge. How do we know about and make meaning of psychic structures such as the shadow, the unconscious, the collective unconscious, and the anima and animus? How do adult learners use the elements of the psychic structure in the meaning-making process? Is meaning making in extrarational transformation a conscious or an unconscious process? Is it cognitive, rational, emotional, or transcendental? Does this knowing need to be experienced by others so that we can communicate with and understand each other? Is it possible to achieve an appropriate consensus or a communicative form? And, most important, how do we know all this, talk about it, and write about it?

Critical examination is a methodological necessity if we are to integrate Jungian perspectives into our field. Without this, we play an active role in misleading people to view the concepts as legitimate without critical reflection or questioning. While celebrating the development of transformative learning as a theory in progress, we, adult educators, should not stop critically examining current developments.

## References

Arner, D. G. (1972). *Perception, reason, and knowledge: An introduction to epistemology*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Bagnall, R. G. (1994). Postmodernity and its implications for adult education practice. *Studies in Continuing Education, 16*(1), 1-18.

Bingham, C. (2002). On Pulo Freire's debt to psychoanalysis: Authority on the side of freedom. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*, 447-464,

Blake, N. (1996). Between postmodernism and anti-modernism: The predicament of educational studies. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 44*, 42-65.

Boyd, R. D. (1989). Facilitating personal transformation in small groups. *Small Group Behavior, 20*, 459-474.

Boyd, R. D. (1991). *Personal transformations in small groups*. London, England: Routledge.

Boyd, R. D., & Myers, J. G. (1988). Transformative education. *International Journal of Life-long Education, 7*, 261-284.

Coady, M. Moses (1939). *Masters of their own destiny: The story of the Antigonish Movement of adult education through economic cooperation*. New York, NY:Harper & Brothers.

Cole, M., Hill, D., & Rikowski, G. (1997). Between postmodernism and nowhere: The predicament of the postmodernist. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 45*, 187-200.

Cranton, P. (2006). *Understanding and promoting transformative learning* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cranton, P., & Roy, M. (2003). When the bottom falls out of the bucket: Toward a holistic perspective on transformative learning. *Journal of Transformative Education, 1*(2), 86-98.

Daloz, L. (1999). *Mentor: Guiding the journey of adult learners*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dirkx, J. M. (1987). Matriarchal consciousness and the transformative adult learning group. In S.J. Levine, R.J. Smith, & J.E. Snoddy (Eds.). *Proceedings of the Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult and Continuing Education*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Dirkx, J. M. (1998, March). *Knowing the self through fantasy: Toward a mytho-poetic view of transformative learning*. Paper presented at the 39th Annual Adult Education Research Conference. Retrieved from http://www.adulterc.org/Proceedings/1998/98dirkx.htm

Dirkx, J. M. (2000a). After the burning bush: Transformative learning as imaginative engagement with everyday experience. In C. A. Wiessner, S. Meyer, & D. Fuller (Eds.), *Challenges of practice: Transformative learning in action. Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Transformative Learning* (pp. 247-252). New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Dirkx, J. M. (2000b). *Transformative learning and the journey of individuation*. Retrieved from the ERIC database. (ED223)

Dirkx, J. M. (2006). Engaging emotions in adult learning: A Jungian perspective on emotion and transformative learning. In E. W. Taylor (Ed.), *New directions for adult and continuing education*: *Vol. 109. Special issue: Teaching for change: Fostering transformative learning in the classroom* (pp. 15-26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dirkx, J. M. (Ed.). (2008). *Adult learning and the emotional self* (New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, Vol. 120). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dirkx, J. M., Mezirow, J., & Cranton, P. (2006). Musings and reflections on the meaning, context, and process of transformative learning: A dialogue between John M. Dirkx and Jack Mezirow. *Journal of Transformative Education, 4*, 123-139.

Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (2000, June). *Lifelong learning: The postmodern condition of education?* Paper presented at the 41st Annual Adult Education Research Conference, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (2001). Lifelong learning: A postmodern condition of education. *Adult Education Quarterly, 51*, pp. 273-287.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London, England: Penguin.

Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests* (J. J. Shapiro, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1979). *Communication and the evolution of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1981). *The theory of communicative action: Vol. 1. Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Harkin, J. (1998). In defense of the modernist project in education. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 46*, 428-439.

Henderson, J. L. (1956). Jung's analytical psychology and its significance for education in the light of recent literature. *International Review of Education, 2*, 368-378.

Heron, J. (1992). *Feeling and personhood: Psychology in another key*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hollis, J. (2001). *Creating a life: Finding your individual path*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Inner City Books.

Huckin, T. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional approaches to written text: Classroom applications* (pp. 78-93). Washington, DC: U.S. Information Agency.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2004). *Critical pedagogy primer*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. New York, NY: Cambridge.

Kovan, J. and Dirkx, J. (2003). "Being called awake": The role of transformative learning in the lives of environmental activists. *Adult Education Quarterly, 53*(2), 99-118.

Leicester, M. (2000). Post-postmodernism and continuing education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 19*, 73-81.

Levering, B. (2006). Epistemological issues in phenomenological research: How authoritative are people's accounts of their own perception. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 40*, 451-462.

Mezirow, J. (1975). Education for perspective transformation: Women's reentry programs in community colleges. New York: Center for Adult Education Teachers College, Columbia University.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J., & Associates. (Eds.). (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Newman, M. (2012). Calling transformative learning into question: Some mutinous thoughts. *Adult Education Quarterly, 62*, 36-55. doi:10.1177/0741713610392768

Peters, M. (2000). Redefining adult education: Research, self and learning in postmodernity. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 21*, 335-343.

Rogers, C. (1969). *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Roustang, F. (1984). On the epistemology of psychoanalysis. *MLN, 99*(French issue), 928-940.

Scott, J. P. (1978). Critical social theory: An introduction and critique. *British Journal of Sociology, 29*, 1-21.

Scott, S. M. (1997). The grieving soul in the transformative process. In P. Cranton (Ed.), *New directions for adult and continuing education: Vol. 74. Transformative learning in action: Insights from practice* (pp. 41-50). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sharp, D. (2001). *Digesting Jung: Food for the journey*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Inner City Books.

Street, A. F. (1992). *Inside nursing: A critical ethnography of clinical nursing practice* (SUNY series). Albany, NY: Teacher Empowerment and School Reform, State University of New York Press.

Taylor, E. W. (2007). An update of transformative learning theory: A critical review of the empirical research (1999-2005). *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 26*, 173-191.

Usher, R., & Edwards, R. (1994). *Postmodernism and education*. London, England: Routledge.

## Bios

**Ilhan Kucukaydin** is an affiliate assistant professor of adult education at the Penn State Harrisburg.

**Patricia Cranton** is a retired professor of adult education, currently affiliated with the University of New Brunswick in Canada.