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Abstract

This study investigates if and how teachers’ relationships to their teaching stress and work transformed as a result of taking part in a workshop designed to have participants interact with the shadow and empowered aspects of five archetypes that manifest in teaching: The Mother, the Servant, the Instructor, the Hero, and the Core Self. The study was conducted in the organic approach through a post-workshop interview. The first part of the study reviews the causes of teacher work stress and burnout, examines the role of beliefs in teacher development and outlines the evidence for and descriptions of each of the archetypes. The second part of the study details the structure of workshop process as well as each participant’s journey through the workshop and personal reflection. The results reveal that by challenging their internal beliefs around archetypal patterns, participants were able to have positive shifts in managing work stress and burnout.
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1 Part 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Burnout is still a taboo issue that few teachers want to openly admit to suffering from. It labels you a teacher who can’t “handle it”, rather than being understood as a natural reaction to a working within a system that has been molded by sexist historical norms and assumptions that are detrimental to mental, emotional, physical and spiritual wellbeing.

In 2004 I burned out from teaching. I felt overwhelmed by the expectations to be a nurturing teacher, a social activist, a creative pedagogue, and a worker with a limitless work ethic. All my free time was spent on planning, marking, creating for school or thinking about how to improve students’ experience. I had lost a sense of my own life. I felt buried beneath countless worksheets from the 10 classes I taught, 6 extracurricular activities, 5 school and district committee, and having over 500 students to report on. I thought, “if I were a CEO I would have a team of administrative support staff to help me. But I’m not a CEO, I’m a teacher, and I feel like I’m in a one-room-school house with no one there but me to do all the work.” When I went to my principal to look at changing my timetable I was told, “This is just how it is; you need to pull your weight.” When I went to the EAP program to look at counseling options, I was told, “You know, most women your age would already have had a maternity leave and that would help you feel less stressed.” With that comment I understood for the first time how sexist notions of femininity in teaching had contributed to my burnout – namely that ‘good girls’ (or good teachers) apparently worked themselves to exhaustion without regard for themselves for the good of others. It was also the first time I noticed how normalized these attitudes were. It never occurred to me that I was burning out. In fact, what motivated me to change some of my teaching habits in terms of boundaries, and time management was simply that I was in such a critical state
I needed to prioritize time to go to therapy every week and spend my evenings working on my healer’s homework, not planning and marking until 2am. Even at my most stressful times in teaching and worse emotional points I just thought I was being a good teacher, I never considered that there was another way to go about teaching.

Once I had recovered and taken sabbatical, I began to share with teachers how I recovered from burning out. At this point my career began to change. As I was taking more courses in healing methodologies and coaching I shifted from teaching into working as a life coach and energy therapist. It was from this interest that I began to look at what other roles we take on as teachers and began to develop the characteristics of the archetypes.

What makes teachers stressed? The answers are as numerous as there are teachers, but there are underlying themes that create stress in teachers’ lives. The role and identity of teachers is shaped not only by the individual teacher, but also by the cumulative social norms of the teaching profession. These norms, generated from history and social context, influence how teachers develop their roles and identities.

These norms can be personified in archetypes. Archetypes allow people to see how patterns within themselves are mirrors of patterns that emerge from the collective consciousness of society. Archetype work is a powerful way to transform habit patterns that create stress. Stressed out teachers, with a sense of personal responsibility can tend towards self-blame in their quest for recovery from stress. Archetypes allow us to see that our stress-creating habit patterns are not personal, but rather that we have been socialized into them. Working with archetypes allows us to transform those habit patterns without self-blame.
1.2 Research Question

Do teachers’ relationships to their teaching-stress and work transform as a result of taking part in the archetypes workshop? If there are changes, what is the nature of those changes?

1.3 Rationale

Teacher stress is epidemic. A BCTF report (Naylor, 2009) on teachers and work stress stated that 60% of staff indemnity plan costs and 43% of claims in the rehabilitation program were linked to psychological/psychiatric disorders. Pajak & Blase (1989) conducted a study on both the positive and negative impact of teachers’ personal lives on their professional roles. One of their conclusions was that burnout among teachers should be understood in the context of teachers’ personal life experiences and could be alleviated by having “an investment in a variety of personal interests and activities and a rich and supportive network of social relationships” (p. 306). While I don’t deny the importance of these factors, I think there are cultural assumptions that feed the expectations placed on teachers by society and by teachers and the profession. Archetypes are a useful way to figure out how the dominant influences and beliefs that we subconsciously carry impact how we teach and how we live.

I want to explore archetypes as a way to come into the empowered aspect of the archetype for self-preservation and renewal for the sustainability of a career in teaching, and not simply focus on the duties of the teacher to the student/system – but the duty of the teacher to herself and her wellbeing and her career.

My observation is that if all the shadow aspects of the main archetypes in the profession were listed and attributed to a person, the mental health profession would recommend counseling, but the teaching profession would award the teacher-of-the-year award. The shadow of archetypes is
normalized in teaching and projected as the model. The purpose of my research is to see how the archetypes workshop can help teachers come out of the shadow and into the light where teaching beliefs and practices are consciously structured to support wellbeing.

1.4 Figure 1: List of Archetypes and their Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHADOW ASPECTS</th>
<th>EMPOWERED ASPECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHETYPE: MOTHER</strong></td>
<td><strong>ARCHETYPE: SERVANT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHADOW: Martyr Mother</strong></td>
<td><strong>SHADOW: Rescuer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I feel guilty when I call in a substitute for a sick day</td>
<td>- I feel no one can teach my class as well as I can so I don’t like to call a sub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I feel like a parent to my students</td>
<td>- I sometimes get angry that other teachers don’t seem to take on as much work as I do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What my students do is a reflection of me</td>
<td>- Good teachers take on every opportunity/activity/special guest for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I often think about my students problems when I am away from school</td>
<td>- I often feel sorry for students and ‘bend’ the rules frequently for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I take on a heavy load of extracurricular activities</td>
<td>- Good teachers focus on what’s not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I often say “it’s for the kids” to motivate myself</td>
<td>- I can say no to requests easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I’m rarely satisfied with the work I do with students, always finding inadequacies with what I do</td>
<td>- I often feel sorry for students and ‘bend’ the rules frequently for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I feel I have too much on my plate but that’s just how it is</td>
<td>- Good teachers focus on what’s not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I work extra hard because the system is broken</td>
<td>- I know I can’t solve everything, I readily ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPOWERED: Grounded Mother</strong></td>
<td><strong>EMPOWERED: Helper</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I easily take sick days when I feel I need them</td>
<td>- I trust that substitutes can handle my class and the teaching when I’m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I feel I can let go of the personal issues of my students. I have done what I can within my professional limitations.</td>
<td>- I can say no to requests easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I expect my ‘kids’ to have accountability in their learning and have clear goals</td>
<td>- My boundaries are firm to support students with care, but flexible when need be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I have good planning/organization to facilitate my job</td>
<td>- I know I can’t solve everything, I readily ask</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
intensely because they want to better the situation

- If not me, then who?
  - Good teachers have a practical response to what is not working and are comfortable letting things “be” if a solution is not immediate

- sometimes I feel like I want to rescue my students from their lives
  - Good teachers can go home at a reasonable time

- Good teachers stay late
  - I always want to help, but I know my limits and can stick to them most of the time

- I feel exhausted from all the help I give
  - Giving makes me feel energized

- I compare myself with others often

**ARCHETYPE:** Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHADOW: Stickler</th>
<th>EMPOWERED: Sage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- I follow the example of my own teachers for most of my approaches to teaching</td>
<td>- I enjoy exploring new approaches to teaching and content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- My class is my space and I control it</td>
<td>- My class is a shared space, student input is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I don’t like exceptions to my rules</td>
<td>- I am assertive, but can negotiate a position to be accommodating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I prefer to follow explicit instructions in teaching (eg manuals)</td>
<td>- Good teachers delegate work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good teachers leave their classroom door closed</td>
<td>- Good teachers are comfortable with allowing unknown to unfold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good teachers are experts in their work</td>
<td>- Good teachers invite suggestions from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good teachers mark everything they hand out</td>
<td>- Good teachers mark only what is relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good teachers don’t need help in the classroom</td>
<td>- Good teachers have a sense of detachment from their students’ behaviour, expect respect, not perfection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARCHETYPE:** Hero

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHADOW: Relentless Warrior</th>
<th>EMPOWERED: Valiant Warrior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Good teachers always create original, creative activities and plans</td>
<td>- Good teachers can use pre-made copiable masters sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There are so many social problems to solve, I can’t rest, problems need solving!</td>
<td>- The world’s problems won’t be solved in one day, I acknowledge a job well done and the limits of what can be done in any space of time, and make plans for next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I am highly irritated by those teachers who don’t deal with social justice-issues/or have passion for their teaching in their class – I either get angry or shut down</td>
<td>- I seek out connection with others who share my vision to accomplish my goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There are so many social problems to solve, I feel deflated</td>
<td>- I am comfortable and forgiving of my own and other’s imperfections. If we fail, we can try again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If you want something done well, do it</td>
<td>- There are social problems, but my approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
yourself so I rather work alone to accomplish my goal to social action is realistic and offers hope

- My passion for teaching eats up time in my personal life - My value comes from who I am, not what I do

- I hold myself and others to high standards, and feel guilty/resentful when things don’t measure up to being good enough - The journey is long, I expect setbacks and disappointments, but I don’t get dejected

- If I feel guilty I work harder - I can ease up on my expectations and still feel like I’m competent

- I’m not afraid of confrontation and can stand up for what I believe

**ARCHETYPE: CORE SELF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHADOW: Self in-exile</th>
<th>EMPOWERED: Return to self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- I wear ‘masks’ to hide aspects of self from students or staff</td>
<td>- I am comfortable being completely myself with students and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I have feelings of exclusion, not being understood</td>
<td>- I feel included, welcome and understood at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I do not have a good support network outside school</td>
<td>- I have a good comfortable support network outside of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I feel bored, lack of enthusiasm</td>
<td>- I have a lot of vitality and enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is lack of stimulation in my career</td>
<td>- I feel well connected and mentored in my career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I feel a lack of connection with people at school</td>
<td>- I experience self-satisfaction and acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I have a “is this my life?” feeling – what am I doing here??</td>
<td>- I have a concept of my life’s purpose &amp; meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I feel like a stranger onto myself</td>
<td>- I sense a feeling of belonging with others and with myself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informed by literature on teacher stress and my own experience and observation, I assembled five archetypal forms with characteristics (see Figure 1). The archetype characteristics are beliefs that are held by people that inform their decisions, actions and words. We know from other research that prior beliefs around learning influence how teachers approach the job (Hollingsworth, 1989; Johnson & Reiman, 2007). While that research is related to curriculum and pedagogy, it would follow that beliefs in the culture of teaching would have a similar impact.
To access the beliefs teachers hold and to support re-thinking some of these norms, I used a model of professional development for the workshop that is contemplative and reflective in nature.

2 Part 2: Literature Review

2.1 Literature Review On The Background To Teacher Stress And Burnout, Contributing Factors And Solutions

2.1.1 Causes of Teacher Stress and Burnout

Difficult student behaviour is cited as a major contributor to teacher stress (Chang, 2009; Day, Sammons, Gu, Kingston & Stobart, 2009; Geving, 2007; Hakanen, Makker & Schaufeli, 2006; Jacob & deWet, 2009; Martin, Sass & Schmidt, 2012; Saha & Dworkin, 2009; VanDroogenbroek, Spruyt & Vanroelen, 2014; Vanderberghe & Huberman, 1999) That its been documented that teachers feel responsible for other peoples behaviour (Kelchtermans & Strittmatter, 1999) is an aggravating factor to the contribution of student behaviour to stress. The archetypes work attempts to address these kinds of irrational beliefs that exacerbate already stressful teaching situations.

The intensification of teaching includes the trend of more teacher accountability, standardized testing and standardization of curriculum. Intensification is noted as having a stressful impact on teachers (Byrne,1999; Chang, 2009; Dworkin, 1987; Gavish & Freidman, 2010; Teven, 2007; VanDroogenbroek et al, 2014; Woods, 1999) because it is seen as de-emphasizing the caring-
aspect of the job, and overemphasizing the teachers as technician or organizational labour and creating stress because what Woods describes as a “realignment of values”.

Intensification leads to de-professionalizing teaching. One of the aspects of de-professionalizing teaching is the lack of mobility in career development (Dworkin, 1987; Gavish & Friedman, 2010). De-professionalization also leads to less decision making power and agency of teachers in their own classrooms (Byrne, 1999; Dworkin, 1987; Farber & Wechsler, 1991; Teven, 2007; Woods, 1999) and this is cited as a major cause of stress for teachers.

Teacher efficacy is prominent in the literature as a major cause of teacher stress (Byrne, 1999; Dworkin, 1987; Fives, Hamman & Olivarez, 2007; Geving, 2007; Larrivee, 2012; Martin, Sass & Schmitt, 2012; Truch, 1980; Vandenberghhe, & Huberman, 1999; Van Droogenbroeck, et al, 2014) Improving teacher efficacy focuses on developing teaching skills and competencies that might be lacking to be more effective in classroom management, pedagogical approaches and curricular knowledge. It promotes the idea that if teachers could be made more competent they wouldn’t burn out.

While no doubt a lack of efficacy can contribute to stress it is false to assume that all teachers who burnout are lacking in efficacy. This teacher-blaming is politically expedient as it takes the responsibility off the systemic issues that create stress and “ignores the reality that factors outside of the control of schools often exert a significant effect upon students knowledge acquisition” (Saha & Dworkin, 2009, p 495). It also negates the impact of beliefs about teaching that teachers are conditioned in during their training. These beliefs make up the characteristics of the archetypes. The literature review on teacher beliefs explores how these beliefs are formed and why they have such a strong hold on the psyches of teachers.
Some of the systemic and school-structural issues are the demands of employment and heavy workload of teachers (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006; Hultel, Melin & Gustavsson, 2013; Hansen & Wentworth, 2002; Farber & Wechsler, 1991; Day, et al, 2009), the expectations that society places on teachers to fix the problems of the world (Hargreaves & Lo, 2000) and the isolation of classroom teachers (Nias, 2002).

All of the above factors that contribute to teacher stress could be understood by this quote in VanDroogenbroeck, et al (2014):

“since the desire to teach and to help children is central in the motivation of teachers, it should not surprise us that externally imposed demands for high-stakes summative assessments, record keeping and accountability are experienced as a burden, as these tasks distract teacher from their perceived core job of teaching students” (p.102).

What the literature shows causes significant stress to teachers is the emotions, commitments, sense of vocation and dedication that this core job of teachers extracts. As we will see when the archetypes are developed the archetypal forms are heavily present at this core teacher job of helping and teaching students.

2.1.2 The Role of Emotions in Teaching

What I felt was missing from these categories and descriptions of the causes of teacher stress was the idea of teacher conditioning. Teachers can be trained to have healthier emotional responses, increase their competency, learn better classroom management techniques to deal with student behaviour, make peace with systemic realities such as standardized testing; but these are all skills-based developments. The underlying, root cause of stress, is not skills, but attitude and
beliefs. The root is the attitudes and belief and behaviours they support. The shadow elements of the archetypes are often the practices that are encouraged and replicated in schools. So long as teachers are conditioned that those elements are desirable in teaching, these elements will form the foundation of all competencies, techniques management practices and systemic approaches in individual teachers and in the system of education. The negative emotions that these shadow archetypes encourage cause stress. Emotions in teaching create exhaustion (Byrne, 1999) and this paves the way to burnout. Unfortunately, “the role that emotions play is teachers work is not acknowledged in public policy and professional teacher standards tend to downplay or ignore the emotional dimensions of the teaching role” (O’Connor, 2008 p.119). If it is ignored in the causes, addressing emotions will be ignored in the solutions. The following review on emotions in teaching demonstrates that emotions are documented to have a major role in teaching. Many of the emotions outlined are found repeatedly in the shadow side of the archetype descriptors.


If decreased teaching efficacy can create low self esteem and lead to burnout, it follows that so would the emotional consequences of unrealistic expectations around caring and teaching goals. “The strains of idealism and commitment maybe experienced by all those teachers who base self-
esteem on attainment of unrealistic, albeit humane and worthy, educational goals” (Farber & Wechsler, 1991, p. 45). Unrealistic expectations, like feeling that they are responsible to fix students problems (Kelchtermans & Strittmatter, 1999) could be linked to over-conscientiousness that is exhibited in teachers that can increase the chances of burnout (Nias, 1997). When teachers feel that they have failed living up to these expectations guilt is a common result (Grumet 1981; Nias, 2002, 1997; Nilsson, Ejlertsson, Andersson, & Blomqvist, 2015.; Tsouluhas, 2005; Woods, 1999). The expectation of selflessness (Farber & Wechsler, 1991; Truch, 1980; Grumet, 1981) is also exhausting. To admit that this is so, or to admit other emotions such as anger is deemed to be unacceptable in the culture of teaching and these emotions are given the term “renegade” (Larrivee, 2012). These “renegade emotions” having no place to be safely expressed and processed, further exacerbate the experience of stress and burnout. Where do these emotional patterns come from?

The emotional traps that teachers fall into, particularly guilt traps “are due to the social conditions of teachers' work and in particular to the conjunction of: a general commitment to care; the open-ended nature of the job; the pressures of accountability and intensification; and self-imposed demands for perfectionism.” (Hargreaves (1994) as quoted in Nias, 1997, p. 20). Guilt in this context, internalized by the teacher, can be seen as an instrument of social control. These social conditions are influenced by the sexist roles imposed on teachers through the feminization of teaching (Grumet, 1981). To interrogate these assumptions Zembylas (2003) encouraged using “feminist and poststructuralist ideas …that invents strategies of subversion of the emotional rules that determine how teachers should or should not feel about curriculum, teaching, and themselves.” (p. 118). Zembylas goes on to say that this approach can encourage “alternative expressions of emotions” and “avoid internalizing certain emotions (fear, guilt,
shame and humiliation) as “appropriate”? (p. 119) The archetype descriptors, because they offer the alternative to the shadow via the empowered aspect, are one effective tool to allow teachers to “create spaces to develop flexible ways of resistance involving emotional depth and expressions that are not following norms prescribed to them” (Zembylas p. 119)?

2.1.3 The Role of Teaching Beliefs

The lack of change in burnout points us towards the possibility that the beliefs that fuel the teachers’ behaviours are based in ideas that create stress. External changes can alleviate some systemic stressors, but the internal-stressors stay the same.

The archetypes’ characteristics are based in beliefs teachers may hold about what makes up good teaching. These beliefs become ingrained and difficult to change. When the beliefs are those that lead to stress, it is then a challenge to work on stress reduction without changing the beliefs that influence our actions and thoughts.

Beliefs form the core of our identity. It could be said that beliefs are the lens through which we perceive and interpret our world, as well as the foundations of how we interact in our world. The beliefs that teachers hold, not only shape their pedagogy and curricular choices, but also their personal behaviour with relation to their work and their classroom. While beliefs can be individually held, they can also form the unspoken codes of how good teaching is understood in their culture of schooling. Beliefs about teaching, then impact how teachers will experience the stress of teaching. Belief-construction then is a major factor that needs to be addressed in any programming for reducing teacher stress, which is why it is central to the construction of the archetypes I created. The literature shows why this is important.
Teaching stress is augmented when teachers are unable to teach in alignment with their personal beliefs and values about teaching (Nias, 1999; Galman, 2008; Geving, 2007). As described in the previous sections of reviewing the literature on the causes of burnout, teacher stress is often caused because the caring, creative autonomy that draws teachers to the profession is not in alignment with the reality of how schools function and with the increase in intensification. This dissonance is the clash between beliefs. This clash is a major source of stress.

This clash can also occur within a person. There can be a dissonance between acting consistently with their beliefs and values (Nias, 1999) and having stress in their job if the teacher does not see that their core values can be supported by new beliefs. Core values create the identity which is expressed by the beliefs, feelings and behaviours of a teacher (Galman, 2009; Maag, 2008; Nias, 1999; Pajares, 1992; Sutherland, Howard & Markauskaite, 2010) Each archetype holds a core value that guides the teacher. The mother values the nurturing aspect of teaching. The Servant places value on being of service to the vocation of teaching and the students. The Instructors’ core value is knowledge and order. The Hero’s core value is social change and creative action.

At the heart of the core-self is a desire for authenticity. The archetypes’ descriptors demonstrate a choice of beliefs and actions that the individual teacher can take in expressing their core values: in a unsustainable, stressful way, or in a empowered, sustainable way. Until beliefs are addressed stress management stays stuck at the level of coping, rather than moving to the level of transformation.

There is literature to support that once beliefs are formed they are not easily changed. According to Pajares (1992) the earlier the belief is formed, the more difficult it is to change. How early are these beliefs formed in teaching? Fives, Hamman & Olivarez (2007) cited Gold, Greer & Greer, noting that “it is during student teaching that pre-service teachers begin to learn the habits of the
profession and begin to develop adaptive or maladaptive coping skills for dealing with the stress of teaching” (p. 918).

Why wouldn’t pre-service training be able to change some of these beliefs and habits about teaching? Why do they seem to replicate from one cohort of teachers to the next? According to Pajares (1992) beliefs only change if they need to be redefined and as pre-service teachers are insiders

> “the classrooms of colleges of education, and the people and practices in them, differ little from classroom and people they have known for years. Thus, the reality of their everyday lives may continue largely unaffected by higher education, as may their beliefs. For insiders, changing conceptions is taxing and potentially threatening. These students have commitments to prior beliefs and efforts to accommodate new information and adjust existing beliefs can be nearly impossible” (p. 323).

Sutherland, et al (2010) also support the concept of prior beliefs strongly influencing our interpretations of reality. One could postulate that these concepts of belief formation are also true for in-service teachers.

Beliefs are not only individual, they also “foster schools of thought” (Pajares, 1992, p. 312). These schools of thought form the belief structures of systems – including the educational system. These unspoken codes creaked the invisible pressure teachers feel to “conform to a picture of the perfect teacher [that] lies at the root of much self-induced stress” (Larrivee, 2012, p. 100). The characteristics of the archetypes come from these unspoken codes and are embedded in what teachers understand to be ideal teaching.
This is problematic for dealing with stress if these codes create irrational beliefs about teaching. Irrational beliefs creates stress because they are unrealistic an often untrue expectations that teachers hold as irrefutable and central to their roles. Larrivee (2012) gives examples of some of these beliefs and these beliefs are also echoed in the work of Maag (2008): I must have constant approval, events in the classroom should always go the way I want, there should be no frustration at school, I should always be in control of class at all times. These irrational beliefs are seen throughout some of the shadow side of the archetypes, specifically in the Stickler and Relentless Warrior.

People are reluctant to change their beliefs because beliefs form our sense of self (Pajares, 1992) and examining that can be threatening. Recognizing this, I developed the archetype workshop with concepts of inner-play, imagination and a holistic reflective approach to be a less threatening way of looking at beliefs. Exploring the empowering beliefs of the archetype can help a teacher create a positive, career-sustainable “psychological construct of self image, supporting a sense of identity and providing a sense of wellbeing and security” (Larrivee, 2012, p. 177).

2.1.4 Solutions for Teacher Stress and Burnout

Most solutions for teacher stress and burnout focus on increasing teacher efficacy (Larrivee 2012; Byrne, 1999; Dworkin, 1987) and emotional coping skills (Ilhan, Hakki & Ender, 2014; Maag, 2008; Larrivee, 2012; Vandenberghe & Huberman, 1999 ). Programs such as the Associates Program described in Hansen, & Wentworth (2002) focus on renewal through professional development, stimulating the intellect, using nurturing pedagogy and rediscovering the passion in teaching that teachers originally came with. Rediscovering one’s passion for teaching does not necessarily prevent future burnout from happening. Unless a teacher changes
their approach to teaching and their beliefs around how they approach teaching and their teacher identity, which is what the Archetype workshop attempts to do, teachers can fall back into the same patterns that caused them stress in the first place.

Do these types of solutions work? Regarding school restructuring and reform based on trying to alleviate teacher burnout Byrne (1999) quotes a study that demonstrates “that despite the best efforts and intentions of those involved in school reform, burnout simply does not disappear” (p. 37). If burnout does not disappear, then what is the solution?

Mindfulness is another solution proposed for teacher stress (Flook, Goldberg, Pinger, Bonus, & Davidson, 2013). Mindfulness could create “a shift in perception and response to stressors” (p. 183) as well as cultivating a sense of observation and practicing self-compassion. Is this enough to be a solution to stress?

In my experience of 10 years of mindfulness meditation practice, it is an effective tool in creating a buffer between oneself and the object of stress, this buffer creates the space for awareness and insight to not be immediately reactive to stress. Mindfulness meditation strips away what is untrue, until we receive the insight of what the root of the problem is. I actually had my nervous breakdown around teaching stress that precipitated my quitting teaching during my third 10-day Vipassana mindfulness meditation retreat in 2004. It’s not that meditation caused my breakdown, it’s that it created that shift in perception, revealing to me that I could not return to the life that I was living or to my teaching situation. Mindfulness works.

So why create the archetypes workshop? Mindfulness takes time to create the insight. I meditated for 2 hours a day for 4 years and it helped me relax and cope with stress, but it wasn’t
until that retreat in 2004 that the major shift happened. It was during the healing work I did to recover that I actually looked at how I was teaching that showed me the ways in which I was creating stress for myself through my beliefs and practices, patterns and habits. I created the archetypes to save teachers the time and trouble of figuring some of the main patterns and habits that create stress in teaching. Why wait for the illumination from meditation or from a breakdown to see empowering ways of approaching teaching, if you can have it pointed out to you from the start? That is the purpose of the archetypes work. The holistic approach of the workshop is to allow teachers a mindful way of interacting with the content, so that the concepts are integrated and not imposed from the outside.

Solutions that increase skills and competencies help teachers deal with emotions in a more healthy way or promote relaxation through meditation help teachers cope with stress. It is not that the solutions suggested do not succeed in reducing teacher stress at all, it is that the solutions commonly employed do not go to the root of the problem. These methods are coping mechanisms. Transformation, on the other had, shifts our world view and can eliminate the problem to being with. Each archetype has a choice of which side, its shadow or empowered aspect, to embody as it engages with the work of teaching. This is a fundamental shift in mindset and approach that can remove the habits and patterns that lead to stress in the first place.

2.2 Literature Review on Archetypes

2.2.1 Archetypes in Teaching

An archetype is a term coined by psychoanalyst Carl Jung. From the realm of the collective unconscious emerged the “fundamental source energy of the human psyche” (Cox, 1968, p. 137). This energy was identified in ‘patterns of behaviour’ (Jacobi, 1959, p. 43). These patterns coalesced into character-forms such as the warrior, the mother, the savior, the divine child, and
many others. Each archetype has a positive and negative manifestation. The negative manifestation is termed the shadow.

The concept of archetypes has been borrowed from Jung and developed in various ways by writers, psychotherapists and others. Joseph Campbell (1972) brought together the idea of Jung’s archetypes with the steps of rites of passage into what he termed the monomyth. A feminist critique of Jung’s archetypes (Perera, 1985) views that they are patterned on a patriarchal and specific class structure within one segment of society and reflect the views of their context. This does not dismiss the power of archetypes, so long as one is cognizant of the context one is working in. For example, the archetype of warrior is a structure seen in almost all cultures, though the patterns of behaviour, imagery in the subconscious will be informed by the values and history of the particular culture a person comes from. So while archetypes as a defined concept were coined by Jung, their fluid nature transcends any one particular definition.

This fluidity has allowed archetypes to be created in various forms for various purposes. The archetypes which I created for this project were designed from my experiences, education and observation of teaching and teachers over 10 years. I am influenced by the Jungian forms, but I do not strictly adhere to them as I am creating archetypes based on the context of teaching only.

Archetype work has great transformation potential. Since these images and behaviours sit in our unconscious, accessing these ideas through holistic meditative means, “unlocks the gate to the roots and sources of our psychic life (Jacobi, 1959, p. 67) where insights into our complexes, problems and solutions can be found.
With respect to teaching, Dobson (2009), Mayes (1999, 2001, 2002a, 2002b; 2003, 2005a, 2005b), Pomson (2002), Reinsmith (1994), Sugrue (2004), Tanverdi, Ulusoy & Cevirme (2009), Ylimaki (2006) all use various archetypal forms as a basis for reflecting on teacher roles and experiences. Dobson (2009) explores power, curriculum development and student/teacher relations from the perspectives of these archetypes: lover, magician, warrior, royal. Sugrue (2004) explores the changing landscape of Irish education by examining Irish school culture, which he sees as rooted in the archetype of the master/mistress. Reinsmith (1994) creates a continuum of several archetypal forms that serve to bring the teacher back into the mode of student in order to engage students in learning. Ylimaki (2006) explores the teacher as visionary. Tanverdi, Ulusoy & Cevirme (2009) survey the use of punishment and reward in teaching. Pomson (2002) analyses the model of the rebbe in the classroom. Clifford Mayes has written extensively about archetypes and outlines several common forms including the mother, the taskmaster, hero, spirit, shaman, prophet among others. Archetypes are easily recognizable in our daily lives even if we don’t ascribe the term to what we experience. They are simply roles we play.

Teacher evaluation is usually assessed through competencies and not the more affective dimensions teachers’ work. These competencies are “not intended to recognize, affirm or deal with the more complex nature of teachers; socially situation and negotiated identities” (O’Connor, 2008, p. 119). The various influences on teacher identity “all have historical, social and cultural roots and contexts which transmit belief systems and perpetuate social and organizational structures. So, the unique sense of self, which every teacher has, is socially grounded” (Nias, 1996, p.29). Archetypes are one way that these identities and their inherent beliefs can be addressed. Archetypes are the collective unconscious “made up of impersonal,
Archetypal symbolism is universal in overarching human themes, if not in the cultural specifics of the stories (Moon & Elder, 1991). Archetypes inform the individual psyche as well as the culture of teaching (Mayes, 1999, 2003, 2005a, 2005b). This is what makes them such a powerful tool in teacher development for inquiry into the root causes and solutions of stress and burnout.

The archetypal forms in this study were created to embody many of the beliefs and common practices that are found in teaching. Each archetype has its persona as well as its shadow. The shadow is what the persona denies or terms as negative. Working with the shadow allows us to dig deep into the assumptions and beliefs we hold to be true. This can be difficult and bring up negative emotions. For example, caring teachers with martyr energy is seen as what teachers are supposed to do. This is termed the persona. However, being caring but having stronger boundaries with regards to teacher emotional output and time investment is seen as a threat to the persona and so it is termed the shadow. The guilt that teachers report feeling tips off that the shadow is being engaged. It is only by going into this shadow that we can learn of its wisdom (the need to have boundaries vs. depleting oneself though martyrdom) and then transform our own beliefs and actions.

In my archetype typology, what I term the shadow is actually the common expression of the particular archetype in teaching. And what the culture of teaching might term the shadow, in my typology, I have titled it the empowered aspect (or persona). I have done this to provide a model that reverses habits, beliefs and practices that promote burnout and challenges teachers to see if their own teaching habits promote stress and burnout in their teaching, or promoted an empowered, sustaining way of working. As Mayes (2005b) states, “if we as teachers persist in
denying and concealing our limitations, those limitations will wind up being folded into our personal shadow” (p. 336). I wanted to bring the true shadow energies in teaching to the forefront, to stop allowing them to masquerade as the healthy persona, and provoke thought and reflection in teachers about their approaches to their work. In fact Mayes (2003) has written that “archetypal reflectivity can come to the rescue and save the teacher psychic pain by granting psychic insight” (p. 108). It is this insight that is central to if and how the archetypes workshop impacts teachers’ views on how they work.

Do these archetypal forms actually impact people’s behaviour? Nelson (2007) writes that, “People are naturally drawn to an archetype whose energy pattern closely approximates their own. It is sad that humans live in front of an archetype, one that drives and motivates behaviour (p. 241). Pomson (2002) reviews research (Cole & Knowles, 1994; Holt-Reynolds, 1992) the shows that “culturally embedded archetypes, inherited images and traditions of teaching powerfully shape the ways in which teachers conceive of their work and lives, their roles and responsibilities.” (p. 23). Teachers’ altruistic visions “are probably powered by archetypal energy, seeing themselves (perhaps consciously, but usually unconsciously) as heroes/heroines on a road of archetypal trials” (Mayes 2001, p. 486).

The work on teachers and archetypes centers of the usefulness of archetypes for maximizing teacher reflectivity in terms of pedagogy and student learning by allowing a teacher to be reflective in the transpersonal realm and integrate spirituality into their teaching and relating to students. My work takes the idea of archetypes out of pedagogy and into teacher development. The empowered aspect of the archetype gives teachers the beliefs and behaviours that promote sustainability, emotional sobriety and manageable boundaries into the practice of teaching. The teacher isn’t required to integrate anything spiritual or holistic into their pedagogy as the focus is
solely for the development of the teacher. Preventing burnout should be considered a vital component of teacher development if teacher retention is a concern. Teacher renewal has to focus on the teacher as person, not just as worker of the education system. “Offering many rich possibilities for personal and professional growth and refreshment, archetypal reflectivity is a powerful tools for teacher renewal” (Mayes 2002b, p. 714).

2.2.2 The Mother – Martyr and Grounded

Kids. That’s teacher lingo for student. Mothering and teaching are two different things, but the line between them can easily be blurred. Women and mothering are often paired as natural complements but this is problematic when a patriarchal and sexist model of femininity narrowly defines the feminine within the confines of mothering. Do we use the term kids to refer to student because it is a colloquialism for students or is it because there is an expectation for teachers to behave in a mothering way towards their charges? The unquestioned use of this word to refer to students may seem innocuous but it creates a mindset that parallels mothering and teaching. That creates problems.

The “mother mandate” (Woods & Carlyle, 2002) is deeply ingrained in the culture of teaching (Grumet, 1981; Maher, 1999; Mayes, 2002a; Miller, 1996; Nias 1996, 1997, 2002; Tsouluhas, 2005; Woods & Carlyle, 2002; Zhang, 2007) The archetype of mother as teacher is rooted in the social construction of teacher roles in the 1800s. “This image of the ideal woman and the ideal mother were extended into the training and work of the ideal teacher” (Grumet, 1981, p. 173) and until today has a tight hold on the culture of teaching.
The ideal of sexist femininity is entrenched in the unspoken cultural, social and academic norms that govern schooling. Grumet (1981) writes in her historical analysis of the feminization of teaching:

“Accordingly, Catharine Beecher argued for placing educational responsibility in the hands of women, maintain their submissiveness and elevating feminine self-sacrifice, purity and domesticity into moral superiority. The good daughter had found a way to advance women into the public sphere without disturbing the dominancy of the patriarchal authority” (p. 171).

The teacher as the good daughter upheld the values of the martyr mother.

The concept of the martyr mother, then is not seen as a negative, because it us upheld as the norm and ideal. “Teachers tend to regard themselves as martyrs”, (Farber & Wechsler, 1991, p. 207) and further teaching enshrines “an occupational rite de passage which equates the establishment of competence with suffering”(Nias, 2002, p. 15). The psychology of the martyr mother is difficult to change because “this mother will not let her children go because, possessed and inflated by her role as matriarch, she fears emotional and spiritual death if they leave her” (Mayes, 2002a p.46). It is difficult to uproot what is normalized.

A manifestation of the martyr archetype is the guilt put on teachers to negate their own wellbeing, time management and personal boundaries for the good of their students is symptomatic of the mother-concept in education. Grumet (1981) stated, “The education for this cult of motherhood required the mastery of self-denial” (p. 172). The result is often compassion fatigue, a syndrome common amongst the caring professions, where emotional distress grows out
of over-caring. Since caring is generally seen as a good thing, there is a taboo-like resistance against voicing this type of burnout.

“The cult of maternal nurturance prohibited those who stayed behind the desk from confessing their rage, frustration and disappointment to each other. The moralistic and impossible demand that women control, without expression anger or aggression, children who were resisting a tightly repressive and tedious regime encouraged teachers to confuse the logical consequences of these harsh conditions for the failure of their own discipline, intelligence and inspiration” (Grumet, 1981, p. 179).

Is this still relevant today? “From those early days of industrialization when the first women took a day at school or summer school session to their majority in the teaching corps today, women teachers have been weighted down by this attribution of passivity and self-abnegation” (Grumet, 1981, p. 174). These mothering values have been internalized in the teacher profession (Nias, 1997, p. 14). Many of the descriptors in the shadow of the mother archetype are still associated with what ‘good’ women do. The behaviour of sexist femininity are often labeled as co-dependent. Women are criticized for being co-dependent as a pathology, yet these are the very societal expectations placed on women that define them as good and valuable (Bebko & Krestan, 1990) and that creates deep internal conflict and stress.

Sexist norms of femininity undermine the teacher’s ability to care for herself and care for others. To be the long suffering woman stripped of agency or feeling compelled to uphold the code of goodness as presented in being loving in a mothering way is emotionally and mentally exhausting and crushing. The problem for “the teacher…who is possessed by the shadow Mother is simply that it is exhausting! Nurturing is hard—even appropriate nurturing. Dysfunctional
nurturing depletes” (Mayes, 2002a, p. 47). The manifestation of this is expressed in high burnout rates amongst teachers. Enforced passivity and self-abnegation depletes the self of vitality. In facilitating these shadow mother archetype dynamics the teacher is actually facilitating her own burnout.

The martyr mother in teaching de-professionalizes the role of the teacher because it puts primary focus on the caregiving role of the teacher rather than that of the skilled educator. Nias (1997) has argued that teaching would improve if caring were not held up as a preeminent value in teaching. This does not mean that teaching should not or does not have an ‘ethic of care’ embedded as a core practice (Noddings, 1984), but given the societal patriarchal foundation of teaching it would be useful to examine what we mean by “care”.

Some of the characteristics of the empowered mother, in traditional Jungian typography would be termed the “terrible mother”. The patriarchal paradigm has defined appropriate behaviour for women. Nouns such as passive, obedient, selfless, accommodating, self-denying are some of the patriarchal norms through which women have been socialized. This denies other aspects of femininity that are strong, assertive, vocal, independent, instinctual and focused on self-determination, not just being defined through service to others. For healthy empowered wholeness, women have reclaimed, and need to continue to reclaim “and redeem what the patriarchy has often seen only as a dangerous threat and called the terrible mother, dragon or witch” (Perera, 1985, p. 139). For teachers to claim the empowered mother, they have to claim the exiled aspects of femininity and reintegrate them to redefine what it means to mother, to nurture and to care outside of the strictures of the patriarchal paradigm.
Without interrogating the sociocultural implications of values such as caring and women’s work and mothering, the conflation of mothering and teaching creates the optics

“as if the flexibility, the knowledge and the judgment required to carry out the job (of teaching) were the outcome of instinctive, innate capacities in women, rather than the result of though, planning, experience discussion with others, and – very importantly – a collection of competencies which must be capable of developing productively over time” (Miller, 1996, p. 106).

When this gets ingrained in the mentality of the culture of teaching, it is easy for teachers to devalue themselves and their work. I believe that this is one of the root causes of poor efficacy in teaching that can lead to low self-esteem.

The concept of the ideal teacher is a discourse shaped by the history, people and institutions of teaching. As teacher centers around students who are children service and so the ethic of care plays a huge role in the psyche of teachers. The discourse of service is constructed around both the giving of self and some forms of self denial (Biklen, 1995, p. 183). Self denial does not have to end in self-abnegation and giving of self does not need to end in depletion. When Nias (1997) writes that “teachers should care less”, she doesn’t mean they shouldn’t care; she means that when the ethic of care through a patriarchal lens is over-emphasized, there is a tendency for some teachers to care to the point that the other aspects of teaching (skills based aspects and academics) are neglected. I would argue it’s not that teachers should care less, but they should re-orient what it means to care and re-evaluate appropriate ways for the ethic of care to be expressed in the professional domain of the classroom. The patriarchal paradigm that has historically influenced the discourse of teaching defines service and care through a lens that does
not give full expression to the psychic space of women: to express not just nurturing, serving, and sacrifice, but also strength, structure and agency. To change the discourse of the ideal teacher, we need to interrogate the assumed norms in teaching that are bred from that historical paradigm.

To prevent burnout, teachers need to be un-schooled from these ingrained ideas of what teaching looks like. If resilience is defined as being able to brush it off, and put a smile on your face and jump right back into that shadow-mother archetype model day after day they we are placing teachers in a trap. Real resilience has to be transformative. Transforming our definitions of what is a good ethic of care in teaching allows us to be resilient and pursue our goals as teachers. When we are working from a healthy model, not based in debilitating, sexist assumptions about how to demonstrate care, the mother archetype is transformed from the martyr to the empowered mother.

How we define caring behaviour is a clear way to differentiate between the martyr mother and the true function of *in loco parentis* – where the point is to take on some, but not all roles of parenting for children in your care. The good enough mother is described in Mayes (2002a) as the mother who functions outside of the martyr paradigm. Clear boundaries between home and school are essential. The primary responsibility within school is to provide an emotionally safe environment for students to fulfill their academic purpose. It is not to become the pseudo-parent. Firm boundaries, honest expression, mediated conflict, not being nice at all costs, understanding that enabling negative behaviour is not loving, saying no and allowing the recipient of that no to learn to handle their disappointment. All of these are also within the healthy ethic of care.
Taking on the role of martyr mother can lead to the psychological phenomenon of transference. In psychology, transference occurs when the client projects onto the therapist wounded concepts from their childhood. Countertransference is when the client’s wounds trigger latent wounds in the therapist. This triggering is emotionally distressing and so psychologists are trained to understand this phenomenon and to be aware of it and counter it in work with clients. Not so in teaching. When teachers act from the influence of the mother martyr archetype, transference is not seen as a problem, but as a natural and good aspect of teaching. This is detrimental to teachers’ (and students’) mental wellbeing. Understanding the phenomenon of transference would help teachers take student reactions less personally and release needless self-blame (Mayes, 2002a). The bond of mother and child is not the same a bond of teacher and student; to teach the way we parent (or the way we were parented) is to set up the teacher for problems in maintaining boundaries, professional objectivity, preventing favoritism, and neglecting academics for emotional intervention. A healthy model of mothering for teaching would understand the phenomenon of transference as it is understood in psychology and be approached with the same clinical dispassion when it shows up in the classroom.

The love for children and concern for their growth and development needs to look different in mothering and in teaching. We cannot be there for our students if we are not there for ourselves. You cannot give from emptiness. To give from emptiness is a dysfunctional understanding of sacrifice as proof of commitment is embodied in the martyr mother.

“Commitment is seen as the quality which separates the caring or dedicated from those who are not concerned about the children, who put their own comfort first. It is also the characteristic which divides those who take the job seriously from those who don’t” (Nias, 2002, p. 30).
If the culture of teaching could re-define commitment we would see that when caring leaves us exhausted we serve neither ourselves nor out students. When we engage in empowered self-care, when we transform our understanding of what it looks like to be loving towards others we can come to an understanding of care that would energize the empowered aspect of the mother archetype.

2.2.3 The Servant – Rescuer and Helper

The servant’s aim is to serve. A synonym for serve is help, and it is the ethic of help that drives the servant. The teacher as “servant leader” (Bowman, 2005; Herman & Marlowe, 2005) is answering the call of a need to serve their school community. Unfortunately “most teachers are socialized into a service ethic that encourages them to ignore their own needs” (Nias, 1999, p.230).

The servant is an archetype that could easily be constructed of a combination of the mother, sage and the hero, and indeed some of the characteristics do overlap, but there are distinctions I’ve made. The mother embodies the ethic of parental nurturance. While the servant has the desire to help it does not have the parental emotional energy embodied in the mother archetype. The help of the servant is leadership in an ethic of “humility, honesty, trust, empathy, healing community and service” (Bowman, 2005, p. 257) But it’s shadow can have “teachers caught in a trap fashioned by their own perception of this time period: their view of public service work such as teaching as an essentially selfless enterprise” (Farber & Wechsler, 1991, p.130). While these characteristics could also be ascribed to the hero, the difference is that the hero embodies a warrior-like determination to catalyze creative or social change while helping students. The servant’s focus is on the students, and not necessarily social transformation.
As archetypes are in the liminal realm they do not have clearly delineated boundaries; their characteristics can integrate into another archetypal form. Herman & Marlowe (2005) suggest how enacting Servant leadership could remedy the burnout that comes from the clash between teachers’ ideas about authority and dealing with oppositional students. They state a “shift from a classroom mindset, where adults stress obedience to authority, to a community mindset, where leaders stress helping others” (p. 175) could facilitate this. In this way we can also see how the embodying the servant-leader archetype can potentially shift the stickler in the classroom into a more sage-like embodiment.

The servant can enter the shadow realm when taking on rescuer energy. Rescuing makes the assumption that who you are serving has no agency. This isn’t a very empowering view to take of teaching students.

“While teachers can be instruments for wondrous change in students, they can also become to invested in the role of ‘saviour’. In other words they become too reliant on evidence of change to validate and elevate their sense of self esteem and professional efficacy” (Tsouluhas, 2005, p.112).

The servant can also slip into the shadow if it takes on the energy of the martyr. The robust work ethic indicated in the “self-inflicted accountability in the service of others” (Bowman, 2005, p. 257) could easily slip into self-martyring work habits.

A healthy sense of service can repair some of the rifts between the emotionality and technical requirements of teaching. In Hebson, Earnshaw & Marchington (2007), teachers had difficulty because their identities were “based solely around philanthropic emotional work in teaching
means teachers are unlikely to be able to marry the technical and emotional aspects of their work that is central to good performance in the standards agenda” (p. 692). By looking to the example of the servant leader this seeming chasm could be reconciled. In the teaching style of the servant leader, the processes of empathy and healing in teaching do not have to be separated from “outer organizational effects” (Bowman, 2005, p. 257).

2.2.4 The Instructor – Stickler and Sage

Although there are many dimensions to being a teacher and teaching it is the nitty-gritty details of life in the classroom that occupies much of a teacher’s workday. How teachers use their classroom space, how it’s managed, how the workload is carried out have concrete impacts and consequences on a teachers’ (and students’) lived school experience. The Stickler aspect of this managerial archetype is born out of a view of education that espouses top-down control and authoritarianism, while the Sage aspect of the archetype emerges from a space of authoritative leadership and inclusivity of the classroom community.

The idea that teacher should always be in control is born out of the philosophy of education modeled on the Prussian military in early models of education. This together with the scientification of curriculum making practices of Franklin Bobbit and W. W. Charters (Kliebard, 1975) contributed to a Spartan-styled approach which Connell (1996) calls the masculinizing practices of traditionalist schooling of students being controlled by teachers. In its worst manifestation the Stickler is emblematic of the stern schoolmaster who lives by the code of never smile before Christmas, commandeering over students seated in rows, heads bent over their books in silence.
The Stickler may be trying to create a sense of order to organize the potential chaos of classroom life and control the experience of stress, but to carry out the Stickler’s orders fully is to become isolated, unconnected, unsupported. This can create a pressurizing type of tunnel-vision. Geving (2007) notes that “teachers may perceive a lack of student effort as stressful because teachers often base their feelings of self-efficacy on how much their students learn and how academically successful their students are” (p. 683). Without reaching out to outside support and trapped in the idea that they must control all outcomes, the Stickler carries all the pressure on their own shoulders. The sage can emerge when we break down the “isolation of classrooms that reinforces the false assumptions of individual teacher blame and responsibility … Teachers need to be supported and respected rather than ignored or solely blamed for the conditions of their work” (Maher, 1999, p. 57).

The control, perfectionism and guilt instilled by the sticker’s principles can contribute to burnout. The essence of this manifestation is to maintain control. Truch (1980) cites a study where teachers “feel most satisfied with areas they feel they can control” (p. 42). Nias (2002) writes that “of the characteristics of control, responsibility and concern … Most [teachers] talked of the personal satisfaction they derived from being able to control and influence children and other adults” (p. 187). This control can also manifest as perfectionism: the well-meaning effort done in a mindset of berating the self, anxiousness and fearfulness, all of which contributes to stress.

The Stickler thrives in institutions that support the status quo over innovation, change and challenge. In Cohn & Kottcamp (1993), Lortie’s work is used to demonstrate that certain attractors of the job for teachers “tend to produce teachers who value the status quo” (p. 21). Further, the article concludes, “the structure of the occupation has functioned to attract those who
tend to be comfortable with these limitations [of the structure], rather than those who would seek to change them” (p. 23). Further, “power, control, passivity, rote memorizing and obedience are major elements of this teaching as a means of indoctrination for conformity” (Sugrue, 2004 p. 587). The stickler sometimes manifests not as a person, but as the constraints of the system within which the person has to work.

Rather than teaching as a mind-opening journey, the focus of teaching as prefabricated instruction with little autonomy for teachers (known as intensification) is a manifestation of the stickler. “The institutional demands on the formal school generally preclude the ‘human development’ goals of cognitive and learning psychology” (Farrell, 2007, p.205). Schools are generally not set up to be spaces of human wellness, but of human learning that is usually very task and test oriented.

“Because the school and the society in general value actions which lead to a result, there seems to be a need for justification when the teachers engage in “being” … there is an element of guilt as they are not achieving, and thereby not abiding the cultural norm of being efficient” (Nilsson, Ejlertsson, Andersson, & Blomqvist, 2015, p. 580).

How can the sage emerge from this educational setting?

“Teacher” is simply one filter through which the “self” is expressed. When teacher development focuses on the teacher as a teacher and ignores much of what the person who is the teacher brings to the table, the Sage fades into the background. The sage manifests when the teacher’s individual soul is inspired to create, innovate and self-express. The soul gives vision and direction to life. Various holistic theorists past and present, such a Maria Montessori,
Rudolph Steiner and Jack Miller (1994) use the ideas of holistic education in curriculum design to bring out the sage archetype from within the teacher.

People need expression, creativity and stimulation to be healthy mentally and emotionally. In his book, *The Element*, Ken Robinson (2009) laments how the structure of the school system stifles creativity and passion. His book is replete with passages of students who drop out of school because of the lack of opportunity to engage with creativity – a lack of *the element*. I have always wondered, if this is how students feel in school – what about the teachers? How many of them are aching to leave a space that doesn’t nurture them?

The element is not likely to be generated by professional development that simply trains teachers in learning to be better instructors of literacy, numeracy, pedagogy, curriculum design and other teaching skills. The mechanical function of this type of professional development is one manifestation of the Stickler. There are various approaches to professional development that support ideas such as summer institutes, professional learning circles, action research, peer observation and curriculum development which are outlined to be substantially beyond the superficial events unrelated to teacher concerns (Feiman-Nemser, 2001) that conventional professional development sessions tend to address. These ideas seem exciting on the surface, but what is the mindset that this professional development is formulated in? Teachers cannot simply become masters of facilitating second-hand knowledge.

The stickler has a historical rootedness in the culture of public schooling, but from the time of the reconceptualists (Grumet, 1989) teaching has been reclaiming the sage.
“It has become very clear over the last several decades that the best classrooms are those in which teachers are not authoritarian taskmasters who presume to know all the answers, but rather work as authoritative facilitators who pose questions and suggest directions but who are also *co-learners* with their students” (Mayes, 2003, p. 113)

To continue to engage in holistic, contemplative practices in curriculum design and pedagogy is a way to bring forth the sage.

2.2.5 **The Hero – Relentless Warrior and Valiant Warrior**

The hero champions a cause. Usually the hero has a special passion that she shares through teaching. The hero archetype maybe one of the most common reasons people go into teaching: to make a difference. These teachers may be highly creative, enchanting students through the arts, they may be motivational sports coaches and PE teachers, they may feel called to serve a specific community of students, or to promote one aspect of education that is close to their heart, such as literacy, and most commonly they are social justice advocates. There is a vigorous, on-fire aspect to the hero who is convinced that with their ideals expressed through teaching they can change the world.

The hero archetype is firmly rooted popular narratives of teaching (Dobson, 2009; Farber & Wechsler, 1991; Galman, 2009; Hansen & Wentworth, 2002; Hargreaves & Lo, 2000; Mayes 1999, 2002b, 2003; Nias, 2002; Sutherland, Howard, & Markauskaite, 2010; Wong & Fernández, 2008). “Since the start of mass schooling and with its spread across the world, public education has been repeatedly burdened with the expectation that it can save society” (Hargreaves & Lo, 2000, p. 168). This is a both a blessing and a curse: a blessing because of the
potential for transformation of students, self and society; a curse because the shadow hero, the relentless warrior, acts is grounded in unrealistic expectations that can lead to burnout.

The shadow of the hero informs our culture of workaholicism. There is glamour in heroism. Who can fault someone for being hardworking, industrious, and pursuing success? The relentless warrior, however, cannot distinguish between industrious productivity, hard work leading to success and being a workaholic and anything less than their standard of work is considered “slacking”. The hero is also attractive to the ego. It attracts adulation and adoration. There is a “narcissistic aspect of burnout ‘I must do it because no one else knows how or cares to help’ ” (Farber & Wechsler, 1991, p. 93) that feeds this negative aspect. This can feed the needs for approval and love of a people pleaser or to fulfill unmet needs. When that is the primary motivation of the hero, the hero will work harder and harder to achieve what it thinks will bring approval – of students, of parents or principals and higher ups. By understanding teaching less in terms of shadow heroics and in terms of our productivity, excellence and meeting goals we see that success in teaching takes more than relentless work. It requires strategy, allocation of resources (including the resources of your own physical and mental wellbeing), and objective assessment.

Contrary to some of the reporting on teacher burnout that a lack of efficacy and training causes teachers to have diminished self esteem and then burn out, Chang (2009) points out that “the best and most idealistic workers would be prone to burnout because they are dedicated to their work and end up doing too much in support of their ideals” (p. 200). The relentless warrior takes on a “commitment to teaching in crusading terms… governed by high, though largely self-imposed, expectations” (Nias, 2002, p. 30). The relentless warrior’s, drive to fulfill a mission can result in “battle fatigue” (Hansen & Wentworth, 2002, p. 17).
Nowhere is the relentless warrior more obvious than in the depiction of the heroic teacher in Hollywood movies who sacrifices everything to pull students out of apparent tragedy, but who we never see doing the actual grunt work of teaching. We idealize this but we never ask what the emotional and personal cost is to the teacher. As Farber & Wechsler (1991) point out these films show “dedicated teachers able to make up for years of educational failure, as well as for years of economic deprivation, parental oversight and racism” (p. 179). Although this can be seen as unrealistic depiction of what teachers can do,

“This teacher archetype in popular culture (due largely to the mass of teacher images that exist in literature, popular fiction, film and television) has significant power in defining the role and expectations of teachers for both teachers and the community” (Sutherland, et al 2010, p. 464.)

When schools cannot meet these unrealistic expectations, according to Hansen & Wentworth (2002) people believe school are failing and “teachers unfairly bear the incredible majority of the responsibilities and in some regards, blame” (p.16). This narrative creates unrealistic images of what real school life is in the eyes of the public. It sets up the expectations that this is what good teachers do. It reproduces the shadow hero narrative of how social change happens. It disconnects the experiences of individual students from the larger social context. It breeds isolation and hopelessness, stress and burnout.

It is this hero that is the “archetypal dimension to Critical Theory's vision of the teacher as political change agent” (Mayes, 1999, p.12) and that hero is set up to burnout within the system. The dissonance between the idealism of the teacher and the ‘real’ world can be a source of stress. No matter what you accomplish, there is always more to do. No matter how safe a learning
environment you can create you can’t be completely buffered from the impact of the outside world. The socio-cultural-economic issues and injustices facing students, the school or the community are always right there in the classroom. Sometimes they are hidden, sometimes they are overt, but they are always there.

“Teacher education faculty stories embedded with progressive ideology may valorize teaching as desirable, theoretically grounded, intellectual work wherein an agentive commitment to social justice and action are possible, positive and rewarded. Meanwhile a competing story is told by the bureaucratic structure and practices of many schools of education and their partner schools and district” (Galman, 2009, p. 47).

This is not to say that the hero archetype is doomed to fail, only that pre-service teachers should be prepared for the political reality of school life they will be entering into to lessen the impact of that dissonance.

There is also the emotional toll of activist work that work that teachers are not adequately prepared to deal with. There is stress in working in school spaces where the discourse of hegemonic dominance permeates almost every aspect of teaching and learning. bell hooks (1994) writes that experiencing racism and other social injustice, even when resisting that injustice, creates “low self-esteem, intensified nihilism and despair, repressed rage and violence that destroys physical and psychological well-being” (p. 6). The impact of psychological terrorism that oppressive systems perpetuate is deep seated. Teachers from oppressed groups are at risk for additionally experiencing emotional triggering of their own experiences with oppression. If these wounds are not healed (by the teacher reaching out for support to appropriate professionals) they
will exhaust the hero at an even faster rate. In addition to this, working to change the dominant paradigm can put the teacher at odds with more conservative colleagues. Wong & Fernández (2008) recount the “stress and hostility” faced by teachers who do social justice work. Wong & Fernández recommend journaling, mentoring, connecting to allies and celebrating “small victories rather than becoming overwhelmed by the big picture or the constant state of inequity around the world” (p.12) to counteract some of this hostility. These are sound strategies for the hero to remain balanced and motivated.

One of the fallacies of the hero is that they ‘do it alone’- this sets up the hero for both burnout and failure in their mission. Schwartz (2009) explains how this is a problematic narrative. In a cultural context of individualism it is common to hold up a figure head that not only represents the cause but takes on the mythology of the cause. The problem is that the person’s human failings and frailties are not talked about. Idealizing this hero figure minimizes the grassroots swell of everyday people, their actions, sacrifices and contributions that actually created the social movement. When heroes of social change are presented through this paradigm, then teachers who work through the hero archetype can understand their work through the same lens and take on the work of change without accessing the support of colleagues, community, and like-minded people to be part of the cause. In reality most heroes do not act alone. Social justice work cannot be done alone – it’s the antithesis of what social change means. It cannot be done in isolation.

This solo narrative of the hero teacher is rooted in a racist colonial narrative. It is expressed through the ‘lady bountiful’ (Meiners, 2002) role who is charged with saving at risk students (p. 88) When not grounded in critical theory, Lady bountiful takes up on herself personal responsibility for what is in fact a dominant social paradigm that requires underlying social
change and so sets herself up for failure. More problematically, “the persistence of this Lady-icon contributes to a climate that makes addressing white supremacy, heteronormativity and class issues in teacher education difficult, if not impossible” (p. 90). When teachers take on this hero narrative they are missing the critical theory aspect of social change and so do not challenge the dominant paradigm that creates the social conditions that students live within. If it takes a village to raise a child, the shadow hero makes the village irrelevant. Since the hero can do so little on their own, maintaining the myth of this kind of hero enables the dominant culture to squelch any significant movement for change burning out the hero in the process.

But the empowered hero is not fooled. The valiant warrior has been referred to as a ‘visionary’ who “consider demands and positive characteristics of their current reality” (Ylimaki, 2006, p. 649). Grounding the hero’s ambitions in sound critical theory can be useful. hooks (1992) reminds us that “theory is not inherently healing, liberatory, or revolutionary. It fulfills this function only when we ask that it do so and direct our theorizing towards this end” (p. 2). Training teachers to ground their activism in theory rather than an idealised image of the relentless warrior could create the healing hooks describes rather than frustration and burnout.

2.2.6 The Core Self – In Exile and the Return

Are teachers’ souls cared for in teaching, or are teachers seen as a dispensable tool in the mechanism of the system? If teachers souls were truly valued in education there would be less emphasis placed on the values of emotional sacrifice through overwork, there would be an understanding of the teacher as an individual as separate from her students. Rather than allegiance to disempowered views of what good teaching and learning looks like, the goals of teaching with intelligence, love and energy could spring from a connection to the regenerative ground of the spiritual core self.
What is the core self? My understanding of the core self comes from the spiritual literature on the inner spiritual self of the inner sacred masculine and feminine (Estes, 1994; Leonard, 1994; Kent, 2011; Noble, 1991; Starhawk, 1987). The core self is the spiritual creative essence of the universal self: full of zest and joy, in tune with the many faces and dimensions of a person’s life, it is not afraid of the shadow, of ugliness and death because it understands its own beauty in the natural cycle of life, it uses its instincts and intuition as guide to knowing itself and not the over-rational intellectualism that denies self-knowledge, it knows its own natural rhythms, desires and needs, it is not domesticated by social constraints that restrict its authentic expression.

Such a core self is illuminated, able to light the way for others. But even this radiance can be negated and cast into the shadow. There is a quote that finds it’s way on a lot of teacher appreciation paraphernalia, it reads: *A good teacher is like a candle; it consumes itself to light the way for others.* If this is a core belief in teaching, then no wonder we literally burn out. That we have inner light that allows us to be inspiring and effective teachers is a fact that should be protected and preserved, not neglected. Negating our needs is a fast way to put out the light of the core self and put it into exile. Restoring the core self is allowing it to return to the ground of our being.

Real needs can only be expressed and met in a space that respects a person’s immanent value. In *Truth or Dare* (Starhawk, 1987) schools are included as institutions of reward-punishment based power-over systems which “erode a person’s value as experienced by the self and viewed by others. … Our value [in systems of punishment] becomes dependent on how closely we conform to the rule; our unique beauty is rendered invisible, worthless” (p. 73). Where immanent value is destroyed so too is our core self. When the core self is alive and well, it is fiercely protective of its habitat and all that nourishes it.
Heart-centered teachers align with their heart-centered values to deliver caring, intelligent, passionate and high quality instruction to students. This is the source from which the ability to perform that kind of work comes. When this source is drained and suppressed, or forced to be suppressed by a dysfunction educational system that overworks and under-supports teachers and them expects them to be complicit in their own disempowerment by aligning with such a system, the result is emotional misalignment and anguish. The “slow steady erosion of the ideals and dreams regarding teaching” (Gavish & Friedman, 2010, p. 146) hurts the core-self of teachers. In such an environment, the heart-centered person (which is really the type of person that teaching requires as well as draws into the profession) is cut off from their source of energy. Cut off from our source we are not at home in ourselves.

When we are overdue for home, our eyes have nothing to sparkle for, our bones are weary…we can no longer focus on who or what we are about…She’s so cross-eyed with tiredness she trudges right on past the place of help and comfort. The dead litter is comprised of ideas, chores and demands that don’t work, have no life and bring no life to her. Such a woman [or man] becomes pale and contentions, more and more uncompromising, yet scattered. Her fuse burns shorter and shorter. Popular culture calls this “burnout” – but it’s more than that, it’s *hambre del alma*, the starving soul (Estes, p. 279).

Recovery from burnout is not an exercise in time management, it is a spiritual discipline of liberation from dysfunction and of empowering and re-aligning of our energy with our inherent worth and values. It is not about bringing our personal life into our work life and finding balance. It is having the courage to cut out dysfunction and assumptions that starve our soul and aligning our actions and thoughts with beliefs that feed our soul.
Parker Palmer says we teach who we are, and it is from there that we find the courage to teach. I agree – but is this inner landscape a space where in the core self is fed or where it is starved? Inner inquiry is not fruitful if the inner landscape is shackled by ideals of what teachers are supposed to do and be, when many of those ideals are at odds with what people need for spiritual wellbeing.

To restore the core for spiritual health we need to know when the core self is injured. To understand what is lost, what has been damaged, shoved down, silenced, forgotten, shamed, scarred, hidden, protected are questions to begin the inquiry (Douglas, 2007) When teachers access this about their personal lives and also about their teaching lives, they breathe life back into the core, coming out of exile and returning to the authentic self.

In the landscape of teaching, the individual core self is often invisible. The key to teacher renewal is the acknowledgement and renewal of the person and the person can’t be renewed if she is not seen. Why is the teacher not seen? It is rooted in a patriarchal context that deems teaching to be women’s work renders the teacher de-valued. This dynamic expresses itself in various ways. In a study of children’s books about school and teachers it was found that teachers were rarely given individualized names.

Does it mean that female teachers - or female caregivers as a whole - are truly so lacking in individuality or force of personality that they do not deserve the recognition that a name indicates? Or does it reflect only a particular perception of females or female caregivers? … what attitude toward female power or powerlessness does this convey for women not even to bear names? (Trousdale, 1992, p. 27)
The emergence of the core self calls all of us to name and claim ourselves. Though student-centered teaching is a solid educational practice, it should not render the teacher invisible. Teachers teach kids and the kid is a large part of why we teach, but we also teach for our own fulfillment, our own professional desires and creative endeavors. The teacher is not just a facilitator of student learning, she is also there for her own learning and contribution. The teacher is more than a worker in service of the goals of education, but an active individual in the art of teaching and education.

What happens when the inner landscape of an educator meets the practices of the institution of education? The core self is creative and radiant and needs to be expressive. The industrial-revolution concept of schooling on which our educational system is modeled silences and restricts the spiritual, creative impulse. Using this model of schooling is “a reproduction of a paradigm that doesn’t work – no wonder ‘creative’ people leave the profession (Glines, 2012, p. 133). This feeling of stuckness is an indication of an injured core-self that has forgotten what it requires to thrive.

“If a woman attempts to be a part of an organization, association or family that neglects to peer into her to see what she is made of, one that fails to ask: what makes this person run? and one that does not put forth effort to challenge and encourage her…then her ability to thrive and create is diminished. (Estes, 1994, p. 226).”

People need expression, creativity and stimulation to be healthy mentally and emotionally. Whether it is to create a way of life, to create a plan, to create a possibility, to create art or a lesson plan or a project – it is a need for overall wellbeing for people to build from the seed of inspiration something of their own expression
The passion teachers come into the profession with comes from the core self. It is the nature of
the system that dulls this passion and leads to exhaustion. We must not allow systemic factors to
dull our birthright to the core self. We must break free of the conditioning that tells us to be
stressed is to be a good teacher – or at least that to be stressed is what being a teacher is.

The core self initiates and inspires, dreams and dances uninhibited. When the core self is
obscured because of our social and personal neglect and we are weary and tired, it comes
galloping through the tired terrain of our psyche and spirit to restore, rejuvenate, and renew us.
Restored, we can reclaim the true power of our wellbeing personally, and then bring this torch of
spiritual knowledge to our lives as teachers and to our students. As teachers, we need not be like
candles that consume themselves, but rather be as guides and keepers of access to the wisdom
core self, who can illuminate our entire landscape if we allow it.

3  Part 3 – The Research

3.1  Methodology

The research and interview questions are based around a workshop I created on teacher
archetypes. My motivation for creating the archetypes workshop was to find a way to create
mental and emotional shifts in teachers understanding of themselves in their environment and
how it relates to stress. Their environment includes not only their teaching situation, but also the
personal environment and the mental-emotional-spiritual space they inhabit. Using archetypal
forms facilitates this. “Focusing attention on a archetype can speed psychological growth by
making the ego more permeable. Archetypal forms can also speed spiritual growth b releasing
unconscious material to allow awareness to merge with the self“ (Nelson, 2007, p. 235). By
seeking to understand the participants process in the deconstruction and construction of
archetypal forms I believe both researcher and participant have their inner-life spaces illuminated with understanding.

The workshop is designed to allow the participant to reflect on their teaching habits and styles, stimulate thinking about the nature of the archetype forms, and allow space for new ways of thinking about teaching to be considered. The workshop is approximately 60 minutes long. The workshop begins with an introduction and setting of expectations of confidentiality and that the intention is for personal reflection, and not that there is any correct way to participate. To have participants get in touch with their emotions about teaching, they complete a check-in reflection based on what they think, feel, say, show and do when they experience teaching stress. This activity is not taken up, but left to be revisited at the end of the workshop. In the next step the participants are given the archetypes characteristics chart. They are to check off the characteristics that they feel apply to their situation, now or in the past. This will be a reference for the participants during the next section of the workshop, which is the presentation. The presentation describes what archetypes are and what their shadow and empowered aspects are. The participants are encouraged to look at their questionnaire and make notes as to how they could imagine shifting some of their shadow habits into empowered habits. Participants examine which archetypal forms they most commonly inhabit. This all sets the stage for the section that creates space for internal transformation.

The next stage in the workshop is a guided meditation. Participants are asked to ‘meet’ their most common archetype in meditation. The guided meditation allows the participants to go within and listen to their inner voice. The meditation asks questions of the motivations and beliefs that the archetype holds and if it can offer any suggestions as to how it could become more empowered. When participants come out of meditation, now having met the inner-
archetype, they revisit the check-in reflection to see how they might feel, think, do, speak from the space of this new archetypal energy. The last phase of the workshop is the integration. This is a guided visualization where the participants are encouraged to visualize the new more empowered archetypal form and to see themselves merging with its energy and visualizing how they will go into their classrooms embodying this new energy.

The participants for this workshop were recruited using a private message invitation on Facebook to teachers on my friend-list, but it was open to associates of teacher-friends as well. It was outlined that it was a reflective and interactive workshop to help teachers deal with stress. I had two participants. Marsha (a pseudonym) is a full-time high school teacher with 18 years experience and is very involved with her school’s extracurricular life. She is in a teacher-leadership position. She has been at the same school, continuously, for her entire career. Alan (a pseudonym) has been a full-time high school teacher for 7 years and an adult education teacher for 3 years. He has taught at 3 different schools. He has taken on some extracurricular involvement, but not any teacher leadership roles (eg: department head or curriculum leader). He took a 2-year sabbatical, after his fourth year of teaching, for career development in a non-teaching related field. Both participants self-identified as having experienced a lot of teaching stress, and were genuinely interested in the potential for transformative work that the workshop had. I also took myself through the reflective aspects of the workshop and used my experiences in the analysis and discussion of the data.

3.2 Organic Inquiry as a Research Approach

Organic inquiry is a research approach that relates to emotional-psycho-spiritual growth of researcher and participant. I chose this approach because it is very closely aligned with content of the workshop. Its transformational aim in the spiritual realm is exactly the type of
transformative work I want to help participant attain. That it focuses on the lenses of self, spirit and service fits with the type of work teachers do and how they attempt to balance their emotional-psycho-spiritual lives between their service to students and their own self-care.

The organic approach legitimizes the experience of body, mind and spirit in research. Stories, in this approach, serve to explore the liminal realm and the inner experiences of participants and researcher. Various methods of data collection include story telling, arts-based work, interviewing, meditation, inner dialogue, and dream work. Feeling and intuiting are considered legitimate inclusions as ways of knowing for conducting and analyzing the research. The validity of the research is measured by the question: Is this useful to me? It has a strong transformational aim as it’s purpose it to create a shift within the researcher’s, participant’s and readers’ predominant personal story through the lenses of self, spirit and service (Clements, 2004).

The 5 aspects of organic inquiry (Braud, 2004; Clements, 2004; Clements, Ettling, Jenett & Shields, 1998) fit with my project in the following ways.

1. Sacred

Research is considered sacred. As I am an energy healer and transformational coach by profession and my workshops encourage participants to engage with their spiritual nature, this supports the vision I have for how I conduct my workshops. As my research will grow out of the archetypes workshops, it will reflect the responsibility of facilitating the viewpoints that emerge from a created sacred space. When I refer to sacred space I am not referring religious conventions, but to the private inner life of the participant. The notion of a sacred space is not
imposed, it is rather implied and it is up to the individual how they work within the inner space created by the reflections and activities of the workshop. The first part of the workshop sets up the expectation for the space through introductions of participant and researcher and the topic and guidelines for interaction. A space safe for sacred inquiry is set up through guidelines such as the right to pass, that personal information does not need to be shared with anyone, everything remains confidential, non-judgmental, nothing is meant to place blame only to become aware of habit we absorb from teaching and how to possibly transform them so we can teach with less stress.

2. Personal

The researcher is not distant and objective in their research, but rather goes deep into their own and participants’ life experiences. This workshop and the creating of the archetype-forms grew out of my own experience with burnout. I interact with the participants as a guide towards their own healing but not as an instructor. As the work is meant to be personal for the participants I designed meditative and visioning activities that allow the participants to access those aspects of themselves. The archetype intake questionnaire given at the beginning of the workshop gives participants the opportunity to self-identify across the spectrum of characteristics that the archetypes embody. The mini-presentation on archetypal forms includes questions about how participants can re-imagine these common archetypes by thinking about how this archetype might behave in the various tasks that a teacher completes throughout the day from the shadow and empowered perspective. I name this part externalizing because there is not meditative internal aspect to this activity, but by interacting with the content in this practical way the participant can begin to see how the archetype behaviours apply to their situation. This way they are coming up with solutions, rather than them being imposed by the workshop leader. The self-
referencing activity (checking into how the participant is feeling, thinking, acting, planning) is intentionally included at the beginning and then at the end of the workshop for participant to check-in with their inner experience in order to bring out this ‘personal’ aspect of the Organic method.

3. Chthonic

The work of the inquiry takes place deep in the psyche of the participants. I use guided visualization and meditative techniques in the workshop to access and bring out the inner dialogue and numinous revelations from the inner-self into the conscious state for the purpose of stimulating transformation in the participants’ perceptions of the archetypes. The purpose of the interview with the shadow side to see if insight can be gained into changing levels of stress or approach to work and stress. To answer the archetype interview questions participants will be asked to look at the one archetype they most feel an affinity with, or with several cross-over characteristics of some archetypes that they most relate to in terms of stress. This can come from any of the archetypes or from the previous activity. This interview with the shadow side archetype is designed to internalize the experience and access this chthonic aspect of the method. The final integrative meditation/visualization also accesses the chthonic aspect. Participants will close with a meditation to integrate this empowered side of their archetype with a visualization that allows them to sense within themselves the embodying of this empowered archetype into the psyche and subconscious.

4. Relational
The stories of the participants and researcher begin to weave together to create an emerging story of inner shifts of self, spirit and service. Because the research begins in a workshop setting, participants will interact with each other’s responses as well as with the researcher. A significant piece of the relational aspect is in the possibilities of responses generated by interacting with the archetypes themselves in the participants’ internal dialogues. The relational aspect can also occur during the post-workshop interview. Relational work often leads to the transformative aspect of this method.

5. Transformative

This collective story when shared creates transformations not only for participant and researcher, but also for readers of the study. To create this transformative aspect I have included spaces for inquiry and reflection so that the possibility of new knowledge and beliefs can come forth. This opening creates a space to allow for participants to transform their perceptions of the archetype forms if they so choose. The final meditation is designed for any new concepts that may have emerged for the participants to be integrated within them. Participants will go back to the self-referencing outline form and fill in the questions again. This time they will answer the questions based on changes they would like to make in their beliefs/actions to be a less-stressed teacher. This allows them to take the information from the workshop and apply it to the same self-reference points. If there is change in their answers or mindsets it will be evident here. Any new beliefs, actions, mindsets or perspectives will illuminate their transformative change.

If transformation occurs, it may not be possible to pinpoint exactly at what point it occurred, but the final meditation allows it to surface and be integrated and anchored as a new perspective within the self. The quality of the unknown of this space allows for the researcher to also be
transformed as she interacts with what is brought forth in this space. The nature of the work, when read by others, can trigger their own shifts in mindset possibly beginning a process of transformation as well. The transformative aspect can also continue to emerge during the interview process. The interview has set questions, but it is to be carried out open-endedly, to allow the conversation to grow organically. This creates possibilities for further change and transformation in both researcher and participants.

After the workshop I interviewed the participants about their experience in the workshop. One participant I interviewed after the workshop and one on a separate occasion briefly after. These interviews lasted approximately one hour and were recorded on my computer’s recording device. These interviews were then transcribed. To analyze the data I looked for points of transformation and realization (a-ha moments) in the participants’ answers as well as points of internal conflict. I also looked to see how each archetypal form was expressed with each participant in both the shadow and empowered aspects.

3.3 Analysis & Discussion

3.3.1 Three Stories of Transformation

3.3.1.1 Marsha

Marsha’s interview was effulgent. I can imagine that her students must adore her. She radiates enthusiasm and love for her job, but she has struggled with many bouts of burnout through her career.

The shadow mother archetype was prominent in Marsha’s early teaching career. “What was said to me by a model mentor teacher was if you are serious and if you are a woman and you are serious about being a good music teacher, you cannot get married and have a family because you
will not be a good mother or wife.” Marsha noted that, “The principal actually said, when you are a parent you can really understand how important a teacher is.” As a single woman with no children, this made her feel devalued as teacher. Her take on is was, “All the psychological stuff that we’re doing to them [the students], guilt or fears like that bad parenting things that teachers used in their classroom all the time. That should be the ethical teacher problem: if you teach like you parent your own children you are crossing a line.”

Marsha had an interesting take on why this archetype is so entrenched. “Our first responses to teachers are as four and five year olds. You can be the professional help, but a child as a friend or a parent would interpret it and that’s how we understand it when we see that … We want them to like us and that we act like a teacher we like the best. We don’t understand where it was coming from.” To shift from the martyr mother to the empowered mother Marsha used the words: “To be firm, affirmative and self-preserved” as an anchor. She said. “I used to be a martyr I think I wanted the kids to like me. But it was really my illness that made me change and realize I could not take that kind of role on anymore. It was too time-intensive.”

Marsha did not relate to being the stickler in the classroom in a personal sense, but in a role she had to play to meet the requirements of the board and ministry of education. “One of the things that I find the most stressful and/or things what I am teaching that I am doing that I don’t believe in. I find that the fact that I have to report on their success and the whole system of this is it inhibitor of student success actually. That they become obsessed with the number so their motivation, their confidence is all wrapped up in this. Like that’s the problem because they are not going to be all successful in the same amount of time, they are not going to be, it’s impossible and nowhere else, the world is a system of the promotion based on how old you are. If you do your job perfectly, you are perpetuating a flawed system.”
When Marsha worked with the Rescuer archetype she had some new insights into her teaching. “I wrote that good help does not have to be timed or emotional empathy. It can be accountability for the student helping them plan quick checklists checking in, so with flexible instructions, improvements goals and you should help as a professional not as a friend or a parent using professional tools, guidance, training and skills.” I believe that Marsha was always using those kinds of accountability tools, but it was exciting to see her reframe their purpose.

Marsha made a really insightful remark noting how the rescuer extends its reach out of the emotional realm and the practical realm of teaching. When discussing marking papers until late at night Marsha remarked, “but what are you trying to rescue out of that paper, it’s like they are digging for evidence, it’s like archeology instead of marking.”

The relentless warrior archetype exerted personal pressure on Marsha. “All of a sudden something happens and then like I am afraid that I am going to be seen as not professional or I am not going to get anything done and I feel restricted because I’m such a warrior I’ve put too much on my plate and I don’t have enough time to get everything finished.”

After the meditation she had an internal shift about her style of leadership. “That’s how I feel, like I’m – and I’m like leading the charge in front of the pack. But I’m literally putting myself in the greatest amount of danger at the front of the pack. Where it doesn’t have to be such an aggressive way of leading. And doesn’t have to be so oppositional; it doesn’t have to be so violent. It’s what I’m trying to achieve is my goals. That was the discussion [with the archetype]. It was like, well, why are we here? Then, well I’m going to help you get all your goals and we don’t need to do it this way. I say that that’s not who I am.”
The transformative nature of this chthonic work both surprised and pleased Marsha (and the researcher too!) “I thought it was really actually interesting how easy it was to get some real answers, like that I would not if I was writing about it. I would be not necessarily afraid, but I might be hesitant to actually write down or to speak. But once I hear them, like within myself, and the internal conversation, it’s easy to acknowledge and like I can see now where that relentless warrior stuff comes from.” Interestingly these insights into the warrior came during the work on the core-self archetype. For Marsha it was a realization that there’s a “really deep seated kind of like self-esteem stuff that is in my teaching”. Given that the core-self is the one that is most closely aligned with our personal feelings, it makes sense that it was this archetype that became the key to shifting beliefs and behaviours within the other archetypes.

3.3.1.2 Alan

Alan seemed tired during his interview and he expressed a lot of frustration with his career even though he has had considerable success in it. He was in the midst of making some decisions about whether or not he should take a sabbatical in the coming year because he felt he was burning out again.

Alan didn’t report having too many expectations place on him in regards to being mothering toward his students, but he said he still felt drawn in to “take care of students” beyond what he later realized was too much. Alan’s main approach to shift away from the negative habits of the shadow mother archetype was to detach from the emotionalism and “allow students to learn from their mistakes”. The shadow mother and the shadow rescuer were closely aligned for Alan.

Where he found it more challenging was with the difficulties of setting boundaries with staff to avoid playing into the role of rescuer where the expectation was that being a rescuer made you a
team player. “I get all the time, I’m not a team player. People say: oh well, you’re not coming up to all the extra meetings that we created for this or that like they don’t have to do with the school itself, but to do with other associations dealing with that in the school. And so then you get labeled as this sort of outsider, rebel, non-conformist, non-team player that’s kept me from getting other positions.” Trying to bring about this change in his teaching is a constant source of stress for Alan.

Overall, Alan’s interview kept returning to the political nature of teaching. He found “needing to be a stickler with students” stressful and related this to the structure of schooling. “I mean the school system needs to be overhauled personally I think. But then the teachers need to build something that’s meaningful for their students. So I could see why some students may not show respect in terms of their learning styles are devalued or the personality is not accepted within a classroom or whatever, that’s another thing.” The lack of control he had over political and systemic structural issues in teaching was a major source of stress.

So it is not surprising that the hero in social justice work was a theme that Alan strongly identified with. “The reason I’m involved in social justice work is because of my own background being marginalized…it was the warrior one, because it had to do with the social justice part. Like because of the systemic nature of discrimination and teaching; that’s the one that’s most difficult to reconcile, both for myself and then when I see it other people”.

For Alan, although stepping in to change systemic abuses takes a personal toll, is “an ethical thing, I have to do it. So – but where do you draw the line, what’s too much, … So you’re constantly either bouncing it or you’re fighting it or you’re challenging it and then if you do
challenge it then people become resistant and then how do you take it up and go further or do you – it’s always an emotional toll that it’s taking. So it’s like it never goes away.”

His shift out of the relentless warrior mode was learned over time: “I’ve learned over time, you know, to pick my battles; to not always hit up every issue that I see. Like I can’t stand up for every teacher, student, everything; that I’ve learned not to do that. But then I still need to protect myself at some students, so it’s kind of – I had to pick and choose which battles I was going to fight. I also had to allow students to take initiative to plan and lead. If we don’t rescue them we acknowledge that they have agency – and that’s positive.”

Both sides of the warrior can have attractive qualities and balancing them continuously is acts both as a stress and a harmonizing effect. Alan says, “I don’t know, for myself like can I work with in a broken system that’s abusive and still protect myself and the answer I keep saying is no, I can’t. But then there is the other part of me it’s like I love being creative. I love being innovative in my subject area. I love bringing about change. I like to see students inspired and being able to find their voice. And like there are all these wonderful things that I love and then there is all these things that I hate and they just – it’s like a Tornado.” Although the interview and workshop process allowed Alan to reflect on these different behaviour and habits he expresses in teaching, he did not feel that he would be able to change much of the stress he is under due to the nature of the school system.

I sensed that he was stressed and not entirely wanting to go too deeply into the issues and his answers were rather short and to the point. But that assumption was wrong. The chthonic nature of this methodology opened a deep realization for Alan. He had been experiencing a lot of anger and depersonalization with regards to his teaching. Upon revisiting the personal-check-in his
insight was that the purpose of those feelings was “in some way to protect me from repeated patterns of abuse” that he was re-living from being present to the experiences of his students. This insight surprised him and he mentioned that he wasn’t expecting that he’d be able to come to any real insight, but that the workshop and interview actually left him feeling changed, more hopeful and less confused about his sources of stress.

3.3.1.3 Joanna (The Researcher)

My first experience with a teaching archetype was when I went to my EAP program to find out what options I had for taking time off because I was burning out. The counselor said, “I can’t ask how old you are, but by the looks of it you look like you could have already had a maternity leave. If you had that it would have given you a nice break from teaching”. I was floored: that was her advice for someone struggling with burnout? How is having a screaming newborn baby and sleeping only two hours a night a great solution for feeling burned out? She was diminishing the exhausting work of motherhood, and I felt like her ridiculous response was shaming me for not doing what good women do: being mothers.

As I researched the literature on mothering in teaching the absurdity of my experience with the counselor fell into place. If mothering is seen as the quintessential and natural female role, then if we emulate it in the classroom we should not be stressed because the sexist assumption is that it should just be natural and easy to be mothering while teaching. The fact that this diminishes both teacher and mothers seems to get lost. Re-thinking how we see mothering in relation to teaching formed the basis of my development of the mother archetype.

I have been developing these archetypes for many years, so most of my experiences with them are related to my teaching in years past. For myself the relentless warrior was just how I was as a
student, always pursuing the A+ and when I started teaching I just continued to pursue
everything the same way. Whether it was social justice advocacy, marking, my career path or my
personal life – I was in relentless pursuit of success and perfection. The archetype of hero was
very much tied to the rescuer. I really believed it was my duty to make a significant difference to
students and to express care for the students by coming to their aid without any consideration as
to how this time commitment would affect my own life.

Although in my teaching I had always perceived myself as the sage I realized in doing these
interviews that I was not very sage-like about my own wellbeing when I was teaching. There was
a lack of discipline in understanding how to manage the demands of the job.

The most insightful and transformative aspect of doing this research for me was when I took my
self through my own workshop. When I originally created these archetypes, I did not include the
core-self archetype. When I went through the workshop I sensed something was missing. At the
core of my experiences with stress was not that I sometimes slipped to the shadow side of the
archetypes; at the core was the feeling that my sense of self was slipping from me as I
experienced the stresses of teaching and their impact on my daily life. Not only was my teacher-
self was separated from my core-self, my teacher-self was in total denial of my core-self.
Teaching really had eaten up so much of my life I was all teacher, and no “me”. This is a
commonplace experience in teaching: that it can take up your life. As a research subject in my
own workshop, I saw that teaching in fact really did take up my life. It took up my life to the
point that it removed me from my life and made teaching the core, and ‘me’ the hobby to do if I
found time for it when I was done with work. Though I had not originally included it in my
archetypes, the core-self manifested in the workshop outline without my realizing it. I was
actually very surprised to see this manifestation of my denied-self showing up in how I was
This demonstrated to me the beauty of the method of Organic Inquiry: it opens researcher and participant to the liminal realms, and chthonic depths where both conscious and subconscious shape the research design, process and outcome.

It may be professionally appropriate to ‘leave your personal problems at the door’, but it’s not wise to leave your actual self at the door. Having the expectation that teaching is a professional career where the teacher has some autonomy to use professional judgment and knowledge, then entering a system where the work reality, with increased practices of intensification, feels like you are assembling merchandise rather than educating humans creates a huge dissonance. If the reality is irreconcilable with the teachers’ inner image of their career aspirations, then it will cause stress. Adjustment disorder is a psychological term that describes this type of dissonance.

Looking back it was when I divorced myself from my job and put the focus on me that the greatest healing from burnout took place. It is implied in the culture of teaching that if teaching is not a vocation, but rather seen as a ‘job’, then the teacher isn’t dedicated. The popular narrative is repeats the same notions: that good teachers should be happy to do extracurricular activities for which they are neither paid more in their collective agreements; that working for hours beyond 9-5 is expected; that teachers make too much, have too much holiday time, have the golden ticket, have it easy so therefore shouldn’t complain about working conditions or burnout. This conditioning is internalized and creates shame as social control. This social control diminishes the will of the individual and subsumes it to the ideal teacher in the collective consciousness. The core self is the teacher; the teacher cannot have a separate core-self that they care for, because a good teacher is to be all-consuming, happily, by their devotion to their work. To care for the self, to care for the inner landscape of the core self is to enter the shadow realm of the “bad” teacher. So self-care is largely dismissed and burnout shrouded in shame. Creating this
separation of the core self from the teacher, and seeing teaching as a job done with professionalism, enthusiasm and high level of competence can allow the individual to see the needs of the core self more clearly and bring passion back to ones work. I know it did for me.

Having worked with the archetypes for much longer than my participants’ limited access to them allowed me to reflect deeply on my own issues of burnout. My burnout was triggered by a long standing personal issue that had nothing to do with work. But my workaholic, type-A, over-dedicated teaching style complete with aligning with both the shadow hero and rescuer archetypes exacerbated the stress I was under and left me with not time or space to address my personal needs. I had to take control of my relationship with teaching in order to create the time and space to heal the relationship with myself. The personal issue that triggered my burnout is not resolved. So in my quest for healing my core self I ask myself, what is wholeness when there is this gaping unresolved issue? Where is balance when there is this burden of the unresolved? Where is rest when the layers to peel back are constantly revealed? I do not have an answer for this, but I can say that my relationship to my work is much more balanced with better boundaries and a clearer idea of what I need to be able to have passion for my career without exhausting myself. I feel that overall I am more at peace with myself having given myself permission to attend to my needs. The reframing of teaching success, care ethics and hard work through the empowered aspects of the archetypes give a functionality: tools to navigate the complexities of the world of teaching and to remain internally intact. The archetypes help us to traverse the inner landscape where personal meets professional and political.
3.3.2 Systemic Frustrations and Lack of Support

There were two additional themes I found in the interview process with the participants that echoed much of the literature on stress and burnout in regards to frustrations with the educational system and a lack of support.

We enact aspects of the archetypes in personal ways – they become our behaviours, thoughts and patterns. When these are very different from what the system allows for, stress follows. Even within the archetypal form there are ways of being that go outside of the common understanding of that archetype beyond its empowered and shadow dimensions. A common theme in my interview with Alan was his creative ways of teaching and approaches to pedagogy that is sometimes more integrative that what the system of education structurally allows for. He illustrated the stress this causes, saying, “You feel that your inner-self is misaligned with the system. I think that when it comes to me, I mean my personality, my ways of being, my sense of creativity is all misaligned with the system, but yet I want to be in the system to change it. So how do you resolve that or can you?” This question has no real answer. When a teacher’s style is out of the box and does not easily fit with the common ways that teaching is structured it is a constant stressor to juggle.

In discussing the archetypes, Marsha noted how the various roles and responsibilities that teachers take on are really very entrepreneurial, but because of the inherent limitations of the school system there is no freedom for leverage and delegating of tasks like the entrepreneur would have. She said, “I read an article and it says the worlds wealthiest CEOs work less than three hours a day…all that stuff like work/home balance is there right from day one. With only craziness it only leads to one place, It only leads to burnout and leads to the death of your
creative mind and your like ingenuity, because you’re working all the time, and your not finding ways to be successful”. Is teaching structured for teachers (and students) to be successful? Or is the plethora of roles expected of teachers diminishing their ability to be creatively successful and inventive? Perhaps other archetypal forms should be explored with regards to teaching such as Entrepreneur, CEO. These behaviours and mindsets could expand the definition and scope of what it means to teach.

The lack of support and the “grin and bear it” approach to work were not only common but they were also tied to the structures within the system of teaching. What was striking was that on the revisiting of the personal-check-in their renewed ideas about these stressors had little to do with reaching out to the structure of teaching. Alan recognized the need to perhaps seek a therapist to help him deal with the student behaviours that trigger his own trauma. Marsha noted the need to herself model the importance of “prioritizing self care and learning to make better choices” and asking others for help. Support was considered to be something she would do for herself: “It has me thinking a little bit more about my own meditation practice actually. And maybe I can meet that positive archetype at that beach now pretty much any time I want.”

There was no mention of how the school structure could help them. Both mentioned that it’s useful to have an administrator who is supportive, but that really depended on their individual school situations. This demonstrates to me that dealing with teacher stress is not generally seen as a responsibility of the school or educational community to work on, but a personal problem to tackle and resolve. It seems that when looking for resources for dealing with stress, looking to the workplace is not where that help will be found. Perhaps this is because if we really looked at the roots of teacher stress, and truly cared for our teachers mental, emotional, physical and
spiritual health and the impact of that on our students we would have to overhaul the system – and that could be seen as an impossible solution.

If the empowered aspect of the archetypes were to become as integrated to the understanding of teacher identity, as I believe the shadow side has, we would have a different value system for how we go about the practice of teaching. This impact on the culture of teaching would also shift the common values and expectation and structures of the system itself. Ideally, in working with archetypes that create patterns of stress in teachers, the resources for stress reduction could be found, not just within the self, but within the system as place of updated teaching practices and beliefs that support sustainability and wellness throughout a career.

3.4 Limitations

As the research was on a very small scale, one limitation was that it did not represent the variety of teacher experiences that exist. In a larger scope with this research I would have interviewed teachers at varying stages in their careers and in a variety of grade levels and subject areas. This would allow me to have a broader picture of how the archetypes play out in different teaching arenas. That said, the main purpose of this particular research project was to see what, if any, transformations teachers had to their own understanding of teaching after doing the archetypes workshop. In that sense, even with a larger participant base from which to draw commonalities and conclusions, the nature of the research is to support personal teacher transformation.

The archetype work as it was carried out allowed space for the participants to observe and question their own teaching practice. It provided for momentary awakenings for teachers to recognize old patterns and how they shifted out of them overtime and in hindsight express that through the archetypal forms. If they had a longer period of time to work with integrating the
empowered aspect of the archetypes into their teaching I think the results would have got more data on how their actual teaching practice had changed and might see other profound changes and insights.

A larger cross-section of teachers would allow an analysis of more systemic commonalities and insights for structural change. But the personal, inner-spiritual nature, of organic inquiry as undertaken in this project, is a means for personal insight, not necessarily structural and systemic analysis.

### 3.5 Further application

This workshop is different from outcomes-based professional learning experience where participants are trained in a curriculum with defined criteria, competencies, goals and outcomes in the service of a particular mandate the school board is training teachers in. I knew that I wanted to use the organic approach with its inner-journeying, chthonic undertones and designed the workshop to reflect this. This I because experiencing stress is personal and because of systemic occupational restraints for system-wide change, resolving stress is equally a personal endeavor. The wisdom required to understand ones relationship to stress is within the self, it can’t be imposed from the outside via a traditionally academically structured professional development session. I think this makes it more effective in combatting stress, then a workshop filled with de-stress tips. Marsha said, “you mentioned the idea of like daydreaming and visualizing in this positive form of the archetype; I’ve been doing, but now I feel a little bit, not a little bit, I feel a lot more empowered that it’s not something that I can’t do. It’s something that I am going to do, and it’s not like a daydream anymore. There’s a couple of things that I wanted to implement, and how I feel inspired to make sure that they happen.” No set of professional
development competencies can train a teacher to come to these realizations, and that is the beauty of using the organic method for professional development.

3.6 Conclusion

It is the transformation that occurs within each participant and their willingness to bring their insights into reality by making changes in their approach to teaching that is the ultimate conclusion to their research process. Marsha echoed the sentiment of what I think many teachers feel about teaching: “I really do feel that it’s an expression of who I am.” When it comes to preventing stress and burnout, we have to find ways to act from these expressions of who we are in ways that don’t harm us and that can sustain our career over the long-term. The archetypes can represent different expression of who we are when we teach. When we work with the shadow and empowered aspects we can begin to climb out of patterns that create stress and forge ways of being that sustain and energize us.

Previous research I quoted stated that even with systemic changes initiated from teacher stress research, little seems to change. I think this is because the core of the system is its teachers; and teachers, being individuals with hearts and souls, relate to the structures of education as persons, not as elements of a system. So, unless burnout prevention work with teachers reaches into the heart and soul of the teacher to bring out personal insight and change from within, any benefits of such work will be superficial. The type of work completed in this research and workshop allows for individual integration. So, rather than add-on tasks for relaxation or self-care, the result of this kind of professional development allows for integrated mindset shifts of how a teacher carries out their work.
All the behaviours I have listed in the shadow aspect of the archetypes will set you up to think, behave and feel in ways that are draining, tiring, deflating, exhausting. If those are held up as the ‘ideal teacher’, then no wonder burnout is epidemic in teaching. It grows out of our cultural paradigm of unsustainable growth and over-consumption, where a “consumption driven mindset masquerades as quality of life” (Kimmerer, 2013, p. 308). We are in a cauldron of understanding that normalizes stress-producing, counterproductive actions and beliefs. Working ourselves hard and bouncing back from difficulty right into continuing to engage in shadow teacher behaviours we are not being courageous. So long as we allow the shadow to masquerade as the ideal, it will not be possible to create the internal changes required to reverse burnout.

Could we create school cultures of mutuality where reciprocity is a core value? This paradigm would not support a space where teachers give of themselves to the point of self-destruction, and it would ensure that the recipients of teachers’ care and work (students, their parents and the larger community) would recognize it for the gift that it is. “Balanced reciprocity” (Kimmerer, 2013) would enable us to “flourish under the most stressful of conditions…success is not measured by consumption and growth, but by graceful longevity and simplicity” (p. 275). School cultures created within such a paradigm would put wellbeing of teachers and students and the sustainability of teacher careers as a priority.

Understanding our shadow and transforming it to that we can breathe, think, believe, feel and act from a paradigm of empowerment is the key to reclaiming teacher wellbeing and restoring our wellness, our enthusiasm, and passion. If we have the courage to look at new ways of being as a teacher, and embody those empowered aspects of the archetypes, then we are creating a new ideal of teaching based in wellbeing and sustainability. Marsha noted during the interview, “I think there are some things I hold on to that I’m not sure of their value”. This is a sign of growth
and hope. The wounds of stress and burnout are initiations into deeper, more profound wells of self-knowledge.

Mahatma Gandhi advised to be the change we want to see in the world. Imposing change on teachers with the good intention to prevent burnout can backfire. Working with the energies of the archetypes, we dig down and go deep within ourselves to recover our strength, our dignity and our sense of self, we become wise. This inner wisdom brought about through archetypal work allows us to create change within ourselves first, thereby becoming a seed of transformation in the educational system for sustainable teaching that enhances, not destroys, wellbeing throughout a career.

4 Sources


5 Appendices

5.1 Appendix A: Interview Protocols

Guiding Questions for Semi-Structured Interview

1. What normally stressed you in teaching and how do you manage the stress you have now?
2. Did any of the archetypes characteristics reflect what stresses you in teaching?
3. What situations have you been in where you took on the role of one of the archetypes?
4. Do you feel that you align with one archetype more strongly than others?
5. How do you feel about the expectations (as outlined in the archetype chart) placed on teachers? How do you deal with them?
6. If you did relate to the archetypes, where do you think you learned these behaviours from? Do you feel these behaviours add to or are neutral to your stress levels?

7. How does your experience of being a woman play out in the expectations placed on you in teaching? Do you find that this contributes to your stress levels in teaching?

8. Did you have any strong negative or positive reactions in the workshop?

9. Did anything stand out for you after the workshop (any a-ha moments or insights)

5.2 Appendix B: Statement of Informed Consent

Dear Participant

Thank you for offering to participate in this project. This letter explains what is involved so you can make an informed decision about taking part. My name is Joanna Krop and I am conducting this study for my MA in Curriculum studies and teacher development at OISE-UT. The study is called: Out of the Shadow: Archetypes that keep teachers in patterns of stress.

I am interested in finding out if teachers can reduce their teaching stress by participating in a holistic, meditative workshop. The workshop helps us examine the beliefs we hold about teaching that have been passed onto us by teaching culture that tells us what ‘good teachers’ should be doing. To do that we will be exploring common archetypes in teaching. Archetypes are roles the culture expects us to play. Some examples are: Mother, Hero, Warrior, Savior, Rescuer, Helper, Sage, School Marm, Core-Self. The workshop will consist of reflective, and meditative activities and some pair-sharing. It will ask the questions: Who are we when we teach? And can we shift how we teach so we can teach with less stress?
After the workshop you would take part in an interview where we would discuss your experience of the workshop and any insights you had into your teaching or teaching stress.

Participating in the workshop will take approximately 90 minutes. The interview will take 45-60 minutes and can be completed right after the workshop or sometime in the week following. With your permission the interview (not the workshop) will be voice recorded and then transcribed, being stored encrypted in a password protected computer assessable only to me. Your own name, the real names of other people and places will be replaced with pseudonyms to protect your confidentiality. You will be invited to review and edit the transcript of your interview. It will be sent to you via email and you can send back the edit to me via email. I will need any edits within 2 weeks of sending you the transcript.

This workshop is not a therapeutic mental health session, it is for educational purposes only dealing with the topic of teaching stress; that it is not suitable for participants who require professional help with their teaching stress and its purpose is not to replace such counselling.

There is a small risk that you may feel uncomfortable or become upset as you interact with the behaviors and mindsets that cause your stress in teaching and you are always able to refuse to participate in any activity or question that makes you uncomfortable.

Although participation in this workshop and interview is confidential, in the event that a person’s participation would indicate that s/he is at a very high risk of seriously harming themselves or others, there would be limits to confidentiality and I would be required to seek the advice of a trained mental health professional for how to proceed.

Before you start the workshop/interview I would like to reassure you that as a participant in this project you have several very definite rights.

- First, your participation in the workshop and interview is entirely voluntary.
- You are free to refuse to answer any questions and free to refuse to participate in any aspect of the workshop
- You are free to withdraw from the workshop/interview at any time. Simply let me know verbally that you no longer want to participate. Any files or transcriptions will be shredded and/or deleted upon your withdrawal.
- At no time will you be judged or evaluated or be at risk of harm; and no value judgments will be made on your participation and interview answers.
• Excerpts from the transcript of this workshop/interview may be included in published accounts (including a self-help book I hope to write about preventing teacher stress, but under no circumstances will your real name or any identifying circumstances be included)

• Only myself and my research supervisor will have access to the data and all the data will be kept confidential and secure in a password-protected computer.

• I will inform you when the completed research project is available at the U of T library for viewing.

I would like to express my appreciation for your participation in this project. Should you have any questions you are welcome to contact the Office of Research Ethics at ---

You can also contact my supervisor Jack Miller at OISE/UT Department of CTL ----

You can also contact me, Joanna Krop, at ---

If you give your consent to be interviewed and understand your rights as a participant in this project, please sign below.

☐ I give my consent to be interviewed as outlined in this letter and understand my rights as a participant in this project.

☐ I consent to the interview being audio-recorded

☐ I request to have a copy of the research findings

_________________________________________________________ (Signature)

_________________________________________________________ (Printed name)

________________________________________ (Date)

Please keep a copy of this letter for your records