

Teaching Psychoanalytic Concepts in the University Setting: Issues, Challenges, and Promises

Jed Yalof, Psy.D.

Psychoanalysis has had a longstanding, but not always easy, relationship with scientific psychology and the university environment. Reasons for this tension include challenges related to empirical support for analytic concepts, the co-opting of analytic ideas by other theories without always citing the psychoanalytic foundations of these ideas, and difficulty teaching these ideas to students. Recently, there has been a call for closer scrutiny of teaching practices and advocacy for more research in psychoanalytic societies and institutes. Thus, conflict is both external against misperception by others outside of the psychoanalytic enclave and internal over longstanding attitudes about teaching and training analytic candidates. In this article, I focus on the way psychoanalysis is perceived and misperceived in academic psychology, relevance of empirical psychoanalytic research for educators, and what this means for the future of graduate education in psychology and psychoanalysis. I also present a sampling of creative teaching approaches beyond the traditional pedagogical strategies of lecture and examination for encouraging student learning of psychoanalytic concepts.

The relationship between psychoanalysis and academic psychology is strained, to say the least. Despite efforts to provide an evidential base for psychoanalytic concepts (e.g., Shedler, 2010; Westen, 1998), an opening up of a discussion about the co-option of psychoanalytic concepts by other disciplines (e.g., Horstein, 1992), and recognition of the importance of Freud's ideas in psychology textbooks (e.g., Park & Auchincloss, 2006), there remains a gap between what psychoanalysis feels it has to offer the teaching of psychology and what the academy privileges when it comes to defining a scientific psychology to its students (e.g., Hethrington et al., 2012; Redmond and Shulman, 2008). Even psychoanalytic institutes are dealing with conflict related to the tension between emphasizing psychoanalysis as a clinical practice versus more open questioning of the rigor of its scientific foundations and teaching methods (e.g., Kernberg, 2011).

Indeed, Freud, in his brief paper “On the Teaching of Psycho-analysis in Universities” (1919–1918), writing about how those universities responsible for educating medical students might incorporate psychoanalysis into their curricula and noting the problems inherent in using lectures to teach it, was prescient in anticipating the conflict confronting the more contemporary conflict facing the nonmedical school academy: Is psychoanalysis valued enough to make it part of the university's academic culture and can it be taught through lecture and other traditional pedagogical procedure, or is something else required to get students enthusiastic about

Jed Yalof, Psy.D., is affiliated with Immaculata University, Department of Graduate Psychology, Immaculata, Pennsylvania, and the Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia, as well as being in private practice.

psychoanalytic theory, technique, and its broad-based applications? In this article, I explore these questions further, focusing on the way psychoanalysis is perceived and misperceived in academic psychology, how the presence of empirical findings struggles to locate itself in graduate training programs in particular and what this means for the future of graduate education in psychology, and a sample of creative teaching approaches that can engage students around psychoanalytic concepts that go beyond the traditional pedagogical strategies of lecture and examination.

THE PROBLEM OF (MIS)PERCEPTION

One of the major issues confronting the psychoanalytic educator involves the manner in which psychoanalytic theory is portrayed to undergraduate students. Bornstein (1988, 1995, 2005) has been a lead advocate of working toward eradicating the misleading, if not arcane, way in which psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic theory has been portrayed to undergraduate students. Bornstein (2005) made a case for revising these misperceptions from the ground up, stating: “Reclaiming psychology’s psychoanalytic center starts in undergraduate introductory psychology courses, where psychoanalytic principles can be used as an overarching framework to link ostensibly unrelated concepts and ideas” (p. 333).

The prospect of such change, however, is opposed by longstanding and inured perspectives related to the portrayal of the psychoanalytic model in academic texts. For example, Bornstein (1988) reviewed four popular undergraduate abnormal psychology texts, each of which had a different perspective on psychoanalytic thought. Texts were reviewed in three general areas: (a) accuracy of presentation of psychoanalytic concepts, (b) representation of selected areas of psychopathology in relation to the psychodynamic model, and (c) integration of projective tests with psychoanalytic theory. Bornstein reported that there was inconsistent and, at times, inaccurate information about core psychoanalytic concepts, and that newer psychoanalytic paradigms were under represented as was the connection between formal diagnostic nomenclature and the relationship between psychoanalytic theory and projective testing. Texts did not give voice, despite new evidence in support of psychoanalytic ideas, although not necessarily to the degree psychoanalytic information was ignored relative to earlier academic texts (Hornstein, 1992).

As such, the same core problem remains: How to generate interest among students when textbooks skew information? Indeed, Bornstein (1995) further commented on how the presentation of psychoanalysis was outdated in undergraduate texts, despite its contemporary contributions to the psychological sciences, and represented negatively to students. Elaborating these points, Bornstein (2005) described the continued marginalizing of psychoanalytic thought, despite empirical support for its effectiveness, and underscored the coopting of psychoanalytic ideas by other disciplines without referring back to the psychoanalytic foundations of these ideas. Bornstein noted, for example, how the psychoanalytic concepts of unconscious memory, parapraxis, and repetition compulsion have reemerged, respectively, within a cognitive psychology model as implicit memory, retrieval error, and nuclear script. Here, Bornstein advocated for psychoanalysis’ reclaiming ownership of concepts accepted by other disciplines, but without appropriately crediting the psychoanalytic foundation of these concepts. Bornstein felt that the use of particular types of investigation, such as epidemiology, meta-analyses, and neuroimaging, and grassroots advocacy to colleagues, students and the public sector about the benefits of psychoanalysis, were two ways to forge this reconnection. Hansell (2005) described the travails of

generating publisher interest in a psychoanalytic text for undergraduates and how his co-author and he used reviewer feedback to their advantage by showing how other models had ideas that overlapped with the analytic approach. The process, however, of pulling the book together, given initial negative reactions by chapter readers, was not easy and demonstrated the uphill battle of psychoanalytically-oriented academics in making their points without making waves.

Park and Auchincloss (2006) further addressed the issue of how psychoanalytic ideas are portrayed in undergraduate textbooks by first detailing the literature in this area, noting short-shrift given to analytic psychology, and then by reviewing thirteen texts (1999–2004 publications) in response to 10 questions “to see how psychoanalysis is presented in them” (p. 1368). Questions focused on depth and breadth of psychoanalytic inclusion, with the authors qualifying their search by stating, “We limited our discussion to the psychoanalytic theory of mind, neglecting a full examination of sections on psychopathology and treatment” (p. 1369). Results were different from other findings: Despite some variation across texts, psychoanalysis was treated respectfully, integrated with other disciplines, and not subjected to “major inaccuracies” (p. 1374), but still linked mainly to Freud, with post-Freudian theories presented in a way that “lacked coherence” (p. 1370). There was still some evidence co-opting of analytic ideas (e.g., discussion of self-concept without reference to the analytic concept of self; drive reduction in motivation theory without referencing Freud; repressed memories of sexual abuse without reference to psychoanalysis), which again raised questions about whether psychoanalysis, as a discipline of subjective and idiographic understanding, can reclaim its concepts from scientific psychology.

EMPIRICAL SUPPORT AND RESISTANCES TO IT?

Such a proposed reclamation project is aspirational and not without resistance. Horstein (1992), writing about the longstanding and complex relationship between psychology and psychoanalysis, used the term “co-option” (p. 259) to describe one of the ways in which behavioral psychology in particular borrowed liberally from psychoanalytic theory (“relabeling the *unconscious* as the *unverbalized*,” p. 259, italics in original) without fully crediting Freud as the primary source (also see Bornstein, 2005; Park and Auchincloss 2006, Westen, 1998). Indeed, tensions between psychology and psychoanalysis, beginning most obviously with Freud’s Clark University lectures in 1909, but likely predating even these talks, has gone through a series of phases related to “how to define science” (Horstein, 1992, p. 254) that had the feel of a heated competition, with a resultant rift between psychoanalysis and academic psychology. Other phases precursor to the cooption of psychoanalytic concepts were, first, questions first about the inconsistent definitions of key terms and the “weird,” “grotesque” or “esoteric” (p. 255) nature psychoanalysis itself and, second, difficulty testing the integrity of these concepts. Concerning matters of concept validity, psychoanalysts felt that only through psychoanalysis proper could the mind be studied, whereas experimental psychologists, even those who actually entered psychoanalysis for relief from problems, held a distinctive “distrust of personal experience” (p. 256), compared to the knowledge gleaned through scientific methodology and quantification of data. Following a period of seeming open-mindedness about whether or not Freudian theory might have some validity, rigid encampment prevailed in the 1970s. Here, even when findings supported psychoanalytic ideas, the mere fact that such support came through experimentation was sufficient to exalt the value of objective research over subjective understanding. In other words, if the concept was valid, it was because of experimental, and not self-evident, truth.

Even though research has provided some convincing empirical support for analytic concepts (e.g., McWilliams, 2013; Shedler, 2010; Westen, 1998), by no means does empirical support guarantee acceptance within academic circles. Thus, although empirical support for psychoanalytic concepts has a brighter vista these days, positive findings do not believers make, especially in psychology departments! For example, Redmond and Shulman (2008) surveyed the catalogs of top-rated undergraduate colleges and universities, using a somewhat limited, key-word methodology to search terms with positive analytic valence (e.g., Freud, Lacan, psychoanalytic, psychodynamic, Erikson). What they found was striking: Courses offering analytic information were mainly outside of psychology departments (i.e., 59% in the humanities, compared to 17.2% in the social sciences, and 13.6% in psychology departments), with *Freud* by far the most frequently occurring target word (89%). Although the authors acknowledged that reviewing catalogs might place a low ceiling on the frequency with which psychoanalytic ideas actually mentioned (i.e., maybe more goes on in classes than meets the eye), the fact that psychology departments fell behind the humanities and social sciences suggested that students in other disciplines may more access to psychoanalytic information than psychology majors. If so, then it represents a sobering finding, indeed, especially in light of Bornstein's (2005) stating that undergraduate introductory psychology courses should be the main vehicle for stimulating psychoanalytic enthusiasm at the college level. Anderegg's (2004) comment about the ennui accompanying student interest in psychoanalytic classes is also applicable here: "The reason I do not teach courses there are solely psychoanalytic theory is that no one will take them" (p. 216). The results of Katz, Kaplan, and Stromberg (2012), who surveyed psychoanalytic candidates and found that undergraduate and graduate classes were among the least important influences on their decision to pursue psychoanalytic education and training, would appear to further echo this concern about the low impact that undergraduate and graduate classes have on motivating students to explore psychoanalytic concepts and careers.

Indeed, finding a home-base for psychoanalytic ideas within psychology departments depends on several factors, including the theoretical preferences/allegiances of those who teach in academic programs and the presence of empirical support for psychoanalytic concepts. Regarding the former, the outlook is not very good. A survey conducted by Hethrington et al. (2012) found that there was a restricted range of clinical training in doctoral programs that was expected to continue, with most programs focusing on a cognitive-behavioral approach, with most faculty members in clinical science programs, in which most students are trained, adhering to a cognitive behavioral or behavioral orientation (89%) compared to a small percentage (7%) endorsing a psychodynamic orientation. For PsyD programs at comprehensive universities, 48% of faculty members endorsed cognitive behavioral, whereas 28% endorsed psychodynamic. At free-standing professional schools (PhD and PsyD), the gap narrowed to where 32% of faculty endorsed cognitive behavioral compared to 29% endorsing psychodynamic. There was more of a range of orientations when studying PhD programs in counseling psychology. Findings were qualified by limited information culled from school self-report to national publications, how theoretical approaches were categorized, omission of some approaches, and lack of clarity around what it meant to endorse a particular orientation. Levy and Anderson (2013) commented on Hethrington et al. (2012) by noting that, despite trends toward a cognitive behavioral orientation, randomly controlled research studies supported both psychodynamic and humanistic-existential orientations, adding that modern versions of behavioral therapy and cognitive behavioral therapy were moving toward a framework with respect to the foundational psychoanalytic concepts of

therapy alliance, transference-countertransference, and therapy relationship. These concepts had clear similarities to psychodynamic and humanistic-existential approaches.

Echoing sentiments of co-option that emerge when cognitive psychology does not recognize the psychoanalytic roots of its concepts (Bornstein, 2005), Levy and Anderson (2013) stated: “Without proper acknowledgement, over time, these techniques often lost the source of their origination contribution; definitional integrity, and important contemporary elaborations” (p. 216). However, findings that point to a shift away from psychoanalytic psychology as a scientific, and therefore influential, enterprise for teaching undergraduates and graduates remains sobering and underscores the concern raised by Bornstein (2001) about the decreasing influence of psychoanalysis “in psychological science, psychiatric diagnosis, undergraduate instruction, and graduate training” (p. 5). In making his argument, Bornstein felt that the empirical method might be the best chance of saving psychoanalysis for future generations, although this point was criticized by Mills (2002a), among others, who stated: “Not only is psychoanalysis alive and well, it is flourishing” (p. 553). Mills drew attention to the richness of analytic thought cross-fertilizing other disciplines and on what he felt was the research-driven focus of Bornstein’s main point about validity as a byproduct only through experimental study (see Bornstein, 2002, for a reply to critics). Others, however, such as Banfalvi (1996), see any effort to sway favor in the academy toward psychoanalysis as a moot point because of an endemic problem between the academy’s emphases on mastery, discipline, hierarchy, and research that exists in opposition to an analytic vision of individuals as subjective, rather than objective, and not quantifiable entities. Petry and Hernández (2010) highlight a similar sentiment when reviewing Lacan’s ideas on education, noting the contrasts between pedagogy and analysis, and underscoring how traditional teaching and language-based instruction mutes what Lacan (2001) called *savoir* (italics in original), thus bypassing Freud’s view on truth. Thus, the very methods and institutions used by traditional academic psychologists to remedy and redirect a positive psychoanalytic focus operate from a system that, to some, hinders the very approach about which they seek to teach and to enjoy.

To further investigate where analytic concepts sit within graduate clinical psychology training, Stacey-Ann Bovell and I conducted a brief, online search of clinical psychology programs accredited by the American Psychological Association (<http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/programs/clinical.aspx>). We searched for required courses by title, reviewing web site homepages and, if needed, links to program handbooks and catalogs. We used *psychodynamic*, *psychoanalytic*, *object relations*, *self psychology*, and *other* as psychoanalytic key words to evaluate if these programs included a key word in a course title. What we found confirmed the data suggesting that psychoanalytic and related ideas are not featured in courses titles. There was a low frequency of required courses in these areas, with *psychodynamic* the most frequent key word. Limitations to our search included not reviewing catalog course descriptions for key words (i.e., Does the course covers a psychoanalytic concept, but not title the course as psychoanalytic or psychodynamic?), not focusing on elective classes or tracks, and not comparing our analytic focus against the presence or absence of other theory-therapy approaches (e.g., cognitive behavioral therapy, existential-humanistic). Still, notwithstanding these limitations, it would appear that clinical graduate school applicants who have a psychoanalytic interest would have a hard time finding more than a few programs that teach a single required class concentrated in this area of study based on a review of program curriculum offerings as posted on websites and related program links.

CREATIVE TEACHING METHODS

In what follows, I present additional literature on some of the creative teaching methods for helping students appreciate and understand psychoanalytic concepts.

Use of Student–Teacher Dynamics

In a prior publication (Yalof, 1996), I reviewed literature on the history of psychoanalytic psychology's contributions to understanding educational processes and examined how psychoanalytic concepts could provide a roadmap for conceptualizing an academic training program. Such concepts as the holding environment, transference, countertransference, the treatment framework, and a psychoanalytic appreciation of administrative-systemic organizationally-driven pressures and dynamics that result in projective identifications and projective counter-identifications can each help the psychoanalytic-academic make sense of the many conflicts and experiences that shape daily work. For example, a student who resists scheduling a basic advisement meeting with a faculty member, even when the faculty member is offering a flexible schedule, can frustrate the process with the back-and-forth of e-mailing. A surface inference might speak to the student's anxiety about meeting with the faculty member, but the deeper issue might be an entrenched fear that the meeting will be punitive, or invite a closer relationship, or pose a threat to the student's self-concept, or any other number of less conscious themes that have characterized the student's history with authority. Another example might be the faculty member's anxiety about grading too hard. Here, superego conflicts associated with fear of being devalued on a public web site where students can anonymously rate faculty members may affect grading decisions. Other examples might be a teacher's mistake on a syllabus about exam due dates that stirs anxiety in students and generates a perception of the teacher as careless and not attuned to student anxiety; a teacher's harsh response to a student that renders the student feeling victimized; or an administrator's harsh response to a faculty member that renders the faculty member feeling disempowered, leading the faculty member to displace frustrations onto colleagues or students. Each of these examples is ripe for psychoanalytic understanding in the areas noted previously. Others, such as Mills (2002b), writing about creative ways to evoke empathy in students, Allen (2002), writing about the challenges of being a "good enough teacher" (p. 141), and Lubin (2002), writing about the instructional value of self-disclosing one's own learning experiences, empathizing with student anxieties, experiential learning, and encouraging student self-observational skills through thoughtful prompts, have also provided examples illustrating the immediacy of the teaching moment as an interpersonally-driven and rich form of pedagogy.

Immersive Learning

Brown and Price (1999), British educators with analytic orientations, recognized that students and teachers cannot be in analysis with each other, raised questions, similar to Freud's own questions (1919–1918), about the place of psychoanalysis in the university. They stated: "Should psychoanalysis have a respected place a university because it at least gives a flavor of what psychoanalysis proper is all about, importing the quality of a psychoanalysis, albeit to a small degree, to offset shortcomings in other disciplines?" (p. 88).

From this start point, responses to the following questions were elaborated in relation to (a) What constitutes a psychodynamic form of learning? (b) What factors make new learning situations (focus here was on the British educational system) stressful? (c) What psychoanalytic knowledge is supposed to be taught in the university? (d) How does analysis contrast with university learning? (e) How can psychoanalysis be taught in the university setting? These are weighty questions, but speak directly to the challenges confronting teachers who are trying to bridge psychoanalysis to the university. Responding to each question with suggestions about how to accomplish this end, the authors described the value of learning from experience, recognizing the importance of not-knowing, using sensory experience as data to be explored, appreciating how the anxiety created by mass learning initiatives in educational settings stimulates different thoughts and feelings in teachers and students, striking a reasoned balance between psychoanalysis as a clinical method designed to deepen self-knowledge and science, and using experiential learning and promoting a self-reflective attitude. These are all points of which teachers should be mindful when trying to promote psychoanalytic studies, while also recognizing the limits of what/how of university teaching.

Auchincloss and Davis (2000) offered a different method of immersive learning of Freud in the form of student writings from their work as analysts and teachers of Freud's writings to undergraduates at Columbia University in New York. They raised the question: Did Freud speak to student concerns? Findings reflected a three-year period during which they found that students were respectful of Freud's insights about such coming-of-age topics as loss and separation, strivings for independence and identity, and sexuality. Their course met twice weekly for thirteen weeks and involved lecture-discussion of Freud's autobiography, including his writings, pictures of Freud, Freud's letters to Fleiss, and love letters during his youth and to his fiancé, while also encouraging a critique of Freud. They presented preliminary data suggesting that most students wanted to study Freud because he was controversial, to learn about Freud for themselves, or because they were children of mental health professionals. Initial student perception of Freud's view on sexuality as oppressive changed over time. Students reportedly remained skeptical about Freud's views on sexuality, but found the originality of his ideas to be rich and embraced him on a personal level. They appreciated his efforts to find himself professionally and the openness with which he shared his ideas. Other attempts to draw students into psychoanalytic dialogue include what Kaley (1993) termed "quasi-teaching" (p. 97), in which she used a group-process course to facilitate student understanding of their own conflicts when treating clients, Grumet's (1994) use of autobiography as a way of helping teachers-in-training identify and empathize with the life narratives of their own students, and Yates's (2001) use of socio-cultural case studies to facilitate discussions about analytic theory, feminism, and the mother-daughter relationship ("pre-oedipal subjectivity," p. 338) in response to what she saw as increased receptivity to a therapeutic /less authoritarian culture at the university level in London.

Countering the Unresponsive Audience

One potential risk in teaching Freud to undergraduates is the anticipation, unless the teacher can engage interest around real-life situations, of an unreceptive audience primed to see Freud as old-fashioned and abstract psychoanalytic concepts as discontinuous with the daily lives of college students. As a counter to this viewpoint, teachers have sought creative applications as ways of encouraging student involvement. For example, Carlson (1989) created a board game,

Psychosexual Pursuit, that involved moving through Freud's various psychosexual stages, with costs including possible fixation, loss of psychic energy, and the need to purchase defenses. In sum, students learn that fixation and defenses come at a cost.

Anderegg (2004), taking a different approach to classroom learning, described how teaching Freud to undergraduates need not be a tedious, defensive venture. Rather than minimize Freud's impact on psychology, Anderegg focused on Freud's strengths, including the novelty of his ideas about how the mind works through discussion, activities, and readings, also noting that younger students may have some difficulty accepting concepts such as the Oedipal Complex and unconscious mental life. In attempting to support undergraduate interest in Freud, Anderegg looked at how other fields, such as neuroscience, provide an interdisciplinary link to psychoanalytic theory, noting that this type of linking between Freud and what students are drawn to in other areas of psychology science reflects a what he saw as a necessary "obeisance" (p. 216) to social pressure around the immediate interests of students.

Reading and Rethinking Original Works

Teaching Freud to graduate students is equally challenging and requires the teacher's creative adaptation of different instructional approaches to encourage an open-minded appreciation for the richness of psychoanalytic theory and technique. Blass (2001), for example, recognized the challenge of presenting and communicating the richness of Freud's ideas in ways that are not reflective of the dry, mechanistic, and outdated modes in which they are often taught and internalized by students. Teaching in a clinical psychology program with a psychoanalytic orientation at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Blass expressed awareness that Freud was a valued figure in his country whose ideas were embraced and celebrated, compared to how students in the United States might be primed to view Freud skeptically and negatively. Blass focused here on describing how she taught Freud's ideas about the male Oedipal complex to graduates by having them read and reflect on original works. With respect to the Oedipal complex, the focus was on its implications for "the dangers of love" (p. 1111) to amplify "two of Freud's most important and poignant statements on the human condition and central teachings of his Oedipus complex" (p. 1111). She observed how two different themes of the Oedipal conflict speak to the importance of love in Freud's writings: (a) how the son's ambivalent feelings of love and hate for the father that "opposed the child's wish to be rid of the father" (p. 1114) and (b) love for the mother, fear of hurting the beloved and rival father, and castration anxiety as an internal conflict leading to repression of sexual desires, "Since sexual satisfaction of the boy's oedipal wishes would have unbearably painful consequences, the sexual nature of the desire is surrendered" (p. 1114). The main point here was to recognize how a careful textual analysis of Freud's original writings permits creative reflection that is not possible when Freud is presented in a static and rapid manner as a precursor to other content in which students are more interested. Creative application of this information to the classroom occurs when students are then invited to imagine, in response to case material, how the boy's relationship to the father might play out in clinical situations.

Boysen (2010) described the development and implementation of a thirteen-week undergraduate capstone course organized around understanding unconscious processes. The course was developed in conjunction with other areas of research in the absence of a primary text that addresses these points as they tie to unconscious processes. A primary source reading list was organized around five core themes related to the unconscious: (a) lack of awareness, (b) lack of

access to the unconscious, (c) lack of control, (d) efficiency in processing information, and (e) confabulation of causality. Topics that structured the course were organized into the following four areas, along with didactic information, sampled in the following, that speak to unconscious processes: (a) why psychology needs the unconscious (e.g., the somatic marker hypothesis), (b) psychodynamic theories (e.g., emphasis on Freud), (c) modern unconscious (e.g., subliminal persuasion), and (d) consciousness and will (e.g., neuroscience and split brain research). Assignments and activities might include having students keep a dream journal or record parapraxes as part of self-analysis; evaluation of psychoanalytic theory through library research of empirical evidence for psychoanalytic theory or self-reflection; self-appraisal of bias; writing about the history of a course topic; and various in-class activities designed to demonstrate various psychoanalytic ideas.

Psychoanalytic Education and Training

Lest one think that the challenge to the traditional way of teaching psychoanalytic principles is the sole purview of undergraduate and graduate students, think again! Psychoanalytic institutes responsible for educating and training psychoanalytic students (i.e., candidates) to the level of psychoanalyst have also had to bear the brunt of teaching methods that have come under critique and scrutiny. Kernberg (e.g., 1996, 2000, 2011) has been a long-time advocate of change in the way in which psychoanalytic institutes and society's train their candidates. Most recently, Kernberg (2011) warned against the continuation of the stodgy, self-absorbed, and ingrained ways of presenting the analytic model to candidates and recommended, as a form of self-preservation, among other items, more of a research-focus and closer scrutiny and evaluation of faculty who teach at analytic institutes, noting the often stale pedagogical approaches to classroom instruction (also see Skorzewski, 2008) and encouraging a wider variety of teachers in order "to avoid ossification" (p. 715). Zepf and Gerlach (2013) commented on Kernberg's article, addressing matters specific to the culture of analytic training, and agreeing with some of his points, including the importance of selecting teachers based on their teaching ability. They also noted the difficulty, however, in reaching consensus on key instructional topics, such as what constitutes an analytic process, which poses an additional challenge to analytic teachers and researchers; that is, psychoanalytic ideas tend to lack clarity. Here, Schacter's (2005) discussion of how the presence of various schools of psychoanalytic thought contribute to what he termed the "simmering crises" (p. 473) in American psychoanalysis. Noting the declining enrollment in applications for training and in the number of available psychoanalytic patients, he supported the partnering of clinicians and researchers to answer important questions about the psychoanalytic method as a way of validating some unproven tenets (e.g., the link between childhood and adult disturbances in such areas as childhood trauma and adult psychopathology, or the relationship between several of the infant attachment patterns and adult behavior), increasing its overall acceptance, and resolving points of dispute within the profession.

CONCLUSION

For years, psychoanalysis and its related concepts have been somewhat at odds with the empirical tradition of psychology as a science and with the often research-oriented focus of most colleges

and universities. Even psychoanalytic institutes and societies have come under scrutiny for their lack of responsiveness to the decline in applications to their programs. Creative and thoughtful evaluations of traditional teaching practices are recommended. Within traditional undergraduate and graduate institutions, educators in psychology have, more often than not, shied away from embracing and integrating psychoanalytic concepts as relevant. Recently, however, and especially with an increased momentum around empirical support for psychoanalytic concepts, there is reason to hope that skepticism is replaced by a deeper appreciation for the monumental insights of Freud and his followers and greater enthusiasm for teaching psychoanalytic ideas as a broad, defensible, applicable, and accessible model of the mind.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I acknowledge the assistance of Stacy-Ann Bovell in helping with the review of the web sites and catalogs of clinical psychology programs accredited by the American Psychological Association.

REFERENCES

- Allen, G. (2002), The “Good Enough” teacher and the authentic student. In: *A Pedagogy of Becoming*, ed. J. Mills. New York: Rodopi, pp. 141–176.
- Anderegg, D. (2004), Paging Dr. Freud: Teaching psychoanalytic theory to undergraduates. *Psychoanal. Psych.*, 21(2): 214–221. doi:10.1037/0736-9735.21.2.214
- Auchincloss, E. L., & N. M. Kravis. (2000), Teaching Freud to undergraduates: A case report. *Internat. J. Psychoanal.*, 81: 753–770.
- Banfalvi, A. (1996), The crises of the univers(al)ity and the future of psychoanalysis. In: *Teaching Transference: On the Foundation of Psychoanalytic Studies*, ed. M. Stanton & D. Reason. London: Rebus, pp. 59–68.
- Blass, R. (2001), The teaching of the Oedipus Complex: On making Freud meaningful to university students by unveiling his essential ideas on the human condition. *Internat. J. Psychoanal.*, 82: 1105–1121.
- Bornstein, R. F. (1988), Psychoanalysis in the undergraduate curriculum: The treatment of psychoanalytic theory in abnormal psychology texts. *Psychoanal. Psych.*, 5(1): 83–93.
- . (1995, Spring), Psychoanalysis in the undergraduate curriculum: An agenda for the psychoanalytic researcher. *Bull. of the Psychoanal. Res. Soc.*, 4(1): 3–4.
- . (2001), The impending death of psychoanalysis. *Psychoanal. Psych.*, 18(1): 3–20.
- . (2002), The impending death of psychoanalysis: From destructive obfuscation to constructive dialogue. *Psychoanal. Psych.*, 19(3): 580–590. doi:10.1037//0736-9735.19.3.580.
- . (2005), Reconnecting psychoanalysis to mainstream psychology: Challenges and opportunities. *Psychoanal. Psych.*, 22(3): 323–340. doi:10.1037/0736-9735.22.3.323
- Boysen, G. (2010), An integrative undergraduate capstone course on the unconscious. *Teaching of Psych.*, 37: 237–245. doi:10.1080/00986283.2010.51072
- Brown, J., & H. Price. (1999), Teaching psychoanalysis: An impossible art? *Psychoanal. Studies*, 1(1): 87–101. doi:1460-8952/99/010087-15
- Carlson, J. F. (1989), Psychosexual pursuit: Enhancing learning of theoretical psychoanalytic constructs. *Teaching of Psych.*, 16(2): 82–84.
- Freud, S. (1918–1919), On the teaching of psycho-analysis in universities. *Standard Edition*, 17: 169–173. London: Hogarth Press, 1981.
- Grumet, M. (1994), Reading the relations of teaching. *Psychoanal. Psych.*, 11(2): 253–254.
- Hansell, J. (2005), Writing an undergraduate textbook—An analyst’s enlightening journey. *Amer. Psychoanal.*, 39(2): 14, 16.

- Hethrington, L., S. B. Messier, L. Angus, T. J. Strauman, M. L. Friedlander, & G. G. Kolden. (2012), The narrowing of theoretical orientations in clinical psychology doctoral training. *Clin. Psych.: Sci. and Prac.*, 19(4): 364–374.
- Horstein, G. A. (1992), The return of the repressed: Psychology's problematic relations with psychoanalysis, 1909–1960. *Amer. Psych.*, 47(2): 254–263.
- Kaley, H. (1993), Psychoanalytic education: Attitude and process. *Psychoanal. Psych.*, 10(1): 93–103.
- Katz, D. A., M. Kaplan, & S. E. Stromberg. (2012), A national survey of candidates II: Motivations, obstacles, and ideas on increasing interest in psychoanalytic training. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 60(5): 1015–1055. doi: [10.1177/0003065112460090](https://doi.org/10.1177/0003065112460090)
- Kernberg, O. F. (1996), Thirty ways to destroy the creativity of psychoanalytic candidates. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 77: 1031–1040.
- . (2000), A concerned critique of psychoanalytic education. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 81: 97–120.
- . (2011), Suicide prevention for psychoanalytic institutes and societies. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 60(4): 707–719. doi: [10.1177/0003065112449861](https://doi.org/10.1177/0003065112449861)
- Lacan, J. (2001), *Outros Escritos [Other Writings]*, trans. V. Ribeiro, A. Harari, & M. A. Vieira. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Zahar, 2003.
- Levy, K. N., & T. Anderson. (2013), Is clinical psychology doctoral training becoming less intellectually diverse? And if so, what can be done? *Clin. Psych.: Sci. and Prac.* 20(2): 211–221.
- Lubin, M. (2002), The classroom experience as a laboratory for self-understanding. In: *A Pedagogy of Becoming*, ed. J. Mills. New York: Rodopi, pp. 199–218.
- McWilliams, N. (2013), Psychoanalysis and research: Some reflections and opinions. *Psychoanal. Rev.*, 100(6): 919–945.
- Mills, J. (2002a), Reexamining the psychoanalytic corpse: From scientific psychology to philosophy. *Psychoanal. Psych.*, 19(3): 552–558. doi: [10.1037/0736-9735.19.3.552](https://doi.org/10.1037/0736-9735.19.3.552)
- . (2002b), An unorthodox pedagogy: Fostering empathy through provocation. In: *A Pedagogy of Becoming*, ed. J. Mills. New York: Rodopi, pp. 115–140.
- Park, S., & E. L. Auchincloss. (2006), Psychoanalysis in textbooks of introductory psychology: A review. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 54: 1361–180.
- Petry, P. P., & F. H. Hernández. (2010), Jacques Lacan's conception of desire in a course on psychology of art for fine art students. *Visual Arts Res.*, 36(2): 63–74.
- Redmond, A., & M. Shulman. (2008), Access to psychoanalytic ideas in American undergraduate institutions. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 56(2): 391–408. doi: [10.1177.0003065108318639](https://doi.org/10.1177.0003065108318639)
- Schacter, J. S. (2005), Contemporary American psychoanalysis: A profession?: Increasing the role of research in psychoanalysis. *Psychoanal. Psych.*, 22(4): 473–492. doi: [10.1037/0736-9735.22.2.473](https://doi.org/10.1037/0736-9735.22.2.473)
- Shedler, J. (2010), The efficacy of psychodynamic psychotherapy. *Amer. Psych.*, 65(2): 98–109. doi: [10.1037/a0018378](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018378)
- Skorzewski, D. (2008), Analyst as teacher/teacher as analyst: A confusion of tongues? *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 56(2): 367–389. doi: [10.1177/0003065108319010](https://doi.org/10.1177/0003065108319010)
- Westen, D. (1998), The scientific legacy of Sigmund Freud: Toward a psychodynamically informed psychological science. *Psycholog. Bull.*, 124(3): 333–371.
- Yalof, J. (1996), *Training and Teaching the Mental Health Professional: An In Depth Approach*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.
- Yates, C. (2001), Teaching psychoanalytic studies: Toward a new culture of learning in higher education. *Psychoanal. Stud.*, 3(3–4): 333–347. doi: [10.1080/1460895012010363](https://doi.org/10.1080/1460895012010363)
- Zepf, S., & A. Gerlach. (2013), Commentary on Kernberg's "Suicide prevention for psychoanalytic institutes and societies." *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 61(4): 771–786. doi: [10.1177/0003065113496634](https://doi.org/10.1177/0003065113496634)

Immaculata University, Box 682
Immaculata, PA 19345
jyalof@immaculata.edu