

Doppelgänger Students and Cast Shadows

An updated archetypal Analysis of the Doppelgängers Mr. Hyde and William W2



Author: Johanna Wänebag

Supervisor: Dr. Maria Bäcke

Term: Fall 2015

Course: ÄENC51 English IV

Individual Research Project (15 hp)

English Teacher Education

Campus Helsingborg

Abstract

This paper is a proposition of how to use an archetypal analysis based on new theoretical concepts of the Jungian archetypes, such as the image schema (Knox, 2001), the bi-polarity of complexes (Perry, 1970), and the culture complex (Singer, 2006). Consequently, these are combined with the cognitive schema theory, cues and the cultural frame switch theory. Furthermore, these theories are connected to the Jungian shadow archetype. In addition, the literary motif of the doppelgänger is used as a tool, through which the schema changes, frame switches, and the projection of the shadow complex are highlighted. The analogue relationship of both sides is connected to the possible pressure felt by bi-cultural students to conforming to the normative culture while still embracing the heritage culture. Conclusively, the analysis aims to offer possible discussion topics regarding otherness processes based on cultural differences. Lastly, these processes are highlighted by coding the processes based on the theories mentioned in the first two sections.

Keywords: Archetypal Analysis, Critical Pedagogy, Otherness, Schema, Shadow Complex

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1-2
2. A Segregated System	2-3
2.1. An Educational Dilemma	2-3
2.2. Literary Criticism as a Tool for Change	3
2.3. Cultural Frames, Schemas and Cues	3-4
2.4. Otherness	4-5
3. Psychoanalytic Criticism.	5
3.1. Psychoanalysis and Literature	5
3.2 Archetypal Analysis	5-6
3.3. The Archetypes.	6-7
3.4. Complexes.	7-8
3.5. The Shadow Archetype	8-9
3.6. The Role of the Doppelgänger.	9
4. Differentiation of the Doppelgängers; Introduction of the Novels	9
4.1.The strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr.Hyde	9-10
4.2.William Wilson by Edgar Allan Poe.	10
5. Methodology	10-11
5.1. Aim of Analysis	11
6. Analysis	11
6.1. Self-Perception	11-12
6.2. Social-Perception	12-13
6.3. Framing Evil.	13-14
6.4. Cast Shadow	14-15
6.5. Accomodationg society and self.	15-17
6.6. The abolition of the double	17-19
6.7. The educational context	19-20
7. Conclusion	20-21
8. References	22-25

1. Introduction

The Swedish society is becoming increasingly multicultural. However, non-normative cultural members feel pressured to assimilate to the normative culture to become included, while societies are exceedingly polarized (Weegeman, 2005). The otherization process fuels the differentiation of different cultures in society. Hence, the school system needs to consider didactic practices to help highlight the otherization practices and the normative bias in social interaction.

Through critical literacy and an updated archetypal analysis of the doppelgängers in “The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde” by Robert Luis Stevenson and “William Wilson“ by Edgar Allan Poe, one could facilitate an in-class discussion about otherization. The archetypal definition used in this essay has been adapted from Knox (2001), which describes the archetype concept as being similar to the schema hypothesis. Hence, the information gathering of the schema, and the archetypal image of the image schema helps individuals to sort experiences, affects, and values.

Building on the gathered schemas, one can construct cultural frames with behaviors, values, and ideals, which are compiled to create a character suitable for the specific cultural interaction. This switch of frames is often dependent on cues, for instance, a school. Regardless, these frame switches can be troublesome if the frames have negative archetypal cores. The archetypal bi-polarity described by Perry (1970) states, that dependent on the archetypal role the subject, the Other will be cast the opposite. Hence, the bi-polarity claim can be combined the literary motif of the doppelgänger, as the doppelgänger is the opposite of its origin.

Not only is the doppelgänger attractive in this analytic setting, but could be a possible narrative for bicultural students. The normative culture complex is biased, which often makes it difficult to break othering practices. The educational system and its schools are functioning as national institutions, thus, carrying its values and norms. Hence, normative culture becomes superimposed on the bicultural students, as well as simultaneously reinstating its superiority. As a result, bicultural students can feel cast into a dispreferred role, due to their association with the Other. According to Skolverket (2003; 2006; 2012), schools are becoming less diverse, as well as increasingly segregated in regards to normative culture members and non-normative culture members. Therefore, the school needs to stop these

othering practices.

This essay will offer an analysis of the doppelgänger, in the context of the Other, and possibly lead to a reconsideration of using the archetypal analysis in class. When adapting new findings, such as the schema, the frame theory, and new definitions in Jungian theory, the analysis gains in relevance to contemporary research.

2. A Segregated System

This section introduces the reader to the educational setting, as well as introduce the theories, that are later connected and contrasted to Jungian theory, and later used to conduct the analysis. Furthermore, the theories introduced in this section aid in updating the traditional archetypal analysis.

2.1. An Educational Dilemma

The education system and society need to adapt and accommodate the demands of an increasingly multicultural society. Furthermore, the school is a micro-representation of the society and functions as a national institution, therefore, reflects society itself (Gustavsson, 2009; Pennycook, 1990). Students of different cultural background often feel pressured to conform to the societal norm, and as a result, take on new personas more compatible with the normative society (SOU, 2005:69; SOU, 2006:40; Badad, 2009; Torpsten, 2008). Furthermore, Bunar (2001) claims that Swedish schools often show a division of students, where the ethnic Swedish student is normal, and the student with a different cultural background is deemed different. As a result, schools are contributing to a perceived cultural hegemony that governs social interactions in the social arena. Therefore, schools need to confront the governing norms, and teach its students to assess the norms critically, only then can norms be changed in society.

John Dewey (2008) was early to point to the school as a primary instance of social development. Hence, schools should and must deal with social issues related to the social reality of the students (Skolverket, 2013). Furthermore, the curriculum for upper secondary (Skolverket 2013, p. 4) states, „The school should promote understanding of other people and the ability to empathise. “. Hence, students should develop empathic abilities to be able to relate to socially stigmatized individuals, and to seek a change of such othering practices. Literature could prove to be beneficial when addressing these issues. Students

construct social worlds when reading with norms and roles (Beach et al., 2010).

2.2. Literary Criticism as a Tool for Change

Dunlop (1999) states “... we need critical pedagogy that raises students’ political awareness by challenging the hegemony of frozen, dichotomized conceptions.” (p. 58). Critical pedagogy focuses on examining socially constructed hierarchies, such as power and culture, and through the realization of such, open up for the possibility of change (Pennycook, 1990; Jeyaraj & Harland, 2014). However, to practice critical literacy, one needs to consider a broad set of critical methods (Gillespie, 2010).

Through intercultural encounters and open dialogue can members of normative and non- normative culture members gain understanding of the Other, leading to better and more compassionate interaction between the two (Van Aker et al., 2014). Furthermore, having students interact with multiple cultures, helps to prevent adverse reactions in intercultural interaction (Van Aker et al., 2014). Nonetheless, as Zembylas (2013) presents in his case study of compassion and pity, invoking feelings of pity instead of compassion, may lead to passiveness and a further victimization of the oppressed. Hence, students should be introduced to various critical lenses to enable them a more diverse understanding of social issues (Gillespie, 2010). The diversity of applications the psycho-analytical analysis could be used as a complement to the traditional critique of a novel.

2.3. Cultural Frames, Schema, and Cues

The human brain is constantly processing visual, auditory, and other sensory input. According to the schema theory, these experiences are sorted into schemas, in an attempt to make the input more comprehensible. Schemas are part of the sense- making apparatus, thus, also an important aspect of the otherization process.

Culture and behaviors are inseparable, as well as culture and language (Benedict, 2005). Furthermore, culture and its inherent values can change depending on which language is spoken (Ramírez - Esparanza et al., 2006; Hult, 2014). This switch is referred to as a frame switch. In addition, social and cultural frames dictate the way individuals interact socially and are socially constructed (Stolte & Fender, 2007). Furthermore, frames indwell the values, norms, and traditions of that particular culture. However, they are not rigid structures and are prone to change.

Frames are often triggered by cues, resulting in a change of conduct, value system or perception (Stolte & Fender, 2007). The cues are often tied to the culture; such as flags or the languages. Hence, a school could act as a cue for a culture frame switch, triggering the cultural frame preferred in school. Furthermore, due to schools functioning as representations of the normative culture, as well as acting as national institutions, the need for bi-cultural students to conduct a culture frame switch could be profound. Consequently, students will find different ways to operate within the boundaries of the normative frames (Langer, 2012). Thus, schools need to work actively on challenging these norms, and to offer its students positive cross-cultural encounters to create positive experiences regarding cultural diversity.

2.4. Otherness

Edward Said introduced Orientalism in the late 70's, which depicts the construction of the Other through the narrative of the Orient by Western scholars and Western discourse (Said, 2004). In addition, Orientalism is about "...a way of defining and 'locating' the Europe's others." (Ashcroft et al., 2000 p. 50). The discourse of divergence focuses on determining what is part of *Them* and what is *Us*. Furthermore, the otherization discourse has led to the linguistic, cultural, and the social diversity of the Orient being compiled to an oversimplified homogenous corpus (Moldagaliyev et al., 2014). By simplifying the Other, the hegemony of cultures is created, hence, rendering the Other to become the opposite of the one describing the Other. Schools as cultural institutions are active in maintaining hegemony that reinforces the notion of otherness (SOU, 2006).

Moreover, the Other could become a threat to the normative community if the normative community concludes it to be a threat to the normative values and culture (Ben-Nun Bloom et al., 2015; Irving Jackson & Parkes, 2007). Hence, if the normative members perceive the non-normative as threatening, the outcome of social interactions are often seen as threatening and troublesome (Van Acker et al. 2014).

In today's society, an increasing degree of radicalization can be observed. This radicalization is often regarded to originate from the Others, and not from the culturally normative members (Weegmann, 2005). As a result, for bi-cultural individuals, who belong to both the normative and non-normative culture, change their frame to suit the social situation (Hult, 2014). The demonization of either one of the inherent cultures may lead to

difficulties for bicultural students to feel accepted in school and society.

3. Psychoanalytic Criticism

This section connects the previously presented theories of Otherness, schema, and frames to the field of psychoanalysis, in particular with the theories of the shadow and complexes. Secondly, this section introduces the reader to the literary motif of the doppelgänger. In addition, it explores how the doppelgänger motif offers the opportunity to discuss otherness based on the archetypal analysis of the shadow. Furthermore, the shadow archetype and complexes are connected to the presented theories of schema and cultural frame.

3.1. Psychoanalysis and Literature

The relationship between literature and psychoanalytic criticism is analog, meaning that literature and psychoanalysis both bring insight to each others fields. The Jungian approach is primarily interested in primordial systems and symbols. This type of analysis is called the archetypal analysis, and can prove to be helpful when working with canonized literature. Furthermore, canonized literature's durability and significance may be missed by students, thus, leads to failure in proving relevance to the student's reality (Beach et al., 2010). In this aspect, the archetypal analysis can help make Canon relevant, in that it searches for reoccurring features and symbols, such as antagonists in the shape of the shadow archetype.

Jung differs from Lacanian and Freudian approaches to literary criticism. Freud and Lacan were both interested in for instance role of sexuality or oedipal complexes, just to name a few. In addition, Lacanian and Freudian analytic approaches attempt to give a diagnosis. Contrary to the clinical approach of Freud's or Lacan's psychoanalysis, the Jungian theory allows the critic to avoid the analysis of fictional characters as real individuals. Jung questioned the notion of absolute truths (Stevens, 1994; Rowland, 2012). Furthermore, Jung was more interested in the cultural complexes and the deep psyche, than the sexuality centeredness of Freud and Lacan (Kumar Das, 2005).

3.2 Archetypal Analysis

The archetypal analysis aim is to highlight and identify the primordial symbols

and their external manifestation. Beach et al. (2010) states due to the Durance and significance canonized literature, that archetypal criticism could be helpful for identifying classic patterns in literature and its portrayal of society. Moreover, students need to know how literature relates into their reality and is relevant (Beach et al., 2010). Hence, the primordial imagery of the archetypes could help students find classical imagery in canonized literature relatable their reality.

The archetypal analysis may demand substantial preparation to reach the intended depth. Nonetheless, it could be helped if different subjects, for instance, social science and psychology, worked together. The connection with newer findings in cognitive science is what makes the archetypal analysis insightful. However, an understanding of how these theories work, and how they fit into these new concepts is needed. Hence, the following section introduces classic Jungian theories, which have been redefined in light of findings within the field of cognitive science.

3.3. The Archetypes

The archetypes are deeply rooted structures part of the collective unconscious, and the first step towards Jungian deep psychology (Stevens, 1994). These structures are part of every individual's psyche and are the basis of development and behaviors (Stevens, 1994). Nonetheless, a true definition of the archetypes was never given by Jung (Stevens, 1994; Roesler, 2012; Lindenfeld, 2009). However, Jungian psychoanalytic researchers have further developed the Jungian concepts, as well as compare and applied them to theories of for instance cognitive development.

Knox (2001) developed a new theory of seeing the archetypes called image schema. The archetypes in the image schema theory are viewed as a cognitive construction. Thus, archetypes become innate structures in place to help react internally to external events, rather than genetically inherited primordial symbols (Knox, 2001). Furthermore, Knox (2001) highlights, that these systems are innate and not dependent on neither cues nor previous external experiences. Moreover, archetypes are a stable part of the unconscious in place for sense making (Roesler, 2012). There are as many archetypes as there are situations in life and various forms, such as the hero, the trickster or the wise old man.

Since the emergence of psychoanalysis, science has come to understand the psyche better and has come to discard the idea of collective archetypes and the collective

unconscious (Stevens, 1994). Moreover, these archetypes are shared by all humans and is the base of human interaction. Jung's claim of all humans sharing a collective unconscious, in which the archetypes are situated, and became outdated and did not correspond to research findings. However, due to further development in other aspects such connected to the collective unconscious, for instance, the schema theory or the culture complex, the theory of the collective consciousness should be reconsidered (Singer, 2006).

3.4. Complexes

Complexes are structures of both unconscious and unconscious experiences and affects with a certain archetypal nucleus (Chang et al., 2014). This unconscious reaction center is the emotional center of the individual and society. In addition, the collective unconscious is where the archetypes are found. Hence, the archetypal nucleus helps respond to one's environment depending on which archetype is active Furthermore, the archetypes are identical for all, regardless of culture or heritage.

Krieger (2014) compares the complex theory to the schema theory. Similarly to the image schema (see in section 3.3), the schema theory is based on indwelling cognitive structures in place to sort experiences, affect and events into clear patterns. Due to the information gathering characteristics, both schemas and complexes are highly influenced by cultural norm and are for the most part an unconscious process. Hence, the emotional response may often be hard to understand, but once processed, becomes more comprehensible.

Perry (1970) states that the complexes are binary and bi-polar in their nature. Consequently, the father archetype is opposed to that of the son, the ego to the shadow and the hero to the oppressed. Hence, the role taken by the individual also determines which one the Other will receive. As a result, the role taken by a participant in an interaction will dominate the adverse or benefactory response of the individual in an interaction.

The cultural complex was not fully developed by Jung, but has been developed by researchers since. Singer (2006) presented a hypothesis of a cultural complex building on the previous hypotheses of both Jung and Henderson The cultural complex is composed of previous personal and collective experiences. These experiences are often founded on believed shared cultural history of the collective. However, the complexes are subject bias and seek to validate oneself and sorts the input accordingly (Singer, 2006). Hence, breaking a

negative culture complex is very difficult, but necessary.

Combining the image schema of Knox (2001) and the cultural complex, the culture complex becomes a latent and inherent cognitive system that arises from the collection of experiences and inexplicit cultural norms and values. Moreover, the input becomes sorted by connecting to an archetypal (image schema) nucleus. The bi-polarity of the complexes (Perry, 1970) determines which archetype the Other is identified as, based on which archetype the subject chooses. Hence, if the own culture is seen as preferred and normative, the Other becomes dispreferred and non-normative. Consequently, the negative denotation of the Other may lead to an increased tendency to view the other as a threat, thus, leading to negative reactions towards the Other.

3.5. The Shadow Archetype

The shadow is the archetype that Jung describes as inhabiting our darkest ideas, thoughts, and emotions. Furthermore, the existence of the shadow is what enables us to determine what is determined to be evil and wrong. Hence, the shadow acts as a counterpart aiding in negotiating what the individual is, and what it is not (Chang et al., 2013). Thus, the *I*, also referred to as the ego, is heavily dependent on the shadow. As a result, the public persona, which one presents to others, can only be created in negotiation with the shadow archetype. Like all archetypes, the shadow archetype could form a culture complex. This complex will gather information that corroborates the affective reaction, hence, reinforcing its presence.

The shadow archetype complex can be applied to how normative culture members feel threatened by the other. Based on Perry's (1970) bi-polarity claim, depending on which role the normative culture takes on determines the Other to be the opposite. Furthermore, the own group is prone to inhabit the positive values, and the Others are prone to be regarded as negative (Weegmann, 2005). Hence, if the normative culture cast themselves as good, the Others will be the bad.

The manifestation of the shadow in a culture complex becomes problematic for society, as well as for individual's part of both preferred and dispreferred cultures. When one part of oneself is demonized, the individual may feel pressured into playing the role of the normative culture member by neglecting the heritage culture, such as the case of bi-cultural students. However, the educational system must treat all students as equals, and that all

students have the right to create awareness of the heritage culture (Skolverket, 2014, p.4). Furthermore, equality and non-discriminative practices can only be achieved without othering processes and casting the shadow on the Other.

3.6. The Role of the Doppelgänger

The doppelgänger is the manifestation, mental or physical, of another self. This literary motif has been used for a long time, and can be found in various cultures (Stone, 2015). However, the doppelgänger motif did not become part of the Canon until the Gothic era (Langmade, 2012). Furthermore, the Gothic doppelgänger came to be ghoulish monsters. With the emergence of psychoanalysis, the doppelgänger regained its human form, turning the focus from an external apparition to the human psyche. The motif still enjoys popularity and can be found in pop culture, in movies, such as Spiderman or the TV-series Vampire diary amongst others.

With the Doppelgänger, the events are described through two perspectives, and allows a more dynamic reading of the protagonist. By doing so, the reader could become more empathically inclined towards the struggles and deeds of the protagonist. The Curriculum for upper secondary has given the subject of compassion its own section, stating amongst other things, that students should be taught to be tolerant and empathic. Furthermore, students should be secure in one's identity and to develop "...awareness of one's own cultural origins and sharing a common cultural heritage..." (Skolverket, 2014, p. 4).

4. Differentiation of the Doppelgängers: Introduction of the Novels

The novels are primarily chosen for their portrayal of the doppelgänger from the different point of view of the split. In addition, the novels are set in England during the Victorian era, an era governed by strict moral and social codes. Both protagonists are members of the higher social class and are struggling with meeting both social and individual demands of conduct. The following section will present the novels.

4.1. The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde

The strange case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde was written by Robert Luis Stevenson at the end of the 19th century. The short story explores motifs connected to the eras contemporary surges in pre- psycho-analytic sciences concerning the duality of man. Hence, the notion of the duality of the individual, and the attempt by the establishment to

both separate good and bad characteristics are focal points, as well as depicting the hegemonic Victorian society.

The story is told through an omnipresent narrator. Furthermore, the narrator draws on witness accounts, experiences, and dialogues of several characters, and is embellished by a written confession by Dr. Jekyll. The series of events take place in a Victorian London and involves servants, common citizens and the upper-class acquaintances of Dr. Jekyll in written and in conversational form.

The respected Dr. Jekyll is plagued by his doppelgänger Mr. Hyde, who is the manifestation of his quest to explore the dark side of his person. However, Mr. Hyde becomes increasingly autonomous. Furthermore, Dr. Jekyll is drawn into the vortex created by the depraved deeds committed by his shadow doppelgänger, Mr. Hyde, which ultimately leads to the resolution of his dual state.

4.2. William Wilson by Edgar Allan Poe

Edgar Allan Poe wrote *William Wilson* in the middle of the 19th century, and is said to have strong autobiographical traits. The story is placed in Victorian England, a society with strong moral code and societal norms. Furthermore, William Wilson experiences personally perceived inadequacy in social settings, resulting in an inner divide of wills.

The story is told by the biased narrative of William Wilson, who has a very negative view of himself and his character. In addition, the narration's focal point is the reoccurring failures of William Wilson to conform to social norm. The young William Wilson is defiant to authority and has taken control over his home environment. However, upon entering a boarding school, these behaviors are no longer tolerated, and William Wilson (William W1) reacts in creating an idealistic, morally superior doppelgänger (William W2). The protagonist and antagonist's relationship is problematic due to the condemning and judging character of the double. In addition, the duality is upheld through an extended amount of time, before ending in an apparent homicide.

5.0. Method

To be able to produce an analysis of academic quality, and to differentiate from simply stating opinion, one needs a systematic approach to literature. Hence, adopting a system of coding, as proposed by Saldana (2004), is needed. The analysis has been coded

using following concepts: personal and social perception, cast shadow, framing evil, accommodating society and self, and the abolishment of the double. Each of the concepts will be connected to the theoretical framework discussed previously sections. In addition, the theoretical discussion will inform the discussion of the concepts to explain how the duplicity of the protagonists could have come to be, its effect, and how it is resolved. Lastly, the analysis will be applied to hypothetical problems possibly experienced by the bi-cultural student in an educational setting at the end of the analysis section.

5.1. Aim of Analysis

As stated by Beach et al. (2010), students need the whole literary criticism spectrum, and not just parts of it to develop the critical thinking sought after. Hence, this essay will offer a possible analysis of the otherness of the doppelgängers of Dr. Jekyll and for William W1.

The aim of the analysis is to examine how the doppelgänger of William Wilson and Dr. Jekyll may have been created as a result of othering processes. Hence, the split becomes the attempt or mean to hide the non-normative cultural frame operated by one of the doubles. In addition, the archetypal analysis informed by the image schema, bi-polarity hypothesis, and cognitive schemas operating cultural frames will aim to highlight how social perception helps create the evil other, both mentally and physically, as well as explore possible personal and social repercussions of being the Other. Lastly, the analysis will be applied to possible problematic situations for bi-cultural students within the educational setting.

6. Analysis

6.1. Self-Perceptions

The protagonists of the novels form a contrast, and the same applies to their doppelgängers. Dr. Jekyll confesses to an early fascination of the human duality in his written confession (Stevenson, 1999, p. 42-43). Hence, Dr. Jekyll's willingness contributes to how he views himself and his doppelgänger. In contrast, William W1's split is not intended, therefore, he is not aware of the doppelgänger and his connection to the doppelgänger. Furthermore, Dr. Jekyll is initially capable of inducing his doppelgänger by consuming a drug (Stevenson, 1999, p. 45). The initial control of the Doppelgänger may be interpreted as

a frame switch. Accordingly, Dr. Jekyll chooses to hide his the socially unacceptable character of his double, stating "... but for the high views that I had set before me, I regarded and hid them with an almost morbid sense of shame" (Stevenson, 1999, p. 42). The hiding the other entails the act of a frame-switch in pursuance of fitting the social role of the gentile doctor. Hence, Dr. Jekyll switches frames to suit the society, of which he is a member (Stolte & Fender, 2007).

In contrast, William Wilson's duplicity is not a chosen duality, but an unconsciously created doppelgänger. As a result, William W1 is not aware that he is the only one seeing the double, "The other boys often thought that my actions and my belongings were his, and his were mine." (Poe, p. 11). As a deduction, the frame switch has gone unnoticed by the protagonist William W1. While Mr. Hyde is oppositional to Dr. Jekyll, William W2 is not. Furthermore, William W1 can find himself agreeing and disagreeing with his double, even stating „On a number of subjects we agreed very well. I sometimes thought that if we had met at another time and place we might have become friends.“ (Poe, n.d., p. 10). This unconsciousness of the split could be an attempt to accommodate to the normative culture members of the school. "He would tell me what I should and should not do; and he would do this not openly, but in a word or two in which I had to look for the meaning. As I grew older I wanted less and less to listen to him." (Poe, n.d., p. 12). Subsequently, the assimilation process is apprehended as failed by William W1, resulting in the split of the personal frame and the cultural frame of normative society. Therefore, the normative culture frame becomes the quintessential, while his personal frame is classed inferior.

6.2. Social Perception

The social perception of the protagonists can be deduced from instances, remarks and interaction in both novels. In Dr. Jekyll's confession, he firstly presents himself: "I was born in the year 18— to a large fortune..." (Stevenson, 1999, p. 41). Belonging to the upper-class in Victorian London meant strict social and cultural frames. Hence, Dr. Jekyll feels compelled to conform to the norm, describing the exploration of the double as "...when I lay aside restraints..."(Stevenson, 1999, p. 42). Nonetheless, His peers fail to identify Mr. Hyde as a doppelgänger even stating " ... mr Hyde if he were studied... must have secrets of his own: black secrets, by the look of him; secrets compared to which poor Jekyll's worst must be sunshine." (Stevenson, 1999, p. 13). The failure to identify the duplicity of Dr. Jekyll leads to the assumption of his peers and acquaintances of him being victimized by the brutish

Mr. Hyde. As a result, Dr. Jekyll is cast the role of the victim by his peers.

William W1's bias narrative of himself makes it difficult to determine the social perception and his constraints regarding William W1 low self-esteem issues. Nonetheless, William W1 reports entering a boarding school (Poe, n.d., p. 6), and has the privilege of acquiring an education at Eton as well (Poe, n.d., p. 14). Moreover, William W1 states, "My father and mother sent me enough money to live like the sons of the richest families in England." (Poe, n.d., p. 15). These insights lead to deduce, that William W1 came from an affluent household, and possibly belonging to the upper-class. Although belonging to the upper-class, William Wilson does not accept authority (Poe, n.d., p. 7), and ultimately the social hierarchy, and possesses an early desire to dominate others (Poe, n.d., p. 10). However, his opinion of himself does not correlate with his peers' opinion. Thus, it is not the doppelgänger, who is cast the role of the wrongdoer, but the origin of the doppelgänger; William W1. Subsequently, William W1 is capable of assimilating to the cultural frame in school, yet his negative internal picture of himself turn the doppelgänger to the positive entity as a result of polarity (Perry, 1970).

The personal and societal perception of the protagonists can be explained using the bi-polarity of the complexes (Perry, 1970) and cultural complexes (Singer, 2006). Both protagonists have been cast a role established by the sorting of experiences, affects, and memories, whether it is given by the community (Stevenson, 1999, p. 13), or themselves (Poe, n.d., p. 6). Perry's bi-polarity claim (1970) of the archetypal core of the complexes, the doppelgänger's character is determined by the origins of its emancipation. Consequently, Dr. Jekyll becomes the victim victimized by the brutal and unscrupulous Mr. Hyde, while William W2 feels subordinate to the superior presence of William W1.

6.3. Framing Evil

Both protagonists claim to be evil. However, their proclaimed nefariousness may be questioned. Dr. Jekyll describes his duality in his confession stating, „Hence, although I had now two characters as well as two appearances, the one wholly evil, and the other still the old Henry Jekyll.“ (Stevenson, 1999, p. 45). Additionally, the narrative of Hyde's evil is found in various parts of the novel. Firstly, the reader is introduced to Mr. Hyde when he is trampling a young child after having chased it (Stevenson, 1999, p. 4). Secondly, Hyde murders a man named Mr. Carew in a fit of rage by bludgeoning him to

death (Stevenson, 1999, p. 16). As a result, the deeds are reinforcing the evil perception of Mr. Hyde nature (Ben-Nun Bloom et al., 2015; Irving Jackson & Parkes, 2007). This evil may be the result of his split into unmitigated evil and the other encompassing the good character (Stevenson, 1999, p. 45).

In the case of William W1 declared evil, the confirmation differs from Mr. Hyde. William W1 corrupts the readers perception of himself by declaring “From small acts of darkness I passed, in one great step, into the blackest evil ever known.” (Poe, n.d., p. 6). However, his proclaimed evil stand to be questioned. While the deeds may not be socially accepted, seen as cultural and social transgressions, such as his gambling (Poe, n.d., p. 15-16). Regardless, William W1 declares “My friends trusted me, however. To them I was the laughing but honorable William Wilson, who freely gave gifts to anyone and every- one, who was young and who had some strange ideas, but who never did anything really bad.” (Poe, n.d. p. 16). Deductively, the split appears to be internal, rather than a physical split. Moreover, the doppelgänger is William Wilsons public persona, and not the negative self-perception of William W1. Subsequently, the negative self-perception reinforces the moral and the quintessential character of his double (Weegmann, 2005).

6.4. Cast Shadow

The bi-polarity (Perry, 1970) dictates the relationship of the doubles. Furthermore, the oppositional function of the archetypal complexes consequently reinforces the extreme adversary nature of the split. Mr. Hyde, who consciously splits good and bad behavior, is locked in the cast roles from the beginning (Perry, 1970). Dr. Jekyll seeks to separate the two to be able to enjoy the studious and ambitious character of Dr. Jekyll, without worrying about Mr. Hyde next transgression disgracing Dr. Jekyll (Stevenson, 1999, p. 43). Due to this intent, the shadow complex in the form of Mr. Hyde is unequivocally evil, and of choice possesses no barriers hindering Mr. Hyde’s will. The Shadow complex has been learnt through the normative cultural frame and its connected schema (Singer, 2006; Weegmann, 2005). As a result, there are no discrepancies on the social, peer, and personal level perception of Hyde’s evil.

William W1 shadow complex stems not from the outside world, but from internalized frames and schemas connected to normative culture (Singer, 2006). William Wilson attempts to conform to normative culture, but assumes to have failed leading to the

devaluation of himself through the comparison to his double. William W1 states, “His sense of what was good or bad was sharper than my own. I might, today, be a better and happier man if I had more often done what he said.” (Poe, n.d., p.12). Hence, William W1 self-perception may be a result of feeling deviant, and simultaneously, making the culturally normative values, behaviors and beliefs the ideal. The perception of his peers does not match his perception (Poe, n.d., p.16), leading to him casting the shadow on himself instead of his peers. Consequently, the peer’s perception contributes to his internal dialogue by creating the ideal image against which he contrasts his perceived self (Stevens, 1994; Chang et al., 2013).

Mr. Hyde and William W1's evil is dependent on the role of the original character. These roles are defined by the complex, and its schematic collection of experiences, values, and emotions found to be culturally attributed to a certain archetype (Krieger, 2014). Murder and abuse cannot be deemed to be dependent on the narration, which leaves the deeds to speak from themselves. Thus, Mr. Hyde’s classification of evil is less problematic, and is further enhanced by the attribution of a deformed appearance (Stevenson, 1999, p. 12). William W1’s evil is neither implicit nor explicitly expressed. In addition, due to the bias of the first person narrator, it becomes more difficult to prove the claim of evil. Nonetheless, the evil nature of the events is real to the protagonist. Hence, William W1 reaches the same conclusion as Dr. Jekyll’s and acquaintances of Mr. Hyde; If I am evil, it must show in my appearance.

6.5. Accommodating Society and the Self

The casting of the roles impacts the protagonist physically and mentally. The roles are tied to a complex with an archetypal nucleus (Knox, 2001). In addition, the archetypal nucleus is accompanied by assumptions of physical traits. Moreover, these complexes are highly emotional and subject biased (Perry, 1970). As a result, the complex gathers input to form a schema, that validates the perception, the emotions, and experiences (Singer, 2006). These result can be seen in the construction of the doppelgänger as the Other.

Dr. Jekyll’s perceived victimization through Mr. Hyde, who is ultimately assumed to have killed Dr. Jekyll (Stevenson, 1999, p.31), helps hide his dual character. His peers believe that evil has to bear a mark of some sort to reflect the depravity of his soul. Hence, instead of his peers realizing the duality of Dr. Jekyll, they form the picture of a monstrously deformed Mr. Hyde distinctively different both mentally and physically. The

description of Mr. Hyde by Mr. Endfield reads: “He is not easy to describe. There is something wrong with his appearance; something displeasing, something downright detestable.” (Stevenson, 1999, p. 7) Furthermore, Dr. Jekyll’s friend and lawyer Mr. Utterson fail to recognize his duplicity, describing him as giving “... impression of deformity without any nameable malformation, he had a displeasing smile,...” (Stevenson, 1999, p. 12). Mr. Utterson goes further claiming, “the last, I think; O my poor old Harry Jekyll, if I ever read Satan’s signature upon his face, it is on that of your new friend!” (Stevenson, 1999, p.12). Subsequently, Mr. Utterson and Mr. Endfield cannot identify Dr. Jekyll due to their assumption the appearance of perpetrators. Hence, the schema and the complex have signaled (Knox, 2001; Singer, 2006), that Mr. Hyde, as evil as he is, must have some deformity. Furthermore, it becomes implicit that perpetrators cannot, and do not physically resemble respectable individuals. Thus, the deformity of Mr. Hyde is a mean for normative society a further distinction of them and the deviant Mr. Hyde. This schema of the normative society is incorporated into his public persona Dr. Jekyll. As a result, Dr. Jekyll is unable to view his double as being physically identical to himself (Stevenson, 1999, p. 45). In contrast, the appearance of Dr. Jekyll is handsome (Stevenson, 1999 p. 14). To conclude, non-normative schemas leads to a changed perception of the physical appearance of both the protagonist and the double.

William W1’s double, William W2, is only described through the biased narration of William W1. Despite William W1 being the only one noticing the double, the effect on William W1 is profound. Upon entering the first school, William W1 is placed in a situation different from that of home. William W1 explains how he “At an age when few children are allowed to be free, I was left to be guided by my own desires. I became the master of my own actions.” (Poe n.d., p.7). However, the split resulting at the same time as entering school may be an indicator why the split occurs. The principal of the school is greatly adored by William W1 (Poe, n.d., p. 7). Moreover, the different characters of the principal stating “...— could this be the same man who with a hard face and clothes far from clean stood ready to strike us if we did not follow the rules of the school?” (Poe, n.d., p. 7). This fascination could influence the unconscious formation of the respectable, preaching principal’s influenced schema, and the initial frame influenced by the authoritative, and scolding principal. Hence, William W1 tries to assimilate to the school culture frame (Langer, 2012). However, as mentioned previously (see section 6.5.), William W1 feels as if he has failed to create a cultural frame sufficiently adequate for the school setting, resulting

in the normative culture frame becoming a moral consciousness in the shape of a doppelgänger. Due to the failed frame-switch, the other students are unaware of his split because it remained internal. Hence, it is only William W1 who can see and hear William W2, and therefore, is solemnly able to perceive his duplicity. William W1 wishes to humiliate William W2, and simultaneously he sees his face. He reacted as follows “Was this — this the face of William Wilson? I saw indeed that it was, but I trembled as if with sickness as I imagined that it was not. What was there in his face to trouble me so?” (Poe, n.d., p. 13). William W1 is incapable to comprehend the identical appearance of William W2 due to the schema he has created. Moreover, the similarity is frightening because it inhibits a clear distinction between him and his double. As a result, the biased complex is reluctant to accept the identic double.

The protagonist’s frames switches are not involuntary, at least not at the beginning. Dr. Jekyll is able to alter his character whenever he wishes through the consumption of a drug (Stevenson, 1999, p. 45). Hence, Dr. Jekyll conducts a switch of frame to fit into the culture complex and societal frame (Stolte & Fender, 2007). However, over time the drug consumption becomes involuntary (Stevenson, 1999, p. 49). The same could be said for the cue function of the school for William W1. Upon entering his first school, he became socialized by the school norms that are the opposite to William W1 previous character (Stolte & Fender, 2007; Langer, 2012). The switch is voluntary in regards to William W1 desire to belong. Hence, the school functions as a cue for the split and change of cultural frame. However, subsequently the double appears without any apparent control of William W1.

6.6. The Abolishment of Duality

The duplicity of the protagonists is unsustainable, and is bound to come to the inevitable death of one of the doubles. The culmination and resolution of the split may be of different sources. The resolution of the split may differ depending on the events and circumstances resulting in the duality from the beginning. Dr. Jekyll’s and William W1’s different resolution may be seen as examples of such an assumption.

Dr. Jekyll anticipated the end of the split, which becomes definite when the two frames become harder to maintain (Stevenson, 1999, p. 48). Dr. Jekyll describes his loss of control in his written confession (Stevenson, 1999, p. 49). Moreover, Dr. Jekyll explains ”

that I was slowly losing hold of my original and better self, and becoming slowly incorporated with my second and worse.“ (Stevenson, 1999, p. 48). Thus, the socially accepted frame of Dr. Jekyll begins to slip. Furthermore, the confession portrays Dr. Jekyll as an excepting latent partner, who takes over after Hyde, hiding their tracks to avoid detection (Stevenson, 1999, p. 48). Nonetheless, Dr. Jekyll knows that death is inevitable; if he continues his respectability and profession would be disgraced by association to the sinister murderer Hyde or he losses further control ultimately outing himself as Mr. Hyde. Hence, Dr. Jekyll becomes fearful of a possible exposure, he explains “I cannot say that I care what becomes of Hyde; I am done with him. I was thinking of my own character, which this hateful business has rather exposed.“ (Stevenson, 1999, p.20).

William W1 manages to kill his own socially perceived self. He describes his last fight with his double:

“It was my enemy — it was Wilson, who then stood before me in the pains of death. His mask and coat lay upon the floor. In his dress and on his face there was nothing which was not my own! It was Wilson; but now it was my own voice I heard, as he said: “I have lost. Yet from now on you are also dead — dead to the World, dead to Heaven, dead to Hope! In me you lived — and, in my death — see by this face, which is your own, how wholly, how completely, you have killed — yourself!” (Poe, n.d., p. 21).

However, while the murder appears to be a suicide, the narrator, William W1 himself describes how he comes be an older man at the beginning of the narration (Poe, n.d., p. 8). Nonetheless, a definite answer to a physical or mental suicide cannot be found. From a frame perspective, the suicide is less physical, but more mental, resulting in William W1 discarding his ideal image doppelgänger. By doing so, he also resolves his complex connected to the doppelgänger (Singer, 2006; Perry, 1970). However, this does not entail a life of evil deeds, but can be regarded as the emancipation of William W1. William W1 states “I saw that his manner seemed to show a kind of love for me. I did not feel thankful for this; I thought it meant only that he thought himself to be very fine indeed, better than me.“ (Poe, n.d., p. 9). Hence, if this is the emancipation of William W1, that would imply he ends his duplicity by killing his moral double, but accepting himself with flaws, and with strengths. Moreover, instead of eliminating the schema connected to the doppelgänger, the schema in this scenario

is morphed and incorporated into the original William W1. As a result, the duplicity is solved by accepting the shadow through reunification of the double, hence, resolving the split.

6.7. Educational Context

The school is an active carrier of normative culture and values, hence, poses as a possible problem bi-cultural students. Furthermore, bi-cultural students can change the cultural frame based on which culture they are interacting with or which language they speak (Hult, 2014). As mentioned in the theoretical section, both doppelgängers of the novels' division stems from trying to fit the norm through either match the norm of the profession (Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde) or the school norm (William Wilson). Badad's (2009) and Torpsten's (2008) highlights tendencies the problematic tendencies of bi-cultural students regarding the adaptation to normative culture. This issue is amplified by Bunar's (2001) claim of the otherness process classing normative members as normal, and non-normative as different. Taking these statements into consideration, one can conclude, that the school as an institution can act as a frame cue on bi-cultural students.

One part of forming the norm is establishing what the norm entails, as well as in regards to appearance. Sometimes the otherness may lead to a distorted view of beauty based on normative cultural members' appearance. What makes the physical reading of the otherness so important, is the practice of perceptions in society. Women wearing a headdress has been long discussed and has lead to the formation of two camps. One is accepting, as long as it is not a mandatory, and the other calling it oppression. However, the bipolarity of archetypes, this becomes difficult claiming either statement (Perry, 1970). Hence, if one claims it to be oppression, the Other will be regarded as oppressors. In contrast, the Other might feel more positively inclined towards headdresses and value it because of it cultural and philosophical value, they are more prone to take it as an attack on their values and beliefs. Subsequently, a strong social tension between the group would arise (Van Acker et al., 2014).

Schools need to encourage students engage and learn to empathize, as well as create spaces for non-normative cultures in school. Thus, instead of seeing bi-culturalism as an obstacle, non-normative culture students should be seen as able contributors to the common cultural heritage mentioned in the curriculum for upper secondary (Skolverket, 2013, p. 4). Hence, Critical pedagogy's role to criticize hegemonies could be used to

highlight and question cultural norms. However, as mentioned by Zembylas (2013), it is important not to evoke pity, but to become emphatic towards the struggles of non-normative culture members. Moreover, the curriculum of the upper secondary; it states that education should aid students developing empathy and acceptance of other cultures (Skolverket, 2013).

There is a need for the resolution of the *them* and *us* problem. This issue is important for the school environment, the student's motivation, and well-being. Moreover, the resolution may have a positive effect but can also lead to further conflict. Either one of the cultural complexes becomes dominant, as in the case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, or finds a way to include both cultures and eliminates the otherness of the other frame. The otherness can be resolved by breaking the bi-polarity of the cultural frames through compassion and by approaching each other (Perry, 1970, Van Acker et al., 2014). Hence, by finding both positive and negative aspect of both cultural frames may end the oppositional relationship of the two. As a result, bi-cultural students can create a synergetic cultural frame made of values, behaviors and affects connected to both previous cultural frames.

7. Conclusion

As seen in the analysis, that based on the form which the Other takes on, functions on different levels, and effect individuals differently. Furthermore, the analysis shows that the otherization process has different results as well. One result is a reunified self, the other in rejection of social norms. Mr. Hyde gave into his dark side after it had corrupted his social persona, and WilliamW1 came to end his split incorporating the split again. Hence, the novels offer two possible outcomes from othering practices.

Otherization of non-normative culture members is a worrying problem. While the analysis seems distant from the reality of the classroom, nonetheless, it proves relevance concerning the reality of students. Otherness is a contributing factor to building social hegemonies (Dunlop, 1999). While Otherness is highlighted in post-colonialist criticism, the archetype analysis offers personal insight into the process of otherization. In its connection to newer research, the archetype analysis receives a broader view of the otherness process.

The application of contemporary theories of the function of the archetypes makes the analysis easier to understand while making it more applicable in regards to the educational context. As mentioned by Beach et al. (2010) and Gillespie (2010), students need to be introduced to multiple criticisms to become truly a critical thinker. Consequently, the

archetypal analysis conducted in this essay might offer some inspiration to try another way of analyzing the concept of the Other. The possibility of analyzing otherness using both postcolonial criticisms, as well as the archetypal analysis discussed in the essay, may lead to a more diverse reading and understanding of both the novels and othering practices. Regardless, the archetypal analysis offers a broad basis on which to conduct a literary analysis. Hence, contrasting other critical lenses to the archetypal analysis might lead to finding new patterns and corroborations with other themes. To conclude, this paper has been an attempt to make teachers and teachers training students to reconsider using a modified archetypal analysis to help facilitate a debate about otherness.

References

- Ashcroft, B., & Ahluwalia, P. (2000). Orientalism. In *Edward Said: Routledge Critical Thinkers* (Chapter 3 pp.----). Retrieved from Literary Reference Center database.
- Badad, E. (2009). *The social psychology of the classroom*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Beach, R., Appleman, D., Hynds, S., & Wilhelm, J. (2010). *Teaching literature to adolescents*, (2nd ed.). New York & London: Routledge.
- Benedict, R. (2005). *Patterns of culture*. New York: Mariner Books.
- Ben-Nun Bloom, P., Arikian, G., & Lahav, G. (2015). The effect of perceived cultural and material threats on ethnic preferences in immigration attitudes. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *38*(10), 1760-1778, doi: 10.1080/01419870.2015.1015581
- Bunar, N. (2001). *Skolan mitt i förorten: Fyra studier om skola, segregation, integration och multikulturalism*. Ågerup: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposion.
- Chang, H.M., Ivonin, L., Dias, M., Català, A., Chen, W., & Rauterberg, M. (2013). From mythology to psychology: Identity archetypal symbols in movies. *Technoetic Arts: A Journal of Speculative Research*, *11*(2), 99-113. doi:10.1386/tear.11.2.99_1
- Dewey, J. (2008). *Individ, skola och samhälle*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.
- Dunlop, R. (1999). Beyond dualism: Toward a dialogic negotiation of difference. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *24*(1), 57-69. doi: 10.2307/1585771
- Gillespie, T. (2010). *Doing literary criticism: Helping students engage with challenging texts*. Portland: Stenhouse Publisher.
- Gustavsson, K. (2009). Us and them - Children's identity work and social geography in a Swedish school yard. *Ethnography and Education*, *4*(1), 1-16. doi: 10.1080/17457820802703457.
- Hult, F. M. (2014). Covert bilingualism and symbolic competence: Analytical reflections on negotiating insider/outsider positionality in Swedish speech situations. *Applied Linguistics*, *35*(1), 63-81. doi: 10.1093/applin/amt003

Irving Jackson, P., & Parkes, R. (2007). Parallel societies, cultural tolerance and securization: Muslim and anti-immigrant sentiment in western democracies. *Journal of Social and Ecological Boundaries*, 3(1), 7 - 42. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=19&sid=0db2f84b-0b17-4c97-b05b-952695816a22%40sessionmgr4004&hid=4211>

Jeyaraj, J., & Harland, J. T. (2014). Transforming teaching and learning in ELT through critical pedagogy: An international study. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 12(4), 343-355. doi: 10.1177/1541344614550042

Knox, J. M. (2001). Memories, fantasies, archetypes: An exploration of some connections between cognitive science and analytical psychology. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 46(4), 613-635. doi: 10.1111/1465-5922.00270

Krieger, N. M. (2014). *Bridges to consciousness: Complexes and complexity*. New York & London: Routledge.

Kumar Das, B. (2005). *Twentieth century literary criticism*, (5th ed.). New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors (P) LTD.

Langmade, L. (2012). The Wilson duplex: Corporatism and the problem of singleton reading in Poe's 'William Wilson' (or, why can't you see twins?). *Poe Studies*, 45(1), 5-39. doi: 10.1111/j.1754-6095.2012.00044.x

Lindenfeld, D. (2009). Jungian archetypes and the discourse of history. *Rethinking History*, 13(2), 217-234. doi:10.1080/13642520902833833

Moldagaliyev, B., Gabitov, T., & Baydarov, E. (2014). Transformation of cultural policy in the context dichotomy "East - West". *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 140, 700-703. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.498

Pennycook, A. (1990). Critical pedagogy and second language education. *System*, 18(3), 304-314. doi:10.1016/0346-251X(90)90003-N

Perry, J. W. (1970). Emotions and object relations. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 15(1), 1-12. Retrieved from

<http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=0db2f84b-0b17-4c97-b05b-952695816a22%40sessionmgr4004&vid=38&hid=4211>

Poe, E.A. (n.d.). *William Wilson*. Retrieved from http://www.americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource_files/the_story_of_william_wilson.pdf

Roesler, C. (2014). Are archetypes transmitted more by culture than biology? Questions arising from conceptualizations of the archetype. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, *57*(2), 223-246. doi: 10.1111/j.14685922.2011.01963.x

Rowland, S. (2012). Jung and the soul of education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *44*(1), 6-17. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2010.00639.x

Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual of qualitative researchers*. California: Sage Publications.

Said, E. (2004). *Orientalism*. Stockholm: Ordfront.

Singer, T. (2006). The cultural complex: A statement of the theory and its application. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, *4*(3), 197-212. doi: 10.1002/ppi.110

Skolverket (2003). *Valfrihet leder till skolutveckling men också till segregation*. <http://www.skolverket.se/om-skolverket/press/pressmeddelanden/2003/valfrihet-leder-till-skolutveckling-men-ocksa-till-segregation-1.10797>

Skolverket. (1996). *Hur likvärdig är den svenska skolan*. Retrieved from <http://www.skolverket.se/om-skolverket/press/pressmeddelanden/1996/hur-likvardig-ar-den-svenska-skolan-1.47568>

Skolverket. (2012). *Allvarlig försämring av likvärdigheten i den svenska skolan*. Retrieved from <http://www.skolverket.se/om-skolverket/press/debattartiklar/allvarlig-forsamring-av-likvardigheten-i-den-svenska-skolan-1.174465>

Skolverket. (2013). *Curriculum for the upper secondary*. Retrieved from http://www.skolverket.se/om-skolverket/publikationer/visa-enskild-publikation?_xurl_=http%3A%2F%2Fwww5.skolverket.se%2Fwtpub%2Fws%2Fskolbok%2Fwtpubext%2Ftrycksak%2Fblob%2Fpdf2975.pdf%3Fk%3D2975

- Stevens, A. (1994). *Jung: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stevenson, R. L. (1999). The strange case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde. In Stevenson, R.L. (ed.). *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde with the Merry Men and Other Tales and Fables* (pp. 1-54). Hertfordshire: Wordworth Editions Limited.
- Stolte, J. F., & Fender, S. (2007). Framing social values: An experimental study of culture and cognition. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *70*(1), 59-69. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/stable/20141767>
- Stone, M. H. (2015). The double: Manifestations of pathology and deluded self. *Journal of humanistic Psychology*, *55*(4), 387-403. doi: 10.1177/0022167814533994
- SOU. (2005:69). *Sverige inifrån: Röster om etnisk diskriminering*. Retrieved from: <http://data.riksdagen.se/fil/C783892C-B88F-4706-A3C5-42D175C3082B>
- SOU. (2006:40). *Utbildningens dilemma: Demokratiska ideal och andrafierande praxis*. Retrieved from: <http://data.riksdagen.se/fil/31EBDB1A-FCE2-48A4-B213-B112120F9A16>
- Torpsten, A. C. (2008). *Erbjudet och upplevt lärande i mötet med svenska som andra språk och svensk skola*. Växjö: University Press.
- Van Acker, K., Phalet, K., Deleersnyder, J., & Mesquita, B. (2014). Do “they“ threaten “us“ or do “we“ disrespect “them“: Majority perceptions of intergroup relations and everyday contacts with immigrant minorities. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *17*(5), 617-628. doi: 10.1177/1368430214536062.
- Weegmann, M. (2005). Edward Said (1935-2003): His relevance to psychotherapy. *Psychodynamic Practice*, *11*(4), 389-404. doi: 10.1080/14753630500387299
- Zembylas, M. (2013). The “crisis of pity“ and the radicalization of solidarity: Towards critical pedagogies of compassion. *Educational Studies*, *49*, 504-521. doi: 10.1080/00131946.2013.844148