

CHAPTER II

FRAMEWORK OF THEORIES

2.1. Theoretical Framework

2.1.1. Character and Characterization

Character is the crucial element in the novel. Holman and Harmon, in their book entitled “A Hard Book to Literature”, state that character can be defined as someone in a literary work who has some sort of identity (it need not be a strong one), an identity which is made up by appearance, conversation, action, name and (possibly) thoughts going on in the head (as cited in Farlina, 2008, p. 19).

Character can be classified into two: major character and minor character. According to DiYanni, a major character is an important figure at the center of the story’s action or theme (DiYanni, 2001, p. 55). Minor character can be identified as a secondary character that supports the major character. Both major character and minor character are equally important in the novel. Both of them support the novel to create a complete story with its plot.

Besides, Minderop, in her book entitled “*Metode Karakterisasi Telaah Fiksi*”, states that an author generally uses two methods or ways in creating the characters. The two methods are called as telling method and showing method. According to Pickering and Hoepfer, telling method is a method that requires the description of character in the exposition and the direct comment of the author. The author directly tells the character written in the novel. When the character is cruel, the author writes ‘cruel’ in the novel. In another side, there is showing method. Pickering and Hoepfer state that showing method tries to show that the author places himself or herself outside the story by giving the opportunity to present the character’s portrayal through dialogue and action. The author does not tell directly or write explicitly the characters’ mannerism. The reader will know their mannerism through their behavior, way of talking, gesture, expression, and even interaction (as cited in Minderop, 2005, p. 6).

Point of view or viewpoint is defined as a position in which the narrator stands for, in relation to the story; the standpoint from which events are narrated (Hicks and Hutching, 1989, p. 113). There is one viewpoint that is rare for author

to use. It is the multiple viewpoints. Kenney (as cited in Minderop, 2005, p. 91) argues;

“Multiple viewpoints; not to be confused with a combination of different point of view techniques is the use of multiple viewpoints, which is actually a particular application of limited point of view. At any given moment in the novel the action is being seen from the point of view of a single character. We see only what the character sees and as that character sees.” (Kenney, 1966, p. 54-55).

It can be said that we can observe how the author describes his or her story by using this viewpoint. Here, the conflict will be seen in two perspectives. It can be understood that various perspectives of the characters can make the difference in point of view. So the complexity of characterization – including logic and soul quality – can be spoken up. It can be concluded that point of view is multifunctional – able to express various aspects in the literary work. Not only the elements but also a matter of sociology, psychology, philosophy, anthropology, and even spiritual can be illustrated in the story with point of view if the reader observes it vigorously detail. Indeed, the author will describe more than one character in creating his or her novel by using this multiple point of view.

2.1.2. A Brief History and Understanding of Anthropology of Literature

2.1.2.1. A Brief History of Anthropology of Literature

Literature research has been developed since 1984 along with its extrinsic aspects. These extrinsic aspects are sociology of literature, psychology literature, and anthropology of literature. Those interdisciplinary were born because of the analysis that mostly focuses on structuralism aspect (intrinsic) by ignoring the other aspect (extrinsic). Literature has been developed by considering the extrinsic aspect. As a proof, literature deals with anthropology this day. Anthropology is a study about human and how human acts symbolically. Suwardi Endraswara, in his book entitled “*Metode Penelitian Antropologi Sastra*”, states that plentiful literary works – purposely or accidentally – try to hide people’s behavior and cultural pattern in society (Endraswara, 2013, p. 15). In addition, literature is a creatively cultural work that is packaged with aesthetic aspect. Wellek and Warren state that literature relates a phenomenon that has the aspect of *dulce et utile* (beautiful and useful) (as cited in Endraswara, 2013, p. 10).

Human is a cultured-creature who likes to think, create, study, and change every time. There is a difference between a writer who lives in a metropolitan city and a writer who lives in a village. Culture has their background in creating stories. That is why anthropology of literature is needed in interpreting literary works. Indeed, anthropology of literature as a study must have its own specific perspective. According to Sudikan (as cited in Endraswara, 2013, p. 13), anthropology has two necessity; (1) as a comparison between sociology of literature and psychology of literature, and (2) as a comparison for multiculturalism legacy. The researchers are able to understand someone's life from cultural horizon and get into the aesthetic aspect of literature. However, there must be a provision in analyzing the culture in literature. The researchers must have multiculturalism knowledge.

2.1.2.2. The Understanding of Anthropology of Literature

There is a relation between anthropology and literature. This relation is strengthened by Poyatos, in his book entitled "Literary Anthropology: A New Interdisciplinary Approach to People, Signs, and Literature". According to Poyatos' perspective:

"A literature research that focuses on culture has been developed into three directions; (1) a research that focuses on the writer's cultural background is analyzed with anthropological side through interview and observation of the writer's life, (2) a literature text research is analyzed by the literature as a cultural reflection, (3) a research on the writer's anthropological feature receptively has an important role in interpreting the literature meaning." (Poyatos, 1988, p. 331 - 335).

Poyatos mentions literary anthropology in his book. However, this is different in meaning with anthropology of literature. Literary anthropology means anthropological writings that have literature nuance while anthropology of literature can be defined as a literary work (literature-basis) which has anthropological aspect (instrument).

According to Endraswara, anthropology of literature study happens because of three premises; (1) a writer lives with cultural context that is various, (2) a writer cannot be separated with the influence of life environment and the imitation of cultural pattern, and (3) a writer can be a bridge for cultural regeneration in a legacy's duty. There are some reasons why anthropology is close with literature in relation (Endraswara, 2013, p. 5 - 6). Those reasons are: (1) both of them focus on

human's behavior, (2) human is a cultured-creature that has a critical creativity to change a life, (3) anthropology and literature gives the attention in imaginative phenomenon that is way more beautiful than real life, (4) plentiful oral discourse and written literature attract the anthropologist and the writer, and (5) various interdisciplinary rounds the field of culture and literature so that it challenges the existing of anthropology of literature.

Anthropology of literature research requires the researchers to analyze the literary work both by focusing on structural aspect; intrinsic elements of literary works, and considering on a cultural view. Although anthropology of literature is piggyback sociology of literature back then, this interdisciplinary has the spotlight now. This interdisciplinary can be classified as a new study and deals with complexity. Endraswara states that culture in literature has more than seven elements when people observe it in deep. The researchers are better to analyze the data without considering the seven elements (Endraswara, 2013, p. 22). Culture in literature contains everything about cultural behavior even it is complex. However, this complexity phenomenon precisely attracts the researchers to analyze.

2.1.3. A General Concept of Culture

2.1.3.1. The Concept of Cultural Value

Culture can be defined as all of a group's guiding values and outward signs and symbols taken together as one big whole. So that cultural value is defined as values that are related with culture. Cultural value is the core principles and ideals upon which an entire community exists. What has to be marked here is the importance of cultural value. Cultural value is important for both of individual and society and cannot be separated. What shape society, and shape and influence the people who live within the society; differences in cultural value between society and the individual within can lead to problems such as culture clash, disagreement, and more.

Sociologists disagree on how to conceptualize cultural value with definition of ideas about what is good, right, fair, and just. Conflict theory focuses on how values differ between groups within a culture while functionalism focuses on the shared values within a culture. Talcott Parsons, in an essay entitled "Norms and values", notes that Americans share the common value of the "American work

ethic,” which encourages hard work (Parsons in Linton, 2015, p. 1). Other sociologists also have proposed a common core of American values, including accomplishment, material success, problem-solving, reliance on science and technology, democracy, patriotism, charity, freedom, equality and justice, individualism, responsibility, and accountability.

2.1.3.2. The Concept of Cultural Identity

Cultural identity can be assumed as a thing that belongs to a particular ethnic group and how that influences one’s feeling, perception, and behavior (Dusek, 1996, p. 162). Meanwhile, Phinney said that cultural identity is defined as the part of person’s self-concept that comes from the knowledge and feelings about belonging to a particular cultural group (as cited in Dacey and Kenny, 1997, p. 191). Thus, in Stuart Hall’s journal entitled “Cultural Identity and Diaspora”, he states;

“Cultural identity, in this second senses, is a matter of ‘becoming’ as well as of ‘being’. It belongs to the future as much as to the past. It is not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But, like everything which is historical, they undergo constant transformation.” (Hall in Farlina, p. 22-23)

Furthermore, Stuart Hall defines cultural identity in terms of one, shared culture, a sort of collective ‘one true self, hiding inside the many other, more superficial or artificial imposed ‘selves’, which people with a shared history and ancestry hold in common (as cited in Farlina, 2008, p. 22-23). What Hall means about cultural identity is a matter that reflects the common historical experiences and shared cultural aspect that shows us a ‘one people’. It can be called with *identity as being*. Stuart Hall’s idea of cultural identity emphasizes the concepts of ‘being’ and ‘becoming’ (as cited in Wati, 2015, p. 7). He states that identities are defined as a transparent product which is never complete and is always in process. Cultural identity is studied as a matter of identification. The process that has been mentioned is about the changing identities that can be identified through observing the character’s mannerism and behavior. It is believed by Hall that different environment brings different history, culture, and experience.

In other hand, Hall also states that cultural identity is an identity of individual, community, or society for living their real life. Not only in reality but also in literary work, cultural identity happens (Hall, 1990, p. 713). The individual

itself can describe the cultural identity of the specific era by doing his or her activity during the era. The individual is able to show the reader about how people live their life in his or her era. The character itself as an individual can be a proof of cultural value of a community and society existed in the novel. The story in the novel mentions about the community that loves to gather around judging someone's life. The community shows the cultural identity lived in the era by seeing their mannerism. When the society sets a party to celebrate their achievement in charity, this is how people live in that era. Indeed, a novel can portray the cultural values lived in society. Hall also defines culture that relates to its relationship with language and society.

2.1.4. The Concept of Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interactionism is introduced by George Herbert Mead (1863 – 1931). This theory is completed by Herbert Blumer. Furthermore, this theory is born from the argumentation of Max Weber about a social behavior that is done by humans that is pushed by social interpretation towards their environment (Weber, 2009, p. 26). Susilastri says that the social symbol can be formed in physical object and gesture, words (representing the physical object, feeling, idea and value), and action (done by individual to give the meaning in communicating with another person).

According to Sperber, symbolic is not the matter of words, but the matter of “memory” towards objects or words from a concept of representation – represent something (Pelly, 1994, p. 83-86). A symbol might bring a memory that makes someone get interacted. For example, there is a pair of ballet shoe that is found by a character in the novel. He or she shows it to the mother. And the mother sees it as a memory when she is a ballerina since she was young. This shows how ‘a pair of ballet’ can make them interaction one another. Fisher states that interaction's perspective views self as a social work which is achieved by communication with another person (Fisher in Amie, 2014, p. 4).

According to Siregar, Mead in explaining the symbolic interactionism classifies this theory into three concepts; mind, self, and society (Siregar in Susilastri, 2019, p. 4). ‘Mind’ is not an object, it is a social process. It refers to the concept that every person experiences a process of thinking in interaction. This

process starts when there is a problem or obstacle that blocks one's action to do something. This concept tries to make human understand the symbols and use them to get the same meaning as the society. Ritzer states that a social process works starting from various stimuli that exists followed by self-interaction to understand the stimulus. And then the person chooses what stimulus he or she wants to response. Next, the person will think about it and try the various responses in the mind until he or she finally decide the proper response and based on the stimulus (Ritzer in Susilastri 2019, p. 4).

The 'self' concept is about self-description by oneself when does interaction with another person. This oneself points him or her as his or her own object by taking someone else's perspective – values and controls the self-behavior. Siregar states that 'self' is defined as a skill to do self-reflection from another person's point of view (Siregar in Susilastri, 2019, p.5). In this context, the control mechanism situates on the meaning that is constructed (Ilawatus, 2017, p. 3).

Furthermore, the concept of 'society' is defined last. It is seen as an individual external organization which has a relation with the individual internal self-concept. Both of them are relevant to each other. Siregar, in her journal, states that a social relationship net is created, established, and constructed by every person in the society. Every person gets involved with the action that he or she chooses actively and voluntarily. In the end, it will push the one-self to get in the process of taking role in the society (Siregar, 2011, p. 104).

2.1.5. A Sociological Perspective on Housewife

A housewife indicates the life and status of woman who lives in the place called as 'home' and cares for household chores, her husband, kids and other members of the extended family or so called as consanguine family who need care. Ozkaplan states household chores and care in the household contain emotional motivations (Ozkaplan in Ozdemir, 2016, p. 2). Many wives perform work in a paid job today. They help the husband in supporting financial aspect in the house. So, the husband and the wife work helping each other in the family economy. However, there is an issue stated that the women who do not work perform housework and care work might think of themselves as not "a good mother or wife or housewife" and feel guilty (Ozkaplan in Ozdemir, 2016, p. 2). There are some factors causes

the housewife that is invisible in the eye of society. These factors are underestimation of housewives' contribution to the economy support and patriarchal culture, tradition, and religion that believe household is the duty of a housewife. Besides, housework and care work are usually performed by unpaid labor of housewives as consumers but not as productive individuals in many societies (Ozdemir, 2016, p. 1).

The housewife is seen as the sacred duty of women and as unpaid job. However, when a housewife is compared with the status of a woman who works outside the home, her status is seen as lower today. It is because not only she takes care of her job but also she takes care of her husband, her children, and the housework. The working wife's duty is added. So, it makes the status of the working wife is higher than just the housewife. And the status of woman is determined to be the status of her husband (as cited in Ozdemir, 2016, p. 3)

With all the fact about a housewife, it patterns a question. The question is why a considerable number of women choose to be a housewife today despite many negative issues about housewifery. There are a lot of answers. According to Ozdemir;

“The reasons why a woman chooses to be a housewife in this modern era are; (1) not being able to find a position in the labor market, (2) forced or early marriage, (3) an oppressive family, or (4) a result of her own choice.” (Ozdemir, 2016, p. 3)

Choosing a marriage life must be thought very carefully and deeply. Marriage can affect woman's future. Marriage is about a man and a woman, a wife and a husband. The housework and care work are not just a woman's sacred duty. This housework becomes a sacred duty of a woman because of society's culture and value. In fact, it needs the husband's hand because marriage is about two people work together in the name of home.

2.1.6. American Housewife in 1950s

If masculinity was contained in the early 1950s, then American women suffered even more from gender standardization, largely ignoring women's experiences (Halliwell, 2007, p. 41). Liwag, in her article, said that there are some ways to be a good wife in the 1950s that she called it as *How to be a Good Wife*. It describes some characteristics of housewife in the 19450s (Liwag, 2014, p. 1).

Liwag states that written throughout the early to mid-nineteenth century tells about the characteristics based on the literature referenced. They are; 1) do not talk, 2) good cooking, 3) greeting with manifest love, 4) the husband is the boss.

First of all, the wife is required to be silent – do not talk. Podolsky, in his book entitled “Sex Today in Wedded Life”, states:

“Be a good listener. Let him tell you his troubles; yours will seem trivial in comparison. ...Remember, your most important job is to build up and maintain his ego (which gets bruised plenty in business). Morale is a woman’s business. ...Let him relax for dinner. Discuss family problems after the inner man has been satisfied.” (Podolsky in Liwag, 2014, p. 1)

It can be said that a wife is not the one who talks first. She has to let the husband choose whether he wants to talk or not. And when the husband wants to talk, the wife should be a good listener. Furthermore, the wife is prohibited to bother the husband with her talks and noises. She has to wait until the husband opens his mouth. This is relevant with the fact that the wife is forbidden to state her ‘argument’. The wife is also the person who will be a place for the husband to reduce all the problems in his business aspects. The job of the wife is building his husband’s mental as if she does not have her own problems.

Second characteristic of a good wife is good cooking. Tyrer, in his book entitled “Sex Satisfaction and Happy Marriage”, states;

“A social service meeting, an afternoon tea, a matinee, a what-not, is no excuse for there being no dinner ready when a husband comes home from a hard day’s work.” (Tyrer in Liwag, 2014, p. 1)

It shows that the wife should welcome the husband with a good meal. The husband works in specific hours to get financial supported in good condition, so the wife has to give the husband good food too. The wife is prohibited to let the husband hungry, especially after work. There are a lot of job demands at work, so the wife is the one who released her husband’s burden with a good meal when welcoming him home. In short, whatever it is, the wife should serve the husband a dinner.

Another characteristic is greeting the husband with manifest love. This characteristic is based on Tyrer’s perspective. Tyrer states;

“Picture a woman preparing a fine meal for her husband. “She remembered his choice of meat and was careful to get an extra-fine cut ... Her best cutlery and dishes and finest linen are all in evidence, and a little colorful decoration has been tastefully displayed ... And as he comes into the house

she greets him with a smile of welcome and a touch of manifest love.” (Tyrrer in Liwag, 2014, p. 1)

Not only a good meal but also a good appearance is needed in welcoming the husband home. The wife has a job in making a good food considering the plating aspect. This plating will make the husband interested to eat immediately. Besides, the wife should be ready in welcoming the husband with a lovely appearance. A lovely appearance with a lovely welcome for the husband shows a touch of manifest love from the wife. In short, it is about perfection welcome when the husband gets home greeted with a good meal and a ‘lovely’ wife. This is called as the ‘hot steak’ side. ‘Hot steak’ can be said as elegant. In other hand, when those two are not served by the wife, the husband will not come home. He will not be possible to go home for dinner. There is no husband who wants to be greeted at home after work with a bad meal and a ‘messy’ wife.

The last characteristic is the husband as the boss. This is fitting to close with the most opposed belief by the women’s movement written by renowned eugenicist, Professor Jefferis. Professor Jefferis, in his book entitled “Searchlights on Health, The Science of Eugenics”, states;

“The Number One Rule. Reverence Your Husband.—He sustains by God’s order a position of dignity as head of a family, head of the woman. Any breaking down of this order indicates a mistake in the union, or a digression from duty.” (Jefferis in Liwag, 2014, p. 1)

It can be said that the wife should respect the husband properly. Jefferis even states that the husband should be treated as a God. There is no need of questions when the husband is ordering around over his wife. The husband seems to have the ‘absolute right’ to make his wife do what he asks to. And the wife should obey her husband. What the husband orders has to be done by the wife properly. There is no wonder that the husband is being bossy. This is relevant with the fact that the husband is the leader of the house. Everything about the house is considered to be the husband’s responsibility. In short, the wife should respect the husband with dignity. This phenomenon relates with patriarchal, when the wife is under the hand of the husband – male domination. The husband is the one who must make a decision over everything.

2.1.7. American Housewife in 2018

Before talking about American housewife in 2018, American culture and lifestyle in this year needs to be mentioned. American culture and lifestyles are quite distinctive. Some important values and characteristics of American culture that are common among most Americans include; independence, privacy, equality, timeliness, informality, achievement, directness, future orientation (as cited in Kelly, 2004, p. 1).

According to a new Institute for Family Studies analysis of the 2017 American Community Survey, among mothers are married to husbands who work full-time and year-round, the population most likely to have the option of staying home. The real housewife of America can be said as most likely to be found among women married to men earning just a little or quite a lot (VerBruggen and Wang, 2018, p. 1). Close to half of mothers whose husbands earn \$250,000 or higher a year (46%) are not in the labor force. On the other end of the income spectrum, 35% of mothers whose husbands make less than \$25,000 a year are stay-at-home mothers.

The priorities in life can also change because of parenthood. VerBruggen and Wang's survey shows that only 28% of American married mothers say it is full-time work, whereas 43% of married women without children say so when asked what their ideal work situation would be (as cited in VerBruggen and Wang, 2018, p. 1). Meanwhile, 40% of married mothers consider working part-time to be their ideal situation, which makes part-time work the most popular choice. Overall, mothers are more likely than non-mothers to express a stronger desire to either work part time or not at all, regardless of their marital status.

Marriage just by itself today does not seem to have an impact on women's labor-force participation. In fact, among women without children under age 18 at home, married women are more likely than unmarried women to work full time. This could be because highly-educated women today are more likely than their less-educated peers to marry, and also more likely to work full time. However, parenthood still matters. Married mother are more likely to be out of the labor force than other women. It can be said that there are many married-women, as a wife to their husband, getting a job in this year.

2.2. Literature Review

Research that focuses on cultural identity and symbolic interactionism are rare. Research related with anthropology of literature study that stresses about cultural behavior is also rare to find, mostly about seven elements traditional. Moreover, a research that combines cultural identity and symbolic interactionism never has never been done before. So, this research uses four previous researches; two in cultural identity theme and two in symbolic interactionism; to help conducting this research.

Two previous studies that deal with cultural identity are; Farlina's thesis entitled "The Issue of Cultural Identity in Khaled Hossein's *The Kite Runner*" and a journal conducted by Wati, Setiawan, and Astutiningsih entitled "Cultural Identity and Cultural Dislocation in Jean Kwok's *Girl in Translation*". Other two previous studies that use the perspective of symbolic interactionism are; a journal that is conducted by Amie, Nuryatin, and Haryati entitled "*Interaksi Simbolik Tokoh Dewa dalam Novel Biola Tak Berdawai Karya Seno Gumira Ajidarma: Kajian Interaksionisme Simbolik George Herbert Mead*" and Dian Susilastri's journal entitled "*Oposisi Biner dalam Interkasionisme Simbolik pada Cerita Pendek 'Tentang Perempuan (TPT)' Karya Benny Arnas*".

Farlina (2008), in her research, uses the cultural identity theory to know how it influences the life of Amir and Hassan in Khaled Hossein's novel "The Kite Runner". These two novel's characters are Afghanistan-American as their background. Farlina stated in her research that Amir and Hassan had the cultural identity that was stable and could not be changed by anything. The cultural identity was seen in the portrait of Hassan who always accepted anything from his land. Diaspora is seen in Amir who used Afghan wedding, even lives in America. The research that conducted by Farlina used cultural identity and diaspora but this research focuses on cultural identity, not diaspora. Of course, the primary data is different.

Wati, Setiawan, and Astutiningsih (2015), in their article, stated that they focused on cultural identity and cultural dislocation. They explained about the process of cultural identity and cultural dislocation toward immigrant experiences.

From the process of adaptation by immigrants depicted from the interaction between the past culture and the new culture as an obstacle and the problem. Their research concluded that Jean Kwok tried to describe immigrants experience cultural identity and cultural dislocation as the impact of doing immigrant. Immigrants who moved from one country to another country had to learn language and culture in order to be accepted by the government. It had Chinese-American as a background. This research is different in cultural dislocation that Wati and her partners' research conducted. The primary data is different, too.

Amie, Nuryatin, and Haryati (2014) conducted a research about symbolic interactionism in their journal. They used symbolic interactionism theory to describe the symbol and its meaning in the novel entitled "*Biola Tak Berdawai*" by Seno Gumira Ajidarma. The symbol was related to the character named Dewa. The research's result is the symbol implicitly used by Dewa to interact with his mother – Renjani. Aniandhini and partners' research did not describe the three concepts of 'mind', 'self', and 'society'. This research explains those three concepts. The primary data is also different.

Susilastri (2019), in her journal, conducted a research about symbolic interactionism related with binary opposition. She described the symbols of interaction in the short story called "*Tentang Perempuan (TPT)*". The research's result is that there was some interactions happened in the process of defining symbol. Mind, self, and society were processed in Mak Atut, the weigh worker "*tukang dacing*", and the society did not show the linier binary opposition. The relation between behavior, punishment, humanity or empathy, and value of money versus a soul did not have correlation. It showed that there was the difference of characters' perspective towards a same symbol that ended up in conflict. It was called as the failure of the process of symbolic interactionism. This research is different with Susilastri's research in the context of binary opposition. This research focuses on symbolic interactionism without the binary opposition. The primary data of this research is different from her research.