

## CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### 2.1 Previous Studies

The first previous study was done by Prakash and Sujata (2014) entitled “Women as the Oppressed Lot in *The God of Small Things*”. They focused the study in lot of oppressed women characters in the novel. Their aim of the study is to analyze lot of women character in Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things*. The main discussion of the study was about gender discrimination, Lack of freedom of the female, breaking the boundaries, and marginalization of women. They also depicted the inner sacrifice of women characters in the novel that rebels the patriarchal assumption

The second related study is thesis from Kennet Grav (2012) “British God in Indian World” , the Portrayals of the legacy of British colonialism in Arundhati Roy’s *The god of small things*, which studied about Postcolonialism in form of how Roy’s attitude about the colonization of British toward Indian. It also used characters analysis that some selected characters were analyzed based on Homi Bhabha’s view on the postcolonial term ‘hybridity’.

The third study was done by Devi Prasad Siwakoti (2010) entitled “Disruption and Subversion of Patriarchal Normativity in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*”. She analyzed the novel dealing the concept of subversion and disruption of the patriarchal normativity. Her finding is that the society described in the novel is run by the patriarchal norms and values, rules and regulations which are bias and partial, and which privileges males as superior and degrades females as inferior.

The next following study was conducted by the researcher of University of 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya. The entitled study “The Images of Kerala’s Women through Kochama’s Family in Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things*” was done by Ratni Sari Wijayanti (2005). This study focused on identifying women major character in the novel (as it is only based the study on the representation of women in Kerala from Kochama’s Family) as a member of Kochama’s family. This study employed descriptive method by analyzing the novel through the intrinsic elements (Character and Setting). Her findings stated that: First women in matrilineal society have enormous right over property and important duty in preparing family rites but the actual ownership isn’t theirs. Second, women at any reason especially due to their appearance are considered as a sex object and considered lower by the man in every caste. Last, considering

that the representation of ideal woman in India is Mamachi as this character educated and a submissive wife but the representation of woman in Kerala is Ammu as this character has an idealism to protect their children.

The last review of related study was done by Gisela Swara Gita Andika (2015) entitled “Breaking the Love Law: Identity and transgression in Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things*”. She studied about the idea of biology and transgression focused on the leading character, Ammu. She applied the theory of feminism and kinship based identity. Her finding stated that the Identity category of Ammu who inherits the obligation to prolong the family’s good reputation function systematically just like a law, a law that is referred in the novel as the Love Law

## 2.2 Theoretical Framework

### a. Marxist literary criticism

This present study in general is based on sociological approach. It is what Terry Eagleton called as the reference for the people in the West as “Sociology of literature” (2006:1). However, Marxist criticism is not somehow precisely equal with the term of sociology of literature that only deals with literary production, distribution and exchange in a particular society. Marxist criticism is more specified identifying that literature can be seen as a product of a particular history. Terry also added that “Marxist criticism is not merely a ‘sociology of literature’, concerned with how novels get published and whether they mention the working class. Its aim is to explain the literary work more fully; and this means a sensitive attention to its forms, styles and meanings. But it also means grasping those forms, styles and meanings as the products of a particular history” (2006:2). “Literature and sociology are not wholly distinct disciplines but on contrary, complement each other in our understanding of society”. (Laurenson and Swingewood, 1972: 20)

Marxist literary criticism considers that economic or material that becomes the fundamental reason for people to react. It is then said that every phenomena happened in the middle of society is affected or related with the mode of production because it is only through economic activity that people can produce the things they need for their physical survival. This term is called as “The economic structure of society” or economic base or infrastructure. The concepts which are shown in Marxist criticism are: *First*, ‘Base’ which is the simple term of economic

base as the portrait relations between class of society: capitalist class who owns the means of production and proletariat class who owns nothing excepts their labor-skill to be sold and exploited by the capitalist.

It is widely known that Marxist literary criticism is considered as a tool to comprehend literary in the relation of historical situation where the literary first made. “Marxist criticism analyses literature in terms of the historical conditions which produce it; and it needs, similarly, to be aware of its own historical conditions”. Economic seems to be a very crucial factor that determines one consciousness. Economic as a power that covers social and political side of a certain society is therefore called as *Socioeconomic* to point out class structure. “In Marxist terminology, economic conditions are referred to as material circumstances, and the social/political/ideological atmosphere generated by material conditions is called the historical situation”(2006:54).

Lois Tyson (2006:53-54) in critical theory today, routledge, newyork-london assert that “For Marxism, getting and keeping economic power is the motive behind all social and political activities, including education, philosophy, religion, government, the arts, science, technology, the media, and so on. Thus, economics is the base on which the superstructure of social/political/ideological realities is built”. Clearly, it is believed that Economic is in the very *base* for people to react as it is already mentioned that the basic idea of all is Economic *base*. Terry Eagleton also noted that “From this economic base, in every period, emerges a ‘superstructure’ certain forms of law and politics, a certain kind of state, whose essential function is to legitimate the power of the social class which owns the means of economic production. But the superstructure contains more than this: it also consists of certain ‘definite forms of social consciousness’ (political, religious, ethical, aesthetic and so on), which is what Marxism designates as ideology. The function of ideology, also, is to legitimate the power of the ruling class in society; in the last analysis, the dominant ideas of a society are the ideas of its ruling class.”

From the above explanations forwarded by Marxists on the notion of base and superstructure, it can be said that the superstructure is a direct or nearly direct reflection of what is happening at the level of the base.

b. Social Inequality

Social inequality, as a terminology, isn't obviously easy to be defined. It has indeed already brought debatable arguments. Marx himself quite frequently and with very few exceptions, mentions 'equality' only to make the point that it is an exclusively political notion, and, as a political value, that it is a distinctively bourgeois value (often associated with the French revolutionary slogan: *liberté, égalité, fraternité*). Far from being a value that can be used to the class oppression, Marx thinks the idea of equality is actually a vehicle for bourgeois class oppression, and something quite distinct from the communist goal of the abolition of classes.

Lydia Hiraide defines "Social inequality refers to the unequal distribution of Resources such as power, wealth and income and Opportunities (related, for example, to health, education and employment) (2013:1). However, Ashley Crossman definition on social inequality is more applicable for sociology research in which he assert that "Social inequality results from a society organized by hierarchies of class, race, and gender that broker access to resources and rights in ways that make their distribution unequal. It can manifest in a variety of ways, like income and wealth inequality, unequal access to education and cultural resources, and differential treatment by the police and judicial system, among others. Social inequality goes hand in hand with social stratification" ([www.thoughtco.com](http://www.thoughtco.com) updated August 07, 2017). Thus, this research still attempts to comprehend the idea or concept of social inequality through Marxist literary criticism.

Structured inequality, and stratification, is a fundamental aspect of social world. Social stratification refers to the way society is structured into a hierarchy of strata that are unequally ranked. A social hierarchy is shaped like a pyramid with each stratum more powerful than the one below it. The most privileged group forms the top layer and vice versa. Stratification involves inequalities between groups in the distribution of socioeconomic resources such as wealth, income, status and power. These inequalities persist or continue over time. There are, in general, two ways of classifying the various types of social stratification system. First, the difference is classified based on how the status in a society could be ascribed or achieved. And second, it depends on how the system applied the open or closed system. In an open system of

stratification, status is achieved and social mobility is possible (meritocratic). In a closed system, status is ascribed so social mobility is highly unlikely (Hiraide, 2013:1).

There are two main ways to measure social inequality: inequality of conditions, and inequality of opportunities. Inequality of conditions refers to the unequal distribution of income, wealth and material goods. Inequality of opportunities refers to the unequal distribution of "life chances" across individuals. This is reflected in measures such as level of education, health status, and treatment by the criminal justice system.

Life chances are the most important part that one should take a note in order to comprehend the term of social inequality. Life chances are a key aspect of studying social inequality and stratification. Life chances refer to people's chances of having positive or negative outcomes over their lifetime in relation to, for example, their education, health, income, employment and housing. Life chances are distributed unequally between individuals and groups because they are affected by social factors such as class position, gender and ethnicity. People in higher social classes have more chance than those in other classes of accessing good quality healthcare and decent housing. Life chances are shaped by inequalities in wealth, income, power and status. (Hiraide, 2013:1)

Lydia Hiraide then divided social inequality based on Gender, Ethnicity, and Age. Social Inequality based on gender is proposed by feminist. It is a kind of feminist approach seeing gender inequality in the middle of patriarchal society. Social inequality based gender is the idea in which the feminist believed that they see society as a patriarchal one in which men: 1. Have a lot of power within families, politics and the workplace, and 2. generally receive a bigger share of rewards such as wealth and status. Inequality based on Ethnicity is a form of inequality based on ethnic group. It is certainly related with the case of racism. "Research has also found that men and women of Pakistani and Bangladeshi heritage have much worse chances of getting professional and managerial jobs than their white peers of the same age and educational level". And the last is inequality based on age. This kind of inequality stress upon the term Ageism (prejudice/discrimination upon

the basis of age) and concerning with the phenomenon of child labor (Hiraide. 2013:4-5)