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Abstract

This research attempts to reveal the social stratification depicted in the short story entitled ‘The Doll’s House’ by Katherine Mansfield. Qualitative research design with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach is applied to achieve the research goal. This research focuses on the points of Social Structure, Field, Doxa, Capitals, and Struggle of Pierre Bourdieu. The theme and characters’ interaction will be dissected using the five elements mentioned. In regard to social structure, the finding shows that The Burnell’s family is undoubtedly rich while The Kelvey’s family is poor. The Burnells mingle with other rich people only. They treat lower-class people arbitrarily, that even their new doll’s house is not open for marginalized group. The social fields of this story are Burnell’s house where the interaction between upper-class people takes place, and the school where children with various status levels associate. Meanwhile, the doxas found are the oldest child has more privileges in family, people tend to befriend with those coming from the same social class, and lower-class people are more likely to speak using non-standard English. The Burnell’s daughters and their allies palpably possess economic, cultural, and social capitals. The Kelveys, on the other hand, lack it all. Lastly, the struggles are experienced by Isabel, Kezia, and little Kelveys in obviously different extent.
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INTRODUCTION

In the broadest sense, literature flaunts how community life takes place. It delineates people involving in social interaction and paves the way for readers to closely examine certain societal issues. It is hence not only imaginative, but also reflective along with its role to portray a particular culture and thought. As mentioned by Keerthika (2018), literature depicts negative and positive values of the society. The negative values are reflected to encourage people to fix and solve the issues, while the positive values are portrayed to influence people to emulate. In line with this, Onyekachi et al. (2020) argue that literature has long been fundamental means for the author to excoriate the unsavory social and political situations which may lead to the oppression by certain high-ranking officials. Thus, as a social document, literary works reserve various problems experienced by human being, both individually and collectively, to assist readers in obtaining a nuanced view of intricate matters.

One of social issues which is often raised in literature is social stratification. It is a system of categorizing individuals into rankings of higher or lower; superior or inferior; prestigious or insignificant tiers, based on education, wealth, income, ethnicity, gender, race, or occupation. Story of ‘The Doll House’ by Katherine Mansfield is one that
takes up this social phenomenon where the characters are stratified based on their family's economic status. Mansfield starts the story by describing the lavish living of Burnell’s children who inhabit a luxurious mansion complete with the maids, and always wear fancy clothes to school. She then compares their lifestyle to the poor life of Kelvey's daughters who wear clothes made of used rags, and whose mother works only as a washerwoman. Mansfield also exposes the discrimination that occurs within the social classes, particularly among upper and lower classes, reflected in how Mrs. Burnell forbids her children from associating with Kelvey's daughters who are in the same school as her children. Besides, The Burnell’s daughters (except Kezia) disallow Kelvey’s daughters to see their sumptuous new doll house.

This study aims to scrutinize the social stratification on the story of ‘The Doll House’. It needs to be done for it enables the readers to examine social stratification as a phenomenon commonly found in society. It also opens the readers’ insights of the norms, traditions, beliefs of other societies, including situations and socio-cultural problems encountered in life. Furthermore, the readers can learn the new cultures that were not known before, for instance how western people in previous century as told in ‘The Doll House’ went through their days under such social class division.

To achieve the objective, the researcher decided to conduct critical discourse analysis by utilizing Bourdieu’s theoretical framework. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) refers to a framework used to disclose the correlation between dominance, power, and inequality as exhibited in language (Wodak, 1995). In a wider context, Fowler (1991) mentions that CDA generally aims to establish vivid connection among discourse, social practice, and social structure. Bourdieu's theoretical framework alone holds the notion that one's behavior is closely related to culture, social structures, and power. He manifest the notion into three major concepts namely habitus, field, and capital (Beames & Telford, 2013).

Similar research had been done previously by Fitriana (2015) regarding self-positioning and social oppression happened in the story. By using postcolonial theory, she found that The Burnells clearly considers themselves as a dominant party while The Kelveys positions themselves as a minority. The two opposing positions then keep them apart to each other. It is reflected by the way The Burnells as the upper class establishes certain rules to oppress The Kelveys socially. The way The Kelveys survive is by obeying the rules created by The Burnells. They obviously lack the courage to fight back. To enrich the readers' insight of this story and to obtain different results from previous research, the researcher decides to analyze the story through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis with the following research question: How is the social stratification in the story of ‘The Doll House’ by Katherine Mansfield according to Bourdieu’s theoretical framework?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Stratification

Social stratification has long been detected among society. Bettero (2005) believes that all human beings live on pre-existing distributions of unequal economic resources, status, and power, leading to the existence of more and less privileged individuals within particular community. The term ‘social stratification’ hence appears to represent this “patterning of inequality and its enduring consequences on the lives of those who experience it” (p.12). Supporting this argument, Sharma & Barbora (2019) define social stratification as the level of social differences which refers to a set of criteria such as power, prestige, and property. Its origin may be caused by functional
requirement of social life, inherited difference from family, the subjugation of one party by the elites, or differential scarcity of certain individuals. There are four main types of social stratification namely slavery, estate, caste, and social class (Vanlaldika, 2010). Slavery happens when a person possesses absolute right to take any action toward those who have officially become his slaves. Estate is the less strict form of caste which evolves in Europe during middle ages. It is established politically by man-made laws instead of religious ordinance. Meanwhile, caste is specified in hierarchical order based on religion, that is varna model in Hinduism—Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya, and Shudra. Lastly, social class is the division of group based on some determinants such as income, wealth, occupation, and so on.

The issue of social stratification is vividly depicted in the story of ‘The Doll House’ written by Katherine Mansfield in 1922. It was first published in The Nation and Athenaeum on February 4th and was written using the modernist with minute details as well as haphazard narratives. Mansfield alone was born in New Zealand on 14 October 1888. She moved to United Kingdom in 1905 and befriended with modernist writers such as D.H Lawrence and Virginia Wolf. During her career journey, she had written many selections of poems, short stories, novels, letters, and journals. The Doll House has been one of her popular works which shows a simple story line of children fancying a doll house of the Burnells, and how children from certain class are treated differently.

**Critical Discourse Analysis**

Critical Discourse Analysis is done to carefully examine the social stratification in the story. It is described as a branch of critical social analysis which serves a focus to discourse and on relations between discourse and other social elements (Fairclough, 1989). Fairclough (1989) further explicates that the discourse had three dimensions: meaning making as an element of the social process (semiosis), the language associated with a particular social field practice, and a way of construing aspects of the world associated with a particular social perspective. Similarly, Van Dijk (1995) perceives Critical Discourse Analysis as an interdisciplinary approach to conceive the connection between discourse, social inequality, power, and dominance. What is meant by dominance here is the enforcement of social power by some elites or groups, resulting in social, culture, ethnicity, gender, or politics inequality.

**Bourdieu’s Framework**

In analyzing the story, the researcher adapts Pierre Bourdieu’s framework of social practice as it is deeply in line with social context reflected in the story of ‘The Doll House’. Bourdieu’s key conceptual tools cover social structure, field, capital, doxa, and struggle. Social Structure here means a set of system which is durable and regulated in such a way penetrating into a pattern. It is the product of social interaction that always presents and affects all dimensions of human experience in society (Bourdieu, 1972). It also relates to being power and powerless, determined “by the structure of relations between all the pertinent properties which gives its specific value to each of them and to the effects they exert on practices” (Bourdieu, 1984, p.106).

Field is viewed as a spatial metaphor, a network of relations among the objecting parties and a social arena in which struggles, or maneuvers take place over specific resources or stakes and access to them. Furthermore, it represents cultural goods, housing, intellectual distinction, employment, land, power, politics, social class, and prestige. Bourdieu (1975) asserts that in field, power relations where practices of agents come about, are not arbitrary. All is understood that all interactions are
anchored in specific social field, that it now must be examined how positions on the respective fields are gained. The scope of social field is where the effect rotates and outside of it, the effects end.

Capitals are resources endowed for agents with a specific quantity and structure to be used to enter the social field. The capitals were transformed into economic capital, cultural capital, social capital, and symbolic capital. Those four capitals generate what is called distinction and could be exchanged into others and have parallel effects (Bourdieu, 1986). Economic capital refers to wealth, fortune, and revenues. Cultural capital is the capital transformed by family and education. Cultural capitals are embodied (habits, manners, attitudes, work ethics), objective (physical objects such as paintings, sculptures, books) and institutionalized (diplomas, certificates, licenses). Social capital is described as a person’s entirety or network that enables a person to access to material, immaterial, information and knowledge resources. This capital can be obtained by efforts or nobility which may be institutionalized and require creation and maintenance. The social capital can also be legitimized (Bourdieu, 1986). Lastly, symbolic capital is a combination of the other capitals that shows the recognition and honor of a person. This capital is recognized internally and externally by other competitors (Bourdieu, 1997).

Doxa is seen as schemes of thought and perception of the authority and hence beyond questions are believed as people’s scheme as a result of social convention (Bourdieu, 1997). The dominant class have an interest to defend the integrity of doxa, while the dominated tend to push it back. Doxa can be based on genders, political views, occupation, or even religious views. It often causes class struggle between the dominant and dominated parties. At last, struggle refers to the way of using capitals to get the best that mainly takes place in the social field. In this stage, agents with complete and higher capitals will get the benefits in the process of struggle.

METHOD

Qualitative research design with the approach of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is applied to reveal the social stratification in the story of ‘The Doll House’. Qualitative research refers to the design used to obtain “understanding of people’s behavior and/or experience in a rich and complex setting that specific for the particular group of people or setting that is being studied” (Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, 2009, p.127). The design is chosen because it enables the researcher to elaborate the characteristics of data systematically and in a detail way.

Moreover, qualitative design suits the objective of this study as it is constructed within the boundary of social sciences, so it enables the research to explore social and cultural phenomena. According to Wertz et al. (2011), there are five approaches under qualitative research design, particularly in the field of social science, namely; grounded theory, narrative research, phenomenology, intuitive inquiry, and discourse analysis. This study chooses critical discourse analysis as the approach to analyze the data, due to its concern on the relation among text and social phenomena.

The source of data in this study is the story entitled ‘The Doll House’ by Katherine Mansfield which was first published in 1922. This story is vividly developed within the theme of class prejudice, depicted from the way the characters divided into a hierarchy of social stratification according to their economic capital. The researcher is therefore interested in revealing the existing social classes and how it furtherly impacts the daily life of the characters.
There are some steps that the researcher takes in gathering the data. Firstly, the researcher reads the story for several times to gain in-depth comprehension. Secondly, the researcher underlines sentences, expressions, or phrases that noticeably refer to social stratification. Next, the researcher analyzes the data using Bourdieu's framework consisting of social structure, field, capitals, doxa, and struggle. The results of analysis are presented descriptively. In a nutshell overall, the data collection was done in December 2020. The data that had been collected were then examined in January-February 2021.

DISCUSSION

The Doll's House story is started with the arrival of Aunt Hay to the Burnell's house. The new doll house — smelt with paint — was put in the courtyard. It soon became the popular object of the Burnell's sisters especially the oldest Isabel who proposed herself the one who spread the news. The children were hypnotized by the brand-new doll house. They examined it carefully and overjoyed. Kezia was the youngest who paid attention to the lamp inside and soon fell in love with it. Isabel spread the good news to her classmates and had the privilege to invite two friends together to watch the doll house. They could get close and enjoyed the miniatures inside the house. All classmates were cordially invited to have a look but the Kelveys. Lil and Else were persona non grata of the affairs. There were not invited and would never be – as proclaimed by Mrs Burnell. The Kelveys were poor – the partnership of a washerwoman Mrs Kelvey and a jailbird, Mr Kelvey. Lil and Else were the consequences – thrown out from the party. Isabel and her friends were strictest in obeying their parents' words, so they treated the Kelvey's sisters in different ways. Some old folks showed the same rejection, even the teacher. Lil and Else felt it. Kezia, the eldest of the Burnell's sisters, one day asked the Kelveys' sisters Lil and Else to see the doll house. Reluctantly, they came with Kezia to see the doll house. They even not that long could enjoy seeing the doll house by the goodness of Kezia. Aunt Beryl knew it and suddenly chased the Kelveys' sisters away. She shooed them off like chicken. Lil and Else were happy to be able to see the doll house like other children did. The different point came from Else who in over joy told her sister that she could see the lamp as Kezia did. The lamp meant something to her.

It is basically a story containing lots of critical values. In this part, the story will be analyzed using the five elements of Pierre Bourdieu namely Social Structure, Field, Doxa, Capitals, and Struggle. The analysis will be arranged into five sections:

Social Structure

Social class prejudice has been pronouncedly portrayed since the beginning of the story. The Burnells here is told to be the upper-class family, detected from their privilege to receive such a luxurious doll's house. The beauty and resplendence of that doll's house are no joke, as revealed in this part:

*There stood the Doll's house, a dark, oily, spinach green, picked out with bright yellow. Its two solid little chimneys, glued on to the roof, were painted red and white, and the door, gleaming with yellow varnish, was like a little slab of toffee. Four windows, real windows, were divided into panes by a broad streak of green. There was actually a tiny porch, too, painted yellow, with big lumps of congealed paint hanging along the edge. But perfect, perfect little house! Who could possibly mind the smell. It was part of the joy, part of the newness.* (D1_DH)
The doll’s house is absolutely perfect with its charming colors and well-thought out design, despite its unpleasant smell. Just by glancing at it, people will know that not just anyone can accept it. Only rich people can receive such glamorous gift, which is of course given by their rich relatives too. The fact that The Burnells own palatial doll’s house makes the children – Isabel, Kezia, and Lottie – adored and approached by their classmates:

Isabel was choosing the two who were to come back with them that afternoon and see it. She chose Emmie Cole and Lena Logan. But when the others knew they were all to have a chance, they couldn’t be nice enough to Isabel. One by one they put their arms round Isabel’s waist and walked her off. They had something to whisper to her, a secret. “Isabel’s my friend.”(D2_DH)

The snippet above illustrates how Isabel’s friends act like social climber. Basically, social clients are people who lack of self-confidence and then use the existence of others to increase their self-confidence. They, thus, are less likely to build genuine friendships. If they are surrounded by people with lower social status, they will feel their ‘needs’ are not being met. The phenomenon of social climber also reflects how society in the story are stratified vertically and that there is always a person who puts more efforts in order to achieve higher personal status for the sake of self-actualization. In this story, the way the girls at school increase their social status is by trying to be nice to Isabel and calling her their friend, so that Isabel will allow her to see her doll house.

Mrs. Burnell’s decision to send her children in the school they are on also indicates her high social status as she chooses that school not because of its great quality, rather because that is the only school nearby:

For the fact was, the school the Burnell children went to was not at all the kind of place their parents would have chosen if there had been any choice. But there was none. It was the only school for miles. (D3_DH)

This is to say that Mrs. Burnell is absolutely able to send her children in a greater, more expensive school if any. She might also choose a more elite school so that her children are not surrounded by lower class children. Unfortunately, there is no such distinguished school near here house, but that one where all the children of the neighbourhood, the Judge’s little girls, the doctor’s daughters, the store-keeper’s children, the milkman’s, are forced to gather. The fact that Mrs. Burnell wanted her daughters to be friends with children whose social status was comparable with her was actually very reasonable. As the proverb says, ‘birds of the feather flock together’, one must have a desire to be in an environment populated with individuals like themselves. This is in line with Umphress et al.’s finding (2007) that a person’s desire to be surrounded by people of the same type is true, especially in dominant or upper social class.

Another proof reflecting the Burnell’s social status is their way to differ themselves from the Kelveys, the poor. Mrs. Burnell openly forbids Kezia to invite the Kelveys observing their doll’s house since the Kelvey’s family background are a way too different with them. Mrs. Kelvey is only a little washerwoman while his husband is a prisoner. Besides that, Lil Kelvey and and Else Kelvey’s physical appearance is very different with their school friends as depicted below:

What a little guy she looked! It was impossible not to laugh. And her little sister, our Else, wore a long white dress, rather like a nightgown, and a pair of little boy’s boots. But whatever our Else wore she would have looked strange. (D4_DH)
Else and Lil do not dress either like their teachers or the other children, and hence The Burnells and most of the people overlook them. History notes that showing off affluence through clothes has become customary in Europe since the late thirteenth century (Medvedev, 2017). Clothes are capable of denoting individual's property, economic status, culture, moral standards, and degree of power in society, so one's social class could be recognize with relative ease by clothes. Here, the way Else and Lil dressed make them be too obvious in signifying their economic status. In consequence, neither Lil nor Else can speak to the Burnells and others in school. When the rich pass them, they would keep their heads up and even mock at them sometimes. This assuredly depicts the enormous gap of social structure among the rich and the poor.

Field

There are two main fields in this story which exhibit the different classes, namely The Burnell’s house and the school. The Burnell’s house is treated as the arena of Isabel to interact with others in the same social level. For instance, when the doll’s house is just landed to their house, Isabel yells, “Open it quickly, someone!” (D5_DH). She might ask her mother, sisters, or Aunt Beryl for help. Second interaction in The Burnell’s house happens among Isabel and her sisters, Kezia and Lottie:

“I’m to tell,” said Isabel, “because I’m the eldest. And you two can join in after. But I’m to tell first.”
“And I’m to choose who’s to come and see it first. Mother said I might.” (D6_DH)

This conversation implies that Burnell’s house is not merely a field for Isabel to communicate with those coming from the same social class, but also an arena for her to utilize her cultural capital. She is certainly aware that it is common for the first-born child to get more privilege compared to younger siblings, at least in the culture where she grows up. She, thus, do not wish to waste that privilege and use it to satisfy her ego, in this case, become the one who tells her friends about the doll’s house and chooses whom to see it. In other words, Isabel shows the power and domination in the field, in which she interacts with the chosen others. The agents here possess the relative similar capital status. At least they are considered “not poor”, as follow:

Isabel was choosing the two who were to come back with them that afternoon and see it. She chose Emmie Cole and Lena Logan. But when the others knew they were all to have a chance, they couldn’t be nice enough to Isabel. (D2_DH)

While Emmie and Lena are chosen due to their family’s economic status, other friends whose status might be slightly below The Burnell compete approaching Isabel to be allowed to see her new doll’s house. From this case, we may conclude that The Burnell’s house and courtyard where the doll’s house stands can be referred to as an exclusive field. Only children from well-respected families may come in. Those coming from lower-class family should not walk even an inch there, otherwise, they will be evicted like Lil and Else;

“How dare you ask the little Kelveys into the courtyard?” said her cold, furious voice. “You know as well as I do, you’re not allowed to talk to them. Run away, children, run away at once. And don’t come back again,” said Aunt Beryl. And she stepped into the yard and shooed them out as if they were chickens. “Off you go immediately!” she called, cold and proud. (D7_DH)
Indeed, only the chosen and respected may visit The Burnell’s house. This field is so arrogant and overwhelmed with social power, domination, and oppression. It is not in the least bit friendly to the marginalized.

On the other hand, the school is a mixed social field where children with various levels of status gather into one. The storekeeper, milkman, doctor, judge’s children and, of course, The little Kelveys are there.

And the consequence was all the children of the neighbourhood, the Judge’s little girls, the doctor’s daughters, the store-keeper’s children, the milkman’s, were forced to mix together. Not to speak of there being an equal number of rude, rough little boys as well (D8_DH).

Such situation is more balanced even though domination is not absent there. Children from the upper and lower class mingle in the classroom and interacted. The field is not exclusive for a certain class as it is an educational interaction rather than hobbies (not “the doll house’s club”). Though it is a mixture field, the difference tells. The way the dominants treated the dominated is implicitly described through the teacher’s attitudes:

Even the teacher has a special voice for them, and a special smile for the other children when Lil Kelveys came up to her desk with a bunch of dreadfully common-looking flowers (D9_DH).

3. Doxa

There are some doxas in the story. The first one is portrayed by Isabel’s statement: “I’m to tell because I’m the eldest. And you two can join in after. But I’m to tell first” (D6_DH) symbolizing that the first and oldest child should be prioritized. Isabel’s statement also shows her power to control over her sisters, that is, their chance to speak. Such doxa of oldest-child’s privilege grows extensively in many regions of worlds and still counts today. Society tends to think that being the firstborn child has its perks, one of them is to be more powerful. Sulloway (2002) examines this phenomenon and figures out that birth order is the most potential source of sibling strategies. It emerges since birth order is highly connected with some differences such as physical appearance, power, age, and status in the family. Those disparities make siblings to feel family bonding in disparate ways and to pursue ways of optimizing their parents’ prosperity. Alfred Adler, one of the foremost psychologists in history, therefore calls the firstborn child as “power-hungry conservatives”. Despite this unknown assumption, taking advantage of ‘the oldest child’ excuse to rule other siblings arbitrarily is fallacy. Every child, regardless their birth order, must have equal rights and opportunities in family.

The second doxa is found within social interaction among the characters in which the rich people only mingle with people of the same level, as the way the Burnells befriend with upper-class children and ignore the Kelveys’ presence:

But the line had to be drawn somewhere. It was drawn at the Kelveys. Many of the children, including the Burnells, were not allowed even to speak to them. They walked past the Kelveys with their heads in the air, and as they set the fashion in all matters of behaviour, the Kelveys were shunned by everybody (D10_DH).

This has been a deep-rooted belief in society which is universally favourable. As it is regarded ‘right’ by many people, it confirms the agent, particularly the dominant group to carry out their actions and thoughts (Bourdieu, 1984). Therefore, this doxa prioritizes the dominant party and rules out to the oppressed like Little Kelveys. This
doxa is most likely triggered by human nature to associate with people similar to them in socially significant ways. Such tendency is called homophily. According to the research done by Curry & Dunbar (2013) people with same education, social class, religion, sex, ethnicity, occupation, attitudes, opinions tend to get along. It applies to all degree of intimacy, from casual acquaintance to married couple. Even so, homophily cannot be established as a justification for mistaken beliefs like discrimination and racism.

The last doxa is represented in the sentence “Your ma told our ma you wasn’t to speak to us” (D11_DH) which was uttered by Lil Kelvey. She utters grammatically wrong sentence that may be caused by her lower-class status. This doxa to which many people believe that lower-class speakers tend to use non-standard English is widespread. It may have to do with sad possibility such as leaving the education earlier, possessing non-professional jobs, and hence they are not exposed to certain lexis or ‘prestigious’ way of speaking. In spite of being considered ‘correct’, many linguists emphasize that standard English is not superior to any spoken dialect and that no dialect is at lower level than standard English (Trudgill, 2011).

**Capitals**

The possession of economic, cultural and social capitals was clearly described by Mansfield in representation of the Burnells’ daughters and her allies (judge and doctor’s daughters), while the presence of a doll’s house completed the capital. The economic capital is portrayed by The Burnell’s real house and doll’s house. It is told in the story that The Burnell’s family lives in a big and plush house. They do not provide for their own needs, their maids do. The beautiful clothes they wear everyday could not be more accurate in reflecting their abundant treasure and high economic status. The doll’s house itself symbolizes The Burnells. It is splendid and expensive-looking, as described below:

*There stood the Doll’s house, a dark, oily, spinach green, picked out with bright yellow. Its two solid little chimneys, glued on to the roof, were painted red and white, and the door, gleaming with yellow varnish, was like a little slab of toffee. Four windows, real windows, were divided into panes by a broad streak of green. There was actually a tiny porch, too, painted yellow, with big lumps of congealed paint hanging along the edge. But perfect, perfect little house! Who could possibly mind the smell. It was part of the joy, part of the newness. (D12_DH)*

*There you were, gazing at one and the same moment into the drawing-room and dining-room, the kitchen and two bedrooms. That is the way for a house to open! Why don’t all houses open like that? (D13_DH)*

It is too marvellous that it fascinates and amazes all the beholder. No one could resist the doll’s house charm. Girls try their best to flatter Isabel, expecting her to let them see the doll’s house closely. It even becomes the talk of the town. The doll’s house is such a powerful magnet to everyone, and so are The Burnell’s economic capital.

*Days passed, and as more children saw the doll’s house, the fame of it spread. It became the one subject, the rage. The one question was, “Have you seen Burnells’ doll’s house? Oh, ain’t it lovely!” “Haven’t you seen it? Oh, I say! (D14_DH)*

The cultural capital, in addition, is showed by the classy acts of The Burnells, i.e. the way the daughters request permissions:
"Mother," said Kezia, "can't I ask the Kelveys just once?" "Certainly not, Kezia." "But why not?" "Run away, Kezia; you know quite well why not." (D15_DH)

The Burnells are illustrated organised and disciplined family despite their unfair inner state. Being rich drives them to be well-educated and completely aware the importance of having good manners such as respecting the elders. Besides, good manners have been associated with elite people all this time, so they are encouraged to be the role model for others.

Lastly, the social capital is represented through the event of experiencing the doll’s house – the member league and the prestige of witnessing the object. Thus, the classmates are to die for visiting Isabel's house and be part of the elite circle as the invited. The group itself can be assumed as political parties. It is prestigious if you have an access to it. The Kelveys sniff the chance to have the access i.e. the social capital though hardly possible. Eventually they got the chance of the joyous moment as they are invited by Kezia to see the doll’s house when nobody's home. They felt they get the network as symbolically Else sees the light. That is the spirit and new hope.

**Struggle**

Isabel, Kezia and The Kelveys show the struggles in the social field. Isabel is the complete with capitals. She has the doll house, the economic capital, cultural capital and social capital as the eldest, so that she own the prime position and power. She might not be hard in winning her struggle given that she is dominant. Isabel tries so hard to spread the domination using the doll house. She tells about the capital to her classmates and invites them to witness the majesty property. Thus, she utilizes the capitals to gain more social capital “the influential power” towards others as follow:

*Isabel tried to make up for it by looking very important and mysterious and by whispering behind her hand to the girls near her, “Got something to tell you at playtime.”* (D16_DH)

*Isabel was choosing the two who were to come back with them that afternoon and see it. She chose Emmie Cole and Lena Logan* (D2_DH)

Kezia, on the other hand, has less power. She does not own as complete capitals as her sister. She is overshadowed by her sister’s capitals. She exercises it, so she finds another flexible way to invite the kelveys during her sister’s absence:

*“Hullo,” she said to the passing Kelveys. They were so astounded that they stopped. Lil gave her silly smile. Our Else stared. “You can come and see our doll’s house if you want to,” said Kezia, and she dragged one toe on the ground. But at that Lil turned red and shook her head quickly. “Why not?” asked Kezia.* (D17_DH)

In that situation, the owner of absolute capitals is unable to control her. That is why the total powerless little Kelveys are invited. The Kelveys are lend a piece of social capital by Kezia. They are granted access to see the doll’s house. Of course, the struggle is harder than Isabel and Kezia as they do not have such capitals. This situation is perfectly described that how they have to silently go through the courtyard in such a terrified move and silence.
CONCLUSION

After analysing the story, some conclusions can be generated that a story can be dissected using the Critical Discourse Analysis perspective. A story can be learned through its characters and theme that they show a certain portrait of societies. Through the story, a line of value can be extracted to shape our understanding of the unfair and imbalanced community. The Burnells show about the upper class’s cavalier attitudes. They are dominants. Other upper-class characters also show the domination through utterances and actions. The Kelveys, on the other side, are the dominated individuals. They have less power and capitals. The five elements of Bourdieu’s theory help us describe the social phenomena, particularly the stratification faced by societies here and there, now and then. By understanding this analysis, proper moral movements and changes could be initiated to have better societal lives.
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