

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

3.1. Research Method

This research is a qualitative, analytical descriptive research. It is qualitative research because the phenomena in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* are portrayed as a social reality that is shaped by social, religious, and sciences values. It is also descriptive research because the phenomena in this novel are interpreted through the written text. The approach of this study is poststructuralist. A poststructuralist approach is a literary discourse that contradicts with structuralism, as structuralist approach always emphasises on the unity of the text through the dominant meaning, whereas poststructuralist approach—deconstructive analysis, to be precise—collects all meanings in the text, even the marginal ones, to show the failure of the text's unity. Therefore, this research does not aim to be a structuralism analysis, but a deconstructive analysis.

A deconstructive analysis, according to Derrida, is an analysis that refuses *logocentrism*. Derridean deconstruction is usually directed to literature, philosophy, and social discourses in general (Derrida 1997). In short, a poststructuralist always believes that every text has meanings and these meanings are not absolute and definitive. The meanings of a text can shift along with the context alternation behind it. Meanings are not singular, but plural. Meanings are not consistent but changing or developing. Even the languages that are believed to create meanings are always signifier and would have never been the signified (Tyson 2015). Therefore,

deconstruction wants to explore this contradiction, ambiguity in the text, as well as the flow or shift in meanings.

3.2. Data Sources

The source of this research is Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818). The primary data of this research is a literary, written text which include the statements, quotations, and events in the novel mentioned above. This research will also include various written resources from other books, journal, internet, and many more as secondary or supporting resources.

3.3. Scope and Limitation

In deconstruction point of view, reading activity is done to discover the multiplicity of meanings and the borderline of a theme. Of course, there have been many kinds of research done using this novel using different contexts such as deconstruction, psychoanalysis, moral values, scientific, or social science theory. However, for a focused analysis, this research will only focus on *differance* and theological *trace* in English social life during the 19th century as the impact of greater technology improvement, and the decline in spiritual beliefs around the same period. Therefore, the centre of this research is the mythological meanings in the activity of making creation as it is projected in Shelley's *Frankenstein*. These meanings can only be found in a textual context that delivers contradictive, inconsistency, ambivalence, and aporia.

3.4. Technique of Data Collection

Documentation is used to collect the data of this research. The documentation is implemented by reading and noting, in which the researcher read the novel entirely and later take notes of the issues to be put as this research data. The process of collecting the data is done by choosing one detail to another or one fragment from the texts that seem to be a coincidence—the presence of one particular metaphor—and later using it as the formula to interpret the entire text (Barry 1995, 85). By collecting the data this way, the researcher chose the narrated events and issues in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* that, both explicitly and implicitly show the deconstruction.

3.5. Technique of Data Analysis

The technique being used in this analysis is a deconstructive study. As it is previously stated, deconstructive reading wants to observe the *differance* and *trace* behind the text. Unlike structuralists who analyse the text to show the integration of the elements in the text, deconstruction wants to illustrate the disintegration under the explicit integration. This deconstructive research on Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* requires, at least, seven steps. First, the researcher describes the narrative in *Frankenstein*. Second, the researcher identifies the binary opposition in the text. Third, the researcher shows that Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* promotes one of the binary oppositions in the text. Fourth, the researcher explains the inconsistency of the text. Fifth, the researcher finds the ambivalence from the text. Sixth, the critic shows the aporia in the text, and finally the *trace* in the text.