

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Violence, in both its overt and covert forms, has long served as a powerful lens through which literature captures and critiques the human condition. From classical tragedies to contemporary novels, literary works have consistently portrayed violence as a multidimensional phenomenon—both a personal tragedy and a systemic social issue. Scholars across disciplines, including psychology, sociology, and literary criticism, have studied how violence shapes identity, reinforces social hierarchies, and distorts human relationships (Galtung, 1990; Herman, 1997). According to the World Health Organization (2002), violence is not limited to physical harm; it includes psychological, emotional, and systemic mechanisms that deprive individuals of dignity, safety, and development.

In the literary domain, depictions of violence often reflect societal dysfunction, giving voice to the silent struggles of those who endure trauma, abuse, and marginalization. As Bildjuschkin & Ewalds (2020) note, violence transcends the act of aggression itself; it embeds in societal structures and ideologies, becoming normalized in ways that escape public scrutiny. Acts such as verbal degradation, emotional manipulation, abandonment, or systemic neglect can all function as forms of violence, particularly when they result in long-lasting psychological scars (Galtung, 2013; O'Moore, 2010).

Kathleen Glasgow's *Girl in Pieces* (2016) is a contemporary young adult novel that intricately weaves these dimensions of violence into the life story of Charlie Davis, a 17-year-old girl whose existence is marked by loss, abandonment, and emotional devastation. Charlie's downward spiral into self-harm and silence stems not from a

single traumatic event but from the cumulative effects of direct abuse, systemic neglect, and the social stigmatization of female pain and mental illness. She bears the burden of witnessing her father's suicide, enduring her mother's physical and emotional abuse, and navigating institutions that are ill-equipped to address her mental health needs.

The novel thus offers fertile ground for a sociological and psychological exploration of violence as theorized by Johan Galtung, whose typology—direct, structural, and cultural/symbolic violence—provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the multiple axes of harm that shape Charlie's identity and behavior (Galtung, 1990; 2013). Direct violence in the form of beatings and verbal abuse is compounded by structural violence that manifests through poverty, lack of access to mental healthcare, and societal indifference. Cultural and symbolic violence further entrench her suffering through normalized gender roles and stigmas that dismiss or silence expressions of female trauma.

By examining Charlie's journey, the novel also underscores the long-term psychological consequences of trauma, including depression, emotional dysregulation, suicidal ideation, and social withdrawal—outcomes that mirror findings from trauma studies and adolescent psychology (Herman, 1997; NCTSN, 2017). Charlie's acts of self-harm, her struggle with addiction, and her yearning for human connection are not isolated behaviors but represent the somatic and emotional imprint of sustained violence. As Hess (2019) suggests, violence shapes not only external reality but also internal emotional landscapes, often leading victims to replicate their trauma through self-destructive behaviors.

The relevance of this topic is further amplified when placed within the global context of adolescent mental health. Research shows that exposure to chronic violence during childhood significantly increases the risk of emotional and behavioral disorders, academic failure, substance abuse, and even suicide (NCTSN, 2017). In this sense, Glasgow's novel transcends fiction—it becomes a socio-literary commentary on the failures of contemporary societies to protect vulnerable youth and to provide them with spaces of healing.

This study, therefore, approaches *Girl in Pieces* not only as a work of fiction but also as a reflection of socio-cultural dynamics that normalize, perpetuate, and conceal violence—especially against women and children. Through a sociological lens and the theoretical apparatus provided by Galtung, the study aims to dissect how different forms of violence intersect in Charlie's life and to what extent literature can be harnessed as a medium for advocacy, healing, and trauma recognition.

1.2 Problem Identifications

Drawing upon the contextual background discussed above, this study is guided by the following core research questions:

1. What types of violence, as classified by Johan Galtung's theory (direct, structural, and cultural), are depicted in Kathleen Glasgow's novel *Girl in Pieces*?
2. How are these forms of violence experienced and represented through the character of Charlie Davis within the narrative?

1.3 Objectives

In accordance with the research questions, this study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

1. To identify and categorize the various forms of violence depicted in *Girl in Pieces*, using Galtung's typology of violence as the analytical framework.
2. To examine how these forms of violence influence the psychological, emotional, and behavioral development of the protagonist, Charlie Davis, as portrayed in the novel.

1.4 Scope

This research specifically focuses on the portrayal of violence experienced by the protagonist, Charlie Davis, in Kathleen Glasgow's novel *Girl in Pieces*. The study aims to analyze the types of violence represented in the narrative—particularly physical, emotional, and psychological forms—drawing upon Galtung's, J., theory of the violence triangle (direct, structural, and cultural violence). Special emphasis is placed on how these acts of violence originate from familial relationships, social environments, and internalized trauma.

Furthermore, this study explores the psychological and emotional consequences of violence on the main character, examining how such experiences influence her behavior, mental health, identity formation, and social interactions. By focusing on Charlie's lived experience, the research intends to highlight the intricate relationship between trauma and self-destruction as depicted through acts of self-harm, withdrawal, and substance abuse.

The analysis is confined to Charlie Davis as the central figure and does not extend to other characters or subplots unless directly relevant to the main character's

experiences of violence. Themes such as friendship, romance, artistic expression, or rehabilitation, although present in the novel, are not the primary focus unless they intersect significantly with the manifestations and repercussions of violence.

This scope is intended to maintain analytical depth and focus, ensuring that the study remains centered on the core issues of trauma, abuse, and survival as experienced and narrated by the protagonist. The findings of this research may serve as a foundation for future studies that wish to examine other dimensions of *Girl in Pieces*, such as narrative structure, supporting characters, or broader societal critiques embedded in the novel.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The significance of the study lies in its dual contribution to both theoretical and practical domains, bridging the fields of literary criticism, trauma studies, and sociological inquiry. By analyzing *Girl in Pieces* through the lens of Johan Galtung's theory of violence and contemporary trauma scholarship, the study not only advances academic discourse but also engages with urgent real – world concerns such as youth mental health, systemic neglect, and the representation of trauma in literature.

Theoretically, this study seeks to enrich literary scholarship by positioning Kathleen Glasgow's *Girl in Pieces* within a broader interdisciplinary framework that includes trauma theory, sociology of literature, and peace studies. By applying Galtung's typology of violence—comprising direct, structural, and cultural (symbolic) violence—this research moves beyond traditional literary analysis focused solely on character and plot. Instead, it emphasizes the socio-political underpinnings of narrative trauma, thus aligning fiction with societal critique.

This theoretical intersection offers a significant contribution to trauma studies, particularly in understanding how literature acts as a medium for representing, encoding, and responding to psychological suffering. The study interrogates how trauma is not only experienced by individuals but also produced, perpetuated, and silenced by broader institutional and cultural systems—an approach that parallels Judith Herman’s foundational work in trauma psychology (1997) and recent literary-critical interventions by scholars such as Cathy Caruth and Kali Tal. Moreover, by drawing on Galtung’s model, the study underscores the analytical value of peace and conflict studies in examining emotional and symbolic dimensions of violence in fiction—an approach still underexplored in literary research.

Through this contribution, the research provides a template for how literary texts—especially within the young adult (YA) genre—can serve as valid and rich sources for analyzing structural and psychological trauma. It opens avenues for future studies to examine literature not merely as a reflection of human suffering but as a critical tool in exposing and resisting the social structures that normalize violence and neglect.

Practically, the study bears relevance for educators, school counselors, mental health professionals, and readers who engage with literature as a resource for understanding youth trauma, psychological distress, and recovery narratives. In highlighting how violence against adolescents—especially girls—is normalized in both personal and institutional contexts, the study raises awareness about the invisibility of mental health struggles and the need for more sensitive, trauma-informed responses in education and social services.

For educators and curriculum designers, this study offers a compelling case for including trauma-themed literature such as *Girl in Pieces* in secondary and post-secondary classrooms. Literature that candidly explores mental illness, self-harm, abandonment, and resilience can foster emotional literacy, empathy, and open conversations about psychological well-being. The novel's portrayal of Charlie's internal world and social marginalization allows students to reflect on issues such as emotional neglect, peer isolation, and the stigma of therapy or psychiatric hospitalization—topics that are especially relevant to today's adolescents.

For psychologists, therapists, and youth counselors, the narrative becomes a potential tool for bibliotherapy, allowing clients to see aspects of their own experiences mirrored in fictional characters. Charlie's story can validate survivors' feelings, help articulate complex emotions, and support the healing process through identification and catharsis.

For parents, social workers, and policymakers, this study emphasizes the importance of creating environments—both in families and institutions—where adolescents feel seen, heard, and supported. Glasgow's novel powerfully illustrates what happens when such safety nets are absent or dysfunctional.

Finally, for readers, especially adolescents who identify with Charlie's pain and silence, the study reinforces the message that trauma is not a solitary burden and that survival, while difficult, is possible. Fiction becomes not only a reflection of despair but also a roadmap toward resilience, dignity, and self-reclamation.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Sociology of Literature

The sociology of literature is a multidisciplinary field that explores the intricate relationship between literary texts and the social environments in which they are produced, circulated, and interpreted. This perspective considers literature not simply as an aesthetic object or a self-contained narrative but as a cultural artifact shaped by, and reflective of, the material, ideological, and institutional realities of its time. Literature, in this framework, functions both as a product of society and as a force capable of influencing it—a dynamic site where personal expression and collective consciousness intersect.

Ralph Waldo Emerson (1993), though primarily a philosopher and essayist rather than a sociologist, eloquently advocated for literature that emerges authentically from one's own national and cultural experience. He encouraged American writers to draw from their specific social and environmental contexts rather than mimicking European traditions. For Emerson, literature should not only mirror society but serve as a moral and intellectual force that uplifts and enlightens its readers. His call for a literature that reflects the "realities, values, and spirit" of its native culture resonates with the sociological perspective, which views literary works as vessels that both absorb and shape societal norms, beliefs, and transformations.

According to Pooyandeh (2002:34), sociology of literature as an academic discipline investigates the relationship between literature and society by analyzing texts through various social lenses—be it the sociology of books (material production and distribution), the sociology of literary creation (the author's social background and

ideology), or the sociology of reading (reception by different audiences). This approach insists that literary texts cannot be fully understood in isolation from the cultural, economic, and political conditions in which they arise. Literature, in other words, is not a detached artistic endeavor but a form of social practice embedded in historically specific contexts.

Cuddon (1998) similarly defines the sociology of literature as a field concerned with how literature interacts with, reflects, and helps shape broader social structures. Scholars employing this lens investigate not only how historical forces impact literary production, but also how literature, in turn, contributes to maintaining or challenging dominant ideologies. By addressing themes such as class conflict, gender dynamics, cultural marginalization, and institutional power, literature becomes a potent instrument for critiquing or reinforcing societal structures.

As Wellek and Warren (1956) assert in their foundational work *Theory of Literature*, literature inherently possesses a social function. It is never wholly individualistic or apolitical. Instead, it speaks to shared experiences, critiques injustices, and reflects the evolving moral and ideological landscapes of its readership. In their view, the social utility of literature lies in its capacity to offer insights into collective dilemmas, making it a valuable tool for both personal enlightenment and social analysis.

The development of sociology of literature gained traction particularly in the latter half of the 20th century, especially after the limitations of purely formalist and structuralist approaches became apparent. As Suwardi (2011) notes, structuralist methodologies, while effective in examining narrative and language systems, often overlooked the broader socio-historical forces that shaped those structures. As a corrective, sociological approaches emerged to re-situate literature within its material

and ideological milieu, emphasizing literature's role as both a reflection of and a participant in societal discourse.

A notable framework within this domain is *genetic structuralism*, advanced by Lucien Goldmann (1970), which seeks to bridge textual analysis with socio-historical critique. Goldmann posits that literature is both the product of an individual consciousness (the author) and a manifestation of collective consciousness shaped by socio-economic and historical conditions. His method requires an examination of both intrinsic textual structures (e.g., narrative form, symbolism) and extrinsic social factors (e.g., class struggle, ideological conflict). This dual-layered approach allows scholars to interpret literature not as a singular or isolated creation, but as a cultural expression born from the dialectical interplay between individual creativity and collective history.

Laurenson and Swingewood (1972) further define sociology as “the scientific, objective study of person in society, the study of social institutions and of social processes.” Literature, they argue, shares this concern with human beings' adaptation to—and critique of—their social world. From this perspective, the sociology of literature investigates how fictional texts illuminate lived social experiences and how authors grapple with societal tensions, whether consciously or unconsciously. Literature becomes a site of struggle, reflection, and potential resistance—a space where individuals and groups articulate their positions in, and desires to change, the social order.

Overall, the sociology of literature serves as a vital bridge between literary analysis and the study of social dynamics. It enables a holistic approach to understanding literature—one that views the text as simultaneously aesthetic and ideological, personal and collective, imaginative and material. Through this lens, literature is not only a mirror of society but also a medium that can critique, challenge,

and transform it. By examining how texts both arise from and respond to social realities, scholars in this field uncover deeper meanings embedded within narrative form, authorial perspective, and cultural reception, thereby enriching both literary interpretation and sociological understanding.

2.1 The Approaches of Sociology of Literature

Sociology of literature is not defined by a single method or theoretical orientation, but rather by a range of interpretive approaches that examine the dynamic interplay between literature and society. Each approach emphasizes different aspects of this relationship—ranging from philosophical reflections on individuality and social values to rigorous analyses of ideology, class, and historical structure. In this section, three influential thinkers—**Ralph Waldo Emerson**, **Terry Eagleton**, and **Lucien Goldmann**—are examined to illustrate distinct yet overlapping approaches within the sociology of literature.

2.2.1 Ralph Waldo Emerson: Literature as an Expression of Individual and Cultural Self-Reliance

Although Ralph Waldo Emerson (1993) was not a sociologist by training and did not formulate a systematic sociological theory of literature, his philosophical outlook has been instrumental in shaping the conceptual foundations of literary sociology, particularly in the American context. A leading figure in the Transcendentalist movement, Emerson emphasized individualism, nonconformity, and the interconnectedness of human beings with nature and the divine—themes that can be extended into sociological interpretations of literature.

Emerson's insistence on self-reliance and intellectual independence speaks to the role of literature in resisting social conformity and articulating alternative worldviews. His belief that literature should emerge authentically from one's **cultural and environmental context** encourages readers and writers to seek truths rooted in their own lived experience rather than imported ideals. He viewed literature not merely as artistic expression, but as a moral and spiritual tool capable of elevating the individual and, by extension, society. In sociological terms, Emerson offers a humanist lens through which literature becomes a mirror of individual development and cultural identity, reflecting the moral and philosophical values of a community.

Emerson's approach—though philosophical in tone—can inform sociological discussions on how literature shapes and reflects identity, resists hegemonic values, and fosters cultural authenticity.

2.2.2 Terry Eagleton: Marxist Critique and Literature as Social Practice

Terry Eagleton (1996), a prominent British literary theorist and critic, offers one of the most influential and explicitly sociological approaches to literature through his Marxist and ideological critique. Unlike Emerson's humanist idealism, Eagleton positions literature squarely within the realm of power, class, and political struggle. For Eagleton, literature is not an autonomous domain of aesthetic pleasure, but a social practice that both reflects and participates in the ideological battles of its time.

His approach can be broken down into several interrelated dimensions:

1. Literature as a Social Practice

Eagleton views literature as deeply embedded in the material, political, and cultural conditions of its historical moment. Texts are not isolated or timeless

artifacts; they are products of the social formations that produce them, shaped by the language, institutions, and discourses that define a given epoch.

2. Ideology and Literature

Drawing from Marxist theory, Eagleton argues that literature plays a key role in either reproducing or contesting dominant ideologies. Literary texts, consciously or not, often internalize the values of the ruling class, but they can also subvert hegemonic norms and serve as spaces of resistance.

3. Class and Power Relations

Eagleton's work often analyzes how literature represents and critiques class divisions, economic inequality, and power hierarchies. He underscores how social injustice, marginalization, and exploitation are encoded in narrative form and character development.

4. Cultural Studies Perspective

As one of the pioneers of cultural studies, Eagleton expands the scope of literary sociology to include popular culture, everyday life, and media. He highlights how literature is both influenced by and contributes to the production of cultural meaning within society.

5. Literature and Politics

Eagleton emphasizes the political stakes of literature, arguing that texts can shape public opinion, foster critical consciousness, and participate in political movements. Literature becomes a vehicle for civic engagement and ideological intervention, not merely a private or aesthetic experience.

Through Eagleton's approach, literature is treated as a historically situated ideological artifact—one that can expose the tensions and contradictions of capitalist society while also offering visions for social change.

2.2.3 Lucien Goldmann: Genetic Structuralism and Collective Consciousness

Lucien Goldmann (1970) advanced a distinct methodology in the sociology of literature known as genetic structuralism, which seeks to bridge formalist literary analysis with socio-historical critique. Goldmann viewed literature not as the creation of an isolated genius, but as a social product that embodies the worldview of a specific social group or class.

His key contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. Genetic Structuralism

Goldmann's method combines structural analysis of literary form with the historical and ideological examination of its genetic conditions—that is, the social and psychological forces that give rise to the work. He believes literary texts are shaped by collective consciousness, particularly of the social class to which the author is affiliated.

2. Literature as a Social Product

Literature, in Goldmann's view, does not arise in a vacuum. It reflects the dialectic between the author's subjective experience and the objective socio-economic structures. Authors become spokespersons for the existential dilemmas and aspirations of their class or community.

3. **The Role of the Author**

Rejecting the myth of the autonomous author, Goldmann emphasizes that literary creation is mediated by social conditioning. The author becomes a vessel for the articulation of a group worldview, not merely a personal voice.

4. **Ideology in Literature**

Literature functions as a site where ideological struggles are represented, negotiated, and sometimes resolved. Texts reveal contradictions between dominant ideologies and emergent alternatives, thereby providing insight into historical change.

5. **Interdisciplinary Integration**

Goldmann insisted that literary criticism must integrate sociology, history, and philosophy. A proper understanding of literature requires attention to class dynamics, historical context, and intellectual traditions.

Goldmann's framework allows scholars to analyze how deep social structures—such as economic systems, class ideology, or political unrest—are crystallized in literary form. His legacy is particularly evident in studies that treat literature as a barometer of socio-historical consciousness.

The approaches outlined above—Emerson's transcendental moralism, Eagleton's ideological materialism, and Goldmann's structural historicism—demonstrate the rich plurality of perspectives within the sociology of literature. While their focuses differ, all three scholars converge on the view that literature is never merely private or apolitical. It is a social act, shaped by the world it emerges from and shaping that world in return.

Each approach provides scholars with tools to interrogate how literature:

- Represents lived experience (Emerson)
- Reproduces or resists ideology (Eagleton)
- Reflects class-based worldviews (Goldmann)

Thus, the sociology of literature serves as an essential interpretive bridge between aesthetic form and historical reality, enabling deeper insight into how literary texts function not just as artistic expressions, but as vital documents of human and social development.

2.2 Violence

Violence is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that transcends the mere application of physical force. It encompasses a wide spectrum of actions, structures, and ideologies that result in harm, oppression, or the denial of human dignity. Within literature—and particularly trauma-informed literary analysis—violence is not only a thematic concern but also a lens through which broader social dysfunctions are explored, critiqued, and reimagined.

At the most foundational level, violence has been defined by the World Health Organization (2002) as: “The intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation.”

This comprehensive definition emphasizes that violence includes both acts and omissions, both physical assault and systemic neglect, and both visible aggression and subtle coercion. As such, violence operates across multiple dimensions—

interpersonal, institutional, cultural—and affects individuals in deeply embodied and psychologically enduring ways (Bildjuschkin & Ewalds, 2020).

In the field of literary studies, violence serves as a powerful narrative force, often symbolizing the rupture between individuals and their environment. It dramatizes the breakdown of ethical, familial, or societal bonds. As *Girl in Pieces* demonstrates, violence is rarely isolated or episodic; it is embedded in the everyday structures and relationships that shape identity and behavior. Thus, understanding violence in literature requires a nuanced conceptual framework—one that captures not only the act of harm but the conditions and ideologies that enable or justify it.

A significant contribution to this field comes from Johan Galtung, a pioneering figure in peace and conflict studies, who developed a typology that classifies violence into three interconnected categories: direct, structural, and cultural (symbolic) violence. This model—often represented as the “**Triangle of Violence**”—has become foundational in interdisciplinary analyses of violence, including its representation in literary texts (Galtung, 1990; 2013). The Triangle of Violence covers **Direct Violence, Structural Violence, and Cultural/Symbolic Violence.**

Together, these three categories form a **relational model** of violence: structural and cultural violence create the conditions for direct violence and help sustain its repetition. Importantly, Galtung (2013) also emphasizes the psychosomatic impact of violence—how harm enacted in one dimension (e.g., emotional) can manifest physically or spiritually. This understanding aligns with trauma theory in literature, where the effects of violence ripple through memory, body, and identity long after the act itself.

Additional definitions offered by scholars complement Galtung’s framework. Good (2003) conceptualizes violence not only as physical harm but also as

encompassing emotional exploitation, cruelty to animals, and even environmental degradation—thereby broadening the ethical and ecological dimensions of the term. For Good, violence can exist wherever power is misused to inflict suffering, whether on a person, community, or ecosystem.

In an Indonesian context, Sukowati et al. (2019) emphasize that violence includes both overt actions and invisible psychological coercion. Their research, particularly on domestic and sexual violence, illustrates how cultural norms and legal systems often fail to protect women and children. Drawing from field studies by the *Aliansi Peduli Perempuan Sukowati (APPS)*, they categorize violence into:

- **Domestic violence:** Includes spousal abuse, child neglect, and familial exploitation.
- **Sexual violence:** Ranges from harassment to trafficking, often facilitated by cultural silence or victim-blaming.
- **Child sexual abuse:** Frequently ignored or minimized due to cultural taboos and institutional barriers.

These categories resonate with the character of Charlie Davis in *Girl in Pieces*, whose experiences of abandonment, sexual exploitation, and systemic neglect underscore how literary characters can embody real-world patterns of violence and oppression.

In the study of literature, violence is not merely depicted—it is interpreted, interrogated, and given voice. As trauma theorist Judith Herman (1997) notes, trauma survivors often lack the language to describe their pain; literature can thus become a surrogate site for expressing the unspeakable. In fictional narratives, characters like Charlie Davis reveal how violence reshapes the psyche, alters perception, and fragments identity.

The representation of violence in literature often fulfills several critical functions:

- **Mimesis:** It reflects real-life injustices and dramatizes them to evoke empathy or awareness.
- **Critique:** It challenges the societal norms and institutions that perpetuate harm.
- **Catharsis:** It offers readers a way to process collective or individual trauma through emotional identification with characters.
- **Survival Narrative:** It reframes suffering not only as destruction but as resilience and resistance, offering pathways to healing.

These literary functions are particularly salient in *Girl in Pieces*, where Kathleen Glasgow constructs a layered depiction of violence that is at once intensely personal and socially grounded. The novel does not romanticize trauma; rather, it insists on its complexity, showing how self-harm and silence are coping mechanisms in a world that too often refuses to listen or care.

Violence is not only a rupture in the social fabric; it is also a revealing force—exposing the failures of institutions, the fragility of relationships, and the deep human need for safety, voice, and validation. In literary analysis, violence must be understood not only in terms of content (what happens in the story), but in terms of structure, discourse, and symbolism.

By employing a multidimensional framework like Galtung's and integrating global and localized research perspectives (Good, Sukowati, WHO), scholars can better analyze how violence operates in literature and why its depiction matters. Literature becomes more than a site of storytelling—it becomes a mirror, a witness, and a critique of the world's enduring inequalities and silences.

There are some previous studies about violence against the main character:

According to Wulaningtiyas (2018) in her research entitled *Violence Against the Main Character in Memoirs of A Geisha film by Rob Marshall 2018*. Her research focused on analyzing violence against women which are to know kinds of violence, to know how the main character solve the violence and to know the effects of violence towards the main character in *Memoirs of A Geisha*. Her research used descriptive qualitative method to analyze this film. She used the theory of violence by Iris Marion Young and the feminist approach. The result of this research present that the main character experienced four types of violence which are; physical violence, sexual violence, emotional violence and psychological violence.

According to Kusmana (2020), in her study titled *Violence on Women in Munro's Who Do You Think You Are*, analyzed various forms of violence experienced by female characters in Alice Munro's short stories. Using a descriptive qualitative approach with a structuralism lens and the theory of violence, she found that characters were subjected to multiple forms of abuse, including humiliation, murder, physical assault, and sexual harassment. The impacts of such violence were profound and included trauma, loss of self-confidence, lifelong disability, mental disorders, and even death. This research focused on analyzing the violence experienced by women characters and the impact of violence and using the structuralism approach and the theory of violence.

Alfianita (2021) in her research entitled *Domestic Violence on Charles Frazier's Night woods 2021*. This research aims to found domestic violence and showed how the characters attempt to deal with the effect of domestic violence in the novel *Night woods* by Charles Frazier. She had used literary criticism to analyze the data from literary works. This research used theory of domestic violence by Zastrow.

The result of this research described the portrait of domestic violence that happened against women and children.

The difference between this research with three previous findings above are different in each focus of the researches and also the used of the theory. This research focuses on the analysis of the forms of violence and to analyze how the types and classification of violence that occur to the main character in the novel *Girl in Pieces* and uses Johan Galtung's (1990) concept of violence.

2.3 Types of Violence

The typology of violence by Norwegian Johan Galtung provides a groundbreaking conceptual model for understanding the different layers of harm that exist within human societies. Known as the "**Violence Triangle**", this framework consists of three interrelated types: **Direct Violence**, **Structural Violence**, and **Cultural (Symbolic) Violence**. Galtung (1990, 2013) emphasizes that these forms of violence are not isolated but mutually reinforcing, often operating simultaneously in ways that obscure their impact and perpetuate cycles of oppression and trauma.

In literary studies, this typology is especially valuable as a tool for analyzing how fictional characters experience violence not only through individual events, but through sustained, normalized, and often invisible systems of harm. Literature becomes a unique space in which these different types of violence can be represented, critiqued, and made emotionally legible.

Below is a brief explanation of the three types of violence as defined by Galtung:

2.3.1 Direct Violence

Direct violence refers to immediate, observable harm inflicted by identifiable actors. It involves actions that cause physical injury, psychological trauma, or

emotional pain and includes behaviors such as **assault, rape, murder, verbal abuse, torture, bullying, and threats**. It is the most recognizable and dramatized form of violence, often sensationalized in both media and literature due to its overt and personal nature.

Galtung (1990) characterizes direct violence by its subject-object relationship, in which the perpetrator clearly inflicts harm upon a victim. This form of violence is rooted in intentionality—someone actively chooses to harm another—and is typically the easiest to condemn, prosecute, or depict in narrative.

However, direct violence also includes self-directed harm, such as self-injury or suicide, particularly when it is a psychological response to sustained trauma. In literary representations like *Girl in Pieces*, the protagonist Charlie Davis engages in cutting and emotional withdrawal as internalized responses to previous abuses. These actions, while self-inflicted, are often consequences of other forms of violence, especially structural and symbolic.

Importantly, the threat of violence—such as intimidation or coercive control—is itself a form of direct violence, as it creates psychological fear and suppresses autonomy. Literature often captures this through characters who live in a state of hypervigilance or trauma re-enactment, even in the absence of current physical abuse.

2.3.2 Structural Violence

Structural violence is a more insidious and systemic form of harm, embedded in the political, economic, and social structures of society. Unlike direct violence, structural violence does not require a clear perpetrator. It occurs when social systems **deny individuals access to basic human needs**—such as food, education, healthcare, security, or equality—thereby preventing them from achieving their full potential (Galtung, 1990).

This form of violence is often **normalized** and rendered invisible through bureaucratic processes, institutional neglect, or legal indifference. Examples include:

- Poverty and economic exploitation
- Racial or gender discrimination in access to education or healthcare
- Inadequate mental health services
- Unjust legal or immigration systems
- Marginalization of minority or disabled groups

In *Girl in Pieces*, structural violence manifests in Charlie's encounters with inadequate psychiatric care, economic deprivation, institutional abandonment, and a lack of familial support. These conditions are not the result of individual malice but of systemic failure, revealing how deeply societal institutions can perpetuate harm.

Galtung argues that structural violence is often more damaging over time than direct violence because it creates **chronic suffering** without triggering the same moral outrage. In literature, characters subjected to structural violence often embody long-term despair, internalized shame, and cyclical trauma. They become "invisible" victims—those whom society fails to notice, much less protect.

2.3.3 Cultural or Symbolic Violence

Cultural violence also referred to as symbolic violence, is the ideological mechanism that legitimizes or normalizes both direct and structural violence. It operates through beliefs, values, language, norms, and symbols that make harmful behavior appear acceptable, inevitable, or even virtuous (Galtung, 1990).

Cultural violence is encoded in various domains:

- Religious dogma that justifies gender inequality
- Educational curricula that erase or distort historical atrocities
- Media narratives that stereotype marginalized groups

- Language that dehumanizes victims (e.g., calling refugees “illegals”)
- Gender norms that stigmatize emotional expression in men or valorize female silence

One of the most potent forms of cultural violence is symbolic violence, as theorized by Pierre Bourdieu and later expanded upon by Galtung. Symbolic violence refers to the internalization of domination, where victims come to accept their marginalization as natural or deserved. In literature, this is often portrayed through characters who self-blame, self-silence, or conform to oppressive social expectations.

In *Girl in Pieces*, symbolic violence is visible in how Charlie internalizes shame about her scars, believes herself unworthy of love or care, and adopts silence as a survival strategy. The gendered double standard that stigmatizes self-harming girls while romanticizing damaged boys (as noted in the novel) is a classic example of cultural violence at work.

Cultural violence functions to obscure the moral clarity of harm. As Galtung states, it "changes the moral color of an act"—transforming violence from a red “wrong” to a green “right” or yellow “acceptable.” This ideological manipulation is especially powerful because it shapes public opinion, legal policy, and even victims' self-conceptions.

Galtung's Triangle of Violence is best understood not as a set of discrete categories but as a triangular relationship, where each form of violence supports and justifies the others:

- Direct violence is often the outcome of structural deprivation and cultural permission.
- Structural violence is sustained by cultural justifications and leads to personal trauma.

- Cultural violence provides the ideological framework that makes both forms appear natural or invisible.

This triadic model allows scholars and readers to trace the origins and consequences of violence in literature more comprehensively. It urges a reading of texts that moves beyond surface-level actions and toward the underlying systems and ideologies that shape narrative events and character development.

In *Girl in Pieces*, these forms of violence converge in the life of Charlie Davis, revealing how deeply trauma is embedded in the intimate, institutional, and ideological layers of society. By using Galtung's framework, this thesis seeks to illustrate not only the types of violence Charlie endures but also the social systems that fail her, the beliefs that silence her, and the strength she gradually reclaims.