

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter is divided into two sub-chapters. The first sub-chapter would be the conclusion of this research. The second sub-chapter would be the suggestion for further study of *Down and Out in Paris and London* by George Orwell.

5.1 Conclusion

After analyzing the characters in *Down and Out in Paris and London* by the structuralism theory, the writer concludes that:

First, the writer analyzed the characters in *Down and Out in Paris and London* as different. In this narrative, there are local characters and foreign characters. They have their behavior and their personalities. This research has found that French people are friendly and sociable in *Down and Out in Paris and London*. French people are good, but if they are fed up or mad, they have a bad temper and will use harsh words against the person who makes them angry. Then, Russian people are hard-working people. Russian people are hard-working people and never give up on something. For example, they will do anything to get a job in Boris's character. He is a hard worker, kindhearted, wise, persistent, and optimistic because he does not easily give up finding a job despite his leg limitations.

On the other hand, one of the Russian men in this narrative has bad behavior, which is the Patron, because he is a liar and cunning. He is cunning because he took benefits by getting some employees to make the restaurant neat for free and did not pay their wages. Italian people in this narrative are depicted as persistent and diligent in their jobs and do their best for their jobs. For example, the character Mario is an Italian man who amuses the customers in his workplace to get more tips from the customers. Then, there is Paddy Jacques, an Irish man. He is kind but a pessimist who surrenders to living in poverty. He also was not persistent.

Second, for the physical characteristics, the French man has brunette hair and red lips. This is shown by how the narrator describes Charlie, a local. Russian man in this novel is described as having a tall, fat, and big body. They are also good at dressing. Irish men are also good-looking and well-dressed, with blonde hair and skinny cheeks. An Italian man is described as a handsome face.

Third, Orwell depicts the lives of poor people in two cities, Paris and London, and demonstrates how social class influences labor, food, and living conditions. There is a socioeconomic divide between the wealthy and lower classes. In Paris, the narrator describes his profession as a *plongeur* (dishwasher) and the harsh workplace conditions that precede it, involving as long hours, low salaries, and the mental stress of manual labor. He demonstrates how workers are treated as tools rather than humans. While in London, the narrator criticizes the social assistance system and workhouses for treating people experiencing poverty with suspicion rather than empathy and genuine empathy.

Fourth, Orwell, as the narrator from a middle-class English man background, had to adjust to the culture of the destitute in Paris and London. He learned the ways of the laborers, the homeless, and the servants, adapting to their language, eating habits, and social standards.

In Paris, he worked as a dishwasher in a hotel kitchen, where he met immigrants, manual laborers, and lower-income people. He understood their work life, solidarity, and how they dealt with oppression from their superiors. Meanwhile, in London, he lived as a homeless man in a government-provided temporary housing system, where he met a social network of beggars, seasonal job seekers, and professional homeless people.

Fifth, foreign people have stereotyped a person, which is Armenian people as cheaters. This labeling or stereotype is given because one of the Armenian people often lies and cannot be trusted. It concludes that Armenian people cannot be trusted by one Armenian behavior from the narrator's point of view in this story because of one of the bad attitudes and behaviors such as often lying when talking and cheating. He concludes and states that the Armenian people cannot be trusted. The narrator even said that snakes and Jews are more trustworthy than the Armenian people. The narrator's statement could be a stereotype that Armenians are not trustworthy.

5.2 Suggestion

In this sub-chapter. The writer would like to suggest researchers who are interested in choosing *Down and Out in Paris and London* as their object of the study. There are many objects and aspects of this book that could be analyzed. One of

my suggestions is to analyze the characters, for example, the behavior and physical appearance of the characters in this book using a structuralism approach. The writer believes that subsequent researchers could analyses the characters and identify the more interesting issues and topics from George Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London*.

