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ABSTRACT


The writer studies about relationship analysis between Hazel and August as the main characters in novel The Fault in Our stars. It aims to know the factors underlying friendship and understand it using J.W Thibaut and H.H Kelley’s social exchange theory. The method of this research is descriptive qualitative, which tries to analyze the main characters’ relationship of the novel using psychological approach in the social exchange theory. The research focuses on the factors underlying friendship using Robert S. Fieldman’s theory. Then it focuses on the relationship analysis by applying J.W Thibaut and H.H Kelley’s social exchange theory. By referring to discussions, the writer concludes that the relationship need perpetuity factors such as similarity, reciprocity of liking, positive qualities, physical attractiveness and physical appearance. Then the writer also finds out that Hazel and August’s relationship is satisfactory, stable and interdependence.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Study

Human being or people need a friend. Social needs are one of the basic needs for human being, such as the needs for belonging, love, and affection (Maslow 1954, 19). As social needs, friendship is one of them. There are several factors that influenced by friendship. For instance, they have a similarity, reciprocity of liking, positives qualities, physical attractiveness and liking, physical appearance and social behavior (Myers 2005, 4). All of these are a natural reason as human being to build a friendship. No exception, people who have disability or people with cancer.

People with cancer have a limited interaction to the society, because most of them are treated as the special one. This treatment make them lack of interaction (American Cancer Society). So, it is hard for them to interact with the society and build a relationship with other people. We can found the example about that situation in the novel of John Green. *The Fault in Our Stars* is one of the novel that tells about people with cancer. The novel is created by John Green and published in January 2012. *The Fault in Our Stars* is about love, faith, spirit, and mortal affection. Set of this novel mostly in modern America and some setting taken in Amsterdam. It has very powerful affection, especially for people with cancer and how love gives people more spirit and power to live. Those happen in Hazel Grace Lancaster (Hazel) and Augustus Water’s (August) life when they met subsequently and decided to build a relationship and love each other.
Hazel was prepared to die until, at 14, a medical miracle shrunk the tumors in her lungs for now. Two years post-miracle, sixteen-year-old Hazel is post-everything else, too post-high school, post-friends and post-normalcy. Hazel lives tethered to an oxygen tank, the tumors tenuously kept at bay with a constant chemical assault. Hazel had very limited interaction to outside world, so she only had one friend till 16 years old. Someday her parents send her to the Cancer Kid Support Group called “Literal Heart of Jesus”. They hope she could make interaction to another people. And she met August. Since they met, they really have a lot of interaction and they become very close friend with wonderful relationship. As people with cancer, they are trying to complement one and another life. Their relationships made their life more beautiful and ignore their condition as people with cancer.

John Green enchants readers to feel a psychological conflict that occurred against people living with cancer in this novel. How teen who desperately need other people in the transition period, but limited by the cancer that they have suffered. This makes a very special relationship will be felt especially when the relationship is to have something that can give encouragement to continue to fight against cancer without passing through puberty with amazing things.

From all what *The Fault in Our Stars* is about, the relationship between Hazel and Gus takes a big part of this novel plot. Relationship or close friendship is an amazing thing in this world that we can see everywhere, even in ourselves. It is a human natural sense.
Human relationships always become a mystery. Human relationship attracted so many experts to do researches because there are many factors that lead and maintain human relationship. Personal characters as the instruments of relationship that we could be analyze. Then we will find what factors two personals can build a relationship and how they maintain their relationship. It very interesting to analyze, because relationship like this made our world so amazing. We can feel how people treat each other with that specific condition and tragically with cancer.

The relationship between Hazel and Gus is one of human relationship mystery. It is wonderful relationship. They complement each other and ignore their physical deficiencies as a person with cancer. Those are similarity of their background as cancer sufferers.

Furthermore, like other relationship they also have differences one another. Amazingly, these differences are a reason of their relationship power. These differences become the powerful things that strengthen their relationship. Then this case becomes one of reason why the writer is interested to analyze the two main characters relationship in novel *The Fault in Our Stars* viewed from interpersonal relationship that the theory explain what factors underlying their relationship, then social-exchange theory by J.W Thibaut and H.H Kelley are to find out about the rewards, cost and comparison of their relationship according by the factors that founded at interpersonal relationship theory.

**B. Focus of the Study**

The writer would like to focus the research on analyzing Hazel and August as the main characters of novel *The Fault in Our Stars* and their relationship by
applying interpersonal relationship J.W Thibaut and H.H Kelley’s social-exchange theory.

C. Research Question

The questions in the research are:

1. What kind of factors underlying Hazel and August to build their relationship?
2. How are their relationship seen from J.W Thibaut and H.H Kelley’s social-exchange theory?

D. Objective of the Study

The objective of the study is to explain the social exchange theory of relationship between Hazel and August in novel “The Fault in Our Stars”, then also to know the factors of supporting the relationship.

E. Significance of the Study

The writer hopes this research can be useful for the readers, especially for those who want to know about interpersonal relationship, especially between two people with cancer. It is one of some tools than can be used to analyze the interpersonal relationship or in groups. Specifically, the writer wants to introduce the J.W Thibaut and H.H Kelley’s social-exchange theory; the signification; it is about J.W Thibaut and H.H Kelley’s conceptualization of the dyad, a two-person relationship, begins with an analysis of interaction and of its consequences for the two individuals concerned.
F. Research Methodology

1. The Method of the Research

The method that is used in this research is qualitative method, specifically, descriptive analysis. Descriptive analysis focuses on the information gathered in relation to how it was gathered, where, and by whom. So, the writer describes the two main characters in novel, and then analyzes relationship of them, based the relevant theory.

2. The Technique of Data Analysis

In this research, the writer uses psychological approach. First, the writer chooses the object or novel that will be analyzed. Then, the writer takes relationship case between the two main characters. After that, the writer reads some theory of interpersonal relationship J.W Thibaut and H.H Kelley’s social-exchange theory. Finally, the relationship will be analyzed through descriptive analysis technique.

3. The Instrument of The Research

The writer of the researcher is the main instrument to obtain qualitative data about factors underlying friendship and the result from that factors in social exchange theory.

4. The Unit of Analysis

Analysis unit that is used in this research is the novel “The Fault in Our Stars” by John Green that published at United States by Dutton Books member of Penguin group Inc. (USA) in 2012.
5. **The Place and Time**

The research is conducted in Jakarta in academic 2015/2016 at the English Language and Literature Major, Faculty of Adab and Humanities, Islamic State University Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. It also done in some namely UIN Library, FAH Library, and UI Library.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Chapter II consist the concept of factors underlying friendship by Robert S. Fieldman and social exchange theory by J.W. Thibaut and H.H. Kelley. The concept of factors underlying friendship is used to know how Hazel and August build their friendship then the concept of social exchange theory is used to analyze the consequences of their relationship.

A. Previous Research

To support this research, the writer decided to add three previous research. The first previous research is by Ana Fathiya Rosida. Her analysis which titled “Optimism as Reflected in Augustus Waters Character of John Green's The Fault in Our Stars” which explained the characteristic of the main character that support the story to be more interesting. In this research, Ana is analyzing optimism of Augustus Waters in the novel The Fault in Our Stars and the influence of his optimism to his friends. Ana are stated the optimism of Augustus Water give positive impact, full of hope, being a hero among his friends. Augustus Waters gives big influence to his friends’ life. The writer finds out that are some similarities and differences between what the writer study and her research. The similarities of the writer’s research and Ana’s research have the same source that The Fault in Our Stars novel by John Green and the method of the research both the writer’s and Ana’s research are qualitative method in collecting and analyzing the data. Then the differences of the writer’s analysis and Ana’s research are about the concept of optimism. Ana use concept of optimism to analyze August as the main character.
and his impact to other character. The writer use the concept of social exchange to know about consequences of the main characters analysis.

The second previous research is titled “A Pragmatic Analysis of Disagreement Act in The Fault in Our Stars Movie” by Dwiansari Ramadhani. The purpose of Dwiansari’s research is to examine and describe the types of disagreement acts employed in The Fault in Our Star movie, identify the way certain types of disagreement acts are expressed, and reveal the reasons for using certain types of disagreement acts in the movie. The results of Dwiansari’s research are as follows. First, there are two types of disagreement acts found in the movie. They are mitigated disagreement acts and unmitigated disagreement acts. The mitigated ones become the main type of disagreement acts performed by the characters. Second, each type of disagreement act is realized in some ways. The similarity between the writer and Dwiansari’s research are both of them use The Fault in Our Stars and the research both the writer’s and Dwiansari’s research are qualitative method in collecting and analyzing the data. The different between the writer and Dwiansari’s research are the concept of Dwiansari’s research uses Pragmatic concept with the dialogs of the movie. Then Dwiansari’s research uses the movie that adapted from the novel The Fault in Our Stars. Meanwhile the writer uses the novel of The Fault in Our Stars and the concept of factors underlying friends and its consequences to main characters relationship.

The last research are from Fadhilatul Muharam that tells about “Psychological Analysis on Two Main Characters Friendship in Novel “Veronica”. It tells about analyzing friendship between Alison and Veronica and the factors underlying
friendship. The researcher using Robert S. Fieldman theory to find out factors underlying friendship and J.W Thibaut and H.H Kelley Social Exchange theory to explain that friendship satisfactory, stable, and interdependence. The researcher focus on psychological aspects and many factors behind their friendship as the results the researcher explains about satisfactory of their friendship. Similarities between the writer’s and Fadhilatul’s research are from the concept of factors underlying friendship and social exchange concept with the same qualitative method in collecting and analyzing data. The differences between the writer’s and Fadhilatul’s research are from the source of the analysis, the writer use The Fault in Our Stars novel by John Green. Meanwhile Fadhilatul’s research use different novel that is Veronica by Mary Gaitskill.

B. Interpersonal Relationship

The writer chooses Interpersonal Relationship from many theories in Psychology as the extrinsic theory to analyze the friendship between Hazel and August as the main characters in novel “The Fault in Our Stars”. The writer will be using Interpersonal Relationship as instrument of the main characters friendship analysis. Interpersonal relationship refers to a strong association amongst individuals with similar tastes, aspirations and interests in life. It is essential for individuals to share a healthy relationship with each other not only for quicker delivery of results but also for a positive ambience at the workplace.

Interpersonal Relationship includes Social Psychology theme as the part of it. According to Myers, “Social Psychology is a science that studies the influences of
our situations, with special attention to how we view and affect one another. More precisely said, it is the scientific studies of how people think about, influence, and relate to one another." (Myers 1959, 4)

In Social Psychology stated “social psychologists try to see beneath the great variation in human relationships to discover general principles that apply to many relationships. An essential feature of any relationship is that two people influence each other or, in more technical terms, that they are interdependent." (Taylor 2006, 265)

1. The Factors Influencing Friendship

According to the Robert S. Fieldman Social Psychology Theories, Research, and Application, there are five things underlying interpersonal attraction they are similarity, reciprocity of liking, positive qualities, physical attractiveness and liking, and physical appearance and social behavior, (Myers 1959, 9)

a. Similarity

Similarity is the first thing that influences the friendship. Almost dyads are based on similarity. It is because first, similarity may be directly reinforcing. Second, the fact that someone else has attitude or qualities similar to our own may lead to a sense of confirmation of our views of the world.

In experiment, Donn Byrne (1971) and his colleagues captured the essence of Laura’s experience. Over and over again, they found that the more similar someone’s attitudes are to your own, the more likable you will find the person.
Likeness produces liking not only for college students but also for children and the elderly, for people of various occupations, and for those in various cultures. This is especially so for those who are satisfy with themselves. If you like yourself, you are likely to have partner with someone like you.

b. Reciprocity of Liking

As the writer mentioned earlier, there is robust general finding regarding reciprocity of liking: someone tends to like those who like him or her. Given information that another individual likes him or her, someone tends to be attracted to that person. The converse process seems to hold true as well: when someone like other persons, he or she tends to assume that they like him or her in return. But the feeling of liking someone is not always shown by the words directly. It can be show indirectly through behavior.

c. Positive Qualities

It is hardly surprising that people with meritorious qualities should be liked more than those with disagreeable qualities. For example, we like intelligent, warm, sincere, and competent people more than people who do not have those attributes.

Otherwise sheer positivity is not the whole story. Sometimes he or she prefer people who display positive qualities that are a bit tarnished by negative ones over people who seem to be without flaw. An example of this was provided in a study by Aronson, Willerman, & Floyd (1966), who had either a very competent or an average individual commit or not commit a pratfall, which consisted of clumsily spilling a cup of coffee. The results showed that liking for the competent person
increased after a pratfall, while liking tended to decrease for the average person. The explanation is straightforward: very competent people who commit a blunder become more human and approachable and, thus, more attractive. On the other hand, the average person gains little from a blunder, since he or she is already seen as human enough. (Myers 1959, 11)

Although later research has shown that relationship between competence and attraction is also related to the self-esteem of the person doing the rating, the basic fact remains: we tend to prefer competent people to incompetent ones.

d. Physical Attractiveness and Liking

In an egalitarian and democratic society, most people would agree that people ought to be judged for what they are and what they do, rather than what they look like. Yet, despite general agreement with the old saying, “Beauty is only skin deep.” It turns out that most people act as if physical attractiveness were a good indicant of how likable a person is. The physical appearance of an individual can be an important aspect of how that person is viewed by others however unwarranted such a bias may be. (Myers 1959, 16)

People who are physically attractive are regarded more highly than unattractive ones with startling consistency, starting with nursery school age children and continuing into old age. Indeed, not only are they liked more, but people make more positive interpretations of the behavior of the physically attractive.
e. **Physical Appearance and Social Behavior**

While the data regarding the relationship between attraction and physical appearance are clearly positive, the question of how appearance is related to subsequent behavior is more ambiguous. We might expect that since people tend to form more ambiguous. We might expect that since people tend to form more favorable impressions about the physically attractive, they will act more positive self-images and interpersonal styles, which lead them to become more effective during social interactions than less people. Following this reasoning, we could expect physically attractive people to have a greater number of and more rewarding social encounters. (Myers 1959, 21)

Most of the evidence that has been collected regarding the social encounters of the physically attractive, and the results have been in the context of dating behavior, and the results have been fairly consistent, showing that attractive people are chosen as dating partners more frequently than less attractive people. Moreover, self-reports of popularity are correlated with attractiveness.

The factors of interpersonal relationship theory will reveal about relationship of the main characters especially factors underlying friendship. Then its factors will be using for support social exchange theory to find rewards, costs, outcomes, and comparison level.
2. **Social Exchange Theory**

The most influential perspective on social relationships is provided by various interpersonal relationships theories. According to Coleman and Hammen there are four theories: 1) social exchange theory; (2) role theory; (3) the ‘games people play’ theory; and (4) interactional theory.

Social exchange theory is firstly introduced by two social psychologists, John W. Thibaut and Harold H. Kelley in 1959. This theory is also called interdependence theory. In Social Psychology, Taylor et al, states “this perspective analyzes the patterns of interaction between partners. One way to conceptualize these interactions is in terms of the outcomes—rewards and cost—that partners give and receive.” (J.W Kelley 1959, 8-9)

According to Thibaut and Kelley in their book The Social Psychology of Groups;

"Our conceptualization of the dyad, a two-person relationship, begins with an analysis of interaction and of its consequences for the two individuals concerned. The major analytic technique used throughout the book is a matrix formed by taking account of all the behaviors the two individuals might enact together. Each cell in this matrix represents one of the possible parts of the interaction between the two and summarizes the consequences for each person of that possible event. Although consequences can be analyzed and measured in many ways, we have found it desirable to distinguish positive components (rewards) from negative components (cost). The many factors affecting the rewards and costs associated with each portion of the matrix are described and note is taken of certain sequential effects that are not handled systematically in the /resent scheme.’’ (J.W Kelley 1959, 8-9)

The four important elements of this theory are rewards, cost, outcomes, and comparison level.
a. **Rewards**

According to Thibaut and Kelley about rewards;

“By rewards, we refer to pleasures, satisfaction, and gratifications the person enjoys. The provision of a means whereby a drive is reduced or a need fulfilled constitutes a reward. We assume that the amount of reward provided by any such experience can be measured and that the reward values of different modalities of gratification are reducible to a single psychological scale.” (J.W Kelley 1959, 12)

A reward is anything a person gains from an interaction, such as feeling loved or receiving financial assistance. It is positive component in dyad.

b. **Costs**


“By costs, we refer to any factors that operate to inhibit or deter the performance of a sequence of behavior. The greater the deterrence to performing a given act—the greater the inhibition the individual has to overcome—the greater the cost of the act. Thus cost is high when great physical or mental effort is required, when embarrassment or anxiety accompany the action, or when there are conflicting forces or competing response tendencies of any sort. Costs derived from these different factors are also assumed to be measurable on a common psychological scale, and costs of different sorts, to be additive in their effect.” (J.W Kelley 1959, 12)

Cost is negative consequence that is occurred in an interaction or relationship. Taylor et al state “an interaction may be costly because it requires a great deal of time and energy, because it entails much conflict, or because other people disapprove of the relationship and criticize us for being involved in it.” (Taylor 2006, 266)
c. **Outcomes**


“The consequences or **outcomes** for an individual participant of any interaction or series can be stated, then, in terms of the rewards received and the cost separately; for other purposes it is assumed that they can be combined into a single scale of “goodness” of outcome, with states of reward and low cost being given high-scale values and states of low reward and high cost, low-scale values. Admittedly, such a scaling operation would be a very ambitious enterprise and would present a number of technical difficulties. However, the present interest is in the theoretical consequences of such an operation (real or imaginary) rather than in its technical properties or even its feasibility.” (J.W Kelley 1959, 13)

So, it’s what we get from the relationship, whether it’s satisfying or suffering. If we get more rewards than cost, it is good outcomes for us. The other way, if the costs are paid more than the reward we would feel it’s losing out.

d. **Comparison Level**

Comparison level (CL) is a standard that someone uses to value his/her relationship with other in present time. The experience of former relationship is usually used as this standard. In addition to determining whether a relationship is profitable, we make comparative judgments, assessing how one relationship compares to another. Two comparison standards are especially important (J.W Kelley 1959, 21).

Thibaut and Kelley state on their book:

“In evaluating the adequacy of the sampled and anticipated outcomes of a relationship, the members of a dyad will have need for some kind of standard or criterion of the acceptability of outcomes. At least two important kind of standard for such an evaluation can be identified. To try to make the distinction between these two standards as intuitively clear as possible, we may begin by saying that the first of these, called the comparison level (or
Comparison Level (CL), is the standard against which the member evaluates the “attractiveness” of the relationship or how satisfactory it is. The second, called the comparison level for alternative (or CL ALT), is the standard the member uses in deciding whether to remain in or to leave the relationship.” (J.W Kelley 1959, 21)

The first standard is Comparison Level (CL). It reflects the quality outcomes a person believes he/she deserved. The comparison level reflects past experiences in relationship.

The second major standard is the Comparison Level for Alternatives (CL alt). This involves assessing how one relationship compares to other relationships that are currently available to us. If your relationship is the best you think possible, you may stay in it, even if the actual benefits you receive are low. In contrast, even if a relationship is profitable in absolute terms, you may leave it if a better alternative becomes available.

Furthermore, we can see the six typologies of relationship in the following table.

Six Typologies of Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Value of Outcome, CL, and CL ALT</th>
<th>State of the relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome &gt; CL &gt; CL</td>
<td>Satisfactory, stable, and interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome &gt; CL ALT &gt; CL</td>
<td>Satisfactory, stable, and, independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ALT &gt; CL &gt; Outcome</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory, broken, and love to stay in other relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ALT &gt; Outcome &gt; CL</td>
<td>Satisfactory, unstable, and feel better to stay in other relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL &gt; CL ALT &gt; Outcome</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory, broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL &gt; Outcome &gt; CL ALT</td>
<td>More unsatisfactory but gratify, interdependence, and cannot broken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CL : Comparison Level  
CL ALT : Comparison Level for Alternatives  
(J.W Kelley 1959, 23)

From the table above we can analyze what kind of the relationship is. If outcomes fall above CL, and CL ALT drops below CL (Outcome > CL > CL ALT) means the relationship in good condition and tend to be continued. The height of outcomes here determines the relationship. The members of dyad are satisfied with the relationship. And alternative relationship never affects the present relationship.

If outcomes still stay in the first place of CL ALT and CL, but CL ALT drops above CL (Outcome > CL ALT > CL), means the relationship is good and has stable
condition. But the dependence each other has no role here. It is caused the alternative relationship gives better effect for the member of dyad.

If CL ALT drops above CL and outcome (CL ALT > C L > Outcome) means the relationship has the lowest outcome. This relationship does not satisfy its members. The members of dyad are more comfortable to stay in their alternative relationship. So it has tendency to leave the relationship.

If CL ALT still stays in the first place and outcome drop above CL (CL ALT > Outcome > CL) means the relationship in good condition and satisfactory but not stable. Although it is good, the members of dyad are more comfortable to stay in their alternative relationship.

If CL drops above CL ALT and outcomes (CL > CL ALT > Outcome) means the outcomes of the relationship is not much as CL. Despite in the alternative relationship is more attractive but never gives a good hope. So it has tendency a broken relationship.

If CL drops above CL ALT and outcomes (CL > CL ALT > Outcome) means the outcomes of the relationship is not much as CL. Despite in the alternative relationship is more attractive but never gives a good hope. So it has tendency a broken relationship.

If CL still stays in the first place of outcome and CL ALT (C’L > Outcome > CL ALT) means the relationship has low outcomes. But the alternative relationship is also not taking good condition. So the relationship is not attractive and satisfying but the members of dyad cannot separate each other and still hope this relationship.
Besides, in the social exchange theory, Thibaut and Kelley also analyze about three control formats. They are reflexive control, fate control, and behavior control.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH FINDING

The factors that influencing relationship like a similarity, reciprocity of liking, positives qualities, physical attractiveness and liking, physical appearance and social behavior. Can be explain what kind of relationship that is, or how about the rewards of that relationship, how many cost of that relationship and the comparison between its relationship with others relationship. With the *Fault in Our Stars* as the main object to explain that factors and what the result can we got.

The main characters of The Fault in Our Stars novel are Hazel and August. Hazel is 16 years old and has been dealing for three years with thyroid cancer that spread to her lungs. She is very close with her mother and father and has largely left behind the friendships she had before she was diagnosed with cancer and pulled from public school. Because she was able to get her GED, Hazel attends classes at a local community college when her health permits. She meets Isaac and Gus at Support Group and becomes romantically involved with Gus until his death. Augustus, 16 years old, meets Hazel at a support group for youths with cancer. Augustus lost part of his leg to osteosarcoma years before and is believed to be cancer-free, though he has a relapse midway through the book that leads to his death late in the book. He falls quickly for Hazel and they begin dating, though she is scared of hurting him through her illness. Gus is a witty character who loves metaphor, symbolism, grand romantic gestures, and he wishes to die with dignity for something larger than himself.
A. The Influencing Factors of Two Main Characters’ Friendship

The writer uses Robert S. Fieldman’s theory about interpersonal attraction in his book *Social Psychology: Theories, Research, and Application* to know the factors that underlying friendship.

1. Similarity

The writer has analyzed the similarities between Hazel and Augustus. There are three things: illness, liking, and vision that they have.

a. Illness

Hazel and Augustus have similar illness that is cancer. Cancer made them different and treated as the special one. They only have access to the outside life if they take a class at Heart of Jesus with another cancer patient.

As the writer analyzed, Hazel felt depressed and spent her time only in bed because of her cancer illness.

“Late in the winter of my seventeenth year, my mother decided I was depressed, presumably because I rarely left the house, spent quite a lot of time in bed, read the same book over and over, ate infrequently, and devoted quite a bit of my abundant free time to thinking about death.” (Green 2012, 3)

Augustus as cancer patient felt depressed too, because his cancer almost makes his life oblivion and took his left leg.

“I fear oblivion,” he said without a moment’s pause. “I fear it like the proverbial blind man who’s afraid of the dark.” (Green 2012, 14)

From the quotation above can be seen that August was "Oblivion". According to the Oxford dictionary, Oblivion is the destruction or extinction. (Oxford 2016) Thus, August was devastated by the situation as cancer sufferer. By the quotations above “Illness” are the one of similarity that influencing their relationship. They
have same condition and nightmare that could be one of the strong factor of influencing their relationship.

b. Preferences

Hazel and August have the same hobbies and preferences. They like reading. They are frequently discussing about Peter van Houten’s *An Imperial Affliction*. Even August to send email to the author of *An Imperial Affliction* only to know how the end of the story in that novel. Moreover, they both also exchanged novel Hazel leave *An Imperial Affliction* to August and he gives her *Prince of Dawn*.

As I recall, you promised to CALL when you finished the book, not text. So I called.
“Hazel Grace,” he said upon picking up. “So have you read it?” “Well, I haven’t finished it. It’s six hundred fifty-one pages long and I’ve had twenty-four hours.”
“How far are you?” “Four fifty-three.” “And?” “I will withhold judgment until I finish. However, I will say that I’m feeling a bit embarrassed to have given you *The Price of Dawn.*” (Green 2012,15)

They have giving opinions about same object who they like. It makes good two way interactions between them. And it could be another strong factors that influencing their relationship because it makes their conversation more intense than before. We can see how more intense and deep about their conversation.

“A sparkling addition to the series. So, okay, is the tulip guy a crook? I’m getting a bad vibe from him.”
“No spoilers,” I said.
“If he is anything other than a total gentleman, I’m going to gouge his eyes out.”
“So you’re into it.”
“Withholding judgment! When can I see you?”
“Certainly not until you finish *An Imperial Affliction.*”
“I enjoyed being coy. “Then I’d better hang up and start reading.”
“You’d better,” I said, and the line clicked dead without another word. Flirting was new to me, but I liked it. (Green 2012,12)
From the quotation above showing they love to read each novels. They are both to conclude their perception of that novels. And they looks enjoy to explain what they just read. As the people who just have met it very good quality of interaction.

The similarity about their hobbies and preference are the factors that influencing relationship.

2. Reciprocity of Liking

There is little bit different between Hazel to August. August can express easily his liking to Hazel. The liking factors of this part are focusing on how they feel of each other. It is not about they are love each other but how they expressing their liking to the physical, hobby, and their treatment to each other.

“What?” I asked.
“Nothing,” he said.
“Why are you looking at me like that?”
Augustus half smiled. “Because you’re beautiful. I enjoy looking at beautiful people, and I decided a while ago not to deny myself the simpler pleasures of existence.” A brief awkward silence ensued. Augustus plowed through: “I mean, particularly given that, as you so deliciously pointed out, all of this will end in oblivion and everything.”
I kind of scoffed or sighed or exhaled in a way that was vaguely coughy and then said, “I’m not beau—”
“You’re like a millennial Natalie Portman. Like V for Vendetta Natalie Portman.” (Green 2012, 18)

On the contrary, Hazel little bit shy to express her feeling. She needs more time than August to tell him about her feeling.

I couldn’t stop thinking about the little moment when I’d tensed up as he touched me. The gentle familiarity felt wrong, somehow. I thought maybe it was how orchestrated the whole thing had been: Augustus was amazing, but he’d overdone everything at the picnic, right down to the sandwiches that were metaphorically resonant but tasted terrible and the memorized soliloquy that prevented conversation. It all felt Romantic, but not romantic. (Green 2012, 21)
She is confused about her feeling to August. But, August make her comfortable to him. And sometimes she cannot refuse how comfort she is.

We crawled into the bed, my freedom circumscribed some by the oxygen, but even so I could get on top of him and take his shirt off and taste the sweat on the skin below his collarbone as I whispered into his skin, “I love you, Augustus Waters,” his body relaxing beneath mine as he heard me say it. He reached down and tried to pull my shirt off, but it got tangled in the tube. I laughed. (Green 2012, 17)

Based on quotation above, we know that Hazel also has good feeling to August. But, she needs more time than August to tell him. She need good timing and good moment to tell him about her feeling. When the moment come she said “I love you, Augustus Waters,” without any interruption.

3. Positive Qualities

In this novel, Hazel and August like each other. August loves Hazel as what she is. All the bad and good she has made sense for August.

Augustus was amazing, but he’d overdone everything at the picnic, right down to the sandwiches that were metaphorically resonant but tasted terrible and the memorized soliloquy that prevented conversation. It all felt Romantic, but not romantic.

The positives qualities of Augustus Water are literate, warm, incredible, and easy going so he can take Hazel to another place outside her house. He is adaptable and very good listener that make Hazel very comfortable to him.

“Because you're beautiful. I enjoy looking at beautiful people, and I decided a while ago not to deny myself the simpler pleasures of existence.”

“The whole thing where a boy who is not unattractive or unintelligent or seemingly in any way unacceptable stares at me and points out incorrect uses of literality and compares me to actresses and asks me to watch a movie at his house. But of course there is always a hamartia and yours is that oh, my God, even though you HAD FREAKING CANCER you give money to a company in exchange for the chance to acquire YET MORE CANCER. Oh, my God. Let me
just assure you that not being able to breathe? SUCKS. Totally disappointing. Totally.” (Green 2012, 15)

From these quotation above the positive qualities of Hazel are thoughtful, knowledgeable, and rebellion that make Hazel have different view with August. However Hazel open minded and humble so August have twisted feeling and its very wonderful feeling.

4. Physical Attractive and Liking

This thing could be main factor of what underlying relationship. But it does not mean this thing could be everything to maintain the relationship. If the physic is not really attractive, the attractive characteristic can interest people. Woman is different from man. Man tends to look someone from the physical appearance, but woman does not. Woman tends to look someone by the behavior qualities. And this statement is the one of references for Hazel and August making and nurturing their relationship.

“I nodded. I liked Augustus Waters. I really, really, really liked him. I liked the way his story ended with someone else. I liked his voice. I liked that he took existentially fraught free throws. I liked that he was a tenured professor in the Department of Slightly Crooked Smiles with a dual appointment in the Department of Having a Voice That Made My Skin Feel More Like Skin. And I liked that he had two names. I’ve always liked people with two names, because you get to make up your mind what you call them: Gus or Augustus? Me, I was always just Hazel, univalent Hazel.” (Green 2012, 18)

5. Physical Appearance and Social Behavior

This physical appearance is one thing build their relationship. Hazel is regular girl with unique performance with oxygen tanks in her hand and she only have half lungs but she is beautiful.
Augustus half smiled. "Because you're beautiful. I enjoy looking at beautiful people, and I decided a while ago not to deny myself the simpler pleasures of existence." (Green 2012, 19)

Then, August is a unique man with amputee feet but nice hair and nice style.

"His hair was parted neatly on the left side in a way that he would have found absolutely horrifying, and his face was plasticized. But he was still Gus. My lanky, beautiful Gus."

“Augustus Waters was sitting on the front step as we pulled into the driveway. He was holding a bouquet of bright orange tulips just beginning to bloom." (Green 2012, 27)

So, they have different style and behavior which make they complement each other. The only same thing is they have cancer in their body. That is why they regard each other.

B. Consequences of Hazel and August’s Relationship Through J.W Thibaut and H.H Kelley’s Social Exchange Theory

Thibaut and Kelley state in their book of ‘Social Psychology of Groups’ that the essence of any interpersonal relationship is interaction. Two individuals may be said to have formed a relationship when on repeated occasions to meet they are observed to interact. By interaction it means that they emit behavior in each other’s presence, they create products for each other, or they communicate with each other. In every case we would identify as an instance of interaction there is at least the possibility that the actions of each person affect the other.

According to Thibaut and Kelley’s theory, the writer wants to analyze the main character’ relationship. In social exchange theory by Thibaut and Kelley, there are four important things in analyzing the dyad; rewards, costs, outcomes, and comparison level.
Hazel and August are the main characters who run the relationship. Their relationship has good condition to reciprocate each other. First, the writer would like to analyze rewards which have the function to increase good outcome in relationship.

1. **Rewards**

Rewards include feeling of pleasures, satisfaction, and gratification that the person enjoys in relationship. It is positive component to increase good outcome in the relationship.

The writer has analyzed the main characters relationship. And there are rewards they had done to maintain good outcome in their relationship. For example when they meet from the first time at The Cancer Support Group. August tell Hazel, she is beautiful and that is make Hazel flattered.

“Why are you looking at me like that?”
Augustus half smiled. “Because you’re beautiful. I enjoy looking at beautiful people, and I decided a while ago not to deny myself the simpler pleasures of existence.” A brief awkward silence ensued. Augustus plowed through: “I mean, particularly given that, as you so deliciously pointed out, all of this will end in oblivion and everything.”
I kind of scoffed or sighed or exhaled in a way that was vaguely coughy and then said, “I’m not beau—”
“You’re like a millennial Natalie Portman. Like V for Vendetta Natalie Portman.”
“Never seen it,” I said.
“Really?” he asked. “Pixie-haired gorgeous girl dislikes authority and can’t help but fall for a boy she knows is trouble. It’s your autobiography, so far as I can tell.”
His every syllable flirted. Honestly, he kind of turned me on. I didn’t even know that guys could turn me on—not, like, in real life. (Green 2012, 22)

In here, Hazel is happy but little bit shy. Because, this is first time someone call her like that for real. Since that moment Hazel accepted August in her life.
Then another rewards also decorate their relationship when August inviting Hazel to his house and watch movie together. They starting to talk about hobby and their private life.

“You should see it,” he said. “V for Vendetta, I mean.”
“Okay,” I said. “I’ll look it up.”
“No. With me. At my house,” he said. “Now.”
I stopped walking. “I hardly know you, Augustus Waters. You could be an ax murderer.”
He nodded. “True enough, Hazel Grace.” He walked past me, his shoulders filling out his green knit polo shirt, his back straight, his steps lilting just slightly to the right as he walked steady and confident on what I had determined was a prosthetic leg. Osteosarcoma sometimes takes a limb to check you out. Then, if it likes you, it takes the rest.
I followed him upstairs, losing ground as I made my way up slowly, stairs not being a field of expertise for my lungs.(Green 2012, 19)

Hazel followed August to his house and watch movie. In this case Hazel started to trust August even “she hardly know August”. Trust coming when someone feel satisfied from another.

About rewards, in their books Thibaut and Kelley state:

“The magnitude of rewards to be gained by to members from the various elements will depend upon their individual needs and values and congruency of the behaviors or behavioral products with these needs and values. Each person’s rewards may be derived (1) directly from his own behavior and/or (2) from the other’s behavior. The former consist of rewards the individuals could produce for himself if he were alone. Any rewards receives that depends at anyway upon the other individual, even if only upon the presence of the other, will be considered as depending upon the other’s behavior. For example, A obtain satisfaction from doing things for B. we can interpret this to mean that B can produce rewards for A (probably at very low cost) by simply assuming a passive set in which he receives A’s contributions and, perhaps, acknowledges receipt in some way.”(Green 2012, 26)
And this happened to Hazel. Once she really strange to meet someone like August. But after all what August has done for her, Hazel changes her feeling and attitude.

She gratifies and loves August now.

"My name is Hazel. Augustus Waters was the great star-crossed love of my life. Ours was an epic love story, and I won't be able to get more than a sentence into it without disappearing into a puddle of tears. Gus knew. Gus knows. I will not tell you our love story, because-like all real love stories-it will die with us, as it should. I'd hoped that he'd be eulogizing me, because there's no one I'd rather have..." I started crying. "Okay, how not to cry. How am I-okay. Okay." I took a few deep breaths and went back to the page. "I can't talk about our love story, so I will talk about math. I am not a mathematician, but I know this: There are infinite numbers between 0 and 1. There's .1 and .12 and .112 and infinite collection of others. Of course, there is a bigger infinite set of numbers between 0 and 2, or between 0 and a million. Some infinities are bigger than other infinities. A writer we used to like taught us that. There are days, many of them, when I resent the size of my unbounded set. I want more numbers than I'm likely to get, and God, I want more numbers for Augustus Waters than he got. But, Gus, my love, I cannot tell you how thankful I am for our little infinity. I wouldn't trade it for the world. You gave me a forever within the numbered days, and I'm grateful." (Green 2012, 23)

Big chances come for August rewarding Hazel. When Hazel want to know about the end of her favorite novel. August who just finished that novel trying to find out with sending an email to the author of that novel. Furthermore, August tell Hazel about that and Hazel so excited.

"'Dear Mr. Waters,'" he answered. "'I am writing to thank you for your electronic correspondence, received via Ms. Vliegenthart this sixth of April, from the United States of America, insofar as geography can be said to exist in our triumphantly digitized contemporaneity.'"

"Augustus, what the hell?"

"He has an assistant," Augustus said. "Lidewij Vliegenthart. I found her. I emailed her. She gave him the email. He responded via her email account."

"Okay, okay. Keep reading."...

"Wow," I said. "Are you making this up?"
“Hazel Grace, could I, with my meager intellectual capacities, make up a letter from Peter Van Houten featuring phrases like ‘our triumphantly digitized contemporaneity’?”

“You could not,” I allowed. “Can I, can I have the email address?”

“Of course,” Augustus said, like it was not the best gift ever. (Green 2012, 24)

August really make Hazel impressed with what he had done. August give her something that she never haven. Something that very special because she really want to know about the end of her favorite novel. That moments make them closer moreover the author of that novel inviting them to come to Amsterdam.

They can rewarding each other with what they had done. They pleasures, satisfies, and gratifies each other. In every moment above they successfully create an incredible relationship.

2. Costs

In a relationship, there are needed costs to maintain it. The costs included mental effort (embarrassment and anxiety), expenses, and distance. The nature of costs tends of negative, because it causes the low outcomes in relationship.

In Hazel and August relationship, there are also costs. Those are got by either from Hazel or August. For example, Hazel ever felt disappointed to August because of his attitude. When he put on cigarette on his lips. Even if it just metaphor by his opinion but Hazel still disappointed about that.

Then Augustus Waters reached into a pocket and pulled out, of all thin gs, a pack of cigarettes. He flipped it open and put a cigarette between his lips. “Are you serious?” I asked. “You think that’s cool? Oh, my God, you just ruined the whole thing.”

“Which whole thing?” he asked, turning to me. The cigarette dangled unlit from the unsmiling corner of his mouth.
“The whole thing where a boy who is not unattractive or unintelligent or seemingly in any way unacceptable stares at me and points out incorrect uses of literality and compares me to actresses and asks me to watch a movie at his house. But of course there is always a hamartia and yours is that oh, my God, even though you HAD FREAKING CANCER you give money to a company in exchange for the chance to acquire YET MORE CANCER. Oh, my God. Let me just assure you that not being able to breathe? SUCKS. Totally disappointing. Totally.”

“A hamartia?” he asked, the cigarette still in his mouth. It tightened his jaw. He had a hell of a jawline, unfortunately.

“A fatal flaw,” I explained, turning away from him. I stepped toward the curb, leaving Augustus Waters behind me, and then I heard a car start down the street. It was Mom. She’d been waiting for me to, like, make friends or whatever.

I felt this weird mix of disappointment and anger welling up inside of me. I don’t even know what the feeling was, really, just that there was a lot of it, and I wanted to smack Augustus Waters and also replace my lungs with lungs that didn’t suck at being lungs. (Green 2012,30)

Then, when she know it just metaphor and he explain it one thing that Hazel really appreciated. Hazel become more wisely after that she becoming the better person and know something that everybody think that could kill, it never killed until you give it a power to kill.

So, the cost should be paid with the high rewards as compensation. But Hazel never feels suffer when she must pay the high costs for maintaining their relationship. Because she satisfied enough for what he has done to her.

3. Outcomes

According to analysis of reward and costs above, the writer concludes Hazel and August relationship have high values. Because they have high rewards and low costs. As Thibaut and Kelley state:
They can be combined into a single of “goodness” of outcome, with states of reward and low cost being given high-scales values. The high value of their relationship because they have more rewards than costs.

4. Comparison Level

CL is a standard by which the person evaluates the rewards and costs of a given relationship in terms of what he feels he “deserves”. Relationships the outcomes of which fall above CL would be relatively “satisfying” and attractive to the member; those entailing outcomes that fall below CL would be relatively “unsatisfying” and unattractive. The location of CL on the person’s scale of outcomes will be influenced by all of the outcomes known to the member, either by direct experience or symbolically.

a. Comparison Level

The standard used CL by the members of dyad is to evaluate the present relationship is their past relationship.

For Hazel, she has only one relationship before she makes a relationship with August. She has a relationship with Kaitlyn. Hazel and Kaitlyn are school friends. She is described as British 25 year old socialite stuck in 16 year old teenager. They drifted apart, but Hazel says she likes to spend a little time with her. Hazel meets up with her at the mall in the beginning of the story, later lies and says that she is leaving. She is of the only girls she can talk with who does not judge her for her cancer. Kaitlyn never wears open toed shoes for fear that her second toes show.
Hazel describes her as being the only person she had ever met with toe specific dysmorphia, which something not as it really is.

“She wore a knee-length charcoal coat that fit perfectly and sunglasses that dominated her face. She pushed them up onto the top of her head as she leaned down to hug me. “Darling,” she said, vaguely British. “How are you?” People did not find the accent odd or off-putting. Kaitlyn just happened to be an extremely sophisticated 25 years old British socialite stuck inside a 16 years old body in Indianapolis. Everyone accepted it.” (Green 2012, 37)

Hazel and Kaitlyn only spent little time together. They only spending time to buy something in the mall like a shoes. They do not have any special moment together. Based on analysis above, the writer concludes three is no good relationship between them and no satisfaction.

b. CLALT (Comparison Level for Alternative)

Thibaut and Kelley state:

“The alternatives relationships with which the present one is compared in evolving the CL ALT may include other dyads, more complex relationships, or even the alternative of joining no groups, of working or being alone.” (J.W Kelley 1959, 22)

Each dyad members are should have alternatives relationships outside the main relationships. And this relationships is used as another standard to evaluate the main relationship.

When August make relationship with Hazel, he have another relationship with Isaac. And this relationship are used as another standard to evaluate the main relationship. He and Augustus are best friend, and through him Augustus best friends Hazel. He has previously in a relationship with Monica, until she broke up with him upon bearing he would go blind. Isaac is known to like video games and
has a wide sense of humor, as evidenced when Hazel visits him after he undergoes his surgery, even though the most intense pain he jokes.

5. The Evaluation of Hazel and August Relationship

Based on an analysis above the writer reviews that Hazel and August has high rewards for their relationship. They gave gratification one another to maintain better relationship

Then for the costs, Hazel and August’s relationship has low costs. Sometimes they do something which is embarassed each other, but they can stabilize their relationship by understanding each other.

Based on rewards and costs value, Hazel and August’s relationship has good outcomes. Because it comes from the high rewards and the low costs. The results of the Comparison Level (CL) and Comparison Level Alternatif (CL ALT) in their relationship is not higher than outcomes. It means their relationship is the best than another relationships that they ever had.

So, finally the writer concludes the value of Hazel and August’s relationship is the tied and interdependence relationship. It is represented by the formula, Outcome > CL > CL ALT. It means satisfactory, stable, and interdependence relationship.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

*The Fault in Our Stars*, a novel by John Green, tells about two teenager with cancer have relationship through their tough life. The writer uses Robert S. Fieldman’s theory to see underlying factors of the main characters relationship; those factors are similarity, reciprocity of liking, positive qualities, physical attractiveness and liking, and physical appearance and social behaviour. Then, social exchange theory to find out about rewards, cost, outcome, and comparison level of the main characters analysis.

Actually, similarity is the first important factor in relationship development. Similarity can be directly reinforcing. For instance, we may have learned through prior experience that people attitudes similar to our own are associated with rewarding circumstances or situations. If two personals have many similar things, they may be directly building a relationship. Then similarity will be followed by the remaining factors.

There is not only similarity, Hazel and August also have some differences. As the writer revealed on the background of the study, their differences strengthen their relationship. Then it makes this relationship so special to be analyzed. Wondering how could they stay in their relationship for long time, even until August dies? The answer is because they have high-scale rewards and outcomes.
To know the detail, the writer has analyzed Hazel and August’s relationship by applying Thibaut and Kelley’s social exchange theory. This theory tells relationship is similar with trade transaction. There are four elements to evaluate relationship in this social exchange theory; rewards, costs, outcomes, and comparison level.

To have good relationship, we should have high rewards and low costs. The writer proves the more rewards produced is tighter relationship we have. On the contrary, the more cost produced is the more estranged relationship we have. As Hazel and August’s relationship, this relationship has good outcomes. The gratification they have done makes high value for rewards. But they have understanding to hold the costs down. So their relationship can always be stabilized.

Comparison level also important role to evaluate the relationship. If comparison level includes CL and CL ALT lower than outcomes in relationship, the relationship would be more stable, satisfactory and interdependence.

Finally, the writer concludes that some factors such as similarity and reciprocity are needed to build good relationship. Similarity is the fundamental factor that should be owned by the members of dyad. They cannot build relationship without having similar attitude and thinking. They also cannot maintain their relationship without doing reciprocity. It is because similarity and reciprocity can increase the rewards value in relationship.
B. **Suggestion**

This novel has a strong psychological side. It is interesting if this novel is analyzed using theories of psychology. The writer suggests the reader and to those who want to analyze this novel by psychological approach, they can use psychoanalysis as the theory. But is better by applying others theory besides psychology. They can use feminism to analyze main character especially Hazel. Or they can use structuralism to analyze all intrinsic in this novel. Finally, hope this work can be useful for the readers.
WORKS CITIED LIST


**Websites:**