QUEERING THE CONSTRUCTION OF GENDER IDENTITY IN CHRIS COLUMBUS' MOVIE *MRS. DOUBTFIRE*

Meng-*Queer* Konstruksi Identitas Gender dalam Film Chris Columbus *Mrs. Doubtfire*

Pradipta Agustina dan Maimunah

The British Institute (pos-el: violet.agustina@yahoo.com) dan Jurusan Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Airlangga, Jalan Dharmawangsa Dalam Selatan Surabaya, Telp: 031-5035676, Pos-el:maymunir@yahoo.com

(Makalah diterima tanggal 7 September 2013—Disetujui tanggal 21 November 2013)

Abstrak: *Film Mrs. Doubtfire karya Chris Columbus menampilkan konstruksi yang berbeda dengan konstruksi peran gender yang telah menjadi mainstream. Berdurasi 1 jam dan 57 menit, film ini menampilkan konstruksi maskulinitas dan femininitas yang dapat saling bertukar, cair, dan tidak baku. Studi ini mengkaji dua pertanyaan utama. Pertama, bagaimana konstruksi peran gender digugat melalui performativitas gender? Kedua, ideologi apa yang terdapat dalam film? Teori Queer terutama gender performativitas yang dikemukakan oleh Judith Butler menjadi kerangka penelitian ini. Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan mengobservasi dan menganalisis adegan terpilih dengan berfokus pada penampilan Daniel Hillard sebagai Euphegenia Doubtfire. Aspek naratif dalam film bukan satu-satunya perhatian utama. Aspek non-naratif juga menjadi bagian analisis kostum, tata rias, penampilan, dan warna. Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa film ini pada satu sisi mengonfirmasi peran gender yang tradisional, tetapi di lain pihak juga mencoba menawarkan performativitas gender. Ideologi film ini menggambarkan femininitas sebagai sesuatu yang cair sehingga femininitas juga sesuatu yang sifatnya performativitas. Kontestasi antara kedua hal tersebut disajikan dengan menarik dalam film Mrs. Doubtfire.*

Kata-Kata Kunci: *konstruksi gender, performativitas gender, teori queer*

Abstract: *The construction of traditional gender roles has affected the understanding of being feminine and masculine. This understanding seems to influence gender performance in the film Mrs. Doubtfire. This one-hour-and-fifty-seven-minute film was directed by Chris Columbus. This study is conducted to examine how gender performativity is illustrated in the film and what ideology lies within the film. Queer theory, especially gender performativity by Judith Butler is used as the framework of the study. The study is done by observing and analysing chosen scenes from the film focusing on the performance of Daniel Hillard as Euphegenia Doubtfire. Narrative aspect of the film is not only the main concern; the non-narrative is also part of the analysis especially on costume, makeup, performance and color. The main finding of this study is this film in one hand celebrates traditional gender roles but on the other hand promotes gender as performance. Femininity is pictured as fluid. Therefore, it is also a performativity. The contestation between those two opposing ideas is smoothly wrapped through amusing film such as Mrs. Doubtfire.*

Key Words: *gender construction, gender performativity, queer theory*

INTRODUCTION

Performance perhaps considered as an insignificant aspect however it still plays an important role in life. Performance helps to differentiate one's gender based on one's biological sex. The way one performs is not freely chosen but it is already designed by the society. As things are divided into two categories such as good and bad, black and white, performance is also divided into two. It follows two gender available; masculine

and feminine. The division follows the notion of binary opposition where one is superior to another (Tyson, 2006:100). This binary opposition leads to traditional gender roles. It is a role that constructs man to be rational, strong, protective, and decisive. Woman is constructed to be emotional (irrational), weak, nurturing, and submissive (Tyson, 2006:85). The performance of gender is expected to follow the traditional gender roles. A man should perform as masculine and woman should perform as feminine, failing to do so may result in bad stigma from the society. As Butler suggests that gender performance leads to punishment, the way one performs is a strategy to survive the compulsory system (Butler, 1999:178). Therefore, in any circumstances man cannot perform as woman and vice versa since punishment may wait.

This study is conducted to examine how gender performativity is illustrated and what ideology lies within the film *Mrs. Doubtfire*. *Mrs. Doubtfire* is a 1993 American comedy film starring Robin Williams and based on the novel *Madame Doubtfire* by Anne Fine. It explores and analyses the gender performativity illustrated by Daniel Hillard as Euphegenia Doubtfire. Comedy film is choosen after considering a research done by Daniel Lieberfield and Judith Sanders on a famous comedy film *Some Like It Hot*. The research has revealed that somehow comedy film is like two sides of a coin. In one hand, it somehow supports the performance of the cross gender since it gives highly sophisticated make-up and costume. On the other hand, it implicitly strengthens the idea of hetero-normativity construction. *Mrs Doubtfire* is choosen because the film gives not only a great quality of cross gender performance through its make-up, costumes and performance, but also provides hidden normative ideas in its narative. The number of award winning is also part of the consideration. The film won Academy Awards for Best Make Up and Golden Globe Awards for Best Picture and Best Actor.

The source of the study is taken from the film titled *Mrs. Doubtfire* produced in 1993 and directed by Chris Columbus. The study focuses on scenes that show Daniel Hillard performing Euphegenia Doubtfire. Those scenes provide narative and non-narative aspects of the film which are analysed using queer theory focusing on the gender performativity by Judith Butler. The make-up and costume from the non-narative aspect is the main concern in the analysis because it helps the performance of cross gender performativity.

THEORY

Gender discussion is never parted from sex issue. It somehow leads to confusion between those two terms. Butler stated that gender is never an expression of biological sex but it is a performativity constructed by the culture. The new definition of gender then 'Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being' (Butler, 1999:43). Therefore, in her book *Bodies that Matter*, "performativity must be understood not as a singular or deliberate 'act,' but, rather, as the reiterative and citational practice which discourse produces the effects that it names" (Butler, 1993:2). Those definition suggest that the notion of male being masculine and female being feminine is only a matter of repetition taught by the culture. If so, then human is not born as male but rather becomes

one, in a radical situation then human can choose not to be male or female.

Queer theory is used to analyse the film *Mrs. Doubtfire* by Chris Columbus under the focus of gender performativity. Queer theory is considered to be the most appropriate theory to be applied. The focus of the theory is Gender Performativity suggested by Judith Butler in her book *Gender Trouble* (1999) and *Bodies that Matter* (1993). Considering the using of film as the object of the study, narrative and non-narrative aspects of the film are included to support the analysis. Queer theory tries to define that one's sexuality is fluid, fragmented, and dynamic. All sexualities, for instance gay sexuality, lesbian sexuality and heterosexuality are only choices of possibilities one may have. Sexuality has its own will, creativity and expression. Therefore, heterosexual is not the opposition of homosexual. Queer theory also believes that our sexuality is socially constructed. Society believes that being heterosexual is the right thing therefore this norm is established in many of social tools such as family, education, religion etc. in order to teach an individual to become heterosexual.

METHOD

In the book *Doing Research on Cultural Studies* Paula Saukko classifies three methodologies in doing research on cultural studies based on the context of the research. First is lived experience research approach, second is text or discourse research approach and third is approach to analyse macroprocess of globalization (Saukko, 2003:10). Film itself, according to Benshoff and Griffin (2006:2) is a cultural artefact connected to our understanding. In this context, the second approach is used. Film here is analysed as a text or discourse therefore the methodology used in this research is a qualitative methodology.

The primary data of the study is taken from the film titled *Mrs. Doubtfire* produced in 1993 and directed by Chris Columbus. However, the writer focuses only on the scenes which show Daniel Hillard performing Euphegenia Doubtfire. Those scenes are believed to provide enough data about the performativity of gender.

DISCUSSION

Gender Performativity

The idea of gender performativity is suggested by Judith Butler. She elaborates and critiques the idea of sex from Simone de Beauvoir. Simone de Beauvoir writes in her book *The Second Sex* that "one is not born a woman but rather becomes one." This statement is understood by Butler as a suggestion that women are merely a cultural accomplishment therefore no one is born with a gender. At the same time, it also suggests that sex is an analytic attribute of the human it is impossible to change. It made an understanding that gender is the variable cultural construction of sex (Butler, 1999:142).

Butler argues that, if gender is constructed, so does sex because the way we know our sex is through society. When a human baby is born, the society chooses a sex for the baby. Thus, both sex and gender are social construction. The implication of Beauvoir theory that sex is natural and gender is constructed is that sex does not limit gender. 'Woman' does not mean a female body and 'man' does not understand as male. It means that one body can produce different gender. This idea of the function of gender leads to an understanding that gender can go beyond the duality of sex. If so, gender is an activity of someone to become a specific gender form. Butler stated that

since gender is not bound by sex, it is an action that can alter beyond the binary limits made by the binary of sex.

In order to support her suggestion she elaborates Wittig's idea of gender and sex. Under the notion delivered by Simone de Beauvoir, one is not born a woman but rather becomes one, Monique Wittig delivers two claims that recall Beauvoir and at the same time set her apart. First the category of sex is not natural it is a political uses of the category of nature to support heterosexuality and second is the idea that lesbian is not a woman. The focus of this study is to reveal Butler's key concept of gender performativity. Therefore, it is necessary to remain focus on the first claim. Wittig as noted in Butler's gives a new definition apart from Beauvoir idea of sex. In her words:

> Sex is taken as an "immediate given," "a sensible given," "physical features," belonging to a natural order. But what we believe to be a physical and direct perception is only a sophisticated and mythic construction, an "imaginary formation," which reinterprets physical features (in themselves as neutral as others but marked by a social system), through the network of relationships in which they are perceive (Wittig, cited in Butler 1999:145).

This definition is a foundation that sex is constructed and it is constructed by gender.

Butler then analyses Foucault's idea about language of internalization that operates among prisoners. This idea gives her a definition of identification which is an established fantasy. It means that acts, gestures and desires affect the internal core, but only on the surface of the body. Therefore, they are performative which means that the essence or identities that they imply are fabrication manufactured by cultural construction (1999:173). This understanding leads to a conclusion that the truth about gender is a fabrication therefore it cannot be said to be true or false. It only produces an identity that cultural construction wants. The notion of an original gender identity is parodied by the practices of drag, cross-dressing, and butch/femme identities (Butler, 1999:174). Gender parody here does not mean that the gender being parodied is the original, referring to the fact that such gender is already a 'figure'. Thus, gender parody affirms that the original identity which gender creates is an imitation without an origin (1999:175).

As people live in a strong cultural construction society, people are taught to perform a particular gender based on their sex. Failing to do so may result a punishment from the society. This phenomenon is understood by Butler as a fact that gender performativity is a strategy for one to survive the compulsory system and avoid punishment (1999:176). The performance of gender in order to become a shield from punishment must be done as perfect as possible therefore it needs a repetition. As Butler stated:

> Performativity must be understood not as a singular or intentional 'act' but, rather, as the repeated and citational practice by which discourse produces the effects that it names (Butler 1993:2).

Therefore, based on that definition, the best strategy to perform a gender is by maintaining the binary opposition of the gender.

Gender Representation

The term gender typically refers to the social process of dividing up people and sexed identities. Gender usually refers to two different and separate categories of human being, men and women, and also

the division of social practices into two fields (Beasley, 2005:11). According to Beasley, gender is based on binary division of human beings and social practices where they are different, opposed each other and have a hierarchy distinction. The hierarchy division means that one is considered to be positive and the other negative. The positive one refers to masculine while the negative refers to feminine (ibid.). In a sense of the roles, the society tends to follow traditional gender roles. Traditional gender roles are a role that constructs man to be rational, strong, protective and decisive. Woman is constructed to be emotional (irrational), weak, nurturing and submissive (Tyson, 2006:85). *Mrs. Doubtfire* opens with the introducing of the main male character, Daniel Hillard. He is a voice-over for a cartoon film. He is able to produce many kinds of voices and even sing with different voices. The first scene is opened by him singing Italian song 'Largo al Factotum' as a bird named Pudgie. Daniel produces an Italian man voice for Pudgie's character and another man voice for the cat's character. The scene depicts his ability to produce many different voices and the voice effects as well. He reads out the script and when it comes to the smoking scenes, he gives an additional dialogue which is not on the script. The producer thinks that this is violating the rules of a voice-over. In his rules, Daniel should read and only read what is on the script; he is not allowed to add any additional conversation. Due to principal clash, Daniel decides to leave the job.

The next scene moves to a school where Daniel's children go. He picks up his three children, two girls and one boy; Lydia, Christopher and Natalie. Based on the conversation between him and Lydia, it seems that he always picks up the children after school.

Lydia	:	I thought you couldn't pick us up.
Daniel	:	Well, I got off early.
Lydia	:	You mean you got fired?
Daniel	:	No, I quit. For reasons of conscience.
Lydia	:	Actors

(00:04:18)

The conversation implies that Daniel is the one who usually pick them up. Perhaps Daniel has said that he has a job to do then the kids assume he is not available so they are going to take a bus to home. This scene depicts Daniel's role in the family. He is the one who is close with the children; he picks them up everyday from school. However, the next conversation implicitly shows Daniel's job condition. Lydia tries to correct his reason of being able to pick them up by verifying if he has been fired from his job. When he says yes, surprisingly none of the kids including Lydia are shocked. It seems that it has already been a usual thing to hear their father got fired.

The next scene portrays Daniel's wife's, Miranda Hillard, job. She is an interior designer under a cooperation named Gregory, Handerson & Hillard. She is a good and skilful businesswoman and seems to have a good career assuming from her office and clients. In one of the conversation with her co-worker, it seems that she is going to handle a contract with a millioner. The conversation implies that Miranda is a successful and trustworthy interior designer. She definitely has a good career and clients. Apparently this good situation makes Miranda has limited time to be with the children.

It is proven when she gets home and finds all the chaos, she starts to fight with Daniel. Miranda feels that she has to carry the entire burden. She cannot be with the children and brings fun because she has no choices. This situation

actually happens because Daniel keeps on losing job so that Miranda has to take control of everything and make money. This condition keeps on happening over and over until Miranda get tired. In her last effort to keep the family, she asks for the divorce.

In the sense of gender performance, this film still sticks on binary opposition. Daniel as man, he performs as a male, wears man outfit like trousers, man shoes, and man shirts. He sounds like a man. Even when he did the voice-over, he produced male voices. Miranda also performs as a female, even though in the outfit she does not wear any skirt, but her look is a businesswoman look.

The Act of Cross Dressing

Gender, as Butler stated in her book *Undoing Gender*, is the apparatus by which the production and normalization of masculine and feminine take place along with the interstitial forms of hormonal, chromosomal, psychic, and performative that gender assumes (Butler, 2004:42). This means that gender is merely a notion of being masculine and feminine, therefore anyone from any sex available may cross and perform any gender available. In this film, the understanding that gender is a performance is somehow strongly supported. Since Daniel is homeless and jobless, the court temporarily decides that the custody goes to Miranda. He has the right to meet the children once a week every Saturday. Because of the close relationship between him and the children, he cannot bear only to meet the children once a week. In the court, he is begging to the judge for not keeping him apart from the children. Miranda on the other hand, faces a difficulty to take care of the children. She does not have enough time to be with the children. In order to solve the problem, she places an advertisement seeking for a house-keeper. The term 'housekeeper' somehow always refers to a woman both for Miranda and Daniel, perhaps judging from the requirement of skills that tends to follow traditional gender roles. The belief of a housekeeper gender becomes the obstacle here. It prohibits Daniel to take care of the children until Miranda gets home.

In this film, the changing of gender is done through cross-dressing and imitating woman voice. The act of cross-dressing here is done under the pressure and as an act of desperation (Phillips, 2006:79). Daniel is under the des-peration to be close with his children that he is willing to change his gender. First thing he does is sabotaging the number so that no 'real' woman will manage to reach Miranda. Then he calls Miranda several times using several different female's voices. As noted in the gender representation that this film still sticks in binary opposition in viewing gender, this scene somehow tries to challenge the notion. This is the first scene where Daniel performs the opposite gender through voices. These female-voice calls are very important here because it may fit with the gender requirements as a housekeeper. The scene is a proof of gender fluidity and performativity. Miranda believes that she has received several calls from different women just because they sound like ones. This scene fits with Woodhouse argument about gender that gender is classified based on the observable features; clothing, hairstyle, facial features, body shape, mannerism, voice and gestures (Woodhouse, 1989:7).

One of the fake phone calls represents the heteronormativity and implicitly hints about the reaction towards cross-gender. Daniel pretends to be a French woman named Ilsa Himmelman and asks the number of

children Miranda is having. When Ilsa Hilmmelman figures out that Miranda has a son, she calmly answers that she is not working with the boy because she was a boy.

Ilsa (Daniel)	:	Ah a boy, I don't work with the males because I used to be one
Miranda	:	(Hang the phone) Yaiks (00:28:47)

Miranda's respond to the confession seems to promote the idea of rejecting transgender and cross-dresser. If the female-voice scene tries to challenge the binary opposition, this scene tries to restore the position of binary opposition back to its throne. In the final call, Daniel performs a very delicate yet assertive voice that only belongs to a skilful woman. He stated that she has worked for Smyth family for fifteen years, which means she is already old. She comes from Britain and asks for several rules, including a healthy food for the children. Miranda gladly accepts her for the interview.

It comes for Daniel to do the transformation. As Butler stated that 'gender is imitations which effectively displace the meaning of the original, they imitate the myth of original itself' (Butler, 1999:176). Therefore, Daniel tries to create an elderly woman persona to fit with his fake experiences as a housekeeper. Daniel goes to his gay brother who happens to be a makeup artist. He asks him to make him become a woman. Several experiments are done to seek the best look. First, they lift Daniel's scalp so the wig will look natural and then they do some makeup. However, the first look fails because it is too wild that may scare the children. In the second look, they try to play with latex and create an older woman yet still not fit the persona. In the third look, they create another woman character but still not fit the persona. Daniel asks for an older look than the third and his brother is referring to two names of old actresses; Shelley Winters and Shirley McClaine. But Daniel propose another reference, Joan Collins which is declined by his brother. This act of changing Daniel's gender is never parted from imitating the myth of being a woman. The first look is a realization of a wild imagination, the second is a look of the usual old woman, and the third is another old woman look. At the end, to create the final look, they refer to several old women as the guidance, to imitate their styles. These are the exact acts that Butler suggests in her book *Gender Trouble* that gender is merely 'styles of the flesh' (Butler, 1999:177).

As Woodhouse argument in previous paragraph that gender is observable through seven features; clothing, hairstyle, facial features, body shape, mannerism, voice and gestures (1989:7), Daniel's attempt in seeking the best look also follows these seven features. First is clothing; in the first look, since it is only a wild imagination without a role model, Daniel does not change his cloth. He keeps on wearing his soft red sweater. In the second look, an elderly woman look, he changes his sweater colour into white since red may look to much for an old woman. In this second look, he also wears brown classy motif scarf to cover the hair. Daniel wears his soft red sweater back in the third look. Finally, in the final look, Daniel changes all of his clothes from head to toes. He changes his sweater into a blouse, his trousers into a skirt, wears stocking and changes his sneakers into Mary-Jane shoes.

Second is hairstyle; the first look's hairstyle follows the wild persona. The

hair is thick, shoulder-length, straight, black and bob-cut. In the second look, Daniel's hair is curly and grey to fit the elderly look. The third look, Daniel's hair is in the same style with the first but it is softened by the cooper hair colour. Next, in the final look, the hair is curly, greyish blonde and bun hair. The last style of hair makes the look more classy and old. The facial features of these four looks are also different. In the first look, Daniel has very thick eyelashes, violet eye shadow, and black eyeliner so the eyes look sharp and strong. The lipstick colour is so bright that creates a wild persona. In the elderly woman look, the facial features are simpler. His brother attaches a latex nose to make it longer. This look makes Daniel feels like a bubbie (a Jewish grandmother). The third look actually has the same features as the first one but in this look the eyelashes are not as thick as before, no eyeliner, no eye shadow, and soft red lipstick. These features create an ordinary woman look. The final look requires a lot of facial features since his brother changes Daniel's entire look. In this final look, Daniel wears a latex face mask, white plastic glasses and thin soft orange lipstick. These features create an old, wise and experienced woman look. Next feature is body shape. There are no significant body shape changes in three trial looks, however, a massive body shape changes happen in the final one. With the help of plaster and latex, Daniel's brother creates an artificial old woman's body. It has big breast, big arms, fat tummy, large hip, and big thigh. This artificial body creates a big, fat, old woman look.

The last three features; mannerism, voice, and gestures are examined together since they are connected to each other. The first look is a wild woman character; Daniel performs a coquettish manner, a French woman voice, and flirtatious gestures like winking eyes. The second look, as Daniel perceives as a Jewish grandmother, he performs all the mannerism, voice and gestures like a Jewish. The third look's mannerism, voice and gestures copy an ordinary woman's. Unfortunately the features in this look are not as clear as two trial looks since Daniel performs them in singing. The last look, the successful one, has special mannerism, voice and gestures. In order to complete the persona, Daniel performs classy, assertive and orthodox mannerism and gestures and also produces a British old woman voice. These features perfected the look of an experienced, assertive yet kind, British old woman.

Those seven features are a work in progress in performing a gender. Those seven features are changed, reproduced, and created in order to fit a persona. Those attempts are only strengthened the idea of gender performativity. If one can fit those seven features of a gender, one can perform that particular gender.

The Revelation

Daniel main job is a shipping clerk in a television studio. One of the TV show is about Dinosaurs which is boring and not interesting to watch. Daniel gives his comment and opinion about the TV shows in the middle of his work to a man he happens to meet. Fortunately, the man is the general manager and owner of the TV studio, Jonathan Lundy. One day after work, Daniel plays with the Dinosaurs figures and act as the host of the show. As an imaginary host, he delivers the show with humour, sounds effect and songs. At the same time, Mr. Lundy is watching Daniel's action and very pleased with it. Mr. Lundy then invites Daniel to meet him on Friday at 7 p.m. at Bridges Restaurant. Unfortunately, Miranda is planning to have a birthday dinner with the whole family and her intimate friend, Stuart

Dunmire, at the same time and at the same restaurant. She insists on asking Mrs. Doubtfire to join the birthday dinner. Unable to resist, she accepts the invitation.

What happens in the next scene is gender parody. Daniel alternately transforms into Mrs. Doubtfire and then transforms into Daniel. In the restaurant, Mrs. Doubtfire chooses the smoking seat since Mr. Lundy chooses the non-smoking one. She makes an excuse that she needs to have her medicine in the restroom where she changes into Daniel. When she has changed, he quickly meets Mr. Lundy and has several drinks. He keeps on watching the family then he realises that the family will not order the food without Mrs. Doubtfire. He quickly excuses Mr. Lundy and changes into Mrs. Doubtfire. After ordering, Mrs. Doubtfire keeps on making trouble, this time her false teeth falls into her Chardonnay wine and needs to reattach. Having difficulties in changing, Daniel forgets to wipe the lipstick and Mr. Lundy is aware of that. Daniel then makes up story that he meets his ex-girlfriend who happens to be the waitress. Surprisingly, Mr. Lundy asks Daniel to ask the girls; if she has a friend for Mr. Lundy. Daniel accepts the request but it is just an excuse so he can go back to the family. In her way back, Mrs. Doubtfire sabotages Stuart's Jamabalaya. She adds a lot of pepper because Stuart is allergic to it. Under the effect of alcohol Daniel drinks with Mr. Lundy, Mrs. Doubtfire sits on the wrong seat. Instead of going back to the family table, she sits in front of Mr. Lundy.

Mr. Lundy	:	Can I help you, ma'am?
Mrs. Doubtfire (in Daniel's voice)	:	Sorry I'm late. But after all those Scotches I had to piss like a race horse.
Mr. Lundy	:	Daniel? Why in God's name are you dressed like a woman?!
Mrs. Doubtfire (in Daniel's voice)	:	Oh, damn. Well... I'd like you to meet the host of your new show.
Mr. Lundy	:	Host?
Mrs. Doubtfire (in her voice)		Euphegenia Doubtfire, dear. I specialise in the education and entertainment of children. (change to Daniel's voice) Surprise! (01: 38:21)

The male to female voice transformation happening in the conversation is a strong proof that gender is performative. As Woodhouse stated before that gender is observable through seven features, one of them is voice, this conversation becomes an example of one. Mr. Lundy does not realize that the old lady in front of him is Daniel, and once she speaks in male voice he then recognises him. The transformation seems to be very easy to be done and when one feature does not match with another, one's gender become more observable. In the same moment, the family is having their dinner and suddenly Stuart is choking because of the pepper. Miranda asks for a help and see Mrs. Doubtfire, she instantly calls her and asks for help. She comes and quickly helps Stuart taken out the choking hazard. She does the Heimlich maneuver and while doing it, her face mask is peeled off. The choking is over but Miranda see the peeled off face mask.

The scene reveals Mrs. Doubtfire disguise in front of everybody. Interestingly, the cover is blown up because of the broken face mask. This revelation symbolises that the face is the most important feature in this transformation. This scene shows how a performance of gender needs complete features. Eventhough Mrs. Doubtfire wears all the seven features but one of them is broken, in this context is the face, the gender classification automatically shifted from female to male. The transformation disguise done by Daniel creates shocked and punishment to him. As Woodhouse argues that, 'the division of masculine and feminine is rigid and demanding and carries punitive sanctions for those who go against the grain... Deviation when exhibited by men is viewed with horror' (Woodhouse, 1989:6). This also confirmed in Butler's idea that 'gender is a performance with clearly punitive consequences' (Butler, 1999:178). The punishment that Daniel receives is that he has no rights for his children since the custody is fully granted to Miranda.

Costumes and Colour

Costume can have specific function for the whole film. In some films costume can be quite stylish in order to gain the attraction of the graphic qualities. Costume also can be used to make the character stands out. Costumes can play important motivic and causal roles in narrative (Bordwell and Thompson, 2008:122). Costumes play an important role in this film by perfecting the cross-dressing act of Daniel Hillard. In order to see the big differences of Daniel costume as a male with Daniel costume as a female, the analysis shall start with this difference. Daniel, as a male, wears male's outfit; a shirt, trousers and sneakers and when he changes into Eupheginea Doubtfire all of his costumes change. Interestingly all of her costumes are in the same model and in the same type. In this film Mrs. Doubtfire always wears blouse, skirt, stocking, and Mary-Jane shoes. She also brings a feminine bag and a travel bag.

Colour affects in psychological aspect, it can symbolise emotions and values which then producing meaning in a text. As a queer cinema, Mrs. Doubtfire has a soft choice of colour. The main colour in Mrs. Doubtfire costume is blue. As Darmaprawira argues that blue's characteristics are passive, calm, peaceful and mild (2002:46), they fit with Mrs. Doubtfire's persona. As a traditional 'woman' Mrs. Doubtfire should act submissively, calmly and wisely, it would be too wild if Mrs. Doubtfire uses red or any bright colour that represents otherwise. The other colours dominant for Mrs. Doubtfire are white and grey. White characteristics are positive, honest and pure (ibid.). This is important as her roles in the family. She is a complete stranger assigned to take care of the children and the house; trustworthy is a big issue here. White colour helps her to create the persona, therefore Miranda is willing to hire her in the first meeting. The next colour is grey; it creates a tranquil, elderly persona, patient and humble effects towards its user. This colour also fits Mrs. Doubtfire personality and character as she is an elderly woman and as a housekeeper she has to be patient with the children. These colours are chosen because actually they are very normative concerning that Mrs. Doubtfire is a queer character.

The Ideology of the Text

Film is believed to be one of the application areas of queer theory (Maimunah, 2008:27). Benshoff and Griffin argues that a film can be classified as queer based on five criteria. One of the

criteria is that particular film contains queer characters and deals with queer issues (2006:9—10). This criterion makes *Mrs. Doubtfire* can be classified as one. In this film, the queer character belongs to Mrs. Doubtfire herself. She is an old woman housekeeper persona performed by a divorced man, Daniel Hillard. The film may fit one of the criteria as a queer film, however, number of screens seem to suggest otherwise.

In *Mrs. Doubtfire* there are several scenes trying to challenge and at the same time also trying to promote the normative belief of gender performance and roles. The first scene, where Daniel Hillard is proven to be the nurturing father while Miranda Hillard is proven to be the breadwinner mother, is a strong challenge of traditional gender roles. Daniel's decision in changing his gender in order to be close with his children is also a strong challenge towards the normative belief. If in patriarchal belief a man should be strong and money dependable, Daniel is not only jobless but also weak regarding to his children. It is a total challenge of patriarchal and masculine belief.

Traditional gender role belief requires that man should act masculine and woman should act feminine. In this film, those beliefs seem to be foiled by the gender parody scenes. These scenes depicted how one gender can be easily performed by the opposite gender. The on and off voice of Daniel and Mrs. Doubtfire is a small example of how traditional gender roles fails to define the nature of gender. Gender can be studied, imitated, and reconstructed by any sex possible; this notion is suggested in the making of Mrs. Doubtfire persona. Daniel and his brother are trying to make a perfect look by referring and imitating several actress and woman persona such as a Jewish grandmother. The attempts are proven to be successful since they are able to create that particular woman character.

This challenging idea, however, is also rechallenged by the traditional gender roles. The crushed face scene, for instance, is a symbol how that new particular idea will be defeated by the stronger and huge ideology, which, in this case, is the traditional gender roles or normativity. The face is a symbol of crossing-gender, as depicted in the film that face is a significant feature to complete the performance and this important feature is being crushed. The ideological interpretation of this scene is that the traditional gender roles as symbolized by the truck will overpower the act of crossing-gender. This scene is an attempt to re-establish traditional gender roles to its throne.

The film keeps on negotiating between gender as performative and gender as normative. Several scenes like the example above even seem to be a contestation between these two opposite ideas. The end of the film where Daniel only performs Mrs. Doubtfire as an imaginary television show host seems to be an implicit message that such performance may not exist in a real life. This implicit idea is somehow a celebration of the normative winning. However, this can also be seen as the film strategy to promote queer notion in the middle of strong normative society.

Aside from challenging traditional gender roles, this film is also a backlash towards feminism. As mentioned before, that Daniel is depicted as a nurturing father and Miranda is a breadwinner mother, this depiction however resulting a problem in the family. Miranda, the success businesswoman, asks for the divorce and creates all the problems. Since her incapability of spending time with the children requires her to hire a housekeeper, Mrs. Doubtfire persona is

created. The role of mother is replaced by a traditional feminine 'woman'. This is a mock towards feminism idea, Miranda's failure of domestic life is already a proof let alone that her role is replaced by perhaps what so called inauthentic woman. This film is also parodied femininity through queer character Mrs. Doubtfire. The character is proposing the fluidity of femininity. If feminism tries so hard to deconstruct the notion of being feminine, this queer character tries to blur everything. This character somehow suggests that being feminine is not only can be done by woman but also can be done by a man.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that Mrs. Doubtfire presents a text that symbolises gender performativity as covered by Queer theory. In this film, the term gender is playfully parodied as merely a transformation of a person. This film is like a double-sided coin. In one hand it playfully promotes queer ideas about gender but on the other hand it also re-establishes traditional gender roles. This phenomenon actually can be seen as the strategy to insert queer issue in the middle of heteronormative society. Eventhough at the end the film may be proven to be very normative yet it still gives a room for queer ideas.

This film can be categorised as preliminary stage of the representation of queer cinema. Mrs. Doubtfire was made in 1993 when sexuality was still considered as a taboo subject. The non-normative subject such as cross-dressing character may become to harsh for the society. Therefore, the ambiguity in this film can be seen as a strategy to survive in the mainstream media. In the end, this film is believed to be a good example of gender performativity idea suggested by Judith Butler.

REFERENCES

Beasley, Chris. 2005. *Gender and Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.

Benshoff, Harry M & Sean Griffin. 2006. *Queer Images: a History of Guy and Lesbian Film in America*. Marylan: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Bordwell, David & Kristin Thompson. 2008. *Film Art: an Introduction*. 8th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that Matter*. New York: Routledge.

--------. 1999. *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge.

--------. 2004. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.

Columbus, Chris. 1993. *Mrs. Doubtfire*. USA, DVD. Film.

Darmaprawira, W.A. Sulasmi. 2002. *Warna: Teori dan Kreativitas Penggunaannya*. 2nd ed. Bandung: Penerbit ITB.

Maimunah. 2008. "Indonesian Queer: Nonnormative Sexualities in Indonesian 2003—2006 Films". *Thesis*. The University of Sydney-Australia.

Phillips, John. 2006. *Transgender on Screen*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Saukko, Paula. 2003. *Doing Research in Cultural Studies*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.

Tyson, Lois. 2006. *Critical Theory Today*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Woodhouse, Annie. 1989. *Fantastic Women: Sex, Gender, and Transvertism*. Hamshire: MacMillan.