

IDEOLOGY, IDENTITY AND POWER: THE LINGUISTIC CONSTRUCTION OF THE VOICE OF THE OTHER IN TWO IMMIGRATION SHORT STORIES⁷⁵

Jorge López Asensio, Universidad de Alcalá

Email: jorlopez8@gmail.com

Abstract: This article explores how the concepts of ideology, identity, and power contribute to the construction of the voice of the Other in immigration short fiction. For this purpose, a twofold linguistic analysis using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and stylistics is carried out. The innovative nature of the study can be perceived in its theoretical background as well as in its analytic process given that it combines CDA and stylistics and it proposes a corpus of immigration literature. The two short stories analyzed are “Negocios” by Junot Díaz and “The Arrangers of Marriage” by Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie. The results show that the voice of the Other as immigrant is destructed and through processes of discursive power there is an attempt to shape his/her identity to conform to a new ideology.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, stylistics, ideology, identity, power, immigration

Resumen: Este artículo explora cómo los conceptos de ideología, identidad y poder contribuyen a la construcción de la voz del Otro en historias cortas de temática de inmigración. Para ello, se elabora un doble análisis lingüístico a través del Análisis Crítico del Discurso y de la pragmaestilística. El carácter innovador del trabajo se percibe en materia teórica y metodológica ya que utiliza un marco teórico combinado de ACD y estilística para analizar un corpus literario de relatos de inmigración. Los relatos analizados son “Negocios” (Junot Díaz) y “The Arrangers of Marriage” (Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie). Los resultados indican que la voz del Otro como inmigrante es destruida y que a través de procesos de poder discursivo existe un intento de moldear su identidad a fin de acomodarlo a una nueva ideología.

Palabras clave: Análisis Crítico del Discurso, estilística, ideología, identidad, poder, inmigración

75 This article was the result of a research project carried out under the “Beca de Introducción a la Investigación”, granted by the Universidad de Alcalá.

1. INTRODUCTION

The possibility of applying a linguistic analysis to a literary text has been object of much discussion and debate (cf. Carter 1982). For instance, Fowler (1981) puts forward the idea of literature being a social practice and, in addition, he considers that the language of literary texts is as valid for a linguistic analysis as any other type. In the same vein, Simpson (2004) suggests that such an approach to literature creates a bidirectional relationship between linguistics and literary criticism that enriches both disciplines. Using a twofold linguistic analysis, it is the main aim of this paper to study how the concepts of identity, ideology, and power contribute to the construction of the voice of the Other in immigrant fiction.

The two analytical frameworks and tools used in this article are Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) and Stylistics. The main motivation behind this idea resides in the fact that studies on the concepts of ideology, identity, and power have been conducted in the fields of politics (Taylor 2010), sociology (Burke and Stets 2009), and psychology (Haslam et al 2011). Within the CDA framework these concepts gain importance in conjunction with discourse, especially regarding issues such as racism (Van Dijk 1992) or the analysis of political speeches (Fairclough 1989). These analyses, nevertheless, have been rarely conducted in literary texts in general and immigrant fiction in particular.

This study aims to cover that gap in the literature by carrying out a CDA that relies on the marked use of certain stylistic features in order to understand how the concepts of ideology, identity, and power contribute to the construction of the voice of the Other in immigrant fiction. Hence, the innovative aspects of this study are to be found in (1) the use of a CDA approach to immigrant fiction; and (2) the incorporation of pragmatic stylistics as a way of critically analyzing discourse.

To achieve this aim, I will attempt to provide an answer to the following research questions:

1. To what extent do ideological constructions and relationships of power in discourse shape the identity of immigrants? Under the light of this CDA approach, how do the concepts of power, ideology, and identity contribute to the construction of the Other?
2. Is it possible to understand such constructions and relations through a stylistic analysis of pragmatic aspects? If so, what are the specific stylistic resources the authors use to construct the voice of the Other?

In what follows, I will firstly develop a theoretical framework that clarifies the most important aspects of the two complementary areas of linguistic research used in this paper: CDA and Stylistics. Regarding the former, I will focus on the concepts of ideology, identity, and power; concerning the latter, I will concentrate in Pragmatic Stylistics, especially on the ideas of representation and self-representation, topicality and turn-taking, and speech acts. Thirdly, I will focus on the data selection and its description. Fourthly, the analysis will be carried out. Finally, the conclusions and findings will be discussed.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In this section, I will concern myself with the description of the two tools used for the analysis: Critical Discourse Analysis and Stylistics.

2.1. Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis is a rather recent approach to discourse analysis and it emerges from the combination of ideas of several backgrounds (Bloor and Bloor 2007). Owing to its interdisciplinary nature, there have been several attempts to conceptualize this area of research. Thus, it is certainly complicated to provide a unifying, authoritative definition of the term. Let us briefly review some of these key definitions. To begin with, Van Dijk (2008: 352), one of the forerunners of CDA, suggests that it is “a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context”.

Already in this first conceptualization, the ideas of social inequality rooted in abuse of power are foregrounded. Along the same line of thought, Fairclough (1995: 132) refers to this area of research as a “[...] discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes [...]”.

Similarly to Van Dijk’s view, the need of relating discourse to broader social issues and unraveling the ways power is exercised through it is emphasized in this definition. In accordance with Fairclough, Wodak and Meyer (2001) focus on unmasking ideologies embedded in every day communicative events considering its contextual aspects. In addition, new trends include a combination between CDA and Cognitive Linguistics (Núñez-Perucha 2011); Positive Discourse Analysis; and an approach based on the connection between CDA and multimodality, which aims to explore more in depth the connection between verbal and nonverbal modes of communication (Waugh et al. 2015).

For the current purposes of this paper, nonetheless, I will focus on identifying the common points of the different CDA approaches. Broadly speaking, Bloor and Bloor (2007) suggest that CD analysts are especially concerned with the ways in which discourse is used with the aim of achieving particular goals of maintaining or changing a status quo in society. In a similar vein, Lin (2014) argues that all the forms of practicing CDA have five principles in common. These principles can be summarized as follows: (1) Its research aims to confront social problems caused by unjust uses of discourse; (2) consequently, CDA is very much a problem-oriented form of applied linguistics. (3) As it was already hinted at, it is fundamentally interdisciplinary, something that calls for flexible approaches. (4) It considers the interest of the subdued, less powerful, groups. (5) Finally, it is important to stress the “researcher reflexivity”; that is, the researcher needs to justify his/her subjective interpretation of a text (Lin, 2014: 214).

All in all, CDA is presented not as a discipline or as a linguistic school, but as a heterogeneous “mode” or “perspective” (Van Dijk 2008: 352) of discussing and analyzing language which aims to challenge those discursive practices that contribute to the creation

or maintenance of unjust social situations. Within CDA, there are three key notions for my current research purposes: ideology, power, and identity.

2.2. Defining discourse, ideology, power, and identity

In this section, I will briefly address three central aspects for CDA that are also driving forces of the paper: ideology, power, and identity. Before, however, I will attempt to explain what I understand by discourse. As with CDA itself, there is not a single conceptualization for this term that prevails over the others. For the purposes of this paper, I will follow the broadest sense of the word that Bloor and Bloor (2007: 6) suggest: “discourse refers to all the phenomena of symbolic interaction and communication between people, usually through spoken or written language or visual representation”. The immediate implication of this definition, I argue, is that literature can also be understood as a form of written interaction and communication (Núñez-Perucha 2011) and, broadly, as having social implications (Fowler 1981).

Regarding the concept of ideology, it has been defined as “a set of beliefs or attitudes shared by members of a particular social group” (Bloor and Bloor 2007: 10). More specifically, Mesthrie (2010: 320) also considers that ideology not only comprises a set of beliefs but also “speech and cultural practices that operate to the advantage of a particular social group”. Van Dijk (2006) takes a step further and defines the concept by relying on four aspects: ideology as a system of belief; as constituent of the identity of a group; its dominating force; and its stability. Furthermore, Johnstone (2008) argues that ideology is engrained in discursive practices and it is an aim of CDA to unravel the ways in which language and ideology relate.

It is not difficult to hypothesize that these ideologies are imposed, constructed, and maintained by those groups or individuals who are somehow powerful. Broadly, according to Mesthrie (2010), power has to do with the probability of a group or individual of carrying out his/her/their will even when they face opposition. This author also notes that power also concerns the ability of preventing this opposition from appearing. Fairclough (1989: 43) already establishes a connection between ideology and dominance. Particularly, he makes a twofold distinction between power in discourse and power behind discourse: the former is the actual exercise of power through discourse; the latter type refers to the how social structures are constructed upon discursive relations of power. Moreover, it is important to stress, as Van Dijk (2008) does, two further features of this aspect: it is rarely absolute and it may be subtle and, in discourse, it may be legitimated to a point in which it becomes natural and even accepted by the dominated groups and hence a hegemony. It is one of the main aims of CDA to investigate how these powerful groups or individuals control discourse and provide tools in order to fight that legitimation of power (Van Dijk 2008).

Finally, it is necessary to relate the concepts of ideology and power to the essential idea of identity. Owing to the complex nature of the term, here I will concern myself with the idea of ethnic identity linked to language. Through discourse, social structures may aim to impose certain identities upon groups or individuals that may not be fitting to reality (Bloor and Bloor 2007). It is not difficult to connect these ideas with immigration: national boundaries established by borders define (at least part of) one’s identity and, when an individual

arrives to establish her/himself in a new country, she/he has to face stereotypes and a process of erasure of the former national identity (Bloor and Bloor 2007). These features that make up an ethnic identity lead to a division between the majority and minority groups. The former is considered to be the “norm” and the latter the “other”; such division, furthermore, is achieved in discourse by opposing “us” to “them” (Singh 2004: 98). The enhancement of the “otherness” in the ethnic individual, moreover, contributes to strip him/her of any kind of power. Hence, there is a clear connection between constructing one’s identity and discourse, something key and that calls for further exploration in the analysis of the text.

In conclusion, these three concepts share the common nexus of discourse. Ideology and power, often discourse-driven, play a fundamental role in the construction of one’s identity. As it will be argued, this idea becomes especially relevant when dealing with the voice of the Other in immigrant literature.

2.3. Stylistics as a tool for CDA

Carter (1982: 4) considers that, in literary criticism, the medium—the linguistic form of the text—has been traditionally overlooked and its relation to the overall text considered “unproblematic”. Stylistics can be defined as the analytical tool concerned with the study of this relation. In fact, even just by glancing at some of the manuals, one notices that stylistics is a vast field that is able to fathom a wide range of aspects and levels of analysis within the literary text (see, for example Carter 1982 or Simpson 2004; among many others). Given that my main aim is to study how the concepts of identity, ideology, and power contribute to the construction of the voice of the Other in immigrant fiction, I will be making use of pragmatic stylistics to develop a critical analysis of the discourse of these texts. Therefore, let us briefly consider this connection between discourse and pragmatic stylistics.

Currently, there is a growing body of research that points to the importance of considering pragmatic aspects in literary texts (Wales 2001; Simpson 2004; Black 2006) and the use of context (which concerns pragmatics) as a constructing element of style (Verdonk 2002). In fact, Wales claims that the emergence of a literary pragmatics is concerned with “the relationship between author, text and reader in real historical and sociocultural contexts” (Wales 2001: 238). Furthermore, pragmatics, in literature, establishes a connection between the text and its discourses, its contexts, and readers (Wales 2001). Wales’s ideas clearly point to this connection that I am also trying to emphasize: the stylistic analysis from a pragmatic point of view provides insight to aspects of literary discourse that, at the same time, are central for CDA. In this line of thought, Verdonk (2002) argues that the analysis of pragmatic elements in literature is concerned with the ways language is used to achieve particular aims. The most salient pragmatic aspects that will concern this analysis are representation and self-representation, topic control and turn-taking, and the use of speech acts. Let us briefly consider each of these aspects from a critical discursive and stylistic point of view.

Very succinctly put, speech acts (a concept developed by J.L Austin and J.R Searle) are the actions that are performed through language which are independent of syntactic and semantic structures (Leech and Short 2007). In this sense, the speech act theory suggests that language is not only to do with the transmission of information but also imprints on it

an active role: language can be used to carry out actions. Regarding the nature of speech acts, there are two components I want to briefly address that are relevant for my purposes: the illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect. The former has to do with the intention the speaker has when uttering something; the latter is the actual consequence the act has on the addressee. In the context of immigration and identity, it will be interesting to consider the lack of correspondence between intention and effect and what the consequences of this are.

In a more practical sense, I will be following Tsui's (1994) classification of speech acts. Specifically, I will focus on the use of what this author terms "directives". These are the acts that are the most related to the ideas of identity, ideology, and power. To put it briefly, Tsui (1994) argues that the main characteristic of directives is that they do not offer the choice of non-compliance with the act, which hints at the idea of being issued by those who are in a position of power. In her classification, Tsui (1994) distinguishes two types of directs: those issued for the benefit of the addressee (advisives) and those that are issued for the benefit of the speaker (mandatives).

It is also worth noting that speech acts are present not only in speech, but also in written texts and, especially, in fiction, where dialogue is a fundamental part for the development of the stories. As Simpson (2004: 30) puts it: "While it is true that a great deal of what makes up a story is action and events [...], it is also the case that stories contain a great deal of reported speech and thought". It is therefore possible to establish a connection between this pragmatic element and the role it plays in literature and in discursive interaction. Furthermore, Short (1996) takes a step further in this idea and links it to the notion of power. He argues that those whose discourse contains speech acts which involve performing orders or commanding are more powerful than those who obey such commands. Thus, here is the threefold connection this paper aims at establishing: stylistics, CDA, and literature.

Turn-taking and control over topic are also pragmatic elements that through a stylistic analysis may provide insight to notions of power and ideology. In fiction, dialogues tend to imitate every day conversation and hence it is interesting to analyze elements like interruptions or hesitations. Short (1996) highlights the idea of power in conversation connected to turn-taking: powerful speakers are usually those who hold the most and longest turns. Among other features, they are also the ones who initiate, control and change topics even if for this they must interrupt the interlocutors—who are thus less powerful speakers (Short 1996). Hence, a critical analysis of these aspects of conversation in fiction could provide insight on the construction of the voice of the Other.

At this macro-level of pragmatic analysis, it is important to briefly consider the concept of positioning, which is to do with identity and that I will be referring to in the following sections. According to Benwell and Stokoe (2006), Positioning Theory examines how one's identity is constructed through the relation between audience and speaker. "Positioning" is the process "through which speakers adopt, resist and offer "subject positions" that are made available in discourses or "master narratives"" (Benwell and Stokoe 2006: 43).

All in all, stylistics is here presented as a tool for CDA that focuses on three pragmatic elements: processes of representation and self-representation (or positioning), topicality and turn-taking, and the use of speech acts.

3. DATA SELECTION AND DESCRIPTION

3.1. Data selection

Wodak and Meyer (2001: 2) argue that CDA shows “an interest in the properties of ‘naturally occurring’ language use by real language users”. But as early as 1981, Fowler argued that literature can be understood as a means of communication and, hence, as “occurring language”. In this sense, there seems to be an intersection between social discourse and the discourse of literature that it is yet to be explored. It is for this reason that I considered literary texts as suitable objects of a critical analysis of discourse.

Bearing in mind the strong social nature of CDA, I deemed appropriate that the literary text should deal with a current and socially relevant issue. There are two motivations behind the selection of literature of immigration. On the one hand, its importance in current affairs cannot be denied. On the other, the topic is in direct connection to the notions of ideology, identity and power. Furthermore, they have been rarely treated under the light of CDA. For this reason, it is my belief that these texts constitute an appropriate corpus for the analysis.

3.2. Data description

Immigrant fiction is in itself too broad a corpus to fathom in a study of these characteristics. For this reason, I decided to use two stories written by two different authors: “Negocios” by Junot Díaz and “The Arrangers of Marriage” by Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie. The selection of these particular texts answers to a desire of maintaining a balance between homogeneity and variety in the data of the study. This way, the study presents a varied corpus: the stories are written by male and female authors with of different ethnic backgrounds, they present a male and female protagonist respectively, and also variations in narrative viewpoint. However, at the same time, they are closely related: both authors are contemporary and immigrants themselves and they both left their country of origin bound for the USA. The stories these differences and connections: they are sufficiently varied to provide different points of analysis, but similar enough to be considered under the same framework. Here follows a short summary of both stories.

In “Negocios”, Ramón de las Casas, a Dominican father and husband, leaves his home country bound for the US with the aim of making a better living. After having a difficult time in Miami, he moves to New York, where he progressively betters his living conditions. Upon his return to the Dominican Republic, Ramón feels out of place and avoids visiting his family. Finally, however, Ramón makes the decision of leaving his new family in the US to return to the Dominican Republic.

“The Arrangers of Marriage” is about the arrival of a Nigerian woman, Chinaza Okafor, to the US where she meets the husband that has been arranged for her. However, for Chinaza, the transition from Lagos to the new country is sharp and difficult. Her expectations do not match the reality and through a variety of processes she is encouraged to leave her Nigerian traits behind. After an initial opposition, she eventually accepts her new life.

4. ANALYSIS

In this section, I will be looking at the stories in detail and selecting specific utterances that will be analyzed. The analysis is divided in three subsections: processes of representation and self-representation, control over turn and topic of the conversation, and the characters' use of speech acts.

4.1. Processes of representation and self-representation

A close look at the data shows that, as soon as the immigrant arrives in the new territory, he/she is placed in a disoriented position, which conveys the feeling of being lost and powerless in a foreign country. The strategy is realized in a different manner in each story. Either it is the narrator who positions the Other or it is the Other herself, through the first person narration, the one in charge of establishing her position. Let us firstly analyze an extract from "Negocios" and then one from "The Arrangers of Marriage".

- (1) "He [Ramón] had trouble finding his way out of the terminal. Everyone was speaking **English** and the signs were no help. He smoked half a pack of cigarettes while **wandering** around" (Díaz 128, my emphasis)

Upon the immigrant's arrival, it can be seen how he is already put in a position of powerlessness. There are two main elements in (1) that build up this position: the use of the verb "wandering" on the one hand, and the idea of speaking a foreign language on the other. The particular use of "wandering" has the aim of emphasizing the recurrent position of the immigrant as being lost and having no control over the situation. The reason for this can be found in the second aspect that needs to be considered: the Other, in this case, is unable to speak English, which has two main consequences. Firstly, there seems to be the recurrent idea of the need of the immigrant of speaking English in order to survive. Secondly, as he is unable to communicate in this language, he has no discursive power whatsoever.

Let us now turn to "The Arrangers of Marriage". In this story, the process of dislocation is done by frustrating the expectation the Other has from the new territory:

- (2) "He had used the word "house" when he told me about our home. **I had imagined a smooth** driveway snaking between **cucumber-colored lawns**, a door leading into a hallway, walls with **sedate** paintings. A house like those of the white newlyweds in the **American films** that NTA showed on Saturday nights.

He turned on the light in the living room, where a beige couch sat alone in the middle, **slanted**, as though **dropped** there by accident. The room was **hot; old, musty** smells hung **heavy** in the air." (Adichie 167, my emphasis)

This passage, presented in the thought of Chinaza, the protagonist, conveys the idea of how frustrated expectations can position the immigrant in an early state of dislocation and unhappiness. The image the Other had of the new land in this case does not correspond with the reality. This clash can be particularly observed in the choice of adjectives:

“smooth”, “cucumber-colored”, and “sedate”, which are used to describe her idea of a house in America, contrast with “slanted”, “dropped”, “hot”, “old”, “musty”, which portray the reality. Hence, the position of dislocation in this case is not achieved by a lack of means of communication or physical disorientation, but through the destruction of the expectations of the Other. It is convenient to note, furthermore, that both these extracts are found at the very beginning of the story, something that, stylistically, points to a foregrounding of this position of the Other as lost, frustrated, and above all, as powerless.

4.2. Control over turn and topic: the Other as ignorant

Not only is the Other positioned by the narrators (i.e. be it a third or first person one) as dislocated and disoriented, but he/she is also placed in a position of ignorance. Because they lack knowledge of the new land, the normative immigrants will attempt to impose the American ideology on them through what could be considered a process of teaching. The first display of dominance in speech can be appreciated in the length of the turns. The normative immigrant, being in possession of knowledge, has the need of showing his superiority through longer, more detailed turns. Contrastively, the turns of the Other are shorter, and they are usually displays of agreement, ignorance or submission. Let us illustrate this point with specific examples from the texts.

The following utterance illustrates the relationship between power, discourse, ideology, and knowledge. Dave, Chinaza’s husband in “The Arrangers of Marriage”, who has fully adopted the American ideology, tries to impose it on her new wife. When Chinaza tries American pizza for the first time he asks her (D stands for Dave and C for Chinaza):

- (3) D: “Do you like the pizza? [...]”
 C: “The tomatoes are not cooked well”
 D: “**We overcook food back home** and that is why we lose all the nutrients. **Americans cook things right**. See how healthy they all look?”
 C: I nodded (Adichie 176, my emphasis).

There are several aspects in this exchange of utterances that need to be analyzed in detail. To begin with, it is convenient to point out that both of Dave’s turns involve questions. As Short (1996) argues, the speaker who asks the more questions in a conversation is the one who holds more power. In this case, both elicitations serve to reassure that the American ideology is being engrained in the Other. The idea of imposition of ideology is perfectly illustrated in a previous utterance to the passage quoted. In said utterance Dave states: “[Pizza] It’s one thing you have to like in America”. However, Chinaza’s first response to this cultural element is negative. As a reaction, arguably, Dave carries out two strategies attempting to erase the Other’s former identity (as a Nigerian individual in this case) and shape a new one based on the American ideology: downplaying and legitimization (Wodak et al 2009). He downplays Nigerian culinary practices introducing two arguments of legitimization: by cooking this way no nutrients are lost and Americans look healthy.

Thus, he arrives at the conclusion that pizza is good and she has to like it. Chinaza, in a display of submission, she just nods.

All in all, it can be seen how the Other has shorter turns than the normalized immigrant, which hints at a lack of discursive power in this aspect. Furthermore, the latter's longer turns are used to impose a new ideology with the ultimate aim of shaping the Other's identity. It is convenient to note that these examples are not isolated cases: these strategies are recurrent in both stories.

In "Negocios", this idea of the normalized immigrant having longer turns and being therefore in a more powerful position than the Other is also present. Let us take for instance this exchange of utterances between Chuito, another immigrant that could be considered "normative" and Ramón (R stands for Ramón):

- (4) Chuito: "[...] Listen Ramón, I can get you a job here if you like. It would be a good place to move. Out of the city, safety. I'll put your name at the top of the list and when this place is done you'll have a nice easy job"

R: "This sounds better than a dream" (Díaz 153)

This excerpt (4) shows how the normative Self has a longer turn and the Other remains with little power in the discursive process. Moreover, this last example can also be connected to the idea of knowledge. The normative Self is usually more knowledgeable and takes advantage of that position in order to exercise power in the conversation.

The position of the Other as ignorant and as someone in need of help can also be understood by looking in detail at how the topics in the conversation are controlled and what is the content of the turns. In order to emphasize the Other's ignorance and the asymmetric power relation, the more knowledgeable normative Self will seize every opportunity in order to teach and, thus, shape the Other's behavior. In a further display of conversational power, the normative Self will not ask the other for his/her opinion and whether or not he/she agrees with the topic being discussed or the actions taking place. Arguably, this can also mean that the normative Self takes for granted that the option that conforms to the American norm is the one that it is most adequate for the Other. Let us analyze some examples to understand how the normative Self controls the topic for the most part of the stories.

In "The Arrangers of Marriage", the topic is constantly controlled by the husband, Dave, who directs the conversation and the actions that take place without asking for Chinaza's opinion. Examples of this are:

- (5) (When they first arrive at the house in the US)

D: "I'll show you around", he said" (Adichie 167)

- (6) D: "Now that you're here, we'll get more furniture"

C: "Okay" (ibid. 168)

- (7) D: "Good morning, baby [...]" "we have to call your uncle and aunt to tell them we arrived safely"

(Chinaza proceeds to do so) (ibid. 168)

- (8) (Being unable to contact them)

D: **“We’ll try** later. Let’s have breakfast” (my emphasis)

(Chinaza agrees to have breakfast) (ibid. 170)

- (9) D: “Look at the people who shop here; they are the ones who immigrate and continue to act as if they are back in their countries [...] They will never move forward unless they adapt to America. They will always be doomed to supermarkets like this”

C: [as narrator] “I murmured something to show I was listening.” (ibid. 175)

It is convenient to note that all these examples are turns that are initiated and developed by the husband. Moreover, the topics are placed in isolation and they are formulated in such a way that they are closed to discussion. Hence, not only is the normative Self controlling the topic of the conversation, but he is also hindering the intervention of the Other. Although this idea is central to the idea of power in the conversation, it is also necessary to pay attention to the content of the topics and the interventions that Dave develops as well as to Chinaza’s answers.

For instance, (5) illustrates the idea of how the Other is positioned as ignorant: in this case, Chinaza, similarly to Ramón in “Negocios”, is disoriented and she is not familiarized with her surroundings. Assuming the role of guide, Dave uses the first person singular and directs Chinaza around the house. In example (6), Dave uses the first person plural for an action that it is not really going to be shared. Chinaza simply does not have a say as she is not asked on what she thinks and she is left only with the choice of agreeing. The use of the first person plural can also be seen in (7) and (8) where another strategy of power can be unraveled: Dave uses the plural for actions that are really orders that Chinaza will carry out by herself. Finally, example (9) is especially relevant as Dave introduces a topic that concerns ideology. In this utterance, on the one hand, he talks about the immigrants as though he was not one of them (he positions himself in the ‘ingroup’). On the other, the topic of this turn, arguably, also serves the purpose of inspiring fear in the Other, conveying the idea that if she does not adapt and conform to the American ideology she will be doomed. The use of that specific adjective, furthermore, brings forward that idea of a fearful fate.

Two further representative examples of topic control can be seen in “Negocios”: when Ramón is driven by two U.S marshals and when he tries to obtain the US nationality through an arranged marriage. Let us briefly point out some aspects of these passages (M stands for marshal):

- (10) M: You need a ride?

R: Jes, Papi said

[...]

M: How far you going? The driver asked.

R: New York, he said, carefully omitting the Nueva.

M: We ain’t going that far but you can ride with us to Trenton if you like. Where the hell you from, pal?

R: Miami.

M Miami. Miami’s kind of far from here. The other man looked at the driver. Are you a musician or something? (Díaz 136)

(11) R: Are you Dominican? Papi asked.

(Woman): No

R: You must be Cuban then.

(Woman): One thousand dollars and you'll be too busy being an American to care where I'm from (ibid. 140).

In (10), at this point of the story, Ramón is leaving Miami bound for New York. He departs, walking with all his bags, and positioned as defenseless and afraid of being deported by the marshals that stop by his side. In the conversation he establishes with them, it is possible to see how his position as a powerless subject is confirmed. The topic is mainly controlled by the marshals who clearly remain in the position of power and the immigrant just answers questions with short interventions. Prior to the passage quoted in (11), Ramón is tricked into giving a thousand dollars in order to be arranged a marriage and obtain the citizenship this way. In this utterance, despite Ramón's attempts to discover the nationality of the woman, he is unable to do so, something that points to his lack of power in the conversation. Furthermore, it is important to note that this frustration of Ramón's attempt to gain discursive power is done through ideology: the country of origin of the woman will not matter once he has paid because he will only have to care about being an American.

The previous examples illustrate how turns and topics are controlled by the normative Self and how the Other is usually pushed into the background of the conversation. Beyond that idea, some of the passages also hint at how through these processes of control of topic and turn the Other is positioned as ignorant and in need of help. Arguably, it is possible to establish a connection between the longer turns and positions of knowledge/ignorance. The Other, recently arrived, has no knowledge of how certain aspects of everyday life work, which puts them in a place where they are constantly taught, which also shapes the identity of the Other as dependent, as someone who needs the normative Self in order to survive in the new land. Furthermore, through these lessons there is also an attempt to impose the American ideology on the Other and shape his/her behavior in accordance to the norm of the new country. This process of teaching with ideological orientation also favors the process of erasure of identity of the Other. The more his/her behavior resembles to the American norm, the more it weakens the Other's connection with his/her origins. In order to round off this last idea of the relationship between knowledge and power in the conversation, let us consider one final passage of "The Arrangers of Marriage":

(12) C (as narrator): Inside the air-conditioned bus, he showed me where to pour in the coins, how to press the tape on the wall to signal my stop.

D: "This is not like Nigeria, where you shout out to the conductor," he said, sneering, as though he was the one who had invented the superior American system (Adichie 173).

These examples foreground the position of ignorance in which the immigrant is placed. Chinaza does not know how buses work in America and Dave teaches her which grants him a more powerful position. Furthermore, as hinted at before, in this process of teaching it

is possible to find, embedded, the imposition of the American ideology. In this case, Dave downplays the Nigerian system in favor of the American one.

4.3. The imposition of ideology through speech acts

In connection to this idea of power in turn-taking and topic control, let us now discuss the content of those topics and turns. Particularly, it is interesting to analyze the strategies behind the speech acts that are used in the texts. In so doing, it will be possible to understand this linguistic feature as another strategy which perpetuates the powerless position of the Other in conversation. As suggested above, I will concern myself with the use of directives, which relate more to the ideas of ideology, identity, and power.

4.3.1. *The use of directives*

Although both types of directives are present (those that benefit the addressee and those that benefit the speaker), it is possible to argue that in a context of immigration, the directives will always benefit the speaker: either by making the Other to perform an action that will benefit the normative Self, or by making the Other to conform to the American norm. The use of directives in the stories is extensive and they are frequently issued by the normative Self rather than the Other, which points to the latter's lack of power.

A) Advisives

This type of directives is supposed to benefit the addressee (in this case, the Other) (Tsui 1994). Nevertheless, as it was suggested, considering that these acts also have a strong ideological content, it will be possible to argue that they actually benefit the normative Self and go in detriment of the Other (as they mainly aim to erase their former identity). In addition, regarding this first type of directives, Tsui (1994) makes a further distinction between warnings and advice. I will also follow this subdivision and discuss each type in relation to the ideas of ideology, identity, and power.

With regard to warnings, Tsui (1994) argues that if the addressee does not comply with the warning issued by a speaker, it will have negative consequences for him/her. In the stories, the warnings issued by the normative Self usually adopt the linguistic realization of the imperative, sentences with the modal “should” or “have to” in order to express obligation. The warning, following Tsui (1994), may or may not state clearly which course of action should be taken by the addressee and what would be the consequence. Arguably, then, there are warnings which are more overt than others. In the stories, it is possible to find examples of both of them. The covert warnings, nonetheless, seem to be more frequent. Let us consider some examples of warnings and briefly discuss them.

(13) D: “You **should** say ‘Hi’ to people here, not ‘you’re welcome.’”

C: “She’s not my age mate.”

D: “It doesn’t work that way here. Everybody says hi.”

C: “O di mma. Okay.” (Adichie 172, my emphasis)

Arguably, the illocutionary force of this speech act is to advise. However, the intended and actual perlocutionary effects is to give an order. Thus, it can be seen how the normative immigrant tries to disguise his speech acts in order for the Other to accept and embrace more easily the new ideology and leave behind the Nigerian–self. Although it is realized with a modal, this utterance can be considered as a warning because, if it is not followed, it will have a negative consequence for the Other: to be singularized (Wodak et al, 2009) due the alien linguistic choice. More specifically, it is the use of the collective “everybody” what he is emphasizing is that if she does not speak in that particular way, she will stand out. Thus, in reality, either way, complying or not, this warning brings a negative consequence upon the Other.

The following example in “Negocios” illustrates how the idea of English being necessary to survive is conveyed using a warning advise:

(14) “You’re going to have to practice [English] if you expect to get anywhere” (Díaz 132)

In this case, the warning and the positive consequence are both clearly formulated: Ramón will find his place in America (positive consequence) if he learns English (warning). It is also interesting to note the ideological content of the utterance, which is based on a sociolinguistic choice: in order to survive in America, Ramón needs to stop talking in Spanish (trace of his identity as Other) and practice English. This act, arguably, also aims to erase a fundamental part of Ramón’s identity: his language. In fact, language is a recurrent aspect targeted by the normative Self to shape the Other’s identity. Regarding the linguistic realization of the act, it is convenient to note the use of the conditional to express the positive consequence of the warning.

Let us now turn to the use of advice as directives in the stories. To begin with, Tsui (1994) notes that if pieces of advice are complied with, they imply positive consequences for the addressee. Supposedly, then, in the context of the stories, if the Other follows a particular piece of advice that he/she is given by the normative Self, desirable consequences will take place. Like in the case of warnings, these consequences may or may not be explicitly formulated. Concerning the linguistic realization of the advice in the stories, it is convenient to point out that they mainly come in the form of the imperative. Once again, it is possible to argue how the normative Self blurs the line between the illocutionary force (an advice) and the intended perlocutionary effect (a command or order) and thus exercising power over the Other and shaping his identity to conform it to the American ideology. Let us now turn to specific examples to understand how this idea unfolds in the stories.

In example (15) Jo–Jo, another immigrant who has been living for a longer time in the US, is apparently advising Ramón on what to do, but he is using the imperative to direct his course of action using his knowledge as a source of power:

(15) “[...] **Save** some money and buy yourself a little business. I’ll sell you one of my hot dog carts cheap if you want. You can see they’re making steady plata. Then you **get** your familia⁷⁶ over here and **buy** yourself a nice house and start branching out. **That’s the American way**” (Díaz 148, my emphasis).

⁷⁶ In Spanish in the story.

Furthermore, this utterance also reflects the desire of normalizing the immigrant to make him as similar as possible to the American ideology (to the “American way” of living, as Jo–Jo puts it). Hence, his argument is based on the idea that if Ramón follows his advice, he will be able to conform to the American ideology. Through this example it is also possible to understand the connection between knowledge and power in conversation. Jo–Jo is able to give these orders because he has been for longer in the US and precisely knows what is that “American way”. In the passage, he is not merely conveying this knowledge, but also trying to impose his ideology on Ramón. To achieve this, Jo–Jo uses the strategy of positive self–presentation (Wodak et al 2009). If Ramón follows Jo–Jo’s advice (rather, order) he will be able to make “steady plata” as well and belong to that idyllic American ideology.

In “The Arrangers of Marriage” it is also possible to find the advisive directive which apparently is issued for the benefit of the addressee but in reality it serves as a means of imposition of ideology. Dave aims to change her wife’s course of action with the ulterior idea of shaping her behavior to conform to the American norm. The use of directive speech acts through the imperative can be seen in utterances such as:

(16) D: “Look around, don’t lower your eyes like that. Look around. You get used to things faster that way,” he said” (Adichie 173).

The imposition of ideology to shape the Other’s is especially important in (16). Dave orders through a directive Chinaza to look around so she can assimilate the American culture faster and thus behave and shape her identity according to the norm. Supposedly, this will have a positive effect on the Other. It is interesting to note that in this last example the positive consequence is explicitly formulated.

Before moving on to mandates, it is worth discussing the relationship between giving advice, threatening and warning the Other. When the previous examples are considered, it is difficult to establish a clear–cut separation between the use of warnings, pieces of advice, and even threats. The normative Self issues these utterances in such a way that their actual perlocutionary force nearly always bounds the Other to accept the course of action that is being imposed. Although the previous examples do illustrate how the line between the three acts (advice, warning, and threat) is blurred, I would like to discuss this idea in depth before moving on to another type of act.

Tsui (1994) suggests that threats have been traditionally classified as commissives in the speech act literature. However, she argues in favor of considering these acts as directives. The reason behind this is that, unlike a commissive, the threat does not bound the speaker to perform an action. Threats, like warnings, involve negative consequences for the addressee. The main difference, Tsui (1994) points out, is that in this case the negative consequence is performed by the speaker him/herself. However, in these stories, although there are no direct threats of the type “If you don’t do [action], I will [negative consequence for the addressee]”, there are certain utterances that could be considered indirect threats despite their appearance as warnings. The main reason behind this idea resides in the fact that they are uttered with in a more compelling way than a warning and the consequence

seems to be more serious. Let us consider two different examples that fluctuate between the threat and the warning.

- (17) D: “You don’t understand how it works in this country. If you want to get anywhere you have to be as mainstream as possible. If not, you will be left by the roadside. You have to use your English name here.” (Adichie 172)

It is possible to argue that the consequence of not complying with this threat is more serious than those of the previous examples. If the Other does not become mainstream and refuses to follow the American norm, she will be left apart as an outcast of society, which is indeed something to fear. To put it in other terms: though the illocutionary force of the utterance may be that of advising, its intended and actual perlocutionary effect is that of a threat. In so doing, the normative Self is able to inspire fear on the Other and direct her course of action and shape her identity (in this case by means of changing Chinaza’s name).

In the following example, it can be seen how the normative Self blurs the line between the piece of advice, the warning, and threat by enhancing the negative consequence

- (18) Jo-Jo: “You, my compadre, have done too many things wrong. If you keep this up, your life will spring apart” (Díaz 150).

Similarly to the previous extract, it could be argued that the illocutionary force of the utterance is to advise. However, it is convenient to question whether the intended and actual perlocutionary correspond with the illocutionary force. The utterance thus can be read as: “change your lifestyle or you will suffer”.

All in all, owing to the multi-functional dimension of these speech acts, it is difficult to establish a clear-cut division between them. From the examples here discussed, it is possible to infer a recurrent strategy performed by the normative Selves: they tend to disguise threats to appear as advice so the Other complies and embraces the new ideology more easily. At the same time, advising or warning can also be understood as strategies of power since they are conveying orders and directing the Other’s course of action.

B) Mandatives

Let us now consider the second type of directives: mandatives. According to Tsui (1994), mandatives are issued with the aim of getting the addressee to perform or prevent him/her from performing an action. Furthermore, this kind of directives usually benefit the speaker. I will focus on the use of one type of mandatives in the story: instructions.

Perhaps one of the most salient aspects of instructions is that they are issued by speakers who hold a position of power (Tsui 1994). It is possible to expect, therefore, that once again, this type of speech acts is more common among the normalized immigrants. Furthermore, instructions are usually issued for the benefit of the speaker. It is possible to see these ideas reflected in examples from the stories:

- (19) D: “Get the store brand. They’re cheaper, but still the same thing” (Adichie 174).

Through this utterance, Dave is instructing Chinaza to get other type of cookies. The benefit for Dave is clear: he will save money. In addition, the idea of giving instructions is also connected to the idea of knowledge: the normative Self, who is more acquainted with the American society, gains power through this knowledge and exercises it over the Other.

(20) “Wash these every day, he said. We stay clean around here.” (Díaz 171)

In this second example, an employer is instructing Ramón on how to handle his aprons. The benefit for the speaker is that hygiene standards in the business will be maintained. The linguistic realization, once again, is through an imperative structure. Interestingly enough, I would like to draw attention to an example in which the normative Self performs an act to forbid the Other to do something. In “The Arrangers of Marriage”, after Chinaza has cooked coconut rice, a traditional Nigerian recipe, Dave says:

(21) “I don’t want us to be known as the people who fill the building with smells of foreign food,” he said (Adichie 179).

Issuing this instruction realized through an imperative, Dave forbids Chinaza to cook Nigerian food. Dave is furthermore imposing an American ideology on her wife in order to avoid singularization and being identified in the outgroup. Arguably, this act can also be understood as an attempt to erase another trait of the Other’s identity.

4.3.2. *The Other’s use of speech acts*

From the previous discussion, it can be inferred that the normative Selves are the ones who issue most of the speech acts, which puts them in a position of discursive power and push the Other to the background of the conversation. However, in order to understand that powerless position of the Other, it is necessary to briefly consider his/her response to the speech acts and whether or not they issue any.

As Short (1996) argues, there must be a correspondence between the intended effect of a speech act (intended perlocutionary effect) and the actual effect (actual perlocutionary effect) for a speaker to be powerful. However, if there is no match between the two, this will denote a lack of conversational power. In the stories, the Other, although in some cases, will try to perform directives and give orders, the acts do not have the desired effect and the lack of correspondence is shown. This is, once again, a display of how the Other is positioned as powerless. Perhaps the most illustrative example of a lack of correspondence in the perlocutionary effects can be appreciated in the following utterance of “The Arrangers of Marriage”. When Chinaza and Dave are about to have intercourse, Chinaza says:

(22) “**Wait—**” I said, so that I could take the nightdress off, so it would not seem so hasty. But he had crushed his mouth down o mine (Adichie 169).

It is important to focus on the imperative, which intends to stop the action carried out by the husband. However, the actual perlocutionary effect is very different: the Other is unable to change the normalized immigrant's course of action. This utterance is not only relevant to show the lack of power of the Other, but also to hint at the double alienation of immigrant women. In this case, the Other is not only alienated because her condition of immigrant who is not adapted to the foreign ideology, but also she has to endure the imposition of power on the behalf of a masculine agent.

In the case of Ramón in "Negocios", he decides not to follow Jo-Jo's orders, which only perpetuates his position as the ignorant Other who is helpless. Furthermore, through the narrator, he is positioned as someone who is lost and not even these pieces of advice can help him:

- (23) "Papi was lost. He would take long perilous night walks home from his jobs, sometimes arriving with his knuckles scuffed and his clothes disheveled". (Díaz 150).

In conclusion, the Other's speech acts do foreground and contribute to the enhancement of their position as powerless individuals: either their intended perlocutionary force does not match the actual one or, they make use of acts to show agreement or gratitude, or they are positioned as powerless through the use of narration.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The results show that the concepts of ideology, identity, and power are central to the discourse of the Other in the stories. Ideological constructions are imposed through the speech of the normative immigrant. The aim behind those constructions is mainly to impose the American norm for the Other to conform to it and thus shift from the outgroup to the in-group. According to the pragmatic stylistic analysis of the stories, here follow some of the features that shape the voice of the Other.

Firstly, through strategies of positioning, namely representation and self-representation, the Other is presented as a dislocated and disoriented individual in need of help. Secondly, in conversation, the Other has short turns only to express agreement or display his/her ignorance or submission. In comparison, the turns of the normative immigrants are longer and have control of the topic that is being discussed. Thirdly, their use of speech acts is very limited and does not display any kind of power. Contrastively, the use of the normative immigrant's speech acts is sustained upon directives (advisives and mandates) which emphasizes the power gap between them and the Other. Such a use of this linguistic aspect has as aim, once again, to impose the foreign ideology on the immigrant.

This study, however, has encountered certain limitations and leaves possibilities for further research. For example, it would be interesting to consider a wider corpus of passages extracted from other immigrant fictions. Regarding ethnicity, it would also be possible to establish a comparison between immigrants from different origins and their response to the imposition of ideology and discuss whether or not it is satisfactory. Finally, the study would also benefit from a consideration of wider stylistic aspects beyond the pragmatic ones.

In conclusion, this study has hinted at the importance of applying a linguistic analysis to a literary text. Critical Discourse Analysis and pragmatic stylistics can shed light on new aspects of fiction. In this analysis, these concepts have been associated to the ideas of ideology, identity, and power in connection with immigration. Through a discursive abuse of power, it has been shown how the Other is forced to destruct his/her previous voice and create a new one that conforms to a foreign ideology. This destruction of the voice leads the immigrants to a vacuum of identity: they are forced to both reject their former self and embrace a new one in which they cannot see themselves reflected.

6. REFERENCES

- ADICHIE, C. N. (2009). *The Thing Around your Neck*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- BENWELL, B., & STOKOE, E. (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- BLACK, E. (2006). *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- BLOOR, M., & BLOOR, T. (2007). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- BURKE, P. J., & STETS, J. E. (2009). *Identity Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CARTER, R. (1982). *Language and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Stylistics*. London: G. Allen & Unwin.
- DÍAZ, J. (1997). *Drown*. London: Faber and Faber.
- FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- FOWLER, R. (1981). *Literature as Social Discourse: The Practice of Linguistic Criticism*. Batsford Academic: London.
- HASLAM, S. A., REICHER, S., & PLATOW, M. (2011). *The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence, and Power*. Hove, East Sussex: Psychology Press.
- JOHNSTONE, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- LEECH, G. N., & SHORT, M. (2007). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- LIN, A. (2014). "Critical Discourse Analysis in Applied Linguistics: A Methodological Review". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34: 213–232.
- MESTHRIE, R. (2010). "Critical Sociolinguistics: Approaches to Language and Power". In R. Mesthrie, J. Swann, A. Deumert, & W. L. Leap (Authors), *Introducing Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 316–353). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- NÚÑEZ-PERUCHA, B. (2011). "Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Linguistics as tools for ideological research: A diachronic analysis of feminism". In C. Hart (Ed.), *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition* (pp. 81–97). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- SHORT, M. (1996). *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays, and Prose*. London: Longman.
- SIMPSON, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.
- SINGH, I. (2004). "Language and Ethnicity". In I. Singh & Jean Stilwell Peccei (Eds.), *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction* (2nd ed., pp. 93–110). London: Routledge.
- TAYLOR, G. (2010). *The New Political Sociology: Power, Ideology and Identity in an Age of Complexity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- TSUI, A. B. (1994). *English Conversation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- VAN DIJK, T.A (1992). "Discourse and the Denial of Racism". *Discourse & Society*, 3 (1): 87–118.
- (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11 (2): 115–140.
- (2008). "Critical Discourse Analysis". In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352–372). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- VERDONK, P. (2002). *Stylistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- WALES, K. (2001). *A Dictionary of Stylistics* (2nd Ed). Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.
- WAUGH, LINDA R.; CATALANO, THERESA; AL MASAEED, KHALED; DO, TOM HONG; AND RENIGAR, PAUL G. (2015). "Critical Discourse Analysis: Definition, Approaches, Relation to Pragmatics, Critique, and Trends". Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education. Paper 201
- WODAK, R., & MEYER, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE.
- WODAK, R., DE CILIA, R., REISIGL, M., & LIEBHART, K. (2009). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.