

APPLICABILITY OF CULTURAL STUDIES IN CHIMAMANDA NGOZI ADICHIE'S

PURPLE HIBISCUS

AONDOVER ALEXIS TSAVMBU
FEDERAL UNIVERSITY DUTSINMA, KATSINA STATE, NIGERIA,

EMMANUEL LANIOR AMASE
FEDERAL UNIVERSITY DUTSINMA, KATSINA STATE, NIGERIA,

AND

DOOCHEN IMOTYOO
COLLEGE OF ADVANCED AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES, MAKURDI
NIGERIA

Abstract

This paper construes 'cultural studies' as a multidisciplinary theory which recognises the relationship between history, culture and power with the conviction that the nature of a people's history and culture, including their concepts of 'right' and 'wrong', are determined by a dominant group at the expense of the minority in any society. The paper shows that it is for this reason cultural critics discountenance expressions like 'factual history', 'true accounts of incidents', 'high art', 'low art' and similar others, which represent sentiments of dominant groups in any society. Using new historicism and post-colonialism as key strands, the paper submits that cultural critics seek to change the existing culture by making it possible for the marginalised to be heard; therefore, giving such marginalised persons the means of influencing the culture of their societies. The paper has used Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's *Purple Hibiscus* to discuss cultural analysis; concentrating on how the colonial culture is depicted in the work vis-à-vis indigenous culture(s), what characters have been used in the work, how characterisation is done, how valid the narrative is, how effectively the novelist has used local expressions to replace those from the dominant culture in the work, and the presence of political statements in the novel as well as what motifs dominate in the novel showing the writer's attitude to each of such motifs amongst other concerns.

Introduction

Although scholars like Roland Barthes, Raymond Williams, Richard Hoggart, Clifford Geertz, and proponents of the neo-Marxist studies are said to be forerunners of cultural studies,

(M.H. Abrams 53) Stuart Hall is generally accepted as the discipline's most important figure. According to Chris Barker, it was between 1968 and 1979 when Hall was the Director of the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Studies that an identifiable field called Cultural Studies began to emerge. However, Abrams contends that Hall's work in the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Studies was largely based on Richard Hoggart's work done as far back as 1958 as well as on the works of notable new historicists and post-structuralists (Abrams 53). Be that as it may, scholars generally regard Stuart Hall as the founder of cultural studies as we know it today.

Conceptual Clarification

Although cultural studies draws from diverse fields such as anthropology, sociology, education, philosophy, history, geography, linguistics, and several others, critics believe that it is not any of these fields. This is why Barker posits that “[c]ultural studies’ does not speak with one voice, [therefore] it cannot be spoken with one voice” (4) implying the multidisciplinary nature of cultural studies; a situation that has affected attempts at providing a concise definition for the field. For instance David Bennett defines ‘cultural studies’ as an interdisciplinary endeavour “concerned with the analysis of cultural forms and activities in the context of the relations of power which condition their production, circulation, deployment and, of course, effects” (60). The strength of Bennett’s definition lies in his acknowledgement that there exist cultural forms as opposed to single cultures and that it is power or politics that determines the relationship between these forms; determining which of the forms is given prominence and which are suppressed. However, one would agree with Threadgold that Bennett’s definition is too expansive, “covering a whole range of other kinds of disciplinary and interdisciplinary endeavours such as media and communication studies, some forms of semiotics, and studies in

areas such as anthropology, sociology, education, philosophy, history, geography, linguistics” (1). This weakness, according to Threadgold, has made Bennett’s definition vague.

For Abrams, “[c]ultural [s]tudies designates a recent and rapidly growing cross-disciplinary enterprise for analyzing the conditions that effect the production, reception, and cultural significance of all types of institutions, practices, and products ...” (53). As persuasive as this definition appears, it shares the weakness of Bennett’s above in failing to narrow cultural studies down to where we are able to tell it apart from other fields of study like anthropology, sociology, history, Marxism and others. However, Abrams’ mention of the ‘conditions’ that determine the production of all aspects of man’s culture is an eloquent testimony to the importance of examining power relations in discussions of cultural studies and this, for this paper, is Abrams’ definition’s greatest asset.

The two definitions above have given us a broad idea of what cultural studies is, but for the purpose of the present discussion, we shall adopt Barker’s view that cultural studies is “... an interdisciplinary field in which perspectives from different disciplines can be selectively drawn on to examine the relations of culture and power” (7). Our preference for this definition is solely because it succinctly embraces much of what we consider important in cultural studies; thus standing out from the others that also emphasise the field’s multidisciplinary nature and the importance of the ‘relations of culture and power’ but fail to aptly capture all the key issues involved.

Cultural critics believe that in every culture there is a dominant or powerful group that defines the culture: decides for everyone what is acceptable and what is not. However, wherever there is a dominant group, there is also a defiant one that makes it impossible for that dominant group to indefinitely maintain the status quo. Cultural studies, therefore, pays particular attention

to those groups of people who do not belong to the dominant groups; those who challenge the hegemony of the group that controls and exercises power. In this way, cultural critics help to "... change power structures where they are unequal, making the subjugated and marginalized more visible and influential makers of the culture" (Dobie 174). This is why all artefacts of a time or a people are important to cultural critics who also reject the idea of high and low literature just as they reject notions of fine and popular art; they believe that such classifications are designed to stifle the voices and cultures of the powerless and pave the way for their continued domination.

Strands of Cultural Studies

There are several strands of cultural studies; most of them deriving from existing critical theories, such as new historicism, post-colonialism, multiculturalism, ethnic studies, neo-Marxism, feminism, queer theory, gay criticism, lesbian criticism, deconstruction/post-structuralism, and several others (Dobie 173). However, this paper restricts itself to new historicism and post-colonialism largely because the tenets of these two strands are, to our mind, representative of the field.

According to Peter Barry, "[t]he term 'new historicism' was coined by the American critic, Stephen Greenblatt, whose book *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: from More to Shakespeare* (1980) is usually regarded as its beginning" (115). Therefore, Greenblatt could be considered as one of the theory's forerunners. New historicism is a departure from traditional historicism which attempted to objectively establish the 'factual accuracy' of stories presented in texts using available historical and biographical records. In literature, traditional historicism approaches a text armed with historical, biographical, anthropological, and sociological information about the author and his work with the belief that such information would illumine it (Dobie 175). New

historicists on the other hand believe that there can be no true or factual accounts of events because all history is coloured by the cultural context of the recorders who are usually those in power: those who decide what is generally considered as truth in that milieu; a situation which leaves the versions of the weak completely untold. Therefore, new historicists insist that there can never be a single historical account, a single history, a single culture or a single worldview in any society; a point on which both new historicism and post-structuralism agree (Dobie 176).

To understand texts therefore, new historicists cast off all previous criticism on the text so that the text can be completely re-contextualised. Rather than revel in the available information on the text, they search for overlooked sources in their quest for more holistic explanations: examining its cultural context which can include the various anxieties, issues, struggles, and politics of the era. They strive to understand the culture by looking at its literature and not the other way round as done by traditional historicists. In doing this, they concentrate on the extent to which the text reveals and comments on the disparate discourses of the culture it depicts (Dobie 176) which revelations and comments become obvious from the parallel reading that the approach upholds. This is because New Historicists consider all texts as social documents which reflect and affect the world that produces them. They expect literature to be the voice of the silenced and the excluded, conscious of the fact that the dominant class always tries to control the thinking and, therefore, the culture and history of the people through many means including literature.

Post-colonialism operates on Fanon's warning, quoted by Emmanuel N. Obiechina, that "[e]very colonised people ... in whose soul an inferiority complex has been created by the death and burial of its cultural originality, finds itself face to face with the language of the civilized

nation; that is, with the culture of the mother country” (67). It is based on this that post-colonial scholars highlight the conflicts of identity and cultural belongings within former colonial countries showing how indigenous or minority cultures or groups are stifled by the domineering colonial forces. The theory closes a critical gap in criticism by revealing that western literature does not address these highlighted issues: the clashes between different cultures and more importantly how power plays an important role in shaping what is eventually regarded as the acceptable culture. Post-colonial scholars believe that there is urgent need to release the energies formerly emasculated by colonialism and neo-colonialism and use the energies freely and uninhibitedly for post-colonial reconstruction.

To do this however, proponents of postcolonial studies uphold the imperative of restoring confidence in the native culture and tradition, reviving the submerged mythologies, resurrecting dead languages, and restoring old habits of dress, language and behaviour among other practices hitherto relegated to the background by colonial hegemony. The belief is that only by so doing can the deeply entrenched inferiority complex among the minorities, mentioned by Fanon above, be destroyed. To achieve this goal, post-colonial scholars recognise the fact that the formal termination of colonial rule does not automatically wipe out colonial legacy, which is usually reflected in the culture that is left behind, giving rise to a cultural hybrid: a situation where the post-colonial environment can be a mixture by the culture of the colonised and that of coloniser. This is why post-colonial criticism stands out by its concern for cultural ambiguity or loss of cultural identity; explaining why Dobie defines postcolonial literature as

... literature written by culturally displaced people, it investigates the clash of cultures in which one culture deems itself to be the superior one and imposes its own practices on the less powerful one. Its writers examine their histories, question how they should respond to the changes they see around them, and wonder what their society will become. They recognize in themselves the old culture and the new, elements of the native one and the imposed one. The result is

writing that is critical of the conquerors and promotional about its own ideologies.
(208)

Looking at the above understandings of post-colonialism and new historicism, one can identify similarities, which have informed their selection, for focus in the discussion of cultural studies; similarities that have been applied in the study of *Purple Hibiscus* in the following section. For the avoidance of doubt, the concentration is on how the colonial culture is depicted in the work vis-à-vis indigenous culture(s), what characters have been used in the work to represent the various cultural orientations depicted, how characterisation is done, how valid the narrative is, and whether or not local expressions have been used to replace those from the dominant culture in the work, as well as whether or not the text makes political statements and what themes appear to be dominant in the work amongst other concerns. These indices are, to large extent, what guides cultural studies conducted in the purview of New Historicism and Post Colonialism that we have selected for discussion in this essay.

Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's *Purple Hibiscus*

Purple Hibiscus presents the story of Eugene, a rich business man who is however, an overzealous religious fanatic so intoxicated by religious piety that he fails to draw the line between his own duty and God's. As a result, he disowns his own father whom he calls 'a heathen'; cruelly abuses the wife and children he claims to passionately love; and allows his only sister to suffer hardship because she does not practise his brand of Catholicism. Consequently, Eugene precipitates his demise at the hands of his wife who later confesses her culpability in his death to their children. In a desperate bid to prevent his mother from going to jail for this crime Jaja, their only son, takes responsibility for the crime and goes to jail where he awaits trial for almost three years. However, the novel ends on a promising note with Jaja released from prison following a military coup d'état.

Setting

Published in 2006, *Purple Hibiscus* is set in post-colonial Nigeria. Although no mention is directly made of Nigeria as the setting, there are several indicators revealing the setting of the novel among which are the facts that Chimamanda, the author, is a Nigerian of Igbo extraction; there is the depiction of military governments with coups routinely taking place as happened at one time in Nigeria; and there is the mention of several Nigerian cities such as Enugu, Nsukka, Awka, Aba, and Ninth Mile among others. Other indicators of setting in this novel are the presence of Igbo words in the diction of the novel, the use of Nigerian names of Igbo, Yoruba and Hausa extractions for characters, the prevalence of strikes by workers over unpaid salaries, the preponderance of fuel shortages and several other issues that have also ignited strikes at one time or another in Nigeria as well as the recurrence of students' demonstration; the incidence of corruption in the corridors of power and several other sociological, historical and anthropological details graphically presented in the novel. All these suggest that *Purple Hibiscus* is set in post-independence Nigeria, particularly Nigeria of the 1980s and early 1990s.

Characters

The novel presents characters from mixed cultural backgrounds in Nigeria as it is characteristic of post-colonial environments. We have Father Benedict representing the British colonial masters and Papa-Nnukwu, Eugene's father, as the epitome of traditional African religion. In between these two symbolic characters is a very interesting cultural mix: there is Eugene Achika who represents highly acculturated Nigerians who are so immersed in the colonial culture that they have jettisoned African ways and languages; denouncing them as diabolic and uncivilised. There is also Father Amadi whom Kambili describes as the "... boyish man in an

open-neck T-shirt and jeans faded so much I could not tell if they had been black or dark blue” (*Purple Hibiscus* 134), as well as Aunty Ifeoma and her children.

Though exposed to the British culture like Eugene, Father Amadi and Aunty Ifeoma’s family have not accepted the foreign culture as gullibly as to ditch the African ways like Eugene has done. But most deserving of our sympathy among all the key characters are Kambili, the narrator, her brother Jaja and their mother Beatrice: being under the full control of Eugene Achika, father and husband, they are maniacally subjected to a foreign culture that their souls loudly protest against. Also significant are the military dictators who have inherited the colonial structures and engage in the power game for self-aggrandisement. They care neither about African cultural ways nor the Christian culture imported into the country by the British. Rather, they revel in the power play that benefits none other than themselves and their foreign collaborators. And finally, there is Ade Coker who also pledges allegiance to neither African culture nor foreign religious dogma. He represents that minority that is ready to fight the excesses of the post-colonial governments even at the expense of their lives and indeed he does pay with his life. With such an interesting mix of characters in the novel, Adichie has set the stage to espouse the disparate dimensions of post-colonial Nigerian culture.

Characterisation

Adichie exposes the various cultures represented in the novel barely concealing her sentiments for each by the way she presents its representatives. Father Benedict hates African culture so much that he will not allow Nigerian hymns at mass. Kambili, the narrator, tells us that “he called them native songs, and when he said “native” his straight-line lips turned down at the corners to form an inverted U” (*Purple...4*). However, although Father Benedict sees little of consequence in ‘native’ culture, he incessantly eulogises Eugene Achika during sermons because

of the latter's generous donations to the church. Thus, Adichie demonstrates how the colonialists pamper the egos of Africans whom they want to make completely subservient to the colonial culture and agenda. No wonder that Father Benedict refuses to see the abuses to which Eugene subjects his wife and children at home. The narrator does not hide her dislike for Father Benedict and the culture he represents as can be seen even in the way Father Benedict is described: "... the colours of his face, the colours of condensed milk and a cut-open soursop[....] And his British nose was still as pinched and as narrow as it always was, the same nose that had had me worried that he did not get enough air when he first came to Enugu" (*Purple*...4).

But even Father Benedict comes out better than Eugene Achika who represents an aberrant and deviant culture that is a bastardisation of the British culture. At the surface, it would appear that Eugene's behaviour is supported by the Bible where Christ says,

I came to send fire on the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled! [...] Do you suppose that I came to give peace on earth? I tell you, not at all, but rather division. For from now on five in one house will be divided against son and son against father, mother against daughter and daughter against mother, mother-in-law and daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. (Luke 12: 49 – 53)

It is probably because of the above that Eugene despises all who do not belong to the catholic faith, including his own father whom Eugene merely refers to as "heathen". Papa-Nnukwu, laments "*Nekenem*, look at me. My son owns that house that can fit in every man in Abba, and yet many times I have nothing to put on my plate" (*Purple*...91). Even Kambili laments her grandfather's excommunication from their house saying, "Papa-Nnukwu had never set foot in it, because when Papa had decreed that heathens were not allowed in his compound, he had not made an exception for his father" (*Purple*...70-71). Eugene also forbids his children from spending more than fifteen minutes during the annual visits they pay to their grandfather. On one occasion he burns their feet for sleeping in the same house with their grandfather while on a visit

to Auntie Ifeoma. Even in death, Eugene rejects his father by neither arranging nor attending his burial claiming: “I cannot participate in a pagan funeral[....]” (*Purple...195*).

Eugene’s conduct, ironically, is at variance with Ephesians 6: 1-3: “[...] honour your father and mother ... that it may be well with you and you may live long on earth”. Perhaps, Eugene’s criminal neglect of this holy injunction is responsible for the way his life is cut short! Anikwenwa, an elder in the community, does not mince words in his condemnation of Eugene when he proclaims “[y]ou are like a fly blindly following a corpse into the grave” (*Purple...78*). In fact, Eugene’s entire characterisation is that of an incurable hypocrite; his Christianity is, therefore, a far cry from the ideal. He is condemned by man and by the same God in whose name he perpetrates a plethora of atrocities. That is probably why the God he serves allows him to die at the hands of his own wife!

Papa-Nnukwu on the other hand comes out more admirable than both Eugene Achike and Father Benedict. Although he is despised by his son for being a “heathen”, denied the opportunity of knowing his grandchildren, deprived quality medicare by a son that could and should care for him and left to struggle in penury when he could have lived in affluence, Papa-Nnukwu possesses the virtues of a godlier man than Eugene and Father Benedict put together; the only difference being that Papa-Nnukwu calls his own God by a different name – Chineke.

The fact that Papa-Nnukwu is a godlier man can be gleaned from his early morning prayer:

Chineke! I thank you for this new morning! I thank you for the sun that rises....
Chineke I have killed no one, I have taken no one’s land, I have not committed adultery....
Chineke! I have wished others well. I have helped those who have nothing with the little that my hands can spare....
Chineke! Bless me. Let me find enough to fill my stomach. Bless my daughter, Ifeoma. Give her enough for her family....
Chineke! Bless my son, Eugene. Let the sun not set on his prosperity. Lift the curse they have put on him....
Chineke! Bless the children of my children. Let your eyes follow them away from and towards good [....] (*Purple...174-175*)

The above is the prayer of a Godly person. He does not allow disappointment with his son's behaviour to overwhelm and make him bitter. Rather, he continues to pray for Eugene's conversion and prosperity. Seen in the light of Papa-Nnukwu's prayer therefore, Eugene who projects a saintly posture to the world but detests his own father, for not being a catholic, is actually the antichrist. Papa-Nnukwu may not be a church going, rosary reciting and Holy Communing Christian crusader like Eugene but he possesses the unconditional love for God and for neighbour which is the bedrock of godliness. Above all, Papa-Nnukwu personifies the highest godly virtue of being able to forgive one's transgressors when forgiveness is sought and in this particular situation even when forgiveness is not sought! In this way, *Purple Hibiscus* makes a strong statement about the superiority of African religious practices represented by Papa Nnukwu over foreign religious practices embodied by both Father Benedict and Eugene in this novel.

The presentation of Kambili, Jaja and Beatrice their mother (Eugene's wife) illuminates the experience of yet another cultural group in post-colonial Nigeria whose appearance had been underrepresented, misrepresented and even ignored: the group that is so fed up with the colonial and neo-colonial cultural strings dictating their lives whereas they have opted to chart their own course irrespective of the consequences. Despite Eugene's brutal attempts to sire "godly" children, he succeeded in raising a couple of "rebels" and turning his meek and humble wife into a murderess. When, for instance, Jaja laments that he could have taken care of his mother as his cousin Obiora does of his (Obiora's) mother, Kambili says, "God knows best [...] God works in mysterious ways" (*Purple*...293) but Jaja carelessly responds: "Of course God does. Look what He did to his faithful servant Job, even to His own son. But have you ever wondered why? Why did He have to murder his own son so we would be saved? Why didn't He just go ahead and save

us?” (*Purple*...293) Jaja implies by this analogy that hope in the Christian God is misplaced; otherwise he and his sister would not have continued to suffer as they do at the hands of their tyrannical father.

It is the same Jaja who refuses to take Holy Communion saying, “[t]he wafer gives me bad breath [...] And the priest keeps touching my mouth and it nauseates me” (*Purple*...14). When his father retorts, “It is the body of our Lord [...] You cannot stop receiving the body of our Lord. It is death, you know that” (*Purple*...14-15). Jaja simply replies, “Then I will die [...] Then I will die, papa” (*Purple*...15). Even Kambili is not much better, that is speaking from Eugene’s point of view, because all the remarks she makes in the novel that appear religious are done deliberately to attract the attention and love of her father and not because she believes in her father’s God; and the first opportunity she has with a good looking young man, she capitulates, forgets her “good Christian upbringing” and completely falls head over heels in love with him forgetting that the young man in question is a catholic reverend father who cannot marry anyone. So the biggest irony of Eugene’s life is that he failed in the one task he thought he had given so much to: raising a godly family.

Apart from the characters above, there are Father Amadi and Aunty Ifeoma who have accepted the catholic faith but have maintained the balance: neither gullibly taking in everything given to them by the Christian faith as Eugene Achika has done nor developing into rebels like Jaja and Kambili. Amadi is a Reverend Father of the Catholic Church but we infer from his general demeanour that he is not as overzealous as Father Benedict and Eugene Achika are. That is why the first time Father Amadi says Mass at St. Agnes’, Eugene condemns him saying, “[t]hat young priest, singing in the sermon like a Godless leader of one of these Pentecostal

churches that spring up everywhere like mushrooms. People like him bring trouble to the church. We must remember to pray for him” (*Purple...*29).

For Eugene, Father Amadi’s behaviour is nothing short of madness but as Kambili and Jaja get to know Father Amadi more at Auntie Ifeoma’s house, they see the difference between their own cheerless worship and the lively and invigorating style favoured by Father Amadi and Auntie Ifeoma. Kambili reveals that “Father Amadi led the first decade, and at the end, he started an Igbo praise song. While they sang, I opened my eyes and stared at the wall, at the picture of the family at Chima’s baptism[...] I pressed my lips together, biting my lower lip, so my mouth would not join in the singing on its own, so my mouth would not betray me” (*Purple...*138). The novel therefore shows that there is a new cultural disposition emerging from the post-colonial culture which new cultural disposition is represented by those not traditional in outlook but who are not dogmatically sold to the British Christian culture either.

We can see from the characterisations above that Adichie is able to give us not just a Nigerian post-colonial cultural reading of her novel but varieties of it. What we encounter in the novel is not a one-dimensional perspective but conflicting and overlapping ones that deepen the portrayal of post-colonial Nigerian culture and this makes it more authentic.

Language Use

One who reads *Purple Hibiscus* from a cultural studies standpoint will also not fail to notice the presence of Nigerian lexical items, which have coloured the English expressions used with a distinct African-Nigerian flavour. There is a generous introduction of Igbo words and exclamations such as “kekwanu?”, “gbo”, “mba”, “O zugo”, “ofe nsala”, “kpa”, “ogwu”, “Bunie ya enu”, “biko”, “Nna m o!”, “Ezi okwu”, and several others. Expressions flavoured by other

Nigerian cultures like the Hausa/Fulani culture can be found in the novel as well. Kambili presents one of these when she talks about their barely literate security man:

His name was Haruna, he had told Jaja and me a few days before, and in his Hausa-accented English that reversed P and F, he told us that our pather was the best Big Man he had ever seen, the best emfloyer he had ever had. Did we know our pather faid his children's school pees? Did we know our pather had helped his wiipe get the messenger job at the Local Government oppice? We were lucky to have such a pather. (*Purple*... 111)

The above quotation reveals the speech pattern of a barely literate Hausa/Fulani person in Nigeria. The narrator could have merely translated or given the reader the sense of what has been captured above. However, presenting the words directly as the security man uttered them is another technique adopted by post-colonial writers. The expressions that clearly indicate mother tongue interference captured above have been used even when Adichie could have found perfect English equivalents for the same contexts. The inclusion of such lexical items has been deliberately done to foreground the pre-colonial cultures which colonialism was out to destroy.

Motifs

Finally, as it happens in most postcolonial literature, Adichie's *Purple Hibiscus* discusses the debilitating effects of colonial intrusion in an African setting. The effects can be seen manifesting in religious intolerance, break up of families along religious lines, mismanagement of the economy evidenced in the unbridled corruption reported widely in the novel and social economic tensions of all sorts observed from the industrial actions, students unrests, hounding of political enemies by the ruling class and routine military coups among several others. The novel also shows the dastard effect of foreign culture on indigenous cultures; a situation that leads to

the creation of persons completely culturally disoriented like Eugene paving way for the abuse of weaker groups represented here by Kambili, Jaja and their mother. All these are consistent with works that attract the attention of cultural critics.

Conclusion

This cultural reading of *Purple Hibiscus* is based on methods favoured by the new historicist and post-colonialist strands of cultural studies. However, it is our belief that whichever approach is adopted, one fundamental realisation is that cultural studies makes it possible for the different discourses of the culture it depicts to be heard; that the discipline focuses on the silenced and the excluded by giving them a voice, exhuming their concerns and foregrounding same as one of several existing others rather than allowing such concerns to remain classified as aberrant and deviant dispositions fit only to be ignored. This is what this paper has attempted to do.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed., Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1999. Print
- Adichie, Chimamanda Ngozi. *Purple Hibiscus*. Lagos: Farafina, 2006. Print
- Barker, Chris. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications Limited, 2008. Print.
- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. 2nd ed. 2002. Web. Accessed 30 Sept. 2015
- Bennett, David ed.: *Cultural Studies: Pluralism and Theory*. Melbourne, Victoria: University of Melbourne, Victoria, 1993.
- Dobie, B. Ann. *Theory into Practice: An Introduction to Literary Criticism*. Wadsworth Engage Learning, 2002. Print.
- Threadgold, Terry (Cardiff). "Cultural Studies, Critical Theory and Critical Discourse Analysis: Histories, Remembering and Futures." *Linguistik Online* 14, 2/03. (5 – 37) Web, accessed 12/10/2015
- Obiechina, N. Emmanuel. *Language and Theme: Essays on African Literature*. Washington D.C.: Howard University Press, 1990. Print.