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Abstract

Postcolonial discourse has been a focus of research for the last two decades. Previous studies attempted to investigate several themes and patterns underlying these discourses using different methodologies (Chae, 2015; Budiyanto & Latifah, 2018; Laguarta Bueno, 2018; Salami & Tabari, 2018). Unlike previous studies, this study utilizes corpus tools to investigate the us versus them binary found in postcolonial texts. The study investigates how prejudice is reflected against the colonized in the selected short stories through the use of adjectives. It looks at the representation of prejudice in the short stories disseminating and reinforcing the binary of us and them. For this purpose, a corpus of 53861 words from eleven postcolonial short stories was formulated. Van Dijk’s (1998) concept of the Ideological Square served as the theoretical framework for this study whereas Corpus Linguistics was the main methodological construct. The adjectives used in the corpus were analysed using WordSmith Tools 5.0. (Scott, 2008). From the adjectives, 19 were chosen for analysis and in those adjectives only 4 were positive while the remaining 15 were negative. The results show that the collocations of the negative adjectives with the colonized are dominant as compared to the positive adjectives which are more common with the colonizer. These results determine that in-group and out-group polarization is created through the use of adjectives.
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1. Introduction

The present study is a corpus-based analysis of postcolonial short stories for exploring the adjectives. It analyses the us versus them binaries portrayed through the adjectives used in the texts. The purpose of exploring these binaries is to reveal the underlying ideas of colonizer and colonized in the light of Van Dijk’s (1998) concept of the Ideological Square.

The binary opposition can be defined as a pair of ‘terms that although opposed to one another are necessarily bound together as each other’s condition of possibility’ (Buchanan, 2010). Binary opposition in literature and culture studies are used in order to explore the relationships between people who belong to different groups, for instance, upper and lower class boundaries lead different groups of people to discrimination and prejudice. In literature,
binary opposition is a system which is used to explore the differences, such as class, cultural, and gender discrimination, between the individuals (Van Dijk, 1990). The postcolonial texts and the themes presented in them are also analysed in the light of binary oppositions (Said, 1978).

A remarkable prominence in the use of corpora can be seen in the field of linguistics. The corpus-based techniques allow the researchers to expand the size of their data which helps them in generalizing their findings in a wider context (Brezina, McEnery, & Wattam, 2015). The use of corpora in order to analyze the literary texts is a methodological approach which is mostly considered under the umbrella of Stylistics. Stylistics is often defined as the linguistic study of literature. In its general sense, it analyses the style of a language (Crystal & Davy, 2016). To look at the corpus from theoretical perspective, it helps the researchers to analyze the co-occurrence of words in the texts which are associated with different meanings (Sinclair, Jones, & Daley, 2004). Although the study of adjectives falls under the field of stylistics yet the focus of this research is on the use of adjectives in the postcolonial texts in order to highlight the portrayal of the binary oppositions. To execute the theme of us versus them in the texts, corpus is used as a tool.

Several studies have been conducted on the adjectives by different scholars. One such study was conducted on Bapsi Sidhwa's, who is an American–Pakistani novelist of Gujarati Parsi descent writing in English, use of adjective in her novels. The study focused on testing the hypothesis that female writers, and especially Sidhwa, use extensive adjectives in their writings. The study is conducted by applying corpus as a tool and the results verified the hypothesis (Mahmood, Mahmood, & Nawaz, 2014).

The present study also deals with the adjectives used in the postcolonial texts. The short stories selected for this research are all written by postcolonial writers and come under the domain of postcolonial literature as they deal with the elements of colonialism, which is the behaviour of the colonizer and its effects on the colonized. Postcolonial literature includes the works that have some relations to the subjugating forces of imperialism and colonial expansion. This literature originated from the areas that once underwent colonization, for instance, Indian subcontinent, Nigeria, South Africa, and numerous parts of the Caribbean (Golden, 2015).

Eleven short stories; The Yellow Wallpaper by Gilman (2008), A Rose for Emily by Faulkner (2008), Dead Men’s Path by Achebe (2008), Recitatif by Morrison (1983), Once Upon a Time by Gordimer (1991), Our Dead, Your Dead by Shamsie (2011), are selected. The eleven stories have several postcolonial elements embedded in them; however, the current study has tried to investigate the dichotomy of us versus them with the help of frequently used adjectives.

The current study is significant in the fields of postcolonial studies as well as Corpus Linguistics as it has taken the data i.e. short stories written by postcolonial writers and analysed it with methods and tools from Corpus Linguistics. There have been several studies on postcolonial discourse; however, those studies are mostly focused on literary analysis of texts rather than using corpus-based techniques (Chae, 2015; Budiyanto & Latifah, 2018; Laguarta Bueno, 2018; Salami & Tabari, 2018). Especially in Pakistan, Corpus Linguistics is rather a new field and therefore it is a less explored area, so the current study will add to this field.
The significance of the infusion of neutral ideals in books is incalculable. Racial and ethnic prejudices are a prevalent part of our society and people do not even realize at times that they are being prejudiced towards a certain group. Such social problems are like termites that slowly weaken the foundations of any society; therefore, awareness must be raised among the masses regarding these issues. This study will be significant in creating awareness among the students as well as the teachers and make them able to critically analyse the deeper meanings of every word within a text. Moreover, if the corpus that has been built for this study can also be expanded and further research can be conducted on it from alternate perspectives.

2. Literature Review

The aim of this study is to critically analyse the *us versus them* binaries portrayed in postcolonial short stories through the use of adjectives. In order to do this, first of all, some of the most notable and relevant studies have been elaborated in this section.

Discourse is an exploitative tool and it is used by politicians, writers, and motivational speakers alike to cumulate the support of public. Such techniques are used by politicians in political discourse in order to elicit emotions and achieve specific objectives (Bhatia, 2006). In order to explore the hidden meanings lying underneath these discourses, several theories have been at practice in the field of linguistics. One such approach is Critical Discourse Analysis or CDA. It is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of discourse that views language as a form of social practice (Van Dijk, 1998). Being a proponent of CDA, Van Dijk defines it as, “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” (1998, p. 352). This approach is concerned with the analysis of discourse within socio-political contexts and it helps in unveiling the underlying discursive practices, such as in-group and out-group polarization, ethnic prejudice, power abuse, racial discrimination and exploitation of basic rights.

Language, society and politics are unavoidably interlinked, so the main objective of critical discourse analysis is to identify language use as social practice. Wodak & Meyer believe CDA is not interested in inspecting a linguistic unit alone rather it is more interested in social phenomena which are not as simple as a single unit but more complex and therefore a “multidisciplinary and multi-methodical approach” is required to study them (2009, p. 2).

Critical Discourse Analysis is an interdisciplinary way to deal with language use as a social practice. The language users do not function in segregation rather they need a cultural, social and psychological framework. Its main concern is looking at the ways in which relations, identity, knowledge and power are developed through text and talks within societies. CDA is concerned with analyzing discourse through a critical method that is magnified by linguistic and social analysis. The key issues that Critical Discourse Analysis concentrates on are the power relations, dominance, inequality as well as the way social power abuse is established, opposed and recreated by the written and spoken texts in social and political setting (Tannen, Hamilton, & Schiffrin, 2015).

CDA is a worldview which is identified in interpreting the belief systems and power through organized examination of language, according to Van Dijk (2001). He believes that the purpose of CDA is to methodically interrogate the connection between the organization of the discourse and formation of ideologies. Additionally, it concentrates on how socio-
political discourse controls, broadcasts, induces and exhibits the power connection in the general public (Van Dijk, 2001).

To assist the theoretical framework of CDA within this study, the methodology of corpus has been used to identify the adjectives which are used to create in-group and out-group polarization within postcolonial discourse. This biasness is created due to the *us versus them* dichotomy within discourse (Van Dijk, 1998). The prejudice between the colonizers and the colonized has been prevalent throughout the history. In order to enhance their positive self-image, the colonizers started producing a negative other image of the colonized (Said, 1978). Such prejudices led to practices such as racism and the emergence of the occident and the orient. The West started a negative discourse about the orient in every field through producing literature in which they legitimized their act of invasion by showing a picture of the orient that was not real (Ambesange, 2016). West has created a hierarchy of the privileged and underprivileged in form of these binary oppositions. These binaries are universal, such as light and dark, as well as cultural, such as self and other (Caldas-Coulthard & Coulthard, 1996). Such dichotomies are also present in postcolonial short stories. They have been scrutinized by studying the adjectives used for the representation of us and them with the help of corpus tools.

Corpus methodology is a research method that is dependent upon qualitative and quantitative analysis both. It “utilizes a large and principled collection of natural texts, known as a ‘corpus’ as the basis for analysis” (Biber, Conrad, & Reppen, 1998, p. 4). It is a relatively new approach in the field of research and with its emergence a new door opened for the researchers. Corpus linguistics can help in identifying the significance of including and excluding certain linguistic and textual features. It uses empirical evidence as a reliable source in order to classify and investigate the linguistic structures being used (Brezina, McEnery, & Wattam, 2015). One of those lexical items can be adjectives, as well.

According to Burke and Swales (2003), adjectives can be categorized into seven different classes in accordance with their denotations like aesthetic appeal, assessment, deviance, relevance, size, acuity and strength. They investigated evaluative adjectives in seven classes within academic writing and speech. They identified from their research that strength and relevance adjectives were more regular in academic writing than academic speech.

Research that has examined the adjectives used to represent the *us versus them* binary in electronic and print media has generally found evidence of biasness. A study conducted on the newspaper coverage of American mass shootings indicated that the adjectives used to describe non-white attackers were negative and were almost always related to their ethnicity. However, the white mass shooters were never labeled according to their ethnicity. This type of language usage contributes towards racial and ethnic discrimination among masses (Tanvir, Khoul, & Zahra, 2018). Another corpus-based study was conducted on the representation of trans people in the British press from 2013 to 2015 which showed similar results (Zottola, 2018).

A study (Pasha, 2011) examined the Islamic ideologies presented in an Egyptian newspaper using Van Dijk’s *Ideological Square* (1998). It found that the newspaper discourse emphasised on positive ideologies while de-emphasising the negative ones. It portrayed negative ideologies to de-emphasise on the good deeds of the Muslim society. Another study was carried out on news reports produced by The Los Angeles Times and
This study investigated the ideological differences in the discourse of both newspapers about Iran’s Nuclear Program. The results showed that both the newspapers used biased and prejudiced language in order to emphasise their positive self-image and create a negative other image for Iran.

In a study, the process of evaluation is used as it is defined by Hunston and Thompson (2010), that evaluation is a mean which is used to express the writer’s or speaker’s attitude and feelings towards their production of language. To make a sentence evaluative, many linguistic features are used; however, adjective is one of the most important features making a sentence evaluative.

Marzá (2011) conducted a study on the use of evaluative adjectives in promotional hotel websites. She analysed the syntactic behavior and collocate patterns within the discourse found on hotel websites. Although she expected to find out a relatively large amount of data on evaluative elements, the results were quite surprising. The findings showed that the hotel websites discourse is not as direct and hyperbolic as one would expect rather it uses subtle language. This means that even though the website discourse includes positive self-representation, yet it doesn’t solely rely on evaluative adjectives and uses other lexical items, too. Other studies using corpus-based techniques have tried to investigate different forms of othering through discourse. A study investigated the concept of othering in the representations of hosts in commercial tourism discourse. The researcher, using the Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies (CADS), compared external (other) and internal (self) representations and found that the Western tourists industry generalizes the role of hosts and as a result showcases then as someone who is more like a servant to the tourists (Jaworska, 2016). Such representation of one group of people leads to forming stereotypical views about them.

The current study has probed eleven short stories from different eras to see how a discourse of us versus them was produced through the use of adjectives. This study has dealt with a practical problem of social prejudice. This becomes a cause for the reinforcement of many preconceived notions about the colonizers as well as the colonized. So, current research has tried to bring forth the hidden elements of discrimination and othering within the adjectives that are used in the stories to help the readers better understand these dichotomies. For this purpose, the study examines following research questions:

1. How is prejudice reflected against the colonized in the selected short stories through the use of adjectives?
2. How is the representation of prejudice in the short stories disseminating and reinforcing the binary of us and them?

3. Research Methodology

The current study is quantitative in nature as the frequency of the words was calculated by using corpus tools and then the findings were qualitatively analysed. So, this study is both quantitative as well as qualitative in nature. The theoretical framework selected to conduct this study is the Ideological Square given by Van Dijk (1998, p. 35). In postcolonial discourse, when the positive aspects of us are emphasized and the negative aspects of us are de-emphasized, the positive aspects of them are de-emphasized and the negative aspects of them are emphasized. This concept is defined as Ideological Square by Van Dijk (1998, p. 35). This strategy works on both levels; form and meaning (Van Dijk,

2006). In this study, we have analysed how this concept is deployed in the selected postcolonial short stories by scrutinizing through the adjectives used to represent the colonized and the colonizers. A corpus of 53861 words was developed from eleven postcolonial short stories which are as follows:

Table 1: Short stories included in the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Short Story</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Man Who Would Be King (1888)</td>
<td>Rudyard Kipling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>An Outpost of Progress (1897)</td>
<td>Joseph Conrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sacrificial Egg (1959)</td>
<td>Chinua Achebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Madman (1972)</td>
<td>Chinua Achebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recitatif (1983)</td>
<td>Toni Morrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Once Upon a Time (1989)</td>
<td>Nadine Gordimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Revenge of Her Race (2002)</td>
<td>Mary Beaumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Yellow Wallpaper (2008)</td>
<td>Charlotte Perkins Gilman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dead Men’s Path (2008)</td>
<td>Chinua Achebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Our Dead, Your Dead (2011)</td>
<td>Kamila Shamsie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socio-political manipulation and mind-control is ideological most of the times, and almost always includes power abuse by the dominant, hegemonic rulers (Van Dijk, 2006). To analyse how and in what ways this manipulation is achieved, Van Dijk (1995) has expanded on how various discursive strategies are used to ensure that the audiences or the readers bend to the speaker’s or writer’s will. Moreover, discourse employs various strategies to emphasize and/or de-emphasize meanings (Van Dijk, 2006). To this end, the strategy of positive self-representation, and negative other representation is most widely used in discourse, especially political discourse (Van Dijk, 2001). This strategy works such that in-group and out-group polarization is created, thereby creating an Us/Them binary, that is readily “coded in text and talk” (Van Dijk, 2006, p. 126). Van Dijk (2001) has also listed different discursive strategies that are utilized by speakers/writers to exhibit positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Within CDA, these discourse levels help to highlight the hidden ideologies that are coded within a specific written or spoken discourse through the strategy of emphasizing and de-emphasizing in-group and out-group properties.

3.1. The Corpus

The instruments used to examine the colonizer/colonized binaries through adjectives in the texts are corpus-based. The data selected for this study was eleven postcolonial short stories and it was retrieved from different websites in .pdf format. The short stories were selected through convenience sampling technique, which is defined as “a technique of sampling where the readily available primary data source will be used for the research without additional requirements” (Dudovskiy, 2016). To analyse this data, the corpus software, WordSmith Tools 5.0 (Scott, 2008) was used. WordSmith Tools 5.0 has three main options: Concord, Keywords and Wordlist, however, for this study only the Concord and Wordlist options were used. A wordlist was generated with the help of Wordlist option in the software. This wordlist was pasted in the CLAWS Tagger (Rayson & Garside, 1998) and a tagged wordlist was obtained which was then scrutinized for identifying adjectives that were projecting the colonizer/colonized binary. These adjectives, taken from the KWIC list
in the corpus, were then selected for qualitative analysis keeping in mind the above explained theoretical framework given by Van Dijk (1998).

4. Data Analysis

The current section has aided the research to move a step ahead by analyzing the data with the help of the selected framework. Using the theoretical framework given by Van Dijk known as the *Ideological Square*, (1998) the data has been analysed. The analysis has further been carried out by examining the social identities constructed through the binaries of us and them. The corpus that has been prepared for this study has a number of different adjectives within it. After short listing those to the ones that are showing *us versus them* binary the researchers further selected every fifth adjective out of the seventy-seven as a detailed analysis of each adjective was not within the scope of this study.

Table 2: Adjectives selected for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dank</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>infuriating</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>peculiar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>puzzling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>repellant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>smouldering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>summery</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>tiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>unclean</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>wavering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current study has analysed the adjectives in two ways. First of all, it analysed which adjectives are used with negative connotations and then those that are used with positive connotations. After analyzing both types of adjectives, their overall frequency was calculated to estimate which type of adjectives are used more in the corpus. The *us versus them* theme is a discursive phenomenon that constructs an ontological, philosophical and ideological dichotomy amongst various identities (Said, 1993). The corpus shows this binary at several places.

Figure 1: Concordance of *bad*
The adjective *bad* has been used in the corpus to refer to the colonized as being a bad example for the colonizers. They are seen as a bad influence for the newer generations of the colonizers. They are seen as a threat and a disgrace to the colonizers as Miss Emily in *A Rose for Emily* (Faulkner, 2008) was seen to be a bad example for the people of the town, especially the younger ones.

As Said mentions in *Orientalism* (2006), the colonizers (or the West to be precise) sees the colonized to be lazy, mysterious, imaginative, unnatural and irrational. This corpus gives us a clear picture of all such adjectives being used for the colonized. The colonizer thinks that the colonized are nothing but imaginative if they ever point out the problems that are around them due to the colonizers. In *The Yellow Wallpaper* (Gilman, 2008), the woman is representing the colonized and whenever she tries to talk to her husband about her thoughts and feelings, he politely shuts her out by that she is imaginative with a power and habit of story making. This shows that the colonizer has no regard for the colonized and it snubs them of their right to speak their heart out by labeling them with such titles.

The colonizers not only have a problem with the thoughts and feelings of the colonized rather they have a major dislike for everything that is related to them whether it is their way of living or the color of their houses or even with the smell that they think is a trademark of their houses. The adjectives used in the corpus to describe this are peculiar, close and dank which have negative connotations associated with them, showing the margin that is created by the colonizer for the colonized. The colonizer has created a specific boundary for the colonized which they cannot come out of.

Looking at the negative adjective *repellent*, it can be seen that even the colors associated with the supposedly inferior class are presented as something entirely repulsive and intolerable. Just to refer to the color of the wallpaper in the room (representing the colonized land) four different adjectives are used, like revolting, smouldering, unclean and not to forget repellent. This shows the intensity of hatred and disgust that is in the minds of the colonizers for the colonized. Two of the four words, revolting and repellent have very strong negative connotations and are only used to express utter disgust.

Another adjective *worse* is also used in the corpus to describe the condition of material related to the colonized people whether it is their furniture or their wallpaper. Everything seems worse to the eye of the colonizer. The colonizer thinks of himself as the superior know-it-all while the colonized, to them, are nothing more than objects.

Obi of the *Dead Men’s Path* (Achebe, 2008), prefers modern methods in place for these superannuated and unprogressive practices. This is also a representation of the *us versus them* binary showing he believes that the natives, who are traditional people, are backward and obsolete as their methods and practices are now outdated. He, representing the colonizers, believes that only he can bring change and a modern environment within the backward land of Ndume, representing the colonized. In doing so, they forget that what they believe is right may not be right for others but in creating their positive self-image the colonizers will see their group succeed instead of having a win-win situation for both the groups (Said, 2006).

Another positive adjective that is used to represent the colonizers is energetic along with young, however; on the other hand, negative adjectives like puzzling and nervous are used for the colonized.
A very interesting adjective is *able* when it occurs in *The Yellow Wallpaper* (Gilman, 2008). The story is written in the first-person narrative with the colonized being the speaker. Throughout the story the adjective *able* has been used in two contexts. In the first place, the narrator says, “*But he said I wasn't able to go, nor able to stand it*” (Gilman, 2008, p. 651), where *he* stands for John, the colonizer and *I* for the narrator. However, as the story progresses the narrator says at point “*I don't want to. I don't feel able*” (Gilman, 2008, p. 651). This shows that how the colonizer was successful in making the colonized doubt their abilities. The colonizer has created these binaries in such a manner that even the ones who have been marginalized and victimized do not even understand that they have been, rather they start feeling as if the discourse created by the colonizer is real.

After looking at the selected adjectives individually, when we scrutinized the entire list of adjectives, it was found that from the 19 adjectives only 4 were used in positive connotations and that too for the colonizers. While the remaining 15 were used in negative connotations and all of them were used for the colonized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Positive Adjectives</th>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Negative Adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>dank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>infuriating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>peculiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>puzzling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>repellant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>smouldering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>summery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>tiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>unclean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>wavering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>worse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusion

This study examined the role of short stories in propagating the stereotypes related to a group of individuals. It analyses the *us versus them* dichotomies present in the selected short stories that are the main feature of postcolonial discourse. A corpus-based approach was used to analyse the postcolonial short stories. For that purpose, a corpus of 53861 words was developed from eleven postcolonial short stories. Within the data, the adjectives were identified and analysed for showing any colonizer/colonized binaries. The data was analysed in the light of CDA approach presented by Van Dijk (1993) and the concept of *us* and *them* also given by Van Dijk (1998) in his *Ideological Square* framework.

There are a number of adjectives used to create the dichotomies of *us* and *them* within the data. However, analyzing all the adjectives was not within the scope of this study. Therefore, every fifth adjective was taken for analysis so, only 19 adjectives were analysed in detail. The result of the analysis shows that the adjectives used in the corpus exhibit a struggle between the binaries i.e. new and old, traditional and modern, the colonizer and the
colonized. The colonizers create these binaries of *us* and *them* in order to marginalize the colonized group and as a result they lose a chance to live in harmony with each other. The findings revealed that in the 19 adjectives only 4 were positive while the remaining 15 had negative connotations. Moreover, the positive adjectives were used for the colonizer while all the negative ones were used for the colonized.

The use of such adjectives that help in creating a positive self-image and a negative other image aids in the promotion of stereotypes. Such strategies are used by writers to subtly reinforce certain ideas in the minds of people regarding every race, class, nation, ethnicity, and gender. These discourses help creating the dichotomies and divisions of black and white, right and wrong, *us* and *them* which ultimately leads to biasness in people’s behavior.

In this way, the researchers have tried to bring forth the cultural clash and social bias between the colonizers and the colonized. Moreover, the research has substantiated its objectives by answering the question about how prejudice is shown in the postcolonial short stories. Also, the results of the research showed that negative adjectives were used to represent the colonized while positive ones were used to represent the colonizer which proved that the research was in line with the theoretical framework given by Van Dijk (1998, p. 35). However, future researchers can expand the corpus and further study the dichotomies of *us versus them* in the corpora. These dichotomies can also be studied in any other genre apart from fiction. So, future research can be conducted on newspaper representations of *us* and *them*. 
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