Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mouloud MAMMERI University of Tizi-Ouzou
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English

Dissertation Submitted for the Partial

Fulfilment of Magister Degree

Speciality: English

Option: Didactics of Literary Texts and Civilisation

Presented by:

Meriam GHENNAI

Supervised by:

Professor Sabrina ZERRAR

Subject

The Deployment of Drama in Teaching Pragmatic Concepts

Board of Examiners:

Souryana YASSINE	M.C.A	University Mouloud Mammeri of Tizi-Ouzou	Chair
Sabrina ZERAR	Professor	University Mouloud Mammeri of Tizi-Ouzou	Supervisor
Nadia GADA	M.C.A	University Mouloud Mammeri of Tizi-Ouzou	Examiner
Mouloud SIBER	M.C.A	University Mouloud Mammeri of Tizi-Ouzou	Examiner

Discussed on April 13th

Academic year: 2018/2019

Abstract

This research addresses the usefulness of excerpts from William Shakespeare's *Tempest*, Edward Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker* as instructional materials while teaching pragmatic concepts. The concepts under study are; speech acts, politeness and conversational management. The dialogues in the three plays are approached in a similar way to the pragmatic approach to dialogues of everyday life. The analysis is conducted for the aim of foregrounding how the concepts operate in context, how they reflect characters' identities and relationships as well as how they manifest themselves linguistically. The results yielded from such analysis help at testing the effectiveness of excerpts from the suggested plays as means of discussing and illustrating the pragmatic concepts in class. The study reveals that the three plays prove to be resourceful with varied social contexts that give rise to manifestations of the target concepts. Additionally, they offer a variety of relationships, social contexts, and speech that allow socio-pragmatic study of the language used. *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and *The Caretaker*'s language is much closer to the language people use nowadays than the language in *The Tempest* by Shakespeare. Moreover, they display more features of everyday talk than *The Tempest* as well more complex, subverted and inappropriate patterns of interaction and strategies of language use.

Key words: Drama, Speech acts, Politeness, Conversational management, Materials, Teaching Pragmatics.

Acknowledgments

Gratitude is not a gratuitous gesture in research, since no piece of research worth its name can be carried out without guidance, this said, I thank first and foremost my supervisor, Professor Sabrina ZERRAR without whose guidance, patience, understanding and generosity, this piece of research could not have been accomplished. In the same line of thought, I would like to thank Professor Bouteldja RICHE, who suggested the research topic as well as the research methodology of this work. I also wish to thank the members of the board of examiners; Dr. Souryana YASSINE, Dr. Nadia GADA and Dr. Mouloud SIBER for giving the feedback to improve my work. I also thank my teachers at the University of Mouloud Mammeri for their valuable guidance and advice throughout the course of my studies. Finally, my thanks go to my family, my friends and my classmates in Tizi Ouzou for their enormous emotional support and encouragements.

List of Abbreviations

CA	Conversation Analysis
FPP	First Pair Part
FTA	Face Threatening Act
IFID	Illocutionary Force Indicating Device
SPP	Second Pair Part
TCU	Turn Constructional Unit
TRP	Transition Relevance Place

CONTENTS

General Introduction

In recent decades, language learning has encompassed more than reading, writing, speaking and understanding sets of sentences. It also includes developing intercultural communicative competence. Communicative competence entails acquiring how to use the forms and the functions of language efficiently and appropriately in a communicative situation. Intercultural competence refers to acquiring a set of skills that help the learner interpret and use the language according to different social and cultural contexts. As a result of focusing on these two components of language learning, it becomes essential to highlight the ways in which language can be interpreted and used differently depending on the context. Moreover, it is necessary to be aware of the norms of speech used in the target language and how these norms vary depending on the context of communication. Such issues are central to the field of second/foreign language pragmatics.

The growing body of research that deals with pragmatics in second/foreign language classrooms focuses on developing learners' pragmatic competence. The main goal is to familiarize the learners with how to use and interpret the target language in a socially appropriate manner. This is due to the fact that different cultures do not judge socially acceptable behavior and language use in the same way. Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003) suggest that dealing with pragmatics in classroom include '… *speech acts, conversational structure, conversational implicature, conversational management, discourse organization, and sociolinguistic aspects of language use such as choice of address forms'*. [1]

In this research, I aspire to establish the dramatic dialogue as one of the means to address pragmatics in the classroom. Generally, pragmatics deals with illustrations of functional and social use of language in daily verbal interactions. It could be argued that dialogues in drama provide

[1]Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig and Rebecca Mahan Taylor*, eds., Teaching Pragmatics,* (Washington: United States Department of State, 2003),p1.

useful source materials for the contextual analysis of language and consequently the application and illustration of pragmatic concepts. This is due to the apparent similarities between dialogues in drama and verbal interactions in daily life. In second/foreign language classroom, drama could be exploited and used to represent an authentic use of language. In addition to the fact that since it is a part of the target language literature, it is also highly motivational.

During the course of their study, students of English in Algerian universities encounter the field of pragmatics as an academic area of language study. In this field, they explore different concepts related to how language is used in context and how it reflects the social elements of communication. They are introduced to concepts such as speech acts, conversational management, conversational implicature, reference and politeness. In order to explain such concepts, it is necessary for teachers to provide examples through which the learners gain better understanding of the concept, the pragmatic feature it refers to, its relative linguistic expression and the different elements involved in the communication. The purpose of my research is to suggest that excerpts of plays could be an adequate and appropriate resource for exploring concepts of pragmatics; specifically, speech acts, politeness and conversational management for English language teachers and learners.

My study draws on the research on addressing pragmatics in second/foreign language classrooms which deals with the main issues of teaching/ learning L2 pragmatics and the different materials used in the process. In addition to that, it refers to the practice of analysing literary texts and specifically dramatic dialogues using pragmatically-based analysis. This type of analysis attempts to explain and exemplify how pragmatics is used as one of the tools to analyse drama as a practice of literary criticism.

Research in the field of second/foreign language teaching has been concerned with raising learners' pragmatic awareness using two instructional methods: implicit pragmatic teaching and explicit metapragmatic teaching. Richards (1990) suggests that in second language context there

are two approaches to teach conversations: indirect and direct. In the indirect approach, learning how to converse takes place through interaction. The direct approach entails raising the learners' attention to the different strategies used in conversation through explaining them[2]. Analogously, Rose (2005) refers to implicit and explicit methods of teaching pragmatics in a research about the effectiveness of pragmatic instruction[3]. The difference between the two lies in the metapragmatic information that highlights the target language pragmatic feature in the explicit method. Bardovi-Harling and Mahan-Taylor (2003) argue for the usefulness of metapragmatic instruction[4]. They state that teaching pragmatics helps students to communicate correctly; moreover, it offers important input to the knowledge of the social components of communication. This would help the learners to be more responsible for the choices they make in using the language through the control of the different components of language use. Additionally, they would have their attention projected towards " *subtle*" elements of communication that may be unnoticeable immediately.[5]

Exploring pragmatic concepts require the use of instructional materials that contain social context, functional language use, and interaction[6]. Some of the instructional materials which have been used to teach pragmatics include; extracts from everyday conversations which were recorded or transcribed, audiovisual resources such as films and technological tools such as computers and internet. Barron (2003) explains that one of the factors that affect the acquisition of foreign language pragmatics is the availability of input[7]. Many researchers and practitioners stress the importance of using authentic language materials. This entails presenting language samples in actual and natural occurring conversation. The contributors in " *Teaching Pragmatics*" by Bardovi-

---

[2] In Richard Schmidt, ''Consciousness, Learning and Interlanguage Pragmatics'' *Interlanguage Pragmatics* edited by Gabriele Kaper and Shoshana Blum-Kulka, eds., (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1993, p21.

[3] Kenneth Rose. ''On the Effects of Instruction in Second Language Pragmatics.'' *System* 33 (2005):393–394.

[4] Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig and Rebecca Mahan Taylor,*eds., Teaching Pragmatics,*(Washington: United States Department of State, 2003).

[5] Ibid

[6] Naoko Tagushi '' Teaching Pragmatics: Trends and Issues'' *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31 (2011):296.

[7] In Eva Alcon Soler and Alicia Martinez-Flor,eds., *Investigating Pragmatics in Foreign Language Learning, Teaching and Testing*, (Bristol: Multilingual Matter,2008),p9.

Harling and Mahan-Taylor (2003) used different authentic materials; they used examples of everyday conversations extracted from tape recordings, messages on answering machines, talk shows and letters and correspondences[8].

Tagushi (2011) mentions many researchers who propose the use of technology as a resource for teaching pragmatics[9]. He believes that technological tools offer input, interaction, simulation, and multimedia environment. Some websites that offer videos and audios of conversations in an interactive and multimedia environment are used to teach speech acts. Using the method of computer–assisted language learning, some researchers developed interactive programs to address pragmatic concepts such as backchannels for Arabic learners and reactive tokens for Japanese ones. Another technological tool that Tagushi refers to is computer-mediated communication which consists of online contextualized dialogues with native speakers. It has been used to teach apology as a speech act, interactional particles and modal particles for American learners of Japanese. Virtual social platforms such as social networks, virtual worlds, online games, and forums are also used to teach pragmatics via structured language socialization. Although, empirical data concerning the use of technological tools as resources to teach pragmatics is still limited as Tagushi concludes, they have turned out to tremendously help the learners to acquire and practice their pragmatic competence[10].

Audio-visual materials such as films and television programs can also be used as instructional materials to teach pragmatics. Alcon Soler and Martinez-Flor (2008) suggest that audio-visual materials provide important sources for developing learner's pragmatic knowledge[11]. They cited many researchers who argue along similar lines such as Alcon (2005), Grant and Starks

[8] As illustrated by the editors Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig and Rebecca Mahan, Taylor,eds., in *Teaching Pragmatics,*(Washington: United States Department of State, 2003).

[9] Naoko Tagushi. '' Teaching Pragmatics: Trends and Issues'' *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31 (2011):297-399.

[10] (Ibid:399)

[11] Eva Alcon Soler and Alicia Martinez-Flor,eds., *Investigating Pragmatics in Foreign Language Learning, Teaching and Testing*, (Bristol: Multilingual Matter,2008),p8.

(2001), Martinez-Flor (2007a) and Washburn (2001). They conclude that audio-visual materials are useful in developing language learners' pragmatic knowledge. Armstrong (2009) discusses the use of scenes in the American popular drama *'' Desperate Housewives"* to teach and learn pragmatics and specifically conversational implicature in Japanese EFL classroom[12]. She concludes that besides raising the students' pragmatic awareness, the use of these scenes helps to develop their listening comprehension, speaking skills as well as promote their motivation and interest.

Although little research is conducted on the use of literary texts as instructional materials for teaching pragmatics, research on the benefits of using literature for language learners indicates that reading literary texts can enrich their pragmatic competence. Widdowson (1975) suggests that *' the study of literature is fundamentally a study of language in operation'*[13]. Therefore, literary texts provide the learner a means to understand the context of language use better by helping them relate the linguistic expressions to the social context in which they appear. Lazar (1993) points out at the ability of literature to illustrate how people *"behave and react in specific situations"*[14]. These remarks could be used to argue that literary texts help to develop learners' pragmatic competence. Nevertheless, they were by-products of the research into using literature for language teaching in general.

Bataineh (2014) used an experimental literature-based syllabus to test the effects of teaching literature on the pragmatic competence of English language learners in a school in Jordan[15]. He used extracts from novels, short stories, poems and plays. He attempts to test the development of learners' pragmatic competence in terms of discourse functions, figurative

[12] Sybil Armstrong '' Desperate Housewives in an EFL classroom.'' Paper presented in at the annual JALT Conference Proceedings, Tokyo,2009.
[13] Radhika O'sullivan .''Literature in the Language Classroom'' *The English Teacher* 20 (1991).
[14] Gillian Lazar, *Literature and Language Teaching: A Guide for Teachers and Trainers,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993),p 17.
[15]Ahmad Bataineh. '' The Effect of Teaching Literature on EFL Students' Pragmatic Competence.'' *Journal of Education and Practice* 5, No.3, (2014): 145.

language, prosodic aspects, metaphorical and idiomatic expressions, and non-verbal communication. The results of the study show that the experimental group outperformed the control one in terms of their pragmatic competence. It is worth mentioning that the experiment did not include any metapragmatic instruction. The experimental group was taught English through mere exposure to literary texts. Furthermore, no analysis was conducted on the texts to elucidate and explore the pragmatic functions they contain.

Literary texts could be analysed pragmatically to highlight the contextual and functional use of the language. This practice is used to offer new insights into the realm of literary criticism. It has been concerned with how meaning is constructed and what social dimensions are involved in the interaction. Culpeper, Short and Verdonk (1998), whose main concern is the language of drama, suggest that discourse analysis, conversation analysis and pragmatics were established as means of analysis in the 1970s[16]. These methods, which were initially used for the analysis of everyday language and interaction, offer important tools to analyse the fictional ones. Herman (1998), for example, explores turn management in John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* and shows how turn taking patterns affect the interpretation of the situation and characters[17]. Simpson (2005) analysed extracts from *The Lesson* by Ionesco. He explains how the interactive roles of the characters are influenced by the linguistic politeness strategies they use[18].

For the purpose of this research, it is important to find ways in which drama could be used to illustrate pragmatic concepts. Drama, the literary genre which is most analogous to everyday communication, could be exploited as a means to teach learners the pragmatic aspects of conversation in the target language. Simpson (1997) explains that dramatic dialogues could provide

---

[16] Jonathan Culpeper, Mick Short and Peter Verdonk,eds., *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*,(London: Routledge, 1998) ,p2.

[17] Vimala Herman, '' Turn Management in Drama'' In *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context* edited by Jonathan Culpeper, Mick Short and Peter Verdonk, (London: Routledge, 1998)p19-33.

[18] Paul Simpson, "Politeness Phenomena in Ionesco's The Lesson" in *Language, Discourse and Literature: An introductory Reader in Discourse Stylistics* edited by Ronald Carter and Paul Simpson (London: Routledge 2005)p196-190.

'*excellent*' source materials for explaining the patterns of everyday conversation[19]. Scholars who analyse drama using discourse analysis tools point out that dialogues in drama could be analysed the same way as everyday ones. This is done in order to show '*how spoken interaction is structured and how speakers' conversational contributions are connected'*[20]. Although many scholars believe that we cannot establish similarities between naturally occurring conversations and dialogues in drama, Herman contends that dramatic dialogues do not necessarily mirror real life conversation. However, the points of reference between the two are the speech conventions used by dramatists as well as the context and the conditions of society that the participants, the characters, reflect[21]. This claim stands as the basis for introducing dramatic dialogue in language classroom to illustrate and teach the pragmatics of the target language.

Abbas (2012) attempts to use literary dialogue in addressing L2 pragmatics[22]. She emphasizes primarily the analysis of literary texts –specifically the novel- to illustrate speech acts. She postulates that analysing dialogues in these texts help the learners expand their pragmatic awareness and develop the target language competence. She uses an extract of Lucy Maud Montgomery's *Anne of Green Gables* to highlight the speech act of asking as well as its illocutionary and perlocutionary effects. She quotes Halbach ; '*a useful source for learning through imitation or psychological identification with the characters'* to suggest that when learners conduct such analysis on literary texts, they can learn how to handle questions in real life situations. She proposes that learning occurs as a result of imitation of literary conversations[23].

All in all, raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners is viewed as being highly important by researchers in the field of language teaching. One of the instructional methods for addressing this issue is pointing out at the different pragmatic strategies used by interlocutors in

[19] Paul Simpson, *Language Through Literature: An introduction*, (London: Routledge,1997), p130.
[20] (Ibid :130)
[21] Vimala Herman, *Dramatic Discourse: Dialogue as Interaction in Plays,* (London: Routledge,1995), p6.
[22] Nawal Fadhil Abbas. '' Pragmatics and the Teaching of Literature'' *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education* 2, (2012):333-346.
[23] (Ibid: p344)

the target language through metapragmatic instruction. For this aim, different source materials have been appropriated such as transcriptions of conversations from everyday communication and extracts from films and series. This opens the possibility for the inclusion of dialogues and extracts from plays. The research on the ability of literary texts to develop pragmatic awareness of the learners as well as the insights from the pragmatic analysis of dialogues in drama as a critical and interpretive interest reinforce this proposition.

The former review of literature gives rise to certain issues that stipulate the conduct of this research. In the light of the practice of teaching pragmatics for language learners, literary texts could be used as instructional materials. Although it has been discussed that using them has positive results in raising learner's pragmatic competence, little research has been done to advocate such claim specifically when discussing dialogues from drama. Additionally, in spite of the fact that the language of these dialogues has been analysed pragmatically, the findings of such analyses have not been extrapolated to foreign language pragmatics context.

Considering the need for using authentic language as instructional material for teaching pragmatics as well as the prerequisite condition of the ability to illustrate social context, functional language use, and interaction, this research suggests that dialogues in drama could be established as resources to explain pragmatic concepts. It aims primarily at illustrating how extracts from William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1610- 1611), Edward Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (1962) and Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker* (1960) could be used to teach the pragmatic concepts of speech acts, politeness strategies and conversational management. This is guided by the hypothesis that dialogues in drama could be used as illustrations of authentic language in use while teaching pragmatics. For the aim of conducting this research, I propose the application of these concepts to understand the different elements involved in meaning making during interaction such as the context of the conversation and the relationship between the participants as well as how these elements affect the way language is used and interpreted. Moreover, since dramatic dialogues

catch the interest of language learners; they facilitate the comprehension of the pragmatic concepts and consequently help to develop the learners' pragmatic competence.

This research falls into three chapters: Theoretical Framework and Methodology, Results and Discussion of the Results. In the first chapter, Theoretical Framework and Methodology, I will attempt to define major concepts of pragmatics; the field of pragmatics and the pragmatic competence as well as the target pragmatic concepts of speech acts, politeness strategies and conversational management. In addition to that, I will lay out the methodology used for selecting and analysing the excerpts from the plays formerly mentioned. In the second chapter, Results, I will report the outcome of the analysis of the excerpts taking into consideration the three pragmatic concepts. In the third chapter, entitled Discussion of the Results, I shall present my interpretation of the results of the analysis of excerpts and how this analysis could be extended to help to teach and learn pragmatics through drama.

Chapter One

Theoretical Framework and Methodology

Introduction

This chapter presents the major concepts and the methodology underlying my research. For this aim, the chapter is divided into two sections. The first one is concerned with offering the theoretical background through a description of what is known as the field of pragmatics as well as the concepts included in the research. The second section succeeds to explain the procedures taken in order to obtain the results of the study.

In the theoretical background, I seek to explain pragmatics in the context of language teaching/ learning as well as the different concepts that will be explored later in the literary excerpts. This section starts by outlining the interests of the field of pragmatics. Then, it moves to dealing with the components of the pragmatic competence in L2 context. It presents a description of the theory of speech acts, their different types and classifications. More importantly, it explains the politeness theory by focusing on the different politeness strategies. Overall, the section shows how conversation works, and how it is systematically organized.

In the second section, I attempt to account for the methodology of the research. First, I will briefly report how data is selected from the target three plays. Then, I will describe how the excerpts shall be exploited using the target concepts. This will show a clear idea of how conducting such analysis can help to test the usefulness of these excerpts in teaching the target pragmatic concepts.

1.1Theoretical Framework

This section is devoted to the major concepts of pragmatics developed in this piece of research: pragmatics, pragmatic competence, speech acts, politeness theory and conversational management with reference to the major works which discuss these concepts.

1.1.1 Pragmatics: Definition of the Concept

The field of pragmatics is regarded to be a relatively recent field in language sciences. Mey (2006) states that its beginnings could be traced back to the work of Charles Morris around 1938[24]. Morris coined the term and defined it using the notion of signs. He states that pragmatics is considered to be the relations of signs to those who use the signs[25]. Mey (2006) opts for the replacement of the notion of signs with communication due the fact that this latter extends to include non-verbal elements. He also stresses the importance of viewing the users of the language not as isolated individuals but rather as social beings who are dependent on the context in which they live[26].

In the same vein as Morris, is George Yule's (1996) defines pragmatics as '*the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of these forms*'[27]. He distinguishes different components of studying pragmatics; the study of speaker meaning, the study of contextual meaning, the study of how more gets communicated than is said and the study of relative distance[28]. He believes that pragmatics allows for a much more profound analysis of human communication. This analysis could be somehow attained thanks to what he calls regularity[29]. This term refers to the patterns of behaviour that people have due to being members of the same social group. Therefore, the speech conventions of a specific social group are the centre of interest to the field of pragmatics. Van Dijk (1977) highlights:

> Pragmatics must be assigned an empirical domain consisting of conventional rules of language and manifestations of these in the production and interpretation of utterances. In particular, it should make an independent contribution to the analysis of the conditions that make utterances acceptable in some situation for speakers of the language[30].

[24] J. L. Mey , *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics* Vol. , 2nd ed., s.v 'Pragmatics overview' (Elsevier,2006).
[25] Ibid
[26] Ibid
[27] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p4.
[28] (Ibid:3)
[29] (Ibid: 4-5)
[30] In Lyle F. Bachman, *Fundamental considerations in language testing*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990),p89.

The speech conventions of a specific society lead the users to build expectations in their minds about how interaction takes place. The awareness of such conventions helps the language users to avoid communication breakdowns while interacting [31]. According to Verschueren (1999), the process of interacting is a continuous process of making communicative choices. It starts first by the addresser who chooses the linguistic forms, the linguistic strategy and the non-linguistic features accompanying them. The receiver of the message is also involved in this process because they have to make a choice about how to interpret this message[32]. Kasper (1997) refers to these choices as communicative actions[33]. He defines pragmatics as the study of these communicative actions as they appear in the socio-cultural context. For him, the language users are social actors who use language to attain goals and in the same time to maintain interpersonal relationships as they engage in communicative acts with other participants[34].

The field of pragmatics stresses the bonds between language and the socio-cultural context in which it is used. Bearing this in mind, Leech (1983) makes an important distinction concerning the domains of the pragmatic study of language[35]. He points that pragmatics comprises two domains; pragma-linguistics and socio-pragmatics. Pragma-linguistics is the domain of pragmatics that is related to linguistics. Thus, it concentrates on the study of the linguistic resources used for constructing specific messages. Socio-pragmatics, on the other hand, is culturally and sociologically based. It attempts to account for the socio-cultural conditions giving rise to specific linguistic actions.

Since different social groups may have different conventions and patterns of behaviour, the study of pragmatics is considered to be an essential component of foreign language learning.

---

[31] Paul Simpson, *Language Through Literature: An introduction*, (London: Routledge,1997), p130-131.

[32] Su Zou, '' Analysis of Fictional Conversations Based on Pragmatic Adaptation'' Journal of Language Teaching and Research Vol. 1, No. 2, p: 160-166, March 2010. p,160.

[33] Gaberiele Kasper, *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, 1997) http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/NW6citation.html accessed on 05/03/2017

[34] Ibid

[35] Geoffery N. Leech, *Principles of Pragmatics,* (London: Longman, 1983), p10-11.

Bardovi-Harlig and Taylor-Mahan (2003) share the same interests and goals of introducing the field of pragmatics into second and foreign language teaching/ learning: '*The teaching of pragmatics aims to facilitate the learners' sense of being able to find socially appropriate language for the situations that they encounter'*[36]. They assume that pragmatic rules are the secret rules of language because they are generally subconscious rules[37]. Therefore, it is important for language learners, university students of English and future teachers to be introduced to such a field of study with the aim of developing their own pragmatic competence through various means such as literature, films and so on and so forth.

1.1.2 Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatic competence is considered to be an important component of the communicative competence. Bachman (1990) is credited to be the first to incorporate it in his model of the communicative competence[38]. His model includes language competence, which reflects organizational competence (grammatical and textual) as well as pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence for Bachman (1990) comprises ' *the types of knowledge which [...] are employed in contextualized performance and interpretation of socially appropriate illocutionary acts in discourse'*[39] . These types of knowledge are categorized as illocutionary competence and sociolinguistic competence. The former is concerned with expressing and interpreting the language used to perform illocutionary acts which will be explained in detail later in this research. The later refers to the knowledge of the context and the conventions for appropriate use of these acts. These terms could be used to explain competences in the domains of pragmatics; pragma-linguistics and socio-pragmatics, which were explained in the above few lines.

---

[36] Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig and Rebecca Mahan, Taylor,eds., in *Teaching Pragmatics,*(Washington: United States Department of State, 2003),p1.
[37] Ibid
[38] Eva Alcón Soler and_Alicia Martínez-Flor, eds, *Investigating Pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing* (Bristol: Multilingual matters: 2008) ,p5.
[39] Lyle F. Bachman, *Fundamental considerations in language testing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990) p 98.

Although Thomas (1983) does not explicitly incorporate pragmatic competence in a model of a communicative competence, he illustrates how the lack of such competence can result in breakdowns of communication especially in cross-cultural contexts. He states that the pragmatic competence is a set of different types of knowledge that allow the language user to use the language and interpret it effectively in a given context. These types of knowledge are grammatical, psycholinguistic and social [40]. He points out that in a cross-cultural situation, there is a possibility of a pragmatic failure due to the differences in the pragmatic values[41]. He refers to the different domains of pragmatics described by Leech (1983), to point out the types of failure that could take place because of the lack of pragmatic competence[42]. Pragma-linguistic failure occurs when the linguistic resources used by the speaker do not fit well into the context whereas the socio-pragmatic one takes place as a result of misunderstanding of the social values in a given context.

Kasper (1997) argues for the importance of pragmatic competence when developing a second language[43]. Nonetheless, he raises the question whether this competence needs '*pedagogic intervention*'. He claims that pragmatic knowledge is universal. Thus, it is easy to transfer from L1 to L2, which he calls positive transfer technique. He argues that the concepts of conversation management, indirectness, power, social distance and others are found in many speech communities around the world. Some of these communities have similarities in speech conventions. Kasper gives the example of formal and informal language used in English and German requesting. He mentions that learners do not make use of the pragmatics universals they possess nor the positive transfer technique. Consequently, they need pedagogic intervention, not in form of teaching pragmatics, but rather as raising learners' awareness to use what is transferrable from pragmatics universals.

---

[40] Jenny Thomas. ' Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure.' *Applied Linguistics* 4 (1983): 92.
[41] (Ibid: 91)
[42] (Ibid: 99)
[43] Gaberiele Kasper, *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Centre, 1997) http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/NW6citation.html accessed on 05/03/2017

Whether pragmatics reflects universally shared values or remarkably different ones according to different speech communities, it is necessary for language educators to incorporate it in language teaching/learning situations. The aim for such action is to build the learners' communicative competence as a whole. First and foremost, learners need to develop the ability to analyse the social and cultural elements of a given context. They also need to develop the ability to interpret and use the different linguistic and non-linguistic resources in accordance to this context. This research discusses this aim in terms of three different concepts in pragmatic study of language; speech acts, politeness and conversational management.

1.1.3 Speech Acts

NICK: I've never hit an older man.[44]

When first noticing the structure of this statement, it might seem like Nick, a character in Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf,* wants to inform someone about the fact that he has never hit an older man. However, when referring to the context in which the statement occurs, this declarative sentence is actually a threat. Nick, in fact, is threatening his interlocutor, George - who is older than he is- after being provoked. What Nick wants to do with his words, threatening, is what we refer to by a speech act.

Speech acts are considered to stand for the actions people want to do with the words they use. Like any other action, they are intended to perform something, they have effects on the people around the speaker/ writer and eventually drive them to respond. Austin (1962) points out that utterances are not made only for making statements which might be true or false[45]. Some utterances are used to make exclamations, commands and wishes and these are called performative utterances. He explains that this name is derived from the verb '*to perform'*, and the noun associated with it is '*action'*[46]. He states that '*the uttering of the words is, indeed, usually a or, even, the leading incident*

[44] Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001) , p48.
[45] J.L Austin, *How to do things with words*, (Oxford: Oxford,1962), p2.
[46](Ibid:6)

in the performance of the act'[47] . In everyday English and in EFL/ ESL contexts such utterances are labelled by their function: apology, complaint, compliment, invitation ... etc[48].

There are three dimensions of meaning related to the use of a performative utterance: locutionary act, illocutionary act, perlocutionary act[49]. Locutionary act refers to the act of producing words, it refers to producing meaningful linguistic expression. For instance, making a speech act in a foreign language does not count as a locutionary act because the addressee does not understand the language. Illocutionary act is the communicative force behind this expression which is also called the illocutionary force. Perlocutionary act refers to the effect intended from a speech act. Short (1996) states that there are two levels of the perlocutionary act[50]. The first is the intended perlocutionary effect/ force which refers to the effect that the speaker wants to establish through his words. The second is the actual perlocutionary effect/ force which refers to the actual effect that the speech act causes. These levels of the speech act could be explained using the former example from Albee's play *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*:

NICK: I've never hit an older man.[51]

The locutionary act refers to the act of producing this meaningful message that is understood by the addressee. Bearing in mind the context of this line, its illocutionary force is meant to be a threat. The perlocutionary force of this act is to get the addressee, George, to stop his verbal attacks towards Nick. This is the intended perlocutionary force of Nick. If George gets intimidated by his threat, and it means that the actual pelocutinary act is the same as the intended one. On the contrary, if George does not stop, the intended perlocutionary act is not the same as the actual one.

Yule (1996) indicates that the most discussed of these aspects is the illocutionary force[52]. He argues that the same locutionary act may have different illocutionary forces. '*I'll see you later*' could be a promise, a prediction or a warning. The same utterance can have different functions according

[47] (Ibid: 8)
[48] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p47.
[49] J.L Austin, *How to do things with words*? (Oxford: Oxford,1962), p95- 107.
[50] Mick Short, *Exploring the Language of Poems*, *Plays and Prose*, (London: Longman, 1996)p,197.
[51] Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001) , p48.
[52] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford university press: 1996), p48.

to the event in which it occurs. This leads to the conclusion that no single utterance corresponds to a specific speech act[53]. This could be used as a strong argument for the importance of introducing speech acts in the classroom because it helps at teaching the learners how to interpret the utterances correctly as well as how to manipulate language to fit their communicative objectives.

Speech acts are classified into five types: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations[54]. This classification has been made by Searle (1973) in reference to different parameters. The most important ones are the difference in the purpose of the act, the difference in the direction of fit between the words and the world and the difference in expressed psychological states[55]. To say simply, Searle's classification makes a difference between an act which is meant to put an obligation on the speaker himself/herself, such as in the case of a promise, and an act which makes an obligation on the addressee, such as in the case of a request. The second parameter tries to explain how the uttered words fit into reality. In the case of promise, the speaker tries to change the world with their words, whereas in the case of assertions, the speaker attempts to use the words to match the world. The third parameter is concerned with distinguishing the attitude and the state of the speaker in each act.

Speech acts can be classified as:

- Representatives: they are meant to deliver what the speaker believes to be true, they include statements of facts, assertions, conclusions and descriptions[56].
- Directive speech acts: they include commands, orders, suggestions and requests. They are used in order to get something done by the addressee.[57]

[53](Ibid: p47)
[54] John R. Searle, 'A classification of Illocutionary Acts' (paper presented at Conference on Performances, Conversational Implicature, and Presuppositions, University of Texas, Austin, March 22-24, 1973) 34-37.
[55] (Ibid: 27-29)
[56] (Ibid: 34)
[57] (Ibid: 35)

- Commissives: they are related to acts which commits -as the name denotes- the speaker to a future action such as promises. [58]
- Expressives: they are speech acts which are made to express how the speaker feels they include acts such as thanking, congratulating and welcoming. [59]
- Declarations: as their name indicates, they declare something and they are meant to bring out a change in the world using words. When an employer, for example, tells an employee '*you're fired'*, his statement makes a change in the world as far as the employment is concerned.[60]

Speech acts can also be classified according to their directness. A speech act can be direct or indirect. Searle (1979) indicates that there are cases of speech acts in which the meaning that the speaker intends is expressed through a sentence that does not reflect that directly[61]. The sentence meaning and the intended meaning are not the same. He explains lengthily with the example *'I have to study for an exam'*. The sentence's primary illocutionary act is a rejection of an invitation, yet the literal meaning of the sentence is a statement about the fact that the speaker needs to study for a test[62]. Searle (1979) indicates that the ability to recognize the primary illocutionary act is through the felicity conditions of the act -which will be explained in few lines- the linguistic and non-linguistic shared background knowledge of the interlocutors, rationality, inference as well as the fact that most of these acts are conducted conventionally[63].

Yule (1996) links the indirectness of the speech acts to the grammatical mood of the sentence [64]. In this case the three sentence types; declarative, interrogative and imperatives are taken into consideration. Direct speech acts result from a direct relationship between the structure

[58] Ibid
[59] (Ibid: 36)
[60] (Ibid: 37)
[61] John R. Searle, *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1979), p 30.
[62] (Ibid: 33- 36)
[63] (Ibid: 31-32)
[64]George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p54-56.

and the function. If a declarative sentence is made to make a declaration, it means that the actualized speech act is direct. Whereas, if the declarative sentence is used to make a question, *'I noticed the curtains pulled down there next door as we came along'*[65], for example is used by one of the characters in an excerpt that is analysed later in the research to ask about whether his host has any neighbours. The speech act in this case is indirect. If an imperative sentence is used to make a command, then it is considered to be a direct speech act. However, if it is used to make an offer such in *' have some coffee'*, the utterance in this case is indirect. In a similar way, the interrogative sentence when used to express a question is labelled direct speech act. Yet, when it is used to make an offer for instance, such as in *'can I make someone a drink?'*[66], it is considered to be indirect.

The use of indirectness is generally associated with politeness. Thomas (1995) identifies other reasons for issuing indirect speech acts. The speaker may use an indirect speech act because he/she wants to make his/her words more interesting, or to add more force to their message or when he/she wants to deliver implicit messages[67]. In the example mentioned above '*I have to study for an exam*', the speaker attempts to decline an invitation politely without having to hurt their interlocutor by saying that they are not interested for instance. Searle (1979) mentions that indirect forms of speech acts are often made conventionally by specific speech community. He gives the examples of conducting directive speech acts in English[68]. For example, requesting someone to do something can take many conventional forms such as: *can you, could you, would you* …etc.

The recognition of certain speech acts is assisted by the speech event, illocutionary force indicating device or IFDS and it contextual conditions (felicity conditions). Speech event refers to

[65] Harold Pinter, *The Caretaker* (London: Methuen,1987),p12.
[66]Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001),p88.
[67] Jenny Thomas, *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics* (London: Routledge, 1995), p143-146.
[68] John R. Searle, *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1979), p 36-39.

the situation and the real-world circumstances in which the utterances take place[69]. For example, when considering the utterance that has been presented at the beginning of speech act discussion:

NICK: I've never hit an older man.[70]

The speech event in which it occurs helps at identifying it as a threat. Nick says that after being provoked by his host George.

Another way to recognize speech acts is through features of the utterances themselves. In this case, these features are called illocutionary force indicating devices or IFDS[71]. They include features such as stress, word order, tone, intonation and/or performative verbs. The performative verbs are verbs which state the intention of the speaker such as tell, warn, promise, ask...etc. For example:

PROSPERO: I do forgive
Thy rankest fault; all of them: and require
My Dukedom of thee. [72]

The verb require in Prospero's line is a performative verb because it indicates the illocutionary force of the utterance.

For the speech act to be conducted and recognized, there has to be specific conditions which are named felicity conditions. Austin (1962) was the first to introduce these conditions[73]. They were later developed by Searle (1969)[74]. Each speech act has specific contextual conditions to be successfully conducted. These conditions are outlined as follows:

- General condition: the participants can understand the language and they are not physically incapable to produce and understand language, joking, pretending or acting. This condition applies to all speech acts.

[69] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford university press: 1996), p 46-47
[70] Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001) , p48
[71] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford university press: 1996), p 49-50
[72] Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. (London: Penguin Popular Classics,2001),p89
[73] J.L Austin, *How to do things with words*? (Oxford: Oxford University Press ,1962), p 14-18.
[74] John R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), p 54-71.

- Sincerity conditions are concerned with how genuine the speaker/writer is concerning their speech act. If they request someone to do something, they genuinely want them to do what is requested.
- Preparatory conditions are concerned with the preconditions of the act. For a request, the speaker must believe in the interlocutor's ability to perform what is requested. Additionally, they normally would not do what is asked from them without requesting.
- Content conditions are concerned with the content of the utterance, for example, when making a request: it is about a future event for the addressee.
- Essential conditions are concerned with using the words to conduct the act. Therefore, when the addresser promises something to someone, s/he put themself under the obligation to do the promise through the use of words.

In his theory of speech acts and the way they are conducted, Searle do not attempt to provide socio-pragmatic explanation for how and when a specific speech act is used. Short (1996) in his analysis of language in drama makes important remarks concerning the relationship between speech acts with the social context in which they take place. He suggests that the patterns of speech acts used by a person can indicate their social background and their relationship with their interlocutors. For instance, a person's use of direct imperative directives acts is associated with being a powerful speaker[75]. In the distinction between the intended perlocutionary effect and the actual perlocutionary one, he states that generally a powerful speaker will have the actual perlocutionary act as they intend it to be, and vice versa[76].

The study of speech acts manifests the importance of studying pragmatics. They illustrate how communication can be implied or connoted and how words can mean more than they literally denote. Yule (1996) suggests that studying speech acts is important due to their usefulness in

[75] Mick Short, *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*, (London: Longman, 1996)p,195.
[76] (Ibid:197)

illustrating how to do things with words, how to use conventional utterances and how to analyse others' words and respond to them correctly[77]. These insights could be of a vital importance when stretched to involve language learning contexts. Learners of language need to be introduced to the different ways language is used. This gives them a great control over their linguistic resources. In addition, this helps them to interpret the language correctly in the different situations they encounter.

Having seen what people can do with language, how they can put words in different structures to perform different speech acts and how one speech act could be expressed using different structures, the next concept that will be explored is the concept of politeness. It is related to the speech act discussion because it aims at explaining what structure of a speech act is suitable for each situation. That is, it refers to the choice people make between different levels or structures of the same speech act according to different social situations.

1.1.4 Politeness

Talking about this term in pragmatics does not refer to fixed set of behaviours, etiquettes and high forms of language. It is rather a flexible notion because it is about making the right choice of language according to different situations. It is agreed on that the use of 'Sir' or 'Madam' as terms of address is usually polite; however, these terms are frowned upon when addressing a friend. This draws the attention to politeness as a linguistic as well as a social phenomenon discussed by different scholars in pragmatics and language philosophy. Among these are Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1987). In their book *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*, they seek to explain the mechanisms of politeness linking it to the concept of face. Their theory is considered to be a universal one which could explain politeness in different cultures and languages.

Politeness is tightly linked to the concept of face. The different strategies people employ to be polite should show an awareness of another person's face. Brown and Levinson (1987) define

[77] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford university press: 1996), p 58.

face as the public self- image. It is the emotional and social sense of self everyone has and everyone expects the others to recognize and sustain during interaction[78]. Each person has expectations concerning their self-image, and they also expect that this self-image would be respected by their interlocutors. The concept of face has two dimensions: positive face and negative face[79].Positive Face reflects the need to be accepted, liked and treated as a member of the group. It also reflects the wish to have one's interests, wants and likes shared and approved by others. Negative Face reflects the need for independence and freedom of action. Therefore, it represents the wish for not being imposed on by others, and for not being forced into actions or having one's actions impeded. Distinguishing these dimensions of face will be used later to explain the strategies of politeness that are used to maintain the interlocutor's face.

In addition to the concept of face, Brown and Levinson (1987) point out an important component that operates during interaction, which is rationality. This concept refers to logical reasoning in assessing one's different methods and choosing the best to achieve one's goals.[80] In terms of politeness theory, this takes place when the interlocutors attempt to choose the most appropriate strategy from several ones to respond to their interlocutor's face want.

The concept of face is always in operation during interaction. As mentioned formerly, the idea of politeness is about showing consideration to interlocutor's face. This consideration is best illustrated when there is a threat to their face in its both dimensions; positive and negative. Any act, verbal or non-verbal, that contains such a threat is called a face threatening act (FTA)[81]. FTAs towards the positive face wants include[82]:

- Acts that indicate negative evaluation of the interlocutor's face such as disapproval, criticism, insults and disagreements.

---

[78] Penelope Brown and Stephen R. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p61.
[79] (Ibid: 62-63)
[80] (Ibid: 64-65)
[81] (Ibid: 65)
[82] (Ibid: 66-67)

- Acts that show indifference towards the interlocutor's face through embarrassment and intimidation, bringing up inappropriate topics and interruption

FTAs towards negative face wants include[83]:

- Acts that limit the addresser's future action such as orders, requests, suggestions, advice, reminding, threats, warnings, challenges and dares.
- Acts that indicates a positive action towards the addresser which is done by the addressee such as offers and promises.
- Acts that indicate negative emotions or desire for the part of the addresser towards their addressee such as hate, anger, lust, compliments, envy and admiration. Such acts pressure the addresser to attempt to protect himself/ herself and their belongings due to the fact that their interlocutor actually wants to harm them or wants something from them.

The former examples of FTAs are mainly concerned with the face wants of the hearer or the addressee. Brown and Levinson (1987) identify other types of FTAs which are related to the negative as well as the positive face of the speaker/addresser himself[84]. The acts that threaten the speaker's negative face include acts that constraint and impede his actions such as:

- Acknowledging debt to the hearer through thanking them and accepting their offers.
- Accepting the addressee's apologies and thanks.
- Giving excuses to respond to their interlocutor's criticism.
- Having to avoid actions that displease the hearer.
- Making promises and offers unwillingly.

The acts that threaten the speaker's positive face include actions that leads to belittling or embarrassing oneself such as

- Losing physical and emotional control.

[83] (Ibid: 65-66)
[84] (Ibid: 67-68)

- Confessing and admitting guilt.
- Giving apologies and accepting compliments.

Even though FTAs are unavoidable, there are some strategies to perform them with minimum damage to the interlocutor face. These strategies are selected depending on three social factors: social distance, power difference, and the ranking of the imposition of the threat[85]. The degree of social distance is related to the frequency of the interaction and the exchange between the interlocutors. Power, as a social factor, refers to material, physical and metaphysical power. It refers to the control that one interlocutor has over the others. Imposition refers to what is required from the interlocutor as materialistic and non-materialistic services and goods. It should be mentioned that these elements are not the only factors influencing politeness strategies, there are other ones such as age, gender and social class [86]. These strategies selected to perform an FTA could be organized into two main types; off- record and on-record[87].

When an FTA is done off-record, it means that in the speaker's utterance there is no direct link between what is said and what is implied or wanted from the interlocutor to identify. The speaker in this case hints at the act they want to perform.[88] Off- the- record strategies allow the hearer great freedom to react in accordance or to resort to acting as they have not understood if they want. Therefore, they save the hearer's face in case of rejection due to the possibility of denying the intended act[89]. For example:

> **DAVIES.** You see, the trouble is, it's right on the top of my bed,
> you see? What I got to watch is nudging ... one of them
> gas taps with my elbow when I get up, you get my meaning?[90]

[85] (Ibid: 76-78)
[86] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p59.
[87] Penelope Brown and Stephen R. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987),P 68-71.
[88] (Ibid:69)
[89] (Ibid: 71)
[90] Harold Pinter, *The Caretaker* (London: Methuen,1987), p26.

Davies is talking about a stove that is situated on the tops of his head and how it is causing him trouble. He is indirectly requesting his interlocutor to remove it and displace it. One can notice that there is no direct link between what he says and his intended request from his interlocutor.

On the other hand, Performing FTAs could be done on-record when the speaker communicates clearly his/their intention and the act he/she wants to perform.[91] In *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?,* this example is found:

MARTHA: *May I have my drink, please?*[92]

Martha's request contains lexical items that denote what she wants from her interlocutor. Therefore, her request is on-record. On- record strategies could be; on-record baldly, positive politeness, or negative politeness.

On-record bald strategy is done through saying something baldly and directly without any attempt to show consideration for the interlocutor's face and redress the FTA. An example for this would be a command:

MARTHA" *Make the kids a drink, George.* [93]

Yule (1996) suggests that on record acts are used by interlocutors who are socially close or speakers who have more power than their interlocutors[94].

When speakers show consideration to their interlocutors' positive face. They demonstrate closeness and solidarity, stress common goals, attend to their wants and interests, and seek agreement. Some of the strategies identified with positive politeness include the following[95]:

1- Noticing and attending to the interlocutor's interests, wants, needs and goods.

---

[91] Penelope Brown and Stephen R. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987),p 69.

[92]Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001), p4.

[93] (ibid: p11)

[94] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p64.

[95] Penelope Brown and Stephen R. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987),p 101-129.

2- Exaggerating interests, approval and sympathy with the interlocutor this could be through the use stress, intonation and adverbs of attitude or degree such as *absolutely* and *really*.

3- Intensifying interest to the interlocutor. This could be done by including them in the conversation through tag questions and expressions such as *'you know what I mean?'*.

4- Using in-group markers such as the address forms *dear* and *mate* as well as similar register to the speaker's.

5- Seeking agreement by opting for safe topics while conversing.

6- Avoiding disagreement by resorting to techniques such as token agreement *'yes, but…'* and hedging opinions to show that it is difficult to disagree.

7- Presupposing, asserting and raising common grounds.

8- Joking.

9- Asserting knowledge and concern for the interlocutor's wants.

10- Offering and promising.

11- Being optimistic that the interlocutor has the same wants.

12- Including the interlocutor in the group by using the inclusive *we* and *let's*.

13- Giving and asking for reasons why the interlocutors have shared wants.

14- Assuming and asserting reciprocity in rights, obligations and debts.

15- Fulfilling the interlocutor's wants: this comprises satisfying both materialistic and emotional needs.

Negative politeness strategies are used to minimize FTAs and to attend to the interlocutor's negative face. Brown and Levinson (1987) observe that negative politeness strategies are the most common in western cultures[96]. Since they are concerned with the negative face, they should

[96] Penelope Brown and Stephen R. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987),p129- 130.

demonstrate distance, stress the importance of someone's independence and freedom of action. There are different strategies for accomplishing this successfully[97]:

1- Using indirectness: for example, when making a request, it is better to use an indirect speech act to perform it. Generally, the indirect forms of some speech acts such as requests and offers are conventional ones.

2- Using hedges: hesitation, mumbling and particles such as " kind of " help to illustrate that it is difficult for the speaker to embark on the FTA. This is a typical example from Pinter's *The Caretaker*:

NICK: May I use the ... uh ... bar? [98]

3-Being pessimistic: the speaker in this case can express that they are not sure having their FTA positively accepted. A good example comes from the same drama:

DAVIES (coming around). Eh, mister, just one thing ... eh
....you couldn't slip me a couple of bob, for a cup of tea,
just you know?[99]

4-Minimizing the imposition: the speaker in this strategy can belittle the imposition using adverbs of degree such as "tiny" or " little bit". The following example from Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* can illustrate this strategy:

HONEY: yes, I'd like a little more Brandy, may be just a drop[100].

5-Indicating deference: one can highlight deference through using polite address titles or through playing oneself down. For example: *" I am not good at this sort of thing ... can you help?"*[101]

6-Apologizing: the speakers in this case apologizes for the imposition they make and state excuses for doing so.

---

[97] (Ibid: 129- 211)
[98] Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001), p23.
[99] Harold Pinter, *The Caretaker* (London: Methuen,1987), p26.
[100] Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001), p2.
[101] Paul Simpson, *Language Through Literature: An introduction*, (London: Routledge,1997), p159.

7-Impersonalizing: the speakers can remove themselves from the FTA and use structures such as " it would be desirable if ..." or use the plural form " we inform you..."

8-Stating the FTA as a general rule: the speakers can remove themselves and state the conditions for the FTA as general ones and they have nothing to do with them.*" Smoking is not allowed in this department".*

9- Nominalizing: for example, it is much more polite to say '*It is my pleasure*' instead of saying '*I am pleased*' due to attaching the feeling directly to the actor.

10- Acknowledging the debt for a favour done by the interlocutor or disclaiming any debt for a favour done for them.

As shown above, politeness -as Brown and Levinson propose- is a set of strategies that the interlocutors must consider while interacting in order to avoid communication breakdowns. These strategies are dependent on the situation, the socio-pragmatic elements of social distance, power, and the degree of imposition. Therefore, politeness consists of the ability of choosing the appropriate strategy that fits in well with the communication situation. Learners of English are generally presented with fixed notion of politeness. For example, they are taught that the use of modals is the sole means for expressing politeness. However, most of the strategies detailed by Brown and Levinson are generally overlooked or taught in an implicit manner.

1.1.5 Conversational management

After presenting the concepts of speech acts and politeness strategies, the next step is to move from focusing on a single utterance into focusing on how utterances are connected in exchanges between the interlocutors. This inquiry is the main objective of conversation analysis. Before embarking on outlining the interests of this field and the different concepts related to it, it is important to define what a conversation is.

Conversation is *a ' form of linguistic communication*' [102]. It is a means through which people socialize, develop and sustain their relationships. The act of conversing does not exclusively consist of verbal communication, but it also includes body language, eye gaze and the real-world context in which all these take place[103]. Cutting (2002) defines conversation as '*...linear on-going event that unfolds little by little. It implies the negotiation of cooperation between the speakers along the way'*[104]. Conversation; then, is considered as a process in which utterances of different participants are linked to one another. Such a link is made by means of the utterances' functions.

Conversation analysis (CA) is a sociologically based approach to looking at the structure of conversation. This approach is influenced by the works of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson[105]. It seeks to explain how conversation is a social activity that is structured, organized and ordered thanks to the participants' socially shared procedures for achieving cooperation. It also accounts for how context shapes and simultaneously is shaped by conversation[106]. Unlike other means of discourse analysis, conversation analysis does not attempt to offer accounts for predetermined linguistic theories and concepts. Therefore, it uses '*an unmotivated looking'* approach in order to foreground the frequency of occurring patterns that emerge in real conversations[107]. These patterns are concerned with how speakers take turn while interacting and how their utterances affect the process of conversing. When speakers engage in a conversation, they generally have expectations concerning the shared social knowledge of their interlocutors. Generally, these expectations are concerned with having an intuition about what makes a well- formed conversation, the cooperation of the different participants, and the relevance

[102] Anthony J. Liddicoat, *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis,* (London: Continuum,2007),p1.
[103] Ibid
[104] Joan Cutting, *Pragmatics and Discourse* (London: Routledge, 2002),p28.
[105]Kiristen Malmkjær,ed., *The Linguistic Encyclopaedia*,(London and New York: Routledge, 1995)
[106] Anthony J. Liddicoat, *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis,* (London: Continuum,2007) p7.
[107] (Ibid: p9)

of what is said about the topic[108]. In order to analyse how conversations are structured, CA introduces two organization systems; turn taking and adjacency pairs.

1.1.5.1 Turn-taking

In every conversation, two or more participants are interacting, taking turns during specific duration of time, giving and taking back the floor in their conversational exchange. Although it appears that conversations are the least organized forms of discourse, they are actually well structured. The system of how long a participant has the floor and the patterns of turn-taking are culturally bound. They are conventionally governed by what is called local management system[109]. Conversation analysts suggest that turns are organized and negotiated by participants in the conversation and this is not governed externally. This happens during the time of interacting[110]. Sacks et al (1974) offer a model of analysing turn taking patterns. It is based on two main concepts; turn constructional unit (TCU) and turn allocation[111].

In a conversation, TCU refers to the elements that constitutes a turn. The knowledge of these elements helps the participants to detect possible turn completion, and therefore the possibility to take the turn to speak[112]. Although the linguistic structure of a TCU is a strong indication of the completion of a turn, it is not always the case. TCUs do not necessarily refer to complete grammatical structure. Any linguistic item can stand as a TCU[113]. For example: in this exchange, *Eh?* is considered to be a complete TCU standing on its own.

> **ASTON.** Welsh, are you?
> **Davies.** Eh?
> **Aston.** You Welsh?[114]

[108] Paul Simpson, *Language Through Literature: An introduction*, (London: Routledge,1997), p132.
[109] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)
[110] Anthony J. Liddicoat, *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis,* (London: Continuum,2007), p8.
[111] (Ibid: p54)
[112] (Ibid: 54-57)
[113] Ibid
[114] Harold Pinter, *The Caretaker* (London: Methuen,1987), p23.

Participants in a conversation can detect the completion of a turn through its grammatical structure, intonation and pragmatic function. *Eh?* in this example stands as a complete speech act. It refers to a request for repetition. Additionally, TCUs are context bound. Their elements are always detected in relation to the interaction is which they take place[115]. On the other hand, some turns tend to be extended because the speakers want to communicate more, even after a single TCU seemed to finish. For this aim, some indicators could be included such as listing devices (first of all, then ...etc and fillers such as *well, um* and *uh*[116] so that the conversation does not get interrupted. The following example indicates how Davies's utterance contains more than one TCU, yet he extends his turn using *huh* and *well*.

DAVIES. Sit down? Huh ... I haven't had a good sit down ... I haven't had a proper sit down ... well, I couldn't tell you .... [117]

When a speaker's turn is completed, other speakers are expected to take the floor and initiate another turn. Liddicoat (2007) indicates that there are two ways in which the participants can take turn in a conversation[118]. Either a speaker moderately allocates turn to the next speaker, or he/she *'self-select'* himself/herself. When a speaker selects the next, this could be done through address terms, or/ and the type of the talk and its context. If a speaker selects himself/herself, this means that there has been no indication who the next speaker is. These cases are concerned with the conversations of more than two participants. When conversations have only two participants, it is always clear who takes the next turn. No matter what way the speaker has the turn, the point of time in which they get it is significant to the structure of the conversation.

The point when a TCU is possibly completed, and there is a chance of another participant to take the turn is called a transition relevance place (TRP)[119]. Sometimes, though, the speakers do not

[115]Anthony J. Liddicoat, *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis,* (London: Continuum,2007), p57-60.
[116] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) ,p 75.
[117] Harold Pinter, *The Caretaker* (London: Methuen,1987) ,p7.
[118] Anthony J. Liddicoat, *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis, (*London: Continuum,2007*)* p57-60.
[119] (Ibid: 61)

wait for the TRP. As a consequence, interruptions and overlaps take place. Other times, none of the participants take turn. This results in a significant silence called attributable silence.

Interruptions take place when the speaker shows that they are not willing to wait the TRP to take their turns. Overlaps, on the other hand, occur when the speakers think that their interlocutor has finished their turn, but they, in fact, has not. Consequently, they end up speaking in the same time[120]. The frequency of interruptions and overlaps occurrence in a conversation is related to the social elements of the interaction[121]. They can denote a sense of distance and absence of familiarity that result in not finding a shared conversational rhythm. In other times, they can confirm closeness and familiarity, especially for young speakers[122].

NICK: Sir, I'm sorry if we ...

GEORGE [*with an edge in his voice*]***:*** You didn't answer my question. [123]

In this example, George does not wait for Nick's turn to be completed. He starts speaking before a TCU is completed, and before a TRP is distributed; thus, he interrupts him. His interruption implies a sense of unfriendliness between the two.

Silence, on the other hand, is also noteworthy. When somebody's turn is completed, they do not want to extend it, and they allocate the next turn to their conversational partner but instead of responding, they do no initiate their turn, the TRP will be characterized by a long pause. This silence is called attributable silence[124]. It is attributable to the next speaker in turn, and it is significant. It could be interpreted differently according to the context. It could be an affirmative response in some situations. In others, it could be understood as a negative response. For strangers or interlocutors who are not well familiarized, it just adds an awkwardness to the interaction[125].

MICK. What did they teach you?

Pause

---

[120] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996),p72.
[121] (Ibid: 73-74)
[122] Ibid
[123] Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001), p16.
[124] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p 73.
[125] Ibid

How did you like my bed?

Pause

That's my bed. You want to mind you don't catch a draught.[126]

The pauses after Mick's questions are significant. His questions are completed, the silence after them indicate a TRP; however, his interlocutor does not take the turn. The pause then becomes attributable to his partner and has an important interpretation in the light of the context of the conversation.

Another feature of turn-taking is backchanneling. It refers to the turn people take just to indicate that they are listening to their conversational partners and receiving their messages especially when they have extended turns. In order to do so, they use verbal or non-verbal signals as well. Non-verbal signals include head nods and facial expressions[127]. Verbal signals include expressions like: *'yeah'* and *'unh-hunh'* as the following example illustrates.

MARTHA: And Daddy built this college ... I mean, he built it
up from what it was ... it's whole life. He *is* the college.

NICK: Unh-hunh.[128]

The absence of backchanneling will be interpreted as if the interlocutor is not paying attention or is not agreeing with what has been said. Therefore, it requires that the speaker checks whether they are following[129]. In the following example, Prospero is telling Miranda some details about a past event. His turn is so long that he had to ask her if she is listening. *''Dost thou attend me?''*

PROSPERO: My brother and thy uncle, called Antonio—
I pray thee, mark me (that a brother should
Be so perfidious!)—he whom next thyself
Of all the world I loved and to him put
The manage of my state, as at that time
Through all the signories it was the first,
And Prospero the prime duke, being so reputed

[126] Harold Pinter, *The Caretaker* (London: Methuen,1987),p34.
[127] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) ,p 75.
[128] Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001),p41.
[129] George Yule, *Pragmatics,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) ,p 75-76.

In dignity, and for the liberal arts
Without a parallel. Those being all my study,
The government I cast upon my brother
And to my state grew stranger, being transported
And rapt in secret studies. Thy false uncle—
Dost thou attend me?

MIRANDA: Sir, most heedfully.[130]

There are different structures a conversation can have when conversation participants take turns. The discussion on turn management attempts to explain how participants take turn, how long they can have it, and when the next participant can contribute to the conversation. In addition to that, there are other possible structures that can result from interrupting, overlapping, pausing, or having a long turn. Although conversation analysts explain the mechanisms of turn-taking structure only in terms of what occurs during the interaction, one cannot deny how they are closely related to cultural and pragmatic elements and how they are influenced by them. Short (1996) explains how the power difference can affect turn taking mechanisms. He indicates that the most powerful speakers tend to have more turns than the rest of the participant initiate the exchanges, control the topics being discussed, interrupts and allocate turns to the rest[131]. This indicates that discussion on turn taking management can not go without reference to the socio-pragmatic context of the conversation.

1.1.5.2 Adjacency Pairs

Another aspect of how participants organize their conversation is related to adjacency pairs since conversations are organized in terms of functions such as invitations, requests, suggestions...etc. The occurrence of one speech act necessities a specific type of another speech act as a response. For example, when someone makes an invitation, it is expected from the addressee

[130] Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. (London: Penguin Popular Classics,2001),p28
[131] Mick Short, *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*, (London: Longman, 1996),p206

to respond either by accepting or declining[132]. Therefore, the acts are organized into pairs. Those acts frequently occurring together are called adjacency pairs. They are divided into two turns. The first turn is called first pair part (FPP) and the second turn is called second pair part (SPP) and they are related by means of relevance[133]. That is if someone initiates an FPP, yet their interlocutor's SPP is not in accordance with it, or it is met by silence, there would be a communication breakdown.

SPPs could be divided into two types: preferred and dispreferred. For example, when someone makes a request, a relevant SPP would be expected to be either an acceptance or a refusal. The occurrence of acceptance as a second part is more frequent than a refusal. The way in which people make an acceptance of a request are more direct and immediate than the one made for a refusal. Refusals are considered to be problematic for relationships and have to be done more elaborately[134]. Other examples for First Pair Parts and their Preferred Second Parts include: question/answer, offer/acceptance, invitation/acceptance, assessment/ agreement, greeting/greeting, complaint/ apology, blame/ denial[135]. Nevertheless, when participants want to produce a dispreferred response, they usually do not do that immediately. They either delay it or use certain devices to show that it is difficult for them to utter an unlikely expected response. These devices include hedges and token agreements[136]. It should be noted that these devices are strongly related to politeness strategies.

When talking about conversational analysis concepts, they are tightly related. Two concepts would be used to describe the same utterance from different approaches. SPPs and FPPs are considered to constitute turns. The first describe the adjacency pairs organization, and the second describes turn taking organization. The difference between the two, is that turns are successive; however, FPPs and SPPs are not necessarily successive as it shall be explained in few lines. Both

[132] Anthony J. Liddicoat, *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis,* (London: Continuum,2007) ,p105.
[133] (Ibid: p106)
[134] (Ibid: 110-111)
[135] Joan Cutting, *Pragmatics and Discourse* (London: Routledge, 2002), p30.
[136] Anthony J. Liddicoat, *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis,* (London: Continuum,2007) ,p113-115.

can be included in a broader term which is a sequence. There are different types of sequences: opening and closing sequences, pre-sequences, and insertion sequences[137]. Opening and closing sequences occur at the beginning and the end of the conversation. They include greetings at the beginning and farewells at the end. Pre-sequences occur as a preparation and introduction for a sequence or a pair such as pre-invitations, pre-requests and pre-offers. For example:

> **HONEY** [*to cover*]**:** What time is it, dear?
> **NICK:** Two-thirty.
> **HONEY:** Oh, it's too late ... we *should* be getting home.[138]

Honey, starts by asking about the time. When Nick answers her, she makes a suggestion for them to go home. Her suggestion is related to the sequence before it. That sequence could be called a pre-suggestion. Insertion sequence takes place in the middle of another sequence. SPPs are not necessarily successively and immediately distributed. The successive flow of the pair could be interrupted with another pair which is relevant to the whole topic of the main sequence. It could be illustrated using the following example:

> **ASTON.** Were you dreaming or something?
> **DAVIES.** Dreaming?
> **ASTON.** Yes.
> **DAVIES.** I don't dream. I never dream. [139]

Aston asks Davies if he was dreaming. Davies puzzlingly makes a rhetorical question which makes Aston confirms for him what he has heard. After the insertion sequence: rhetorical question-confirmation, Davies provides the SPP, answer, for Astons FPP, question.

The organization of sequences, pairs and turn taking patterns helps to illustrate how speakers mutually conduct their conversations and how they cooperate to make a successful communication. It also shows how sometimes communication breakdowns occur as a result of not maintaining a mutual conversational rhythm or simply refusing to cooperate. Such patterns are tightly linked to

---

[137] Ibid
[138] Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001),p 23-24
[139] Harold Pinter, *The Caretaker* (London: Methuen,1987), p23.

the context of conversations, the background of the participants and the objective behind the conversation. Therefore, conversational management is an important domain to be introduced in language study in general and in pragmatics in particular.

The above few pages aim to introduce some major concepts related to pragmatics in second/foreign language contexts with reference to the plays under study. I attempted to present brief definitions for these concepts and give reasons for supporting the claim that they are important to be dealt with in the classroom. The next section of this chapter is dedicated to explaining how excerpts from drama are selected and analysed for the aim of using them as instructional resources for the target pragmatic concepts.

1.2. Methodology

1.2.1. Research Method

The conduct of this research relies heavily on the application of pragmatic concepts to discourse and dialogues in drama. The dialogues in the three plays; Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, Albee's *Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and Pinter's *The Caretaker* are approached in the light of speech act theory, politeness strategies and conversational management. Through the application of the pragmatic analysis of the plays, this research aims at giving accounts for how the context and the backgrounds of the characters affect their strategies and choice of words. Therefore, it attempts to explain the reasons for the specific choice of utterances and their specific organization in conversations. This helps to illustrate the importance of contextual consideration and the socio-pragmatic elements while communicating. This could be used in the classroom to explain the target pragmatic concepts. The analysis conducted is based on considering the assumption that the dramatic dialogue is similar to everyday dialogue as formerly discussed in the introduction. Therefore, the tools of analysis applied on everyday conversations to highlight the pragmatic concepts operating while conversing would be useful on dialogues in drama.

1.2.2. Data Selection and Research Procedure

The three plays selected for the aim of conducting this study are Shakespeare's *The Tempest,* Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and Pinter's *The Caretaker*. Students of English throughout Algerian universities encounter these plays among others as a part of their departments' syllabi. In my study, I attempt to give new ways of approaching these plays in class using them as materials to explore concepts of pragmatics.

The three plays are deliberately chosen from different time periods which allows for a much more variety of contexts and language usage exploration. Shakespeare's play was written around 1611 while the other two plays were written in the early 1960s. *The Tempest* was written in times when language was considered to be a divine gift and a powerful tool. Literature produced during this period explores power in court and in imperial contexts. In the play, this is reflected through the power status that Prospero has over the rest of characters. Edward Albee and Harold Pinter's plays belong to the Theatre of the Absurd or the Theatre of Language. Such style of theatre explores the problematic of language as well as the issue of communication failure and socio-pragmatic breakdowns that result from feelings of distance and alienation in post-World War II context. Therefore, the choice of the three plays reflects the different states of language in regard to the socio-pragmatic aspects and power and social distance.

The analysed data is selected from the characters' utterances and dialogues in the plays. The purpose of this study is to account for how the characters language use could offer illustrative examples for classroom exploitation to explain the pragmatic concepts of speech acts, politeness and conversational management. In order to select excerpts to be analysed, a reading of the plays would be conducted for the aim of looking for instances where the utterances of the characters and their dialogues best illustrate the pragmatic and contextual backgrounds that are in operation.

For the speech act analysis, I shall attempt to highlight the way characters choose specific structures to construct different types of speech acts. After drawing the attention to the structure, a

link would be established between the contextual and social background of the interaction and the speech act. This would explain why the specific speech act is produced and interpreted in a specific way.

Furthermore, I shall highlight the politeness strategies chosen by the characters in different speech situations. Some characters' strategies would be appropriate to the context and others are not. They would be singled out with the aim of eliciting the reason why they are appropriate focusing on the link between the socio-pragmatic elements and the language use. However, some characters tend to sound impolite due to their inappropriate politeness strategies. I shall elicit these strategies in order to account for their inappropriateness, and the possibility to engender communication breakdowns.

For the last concept to be applied, conversational analysis, I will select some typical examples of turn taking and adjacency pairs to show how turn taking and pair patterns function in conversations and how these patterns are shaped by the context of interaction. Such analysis can demonstrate whether the communication is successful or not.

Overall, the selected data is based on how the parameters of the social distance, power difference, age, gender, the background story and the objective of the interaction can account for the specific choice of speech acts, the specific politeness strategy and the way the characters organize their conversation. Some characters take in consideration those pragmatic parameters and others do not just as in everyday life communication. In the first case, this results in a smooth successful communication. In the second case, the consequence is the breakdown of the communication. In this piece of research, I will concentrate on both cases for the sake of contrasting good and bad ways of communicating and illustrating for the students the dos and don’ts in communication in terms of pragmatics.

Summary

Establishing drama as a resourceful instructional material for explaining pragmatic concepts is the claim upon which my whole study is based. Throughout the first chapter, I have offered insights into the theoretical framework and the research method that underlie the conduct of this study. I have explained the target pragmatic concepts as well as how I would utilize excerpts from the plays to assess my claims.

In the theoretical framework, I attempted to clarify the theory of speech acts, politeness strategies and conversational analysis as pragmatic concepts. Along with the explanation, I have provided examples from the plays under study to illustrate how the concepts function, and how they are realized linguistically. First, I defined what is meant by a speech act. This term refers to what people want to achieve through the words they say. After defining them, I have proceeded to show their different types, how they are, also, divided according to their structure into direct and indirect, and how they have different levels of analysis; locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary. Then, I have moved to the subsequent concept that my research is interested in, which is the politeness phenomenon. This pragmatic concept is based on the concept of face and how people can attend in an appropriate way to the face of their interlocutors. I discussed the different strategies by which people can achieve that. For the third concept, which is conversational management, I have defined briefly the term of conversation, and followed it up by outlining what conversation analysis is and how it can be conducted to account for the different ways people organize their conversation through turns and pairs. All the three concepts I have presented were discussed along with how the different contextual and social factors that can affect their conduct.

In the second section, entitled methodology, I have reported the research method and the data selection procedures. In order to illustrate the resourcefulness of drama in explaining pragmatics, excerpts from the targeted plays should be selected. This is done through going through the plays and highlighting the instances where the previously discussed concepts are in

operation, how characters show specific patterns in their conduct of those concepts, how this can affect the context as a whole, and most importantly how they are related to the socio-pragmatic element of communication.

Chapter Two

Results

Introduction

Having presented the main objectives of this research, the theoretical framework and the methodology underlying its conduct in the first chapter. The second chapter follows up with the aim of foregrounding the concepts discussed formerly, speech acts, politeness and conversational management, in excerpts from Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and Pinter's *The Caretaker*.

The aim of this chapter is to present detailed analysis of the pragmatic concepts functioning during a dialogue. In the same time, it aims at illustrates how these concepts are related to the dialogue's social context. Thus, it tries to explain how the social backgrounds of the characters and their relationships affect their utterances and their interaction. Moreover, it attempts to highlight instances when the characters' utterances and strategies are pragmatically correct resulting in a smooth interaction concurrently drawing the attention towards instances when the characters' use of language is not pragmatically appropriate, and how this engenders a social conflict.

Accordingly, this chapter is divided into three section, each of them is devoted to one of the three plays. Each section is started with the plot summary of the play before the results yielded from the analysis of the plays are laid down as far as speech act analysis, politeness theory analysis and conversational analysis are concerned.

2.1 William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*:

The play was written by William Shakespeare around 1610 -1611 and first performed in 1611. It is a five-act play belonging to the tragic comedy genre. Thus, it contains elements of both,

tragedy and comedy. Shakespeare presents before the audience in this play some near fatal tense accidents. After that, the play resolves with a happy ending of marriage and forgiveness.

Twelve years before the events of the play Prospero, the former Duke of Milan, got his dukedom usurped by his brother, Antonio, with the complicity of the king of Naples, Alonso. He flee his land with the help of a nobleman called Gonzalo, who set him with his books and his daughter and adrift on the sea. He lands on an island near Algiers ruled by Sycorax, a witch who had been exiled there. Prospero uses his magic to get rid of Sycorax and enslave the good spirit Ariel and Sycorax's son Caliban.

Both, Ariel and Caliban become the servants of Prospero. Caliban, who is described in the play as a deformed monster, believes that the island is his. He has a tense relationship with Prospero. Prospero mentions his numerous favours to the unthankful Caliban as how he tried to teach him language. However, their relationship deteriorated upon the attempt of Caliban to rape Miranda.

Some of these details are unveiled when Prospero decides after twelve years upon his landing on the island to inform his daughter on the major motive behind the tempest which the play starts off with. Prospero, with the help of Ariel, creates a wild tempest to entangle a ship on board of which there are his brother, Antonio, the King of Naples, Alonso, his brother, Sebastian, his son, Ferdinand, the nobleman Gonzalo along with other noblemen and mariners on their way back from Tunis. The events of the play show that the tempest was just a reason to make those on board believe that they are shipwrecked and to strand them upon the island in separate groups. All for the sole aim of what it appears to be Prospero's revenging plan.

During the tempest, the people on board split into groups. The mariners are locked in the ship ashore and are induced to sleep by Ariel. The king, his brother, Sebastian, Prospero's brother, Antonio, Gonzalo, other noblemen and some courtiers are stranded together. The third group

consists of Stephano, the king's butler, and Trinculo, the court's jester are also stranded in another place on the island. As for the king's son, Ferdinand, he is cast upon the shore alone.

The king desperately launches a search for his son. During their search, Antonio proposes that Sebastian kill his brother, the king, while he and the rest of the group are asleep and by that he can become the king of Naples. However, Ariel wakes the group up and saves the king's life. Ferdinand, on the other hand, still thinks that he is the only survivor. In accordance to Prospero's plans Ferdinand meets Miranda. Both of them fall in love on first sight. It is part of Prospero's plan to achieve a royal marriage between the ruling family of Naples and the true ruling family of Milan. Yet, before executing the plan, Ferdinand has to go through some of Prospero's tests that he successfully pass. On another part of the island, Stephano and Trinculo encounter Caliban. Stephano gives Caliban a taste of the liquor he carries with him. Delighted by its effect, Caliban proclaims Stephano as his god. He urges him to become the ruler of the island and urges him to kill Prospero in order to achieve that.

In the final scene of the play, all the enemies of Prospero, stand before him. His brother who usurped his title, the king of Naples who conspired with him, the members of the court as well as Caliban and his new allies wait to be punished for their betrayal. However, Prospero is not of revenging character. He changes his revenging plans and resolves to forgive them all, having his daughter married to the king's son and leaving the island to Ariel and Caliban.

2.1.1 Analysis of the Play

2.1.1.1 *The Tempest* Speech Act Analysis

The analysis of different exchanges in the play illustrates how different characters use language to get things done and to perform different actions. There is a considerable difference in the way characters perform speech acts depending on their social background. This is also affected by the relationship between characters and the context of their interaction. This play contains a variety of examples that present the relationship between a character with considerable amount of

power with a character with little power in comparison such as master-servant and king-nobles relationships. Many dialogues illustrate how these characters address each other using direct or indirect speech acts and how this use can affect the exchanges.

Prospero uses different forms of speech acts when addressing different characters in the play, these forms are affected by the relationship of Prospero to them. In the following exchange, Prospero orders his slave Caliban to finish his assigned chores.

PROSPERO: What hoa: slave: Caliban:
Thou earth, Thou: speak.
CALIBAN: There's wood enough within.
PROSPERO: Come forth I say, there's other business for
thee:
Come thou tortoise, when?[140]

Few lines later, Prospero issues his order:

PROSPERO: Hag-seed, hence:
Fetch us in fuel. And be quick thou'rt best,
To answer other business: shrug'st thou, malice?
If thou neglect'st, or doest unwillingly
What I command, I'll rack thee with old cramps,
Fill all thy bones with aches, make thy roar,
That beasts shall tremble at thy din.[141]

It could be noticed that Prospero wants Caliban to get some wood cut for fuel. He uses directive speech acts and specifically orders. He uses direct speech acts. That is, there is a direct link between his use of the imperative structure, the lexical items and the orders. First, he orders him to speak because he is somewhere ignoring his calls, hence, he uses a direct speech act: *Speak.* When Caliban objects to his master anticipating that he is about to order him to get wood. He complains saying '*There's wood enough within'*. Prospero commands him to come out: '*Come forth I say'*. After few lines, Prospero orders Caliban to go away saying '*hence'*. He commands him to bring

[140] William Shakespeare, *The Tempest,* (London: Penguin Popular Classics,2001), p37.
[141](Ibid: 39)

wood and act upon his orders directly *Fetch us in fuel. And be quick.* A direct commissive speech act with threatening illocutionary force follows up. He threatens him if he disobeys or performs his commands reluctantly.

I'll rack thee with old cramps,
Fill all thy bones with aches, make thy roar,
That beasts shall tremble at thy din.[142]

Although Caliban always mumbles about Prospero's orders, he eventually set himself to do them. What makes Caliban afraid of his master's threats is that he is sure about his ability to execute them. The intended perlocutionary effect of Prospero's utterances is always the same as the actual perlocutionary one. This explains why Caliban is afraid.

CALIBAN: No, pray thee,
I must obey, his' Art is of such power,
It would control my dam's god Setebos,
And make a vassal of him.

The way in which Prospero addresses his other slave, Ariel, does not differ much from the way he addresses Caliban. He uses direct speech acts. This is due to the power difference between the two. However, it could be noticed that since Ariel appears to be a more obedient slave than Caliban is, Prospero tends to use a less sharp language, especially when giving feedback and reward concerning Ariel's performance. Nonetheless, there is an instance in which Ariel objects on the duty assigned to him unless Prospero fulfils his promise to free him. As a consequence, Prospero has to remind Ariel of their statuses and that he has stepped over the limits.

The exchange starts as a normal interaction between a master and a slave:

ARIEL: All hail, great Master, grave sir, hail: I come
To answer thy best pleasure; be' to fly,
To swim, to dive into the fire: to ride
On the curl'd clouds: to thy bidding, task
Ariel and his quality

[142] Ibid

PROSPERO: Hast thou, spirit.

Performe'd to point, the tempest that I bade thee?

ARIEL: To every article ...[143]

He proceeds to give details of how he has launched the storm and how the people on board react answering questions posited by Prospero. Prospero responds to him positively:

PROSPERO: My brave spirit[144],

After few lines:

PROSPERO: Ariel, thy charge

Exactly is perform'd; ...[145]

In terms of illocutionary acts analysis, Ariel first starts with greeting his master, then he promises that he will accomplish all Prospero's commands. Prospero asks to check whether what he has ordered is properly fulfilled. When he received satisfactory confirmation that what has been expected is what has been done, he issues a positive feedback.

Immediately after the former exchange, Prospero wants to set Ariel on a new mission. Instead of abiding by his master's orders, Ariel starts to complain and reminds Prospero of the ultimate reward of freedom, that the latter promised him and has not made true.

PROSPERO: Ariel, thy charge

Exactly is perform'd; but there's more work:

What is the time o' th'day?

ARIEL: Past the mid season.

PROSPERO: At least two glasses: the time 'twixt six and

now

must by us both be spent most preciously.

ARIEL: Is there more toil? Since thou dost give me pains,

Let me remember thee what thou hast promis'd,

Which is not yet perform'd me.

---

[143] (Ibid: 32-34)

[144] (Ibid: 33)

[145] (Ibid: 34)

PROSPERO: How now? moody?

What is thou canst demand?

ARIEL: My liberty.

PROSPERO: Before the time out? No more[146].

Prospero asks for the time to urge Ariel that there is no time to waste, and there are other things that need to be attended to. To this, Ariel responds with a question '*Is there more toil?'* Although the form of the speech act is a rhetorical question, its illocutionary force is meant to be a complaint. Ariel does not expect an answer to this question. He rather wants to express his complaint that his reward is not delivered in accordance to the promise made by Prospero. Even though there is no lexical link between the sentence and its illocutionary force, Prospero recognizes its primary illocutionary point. As a response, Prospero poses rhetorical questions as if addressed to a child: '*How now? Moody?'*, he says before he asks what Ariel could ask for. When Ariel reveals that he is asking for his promised freedom. Prospero orders Ariel not to say anything again about that subject until it becomes timely. As noticed in the exchange he first asks a question '*Before the time out?'* yet his objective is not to get an answer from Ariel, but rather as an exclamation for Ariel's demand that takes place before its time.

Ariel, then, starts to beg his master. He uses the performative verb '*prithee*' which is a short form for *' I pray thee'* that refers to pleading and begging someone. He begs his master to remember all the services he has done for him, and how he has conducted them with no complaining. He also reminds him that he has promised him to take a full year from his sentence as a reward.

ARIEL: I prithee, Remember I have done thee worthy service,

Told thee no lies, made thee no mistakings, serv'd

Without grudge or grumblings. Thou dids't promise

To bate me a full year[147].

[146] Ibid

[147] Ibid

In the verses that follow, Prospero reminds Ariel of all the torments he suffered before finding him and releasing him from the clutches Sycorax, the witch, for refusing to abide to her orders. He threatens to punish him the same way. What is noteworthy about Prospero's words is the way he constructs his speech acts. Let us take an example:

PROSPERO: Doest thou forget
From what a torment I did free thee?
PROSPERO: Thou liest, maligant thing: Hast thou forgot
The foul which Sycorax, who with age and envy
Was grown into a hoop? Hast thou forgot her?[148]

Again, we can notice a mismatch between the locutionary force and the illocutionary one. Prospero use an interrogative structure to make a question. However, this question is not intended to get a direct answer from Ariel. These questions function as pre-sequences, which were explained in the first chapter in the conversational analysis section. They are intended to bring up the story of how Ariel was saved for the sake of reminding him of his master's favours and reminding him at the end that he will face the same fate and sufferings as the one of Sycorax punishment if he ever complains again. Prospero threatens Ariel openly:

PROSPERO: If thou more murmur'st, I will rend an oak
And peg thee in his knotty entrails till
Thou hast howled away twelve winters.[149]

After this threat, Prospero promises Ariel that he will set him free if the latter begs for forgiveness and promises that he will do his tasks as ordered.

ARIEL: Pardon, Master. I will be correspondent to command
And do my spiriting gently.
PROSPERO: Do so, and after two days,
I will discharge thee.[150]

[148] (Ibid: 35)
[149] (Ibid: 36)
[150] Ibid

The next excerpt to analyse is the one in which Prospero faces his brother and demands his dukedom back. When going through Prospero's utterance, one could notice that even though his brother has betrayed him and usurped his title, the way in which he orders him to give it back is not a direct as the orders he makes for Caliban and Ariel.

PROSPERO: For you, most wicked sir, whom to call brother
Would even infect my mouth, I do forgive
Thy rankest fault; all of them: and require
My Dukedom of thee, which perforce I know
Thou must restore.[151]

In this utterance, Prospero does not use an imperative structure to order his brother to give him back his title. He rather uses a declarative structure '*(I) require my Dukedom of thee which perforce I know thou must restore'*, which makes the speech act indirect. The indirectness of the speech act as well as the employment of the verb '*require*' can have a substantial consequence on the force of the directive speech act. He adds *'you must restore*' which is also a directive speech act meant to be an order, yet it is an indirect one. One of the reasons that probably makes Prospero use this strategy to form his speech act is that his brother is of a noble of a high social status. The other one could be due to his loss of his magical powers which makes him less powerful.

Few lines before these lines, the aspect of the usurped dukedom is brought up. This time in an utterance directed towards the King of Naples.

PROSPERO: Behold Sir King
The wronged Duke of Milan, Prospero:
For more assurance that a living Prince
Does now speak to thee, I embrace thy body,
And to thee, and thy company. I bid
A hearty welcome.
ALONSO: Whe'er thou be'st he or no,
Or some enchanted trifle to abuse me,

[151] (Ibid: 89)

(As late I have been) I not know: thy pulse
Beats as of flesh, and blood: and since I saw thee,
Th' affliction of my mind amends, with which
I fear madness held me: this must crave
(And if this be at all) a most strange story.
Thy Dukedom I resign, and do entreat
Thou pardon me my wrongs: but how should Prospero
Be living and be here. [152]

One may wonder if there is no indication that Prospero demands his dukedom from Alonso, yet, he says '*Thy Dukedom I resign'*. It is true that Alonso conspired with Anthonio to usurp his brother's dukedom, nevertheless, he is still addressed respectfully by Prospero due his high rank. Prospero employs an indirect directive speech act to imply his demand for the restoration of his title. He just says *'Behold Sir King The Wronged Duke of Milan, Prospero'* to introduce himself to Alonso. He does not think that he needs to say much more about the matter, given the fact that Alonso knows the background story and that Prospero is probably is the one behind the strange incidents that happened to him.

2.1.1.2 *The Tempest* Politeness Analysis

As formerly mentioned in the first chapter, politeness accounts for the strategies the people make in order to deliver their messages especially when the face of their interlocutor is threatened. Thus, it represents the different choices that they can choose from in order to construct their utterances. When choosing, they should refer to the different socio-pragmatic factors involved in the situation. These factors include the social background of their interlocutor as well as theirs and the nature of the delivered message. There are different instances in *The Tempest* that could work as illustrative examples of this concept. The characters' interactions could account for how the different strategies the characters make are influenced by the situation, the degree of social distance, the power difference and the degree of imposition. Some interactions represent how the

[152] (Ibid: 88)

character makes use of appropriate politeness strategies which result in a successful interaction. Others indicate how the character chooses inappropriate strategies ending up in rudeness.

The play starts with a scene where men are on deck concerned about their safety due to a raging tempest. The ship carries some high-ranking officials from Naples and Milan. The boatswain asks them to stay below deck so as not to get themselves hurt[153].

ALONSO: Good Boatswain, have care. Where's the master?
Play the men.
BOATSWAIN I pray now, keep below.
ANTONIO Where is the Master, Boatswain?
BOATSWAIN Do you not hear him? You mar our labor.
Keep your cabins. You do assist the storm.
GONZALO Nay good, be, patient.
BOATSWAIN When the sea is. Hence! What cares these
roarers for the name of king? To cabin, silence! Trouble
us not.
GONZALO Good, yet remember whom thou hast aboard.
BOATSWAIN None that I more love than myself. You are
a councillor. If you can command these elements to
silence, and work the peace of the present, we will not
hand a rope more. Use your authority. If you cannot
give thanks you have lived so long, and make yourself
ready in your cabin for the mischance of the hour, if it
so hap.—Cheerly, good hearts!—Out of our way, I say.[154]

Gonzalo's line '*Good, yet remember whom thou hast aboard.*' is intended to remind the Boatswain that his way of addressing does not correspond well with the people he is talking to and that his words are not appropriate. The utterances the boatswain used to ask / order the noblemen to return below deck are as follows:

I pray now, keep below.

[153] (Ibid: 23-24)
[154] Ibid

You mar our labor. Keep your cabins. You do assist the storm.

Hence! What cares these roarers for the name of king? To cabin, silence! Trouble us not.

Out of our way, I say.

When analysing the Boatswain's utterances, it could be noticed that he uses bald on-record orders for the noblemen except for one line when he adds *'I pray now'* in which he pleads them to leave the deck for their cabins. It seems that they are adding more troubles for him and the mariners. So, he orders them again to keep their cabins. Because of the context where rank does not count, he points out that the dangers of the sea take no account for their titles and so does he. He orders them again to keep silent and get back to their cabins. It is true that what they are experiencing is a life or death situation. However, the noblemen still expect the people working for them to address them in a polite way. The Boatswain does not care for the social status and power difference. Therefore, his utterances are considered rude.

The same strategy used by the Boatswain is not considered to be rude if we change the situation to contain a figure in power addressing another one less powerful in comparison. For example, when Prospero addresses Ariel and Caliban, his servants.

PROSPERO: What, hoa: slave: Caliban:

Thou earth, speak.[155]

PROSPERO: Come forth I say, …[156]

PROSPERO: PROSPERO: Hag-seed, hence:

Fetch us in fuel. And be quick thou'rt best,...[157]

Prospero addressing Ariel:

PROSPERO: Come away, servant, come; I am ready now,

Approach my Ariel, come.[158]

PROSPERO: Go make thyself like a nymph o' th' sea, be subject

To not sight but thine, and mine: invisible

To every eye ball else: go take this shape

[155] (Ibid: 37)
[156] Ibid
[157] (Ibid: 39)
[158] (Ibid: 33)

And hither come in 't: go: hense with deligence.[159]

These orders by Prospero are bald on-record and contain no strategies to redress the threat towards the faces of Ariel and Caliban. Prospero thinks he does not have to take into consideration the face of his servants no matter what the imposition is due to the fact that he is their master. Nonetheless, towards the end of the play he tends to insert some strategies to redress his FTAs, especially with Ariel, his favourite servant.

PROSPERO: Why, that's my dainty Ariel: I shall miss thee,
but yet thou shalt have freedom: so,so, so.
To the king 's ship, invisible as thou art.
There shalt thou find the mariners asleep
Under the hatches: The master and the boatswain
Being awake, enforce them to this place;
and presently I prithee.[160]

At the beginning he addresses Ariel saying *my dainty Ariel*. He admits he is going to miss him but he is going to get his freedom anyway. All these are in fact done for the aim of attending to Ariel's positive face wants. Before making his FTA, which is an order, he repeats the word *'so'* three times, which is a politeness strategy attending to the negative face of the addressee. It shows that it is a little hard for him to make this imposition. He adds *'I prithee'* which is another negative politeness strategy.

This also could be noticed with his last order for Caliban in the play.

PROSPERO: …go, sirrah, to my Cell,
Take with you your companions. As you look
To have my pardon, trim it handsomely.[161]

The difference between the ways Prospero addresses Caliban in the first act of the play and the fifth one is what foregrounds these lines. In the first act he calls him *slave* and *earth*, whereas in

[159] (Ibid: 36)
[160] (Ibid: 89)
[161] (Ibid: 95)

these lines he calls him '*sirrah'*. Even though Caliban was plotting to kill him, this time Prospero does not include threats with his order. He uses a promise of forgiveness '*As you look to have my pardon*'. These strategies are used to attend even in a slight way to Caliban's positive face wants.

The question that arises from the comparison between the way Prospero addresses his servants at the beginning of the play and its end is about the reasons that make him inclined to opt for these strategies. For Ariel, it could be argued that he has always executed Prospero's commands exactly as he wished. This makes his master satisfied with his performance. However, this is not the case for Caliban, who according to Prospero's account has always been unthankful and even tried to rape his daughter, and who always responds to Prospero's commands in cursing. This has made Prospero resort to his magical powers constantly to impose on him. The change that occurs towards the end of the play concerning Prospero's politeness strategies could be a result of Prospero's abandonment of his magical powers and his decision to desert his revenging plots in favour for more forgiving tendencies. This has made him appear more permissive and friendly towards his servants.

The directness of utterances does not necessarily always refer to the power difference between the interlocutors. It can also account for the degree of familiarity between them. Prospero and his daughter's interactions throughout the play represent normal father-daughter exchanges. Such exchanges imply a great degree of familiarity due to the blood relationship and a slight difference in the degree of power due the nature of relationship.

MIRANDA: If by your Art (my dearest father) you have
Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them …[162]

PROSPERO:… wipe thou thine eyes, have comfort, …
sit down,
For thou must now know farther. [163]

[162] (Ibid: 25)
[163] (Ibid: 26)

Miranda does need complicated politeness devices when making a request from her father to ask him to put an end to the storm. She uses the direct imperative form *'Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them'*. Similarly, Prospero uses direct forms to request his daughter to wipe her eyes and sit down. She addresses him using *'my dearest father'* as a way of attending to his positive face. She also uses the plural possessive adjective form *'your'* instead of *'thy'* to indicate deference and to attend to his negative face. The positive and negative politeness she uses are a result of the slight power difference between the two.

When using the same directness in a situation where the degree of social distance is great, it may end in an awkward situation and getting dubbed as impolite. This could be illustrated in the interaction when Prospero and Miranda met Ferdinand. Ferdinand introduces himself as king since he thinks his father is dead. To this, Prospero accuses him of lying, being a spy and wanting to take his land, which is just an excuse to imprison him and test the love that is going to unfold between him and his daughter as planned.

PROSPERO: … A word, good sir,
I fear you have done yourself some wrong: A word.
MIRANDA: Why speaks my father so ungently?...
PROSPERO Soft, sir, One word more…
One word more. I charge thee
That thou attend me Thou dost here usurp
The name thou owest not, and hast put thyself
Upon this island, as a spy, to win it
From me, the lord on 't.[164]

Miranda makes the remark that her father speaks *'ungently'* that is in an impolite manner. This remark is made due to the fact that her father is using a direct speech act. In addition, he is accusing his interlocutor. This is considered a direct threat to Ferdinand's negative and positive face. The

[164] (Ibid: p42)

threat to Ferdinand's negative face is done through imposing on him without using any repressive device. The threat to his negative face is the direct accusations that Prospero has made.

Ferdinand, on the other hand, upon his first meeting with Miranda, has made appropriate requests in the light of their unfamiliarity.

FERDINAND Most sure, the goddess
On whom these airs attend: vouchsafe my prayer
May know if you remain upon this island,
And that you will some good instruction give
How I may bear me here my prime request,
(Which I do last pronounce) is (O you wonder)
If you be maid or no?[165]

As he is wandering on the island, he keeps on hearing enchanting music, songs and sounds. Suddenly, he sees Miranda and assumes that she must be the goddess for which the music is played. Then, he requests that she answers his question about whether she lives on the island and whether she is a human or a goddess. He also requests that she instructs him how to mind his behaviour. He is aware that he is making FTAs, therefore, he makes his requests and questions indirect: he uses the interrogative form to make a request using the modal may. This creates a sense of deference which attends to Miranda's negative face. Then, he compliments her saying ' *O you wonder'* in order to attend to her positive face.

Up until now, the discussion was concerned about how the power difference and the degree of familiarity could affect the way people construct their message. Another element to be discussed is the degree of the imposition or the degree of the threat towards the interlocutor's face.

The first interaction to be taken into consideration is the different exchanges between Caliban and Stephano. Caliban who establishes Stephano as his new master instead of Prospero, attempts to convince him to assassinate Prospero and gain the rule of the island.

CALIBAN: I say, by sorcery he got this isle.

[165] (Ibid: 41)

From me, he got it. If thy greatness will
Revenge it on him (for I know thou dar'st)
But this Thing dare not.

STEPHANO: That's most certain.

CALIBAN: Thou shalt be lord of it and I'll serve thee. [166]

The construction of Caliban's request is influenced by the power difference between the two as well as the degree of the request's imposition. Caliban is influenced by Stephano's wine, makes him his new master instead of Prospero. Therefore, when he makes a request with a great imposition such as killing his former master, he needs to do that carefully. Caliban makes his request on-record with some negative and positive politeness strategies. He attends to Stephano's negative face wants by using a declarative conditional structure which is an indirect form for requests. Then, he uses *' thy greatness'* as an address term. He inserts a sense of deference through saying that such an act - killing his former master- is something he cannot conduct on his own while Stephano can do it. He finishes his request by stating that after killing Prospero, he will be the owner of the island and promising him his services which is a positive politeness strategy.

However, Caliban's politeness strategies change towards the near end of the play when Stephano couldn't perform them due to his drunkenness and being entangled in a trap which is set up by Prospero. Both of them have followed Ariel's enchanting music that drove them to be stuck in a pond near Prospero's house. Smelly and wet, Ariel presented before them some clothes. So, Stephano and his friend, Trinculo, who accompanied them all along, are more interested in the clothes rather than executing Caliban's request. Caliban being angry and impatient says:

CALIBAN: Prithee, my king, be quiet. Seest thou here,
This is the mouth o' th' cell. No noise, and enter.
Do that good mischief which may make this island
Thine own for ever, and I, thy Caliban,
For aye thy foot-licker.[167]

[166] (Ibid: 67)
[167] (Ibid: 83)

Except for the mitigating device '*I prithee'* and the address term *'my king'* all of Caliban's utterances are baldly on- record. He orders his so-called king saying: '*be quiet, seest thou here'*, *'no noise', 'enter'* and '*do that mischief*'. He reminds him again of the land-owning promise. The remarkable difference in the strategies of Caliban's utterances drive the reader to understand that Caliban is merely manipulating Stephano to kill Prospero.

Caliban's grows angrier when Stephano and Trinculo fight over the clothes. He curses Stephano and even calls him a fool. He orders him to throw the clothes from his hands and commits the murder. This time Caliban does not attempt to sound polite.

> **CALIBAN**: The dropsy drown this fool! What do you mean
> To dote thus on such luggage? Let's alone,
> And do the murder first. If he awake,
> From toe to crown he'll fill our skins with pinches,
> Make us strange stuff.[168]

Another example of how people should take into consideration the nature of the message and its degree of imposition in delivering it is when some of the characters are discussing and criticizing the king of Naples's decision to marry his daughter to an African king. The act of criticism is in itself a threat to the positive face of the addressee. Generally, people want to have their actions and wishes to be liked and shared by the members of the group. The exchange starts when the king announces that because of that wedding he lost a daughter and a son, too. He thinks that his son Ferdinand is dead. The marriage's decision is heavily criticized by his brother Sebastian.

> **SEBASTIAN:** Sir, you may thank yourself for this great loss,
> That would not bless our Europe with your daughter,
> But rather loose her to an African,
> Where she at least is banished from your eye,
> Who hath cause to wet the grief on 't.

[168] Ibid

ALONSO: Prithee, peace.

SEBASTIAN: You were kneeled to and importuned otherwise
By all of us, and the fair soul herself
Weigh'd between loathness, and obedience, at
Which end o' th' beam should bow. We have lost your son,
I fear, for ever: Milan and Naples have
Mo widows in them of this business' making
Than we bring men to comfort them:
The fault's your own.[169]

Sebastian's criticism is an indirect one, yet this is not done for the sake of making it polite, but rather making it sound sarcastic one. It leads the king to ask him to keep quiet. Sebastian, however, resumes his criticism baldly on-record saying that the wedding and the disastrous trip are all the king's fault. The way in which Sebastian issues his criticism makes him sound very rude. Gonzalo comments on it and says that it *'lack some gentleness'* and comes at the wrong time.

GONZALO: My lord Sebastian,
The truth you speak doth lack some gentleness
And time to speak it in. You rub the sore,
When you should bring the plaster.[170]

Gonzalo's aim is to criticize the way in which Sebastian criticizes his brother's actions. Nonetheless, he does that in a politer way. He tries to redress the threat to Sebastian's positive face through using the address term *'my lord'*. Then, he stresses the fact that he agrees with his opinion trying to establish a common ground. He also uses the word *'some'* to hedge his opinion for the aim of not sounding dogmatic.

Gonzalo continues his speech to the king trying to comfort him and probably soothe Sebastian's criticism. He does so by attending to the king's positive face. He stresses that they share the same sad feelings with him.

GONZALO: It is foul weather in us all, good sir,

[169] (Ibid:48)
[170] (Ibid 49)

When you are cloudy.[171]

The last exchange to be analysed in this section offers an example for an off-record politeness strategy. In this exchange, Anthonio tries to convince Sebastian to kill his brother Alonso for the aim of taking over the throne. When everybody has slept due to Ariel's enchantment. Only Sebastian and Anthonio stay awake.

ANTHONIO: …What might
Worthy Sebastian? O, what might? No more:
And yet, methinks I see it in thy face,
What thou shouldst be: Th' occasion speaks thee, and
My strong imagination sees a crown
Dropping upon thy head.

Due to the great imposition of his suggestion, Anthonio repeats his words *'what might worthy Sebastian? O, What might? "* . He stumbles and tries to order himself loudly not to carry on *'No more'*. He also tries to make his utterance as indirect as possible. All these strategies make it appears that it is hard for him to issue the message. Therefore, he uses these devices to attend to Sebastian's negative face.

2.1.1.3 *The Tempest* Conversation Analysis:

One of the means to explain how people organize their talk in conversations is the analysis of the way in which they take turns, keep them, allocate them and control the topic. It has been mentioned in the first chapter that a direct link between the social background of the participants in a conversation and the organization of turn taking could be established. Generally, the most powerful speakers are the ones responsible for organizing turns and controlling them. Such argument could be illustrated using the following example:

GONZALO: All torment, trouble, wonder, and amazement
Inhabits here: some heavenly power guide us
Out of this fearful country.

[171] Ibid

PROSPERO: Behold Sir King

The wronged Duke of Milan, Prospero:

For more assurance that a living Prince

Does now speak to thee, I embrace thy body,

A hearty welcome.

ALONSO: whe'er thou be'st he or no,

Or some enchanted trifle to abuse me,

(As late I have been) I not know: thy pulse

Th' affiction of my mind amends, with which

I fear a madness help me: this must crave

Thy Dukedom I resign, and do entreat

Thou pardon me my wrongs: but how should Prospero

Be living, and here?

PROSPERO: First, noble friend,

Let me embrace thine age, whose honour cannot

Be measur'd, or confin'd.

GONZALO: whether this be,

Or be not, I'll not swear.

PROSPERO: you do yet taste

Some subtlities o' th' Isle, that will not let you

Believe things certain: welcome, my friends all.

But you, my brace of Lords, were I so minded

I here could pluck his Highness' frown upon you

And justify you traitors: at this time

I will tell no tales.

SEBASTIAN: The Devil speaks in him-

PROSPERO: No

For you, most wicked sir, whom to call brother

Would even infect my mouth, I do forgive

Thy rankest fault; all of them: and require

My Dukedom of thee, which, perforce I know

Thou must restore.

ALONSO: if thou be'st Prospero

Give us particulars of thy preservation,

How thou hast met us here, who three hours since
Were wrack'd upon this shore? Where I have lost
(How sharp the point of this remembrance is)
My dear son Ferdinand.

PROSPERO: I am woe for 't, sir.

ALONSO: Irreparable is the loss, and patience

PROSPERO: as great to me, as late, and supportable
To make the dear loss, have I means much weaker
Than you may call to comfort you; for I
Have lost my daughter.[172]

This excerpt is found near the end of the play. Prospero's plan of coming together with his enemies, the ones for which he rises the tempest, is realized. He finally meets his betraying brother, Anthonio, who usurped his title. He also meets Alonso, the king of Naples, who conspired with Anthonio to take over Prospero's dukedom. Along with Alonso and Anthonio, there are Sebastian, Alonso's brother, and Gonzalo, Prospero's old friend.

Prospero seems to be in total control of the situation. This could be illustrated through the turn organization in the exchange. He has the largest number of turns in comparison to the rest of the participants: seven turns for Prospero, four for Alonso, two for Gonzalo, one for Sebastian and no turn for Anthonio. He has the longest turns in comparison with the rest. The only one that could compete with the length of turns is the King Alonso due to his high rank. Most of the times, it is Prospero who initiates the talk.

The meeting starts with Gonzalo commenting on their situation and the place they are in. Prospero does not give any response to that. He addresses the king of Naples and introduces himself as the duke of Milan whose title was usurped. Alonso comments on that and announces that he restores the title to him asking for forgiveness. Then, he wonders about how Prospero is still alive. Prospero ignores his question and addresses Gonzalo to welcome him, then comments on the weird

[172] (Ibid: 88-90)

feelings the whole group has. He follows up by directing his talk to Sebastian and Anthonio and calls them traitors. Anthonio doesn't say anything at all. He does not even reply when his brother blames him, forgives him and demands his usurped title from him. In the next part of the exchange, Alonso changes the topic to talk about his loss of his son. The discussion continues as Prospero proceeds to tell them that he has lost a daughter, too, in the Tempest. He halts inviting the king to take a look at his son and Prospero's daughter[173], who are flirting nearby.

The analysis of how TRPs function in this exchange indicates that every character knows exactly when to take the turn. There is no interruption and no overlapping in their turns. The whole play has rare occurrence of these features. This could be attributed to the fact that such features were not presented in drama at that time. There are only two incidences of interruption throughout the whole play. The first is in the previous excerpt when Prospero takes over Sebastian's turn before the former is done. This is marked through the use of a dash '-'

SEBASTIAN: The Devil speaks in him-
PROSPERO: No
For you, most wicked sir, whom to call brother
Would even infect my mouth, I do forgive
Thy rankest fault; all of them: and require
My Dukedom of thee, which, perforce I know
Thou must restore.

The second takes place when the noblemen are wandering on the island. Gonzalo is trying his best to comfort the grieving king, who lost sight of his son. Sebastian keeps on mocking Gonzalo's method and words. His interruption is a sign of distance and lack of friendliness.

GONZALO: When every grief is entertain'd, that's offer'd
Comes to th' entertainer –
SEBASTIAN: A dollar.
GONZALO: Dolour comes to him indeed, you have spoken
truer than you purpos'd.

[173] (Ibid: 90)

SEBASTIAN: you have taken it wiselier than I meant you
should.[174]

As it has been mentioned in the previous chapter, people's conversations are generally organized in terms of pairs that are called adjacency pairs. These pairs are organized into two parts. The first pair part FPP creates the expectation of the second pair part. However, not all SPPs have the same regard as responses. Some of them are preferred, they are more probable and easier to conduct as in the case of agreements. Whereas, others such as disagreements are dispreferred. They are less frequent and more difficult to perform especially if one wants to maintain good social relationships.

A clear distinction between the way Prospero deals with his servants, Ariel and Caliban, has been conducted in the previous sections in this chapter. Ariel is more favoured by his master in comparison to Caliban. This could be foregrounded by analysing their conversational structure and specifically the way both of them conduct their SPPs.

Most of Ariel's SPPs during the play are preferred ones. If he ever uses dispreffered ones, he does not do that immediately. On the contrary, Caliban makes dispreffered SPPs directly without any delay or mitigating devices. Generally, such way of doing SPPs is considered to be rude and hostile, thus, affecting the social relationships negatively.

PROSPERO: To the king 's ship, invisible as thou art.
There shalt thou find the mariners asleep
Under the hatches: The master and the boatswain
Being awake, enforce them to this place;
and presently I prithee.
ARIEL: I drink the air before me, and return
Or ere your pulse twice beat. [175]

Since Ariel is Prospero's servant, it would be expected that he executes his orders directly. This is shown in their conversations. When Prospero orders Ariel to get things done, Ariel complies

[174] (ibid: 45)
[175] (Ibid: 89)

immediately. In terms of adjacency pairs' description, Prospero's FPP is an order. Ariel's SPP to that order is a preferred one which is compliance.

Another example of how Ariel responds using preferred SPPs is supplied in the following verses.

PROSPERO: If thou more murmurs't, I will rend an oak
And peg thee in his knoty entrails, till
Thou hast howl'd away twelve winters.
ARIEL: Pardon Master,
I will be correspondent to command
And do my spiriting, gently[176]

In this exchange, Prospero's FPP is a threat. He threatens Ariel to lock him in an oak tree due to his complaint about not getting his freedom sooner. Ariel's SPP contains an apology and a promise to be well-behaved. He did not challenge Prospero, this is why his SPP is considered to be preferred. A distinction between this SPP to a threat and a challenging one will be discussed when analysing Caliban's SPPs.

Ariel frequently makes preferred responses to his master's commands and statements. However, in the following example he has made a dispreferred one. Ariel is considered to be polite while doing it given the strategy he has used.

ARIEL: Is there more toil? Since thou dost give me pains,
Let me remember thee what thou hast promis'd,
Which is not yet perform'd me.
PROSPERO: How now? moody?
What is thou canst demand?
ARIEL: My liberty.
PROSPERO: Before the time out? No more[177].
ARIEL: I prithee, Remember I have done thee worthy service,
Told thee no lies, made thee no mistakings, serv'd

[176] (Ibid: 36)
[177] Ibid

Without grudge or grumblings. Thou dids't promise

To bate me a full year[178].

Ariel initiates the exchange with a complaint that Prospero has not granted him what he promises. Since Prospero does not understand what he refers to he does not issue an SPP for that immediately. A sequence of question – answer is inserted where Prospero asks Ariel about what he wants, Ariel answers that he wants his freedom. His answer is considered to be an FPP of a request. He requests his freedom, but Prospero refuses to grant him that so soon before his job is done. Prospero's SPP is a disprrefered one and since he is the master, he can do it without any stumbling or delaying. It could be noticed that in his refusal he implies that Ariel cannot be free before his contract ends. Ariel issues a disagreement to that. This constitutes an FPP to Prospero's implied statement. He does not do that in immediately after the SPP. He delays it in the same line. He first makes a plea reminding him of the services he has done and then says 'thou *dids't promise to bate me a full year'*.

On the other hand, Caliban's most SPPs are dispreferred. Moreover, he makes them immediately with no delaying or mitigating devices. His SPPs are significant indicators of his rudeness and his problematic relationship with his master.

PROSPERO: What hoa: slave: Caliban:

Thou earth, Thou: speak.

CALIBAN: There's wood enough within. [179]

In this example, Prospero summons Caliban as an FPP. Caliban does not do the expected SPP for summoning which is answering. He believes that Prospero is going to order him to bring wood. He immediately issues a dispreferred SPP to that, which is refusal. Caliban does so without any strategy to be polite towards his master.

Another typical example that illustrates Caliban's SPPs occurs in the following conversation between him, his master and his master's daughter.

---

[178] Ibid

[179](Ibid: 37)

PROSPERO: Thou most lying slave,

Whom stripes may move, not kindness: I have us'd thee

(Filth as thou art) with humane care, and lodg'd thee

In mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate

The honour of my child.

CALIBAN: Oh ho, oh ho, would't had been done:

Thou didst prevent me, I had peopled else

This Isle with Calibans.

MIRANDA: abhorred slave,

Which any print of goodness wilt not take,

Being capable of all ill: I pitied thee,

Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour

One thing or other: when thou didst not (savage)

Know thine own meaning; but wouldst gabble, like

A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes

With words that made them known: but thy vile race

(Though thou didst learn) had that in 't, which good natures

Could not abide to be with; therefore wast thou

Deservedly confin'd into this rock,

Who hadst deserv'd more than a prison.

CALIBAN: you taught me language, and my profit on 't

Is, I know how to curse: the red plague rid you

For learning me your language. [180]

There are two pairs in this exchange. The first one is between Prospero and Caliban. The subsequent one is between Miranda and Caliban. In the first pair, Prospero's FPP is considered to be a blame. He blames Caliban for being ungrateful. He treated him well but instead of returning the favour, Caliban betrays him and attempts to rape his daughter. Normally a preferred SPP for blame would be a denial or at least asking for forgiveness. However, Caliban issues a dispreferred

[180] (Ibid:38-39)

SPP in which he approves that he would have raped her if Prospero did not prevent that. The same pattern could be noticed in the second pair between Miranda and Caliban talking about how she taught him skills and language when he was found in an animalistic state on the island and blamed him for not being thankful. Caliban neither apologies, nor he denies the blame. Instead, he cursed her. His SPP is very rude, it is dispreferred, and he does not attempt to redress it.

The overall analysis of the three target concepts, speech acts, politeness and conversation management, in The Tempest indicates that excerpts from the play serve well to illustrate and reflect the different socio-pragmatic elements involved in communication. Even though the language used in the play is archaic in comparison to English used nowadays, the analysis of the strategies used by the characters to issue their utterances as well as their conversational contribution management can clearly demonstrate the mechanisms of communication. Furthermore, the socio-pragmatic parameters involved in interaction can be highlighted throughout the excerpts. The way characters view themselves and each other in terms of social position, power difference and familiarity is easily distinguished from their language as well as the context. The variety of the relationships as well as the effect of the context and the events of the play on these relationships offer tangible variety of excerpts to be explored.

2.2 Edward Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*

Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf? is a three-act play written by the American dramatist Edward Albee around 1962. Some critics do not considered this play to belong to the Theatre of the Absurd (the Theatre of Language). Nonetheless, it contains many elements that resemble absurdist plays[181]. It explores themes such as the failure of communication in modern society. Moreover, its dialogues are incoherent and puzzling.

The events present a glimpse into the marital troubles of two couples, George and his wife Martha as the centre of the plot, as well as of Nick and his wife Honey. George is an associate

[181] James L. Roberts, *Edward Albee's Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (New York: Hungry Minds,1979) p, 6

professor at the history department in New Carthage, a New England town. Martha, his wife, is the daughter of the university president where George works. One night after a faculty party, Martha informs George that they are having a new teacher and his wife, Nick and Honey, for a nightcap. George stresses that Martha should not mention their kid. The guests arrive around two in the morning, only to find their hosts engaging in endless verbal abuse towards each other. Despite the awkwardness of the situation, they decided to stay.

What starts as an all-night drinking party, turns out to become a night for getting into the couples' marital troubles and secrets. Martha keeps recounting humiliating stories of her husband and how he fails to rise up to her expectations as well as her father's to be this latter's successor to the presidency of the university. She also keeps praising Nick's built and success and gets to seduce him in the later events of the play. George reacts to the embarrassing accounts of Martha violently and abusively. He declares how it is difficult to be married to the daughter of the president of the university. Nick and honey were also a subject of his mocking, sarcasm and humiliation. As perfect as the younger couple seems to be, it is revealed that Nick married Honey for her father's money and because of a pregnancy that turned out to be a hysterical one.

Among all the taunting and the humiliating, there is a mentioning of Martha and George's son, whom George insisted on keeping him a secret. However, Martha brings the secret up to Honey, who in turn tells Nick in the presence of George. In the final act of the play, Martha's language change drastically after a failed sexual encounter with Nick. She starts to talk sadly of how her relationship with George has been ruined. She talks also in detail and in a poetic manner about their son's birth and childhood. As she talks, George recites the prayer of the dead in Latin and announces that they received a telegram about the death of their son some time earlier. Martha gets mad and tells George that he doesn't have the right to decide such matter. This exposes that the whole story of the son is fictitious. George decides to end it because he and Martha agreed to keep the story of the son a secret between them. However, she has broken the rule.

2.2.1 Analysis of the Play

2.2.1.1 *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* Speech Act Analysis

The discussion of speech acts in teaching/ learning the pragmatics of the language, aims at illustrating for the learners that there is no specific way of making a specific speech act. The different ways people construct their utterances are tightly linked with the context in which they are interacting and the different socio-pragmatic elements involved. These elements are concerned with the relationship between the interlocutors, their social backgrounds and the nature of the utterance.

The beginning of the play shows that Martha is in control of the relationship. This shows through her utterances and George's. To sustain this claim, some scattered exchanges are selected for the aim of analysing her speech acts and how George responds to them.

MARTHA: Jesus …
GEORGE: … Shhhhhhh…
MARTHA: … H.Christ …
GEORGE: For God's sake, It's 2 o'clock in the …
MARTHA: Oh, George!
GEORGE: Well, I'm *sorry.* but …
MARTHA: What a cluck! What a cluck you are.
GEORGE: It's late, you know? Late.
MARTHA [*looks about the room. Imitates Bette Davis*]**:** What a dump! Hey, what's that from? "What a dump! "[182]

Martha enters the house speaking too loudly, so George indicates that through trying to shush her. There are different ways of silencing someone. Shushing is a conventional way to direct someone to keep silent, so it stands as a speech act. Martha, on the other hand, continues her words. He, then, tries to add force to silence her again by expressing his impatience *'For God's Sake'*. This time, he uses an indirect speech act. The literal meaning of his sentence *'It's 2 o'clock in the*

[182]Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001), p1.

…' indicates that he is telling the time. However, bearing in mind the contextual background of the utterance, it appears to have a directive illocutionary force. He is giving her the reason why she has to lower her voice, that it is two in the morning and she must not disturb the neighbours. Martha, however, does not stop. Her utterance *'Oh, George!'* expresses her anger. As a response to that, George apologizes and tries again in the same way to silence her using an indirect speech act and to give reasons why he is silencing her. Before he could do so, Martha interrupts and insults him. He does not respond to that, instead he continues his attempt to convince her that it is too late for a loud talk. She confirms that she cares less about his attempts and insults him again using a famous bitchy line '*What a dump!'* employed by Betty Davis in the film *Beyond the Forest* (1949).

The next exchange also indicates how Martha controls the speech with her husband through her use of speech acts. After she insists on George to find out what film her line *'What a dump!'* is originally form, he responds that he is tired and it is late:

MARTHA: I don't know what you're tired about…you haven't *done* anything all day; you didn't have any classes, or anything ….

GEORGE: Well, I'm tired ….If your father didn't set up these goddamn Saturday orgies all the time ….

MARTHA: Well, that's too bad about you, George ….

GEORGE[*grumbling*]**:** Well, that's how it is, anyway.

MARTHA: You didn't *do* anything. You never *do* anything; you never *mix*. You just sit around and *talk.*

GEORGE : What do you want me to do? Do you want me to act like you? Do you want me to go around all night *braying* at everybody, the way you do?

MARTHA[*braying*]**:** I DON'T BRAY!

GEORGE[*softly*] **:**All right… you don't bray.

MARTHA[*hurt*]**:** I do not *bray*.

GEORGE[*still softly*]**:** All right …I said you didn't bray! [183]

[183](Ibid: 3)

When Martha says: *'I don't know what you're tired about[…]you haven't done anything all day; you didn't have any classes, or anything […]* 'She is not actually telling George that she doesn't know the reason why he is tired. She is not, also, telling him that he hasn't done anything throughout the day as the literal meaning of her sentences might at first signal. In fact, her aim is to criticize him, even if it sounded a little bit exaggerated. This adds to the force of the criticism. George seems to be indifferent to this sarcastic criticism, he implies that even though what she says might be true through the use of *'well',* he is, in fact, tired. He restates that to confirm it. He does not dare to challenge what she says in order to placate her. He tries to give the reason why he is tired, complaining about the Saturday night parties her father organizes calling them *' goddamn Saturday night orgies'* in order to add perlocutionary force of his complaint. Martha goes on with her criticism keeping in mind his complaint about her never doing anything at all. This time, George replies in a way that is different from the first one. He slashes back at her by asking her questions '*What do you want me to do? Do you want me to act like you? Do you want me to go around all night braying at everybody, the way you do?'* He is as a matter of fact not waiting for her to give answers. His speech act is indirect. He is actually alluding that doing nothing is better than what she does. He uses the word *'bray'* and his criticism is made harsher. She denies the yelling. As the capital letters and the stage direction indicate, she strongly denies that and she keeps on braying. She expresses he outrage in the second time. Her utterance pushes George to reconsider his criticism and approve that she doesn't bray.

After this exchange, Martha asks her husband to make her a drink. He accepts saying that just little more drinks will not hurt. Martha indicates that there will be a long night of drinks because they have guests coming over. She is clear about that, she uses a direct declarative speech act: '*We've got guests'*.

MARTHA: A nightcap! Are you kidding? We've got guests.
GEORGE[*disbelieving*]**:** We've Got what?
MARTHA: Guests. GUESTS!

GEORGE: GUESTS!

MARTHA: Yes… guests… people. We've got guests coming over.

GEORGE: When?

MARTHA: Now.[184]

It appears from this exchange that Martha imposes on her husband the fact that they are receiving guests. George's question *'We've got what?'* is a rhetorical question because he has not heard. He means to indicate his surprise and disbelief. The stage directions along with the contextual background help to interpret it in this way. Martha answers to confirm for him that they have guests. Her repetition of the word guests, yelling this time as the capital letters indicate, shows that this matter is done and George has no say about it. George shockingly repeats his exclamation because it is not the right time for guests. Martha again confirms this *'yes guests'*, she explains the word guests as if George does not understand it and repeats again the fact that they are receiving guests. George asks in the same disbelieving tone *when?* Martha confirms yelling *NOW*! indicating that she is surprised by what seem to be stupid questions by George.

George tries to express that it is not the right time for someone to visit. To which Martha says:

MARTHA[in a so-there voice]**:** Because Daddy said we should be nice to them, that's why.[185]

and again, when George complains:

MARTHA: Because Daddy said we should be nice to them.[186]

When George expresses his disapproval, she settles the matter once and for all using a direct declarative speech act *'It's done'*:

GEORGE: I mean … it's ridiculous.

MARTHA: well, it's *done.* [187]

---

[184] Ibid
[185] (Ibid :4)
[186] Ibid
[187] (Ibid :5)

As it has been shown through the few exchanges analysed above, George seems to have in a lesser position in comparison with his wife. Martha appears to use more direct forms of speech acts than he does. She appears to use more declaration in a way that she imposes things on him or as he puts it 'spring' things at him indicates that. Yet, this pattern of interaction will slowly turn especially at the end.

Just as the guests arrive and start knocking at the door, Martha orders her husband to open the door. George warns Martha not to talk about their biggest secret, their made-up son.

GEORGE: Just don't start in on the bit about the kid, that's all.
MARTHA: What do you take me for?
GEORGE: Much too much.
MARTHA [*really angered*]**:** Yeah? Well, I'll start in on the kid if I want to.
GEORGE: Just leave the kid out of this.
MARTHA[*threatening*]**:** He's mine as much as he is yours. I'll talk about him if I want to.
GEORGE: I'd advise against it.
MARTHA: Well, good for you. [*Knock.*] C'mon in. Get over there and open that door!
GEORGE: You've been advised.
MARTHA: Yeah …sure. Get over there!
GEORGE: Yes, love. Whatever love wants…[188]

George orders Martha not to start talking about the kid. Martha challenges that using a question '*what do you take me for?'* .Her question pushes George to issue a response which implies a threat '*much too much*'. She goes on challenging him, using an interrogative *'yeah?'* which is a more sarcastic question than just a question to make sure, she follows that by confirming that it is up to her to mention the kid if she wants to. Although George is using the verb advise in his next utterance '*I'd advise against it* and *You've been advised'* , he is rather warning not to mention the

[188] (Ibid: 8-9)

kid. Martha restates her challenge through the use of sarcastic language, first by saying '*Well, good for you'* which has nothing to do as a response for warning. She also replies using '*Yeah …sure.'* which is used just to silence George and get him to stop talking and get to open the door rather than admitting that she will not talk about the kid. Apparently, George's locutionary utterances are not getting his intended perlocutionary effects. This could be used to argue why Martha appears to be more in control of the situation. During the play, Martha talks about the kid, ignoring George warning's. Consequently, she pays costly because George destroys this fantasy forever and declares that the kid is dead.

After being angry about how his wife was telling embarrassing stories in front of their guests, revealing the secret of their fictional son, George announces that he is going to make Martha regrets in the same way she plays. He is aware of her attempts to seduce their guest, Nick. However, he decides not to give Martha the attention she seeks. He grabs a chair, and he says he is going to read.

> **MARTHA:** You're gonna do what?
>
> **GEORGE**[*quietly, distinctly*]**:** I am going to read a book.
> Read. Read. Read? You've heard of it? [*Picks up a book.*]
>
> **MARTHA**[*standing*]**:** Whaddya mean you're gonna read?
> What's the matter with you?
>
> **GEORGE**[*too calmly*]**:** There's nothing the matter with me,
> Martha ... I am going to read a book. That's all.
>
> **MARTHA**[*oddly furious*]**::** We've got Company.
>
> **GEORGE**[*over-patiently*]**:** I know, my dear... [*Looks at his watch.*]... but ... it's after four o'clock, and I always read around this time. Now you ... [*Dismisses her with a little wave*] ... go about your business ... I'll sit here very quietly ....[189]

[189] (Ibid: p89-90)

In the light of the present situation, George's decision to read a book shocks Martha. It is four in the morning and they have got guests. She exclaims '*You're gonna do what?'* which is not a question to elicit and answer, but rather an exclamation. George takes her utterance as it is and answers that he is going to read a book. He reacts as if she does not know what the word 'read' means not caring about her utterance's illocutionary force. This pushes Martha to reform her utterance '*What do you mean you're going to read? What's the matter with you?'* Again, George decides to ignore the exclamation and issues a response to confirm that he is just going to read a book. Martha tells him what he already knows to highlight the reason why he is going to do is surprising: *'We've got guests.'* George confirms that he knows that and that he is going to read because it is four o'clock. He requests her to carry on what she has been doing and tells her he will not interfere '*I'll sit here very quietly'*.

Martha indicates that she's going to amuse herself with Nick.

MARTHA[*not looking up*]**:** We're going to amuse ourselves, George.
GEORGE[*never looking up*]**:** Unh-hunh. That's nice.
MARTHA: You might not like it.
GEORGE[*never looking up*]**:** No, no, now ... you go right ahead ... you entertain your guests.[190]

What is Martha trying to do is warning George about what she going to do with Nick. She makes her utterance declarative and indirect tell him about her plans. The second utterance that indicates that this is a warning more than a simple declaration of plans is the fact that she says: '*You might not like it'*. Nonetheless, George decides to ignore the illocutionary force of her utterances. This is possible due to the indirectness of her utterance. He responds to them as if they were direct ones. This makes Martha grow angrier and more frustrated at the fact that George ignores her attempts. She makes direct threats.

MARTHA[*hopeless*]**:** I'll make you sorry you made me want to marry you. [*At the hallway*] I'll make you regret the day

[190] (Ibid p90)

you ever decided to come to this college. I'll make you sorry you ever let yourself down.[191]

George starts to seem more of control of the situation, and more assertive. The exchange analysed above shows that the fact that George ignores Martha's threats. At the end of the play, it is George's turn to make decisions. The final decision is to kill their fictional child.

GEORGE: Now, listen Martha; Listen carefully. We got a telegram; there was a car accident, and he's dead, POUF! Just like that! now, how do you like it?

MARTHA [*a howl which weakens into a moan*]: NOOOO-OOoooooo.

GEORGE [*to NICK*]: Let her go. [*MARTHA slumps to the floor in a sitting position.*] She'll be all right now.

MARTHA [*pathetic*]: No; no, he is not dead; he is not dead.

GEORGE: He is dead. Kyrie, eleison. Christe, eleison. Kyrie, eleison.

MARTHA: You cannot. You may not decide these things.

NICK [*leaning over her; tenderly***]:** He hasn't decided anything, lady. It's not his doing. He doesn't have the power….

GEORGE: That's right, Martha; I'm not a god. I don't have the power over life and death, do I?

MARTHA: YOU CAN'T KILL HIM! YOU CAN'T HAVE HIM DIE!

HONEY: Lady … Please ….

MARTHA: YOU CAN'T![192]

Now, it's time for George to '*spring things*' at Martha. He orders her to listen carefully. He tells her that they received a telegram and their son has been killed in a car. He makes a declarative speech act to say that the kid is dead. He says that simply as if the weight of the news did not affect his words. He, then, asks her *'how do you like that?'*. This question is shocking for anyone who

[191] (Ibid: p92)
[192] (Ibid: p124-126)

does not know the background story of their fictional child. Here, George is asking her opinion about his performance and not about the news, because both of them now that the whole story of the child is in fact a made – up one.

Martha's response is typical in the light of the news that she has received for both its superficial message and the intended message of George. It is true that there is no real child to die, so that makes George's speech act a defective one. Yet, the illusion that they have had for a long time is shattered before her. George confirms '*He is dead'* and continues his Latin prayers that he has started earlier in the act. Martha states in disbelief that he cannot do that, she adds that he may not do that referring to idea of her child's death. The change of the modal verbs indicates that it is not something he can do as well as that she does not allow that.

Since Nick does not know the real story, he tries to calm her down and tell her what has happened is not done by George. George supports what Nicks says and responds accordingly. Martha repeats that he cannot wish the death of their child in disbelief, twice.

GOERGE: I can kill him, Martha, if I want to.
MARTHA: HE IS OUR CHILD!
GEORGE: Oh yes, and you bore him, and it was good delivery….
MARTHA: HE IS OUR CHILD!
GEORGE: AND I HAVE KILLED HIM!
MARTHA: NO!
GEORGE: YES![193]

After few lines discussing the telegram, George confirms for Martha that he can kill him. She reminds him that he is their child, implying that the decision he made is not his alone. She repeats that twice. In George's response: '*AND I HAVE KILLED HIM* ', 'AND' functions as a reference to the previous sentence's completion in a way that he confirms that even though he is their child, he decides to kill him. Martha makes a last attempt to deny that; however, George

[193] (Ibid: 125-126)

confirms. The long silence indicates that it is done and that Martha gives up opposing what George has done.

2.2.1.2 *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* Politeness Analysis

Politeness is one of the major pragmatics concepts that operates during any kind of interaction. As discussed before in Chapter One, it does not refer to specific type of honorific language, but rather it reflects the mastery of using the right language in a specific situation. This entails the consideration of the interlocutor face, whether the positive or the negative one. It means that while interacting one has to avoid FTAs, and if ever one is necessary it should be redressed using specific techniques. Going through the interactions in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* shows how the characters abide by such rules in some instances, and how some for specific reasons resort to not take them into account. The presented analysis of some of the exchanges would account for why and how some characters opt for specific strategies and the consequences of their choice.

The first exchange to be analysed is when Martha and George's guests, Nick and Honey, arrive.

MARTHA [*a little too loud … to cover*]**:** Hi! Hi, there…
c'mon in!
HONEY and NICK [*ad lib*]**:** Hello, here we are … hi … [etc.]
GEORGE [*very matter-of-factly*] **:**You must be our little guests.
MARTHA: HA, ha, ha, HA! Just ignore old sour-puss over there.
C'mon in, kids … give your coats and stuff to sour-puss.
NICK [*without expression*]**:** Well, now, perhaps we shouldn't
have come ….
HONEY: Yes … it is late, and …
MARTHA: Late! Are you kidding? Throw your stuff down
anywhere and c'mon in.
GEOARGE [*vaguely … walking away*]**:** Anywhere … furniture,
floor … doesn't make any difference around this place.

NICK [*to HONEY*]**:** I told you we shouldn't have come.

MARTHA [*stentorian*]: I said c'mon in! Now c'mon!

HONEY [*giggling a little as she and NICK advance***]:** Oh, dear.

GEORGE [*imitating HONEY's giggle*]**:** Hee, hee, hee, hee.

MARTHA [*swinging on GEORGE*]**:** Look, muckmouth … you cut that out!

GEORGE [*innocence and hurt*]**:** Martha! [*To HONEY and NICK*] Martha's a devil with language; she really is.

MARTHA: Hey, kids … sit down.

HONEY [*as she sits*] Oh, isn't this lovely!

NICK [*perfunctorily*]**:** Yes indeed … very handsome.

MARTHA: Well, thanks.[194]

It does not take much to notice how the hosts, and most notably George are acting very rudely towards their guests, who in fact seem very polite in comparison. When applying the politeness theory of face upon this exchange, first, one has to take into consideration the social background and distance between the interlocutors. They belong to the same social class with approximately twenty-year age difference. They are not familiar with each other except for the fact that they saw each other in a party set by Martha's father earlier in the evening. Nick and Honey are very considerate concerning the imposition they are making towards their hosts negative face, which is visiting someone at two in the morning. However, George complains with no consideration of their positive face. Although Martha seems to attempt to attend to their faces' wants, she makes some serious FTAs towards their positive face through the use of inappropriate language.

The exchange starts with usual greetings and Martha inviting her guests in. Then, George addresses the guests in a very weird tone as stated in the stage direction.

GEORGE [*very matter-of-factly*] **:**You must be our little guests.

[194] (Ibid: p9-10)

He attacks their positive face through making them feel unwelcomed. His use of the adjective '*little*' is not a successful way of addressing and it shows that he belittles them instead of addressing them appropriately by attending to their negative face.

MARTHA: HA, ha, ha, HA! Just ignore old sour-puss over there.
C'mon in, kids … give your coats and stuff to sour-puss.

Martha attempts to attend to their positive face and make them feel welcomed. She tries to be friendly with them and invites them in again. She uses direct imperative forms, but not in a commanding manner, but in a way that stresses familiarity and social closeness. However, she attacks their positive face directly in another way, through the use of offensive language to insult George. She does this again a few lines later. *'Look, muckmouth … you cut that out!'*

Embarrassed by the whole situation, and trying to indicate the imposition he and his wife made Nick says: *'Well, now, perhaps we shouldn't have come'*. He attempts to show consideration for his hosts wishes and not to intrude by causing an imposition on their negative face. First, he hedges his utterance using the filler '*well*' and the adverb 'perhaps' . Then, he mentions that he and his wife should not have made such imposition in the first place. Honey supports his opinion through agreeing with him and stating that it is late, adding force to it: *'Yes … it is late, and …'*

Martha interrupts her, tries to attend to their positive face and makes them feel welcomed**:** **'***Late! Are you kidding? Throw your stuff down anywhere and c'mon in'*. She disagrees with Honey in a friendly way implying that there is no imposition of their part. Nonetheless, George seeks an opportunity to remind them again that they are not welcomed and that they are imposing on him at his home. He comments on Martha's invitation sarcastically which threatens Nick and Honey's positive face: *'Anywhere … furniture, floor … doesn't make any difference around this place'*.

George's words make Nick restates his statement that they shouldn't have come. To which Martha stresses her invitation again. As Nick and his wife move inside the house, she makes a giggle that George mocks. His act is a direct threat to Honey's positive face. This time, Martha responds to that via insulting him and calling him '*a muckmouth*'. She tries to be friendly with her

guests and asks them to sit down. As they sit down, Nick and Honey attend to Martha's positive face by complimenting her about her house, which is an attempt to redress the imposition they are making.

HONEY [*as she sits*] Oh, isn't this lovely!

NICK [*perfunctorily*]**:** Yes indeed … very handsome.

The first encounter between the characters of the play is marked by excessive politeness strategies' examples. It cannot be argued that all the characters' strategies are appropriate to the situation, that is why George seemed to be rude, Martha seemed to be friendly and Nick and his wife seemed to be polite. Nevertheless, throughout the play characters will not keep such pattern of politeness.

Martha who seems at the beginning of the play to be friendly towards Nick and Honey, starts to be less considerate towards them as the evening proceeds and as they get be introduced to her private life bit by bit. For example, if we take this exchange into considerations:

MARTHA: The college is him. You know what the
endowment was when he took over, and what it is *now*?
You look it up some time.

NICK: I know … I read about it …

MARTHA: Shut up and listen… [*As an afterthought*] …
cutie. So after…

(She continues to talk about her first marriage and how it was dissolved and how she came back to live with her dad)

I came back here and sort of sat around for a while. I was
hostess for Daddy and I took care of him … and it was …
nice. It was very nice.

NICK: Yes…yes.

MARTHA: What do you mean, yes, yes? How would you
know?
[*Nick shrugs helplessly*]
Lover.

[*Nick smiles a little*][195]

Nick attends to his hostess positive face through cooperation in the conversation and expressing common opinions and backgrounds. He backchannels while she is talking which is a sign of showing that one is paying attention. He does this twice, first by saying: *'I know … I read about it …'* , and in the second time: '*Yes…yes'* which is a usual backchanelling technique. However, the way Martha responds to both of them is complicated in terms of politeness discussion. She attacks his negative face in the first utterance by ordering him to shut up and listen. Then, she attempts to repair that by following it with *'cutie'*, which attempts to attend to his positive face. In her second utterance, she threats his positive face by stressing a sense of deference to oppose the agreement he is trying to establish by asking him *'what do you mean, yes, yes? How would you know?'*. She adds *lover* as an attempt to be friendly and repair the damage caused by her FTA by attending to his positive face.

In the last act of the play, Martha is very disappointed with Nick for their failed sexual encounter. She asserts that he has been interested in it just to climb the social ladder because her father is the president of the college. After the door rings, she orders him to go open it, which is a very impolite way to address a guest.

MARTHA: Go answer the door.
NICK [*amazed*]: What did you say?
MARTHA: I said, go answer the door. What are you, deaf?
Nick [*trying to get it straight*]: You… want me… to go answer the door?
MARTHA: That's right, lunk-head; answer the door. There must be something you can do well; or, are you too drunk to do that, too? Can't you get the latch up, either?
Nick: Look, there's no need [door chimes again.]
MARTHA[*shouting*]: Answer it! [*Softer*] You can be houseboy around here for a while. You can start off being

[195] (Ibid: p42)

houseboy right now[196].

Nick's reaction indicates that the nature of the message and the way it is addressed is shocking. She does the FTA baldly on-record, not caring for Nick's negative face. After that, she threatens his positive one in many subsequent unmitigated FTAs. She repeats her order again, calling him a names, that he is hard of hearing. She, also, calls him a *lunk-head* when he tries to make sure of what he is hearing. Not only that, she adds a few questions that are meant to function as criticism. She returns to ordering him again to answer the door, this time sharply as the stage direction denotes. She tells him that he can become her house boy.

The following exchange shows how George treats Nick in the same way. What is different is that there is no change in the way George treats Nick. George considers Nick from the beginning of the play as a rival. Martha stresses all the positive qualities that that Nick has as opposed to George. He is young, well-built man with a potential to take over the presidency of the college as an heir to her father, unlike George who could not. She also keeps on insulting George in front of Nick and bringing up embarrassing stories. As George is preparing to announce the death of their fictional child. He orders that all the characters should be presented before him. Honey is not there.

GEORGE[*seeing them both cowed purrs*]: Goooooood.
[*Looks about him.*] But, we're not all here.
[*snaps his fingers a couple of times at NICK.*] You; you ...
uh... you; your little wifelet isn't here.

NICK: Look; she's had a rough night, now; she's in the can,
and she's ...

GEORGE: Well, we can't play without everyone here. Now
that's a fact. We gotta have your little wife. [*Hog-calls*
towards the hall] SOOOWWWIIIEEE!! SOOOWWWIIIEEE!!

NICK [*as MARTHA giggles nervously*]: Cut that!

GEORGE [*swinging around, facing him*]: Then get your butt
out of that chair and bring the little dip back in here. [*As*

[196](Ibid: 103)

NICK does not move] Now be a good puppy. Fetch, good puppy, go fetch.

[*NICK rises, opens his mouth to say something, thinks better of it, exits.]*[197]

George's threats to Nick's face are appalling, He indicates that Nick's wife is not around. He addresses Nick using ' *you… uh … you*' and calls his wife ' *a little wifelet*' making a direct threat to Nick's negative face wants, the term of addresses used indicate no sense of deference , they are rather belittling. When Nick tries to tell him that his wife is tired George interrupts saying that their game would not be complete without her and starts calling her. When Nick orders him to stop that. George orders him to get his wife in a very bald on-record way of saying things. Not only that, he uses offensive language '*get your butt out of that chair*' , calls his wife ' *a dip*' , and talks to him in the same manner dogs are addressed and talked to '*be a good puppy. Fetch, good puppy, go fetch'* The offensive language he used is a direct threat to Nick's positive face. It is so shocking for Nick that he decided to go get his wife so that they can get done with the long hysterical night.

Nick and his wife start the night thinking that it would be a usual drinking night in which they get to know more people in the faculty where Nick works. However, they get entangled in confusing existential and marital troubles between George and Martha. As perfect as Nick and his wife, Honey, seem to be at the beginning, the reader gets to be introduced to the fact that they are no better than their hosts. In the next following exchanges to be analysed, we are going to focus on the change of Nick's behaviour from polite into impolite.

NICK: What I mean is ... you two... you and your wife ... seem to be having *some* sort of a ...[198]

NICK[*cool again*]**:** It's just that I don't like to ... become involved ... [*An afterthought.*] uh ... in other people's affairs.[199]

[197] (Ibid:110)
[198] (Ibid: 17)
[199] Ibid

Since George has no consideration to his guests' positive face and discusses personal matters in front of them, Nick decides to comment on that and complain politely. He does that using an indirect speech act. He first comments on the situation and he does that trying to minimize the criticism through mumbling and repetition, '*... you two... you and your wife ...*', through using particles; the verb *seem* and the quantifier *some* as not to sound imposing. He states that he does not like to be involved, making a complaint in a polite manner. He hedges his complaint using the adverb '*just*', observes pauses, and stumbles over his words.

In the next example, we notice that Nick strategy changes a little bit. Probably because of George's continuous attacks on his face, he feels compelled to react towards that.

NICK: You may not understand this ... but I wish you
wouldn't talk that way in front of my wife.

Nick's line could be divided into two parts, in the first part, he attacks George's positive face that of wanting to be liked and approved of. He comments on the fact that George may not understand. In the second part, he requests him politely not to talk in an offensive language in front of his wife. The verb '*wish*', the modal '*would*' and the indirectness of the speech act minimize the threat of his request.

NICK [*with great disdain***]:** I just don't see why you feel you
have to subject *other* people to it.
GEORGE: *I*?
NICK: if you and your ... wife ... want to go at each other,
like couple of ...
GEORGE: *I*? Why *I* want to!
NICK: ... animals, I don't see why you do it when there
aren't any... [200]

Nick's complaint in this exchange denotes that he is bored. The act of complaining is a threat to a person's positive face. Nick in this exchange does not use any redressive techniques. He

[200] (Ibid: 48)

rather adds to the threat by the use of the word *animals* to describe the discussions of Martha and George.

2.2.2.3 *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* Conversation Analysis

The analysis of characters' speech acts and politeness strategies offer rich illustrations for how language is context-based and how this context is changing due to the actions people create through their language. This can also be explained through the way people organize their talk in a conversation that is to say, how they take turns and how they organize their speech acts into pairs. This organization in itself communicates the way people perceive themselves and others. In addition, it helps to understand the context in which the interactions take place. Such views could be highlighted by using excerpts from this play.

As seen in the previous analyses, George tends to be very rude and hostile towards his guests and more notably towards Nick. He establishes Nick as a rival because Martha is shaming him to be like Nick. To make it worse, she keeps on embarrassing him and praising Nick. This hostility of George could be seen in the following exchanges between him and Nick.

GEORGE: Vanish. [*The women have gone*.] So what'll be it?
NICK: Oh, I don't know ... I'll stick to bourbon, I guess.
GEORGE [*takes NICK's glass, goes to the portable bar*]: That what you were drinking over at Parnassus?
NICK: Over at ...?
GEORGE: Parnassus.
NICK*:* I don't understand....
GEORGE: Skip it. [*Hands him his drink.*] One bourbon.
NICK: Thanks.
GEORGE: It's just a private joke between li'l ol' Martha and me. [*They sit*.] So? [*Pause*] So ... you're in the Math Department. eh?[201]

[201] (Ibid: 15)

Analysing the exchange in terms of adjacency pairs supports the argument established above. First, there is an offer -acceptance pair. Nick's answer could be established as a request that Georges accepts at the end of the exchange. While he is preparing Nick's drink the following sequence happens. George initiates another pair of question- answer. George's FPP is *'that what you were drinking over at Parnassus?'* . Nick does not understand his question so he initiates an insertion sequence that starts with a question *'over at ...?'*. George answers this question as if Nick has misheard him. He repeats the word *'Parnassus'*. Since George's SPP to Nick's question is not satisfactory. He re-initiates another insertion sequence requesting for an explanation indirectly by saying *'I don't understand'*. George's SPP to that causes a communication breakdown. His question is not answered, and Nick's requests for explanation is faced with a dispreferred SPP in the form of a rejection *'skip it'*. George follows up with serving Nick his bourbon, which is considered as an acceptance of Nick's request. When Nick thanks him for his service. George does not respond to that. Instead, he offers an explanation to Nick's request for understanding what *'Parnassus'* refers to. It is merely a joke between him and his wife. George's refusal to respond to Nick's request aims at establishing his control over the situation. This also could be noticed in another exchange in the play.

NICK [*very quietly*] : Thank you. What … what happened to
The boy … the boy who had shot his mother?
GEORGE: I won't tell you.
NICK: All right.
GEORGE: The following summer, on a country road, with his learner's permit in his pocket and his father on the front seat to his right, he swerved the car, to avoid a porcupine, and drove straight into a large tree.[202]

Returning to the conversation that started earlier, George continues the conversation:

GEORGE: It's just a private joke between li'l ol' Martha

[202] (Ibid: 51)

and me.[*They sit*.] So? [*Pause*] So ... you're in the Math Department. eh?

NICK: No ... uh, no.

GEORGE: Martha said you were. I think that's what she said. [*Not too friendly*] What made you decide to be a teacher?

NICK: Oh ... well, the same things that ... uh motivated you, I imagine.

GEORGE: What were they?

NICK [*formal*]***:*** Pardon?

GEORGE*:* I said, what were they? What were the things that motivated me?

NICK[*laughing uneasily*]***:***Well... I'm sure I don't know.

GEORGE*:* You just finished saying that the things that motivated you were the same things that motivated me.

NICK [*with a little pique*] : I said I *imagined* they were.

GEORGE [*offhand*] Did you? [*Pause*]Well ... [*Pause*] You like it here?[203]

George changes the topic by asking Nick for a confirmation about his assumption that Nick is in the Math Department. He issues an FPP that contains a yes-like question to get an agreement; however, Nick's SPP is dispreferred *' No ... uh, no.'* Nick's dispreferred SPP is accompanied with a hedge *'... uh'*. It means that Nick attempts to deliver it less directly. George comments on that saying that it is Martha who has said so earlier. He; then, changes the topic and initiates a new sequence by asking a question: *'what made you decide to be a teacher?'*. Nick's response to George's question is not preferred because he does not in fact offers an answer to that. He makes his answer very vague and indirect: *'Oh ... well, the same things that ... uh motivated you, I imagine'*. He adds mitigating devices to sound friendlier. George; however, does not give up and asks about these things. He imposes the topic on Nick, because Nick seemed to issue such a vague answer just to not go into further details about his life or maybe he has never thought about such a

[203] Ibid

topic. George asks: '*what were they?*'. Nick's response initiates an insertion sequence: He requests a clarification; however, it seems more like a clarification question.

NICK [*formal*]***:*** Pardon?

GEORGE*:* I said, what were they? What were the things that motivated me?

George accepts, repeats his words and explains them. Nick, now, has to offer a SPP to George's question. It is a dispreferred one because he says he does not know. He precedes that with an uneasy laugh as the stage direction indicates. Thus, he attempts to delay the dispreffered utterance as a sign of politeness:

NICK[*laughing uneasily*]**:**Well... I'm sure I don't know.

George then blames Nick for not answering his question:

GEORGE*:* You just finished saying that the things that motivated you were the same things that motivated me.

Nick responds to that by explaining himself:

NICK [*with a little pique*]: I said I *imagined* they were.

George responds with an expression of doubt: *'did you?'*. His question is not meant to elicit any kind of answers, so, he changes the topic again.

GEORGE [*offhand*] Did you? [*Pause*]Well ... [*Pause*] You like it here?

NICK [*looking about the room*]: Yes ... it's ... it's fine.

GEORGE: I mean the university.

NICK: Oh.... I thought you meant ...

GEORGE: Yes... I can see you did. [*Pause*] I meant the university.

NICK: Well, I ... I like it ...fine.[*as GEORGE just stares at him*] Just fine. You ... you've been here quite long time, haven't you? [204]

George asks nick if he likes it *' here'*, which Nick takes that to mean George and Martha's house. He answers that he does while looking around the rooms. George notices that Nick did not

[204] (Ibid: 15-16)

understand the reference *'here'*. So, he explains for him what he means by that. Nick explains the reason behind his answer, and then Georges responds by making his question explicit.. Nick is finally able to deliver a satisfactory SPP answer to George's question after a long insertion sequence. For the first time in the conversation analysed here, Nick initiates a topic asking George to confirm his assumption: *'you ... you've been here quite long time, haven't you?'*.

GEORGE [*absently as if he had not heard*] : What? Oh ... yes.
Ever since I married ... uh, What's-her-name ... uh,
Martha. Even before that. [*Pause*] For ever. [*To himself*]
Dashed hopes, and good intentions. Good, better, best,
bested. [*Back to NICK*] How do you like that for
declension, young man? Eh? [205]

George provides an answer for Nick's question, and he changes the topic by making a vague statement and requesting Nick to comment on it in an interrogative form.

NICK: Sir, I'm sorry if we ...
GEORGE[*with an edge in his voice*]***:*** You didn't answer my question.
NICK*:* Sir?
GEORGE*:* Don't you condescend to me! [*Toying with him*] I
asked you how you liked that for a declension: Good;
better; best; bested. Hm? Well?
NICK [*with some distaste*]***:*** I really don't know what to say.[206]

Nick, nonetheless, does not provide an SPP to his request. He rather assumes that George is being unfriendly with him and apologizes. He does not finish his turn, George interrupts him stating that he didn't answer his question in a sharp way. Nick confusingly demands an explanation by saying *'Sir?'*. George orders him and repeats his unanswered question. Nick is very confused. He doesn't answer. He rather expresses his confusion as what the appropriate answer should be. This small exchange denotes a communication breakdown between the two men. None of the utterances could

[205] (ibid: 16)
[206] Ibid

be organized into pairs, because none of them is satisfactory in the light of the FPP that proceeds them. The following exchange demonstrates how Nick perceives this breakdown.

GEORGE[*feigned incredulousness*]**:** You really don't know what to *say*?

NICK[*snapping it out*]**:** All right ... what do you want me to say? Do you want me to say it's funny, so you can contradict me and say it's sad? Or do you want me to say it's sad so you can turn around and say no, it's funny. You can play that damn little game any way you want to, you know!

GEORGE[*feigned awe*]**:** Very good! Very good! [207]

George repeats Nick's words in a form of yes/ no question to show that he doubts Nick's statements. Nick, being angry, does not provide a confirmation to that. He explains why he does not know what to say. He suggests that no matter what he says, it will not be satisfactory for George, this means there are two possible SPPs to George's question and both of them are problematic. George does not offer any explanation in his turn. He just comments saying *'very good'* as an assessment. His comment is perceived by Nick as a confirmation of George's unfriendliness He expresses his indignation saying that he and his wife will go.

NICK[*even angrier than before*]**:** And when my wife comes back, I think we'll just ...

GEORGE[*sincere*] : Now, now... calm down my boy. Just ... calm...down. [*Pause*] All right? [*Pause*] you want another drink? Here, give me your glass.

NICK: I still have one. I *do* think that when my wife comes downstairs ...

GEORGE: Here ... I'll freshen it. Give me your glass. [*Takes it.*][208]

[207] Ibid
[208] Ibid

George initiates an FPP; he attempts to calm Nick down and offers him another drink. Nick' s SPP to that is a refusal for the offer saying he still has one. He does not attempt to mitigate the dispreferred response, which indicates how the unfriendliness between the characters. Nick restates that he wants to go home again. George restates that he insists on his offer and takes Nick's glass.

The above analysis attempts to explain how George attempts to establish his control over his guest Nick in terms of how their talk is organized into pairs. It also indicates the amount of unfriendliness between the two in the way they initiate the sequences and how they respond to each other.

Analysing the exchange in terms of turn taking organization indicates the same results. Since only two people are participating in the conversation, turn taking distribution is equal. It is obvious who the next person is in turn. Thus there is no control over turn allocation. Yet, it could be argued that George is the person who controls the topics of the exchanges in the conversation that started from the beginning of this section, with only one exception when Nick asked George about how long he has been at the university. It is also George who initiates most of the sequences and he is also the person who has the longest turns.

2.3 Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker*

The caretaker is a three-act play written by Harold Pinter. It premiered in 1960. This play is considered to be an absurdist one due to the fact that it offers a critique of the modern world isolation and lack of communication. The language used by characters in the play fails to establish any form of communication which renders it meaningless.

It revolves around three characters: Aston, an introverted but a compassionate man in his early thirties, his younger ambitious and cunning brother, Mick, who is in his late twenties, and Davies, an old homeless ungrateful man. The events of the play take place in a room in west London.

The play starts when Austin brings Davies to the room after he saved him from a fight in this latter's workplace. He provides him with shoes -since he has only sandals on him-and a few shillings. In addition to that, he invites him to stay there for some time. The next day, Aston makes a remark to Davies that he makes a noise while he is asleep which prevents Aston from sleeping. However, Davies denies the accusation blaming that on the neighbours. Then, Aston goes out leaving Davies alone in the house.

Davies starts by examining the different objects set up in the room when Mick, Aston's brother, arrives unnoticed. He attacks Davies and knocks him down and starts to inquire about who he is and why he is there. When told that he is brought by the owner of the house, Mick says that he is the owner. He starts to play word games on Davies and makes propositions for him to get the house after Aston finishes fixing its different rooms. While Mick is still there, Aston arrives with a bag since he promised Davis to get his stuff from where he worked. The bag is not actually his; however, Aston picked it up for him along with a few clothes as well.

When Mick leaves, Aston proposes that Davies becomes a caretaker at the house. Davis refuses the proposition due to the dangers he could encounter while serving there and responding to the bell. These dangers may be caused by the person he fought with, or the police since he uses a false name, Bernard Jenkins, and false papers. Sometime later, Mick returns. He and Davis have a little chat over Aston. Davis says that he cannot understand him and he does not consider him as a friend. Mick also complains a little about the fact that his brother is idle and unable to work and get things done. He proposes to Davies to become a caretaker at the house on the condition that he provides his references. Davies states that he has to get to Sidcup in order to get his papers when the weather gets better as well as some good pair of shoes- which he kept saying from the beginning of the play but seemed reluctant to do.

The next day, Davies wakes up complaining about how the open widow of the room lets in rain and winds on his head. He also complains about not being able to go out without a decent pair

of shoes that Aston is supposed to provide him with. He says that he can't even go out and get a cup of tea. Aston suggests that there is a coffee shop down the road when he used to be a popular client. He used to talk a lot while others listen, in the coffee shop or in the factory where he worked. He had hallucinations and had to be committed to a mental facility and got an electroshock treatment. Since then, he says that he could not get his thoughts together and that he ceased talking to people as he used to.

Two weeks later, in an encounter between Davies and Mick at the room, Davies complains that since the day Aston told him about his tragedy, they hardly ever talk and he never cares for him. He attempts to turn Mick against his brother through saying that the two can get the house better without him. During that time, Aston comes in with a pair of shoes for Davies which he did not like. Later, at night, Aston wakes Davies up for the sounds he makes. This latter, gets furious, grumbles, taunts Aston about his electroshock treatment. When Aston asks him to leave the place, he threatens him. He leaves the house only to return later that day with Mick. He recounts what happened Aston and calls him nutty. Mick takes his brother’s side. He accuses Davis for causing trouble in the house and for being a fraud. A few minutes later, Aston arrives to find Davies there pleading him to get back. Aston refuses that claiming that Davis makes too much noise.

2.3.1 Analysis of the Play

2.3.1.1 *The Caretaker* Speech Act Analysis

As always noted in this research, speech acts refer to the way people use the language for specific action. The realization of a speech act does not consist of the mere use of words, it also includes the socio-pragmatic elements surrounding the utterance and the speech event in which it occurs. Speech acts could be direct or indirect. It could be argued that the choice of the speech act can reveal aspects of the speaker's personality and their relationship with their addresses. Taking into consideration the play under analysis, *The Caretaker,* it appears that there is a direct link between the character's personality and the way they conduct their speech acts.

Davies is a homeless old man. He met Aston when this latter saved him from a fight. He invited him over to his house. At the beginning of the play, Davies tells stories of how clean, decent and respected he is. However, the play proceeds to indicate that he is none of what he says. He is a self-centred and grateful. This shows through his use of speech acts. At the beginning he uses more often indirect speech acts when asking, complaining and refusing. However, towards the end of the play, his words revealed who he really is. His speech acts become more direct and he even ends up threatening and ordering his host out of the house.

The following exchange occurs around the beginning of the first act:

DAVIS. Anyway, I'm obliged to you letting me... letting me have a bit of rest, like ... for a few minutes. (*He looks about)* This your room?

ASTON. Yes.

DAVIS. You got a good of stuff here.

ASTON. Yes.

DAVIS. Must be worth a few bob, this ... put it all together.

Pause.

There's enough of it.

ASTON. There's enough of it, all right.

DAVIS. You sleep here, do you?

ASTON. Yes.

DAVIS. What, in that?

ASTON. Yes.

DAVIS. Yes, well, you'd be well out of draught there.

ASTON. You don't get much wind.

DAVIES. You'd be well out of it. It's different when you're kipping out.

ASTON. Would be.

DAVIES. Nothing but wind then.

Pause.

ASTON. Yes, when the wind gets up it ...

Pause.

DAVIES. Yes ....

ASTON. Mmnn....

Pause.

DAVIS. Gets very draughty.

ASTON. Ah.

DAVIS. I'm very sensitive to it.

ASTON. Are you?

DAVIS. Always have been.[209]

Davies thanks Aston for getting him to his house. He adds '*for few minutes'* which has an important implication for understanding the motive behind his words. He then proceeds to ask him several questions about his house, bed and belongings. Shortly afterwards, he makes a comment about the wind not getting inside the room, unlike when he sleeps out. He states that he is very sensitive to the wind. He confirms that again in the last line of the exchange. All the previous acts could be assembled in one major speech act which is requesting Aston that he spends the night at his home. This is what later really happens.

Another example of his indirect speech acts is when he asks question.

DAVIS. (*talking how lucky he is being saved)*

Pause.

I noticed there was someone was living in the house next door.

ASTON. What?

DAVIES. (*gesturing*). I noticed….

ASTON. Yes. There's people living all along the road.

DAVIES. Yes, I noticed the curtains pulled down there next door as we came along.

ASTON. They're neighbors

DAVIES. as we came along. I noticed them heavy big curtains right across the window down there. I thought there must be someone living there.

[209] Harold Pinter, *The Caretaker* (London: Methuen,1987),p10-11

ASTON. Family of Indians live there.[210]

Davies in this exchange does not ask directly who lives next door. He does not use interrogative form. He rather uses declarative sentences. He says: ' *I noticed the there was someone was living in the house next door'.* He repeats the same strategy of constructing his speech act twice to elicit more clarification from Aston about the neighbours. The next exchange also illustrates his way of asking indirect questions. When Aston asks him about if he wants to be a caretaker around the house. He wants to know what the nature of the work he will have to do if he becomes one.

ASTON. How do you feel about being one, then?
DAVIES. Well, I reckon … Well, I'd have to know …
you know …
ASTON. What sort of …
DAVIES. Yes, what sort of … you know …
Pause.
ASTON. Well, I mean …
DAVIES. I mean, I'd have to … I'd have to…
ASTON. Well, I could tell you ….
DAVIES. That's … that's it … you see … you get my meaning?
ASTON. When the time comes ….
DAVIES. I mean that's what I'm getting at, you see ….
ASTON. More or less exactly what you …
DAVIES. You see, what I mean to say … what I'm getting at is… I mean, what sort of jobs ….[211]

It is true that the exchange is very long for achieving the act of asking a question. This could be explained later in the conversational management section. Nonetheless, if we could assemble his question in one sentence it would be something like the following: '*I reckon I 'd have to know what sort of jobs …*' The knowledge of the speech event would help the receiver recognize the

[210] (Ibid: 12-13)
[211] (Ibid: 42-43)

rest of the question, which is about the nature of the job the Davis would do as a caretaker. Davies, again uses a declarative sentence to ask a question. This renders the speech act indirect.

The indirectness is also seen in his way of making the speech act of refusal. In the following line, Davis refuses some T-shirts that Aston brought for him.

> **DAVIES.** Yes … well, I know about these sort of shirts,
> You see. Shirts like these, they don't go far in the winter-
> Time. I mean, that's one thing I know for a fact. No, what
> I need, is a kind of a shirt with stripes, a good solid shirt,
> With stripes going down. That's what I want. (*He takes from the bag a deep-red velvet smoking-jacket.*) what's this?[212]

This long line could be put into three words. No, I don't want them. However, Davis chooses to make his act of refusal elaborate and indirect, probably as a politeness strategy. He first comments on them, that they are not very useful for him in the winter. Then, he talks about his preferred type of shirts. This act of refusal contrasts significantly with the one that would be presented later when explaining how Davies changes his speech acts into more direct forms.

His complaints are also characterized by some degree of indirectness around the beginning of the play.

> **DAVIES.** You see, the trouble is, it's right on the top of my bed,
> you see? What I got to watch is nudging ... one of them
> gas taps with my elbow when I get up, you get my meaning?[213]

In this line Davies was complaining about the stove that is set near his bed. What Davies does is that he mentions that he has to be careful not to bump into the gas taps. He does not complain about the placement of the stove in a direct way.

[212] (Ibid: 41)
[213] (Ibid: 26)

It should be mentioned here that in the first parts of the play, there are some instances of direct speech acts by Davies. The examples mentioned above illustrate that besides the direct ones, there are some indirect speech acts especially when there is a great imposition. There is a decrease in the frequency of the indirect speech acts used by him in the last parts of the play as a consequence of knowing that Aston is not the landlord and seeing that Mick, the real owner of the house, does not seem to have a close relationship with Aston, his brother.

Aston brings Davies the pair of shoes that he promised him

ASTON. Pair of shoes.
DAVIES. (*turning*). What?
ASTON. I picked them up. Try them.
DAVIES. Shoes? What sort?
ASTON. They might do you.

DAVIES *comes down stage, takes off sandals and tries the shoes on. He walks about, waggling his feet, bends, and press the leather.*

DAVIES. No, they're not right.
ASTON. Aren't they?
DAVIES. No, they don't fit. [214]

It could be deduced from the first parts of the play that despite the kindness of Aston and his enormous help to Davis, he is an unthankful and a self-absorbed person. Although he has got nothing to wear, he refuses the clothes and shoes that Aston brings to him. In the previous example about shirts, Davies refuses them in an indirect way; however, this time he refuses them in a direct manner: '*no, they're not right'* and '*no, they don't fit'*.

He makes his complaints in a direct way also:

It's getting so freezing in here I have to keep my trousers on to go to be. I never done that before in my life. But that's what I got to do here. Just because you won't put in any bleeding heating! I've had just about enough with you

[214] (Ibid: 65)

mucking me about. [215]

Even though Davies is homeless, he is fussy about his staying in the house. He complains about how cold it is. His complaint is straightforward and direct unlike the complaint analysed about the stove.

He complains many times towards the end of the play, especially about Aston. While he talks to Mick he expresses his dissatisfaction about the way Aston treats him. For example:

He don't answer me when I talk to him. [216]

He don't give me no knife. [217]

and: *he don't care about me. He was talking to himself!*

That's all he worries about. [218]

At the end of the play, Davies gets himself kicked out of the house due to his demanding and hypercritical behaviour. He insults Aston extensively after he wakes him up in the middle of the night because he snores while asleep. When Aston reacts and moves towards him, Davies threatens him with a knife.

DAVIES: […]Don't come nothing with me, mate. I got this here. I used it. I used it. Don't come it with me.

A pause. They stare at each other.

Mind what you do now.

Pause.

Don't you try anything with me.

He orders him not to advance, He tells him that he has got a knife and tells him that he has used it before. He implies that he will not hesitate to use it again. He carries on his orders for him. All these acts serve as a threat. After this shocking act, Aston kicks Davies out of the house by telling him to find somewhere else to live in. Davies exclaims: '*find somewhere else? Me? You talking to*

[215] (Ibid 67)
[216] (Ibid: 59)
[217] Ibid
[218] (Ibid :60)

me?'. Then, he answers his own questions*: 'Not me, man!'* He tells Aston that it is him, Aston, who has to leave his own house.

ASTON. I … I think it's about time you found somewhere
else. I don't think we're hitting it off.

DAVIES. Find somewhere else?

ASTON. Yes.

DAVIES. Me? you talking to me? Not me, man! You!

ASTON. What?

DAVIES. You! you better find somewhere else! [219]

The last blow is when Davies describes Aston's shed as stinky. This shed represents Aston's dream which he has been talking about all the time. Aston gets outraged and decides to tell Davies the truth that in facts he is the one who stinks. Davies grabs his knife again and threatens him, saying:

DAVIES. I'LL STINK YOU![220]

Aston collects Davies belongings then:

DAVIS. You ain't … you ain't got the right… Leave
that alone, that's mine!
DAVIES takes the bag and presses the contents down.
All right … I been offered a job here … you wait …
(*He puts on his smoking jacket*) .. you wait … your
brother … he'll sort you out… you call me that…
you call me that …no one's ever called me that..
(*He puts on his overcoat*.) You will be sorry you called me that
…. you ain't heard the last of this … (He picks his
bag and goes to the door.) you will be sorry you called me
that …
He opens the door ASTON watching him
Now I know who I can trust.[221]

[219] (Ibid: 68)
[220] (Ibid: p69)
[221] Ibid

He refuses Aston's decision to kick him out and he orders him to put down his bag. He tells him that he has a job there. He also warns him that his brother will deal with him, threatening him that he will be sorry for the insult of being called stinky. Before he leaves he states that after all what happens he will be friends with Mick, and that he is disappointed with Aston's behaviour.

2.3.1.2 *The Caretaker* Politeness Analysis

Pragmatically speaking, the term of politeness is not fixed for specific people in specific situations. It is rather flexible. Thus, one has to opt for the right strategy according to the situation. Politeness helps to get things done while preserving social relationships by the simple consideration of the addressee's face.

It shows through the play that Davis is very aware of how politeness functions. He uses politeness strategies tactfully especially when needed. However, he turns to be pretty rude in other situations.

> **DAVIES.** I'll tell you what, mate, you haven't got a spare pair of shoes? [222]

He is in fact badly in a need for shoes. In this utterance he requests Aston if he had got a pair of shoes. He addresses him using the term address *mate* to attend to Aston's positive face. '*Mate*' *is* an in-group marker that stresses familiarity and closeness. He follows up his request in an indirect way using a hybrid declarative and interrogative form to show that he is not sure that Aston has a spare pair of shoes. Additionally, he shows pessimism about his concern. Indirectness and pessimism are considered to be strategies for negative politeness to redress the imposition one is about to make.

Another example to illustrate Davies's politeness is the following:

> **DAVIES** (*coming around*)**.** Eh, mister, just one thing ... eh .... you couldn't slip me a couple of bob, for a cup of tea, just, you know?

[222] (Ibid: 13)

ASTON. I gave you a few bob last night.

DAVIS. Eh, so you did. So, you did. I forgot. Went clean out of my mind. That's right. Thank you, mister. Listen. You're sure now, you're sure you don't mind me staying here? I mean, I'm not the sort of man who wants to take any liberties. [223]

He makes a request for money from Aston. This time he uses the term address *mister* to imply deference, thus, an attendance to Aston's negative face. He also stumbles '*eh ... eh...'* , and hedges his request using *'just'* and repeats it twice in the request. He uses the verb '*slip'* instead of give. He uses the model '*could*' and repeats the strategy he made in his request for shoes; using declarative sentence with an interrogative form and using the technique of seeming pessimistic about getting his request done. All these strategies are done for the aim of minimizing his FTA. Nonetheless, Aston refuses his request saying that he has given him money in the previous night. Davies responds to that saying that he forgets about it and thanks Aston for that. He, then, proceeds questioning Aston's decision for letting him stay there. Stressing that he is a respected and polite person that does not '*take any liberties'*. By saying that, he draws the attention towards the fact that he attends to his host's freedom of action and independence.

Despite the fact the Aston lets him stay in his house since he is homeless, Davies remarkably complaints many times about several things in the house. At the beginning he does that in a polite way.

DAVIES. Eh, I was going to ask you, mister, what about this stove? I mean, do you think it's going to be letting out any ... what do you think?

ASTON. It's not connected.

DAVIES. You see, the trouble is, it's right on the top of my bed, you see? What I got to watch is nudging ... one of them

[223] (Ibid: 26)

gas taps with my elbow when I get up, you get my meaning?[224]

As could be noticed, Davies keeps on calling Aston '*mister*'. He hedges his complain with '*eh'* at the beginning, and he makes it seem like it is hard to embark on it by adding an introductory statement: *'I was going to ask you mister'*. He tries to ask about the stove in general: '*what about this stove?'* He again makes it seem hard to pronounce his complaint by adding : '*I mean'* . Additionally he hedges it using the verb '*think'*. He asks him if he thinks if the stove is going to let out '*any…*' and he does not finish off his question. He adds another question: '*What do you think?'* All these strategies are used to redress his complaint. However, he is not satisfied with Aston's answer that the stove is not connected. He makes another complaint about the fact that his elbow nudges the stove when he gets up. To accomplish his complaint politely, he repeats '*you see'* twice and adding '*you get my meaning'* trying to get his host to agree with him.

In the above few examples, Davies chooses his politeness strategies depending on the social distance between him and his host as well as the power difference between them, due to the fact that he believes that Aton is the owner of the house where he wants to stay. The turning point in the discussion about Davies's politeness is learning that Aston is not the owner of the house, but it is rather his brother Mick. He thought also that the relationship between Aston and Mick is not good due to the fact that they hardly communicate, so, he attempts to take advantage of that. Consequently, he lines up with Mick and even tries to turn him against his brother. The reader can notice how Davies's talk changes dramatically towards Aston. He realizes that the degree of power that he has thought that Aston has is not a true one. The following exchange is an example of that. Davies complains about the window that Aston leaves open. Aston says that he does so because the room needs air.

DAVIES (*putting his sandals***).** Listen. I've lived all my life in
the air, boy. You don't have to tell me about air. What I'm
saying is, there's too much air coming in that window when

[224] (Ibid: 26)

I'm asleep.[225]

Davies no longer hedges his complains. He makes them baldly on- record with no attempt to redress his FTAs. In addition to that, he ceased to use '*mister'* and '*mate'* when addressing Aston. He uses the belittling term *boy*. When Aston says that he does so because the room needs air. Davies restates his complaint.

DAVIES. Yes, but listen, you don't know what I'm telling you. That bloody rain, man, come right in on my head. Spoils my sleep. I could catch my death of cold with it, with that draught. That's all I'm saying. Just shut that window and no one's going to catch any colds that s all I'm saying.[226]

Davies appears to be more dogmatic when asserting his claims. This could be noticed through the use of '*you don't know what I'm telling you* and *that's all I'm saying'*. He uses the term *man* to address Aston which indicates distance. He makes his complaint very direct and then he suggests that Davies closes the window using an imperative structure: *shut that window*.

Near the end of the play Davies becomes very rude. He reacts in a furious way towards Aston who tells him that he snores while asleep. He complains about how Aston treats him. He also criticizes him using the story of how he was committed to a mental institution.

DAVIES: You want me to do all the dirty work all up and down them stairs just so I can sleep in this lousy filthy hole every night? Not me, boy. Not for you boy. You don't know what you're doing half the time. You're up the creek! You're half off! You can tell it by looking at you. Who ever saw you slip me a few bob? Treating me like a bloody animal! I never been inside a nuthouse! [227]

Davies's criticism and complaints are direct FTAs towards Aston's positive face. He does not attempt in any way to redress them. As a reaction, Aston decides to tell him to find another place

[225] (Ibid: 53)
[226] Ibid
[227] (Ibid: 58)

to stay in. They fight and eventually Davies leaves the house only to return later and try to involve Mick in a brawl against his brother. However, Mick does not seem to offer a positive reaction. Humiliated Davies, then, tries to convince Aston to accept him back in the house. The play finishes with these words by Davies:

> Listen... if... I got down... if I was to ... get
> my papers... would you... would you let... would
> you... if I got down... and got my....[228]

In his final words in the play, Davies tries to request Aston to let him stay. He resorts to the use of politeness strategies in the first exchanges, such as stumbling, repetition and indirectness.

Davies' growing impoliteness towards Aston, as discussed above, is accompanied by a total opposed politeness towards his brother. Since he learns who the true landlord of the house is, he decides to befriend him. When he learns about Mick's plans to rearrange the house, he proposes to stay in as the caretaker of the house.

> **DAVIS.** You and me, we could get this place going. [229]

In this line, Davies stresses the common wants and interests between the two, which is a positive politeness strategy. He wants to confirm for Mick that he wants to stay around. This can also be noticed in the following utterance:

> **DAVIS.** He's no friend of mine. You don't know where you
> are with him. I mean with a bloke like you, you know where
> you are.
> *MICK looks at him.*
> I mean, you got your own ways, I'm not saying you ain't
> got your own ways, anyone can see that. You may have
> some funny ways, but that's not the same with all of us, but
> with him, it's different, see? I mean at least with you, the
> thing with you is you're ...
>
> **MICK.** Straightforward.

[228] (Ibid: 78)
[229] (Ibid: 60)

DAVIES. That's it, you're straightforward.[230]

Davies attempts to turn Mick against his brother. He starts by criticizing him because he is not a talkative man. He proceeds to oil the wheel with Mick by attending to his positive face. He uses the term '*bloke'* to address him which sounds friendly. He adds that unlike with Aston, he knows where he is with Mick. He comments on Mick's ways. He hedges that with '*I mean, some funny ways'* and by repetition. He stresses their common ground and in-group membership by saying that it the case with all of '*us'*. He tries to bring him to agree with his opinion saying '*see?'* and at the end he compliments him by saying that he is '*straight forward*. However, he comes to discover that all his attempts are in vain.

Mick, as Davies calls him, is a '*joker'* and a cunning character. This could be noticed through his use of the language. Sometimes he uses very polite strategy when addressing Davies and at other times, he seems to be rude. They meet when Mick enters the room when Aston is not there. He sees that Davies is examining the different objects set there. He attacks him physically and starts interrogating him about who he is and about what he is doing in the room. The way he was asking him is a typical way of asking an intruder.

MICK. What's your name?
DAVIES.I don't know you. I don't know who you are.
Pause
MICK. Eh?
DAVIES. Jenkins
MICK. Jenkins?
DAVIES. Yes.
MICK. Jen...kins
Pause
MICK. You sleep here last night?
DAVIS. Yes.
MICK. Sleep well?

[230] (Ibid: 61)

DAVIES. Yes. [231]

Mick in this exchange is considered to be in a position of power in comparison to Davies. He uses direct questions: '*What's your name? You sleep here last night? Sleep well?'* Moreover, he forces him to answer using just an '*Eh?'* and to repeat rhetorically his name '*Jenkins?'*. These strategies contrasts considerably in the following exchange:

MICK. I'm awfully glad. It's awfully nice to meet you.

Pause

What did you say your name was?

DAVIES. Jenkins.

MICK. I beg your pardon?

DAVIES. Jenkins!

Pause

MICK. Jen...kins.[232]

He gives a long line about how Davies reminds him of his uncles' brother and follows up by saying:

'I hope you slept well last night.'

Mick indicates that it is nice to meet him attending to Jenkins positive face want to be liked and accepted. He reinforces this by using the word '*awfully'*. He goes on to repeat his name, but more politely this time. He asks a question: *'what did you say your name was?'* and the polite form of asking someone to repeat '*I beg your pardon'*.

One would think that Mick begins to be polite towards Davies because he inferred that he has been invited by his brother to sleep the night there. However, Mick returns to his unfriendly manner of talking.

MICK. I'm afraid you're a born fibber. en't you? You're speaking to the owner. This is my room. You're standing in my house.[233]

MICK. ... I think I'm coming to the conclusion that you're an old rogue. You're nothing but an old scoundrel.

---

[231] (Ibid: 30)
[232] (Ibid: 31)
[233] (Ibid: 34)

DAVIES. Now wait-

MICK. Listen, son. Listen, sonny. You stink. [234]

The previous lines of Mick are considered to be direct threats towards Davies positive face and negative face. He first accuses him to be a liar. He continues to insult him by calling him '*an old rogue'* and '*an old scoundrel'*. These are direct FTAs towards Davies's Positive face. He interrupts him, and he orders him to listen in a direct speech act without using any politeness strategy. Both are FTAs towards Davies's negative face wants: freedom of action and imposition. He also calls him '*son'* and *'sonny'* despite the fact that Davis is older than he is. He does so for the aim of belittling him.

A day later, Davies arrives into the house to find Mick playing him around in the dark with a vacuum cleaner. Mick appears to be friendly with Davies. He offers a sandwich him and they had a chat about Aston. He asked Davies for advice concerning his brother in a polite manner.

MICK. Uuh ... listen ... can I ask your advice? I mean,
you're a man of the world. Can I ask your advice about
something?

DAVIES. You go right ahead.

MICK. Well, what it is, you see, I'm ... I'm a bit worried
about my brother. [235]

One of the main factors that affect his way of requesting the advice is its nature. It is a serious matter, since he is addressing it towards someone he does not really know and who claims that he and his brother are not very close. However, he embarks on it anyway. At the beginning, he hesitates and makes it appear like it is hard for him to start his request. He constructs his message in an indirect way using the model '*can'* which is a negative politeness strategy. Before repeating his request, he compliments Davies calling him '*a man of the world'* attending to his positive face.

[234] (Ibid: 35)
[235] (Ibid: 48)

Nevertheless, Mick gets angry when Davies criticises his brother and calls him '*funny'*. Davis thought that he could cooperate with Mick against his own brother. Mick notices this and decides to puts an end to Davies's attempts through criticising him and telling him that he lies to him by saying he is an interior decorator, which Davies in fact did not.

MICK. You're a bloody imposter, mate!

The act of criticism is a threat to the addressee's positive face. Mick makes it baldly on-record. He insults Davies by calling him '*imposter'* and reinforces the insult using '*bloody'*. He attempts in no way to redress his criticism to attend to Davies's face because he thinks that the situation does not need that.

2.3.1.3 *The Caretaker* Conversation Analysis

Conversations are considered to be forms of social action. There are many reasons for people to engage in them, e.g. inviting someone or gossiping. Conversations are spontaneous and less organized in comparison with other forms of discourse. However, as we have seen in the first chapter, they are structured and systematically organized. Their structure can be noticed through the way people take turn and organize their talk in terms of sequences. It could be argued that the way in which people conduct conversation is tightly related to pragmatic aspects. Therefore, they are strong indicators of the relationship between the different participants as well as their social backgrounds. Conversations of characters in Pinter's play *The Caretaker* offers valuable examples of how pragmatic elements affect in a great deal the organization of conversation.

Isolation and failure of communication are one of the themes explored in the play. They are indicators of how characters fail to establish strong relationships with one another. They tend to be redundant, repeat the same questions and answers with no apparent objective. They make long speeches about themselves with no response from the other participant or even address them without waiting for reaction. Such patterns lead to communication breakdowns between them due to the fact that they do no attain a specific objective from their communication.

Aston and his brother Mick hardly ever communicate in the play. The following conversation is an instance of the way they converse. Mick has been talking to Davies lengthily about how he can pay to stay in the room and asks him about his bank information when Aston enters:

Silence.

A drop sounds in the bucket. They all look up.

Silence.

You still got that leak.

ASTON. Yes.

Pause.

Its' coming from the roof.

MICK. From the roof, eh?

ASTON. Yes.

Pause.

I'll have to tar it over.[236]

Mick statement '*you still got that leak'* is noteworthy owing to the fact that the leak in the bucket has been obvious for all of them, and Mick makes a statement about it. He addresses it to his brother as an attempt to start a conversation with him. Aston in his turn confirms. Then, there is a considerable pause which could be described as an attributable silence that belongs to none of the conversational participants. The previous sequence is finished and none of them starts a new one. Aston then continues and explains that it comes from the roof, which is something obvious also. Mick as an attempt to carry on the conversation reformulates his brother's words in a form of a question '*From the roof, eh?'*. His objective is not to confirm the source of the leak, because it is already known and already mentioned by his brother. Aston answers to confirm and observes another pause. After the pause, Aston declares that he will tar it over. Such a declaration could be taken as an end of the exchange. However, Mick repeats the patterns of reformulating his brother's words into questions, asking about, and commenting on obvious matters just to keep the conversation going, all with the interspersion of pauses.

[236] (Ibid: 37)

MICK. You're going to tar it over?

ASTON. Yes.

MICK. What?

ASTON. The cracks.

Pause.

MICK. You'll be tarring over the cracks on the roof.

ASTON. Yes.

Pause.[237]

For the first time Mick asks a question in order to elicit a real answer from his brother:

MICK. Think that'll do?

ASTON. It'll do it, for the time being.

MICK. Uh.

Pause.

He asks his brother to confirm his opinion about the necessity of tarring the cracks in the roof to stop the leak. Aston answers that it would do well for the time being. Mick then backchannels to indicate that his brother's opinion is well- received. Immediately after, there is another pause that indicates that none of them is taking the turn. Davies decides to address Aston starting a new sequence:

DAVIES (*abruptly*). What do you do- ?

They both look at him.

What do you do … when that bucket's full?

Pause.

ASTON. Empty it.

Pause.[238]

Although the question is addressed to Aston, there is a pause before he answers the question. That is because of the illogical nature of the question. Logically speaking, when a bucket is full, it should be emptied. So, Davies's question could be argued to be just a way of trying to fill in the awkwardness of the conversation. Aston answers it anyway by saying that he empties it. There is

[237] Ibid
[238] Ibid

another attributable silence and no one takes the turn directly. Mick addresses his brother as follows:

MICK. I was telling my friend you were about to start decorat-
ing the other rooms.
ASTON. Yes.
Pause.
(*T*o DAVIES.) I got your bag.[239]

Mick attempts for the last time to initiate an exchange with his brother telling him about what he and Davies have been talking about. Aston does not actually understand the objective of his brother's attempts. His short answer *'yes'* with a pause after it indicates that he does not attempt to carry on the exchange with his brother. He addresses Davies to tell him about his bag.

Although in terms of adjacency pairs and preference structure, there is nothing that indicates incomplete sequences and failure of communication, Aston seems to be uncooperative in this exchange because he fails to recognize the objective of his brother's attempts to start a conversation with him. One can see that Mick's questions and comments are in fact phatic. He just attempts to keep the conversation going as a way to communicate and maintain a good social relationship with his brother. However, these attempts are met with short *'yes'* answers and pauses which render the exchange awkward. This awkwardness is an indicator of the failure of communication between the two.

Communication breakdowns are indicators of social distance. They show that participants fail to find a shared conversational rhythm. This can be illustrated in misconstructed sequences. When a conversational participant fails to provide an appropriate SPP to the FPP of his partner or by constructing sequences that have no relationship with the whole exchange can result in very odd exchanges. The analysis of the following exchange supports this claim. Aston and Davies are talking about Mick and how Aston is supposed to fix the house for him:

[239] Ibid

ASTON. I'm supposed to be doing up the upper part of the house for him.

DAVIES. What … you mean … you mean it's his house?

ASTON. Yes. I'm supposed to be decorating this landing for him. Make a flat out of it.

DAVIES. What does he do, then?

ASTON. He's in the building trade. He's got his own van.

DAVIES. He don't live here, do he?

ASTON. Once I get that shed up outside … I'll be able to give a bit more thought to the flat, you see. Perhaps I can knock up one or two things for it. (*He walks to the window*.) I can work with my hands, you see. That's one thing I can do. I never knew I could. But I can do all sorts of things now, with my hands. You know, manual things. When I get that shed up out there … I'll have a workshop, you see. I … could do a bit of woodwork. Simple woodwork, to Start. Working with … good wood.

Pause.

Of course, there's a lot to be done to this place. What I think, though, I think I'll put in a partition … in one of the rooms along the landing. I think it'll take it. You know … they've got these screens … you know … Oriental. They break up a room with them. Make it into two parts. I could either do that or could have a partition. I could Knock them up, you see, if I had a workshop.

Pause.

Anyway, I think I've decided on the partition.

Pause.

DAVIES. Eh, look here, I been thinking. This ain't my bag.[240]

Aston initiates the exchange by telling Davies about the work he has to do in Mick's house. Davies does not offer any comment on that. He just starts an insertion sequence to confirm if the house is

[240] (Ibid: 40-41)

in fact Mick's. Aston confirms that and then moves on to talking about the work again. Davies does not offer any comment on that either. He seems preoccupied with Mick, so he asks Aston about Mick's job, and Aston answers that. He asks another question, this time in order to confirm whether Mick lives in the house using a tag question. Aston does not confirm Davies's questions. Surprisingly, he starts a longue turn about why he has not started the work on the house, about how he can work with his hands, his plan of building a shed and having a workshop. A pause follows. Davies does not take the turn, nor does he backchannel. Aston carries on his speech about the work to be done in the rooms and about how he can put up partitions. While he is talking he inserts *'you know'* and *'you see'* as a way of attracting Davies's attention. Davies does not say anything during the pause. Aston takes a turn again: '*anyway, I think, I've decided on the partitions.'* Another pause occurs. Davies takes the turn. However, he does not comment on what Aston has been saying. He initiates another sequence commenting that the bag which Aston brought him earlier is not his.

This example shows Davies and Aston's social- distant and unfriendly relationship. Davies does not cooperate in the conversation with Aston unless there is a relevance for his own interests. Although there are many TRPs, Davies takes none of them and remains silent. He does not backchannel nor he comments on Aston's talk.

The next excerpt to be analysed in terms of conversational management starts when Mick enters the room. He finds Davies checking up its different objects, attacks him physically and starts interrogating him about who he is and what he is doing there. He also tells him that he resembles someone he knows. He asks him if he slept there last night. The conversation carries on as follows.

MICK. Did you sleep here last night?
DAVIES. Yes.
MICK. Sleep well?
DAVES. Yes!
MICK. Did you have to get up in the night?
DAVIES. No!

Pause.

MICK. What's your name?

DAVIES (*shivering, about to rise).* Now look here!

MICK. What?

DAVIES. Jenkins!

MICK. Jen … kins.

DAVIES makes a sudden move to rise. Violent bellow from MICK sends him back.

(*A shout.*) Sleep here last night?[241]

This is not the first time Mick asks Davies about his name and how well he slept the previous night. The lines before such exchange have been analysed in the previous section. Mick is in total control of the situation. The organization of the sequences and turn taking indicate that. All his questions are answered by Davies directly. He is also in control of the topic of the exchange. He changes the topic many times. When Davies attempts to challenge the interrogating pattern by saying ' *now look here'* . Mick does not comment on that and repeats his question about Davies's name. When Davies answers Mick repeats his answer *"Jen … kins"* in a sceptical manner. The slight pause in his utterance indicates that. He jumps to the talk about Davies's night and asks:

(*A shout.*) Sleep here last night?

DAVIES. Yes …

MICK (*continuing at great pace*). how'd you sleep?

DAVIES. I slept-

MICK. Sleep well ?

DAVIES. Now look-

MICK. What bed?

DAVIES. That-

MICK. Not the other?

DAVIES. No!

MICK. Choosy.

Pause.

[241] (Ibid: 32-33)

(Quietly) Choosy.

Pause.[242]

Mick continues his interrogation. This time he does not let Davies finishes his sentences. He does not wait for a TRP and jumps in right in the middles of Davies' turn and interrupts him. Mick's interruptions are indicators of lack of friendliness. Mick continues his questions:

(*Again amiable*.) What sort of sleep did you have in that bed?

DAVIES. (*banging on floor*). All right!

MICK. You weren't uncomfortable?

DAVIES (groaning). all right![243]

Analysing Mick's questions without any reference to the context or the stage directions makes it seem as if he is being friendly to him. That is why Davies call Mick a joker, later in the play. If we take into consideration their interaction before and after this exchange, Davies's claim would seem logical.

MICK *stands, and moves to him.*

MICK. You a foreigner?

DAVIES. No.

MICK. Born and bred in the British Isles?

DAVIES. I was!

MICK. What did they teach you?

Pause

How did you like my bed?

Pause

That's my bed. You want to mind you don't catch a draught.

DAVIES. From the bed?

MICK. No, now, up your arse.[244]

The first two sequences containing question-answer pairs are normal. Mick inquires about the origins of Davies. Mick's provides an FPP which is a question whereas Davies supplies the suitable

[242] (Ibid: 33)
[243] Ibid
[244] (Ibid: 33-34)

SPP, an answer. Mick asks two consecutive questions that Davies does not answer. After each question there is a pause of attributable silence. It seems as if Mick was offering a TRP for Davies to take the turn, but the latter, does not. Mick does not force him to answer as he does previously when asking about Davies's name. After these questions, Mick tells him that he slept on his own bed and he advises him about the draught. When Davies asks him to confirm whether he can catch the draught. Mick answers '*no*' and orders him to get up. The way the conversation unfolds between the two indicates the difference in power. As mentioned in the above few lines, Mick is in total control over this exchange.

Summary

This chapter presents different excerpts from the three play under study with reference to the target concepts. Characters language and dialogues are approached in the light of the speech acts, politeness and conversation management. Their utterances illustrate different ways in which they conduct their speech acts and how these acts are interpreted depending on the contextual and social elements of the communicative situation. The politeness analysis of the plays provides different instances when the strategies chosen by the characters could be seen clearly to reflect their identities and relationships with one another. The analysis of the characters' conversations shows that different mechanisms and conversational techniques are found in experts from the three plays. The contexts in which these conversations take place permits the study of socio-pragmatic elements of the communication.

Chapter Three

Discussion of the Results

Introduction

The exploration of pragmatic concepts in the second/foreign language classroom requires authentic instructional materials. Students need to be introduced to the target concepts while in operation in context. This helps to facilitate their understanding of the impact of the cultural and social elements of communication on the way people use language. This study establishes literary dialogues and specifically dialogues in drama as a resource that could be exploited in the classroom. It extrapolates the findings of the stylistic and pragmatic analysis of plays as means of interpretation and criticism into the teaching/learning context. This chapter is dedicated to the discussion of the results obtained from such analysis and explaining how they fit into the objectives of the study.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section is concerned with the discussion and the interpretation resulted from the analysis of speech acts in the selected excerpts from the three plays. Whereas the second section is devoted to the findings of the analysis of politeness strategies used by the characters. As for the third section, it announces the results of conversational analysis of the excerpts, their discussion and interpretation. Methodologically, the characters' language and dialogues were used as illustrations of the target concepts of speech acts, politeness phenomenon and conversational management.

3.1 The Results of Speech Act Analysis

Since the study of speech acts aimed at indicating how people get things done using their words, the use of language becomes an action in itself. Waving a knife at someone's face is a threat

the same way as threatening them verbally by saying *" I'll rack thee with old cramps"*[245] as Prospero threatens his slave Caliban. The study of speech acts also aimed at illustrating that there is not one single way of conducting a speech act. It sought also at signalling out the different ways in which people can infer the intended speech acts from the context. Excerpts from the three plays under study helped to illustrate such objectives through the examination of how characters address each other and how they do that differs according to the speech event and the socio-pragmatic elements of the context.

The analysis of Prospero's speech acts demonstrated the effect of power as a social factor in the way speech acts are conducted. The exchange between Prospero and Caliban illustrated a master-slave relationship. Since Prospero is the most powerful figure in this relationship, his speech acts are direct. He uses directive speech acts and specifically orders. Prospero's orders are direct; thus, the sentence contains lexical indications of its illocutionary force. Additionally, its grammatical structure matches its function since Prospero uses imperative structure to conduct his orders. A similar conclusion is also drawn through the way Prospero issues his speech acts of threats. Caliban is not an obedient slave. Prospero's orders are almost always faced with challenges and complaints. This drives Prospero to form his threats in direct speech acts. This is what typically happen when a powerful figure and specifically a master, has his/her commands challenged.

Prospero's speech acts change evidently into less direct ones in the light of his interactions with other characters. He moves from being the ultimate powerful figure into relatively having less power. This could be shown in the difference in his directive speech acts. They are remarkably different from the ones addressed to his slaves. Since Prospero is addressing his brother, a nobleman, and the king of Naples, his directives have changed from orders into requests even though he considers both men to be his enemies. He addresses his brother using an indirect speech act thus, instead of using an imperative structure he uses a declarative one '*I do forgive Thy rankest*

[245] Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. (London: Penguin Popular Classics,2001),p89

fault; all of them: and require My Dukedom of thee'[246]. Then, when he addresses the king of Naples, he uses an implied request, which is an indirect way also. The way in which Prospero makes his directive speech acts could be used in comparison with his orders to explain the directness and indirectness of speech acts and how this is affected by the way in which people view themselves and their relationship with their interlocutors.

Short (1996) makes important remarks concerning the perlocutionary force of the speech acts[247]. His identification of two levels of the perlocutionary force; the intended perlocutionary force and actual perlocutionary force, has important implications when discussing how power as a social factor affect the interpretation of speech acts. This is illustrated in the play through the way Prospero's power is perceived by Caliban and Ariel, and specifically the way they receive their masters' threats. They realize that these threats are not empty. In this case, the intended perlocutionary effect of Prospero's threats are the same as the actual one. He wants to threaten his slaves in order to get them to do his orders, and this is what really takes place because they set on doing their master's orders.

The same results could be inferred from the selected excerpts from Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*. The analysis showed how the assumption of the difference in power can affect the way in which people conduct speech acts and the way they respond to them. The examples analysed mainly focus on the interaction of two main characters, George and Martha. The relationship between the couple is brought under scrutiny through a speech act analysis. The speech acts both characters use to address each other could be used as examples of how language functions in a context. That is how people use language to reflect the way they see each other and the way they view themselves as well. It is true that the examples are related with only two characters. However, there is a remarkable variety in the excerpts concerning the language they use. This

[246] William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (London: Penguin Popular Classics,2001), p89.
[247] Mick Short, *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*, (London: Longman, 1996), p 197.

variety is mainly concerned with the change in the way they treat each other as a consequence of their complicated relationship and the events taking place in the play. This change has effects on the pattern of speech acts use. It is also dramatic and can be highly motivational once used in the classroom.

The play starts when the couple, George and Martha, come home from a night party only to start a long night of drinking and exhausting mental games with their guests, Nick and Honey. At the beginning of the play, Martha seems to be in total control. Her utterances indicate such claim. She speaks loudly and responds aggressively. She also insults and criticises George openly. He apologizes and always tries to give her reasons for his requests and complains. Martha surprises him with the news about the guests coming over and forces him to accept that. The excerpt showed how Martha seems to be the one who uses George as a puppet. Her speech acts are direct and assertive. Her utterance *'well, it's done'*[248] when George tries to complain is a good example of that. George's utterances are less direct. This is especially clear when he tells her not to talk about their fictional kid and threatens when she challenges him that she will. His threats are indirect such as when he tells her *'you have been advised'*[249]. Martha does not take his words seriously. In other words, his threats do not achieve their actual perlocutionary effect unlike the threats that Prospero addresses to his slaves.

The reader of the play can notice an apparent rotation of power between George and Martha. The analysis of the speech acts and their perlocutionary forces supported this claim. When George gets mad that Martha revealed the secret of their fictional child, he decides not to pay attention to his her games. Frustrated Martha issues some threats. Her threats are indirect due to the fact that their degree of offensiveness is high. She uses declarative sentences to tell George about her plan of amusing herself with Nick, when in fact she is threatening him that she is going

[248] Edward Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Vintage, 2001), p5.
[249] (Ibid: 9)

to have some sort of sexual activity with Nick. George still does not pay any form of attention to what she does. He does not manifest the reaction she wants. As a result, she threatens him again. Her intended perlocutionary effect is to scare George and gets him to pay her more attention. However, he ignores her. There is a mismatch between her intended perlocutionary effect and the actual one. Therefore, she feels less powerful and more frustrated.

By the end of the play George becomes the one who is in complete control of the situation. He decides to deliver the news about the death of their fictional child. He grows more assertive. He springs the news the same way she springs the one about the guests, and it is done. This is shown through his use of speech acts. They are direct and they achieve their intended perlocutionary effect. Martha tries to tell him that he cannot decide that matter on his own, but that is not fruitful. Her speech acts cannot get George to react as she wants. This means that she loses any power over him.

The analysis of the way Martha and George construct their utterances at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of the play showed how language is tightly related with the contextual background of the interaction. It reflects power relationships between the characters. In addition to that, the examples used to explain the match between the intended perlocutionary effect and the actual one, indicated that when there is a match, the person is viewed by their interlocutor to be powerful. When the opposite happens, it shows that the person does not regard their interlocutor the ways they want to be regarded.

Excerpts from Pinter's play, *The Caretaker*, also proved to contain many occasions for the applications of the specific pragmatic concepts of this study. The examples used to explain speech acts from this play are concerned with indicating how people can get what they want through the awareness of how they can use language. One deceives others in order to get what he/she wants by using language. However, when he/she is no longer in need, he/she can turn out to be the exact

opposite of what they claim to be. Such tendency is shown through the analysis of the speech acts of Davies at the beginning and around the end of the play.

Davies is a homeless man who has been saved and brought into Aston's house. He always tries to indicate his respectfulness and decency. In the first interactions of the play, he uses indirect speech acts in his to questions, requests or complaints. Sometimes that he uses declarative sentences to make questions. He also complains using indirect acts. His indirectness is shown through the use of sentences whose primary illocutionary force do not match their literal meaning as well as their structures that do not match the speech act as shown in the first chapter. The reason why he opts for indirectness as a strategy is due to his unfamiliarity with Aston. Another reason is that he is probably feigning politeness with him so that he could stay in the room.

Towards the end of the play, Davies's speech acts become direct, especially when he knows that Mick, Aston's brother, is the real owner of the house. Since then, he does not care about his relationship with Aston anymore. This explains the influence of contextual background on the way people construct their speech acts. The way Davies does that changes remarkably. His indirect speech acts become direct ones. This is demonstrated in the way he issues complaints and threats. Davies is very aware of the effect of the pragmatic context on language. This is indicated in his construction of speech acts. At the beginning he is not familiar with Aston, he takes him to be the owner of the house. As a consequence, he tries to be polite with him. However, when he discovers that Mick is the true owner he decides to ally himself with him. Therefore, he shows that the power difference between him and Aston is not that great because this latter is not the one who can allow him to stay in the house, so this results in the shift of speech acts pattern to indirectness.

The basis for exploring speech acts is to help the learners notice how people get things done through the use of words, which is the main purpose of Austin and Searle. There are different ways for people to construct their messages in order to achieve an objective. For instance, in order to make a request, there is not one single way to formulate it. The study of speech acts helps to give

the learners great control over their words by getting a mastery about how to construct their messages in various ways. In addition, it gives them the tools to interpret other people's messages correctly in accordance to the situation. Excerpts from the three plays are replete with examples of different types of speech acts in different situations. There are examples of direct and indirect speech acts which illustrate the variety of ways of constructing messages. The background stories of the plays, the events and the social background of the characters can help the learners expand their knowledge concerning the interpretation of speech acts and how they function in the context.

3.2 The Results of Politeness Analysis

Through the application of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987) on the three plays, one can say that different excerpts illustrated different strategies used by the characters. The strategies are sometimes appropriate resulting in a smooth interaction. At other times, the strategies are not appropriate to the situation, resulting in impoliteness or rudeness. All this was explained with reference to the socio-pragmatic parameters of social distance, power difference and the nature of the message addressed. Since the examples contain politeness strategies functioning in context, they served as excellent materials for the illustrations of the concept of politeness.

The analysis of politeness in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* indicated how social factors involved in interaction give rise to specific linguistic strategies. The power difference between interlocutors affect the way in which they address each other. In social encounters, a person is considered to have more power when they have physical, economical and metaphysical control over their interlocutors[250]. For example, in an exchange between nobles and their servants, it is clear that nobles have more power. Therefore, they expect to be talked to in a polite manner by using elaborate polite strategies. Nonetheless, in the exchange between the Boatswain and the nobles on the deck of the ship that is caught in a tempest in the middle of the sea, the Boatswain

[250] Penelope Brown and Stephen R. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p77.

does not seem to care about addressing them politely. Since the nobles are impeding to some extent the conduct of boatswain's chores, he wants them to go below deck. Nobles expect the boatswain to attend to their faces by redressing his FTA. Contrary to what they expect, he issues direct on-record orders, except for once when he uses *' I pray thee'*. This makes his utterances very rude due to the fact that he chooses inappropriate strategy for the situation.

The same strategy used by the Boatswain is also used by Prospero when he addresses his slaves. Such strategy is seen as normal due to the fact that Prospero is the most powerful speaker. He does not have to attend to his slave's faces. Nonetheless, in the analysis of the play, there has been a significant change in the strategies used by Prospero with his slaves, Ariel and Caliban. Prospero politeness strategies shift to attend to their negative and positive faces. Even though the change in the strategies is not a great one; it reflects the contextual background change, and specifically the change in power difference. For instance, Prospero attends to Ariel's face positive face by calling him *'dainty'*, telling him he will miss him and by admitting to his want to be free. Even for Caliban, whose relationship with him in not on good terms, he calls him *'sirrah'* which is significant in comparison to the way he calls him at the beginning of the play *'earth'* and *'slave'*. He also admits that he forgives him. All these are considered to be an attendance to Caliban's positive face. Such shift takes place due to Prospero's abandonment of magical powers and his decision to abandon his revenging plans and becoming more forgiving.

Excerpts in the play also illustrated that the parameter of power is not the only one that is in operation when it comes to deciding on politeness strategies. Directness is not always perceived as being rude. It can express friendliness, familiarity and close relationships. It would be awkward if someone addresses his friend in an indirect way or using elaborate politeness techniques. The exchange between Miranda and her father indicated how directness can be an appropriate strategy in the right situation. When this directness is used with a stranger, it is considered to be inappropriate because the parameter of familiarity indicates distance. Prospero uses bald on-record

orders with Ferdinand when they first meet. This strategy is considered to be rude and inappropriate because Prospero does not show any sort of attendance towards Ferdinand's face. Unlike Prospero's inappropriate strategy, Ferdinand's strategy is definitely suitable when he first meets Miranda. He clearly shows how the parameter of social distance is taken into consideration when making requests. He mitigates them by using negative and positive politeness strategies. This shows that he is aware of his FTAs and he attempts to redress them by attending to Miranda's face.

The last parameter to be illustrated in the play and how it affects the way people construct their messages is the degree of imposition. This parameter refers to the extent to which the FTA affects the positive and the negative face of the interlocutor. When Caliban requests Stephano to assassinate his Master, Prospero, the degree of imposition is great due to the nature of the request. Caliban has to do that elaborately; he expresses deference by addressing Stephano using '*thy greatness'* and he indicates that such thing is hard for him to accomplish and easy thing for Stephano, which are negative politeness techniques. Nonetheless, at the end of the play, Stephano does not show great interest in achieving Caliban's request. Therefore, outraged and frustrated, Caliban changes his strategies and makes them bald on-record with no account for the degree of his imposition which make him sound impolite. His strategy contrasts remarkably with the one used by Anthonio when he suggests that Sebastian kills his brother, Alonso, and takes over his title as a king. Anthonio does this FTA, which is the suggestion, off-record. He does not establish a direct lexical link between his intention and his words. He even adds mitigating devices to indicate that it is hard for him to suggest such a terrible thing. By doing that, he attempts to show that he attends to Sebastian negative face.

Another instance of the play where the degree of the FTA is an important socio-pragmatic factor is when Sebastian and Gonzalo criticize Alonso's decision to marry his daughter to a King from Tunis, and how travelling for the wedding has resulted in having their ship wrecked. The whole idea of criticism is considered to be an FTA towards someone's positive face. Therefore, it

has to be done tactfully. The strategies by which both of the characters conduct their criticism are remarkably different. Sebastian is considered to be impolite due to the fact that he fails to attend to his brother's positive face. Whereas, Gonzalo's criticism for Sebastian for the way he is addressing the king as well as his criticism towards the king's decision are considered to be polite and considerate. He hedges his opinion to attend to Sebastian's positive face, and then he attends to his negative face calling him *'my lord'*. He attends to the king's positive face saying that they share his sadness for losing his daughter to the wedding and losing his son to the tempest.

Politeness analysis of Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* yielded the same results as the analysis of *The Tempest.* It accounted systematically for why some characters are rude while others are polite. Additionally, it explained how the politeness strategies chosen by the characters shape and are in the same times shaped by the context in which they interact. The characters do not always present consistent patterns of politeness which is significant in terms of the interpretation of the play. This offered rich examples to be deployed to explain the concept further.

The first example that was analysed takes place when the guests Martha has been expecting arrive. The guests, Nick and his wife Honey, are extremely polite with their hosts, yet they encounter very rude and awkwardly friendly hosts, George and Martha, respectively. Nick and his wife attempt to be polite by attending to their hosts' negative faces and admitting that they should not have visited in the middle of the night. George, on the other hand, is considered to be rude towards his guests due to the fact that he complains about their presence and mocks Honey. The acts of complaining and mocking are direct threats to the positive faces of the guests, yet he does not try to redress these FTAs. Martha attempts to appear friendly. She uses direct on the record requests to making them feel socially close. However, she insults George in front of them, attacking the guests' positive faces. She does not even apologize for that or tries to ease the awkwardness resulting from it.

As the play proceeds, Martha starts to act awkwardly in terms of her politeness strategies' pattern. When she embarks on telling stories from her past, Nick does as expected from the interlocutor to do when there is an extended speech, he backchannels. However, she responds rudely to that. She tells him to shut up and listen, attacking his negative face by using bald-on record orders. She follows up by trying to fix that calling him '*cutie'*. She tries to oil the wheel and attend to his positive face. The same thing happens again shortly after that. This is what renders Martha's politeness strategies very awkward. She wants to appear as a good host. However, she sometimes loses control over he manners. At the end of the play, Martha's friendliness or even awkward politeness fades away most notably towards Nick. She cares so little about the fact that he is a guest. She makes her FTAs with no consideration for his face. She treats him and orders him as if he is a house boy. She criticises him openly because she is disappointed with him given the failed sexual encounter between the two. Her strategies change as a result of contextual change.

George is seen as bad-mannered throughout the whole play. From the beginning, George's politeness strategies are not appropriate most of the time. He doesn't not take into account that he has guests. He does not treat them with deference to attend to their negative faces given the fact that they are socially distant, and he does not attempt to attend to their positive faces to establish any form of familiarity. This tendency is indicated clearly with Nick since he considers him to be his rival. He snaps his fingers at him, he makes bald-on record FTAs when addressing him, and he even offends him.

Nick's politeness strategies are also worthwhile. He seems to be very polite at the beginning of the play. He stresses deference to attend to his hosts' negative face wants. He bears in mind the fact that they are not familiar. Even if the FTA was minimal, he would use elaborate politeness strategies in order to conduct it. However, at the end of the play, there is a change in his politeness techniques which results from his outrage after his chats with George. He becomes rude treats George in the same way the latter does. For instance, while chatting with George, he complains

about George and Martha insulting and embarrassing each other in front of him and his wife. He does that while attacking George's positive face referring to him and Martha as animals. Such dramatic change in Nick's politeness pattern is a result of the change in the way he perceives his relationship with George. He understands that George does not treat him as a guest and acts accordingly.

Such changes in politeness patterns are also seen in Pinter's *The Caretaker*. Excerpts from this play offered rich context for highlighting different strategies used by the characters. These strategies are appropriate at the beginning of the play. However, they change dramatically at the end of the play when the characters' politeness strategies become very inappropriate. This dramatic change can be very motivational in the analysis of how characters fail to be polite and how this takes place through a pragmatic explanation.

Davies moves from being tactful and polite into the other way of the spectrum of politeness. His strategies in choosing the language that fits the situation change from total consideration of his interlocutor face into not caring at all. For instance, around the beginning of the play, he asks Aston for an extra pair of shoes. He uses both of negative and positive politeness strategies. He calls Aston *'mate'*, and he uses indirectness and pessimism about having his requests met. Such elaborate strategies also occur when he makes requests for money and his ability to stay in the room. Moreover, when he complains, he makes sure that he does that off-record. Davies is perfectly aware of the effects of the contextual socio-pragmatic elements on his interaction with Aston. He chooses his strategies based on the degree of social distance since they are strangers, the power difference because Aston is the owner of the house and the ranking of the imposition of the FTAs he makes.

Davies's word and utterance choice changes entirely with Aston as the play proceeds. This happens due to finding out that Aston is not the actual owner of the house, which seems to Davies an important matter. After he notices that Aston and his brother hardly communicate, Aston stays

only to fix his brother's house, and that he has not even started that, Davies decides that the one that he should attends to should be Mick not Aston. He starts to do FTAs with no consideration for Aston's face. He makes on-record complains about the air and the rain coming from the window while he is asleep. The forms of address that indicate deference such as *'mister'* or the ones that stress familiarity such as *'mate'* change into a belittling one, which is '*boy'*. He even mocks Aston for being mentally hospitalized and he calls his room a '*lousy filthy hole'*

At the end of the play, Davies returns to his elaborate politeness techniques. He attempts to be polite again with Aston. This change is significant in the light of the analysis, because it highlights how Davies is in fact a selfish and self-centred person. After discovering that collaborating with Mick will not grant him a chance to stay in the house. He regrets being mean to Aston and tries to be polite to him again. He uses strategies similar to the ones he uses at the beginning of the play. He redresses his FTAs, and he attends to Aston's face. He uses negative politeness strategies and specifically repetition, indirectness and stumbling in order to sound that it is hard for him to make his request to stay in the house. Being a self-centred character is also inferred through the way in which he addresses Mick. He knows how to use the appropriate politeness strategies to the situation in order to get what he wants. He attends to Mick's face and compliments him in order to let him stay in his house. He uses positive politeness strategies to stress shared opinions and that his interlocutor is liked and appreciated. He mentions that he shares with Mick the plans of fixing the house.

The analysis of the play also highlighted the politeness strategies of Mick. Sometimes he appears to be polite and in other times he is appears to be uncouth. There is no apparent contextual reason for this change except that he is a cunning character. This appears best when he interacts with Davies as if he is not aware of this latter's plans, when in fact he is just manipulating him. Even upon their first meeting, he sometimes shows extreme impoliteness and at other times he manifests some politeness towards Davies. This supports the claim the Mick likes to play with

words. Sometimes he uses direct on-record FTAs and in other times he seems to be concerned about Davies's face, so he uses positive and negative politeness strategies to attend to it.

The importance of discussing politeness theory lays in its ability to explain that politeness does not refer to specific expressions used in specific situations, but rather a set of strategies chosen depending on the social and contextual background of the situation. When considering the use of dialogues in drama to explain such concept, they proved to be full of instances that could be used as illustrations. The background story can offer information about the characters' identities as well as their relationships with one another. Therefore, the parameters of social distance and power difference are easily distinguished. In addition, the interaction between the characters can offer information about the degree of the threat of the message being delivered. After studying the different strategies, learners can judge whether the strategy is appropriate to the situation or not. This can also be noticed through how this strategy affect the events of the play. The three plays offered a variety of situations in which different strategies can be highlighted. Nonetheless, the two absurdist plays *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and *The Caretaker* offer more rich examples that reflect the complexity of interaction. They have more changing patterns of politeness of the same characters in the same play. Since this type of plays pay more attention to words than actions, the characters' words and strategies can have great influence on the story as a whole.

3.3 The Results of Conversation Analysis

During the course of interaction, people tend to cooperate and mutually construct their exchange in a form of conversation. The different mechanisms by which people take part in conversations is the main interest of conversation analysis. The aim of introducing such field in language learning contexts aims at explaining how people organize their conversations. The way in which such organization takes place could be explained through two levels. The first is turn taking management which seeks to explain how participants take turns, keep them and distribute them to other participants. It seeks also to explain the different features related to these actions.

The second is related to adjacency pairs' organization which is concerned with explaining how participants organize their talk in terms of functions. The different ways people organize their conversations are strictly tied to the socio-pragmatic contextual elements involved in the exchange. Short (1996) indicates that power has an important impact on the way people manage their turns. Yule (1996) also mentions how having a shared conversational rhythm can help people avoid communication breakdowns. Such important remarks are displayed in different instance in the three plays under analysis.

Different excerpts from *The Tempest* by Shakespeare illustrated the turn-taking and the adjacency pairs' organization. The analysed example demonstrated how a powerful person can be in control of the conversation flow in terms of turn-taking organization. At the end of the play, Prospero meets his enemies: his brother, Anthonio, who usurped his title and the king of Naples, Alonso, who conspired with him. Along with them, there are other noblemen. The exchange indicated the power status that Prospero has over the rest of the characters just by observing the number of turns Prospero have in comparison with the rest, his extended turns and his control of the topics of the exchange all

The analysis of the exchanges in the play did not show any form of communication breakdowns due to violating the organization of turn taking. Each one of the characters seem to be aware of when and how to take turn. Almost all of them wait for the TRP to start their turns. There are not many interruptions and overlaps, except for two instances throughout the whole play.

For the adjacency pairs' organization, the selected example illustrated the preference organization and the way in which it is conducted. It uses the difference in which Ariel and Caliban make their SPPs to respond to Prospero's FPPs. Most of the time, Ariel's SPPs are preferred, and whenever he has to make a dispreferred one he delays or mitigates it. Whereas, Caliban makes his SPPs directly. As a result, it affects his relationship with his master negatively. Such example shows how the way people make their SPPs can affect their relationships.

Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* contains many excerpts that illustrate turn taking patterns and adjacency pairs in context. The aim of selecting an illustrative example is to indicate to the learners that the way people organize their conversations says a lot about how people view themselves and their interlocutors. The patterns resulting from the conversational organization indicated how the level of power difference and the degree of distance between the conversational participants can affect their conversational techniques.

The example that was selected and analysed is rich with instances that could be exploited to explain the mechanisms of conversation. George's rudeness that resulted from viewing Nick as a rival is explored using adjacency pairs' analysis. George establishes his control through choosing not to cooperate with Nick in the conversation whereas Nick appears to be cooperative. George starts the sequences by telling Nick something, and when Nick inquires about it, George refuses to answer immediately and delays his answers implying that he will provide the SPP to Nick's FPP whenever he wants to. In other words, he shows that he cannot be confined by Nick's expectations. When Nick chooses not to answer George's tricky questions, George forces him to do so, which results in Nick getting angry and indicating that no matter what he answers, George is going to make a big fuss about it. George's conversational behaviour contrasts with Nick's one. When George offers an FPP Nick is very cooperative and is seen to be polite, he distributes preferred SPPs most of the time, and whenever he has to make a dispreferred SPP, he does that tactfully. When Nick for once initiates an FPP, which is a question. George's answer is very vague, which is taken by Nick as a dispreferred SPP. Turn taking analysis of the same example also confirmed George's attempts to establish control over Nick. The number of turns is equal since there are only two speakers. George has significantly the longest turns most of the time. He is the one responsible for initiating the topics. Nick initiates a topic of discussion only once. George often interrupts him, most notably when he does not answer his question in the way he wants him to, which is a sign of unfriendliness.

The analysis of this example could be used to illustrate that not all conversations have participants that are willing to cooperate. There could be different reasons for that as well as different organization choices to indicate that. All what it needs is to break the conversational rhythm as well as not abide by other participant's expectations in terms of adjacency pairs structure, which eventually engenders communication breakdowns. Such actions are considered to be significant given the fact that conversation is based on the cooperation of the interlocutors and the expectations they have concerning what constitutes a well- formed conversation. Teachers should not exclude unsuccessful communications while explaining the mechanisms of conversations. By analysing such examples learners can detect the usefulness of the concept study and application.

Conversation analysis of *The Caretaker* also indicated similar results. The conversations in this play are most of the times meaningless and fail to communicate a specific objective. There are many instances of communication breakdowns due to having some odd conversational organizations. The characters failure to maintain a good conversational rhythm, in fact, reflects their problematic relationships.

In the play, the two brothers, Aston and Mick, hardly ever communicate. Even when they have a conversation, they fail to communicate. In their only exchange throughout the play, there is no clear objective for their conversation. The exchange is complicated in terms of adjacency patterns analysis. At the beginning of the exchange, Mick makes a comment about the leak from the roof. Then, he declares that he is going to make something concerning that. The exchange carries on by Mick's reformulating Aston's statements into questions to which Aston replies with short answers '*yes'*. Between every sequence and another, a pause occurs. These pauses add to the awkwardness of the whole exchange. Besides, Mick's questions, which are mere reformulations of his brother's statements, seem to be meaningless because they refer to something that is already mentioned. They just show Mick's desperate attempts to communicate with his brother. However, these attempts fail. At the end of this exchange, Mick tells his brother about the discussion he and

Davies has had before his arrival. Aston's response indicates that he does not understand the aim of Mick's attempts to reach out for him. He answers with a short ‘yes’ and shifts his interest to Davis.

Communication breakdowns that lead to an overall failure of communication could be seen in different excerpts in the play. Characters seem to be self-absorbed and preoccupied only with their personal interests. They are only concerned with their dreams and plans. The lack of real communication results in the isolation and the alienation that the characters experience. In the example analysed Davies and Aston are having a conversation about how Aston should fix the house for his brother. Davies keeps asking Aston about who the owner is, and what he does. He neglects Aston's attempts to tell him what he is doing there. Then, Aston starts an extended turn about himself, his skills and his plans for the house, the workshop and the shed. Davies does not comment on that. Instead, he initiates another sequence about his bag. The illogical flow of sequences and first parts of the adjacency pairs that have no second parts foregrounds the idea of communication breakdown.

The last example analysed also explores how conversational management techniques help to reflect the relationship between characters. When Mick first meets Davies, he attempts to display his control through the way he manages the conversation with him. He asks him repeatedly about his name and how he slept the previous night. When, Davies tries to challenge that by not giving an answer, Mick obliges him to do that. The fast rate of the questions, along with physical attacks makes Davies obliged to give preferred SPPs. Mick’s total control of the situation can be also explored in terms of turn taking management. Nick is the one responsible for changing the topics of the exchange by changing the questions he asks. In addition to that, he keeps on interrupting Davies and initiating questions without giving the time for Davies to answer.

The way characters make their conversational contributions, and the way they organize them supports the play's main theme which is the absurdity and meaningless of human experience

and human communication. Most of the conversations in this play seem to have no clear objectives and they reflect the distant relationships that the characters have. Questions are left with no answers, and long turns in which the characters seem to address nobody are left with no comments. For the aim of discussing the pragmatics of speech, such conversations are useful to illustrate odd conversational structures which in turn help to understand the target concepts of conversational management and how they function in interaction.

Conversation analysis has important implications on the study of the pragmatics of language. As a form of human interaction, conversation reflects through its organization many social aspects of the participants and their relationships and their willingness to cooperate for successful communication. Studying how participants in a conversation organize their conversational contributions in terms of taking turns and adjacency pairs offers for the learners tools to enhance the way they communicate appropriately. The excerpts obtained from the three plays demonstrates a variety of conversational structures that can be deployed in class to explain the target concepts and features of conversations. However, much more rich examples were extracted from Albee and Pinter's plays. These plays reflect more features of everyday conversations such as interruptions and disorganized turn taking managements. Additionally, these plays contain many instances of communication breakdowns that could be used to understand the mechanisms of conversations better.

Summary

All in all, excerpts from the three plays provided a variety of instances that highlight how linguistic expressions and strategies as well as conversational techniques are tightly related to the social and the contextual background of the communicative situation. The speech act analysis of different excerpts showed the variety of ways in which characters can achieve certain linguistic objectives depending on the social context of the interaction. Similarly, the analysis of politeness

indicated that these plays are replete with various linguistic strategies people use to attend to their interlocutors' faces. Moreover, they provided rich context for the discussion of the specific choice of strategy. Nonetheless, not all the strategies are appropriate ones. Many instances, especially in Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and Pinter's *The Caretaker*, provided evidence for how inappropriate politeness strategies affect the interaction between characters. Finally, conversation analysis of the plays offered clear examples of how people take turns and organize their conversations in terms of sequences. Some characters tend to be cooperative when it comes to the conversation organizations whereas others tend to pay no attention to such cooperation. This latter results communication breakdowns and unsmooth conversations as indicated by the examples from Albee's and Pinter's plays. In both ways, such discussion cannot go without reference to the context in which the conversations take place as well as how the character's conversational choices influence this context. The overall discussion led to sustaining the claim of establishing plays as resourceful material for teaching the pragmatics of language.

General Conclusion

Developing learners' pragmatic competence has become one of the major components of intercultural communicative language teaching/learning. It is based on acquainting learners with how language is used in different cultural and social contexts. It aims to help learners acquire the ability to analyse the social elements involved in a communicative context and to use language and interpret it accordingly. My research deals with how three areas of the pragmatic study of language: speech acts, politeness and conversational management can be addressed and explained using dialogues in drama as instructional materials.

The main criteria for evaluating materials used to teach pragmatics include the ability to manifest language function, social context and interaction. The conduct of my research leads me to the conclusion that excerpts from drama serve as useful source materials given the fact that they reflect such criteria. In addition, the excerpts present authentic language, and they are highly motivational as well. The pragmatic analysis of speech acts, politeness and conversational management of excerpts from Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and Pinter's *The Caretaker*, supports this claim. This is evident due to the fact that the pragmatic analysis of these excerpts elucidates the socio-pragmatic context of interactions as well as the linguistic expressions and strategies responding to them.

Plays provide rich resources for authentic language use which is an important criterion for language materials in second and foreign language teaching/ learning contexts. Literature in general, and drama specifically as the main concern of this research, are written by native speakers of the target language and they are not purposefully designed for a specific teaching objective. Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and Pinter's *The Caretaker* were written around the early sixties. Therefore, the language of these plays is somehow close to the language used nowadays. Shakespeare's *The Tempest* was written around early seventeenth century. The language in this

play is considered to be archaic and requires additional effort to be dealt with in ESL/EFL classes. Expressions such as *'I pray thee'* and *' Sirrah'* are rarely used these days. Nonetheless, this does not mean that the play fails to illustrate the pragmatic concepts under study.

In addition to the authenticity of language in drama, plays offer a variety of themes and plots that make them motivational instructive materials for learners. The learners may encounter different dramatic events and conflicts that can catch their interests and eventually engage them in the different tasks during explaining the target concepts. This may even motivate them to read the play as a whole and expand their knowledge concerning the target language literature. The three plays analysed in this research offer a variety of themes that learners can connect to or view in their everyday life such as forgiveness, marital problems and isolation. The dramatic conflicts between characters, the misunderstandings, and the communication breakdowns can also catch the learners' attention. For instance, some characters tend to verbally attack, threaten and mock each other. Such instances can create dramatic scenes, they can have great effect on the flow of the events in the play and can be eye-catching.

Drama is the literary genre the most similar to everyday interaction between people. For the aim of this research, characters are perceived as normal people with specific social backgrounds, personalities and points of view, interacting for specific objectives. It is also assumed that the characters' language reflects the pragmatic rules of the language of the playwright. Moreover, the social backgrounds of the characters and their relationships could be easily distinguished from the context of the plays and they are comprehended due to the fact that they are similar to the ones people have in everyday life. Even a master-slave relationship, such as the one Prospero and Caliban have in *The Tempest,* could be referential for a relationship of a figure with a great amount of power with another one with one with little power in comparison. The social factors shaping the relationships between characters in plays are similar to the ones governing the relationships people have in everyday life. These factors include age, sex, social

class, familiarity, power difference …etc. Therefore, the characters utterances and dialogues are put under examination to elicit the target pragmatic concepts while functioning in a context in the same way as everyday interactions.

Teaching speech acts as a pragmatic concept aims primarily at indicating for learners that the way in which they attain and interpret a specific linguistic objective such as requesting, asking or threatening is not limited to one form of linguistic expression. For instance, one can request for water by saying in a direct way '*pour me a glass of water*' or in an indirect way by saying '*I am thirsty*'. The recognition of the primary illocutionary force of the utterance '*I am thirsty'* as a request for water is influenced by different factors. The context in which the utterance occurs has an important role, because in some contexts it may mean that the person is just informing their interlocutor that they are thirsty as the literal meaning of the utterance denotes. Other elements include intonation, stress, body language and performative verbs.

Such a variety of linguistic expressions is illustrated in many instances in the plays. Since the discussion on a specific speech act does not go without reference to the context in which its relative expression takes place, the use of plays offers rich contexts for such discussion. There are various examples of speech acts of different kinds in the excerpts from the three plays. The contexts of the excerpts offer explanations as why a specific character opts for a specific way of conduction a speech act and how it is interpreted by his/her interlocutor. The importance of the contextual study of the characters' speech acts lays in its ability to facilitate for the learners understanding how speech acts are conducted and interpreted appropriately. One cannot turn a blind eye to the fact that intonation, stress and body language cannot be displayed in written dialogues in general. Nonetheless, some stage directions in the plays especially in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf? and The Caretaker* indicate these elements. The use of directions such as *'shivering'* ,'*braying*' and '*impatiently*' can help the learners to detect the general tone of the utterance.

The use of speech acts is strongly related to the social backgrounds of people and their relationships. It is also connected to the context of the interaction and can change accordingly. Establishing such link in the analysis of plays can help learners to acquire the ability to infer socio-pragmatic information of the context from the language used by a specific person. The directness which Prospero use to construct his speech acts of orders and threats in *The Tempest* is an indicator of his dominant personality. The analysis of speech acts in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* also demonstrate similar results. The speech acts used by George and his wife, Martha, indicate the complexity of their relationship as well as the changeability of the socio-pragmatic factors due to context change. The speech acts of both characters indicate a shift of power between the two. Martha seems to be in control at the beginning of the play. This changes drastically at the end when George seems to take control. The speech acts of Davies in *The Caretaker* support the same claim, the way in which he addresses Aston when he thinks that he is the owner of the house, where he wants to stay, is remarkably different from the way he uses when he discovers the opposite.

The excerpts analysed from the three plays also display their usefulness in explaining and illustrating the pragmatic concept of politeness. Language learners generally get to see politeness in terms of formality and specific conventional expressions based on modals such as *may, could* and *would* as well as specific address terms such as *Sir* and *Madam.* Nonetheless, politeness encompasses more than that. It actually refers to the ability of being tactful at weighing the social elements involved in a specific situation and responding to them with the appropriate strategy. For instance, one can still be polite by using informal language and address terms that indicate social closeness and familiarity such as '*mate*' while addressing a stranger and attempting to be friendly with him/her. There are several strategies listed by Brown and Levinson in their theory of politeness (1987)[251]. The concept of face stands as the main premise of this theory. Politeness

[251] Penelope Brown and Stephen R. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

strategies are used to show a consideration for one's interlocutor's face especially when an FTA (face threatening act) has to be made. The choice of a specific strategy is dependent on social distance, dower difference and the ranking of imposition of the message in addition to other social factors.

In order to teach such concept, teachers need to highlight instances where it is in operation. In addition, they need to explain the specific choice of utterance based on the social context in which it occurs. This could be seen in different instances in the three plays. There is a wide range of politeness strategies used by the characters in different encounters. This variety reflects the diversity of relationships found in the plays. We can see encounters between strangers, relatives, couples, guests and hosts …etc. These relationships exhibit social distance and power difference in different degrees. There is also a variety of examples of FTAs with different degrees of imposition such as criticism, complaints, requests and suggestions. This diversity is significant because it provides a variety of illustrations that could be exploited in teaching/ learning situations.

After going through the explanation of the different politeness strategies; off-record, bald on-record, on-record with positive or negative politeness, it is easy to discern from the excerpts whether the character's choices of politeness strategies are appropriate to the situation or not. The strategy can be weighed through the consequences it engenders on the events and the context of the play. In *The Tempest,* the majority of politeness strategies used by characters seem to be appropriate to the situation except for few examples. Characters seem to be aware of the importance of taking into account the factors of power, familiarity and the degree of offensiveness while constructing their messages and they generally indicate a consistent pattern of strategies. Whereas in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and *The Caretaker,* the excerpts indicate great inconsistency of politeness strategies used by the characters due to the changes of the socio-pragmatic elements of the context as a result of certain events. Thus, these two plays have much more rich instances to illustrate the complexity of interaction in terms of politeness in real life.

The focus on single utterances as speech acts and the strategies of conducting them moves to the focus on how these utterances are connected to each other in forms of conversations. Addressing this pragmatic concept in class shows for learners that conversations are organized by means of cooperation between interlocutors as well as expectations of what occurs after one's turn. The description of the way people manage their conversations is explained using conversation analysis techniques and specifically two main concepts; turn taking and adjacency pairs. Turn taking management refers to the way in which people have turns to talk in a conversation. It is also concerned with how people detect the end of a turn, how they take it, how they distribute it and how they sometimes interrupt and overlap each other's talk. Adjacency pair description is related to the way people converse in terms of the functions. The pair's first part (FPP) for instance could be an invitation, its second part (SPP) logically would be either an acceptance or a refusal. When discussing SPPs, a distinction is made between a preferred SPP and dispreferred one. In the case of invitation, an acceptance is a preferred response, whereas a refusal is a dispreferred one. Dispreferred SPPs are done tactfully whether by using mitigating devices or delaying the SPP. In a conversation, every choice a person makes is noteworthy, even silence, because these choices can affect the flow of a conversation.

Conversational contributions of interlocutors say a lot about them as persons and their relationships. Since conversations are based on cooperation, the refusal to cooperate or the inability to find a way to do that results from a distant or unfriendly relationship between the interlocutors. Such inference is made because they are unable to find a mutual rhythm of conversing. This is illustrated in the way they exchange turns and topics, the way they interrupt each other, and the way they manage adjacency pairs' structure. George and Nick's tense relationship could be viewed clearly in the excerpt analysed from *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* George constantly interrupts his interlocutor and refuses to provide SPPs to any of Nick's initiated FPPs. Such analysis also accounts for the social contextual backgrounds of the characters. Since George is the older

character, he is the host of the night cap, and he establishes Nick as a rival since his wife shows interest in him, he attempts to show that he is superior and in control of the conversation.

The illustrations of conversational management, the different concepts related to it and the social background of the participants are found in different excerpts in the three plays analysed in this research. *The Tempest* by Shakespeare contains dialogues with smooth turn taking patterns, everyone seems to know how take turns without causing any form of disruption. The adjacency pairs' analysis indicates that there is no violation to the pairs' organization which results in no breakdowns taking place. It should be mentioned that excerpts from this play do not reflect some of the features of everyday talk such as pauses, repetitions and interruptions whereas such elements are seen constantly in Albee's and Pinter's plays. Such features function in the same way they do in everyday dialogues and they are significant. The results of conversation analysis in these two plays show that they display more communication breakdowns in comparison with Shakespeare's play. Since these plays demonstrate elements from the Theatre of the Absurd, the language and the dialogues of the characters help to foreground the themes of the failure of communication and alienation. Excerpts from *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* show the inability of characters to establish successful communication due to complications in their relationships. Excerpts from *The Caretake* contain meaningless conversations; ones which are conducted with no clear objective. Additionally, they illustrate conversations that are distorted in a way in which FPPs are left with no SPPs or are met by silence.

Since teaching the target pragmatic concepts requires instances of interaction where learners can see them in function, it is equally important to provide instances containing both appropriate and inappropriate application of the concept. In other words, teachers should not exclude excerpts and examples where characters fail or refuse to respond to the social context appropriately and use utterances and strategies that are inappropriate to the situation. Such instances help to illustrate the consequences for not abiding by the specific norms of speech. For

example, when a character's choice of politeness strategy is not appropriate to the social context, this may result in a conflict between them and their interlocutor. When they refuse to cooperate in a conversation by being silent when they should not, this may engender a communication breakdown. These instances can be highlighted and explained in the light of the target concept. Simpson stresses the importance of such instances because according to him, they create a dramatic sense and they also show what happens when the norms of interaction are '*distorted or subverted*'[252]

[252] Paul Simpson, *Language Through Literature: An introduction*, (London: Routledge,1997), p174.

Selected Bibliography:

Primary Sources

Albee, Edward. *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* London: Vintage, 2001.

Austin, J.L. *How to do things with words*? Oxford: Oxford University Press,1962.

Cutting, Joan. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Liddicoat, Anthony J. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis.* London: Continuum,2007.

Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen R. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Pinter, Harold. *The Caretaker*. London: Methuen,1987.

Searle, John R. 'A classification of Illocutionary Acts' Paper presented at Conference on Performances, Conversational Implicature, and Presuppositions, University of Texas, Austin, March 22-24, 1973: 27-45.

Searle, John R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Searle, John R. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1979.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest.* London: Penguin Popular Classics,2001.

Short, Mick. *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose.* London: Longman, 1996.

Yule, George. *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Secondary Sources

Abbas, Nawal Fadhil. " Pragmatics and the Teaching of Literature" *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education* 2, (2012):333-346.

Alcón Soler, Eva and Martínez- Flor, Alicia,eds. *Investigating Pragmatics in Foreign Language Learning, Teaching and Testing*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2008.

Armstrong, Sybil " Desperate Housewives in an EFL classroom." Paper presented at the annual JALT Conference Proceedings, Tokyo, 2009 :460-466.

Bachman, Lyle F. *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen and Mahan Taylor, Rebecca. *eds, Teaching Pragmatics.* Washington: United States Department of State, 2003. Excerpt in http://www.indiana.edu/~dsls/publications/introms.pdf Accessed on: 16/05/2015.

Culpeper, Jonathan, Short Mick and Verdonk, Peter, eds. *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Herman, Vimala. *Dramatic Discourse: Dialogue as Interaction in Plays,* London: Routledge, 1995.

Herman, Vimala. " Turn Management in Drama" In *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*, edited by Culpeper Jonathan, Short Mick and Verdonk Peter,eds, London: Routledge, 1998.

Kasper, Gabriele and Rose, Kenneth, eds., *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Excerpt in: http://assets.cambridge.org/97805218/03793/excerpt/9780521803793_excerpt.pdf Accessed on: 05/06/2015.

Lazar, Gillian. *Literature and Language Teaching: A Guide for Teachers and Trainers,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Leech, Geoffrey N. *Principles of Pragmatics.* London: Longman, 1983.

Bataineh, Ahmad. " The Effect of Teaching Literature on EFL Students' Pragmatic Competence." *Journal of Education and Practice* 5, No.3, (2014) : 137-156.

Erton, Ismail. "Contributions of Discourse Analysis to Language Teaching." Hacettepe *niversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 19 (2000): 201-211.

Malmkjær , Kiristen.ed., *The Linguistic Encyclopaedia*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Mey, J. L. *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd ed., 'Pragmatics overview' Elsevier,2006.

O'sullivan, Radhika. "Literature in the Language Classroom" *The English Teacher* 20 (1991). http://www.melta.org.my/ET/1991/main6.html (Accessed on 05/06/2015).

Roberts, James L. *Edward Albee's Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* New York: Hungry Minds,1979.

Rose, Kenneth. "On the Effects of Instruction in Second Language Pragmatics." *System* 33 (2005): 385-399.

Simpson, Paul. *Language Through Literature: An introduction*. London: Routledge,1997.

Simpson Paul, "Politeness Phenomena in Ionesco's The Lesson" in *Language, Discourse and Literature: An introductory Reader in Discourse Stylistics*, edited by Carter, Ronald and Simpson, Paul. London: Routledge, 2005.

Schmidt, Richard "Consciousness, Learning and Interlanguage Pragmatics" in *Interlanguage Pragmatics* edited by Kasper, Gabriele and Blum-Kulka Shoshana. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Tagushi, Naoko. " Teaching Pragmatics: Trends and Issues " *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31 (2011):289-310.

Thomas, Jenny. 'Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure.' *Applied Linguistics* 4 (1983): 91-112

Thomas, Jenny. "Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics" London: Routledge, 1995.

Widdowson, H.G. *Teaching Language as Communication.* Oxford: Oxford, 1978.

Zou, Su. " Analysis of Fictional Conversations Based on Pragmatic Adaptation" *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1, No. 2 (2010): 160-166.