LATVIJAS UNIVERSITĀTE

BAKALAURA DARBS

RĪGA 2016

UNIVERSITY OF LATVIA
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES

TURN MANAGEMENT IN OSCAR WILDE'S COMEDY "AN IDEAL HUSBAND"

DIALOGA SECĪBAS IZKĀRTOJUMS OSKARA VAILDA LUGĀ "IDEĀLS VĪRS"

BACHELOR THESIS

Rūdolfs, Balodis
Matriculation card No. rb12036

Adviser: lect. Tatjana Bicjutko

RĪGA 2016

ANOTĀCIJA

Analizējot dramaturģiskus darbus, īpaši vērts aplūkot dialoga secības izkārtojumu. Šie literārie teksti lielākoties sastāv no mutvārdu diskursa, tāpēc veids, kā runātāji savā starpā virza un attīsta sarunu, daudz atklāj par atainoto situāciju. Šajā Bakalaurā darba analizēts dialoga secības izkārtojums Oskara Vailda lugas "Ideāls vīrs" fragmentā, kurā sarunājas lugas divi galvenie personāži, Sers Roberts Čilterns un Misis Čevelija, lugas pirmajā cēlienā. Ņemot vērā, ka analīzei izvēlētais fragments ataino šantāžu un izspiešanu, pētījums koncentrēts uz to, kā dialoga secības izkārtojums atklāj spēku samērus starp personāžiem. Analīzes procesā izmantota kvalitatīvā metodē, toties metodoloģija izstrādāta balstoties uz pētnieku V. Hermanes un M. Šorta teorijām. Analīzes galvenais secinājums – Misis Čevelija, šantažētāja un izspiedēja šajā kontekstā, acīmredzami ir sarunas dominējošais personāžs, un to apliecina visi aplūkoti dialoga secības izkārtojuma aspekti.

Atslēgvārdi: dialoga secības izkārtojums, mutvārdu diskurss, saderīgas frāzes, spēku samēri, dramaturģijas diskurss, O. Vailds, "Ideāls Vīrs"

ABSTRACT

Turn management is particularly beneficial for the analysis of dramatic texts. These literary works mostly consist of spoken discourse, therefore the situation is much represented through the way turns are managed between the interactants. This Bachelor theses analyses turn management in an excerpt from Oscar Wilde's comedy "An Ideal Husband", namely, a conversation between two leading characters Sir Robert Chiltern and Mrs Cheveley in Act 1. Given that the extract involves blackmail, the focus of the research is on the way turn management is used to express power relations. The analysis is qualitative, while the methodology is mostly based on theories by scholars V. Herman and M. Short. The analysis reveals that Mrs Cheveley, the blackmailer, clearly is the dominant party in the conversation, as indicated by all considered aspects of turn management.

Keywords: turn management, spoken discourse, adjacency pair, power relations, dramatic discourse, O. Wilde, "An Ideal Husband"

Contents

INTRODUCTION

Turn management is an aspect of spoken discourse that deals with the way a conversation is organized between two or more interactants. Because dramatic texts mainly consist of represented spoken discourse, analysis of turn management is particularly suitable for this type of literary texts.

Dramatic texts are also considered to be interactional, meaning that they exhibit emotions, attitudes and different statuses that operate between two or more characters. In order to comprehend the situation presented by a dramatic text, not only language itself but also turn management has to be taken into account.

This Bachelor's paper analyses the turn management in an excerpt from Oscar Wilde's comedy "An Ideal Husband". The excerpt under analysis is a conversation between two leading characters, Sir Robert Chiltern and Mrs Cheveley, in Act 1. The given extract was chosen for analysis because it presents a conversation involving blackmail. If to consider power relations between the characters, such a situation is particularly beneficial because it involves a conflict and, in consequence, strong emotions and changing status of dominance. In addition, it is likely that the power relations are expressed by means of turn management. Therefore, the goal of this research is to analyse how turn management in the given extract depicts power relations.

Consequently, the research question is as follows: "How does turn management in the given extract depict power relations between Sir Robert Chiltern and Mrs Cheveley?"

The enabling objective are:

- To read the play;
- To get acquainted with the available theoretical literature regarding turn management in general and particularly in drama;
- To formulate the framework for the analysis;
- To conduct the analysis of the extract under the devised framework;
- To draw relevant conclusions.

For the most part the analysis is qualitative, namely, it is not based on solid numeric data, but interpretation. However, in considering turn length, the analysis is partly quantitative.

This research is mostly based on theories of such scholars as V. Herman, G. Jefferson, H. Sacks, E.A. Schegloff and M. Short.

The first chapter of the thesis deals with the concept of turn management. First, the concept of turn management is introduced. Second, the rules that operate in turn management are explained. Then different aspects of turn management such as turn length, turn allocation, topic change etc. are considered. Lastly, the role of turn management in dramatic discourse is discussed.

Drawing on the overview given in the first chapter, the second chapter describes the methodology of the analysis for this research.

The third chapter provides the analysis of the given extract from Oscar Wilde's play.

1. TURN MANAGEMENT

1.1. THE CONCEPT OF TURN MANAGEMENT

This chapter introduces to the idea of turn management. First, it explains why this notion has been invented. Second, the function of turn management is shortly described. Then, the fundamental element of turn management, namely, the turn is explained. Lastly, the turn-allocational and turn-constructional components of turn management are briefly discussed.

The concept of turn management is based on the observation that 'the organization of conversation in day-to-day setting […] must be controlled by some kind of mechanism which facilitates the orderly distribution of turns and governs the progress of talk' (Herman, 2005: 80). Turn management is the term to name this mechanism.

Turn management is a set of strategies used in turn taking process that function to organize 'the distribution and flow of speech between two [or more] poles of interaction thereby keeping speech, generally, continuous' (Herman, 2005: 79). It normally allows to achieve rapidity with 'the time gap between one persona stopping and the other starting being just a few fraction of a second' (ibid). In addition, 'the turns are appropriated in orderly fashion' (ibid). Undoubtedly, there are overlaps (ibid). However, in a conversation where overlap is not a norm, they constitute 'about 5 per cent of the interaction' (ibid).

Central to the concept of turn management is *the turn*, which Herman describes as 'the enactment of a speaker's right to speak by taking an opportunity' (2002: 19). A different explanation is provided by Short, who writes that 'a turn is a period of talk by one participant which is usually bounded by turns by other participants or a significant period of silence' (n.d.). A turn might be one sentence long or longer, and it can end voluntarily, by the current speaker deciding to stop or owing to an interruption by someone else (ibid).

The system of turn management consists of two components: 1) a turn-allocational and 2) a turn constructional one (Sacks *et al*, 1974). The first component 'regulates the changeover of turns' (Herman, 2002: 20). Herman explains that 'in general, turn change proceeds smoothly: one participant talks, stops, the next participant talks, stops, and so on' (ibid). Nonetheless, a conflict may arise at transition relevance places (hereafter: TRP) (ibid; Sacks *et al*, 1974). In order to avoid any disagreements between interactants, it is crucial that every one of them finishes their turns, so that the next one can be allocated and 'the alternating course of the dialogic structure […] comes into existence for the interactive possibilities of dialogue to be realized' (Herman,

2002: 20). The second, turn constructional component 'regulates variables like the size or length and linguistic texture of a turn' (ibid: 21).

The notion of turn management developed due to the observation that conversations are regulated by some sort of mechanism. Turn management, given that it operates successfully, functions to ensure organized and continuous interaction between two or more participants. The fundamental element of the concept, the turn, can be described as a period of talk by one speaker that is influenced by turns of other interactants or considerable times of silence. Turn management is considered to consist of two components: the first one, turn-allocational component, ensures changeover of turns, and the second one, turn constructional component, concerns such variables as the size and length of a turn. In the next chapter, the rules that govern turn management are explained.

1.2. THE RULES OF TURN MANAGEMENT

This chapter explains the rules that govern turn management, as proposed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson in 1974.

Sacks *et al* (1974) have laid out three rules or strategies that operate when a turn is relinquished, in other words, when one speaker allocates a turn to another. The function of these three strategies is to govern turn construction, 'providing for the allocation of a next turn to one party, and co-ordinating transfer so as to minimize gap and overlap' (ibid: 704).

The first strategy is for the current speaker to allocate the turn to the next speaker (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 704); the current speaker can determine the next speaker 'by naming, by the use of pronouns or address forms, by pointing, or by eye contact and gazing at the speaker' (Herman, 2002: 20).

The second strategy is for the next speaker to self-select (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 704).

The third strategy is for the current speaker to continue if no one takes a turn (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 704). If so, 'the current speaker ought to continue, otherwise the turn lapses (Herman, 2002: 20); a lapsed turn, logically, results in a silence that is regarded as '*attributable* […], and attributed to the lapser as his or her silence' (ibid).

Sacks *et al* (1974) also enlist 14 rules that govern turn management.

The first rule is that 'speaker-change recurs, or at least occurs' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 706). It is explained by the fact that 'the possibility of speaker-change is built in […] because any unit-type

instance out of which a turn may be constructed will reach a [TRP]' (ibid); in other words, no one can speak forever. At a TRP either the first or the second turn-allocational strategy is enacted (ibid); even if both strategies fail, the third one can be applied (ibid).

The second rule is that 'overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 706). This principle is ensured by two features of the turn-allocation system: first, every turn is allocated to only one speaker and, second, 'all turn-transfer is coordinated around transition-relevance places, which are themselves determined by possible completion points' (ibid), therefore other participants of a conversation know when they can and cannot start speaking.

The statement by Sacks *et al* that every turn is allocated to only one speaker appears to be wrong. The following example illustrates a situation when a turn is allocated to more than one interactant in a form of a question; the following example, as well as all the others, are made by the author of this research; the bracketed segment here and in the following examples roughly indicate the places of overlap,

A: Who did this?
B: I don't (know.)
C: I(t wasn)'t me.

The third rule is that 'occurrences of more than one speaker at a time [in other words, overlaps] are common, but brief' (Sacks *et al*,1974: 706). Sacks *et al* mention just a few reasons for overlaps: first, in using the second turn-allocation strategy, there might be more than one self-selector that results in simultaneous turns (ibid); second, the current speaker might be near the TRP when the next speaker has already started (ibid: 707-708), as in the following example,

A: I think you know wh(at I mean.)
B: (Yeah, I d)o.

The fourth rule is that 'transitions (from one turn to a next) with no gap and no overlap are common' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 708). It is because the rules of turn management, 'in organizing transfer exclusively around transition-relevance places', reduces any silences between one speaker finishing and another one starting (ibid).

The fifth rule is that 'turn order is not fixed, but varies' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 708). The rule operates on the basis of two features of the turn taking system: first, 'single turns are allocated at a time [and, second], for each allocation, a series of options is provided, each of which can provide for different next speakers' (ibid). Sacks *et al* add that turn order 'does not vary randomly' because there is a tendency 'for speaker just prior to current speaker to be selected as next speaker' (ibid).

The sixth rule is that 'turn size is not fixed, but varies' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 709). The changing length of a turn is due to two features of the turn-taking system: first, the speaker has 'the availability of a range of unit-types', any of which might or might not be allowed to be initiated, and 'the turns in the set may have varying turn sizes' (ibid); second, the third turn-allocation strategy 'provides for the possibility that any current speaker may get a chance to produce more than a single instance of a unit-type', in other words, the existence of the third turn-allocation strategy 'means that the system does not define maximum turn size' (ibid).

The seventh rule is that the 'length of conversation is not specified in advance' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 710). It is because the turn-taking system does not provide rules 'for achieving conversational closing (and thus length)' (ibid). In other words, 'the turn taking system itself is compatible with varying lengths, and does not predetermine any length' (ibid).

The eighth rule is that 'what parties say is not specified in advance' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 710). In a conversation 'the turn-taking organization […] makes no provision for the content of any turn, nor does it constrain what is (to be) done in any turn' (ibid).

Still, there are some limitations to what may be said in any turn (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 719). The very first turns of an interaction often consist of greetings (ibid). Also, it should be pointed out that 'there is a set of utterance-types, [or adjacency pairs]', and the first part of these pairs require a particular response (ibid) that 'share the property of possibly selecting next speaker' (ibid: 716). The question-answer sequence is one example of an adjacency pair (ibid); other examples include the greeting-greeting, invitation-acceptance/decline sequences etc. (ibid) There are other situations where the interaction is predetermined content-wise, as in a wedding where vows are strictly fixed (ibid); another example is an interview that follows a question-answer pattern (ibid).

The ninth rule is that 'relative distribution of turns is not specified in advance' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 711). This is achieved by the three strategies of turn allocation where the first strategy allows the current speaker to select the next one, and the second strategy allows the next speaker to self-select (ibid); therefore, alternative routes are created 'whereby any current non-speaker is potential next speaker' (ibid). In addition, the third rule 'has the consequence of not excluding even current speaker from next speakership' (ibid).

The tenth rule is that 'the number of parties can vary' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 712). The turn taking system organizes 'two turns at a time, current and next, […] so also it organizes but two speakers at a time, current and next, and is not overtly directed to the size of the pool from which

they are selected', meaning that 'the system is compatible with different numbers of participants from conversation to conversation' (ibid). Furthermore, new participants can join the interaction and the current ones can leave it (ibid).

The eleventh rule is that 'talk can be continuous or discontinuous' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 714). Talk can be labelled 'continuous when, for a sequence of transition-relevance places, it continuous' (ibid). On the other hand, 'discontinuities occur when, at some transition-relevance place, a current speaker has stopped, no speaker starts (or continues), and the ensuing space of non-talk constitutes itself as more than a gap' (ibid); this prolonged silence, longer than just a gap, can be labelled a *lapse* (ibid).

The twelfth rule is that 'turn-allocational techniques are used' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 716). It can be seen in obvious cases as when 'an addressed question selects its addressee to speak next – or that, in starting to speak when not selected, a party selects himself to speak' (ibid). There are other less obvious cases of turn-allocation, still they both can be grouped under two main categories: the current speaker selects the next one and the next speaker self-selects (ibid).

The thirteenth rule is that 'various turn-constructional units are employed for the production of the talk that occupies a turn' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 720). Sacks *et al* emphasise that 'whatever the units employed for construction, and whatever the theoretical language employed to describe them, they still have points of possible unit completion, points which are projectable before their occurrence' (ibid).

The fourteenth and the last rule is that 'repair mechanisms exist for dealing with turn-taking errors and violations' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 723). Sacks *et al* write that 'the turn-taking system lends itself to, and incorporates devices for, repair of its troubles' (ibid: 724). Moreover, the system functions as 'a basic organizational device for the repair of any other troubles in conversation' (ibid). The following example illustrates a repair mechanism in use:

A: How long it took you?
B: How long took *what*?
A: How long it took you to make dinner?
B: Just an hour.

Here we see Person A making a question to Person B. Person B does not understand the question, therefore he asks Person A to clarify; this request for clarification is a repair mechanism. When Person A clarifies his question, Person B can finally answer and the conversation can proceed.

To sum up, Sacks *et al* provide a set of rules governing turn management. They list three rules or strategies of turn allocation: the current speaker selects the next one, the next speaker self-selects or no one takes a turn, therefore the current speaker continues speaking or the conversation lapses. Sacks *et al* also enlist 14 rules of turn management that both explain why conversations remain unpredictable, yet organized. The next chapter explains the different aspects of turn management.

1.3. THE ASPECTS OF TURN MANAGEMENT

Turn management has various aspects which are of importance in analysing drama. These aspects are discussed in the successive paragraphs and they include: number of turns, turn length, interruptions and overlaps, silences, turn-allocation, sequential organization, topic change and, finally, speech acts.

1.3.1. NUMBER OF TURNS

This subchapter explains what a number of turns each participant takes might imply about power relations.

Culpeper notes that there is a correlation between one's participation and influence in a conversation (2001: 174). The correlation is particularly visible 'between influence and the number of successful turns' (ibid). Undoubtedly, in a conversation with more than two participants, the person who takes most turns would be considered as the one possessing most influence.

Different dynamics operate in a conversation with only two interactants, because in such a case 'the number of turns will be roughly equal for each speaker, no matter what the power relation' (Short, n.d.).

Thus, the participant, having the greatest number of turns in a conversation, is considered to possess the most influence. Yet this is not the case when there are only two speakers, meaning that the number of turns for each would be approximately equal. The next chapter deals with turn length.

1.3.2. TURN LENGTH

This subchapter discusses the relation between turn length and conversational influence. It looks at the implications of long and short turns in terms of character relationships, as well as explains the necessity to consider turn length in context.

A turn may have 'different lengths of input […] – clauses, phrases, one-word turns' (Herman, 2005: 83). In other words, 'variability in turn size can be quite extensive' (ibid). Turn length indicates the amount of power a participant has in a conversation or, at least, the power he attempts to have (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 711).

In a culture where each participant has equal turn rights, 'long speeches require negotiation' (Herman, 2002: 21). Participants that want to speak for considerable amount of time, 'usually signal the need, and attempt to get ratification prior to taking a long turn' (ibid). Such is the case 'when speakers wish to narrate some personal experience' (ibid). Initially, a bid to take a turn is made, and, 'if accepted, the narrative proceeds' (ibid); the following exchange illustrates this,

A: I had such a client today.
B: What about him?
A: Well, he was angry and…

At first, Person A asks to take a long turn by implying that he has a story to relate. Person B allows person A to speak for an extended period of time. Having received approval, Person A proceeds with his story.

Long turns demand the effort of paying attention for some time, therefore such turns 'should be used judiciously if the threats of boredom, hostility, etc. on the part of listeners are to be countered' (Herman, 2002: 21). In addition, long turns forbid other participants from speaking and might be used as 'a ploy for dominance, exclusion or coercion, depending on whether resistance or challenge or counter-measures are undertaken in response' (ibid). Short turns, on the other hand, may exhibit a range of emotions and behaviours such as 'indifference, urgency' (ibid).

Turn length has to be considered in context because 'the amount of speaking is not a completely reliable cue to status' (Bennison, 2002: 70). In analysing Tom Stoppard's "Professional Foul", Bennison shows an example where turn length is indicative of something else than power relations (ibid). The main character in the play, Anderson, does not normally talk much, 'but he does occasionally produce lengthy utterances, which suggest the vagueness' (ibid).

Moreover, ‘Anderson’s occasional bursts of verbosity’ imply his preference to certain topics (ibid).

A turn may be of various lengths. Frequently, the longer the turns, the more influence the speaker has. One needs to receive approval for a long turn, otherwise listeners might be bored, irritated etc. At the same time, short turns are indicative of emotions such as indifference or urgency. Turn length must be considered in context to see if it is really indicative of power relations. The next chapter concerns interruptions and overlaps.

1.3.3. INTERRUPTIONS AND OVERLAPS

This chapter discusses interruptions and overlaps in conversation, namely, what is the overall attitude towards interruptions and overlaps, what they might express about character relationships and how they occur in a free-for-all floor context.

With one-party-speaks-at-a-time rule in use, interruption of the current speaker or overlapping of speech at TRPs are not accepted (Herman, 2002: 20). If an interruption or overlap occurs, ‘one speaker will drop out so that the turn-holder can proceed with his or her speech’ (ibid).

In case ‘overlaps hold across most or all of the duration of the current speaker’s turn’, the situation much likely is conflictual (Herman, 2002: 20). However, prolonged overlaps do not always imply a conflict because ‘the next speaker may mistakenly assume that [the current speaker’s] turn has been completed,’ and he may start speaking (Herman, 2005: 83).

Interruptions and overlaps might not only imply conflict, but also exhibit the traits of a character (Herman, 2002: 25). A person that is regularly interrupted and denied a chance to speak and no counter-reaction from his side is successful – that character ‘can be interpreted as the less powerful interactant’ (ibid). On the other hand, a character that often interrupts normally appears assertive and ‘reduces sociability’ (Robinson & Reis, 1989: discussed in Culpeper, 2001: 174).

Interruptions, which can also be called ‘turn-grabs’, can function in many ways (Herman, 2002: 27). As Herman writes, ‘interposing oneself into an interaction uninvited and against the rights of invited speakers can be either self-orientated, to promote one’s own interests, or other orientated’ (ibid). The following example illustrates self-orientated interruption:

A: You look awful!
B: Oh, I was just riding in a bus and…
A: Whatever. Just get to work.

Initially, Person A expresses interest in Person's B unfortunate state. When Person B starts explaining the situation, Person A interrupts him because, most likely, he has no time to hear Person B complaining.

The next example illustrates other orientated interruption:

A: Why are you here?
B: Eh… I was just…
C: He's with me. I'm giving a tour.

Person A asks Person B why he is in a place he supposedly should not be. Person B is about to give an excuse, when he is interrupted by Person C. Obviously, Person C tries to protect Person B from any trouble.

Different dynamics operate in free-for-all or collective floors, in other words, when one-speaker-at-a-time rule is not in use (Herman, 2002: 23). Such conversation is 'more multi-dimensional than linear, with different kinds of speech business proceeding simultaneously' (ibid). A collaboration of a different sort is operating, in which many speakers – for instance, responding to one question – might take the next turn (Edelsky, 1993, discussed in Herman, 2002: 23). In the same way, multiple speakers can contribute to a development of an idea (ibid). Such cooperation 'uses simultaneous speech, overlaps, etc. positively' (Herman, 2002: 23).

Given that normally only one participant speaks at a time, interruptions and overlaps are undesirable and might imply conflict. Interruptions and overlaps also exhibit various character traits. An interruption can be both self-orientated or other orientated. Contrary to traditional norms, interruptions and overlaps are accepted and operate in a positive manner in a free-for-all floor situation. The next chapter consider occurrence of silences.

1.3.4. SILENCES

This chapter deals with the occurrence of silences in a conversation and what they might imply.

The silence between turns can be labelled as a *pause* (Herman, 2002: 20). It may indicate a wide range of things, for example, it might 'signify hesitation, or be used as a ploy for emphasis' (ibid). Speech with many pauses might be indicative of the effort to put one's thoughts into words (Chafe, 1985, discussed in Herman, 2002: 20).

Another term for silences in a conversation is *gap*. A gap is a period of silence that 'can stretch from initial non-responsiveness followed by a response to full-scale silence' (Herman, 2002: 20-21). Silence that follows 'in response to another's speech can also be interpreted as

caution, the speaker following the "think before you speak" maxim' (ibid: 21). Constant stretches of silence 'on the part of a targeted other who is addressed by a speaker can signal indifference, boredom, hostility, the desire to be left in peace, opting out, etc. and import negative tones into the interaction' (ibid: 25). In case no one is selected as the next speaker or the next speaker does not self-select, 'the gap that follows can bring about closure' (ibid: 21).

Silences have to be interpreted taking into account 'the various cultural or interpersonal values' (Herman, 2002: 21). For example, in the USA silence is undesirable, therefore interactants normally avoid moments of absence of speech. In addition, one person might prefer a fast tempo and verbosity, thus finding 'slower, deliberate, disfluent or laconic speakers a trial – and vice versa' (ibid).

The possibilities that silence can express are endless. The best approach in analysing silences is to consider them on a case to case basis, with cultural and social context being taken into account. The next chapter deals with turn-allocation.

1.3.5. TURN-ALLOCATION

This chapter deals with turn-allocation. First, it discusses the importance of it. Second, it explains what it might imply about character relationships. Third, it describes conventions of turn allocation. Lastly, it lists a couple of ways of allocating a turn.

The way turns are distributed is crucial to avoid the interaction becoming chaotic, especially 'when numerous interacting participants have rights to speak and wish to make turns' (Herman, 2002: 19), and the order, in which turns might be constructed, can vary greatly owing to the different strategies for turn allocation (ibid: 21).

With only two interactants in a conversation, the order of turns might be 'in A-B-A-B fashion' (ibid). On the other hand, with more than two interactants in a conversation, 'the order may sanction speech rights for only some selected or self-selected other or others within the pool of possible participants' (ibid). Some interactants might not get an opportunity to speak, therefore the equal distribution of turn rights is violated and this right is thought to be 'the unstated norm believed to be operative in Western, English-speaking contexts' (ibid). The order of turns is worth considering, 'since who speaks to whom and who is not spoken to within the contingencies of a situation can colour the way in which the situation develops' (ibid). A three-party

conversation with turn order A-C-A-B-A-B-A, for example, may suggest C's exclusion by A and B (ibid).

In a conversation, an interactant assumes either the role of the initiator or the responder, or both (Short, n.d.). The initiator is the one who allocates a turn, the responder – the one taking the allocated turn (ibid). Who initiates a turn and who responds is particularly revelatory of power relations because it may 'suggest who may be dominant, a motivator, compliant, or obstructive' (Culpeper, 2001: 174).

The topic about the roles of the initiator and the responder is much related to the concept of adjacency pairs. As noted earlier, adjacency pairs are 'tied pairs of utterances and ordered such that the issue of the first part in a turn sets up an expectancy that the other will follow in the next turn' (Herman, 2005: 85). These pairs are 'interactively consequential in that they constrain […] the interlocutor's response' (ibid); the following example illustrates that,

A: Are you staying inside or going out with me?
B: Actually, I will go out. Though, not with you. I rather take a walk on my own.

The question asked by Person A is an alternative question, leaving Person B with only two options. Person B has to defy Person A in order to act according to his own interests.

The omission of the second part of an adjacency pair is also very noticeable (Herman, 2005: 85); such would be the case of a greeting-greeting sequence when the first part of the pair, a greeting, is not responded with the same, which translates as impoliteness on the responder's part.

Herman writes that there are different rule-sets of turn allocation or, in other words, 'different floor conventions [that] generate different turn-taking strategies and the interactive structures that they authorize as "normal"' (2002: 23). A conversation 'with the one-speaker-at-a-time rule in force' has the trait to give 'a pivotal role to the sotto voce speaker, with "collaboration" interpreted as respect of speaker's rights' (ibid); those not taking a turn to speak 'are cast as non-speaking "hearers" who change discourse role to speakers with the same turn rights' (ibid).

Different floor conventions operate when 'one speaker acts like a ring-master, telling other speakers when they can contribute and when they should stop' (Short, n.d.); such is the case of a TV host in a political debate or a teacher in a class. Another set of conventions are in force 'in institutional settings [where] the order of turns is controlled not spontaneously but by appropriate institutional conventions' (Herman, 2002: 22). A formal board meeting, for example, has the Chair allowing or forbidding to speak (ibid). Yet another set of conventions are in force in such

speech situation as a debate (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 701). Turn management conventions also vary across cultures, and some of them might 'award precedence to seniority by age or social rank' (Herman, 2002: 22), which is the case of Japanese and South Korean societies.

Sacks *et al* distinguish many ways of allocating a turn that, as noted earlier, can be grouped into two large categories: 1) the current speaker selects the next one and 2) the next speaker self-selects (1974: 716). Some techniques for allocating a turn are described in the following paragraphs.

The first technique is 'the "obvious" case of an addressed question' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 716). It is 'a special case of a class of utterance types, or "type of sequence parts" (ibid)'. A question, if considered as a constituent of an adjacency pair, is the first part of a question-answer sequence (ibid). First components of adjacency pairs 'set constraints on what should be done in a next turn'. More importantly to the discussion of turn allocation, these first parts of a sequence hold 'the affiliation of an address term (or some other device for achieving "addressing", e.g. gaze direction)' (ibid: 717).

The second technique is very similar to the previous one, but differs in accomplishing 'a next-speaker selection without addressing or any such technique' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 717). Instead, the next-speaker self-selects by understanding he is the only one given the right to self-select (ibid). The technique is really a question, possibly appearing as repetition of the previous utterance with an intonation of a question (Jefferson, 1972, discussed in Sacks *et al*, 1974: 717), or it might be 'a variety of "one word questions" such as *what?, who?,* etc.' (Sacks *et al*: 1974: 717). In short, this technique uses a question without addressing anyone directly, but, by referring to a previous utterance, the turn is allocated to a particular person. The next example illustrates this technique:

A: I've got some bad news.
B: Bad news?
A: It's about the new employee.

At first, Person B says he has bad news to announce. Person B partially repeats the previous turn with a questioning intonation. Although Person B's question is not directly addressed to Person A, the question carries reference to the previous utterance and thus surely addresses Person A.

Sacks *et al* state that this technique,

> introduces the turn-order bias, [namely], the only systematic mechanism available for next-speaker selection which can prefer, formally, a next speaker identified only in turn-taking

terms (and thus context-free terms) is one which selects prior speaker as next speaker. (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 717-718)

The third technique involves the use of a tag question (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 718). This technique is especially useful 'when a current speaker has constructed a turn's talk to a possible TRP without having selected a next, and he finds no other self-selecting to be next' (ibid); on such an occasion, the current speaker may use 'a tag question, selecting another as next speaker upon the tag question's completion, and thereby exiting from the turn' (ibid). The tag question, in terms of turn management, can be labelled as *recompleter* (ibid).

The fourth technique, or rather set of techniques, 'employ social identities in their operation' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 718). For example, 'in a conversation involving two couples, an invitation made by a speaker to go to the movies' will be addressed to the other couple, with exclusion of his/her own spouse (ibid). Social identities may change during a conversation, thus affecting how turns are allocated (ibid).

The fifth technique belongs to the category of the next speaker self-selects, and 'the basic technique for self-selection is "starting first"' (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 718). Several people might start speaking simultaneously, and in such case the first speaker is not apparent (ibid: 719). However, 'regularly, after a very brief pause [following the previous speaker's turn], only one starts' (ibid). The provision to start first 'motivates any intending self-selector to start as early as possible at an earliest/next transition-relevance place' (ibid).

The sixth and the last technique mentioned here also involves self-selection, but in this case, instead of taking a turn by starting first, the self-selected speaker grabs the turn by interrupting the first starter (Sacks *et al*, 1974: 720). For example:

A: It's almost time for lunch.
B: I'm hungry. (Let's…)
C: (I'm hu)ngry, too. I know a good place that's just opened.

Person A suggests that it is time to have lunch. Person B expresses his desire to eat. Before he gets to say anything more, Person C interrupts him and starts his turn.

To sum up, turn allocation is crucial to maintain a conversation in order. The order of turns in two-party conversation is fixed; on the other hand, in a multi-party conversation turns may not be distributed equally, thus revealing some aspects about relationships between characters. It is worth noting who mainly allocates the turns, acts as the initiator, and who mainly takes the allocated turns, acts as the responder; such role distribution exhibits power relations between the interactants. Conventions for turn-allocation vary across contexts, including different institutional

settings and cultures. There are also many ways of allocating a turn, generally grouped into two categories: 1) the current speaker selects the next one and 2) the next speaker self-selects. The next chapter discusses sequential organization.

1.3.6. SEQUENTIAL ORGANIZATION

This subchapter explains how turn sequencing operates in interactions. First, the properties of a turn that make them form sequences are described. Then the notion of adjacency pair is discussed. The last topic considered in this subchapter is that of turn repair sequences.

Levinson gives an example of a sequence of turns with only two participants, in which 'one participant A talks, stops (1983: 296); another, B, starts, talks, stops (ibid); and so we obtain an A-B-A-B-A-B distribution of talk across two participants' (ibid). Such would always be the case in every two-party interaction. In multi-party interactions, sequences become more complicated.

Sacks *et al* write that 'a turn is to be thought of as a "turn-in-a-series", with the potential of the series being made into a sequence' (1974: 722). Such observation is explained by the fact that 'turns display gross organizational features that reflect their occurrence in a series' (ibid). More precisely, a turn normally exhibits a relation to the previous turn, as well as the succeeding one (ibid).

Herman express similar ideas, arguing that 'turns in sequence have a projective and a retroactive dimension to them (2002: 22)'; a turn might exhibit its relation to the previous turn, 'as when an answer is given to a question issued in a previous turn, or constrain the nature of the next turn, as when one issues a greeting to another' (ibid).

As noted earlier, 'turns call forth other turns' with the help of sequencing mechanisms (Herman, 2005: 85). The smallest interactional unit consists of not less than two turns, 'through which the reciprocity of interaction is enacted' (ibid). In every exchange 'there is some degree of latitude in respect of what may follow what', nonetheless 'regularities and expectancies' are also present, especially due to the adjacency pairs that 'account for next-turn constancies which underlie the linear structuring of talk' (ibid).

Adjacency pairs, a notion that has been referred to earlier, are 'tied pairs of utterance [that are] ordered such that the issue of the first part in a turn sets up an expectancy that the other will follow in the next turn' (Herman, 2005: 85). A question, for example, 'presupposes or requires an answer, the use of a greeting raises expectations of a reciprocal greeting' (ibid).

The two aforementioned cases of adjacency pairs, a question-answer and greeting-greeting sequence, motivate to give only one sort of reply (Herman, 2005: 86). However, there are cases when 'ordered options provide alternatives, as in offers or invitations which may either be accepted or refused' (ibid: 86-87). In a similar fashion, 'comments call forth comments, and where comments are assessment, the second part may either agree or disagree with the first part' (ibid: 87). Unlike an agreement, construction-wise a disagreement can be quite complex and 'need not be confined to two or even three turns' (ibid).

Turns might be organized in a 'strict, linear adjacency', but certainly it is not always the case (Herman, 2005: 85). Adjacency pairs can be expanded by the various options the first part of the pair might provide (ibid). Moreover, there is a possible occurrence of '*insertion sequences* that can complicate the structure of the basic [adjacency] pair through embedding of various kinds' (ibid).

Although conversational troubles of various sorts can still occur, 'there are *repair mechanisms* for dealing with them' (Herman, 2005: 88). The function of repair mechanisms is 'to check and monitor that the interaction is working as desired and that errors in production or problems with comprehension are being countered' (ibid). Herman expands that 'these [repair mechanisms], if anything, serve to strengthen the claim that conversations are co-productions of meaningful activity, which, when threatened, can be attended to jointly in order to produce mutual satisfaction' (ibid).

Turn repairs make a special sort of turn sequencing, and 'they can also stretch across many turns, since the structures […] are composed of *slots* and not necessarily turns in adjacency' (Herman, 2005: 88). A turn repair can be executed by the one who made the mistake or it can be done by others, 'and accomplished with or without prompting from an interlocutor' (ibid). Here is an example of a self-initiated turn repair

> A: What are you still doing? It's almost 7 PM. We should have left already. [Silence.] Oh, I forgot to switch to Summer time. We still got an hour.

The next example illustrates an other-initiated turn-repair:

> A: I've got a meeting at 11 AM.
> B: You mean 10 AM.
> A: Yeah, 10 AM. I forgot I pushed it in earlier.

In this example, Person A makes a statement that is corrected by Person B. This time Person A is not offended because he might not have corrected himself and therefore feels thankful. However, normally self-correction is preferable, since 'others repairing speaker's errors

could create offence or signal power imbalances' (Levinson, 1983: 339-342, discussed in Herman, 2005: 88).

Some turn repairs are small-scale and can be easily fixed, allowing the conversation to proceed (Herman, 2005: 88). Yet there can arise full-scale misunderstanding 'in which proper remedial action has to be undertaken, if desired, in order to restore the breach in interactive harmony' (ibid).

Turns have an intrinsic quality to form sequences because each of them has a connection to the previous and the upcoming turn. Most sequences are formed by some sort of an adjacency pair. The initial part of an adjacency pair can give a wide range of possibilities how the sequence can be formed and might also significantly limit what can be said. There are also repair sequences, which cannot be analysed under the notion of adjacency pair, as they make unique sequences. It is better that a repair sequence is initiated by the one making the mistake. The next chapter deals with topic change.

1.3.7. TOPIC CHANGE

This chapter discusses topic change in a conversation. First, the concept of topic is introduced. Second, the occurrence of topic change in a conflict situation is described.

Every talk may have a 'common focus to which participants orientate, like *topic*' (Brown and Yule, 1983; Craig and Tracy, discussed in Herman, 2005: 91). Means by which the coherence in a conversation is maintained vary, 'but the glue of topic is one important factor' (Herman, 2002: 22).

From the perspective of conversational analysis, 'topics are what users construct via their formulations within a discourse context, which they maintain via mutual orientation to a common point of reference to which utterances contribute' (Herman, 2005: 91). Interactants can co-operate 'to develop a topic, or negotiate change or closure' (ibid).

Initiation of a new topic 'generally assumes that it is *newsworthy*' (Herman, 2005: 91). There might also be restrictions on the selection of a topic, 'since some may be taboo in a particular situation', and in these situations 'what not to say and to whom requires equal attention' (ibid).

The topic of the conversation changes over the course of the interaction, however, sometimes such changes are hard to notice because, for they are ‘gradual, and may look like different aspects of the same topic (Short, n.d.)

An interaction might become competitive ‘via topic conflict, [as when] competing aspects of the *same* topic or even different topics are attended to independently by the participants’ (Herman, 2005: 91); in other words, ‘turn clashes against turn with the common focus being lost’ (ibid). In such a case each interactant only pays attention to his own turns, ‘while ignoring that of the interlocutor’ (ibid: 91-92), as the following example shows:

A: You didn’t wash the dishes.
B: You didn’t take out the dog.
A: I asked you to do the dishes in the morning. You had a plenty of time.
B: You seem not to care about Chapo at all.

Person A starts the conversation by accusing Person B for not doing the dishes. Person B does not respond to the accusation directly, instead he blames Person A for not taking care of the dog. Person A, in his turn, does not respond to Person B’s accusation and proceeds with his topic about the dishes. Person B once again ignores Person A’s accusation and carries on with his topic about the dog. When interactants ignore each other’s turns, ‘a double strand of talk running more or less independently can […] occur’ (Herman, 2002: 22). In the result, an interaction might have ‘different degrees of co-operativeness’ (ibid).

Lack of co-operativeness is not always indicative of a conflict. The interactant might ignore the topic without being impolite and avoiding a conflict by ‘the use of “misplacement marker” and prefaces of various kinds to alert the interlocutor to the fact that what is about to be said must not be linked to the immediately preceding turn’ (Herman, 2005: 90). Such a *misplacement marker* is, for instance, the phrase “by the way” (ibid).

To summarise, topic is a point of focus around which a conversation is orientated. A topic needs to be worthy of attention to be introduced. Topics also change during a conversation, but not always this transition is easy to detect. In a conflict situation, normally there is a lack of orientation to one topic. The act of ignoring a topic can also be non-conflictual. The next chapter deals with the concept of speech act.

1.3.8. SPEECH ACTS

This chapter deals with the concept of speech act. First, the definition of the term is given. Second, the conditions for a speech act to be successful are explained. Then the three types of speech acts are described. Lastly, the relation between context and speech act is discussed.

Speech act is a term describing 'actions performed through speech' (Short, n.d.). This means that an utterance carries a performative function, in other words, 'the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action – it is not normally thought of as just saying something' (Austin, 1962: 6). Some types of speech act are 'threatening, apologizing, surrendering, christening, and explaining' (Short, n.d.).

There are conditions for an utterance to be successfully performative, for example, the circumstances need to be fitting (Lowe, 2002). In such situations as a wedding it is not sufficient just to give vows, both parties must not be already married, too (Austin, 1962: 8).

In other cases for the utterance to perform an action, some mental processes must take place (Austin, 1962: 15). Apology, for example, suggests remorse, and yet saying 'I'm sorry' does not mean that a person has the appropriate feelings for apology (ibid: 83); the absence of appropriate thoughts and feelings in a speech act 'constitutes an abuse of the procedure' (Lowe, 2002: 131). Moreover, an apology might not be successful in case the other party rejects it, 'even if [the apology] is sincere, thereby illustrating the gap between the intentions of the speaker and the reaction of the hearer' (ibid).

Austin distinguishes three types of speech acts: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary (Austin, 1962).

The first type of a speech act, locutionary, concerns solely the meaning of the utterance (Austin, 1962). Austin writes that 'in saying something we perform a locutionary act which is roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference, which again is roughly equivalent to "meaning" in the traditional sense' (ibid: 109). Simply put, the locutionary act is only the literal meaning of the utterance without the intentions behind it.

Illocutionary act, on the other hand, is the type of speech act that intends the hearer to act in some way (Austin, 1962). In a sentence "Wait!", for example, the meaning of the word 'wait' is the locutionary act, but the force to make the hearer react is the illocutionary act (ibid). Both aforementioned speech acts are performed simultaneously (ibid).

The likelihood of the illocutionary act to be performed depends on the hearer's willingness to comply with the speaker's intentions or his ability to comprehend what is expected of him (Austin, 1962). Thus there is the third type of a speech act, perlocutionary, which concerns the outcome of the whole speech act (ibid).

As usual, context has to be taken into account to fully understand a speech act (Short, n.d.). There might be cases when 'different people might accord the same utterance different speech act statuses depending upon their different contextual assumptions' (ibid). Toolan expresses the same belief, arguing that 'the surface form of an utterance taken separately cannot tell us which speech act is being performed, [therefore] we have to look at utterances in context' (2002: 146). The one-word sentence 'Great!', for example, can be a commendation, as wells as a criticism expressed in sarcasm.

Speech act is a term to describe actions initiated by spoken discourse. For a speech act to be successful, sometimes specific conditions need to be met – be they physical, institutional, mental or of any other kind. There are three types of speech acts: the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary act; the first one concerns the literal meaning of the speech act, the second concerns its intentions and the last one concerns the outcome of the whole speech act. Context always has to be considered to properly comprehend a speech act.

1.4. TURN MANAGEMENT IN DRAMATIC DISCOURSE

This chapter explains the importance of turn management in analysing dramatic texts. Particularly, how turn management is used to construct power relations between characters in these texts of fiction.

Herman writes that 'what is important in interpreting dramatic dialogue is not just the meaning of what is said, but the management of the saying itself' or the way turn-taking system operates (2002: 32). In another work, Herman elaborates that 'a significant aspect of dramatic art is to be found […] in the strategic patterning of turn rights and turn distribution' (2005: 92). The way an interaction develops in a play 'can be seen to be the product of the manipulation and exploitation of [the rules] and conventions [of turn management] by dramatists for dramatic purposes' (ibid).

Herman expands her argument by saying that 'although the purely verbal aspects of dramatic dialogue have generated much interest in the analysis of drama, the genre is basically an

actional one' (2005: 93). She adds that 'the shaping of dramatic speech in its actional and interactional mode is not dependent on literary quality alone, or even on language alone' (ibid). What she urges to consider are 'the more basic mechanisms that regulate turn change, turn order, distribution of turns, sequencing and the like' (ibid).

Bennison pays particular attention to the length of turns that he believes 'can provide useful initial clues to a character's behaviour – their relative power in the speech situation, or their interest in a particular topic (2005: 70)'. However, he states that 'the statistical evidence is not conclusive in isolation' (ibid).

Culpeper also agrees that turn length should be analysed with context taken into account (2001). He writes that in an interaction such as 'an interview it is the interviewee, the relatively powerless participant, who contributes most talk' (ibid: 174-175); this is done 'in the interests of the more powerful participants, the interviewers, to have the interviewee talk at length in order to find out more about him' (Short, n.d.). These exceptions can be labelled as 'institutionalised' (ibid).

As explained by Short, 'looking at a particular set of turn-taking patterns may also help [one] to see other things about characters in play' (n.d.). A character with the most 'powerful turn-taking characteristics' might avoid interrupting others, thus appearing polite, 'whereas someone who interrupts others a lot may be thought of as domineering and overbearing' (ibid).

The analysis of turn management in drama can be done on the micro level – narrowing down analysis just to one excerpt, as well as on macro level – taking into account the whole play (Short, n.d.).

When analysis dramatic discourse, Short focuses on power relations. He distinguishes four types of power which frequently operate in dramatic texts:

- Physical power or physical strength;
- Institutional power, as in manager vs. worker situation in a company
- Social power, as in parents vs. children situation in a family;
- Personal power, as in a situation when someone dominates an interaction thanks to his personal qualities, such as intelligence or experience (n.d.).

These types of power and the ways they function are often mirrored in dramatic discourse.

Certainly, there are exceptions that arise due to 'clashes between different kinds of power' (Short, n.d.). In a conversation between a student and a tutor, the student might be very confident,

expressing personal power, and he might speak at lengths and even interrupt the tutor, who possesses the institutional power (ibid).

Then there are cases when other factors 'get in the way', as in a situation when 'a teacher may allocate a turn to a particular student […], but the student may be too shy (or too terrified, or not have anything to say) to take up the turn allocated' (Short, n.d.). It might also be that 'the personality of the most powerful participant might make a difference' (ibid); in a job interview the interviewer might want the interaction to be less formal and more of a chit-chat, assuming that such an approach 'would be useful for some reason' (ibid).

The main argument for turn management in analysing drama, as proposed by Herman, is that dramatic texts are interactional. It means that in dramatic speech not only language itself is important, but also patterning of turn rights and distribution. For Bennison, the length of turns is especially significant. However, turn-management always has to be considered with attention to context. Turn management in drama can be analysed both on micro and macro level. As for power relations, there are four types of it: physical, institutional, social and personal power. Sometimes these different powers clash between one another. Other times other factors prevail, changing the way power relations are expected to be.

2. THE PROCEDURE OF ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the procedure of analysis for turn management in Oscar Wilde's comedy "An Ideal Husband". The scope of analysis is outlined, after which the procedure of analysis is explained in detail.

As stated above, the analysis of a dramatic discourse can be done on macro- and micro-level. This analysis is done on the micro level, namely, only one excerpt is considered and that is the conversation between Sir Robert Chiltern and Mrs. Cheveley in Act One (see Appendix 1). This excerpt was chosen for the merits it offers in analysing power relations: the conversation in question involves blackmail and consequently shifting power relations, and these shifts are revealed by turn management. In this conversation Mrs Cheveley slowly and deliberately blackmails Sir Robert Chiltern; at first, Sir Robert Chiltern does not succumb to Mrs Chiltern's demands but, in the end, he is persuaded. For the sake of convenience, every turn is labelled from 1 to 66.

The procedure of analysis in this research is largely based on methodologies proposed by Herman (2005) and Short (n.d.). The analysis is conducted as a list of questions that are answered one after another. Altogether, there are six questions that are discussed in the following paragraphs of this chapter.

1. Who has the longest turns? – Given that there are only two interactants, both parties take equal number of turns. As for turn length, the best way of assessment is to count the number of words each turn comprises. It is also worth calculating the average length of a turn for each character, because those turns that considerably deviate from the average are of particular interest. In other words, exceptionally short or long turns have to be marked as they might tell much about the situation in question.

2. Who interrupts and who is interrupted? – Answering this question can tell much about power relations. The task is to spot these instances and give an explanation for each of them.

3. Who makes pauses and why? - The possibilities what silence can express are endless. The best approach in analysing these instances is to consider them in context.

4. Who assumes the role of the initiator and who assumes the role of the responder? – The main question is who mostly controls the conversation by making the other half being the responder to his/her turns. For instance, one character might allocate turns to the other one by

asking one question after another; in the result, the whole conversation might resemble an interrogation. Another thing to consider is what are the reasons for such role distribution.

5. Who controls the topic of talk? – The one who controls the topic of the conversation is usually the one possessing most influence. It is worth noting every instance of topic change and answering who initiated it and whether the other party is willing to succumb.

6. Who is dominant and why? – To a great degree, this question would be answered by the previous ones. Still another aspect has to be considered, that is to say, what sort of power each character possesses and how these different powers clash against one another.

In conclusion, these six questions are answered in succession. Even though there might be some overlap of subject matter being discussed, each question deals with its unique aspect of turn management and require full focus.

3. ANALYSIS

This chapter presents analysis of an excerpt in Oscar Wilde's comedy "An Ideal Husband". This excerpt is a conversation between Sir Robert Chiltern and Mrs Cheveley in Act One (see Appendix 1). The analysis follows a procedure established in the previous chapter.

3.1. TURN LENGTH

This chapter deals with the length of turns: the average turn length for each character is considered and, taking this number into account, turns that significantly deviate from the average are singled out and discussed.

Average turn length is analysed by counting the number of words each character produces and dividing it by the number of turns he or she has taken; for both characters the number of turns taken is 33. The result of the calculation is in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1. **The Average Turn Length**

	Number of words produced	**Number of turns taken**	**The Average Turn Length (words)**
Sir Robert Chiltern	545	33	≈ 17
Mrs Cheveley	1191		≈ 36
Mrs Cheveley (without considering Turn 48)	824	32	≈ 26

As seen in Table 3.1., Sir Robert Chiltern produces 545 words and his average turn length is approximately 17 words. In comparison, Mrs Cheveley produces 1191 words and her average turn length is about 36 words. The conclusion is that Mrs Cheveley speaks about twice as much as Sir Robert Chiltern does.

However, Turn 48 for Mrs Cheveley is exceptionally long – 342 words and it makes 28.71% of all the words she pronounces; the turn is so long because at that point Mrs Cheveley dominates the conversation and she uses the chance to instil fear in Sir Robert Chiltern by giving a detailed illustration of his possible future. Without considering Turn 48, the average turn length for Mrs Cheveley is approximately 26 words.

Because there might be big variations in length from turn to turn, the average turn length might not lead to straightforward conclusions. Therefore, the average deviation from the average turn length was calculated; it was done by counting the number of words that deviate from the average in each turn and then dividing the sum by the number of turns. For instance, the average

turn length for Sir Robert Chiltern is around 17 words; Turn 5 for him is 12 words longs, therefore the deviation is 5 words; Turn 7, on the other hand, is 41 words long, therefore the deviation is 24 words; in the end, all these deviations are counted and divided by the number of turns. The results are shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2. **The Average Deviation from the Average Turn Length**

	The Average Turn Length (words)	**The Average Deviation**	**The Percentage of Average Deviation**
Sir Robert Chiltern	≈ 17	13.15	77.35%
Mrs Cheveley	≈ 36	34.24	95.11%
Mrs Cheveley (without considering Turn 48)	≈ 26	15.75	60.57%

As seen in Table 3.2., the average turn length itself is not indicative of much. The average deviation from the average turn length for Sir Robert Chiltern, expressed in percentage, is 77.35% deviation, but for Mrs Cheveley – 95.11%. Roughly speaking, every turn for each character is either twice as short or long as it is from the average turn length.

The 95.11% deviation for Mrs Cheveley is mostly due to Turn 48; if this turn is excluded from the calculation, then the average deviation is 15.75 words, which makes 60.57%.

With average deviation being calculated, it can be answered more precisely which turns really deviate from the average. The turn length in each turn by each character is shown in the table in Appendix 2. The exceptionally short turns are marked in yellow; only multiple short turns in a sequence are highlighted because a sole short turn might not be indicative of anything much. Those turns that are exceptionally long are marked in green.

The very first turn of Mrs Cheveley, Turn 2, is quite long. She responds to a question by Sir Robert Chiltern, who expresses interest in her plans during her stay in England. She proceeds with a small talk about British customs. This might imply that Mrs Cheveley has tendency for chattering. This might also imply that she aims to set a relaxed and friendly tone of the conversation.

At the beginning of the conversation there are two long turns by Sir Robert Chiltern – Turn 7 and 9 that are 41 and 113 words long respectively. In those two turns, Sir Robert Chiltern responds to Mrs Cheveley's interest to speak about the Argentine Canal, a project under construction. Given Sir Robert Chiltern's position of Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, he knows a lot about the two subjects. He expresses his stance that the Argentine Canal is expected to be a failure and also reveals that he is about to advise the Parliament not to make any investment in it. Turn 7 and 9 are exceptionally long because the assessment of the prospects for

the Argentine project is part of Sir Robert Chiltern's work; he might have spent a long time considering this project and preparing his speech at the Parliament. Turn 7 and 9 imply that Sir Robert Chiltern is inclined to speak more about certain topics.

While Sir Robert Chiltern produces two long turns, Mrs Cheveley does 4 short turns in succession – Turn 8, 10, 12 and 14. After Sir Robert Chiltern has criticized the Argentine Canal project, Mrs Cheveley responds that he is simply speculating. In the next turn she reveals that she has invested in the project being discussed. In the next two turns she tells that such an investment was made after being advised by a common friend – Baron Arnheim. Mrs Cheveley keeps her turns short because she wants that Sir Robert Chiltern is mostly talking; she wants to learn his stance on the Argentine Canal project. She also withholds her true intentions. When it comes to blackmailing, she is slow, careful and deliberate.

Another long turn for Sir Robert Chiltern is Turn 19 that consists of 48 words. It comes after Mrs Cheveley has revealed she has invested in the Argentine Canal project. In Turn 17, Sir Robert Chiltern tries to change the topic, but Mrs Cheveley insists on talking about the canal. Then, in Turn 19 he expresses his unwillingness to speak about the topic and reminds that he is to denounce the project in question. Turn 19 is of such length because Sir Robert Chiltern takes time to express his attitude and reiterate his stance on the Argentine Canal project.

Turn 22 for Mrs Cheveley is a long one – 126 words – and it comes as a surprise to Sir Robert Chiltern. Not only she asks him to withdraw his report on the Argentine Canal project, but also she explains in detail how he should do it. Although at that moment it is unclear why Mrs Cheveley can afford to act so boldly, she appears to be in a superior position to Sir Robert Chiltern, as supported by the length of the turn.

The following six turns for Sir Robert Chiltern – Turn 21, 23, 25, 27, 29 and 31 – are rather short and are respectively 12, 12, 9, 2, 10 and 4 words long. This is the moment Mrs Chiltern starts blackmailing Sir Robert Chiltern. First, she suggests that support of the Argentine Canal is in his own interests. Sir Robert Chiltern is confused and he responds with two questions of clarification. Then Mrs Cheveley directly expresses that she wants Sir Robert Chiltern to support the Argentine Canal project at the Parliament. In Turn 23, 25 and 27, Sir Robert Chiltern expresses his shock and disbelief for hearing such a proposition and for being offered to pay. Then Mrs Cheveley claims she can pay for the favour she is asking, but she does not specify how. In Turn 29 and 31, Sir Robert Chiltern expresses confusion about what Mrs Chiltern is trying to imply. To sum up, these six turns in succession by Sir Robert Chiltern are short because Mrs

Cheveley has made a bold demand and Sir Robert Chiltern reacts with bursts of shock and confusion.

Turn 33, which is the next turn for Robert Chiltern, consists of 36 words and can be considered as long. Having been offended by Mrs Cheveley, he reacts with indignation and asks Mrs Cheveley to leave his house. The fact that this turn is much longer than the previous six suggests he has regained his composure.

The next three turns for Sir Robert Chiltern – Turn 35, 37 and 39 – once again are short. Mrs Cheveley continues blackmailing him and reveals that she knows a dark secret of Sir Robert Chiltern's past. That secret is that he sold some classified government information to Baron Arnheim, a crime that laid foundations for his career and wealth. Mrs Cheveley claims to have a letter that proves his deed. In Turns 35, 37 and 39 Sir Robert Chiltern pretends not to know anything and denies her claims. These short turns might express that Sir Robert Chiltern is afraid or simply unable to give a better response.

After multiple short turns, in which Sir Robert Chiltern denies accusations of selling a government secret, Mrs Cheveley becomes direct with him. In Turn 42, she plainly explains him that he has committed a crime, she has a proof of that and, if he does not succumb to her demand, that crime would be revealed. In this long turn, Mrs Cheveley tries to change the way conversation progresses, because at that moment Sir Robert Chiltern is only denying any accusations. Not only she shows dominance, but also her skills in blackmailing.

Then Sir Robert again has a succession of short turns – Turn 43, 45, 47 and 49. In Turn 43 and 45, he responds to Mrs Cheveley's demands to speak in favour of the Argentine Canal project. He does not have an upper hand in this situation, so all he can say is no. When Mrs Cheveley threatens him with exposing his secret, he can only reply with a question, 'What then?' (Wilde, 1908) After that comes the longest turn in the whole conversation, Turn 48, in which Mrs Cheveley envisions Sir Robert Chiltern's future in case he does not succumb to her demand. After this long turn he repeats that he cannot do what is asked of him. Turn 43, 45, 47 and 49, being so short, mirror that Sir Robert Chiltern is powerless and desperate.

Mrs Cheveley has two long turns in succession, Turn 48 and 50, the first of which is 342 words long and the second – 91. So far Sir Robert Chiltern has only refused to succumb to Mrs Cheveley's demand, although he is aware of the consequences. In Turn 48 and 50, Mrs Cheveley switches her tactics in blackmailing. Instead of being direct, she explains in detail what would happen to him if he refuses to co-operate; shortly put, she says that his career and public life

would be ruined. Moreover, she comments on English morals that expect everyone to be just and proper, seemingly without flaws. Mrs Cheveley can afford to produce these two long turns because she dominates the interaction completely. The intention behind those turns is to finally convince Sir Robert Chiltern to give in to her demand, and she tries to achieve that by giving a long description of his possible future.

After Sir Robert Chiltern has expressed willingness to succumb, Mrs Cheveley's Turn 58 is correspondingly long and formal. She explains the procedure in case Sir Robert Chiltern withdraws the report on the Argentine Canal project. She treats the deal like a business. The length of the turn and the content indicates that Mrs Cheveley is still dominating the conversation and, given her matter-of-fact attitude, seems to enjoy it.

Then comes a succession of short turns, Turn 59-64, both by Sir Robert Chiltern and Mrs Cheveley. In the first four turns, Turn 59-62, Sir Robert Chiltern asks for more time to consider her offer, but Mrs Cheveley denies him that. Sir Robert Chiltern is distressed, so in Turn 63 he exclaims, 'My God! what brought you into my life?' (Wilde, 1908), to which Mrs Cheveley replies, 'Circumstances.' (ibid) These six turns are the most emotionally charged in the whole conversation, as well as the shortest. Not only Sir Robert Chiltern produces short turns, but also Mrs Cheveley who seems to have decided to stop convincing him; she appears to have achieved what she desired.

The last turn for Mrs Cheveley, Turn 66, is long and it ends the whole conversation. It is similar to the very first turn by Mrs Cheveley, Turn 2, giving the dialogue a circular structure. She speaks in a relaxed and friendly manner, as if making a small talk, and that contrasts the mood of the previous conversation. She thanks Sir Robert Chiltern to consenting to her demand and asks for the carriage. This nonchalant and playful manner of speech, as well as the longish turn of exit, indicates Mrs Cheveley satisfaction with the result of the conversation.

Mrs Cheveley has turns that are on average twice as long as that of Sir Robert Chiltern, explained by the fact that the former is blackmailing the latter. Sir Robert Chiltern mainly responds in short and often emotional phrases testifying to his confusion, denial and distress, while Mrs Cheveley is more eloquent in giving orders to Sir Robert Chiltern and explaining the consequences in case he does not consent. Mrs Cheveley clearly dominates the conversation, and the variation of turn length supports the claim. The next chapter considers interruptions.

3.2. INTERRUPTIONS

This chapter considers interruptions in the given extract. More precisely, this chapter explains what interruptions in the conversation between Sir Robert Chiltern and Mrs Cheveley tell about the power relations.

Given that Wilde uses both dashes and dots to indicate abrupt stops in an utterance, there are instances when it is hard to distinguish between a pause and an interruption. Therefore, it was decided that every turn that ends with a dash or dots constitutes an interruption by the other character.

Although the conversation is very intense, there are only two instances of interruption. The characters are able to restrain their emotions, so that the interaction does not turn into a quarrel.

The first instance of interruption occurs in the following passage,

46) MRS. CHEVELEY. You mean you cannot help doing it. You know you are standing on the edge of a precipice. And it is not for you to make terms. It is for you to accept them. Supposing you refuse—
47) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. What then? (Wilde, 1908)

Mrs Cheveley threatens Sir Robert Chiltern with detrimental consequences in case he does not consent to her demand. Mrs Cheveley is about to explain further, when Sir Robert Chiltern in Turn 47 interrupts her. He is too impatient, as he wants to know about the subject worrying him. Sir Robert Chiltern appears as neither rude, nor dominant, but simply anxious.

The following passage is the second instance of interruption,

56) MRS. CHEVELEY. You have to. If you don't . . . [*Rises from the sofa*.]
57) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Bewildered and unnerved*.] Wait a moment! What did you propose? You said that you would give me back my letter, didn't you? (Wilde, 1908)

In Turn 56, Mrs Cheveley insists Sir Robert Chiltern to comply with her demand and sits up. In the next turn, Sir Robert Chiltern interrupts her and asks her to stay. Then he asks two questions about the proposal she has put forward. Not only Sir Robert Chiltern interrupts Mrs Cheveley, but he also shows that he has not been paying attention to the conversation. When he does that, he is under a great deal of stress and might not even notice that he stops Mrs Cheveley in mid-utterance.

There are only two cases of interruption in the extract under analysis. In both cases Sir Robert Chiltern interrupts Mrs Cheveley, and in both cases the interrupter seems to be highly distressed. These two interruptions made by Sir Robert Chiltern indicate that he is unable to cope

with his emotions, therefore he is the one with the least influence in the interaction. The next chapter deal with pauses.

3.3. PAUSES

This chapter deals with instances of pauses in the given extract and their implications.

The first of the seven pauses that occur in the extract appears in the following passage,

10) MRS. CHEVELEY. I have invested very largely in it.
11) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. Who could have advised you to do such a foolish thing?
12) MRS. CHEVELEY. Your old friend—and mine. (Wilde, 1908)

In Turn 10, Mrs Cheveley reveals that she has invested in the Argentine Canal project and Sir Robert Chiltern asks who advised her. Mrs Cheveley vaguely replies that she was advised by an old friend of Sir Robert Chiltern. Then she takes a pause and says that this old friend of his was also her friend. Mrs Cheveley emphasises that this person, later revealed to be the deceased Baron Arnheim, is also known to her. She suggests that they had a close relationship – close enough, so that Baron Arnheim would have told her about Sir Robert Chiltern's ugly past.

The second instance of a pause is in the following passage,

25) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Coldly*.] Pray allow me to believe that you are not.
26) MRS. CHEVELEY. [*Speaking with great deliberation and emphasis*.] Ah! but I am. And if you do what I ask you, I . . . will pay you very handsomely! (Wilde, 1908)

In Turn 25, Sir Robert Chiltern expresses disbelief that Mrs Cheveley asks him to withdraw the report on the Argentine Canal project. Mrs Cheveley has not yet revealed she knows of the crime Sir Robert Chiltern once committed. When she is about to do that, she stammers, then changes her mind. In the end, she gives a vague reply. The pause in this passage shows that Mrs Cheveley is slowly considering her next move.

In the following passage there are three instances of a pause,

48) MRS. CHEVELEY. […] Nowadays, with our modern mania for morality, every one has to pose as a paragon of purity, incorruptibility, and all the other seven deadly virtues—and what is the result? You all go over like ninepins—one after the other. Not a year passes in England without somebody disappearing. Scandals used to lend charm, or at least interest, to a man—now they crush him. (Wilde, 1908)

In this passage, Mrs Cheveley speaks about British morals, while also telling Sir Robert Chiltern what would happen to him if he refuses to comply. A pause appears in three sentences; in all of these cases it separates the final part of sentence from the rest, the separated part thus being emphasised. In the first instance, she emphasises a rhetorical question, 'What is the result?'

(Wilde, 1908), thus stating that British morals have hurt many men. In the second instance, she emphasises the phrase 'one after the other' (ibid), thus implying that many men have been ruined due to some scandal. Lastly, she emphasises that scandals crash people. Shortly put, in this passage Mrs Cheveley emphasises certain parts of her utterance to instil fear in Sir Robert Chiltern.

The last two instances of a pause are in the following passage,

> 58) MRS. CHEVELEY. […] I intend to play quite fairly with you. One should always play fairly . . . when one has the winning cards. The Baron taught me that . . . amongst other things. (Wilde, 1908)

Mrs Cheveley uses pauses for emphasis once again. In the first instance, she says that 'one should always play fairly' (Wilde, 1908), then takes a pause to make the whole statement cynical. She says that Baron Arnheim taught her this principle, then she takes another pause before saying that the Baron taught her also other things. By *other things* she might be implying her skills of manipulation.

In this extract, only Mrs Cheveley pauses. In almost all seven instances she uses them for emphasis, especially when the function is to instil fear in Sir Robert Chiltern. In other cases, pauses help to convey vague messages about Mrs Cheveley's relationship with Baron Arnheim. Pauses serve to portray Mrs Cheveley as manipulative and cynical person. The next chapter discusses the roles of the initiator and the responder.

3.4. THE ROLES OF THE INITIATOR AND THE RESPONDER

This chapter deals with an aspect of turn allocation that concerns the roles of the initiator and the responder in a conversational exchange.

There are only two interactants in this conversation, therefore there is only one way a turn can be allocated, namely, the current speaker selects the next one. For this reason, turn allocation is worth analysing in one aspect – who assumes the role of the initiator and who assumes the role of the responder and, not less importantly, why these roles are distributed the way they are.

Sir Robert Chiltern starts the conversation by asking a question, to which, as expected, Mrs Cheveley responds with an answer. Thus a question-answer sequence in Turn 1 and 2 is created, in which Sir Robert Chiltern is the initiator and Mrs Cheveley is the responder. However, at the end of Turn 2 Mrs Cheveley becomes the initiator by making a statement, 'My stay in England really depends on you, Sir Robert.' (Wilde, 1908) The statement prompts Sir Robert Chiltern to

ask for clarification. Therefore, Turn 2 and Turn 3 can be considered to be a statement-clarification sequence.

In the upcoming couple of turns Mrs Cheveley continues to assume the role of the initiator. In Turn 4, she makes a request to speak about the Argentine Canal Company and Sir Robert Chiltern expresses his disinterest in this subject. In Turn 6, Mrs Cheveley replies that she would still prefer to speak about this subject, yet she finishes the turn by asking Sir Robert Chiltern a question, 'You were Lord Radley's secretary, weren't you, when the Government bought the Suez Canal shares?' (Wilde, 1908) Sir Robert Chiltern answers in affirmative, therefore Turn 6 and Turn 7 make a question-answer sequence.

In Turn 7, Sir Robert Chiltern once again becomes the initiator and proceeds to assume this role for several next turns. In Turn 7, Sir Robert Chiltern answers to a question and in addition he praises Suez Canal project and criticises the Argentine scheme. His answer invokes a negative response in Mrs Cheveley and she replays 'A speculation, Sir Robert! A brilliant, daring speculation.' (Wilde, 1908) In Turn 9, Sir Robert Chiltern continues criticising the Argentine Canal project and at the end of the turn he makes two statements which rather translate as questions; these statements are, 'I hope you have not invested in it. I am sure you are far too clever to have done that.' (ibid) Mrs Cheveley replies that, indeed, she has invested a lot in this project, thus Turn 9 and Turn 10 make a question-answer sequence. Then follows two question-answer sequences. In Turn 11, Sir Robert asks who has advised Mrs Cheveley to make such an investment and she replies with ambiguity, 'Your old friend – and mine.' (ibid) In Turn 13, Sir Robert Chiltern wants to clarify who is this person, and Mrs Cheveley finally reveals that it was Baron Arnheim.

In Turn 15 and 16, Sir Robert Chiltern and Mrs Cheveley share their memories of Baron Arnheim, and in this part of conversation no one assumes the role of either the initiator or the responder.

Turn 17 and 18 make a question-answer sequence, in which Sir Robert Chiltern is the initiator. He suggests seeing his Corots (or paintings done by French artist Jean Baptiste Camille Corot). Mrs Cheveley rather rudely replies that she does not want to see these paintings. At the end of Turn 18, she makes a demand to Sir Robert Chiltern that she wants to discuss some business. This is when she assumes the role of the initiator. In Turn 19, Sir Robert responds that he has no interest to discuss any business and repeats that he is about to reject the Argentine Canal project at the Parliament. Turn 18 and 19 make a demand-refusal sequence.

In Turn 20, Mrs Cheveley makes a demand to Sir Robert Chiltern that he has to withdraw his report on the Argentine Canal project and she states that it is in his own interests. Sir Robert Chiltern is confused and responds with two questions. Although Turns 21 and 22 in formal terms make a question-answer sequence, Sir Robert Chiltern is not the initiator. Mrs Cheveley is making demands and Sir Robert Chiltern is simply responding, therefore questions he makes in Turn 21 are rather responses to these demands in a form of clarifying inquiries. In Turn 22, Mrs Cheveley clarifies her demand by stating exactly what course of action she wants Sir Robert Chiltern to take. Mrs Cheveley finishes the turn with a request, 'Will you do that for me?' (Wilde, 1908) However, given what she has said before this is a demand, yet presented as a polite request.

In Turns 23-31, Sir Robert Chiltern expresses his disbelief at Mrs Cheveley's demand. Mrs Cheveley affirms that she is serious and says that she would pay him in an unspecified way. Then Mrs Cheveley expresses her frustration that Sir Robert Chiltern does not understand her. In these turns Mrs Cheveley certainly is the initiator, because Sir Robert Chiltern simply responds to her demand in disbelief.

In Turn 32, Mrs Cheveley tells Sir Robert Chiltern that he, like any other man, can be bribed at the right price. Sir Robert Chiltern becomes indignant and asks Mrs Cheveley to leave his house. This is the moment he stops responding to her demand. Sir Robert Chiltern seems to assume the role of the initiator, however Mrs Cheveley does not respond to his demand. Instead, she continues blackmailing him by revealing that she knows a dark secret of his past.

The following 8 turns – Turn 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40 and 41 – are a series of accusations and threats by Mrs Cheveley and a succession of denials and an excuse by Sir Robert Chiltern. First, in Turn 34, Mrs Cheveley reveals that she knows Sir Robert Chiltern sold a cabinet secret in his past, to which he responds with a denial. Then in Turn 36, Mrs Cheveley says that she has a letter that proves his crime, to which Sir Robert Chiltern replies by pretending he does not know what she means. In Turn 38, Mrs Cheveley elaborates on the evidence she has and once again Sir Robert Chiltern denies her accusations. In Turn 40, Mrs Cheveley persists she has the evidence and finally Sir Robert Chiltern gives in and starts making excuses. These 8 turns can be labelled as such sequences: Turn 34 and 35, 36 and 37, 38 and 39 are accusation/threat-denial sequences, while Turn 40 and 41 is an accusation/threat-excuse sequence. In all these turns Mrs Cheveley assumes the role of the initiator.

Turns 42-50 proceed in a similar manner as the previous eight turns, but this time Mrs Cheveley slightly changes her tactics. Instead of simply accusing and threatening Sir Robert Chiltern, she starts convincing him to succumb to her demand. Sir Robert Chiltern, on the other hand, refuses to do so. In Turn 42, Mrs Cheveley tells Sir Robert Chiltern that he benefited from a crime and thus he has to help others benefit from a similar deed, but he refuses to comply. In Turn 44, she tells him that this is the way life is, but he replies, 'I cannot do what you ask me.' (Wilde, 1908) In Turn 46, Mrs Cheveley says that he does not really have a choice, and Sir Robert Chiltern asks what could happen if he refuses to comply. In Turn 48, she illustrates what could happen in case of his non-compliance and at the end of the turn once again makes a demand to change his stance on the Argentine Canal project. In Turn 49, Sir Robert Chiltern yet again refuses to comply. In Turn 50, Mrs Cheveley still tries to convince him by once again telling him of the consequences that await him if he does not comply. All these turns are basically persuasion-refusal sequences, in all of which Mrs Cheveley is the initiator.

Turns 51-54 show an attempt by Sir Robert Chiltern to gain the control of the conversation, and for this short time he is the initiator. Initially in Turn 51, he clarifies what Mrs Cheveley is asking from him and she replies that he has understood her terms correctly, therefore Turn 51 and 52 make a question-answer sequence. In Turn 53, Sir Robert Chiltern offers her money, but she replies that he cannot buy himself out of this problem, therefore Turns 53 and 54 make an offer-refusal sequence. Sir Robert Chiltern in this case is the initiator.

In Turn 55, Sir Robert Chiltern once again refuses to comply, prompting Mrs Cheveley to leave. Then in Turn 57 Sir Robert Chiltern shows first signs that he would comply,

> 57) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Bewildered and unnerved*.] Wait a moment! What did you propose? You said that you would give me back my letter, didn't you? (Wilde, 1908)

These two question in Turn 57 are not really questions, but rather a clarification of the terms of the demand that Mrs Cheveley has made. In Turn 58, Mrs Cheveley elaborates on the procedure that would take place in case he complies.

Turns 59-62 are cases when Sir Robert Chiltern again assumes the role of the initiator. In Turn 59 and 61, he pleads to be given more time. On both occasions Mrs Cheveley turns down his requests. Turns 59 and 60, as well as 61 and 62, make request-refusal sequences with Sir Robert Chiltern as the initiator..

In Turn 63 Sir Robert Chiltern expresses his despair, 'My God! what brought you into my life?' (Wilde, 1908), to which Mrs Cheveley replies, 'Circumstances.' (ibid). Although Sir Robert

Chiltern makes a rhetorical question, Turn 63 and 64 can still be considered a question-answer sequence.

In Turn 65, Sir Robert Chiltern finally succumbs to Mrs Cheveley's demand. In the last turn of the conversation, Mrs Cheveley expresses her delight and requests Sir Robert Chiltern to call a carriage for her.

In conclusion, it is obvious that in most cases Mrs Cheveley assumes the role of the initiator and Sir Robert Chiltern assumes the role of the responder. Only at the beginning of the conversation before Mrs Cheveley starts blackmailing, the roles are distributed equally. Later in the conversation Sir Robert manages to assume the role of the initiator, but only for a short time and at the moments of weakness when he either offers Mrs Cheveley money or pleads with her to give him more time. The next chapter considers topic change.

3.5. TOPIC CHANGE

This question intends to answer which character mostly controls the topic of talk, for it usually implies who has the most influence in a conversation. Sometimes topic change is subtle and hard to spot, therefore only the most obvious and attention-worthy instances are analysed.

Right at the beginning of the conversation, Mrs Cheveley takes the control of the topic of talk. In Turn 4, she explicitly says,

> 4) MRS. CHEVELEY. Quite seriously. I want to talk to you about a great political and financial scheme, about this Argentine Canal Company, in fact. (Wilde, 1908)

Although in Turn 5 Sir Robert Chiltern expresses unwillingness to speak about the Argentine Canal project, claiming it to be tedious, this topic is continued to be discussed. By and large, this topic remains under discussion for the rest of the conversation.

After criticizing the Argentine Canal project in Turn 9, Sir Robert Chiltern slightly changes the topic by inquiring whether Mrs Cheveley has invested in this scheme. She replies that she has. Then Sir Robert Chiltern inquires who advised her to make this investment. Mrs Cheveley replies that Baron Arnheim was her advisor. Her answers open up a new topic, because Baron Arnheim has been their common acquaintance. The topic is discussed only for a short time.

In Turn 17 by Sir Robert Chiltern, an attempt to change the topic can be seen,

> 17) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Rising*.] But you have not seen my Corots yet. They are in the music-room. Corots seem to go with music, don't they? May I show them to you? (Wilde, 1908)

Sir Robert Chiltern tries to change the topic abruptly and his attempt is accompanied by a physical action, namely, he rises from his seat. All this implies his unwillingness to speak about whatever Mrs Cheveley intends to discuss. What seems to cause him the most anxiety is the mention of Baron Arnheim. However, Mrs Cheveley responds rather rudely, saying that she has no interest in seeing paintings by Jean Baptiste Camille Corot and that she only wants to discuss the business, which is that of the Argentine Canal project. Sir Robert Chiltern does not want to discuss this matter any further, however this is what he does. In Turn 17 and 18, Mrs Cheveley clearly shows that she controls the topic of talk.

A new development in the conversation and subsequently a change of topic is in Turn 26, in which Mrs Cheveley suggests that she will pay Sir Robert Chiltern, given that he withdraws his report on the Argentine Canal project. At first, the topic does not proceed in any way because Mrs Cheveley is vague and Sir Robert Chiltern is simply confused.

In Turn 34, Mrs Cheveley starts a new topic by saying that she knows about the government secret Sir Robert Chiltern sold to Baron Arnheim. This topic also does not really develop, because Mrs Cheveley is making accusations and Sir Robert Chiltern denies them. Only when Sir Robert Chiltern inexplicitly admits his crime, the conversation moves further.

The next topic is not the crime Sir Robert Chiltern once committed, but the future that awaits him if he does not consent to Mrs Cheveley's demand. This topic is discussed in the two longest turns by Mrs Cheveley – Turn 48 and 50. In the meantime, Sir Robert Chiltern does not say almost anything.

The last significant change of topic takes place in Turn 57, in which Sir Robert Chiltern indirectly expresses his consent to speak in favour of the Argentine Canal project. What follows is the discussion of the terms of this deal. Although Sir Robert Chiltern initiates this topic, his control of the conversation amounts to nothing, because actually he succumbs to Mrs Cheveley's demand.

To summarise, Mrs Cheveley is the one mostly controlling the topic of talk. Right at the start she begins discussing the Argentine Canal project and this topic is under discussion for the rest of the conversation. At one point, Sir Robert Chiltern attempts to change the topic, but fails. Since then, only Mrs Cheveley initiates new topics. The only exception is at the end of the conversation when Sir Robert Chiltern begins discussing the terms of the deal between the two parties, however this topic change marks his submission to Mrs Cheveley's demand. The next chapter consider conversational dominance.

3.6. CONVERSATIONAL DOMINANCE

This question is answered considering the four types of power as laid out by Short, which are physical, institutional, social and personal. The aim is to answer which type of power is associated with which character most and how these different powers clash against one another.

Although Sir Robert Chiltern possesses more physical power, he never puts it to use, as it would not be appropriate for a man with his status. If there is a case in the whole conversation when physical power plays any significance, it is in Turn 34, in which Mrs Cheveley detains Sir Robert Chiltern with her fan, yet her motion would account to nothing if not accompanied by words. The remaining types of power – institutional, social and personal – are applicable for analysis.

For the first half of the conversation, Sir Robert Chiltern is the most powerful participant of the conversation. The Argentine Canal project is the main object of conflict – Sir Robert Chiltern intends to criticize it at the Parliament and Mrs Cheveley does not want that. Without doubt, Sir Robert Chiltern has more say in this matter because he is a government official directly responsible for this matter. Therefore, requests by Mrs Cheveley to withdraw his condemning report on this project come as a surprise.

Sir Robert Chiltern also has more social power because the conversation takes place in his house and he has the role of the host, while Mrs Cheveley – the one of a guest. Sir Robert Chiltern is polite and tolerates Mrs Cheveley's behaviour. His role of a host is especially apparent when he suggests that they see his Corots, however Mrs Cheveley turns down his offer and imposes the topic she wants to discuss. Another instance Sir Robert Chiltern uses his social power is in Turn 33 when he asks Mrs Cheveley to leave his house; once again he fails.

Turn 34 is the changing point in the whole conversation. This is when Mrs Cheveley reveals she knows about the government secret that Sir Robert Chiltern once sold. Thus she gains personal power over Sir Robert Chiltern. This personal power turns out to prevail over the institutional and social power Sir Robert Chiltern possesses. The reason for that is clear – the knowledge Mrs Cheveley has might destroy Sir Robert Chiltern as a person and might eliminate his institutional and social power, too; Sir Robert Chiltern, on the other hand, cannot do anything but succumb to whatever Mrs Cheveley is demanding him. The different types of power in this conversation does not really clash, because the personal power, possessed by Mrs Cheveley, prevails over everything.

For the first half of the conversation, Sir Robert Chiltern seems to have more influence, as he possesses more institutional and social power. However, when Mrs Cheveley reveals that she knows a dark secret of Sir Robert Chiltern's past, she gains personal power. This personal power has more importance than anything else. The sudden shift in power relations also highlight the lack of power for Sir Robert Chiltern against the blackmail.

CONCLUSIONS

In this research, turn management was analysed in an excerpt from Oscar Wilde's comedy "An Ideal Husband", namely, a conversation between two leading characters – Sir Robert Chiltern and Mrs Cheveley. Given that the conversation involves blackmail, there are changing power relations between the two interactants. Therefore, the goal of this research was to analyse how turn management is used in order to showcase power relations between Sir Robert Chiltern and Mrs Cheveley.

Turn management is a concept in spoken discourse. It operates as a mechanism, regulating the way interaction develops between two or more participants. Fundamental to the whole notion is the turn – a period of talk by one speaker that is influenced by other turns and silences. Turn management consists of two components: the turn-allocational component that ensures changeover of turns and the turn constructional component that concerns such variables as the size and length of a turn.

There are three ways a turn can be allocated: the current speaker selects the next one, the next speaker self-selects or no one takes a turn, in which case the current speaker continues speaking or otherwise the conversation lapses. Altogether, Sacks *et al* enlist 14 rules of turn management that ensure a conversation is organized, yet still unpredictable.

There are many aspects of turn management that are significant in analysing dramatic texts. These aspects are: number of turns, turn length, interruptions and overlaps, turn-allocation, sequential organization, topic change and speech acts.

A person, who has the greatest number of turns in a conversation, is considered to possess most influence. Moreover, a person who has the longest turns, normally has the most dominant position. Interruptions and overlaps are undesirable in most conversations, and they might imply a wide range of emotions and character traits, such as urgency and impoliteness. As for silences, the possibilities they can express are endless, therefore it is better to analyse them on a case to case basis. With regards to turn-allocation, it mainly functions to maintain the conversation in order; it is worth noting who acts as the initiator, allocates the turn, and who acts as the responder, takes the allocated turn. In addition, turns have a quality to form sequences, mainly due to adjacency pairs; these pairs provide a wide range of possibilities a conversation might develop, as well as limit it. Topic, on the other hand, is a point of focus of a conversation that

changes over the course of the interaction. Lastly, there are speech acts that concerns the link between what is said literally and what is intended to be achieved.

Turn management is especially suitable for analysing drama. These literally texts are interactional, meaning that not only language, but also the way turns are distributed is of importance. Turn management can be analysed both on micro and macro level. In almost any dramatic text, it is worth considering power relations between characters; the main for types of power are physical, institutional, social and personal.

The analysis of turn management comprises six questions that are answered successively. These questions are: “Who has the longest turns?”, “Who interrupts and who is interrupted?”, “Who makes pauses and why?”, “Who assumes the role of the initiator and who assumes the role of the responder?”, “Who controls the topic of talk?” and “Who is dominant and why?”. As implied by the questions, the aspects that were considered are: turn length, interruptions, pauses, the roles of the initiator and the responder, topic change and conversational dominance.

The turns produced by Mrs Cheveley are twice as long as those produced by Sir Robert Chiltern. The main reason for such a turn length is that she controls the conversation; she gives orders to Sir Robert Chiltern, threatens him and gives long descriptions of what would happen to him if he does not submit to her demands. On the other hand, Sir Robert Chiltern mainly responds with short phrases of denial and refusal that indicate his great distress.

There are only two instances of interruption. Both times the interrupter is Sir Robert Chiltern who acts in such a way due to high distress. Given the context, interruptions by Sir Robert Chiltern show him as the weak party in the interaction, as he does not maintain an orderly conversation, being incapable of controlling his emotions.

As for pauses specifically indicated by Oscar Wilde, only Mrs Cheveley uses them. In almost all seven instances pauses are used for emphasis, particularly so if the goal is to instil fear in Sir Robert Chiltern. In two other cases, pauses convey vague messages about Mrs Cheveley’s relationship with Baron Arnheim.

With regard to the roles of the initiator and the responder, it is only at the beginning of the conversation that these roles are distributed equally. When Mrs Cheveley starts blackmailing, she assumes the role of the initiator and Sir Robert Chiltern – that of the responder. Later in the conversation, Sir Robert Chiltern assumes the role of the initiator only for short periods of time, and even then at the moments of weakness, such as when he offers Mrs Cheveley money, so that she does not reveal his secret.

The topic of talk is mostly controlled by Mrs Cheveley. Right at the start of the conversation she begins discussing the Argentine Canal project, which is a topic maintained for the rest of the interaction. There is a moment when Sir Robert Chiltern attempts to change the topic, however he does not succeed. The only instance when Sir Robert Chiltern controls the topic of talk is the moment he initiates a discussion of the terms of the deal between the two parties, however this topic change also indicates his submission to Mrs Cheveley's demand.

Although Mrs Cheveley dominates the interaction, Sir Robert Chiltern possesses more influence in the first half of the conversation. The main conflict between the two parties is the Argentine Canal project – Sir Robert Chiltern intends to denounce it, while Mrs Cheveley wants him to do the opposite. Sir Robert Chiltern has more institutional and personal power in making the decision. However, the moment Mrs Cheveley reveals that she knows about a crime Sir Robert Chiltern once committed, she gains personal power that outweighs everything. This shift in power highlights the powerlessness of Sir Robert Chiltern against the blackmailer.

The main result of the analysis show that Mrs Cheveley clearly has a dominant status in the conversation over Sir Robert Chiltern, as shown by all aspects of turn management considered in this research. The extract chosen for analysis is particularly beneficial if considered from the viewpoint of turn management, given that power relations are much revealed through such aspects as turn length, pauses, topic change etc. The conflict between the two characters develops slowly, reaches its climax and smoothly comes to a conclusion, and this progression is achieved by the masterful use of turn management.

Unfortunately, when answering the six questions of analysis, a great deal of material under discussion overlapped, therefore there is a potential for further research, if the methodology is improved. Elimination of these overlaps would shorten the analysis and would allow to consider a longer extract or more extracts.

THESES

1. Successful turn management functions to ensure organized and continuous interaction between two or more participants.

2. There are three rules or strategies of turn allocation: the current speaker selects the next one, the next speaker self-selects or no one takes a turn, in which case the current speaker continues speaking or the conversation comes to an end.

3. Dramatic texts are interactional, which means that not only language itself is important, but also patterning of turn rights and their distribution.

4. There are multiple aspects of turn management that are of importance in analysing drama, namely, number of turns, turn length, interruptions and overlaps, silences, turn-allocation, sequential organization, topic change and speech acts.

5. Usually there are four types power operating in a dramatic text: physical, institutional, social and personal power; these different powers clash, setting power relations between the characters.

6. The turns produced by Mrs Cheveley are twice as long as those produced by Sir Robert Chiltern, the former making threats, while the latter is answering with short phrases of confusion and denial.

7. There are two cases of interruption, showing Sir Robert Chiltern's distress, therefore portraying him as the weak party, incapable of controlling his emotions.

8. Only Mrs Cheveley uses pauses, as specifically indicated by Oscar Wilde; these pauses are mostly used to give emphasis.

9. Mrs Cheveley mostly assumes the role of the initiator of conversational exchanges, while Sir Robert Chilterns mostly assumes the role of the responder; such role distribution perfectly portrays the blackmail.

10. Mrs Cheveley, being in control of the topic of talk, demonstrates her personal power; although Sir Robert Chiltern has more institutional and social power at the beginning of the conversation, Mrs Cheveley's personal power outweighs it.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, J.L. (1962) *How to do Things With Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available from http://michaeljohnsonphilosophy.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/austin-how-to-do-things-with-words.pdf

2. Bennison, N. (2002) Accessing Character Through Conversation: Tom Stoppard's Professional Foul. In J. Culperer, M. Short, and P. Verdonk (eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*. (pp. 67-82) Taylor & Francis e-library. Available from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.464.3772&rep=rep1&type=pdf

3. Brown, G., Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Available from: https://abudira.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/discourse-analysis-by-gillian-brown-george-yule.pdf

4. Chafe, W. (1985) Some Reasons for Hesitating. In D. Tannen and M. Saville-Troike (eds). *Perspectives on Silence*. (pp. 77-93) Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

5. Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (1983). *Conversational coherence: Form, structure, and strategy*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

6. Culpeper J. (2001) *Language and Characterisation: People in Plays and Other Texts*, London: Longman.

7. Edelsky, C. (1993) Who's Got the Floor?. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. (pp. 189-227) New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

8. Herman, V. (2002) Turn Management in Drama. In J. Culperer, M. Short, and P. Verdonk (eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*. (pp. 19-34) Taylor & Francis e-library. Available from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.464.3772&rep=rep1&type=pdf

9. Herman, V. (2005) *Dramatic Discourse: Dialogue as Interactions in Plays*. Taylor & Francis e-library.

10. Jefferson, G. (1972) Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*. (pp. 294-338) New York: Free Press

11. Levinson, S. C. (2000) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

12. Lowe, V. (2002) Unhappy confessions in *The Crucible*: A Pragmatic Explanation. In J. Culpeper, M. Short, and P. Verdonk (eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*. (pp. 128-141) Taylor & Francis e-library. Available from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.464.3772&rep=rep1&type=pdf

13. Robinson, L.F., Reis, H.T. (1989) The Effects of Interruption, Gender, and Status on Interpersonal Perceptions, *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 13(3): 141-153

14. Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. (1974) A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4): 696-735. Available from http://www.cs.columbia.edu/~julia/cs4706/Sacks_et_al_1974.pdf

15. Short, M. (n.d.) *Ling 131 Language and Style: Topic 11*. Lancaster: Lancaster University. Available from http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/stylistics/topic11/begin11.htm

16. Toolan, M. (2002) The Give and Take of Talk, and Caryl Churchill's *Cloud Nine*. In J. Culperer, M. Short, and P. Verdonk (eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*. (pp. 142-160) Taylor & Francis e-library. Available from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.464.3772&rep=rep1&type=pdf

17. Wilde, O. (1908) *An Ideal Husband*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. Available from http://www.gutenberg.org/files/885/885-h/885-h.htm

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *An Ideal Husband* (1999) [Film] Directed by: Oliver Parker; Screenplay by Oliver Parker. USA & UK: Miramax

Appendix 1

Excerpt from Oscar Wilde's Comedy "An Ideal Husband", a Conversation Between Sir Robert Chiltern and Mrs Cheveley in Act One

1) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. And are you going to any of our country houses before you leave England, Mrs. Cheveley?

2) MRS. CHEVELEY. Oh, no! I can't stand your English house-parties. In England people actually try to be brilliant at breakfast. That is so dreadful of them! Only dull people are brilliant at breakfast. And then the family skeleton is always reading family prayers. My stay in England really depends on you, Sir Robert. [*Sits down on the sofa*.]

3) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Taking a seat beside her*.] Seriously?

4) MRS. CHEVELEY. Quite seriously. I want to talk to you about a great political and financial scheme, about this Argentine Canal Company, in fact.

5) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. What a tedious, practical subject for you to talk about, Mrs. Cheveley!

6) MRS. CHEVELEY. Oh, I like tedious, practical subjects. What I don't like are tedious, practical people. There is a wide difference. Besides, you are interested, I know, in International Canal schemes. You were Lord Radley's secretary, weren't you, when the Government bought the Suez Canal shares?

7) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. Yes. But the Suez Canal was a very great and splendid undertaking. It gave us our direct route to India. It had imperial value. It was necessary that we should have control. This Argentine scheme is a commonplace Stock Exchange swindle.

8) MRS. CHEVELEY. A speculation, Sir Robert! A brilliant, daring speculation.

9) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. Believe me, Mrs. Cheveley, it is a swindle. Let us call things by their proper names. It makes matters simpler. We have all the information about it at the Foreign Office. In fact, I sent out a special Commission to inquire into the matter privately, and they report that the works are hardly begun, and as for the money already subscribed, no one seems to know what has become of it. The whole thing is a second Panama, and with not a quarter of the chance of success that miserable affair ever had. I hope you have not invested in it. I am sure you are far too clever to have done that.

10) MRS. CHEVELEY. I have invested very largely in it.

11) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. Who could have advised you to do such a foolish thing?

12) MRS. CHEVELEY. Your old friend—and mine.

13) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. Who?

14) MRS. CHEVELEY. Baron Arnheim.

15) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Frowning*.] Ah! yes. I remember hearing, at the time of his death, that he had been mixed up in the whole affair.

16) MRS. CHEVELEY. It was his last romance. His last but one, to do him justice.

17) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Rising*.] But you have not seen my Corots yet. They are in the music-room. Corots seem to go with music, don't they? May I show them to you?

18) MRS. CHEVELEY. [*Shaking her head*.] I am not in a mood to-night for silver twilights, or rose-pink dawns. I want to talk business. [*Motions to him with her fan to sit down again beside her*.]

19) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. I fear I have no advice to give you, Mrs. Cheveley, except to interest yourself in something less dangerous. The success of the Canal depends, of course, on the attitude of England, and I am going to lay the report of the Commissioners before the House to-morrow night.

20) MRS. CHEVELEY. That you must not do. In your own interests, Sir Robert, to say nothing of mine, you must not do that.

21) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Looking at her in wonder*.] In my own interests? My dear Mrs. Cheveley, what do you mean? [*Sits down beside her*.]

22) MRS. CHEVELEY. Sir Robert, I will be quite frank with you. I want you to withdraw the report that you had intended to lay before the House, on the ground that you have reasons to believe that the Commissioners have been prejudiced or misinformed, or something. Then I want you to say a few words to the effect that the Government is going to reconsider the question, and that you have reason to believe that the Canal, if completed, will be of great international value. You know the sort of things ministers say in cases of this kind. A few ordinary platitudes will do. In modern life nothing produces such an effect as a good platitude. It makes the whole world kin. Will you do that for me?

23) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. Mrs. Cheveley, you cannot be serious in making me such a proposition!

24) MRS. CHEVELEY. I am quite serious.

25) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Coldly*.] Pray allow me to believe that you are not.

26) MRS. CHEVELEY. [*Speaking with great deliberation and emphasis*.] Ah! but I am. And if you do what I ask you, I . . . will pay you very handsomely!

27) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. Pay me!

28) MRS. CHEVELEY. Yes.

29) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. I am afraid I don't quite understand what you mean.

30) MRS. CHEVELEY. [*Leaning back on the sofa and looking at him*.] How very disappointing! And I have come all the way from Vienna in order that you should thoroughly understand me.

31) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. I fear I don't.

32) MRS. CHEVELEY. [*In her most nonchalant manner*.] My dear Sir Robert, you are a man of the world, and you have your price, I suppose. Everybody has nowadays. The drawback is that most people are so dreadfully expensive. I know I am. I hope you will be more reasonable in your terms.

33) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Rises indignantly*.] If you will allow me, I will call your carriage for you. You have lived so long abroad, Mrs. Cheveley, that you seem to be unable to realise that you are talking to an English gentleman.

34) MRS. CHEVELEY. [*Detains him by touching his arm with her fan, and keeping it there while she is talking*.] I realise that I am talking to a man who laid the foundation of his fortune by selling to a Stock Exchange speculator a Cabinet secret.

35) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Biting his lip*.] What do you mean?

36) MRS. CHEVELEY. [*Rising and facing him*.] I mean that I know the real origin of your wealth and your career, and I have got your letter, too.

37) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. What letter?

38) MRS. CHEVELEY. [*Contemptuously*.] The letter you wrote to Baron Arnheim, when you were Lord Radley's secretary, telling the Baron to buy Suez Canal shares—a letter written three days before the Government announced its own purchase.

39) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Hoarsely*.] It is not true.

40) MRS. CHEVELEY. You thought that letter had been destroyed. How foolish of you! It is in my possession.

41) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. The affair to which you allude was no more than a speculation. The House of Commons had not yet passed the bill; it might have been rejected.

42) MRS. CHEVELEY. It was a swindle, Sir Robert. Let us call things by their proper names. It makes everything simpler. And now I am going to sell you that letter, and the price I ask for it is

your public support of the Argentine scheme. You made your own fortune out of one canal. You must help me and my friends to make our fortunes out of another!

43) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. It is infamous, what you propose—infamous!

44) MRS. CHEVELEY. Oh, no! This is the game of life as we all have to play it, Sir Robert, sooner or later!

45) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. I cannot do what you ask me.

46) MRS. CHEVELEY. You mean you cannot help doing it. You know you are standing on the edge of a precipice. And it is not for you to make terms. It is for you to accept them. Supposing you refuse—

47) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. What then?

48) MRS. CHEVELEY. My dear Sir Robert, what then? You are ruined, that is all! Remember to what a point your Puritanism in England has brought you. In old days nobody pretended to be a bit better than his neighbours. In fact, to be a bit better than one's neighbour was considered excessively vulgar and middle-class. Nowadays, with our modern mania for morality, every one has to pose as a paragon of purity, incorruptibility, and all the other seven deadly virtues—and what is the result? You all go over like ninepins—one after the other. Not a year passes in England without somebody disappearing. Scandals used to lend charm, or at least interest, to a man—now they crush him. And yours is a very nasty scandal. You couldn't survive it. If it were known that as a young man, secretary to a great and important minister, you sold a Cabinet secret for a large sum of money, and that that was the origin of your wealth and career, you would be hounded out of public life, you would disappear completely. And after all, Sir Robert, why should you sacrifice your entire future rather than deal diplomatically with your enemy? For the moment I am your enemy. I admit it! And I am much stronger than you are. The big battalions are on my side. You have a splendid position, but it is your splendid position that makes you so vulnerable. You can't defend it! And I am in attack. Of course I have not talked morality to you. You must admit in fairness that I have spared you that. Years ago you did a clever, unscrupulous thing; it turned out a great success. You owe to it your fortune and position. And now you have got to pay for it. Sooner or later we have all to pay for what we do. You have to pay now. Before I leave you to-night, you have got to promise me to suppress your report, and to speak in the House in favour of this scheme.

49) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. What you ask is impossible.

50) MRS. CHEVELEY. You must make it possible. You are going to make it possible. Sir Robert, you know what your English newspapers are like. Suppose that when I leave this house I drive down to some newspaper office, and give them this scandal and the proofs of it! Think of their loathsome joy, of the delight they would have in dragging you down, of the mud and mire they would plunge you in. Think of the hypocrite with his greasy smile penning his leading article, and arranging the foulness of the public placard.

51) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. Stop! You want me to withdraw the report and to make a short speech stating that I believe there are possibilities in the scheme?

52) MRS. CHEVELEY. [*Sitting down on the sofa*.] Those are my terms.

53) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*In a low voice*.] I will give you any sum of money you want.

54) MRS. CHEVELEY. Even you are not rich enough, Sir Robert, to buy back your past. No man is.

55) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. I will not do what you ask me. I will not.

56) MRS. CHEVELEY. You have to. If you don't . . . [*Rises from the sofa*.]

57) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. [*Bewildered and unnerved*.] Wait a moment! What did you propose? You said that you would give me back my letter, didn't you?

58) MRS. CHEVELEY. Yes. That is agreed. I will be in the Ladies' Gallery to-morrow night at half-past eleven. If by that time—and you will have had heaps of opportunity—you have made an announcement to the House in the terms I wish, I shall hand you back your letter with the prettiest thanks, and the best, or at any rate the most suitable, compliment I can think of. I intend to play quite fairly with you. One should always play fairly . . . when one has the winning cards. The Baron taught me that . . . amongst other things.

59) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. You must let me have time to consider your proposal.

60) MRS. CHEVELEY. No; you must settle now!

61) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. Give me a week—three days!

62) MRS. CHEVELEY. Impossible! I have got to telegraph to Vienna to-night.

63) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. My God! what brought you into my life?

64) MRS. CHEVELEY. Circumstances. [*Moves towards the door*.]

65) SIR ROBERT CHILTERN. Don't go. I consent. The report shall be withdrawn. I will arrange for a question to be put to me on the subject.

66) MRS. CHEVELEY. Thank you. I knew we should come to an amicable agreement. I understood your nature from the first. I analysed you, though you did not adore me. And now

you can get my carriage for me, Sir Robert. I see the people coming up from supper, and Englishmen always get romantic after a meal, and that bores me dreadfully. [*Exit* SIR ROBERT CHILTERN.]

Appendix 2

Number of Words Produced Per Turn

Turn Number	Sir Robert Chiltern	Turn Number	Mrs Cheveley
1)	16	**2)**	51
3)	1	**4)**	22
5)	12	**6)**	44
7)	41	**8)**	8
9)	113	**10)**	7
11)	11	**12)**	5
13)	1	**14)**	2
15)	21	**16)**	13
17)	27	**18)**	18
19)	48	**20)**	21
21)	12	**22)**	126
23)	12	**24)**	4
25)	9	**26)**	21
27)	2	**28)**	1
29)	10	**30)**	20
31)	4	**32)**	45
33)	36	**34)**	26
35)	4	**36)**	21
37)	2	**38)**	33
39)	4	**40)**	16
41)	27	**42)**	66
43)	7	**44)**	20
45)	7	**46)**	37
47)	2	**48)**	342
49)	5	**50)**	91
51)	24	**52)**	4
53)	10	**54)**	16
55)	11	**56)**	6
57)	19	**58)**	100
59)	10	**60)**	5
61)	6	**62)**	9
63)	8	**64)**	1
65)	23	**66)**	59