Volume 3: 2010-2011 ISSN: 2041-6776

INNERVATE
Leading Undergraduate Work in English Studies

The University of Nottingham
School of English Studies

Power, struggle and control: An Analysis of turn-taking in Edward Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*

Rachel King

Introduction

Dialogue is defined as '[v]erbal interchange of thought, between two or more persons, conversation' (Oxford English Dictionary 2010). Analysis of dramatic dialogue involves a consideration of how the characters negotiate their 'verbal interchange of thought', thus giving rise to the concept of the 'turn': 'when a speaker speaks, he or she takes a turn at speech and as speech alternates, turns alternate as well' (Herman 1998:19). In the first part of my essay, I will outline the work of the Conversational Analysts of the ethnomethological school in their developments of a system for turn-taking and turn management in conversation. In the second part of my essay, I will consider how the findings of the Conversational Analysts can be applied to conversation in drama to inform an audience's understanding of the interpersonal dynamics between characters. The focus of my discussion is the conflict between George and Martha, in Edward Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (1962). I will analyse an extract taken from the end of Act One, 'Fun and Games', focusing, in particular, on how the rules of turn-taking and turn management are observed or violated by Martha and George in their respective attempts to exercise the level of interactional control and power required to win the verbal games.

Turn and Floor Management

In 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation', Sacks et al. (1974) outline a method by which speakers manage turn-taking in conversation. They observe that:

> …overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time, though speakers change, and though the size of turns and ordering of turns vary; that transitions are finely coordinated; that techniques are used for allocating turns.
>
> (Sacks et al. 1974:699)

They go on to describe the turn-taking system 'in terms of two components and a set of rules' (Sacks et al. 1974:702) which facilitate smooth, ordered conversation between participants and 'minimize gap and overlap' (Sacks et al. 1974:704). The first component is the 'turn-constructional component', which regulates 'various unit-types' (Sacks et al. 1974:702). The second, the 'turn-allocational component' (Sacks et al. 1974:703), refers to the way in which the changeover of turns between speakers is regulated and the dyadic form of conversation maintained.

Turn-constructional Component

Turns are constructed out of turn-construction units (hereafter TCUs), which can vary in 'size or length and linguistic texture' (Herman 1998:21). The speaker is 'initially entitled, in having a turn, to one such unit', the completion of which 'constitutes an initial transition relevance place' or TCP (Sacks et al. 1974:703) where speakership can be transferred. Itakura

(2001) notes that 'everyday conversation is rarely symmetrical' (1860) and that this asymmetry is indicative of 'one speaker's control over the other' (1862). Longer turns 'block access to the floor for other potential speakers' (Herman 1998:21) and can be used to exercise interactional dominance.

Selting (2000) interrogates Sacks et al.'s definition of the TCU as a 'potentially complete turn' that is 'not per definition a linguistic unit' but 'an interactionally relevant unit that ends in a TRP' and is reliant upon 'syntactic structure' and 'projectability' (Selting 2000:480). She suggests a modification of the turn-constructional component in the model of Sacks et al., arguing that the 'interplay of syntax and prosody' in the 'semantic, pragmatic, and sequential context' of the turns (Selting 2000:512) creates the possibility of 'different kinds of projection': 'single TCUs ending in TRPs', or 'multi-unit turns where the TRPs of internal TCUs are blocked until the final TCU of the turn that ends in a TRP' (Selting 2000:512). In short, 'every complete turn is by definition also a TCU, but not every TCU is a possible turn' (Selting 2000:513) because the TRP may be postponed by the speaker. This means that conversational organization involves both active "speakership" and a very active "listenership" (Zimmerman and West 1975:108) because each listener has to anticipate the location of the TRP in order to avoid overlap.

Turn-allocational Component

The 'turn-allocational techniques' fall into two groups: 'those in which next turn is allocated by current speaker's selecting next speaker'; and 'those in which a next turn is allocated by self-selection' (Sacks et al. 1974:703). The rule-set for turn-allocation is as follows: first, the current speaker can select the next speaker (Sacks et al 1974:703). Second, if the current speaker does not select the next speaker then self selection 'may, but need not be implemented' (Sacks et al. 1974:703). Third, if the current speaker does not select the next speaker, and another does not self-select, then 'the current speaker may, but need not continue' (Sacks et al, 1974:703). If neither the first nor the second rule have operated and the current speaker has continued, then the rule set 're-applies at the next transition-relevance place', and keeps re-applying - in the same order - until transfer occurs (Sacks et al. 1974:703). These rules ensure that there is 'one speaker at a time' (Sacks et al. 1974:705) and that overlaps, interruptions and gaps are avoided. However, Schiffrin (1988:268) suggests that 'turn-exchange rules may need to be calibrated to the content of both current and next turn'. She reports that in her 1986 study entitled 'Turn-initial variation: structure and function in conversation', she found that 'turns are differently placed relative to prior turns depending upon the semantic content of their initiating word'; for example, 'turns initiated with but are more likely to occur at non-transition relevance places than turns initiated with either so or and' (Schiffrin 1988:268).

Silence

Sacks et al. make a distinction between three types of non-speech: lapses, pauses, and gaps. They are accessed 'according to their placement in the turn and the exchange' (Herman 1995:84). While an 'intra-turn silence (not at a transition-relevance place) is a "pause"', a gap is a 'silence after a possible completion point' and lapses are 'extended silences at transition-relevance places' (Sacks et al. 1974:715). Gaps can be prevented from turning into lapses by the current speaker self-selecting, thereby turning the gap into a pause and producing another TCU which ends in a TRP. When a turn is lapsed, the silence that follows is termed an 'attributable silence' (Herman 1995:84); it is attributable to the speaker whose turn has lapsed. Saville-Troike (1985:6) states that silences, 'like speech, carry illocutionary force and

have perlocutionary effects'. While short pauses are 'normally seen as giving interlocutors time to think', longer silences can reflect 'both positive and negative attitudes and values', either 'consideration for the other person or lack of it' (Sifianou 1997:65).

Interruptions and Overlaps

Where overlaps occur, one speaker drops out, 'thus removing a component of the overlap, and thereby the overlap' (Sacks et al. 1974:708). For Sacks et al.'s (1974) model for an 'orderly, one-at-a-time type of floor' (Edelsky 1981:384) occurrences of simultaneous talk such as interruption and overlaps are considered undesirable and can be symptomatic of conflict. However, Edelsky notes that there is a second type of floor, characterized by simultaneous speech, 'where two or more people either took part in an apparent free-for-all or jointly built one idea' (Edelsky 1981:384) and interruption/overlap is non-competitive. The fact that overlaps are sometimes positive signs of 'cooperative involvement and enthusiasm' changes 'the definition of the conversational problem which the turn-taking system is designed to resolve', meaning that the implementation of turn rules which are designed to avoid overlap 'may not succeed in providing for the current solution at each juncture' (Schiffrin 1988:268).

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

In *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?,* George and Martha (husband and wife) take part in a series of verbal 'games'. The games 'demand little action, only an abundance of verbal energy' (Malkin 1992:165), and to win or to lose a game depends upon one's level of 'verbal mastery' (Malkin 1992: 162). George and Martha are 'two connoisseurs of verbal duelling' (Roudané 2005:45), experts in 'sadomasochistic language' (Cohn 2005:217) who treat language 'as a power tool, to be controlled and possessed' (Malkin 1992:171). Fairclough (2001:38-9) explains that '[p]ower in discourse is to do with powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants'. To prevent or to limit another speaker's 'contributions', that is, their access to the floor, is to control how much and what they are able to say and to establish oneself as the more powerful speaker. In *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?,* George and Martha use language to construct reality, culminating in the construction of an 'imaginary son' (Kane 1984:20). To have control over language, that is, to have control over how much and what one is able to say is to have control over the construction and preservation of that reality, whether it be truth or illusion. Exercising control over turn-taking in conversation is therefore central to George's and Martha's struggle for power and dominance.

Analysis

I have chosen an extract from the end of Act One, 'Fun and Games' for my analysis [Appendix 1]. At this point in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?,* George and Martha have returned to their home 'on the campus of a small New England college' (Albee 1962:9) from a party in the early hours of the morning and are entertaining guests; a younger couple called Nick and Honey.

Turn size and Texture

Itakura (2001:1862) describes conversational dominance as 'a multi-dimensional construct consisting of sequential, participatory and quantitative dimensions'. According to his theory, Martha can be seen to exercise quantitative conversational dominance in the extract, measured in terms of the number of words spoken by each participant' (Itakura 2001:1862). Out of the total 498 words of the extract, she speaks 331, or 67%. In contrast,

George only speaks 131, or 26% of the words. The remaining 7% are shared between Nick and Honey, who take a largely silent role in the exchange and exercise the least amount of conversational dominance in the extract. Although there is a huge discrepancy in the number of words spoken by George and by Martha, the number of turns they take are roughly equal: Martha (16) and George (15). While an equal number of turns suggests that the power between participants is similarly equal, examination of the turn-allocation strategies and the texture of the turns reveals how quantitative dominance is central to Martha's ploy for authority. The difference in turn-size becomes obvious after Turn 20, after which Martha becomes more intent on degrading George after he has explicitly warned her against doing so ('I warn you', Turn 18). In contempt of George's attempt to control her speech, Martha tries, and succeeds in inciting George's temper ('You getting angry, baby? Hunh?/ 'You getting angrier?') by increasing the amount and strength of the threats to George's positive face, that is, his positive self-image (Brown and Levinson: 1978:87). The increase in face threatening acts results in an increase in turn length and thus contributes to her quantitative dominance. She piles up increasingly bald, on-record and without redress face threatening acts (Brown and Levinson 1978): 'A great…big…fat …FLOP!' (Turn 22) / 'this flop' (Turn 24) / 'this BOG' (Turn 26). In direct contrast, George's speech is characterised by its brevity and his use of directives (Turn 6, 16, 18, 21, 25, 27). Searle (1976:11) notes that directive speech acts 'are attempts…by the speaker to get the hearer to do something' (Searle 1976:11). As such, they tend to 'come from more powerful speakers' (Fairclough 2001:39) and can contribute towards conversational dominance despite their pithiness. George's repetition of the explicit 'performative' (Austin 1962:65): 'I warn you' (Turn 16, 18) has the 'illocutionary force' (Austin 1962:70) of issuing a warning, he is trying to assert his authority over Martha to stop her from talking about 'the other business' (Turn 14). At first, it seems George is successful: Martha confirms the 'achievement of a perlocutionary object' (Austin 1962:71) in Turn 20: 'I stand warned'. However, she then continues as before ('So, anyway…'), refusing to endorse his authority and 'demonstrating the actual impotence of George's speech act' (Zwagerman 2010:107). George's performative is therefore an 'unhappy' one, a 'failure' (Austin 1962:66) which illuminates his lack of interactional power. Moreover, his anger (it's going to make me angry', Turn 14) is itself 'unhappy', since 'one cannot threaten to bring about a state of affairs already in play' (Zwagerman 2010:108). George's speech acts continue to fail in the second half of the extract: Martha continues to ignore his requests, despite his employment of metalanguage ('I said stop, Martha', Turn 23, 'I said, don't', Turn 29) to emphasise the speech acts and to attempt to endow them with power and authority. George's violent, physical reaction ('George breaks a bottle against the portable bar') to Martha's bald, on-record positive impoliteness of Turn 22 (Brown and Levinson 1978) is an attempt to take control of the situation, to assert himself as the powerful, 'aggressive' (Turn 22) individual that Martha has made him out not to be, while also curtailing Martha's level of conversational dominance by proving her claims to be insubstantial. However, any interactional authority that he may have gained by this act of physical rebellion – which is manifested in the 'silence' that follows - is immediately undermined, firstly by his discernible distress ('almost crying') and then by Martha's disdainful response: 'I hope that was an empty bottle, George. You don't want to waste good liquor…not on your salary' (Turn 24). Not only does Martha yet again ignore George's attempt to get her to 'stop' (Turn 23) the verbal abuse, but she uses the smashing of the bottle as cannon fodder to fuel her self-selected turn - another attack on his positive face and assert her own power over her husband.

Turn allocation

In defiance of Sacks et al.'s (1974) turn-allocation rule-set, Martha resists the projection of a TRP by the use of coordinating conjunctions, subordinating conjunctions and adverbs (Turn 1 'so', 'And'; Turn 5 'and so'; Turn 20 'So', 'anyway', 'and', 'and', 'then', 'when', 'And', 'until', 'until', 'and'; Turn 24 'So'). She also resists turn change by addressing her speech exclusively to Nick and Honey, distancing and excluding George from the conversation with her use of the third person pronoun 'he'/ 'him' (Turns 1, 20, 22, 24, 28) so that he is not permitted to contribute to the narrative as would be appropriate in a 'free-for-all' floor where speakers can 'jointly buil[d] one idea' (Edelsky 1981:384). Martha violates the turn-taking system by not providing a TRP where George could self-select, and, for the most part, he responds in kind: Turns 2, 4, 6, 21, 23, 25, 27 and 29, are violations of the turn-taking system since he does not wait for a TRP to speak. Martha eventually responds to George's attempted interruptions (Turns 2, 4, 6) in Turn 7, selecting George as the next speaker with the interrogative: 'Whadda you want?'. Martha uses a total of nine questions in the extract, whereas George asks none, marking her as a powerful speaker (Short 1997:206-7). Moreover, the questions asked by Martha in Turn 7, Turn 13 and Turn 17 can be seen to contribute towards Martha's 'sequential dominance'; that is, her control of the 'direction of the interaction and the sharing of initiating and responding roles' (Ikatura 2001:1862) because George provides answers to each question, thereby fulfilling Martha's 'illocutionary intent' (Ikatura 2001:1865) to obtain a reply. In contrast, Martha ignores George's projection of TRPs: in Turn 14, George pauses between each epithet for his son ('about the apple of our eye…the sprout…the little bugger…') providing three possible TRPs and giving Martha the opportunity to speak. However, Martha does not self-select, and George, in accordance with the turn-taking rule-set, is forced to turn the gaps into intra-turn pauses so that the gaps do not turn into lapses and give rise to attributable silences. By choosing not to speak in the pauses, Martha is not actually breaking any of Sacks et al.'s turn-taking rules, but still manages to manipulate George into speaking plainly about their imaginary son, a subject which he is clearly trying to avoid and shield from Nick and Honey with his non-specific 'you-know-what' (Turn 12) and his provision of three consecutive epithets before he finally 'spits' out the precise noun. Although George succeeds in diverting attention from 'the other business' (Turn 8) of his professional inadequacies, Martha reclaims sequential dominance through this manipulation of the turn-taking rules so that George is forced to elaborate on a topic that his interruption aimed to avoid.

Nick's self-selection (Turn 19) is an 'other-orientated' 'turn-grab', he is an 'unauthorized speaker' (Herman 1998:27) who, by questioning the pertinence of the conversational topic, attempts to prevent the situation from escalating any further and to prevent George from acting upon his warnings. His efforts are unsuccessful, however; he is unable to either complete his utterance or to stop the argument. His level of sequential dominance and discoursal power is further diminished by the fact that it is Martha who interrupts his turn-grab and unapologetically dismisses his gallant effort to protect her from George's wrath. In Turn 20, Martha addresses her questions to George questions mid-turn: 'You getting angry, baby? Hunh?' / 'You getting angrier?'. Dependent upon direction, the questions could be used to show the sequential dominance and discoursal power of either Martha or George. Although Short's (1996) Turn-taking and Power Guide states that questions are a feature of powerful speakers' speech, the portrayal of power is dependent upon the way in which the Martha actor delivers her questions. If they are spoken quickly, without a pause separating the end of the question with the continuation of her story, then they are a form of linguistic oppression in that George is not given time to respond. However, if Martha does pause after her questions in anticipation of a response, which George does not

provide, then her inability to relinquish the turn shifts the power dynamic in George's favour since by not providing an answer he is refusing her interactional control.

Interruptions

Over half of George's turns (Turns 2, 4, 6, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29) are made up of either attempted or successful violations of Martha's speech. Jefferson (1983:6) defines interruptions as the 'starting up "in the midst of" another's turn at talk, not letting the other finish'. Although interruptions and overlaps are not considered undesirable in Edelsky's (1981:384) 'free-for-all' floor model, here they are deliberately 'untoward and violative, an interference with an interactant's speaking rights' (Bilmes 1997:507), in Sacks et al.'s (1974:705) 'one speaker at a time' conversational model as George tries to usurp Martha from the conversational floor. Ikatura (2001:1862) comments on the significance of interruptions in conversational dominance; they are symptomatic of 'participatory dominance' of one speaker, of his or her 'restriction of speaking rights' of the other participants. George's attempts to stop Martha from straying from 'the story of [their] courtship' (Turn 8) can therefore be seen as examples of his effort to exercise 'participatory dominance' over his wife: he violates Sacks et al.'s rules for turn-allocation by talking before the current speaker (Martha) has projected a TRP in his effort to restrict Martha's speaking rights. However, his interruptions are not always successful: Martha sometimes 'refuses to cede control of the floor and continues to talk' (Kollock et al. 1985:38). Since interruptions are only indicative of a powerful speaker when they are effective, such instances of Martha's unaffected speech reinforce her verbal dominance over George.

Bilmes (1997:515) notes that there are three ways of 'doing being interrupted': 'direct claims, interruption displays, and ignoring'. Martha's first way of 'doing being interrupted' is 'ignoring': showing no verbal sign of George's violative speech and carrying on with her speech. In Turns 3 and 4, she appears oblivious to George's two attempts to gain a turn ('Just a minute, Martha'). By ignoring George's speech, Martha treats his 'interruptive utterance as illegitimate, null, and void' (Bilmes 1997:520), simultaneously asserting her conversational dominance and insulting her husband. George's first two attempts at interruption (Turns 2, 4) fail, and he is only successful in Turn 6 when he shouts a directive: 'STOP IT, MARTHA!'. Although he eventually manages to achieve participatory dominance in Turn 6, the fact that it takes three attempts and a directive to do so minimizes the significance of this achievement. In Turns 26 and 28, Martha does not directly respond to George's speech, but uses stresses to show that she is aware of his requests for her to stop talking (Turns 25, 27). In Turn 26, she stresses the insulting epithet for George ('BOG'), emphasising her 'determination to hold the floor' (Bilmes 1997:519), to deny George access to the floor and refuse him participatory dominance. Similarly, in Turn 28, the increasing volume of Martha's speech ('her voice rising to match his') displays her awareness of the fact that George is trying to impinge upon her turn while initially still refusing to relinquish either the turn or any discoursal power (an 'interruption display' Bilmes 1997:515). At the end of Turn 28, Martha stops talking about George's inadequacies and shouts 'ALL RIGHT, GEORGE!'. She simultaneously concedes defeat to George's violative speech/song with the conventional expression of compliance while defiantly attempting an interruption herself, superficially surrendering participatory dominance to George but in fact trying to win it back. By continuing singing (Turn 29, joined by Honey), George refuses to acknowledge Martha's attempted interruption and retains control of the conversation. He also appears to gain an ally in Honey, whose drunken accompaniment augments his authority. Martha then attempts to interrupt again, finding success (like George, Turn 6) with the use of the explicit directive 'STOP IT' (Turn 31).

Martha thereby reclaims participatory dominance over George in this extract, who completely withdraws from the conversational floor.

Conclusion

My analysis has shown that turn-taking and turn-management are central to Martha and George's struggle for power and that the framework provides a useful guide by which their respective levels of conversational dominance can be measured. They both exploit and violate the turn-taking system in their attempts to attain conversational dominance and power and thereby win the verbal game. Martha's long turns, her avoidance of TRPs and treatment of George's speech give her complete control (quantitative, sequential and participatory) over what and how much is said; she limits George's verbal contributions and thereby renders him verbally, as well as physically, impotent. Whereas George appears uninterested in obtaining quantitative dominance over his wife, he does try to win sequential and participatory dominance when he detects a threat to his positive face. George also attempts to win conversational control by violating the rules of turn-taking: his interruptions aim to divert the topic of conversation away from his professional and personal incompetence and protect his positive self-image. George's speech is largely ineffectual in this extract – Martha refuses to submit to his requests or comply with his directives. Although Martha appears to be the dominant speaker in this extract, her victory, like that of George with the parasol-gun earlier in Act One, is 'Pyrrhic' (Albee 1962:42), because they share the 'disappointment and frustration' (Zwagerman 2001:117) with life. Their equal disregard for the collaborative rules of turn-taking is symptomatic of their ultimate desire to win the game by whatever means, and at whatever cost, necessary. Indeed, George's final 'victory' in Act III, in which he exercises conversational dominance over Martha and shatters the illusion of their son, is as damaging to George as it is to Martha, reducing their speech to disjointed, incomplete utterances and leaving both characters powerless.

Bibliography

Adler, T. P. (1973) *Albee's Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?: A Long Night's Journey into Day*. Educational Theatre Journal, 25: 1: 66-70.

Albee, E. (1962) *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Penguin).

Austin, J. L. (1962) 'How to do Things with Words'. Oxford: Oxford University Press. In Jaworski, A., Coupland, N. (eds.) (1999) *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge. 63-75.

Bilmes, J. (1997). 'Being Interrupted'. *Language in Society*. 26: 4: 507-531.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1983) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1983) Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohn, R. (2005) "Words; Words…They're Such a Pleasure." (An Afterword). In Bottoms, S. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Edward Albee*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). 217-230.

Edelsky, C. (1981) 'Who's Got the Floor?' *Language in Society*. 10: 3: 383-421.

Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and Power*, 2nd ed. (Harlow: Longman).

Herman, V. (1995) *Dramatic Discouse: Dialogue as Interaction in Plays* (London: Routledge).

Herman, V. (1998) 'Turn management in drama'. In J. Culpepper, M. Short and P. Vedonk Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context (London: Routledge).

Ikatura, H. (2001) 'Describing Conversational Dominance.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 12: 1859-1880.

Kane, L. (1984) *The Language of Silence: On the Unspoken and the Unspeakable in Modern Drama*. (Cranbury: Associated University Presses).

Kollock, P., Blumstein, P. and Schwartz, P. (1985) 'Sex and Power in Interaction: Conversational Privileges and Duties'. *American Sociological Review* 50:34-46.

Malkin, J. (1992) *Verbal Violence in Contemporary Drama: From Handke to Shepard.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Meyer, R. (1968) 'Language: Truth and Illusion in "*Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*"' Educational Theatre Journal 20: 1: 60-69.

Oxford English Dictionary Online <www.oed.com> dialogue, n. 1b. [accessed 30/12/10].

Roudané, M. (2005) 'Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf : Toward the Marrow'. In Bottoms, S. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Edward Albee*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). 39-58.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation'. *Language*. 50: 4: 696-735.

Saville-Troike, M. (1985). 'The Place of Silence in An Integrated Theory of Communication'. In Tannen, D. and Saville-Troike, M. (eds.) *Perspectives on Silence*. (Norwood, N.J: Ablex).

Schiffrin, D. (1988) 'Conversation analysis' in Newmeyer, F. J. *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey. Language: The Socio-cultural Context* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge).

Schiffrin, D. (1986) 'Turn-initial variation: structure and function in conversation'. In Sankoff, D. (ed.) (1986) *Diversity and Diachrony* (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

Searle, J. R. (1976) 'A Classification of Illocutionary Acts'. *Language in Society*. 5: 1: 1-23.

------, (1983) *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

------, (1969). *Speech Acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selting, M. (2000). 'The Construction of Units in Conversational Talk'. *Language in Society*. 29: 4: 477-517.

Short, M. (1996) *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose* (Harlow, England: Longman).

Sifianou, M. (1997) 'Silence and Politeness'. In Adam Jaworski (ed.) *Silence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives.* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter) 63-84.

Taylor, C. M. (1973) 'Coming of Age in New Carthage: Albee's Grown-Up Children'. *Educational Theatre Journal*. 25: 1: 53-65.

Zimmerman, D. H. and West, C. (1975) 'Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation'. In Thorne, B. and Henley, N. (eds.*) Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. (Rowley, MA: Newbury House).

Zwagerman, S. (2010) *Wit's End: Women's Humour as Rhetorical and Performative Strategy* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press).

Appendix

Edward Albee (1962) *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (London: Penguin)

Act One, Fun and Games, pp.55-57.

1. MARTHA: That I am. So, I actually fell for him. And the match seemed…practical too. You know, Daddy was looking for someone to…

2. GEORGE: Just a minute, Martha…

3. MARTHA: …take over, some time, when he was ready to…

4. GEORGE [stony]: Just a minute, Martha…

5. MARTHA: …retire, and so I thought…

6. GEORGE: STOP IT, MARTHA!

7. MARTHA [irritated]: Whadda you want?

8. GEORGE [too patiently]: I'd thought you were telling the story of our courtship, Martha… I didn't know you were going to start in on the other business.

9. MARTHA [so-thereish]: Well, I am!

10. GEORGE: I wouldn't, if I were you.

11. MARTHA: Oh…you wouldn't? Well, you're not!

12. GEORGE: Now, you've already sprung a leak about you-know-what…

13. MARTHA [a duck]: What? What?

14. GEORGE: …about the apple of our eye…the sprout…the little bugger… [Spits it out] … our son… and if you start on this other business, I warn you, Martha, it's going to make me angry.

15. MARTHA [laughing at him]: Oh, it is, is it?

16. GEORGE: I warn you.

17. MARTHA [incredulous]: You what?

18. GEORGE [very quietly]: I warn you.

19. NICK: Do you really think we have to go through…?

20. MARTHA: I stand warned! [Pause…then, to HONEY and NICK] So, anyway, I married the S.O.B., and I had it all planned out…He was the groom…he was going to be groomed. He'd take over some day…first he'd take over the History
Department, and then, when Daddy retired, he'd take over the college… you know? That's the way it was supposed to be.
[To GEORGE, who is at the portable bar with his back to her]
You getting angry, baby? Hunh? [Now back] That's the way it was supposed to be. Very simple. And Daddy seemed to think it was a pretty good idea, too. For a while. Until he watched for a couple of years! [To GEORGE again] You getting angrier? [Now back] Until he watched for a couple of years and started thinking maybe it wasn't such a good idea after all…that maybe Georgie-boy didn't have the stuff…that he didn't have it in him!

21. GEORGE [still with his back to them all]: Stop it, Martha.

22. MARTHA [viciously triumphant]: The hell I will! You see, George didn't have much…push…he wasn't particularly aggressive. In fact he was sort of a…[Spits the word at GEORGE'S back]…a FLOP! A great…big…fat…FLOP!
[CRASH! Immediately after FLOP! GEORGE breaks a bottle against the portable bar and stands there, still with his back to them all, holding the remains of the bottle by the neck. There is a silence, with everyone frozen. Then…]

23. GEORGE [almost crying]: I said stop, Martha.

24. MARTHA [after considering what course to take]: I hope that was an empty bottle, George. You don't want to waste good liquor…not on your salary.
[GEORGE drops the broken bottle on the floor, not moving.]
Not on an Associate Professor's salary. [To NICK and HONEY] I mean, he'd be…no good…at trustees' dinners, fund raising. He didn't have any…personality, you know what I mean? Which was disappointing to Daddy, as you can imagine. So, here I am, stuck with this flop…

25. GEORGE [turning around]: …don't go on, Martha…

26. MARTHA: …this BOG in the History Department...

27. GEORGE: …don't, Martha, don't…

28. MARTHA [her voice rising to match his]: …who's married to the President's daughter, who's expected to be somebody, not just some nobody, some bookworm, somebody who's so damn... contemplative, he can't make anything out of himself, somebody without the guts to make anybody proud of him… ALL RIGHT, GEORGE!
29. GEORGE [under her, then covering, to drown her]: I said, don't. All right…all right:
[Sings]
Who's afraid of Virgina Woolf,
Virginia Woolf,
Virginia Woolf,
Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf, early in the morning.

30. GEORGE and HONEY [who joins him drunkenly]:
Who's afraid of Virgina Woolf,
Virginia Woolf,
Virginia Woolf…[etc]

31. MARTHA: STOP IT!
[A brief silence]

32. HONEY [rising, moving towards the hall]: I'm going to be sick…I'm going to be sick…I'm going to vomit.
[Exits]

33. NICK [going after her]: Oh, for God's sake!
[Exits]

34.MARTHA [going after them, looks back at GEORGE contemptuously]: Jesus! [Exits. GEORGE is alone on stage.]