Dr. Hoda Soliman Mohammed

An Appraisal of Dominance in Osborne's *"Look Back in Anger"*

By
Dr. Hoda Soliman Mohammed

Associate Professor of English Literature, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Menoufia University, Egypt

Abstract

Embarking on a work of art like "Look Back in Anger" (LBA) by John Osborne(1929-1994) is not the one and only attempt to manipulate. Many researchers entered this mine to mark the "fourth movement" in modern English drama (Schlueter, 1979:89), or to show the abnormal and the angry mood which prevailed in England after World War II (Lall, 1996:12-15), or to do an appraisal of the behavior of the characters of this play (Alkhidir, 2020). This study is a revisit to the play LBA with a special concentration on the element of "dominance" of some characters over others and "dominance" of the post-war generation over the intolerable realities of society. Mechanisms of turn-taking and turn allocation (Sacks *et al.* (1978) and Levinson (1983) are used as the methodology in the study. The research concludes with an outrage raised against the idealized society that is in fact inauthentic. The voice of this visit represents a high cry against all forms of inauthenticity that might exist in any present-day society.

الملخص

إن معالجة عمل أدبي مثل مسرحية "أنظر إلى الوراء بغضب" للكاتب المسرحي جون أوزبورن (١٩٢٩ – ١٩٩٤) ليست بالمرة الأولى أو الأخيرة في مضمار تحليل الدراسات الأدبية. فلطالما ارتاد العديد من الباحثين هذا المنجم، إما لترسيم حدود الحقبة الرابعة للدراما الإنجليزية الحديثة (شلوتر ١٩٧٩: ٨٩)، أو لتوضيح المزاج اللاسوي والغاضب الذي ساد انجلترا إبان الحرب العالمية الثانية (لال ١٩٩٦: ١٢ – ١٥) ، أو لأداء تقييم لسلوك الشخصيات التي مثلت تلك المسرحية (الخضر ٢٠٢٠). تمثل الدراسة الحالية محاولة جديدة لتحليل مسرحية "أنظر إلى الوراء بغضب" من زاوية خاصة وهي التركيز على عنصر "الهيمنة" لدى بعض الشخصيات على بعضها البعض وكذلك "هيمنة" جيل ما بعد الحرب على الأوضاع الإجتماعية التي لم يعد بالإمكان تحملها. ولتحقيق ذلك فقد تم تطبيق آليات أخذ وتوزيع الأدوار (ساكس وآخرون ١٩٧٨ و ليفينسون ١٩٨٣) كمنهج لهذه الدراسة. واختتمت الدراسة بتوضيح الغضب ضد المجتمع المثالي شكلا والغير جدير بالتصديق فعلا. إن صوت هذا البحث ليمثل صيحة عالية ضد كل الأشكال التي قد تفتقد إلى المصداقية في أي مجتمع من مجتمعات اليوم.

An Appraisal of Dominance in Osborne's *"Look Back in Anger"*

By
Dr. Hoda Soliman Mohammed

Associate Professor of English Literature, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Menoufia University, Egypt

1. Introduction
1.1 The Problem and its Setting

This research paper focuses on dominance in dramatic conversation via the systematics of turn-taking. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974, 1978) studied turn-taking mechanisms which organize the distribution and the flow of speech. The relation between these mechanisms and dominance is very obvious in Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*, where we find the dominant character, Jimmy Porter, adopts certain mechanisms all through the play. He always initiates new topics and controls the content of what follows. The size and length of his turns are remarkable because they point out that he is the dominant speaker in full control of conversation.

We can hardly find another challenging character, except for Helena, who sometimes defies him. Consequently, we find a relation between dominance and certain turn-taking mechanisms such as topic-control, topic shift, turn length and number.

Look Back in Anger (LBA) as a dramatic text has been specially chosen to prove the relation between turn-taking mechanisms and dominance because drama provides an important feature: To Burton (1980), the conflict created by the characters through dialogue:

> "drama dialogue presents the conflict … but this feature makes drama data radically different from all other data … the interactants-fictitious as they are- argue, try to assert themselves , insult each other , ignore each other , refuse to do what they are asked to do, do not bother to be polite, create unnecessary obstacles and so on . In short, they exhibit all sorts of conversational behavior" (p. 116).

Evaluating characters' relative hegemony via the words they utter proves that one can move , as Dowson (1988) states, from words on page to judgments concerning characters:

> "A real person is a theoretical entity for his own interpreters, to which they assign those intentions that make sense of what

he does. A character in drama is an analogy of a person and is interpreted in the same way" (p.68).

1.2. Significance

Investigating the dramatic style via a conversation analysis method including the turn-taking system and its relative power may be significant because it affirms the close relation between language and acting. This study is significant in that some characters practice real dominance, in real context, and in real life. According to Alkhidir (2020), "In Look Back in Anger, the characters are different from the contemporary characters. Their expression and the language are so real that one is compelled to believe its match with the real life situation. The characters are very much close to the generation of the post second world war period who are confused, frustrating and full of uncertainty. They are the victim of the era which is reflected from their behavior" (p. 405-406).

"As far as science is concerned language is simply an instrument, which it profits it to make as transparent and neutral as possible; it is subordinate to the matter of science (workings, hypotheses, results) which, so it is said, exists outside language and precedes it. On the one hand and *first* there is the content of the scientific message, which is everything, on the other hand and *next*, the verbal form responsible for expressing that content, which is nothing….
For literature on the other hand, or at any rate that literature which has freed itself from classicism and humanism, language can no longer be the convenient instrument or the superfluous back cloth of a social, emotional or poetic 'reality' which pre-exists it, and which it is language's subsidiary responsibility to express, by means of submitting itself to a number of stylistic rules. Language is literature's Being, its very world; the whole of literature is contained in the act of writing and no longer in those of 'thinking', 'portraying', 'telling', or 'feeling'." (Newton, 1997:94)
Dawson (1970) also observes that language is very important in drama as:
 "... The action is the language, that the language creates the dramatic world of the play …" (p. 8-9).

1.3. Aim

The main objective in this research is to apply a Conversation Analysis (CA) approach including the turn-taking system in order to evaluate the relative power of characters in Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* (1956).

1.4. Theoretical Background
1.4.1. Conversation Analysis

Have (1999) defines conversation as being people's talk either as a form of sociability or to indicate any activity of interactive talk. He also considers conversation analysis to be having both a broad and a restricted sense. In its broad sense, it refers to the study of people's talk, oral communication, or language use. In its restricted sense, it points to one particular approach of analytic work that was started by Sacks and his followers such as Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (p. 4-5).

Hutchby and Woffitt (1988) explain more elaborately the term conversation analysis. They believe that it is characterized by the view that how talk is produced and how its meanings are determined.

Talk, here, is not the simple exchange of information between speakers and hearers:

> "Rather, participants in conversation are seen as mutually orienting to and collaborating in order to achieve, orderly and meaningful communication. The aim of CA is thus to reveal the tacit, organized reasoning procedures which inform the production of naturally occurring talk " (p. 1-16).

They also add that the objective of CA is to present and explain the procedures on which people rely to utter speech and by which they understand others' talk.

Thus, conversation analysis is the systematic analysis of talk in interaction:

> "To put it at its most basic, conversation analysis is the study of talk. More particularly, it is the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction" (p. 13).

1.4.2. Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis

According to Taylor and Cameron (1987), the ethnomethodological conversation analysts have formed a school whose approach is distinctive among various approaches to conversation. They are a group of sociologists. The American founder of the ethnomethodological school is Harold Garfinkel (1974). He explains the term ethnomethodology as being the social actor's or community's own methodology, i.e.

> "… an organizational study of a member's own knowledge of his ordinary affairs " (p. 18).

Levinson (1983) considers the term ethnomethodology to be " the study of ethnic (i.e. participant's own) methods of production and interpretation of social interaction" (p. 295).

1.4.3. Turn-Taking

When a speaker takes an opportunity to speak in a speech situation, he takes his turn.

In a seminal article entitled "A Simplest Systematic for the Organization of Turn Taking in Conversation", the conversation analysts of the ethnomethodological school, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1978) have described the mechanisms of turn-taking in the form of components. According to Sacks *et al*. (1978) and Levinson (1983), the system of talk has two components: a turn allocational component which regulates the changeover of turns and a turn constructional component which organizes the size, or the length, and the linguistic textures of turns.

1.4.4. Power

According to Fowler (1985:61), power is the ability of people to influence or control the material lives of others.

West and Zimmerman's (1985:116) concept of participants' identities explains the distinction between social or institutional power, and discursive power.

They distinguish between three types of participants' identities:

1- Master identities: they are permanent identities such as: age, sex, social class, etc...

2- Situated identities: they are related to certain social settings as job-status. They are less permanent identities.

3- Discourse identities: they are ephemeral identities created by verbal activities. For example, apologizing threatens one's face and puts him in the position of the powerless participant. Commands, on the other hand, threaten the other's negative face and put the utterer of the command in the position of the powerful discourse participant.

Consequently, power relations are dynamic because power is the effect of discourse. A socially powerless participant might gain some discursive power, in certain contexts, over a socially powerful participant. This is, again, done through discourse. As a result, one might distinguish between a powerful and a powerless speech style. Powerless styles are filled with hesitations, repetitions, and incomplete turns.

Thomas (1995: 127) mentions that there are three types of power:

Legitimate power: it is constant within a relationship. It is that one person has power or the right to request certain things by virtue of role, age or status, for example, teachers and parents.

Referent power: it is that one person has power over another because the other admires him and wants to be like him. It is the sort of power which pop stars and sport idols have over the youth.

Expert power: one person has some special knowledge or expertise which the others need. Doctors, for instance, have expert power over their patients. Some researchers such as Erickson et al. (1978) distinguish between a powerful and a powerless speech style. The former is marked by very few cases of interruptions. The latter, on the contrary, is marked by hesitations, repetitions, and incomplete turns.

The previous discussion about the turn-taking system involves certain mechanisms which reflect the character's status of power. For example, the character that controls the topic of conversation, or is rarely interrupted by others, is said to be the powerful interactant. On the contrary, the character whose participation is limited and whose role is to respond to others is the powerless one.

2. John Osborne (His world, life, and plays)
2.1 Osborne' England.

After World War II, England has gone through a political crisis because of the Suez Crisis. England has also lost a lot of its economic basis of power after the war. The dropping of the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki makes people feel frustrated, as Travers (1998:192) comments:

> "It was the day on which humanity was confronted with the prospect of its extinction as a species" (p. 192).

Literature in Europe after 1945 reflects the real conditions of life. Blamires (1986) considers that the theatre of the fifties and sixties mirrors the real issues of society: "the demand for art to commit itself frankly to political and social causes" (p. 211).

2.2. Post-War Drama

Post-war drama tends to be explicit in expressing the moods of the century. This new realism in the theatre makes drama depict ordinary characters belonging to the middle class. Alexander (2000) believes in this realism saying:

> "The remembered social cohesion of the war years gave a dramatic edge to Jimmy's frustration at social inequality and the futility of individual action. Osborne made the gritty flat with its Sunday newspapers and ironing board an image of its time: kitchen sink-realism was at hand" (p. 363-364).

2.3. The Angry Young Men

The movement of the 'Angry Young Men' refers to:

"Various British novelists and playwrights who emerged in the 1950s and expressed scorn and disaffection with the established sociopolitical order of their country. Their impatience and resentment were especially aroused by what they perceived as the hypocrisy and mediocrity of the upper and middle classes. The Angry Young Men were a new breed of intellectuals who were mostly of working class or lower middle-class origin. Some had been educated at the post-war red-brick universities at the state's expense, though a few were from Oxford. They shared an outspoken irreverence for the British class system, its traditional network of pedigreed families and the elitist Oxford and Cambridge Universities. They showed an equally uninhibited disdain for the drabness of the post war welfare state and their writings frequently expressed raw anger and frustration as the post war reforms failed to meet exalted aspirations for genuine change.

The trend that was evident in John Wain's novel Hurry on Down (1953) and in Lucky *Jim* (1954) by Kingsley Amis was crystallized in 1956 in the play *Look Back in Anger*, which became the representative work of the movement. When the Royal Court Theatre's press agent described the play's 26-year-old author John Osborne as an "angry young man", the name was extended to all his contemporaries who expressed rage at the persistence of class distinctions, pride in their lower-class mannerisms and dislike for anything high brow or "phoney". When Sir Laurence Olivier played the leading role in Osborne's second play, *The Entertainer* (1957), the Angry Young Men were acknowledged as the dominant literary force of the decade.

Their novels and plays typically feature a rootless, lower middle or working class male protagonist who views society with scorn and sardonic humour and may have conflicts with authority but who is nevertheless preoccupied with the quest for upward mobility.

Among other writers embraced in the term are the novelists John Braine (*Room at the Top*, 1957) and Alan Sillitoe (*Saturday Night and Sunday Morning,* 1958) and the playwrights Bernard Kops (*The Hamlet of Stepney Green*,

1956) and Arnold Wesker (*Chicken Soup With Barley*, 1958) ".

http://w.w.w.britannica/bcom/eb/article/010,5716,58960+1+57722,0 0. html

Consequently, the angry young men are voicing the bitterness of the youth of "post-atom-bomb world" (Lall, 1996:4).

2.4. Osborne's Life and Plays

Lall (1996) reported that John Osborne was born in 1929 in London. His father was a commercial artist. As a result, John was interested in the theatre. He tried acting and writing plays. Because of *Look Back in Anger* (1957*),* which ushered in a new movement in British drama, and some other plays, Osborne became known as "the angry young man". He also wrote film scripts.

Osborne has gone through many stages in his artistic development. He has written two plays in collaboration: *The Devil Inside Him*, and *Personal Enemy*.

When he writes *Look Back in Anger*, he gains a widespread reputation. The play is a starting point of a new kind of drama: that which mirrors with great realism the hero's anger at the social evils in post-war Britain. In the *Entertainer* (1957), Osborne presents the story of a run-down comedian. He also writes *A Subject of Scandal and Concern (1960), Luthor* (1961),*Inadmissible Evidence*(1964), *Time Present*(1967), *The Hotel in Amsterdam* (1976), and *A Sense of Detachment* (1972) .His last play , *Déjà vu*(1992), is a sequel to his earlier play: *Look Back in Anger.* Osborne dies in 1994.

2.5. *Look Back in Anger* (1956)

In form, it is a conventional play with a realistic setting and a firm plot. However, the content of the play is revolutionary because the protagonist always utters furious criticisms against his wife and her upper social class.

The title of the play itself is unusual and it refers to the angry mood that prevails throughout the three acts of the plays as Innes (1992) states:

> "The title of *Look Back in Anger* defines the underlying theme of all Osborne's plays. Each is motivated by outrage at the discovery that the idealized Britain, for which so many had sacrificed themselves during the war years, was inauthentic (p. 102).

The value of *Look Back in Anger* is obvious in all times. Sanders (2000) emphasizes this as he says: "It was assumed at the time, and it continues

to be assumed, that John Osborne's play *Look Back in Anger…* marked either a 'revolution' or a 'watershed' in the history of the modern British theatre (p. 585).

3. Application

The analysis of turns can provide initial clues to the characters' behaviours and their relative power and dominance.

Look Back in Anger is the story of Jimmy Porter, his wife Alison, his friend Cliff and Alison's friend Helena. Jimmy is the dominant character who makes all the most important speeches. He looks back in anger because he is displeased with his present situation: An intellectual person who is deprived of any progress in society due to his low-class origins. Jimmy directs his anger towards his high-class wife, who symbolizes, for Jimmy, the wicked section of society.

3.1. Turn Length

In Act I, Jimmy's utterances vary in length. At the beginning of act one, his turns are shorter, when he speaks with Cliff about the daily news. His first long turn comes when he expresses his sense of boredom with the routine of life and his wife's lack of human enthusiasm:

> " ………..   I know you're going to drive me mad. Oh heavens, how I long for a little ordinary human enthusiasm …." (p. 15).

Jimmy's long turns start to follow one after another. He, first, talks about Alison's brother, Nigel, in an ill manner.

> " …. He and his pals have been plundering and fooling everybody for generations … nothing is more vague about Nigel than his knowledge. His knowledge of life and ordinary human beings is so hazy" (p. 20), and "Nigel and Alison. They're what they sound
> like: sycophantic, phlegmatic and pusillanimous " (p. 21).

Then, he continues to criticize Alison heavily in long turns:

> "Neither did I really. All this time I have been married to this woman this monument to non-attachment, and suddenly discover that there is actually a word that sums her up. Not just an adjective in the English language to describe her with- it's her name! Pusillanimous! It sounds like some fleshy Roman matron, doesn't it? The Lady Pusillanimous seen here with her husband Sextus, on their way to the games" (p. 21).

And:
> "She's so clumsy. I watch for her to do the same things every night. The way she jumps on the bed, as if she were stamping on some one's face, and draws the curtains back with a great clatter, in that casually destructive way of hers. It's like some one launching a battleship. Have you ever noticed how noisy women are"? (p. 24).

After that, Jimmy continues his bitter comments in the same long turn:
> "I've watched her doing it night after night. When you see a woman in front of her bedroom mirror, you realize what a refined sort of a butcher she is; did you ever see some dirty old Arab, sticking his fingers into some mess of lamb fat and gristle? Well, she's just like that. Thank god they don't have many women surgeons. Those primitive hands would have your guts out in no time" (p. 24).

The end of this scene witnesses one of Jimmy's most offensive remarks about Alison. He describes her, in a long turn, as a monster killing him:
> "Oh, it's not that she hasn't her own kind of passion. She has the passion of a python. She just devours me whole every time, as if I were some over-large rabbit. That's me. That bulge around her navel-if you're wondering what it is-it's me. Me buried alive down there, and going mad, smothered in that peaceful-looking coil. Not a sound. Not a flicker from her-she doesn't even rumble a little. You would think that this indigestible mess would stir up some kind of tremor in those distended, over fed- tripes but not her!….she'll go on sleeping and devouring until there's nothing left of me" (p. 37-38).

The considerable lengths of these turns reflect Jimmy's dissatisfaction with his wife and even her family.

Alison's first reaction to Jimmy's long criticism is surprising as she doesn't respond. She is a passive listener. She can hardly make a comment nor defend herself. Her turns are very short such as: "what's that", and "I am sorry, I wasn't listening properly" (p. 11). She never comments on Jimmy's criticism and never pays any attention to his angry cries. She shows indifference and carelessness towards her low-origin husband.

Cliff's turns are also short. He is subordinate to Jimmy who dominates him. He tries to calm Jimmy and Alison in an attempt to make peace between them: "leave the poor girl alone " (p. 11).

Cliff's linguistic contribution is very limited and this is due to his weak character compared with Jimmy's hegemony.

This analysis proves that Jimmy is the most powerful character as he is the dominant speaker. Others listen to him and don't respond to his outbursts. Alison's silence may be taken, on a hidden dimension, as a sign of power: she doesn't care, and that's why she torments Jimmy with the weapon of silence.

In act II scene I, Alison's turns become of considerable length as she speaks with Helena.

This proves that her silence with Jimmy is not due to her passive nature, it is a means to torment Jimmy. This impression is emphasized when she defies Jimmy, in a quite long turn, and interrupts him for the first time saying:

> "Oh, yes, we all know what you did for me! You rescued me from the wicked clutches of my family, and all my friends! I'd still be rotting away at home, if you hadn't ridden up your charger, and carried me off!" (p. 51).

Jimmy's turns continue to be long especially when he describes Alison's mother using bad terms:

> "I really did have to ride up on a white charger-off white, really. Mummy locked her up in their eight bed roomed castle, didn't she?
>
> There is no limit to what the middle-aged mummy will do in the holy crusade against ruffians like me. Mummy and I took one quick look at each other, and from then on, the age of chivalry was dead…
>
> Threatened with me, a young man without money, background or even looks, she'd bellow like a rhinoceros in labour-enough to make every male rhino for miles turn white, and pledge himself to celibacy……
>
> she's as rough as a night in Bombay brothel and as tough as a matelote's arm.
>
> she's probably in that bloody cistern, taking down every word we say" (p. 51-52)

He also makes Helena another target of his criticism in a very long turn:

> " ….. She's an expert in the New Economics-the Economics of the Supernatural … She's one of those apocalyptic share pushers who are spreading all those rumors about a transfer of power …: The Big crash is coming, you can't escape it, so get

in on the ground floor with Helena and her friends while there is still time……

I know Helena and her kind so very well. In fact, her kind are every- where, you can't move for them. They're a romantic lot. They spend their time mostly looking forward to the past. The only place they can see the light is the Dark Ages. She's moved long ago into a lovely little cottage of the soul, cut right off from the ugly problems of the twentieth century altogether. She prefers to be cut off from all the conveniences, we've fought to get for centuries. She'd rather go down to the ecstatic little shed at the bottom of the garden to relieve her sense of guilt. Our Helena is full of ecstatic wind" (55-56)

However, Helena's reaction to Jimmy's bitter comments is different from Alison's. She defies him in short turns as: "Oh for heaven's sake. Do not be such a bully" (p. 53) and "If you come any nearer, I will slap your face " (p. 56).

In scene II Alison speaks to her father about Jimmy and uses quite long turns to describe his behaviour as:

"Oh yes. Some people do actually marry for revenge. People like Jimmy, any way … well, for twenty years, I've lived a happy, uncomplicated life, and suddenly, this spiritual barbarian throws down the gauntlet at me …." (p. 67).

In the final part of this scene Jimmy utters a long turn in which he attacks Alison because she leaves him.

In the third act, scene I, Jimmy continues to use long turns to criticize news paper reports and make sarcastic comments about Cliff. He also criticizes Helena, in a long turn, as she convinces Alison to leave. Yet, she replaces her as Jimmy's mistress:

"Do I detect a growing, satanic glint in her eyes lately? Do you think it's living in sin with me that does it? Do you feel very sinful my dear? Well?
Do you feel sin crawling out of your tears, like stored up wax or something" (p. 78).

Again, Jimmy expresses his fury at women's cruel nature and the worthlessness of life:

"Why, why, why, why do we let these women bleed us to death?

Have you ever had a letter, and on it is franked, "Please. Give your blood generously?" Well, the Postmaster-General does that, on behalf of all the women of the world.

I suppose people of our generation aren't able to die for good causes any longer. We had all that done for us, in the thirties and forties, when we were still kids. There aren't any good, brave causes left

If the big bang does come, and we all get killed off, it won't be in aid of the old-fashioned, grand design. It'll just be for the Brave New-nothing-very-much-thank-you. About as pointless and inglorious as stepping in front of a bus. No, there's nothing left for it, me boy, but to let yourself be butchered by the women" (p. 84-.85).

The final scene is very remarkable regarding its turn length. Alison uses long turns to express that she should not come back, and then regrets leaving Jimmy and is seeking a reunion with him.

Helena also uses long turns to express her sense of guilt that she replaces Alison and her determination to leave Jimmy.

Jimmy also practices his manner of speaking in long turns to torment Alison, but, he finally forgives her.

Generally speaking, Jimmy is the most powerful and dominant character as he is the dominant speaker. Cliff is the least powerful one. His contributions are so limited. Between them, we find Alison, who defies Jimmy with her silence, and Helena, who defies him with her directly sharp comments.

Herman (1995:120) observes that long speeches "necessitate long spates of listening on the part of the addressees". The length of Jimmy's turns, then, reflects his role as a powerful participant, as it shows his ability to speak freely at any topic, and with any character. This length of his linguistic participation proves that he is self- confident. He never fears others' comments. He expresses his anger, in full details, at the social conditions and with everyone around. He attempts making a change and seeking a response from his wife and his friend.

Jimmy is unjustly treated by the social system: an educated person runs a mere sweet stall. Because of his poverty, his wife and her family despise him. His long furious turns with Alison aim at making her communicate with him. His denunciation of her mother and her brother reflects the social injustice, as rich people are socially privileged even though they are worthless. However, Jimmy does not surrender. His long criticism is an attempt towards seeking a change. This very attempt is an evidence of his powerful nature. He is not as passive as Alison and Cliff. Jimmy refuses the existing social conditions, and this is the core of his powerful nature. His refusal of the social injustice is expressed in long turns to emphasize his determination to seek a change. Lall (1996) observes that Jimmy Porter is a spokesman of the post-war generation who felt desperate and frustrated:

"… and it is Jimmy who gives expression to this mood through his many long speeches. He thus becomes a kind of representative of the young people of his time" (p. 144).

3.2. Topic-Shift and Topic-Control

Throughout the play, Jimmy initiates new topics and the other characters are unable to keep up with him, either because of their ignorance, as Cliff, or indifference, as Alison.

Jimmy talks about diverse topics such as the daily news, the routinestic nature of life, lack of human enthusiasm and the bad nature of Alison and her family. Cliff's comments on Jimmy's topics dissatisfy Jimmy because they are short comments that show no understanding:

"Jimmy: why do I do this every Sunday? Even the book reviews seem to be   the same as last week's: Different books, same reviews. Have you finished that one yet?

Cliff: Not yet.

Jimmy: I've just read three whole columns on the English novel. Half of it's in French. Do the Sunday papers make you feel ignorant?

Cliff: Not 'arf

Jimmy: Well, you are ignorant. You're just a peasant. (To Alison) what about you? You are not a peasant are you?

Alison: (absently). What 's that?" (p. 10-11).

When Jimmy talks about human enthusiasm, Cliff doesn't understand what he says:

"Jimmy: ….. Oh, brother, it's such a long time since

  I was with any one who got enthusiastic about anything.

Cliff: what did he say?" (p. 15).

Neither Cliff nor Alison are able to satisfy Jimmy's intellectual interest. He is the one who controls the topics of conversation, but hardly can he find a satisfactory response, that's why he shouts at Cliff and Alison's face saying: "Oh, nothing, nothing .Damn you, damn both of you" (p. 15).

Jimmy's long turns denouncing Alison and her family fail to make her comment on them. She shows no interest in whatever Jimmy says. Sometimes Cliff interferes to stop Jimmy. However, Alison's reactions are often that of silence. One of her rare comments on Jimmy's turns is:

"God help me, if he doesn't stop, I'll go out of my mind in a
  minute" (p. 22).

Helena is the one who challenges Jimmy's control over the conversation. When he talks about a poem he writes, she criticizes him changing the topic:

"Jimmy:…. I wrote a poem while I was at the market yesterday. If you're interested, which you obviously are. (To Helena) It should appeal to you, in particular. It's soaked in the theology of Dante, with a good slosh of Eliot as well. It starts off "there are no dry cleaners in Cambodia!"
Cliff: what do you call it?
Jimmy: "The Cess Pool". Myself being a stone dropped in it, you see—
Cliff: You should be dropped in it, all right.
Helena: (to Jimmy). Why do you try so hard to be unpleasant?
Jimmy: what's that?
Helena: Do you have to be so offensive?
Jimmy: You mean now? You think I'm being offensive? You underestimate me. (Turning to Alison) Doesn't she?
Helena: I think you're a very tiresome young man" (p. 50).

Helena, here, controls the topic and changes it. She is the only character who defies Jimmy's power.

Instances of her changing the topic are numerous. When Jimmy insults Alison' mother, she says:

"I feel rather sick, that's all. Sick with contempt and loathing"
(p. 53).

When he criticizes Helena's nature, she changes the topic saying:

"It's a pity you've been so far away all this time. I would probably have slapped your face" (p. 56).

Helena understands Jimmy's nature, that's why she is able to confront him. She can understand the motives behind his anger:

"You think the world's treated you pretty badly, don't you? "
(p. 54) .

Her intelligence makes her able to show power in controlling conversation, especially with Alison. In act II, scene I, Helena controls Alison and makes her leave Jimmy. Alison tells Helena about her fondness of Cliff. Then, Helena initiates a new topic by making Alison tell her about her life with Jimmy:

"And what about Jimmy? After all he is your husband. Do you mean to say he actually approves of it (Alison's fondness of Cliff)?" (p. 42).

In the end, Helena urges Alison to leave Jimmy, and this is the climax of her control over Alison.

In the previous analysis, Jimmy's power over conversation is faced with Helena's. However, Jimmy proves to be more powerful because he continues to talk in the same offending manner till the end.

The only change is that Helena replaces Alison and becomes the target of his attack.

Topic control is an indication of power, because the one who is able to select a certain topic and force the other interactants to listen must be powerful. This power stems from knowledge of life and a wide understanding of its circumstances. In this respect, Jimmy is superior, as he is cultured and well informed. His allusions to poets (p. 50) and classical names (p. 21), and his discussions of the daily news (p. 10-11) indicate his awareness. This awareness enables Jimmy to choose a diversity of topics and comment on them. Helena's understanding enables her to challenge Jimmy. However, Jimmy proves to be a powerful person with a wide understanding of current situations. He can understand French "Half of it's in French" (p. 11); he also satirizes the Bishop of Bromley who assists the manufacture of the H. Bomb (p. 13). He complains of his feelings of depression on Sundays, and of the routinestic nature of life (p. 14). This knowledge helps him control conversation. He is like an expert in more than one field. Though Alison is socially higher, Jimmy is, in terms of expert power, more powerful.

3.3. Turn-Allocation and Turn-Taking

Sacks *et al.* (1978) have demonstrated rules for the turn-taking system. These rules are: current speaker selects next, self-selection, and current speaker may continue.

"First speaker selects next" technique is dominant as Jimmy always addresses Cliff, Alison, or Helena.

Cliff, sometimes, self-selects in order to defend Alison: "Leave the poor girlie alone. She's busy", "Leave her alone, I said" (p. 11).

When Helena appears in act II, she adopts the technique of "self-selection" more than once in order to challenge Jimmy. A case in point is the previous quotation about Jimmy's poem. Another example appears when she speaks on Alison's behalf:

> "Jimmy: (To Alison) I didn't ask what was the matter with
> you. I asked you where you were going.
> Helena: (steadily) She's going to church" (p. 51).

A third example of Helena's self-selection occurs when Jimmy speaks ill of Alison's mother:

"Oh for heaven's sake, don't be such a bully! You've no right to talk about her mother like that! " (p. 53).

It is ironical that act three nearly repeats act one; it has the same setting. The only difference is that Helena replaces Alison and becomes the focus of Jimmy's criticism.

Again, Cliff self-selects to defend, this time, Helena.

As a result of the previous analysis, the general pattern of turn-allocation is that Jimmy addresses other characters. He is the most powerful character who carries the burden of the whole conversation and allocates turns to others. His choice of the addressee is significant as he targets the addressee most likely to be undermined by his verbal attacks. Cliff is usually the untargeted addressee, as he is the least powerful character. Helena's technique of self-selection and allocating turns to Jimmy emphasizes her powerful character, though she submits to him in the end. Alison's very silence indicates her passivity and her power, as she teases Jimmy with it. Generally, the turn-allocation system specifies Jimmy as the most powerful participant.

3.4. Turn-Order

Turn-order reveals unequal distribution of turns among participants. In the play, we have four major characters: Jimmy, Helena, Alison, and Cliff. Jimmy is the focal point of others' speech. They all address him. He is the center of interaction as a prominent speaker. Here, we find a "one-speaker- speaks-at-a time" technique; this speaker is almost always Jimmy Porter. The usual pattern of turn order is: Jimmy-Cliff, Jimmy-Alison, or Jimmy-Helena.

This distribution of turns privileges Jimmy and awards him interactive prominence. He is the focus around whom others' attention revolves. Again, this is an indication of his role as a powerful character.

3.5. Turn-Texture

In general, the linguistic style is standard language in its informal style.

Jimmy's speech contains some literary allusions (Dante, Eliot, Wilde), especially when he talks to Helena. These allusions distance him from his poor origins and his speech indicates that he is a university educated middle class . He, sometimes, becomes indirect and ambiguous when he targets Helena (p. 55-56) and Alison (p. 37-38). However, he is direct in expressing his personal outrage (p. 15, 57-58).

With Cliff, he makes sarcastic comments; with Alison, he is clear in demanding her interaction, and with Helena, he is challenging.

Cliff's speech is a sort of short comments.

Helena is direct in delivering face-threatening questions, or answers, to Jimmy. Alison's speech reflects her upper class origins. It is mostly composed of answers, even short ones.

The linguistic texture of turns proves that Jimmy is the most powerful character who always controls others with his complex style. Helena is his equal. However, she submits to him in the end. His mastery over language and its complexities enable him to continue his verbal skirmishes with great proficiency. His criticism against Alison and her family manifests his command over language. This linguistic excellency provides him with an expert power over the linguistic style.

3.6. Interruptions

Characters in dramatic texts may be prepared to interrupt others. The degree of cases of interruptions is an important indication of power and self-confidence.

Jimmy, the leading character, always speaks in long turns without being interrupted.

Cliff interrupts him to defend Alison in act one. Alison rarely responds to Jimmy's critical comments. Under Helena's influence, she interrupts him strongly in act two and satirizes him for the first time: "Oh yes, we all know what you did for me! .. " (p. 51).

This, again, proves that Jimmy is a powerful character; he speaks a lot without being interrupted. Other characters dare not interrupt him, otherwise they'll be targets of his offending criticism.

3.7. Hesitations and Incomplete Turns

Hesitations and incomplete turns indicate the character's state of mind, as they imply unease and powerlessness.

Jimmy Porter, the major character who makes the most important speeches, shows power in his speech style. The lack of hesitations and absence of incomplete turns distinguish Jimmy's utterances. He has confidence in whatever he says. He shows fluency in using language and command over its rules.

No other character talks like him, as they often comment on Jimmy's words in rather short turns.

4. Conclusion

The mechanisms of the turn-taking system have thus been used throughout the play to help interpret characters' relative power. Jimmy is the constant participant with every character and, all turns of other characters are directed towards him. He is the focus of attention of other characters. He initiates most topics and controls them. He utters the majority of turns. His style is eloquent, complex and sometimes indirect.

He also varies his style by being direct in expressing his personal sadness.

Long turns belong to him. Herman (1995) believes that

> "Hyperdominant speakers who claim time and extended speech rights put pressure on the floor disproportionately, on their own behalf and at the expense of other participants. The expenditure of time, too, is crucial, since drama's element is time. Speech size, therefore, can be used as a coercive tool to dominate, but as a sign of power" (p. 118).

Rarely is Jimmy interrupted. Moreover, he seldom utters incomplete turns. His control of turn management procedures makes him the most powerful character. Turn-order centralizes him as the dominant speaker. Jimmy's power over conversation helps him mirror his anger clearly. He stands for the whole generation who felt defeated in the fifties as Nicoll (1976) says:

> "Jimmy flails with verbal vigour and intellectual incontinence at everything from the Government to his wife and his mother in law. The rawness of the language and the irreverence caught a prevailing mood of the times…" (p. 810).

Jimmy's anger and his furious speeches give the play a great value. This is evident in Ousby's (1988) opinion:

> "The play's contemporary importance was not dependent on its flimsy plot, but on the articulate anger of Jimmy Porter, whose tirades against the complacency of the English establishment won Osborne a reputation as leader of a group of Angry Young Men" (p. 602).

Helena's strategies portray her as Jimmy's powerful opponent. She is criticizing him directly .She is able to self-select and initiate new topics, which frustrates Jimmy's choices. Like Jimmy, she is not interrupted. However, Jimmy overcomes her in the final act and treats her the way he used to treat Alison. Alison's linguistic contributions show her as a passive participant. However, she hides a special kind of power in her very silence because she is able to provoke Jimmy by her carelessness. Cliff's limited contributions mirror his weak character. His subordinate role in Jimmy's life ends as he leaves for another better place. Nothing changes after his departure. However, his kindness appeals to us.

This examination of *Look Back in Anger* shows us that in interpreting dramatic texts the meaning of what is said is as important as the management of the saying itself. It also presents the powerful speech style as characterized by long turns and control of topics, and devoid of interruptions, hesitations, and incomplete turns.

"Look Back in Anger" (LBA), as a text, is really a challenge in which language and culture defy globalization. This kind of dramatic

language, belongs to the "Drama of Anger"- exactly as the "Drama of the Absurd". It is neither new nor revolutionary. It is just a kind of "infantile" protest against the prevailing social conditions. The anger accompanying this protest soon disappears when the ruling classes accept the author and his ideas as one of their intellectual echoes. It is then that the "Drama of Anger" comes and goes, appears and vanishes. It is the horn that blows in the ears of the authority, the flashlight that shines in the eyes of the ruling classes, and it is the challenge that hits the heads of the custodians of globalization.

Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974, 1978) study the turn-taking mechanisms which organize the distribution and flow of speech. The relation between these mechanisms and power is very obvious in Osborne's Look Back In Anger, where we find the dominant character, Jimmy Porter, adopts certain mechanisms all through the play. He always initiates new topics and controls the content of what follows. The size and length of his turns are remarkable because they point out that he is the dominant speaker and he is in full control of conversations.

There can hardly be found another challenging character; except for Helena, who sometimes defies Jimmy. Consequently, we find a relation between power and certain turn-taking mechanisms such as topic-control, topic shift, turn length and number. Drama creates the conflict, the challenge that language and culture present to globalization through dialogue.

Jimmy Porter, with his language and culture, presents a challenge to the intellect; to global ideas. Through his language and knowledge, he is imposing his own power, and his own ideas. Language and culture here is the challenge, the conflict, and the "action", as Dawson (1970) calls it, to globalizatioin, i.e. to change.

Positive language and culture $\longrightarrow$ Globalization
Negative language and culture $\longrightarrow$ No Globalization

The question is: Can Globalization be achieved? The answer is: Yes, but with a challenge. The reason is that, first, we have one powerful style (Jimmy Porter's) and the rest are powerless styles (Helena, Alison, Cliff, Nigel).

Second, Jimmy lacks any kind of power mentioned by Thomas (1995). Jimmy requests change of certain things. He has no virtue of role, age, or status. He does not even have a referent power, i.e. the sort of power which pop stars have, for example, over the youth. No other character wants to imitate him or be like him. He does not even possess some

special knowledge or expertise which the other characters need.

Despite Jimmy's possession of certain mechanisms of turn-taking which could lead to a status of power like control of topic, rare interruption on the part of the other, and taking of the floor, this power is weakness in reality. Weakness that represents hindrance to the achievement of globalization. One powerful interactant among many powerless interactants is a challenge to globalization. "Look Back in Anger" (LBA) is only a horn that blows in the ears of the authority. To be global is to have many "Look Back in Angers". Because "LBA" generated many "Look Back in Angers" in the 1950s, and John Osborne as an "angery young man" became a representative of a global movement against the established sociopolitical order of England, the name "angry young man" was extended to all his contemporaries who expressed rage at the persistence of class distinctions. The challenge gave its fruit and faced the existing conditions with global scorn and sardonic humour , and caused conflict with authority.

Globally speaking, the voices in the "angry" plays and novels of the 1950s represented both "referent power" and "expert power" but it lacked "legitimate power". There was no consensus in the society. Language and culture represented by the voices of the working class or low middle-class became a challenge to globalization represented by the hypocrisy and mediocrity of the upper and middle classes. And so long as there are power relations and mechanisms of roles and turns, the challenge continues.

Bibliography

Primary sources.

Osborne, J. (1957). *Look Back in Anger.* London: Faber and Faber.

Secondary sources.

Alexander, M. (2000). *A history of English literature.* Macmillan Foundations.

Alkhidir, Afaf, Y. Issue No. (75) July, 2020, 403-428.

Blamires, H. (1986). *Twentieth century English literature* (2nd ed.). London: Macmillan Education LTD.

Burton, D. (1980) *Dialogue and discourse: A Sociolinguistic approach to modern drama dialogue and naturally occurring conversation.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Dawson, S.W. (1970). *Drama & the dramatic.* London: Methuen & Co LTD.

Downes, W. (1998). *Language and society.* 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Downes, W. (1988) *Discourse and drama: King Lear's Questions to his daughter in W. Van Peer* (ed). *The Taming of the Text: Explorations in language and literature and culture.* London: Routledge.

Edelsky, C.(1993) "*Who's Got the Floor*", in D.Tannen (ed.) *Gender and Conversational Interaction*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Erickson, B., Lind, A. E., Johnson, B. C., and O'Barr, W. M. (1978) "Speech style and impression formation in a court setting: The effects of powerful and powerless speech". *Journal of Experimental, Social Psychology*, 14: 266 - 279.

Fowler, R. (1985) "*Power*", in T. A. van Dijk (ed.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* 1, London: Academic Press.

Garfinkel, H.(1974) *On the origins of the term "ethnomethodology*", in Turner, R.(ed.), *Ethnomethodology.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Have, Ten, P. (1999) *Doing conversational analysis. A practical guide.* London, thousand Osaka and New Delhi: Saga Publication.

Herman, V. (1995). *Dramatic discourse. Dialogue as interaction in plays.* London and New York: Routledge.

Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1988). *Conversation Analysis.* UK: Polity Press. USA: Blackwell publishers Inc.

Innes, Ch. (1992). *Modern British drama.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Internet: http://w.w.w.britannica/bcom/eb/article/010,5716,58960+1+57722,00. html

Lall, R. (1996). *Look Back in Anger.* A critical study. 13th ed. New Delhi: Rama Brothers.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newton, K. M. (1997). *Twentieth century literary theory.* Second Edition. Macmillan press L.T.D.

Nicoll, A. (1976). *World drama.* London: Harrap & CO LTD.

Ousby, I. (1988). *The Cambridge guide to literature in English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. London: Hamlyn Publishing Group Limited.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., and Jefferson, G. (1974) *A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation.* Language, 50, 4 (696 - 735).

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., and Jefferson, G. (1978) *A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation.* Scheinkein, J. (ed) Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction. New York: Academic Press.

Sanders, A. (2000). *The short Oxford history of English literature.* Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schlueter, J. (1979). *Metafictional characters in modern drama*. New York: Colombia University Press.

Taylor, J. (1962). *Anger and after*. London: Methuen.

Taylor, J. (1969). *The angry theatre*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Taylor, J. (1980). *Look Back in Anger; A Case Book.* London: the Macmillan Press LTD.

Taylor, T. J. and Cameron, D. (1987). *Analysing Conversation. Rules and Units in the Structure of talk.* Oxford and New York: Pergaman Press.

Thomas, J, (1995). *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics.* London and New York: Longman.

Travers, M. (1998). *An introduction to modern European literature.* London: Macmillan Press LTD.

West, C. and Zimmerman, D.H. (1985) *"Gender, Language, and Discourse" in T.A.van Dijk* (ed) Handbook of Discourse Analysis 4, London: Academic Press.