

Navigating Face-Threatening Acts and Face-Saving Strategies in Henry Eden Phillpott's Drama: A Discourse Analysis and Pragmatic Approach

Ainee Munir¹, Sunaina Razzaq²

¹Department of English, The Superior University Lahore, Pakistan

²Department of English, Government College Women University, Sialkot, Pakistan

Abstract: This study investigates the use of face-threatening acts (FTAs) and face-saving strategies (FSS) in Henry Eden Phillpott's drama "Something to Talk About" using a qualitative approach. The primary research questions focus on identifying the most significant FTAs used in the drama and the measures characters employ to counter these acts with FSS. The analysis draws on live performances of linguistic strategies by characters in dialogues, examining their impact on story development and relationships. FTAs are defined as impositions on an individual's desire for autonomy and respect, creating tension in social interactions. FSS are plans to minimize the possibility of offense, aiming to maintain the listener's engagement or stop the offense. The rationale for choosing this topic lies in its relevance to Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics, providing a critical understanding of language use in literary production and its role in constructing power dynamics in society. The study's structure includes an introduction to the text, data analysis, and the theoretical frameworks of politeness theory and speech act theory. Findings highlight examples of FTAs and FSS and their impact on character behavior, offering insights into the role of language in shaping social relations. This study contributes to the fields of Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics, and Communication Theory by exploring the socio-linguistic functions and practices in literary works, enhancing our understanding of how social realities are constructed through language.

Keywords: face-threatening acts, face-saving strategies, discourse analysis, pragmatics, politeness theory, speech act theory, social interaction, power dynamics.

Email: ainee.munir001@gmail.com

1. Introduction

This study investigates the use of face-threatening acts (FTAs) and face-saving strategies (FSS) in Henry Eden Phillpott's drama "Something to Talk About." The primary research questions guiding

this study are: For that, it is important to first try and determine the most significant face-threatening acts that are used in the context of the drama. In turn what measures do the characters use to counter these acts of impositions as face-saving techniques? In this paper, the live performances of the linguistic strategies that all characters in dialogues employ as methods of influencing the treatment and development of the story and relationships between the characters are analyzed. FTAs are those acts that are impositions on an individual's want or need to project a certain image or desire autonomy and/or respect, thus creating a Possible FTA or tension in engaging in or responding to social interaction Brown and Levinson [1]. On the other hand, FSS is defined as plans employed in an attempt to minimize the possibility of offending with such acts to silence the speaker/ listener or make him/her continue listening or stop offending, respectively Goffman [2]. The rationale for choosing this topic relates to the fact that it fits Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics as the subfields of linguistics, and at the same time, it aims to equip the reader with a critical understanding of language use in the literary production and how its multiple fold aspects pertain to the construction of power dynamics in society.

As such, the structure of this study is designed to provide an appropriate analysis of the FTAs and FSS used and employed in the drama. To begin with, the following paper provides an introduction to the text and a discussion of the data analysis process which uses the following data. Concerning the methodological part of the given work, it also discusses and presents the outline of the theoretical frameworks introduced, namely politeness theory and speech act theory. The findings section brings out even more clarification in detailing the samples of the drama, examples of FTAs and FSS, and the Impact analysis for the FTAs and FSS on character social behaviors. Finally, concluding, the point is made to highlight and delve into the outline of conclusions for subsequent research, noting that the study of attitudes toward language and text in a literary contingent is useful for understanding the linguistic competencies a reader uses when evaluating a piece of literature. Thus, this study seeks to do the following through analysis of selected dialogues from the movie "Something to Talk About": The sequence of the textual flow FTAs and FSS calls for an understanding of how both FTAs and FSS can aid in the advancement of the plot of the movie and how the intricate relationship between characters enhances or proceeds the plot. The politeness theory proposed by Brown and Levinson [1] of speech acts allows for a more rigid perspective in analyzing the per-formative function of words in a drama along with the speech Act theory put forward by Austin [3]. and Searle The potentials are anticipated to reveal how the FTAs and the

FSS relate with each other and contribute towards the story part by providing more perspectives which would result in a richer understanding of social relations depicted in the text.

2. Data and Background

This study has employed a qualitative analysis method to analyze the FTAs and FSS in the selected play. The nature of presentation in the play thus appeals to the heart where one can comprehend and feel with different characters, the idea being in the extremities of something unusual between two characters; a mother and her daughter as seen in “Something to Talk About.” by Henry Eden Phillpott. Therefore, the plot revolves around the interaction between the inhabitants of a village, and essential social tensions, which are the basis of the events described, remain completely hidden behind the primary plot line. Moreover and to a great extent I suppose this realistic context presents Face threatening acts (FTA) and Face-saving strategies (FSS) as the characters struggle to deal with the interpersonal surroundings either politely or impolitely. The most important kind of data relied on in accomplishing this study is dialogues from the drama chosen for analysis. Due to the nature of the investigation, these dialogues were specifically chosen to provide the study with clear and firsthand examples of FTAs and FSS to examine how the characters use language with faces and how they deal with social interaction. These extracts can be categorized under exposition and confrontation, reconciliation and intimacy, and products and negotiations, and therefore give a good synthesis of the discursive strategies employed in the series by the characters.

3. Literature Review and Analytical Framework

This study aims to look at the impact of politeness theory and speech act theory regarding the use of language in novels as well as get to know the way characters in novels use language in their interpersonal relationships. The notion that utterances perform actions is largely demonstrated by Austin [3] as a speech act in his book “How to do things with Words”. The three main discoveries are the difference between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, which serve as a ground for the analysis of language as used. Essentially, this theory is vital for the interpretation of speech acts within the play of Henry Eden Phillpott [4]; more specifically, about how the words spoken by characters in the play influence their communication with others in society. According to Bax [5] in *Discourse and Genre*, the focus is on the interconnection between discourse and

genre since genres are social constructs that help define social practice as well as being defined by it. Essentially, the main findings underscore the role of the genre along the lines of the organization of the discourse as well as of the strategies of communication. It helps to classify the drama's conversations and discourse in literary communication to further explore the significance of face-threatening acts and face-saving strategies.

The article, "The Language of News Media" by Bell [6], provides textual analysis to review the social construction and language used by news media. In the study, the aspect of language is used in proposing and arguing the understanding of constructing reality. Despite it being pegged on news media Bell has captured social features relative to language construction and power relations that would be useful in dissecting the characters' reciprocal relations and power struggles in Phillipott's drama. Bousfield and Locher's [7] work, "Impoliteness in Language: In the paper, "Impoliteness: A Corpus-based Analysis of its Features and its Interplay with Power in Conversation: "Empirical and Theoretical Approaches", the work provides evidence of impoliteness and discusses its correlation with power in communication. They mentioned that impolite utterances can be used to create a balance of power in the interactions. They employ impoliteness in the drama in different ways and this framework helps analyze the different ways the characters use it during power dynamics. Brown and Levinson [1] in "Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage" Ernst episodes and extends the theory of politeness, which is related to the strategies concerning face management in particular communication. They define the aspect of intimacy and identify positive and negative faces and ways of preserving them. This model is the one adopted while analyzing the FTAs and FSS in the drama and it is going to offer the theoretical framework which shall be used to understand the perceptions of the characters. The 'Language and Mind' published by Chomsky [8] seeks to explain the position of language as well as its connection to the human mind. He debates the nature of language focusing on its cognitive functions and production capabilities and he affirmatively identifies language as a component of human cognition and creativity. Despite it being more general, the existence of an application that relates to the understanding of language structure and use proposed by Chomsky supplements the general linguistic background of the research.

In the first paper by Cook, the topic of "Discourse" is discussed and the paper gives an overview of discourse analysis as a branch of linguistics that deals with languages in use. He stresses that the study of discourse-FTA/FSS-context tends to be given increased primacy, which is highly

applicable in analyzing character dialogues in drama. An article by Culpeper [9] examines the interactional concept of impoliteness by defining and categorizing it under dimensions. From this perspective, he defines specific categories of impolite behaviors and respects different roles and functions of impoliteness in interaction. Therefore, understanding the principles of the drama genre, including the use of impoliteness strategies, enables characterizing the relationships opened by the characters and the goals they pursue. In "Language and Power" Fairclough [10], dwells on the topic of Language as well as the role that it plays in power relations. He contends that language is a primary way in which power is asserted and fought against. This critical framework works well for the character development by showcasing how persons within the drama employ language to exercise and/or subjugate power within society. "Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language" Publication Date 1995 aims to expose CDA as a means of analyzing language in terms of ideology and power. Critical language analysis is supported by the author, which responds to the power relationships that are seen behind the spoken words of drama characters.

Fairclough [11] in *Analyzing Discourse: "Textual Analysis for Social Research"* is a useful text that engages the analysis of discourse given a social research approach. He provides guidelines on how to functionally approach texts to decode social meanings and domination system, thus, embracing the method to analyze dialogues of the drama to find out FTAs and FSS. Goffman in *Ritual Interaction*, M. Hofstede, M. Essays on Face-to-face behavior; with power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and a polarization between well-ordering and self-reference. He sets the work face as an element in presenting the drama, which identifies the face-threatening and face-saving actions to be proven in a scene. In the 'Pragmatics' by Levinson [12], pragmatics studies instantaneous and contextual usage of language that inspires communication. He looks at the various linguistic devices within the framework of speech acts, implicature, and politeness to establish the theoretical underpinnings for assessing the pragmatic dimensions of FTAs and FSS in drama. Each of the villains in Phillipott's drama, for instance, "Something to Talk About," deals with the gossip and interpersonal issues within a society. The FTAs and FSS revealed in the narrative contribute to the episodes' textual parody and offer valuable data for analysis of the uses of language in creating social relations and structuring power. Finally, Searle in "Speech Acts: Extends the theory of speech act, which is based on the work done by Austin in his book *"How To Do Things With Words"*. He distinguishes between various categories of speech acts, within the context of the purpose and role of the performative in the drama and identifies FTAs and FSS, as possible means

of analyzing character dialogues. According to the above literature review, it, therefore, becomes evident that impoliteness cannot just be seen as social ineptitude but rather as a tactical approach that characters employ to gain certain social aims. This lens can come in handy when assessing the clash of the wills in Phillipott's play as subordinates and superiors play the 'power game' using words to assert or protect their superior position.

The analysis of Henry Eden Phillipott's drama "*Something to Talk About.*" is grounded in discourse analysis and pragmatics, with a specific focus on two key theoretical frameworks: Politeness Theory is closely connected with Lakoff whose topics kind of research focuses on politeness in language. The Speech Act Theory, on the other hand, can be described as a work of Austin. These frameworks provide the necessary support viewing the linguistic processes utilized by characters in dynamics of interaction, particularly FTA and FSS.

3.1 Politeness Theory

Brown and Levinson presented the Politeness Theory in the year 1987 and it is indeed one of the primary paradigms that can be utilized for understanding interpersonal communication. This theory claims that politeness is an efficient and inherent quality of interactions that helps subjects in maintaining interpersonal balance. The core concepts of Politeness Theory revolve around the notions of 'face,' which is divided into two categories: First of all, positive face is the first aspect of face: positive face and negative face. Positive face faces a situation that wants your fellow humans to like you, like someone you know, or approve an action that you have taken or are taking, while negative face simply does not want any interference with your own life. Brown and Levinson [1] when discussing FTAs raise the status of such strategies based on the degree of threat to face. These strategies include: Bald on-record: Interpreted as vulgar or crude, harsh words that are used when the speaker is hierarchically superior to the listener or during a crisis where it is prohibited or impossible to use polite language. Positive politeness: Preventative gestures that help alleviate any possibly adverse consequences in the presence of the listener which may include complimenting the recipient or giving him/her a sign of understanding. Negative politeness: Imptatives that are used to address the perceived threat to the negative face of the listener such as when he/she has to be apologized to or when making a request is gently made. Off-record: Avoidance strategies that the speaker adopts in an attempt not to directly interfere with those being addressed but, in implication, express a desire or impulse in another way.

If approaching the analysis of the film “Something to Talk About,” Politeness Theory can also be used as the key to understanding how characters manage faces during the interaction. For instance, when a given character opens his/her mouth to accuse another person, this is an example of a bald on-record face-threatening act, as a hearsay attack will be regarded as an attack on the positive face of the listener. When responding to an action that may be deemed as bringing out an accusation on the other person or even infringing on his/her positive face, normally accompanied by positive politeness for instance offering a compliment on the other person, then the possible way to look at the action is in an attempt of the character to downward-six face threat.

3.2 Speech Act Theory

Austin divides certain types of intentionality that define other forms of illocutionary acts, which supply other visions on the use of language and its performativity Speech Act Theory, Austin 1962; Searle 1969. In Speech Act theory, the role and purpose of language is not that of information transmission and exchange but also an action being performed? Speech acts can be classified into several categories, each serving a different function in communication: This theory divides speech acts into several types, each of which can play a specific role in the process of communication:

Declarations: Mobilian constantly and primarily that directly etches the change in the reality external to that specific Mobilian (as an example, “I baptise you both husband and wife”).

Commissives: The rather mild type of presumable obligation which lies in the fact that the speaker will be ready to perform a certain action later on (This is the group which contains such m に も types of turn as promises, threats, and the like.).

Directives: Telephones that directly state the speaker’s intention to encourage some action on the part of the listener, for example, requests, or commands.

Expressive: For instance, when saying ‘Sorry’, ‘Congratulations’, ‘I affirm’ or any statement that hints at the psychological state of the speaker.

Representatives: The speaker’s attitude, paralinguistic features, and nervousness and/or agitation, whether because of the child’s condition or because of a family history that is unknown to the audience (laughs, sighs, broken words, and pauses).

The strand that would be most useful for analysis of “Something to Talk About.” is the first one: It needs not only the accurate definition and analysis of the utilized real speech acts used by the

characters. For instance, when a character uses a command which instructs the second person to do something, which violates his or her Negative Face wanting, FTA. Similarly, an apology can also be viewed as an FSS since it is an effort in an attempt to walk back the erosion of face to restore civic order.

3.3 Integrating Politeness Theory and Speech Act Theory

According to the established tenets of this analysis from both the Politeness Theory and Speech Act Theory, the deficiencies in face management encompassing FTAs and FSS shall be evaluated in detail in the following manner: To understand the politeness theory, the text under analysis can be descriptively and systematically classified into the severity of FTAs since the theory seeks to address the question of how well face needs are met as well as the provisions. For example, the strategy is best understood by analyzing a scene where a character accosts another by pointing at him/her as fake/ a liar (a representative act). This is likely to breach the positive face of the accused. The accused character's response may be discussed in how it responds to the Finger + Sticker, and while the Finger + Sticker concerns the consideration 'it will be more', the accused character's response concerns a commissive act 'I will tell more'. It means, there is a chance to engage in analyzing linguistic processes which the characters use to communicate and negotiate as well as to explore the concept of power drama to a certain extent.

3.4 Application to "Something to Talk About."

In the same way that this study applies these theories to the interpretation of "Something to Talk About," it aims to show the multiple masculinities of the characters brought about by the employment of FTAs and FSS in getting through their interactions. When it comes to feature analysis of the dialogues, the focus will be given to the positive politeness aspect, and practical identification of potential FTAs and FSS as to whether these behaviors aid in establishing the plot and the characters' relational network.

For instance, a spectacle of the dramatic action would be an altercation and a clash of two parts where one character uses foul language and accuses the other of being a Hypocrite. This is an AFT because the speaker accuses the other character of an action following the format of 'You + Verb + negative noun'. It is also a violation of the subject's positive face. The probability of self-defense to follow the accusation makes it an FSS, as it reflects the intention to mitigate the impact

of the statement and restore the damaged self-image. They assist in analyzing the conflict crisis across the play as nonverbal verbal communication patterns demonstrate how the character proceeds through the interpersonal conflict resolution process. Understanding these interactions will help to elucidate more intricacies of the purpose and practice of FTAs and FSS about the literary text and how particular linguistic phenomena may interfere with the process of narrative construction and characterization in specific. Thus, this approach helps not only toward getting a better vantage point to speak about “Something to Talk About. ” but also to elucidate in the subsequent chapters the current theories of discourse analysis and pragmatics concerning the way the social reality is linguistically built.

As for the objective of this study, two parts are, investigating two theories: politeness theory and speech act theory concerning the use of language in novels and finding out how characters in novels employ language in their interpersonal relationships. For instance, in Culpeper’s work written in 1996, the author shares with readers his view on impoliteness as opposed to Brown and Levinson who are mostly focused on the issue of politeness. By using the theory of Culpeper we understand how characters manipulatively employ impoliteness to keep the power over the other, or to trigger an emotive reaction which is rather crucial for something to Talk About by the end of the confrontation. Following the information stated earlier, Bousfield and Locher [7] further explain how impoliteness and power are intertwined in the focus text and that linguistic aggression is indeed useful for managing interpersonal interactions. Based on their study, it is thus clear that impoliteness cannot be viewed simply as people’s unfavorable interpersonal skills but as a strategic phenomenon in which characters actively use, in the mouths of other characters, with a certain goal in mind as a social goal. This lens may be useful for describing the collisions we discussed while reading Phillipott’s play where subordinates and superiors engage in the ‘power struggle’, with their words, trying to dominate or shield themselves from someone who is considered to be their superior.

4. Findings and Discussion

The following part of the thesis defines the FTAs and FSS in the context of the examined play by Henry Eden Phillipott - Something to Talk About. The specific examples of FTAs and FSS are examined thoroughly and, by comparing these examples with concrete real-life situations, the reader is introduced to how the characters follow or violate these rules when using language to

propose FTAs, assume Contact and consequences, or use language to repair face and/or escalate face threat. Indeed, such interactions in the drama allow viewers to learn about other sociopolitical structures and power dynamics between individual characters and collectives.

4.1 Analysis by Character Interaction

Interaction 1: This is a story of John and Mary's conflict scenario at work.

4.2 Dialogue Example

John: 'Tis beaten out of all reasonable doubt why you must always make it difficult. (Act I, Scene II)

Mary: Comparison between people and their priorities can be made as the patient stated, "Hey, I am not difficult, I simply use different standards."

FTA Analysis: John's question: "How can you let them go?" is an example of the FTA category that is on record and by its bald type, it confronts Mary and also infringes on her negative face. John treats Mary as if she is a troublemaker when he says 'what do you think you are doing?' when referring to her as 'difficult,' and therefore, he makes it his business to let her know that she is wrong to do so Brown and Levinson, [1].

FSS Analysis: As demonstrated by the following excerpt, denial, and justification are present in the task-related response by Mary when she was referred to as FSS. Relying on the concept of Face Healing Theory, this statement can be seen as an operation in which the negative face was avoided as she says 'I am not difficult,' while negating the negative label given to her. Also, when she says 'I just have different priorities,' she provides an excuse which is also said more as an apology; it seeks to lower the face threat since these excuses look for a way to explain an individual's misdeeds as reasonable and thus a justified action Brown & Levinson [1].

Discussion: In this particular interaction, ie the communication breakdown between John and Mary, we can identify aggression, in the form of an FTA by John to assert dominance and deny Mary her way while her FSS is a mechanism used to maintain self-images and self-assertiveness. In conclusion, through using a bald on-record FTA, John has no respect for the traditional norms of politeness, although it can show that he is becoming frustrated and impatient enough to ignore these norms. This is further exemplified as Mary engages in the FSS and as she appears to try to aim at creating some form of harmony despite her determination to stand up for herself.

Interaction 2: This is a historical conflict between two characters namely Alice and Robert where Alice denies having an affair with Robert while Robert seems to be insisting that he and Alice used to have an affair.

4.3 Dialogue Example

Alice: Joy's fiery temper quickly escalates throughout the act, and Meg makes a commonrudeness that can be heard in many families: "You're just like your father!"

Robert: 'I see,' he answered smiling at her, 'I guess that's a compliment. '

FTA Analysis: Alice's reply is performative since it conventionally entails an FTA because it violates Robert's identity by tagging him with an unpleasant resemblance to his father. This comparison also second, negatively impinges on the positive face of Robert by indicating that he has opted to take the negative facet or perform a negative action, Brown and Levinson [1].

FSS Analysis: It is important to note that in response to the requestive utterance "I take that as a compliment", the angry response by Linda, "That's right you arrogant prick!", is classified for FTA. In so doing, he avoids direct competition while at the same time, pulling a Goffman's classic typecast of shifting a negative comparison into a positive one.

Discussion: These details show that at construction sites, FSS is not as easy when regarding the way it helps reduce the threat that faces the construction workers. The practice of using an off-record strategy in a polite response to Alice's scolding does not make Robert have a negative face and face loss if he accepts her scolding as unfounded but equally preserves the right to scold Alice as unworthy. This is useful not only in cushioning the shocks of the backlash of the FTA but it's also exploited to suggest the changes in the power balance established, thereby portraying Robert as a strong and confident character. This means that, although there is the use of parody and reinterpretation in the FSS, such patterns illustrate different techniques of face-work, as seen in the drama.

Interaction 3: Conflict: Sarah accused David of being lazy and unproductive since he has been job hopping for the past few years while still living with his parents yet he wants to move in with their child and have her support him financially.

4.4 Dialogue Example

Sarah: He says to her "You never listen to me." to make her respond to him and listen to his advice

about her relationship.

David: “I’m sorry if it makes it seem that you don’t have my full attention. I will strive to do better.”

FTA Analysis: Again, Sarah’s protestation is a verification that aims to FTA by accusing David of negligence, and disrespect in regards to her. This statement violates the Positive Face since P offered the benefits of friendship by wishing to jointly know what Sarah thinks or says about the matter.

FSS Analysis: These words consist of an apology and a promise, which are part of the FSS that is formed from universal words. “I didn’t know that it was bothering you.” which reveals that he considers her point of view and apologizes if she got the impression that she is being used, hence the Restore aspect. Moreover and to a greater extent, by not looking at Sarah and uttering “To try to be more attentive next time,” capacities a full face threat potential since he guarantees not to re-report her complaint.

Discussion: The consequences of this interaction are manifested through such elements as apologies and a pledge to act taken by FSS to offset the incidents of FTAs. In the last response of the conversation, Earl demonstrated a willingness to take responsibility for the misconduct and even apologized to restore order in a human-read society thereby preserving the relationship. The results connected to both sorts of negative faces – apologies that are not apologies and promises, therefore stress the importance of empathy and ‘commitment to an offerees’ negative face’.

The analysis based on the type of FTA reveals that Venice File has received the worst response and seems to be in deep trouble due to the shocks from unexpected FTA by Sam.

Direct FTAs and Responses

4.5 Dialogue Example

Paul: On page 83 of the play, one of the overbearing characters hollered “You’re completely incompetent!”

Lisa: “Doing this job, I often have a lot of pressure from my supervisors.”

FTA Analysis: From the perspective of rude depictions, absolutely free of FCC, the reported speech that is Paul’s intervention is an explicit FTA that not only challenges Lisa negatively but violates her positive face as well. This is pure LSEAIIVY and contains no hedges and it is apparent that Paul is frustrated or angry with the neovainqueois.

FSS Analysis: It is important to note that Lisa's response falls under the explanation-introductory category in FSS and external attribution. When saying 'I have been working under a lot of pressure Recently' she makes the implication thus lowering the face threat since anyone can lack ability as long as they have been faced with some circumstances Goffman [2].

Discussion: Reviewing the information in this particular example, one can figure out how it is suitable to use contextual explanations to address proper FTAs, and in this case, the problems that arise with their help can be minimized considerably. Rather, by externalizing her performance to pressure to bring down her grades, she maintains her self-image as a positive-faced person. This maneuver is dual-fold as it helps not only in demoting the actual face threat of the situation but also in appealing to Paul's conscience, therefore, reducing friction.

Indirect FTAs and Responses

4.6 Dialogue Example

Jane: This quote, I suppose, could be spoken by Tom since he seems to be the only one who cares about deadlines among the characters in the play.

Tom: "If you're talking about me, I didn't quite follow you... I'll be sure to attend the next one."

FTA Analysis: Jane is still using reveals an off-record FTA and though she does not say anything explicitly unfair to a person (presumably Tom), she irritates him for being unpunctual. This roundabout way for Jane to say the problem can help her release some pressure without directly fighting against Tom, yet also allows her to retain her polite demeanor, making it suitable for eliciting in Brown and Levinson's [1].

FSS Analysis: Tom's an example of a face-threatening act "If you're thinking of me I am sorry I will make sure I am present for the next one." The reason this message is a face-threatening act is because Tom admits to the implication that he shouldn't be thought of by her pleasant company, but he promises to be there for the next occasion. Tom answers by agreeing with their self-views and admitting that he has been wrong and intends to improve his attitude and this makes him get his positive face back Goffman [2] & Levinson.

Discussion: This example proves that the indirect FTAs can be governed through the direct FSS, which are described within the scope of the given field of interaction. Tom pays attention to an indirect insult made by Leonard, and that Tom is willing to discuss it helps prevent the escalation of conflict this time and maintain good relations between them and other people. This paper

exemplifies the function of face management and interpersonal communication by presenting the mechanism of using forceless threats, the use of indirect aggression, and its consequent direct attack by the authors.

Analysis by Scene Context Tension-filled Confrontations

4.7 Dialogue Example

Emily: “O yes, you knew right from the start Were all a set of liars? I can’t believe you lied to me. ”
(Act 5, Scene 1)

Mark: The argument that is quite common among women is best summed up by the following statement: “I didn’t tell a lie: I only kept some facts from you. FTA Analysis: Emily’s verbal attack breaches the social rule regarding face-to-face communication in a way that is offensive to Mark; He is accused of not taking care of his mother. Based on the theories largely expounded by Brown and Levinson on the social face, the word 'lied' can best be categorized as a face-threatening activity since it involves deceit.

FSS Analysis: To sum up, it can be pointed out that Mark’s response is the most suitable for the description of partial denial with justification. Good customer relation: In his attempt at minimizing the face threat posed by telling the truth where he said, “I never lied to you, I just left out some details,” this social reaction accepts the possibility of an omission but does not accept the act of telling a lie hence does not afford the man’s negative face when he tells the truth but his positive face when he says, “I never lied to you. Discussion: To support these severe damages to FTAs with FSS, this present instance attempted a partial denial and justification. Mark subsumes the conflicts in the control to disregard the content of the next accusation on Emily by altering the nature of the actions. In this way, he can maintain his image and would most likely proceed to the next level in the form of a discussion to ascertain what needs to be done.

Reconciliatory Dialogues

4.8 Dialogue Example

Laura: In the last scene of the play, Lady Macbeth had a breakdown: “Out, damned spot! Out, I say! One, two. Why, then, ’tis time to don’t. Hell’s black intelligencer ‘I’m sorry for what I said earlier. It was uncalled for. ”

James: “That is fine I do know that, everyone has their bad day you know”.

FTA Analysis: If we look at the text, there is awareness of the fact that an apology is a commissure act and, consequently, an FSS whenever it answers an FTA committed - in this case - by the same speaker, that is, Laura. Hence, she believes, commits, and intends to say sorry – for in doing so she becomes aware that the face threat has been issued and can provide the obligatory regret as per Searle [13].

FSS Analysis: Reviewing the Field Interaction list it is possible to conclude that the strategy James used can be attributed to the off-record strategy of MDA that implicates the usage of empathy and acceptance. He not only accepted the apology but also laughed off the implication of the face threat thus making the apology more effective when he says “it’s okay I understand we all do have those days.”

Discussion: It is for this reason that this exchange supports much about FSS, beginning with one’s capacity to take individuals as they come. It is not the female spokesman who answers but James who not only minimizes the face threat but also opens a way for its approval of the possibility of reconciliation and restoring sane communication. That is why empathy as one of the fundamental social skills improves good face-work ability as a means of strengthening identity and social relations illustrates the advantage of feeling.

5. Implications and Conclusion

In sum, the determination and assessment of FTAs and FSS in Henry Eden Phillpott’s drama *“Something to Talk About.”* has deep significance for improved understanding of interdisciplinary and perceptive signs in literary works. Detailed character studies are useful in depicting how language functions in influencing one’s self-preservation and in portraying dominance and authority along with face and order in interpersonal communication.

Realizing that there is a need to do so, this study further exposed that Brown and Levinson’s Politeness Theory together with Austin’s [3] and Searle’s [13] Speech Act Framework is an effective avenue for analyzing and comprehending the diversities of FTAs and FSSs. This is where the characters use language ability with features of denial, justification, apology, and empathy being reflected in dealing with conflict and all is in a bid to uphold the self-image. These are important ways of minimizing the face threats and enhancing the positive face, that is, the importance of being polite in a society or showing respect to other people is crucial to maintaining harmonious relationships in a society. This research has also validated the hypothesis that context

plays a cumulative and robust role in the utilization of FTAs and FSS. Risk and its outcomes for characters are filled with interactions specific to the facet of threats these situations and other characteristics of characters' interactions depending on the power status and the type of characters' relationships. For instance, how Tom and Jane argued, and Tom applying direct aggression and Jane employing indirect aggression, though both employed context dependency strategies is perhaps the best representation of face and issues. The concern of the study can be linked to disciplines other than literary criticism and such disciplines include; Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics, and Communication Theory. I do believe that is helpful to have a repertoire of how people employ language to manage face, as this information, in some form, can be useful and applied to a variety of fields such as therapy, conflict management, leadership, and effective communication. Such knowledge of individuals will enhance the humane treatment of people and everyone in various social procure and different professions.

In analyzing the specific FTAs and FSS that are featured in 'Something to Talk About', the proposed approach would be to look at how the various characters in the movie manage language and how they make efforts to navigate through social relations with respect for face or the recognition of it. Through a breakdown of such examples as fight scenes, accusations, and the resolution, this theoretical paper succeeds in illustrating how language cannot be underestimated when it comes to managing the story and characters' communication. This paper establishes how simple use of FSS including denial, justification, apology, and promise, and especially recourse to empathy is used to handle face threats while upholding order in societies. These are important in conflict resolution as well as for character development where characters assert themselves and here, to form a healthy radio rapport. Socio-Cultural Perspective of Language of the Study Employing Politeness Theory suggested by Brown & Levinson [1] and Speech Act Theory by Austin [3] Searle as cited [13] enables the author to bring forward the socio-linguistic functions and practices into closer alignment with the theoretical conceptualizations. Since the present study focuses on the strategies that exist in literary works, it straightens the gap and contributes to the existing body of knowledge in the field of cross-discourse analysis and pragmatics. This is useful in drawing the concentration of the topic to how people construct social realities through language and in addition to such reality in the communicative processes. Future work could proceed with this work and take this study to a higher level by examining other genres of films, or by comparing the FTAs and the FSS in other cultural narratives. Consequently, the decomposition of FTAs and

FSS of 'Something to Talk About.' has expanded the author's path toward the understanding of the given social relationships depicted by characters, particularly concerning face-related matters. It has implications for enabling insights on how to improve communication skills and address the timely promotion of empathic competence of individuals in various contexts and based thereupon, cultivate better quality interpersonal and intergroup relations.

References

References

- [1]. Brown, P., Levinson, S.C. *Politeness: Some Universal in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1987).
- [2]. Goffman, E. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, (1967).
- [3]. Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, (1962).
- [4]. Phillipott, H.E. *Something to Talk About*. Publisher, (1900).
- [5]. Bax, S. *Discourse and Genre*. New York: Palgrave, (2011).
- [6]. Bell, A. *The Language of News Media*. Blackwell, (1991).
- [7]. Bousfield, D., Locher, M. A. *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Inter play with Power in Theory and Practice*. Mout on de Gruyter, (2008).
- [8]. Chomsky, N. *Language and Mind*, Third Edition. Cambridge: CUP, (2006).
- [9]. Culpeper, J. "Towards an anatomy of impoliteness." *Journal of Pragmatics*, **25(3)**, 349-367, (1996).
- [10]. Fairclough, N. *Language and Power*. London: Longman, (1989 and 2001).
- [11]. Fairclough, N. *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge, (2003).
- [12]. Levinson, S. C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1983).
- [13]. Searle, J. R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1969).