

**AN ANALYSIS OF POSITIVE POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN
“A MAN CALLED OTTO” FILM**

THESIS

Submitted by:

LINDA AMALIA

Student ID: 220203047

Student of English Language Education
Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Ar-Raniry State Islamic University
Banda Aceh



**FACULTY OF TARBIYAH AND TEACHER TRAINING
AR-RANIRY STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY
BANDA ACEH**

2026

**AN ANALYSIS OF POSITIVE POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN A MAN
CALLED OTTO**

THESIS

Has been Approved and Submitted to the Thesis Munaqasyah Defense as
One of The Requirements to Obtain a Bachelor's Degree in the Field of
Education in English Language Teaching

By:

LINDA AMALIA

220203047

Student of English Language Education Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training
Ar-Raniry State Islamic University Banda Aceh

Approved By:

Supervisor

Head of Department



Dr. Risdaneva, MA.

NIP.198310292015032003



Syarifah Dahliana, M.Ag., M.Ed., Ph.D

NIP. 197504162000032001

It has been defended in *Sidang Munaqasyah* in front of the board of the Examination for the working paper and has been accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Bachelor of Education in English Language Teaching.

On:

Wednesday

August, 19th 2026 M
6 Rabi'ul-Awwal 1447 H

Board of Examiners,

Chairperson



Dr. Risdaneva, MA.
NIP. 198310292015032003

Secretary



Rizki Rinaldi, S. S., M.Hum.
NIP. 198806182025211003

Examiner 1



Rahmi Fhonna, MA
NIP. 198211132015032004

Examiner 2



Fera Busfina Zalha, MA.
NIP. 198902272018012001

Certified by:

The Dean of Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan
Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh



Prof. Saifuddin Muluk, Ag., M.A., M. Ed., Ph.D

NIP. 197301021997031003

STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY OF SCIENTIFIC THESIS

I, the undersigned below:

Name : Linda Amalia
Student ID : 220203047
Study Program : English Education Department
Faculty : Tarbiyah and Teacher Training
Thesis Title : An Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies in *A Man Called Otto*

Hereby declare that in writing this thesis, I:

1. Did not use the ideas of others without being able to develop and be accountable for them;
2. Did not plagiarize the work of others;
3. Did not use others' works without proper citation or permissions;
4. Did not manipulate or falsify data;
5. Completed this work independently and am fully responsible for it.

If at any point in the future, a party raises a legitimate concern and proves that I have violated this declaration, I am willing to accept the sanctions in accordance with the prevailing regulations of the Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, Ar-Raniry State Islamic University Banda Aceh.

This statement is made truthfully and without coercion from any party.

Banda Aceh, August 05, 2026
Declarant,




Linda Amalia
220203047

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Bismillahirrahmanirrahim. First, the researcher expresses the highest gratitude to Allah SWT for His blessings, mercy, guidance, and strength throughout the process of completing this thesis. Through His help, the researcher was able to face the difficulties that arose during the research and writing process and complete this study. Peace and blessings be upon Prophet Muhammad SAW, who guided humanity toward knowledge and the right path.

The researcher would like to express sincere gratitude to Dr. Risdaneva, MA., the thesis supervisor, for the guidance, patience, time, and valuable suggestions provided during the completion of this thesis. The supervisor's comments, corrections, and explanations helped the researcher understand what needed improvement and develop each chapter more carefully. The support and direction given throughout the consultation process were very meaningful in completing this study.

The researcher also expresses deepest gratitude to their beloved parents and family for their endless prayers, love, care, patience, and support. Their encouragement gave the researcher strength during difficult moments and helped the researcher remain motivated throughout the study. Their sacrifices, understanding, and trust have played an important part in the completion of this thesis.

The researcher would also like to thank the researcher's friends for their support and companionship throughout the years of study. Their encouragement, assistance, willingness to listen, and shared experiences made the research and writing process more manageable. The researcher truly appreciates every discussion, suggestion, and form of support throughout this journey.

Sincere appreciation is also extended to all lecturers, academic staff, and other people who contributed to the completion of this thesis, either directly or indirectly. Although not everyone can be mentioned individually, every prayer, suggestion, encouragement, and form of assistance has been valuable and is sincerely appreciated.

Finally, the researcher realizes that this thesis still has limitations and may need further improvement. Therefore, constructive criticism and suggestions are welcome to improve this study. The researcher hopes that this thesis will be useful to readers and provide additional insight into pragmatics, particularly the use of positive politeness strategies in film dialogue.

Banda Aceh, August 3, 2026

Linda Amalia



ABSTRACT

Name : Linda Amalia
Student ID : 220203047
Faculty : Tarbiyah and Teacher Training
Department : English Language Education
Title : An Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies in “A Man Called Otto” Film
Supervisor : Dr. Risdaneva, MA.
Keywords : Positive politeness strategies, pragmatics, film dialogue, relationship development, *A Man Called Otto*.

This research examines the positive politeness strategies used by Marisol and Otto in *A Man Called Otto* (2022). It aims to identify the types of positive politeness strategies in their interactions and analyze how these strategies function as their communication changes. This research employed a qualitative design using directed qualitative content analysis. The data were taken from the utterances exchanged between Marisol and Otto in the film transcript, while the film was used to verify the dialogue and provide contextual information. The analysis used Brown and Levinson's (1987) fifteen positive politeness strategies. The analysis identified 33 utterances containing positive politeness strategies, which were classified into 12 strategies. The most frequently used strategy was Give Gifts to the Hearer with seven occurrences (21.21%), followed by Give (or Ask for) Reasons with five occurrences (15.15%) and Notice, Attend to the Hearer with four occurrences (12.12%). Marisol produced more positive politeness strategies than Otto, mainly in initiating communication, showing attention, and expressing concern. The findings show that positive politeness strategies appeared in different contexts of their interactions, including initial communication, cooperation, personal conversations, and mutual support. The study concludes that positive politeness strategies should be understood by considering the context of interaction and the relationship between speakers. This research also highlights film dialogue as a source for understanding politeness strategies in pragmatic studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF APPENDICES	vii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background of the Study.....	1
B. Research Questions.....	5
C. Research Aims	5
D. Significance of the Study	5
E. Terminology.....	6
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
A. Pragmatics.....	7
B. Politeness Theory.....	8
C. Film and Pragmatic Analysis	16
D. Previous Studies.....	17
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	20
A. Research Design.....	20
B. Sources of Data	21
C. Data Extraction Procedures.....	22
D. Data Analysis Procedures	23
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	25
A. Findings.....	25
B. Discussion	46
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	50
A. Conclusion	50
B. Recommendation	52
REFERENCES.....	54
APPENDICES	
AUTOBIOGRAPHY	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4. 1 Types and Frequencies of Positive Politeness Strategies Employed by Marisol and Otto.....	26
Table 4. 2 Distribution of Positive Politeness Strategies Employed by Each Character ..	27



LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Film Transcript Of “A Man Called Otto” Film.....	56
Appendix 2: Thesis Approval Letter.....	61



CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, research questions, research aims, significance of the study, and key terminology.

A. Background of the Study

Language plays an important role in social interaction. It is used not only to exchange information, but also to express ideas, feelings, attitudes, and responses toward other people. Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015) describe language as a social system that enables members of a community to communicate with one another. Therefore, the way people use language may also reflect how they respond to others and how they manage their relationships during communication.

The meaning of an utterance cannot always be understood only from the literal meaning of the words. Its interpretation may also depend on who produces the utterance, to whom it is addressed, the situation in which it occurs, and what the speaker intends to communicate. These aspects are studied in pragmatics. Yule (2010) explains that pragmatics is concerned with speaker meaning, including meanings that are not always stated directly. Similarly, Birner (2013) describes pragmatics as the study of language use in context and emphasizes the role of context and speaker intention in understanding meaning. Pragmatic analysis therefore considers both what speakers say and what they intend their hearers to understand.

One aspect of language use discussed in pragmatics is politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain politeness through the concept of face, which refers to the public self-image that people want to maintain during interaction. Face includes the desire to be accepted and appreciated by others, as well as the desire to act without unnecessary imposition. Some utterances, such as requests, disagreements, criticism, or complaints, may affect these wants. Speakers may

therefore use politeness strategies to reduce possible threats to face and to show consideration toward the person they are speaking to.

Politeness is also related to the way people maintain social relationships through language. Holmes (2013) explains that politeness contributes to harmonious social relations and can help reduce possible conflict between participants. For this reason, politeness is not simply a matter of using expressions such as “please” or “thank you.” It also involves choosing language that is appropriate to the situation and to the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. The way people speak may change depending on how familiar they are with one another, what they want to communicate, and how they expect the other person to respond.

Among the politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), positive politeness is directed toward the hearer’s positive face. Positive face refers to a person’s desire to be accepted, appreciated, understood, and connected with others. Positive politeness may be expressed by showing interest in the hearer, seeking agreement, offering help, giving reasons, using humor, or showing sympathy and cooperation. Yule (2010) also explains that positive face is related to the need to belong and to be recognized as part of a group. In this way, positive politeness can show involvement, attention, and a sense of connection between participants.

Holmes (2013) describes positive politeness as solidarity-oriented because it can emphasize shared attitudes and familiarity between participants. Birner (2013) also explains that the way speakers formulate their utterances may reflect assumptions about their relationship with the hearer. This orientation is relevant to the present study because the relationship between the characters under investigation does not remain the same throughout the story. Examining positive politeness makes it possible to consider not only the type of strategy used, but also how it functions in communication as the changing patterns of interaction between the speakers.

Politeness strategies can also be examined through film dialogue. Although film dialogue is scripted rather than produced spontaneously,

characters are still presented as communicating in particular situations and relationships. Locher and Jucker (2021) describe film as performed fiction in which actors perform dialogue created for an audience. The meaning of an utterance in a film may be understood from the surrounding conversation, the situation in the scene, the response of another character, and relevant visual information. For this reason, film dialogue can provide data for pragmatic analysis when utterances are interpreted alongside their context.

The present study examines the dialogue in *A Man Called Otto* (2022), directed by Marc Forster. The English transcript is used as the main textual source to identify the utterances exchanged between the characters, while the film is used to verify the dialogue and provide the context needed to interpret the utterances. The film also helps identify the speaker, the intended hearer, the situation in which the conversation takes place, and the response that follows.

Throughout the film, Otto and his new neighbor, Marisol, interact repeatedly. Otto is generally portrayed as reserved and reluctant to interact with people around him, while Marisol is more expressive and frequently initiates conversations with him. Their communication gradually changes as the story progresses. In the earlier part of the film, Otto often responds briefly and tends to keep his distance. Later, he becomes more willing to communicate with Marisol, help her, share personal experiences, and become involved with her family. Meanwhile, Marisol continues to approach him, ask for his help, show concern, and respond to the personal matters he shares with her.

The repeated interactions between Marisol and Otto allow this study to follow the same relationship throughout the film and observe how their communication changes over time. The study focuses specifically on positive politeness because this strategy is concerned with the hearer's positive face, including the desire to be accepted, appreciated, and connected with others (Brown & Levinson, 1987). This focus is also related to the second research question, which examines how positive politeness functions as Marisol and Otto's relationship develops. Other politeness strategies may also occur in their conversations, but they are not included in the present analysis.

Previous studies have examined politeness strategies in film dialogue from different perspectives. Studies on *Spider-Man: Far From Home* and *The Social Network* have investigated the types and use of politeness strategies in interactions between film characters, including positive politeness and its role in communication (Sari & Sutopo, 2024; Abdul Aziz & Hashim, 2025). These studies show that film dialogue can be used to examine how politeness strategies are expressed and function in interactions between characters.

Research has also been conducted on *A Man Called Otto*, although with different focuses. Previous studies have examined impoliteness strategies used by Otto and politeness strategies found in phatic utterances involving Otto and other characters (Khaqqi & Pradipta, 2024; Nurmasyitah & Rahayu, 2025). Although one of these studies included positive politeness, it examined it as part of phatic communication rather than as the main focus of interactions between Marisol and Otto.

However, these previous studies have not specifically examined the positive politeness strategies exchanged between Marisol and Otto or how those strategies function as their relationship develops. The present study therefore focuses on their interactions throughout the film. By examining their recurring exchanges, the study identifies the positive politeness strategies used by Marisol and Otto and considers how those strategies function at different points in their relationship.

Based on this focus, the present study examines the positive politeness strategies employed by Marisol and Otto in *A Man Called Otto* (2022). Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework is used to identify the types of positive politeness strategies found in their utterances. The conversational situation and relevant visual context are also considered to support the interpretation of the strategies and their functions in the development of Marisol and Otto's relationship.

B. Research Questions

Based on the background of the study, the research questions are:

1. What types of positive politeness strategies are employed by Marisol and Otto in their interactions in the film *A Man Called Otto* (2022)?
2. How do the positive politeness strategies employed by Marisol and Otto function in the development of their relationship?

C. Research Aims

This research aims to:

1. Identify the types of positive politeness strategies employed by Marisol and Otto in their interactions in the film *A Man Called Otto* (2022).
2. Analyze how the positive politeness strategies employed by Marisol and Otto function in the development of their relationship.

D. Significance of the Study

1. Theoretical Significance

This study may contribute to studies of pragmatics, particularly research on positive politeness in film dialogue. By focusing on the recurring exchanges between Marisol and Otto, the study examines positive politeness within the same relationship as their interactions change over time. The findings may contribute to understanding the types and functions of positive politeness in character interaction.

2. Practical Significance

This study may be useful for English Education students, especially those studying pragmatics. The examples from Marisol and Otto's interactions can help students understand how positive politeness strategies are identified by considering an utterance together with its context. The

study may also serve as a reference for students who are interested in conducting similar pragmatic research on film dialogue.

E. Terminology

To avoid ambiguity and clarify the key terms used in this study, the following terms are defined based on the focus of the research:

1. Positive Politeness Strategies

Positive politeness refers to strategies directed toward the hearer's positive face, or the desire to be accepted, appreciated, understood, and connected with others (Brown & Levinson, 1987). It may be expressed through attention, agreement, cooperation, sympathy, humor, offers, or other forms that recognize the hearer's positive face.

In this study, positive politeness strategies refer to Brown and Levinson's (1987) fifteen strategies used to classify the selected utterances exchanged between Marisol and Otto. When an utterance appears to contain more than one strategy, it is classified according to the strategy that is most clearly represented by the speaker's intention, the meaning of the utterance, and the context of the interaction.

2. *A Man Called Otto*

In this study, *A Man Called Otto* refers to the 2022 film directed by Marc Forster. The analysis focuses specifically on the dialogue exchanged between Marisol and Otto. The English transcript serves as the main textual source for identifying and organizing their utterances, while the film is used to verify the dialogue and provide the conversational and visual context needed for interpretation.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses the theoretical background and previous studies related to this research. It begins with a discussion of pragmatics and Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, with particular emphasis on positive politeness strategies. It then discusses film dialogue as a source of verbal and contextual data for pragmatic analysis. Finally, the chapter reviews previous studies related to politeness strategies in film dialogue, including studies of *A Man Called Otto*.

A. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies meaning in relation to context. The meaning of an utterance is not always limited to the literal meaning of the words used by a speaker. In many situations, understanding what a speaker means also requires information about who is speaking, who the hearer is, and what is happening during the interaction. Yule (2010) states that pragmatics deals with speaker meaning and with meanings that may not be directly expressed. Birner (2013) also explains that hearers often need to use context and inference to understand what speakers intend to communicate.

Pragmatics and semantics are both concerned with meaning, but they focus on different aspects of it. Semantics generally deals with the conventional meaning of words and sentences, while pragmatics considers how meaning is understood in a particular situation. Birner (2013) distinguishes between sentence meaning and speaker meaning. Sentence meaning is related to the linguistic form of an expression, whereas speaker meaning refers to what the speaker intends to communicate through that expression. This distinction is important because the same words may communicate different meanings when they are used in different situations.

Context is therefore an important part of pragmatic interpretation. Yule (2010) distinguishes between linguistic context and physical context. Linguistic context, or co-text, refers to the words and expressions that surround an

utterance. Physical context refers to the situation in which the utterance occurs, including relevant aspects of the setting. The relationship between the speaker and the hearer can also help explain why an utterance is expressed in a particular way. For this reason, an utterance needs to be understood together with the surrounding conversation and the situation in which it occurs.

The importance of context can also be seen in the study of politeness. Speakers may express the same intention in different ways depending on whom they are speaking to and the situation surrounding the interaction. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that social considerations can influence the politeness strategy chosen by a speaker. In this study, pragmatics provides the basis for examining the utterances found in the transcript of *A Man Called Otto*. The utterances exchanged between Marisol and Otto are interpreted by considering their linguistic meaning, the surrounding conversation, and the relevant context of the interaction. These considerations support the identification and interpretation of the positive politeness strategies used by both characters.

B. Politeness Theory

Politeness concerns the way speakers show awareness of other people during interaction. It does not only involve formal or respectful expressions, but also the way speakers consider the person they are addressing and the possible effect of what they say. Yule (2010) explains that politeness involves awareness of another person's face, or public self-image. Speakers may therefore choose different ways of expressing their intentions depending on the situation and the person they are speaking to.

This study applies the politeness theory proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Their theory explains how speakers manage face when an utterance may affect the speaker's or the hearer's face. Three main concepts form the basis of the theory: face, face-threatening acts, and politeness strategies.

1. Face and Face-Threatening Acts

Brown and Levinson (1987) place the concept of face at the center of their politeness theory. Face refers to the public self-image that people want to maintain during interaction. Participants normally pay attention to both their own face and the face of the person with whom they communicate. Brown and Levinson divide face into two aspects: positive face and negative face.

a. Positive Face

Positive face refers to a person's desire for their wants to be considered desirable by others. It includes the desire to receive approval, appreciation, understanding, and acceptance from other people (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Yule (2010) also relates positive face to a person's need to feel connected with others and to belong to a social group. Positive face therefore concerns how people want others to recognize and respond positively to them and their wants.

b. Negative Face

Negative face concerns a person's desire to act freely without unnecessary interference or imposition from others. Brown and Levinson (1987) describe it as the desire for freedom of action and freedom from imposition. The word *negative* in this term does not indicate something undesirable. Instead, it refers to a person's wish to maintain independence and control over their own actions. Yule (2010) similarly describes negative face as the need to remain independent and free from imposition.

c. Face-Threatening Acts

Certain communicative acts may conflict with the face wants of the speaker or the hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) refer to these acts as face-threatening acts, or FTAs. Requests and orders, for example, may threaten the hearer's negative face because they

place some demand on the hearer's actions. Criticism, disagreement, complaints, accusations, and insults may threaten positive face because they can express disapproval or rejection of the hearer's opinions, qualities, feelings, or wants.

An FTA may affect the speaker, the hearer, or both participants. When speakers need to perform an act that may threaten face, they can choose a particular strategy to manage or reduce its possible effect. Brown and Levinson explain these choices through their politeness strategies.

2. Politeness Strategies

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that speakers have several choices when dealing with a face-threatening act. A speaker may decide not to perform the FTA or may perform it through a particular strategy. When speakers choose to perform the act, they may use four main strategies: bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record. Each strategy differs in the degree of directness and in the attention that the speaker gives to the hearer's face.

a. Bald on Record

Speakers use bald on record when they express an intention directly without attempting to reduce the possible threat to the hearer's face. The message usually remains clear and unambiguous. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that speakers may use this strategy when directness or efficiency becomes more important than face concerns, such as in urgent situations or when the threat to face is relatively small.

b. Positive Politeness

Positive politeness provides redressive action toward the hearer's positive face. Through this strategy, speakers recognize the

hearer's desire for approval, appreciation, understanding, or acceptance. They may show interest, emphasize common ground, seek agreement, offer help, or present themselves as cooperative with the hearer (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Positive politeness may reflect familiarity between participants, but speakers can also use it to establish common ground and encourage a more cooperative interaction.

c. Negative Politeness

Negative politeness addresses the hearer's desire for freedom of action and freedom from imposition. Speakers use this strategy to reduce the pressure created by a face-threatening act and to acknowledge the hearer's independence. They may use indirect expressions, hedges, apologies, or other forms that reduce the force of an imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In this way, speakers can communicate their intentions while showing consideration for the hearer's negative face.

d. Off Record

Speakers use an off-record strategy when they communicate an intention indirectly and leave the hearer to interpret the intended meaning from the context. The utterance does not express one explicit interpretation, so the hearer needs to make an inference. Brown and Levinson (1987) include forms such as hints, irony, rhetorical questions, metaphors, and understatement within this strategy. Off-record communication therefore gives speakers a way to communicate without stating their intended message directly.

3. Positive Politeness Strategies

Positive politeness forms the main theoretical focus of this study. Brown and Levinson (1987) describe positive politeness as redressive action directed toward the hearer's positive face. Speakers can use it to

recognize the hearer's wants, establish common ground, or present the speaker and hearer as cooperators.

Brown and Levinson (1987) organize fifteen positive politeness strategies into three broader groups. The first group involves claiming common ground between the speaker and the hearer. The second presents the speaker and the hearer as cooperators. The final group concerns fulfilling particular wants of the hearer. This study uses these fifteen strategies as categories for identifying and classifying positive politeness in the selected utterances.

a. Notice, attend to the hearer (Interests, Wants, Needs, Goods)

Speakers use this strategy when they notice or pay attention to something related to the hearer, such as the hearer's interests, wants, needs, condition, or possessions. They may notice something that the hearer wants others to recognize or appreciate. By giving this attention, speakers show that they regard the hearer and matters related to the hearer as important (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

b. Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with the hearer)

This strategy involves exaggerating the speaker's interest, approval, or sympathy toward the hearer. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), this approach is realized through exaggerated expressions, including intensified words, stress, or other prosodic features, which serve to emphasize the speaker's feelings toward the hearer or something related to the hearer. By showing stronger interest or appreciation, speakers can indicate involvement and fulfill the hearer's positive face needs.

c. Intensify interest to Hearer

Speakers can make their contribution more interesting in order to draw the hearer further into the conversation. They may use vivid descriptions, direct quotations, detailed storytelling, or other expressions that increase the hearer's involvement. Through this

strategy, the speaker treats the hearer as someone whose attention and participation matter in the interaction (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

d. Use in-group identity markers

In-group identity markers emphasize a shared identity or familiarity between the speaker and the hearer. Speakers may use particular forms of address, shared language or dialect, jargon, slang, contractions, or other expressions associated with a group. These linguistic choices can highlight common ground and present the participants as sharing some degree of group membership or familiarity (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

e. Seek agreement

Speakers may seek agreement by choosing topics on which they expect the hearer to agree or by repeating part of the hearer's previous statement. Both forms emphasize similarity between the participants' views. Seeking agreement also shows that the speaker recognizes and responds to the hearer's contribution instead of ignoring it (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

f. Avoid disagreement

When disagreement may arise, the speaker can avoid expressing it directly to maintain agreement with the hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) describe several ways of avoiding disagreement, including token agreement, pseudo-agreement, white lies, and hedging opinions. These forms allow the speaker to give a different response without openly opposing the hearer's opinion.

g. Presuppose, raise, or assert common ground

This strategy emphasizes knowledge, experiences, interests, or attitudes that the speaker and the hearer share or appear to share. Speakers may refer to information that both participants already know, discuss familiar topics, or draw attention to shared experiences. Such expressions create or strengthen a sense of

common ground between the participants (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

h. Joke

Jokes can function as positive politeness when they depend on knowledge, experiences, or values shared by the speaker and the hearer. By making a joke, the speaker assumes that the hearer can understand the humorous reference. Humor can therefore emphasize shared understanding and contribute to a sense of familiarity between participants (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

i. Assert or presuppose the speaker's knowledge of and concern for the hearer's wants

Awareness of the hearer's wants is shown when the speaker indicates that they understand and care about what the hearer needs or desires. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), this strategy presents the speaker and the hearer as cooperators because the speaker pays attention to the hearer's wants. In this way, the speaker shows concern for matters that are important to the hearer.

j. Offer, promise

Offers and promises allow speakers to show their intention to cooperate with the hearer. By offering help or promising to perform an action, the speaker shows willingness to support the hearer's wants or interests. Brown and Levinson (1987) include these acts in positive politeness because they express the speaker's positive intention toward the hearer.

k. Be optimistic

Offers and promises allow speakers to show their intention to cooperate with the hearer. By offering help or promising to perform an action, the speaker shows willingness to support the hearer's wants or interests. Brown and Levinson (1987) include these acts in positive politeness because they express the speaker's positive intention toward the hearer.

1. Include both the speaker and the hearer in the activity

The use of inclusive expressions such as “we” enables speakers to involve the hearer in the activity or action under discussion. Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that this strategy highlights cooperation between the speaker and the hearer by framing an action as one that involves both participants. Through this strategy, speakers can soften requests or offers by making the hearer feel included in the proposed action.

m. Give (or ask for) reasons

Giving or asking for reasons involves the hearer in the reasoning behind an action, request, or decision. A speaker may explain why an action is necessary or ask the hearer to provide a reason for not doing something. By exchanging reasons, the speaker treats the hearer as someone who can understand the situation and participate in reaching an outcome (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

n. Assume or assert reciprocity

Speakers may use reciprocity by referring to the mutual rights, obligations, or actions that exist between themselves and the hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this strategy signals cooperation between the Speaker and the Hearer by highlighting that both participants have certain responsibilities or benefits in their interaction. By referring to this reciprocal relationship, speakers can make an action or request seem less imposing by presenting it as part of an existing exchange between them.

o. Give gifts to the hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

Brown and Levinson (1987) use the term *gifts* in a broader sense than physical objects alone. Speakers may attend to the hearer's positive face by giving goods, sympathy, understanding, or cooperation. A material gift can satisfy a particular want, while sympathy and understanding can respond to emotional or

interpersonal needs. Through this strategy, speakers show that they recognize and care about something that matters to the hearer.

C. Film and Pragmatic Analysis

Film dialogue is different from spontaneous everyday conversation because it is written and performed as part of a fictional story. Locher and Jucker (2021) describe film as performed fiction in which actors present scripted dialogue to an audience. Although the dialogue is constructed, it still represents communication between characters in particular situations and relationships. The language used in these interactions can therefore be examined from a pragmatic perspective.

A film transcript provides a written form of the dialogue spoken by the characters and makes the utterances available for textual analysis. However, the meaning of an utterance cannot always be understood from its linguistic form alone. Birner (2013) explains that understanding an utterance involves considering the speaker, the context in which it is produced, and what the speaker intends the hearer to understand. The surrounding conversation and the situation of an interaction can therefore provide important information when interpreting an utterance.

Context is also important when examining politeness. An expression may function differently depending on who produces it, who receives it, and what is happening in the interaction. To identify positive politeness, an utterance should therefore be considered alongside the surrounding conversation and other relevant contextual information. This context supports the interpretation of the utterance, while the linguistic expression itself remains the main focus of the analysis.

In the present study, the English transcript of *A Man Called Otto* (2022) serves as the primary source of linguistic data. The research data consist of selected utterances exchanged between Marisol and Otto, which are examined using Brown and Levinson's (1987) positive politeness framework. The film is

used to verify the dialogue when necessary and to provide contextual information that may not be fully represented in the transcript, including the speaker, the intended hearer, the interaction context, and the response that follows. Thus, the analysis remains focused on the characters' utterances, while information from the film supports their pragmatic interpretation.

D. Previous Studies

The present study is related to earlier research on politeness and impoliteness in scripted dialogue. The studies reviewed in this section were selected because they either examine positive politeness through Brown and Levinson's framework or investigate language use in *A Man Called Otto*. Their findings provide useful points of comparison for the present study.

Sari and Sutopo (2024) analyzed positive politeness strategies used by the characters in *Spider-Man: Far From Home* through Brown and Levinson's framework. They identified eight types of positive politeness strategies, with *Notice, Attend to the Hearer* appearing most frequently. They also discussed payoff and relevant circumstances, including social distance, relative power, and degree of imposition, as factors related to the use of positive politeness. This research is closely related to the present study because both examine positive politeness using the same theoretical framework. However, Sari and Sutopo analyzed interactions involving various characters, while the present study focuses on the recurring exchanges between Marisol and Otto and follows the use of positive politeness within the same interactional relationship.

Similarly, Abdul Aziz and Hashim (2025) investigated politeness strategies in the dialogue of *The Social Network* using Brown and Levinson's framework. Their study covered positive politeness, negative politeness, bald on record, and off-record strategies. They used screenplay and transcript data and consulted the film to check the accuracy of the dialogue and understand its context. Their findings showed that positive politeness supported camaraderie, solidarity, and cooperation, particularly in interactions involving persuasion and

alliance-building. While their study examines several types of politeness across different character interactions, the present research concentrates specifically on positive politeness in the exchanges between Marisol and Otto.

Research on *A Man Called Otto* has also examined the characters' language from other pragmatic perspectives. Khaqqi and Pradipta (2024) studied the types and functions of impoliteness strategies used by Otto as the main character and identified 63 instances across five types of impoliteness. Negative impoliteness occurred most frequently, while coercive impoliteness was the most frequent function. They related Otto's frequent use of impoliteness to his grief, loneliness, impatience, and irritability, while coercive impoliteness was associated with his tendency to maintain control or gain an advantage in particular interactions. Although their study examines the same film and character, it focuses on Otto's impoliteness rather than the positive politeness exchanged between Otto and Marisol.

Nurmasyitah and Rahayu (2025) examined politeness strategies in phatic utterances involving Otto and other characters in *A Man Called Otto*. Their study combined Aitchison's framework of phatic communion with politeness theories from Brown and Levinson and Yule. They identified 72 phatic utterances in four forms, with supportive chat occurring most frequently, while positive politeness appeared more often than the other politeness strategies. Their findings show that supportive chat and positive politeness helped maintain social connection, reduce social distance, and gradually build closeness with Otto. However, their analysis was limited to utterances classified as phatic communication and included Otto's interactions with several characters rather than focusing specifically on his recurring exchanges with Marisol.

The four studies above provide different points of comparison for the present research. Sari and Sutopo (2024) are relevant to the analysis of positive politeness, while Abdul Aziz and Hashim (2025) show how politeness in scripted dialogue can be examined through textual data together with relevant interactional context. Khaqqi and Pradipta (2024) and Nurmasyitah and Rahayu (2025) are particularly relevant because both examine language use in *A Man*

Called Otto. However, among these studies, none specifically focuses on the positive politeness strategies exchanged between Marisol and Otto across their recurring interactions or examines how these strategies function as their interactional relationship changes. The present study therefore identifies the positive politeness strategies found in their selected utterances and examines their functions throughout the development of their interactions.



CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the methodology used in this study and outlines how the research was conducted to address the research questions. It covers the research design, data sources, data extraction process, and data analysis procedures. Each section also explains the reasons behind the methodological choices, including the selection of data, the extraction of relevant utterances, and the identification and interpretation of the positive politeness strategies used by Marisol and Otto in the film *A Man Called Otto*.

A. Research Design

This study used a qualitative research design and employed directed qualitative content analysis. A qualitative approach was appropriate because the study aimed to interpret how positive politeness was expressed and functioned in the utterances exchanged between Marisol and Otto. The analysis therefore focused on the meaning of the selected utterances and the contexts in which they occurred.

Schreier (2012) explains that qualitative content analysis provides a systematic way of describing the meaning of qualitative material through a coding frame. This method suits material that requires interpretation and allows relevant parts to be classified according to defined categories. In the present study, the selected utterances from the English transcript formed the textual material examined through this process.

More specifically, the study employed a directed approach to qualitative content analysis. Hsieh and Shannon (2005) explain that directed content analysis begins with an existing theory or previous research that provides initial coding categories. This approach was suitable for the present study because the analysis did not develop the strategy categories from the data. Instead, Brown

and Levinson's (1987) fifteen positive politeness strategies were used as predetermined categories for identifying and classifying the selected utterances.

The analysis involved both classification and interpretation. The types of positive politeness strategies were identified deductively according to Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework. After classifying the strategies, the functions were interpreted by considering the meaning of each utterance, the surrounding conversation, the hearer's response, and its position within the sequence of Marisol and Otto's interactions. The film was consulted when contextual information was needed to support this interpretation, but its visual elements were not treated as separate coding data.

B. Sources of Data

The data in this study were taken from the English transcript of *A Man Called Otto* (2022), which was published by Scraps from the Loft (2023). The transcript was used to find the conversations between Marisol and Otto. The data were the utterances spoken by Marisol to Otto and by Otto to Marisol. The researcher included only utterances spoken directly by one character to the other.

The film *A Man Called Otto* (2022), directed by Marc Forster, was also used during the research process. It was not treated as the main linguistic data, but was used to check dialogue accuracy and understand the context of particular interactions when needed. This included confirming who was speaking, whom the utterance was directed to, and what was happening in the conversation. The analysis was limited to interactions between Marisol and Otto because this scope follows the focus of the research questions on the positive politeness strategies used by the two characters.

C. Data Extraction Procedures

Before collecting the data, the researcher established criteria for selecting the utterances. An utterance was included when it was spoken by Marisol and clearly directed to Otto, or spoken by Otto and clearly directed to Marisol. In conversations involving other characters, an utterance was still included when the intended hearer could be identified from the flow of the conversation, the form of address, the speaker's orientation, or the response that followed. Utterances in which Marisol or Otto only talked about the other character while speaking to someone else were excluded. Utterances with an unclear intended hearer were also excluded.

The extraction process began by reading the English transcript from beginning to end and marking the conversations that met these criteria. At this stage, all relevant exchanges between Marisol and Otto were collected without first deciding whether they contained a positive politeness strategy. The selected utterances were then recorded in a data extraction sheet containing the data number, timestamp, speaker, intended hearer, utterance, and a short description of the interaction. At this stage, the researcher collected only the relevant utterances and did not yet classify them into positive politeness strategies.

After collecting the utterances, the researcher checked them against the film. The relevant scenes were replayed when needed to confirm the wording of the utterance, the speaker, the intended hearer, the timestamp, and the context of the conversation. If the wording in the transcript differed from what was spoken in the film, the scene was checked again, and the entry in the extraction sheet was corrected to match the spoken dialogue. Any scene in which the speaker, hearer, or wording was uncertain was reviewed again before a decision was made. If the intended hearer still could not be clearly identified, the utterance was not included.

A final check was carried out after the initial extraction and verification. The researcher reread the full transcript and compared each relevant exchange between Marisol and Otto with the data extraction sheet. This step checked

whether any utterance that met the selection criteria had been missed during the first extraction. Any additional or uncertain data found at this stage were checked again with the corresponding scene in the film. After these checks, the verified utterances were organized for the data analysis stage.

D. Data Analysis Procedures

The data were analyzed using directed qualitative content analysis as described by Hsieh and Shannon (2005). Since this approach begins with categories from an existing theory, Brown and Levinson's (1987) fifteen positive politeness strategies were used as the predetermined categories for the analysis. The practical stages of the analysis also followed the preparation, organizing, and reporting phases described by Elo and Kyngäs (2008).

In the preparation phase, each verified utterance from the data extraction process was treated as one unit of analysis. The researcher read each utterance together with the surrounding conversation so that its meaning could be understood within the interaction. The descriptions of the fifteen positive politeness strategies presented in Chapter II were used as the coding criteria. Each utterance was examined in terms of its linguistic form, meaning, and context to determine whether it represented one of the strategies. Utterances that did not match any of the fifteen positive politeness strategies were not included in the coded findings.

In the organizing phase, utterances that contained positive politeness were assigned to the strategy that best represented their use in the interaction. The classification was not based only on the presence of a particular word or expression. The researcher also considered the communicative purpose indicated by the utterance and its context. When an utterance could be interpreted as containing more than one positive politeness strategy, the strategy most clearly expressed in the utterance was selected as the dominant strategy. For consistency in the classification and frequency count, each utterance was assigned to only one strategy category.

After completing the initial coding, the researcher reviewed the coded utterances again by comparing each classification with the descriptions of the fifteen strategies and the interaction context. Utterances that appeared unclear or could reasonably fit more than one strategy were checked again before the final category was assigned. This review was carried out to maintain consistency in applying the same coding criteria across the data.

The coded utterances were then grouped according to the type of positive politeness strategy and the character who used it. The frequency of each strategy was counted to show the distribution of strategies used by Marisol and Otto. The percentage of each strategy was calculated by dividing its frequency by the total number of coded utterances and multiplying the result by 100. These frequencies and percentages were used only to describe the distribution of the findings, while the main analysis remained qualitative.

To answer the second research question, the coded utterances were arranged according to the order in which the interactions occurred. The researcher examined what each strategy communicated within its particular interaction by considering the meaning of the utterance, the surrounding conversation, the hearer's response, and the situation in which it was used. Earlier and later interactions were compared to examine how positive politeness functioned at different points in Marisol and Otto's interactions. Unlike the strategy types, the functions were not classified using predetermined categories. They were interpreted from the context of the interactions and from the way each strategy contributed to communication between the two characters.

In the reporting phase, the findings were organized according to the two research questions. The types, frequencies, and distribution of positive politeness strategies were presented first. Selected excerpts were then provided together with the speaker, timestamp, utterance, strategy, and an explanation of the classification. The discussion continued by examining patterns of strategy use and explaining how the strategies functioned across Marisol and Otto's interactions.

CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings and discussion of the positive politeness strategies employed by Marisol and Otto in their interactions in *A Man Called Otto* (2022). The strategies were identified and classified based on the fifteen positive politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). This chapter is divided into two main sections. The first section presents the types and frequencies of the positive politeness strategies employed by both characters. The presentation of the findings is supported by relevant excerpts from *A Man Called Otto*, with the utterances containing the positive politeness strategies identified in bold. The second section discusses how the strategies function in the development of Marisol and Otto's relationship by considering the context and sequence of their interactions throughout the film

A. Findings

1. Types of Positive Politeness Strategies Employed by Marisol and Otto

This section presents the positive politeness strategies found in interactions between Marisol and Otto in *A Man Called Otto* (2022). The analysis used Brown and Levinson's (1987) fifteen positive politeness strategies as the framework for identifying the data.

The analysis identified 33 utterances containing positive politeness strategies in Marisol and Otto's conversations. These utterances were classified into 12 strategies out of the 15 strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). The frequency of each strategy is presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4. 1 Types and Frequencies of Positive Politeness Strategies Employed by Marisol and Otto

No.	Types of Positive Politeness Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Strategy 1: Notice, Attend to Hearer	4	12.12 %
2.	Strategy 2: Exaggerate	3	9.09 %
3.	Strategy 4: Use In-Group Identity markers	1	3.03 %
4.	Strategy 5: Seek Agreement	2	6.06 %
5.	Strategy 7: Presuppose, Raise, Assert Common Ground	1	3.03 %
6.	Strategy 8: Joke	3	9.09 %
7.	Strategy 10: Offer or Promise	2	6.06 %
8.	Strategy 11: Be Optimistic	2	6.06 %
9.	Strategy 12: Include Both the Speaker and the Hearer in the Activity	2	6.06 %
10.	Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) Reasons	5	15.15 %
11.	Strategy 14: Assume or Assert Reciprocity	1	3.03 %
12.	Strategy 15: Give Gifts to Hearer	7	21.21 %
		33	100 %

As shown in Table 4.1, Strategy 15: Give Gifts to the Hearer was the most frequently found strategy, appearing seven times (21.21%). The second most frequently used strategy was Strategy 13: Give (or Ask for) Reasons, which occurred five times (15.15%). Meanwhile, Strategy 1: Notice, Attend to the Hearer appeared four times (12.12%). The other strategies occurred less frequently, ranging from one to three occurrences.

Three positive politeness strategies were not found in the data. They were Strategy 3: Intensify Interest to the Hearer, Strategy 6: Avoid Disagreement, and Strategy 9: Assert or Presuppose the Speaker's Knowledge of and Concern for the Hearer's Wants. Table 4.2 presents the distribution of these strategies by character.

Table 4. 2 Distribution of Positive Politeness Strategies Employed by Each Character

No.	Positive Politeness Strategies	Marisol	Otto
1.	Strategy 1: Notice, Attend to Hearer	4	0
2.	Strategy 2: Exaggerate	2	1
3.	Strategy 4: Use In-Group Identity markers	0	1
4.	Strategy 5: Seek Agreement	2	0
5.	Strategy 7: Presuppose, Raise, Assert Common Ground	1	0
6.	Strategy 8: Joke	1	2
7.	Strategy 10: Offer or Promise	2	0
8.	Strategy 11: Be Optimistic	2	0
9.	Strategy 12: Include Both the Speaker and the Hearer in the Activity	1	1
10.	Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) Reasons	4	1
11.	Strategy 14: Assume or Assert Reciprocity	1	0
12.	Strategy 15: Give Gifts to Hearer	5	2
		25	8

Table 4.2 shows that Marisol produced more positive politeness utterances than Otto. Marisol produced 25 utterances, while Otto produced eight utterances. In terms of strategy variety, Marisol used 11 of the identified strategies, whereas Otto used seven strategies.

The following parts describe each strategy identified in the data. Each strategy is explained by presenting the relevant utterance and the context in which it occurred.

Strategy 1: Notice, Attend to Hearer

This strategy is used when the speaker pays attention to the hearer's interests, wants, needs, condition, or possessions (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Four utterances were classified under this strategy, and all of them were employed by Marisol toward Otto.

Excerpt 1

Otto: "What?"

Marisol: **"My father used to smile like that."**
(Timestamp 51:08)

The utterance occurs when Marisol notices Otto smiling in the car. By saying, "My father used to smile like that," Marisol shows that she attends to a change in Otto's facial expression. She does not ignore the unusual expression but responds to it by connecting Otto's smile to a personal memory of her father.

Excerpt 2

Marisol: **"Your counters are so low. Where did you get them?"**

Otto: "I built them. For Sonya. For my wife."
(Timestamp 53:38)

The dialogue takes place when Marisol enters Otto's kitchen and notices the unusual height of the counters. Her statement, "Your counters are so low," shows her attention to a particular feature of Otto's house. She then asks where he got them, expressing interest in something connected to Otto and giving him an opportunity to explain why the counters were built that way.

Excerpt 3

Marisol: **"Mmm! How did you find this place?"**

Otto: "This was Sonya's place. We used to come here every Saturday at 1:00."

(Timestamp 01:09:16)

The dialogue occurs after Otto takes Marisol to a café and introduces her to semlor. After tasting the food, Marisol asks how Otto found the place. Her question shows that she is interested in the place he has chosen and wants to learn more about its connection to him. Although "Mmm!" expresses her enjoyment of the food, the main focus of the utterance is her interest in something that is meaningful to Otto. For this reason, *Notice, Attend to the Hearer* is treated as the dominant strategy.

Excerpt 4

Marisol: **"Otto, Otto. Otto, what's going on? Are you okay? Do you feel okay?"**

(Timestamp 01:23:05)

The utterance occurs when Marisol notices that Otto is having difficulty breathing and does not appear well. She repeatedly calls his name and asks, "Are you okay?" and "Do you feel okay?"

Her questions show immediate attention to Otto's physical condition and concern for his well-being.

Strategy 2: Exaggerate (Interest, Approval, Sympathy with Hearer)

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this strategy is used when the speaker intensifies interest, approval, or sympathy toward the hearer. Three utterances were classified under this strategy. Two were employed by Marisol toward Otto, while one was employed by Otto toward Marisol.

Excerpt 1

Otto: "I can't stand watching one idiot teach another how to drive. You. Put on your coat. It's lesson time."

Marisol: **"What? You're gonna teach me? Really? Otto, thank you!"**

Otto: "Mm."

Marisol: "Thank you. I'll be right out!"

(Timestamp 01:04:23)

The dialogue occurs when Otto decides to teach Marisol how to drive. Marisol responds with surprise and excitement through the questions, "You're gonna teach me?" and "Really?" She also repeats "thank you," emphasizing how much she appreciates Otto's willingness to help. Her immediate response, "I'll be right out," further shows her enthusiasm for the driving lesson.

Excerpt 2

Otto: **"Now you listen to me. You have given birth to two children. Soon it'll be three. You have come here from a country very far away. You learned a new language, you got yourself an education and a nitwit husband and**

you are holding that family together. You will have no problem learning how to drive.”

(Timestamp: 01:07:17)

The utterance occurs when Marisol becomes frustrated and says that she cannot drive. Instead of giving her a brief reassurance, Otto lists several difficult things she has already accomplished. The repeated use of “you have” and the detailed description of her achievements strengthen his approval of her abilities. His final statement, “You will have no problem learning how to drive,” further emphasizes his confidence in her.

Excerpt 3

Marisol: **“I thought you handled it really well. I mean, closing her in your garage. That was, like, excellent strategy. [grows] Good job.”**

(Timestamp 01:26:46)

The utterance is produced after Otto locks the journalist inside his garage. Marisol praises his action through several intensified expressions, including “really well,” “excellent strategy,” and “good job.” Rather than giving a simple compliment, she repeats and strengthens her approval. Although the utterance is delivered playfully, its main focus is Marisol’s enthusiastic appreciation of Otto’s action.

Strategy 4: Use In-Group Identity Markers

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this strategy can be expressed through forms of address, in-group language, dialect, jargon, or other expressions that indicate familiarity between the speaker and

the hearer. One utterance was classified under this strategy, and it was employed by Otto toward Marisol.

Excerpt 1

Otto: “Ah... Yeah. Qué bueno.”

Marisol: “Qué bueno.”

(Timestamp 01:08:10)

The dialogue occurs during the driving lesson after Marisol successfully moves the car. Otto encourages her by using the Spanish expression “Qué bueno” instead of speaking only in English. His choice of language shows that he adjusts his speech to an expression familiar to Marisol’s linguistic background. Marisol repeats the same expression, showing that she recognizes and responds to the language Otto uses. In this utterance, the use of Spanish is the most prominent feature, making the in-group identity marker the dominant strategy.

Strategy 5: Seek Agreement

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that speakers may seek agreement by emphasizing similar opinions or repeating part of the hearer’s previous utterance. Two utterances were classified under this strategy, and both were employed by Marisol toward Otto.

Excerpt 1

Otto: “What the hell is he doing?”

Marisol: “Yes! Exactly! That’s exactly what I was saying”

(Timestamp 13:41)

The dialogue occurs during Marisol and Otto’s first interaction, when Tommy has difficulty parking the car and trailer.

After Otto expresses his frustration, Marisol immediately responds with “Yes! Exactly!” Her response directly agrees with Otto’s opinion and shows that they have the same view of Tommy’s driving. The repetition of “exactly” further emphasizes her agreement with him.

Excerpt 2

Tommy: “Excuse me, Mr Otto. You wouldn’t have an Alvin wrench I could borrow, would you?”

Otto: “You mean an Allen wrench.”

Marisol: **“It’s “Allen” wrench, right? It’s Allen wrench.”**
(Timestamp 20:37)

In this scene, Tommy asks to borrow a tool from Otto but calls it an “Alvin wrench.” After Otto corrects him, Marisol repeats the term “Allen wrench” and asks Otto to confirm it. Her repetition shows that she accepts Otto’s correction and aligns herself with his statement. This reflects the repetition form of seeking agreement described by Brown and Levinson.

Strategy 7: Presuppose, Raise, Assert Common Ground

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this strategy is used when the speaker refers to shared knowledge, experiences, or information that is already understood by both the speaker and the hearer. One utterance was classified under this strategy, and it was employed by Marisol toward Otto

Excerpt 1

Otto: “They didn’t even realize what they were doing until we told them, Reuben and I.”

Marisol: **“But this was before the coup?”**

Otto: “Oh, yeah, yeah. Reuben and I were friends then. After that, all we saw were the differences.”

(Timestamp: 1:11:39)

The dialogue occurs while Otto is telling Marisol about his past friendship with Reuben. Marisol refers to an earlier conflict between Otto and Reuben as “the coup” without explaining the event again. Her use of this expression assumes that both of them already understand what it refers to. It also shows that she remembers information Otto shared in their previous conversation and uses it to follow his story. In this context, the shared reference creates common ground between Marisol and Otto.

Strategy 8: Joke

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that jokes can be used as a positive politeness strategy when they are based on shared knowledge or understanding between the speaker and the hearer. Three utterances were classified under this strategy. Two were employed by Otto toward Marisol, while one was employed by Marisol toward Otto.

Excerpt 1

Otto: **“What about Alvin Wrench, is he coming?”**

(Timestamp 51:16)

The utterance occurs when Otto is waiting with Marisol and her children to pick up Tommy. Otto calls Tommy “Alvin Wrench,” referring to the earlier moment when Tommy mistakenly called an

Allen wrench an “Alvin wrench.” Marisol understands the reference because she was present during the previous conversation. Otto turns the earlier mistake into a humorous nickname based on their shared knowledge.

Excerpt 2

Otto: **“I don’t know what went wrong with Reuben, but that’s when I knew I’d lost him. I mean, a man has to stand up for what he believes in. Even if it is a F-O-R-D.”**

Marisol: [Chuckles]

(Timestamp: 01:13:27)

The dialogue occurs while Otto is telling Marisol about his past friendship with Reuben. Otto says that a person should remain loyal to what they believe in, even if it is a Ford. The final remark adds humor to his serious story because Otto strongly prefers Chevrolet. Marisol’s laughter shows that she understands the joke.

Excerpt 3

Marisol: **“You’re really bad at dying, you know that?”**

(Timestamp 01:47:10)

In the scene after the doctor explains Otto’s heart condition. Marisol responds with a joke rather than a serious comment about the diagnosis. Her remark refers to Otto’s repeated unsuccessful attempts to die and shows that she can discuss the sensitive topic with him through humor.

Strategy 10: Offer, Promise

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this strategy is used when the speaker shows willingness to cooperate with the hearer by

offering help or promising to do something. Two utterances were classified under this strategy, both of which were employed by Marisol toward Otto.

Excerpt 1

Marisol: “Hm! I have a very good idea. You can be my driver’s instructor.”

Otto: “No. No, no, no. I don’t have time for that.”

Marisol: **“But don’t worry, I’ll pay for the gas and everything.”**

(Timestamp 58:54)

The dialogue occurs when Marisol asks Otto to teach her to drive. After Otto refuses, Marisol says she will pay for gas and other expenses. The expression “I’ll pay” shows her commitment to covering the costs of the driving lessons. By making this promise, she shows she is willing to take responsibility rather than placing the entire burden on Otto.

Excerpt 2

Marisol: **“I was thinking that I can help you clean out your house and clean out the front hall in your home, and help you pack the coats and shoes you have there of Sonya’s.”**

Otto: “That’s not needed.”

(Timestamp 01:21:16)

This exchange takes place when Marisol offers to help Otto organize his house and pack Sonya’s belongings. The repeated expression “I can help you” clearly shows her willingness to assist

him with several tasks. Unlike the first data, which contains a promise, this utterance is a direct offer of practical help to Otto.

Strategy 11: Be Optimistic

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this strategy is used when the speaker assumes that the hearer is willing to cooperate or share the same goal. Two utterances were classified under this strategy, and both were employed by Marisol toward Otto.

Excerpt 1

Marisol: **“Hm! I have a very good idea. You can be my driver’s instructor.”**

Otto: **“No. No, no, no. I don’t have time for that.”**
(Timestamp 58:42)

Here, Marisol suggests that Otto teach her how to drive. Instead of first asking whether he is willing to help, she directly says, “You can be my driver’s instructor.” Her statement shows that she assumes Otto is able to take part in the plan and expects his cooperation.

Excerpt 2

Otto: **“I’m not sure about this.”**

Marisol: **“No. Don’t be silly. It’s gonna be very fun. If you remember, Abbie has to be in bed by 9:00, okay? You’re good?”**

(Timestamp 01:14:32)

The dialogue occurs when Otto expresses uncertainty about taking care of Marisol’s children. Marisol responds by saying that it will be fun and continues giving him instructions about Abbie’s

bedtime. Rather than treating Otto's hesitation as a reason to cancel the plan, she speaks as if he is able and willing to look after the children. Her response shows confidence in Otto's cooperation.

Strategy 12: Include Both the Speaker and the Hearer in the Activity

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this strategy is commonly expressed through inclusive forms such as *we* and *let's*. These expressions present an activity as involving both the speaker and the hearer. Two utterances were classified under this strategy. One was used by Otto toward Marisol, while the other was used by Marisol toward Otto.

Excerpt 1

Otto: "They're a little messy. But let's try."

Marisol: "Yes."

(Timestamp: 01:09:02)

The dialogue occurs when Otto introduces Marisol to *semlor*. By saying "let's try," Otto includes both himself and Marisol in the activity of tasting the food. Rather than simply telling Marisol to try it, he presents it as something they can do together.

Excerpt 2

Marisol: "Otto? You got your truck! Oh, my God!"

Otto: "Wanna go for a ride?"

Marisol: "Let's go for a ride?"

(Timestamp 01:52:47)

The dialogue occurs after Otto buys a new truck and invites Marisol to go for a ride. Marisol accepts the invitation by saying,

“Let’s go for a ride.” The inclusive expression “let’s” involves both Marisol and Otto in the proposed activity and presents the ride as something they will do together.

Strategy 13: Give or ask for Reason

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this strategy is used when the speaker gives a reason for an action or request so that the hearer can understand the speaker’s intention and is more likely to cooperate. Five utterances were classified under this strategy. Four were employed by Marisol toward Otto, while one was employed by Otto toward Marisol.

Excerpt 1

Marisol: **Anyway, we just, uh... We wanted to properly introduce ourselves because we’re gonna be neighbors and everything, so...**

Otto: **“Okay. Bye.”**
(Timestamp 18:57)

This exchange takes place when Marisol and Tommy visit Otto’s house and bring him food. Marisol explains that they come to introduce themselves because they will be living next to him. The clause “because we’re gonna be neighbors” gives Otto a reason for their visit and helps him understand why they want to begin a conversation with him.

Excerpt 2

Marisol: **“Can you please take me to the hospital? Please? Tommy fell off the ladder, and the ambulance just took him away.”**
(Timestamp 46:04)

The utterance occurs after Tommy falls from a ladder and is taken to the hospital. Marisol asks Otto to drive her there and immediately explains the emergency behind her request. By telling him what happened to Tommy, she gives Otto a clear reason for why she urgently needs his help.

Excerpt 3

Otto: “No, why can’t you?”

Marisol: **“Because I’m pregnant. I cannot handle the cats because I can get the toxo thing.”**

(Timestamp 52:16)

The dialogue occurs when Marisol asks Otto to handle a cat. After Otto asks why she cannot do it herself, Marisol explains that she is pregnant and concerned about the possible health risk. Her explanation helps Otto understand why she needs him to take care of the cat.

Excerpt 4

Marisol: **“Ah. Otto, pero can we go in our car? Because I’ve only ever driven automatic.”**

(Timestamp 01:05:05)

The utterance happens before Otto starts teaching Marisol to drive. She requests permission to use her own car, citing that she has only driven an automatic. Her explanation clarifies her preference and demonstrates why her own vehicle would be more appropriate for the lesson.

Excerpt 5

Otto: **“The real estate bastards are trying to force Anita and Reuben out of their home. That’s why I need to use your phone.”**

Marisol: “Okay, fine. Come on.”
(Timestamp: 01:38:53)

The conversation takes place after Marisol refuses to allow Otto to use her phone because he has not explained his reason for needing it. Otto then informs her that Anita and Reuben are at risk of being displaced from their home. The phrase “that’s why” directly links the problem to his request. Marisol’s reply indicates that she understands the reason and agrees to let him use the phone.

Strategy 14: Assume or Assert Reciprocity

Brown and Levinson (1987) describe this strategy as referring to a mutual exchange between the speaker and the hearer. The speaker may mention what the hearer has done and express a willingness to return the help. One utterance was classified under this strategy, and it was employed by Marisol toward Otto.

Excerpt 1

Marisol: **“Otto, also, I was thinking you've done so much for us. I wanna do something for you too.”**

Otto: “I don't need anything.”
(Timestamp 01:20:59)

After receiving help from Otto on several occasions, Marisol expresses her intention to return his kindness. The statement “you’ve done so much for us” refers to Otto’s previous support for her family,

while “I wanna do something for you too” shows that she wants to help him in return. The word “too” highlights the mutual nature of their relationship, since Marisol presents her offer as a response to what Otto has already done for them.

Strategy 15: Give Gifts to Hearer

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that gifts in positive politeness are not limited to physical objects. They may also include sympathy, understanding, attention, and cooperation that respond to the hearer’s wants. Seven utterances were classified under this strategy. Five were employed by Marisol toward Otto, while two were employed by Otto toward Marisol.

Excerpt 1

Marisol: **“I brought you some food.”**

Otto: “Why?”

Marisol: “Because you looked hungry.”

(Timestamp 18:43)

Marisol visits Otto’s house after he helps Tommy to park the car and brings him food. Her explanation, “Because you looked hungry,” shows that the food is given in response to what she sees as Otto’s need. The gift therefore carries both a material form and an expression of care.

Excerpt 2

Marisol: **“And I made you some salpores de arroz.”**

Otto: “Is that chicken and mole?”

Marisol: “No. These are Salvadoran cookies. They were my father’s favorite, so...”

(Timestamp 33:26)

When Marisol and Tommy return Otto's tools, Marisol also gives him homemade Salvadoran cookies. The phrase "I made you some" indicates that she prepared them specifically for Otto. By sharing food connected to her own family background, she gives him a personal gift rather than simply returning what they borrowed.

Excerpt 3

Marisol: **"Oh. I'm sorry."**
(Timestamp: 54:01)

After learning that Sonya has died, Marisol responds with "I'm sorry." The expression is not an apology for something she has done, but a way of showing sympathy for Otto's loss. Her response acknowledges the emotional importance of Sonya and offers Otto support during a sensitive conversation.

Excerpt 4

Marisol: **"Look at this. Um... Abbie wanted to make a picture of her new neighbor. She wants you to have that. [chuckles] That's you. She always draws you in color."**
(Timestamp 58:27)

Marisol gives Otto a picture drawn by Abbie and explains that the child made it for her new neighbor. Since the drawing was created specifically for Otto, it functions as a personal gift. Through the picture, Marisol also lets him know that Abbie sees him positively and considers him part of her social environment.

Excerpt 5

Marisol: "I suck at this. [groans] I suck."

Otto: **“You’re learning.”**
(Timestamp: 01:06:00)

During the driving lesson, Marisol becomes frustrated and speaks negatively about her ability. Otto responds by reminding her that she is still learning. Instead of agreeing with her self-criticism, he gives reassurance and shows understanding of the difficulty she is experiencing. His response provides emotional support when her confidence begins to decrease.

Excerpt 6

Otto: “My life was black and white before I met Sonya. She was the color.”

Marisol: **“I would have liked her.”**
(Timestamp 01:10:05)

Otto describes how important Sonya was in his life, and Marisol responds by saying that she would have liked her. The statement shows that Marisol understands Otto’s affection for Sonya and responds warmly to his personal memory. Her words offer acceptance and sympathy without interrupting the emotional meaning of his story.

Excerpt 7

Otto: **“I brought you something.”**

Marisol: “Otto. Otto.”

Otto: “I gave it a fresh coat of paint.”

Marisol: “I love it.”

Otto: **“It’s for the baby.”**
(Timestamp 01:48:26)

After Marisol gives birth, Otto brings a repainted bassinet for her baby. He not only gives her a physical object but also takes the time to prepare it before bringing it to her. The gift reflects his attention to Marisol's growing family and his willingness to support them.

2. Functions of Positive Politeness Strategies in Marisol and Otto's Interactions

This section presents how positive politeness strategies functioned in Marisol and Otto's interactions in *A Man Called Otto* (2022). The analysis shows that these strategies appeared in different interactional situations, including initial communication, cooperation, personal conversations, and mutual support between the two characters.

At the beginning of their interaction, positive politeness strategies mainly functioned to establish initial contact and reduce social distance between Marisol and Otto. When Marisol visited Otto's house and said, "I brought you some food" (00:18:43), she showed attention through an action that helped start their conversation. Similarly, when she explained, "We wanted to properly introduce ourselves because we're gonna be neighbors and everything, so..." (00:18:57), she provided a reason for her visit and created a more comfortable situation for interaction. These examples show that positive politeness strategies helped initiate communication between the two characters.

As their interactions continued, positive politeness strategies functioned to create cooperation and support the continuation of their conversations. This is evident when Marisol asked Otto for help in different situations. For example, when she asked him to take her to the hospital, she explained the situation by saying, "Tommy fell off the ladder, and the ambulance just took him away" (00:46:04). By providing a reason for her request, Marisol made the situation clearer and supported the continuation of their interaction. Similarly, Otto's response during the driving lesson,

“You’re learning” (01:06:00), functioned as encouragement during their conversation.

Positive politeness strategies also supported more personal exchanges when Marisol and Otto began sharing personal experiences. When Otto talked about Sonya and his past, Marisol responded, “I would have liked her” (01:10:05), showing recognition of something meaningful to Otto. Another example appeared when Marisol referred to Otto’s previous story about Reuben by saying, “But this was before the coup?” (01:11:39). This response shows that she remembered information from their previous conversation and used it to continue their interaction.

In later interactions, positive politeness strategies expressed mutual support between Marisol and Otto. Marisol showed appreciation for Otto’s previous help by saying, “You’ve done so much for us. I wanna do something for you too” (01:20:59). Similarly, Otto showed support by giving a repainted bassinet for Marisol’s baby and saying, “It’s for the baby” (01:48:26). These examples indicate that positive politeness strategies appeared in interactions involving reciprocal support, understanding, and cooperation between the two characters.

B. Discussion

1. Positive Politeness Strategies Used by Marisol and Otto

The findings of this study show that positive politeness strategies played an important role in Marisol and Otto’s interactions in *A Man Called Otto* (2022). Based on Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory, positive politeness strategies are used when speakers attempt to show attention, appreciation, and involvement toward the hearer. In this film, these strategies were expressed not only through direct compliments or friendly expressions but also in everyday conversations, requests, and supportive responses between the two characters.

One noticeable pattern found in this study is the frequent use of Strategy 15: Give Gifts to the Hearer. The frequent appearance of this strategy reflects that positive politeness in Marisol and Otto's interactions was often expressed through attention, support, and consideration toward each other. These expressions were not always shown through direct verbal praise, but also through small actions and responses that acknowledged the other character's situation. This finding supports Brown and Levinson's (1987) explanation that positive politeness involves showing that the speaker recognizes and values the hearer's positive face.

Another pattern found in the data is the use of Strategy 13: Give (or Ask for) Reasons, particularly in situations involving requests and cooperation. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), providing reasons can reduce the pressure of a request because the hearer can better understand the speaker's intention. In Marisol and Otto's interactions, this strategy appeared when one character needed help or wanted to explain a certain situation. By providing reasons, the characters communicated their needs more clearly and maintained cooperation during their conversations.

The difference in the use of positive politeness strategies between Marisol and Otto also reflects their different communication patterns. Marisol used these strategies more frequently because she was often the character who initiated conversations with Otto. However, this difference does not indicate that Marisol was more polite than Otto. Instead, it shows that both characters participated in the interaction in different ways. Marisol often created opportunities for communication, while Otto gradually became more involved through his responses and participation in shared activities.

2. The Role of Positive Politeness

The findings suggest that positive politeness strategies played a role in managing Marisol and Otto's interactions throughout *A Man Called Otto* (2022). Based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory, positive politeness

involves the speaker's effort to recognize the hearer's positive face by showing attention, appreciation, and involvement. In this study, positive politeness is not interpreted as the direct cause of changes in their interaction patterns, but as a form of communication that appeared alongside the development of their interactions.

One important role of positive politeness in Marisol and Otto's interactions was reducing social distance and creating opportunities for communication. At the beginning of the film, the two characters showed different levels of participation: Marisol was more active in initiating conversations, while Otto offered limited responses. Through strategies such as showing attention, providing explanations, and expressing concern, Marisol maintained interaction with Otto and created opportunities for further communication. This shows that positive politeness can help manage initial encounters between individuals who do not yet have an established connection.

Another role of positive politeness was supporting cooperation during their interactions. When one character needed assistance, positive politeness strategies helped maintain the flow of communication by allowing requests and responses to occur in a more considerate way. For example, the use of reasons in requests enabled the speaker to explain the situation clearly and helped maintain cooperation between the characters. This reflects Brown and Levinson's (1987) view that positive politeness can reduce potential tension in interaction by emphasizing shared understanding between the speaker and the hearer.

The role of positive politeness in supporting interpersonal connection is also in line with previous studies. Abdul Aziz and Hashim (2025) found that positive politeness strategies contributed to solidarity and cooperation among characters in *The Social Network*. Similarly, Sari and Sutopo (2024) showed that positive politeness strategies in film dialogue were used to maintain interaction between characters. In relation to these studies, the present research also shows that positive politeness supported

interaction between Marisol and Otto through attention, cooperation, and personal conversations.

However, this study provides a different focus from previous research on *A Man Called Otto*. Nurmasiyah and Rahayu (2025) examined politeness strategies in relation to phatic communication, while this research focuses specifically on positive politeness strategies used by Marisol and Otto and how their roles appeared throughout their interactions. Therefore, this study highlights how positive politeness functions as part of changing interaction patterns between characters in a fictional context.



CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter presents the conclusion drawn from the findings and discussion of the study. The conclusion is organized around the two research questions: the types of positive politeness strategies employed by Marisol and Otto, and the functions of those strategies in the development of their relationship. This chapter also provides recommendations for teachers and lecturers, students of English Education, and future researchers.

A. Conclusion

This study examined the positive politeness strategies employed by Marisol and Otto in their interactions in *A Man Called Otto* (2022). It focused on the types of strategies used by both characters and how those strategies functioned in the development of their relationship. Based on the analysis, 33 utterances containing positive politeness strategies were identified.

Marisol and Otto employed 12 of the 15 positive politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). The identified strategies were Notice, Attend to the Hearer; Exaggerate Interest, Approval, or Sympathy with the Hearer; Use In-Group Identity Markers; Seek Agreement; Presuppose, Raise, or Assert Common Ground; Joke; Offer or Promise; Be Optimistic; Include Both the Speaker and the Hearer in the Activity; Give (or Ask for) Reasons; Assume or Assert Reciprocity; and Give Gifts to the Hearer. The three strategies that were not identified were Intensify Interest to the Hearer, Avoid Disagreement, and Assert or Presuppose the Speaker's Knowledge of and Concern for the Hearer's Wants.

Give Gifts to the Hearer was the most frequently identified strategy, with seven occurrences or 21.21% of the data. It was followed by Give (or Ask for) Reasons, with five occurrences or 15.15%, and Notice, Attend to the Hearer, with four occurrences or 12.12%. These findings show that positive politeness

in their interactions was often expressed through attention, reasons, practical help, sympathy, understanding, and emotional support.

The two characters showed different patterns in their use of positive politeness. Marisol produced 25 of the 33 utterances, while Otto produced eight. Marisol employed positive politeness more frequently and through a wider range of strategies. She often used these strategies when initiating communication, asking for help or cooperation, showing concern, and maintaining communication with Otto. Otto employed fewer strategies, but his encouragement, humor, inclusive expressions, reasons, and gifts showed that he gradually became more open and involved in their interactions. This difference reflects their different communication styles and roles in the relationship rather than simply showing that one character was more polite than the other.

The functions of positive politeness also changed as their relationship developed. In their earlier interactions, the strategies mainly functioned to establish contact, create friendlier communication, and reduce the distance between them. At this stage, Marisol made most of the efforts to approach Otto, while Otto generally remained reserved. As their interactions continued, positive politeness supported cooperation and personal openness. Marisol began to treat Otto as someone she could depend on, while Otto became more willing to help her and share personal experiences.

In their later interactions, the use of positive politeness became more reciprocal. Both characters showed greater concern, understanding, cooperation, and willingness to support each other. Marisol continued to approach and communicate with Otto, while Otto gradually became more willing to accept her presence, respond to her, and offer his support. Overall, the use of positive politeness reflected the gradual development of their relationship from initial distance toward cooperation, personal openness, and mutual care.

Overall, this study highlights the importance of interpreting positive politeness strategies by considering the context in which they are used and the relationship between the speakers. In *A Man Called Otto*, the strategies

employed by Marisol and Otto show how their language use reflects their interactions and relationships throughout the film.

B. Recommendation

The findings of this study form the basis for several recommendations addressed to Teachers and Lecturers, English Education students, and future researchers.

1. For Teachers and Lecturers

Teachers and lecturers, especially those teaching pragmatics or related language courses, may use film dialogue as supplementary material to illustrate how positive politeness strategies are used in context. Selected excerpts can be used to guide students in identifying the strategies and explaining their interpretations by considering the speaker's intention, the surrounding conversation, and the situation in which the interaction occurs. Through this kind of activity, teachers and lecturers can encourage students to analyze politeness strategies based on the whole context of an utterance rather than relying only on particular words or expressions.

2. For English Education Students

English Education students are encouraged to develop a deeper understanding of pragmatics by examining how language is used in context. A politeness strategy cannot always be identified from a single word or expression. Its interpretation should also consider the speaker's intention, the situation in which the interaction occurs, the relationship between the participants, and the hearer's response.

To develop this skill, students can explore the various ways positive politeness is conveyed, such as showing attention, seeking agreement, giving reasons, offering help, using humor, and expressing sympathy or understanding. Film dialogue can serve as useful material for this purpose

because each utterance is presented within a scene that provides contextual clues for interpreting its meaning and function.

3. For Future Research

This study focused on the positive politeness strategies employed in the interactions between Marisol and Otto in one film. Future researchers may examine positive politeness in interactions between other character pairs, either in *A Man Called Otto* or in other films. Focusing on a different relationship may provide a broader understanding of how positive politeness is used by characters with different personalities, communication styles, and levels of closeness.

Future researchers may also use other data sources, such as television series, interviews, classroom interactions, or everyday conversations. Since film dialogue is scripted, using other data sources may provide a different context for examining how positive politeness is employed in communication.

When analyzing positive politeness strategies, future researchers are advised to consider each utterance together with its context. The speaker's intention, the surrounding conversation, the hearer's response, and the situation in which the interaction occurs should be considered when identifying and interpreting a strategy.

REFERENCES

- Aziz, A. K., & Hashim, H. U. (2025). Politeness Strategies in Film: A Pragmatic Analysis of Dialogue in "The Social Network". *International Journal of Linguistics of Sumatra and Malay (IJLSM)*, 25-37. <https://doi.org/10.32734/ijlsm.v4i1.20786>
- Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>
- Khaqqi, A. A., & Pradipta, B. (2024). An analysis of impoliteness strategy used by the main character in *A Man Called Otto* movie. *Proceeding of Conference on Literature, Linguistic, and Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 115-123. <https://doi.org/10.30996/uncollcs.v3i1.4465>
- Locher, M. A., & Jucker, A. H. (2021). *The pragmatics of fiction: Literature, stage and screen discourse*. Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781474447959>
- Nurmasyitah, S., & Rahayu, F. E. S. (2025). Politeness strategies in phatic utterances: A pragmatic study of film *A Man Called Otto*. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya*, 9(3), 115–128. <https://doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v9i3.23018>

- Sari, I. N., & Sutopo, A. (2024). An analysis of positive politeness strategies in *Spiderman: Far From Home* movie (2019). *ELTIN Journal: Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 12(1), 63–72. <https://e-journal.stkipsiliwangi.ac.id/index.php/eltin/article/view/4087>
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. SAGE Publications.
- Scraps from the Loft. (2023, March 3). *A man called Otto* (2022) Transcript. <https://scrapsfromtheloft.com/movies/a-man-called-otto-transcript/>
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (7th Ed). Wiley Blackwell.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.



APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Film Transcript Of “A Man Called Otto” Film

No.	Timestamp	Utterance	Strategy
1.	00:13:41	Marisol: “Yes! Exactly! That’s exactly what I was saying”	Seek Agreement
2.	00:18:43	Marisol: “I brought you some food.”	Give Gifts to Hearer
3.	00:18:57	Marisol: “Anyway, we just, uh... We wanted to properly introduce ourselves because we’re gonna be neighbors and everything, so...”	Give or Ask for Reasons
4.	00:20:37	Marisol: “It’s “Allen” wrench, right? It’s Allen wrench.”	Seek Agreement
5.	00:33:26	Marisol: “And I made you some salpores de arroz.”	Give Gifts to Hearer
6.	00:46:04	Marisol: “Can you please take me to the hospital? Please? Tommy fell off the ladder, and the ambulance just took him away.”	Give or Ask for Reasons
7.	00:51:08	Marisol: “My father used to smile like that.”	Notice, Attend to Hearer
8.	00:51:16	Otto: “What about Alvin Wrench, is he coming?”	Joke
9.	00:52:16	Marisol: “Because I’m pregnant. I cannot handle the cats because I can get the toxo thing.”	Give or Ask for Reasons

10.	00:53:38	Marisol: “Your counters are so low. Where did you get them?”	Notice, Attend to Hearer
11.	00:54:01	Marisol: “Oh. I’m sorry.”	Give Gifts to Hearer
12.	00:58:27	Marisol: “Look at this. Um... Abbie wanted to make a picture of her new neighbor. She wants you to have that. [chuckles] That’s you. She always draws you in color.”	Give Gifts to Hearer
13.	00:58:42	Marisol: “Hm! I have a very good idea. You can be my driver’s instructor.”	Be Optimistic
14.	00:58:54	Marisol: “But don’t worry, I’ll pay for the gas and everything.”	Offer, Promise
15.	01:04:23	Marisol: “What? You’re gonna teach me? Really? Otto, thank you!”	Exaggerate (Interest, Approval, Sympathy with Hearer)
16.	01:05:05	Marisol: “Ah. Otto, pero can we go in our car? Because I’ve only ever driven automatic.”	Give or Ask for Reasons
17.	01:06:00	Otto: “You’re learning.”	Give Gifts to Hearer
18.	01:07:17	Otto: “Now you listen to me. You have given birth to two children. Soon it’ll be three. You have come here from a country very far away. You learned a new language, you got yourself an education and a nitwit husband, and you	Exaggerate (Interest, Approval, Sympathy with Hearer)

		are holding that family together. You will have no problem learning how to drive.”	
19.	01:08:10	Otto: “Ah... Yeah. Qué bueno.”	Use In-Group Identity Markers
20.	01:09:02	Otto: “They’re a little messy. But let’s try.”	Include Both the Speaker and the Hearer in the Activity
21.	01:09:16	Marisol: “Mmm! How did you find this place?”	Notice, Attend to Hearer
22.	01:10:05	Marisol: “I would have liked her.”	Give Gifts to Hearer
23.	01:11:39	Marisol: “But this was before the coup?”	Presuppose, Raise, Assert Common Ground
24.	01:13:27	Otto: “I don’t know what went wrong with Reuben, but that’s when I knew I’d lost him. I mean, a man has to stand up for what he believes in. Even if it is a F-O-R-D.”	Joke
25.	01:14:32	Marisol: “No. Don’t be silly. It’s gonna be very fun. If you remember, Abbie has to be in bed by 9:00, okay? You’re good?”	Be Optimistic

26.	01:20:59	Marisol: “Otto, also, I was thinking you've done so much for us. I wanna do something for you too.”	Assume or Assert Reciprocity
27.	01:21:16	Marisol: “I was thinking that I can help you clean out your house and clean out the front hall in your home, and help you pack the coats and shoes you have there of Sonya’s.”	Offer, Promise
28.	01:23:05	Marisol: “Otto, Otto. Otto, what’s going on? Are you okay? Do you feel okay?”	Notice, Attend to Hearer
29.	01:26:46	Marisol: “I thought you handled it really well. I mean, closing her in your garage. That was, like, excellent strategy. [grows] Good job.”	Exaggerate (Interest, Approval, Sympathy with Hearer)
30.	01:38:53	Otto: “The real estate bastards are trying to force Anita and Reuben out of their home. That’s why I need to use your phone.”	Give or Ask for Reasons
31.	01:47:10	Marisol: “You’re really bad at dying, you know that?”	Joke
32.	01:48:26	Otto: “It’s for the baby.”	Give Gifts to Hearer
33.	01:52:47	Marisol: “Let’s go for a ride?”	Include Both the Speaker and the Hearer in the Activity



Appendix 2: Thesis Approval Letter



KEPUTUSAN DEKAN FAKULTAS TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN UIN AR-RANIRY BANDA ACEH NOMOR : 643 TAHUN 2026

TENTANG: PENGANGKATAN PEMBIMBING SKRIPSI MAHASISWA

DENGAN RAHMAT TUHAN YANG MAHA ESA

DEKAN FAKULTAS TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN UIN AR-RANIRY BANDA ACEH

- Menimbang :
- bahwa untuk kelancaran bimbingan skripsi mahasiswa pada Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh maka dipandang perlu menunjuk Pembimbing skripsi;
 - bahwa yang namanya tersebut dalam Surat Keputusan ini dianggap cakap dan mampu untuk diangkat dalam jabatan sebagai Pembimbing skripsi Mahasiswa;
 - bahwa berdasarkan pertimbangan sebagaimana dimaksud dalam huruf a dan huruf b, perlu menetapkan Keputusan Dekan Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh.

- Mengingat :
- Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003, tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional;
 - Undang-Undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2005, tentang Guru dan Dosen;
 - Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2012, tentang Pendidikan Tinggi;
 - Peraturan Presiden Nomor 74 Tahun 2012, tentang perubahan atas peraturan pemerintah RI Nomor 23 Tahun 2005 tentang pengelolaan keuangan Badan Layanan Umum;
 - Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 4 Tahun 2014, tentang penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Tinggi dan Pengelolaan Perguruan Tinggi;
 - Peraturan Presiden Nomor 64 Tahun 2013, tentang perubahan Institusi Agama Islam negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh Menjadi Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh;
 - Peraturan Menteri Agama RI Nomor 44 Tahun 2022, tentang Organisasi & Tata Kerja UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh;
 - Peraturan Menteri Agama Nomor 14 Tahun 2022, tentang Statuta UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh;
 - Keputusan Menteri Agama Nomor 492 Tahun 2003, tentang Pendelegasian Wewenang Pengangkatan, Pemindahan dan Pemberhentian PNS di Lingkungan Depag RI;
 - Keputusan Menteri Keuangan Nomor 283/Kmk.05/2011, tentang penetapan institusi agama Islam Negeri UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh pada Kementerian Agama sebagai Instansi Pemerintah yang menerapkan Pengelolaan Badan Layanan Umum;
 - Surat Keputusan Rektor UIN Ar-Raniry Nomor 01 Tahun 2016, Tentang Pendelegasian Wewenang kepada Dekan dan Direktur Pascasarjana di Lingkungan UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh.

MEMUTUSKAN

- Menetapkan :
- Keputusan Dekan Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh tentang Pembimbing Skripsi Mahasiswa

- KESATU
KEDUA :
- Menyebut Keputusan Dekan FTK UIN Ar-Raniry No: 015 TAHUN 2026
 - Mesrajak Saudara:
Dr. Risdanwa, S.Pd.I., M.A

Untuk membimbing Skripsi

- Nama : Linda Amalia
NIM : 220203047
Program Studi : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Judul Skripsi : An Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies in A Man Called Otto

- KETIGA :
- Kepada pembimbing yang tercantum namanya diatas diberikan honorarium sesuai dengan peraturan perundang-undangan yang berlaku;

- KEEMPAT :
- Pembayaran akibat keputusan ini dibebankan pada DIPA UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh Nomor SP DIPA-025.04.2.423935/2024 Tanggal 02 Desember 2024 Tahun Anggaran 2025.

- KELIMA :
- Surat Keputusan ini berlaku selama enam bulan sejak ditetapkan;

- KEENAM :
- Surat Keputusan ini berlaku sejak tanggal ditetapkan dengan ketentuan bahwa segala sesuatu akan diubah dan diperbaiki kembali sebagaimana mestinya, apabila kemudian hari ternyata terdapat kekeliruan dalam Surat Keputusan ini

Ditetapkan di : Banda Aceh
Pada tanggal : 08 Juli 2026
Dekan

[Signature]
Saifur Muluk

Tembusan

- Sekjen Kementerian Agama RI di Jakarta;
- Direktur Pendidikan Islam Kementerian Agama RI di Jakarta;
- Direktur Pendidikan Tinggi Kementerian Agama RI di Jakarta;
- Kalider (Kelayakan Pendidikan) Kementerian Agama RI di Banda Aceh;
- Rektor UIN Ar-Raniry di Banda Aceh;
- Kepala Bagian Keuangan dan Akuntansi UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh;
- Yang bersangkutan;
- Asip.



pusaka