

---

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

## “Who the Hell are You?”: Language Styles and Politeness in the Film *Enola Holmes*

Devi Putri Hartika<sup>1</sup> and Ardik Ardianto<sup>2</sup> ✉

<sup>1,2</sup>English Language and Literature Department, Universitas Terbuka, South Tangerang, Indonesia

**Corresponding Author:** Ardik Ardianto E-mail: [ardik@ecampus.ut.ac.id](mailto:ardik@ecampus.ut.ac.id)

---

**ABSTRACT**

Language is a human communication tool consisting of words, grouping of words, phrases, and sentences, used in both spoken and written forms. Language, in sociolinguistics, serves as a means of representing social status and plays a crucial role in defining a society's cultural identity. Language style refers to the way individuals adjust their language as per the situation, the person engaged, and the topic of conversation, otherwise known as cultural and situational contexts. This research aims to identify the language styles used in the film *Enola Holmes* and explore the elements influencing the language style used by characters in the film. This study employed a qualitative methodology incorporating Martin Joos's theory to examine various language styles and Brown and Levinson's theory to identify the determinants of language style selection. Based on the findings, the predominant language style used was casual (64.4%), followed by consultative (21.6%), intimate (11.2%), and formal (2.4%). It concluded that language styles are influenced by various events and personal factors. Formal language helps establish boundaries among interlocutors, allowing individuals to enhance their likability and social image using positive face strategies whereas informal language, viz. casual, consultative, and intimate styles, is used to communicate with friends or family members in casual, everyday situations.

**KEYWORDS**

Face-threatening act, language styles, politeness strategies

**ARTICLE INFORMATION**

**ACCEPTED:** 02 November 2024

**PUBLISHED:** 26 November 2024

**DOI:** 10.32996/ijllt.2024.7.12.7

---

### 1. Introduction

Language is a fundamental aspect of human cognition, enabling individuals to communicate thoughts, concepts, wishes, emotions, and encounters through written or spoken means (van Berkum, 2019; Wiltschko, 2022; Zong & Zhen, 2021). It also emerges, as per the systemic functional linguistics perspective, as a type of social semiotics that functions within the certain situational and cultural context (Fomin & Ilyin, 2019; Liu, 2014). Human lifestyles in diverse social groups and regions potentially impact language use, particularly language variation, in modern times (Huang & Wu, 2023). Language variation is a complex and multi-faced phenomenon, involving discrepancies in structure and meaning within and among languages due to numerous sociocultural aspects (Bassiouney, 2020; Walker, 2021). Language style, as part of language variation, highly relies on the importance of audience design, which suggests that speakers modify discourse to suit listeners, highlighting social environment and identity (Bell, 1984, 2007; Coupland, 2007). It is crucial to recognize changes in language style according to different circumstances and conversational partners. This involves using structured language in professional settings and a relaxed tone in casual ones. Understanding cultural norms and actively listening to your conversational partner ensures respectful and effective communication, leading to more successful and meaningful exchanges.

Language style can reflect an individual's personality and emotions (Langley, 2017; Semin et al., 2002). The language style in a formal situation differs from that in a casual setting. Each individual possesses a distinct language style that plays a crucial role in facilitating mutual understanding in social situations. Martin Joos (1967) categorizes language use under five distinct styles: frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate. The use of these five linguistic styles is adapted based on the circumstances, the

interlocutors, and the subject matter under consideration (Beade, 1968). For instance, during a speech in a ceremonial address, the language employed is the formal and rigid style known as the frozen language style; meanwhile, during a lecture in a class, a lecturer often employs a formal language style in the conversation. In a family setting, a father converses with a mother using an intimate language style to demonstrate their close and intimate relationship; so does lovers address each other through the use of personal addressing terms, such as “dear” and “my love”. In a more relaxed and informal setting, interlocutors often use a casual style to highlight simplicity, cultural and social adaptability, and familiarity so as to ease interlocutors to understand and apply in daily communication (Debora, 2013).

Joos (1967) further defines language style as a continuum ranging from high to low convenience, which varies depending on the circumstances. His book *The Five Clocks* explores the different degrees of formality in both spoken and written language, categorizing them into five distinct styles: (1) frozen style, a rigid and unchanging language style that is exclusively used in highly formal and significant events like religious ceremonies or inauguration ceremonies; (2) formal style, employed in formal and important situations, adhering to the patterns and rules of grammar in standard English; (3) consultative style, oriented towards a professional or semi-formal atmosphere; (4) casual style, used in everyday life, in comfortable and relaxed situations, such as conversing with family and friends; finally, (5) familiar or intimate style, privately used by individuals sharing very close interpersonal relationships, such as parents, children, close friends, and lovers. This nuanced approach, incorporating these five language styles, provides valuable insight into how language adapts to various social contexts, enhancing our understanding of effective communication in diverse environments.

The universally acknowledged reason for this variance in linguistic style is the meticulousness with which interlocutors articulate their thoughts. In formal settings, it is more likely to be mindful of language choices and are more likely to adhere to the preferred and informed cultural conventions. A multilingual speaker has the ability to manipulate several linguistic variations and selects the appropriate level of discourse based on the specific audience being addressed (Ting, 2001; van Compernelle, 2017). So as to create a welcoming impression, we may deliberately adopt an informal manner as conversing with unfamiliar individuals. In relation to this subconscious adaptation, we instinctively modify our speech to become more akin to our conversation partner in terms of lexical choices, acoustic-prosodic features, and discourse-level elements (Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil & Lee, 2011; Hirschberg, 2008). These two techniques provide insights into the significance of language in constructing social connections and expressing the interlocutor’s personal identity.

Another salient theory that is a part of the language style in conversational discourse is that of politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The theory of politeness focuses on correcting insults to self-esteem and promoting positive norms in social interactions. It includes the sociological concept of face, which includes positive and negative face, face threatening and saving acts, on-off records, and positive and negative politeness strategies (Borris & Zecho, 2018; Korneliaeva, 2019; Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2017; Yusny, 2013). The concept of face in politeness theory is not about the literal meaning of face but rather the image or self-image one wants to be recognized in the social eye (Sifianou, 2011). A positive face is used when someone has the motivation to be liked and considered part of a social group, aiming to maintain a good image in front of the public. Hastings and Castle Bell (2018) details the concept of positive face into three categories, namely character, social, and status face, by considering protective strategies adopted, types of face threats, corrective strategies, and pejorative labels.

If a positive face is employed to get approval from others, a negative face tends to exhibit more self-centered behavior. Having a negative face does not inherently imply something negative. This strategy is intended for individuals who desire solitude or wish to avoid requests and obligations that are intended to please others (Zhang, 2021). Put simply, one desires to avoid feeling obligated or encumbered to comply with the desires of others due to their words or requests. Note that in this context, the terms “positive” and “negative” do not pertain to the conventional notions of good and bad. Rather, they both denote a state devoid of any form of evaluation or judgment (Haugh & Bargiela-Chiappini, 2010). Positive face emphasizes the concepts of solidarity and equality, while negative face emphasizes the concepts of respect and caring (Arundale, 2006). Negative face is not inherently inferior to a positive face, and vice versa. It refers to the desire for freedom from restrictions and influence imposed by others, which is reinforced by communication that emphasizes autonomy, independence, and personal resilience (Samp, 2015).

A Face-Threatening Act refers to an activity threatening someone’s expectations as of how their public perception or image emerges (O’Driscoll, 2007; Silalahi, 2018). Face-threatening activities typically involve making forthright statements without considering the impact on the other person’s reputation or self-image (Putri & Nurita, 2021). For instance, if someone intends to admonish by saying, “please lower your voice as it is highly disruptive,” then this would be considered an FTA. Conversely, when someone minimizes the likelihood of harm to others’ reputation, this activity is referred to as a Face-Saving Act (Eriksson et al., 2015). As demonstrated in the following sentence, “sorry, I’m trying to study; may I request some personal space to concentrate on my studies?”, as an individual employs a face-saving act, it diminishes the influence of external threats on their reputation or the expectations of others. Furthermore, on record is a method where we explicitly express our wishes to the interlocutor, such as

asking for help when we forget to bring a notebook. This method is face-threatening and burdens the interlocutor, making it difficult to understand if the request is an order (Pichonnaz et al., 2021). Off record, on the other hand, does not directly express the speaker’s wishes to the listener, allowing the other person to ignore the speaker’s words (Félix-Brasdefer, 2005).

This study aims to firstly identify the language styles employed in the film *Enola Holmes* (Bradbeer, 2020) and secondly analyze the function and purpose of the chosen language styles utilized by the key characters in the film based on Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory (1987).

### **3. Methodology**

This study employed a descriptive qualitative method to examine the language styles found in the film “*Enola Holmes*” (Bradbeer, 2020). Qualitative research is characterized by its descriptive nature, as it primarily concentrates on the process, meaning, and comprehension derived from words or descriptions (Awasthy, 2019; Nassaji, 2015). It focused on identifying and categorizing different sorts of language styles based on specific sentences. The data were derived from the first film of the Netflix “*Enola Holmes*” (Bradbeer, 2020) based on the novel by Nancy Springer. The narrative revolves around the exploits of the youngest sibling of Mycroft and Sherlock Holmes as she embarks on a quest to trace her mother’s whereabouts. The film was selected for this study due to its setting in the late Victorian era. It is intriguing to analyze the language styles employed by characters in the film in different situations. This is due to language dynamics and the choice of words used during the era that differs from the present day. The data collection and analysis in this study consisted of several phrases, viz. 1) identifying the film by carefully watching it on the official Netflix platform; 2) analyzing and categorizing the dialogue in the film into a data table that includes different language styles based on Martin Joos’s theory; 3) examining the factors influencing the use or selection of language styles using Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory; lastly 4) presenting the representative data accordingly.

### **4. Results and Discussion**

After collecting the data, this study found 4 types of language styles in film, i.e., consultative style, formal style, casual style, and intimate style. Of the four language styles, the casual style was the most widely used or predominant style, followed by consultative, intimate, and formal ones. The following table presents the details of the data.

**Table 1:** Language Styles in the Film *Enola Holmes* Season 1

<b>Language Style</b>	<b>Data (Dialogue)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Casual Style	161	64.4%
Consultative Style	54	21.6%
Intimate Style	28	11.2%
Formal Style	7	2.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100%</b>

From the analysis results of 250 conversational data, there were four language styles used in the *Enola Holmes* Season 1. The table above shows that the most common style used is casual as much as 161 data or 64.4%. The second is consultative language style as much as 54 data or 21.6%. The third most language style is familiar style as much as 28 data or 11.2%, and the last is formal style as much as 7 data or 2.4%. The following section elaborates on several representative samples along with factors influencing the interlocutors in choosing a language style. Firstly, the prevalence of a casual linguistic style in the film indicates that the characters often express their acquaintance with each other in situational contexts that are often amicable and resemble regular everyday conversations, emphasizing aspects of mutual respect for one another (Purba et al., 2021; Putra et al., 2024; Turnip et al., 2021). Secondly, consultative and imitative styles indicate that the conversations that occurred in the film range from an intimate relationship among interlocutors, such as among Holmes’s family members, to professional and semi-professional ones. Lastly, the formal style frequently occurred during the formal interactions, highlighting politeness, respect, and self-dignity.

#### **3.1 Formal Style**

Formal language style is appropriate for formal and significant occasions, adhering to the grammatical patterns and rules established by the standards of a language. It is characterized by explicit description, detachment, and accuracy in favor of reducing ambiguity and context-dependence. It typically features prepositions, adjectives, and nouns (Heylighen & Dewaele, 1999). The film *Enola Holmes*, released in 2020, incorporates formal linguistic patterns throughout three key scenes: as Mycroft Holmes seeks to enroll Enola in a personality school, as Miss Harrison instructs her students, and as Sherlock Holmes paid a visit to see Enola Holmes. The following dialogue illustrates the data for the formal style:

*Mycroft: “A motor car. How delightful, Miss Harrison.” (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:12:09 – 0:12:11)*

Miss Harrison: "Well, I am an educator, **Mr. Holmes**. I like to keep ahead of the times." (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:12:12 – 0:12:16)

This situation occurred in front of the Holmes family house. Mycroft and Miss Harrison were old friends; however, in this situation Mycroft used a formal style by addressing her *Miss Harrison*. In addition, Mycroft welcomed her as a teacher and himself as the guardian of his sister, Enola Holmes. Politeness is a principle in every interaction, and interlocutors are bound to it every day either consciously or unconsciously. Based on the Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987), Mycroft in this conversation used a positive face to demonstrate his politeness towards Miss Harrison. He wanted to appear polite as well as friendly so as to be liked and appreciated by others in social aspects, especially from his interlocutor, Miss Harrison. Mycroft's desire encouraged him to use a more formal language style in order to gain a good image as a man with dignity. The use of formal language between Mycroft and Miss Harrison demonstrates that on particular occasions, especially in the formal one, interlocutors tend to demonstrate their politeness through a positive strategy aiming to earn mutual respect dignity, and maintain faces. Such strategy is often manifested through the use of formal addressing terms or honorifics, which is closely related to face preservation (Ide, 2005).

Mycroft: "Oh, Miss Harrison, I am so **grateful** for your kindness." (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:15:02 – 0:15:05)

Miss Harrison: "**Mr. Holmes**, It's an honor." (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:15:07 – 0:15:09)

Mycroft: "I **shall** bring her tomorrow myself." (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:15:10 – 0:15:12)

The situation takes place in the Holmes' parlor in which Enola asks her older siblings, especially Sherlock to persuade Mycroft not to admit her to Miss Harrison's personality school. Miss Harrison thought Enola would actually go to her school and got along with her. Nevertheless, Mycroft did not want Miss Harrison to take his sister right away and therefore told her directly his wish. In this situational context, Mycroft still used formal language style to show his gratitude for Miss Harrison's help in dealing with Enola. The word *grateful* primarily refers to a formal situation, as well as the use of the word *shall* which is more polite and formal than that of *will*. In this occasion, Mycroft used the negative face approach—it does not necessarily mean a bad thing. Unlike the positive face which tends to adjust the desire to be accepted, liked, or appreciated in a social environment, the negative face prioritizes personal desires which gives more freedom that is not imposed by others on him (Arundale, 2006). From the conversation, it can be inferred that Mycroft wished to escort his own sister and his statement cannot be contested by Miss Harrison. He maintained a formal style of language to maintain politeness as a dignified person and preserve his negative face before Miss Harrison.

### 3.2 Consultative Style

Consultative language style refers to semi-formal situations or within the scope of professionalism at work, which is often characterized by short responses, complete structure, standard signals, and polite utterances among interlocutors. In some situations that occur, the consultative style is found in several scenes, e.g., as the Tewksbury family looks for her, as Enola disguises herself and offered services to the Tewksbury family, or as Sherlock talks to the maid in his house. The following dialogue illustrates the data for the consultative style:

Police Commander: "He's not on the train." (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:21:30 – 0:21:32)

Tewksbury's uncle: "Of course he's on the train! You simply haven't looked properly." (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:21:32 – 0:21:35)

Police Commander: "**Sir**, I've had my officers search this train from top to bottom." (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:21:35 – 0:21:38)

The situation takes place at the railway station where the Tewksbury family was looking for Enola who disguised herself. The language style used by Uncle Tewksbury is consultative style. The consultative style is also known as the semi-formal style used in professional situations, e.g., in the example above, the conversation took place between a member of a noble family and the Police Commander guarding the station. The word *Sir* was used to mark politeness in the consultative style used by the Police Commander to Uncle Tewksbury. In this context, Uncle Tewksbury used the face threatening act (FTA) approach. This approach was used by not giving the listener a choice or not paying attention to the listener's view of the speaker by bluntly stating his wishes (O'Driscoll, 2007; Pichonnaz et al., 2021; Silalahi, 2018). However, on the negative side, the Police Commander was in a difficult position to decide or reject Uncle Tewksbury's wishes. The Police Commander used a consultative style to maintain professionalism at work. This dialogue illustrates that the FTA used by Uncle Tewksbury indicates asymmetrical power relation—Uncle Tewksbury put himself higher in power position than Police Commander. However, such asymmetrical power relation occurs due to professionalism in lieu of social hierarchy. The FTA demonstrated by Uncle Tewksbury is also manifested through the use of direct imperative addressed to the Police Commander, viz. in this case so as to demand the Police Commander to look or search properly the whole train.

Sherlock: "So now we've lost them both. I presume they have no clue as to where she's gone, **Mrs. Lane**?" (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:28:56 – 0:29:00)

Mrs. Lane: "No, they found her bicycle." (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:29:01 – 0:29:03)

Sherlock: "Planted so as to send us in the wrong direction." (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:29:04 – 0:29:05)

This situation took place in the Holmes family house. The conversation involved Sherlock and Mrs. Lane who is the maid of the Holmes' house. The language style used by Sherlock was consultative style as it occurred in semi-formal conditions. In addition,

Sherlock still respected Mrs. Lane’s position as a worker as well as being older than him. Sherlock used positive politeness strategy as talking to Mrs. Lane, a woman maid who works in his house. To gain approval from the interlocutor, this approach suggests that the speaker uses utterances that the interlocutor would like to hear to make him agree or justify the speaker’s opinion (Sifianou, 2011). Through this approach, Mrs. Lane was freer to respond. In this case, apart from wanting to ask for approval of the opinion conveyed by him, Sherlock also used a consultative style to still respect Mrs. Lane’s position or profession in his house. Different from the previous data, this dialogue illustrates that a consultative style can accommodate not only an FTA but also a positive politeness strategy, i.e., maintaining the interlocutor’s positive face. Despite potentially asymmetrical power relation intertwined between Sherlock and Mrs. Lane due to professional demand, i.e., Sherlock as the employer and Mrs. Lane as the employee, the positive politeness strategy preferred by Sherlock in this dialogue demonstrates that he aims to respect and gain justification politely from Mrs. Lane as to the Enola’s whereabouts.

### **3.3 Casual Style**

The casual style employs simpler language that is appropriate for everyday interactions, including those with family members, co-workers, and friends (Putri et al., 2023). It often highlights simplicity, cultural and social adaptability, and familiarity so as to ease interlocutors to understand and apply in daily communication (Deborá, 2013). The film prominently features a casual manner, particularly evident in the interactions between Enola and Tewksbury. Several instances in the film showcase the use of this language style, including Enola’s retrieval of her two brothers at the train station, her encounter with Tewksbury, and the contact between Enola and Edith, a friend of Enola’s mother, to name a few. The following dialogue illustrates the data for the casual style:

*Tewksbury: “Who the hell are you? Look, I believe our recent brush with death deserves me at least a name.” (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:30:10 – 0:30:15)*

*Enola: “Enola Holmes.” (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:30:15 – 0:30:16)*

*Tewksbury: “Holmes...Like Sherlock?” (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:30:18 – 0:30:20)*

Tewksbury’s language style is casual. The situation occurred after Enola and Tewksbury had escaped from the pursuit of a hitman on a train. Casual style is a language style used in a normal setting, suitable for conversations with friends or sometimes family. It can also be used with strangers to show friendliness. The approach used by Tewksbury is *on-record* which can also be considered as a face threatening act (FTA). By going on record, a speaker can make the listener believe that he is an honest person and give trust to the listener, but Tewksbury’s request left Enola with no other choice but to answer. Tewksbury used a casual language style because he thought that he and Enola could become friends due their same age and seeing the fact that Enola was an ordinary person. He tried to communicate more casually with Enola through an *on-record* approach where Tewksbury directly asked Enola’s name so as to get to know her better. The use of swearing *who the hell* to address Enola further illustrates that a casual style can accommodate various linguistic features, including swearing, slang, colloquial, to name a few, in favor of cultural and social adaptability and familiarity between Tewksbury and Enola. The swearing in this context is rather used to demonstrate equal relation between them. Such equal relation is further enforced by the direct *on-record* requested by Tewksbury in regard to Enola’s identity.

*Enola: “Hmm. I’ve been thinking. You need to disguise yourself a little. How do you feel about your hair?” (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:32:00 – 0:32:04)*

*Tewksbury: “I’ve never cared for it. Cut it off with a Knife. Of course, you will. Who taught you how to sharpen it like that?” (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:32:05 – 0:32:20)*

It occurred as Enola and Tewksbury were still on the run and spent the night in the depths of the forest before continuing their journey back. The language style used is casual. In the casual style, it demonstrates some casual and simple expressions signifying that they were in an informal situation. In the graphological form, the word *I have* which is shortened to *I’ve* is one of the markers of informal style. The approach used by Enola is a positive politeness strategy in which she gave a reason so as to get the idea whether Tewksbury, who is her counterpart, wanted what she wanted. This strategy directs the counterpart to cooperate insofar as there is a good reason. To reduce the FTA, Enola made a statement that Tewksbury should disguise himself to escape pursuit and not be easily recognized by others. Further, she also asked Tewksbury’s opinion whether he cut his hair as a small change to his striking appearance. Enola’s remark made Tewksbury think her reasoning was good and Tewksbury replied that she didn’t mind the haircut. Similar to the previous data, this dialogue concisely highlights the simplicity feature in the dialogue structure indicating that both interlocutors intentionally communicate in the equal or symmetrical term under the informal situation.

### **3.4 Intimate Style**

The intimate style is used entirely in private settings involving interlocutors with close relationships, such as with family members, close friends, or lovers (Handayani, 2023; Octaviani & Purwarno, 2021). The intimate style has no social barriers, making the dialogue comfortable. Normally, the intimate style is characterized by nicknames or personally intimate addressing terms, e.g., *oh dear, dear, brother, mother, father*, to name a few. Based on the data analysis, the intimate style was mostly used between Mycroft

and Sherlock as brothers who are very close and between Enola and Eudoria, her mother. The following dialogue illustrates the data for the intimate style:

*Mycroft: "You haven't given our name in the search for her?" (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:37:34 – 0:37:36)*

*Sherlock: "Of course not. I don't want anyone knowing our business any more than you do." (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:37:36 – 0:37:40)*

*Mycroft: "Oh, don't worry, **little brother**. She may have escaped us for now, but I have the best police officers in London looking for a child matching her description. And they will find that stupid little girl and bring her back to us." (Bradbeer, 2020, 0:37:42 – 0:37:55)*

The situation took place in a public library where Sherlock and Mycroft were reading a newspaper. The language style used by Mycroft to his brother is an intimate one, characterized by the use of nickname *little brother* in his sentence. In addition, the relationship between Mycroft and Sherlock was quite close since they, as a family, often spent time together compared to Enola who spent time only with her mother. In this situation, Mycroft used a positive politeness strategy, aiming to give or ask for reasons. Mycroft wanted to make sure that Sherlock had the same reason as his, i.e., not to look for Enola by putting the name *Holmes* so that no one would find out about the problems in their family. Furthermore, Mycroft also used a way of affirming that he and Sherlock were on the same side—both wanted to find the runaway Enola. The strategy used is characterized by the choice of deictic personal pronoun *us* as a statement that Mycroft also had the same goal as Sherlock, i.e., to find Enola. The epithet *little brother* in the dialogue illustrates the extent of the relationship these two have, viz. the intimate relationship between family members.

*Mycroft: "You are **a strange fish, little brother**." (Bradbeer, 2020, 1:50:14 – 1:50:16)*

*Sherlock: "And you're **a tank one, older brother**." (Bradbeer, 2020, 1:50:14 – 1:50:16)*

This situation occurred in the town hall as Sherlock, accompanied by Mycroft, awaited Enola's arrival after solving the clue given by Sherlock; however, Enola chose to disguise herself and not meet the two of them. In this context, Mycroft and Sherlock both used an intimate language style characterized by using nicknames and idioms thrown at each other so as to tease. Their approach is a positive politeness strategy in which they both used jokes to reduce the FTA (Aporbo, 2022; Suyami et al., 2019). Jokes are used to emphasize that the speaker and the listener have the same background knowledge and values. In addition, jokes are a basic technique of positive politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Gunawan & Tjitrakusuma, 2021). In this situation, Sherlock wanted to show that he also understood what Mycroft was trying to say of him; therefore, he responded with a joke as well. A strange fish is an idiom that means "someone is very unique, eccentric, strange, crazy, to name a few". Mycroft said this to Sherlock to tell his brother that he had a view where Sherlock possessed a very strange mindset. Meanwhile, the idiom of the tank spoken by Sherlock to Mycroft is more of a psychological trait. Tank here means that "someone has an aggressive, confrontational, angry, rude, and pushy nature". This kind of expression can only be said to the closest people, such as family members or close friends. This such conversation best describes that both used an intimate language style.

### **3.5 Politeness Playbook: Navigating Language Styles and Politeness in the Movie**

The film predominantly featured a casual linguistic style, where characters expressed their acquaintance in amicable situations, emphasizing mutual respect (Purba et al., 2021; Putra et al., 2024; Turnip et al., 2021). In several dialogues, the negative face prioritizes personal desires, giving more freedom than imposed by others. The interlocutors used utterances that the counterpart would like to hear to gain approval or justify their opinion. This approach highlights the importance of respect and politeness in social interactions (Arundale, 2006). Furthermore, the second predominant style, i.e., informal styles, suggests that the characters prioritize maintaining close, personal connections over formal social boundaries. The use of casual and consultative language styles indicates a preference for communication that fosters friendliness and approachability, rather than strict adherence to formal etiquette (Debora, 2013). Each language style is used as per the situation, the interlocutor, and the topic being discussed—otherwise known as sociocultural aspects (Bassiouny, 2020; Walker, 2021). After understanding the three main factors, the politeness strategy, then, will follow consciously or unconsciously so as to maintain image and politeness which become a principle of life as humans living in groups.

Politeness strategies used in the film incorporates two types, i.e., positive and negative one. Positive politeness is a strategy employed to mitigate the impact of actions that may harm one's reputation and uphold the listener's positive self-image. This approach entails being mindful of the recipient's desires and mitigating any possible risks. Studies have identified various positive politeness strategies, including exaggerating interest, seeking agreement, avoiding disagreement, and joking (Borris & Zecho, 2018; Damayanti & Mubarak, 2021; Gunawan & Tjitrakusuma, 2021). Meanwhile, negative politeness entails demonstrating self-control (Culpeper & Demmen, 2011) and deference (Pompeu, 2021; Wood & Kroger, 1991) towards the listener's preference to avoid feeling overwhelmed or saddened. Research has identified multiple strategies in this regard, such as employing indirectness, utilizing address terms and honorifics, posing questions and hedges, minimizing imposition, offering apologies, and showing deference, all of which are influenced by factors such as social distance, power dynamics, and cultural norms (Ide, 2005; Nurlayli & Widyastuti, 2022; Suyono & Andriyanti, 2021).

## **5. Closing Remarks**

The Enola Holmes season 1 film employed four distinct language styles, viz. formal, consultative, casual, and intimate. The casual style was widely employed in everyday conversations with family and friends, making it the most prevalent choice. The use of these styles was mainly influenced by Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory, which underscores the importance of demonstrating respect and maintaining boundaries in communication among interlocutors. The film predominantly employed a casual style, which is more prevalent in the interactions between Enola, Tewksbury, and her family. Furthermore, the second predominant style, i.e., informal styles, suggests that the characters prioritize maintaining close, personal connections over formal social boundaries. The use of casual and consultative language styles indicates a preference for communication that fosters friendliness and approachability, rather than strict adherence to formal etiquette. Each language style is used as per the situation, the interlocutor, and the topic being discussed—otherwise known as sociocultural aspects. The formal style was infrequently used, only occurring when Mycroft enrolled Enola in a personality school and Sherlock paid a visit to the school. The film’s utilization of language styles was majorly shaped by diverse circumstances and individual motivations associated with courtesy. Eventually, this study concluded that formal language helped establish boundaries between the speaker and the listener, allowing individuals to enhance their likability and social image using positive face strategies, whereas informal language, viz. casual, consultative, and intimate styles, was used to communicate with friends or family members in casual, everyday situations.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**ORCID iD** <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8642-5840>

**Publisher’s Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

## References

- [1] Aporbo, R. (2022). Face-Threatening Acts of Teachers: A Discourse Analysis of Politeness in the Workplace. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 97(1). <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP100971320222958>
- [2] Arundale, R. B. (2006). Face as Relational and Interactional: A Communication Framework for Research on Face, Facework, and Politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2006.011>
- [3] Awasthy, R. (2019). Nature of Qualitative Research. In *Methodological Issues in Management Research: Advances, Challenges, and the Way Ahead* (pp. 145–161). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78973-973-220191010>
- [4] Bassiouney, R. (2020). *Arabic Sociolinguistics: Topics in Diglossia, Gender, Identity, and Politics* (2nd ed.). Georgetown University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv10kmbxg>
- [5] Beade, P. (1968). [no title] - The Five Clocks: A linguistic excursion into the five styles of English usage, by Martin Joos. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967. Pp. xvi + 108. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue Canadienne de Linguistique*, 13(2), 123–124. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008413100006204>
- [6] Bell, A. (1984). Language Style as Audience Design. *Language in Society*, 13(2), 145–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450001037X>
- [7] Bell, A. (2007). Style in Dialogue: Bakhtin and Sociolinguistic Theory. In *Sociolinguistic Variation* (pp. 90–109). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511619496.006>
- [8] Borris, D., & Zecho, C. (2018). The Linguistic Politeness Having Seen on the Current Study Issue. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 2(1), 32–44. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v2n1.10>
- [9] Bradbeer, H. (2020). *Enola Holmes* [Video recording]. Netflix.
- [10] Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511755064>
- [12] Culpeper, J., & Demmen, J. (2011). Nineteenth-century English Politeness. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 12(1–2), 49–81. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.12.1-2.03cul>
- [13] Damayanti, A., & Mubarak, Z. H. (2021). Positive Politeness in “Oprah’s 2020 Vision Tour” How Reasons and Factors Influenced the Choosing of Strategy. *Jurnal Basis*, 8(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.33884/basisupb.v8i1.2790>
- [14] Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, C., & Lee, L. (2011). Chameleons in Imagined Conversations: A New Approach to Understanding Coordination of Linguistic Style in Dialogs. *CMCL@ACL*.
- [15] Debora, I. (2013). The Using of Casual Style in ELT For Young Learners (Sociolinguistics Perspectives). *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 4(1), 124–128. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v4n.1p.124>
- [16] Eriksson, T., Mao, L., & Villeval, M. C. (2015). Saving Face and Group Identity. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2613976>
- [17] Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2005). Indirectness and Politeness in Mexican Requests. In D. Eddington (Ed.), *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 66–78). Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- [18] Fomin, I. V., & Ilyin, M. V. (2019). Social Semiotics: Paths towards Integrating Social and Semiotic Knowledge. *Sociological Journal*, 25(4), 123–141. <https://doi.org/10.19181/socjour.2019.25.4.6822>
- [19] Gunawan, J. D., & Tjitrakusuma, N. I. (2021). The Politeness Strategies Found in @kulinersby’s Instagram Account in Promoting Culinary Businesses. *K@ta*, 23(2), 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.23.2.58-68>
- [20] Handayani, S. (2023). Casual and Intimate Style Uttered by Eloise Bridgerton in “Bridgerton 2” TV Series. *Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature*, 9(2), 307–318. <https://doi.org/10.30812/humanitatis.v9i2.2561>

- [21] Hastings, S. O., & Castle Bell, G. (2018). Facing our Heuristic Limits: Expanding the Terminology for Types of Positive Face. *Communication Quarterly*, 66(1), 96–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2017.1340317>
- [22] Haugh, M., & Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2010). Face in Interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(8), 2073–2077. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.12.013>
- [23] Heylighen, F., & Dewaele, J.-M. (1999). *Formality of Language: Definition, Measurement and Behavioral Determinants*.
- [24] Hirschberg, J. (2008). Speaking more Like you. *Proceedings of the 9th SIGdial Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue - SIGdial '08*, 128. <https://doi.org/10.3115/1622064.1622090>
- [25] Huang, L., & Wu, W. (2023). Social Identity and Language Use: Gender, Age, Region, Social Factors. *Communications in Humanities Research*, 27(1), 291–297. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7064/21/20231527>
- [26] Ide, S. (2005). *How and Why Honorifics can Signify Dignity and Elegance* (pp. 45–64). <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.139.06ide>
- [27] Joos, M. (1967). *The Five Clocks: A Linguistic Excursion into the Five Styles of English Usage* (5th ed.). Harcourt.
- [28] Korneliaeva, Y. (2019). Politeness Phenomenon. *Scientific Journal of Polonia University*, 32(1), 99–106. <https://doi.org/10.23856/3212>
- [29] Langley, P. (2017). A Cognitive Systems Analysis of Personality and Conversational Style. *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Conference on Advances in Cognitive Systems*.
- [30] Liu, M. (2014). The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(6). <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpsl.4.6.1238-1242>
- [31] Miller-Ott, A. E., & Kelly, L. (2017). A Politeness Theory Analysis of Cell-Phone Usage in the Presence of Friends. *Communication Studies*, 68(2), 190–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2017.1299024>
- [32] Nassaji, H. (2015). Qualitative and Descriptive Research: Data Type Versus Data Analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(2), 129–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815572747>
- [33] Nurlayli, R., & Widyastuti, W. (2022). Negative Politeness Strategies Used by American Girl in TV Series Emily in Paris. *J-Lalite: Journal of English Studies*, 3(1), 85. <https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jes.2022.3.1.5935>
- [34] Octaviani, A., & Purwarno, P. (2021). Intimate Language Style in Nicholas Sparks' Movie Script The Notebook. *Journal of Language*, 3(1), 54–64. <https://doi.org/10.30743/jol.v3i1.3715>
- [35] O'Driscoll, J. (2007). What's in an FTA? Reflections on a Chance Meeting with Claudine. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2007.011>
- [36] Pichonnaz, D., Staffoni, L., Greppin-Bécherraz, C., Menia-Knutti, I., & Schoeb, V. (2021). "You Should Maybe Work Together a Little Bit": Formulating Requests in Interprofessional Interactions. *Qualitative Health Research*, 31(6), 1094–1104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732321991508>
- [37] Pompeu, A. C. M. (2021). Analysis on the Use of Politeness Strategies in a Scene of the Crown. *BELT - Brazilian English Language Teaching Journal*, 12(1), e41365. <https://doi.org/10.15448/2178-3640.2021.1.41365>
- [38] Purba, D., Sulistia, F., & Lelyana Br. Manurung, H. V. (2021). Sociolinguistics Analysis on Language Style Form at the Movie Script of Papillon. *Trends Journal of Sciences Research*, 1(1), 37–45. <https://doi.org/10.31586/ujssh.2021.110>
- [39] Putra, I. M. P. Y., Santika, I. D. A. D. M., & Skolastika, I. M. P. (2024). Analysis of Language Style Uttered by the Characters in Premature Movie. *Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 133–142. <https://doi.org/10.22334/traverse.v5i1.140>
- [40] Putri, I. G. A. V. W., & Nurita, W. (2021). Tindakan Pengancaman Wajah dan Strategi Kesopanan pada Komunikasi Masyarakat di Singaraja-Bali. *Prasasti: Journal of Linguistics*, 6(2), 168. <https://doi.org/10.20961/prasasti.v6i2.44320>
- [41] Putri, R. A., Hidayati, H., & Geubrina, M. (2023). Five Language Style in The Sea Speaks His Name Novel Leila S. Chudori. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Sastra Inggris*, 3(3), 179–187. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jupensi.v3i3.3009>
- [42] Samp, J. A. (2015). Facework. In *The International Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 1–8). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118540190.wbeic063>
- [43] Semin, G. R., Görts, C. A., Nandram, S., & Semin-Goossens, A. (2002). Cultural Perspectives on the Linguistic Representation of Emotion and Emotion Events. *Cognition & Emotion*, 16(1), 11–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930143000112>
- [44] Sifianou, M. (2011). On the Concept of Face and Politeness. In *Politeness Across Cultures* (pp. 42–58). Palgrave Macmillan UK. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230305939\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230305939_3)
- [45] Silalahi, R. M. P. (2018). How University Students as Non Native English Speakers Perform Face Threatening Acts. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.30813/jelc.v9i1.1451>
- [46] Suyami, S., Djatmika, D., Sumarlam, S., & Purnanto, D. (2019). Javanese Politeness: Strategy of Politeness of FTA Recipients in KBJ VI. *First International Conference on Culture, Education, Linguistics and Literature, CELL 2019*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.5-8-2019.2289814>
- [47] Suyono, M., & Andriyanti, E. (2021). Negative Politeness Strategies in What Would You Do? TV Show. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 21(2), 439–452. <https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v21i2.3430>
- [48] Ting, S.-H. (2001). *Language Choice in Multilingual Organisational Settings: The Case of Sarawak, Malaysia* [The University of Queensland]. <https://doi.org/10.14264/105665>
- [49] Turnip, R. Y., Herman, H., Sihombing, P. S. R., & Purba, R. (2021). An Investigation to Conversations to Identify the Language Style in a Movie: A Study on Sociolinguistics. *Trends Journal of Sciences Research*, 1(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.31586/ujll.2021.152>
- [50] van Berkum, J. J. A. (2019). Language Comprehension and Emotion. In G. I. de Zubicaray & N. O. Schiller (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Neurolinguistics* (pp. 735–766). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190672027.013.29>



- [51] van Compernelle, R. A. (2017). Preferences for (In)Formal Language: Correlations with Attitudes toward Linguistic Variation, Multilingualism, Tolerance of Ambiguity, and Residence Abroad. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(4), 317–331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2016.1165229>
- [52] Walker, J. A. (2021). Language Variation. In *Similar Languages, Varieties, and Dialects* (pp. 3–16). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108565080.003>
- [53] Wiltshko, M. (2022). Language is for Thought and Communication. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.5786>
- [54] Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (1991). Politeness and Forms of Address. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 10(3), 145–168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X911103001>
- [55] Yusny, R. (2013). Appropriating Politeness Theory for Intercultural Communication in ELT. *Jurnal Ilmiah Didaktika*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.22373/jid.v14i1.496>
- [56] Zhang, P. (2021). From Silence to Positive Self-presentation: Gradual Emergence of Negative Face Wants in Kōngguizú's (恐归族) Intergenerational Conflicts with their Family Elders. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 17(2), 291–313. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2018-0009>
- [57] Zong, F., & Zhen, S. X. (2021). Link between Language and Thought. *Macrolinguistics and Microlinguistics*, 2(1), 12–27. <https://doi.org/10.21744/mami.v2n1.12>