

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20385554

USE OF COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES IN MANAGING RELATIONSHIPS: A STUDY OF SRIRAM BALASUBRAMANIAN'S JAMBA THE JOINT FAMILY

Jayashree Karunakaran¹ and Sangeeta Mukherjee^{2*}

¹Research Scholar, Department of English, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India.
Email - jayakarun97101mini@gmail.com <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2066-335X>

²Senior Assistant Professor, Department of English, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India. Email- sangeetamukherjee70@gmail.com <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5488-2876>

Received: 01/03/2026
Accepted: 26/04/2026

Corresponding Author: Sangeeta Mukherjee
sangeetamukherjee70@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Communication is the foundation of healthy relationships, acting as the fundamental tool for building trust and resolving conflicts. Simultaneously, lack of communication or misunderstanding may lead to conflicts and damage relationships. Thus, avoiding conflicts or conflict resolution can be achieved with the help of communicative strategies that can sustain relationships within immediate family and beyond. This study aims to examine the diverse communicative methods that promote conflict resolution among family members, especially within extended families. Sriram Balasubramanian's Jamba the Joint Family has been selected for analysis due to its congruence with the concept. Additionally, Stella Ting-Toomey's Face Negotiation strategies have been utilized to analyse the text, as these strategies offer enough opportunity for contextual application and examination. The findings show that members of Indian extended families care about nurturing and maintaining relationships.

KEYWORDS: Communication Strategies, Politeness Theories, Face Negotiation Strategies, Conflict Communication Style, Facework.

1. INTRODUCTION

Family connections are intricate and multifaced, influenced by a combination of emotions, beliefs, expectations, and daily interactions that affect how members relate, dispute, and coexist. They depend on factors like power, rank, and priority. Healthy relationship can be built on trust, mutual respect and open communication. Effective communication relies on the straightforward and polite sharing of ideas, bolstered by careful listening, which fosters trust and enhances relationships; whereas, misunderstanding undermines understanding and frequently results in estrangement and conflict. Conflicts are normal in any relationship and arise from poor communication, unmet expectations, and generation gaps. These can be reduced through open, respectful communication and active listening and more significantly, they can be resolved or often avoided with the use of effective communicative strategies.

Effective Communicative strategies reduce conflicts by decreasing emotional tension, establishing mutual understanding, and solving problems. Politeness is considered to be one of the communicative strategies used to avoid conflicts. Linguists have propounded different theories of politeness. H.P. Grice (1975), one of the first linguists, defined his cooperative principle as "make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice 1975, 45). The later theorists have postulated their politeness theories based on the cooperative principle of Grice. Lakoff's politeness theory (1973) was one among them which has stated that there are some laws to be followed which would make linguistic acts to be polite or rude when flouted. After surveying different cultures and languages, Lakoff proposed three sets of rules: formality, deference, and camaraderie. On the other hand, Leech's politeness theory (1983) scrutinizes the illocutionary acts such as request, order, or apology which is further divided into four types - competitive, convivial, collaborative, and conflictive.

Similarly, Goffman (1967) established the concept called 'face' as the positive social value of a person, which can effectively be claimed through interaction with others. Based on Goffman's face theory and Grice's conversational maxims; Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed their politeness theory. They elucidated the face threatening acts (FTA) as communicative acts threatening the 'face' of either the speaker or the hearer classified by the target of the threat and the origin. To avoid the face-

threatening act, they formulated four politeness principles: on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record. Following Brown and Levinson, Stella Ting-Toomey (1988) devised the face negotiation theory. She developed a frame work for understanding how people from different cultural backgrounds manage conflicts with the help of 'face'. Later, Fraser's theory of politeness (1990) presented the Conversational-Contract view (CC), stimulating the political state and democratic regime that lie on the truth of social contact.

Stella Ting-Toomey's face negotiation theory deals with face and facework. According to her, 'face' is the person's self-image, and 'facework' is considered to be the act of saving face. Facework can be performed in two ways by i) restoration - where face can be saved after damage, and by ii) prevention - where face can be saved before damage. Each individual has a self-image and a public image that they safeguard for the sake of conflict management. She elaborates that an individual's face serves multiple functions throughout interactions with a variety of people and contexts. She elucidates two primary cultural dimensions regarding facework: i) Individualistic culture - where people focus on self-face and prefer dominating or competing conflict styles to protect their own individualism, as the Americans do, and Germans do, and ii) collectivistic culture - where people focus on mutual-face or other-face and prefer avoiding or compromising styles to maintain harmony as the Japanese and Chinese do. She concludes that (1) in every communication circumstance, people from all cultures attempt to preserve and negotiate their face expressions, (2) the notion of face becomes particularly contentious in emotionally precarious or vulnerable circumstances when the contextual identities of the communicators are challenged, (3) the cultural value spectrums of individualism versus collectivism, and small or large power distance shapes facework concerns and styles, (4) members' preferences for self-oriented facework over other-oriented facework are influenced by individualism and collectivism value patterns, (5) small and large power distance value patterns shape members' preferences for horizontal-based facework versus vertical-based facework, (6) the value dimensions, in conjunction with individual, relational, and situational factors influence the use of particular facework behaviors in selected cultural scenes, and (7) intercultural facework competence refers to the optimal integration of knowledge, mindfulness, and communication skills in managing vulnerable identity-based conflict situations appropriately, effectively, and adaptively (Ting-

Toomey & Crockett, 1994).

Stella Ting Toomey's 'face negotiation theory' outlines five sets of themes: i) Face orientation – this concerns with a person's attempt to protect their 'self-face' or 'other-face' or 'mutual-face' depending on the concerned person, ii) Face movements – this clarifies the choices a person must make to control his public persona in contradictory circumstance, such as mutual-face protection, mutual-face obliteration, self-face defence, or other-face defence, iii) Face interaction strategies – this specifies the verbal and non-verbal behaviors used by the interlocutors for maintaining or restoring face, iv) Conflict Communication styles – this theme divides the responses to conflict into dominating, avoiding, obliging, compromising, and integrating styles, and v) Face content domains – this outlines specific identity needs – such as autonomy, inclusion, status, dependability, and morality that an individual desires throughout communication.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section deals with a review of the literature on the applications of facework in different contexts and situations by various researchers and academicians. For instance, Oetzel, Ting-Toomey, Yokochi, Masmoto, and Takai (2000) discovered the typology of facework techniques in interpersonal conflicts with relative strangers or best friends among U.S. and Japanese students. The study on facework behavior suggests that integrative strategies are considered to be more competent than the avoiding, and dominating strategies, which have little effective. Later, Spitzberg and Daniel J. Canary indicate that the outcome competence perception was rational with integrative strategies leading to trust and satisfaction, whereas dominating strategies left negative effects. These patterns coordinate with Stella Ting-Toomey's *Face Negotiation Theory*, highlighting cultural differences in conflict management and giving the significance of situational context in evaluating communication competence.

Oetzel, J. G., et al. (2002) examined the face concerns and facework strategies in Germany, Japan, Mexico, and the USA, especially in the context of conflicts among family members. The results indicated that although culture had both direct and indirect implication on facework behaviours, individualism had a greater impact on self-perceptions than other cultural elements. This study demonstrated the significance of face and multidimensional face in Stella Ting-Toomey's face negotiation theory, where assessments of

individualistic culture must be context-sensitive and culturally nuanced communication behaviour.

Oetzel, Garcia, and Ting-Toomey (2008) examined 768 participants across cultures of China, Japan, Germany, and the United States. They identified Stella Ting-Toomey's face negotiation theory demonstrates an important role in relationships between face concerns and facework strategies during conflicts. Other-face associated with integrating or avoiding style whereas study showed self-face was a dominating style. However, the cross-cultural study revealed both the consistencies and variations during conflict indicating the conceptualization of conflict and the difference of facework across culture.

Amarasinghe, A. D. (2012) in his article 'Understanding intercultural facework behaviors' has contributed to the understanding of cross-cultural communication by analyzing Sri Lankans working in Australia. The intercultural facework research has relied on the cultural frameworks like Geert Hofstede's dimensions and Edward T. Hall's high-low context model to explain communication differences. The Face Negotiation Theory of Stella Ting-Toomey is a theoretical framework that explicates conflict approaches across various cultures. The research posits that the multidimensional approach is more effective in comprehending and elucidating differences in conflict management and facework behaviour when the factors of gender, age, and socio-economic status are taken into account.

Q. Zhang, Oetzel, Ting-Toomey, and J. Zhang (2019) explored the cross-cultural interpersonal forgiveness by making comparisons between the Chinese and the Americans during relational transgression. This interpersonal forgiveness takes the role of self-construal, face concern, and apology as a tool of mediating factor to reconciliation and revenge. Using Stella Ting-Toomey's face negotiation theory shows the cross-cultural similarities in contextual differences and the reliance on self-reported data. They concluded that forgiveness is a critical communicative behavior in both the context of support to sustain relationships and reconciliation.

Suryandari and Hidayatullah (2020) examined the experiences of female sex workers in the Dolly area, focusing on their interactions with customers, family, and society, utilizing Stella Ting-Toomey's Face Negotiation Theory. It highlights the use of both primary and secondary conflict styles that include emotional expression, third-part assistance, and neglect, in managing interpersonal conflicts. Their

research studied certain facework approaches that oscillate between alluring professional personas and familial conflicts, highlighting stigma, power relations, and situational pressures in influencing communicative behaviour.

Gu, Guan, Tang, and Wu (2021) conducted a mixed-method literature review by comparing six different studies to authorize the application of face negotiation theory in cross-cultural context. Their extensive research, which mainly focused on the US-China negotiations, revealed that face negotiation theory has remained an authoritative frame work for understanding facework.

Hsieh, Kunz, & Wu (2023) used face negotiation theory to investigate how particular antecedents drive socially motivated gift purchasing on live-streaming platforms. The community gift-giving model uses Stella Ting-Toomey's Face Negotiation Theory to identify the factors that influence virtual gifting behaviour, such as competitive arousal, design aesthetics, and overall image. The study also discovered that managing facework reinforced the continuous purchasing behaviours by focusing on the importance of public impression and acted moderate in digital consumption contexts.

Surakhmad, Ronda, and Widowati (2023) examined the identity negotiation of high-skilled immigrants in a culturally diverse work environment using Stella Ting-Toomey's face negotiation theory. It resulted in the negotiation of their own identity; the highly skilled workers never saw race and nationality as complicating identity negotiation in the expanded space. The immigrant will never categorize the newcomer or hosted culture. They negotiated identity to ensure proper communication and create a working place.

Falco and Emungtyas (2024) used face negotiation theory to analyse how difference in cultural communication led to the disowning of Rohingya refugees in Aceh. The study suggested collectivist cultures promoted interdependent self-construal and accommodative conflict styles, and such cultural labels were insufficient to explain conflict behaviour. The Indonesian government preferred an integrating approach, but the local leaders and civilians used to avoid or dominating strategies due to cultural clashes and language barriers. The findings emphasized the importance of face and facework, along with situational and relational factors, in providing a more nuanced understanding of conflict management across cultures.

Fabriar, A. N. Fitri, F. Fitri, and Rachmawati (2025) analysed the communication between Muslims and Aboge adherents in Mudal Urban

Village and Wonsobo. The study disclosed Stella Ting-Toomey's Face Negotiation Theory helped maintain harmony despite differences and conflict. The authors found that the use of Stella Ting-Toomey's Face Negotiation Theory helped Muslim and Aboge community make equal effort to maintain a collective face in understanding and respecting each other's tradition. It also effectively highlights the role of collectivism, mutual respect, and mindfulness in fostering inclusive communication and social stability.

Fitria & Lukmantoro (2025) explored how Muslim students' wearing Hijab dealt with their identity and adopted to the culture of South Korea. The study revealed that competence of intercultural communication is essential for managing with one's identity with resilience and achieving meaningful integration in a predominant non-Muslim learning environment.

The existing literature review indicates that Stella Ting-Toomey face negotiation theory has mainly analyzed conflict management among different cultural groups, interpersonal communications in everyday conflicting situations with different perspectives such as cultural perspective, self-construal perspective, communicative competence perspective, relational and emotional perspective, contextual and situational perspective and critical and contemporary perspective. The studies, thus agree the Face Negotiation theory is a powerful tool where culture matters, the identity, relationship, and context deeply influence facework the theory in flexible and applicable across setting. Taking that into account the novel *Jamba: The Joint Family* is analyzed with Face Negotiation Theory. However, a large gap is noticeable in studies applying this theory to examine interpersonal conflicts between Characters in Fiction. Thus, to fill this gap, the present study fix to scrutinize the communicative strategies employ by the characters to resolve conflicts in the novel *Jamba: The Joint Family* employing the analytical framework of Stella Ting-Toomey's face negotiation theory.

3. ANALYSIS

Stella Ting-Toomey's Face Negotiation Theory is used to know or study how people from different cultural backgrounds manage conflict with the concept of 'face'. 'Face' refers to persons' social identity, dignity, and self-image, which individuals try to maintain, protect, or restore during interactions. It has cultural values that influence people to handle conflict among the cultural group they belong to. Individualistic cultures focus on self-

face with direct and dominating styles, while collectivist cultures focus on other-face and mutual-face to maintain harmony through avoiding, obliging, or integrating styles. Here in the novel *Jamba: The Joint Family*, the characters use of face and face negotiation at different conflicting situations and their cultural influences have been analyzed comparing different situation in the novel. The purpose has been to explore how the individual uses their face in the extended family to compromise, negotiate, oblige, dominate during personal threats or in a conflict situation with respect to their own individual self or the other members of the family.

Jamba: The Joint Family (2016) centers round a traditional, orthodox, middle-class Brahmin joint family from Chennai. The story line is about a joint family where all members come together to celebrate Lalitha's wedding. During the wedding celebrations, many problems crop up but the family members come together to solve those problems. The story gives the readers the dynamics of a typical Indian middle-class family that straddles both tradition and modernity. It highlights each family member's extra efforts to manage and sustain relationships. The analysis of the characters in *Jamba: The Joint Family* is made based on the inferences of how the characters would negotiate with face during hostile situations to save relationships and maintain peace and harmony.

3.1. Self-Face

Self-face refers to an individual's concern for their own image, needs, desires, and personal goals over others during a conflict. It is linked to dominating or competing conflict management style where the goal is to prefer one's own interest over others.

3.1.1. Self-Face: Prioritizing Personal Aspirations

"If there was an issue, you could have told me; why were you making me freak out? Don't you understand that this is my life?" (Balasubramanian 2016, 6). Anirudh was very passionate about his dream of becoming a musician, and owns a music band. He leaves a very important CD at Karthik's house, which contains the whole music score of his band, and should be delivered on time. Though Karthik knows about the importance of the CD, he fails to deliver it on time. A tensed Anirudh shouts at Karthik when he reaches late instead of asking the reason of his delay. He speaks of his unfortunate life and ill-fate rather than admitting his own mistake and thinking about Karthik's face. He thinks of his self-face rather than being reasonable with Karthik. This example shows a dominating conflict

management style where the individual stands up for his own position and uses aggressive towards others. He does not show concern for 'other-face'.

"Neither do the people in the house understand me nor have they provided for me the environment to succeed. This deep disgust has made my music the vent for my sorrows. It has become my obsession," he said, stretching his legs and looking towards the ceiling." (Balasubramanian 2016, 8). Anirudh here is worried about his dreams of becoming a musician as his family is not supportive about this. He tries hard to achieve his dream but whenever anything goes wrong, he blames his luck and others instead of himself. He is less concerned about Lalitha's wedding and thinks of his misery. This is an instance of self-face where the individual focuses on themselves rather than the other important occasions and persons him. He acts selfishly and pitiable. This again shows the employment of dominating conflict management style and face restoration strategy.

3.1.2. Self-Face: Prioritizing Financial Status

America can wait. I want to be a journalist ...
Oh, this and all won't take you...to America...make you money...like my son in Seattle, working for Microsoft...
Journalista, what is that?...
Hmm, that won't pay you much, will it?...
It doesn't pay much at the lower level but it can, if you establish yourself, be great... (Balasubramanian 2016, 21-22)

Here Karthik expresses his desire to be a journalist in front of his rich relatives from America. One of his aunts' mocks at him by saying that journalism cannot fetch him money like her son who works for Microsoft in Seattle. Karthik feels insulted as she is demeaning his ambition and financial status. But Karthik adopts an avoiding conflict management style by choosing to prove himself rather than arguing with an elderly aunt. The maternal aunt on the other hand thinks of her self-face and her son's face rather than Karthik's face. This is an example of self-construal where an individual thinks about his autonomy over others. She could have expressed her views as an advice rather than damaging the face of Karthik in front of other relatives. Here financial status is prioritized over individual dreams and aspirations.

3.1.3. Self-Face: Defying Social Constraints in Marriage

Most Tam Bram families have their own stereotypes when it comes to the marriage game... Isn't this crazy? You say you love a guy ...you risk

the wrath of your parents...

"You know what? Even if you go tell people, I don't care..."

"Listen, I don't really care what you do, but do not interfere with Lalu..." "Worse comes to worst... "I would elope straightaway." (Balasubramanian 2016, 46-47).

"She started blasting her mother. I mean, she was talking about her rights, her responsibilities, her future, and so on," (Balasubramanian 2016, 114).

"I don't want to be with Mano. I want to be with him," she said pointing at Chris. "If I go back, my parents will force me to get engaged. I don't know what to do. I really don't know, I really don't know..." (Balasubramanian 2016, 167-168).

"In case that Mano guy stutters, this whole thing is off. You guys have to leave us or we will create a fracas," Neha said, holding Chris's hand as he stood staring at us. He always made sure she was holding him." (Balasubramanian 2016, 169).

In all the above situations, Neha vehemently expresses her desire to get married to her Christian boyfriend, Chris against her parents' wishes. She even argues with her mother. Though she appears momentarily confused, she is fixated on marrying Chris. Karthik asks her to think twice before taking any action since their family is an Orthodox Brahmin family which would never accept an inter-religion marriage. But Neha is more concerned about her 'self-face' than 'other-face'. She thinks only about her future and is ready to contradict her family's wishes. She has high self-concern due to her upbringing in an individualistic cultural environment. Thus, she adopts a dominating conflict management style, 'self-face defense'. Karthik raised in a collectivist cultural context, seeks to preserve 'other-face' and hence advises Neha to comply with her parents' demands. In this context, 'self-face' takes precedence over societal conventions.

3.1.4. Self-Face: Protecting One's Self-Image

"Neha stood right there... For a change, there was a pleasant smile in her face. I mean, she was happy. That was hard to believe. Everyone in the house seemed to think she had come to terms with being engaged to the American-return mappilai." (Balasubramanian 2016, 131).

"Neha was ushering in the guests, trying her best to be the gleeful girl that she usually portrayed herself to be." (Balasubramanian 2016, 151).

In the above instances, Neha tries to smile to give an impression to others that she was happy and has accepted the marriage proposal. She was very clam and her gestures showed that she was happy. Here

Neha is more concerned about her self-face and she uses verbal and non-verbal strategies to maintain her face. In the above situation she adopts a temporary compromising conflict management style for the others to believe that she has agreed to the proposal to keep the family happy but in reality, she is more concerned about her public-image and does not want to cause any damage to it.

I heard Ravi yelling at someone on the phone."

...

"The moment he saw me, he gave me an artificial smile and went inside his office. I am pretty sure he did not want me to know what was happening and I am sure he was nervous." (Balasubramanian 2016, 140-141)

Here Ravi's uncle was shouting at someone over the phone but as soon as he saw Nikhil and Shas, he tries to coverup the incident with his facial expressions. He tries to avoid this situation from being disclosed since he does not want to spoil the festive mood. Here Ravi's uncle used self-face to protect his reputation and autonomy in the family. He did not want his nephews to think negatively about him.

A consistent pattern was observed when these examples were analyzed collectively. Self-face is used when there is in need of proving one's identity. The characters such as Anirudh, Neha, Ravi, Karthik, and Aunty tried to showcase the great identity of self. It was more on the image of self where they didn't want to lose their face to others by any chance. These characters chose to goal of self than the others. Although each character's individual objective varies, the pursuit of that goal tends to remain consistent. The characters gave importance to self than that of others in maintaining their image, defending others for their own self-desires and speaking high of oneself without thinking of the consequences or the perspectives of others. Here it is observed that the personal goals override the need of social harmony where the individuals among collectivist group emerge the tendency of individualistic perspectives.

3.2. Other-Face

The other-face prioritizes the respect and public image at the other party to maintain peace and harmony. This is preferred by people living in collectivist culture. It is intense to protect the other person from harm or embarrassment.

3.2.1. Other-Face: Family Concerns

I am opening up to you is because I think you are the one I can relate to on this matter."

...
I know, but I think there is something strange about it.

...
"He was arguing fiercely as well....They had sticks in their hands, hockey sticks that are used to threaten people,"

...
"Listen, I don't want you to open your mouth to ANYONE ... we have a big function coming up. Let's keep it between us. Deal?" (Balasubramanian 2016, 66-68)

Here, Nikhil discussed a particular incident with Karthik at Ravi uncle's shop. He saw Ravi uncle engaging in fervent argument with a few gowns who demanding their money back. Nikhil prioritized the other things that is Ravi uncle's face. He wanted Ravi uncle to be safe and unharmed. Therefore, he discussed this with Karthik. Karthik also focused on the other-face out of his respect for his uncle. He also wanted to protect Ravi uncle from embarrassment and harm.

3.2.2. Other-Face: Affection and Emotional Consideration

"This was indeed a big deal ... handicap was a hindrance ... Her marriage had brought some measure of relief... not going to allow anything to stop this wedding." (Balasubramanian 2016, 48). Here Karthik was concerned about Lalitha's marriage he did not want Neha's affair to affect or hinder Lalitha's marriage and future happiness. So, in this situation Karthik prioritized other-face to protect the image of Lalitha. He did not want her to be embarrassed or unhappy.

Neha had a huge soft corner... her dad had bypass surgery twice and had a weak heart... opened up on this topic now and argued ... result in tragedy... Give me some time ... Don't expect me to be positive though," (Balasubramanian 2016, 88)

Here Neha prioritized other things. She was concerned about the health and safety of her father who was a chronic heart patient. Although she did not wish to marry the groom her parents chose for her yet bothered for the safety of her father. She decided to postpone the matter for a while. Neha here adopted and avoiding conflict management style to save her father's face and to maintain harmony in the family.

"She doesn't like that guy, dude. She has to find a way out - common, have some empathy," ... "The point is, she is also our cousin. One of our kith and Kin. We should stand by her."" (Balasubramanian 2016, 114-117). In this example Anirudh one of

Neha's cousins gave importance to Neha public image as he wanted her to be happy just like Lalitha. Anirudh emphasized the significance of the other-face and urged Karthik to do so. He preferred a compromising conflict management style to protect both Neha's and Lalitha's face.

"I am selfish because I want my desire to trump my father's," he said and added the punch. "My desire is that my brother's wedding goes through."" (Balasubramanian 2016, 181). Here Mano decided to cancel his engagement with Neha as he came to know about her affair. He loved his brother Eshwar and prioritized his face over his father's. Here Mano was more concerned about other-face as he wanted his brother Eshwar to be happy with his bride. He therefore, decided to defy his father's wishes over his brother's. He adopted an obliging conflicting management style as he decided to get go of Neha.

3.2.3. Other-Face: Strong Advocacy for Family Concerns

Listen, before you come to any conclusions, let me make three things clear. One, I never knew you were Neha's guy before tonight. Two, I never wanted to see you again in life, but I don't have a choice now, and three, I am here to make peace."let's stay calm and work something out. Lalu's marriage is on the line," (Balasubramanian 2016, 166).

"I need you," I said, pointing my finger at Neha, "at the wedding hall for just one more day ... "I will break your engagement," ... "I will speak to Mano and convince him to break it off ... I guarantee you guys that he would tell his parents that he is not for this engagement. In other words, to the outside world, he will seem to reject you," I said in a succinct manner. (Balasubramanian 2016, 167-168)

"I have kept my world. He has said he will call it off. It's time for you to keep your side of the bargain," I said. "I will. I am glad that Lalu is getting married." (Balasubramanian 2016, 182).

In all three instances, Karthik was concerned about Lalitha's face as he wanted to see her happily married. He even adopted a compromising conflict management style when dealing with Chris as he was more concerned about Lalitha. He wanted to make peace with Neha and Chris so that they did not embarrass the family's reputation. He decided to make Mano cancel the engagement with Neha. In all the examples Karthik adopted compromising conflict management style and gave priority to other-face.

3.2.4. Other-Face: Supporting the Family Member in Financial Crisis

"Here it is. My Jewellery is here," she said

opening her eyes... "Nice. I have set a precedent for solving the issue. It's up to all of you. This could be solved in minutes if you cooperate," (Balasubramanian 2016, 188), Here, Ravi uncle was on their verge of getting arrested by the policeman for not paying the debt on time. Though he had a massive debt worth Lakhs yet Jamba Patti the eldest member of the family decides to save his face by repaying the debt amount. She gave away her Jewellery which was followed by other members of the family. Here, all the family members united together to overcome the crisis moment and protected Ravi uncle's face. This example showed how all the family members prioritized other-face to save the reputation of Ravi and other family members. It is also an example of collectivist culture where other-face has been prioritized for maintaining harmony and peace in the family. All the members in the family adopted a collaborating conflict management style to overcome the crisis and to protect the family's reputation.

With the study of the above instances taken place in the family, contrast patterns of using other-face are observed. Here the characters suppressed their own preferences in concern of others to maintain harmony and to preserve the relationship intact. They sacrificed their personal concerns for the sake of the members of the family and family's reputation. They wanted to avoid the threat which would destroy the family's peace and harmony and wanted to get hold of familial expectations. The act of helping, requesting, compromising, guiding, and making a deal were used as a tool to save the interpersonal relationship in the conflict situations. The use of other-face was not considered only as a politeness act but as a relational preservation, where emotional restraint ensured social ability. The repeated use of other-face by the characters gave importance to collectivistic behaviour.

3.3. Mutual-Face

Mutual-face is a result of high level of concern for both self-face and other-face in a conflicting situation. It is used to protect one's self-image and that of others. It is used to save and avoid damage to interpersonal relationships.

3.3.1. Mutual-Face: Balancing Personal Desires and Family Responsibilities

"Sir, I want to marry Lalitha at any cost. I am giving you a blank cheque book. Please fill in the rest of the amount needed," he said." (Balasubramanian 2016, 191). Here Lalitha's uncle, Ravi was about to be arrested by the policemen for failing to repay the debt

amount. In this situation Eshwar, the groom came forward to help repay Ravi uncle's debt by handing over a blank cheque book to the policemen. This incident revealed how the concern of the members of a family for mutual-face saved a crisis in the family. Eshwar preferred mutual-face over self-face as he gave priority to the bride's family. Thereby he not only saved the crisis but also maintained his self-face as a responsible future son-in-law of the family.

Comparing the other facial orientations, the use of mutual-face negotiations helps to balance both personal and relational needs. Here, the concern for both the parties of self and other patterns are seen. The use of mutual-face works as a collaborative strategy were supporting without any compromise. This act of using mutual-face commits to both self-respect and collective well-being.

4. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The Key findings deduced from the above analysis are as follows:

- i) All the prominent characters in the text use either self-face, mutual-face, or other-face based on their needs and situations.
- ii) The younger members of the family use self-face when it concerns archiving their personal goals and ambitions. On the other hand, they use other-face whenever there are conflicting situations or crises within the family.
- iii) The elder members of the family use self-face to show their power and status within the family. Independent self-construal style is more prevalent among them. They also use a dominating or competing conflict management style when dealing with the other members of the family or to protect their self-image. At the same time, they use other-face whenever there is a crisis in the family.
- iv) Only one character Neha who was brought up in the western culture is more conscious of her self-face than that of others. She has high self-face concern and adopts a dominating conflict management style when it comes to her marriage and future plans. It reflects the dominance and influence of individualistic culture.
- v) In spite of trivial, mutual jealousies and conflicts among the family members related to power, age, and financial status where they become more concerned about 'self-face'; they also care or concern about 'other-face' for the happiness and well-being of the family (here 'extended').

Thus, the analysis and findings inferred thereby

indicate that the success of nurturing and sustaining relationships within a family whether nuclear or joint (extended) depends on using mutual-face or other-face. Though self-face is necessary sometimes to exert independence and pursue one's ambitions or goals, yet considering the bigger whole or the happiness of other members in the family; 'other-face' or 'mutual-face' is given preference. The analysis of the current text using Stella Ting-Toomey's face negotiation theory tries to highlight how a large extended family like the Jamba's try to

survive in an era where families are mostly nuclear with the help of 'other-face' or 'mutual-face'. Despite having conflicts, complication, generational gaps and influence of modernity, the family members try to cohabit happily by using effective communicative strategies. In the present age of globalization where individuals have become more self-centered and 'self-face' concerned, the current study tries to serve as a wake-up call for them so they can save the delicate relationships around them by effectively using the right communicative strategy.

REFERENCES

- Amarasinghe, A. D. (2012). Understanding intercultural facework behaviours. *Journal of International Communication*, 18(2), 175-188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13216597.2012.708666>
- Balasubramaniyan, S. (2016). *Jamba: The Joint Family*. Read Out Loud Publishing LLP.
- Fabriar, S. R., Fitri, A. N., Fitri, F., & Rachmawati, F. (2025). Managing cultural diversity through communication: A face negotiation perspective on Muslim and Aboge interactions in Wonosbo. *Islamic Communication Journal*, 10(1), 107-124. <https://doi.org/10.21580/icj.2025.10.1.25360>
- Falcao, F., & Ernungtyas, N. F. (2024). Conflict style of Rohingya refugee rejection in Aceh from face negotiation approach. *Journal La Sociale*, 5(2), 425-436. <https://doi.org/10.37899/journal-la-sociale.v5i2.1118>
- Fitria, N. H. N., & Lukmantor, T. (2025). Understanding the identity negotiation and cultural adaptation of muslim students with Hijab in South Korea. *Interaksi Online*, 13(3), 1-12. Retrieved from <https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/interaksi-online/article/view/51274/33790>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). Brill.
- Gu, T., Guan, Z., Tang, J., & Wu, D. (2021). Comparisons of the different views of face negotiation theory. In *2021 3rd International Conference on Economic Management and Cultural Industry (ICEMCI 2021)* (pp. 2585-2587). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211209.421>
- Heish, J. K., Kunz, W.H., & Wu, A. Y. (2023). Virtual gifting behavior on new social media: the perspectives of the community gift-giving model and face-negotiation theory. *Internet Research*, 33(4), 1597-1632. <https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-09-2021-0691>
- Oetzel, J. G., Ting-Toomey, S., Yokochi Y., Masumoto, T., & Takai, J. (2000). A typology of facework behaviors in conflicts with best friends and relative strangers. *Communication Quarterly*, 48(4), 397-419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370009385606>
- Oetzel, J., Garcia, A. J., & Ting-Toomey, S. (2008). An analysis of the relationships among face concerns and facework behaviors in perceived conflict situations: A four-culture investigation. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 19(4), 382-403. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10444060810909310>
- Oetzel, J., Ting-Toomey, S., Chew-Sanchez, M. L., Harris, R., Wilcox, R., & Stumpf, S. (2002). Face and facework in conflicts with parents and siblings: Across-cultural comparison of Germans, Japanese, Mexicans, and US Americans. *Journal of Family Communication*, 3(2), 67-93. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327698JFC0302_01
- Surakhmad, W. A., Ronda, M., & Widowati, D. (2023). Identity Negotiation of Expatriates (High-Skilled Immigrants) in the Context of Intercultural Communication in Work Environment. *International Journal of Environment, Sustainability, and Social Science*, 4(2), 408-416. <https://doi.org/10.38142/ijesss.v4i2.415>
- Suryandari, N., & Hidayatullah, P. (2020). Face Negotiation Theory in Lived Experiences of Female Sex Workers in Former Dolly. In *6th International Conference on Social and Political Sciences (ICOSAPS 2020)* (pp. 616-621). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201219.093>
- Ting-Toomey, S. & Crocft, B. (1994). Face and Facework: Theoretical and Research Issues. In S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), *The Challenge of Facework: Cross-Cultural and Interpersonal Issues* (pp. 307-340). State University of New York Press.
- Zhang, Q., Oetzel, J. G., Ting-Toomey, S., & Zhang, J. (2019). Making up or getting even? The effects of face concerns, self-construal, and apology on forgiveness, reconciliation, and revenge in the United States and China. *Communication Research*, 46(4), 503-524. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215607959>