



---

**The Comparison of Politeness Components between *New Headway Intermediate Student's Book* and *Bahasa Inggris SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas X***

Nizar Ibnu<sup>✉</sup>, Yan Mujiyanto

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

---

**Article Info**

Article History:  
Accepted 18 May 2017  
Approved 25 June 2017  
Published 15 March  
2018

Keywords:  
politeness, textbook,  
pragmatics

---

**Abstract**

Politeness plays an essential role in communication. Politeness is presumably realized differently in textbooks written by native speakers and in textbooks written by non native speakers as they come from different cultural background. This study aims at investigating the difference of politeness realization in a textbook written by native speakers and a textbook by non native speakers. The subjects of the study were New Headway Intermediate Student's Book and Bahasa Inggris SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas X. Apart from the data taken from the textbooks, interview to two teachers who used the both textbooks were also conducted. The functional texts and model conversations displayed in the textbooks were analyzed using Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies and Leech's (1983) politeness principles. The findings reveal that the both textbooks employ all politeness strategies with equal percentages. In Headway, positive politeness is realized for 68%, bald-on record 24%, negative politeness 7%, and off record 2%. In Bahasa Inggris, positive politeness is realized for 71%, bald-on record 14%, negative politeness 11%, and off record 3%. Positive politeness are dominant in the both textbooks. Besides, the teachers report they usually teach students explicitly and implicitly about the difference of politeness form one culture to another.

© 2018 Universitas Negeri Semarang

---

Correspondence Address :

**p-ISSN 2087-0108**  
**e-ISSN 2502-4566**

Kampus Pascasarjana Unnes, Jalan Kelud Utara III Semarang 50237  
E-Mail: [nizaribnus@gmail.com](mailto:nizaribnus@gmail.com)

## INTRODUCTION

Politeness holds an important role in the success of communication. Politeness makes conversation run pleasantly by the act of showing awareness of another person's face. The desire of people to be unimpeded or being independent from others is called negative face, while the want to be desired by others is defined as positive face. Both speaker and hearer should avoid acts that potentially threaten another person's face or called Face Threatening Act (FTA) by utilizing appropriate politeness strategies (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The strategies including positive politeness (addressing other people's positive face), negative politeness (addressing other people's negative face), bald-on record (going without redress), and off record (going indirectly).

Leech (1983) views politeness as a strategy to avoid conflict which can be measured in terms of effort to avoid conflict and maintain comity. Leech also proposes politeness principles which purpose is to maintain social equilibrium and friendly relations which create an assumption that the interlocutors are cooperative. The politeness principles are Tact Maxim (minimize cost to other and maximize benefit to other), Generosity Maxim (minimize benefit to self and maximize cost to self), Approbation Maxim (minimize praise of self and maximize dispraise of self), Modesty Maxim (minimize praise of self and maximize dispraise of self), Agreement Maxim (Minimize disagreement between self and other and maximize agreement between self and other), and Sympathy Maxim (minimize antipathy between self and other and maximize sympathy between self and other).

Lakoff (1990) defines politeness as a system to facilitate interaction by reducing the potential for conflict and confrontation in existing in human interchange. Politeness acts as a set of norms for cooperative behavior. Furthermore, Lakoff suggests that a speech act can be considered polite if it (a) does not contain any speaker's coercion, (b) gives option to

speakers to do something, (c) provides comfort or is friendly to hearer.

Moreover, Lakoff also explains that culture has strong influence on the realization of politeness. Culture affects strategy on (1) social distance characterized by impersonality, (2) deference characterized by respect and (3) camaraderie characterized by assertiveness. This is concluded by Watts (2003) by stating that politeness is culturally specific. Politeness is different from culture to culture, language to language, and dialect to dialect.

Textbooks as the most fruitful and frequently used learning source have an essential role to build students' communicative competence. A good textbook ideally provides adequate linguistic input as well as pragmatic input. In fact, many textbooks reportedly lack of this pragmatic input.

Alemi and Razzaghi (2012) investigate the politeness markers based on House and Kasper's (1981) politeness structure taxonomy in the spoken discourse of the ESP textbook entitled *Business Result* in order to find a pattern of these politeness markers in business conversations. The findings reveal that there are inadequate inclusion of politeness markers in the textbooks. That this limited amount of pragmatic input can lead to inappropriateness of the development of the business students' communicative competence which may bring about more serious financial or economic losses in the future.

Inadequacy of pragmatic input is also found in Nozawa's (2014) study takes place in Japanese context. The findings show that the proportion of polite request forms in *Englishin Mind* for upper-intermediate learners and *Message 3* for lower secondary learners aiming at taking learners to an intermediate level is 11%, and thus not necessarily sufficient and some of the contexts are also different from those of Japanese learners' in L1 communication. Besides lacking of pragmatic input, the both textbooks are not able to explain the cultural differences between English speaking countries and their native countries. Ideally students are taught English within their target situation. This

results might not successfully enhance learners' pragmatic development.

Hahn (2010) investigated the pragmatic features used in textbook-relied classroom activities in Korean schools. Hahn presupposes that English classroom interactions in Korean schools depend heavily on textbooks in which the conversations provided are unnatural. The study attempts to find out kinds of politeness strategies used in the classrooms as well as how speech acts are realized.

Four speech acts are identified as recurring across different kinds of textbooks including responses, questions, advice, and suggestions. Responding is the most frequent act and belongs to positive politeness in a way that it keeps conversations going on to satisfy the addressee's connection and solidarity. The study also recommends teachers or language instructors to consider natural communication style to maintain verbal interaction in the classroom.

Previous studies inform us that textbooks especially in EFL context sometimes contain inadequate pragmatic input and unnatural communication style. This situation frequently happens as a result of difference cultural background of the author. A textbook published internationally is not able to portray contexts related students daily situation who lives in a particular area. Therefore, this study is made to reveal that phenomenon. This study attempts to explain the differences and the similarities of politeness realization between the textbooks written by native speakers and non native speakers.

## METHODS

This study is descriptive qualitative in nature attempting to gather clearer picture and deeper understanding on the realization of politeness components in *New Headway Intermediate Student's Book* and *Bahasa Inggris SMA/MA/SMK/MAK KELAS X*. The functional texts and model conversations in both textbooks are analyzed by Brown and Levinson' (1987) politeness strategies and Leech's (1983)

politeness principles. An interview to teachers as the textbook users were also carried out to investigate their perspectives on how to teach students about politeness difference from those textbooks.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### The Politeness Realization in *Headway* and *Bahasa Inggris*

Both *Headway* and *Bahasa Inggris* use politeness strategies in the identical amount. From the highest to the lowest percentage it can be ordered this way: positive politeness, bald-on record, negative politeness, and off-record. In general, positive politeness dominates the use of politeness strategy with the total percentage 70%, thereby outnumbering other strategies including bald-on record with 19%, negative politeness with 9%, and off-record with 2%. The gaps among strategies are huge and this may implicate the tendency of the authors in providing pragmatic input.

**Table 1.** The appearance of politeness strategies in *Headway* and *Bahasa Inggris*

Politeness	<i>Headway</i>		<i>Bahasa Inggris</i>		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
OffRecord	1	2	2	3	3	2
Bald-on Record	14	24	10	14	24	19
Positive Politeness	40	68	50	71	90	70
Negative Politeness	4	7	8	11	12	9
TOTAL	59	100	70	100	258	100

In general, the choice of politeness strategies depends on social distance, power, and ranking of imposition (Brown and Levinson, 1987). In other words, the context of situation plays significant role in deciding how someone produces an utterance. In textbooks, however, authors are the ones who create the context

unless they take the authentic materials like form newspapers, fliers, and actual daily conversations. They may can freely to choose what context to apply but they have to provide the utterance or sentence accordingly. Therefore, the distribution of politeness strategies is actually a result of the context that the authors have made.

### Positive Politeness

In *Headway*, positive politeness is utilized 68% in average, 65% in functional texts, and 77% in model conversations. This percentage becomes the highest of all. This positive politeness is realized through interaction between two or more parties with presumably have quite close relationship. Many of them are represented as students with their friends, relatives, and parents. This politeness strategy is also represented by advertisements which are intended to minimize distance with the readers. Various strategies are employed to achieve positive politeness.

Meanwhile, positive politeness also claims its domination in *Bahasa Inggris*. This textbook averagely uses positive politeness 71%, 59% in functional texts, and 79% in model conversation. The total percentage is even higher than that of *Headway*. Positive politeness most frequently appears in model conversations involving interaction among parties with close relations, such as between friends or acquaintances.

The findings about the domination of positive politeness usage is in accordance with other studies' results. This finding reflect the actual usage of this politeness strategy. Suwartama and Fitriati (2017) reports that in actual conversation English graduate students of a public university in Semarang mostly used positive politeness. This is because they tried to minimize threat to other people's face and avoid conflict in convesations.

**Table 2.** Distribution of the strategies in the realization of positive politeness

Strategy	<i>Headway</i>		<i>Bahasa Inggris</i>	
	f	%	f	%
Give gift to hearer	0	0	3	61
Use in-group identity markers	9	27	1	22
Promise	2	6	2	4
Exaggerate	4	12	3	6
Intensify interest to hearer	2	6	1	2
Presuppose common ground	1	3	1	2
Be optimistic	1	3	0	0
Presupposes speaker's concern	2	36	0	0
Seek agreement	1	3	0	0
Offer	2	6	2	4
	0	0	4	7
TOTAL	3	10	5	10
	3	0	6	0

Positive politeness is realized through several strategies. The strategy that is always frequent in both textbooks is in-group identity markers, 27% in *Headway* and 22% in *Bahasa Inggris*. It seems this strategy becomes the most popular strategy to show cooperation and satisfy hearer's positive face in both texts. The writers have exemplified the way to satisfy others' positive faces and maintain good relationship with them by calling others with friendly names. It can give students a good lesson that closeness has something to do with politeness. Close distant relationship allows people to talk more conveniently and can minimize threat to other people's face.

Both textbook writers are in favor of exploring contextual learning which relies on students' closest context. Interactions mostly involve students and their daily situations (Johnson, 2002). Such contextual learning is argued to be effective because students can relate themselves to the lessons, and thereby enhances learning (Satriani, *et al.*, 2012).

**Bald-on Record**

Bald-on record is the second most frequent politeness strategy used in both *Headway* and *Bahasa Inggris* 19% in total. In average, *Headway* employs 24% bald-on record, 24% in functional texts and 23% in model conversations. This number is a little bit higher than that of *Bahasa Inggris*. Bald-on record is realized through farewell, task-oriented interaction, and offer. Task-oriented interaction claims its domination especially in interaction between participants who have unequal power or close relation.

*Bahasa Inggris* textbook contains less bald-on record. It is averagely utilized only 14%, 15% in functional texts and 14% in model conversations. Strategies implemented are farewell, task-oriented interaction, advice, and welcoming. Advice and welcoming strategies are only found in *Bahasa Inggris*. They appear in verbal communication in which immediate response is necessary.

**Table 3.** Distribution of the strategies in the realization of bald-on record

Strategy	<i>Headway</i>		<i>Bahasa Inggris</i>	
	f	%	f	%
Welcoming	0	0	1	10
Advice	0	0	2	20
Offer	5	45	0	0
Taskorientation	4	36	6	60
Farewell	2	18	1	10
TOTAL	11	100	10	100

As the most straight forward politeness, bald-on record conveys clear message. It occurs when redressive action is not necessary. Interactions among people in higher social position to the lower social position and people with very close relation usually involve this. Besides, in some cases bald-on record can also address someone's positive face indicating cooperation, such as in welcoming and farewell.

Even though indirectness has always been associated with politeness and vice versa, bald-on record strategy is still needed in giving pragmatic input to students through textbooks.

The bald-on record strategy is realized in the both textbooks through farewell, and task-oriented interaction. Offer is only used in *Headway*, while advice and welcoming appear only in *Bahasa Inggris*.

**Negative Politeness**

Negative politeness is subtly found in *Headway* 7% in average. All of them are in functional texts. Meanwhile, *Bahasa Inggris* consists of a bit more negative politeness as 11% in average, 19% in functional texts and 7% in model conversations.

Apology is the most frequent strategy of all. It is able to minimize speaker's superiority immediately and satisfy hearer's negative face at the same time. Apology lowers down someone's ego to admit mistakes he or she made. Apology and other strategies to accomplish negative politeness are illustrated below.

**Table 4.** Distribution of the strategies in the realization of negative politeness

Strategy	<i>Headway</i>		<i>Bahasa Inggris</i>	
	f	%	f	%
Apologize	1	25	4	57
State FTA as general rule	1	25	0	0
Give deference	1	25	0	0
Conventionally indirect	1	25	0	0
Impersonalize	0	0	1	14
Question	0	0	2	29
TOTAL	4	100	7	100

As opposed to positive politeness, negative politeness is intended to fulfill interlocutor's negative face wants. Little assumption about hearer's wants or needs is made in this politeness. By having this politeness in the textbooks the author provide learners input about how to respect people as it is important to keep away from the fence. Moving away beyond this limitation may be considered rude.

### Off Record

Off record is the least frequent of all. It is subtly found 2% in *Headway* and 3% in *Bahasa Inggris*. It is realized through hints, metaphor, and rhetorical question. In *Headway*, off record is shown by giving hints (100%), while *Bahasa Inggris* uses metaphor (50%) and rhetorical question (50%). Off record is considered as the most indirect strategy and it leaves hearer to guess its real meaning.

**Table 5.** Distribution of the strategies in the realization of off record

Strategy	<i>Headway</i>		<i>Bahasa Inggris</i>	
	f	%	f	%
Give hints	1	100	0	0
Metaphor	0	0	1	50
Rhetorical question	0	0	1	50
TOTAL	1	100	2	100

Off record is the most indirect and ambiguous politeness. It hardly appears in the textbooks as probably the writers assume it is not yet appropriate to provide learners with sentences containing implicit meanings. Students, especially in intermediate level who become the target readers of these textbooks, are not ready yet to understand pragmatic elements as they still have problems with linguistic elements. In some conversations, even though students were able to acquire main features of conversational structure, they still reportedly used patterns influenced from their native language (Sofwan, 2015). When negative transfer from the native language happens, it indicates they still lack of linguistic competence.

### How to Bridge the Gap between the Politeness in *Headway* and *Bahasa Inggris*

Firstly, it is found that teacher A and teacher B use the textbooks in their classes. Their opinions about the role of textbook in language teaching corroborate previous researcher' views. Textbooks also function as a learning tool (Graves in Nunan, 2003), a principle (Ur, 1996), and a staple (Garinger,

2001). As a learning tool, textbooks facilitate learning. As a principle, textbooks become a guide to organize learning systematically. As a staple, textbooks become the important part of English language teaching even they have become compulsory in several cases. These significant roles of textbook make it important for teachers to choose textbooks to be applied. *Headway* and *Bahasa Inggris* as the subject of the study hold the same role as they are also implemented in a lot of schools.

Teacher A does not consider whether the textbook is written by native or non native speakers. As long as the textbook is in line with curriculum, provides the material needed, and develops students' critical thinking and creativity it is suitable for the class. Meanwhile, teacher B suggests the same point with teacher A in terms of content. Further she adds that reputation of the publisher and the writers is also important. A good reputation can be a guarantee that the content will be also good. It can help teachers and other teaching practitioners to select a textbook by only looking at the name of the publisher. In Indonesia there have been several publishers which are reviewed good and the books are frequently used in many schools. Teacher B, however, she does not consider whether an appropriate and good textbook should be written by native or non native speakers. In fact, a reputable textbook publisher and writer can be native or non native speakers.

The teachers' opinions on how a textbook should be corroborates Richards' (2001) idea on the advantages of textbooks stating that textbooks provide structure and syllabus for a program, help standardize instruction, maintain quality, provide a variety of learning resources, are efficient, can provide effective language models and input, can train teachers, and are visual appealing.

Both teachers recognize the difference between textbooks written by native and non native speakers. They agree on the different culture which makes them differ to each other. The non-existence of some cultural events and habits in students' culture which thereby brings unfamiliar words in a textbook may become

advantage and disadvantages. If it leads to new knowledge, it will be advantage for students. Otherwise, if students misunderstand the context believing that every western culture is relevant to their culture, it will be a drawback. Therefore, it is reasonable for teacher A to afraid that western culture and habit can give negative influence for students if it is not explained properly. Further, this culture difference leads to different politeness standard as politeness is actually culturally specific or culture-dependent. Politeness is different from culture to culture, language to language, and dialect to dialect. Therefore, it is essential for anyone to use not only appropriate politeness strategies but also to understand the context of situation (Watts, 2003).

It can be implied from teacher B's response that a global published textbook does not represent students' local contexts and thereby fails to accommodate student's interests and needs adaptation (Cunningsworth, 1995). Teacher in this case hold an important role to make an adjustment or explanation when necessary. This could be the drawback of a global marketed textbook.

Responding to the previous question about the cultural difference, it is found that teacher A and teacher have conflicting opinions. Teacher A believes that both English speaking country's culture and our culture should be included in a textbook. Using other country's context can be new knowledge for students, but it should not be more dominant than context related to students' lives. The importance of multicultural contents in a textbooks have been proved effective in enhancing elementary school students' reading ability. Students' reading scores in multicultural reading materials is higher 82.85 which is higher than their scores in reading materials without multicultural contents as 65.17 (Salimudin, 2015). Besides, the combination of multicultural contents in textbook may improve students' intercultural communicative competence (ICC). ICC final goal in English language teaching is not only to help students gain the competence of a native speaker, but also to understand language and

behaviour of target language community (Corbett 2003).

Teacher B argues that context outside students' lives should not be presented, while students related context should be exposed in the textbooks. In a country where English has been considered as foreign language (Sutopo and Mahardhika, 2016) to provide familiar context for learning is important because it can give students prior knowledge, and help them to find the gist. That kind of textbook can promote contextual teaching and learning (CLT). CLT, according to Johnson (2002), lets teachers and students relate the real world situation with the subject matter. Moreover, students are expected to learn the subject matter through experiencing not memorizing (Satriani, *et al.*, 2012).

Meanwhile as responseto another question, both teacher A and teacher B suggest that students need to be taught explicitly and implicitly about the politeness difference. Teacher A believes that it is important to involve students in a discussion about context inside or outside our country which might awaken their awareness of the politeness difference. By doing so, students' critical thinking is trained. Teacher, however, plays essential role to facilitate discussion and to make sure students do not get wrong conclusions. The identical teaching strategy has been applied in higher education level in English Departmen of Semarang State University. The lecturers have reportedly explicitly and implicitly embedded the aspect of intercultural communication in a form of politeness through explanation, practice, and degree of formality displayed in textbook (Saraswati, 2017).

Meanwhile, teacher B adds by giving an example of how a word can be understood differently when it is put in different context. It is implied that pragmatic input, particularly politeness, has been considered important by the teachers as politeness acts as a vital element in social interaction. It is able to avoid conflict and maintain comity (Leech, 1983) as well as promote rapport (Hill, 1986). Student should aware in what context they speak so that they can mitigate any threatening act by suitable

politeness strategy. Therefore, knowledge about cultural background is necessary.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussions of the findings, some conclusions of this study can be drawn. First, regarding the first research question, the study reveals that Headway and Bahasa Inggris implement all the politeness strategies of Brown and Levinson. The percentages of each strategy are also identical. In Headway, positive politeness is realized for 68%, bald-on record 24%, negative politeness 7%, and off record 2%. In Bahasa Inggris, positive politeness is realized for 71%, bald-on record 14%, negative politeness 11%, and off record 3%. This results show how positive politeness dominates in both textbooks and leaves a huge gap to off record as the least politeness strategy. This happen as both textbooks use similar contexts. Many conversations and functional texts especially letters in both textbooks involve participants who maintain close relationship, such as between friends, and parent to children. This choice is reasonable as learners need contexts which are close to their lives in order to promote contextual learning. In addition, bald-on record position as the second most used politeness in both textbooks is also influenced by the choice of contexts. Interaction among people who maintain close relationship and utterance by people with higher power and social status to others in lower social level does not usually need redressive action. On the contrary, negative politeness and off record are found appear mostly when speaker talks to someone who is more respectful or older and when speaker wants to be humble and raise the interlocutor.

Second, it is regarding the politeness realization difference. The differences are found in how each politeness is realized in each textbook. Positive politeness in Headway is realized by various strategies including give gifts to hearer, use in-groups identity markers, promise, exaggerate, intensify interest to hearer, presuppose common ground, be optimistic, presuppose speaker's concern, and seek

agreement. Positive politeness in Bahasa Inggris realized through the same strategies except be optimistic and presuppose speaker's concern. Giving gift to hearer becomes the only strategy that appears in great number in both of the textbooks. As for bald-on record, Bahasa Inggris uses more strategies than Headway does. They are farewell, task-oriented interaction, advice, and welcoming. Headway uses farewell, task-oriented interaction, and offer. Meanwhile, negative politeness is achieved through apologize, state FTA as general rule, give deference, conventionally indirect, and impersonalize. Bahasa Inggris only uses apologize and question. Lastly, off record as the least one is realized only through hints in Headway, and metaphor and Rhetorical question in Bahasa Inggris. These results about the way politeness is realized reflects choice made by authors in what manner an interaction should be learned by students.

Last, interview results show how teachers teach students about the difference of the politeness realization. At the beginning of the interview, the teachers admit that they recognize the difference. The difference in politeness derives from the different context used. Western and Indonesian people share different concept of politeness. When teacher uses Headway which contains western context to students' lives, teacher needs adjustment using discussion and explanation. Teacher invites students to discuss which kind of speech that is polite and not polite in their culture and in western culture. It is important because it can improve students' socio-cultural competence as a part of communicative competences.

## SUGGESTIONS

Considering the above mentioned conclusions, some recommendations are proposed. The first recommendation goes to teachers especially who involve textbooks as one of sources of their teaching. Determining good contents in a textbook is one thing, but considering the pragmatic input for the text is also necessary. Teacher should be able to

explain to students how to use politeness properly to particular people and in particular situation. Therefore, selecting language input from a textbook should involve pragmatic consideration.

Second, this study leaves many things unrevealed. Further research can be done not only in terms of politeness but also others pragmatic elements such as speech acts, and appraisal in the textbooks in order to give a comprehensive understanding. The findings might be beneficial to contribute to the textbooks evaluation.

## REFERENCES

- Acklam, R. 1994. The Role of the Coursebook. *Practical English Teaching*, 14 (3), 12-14.
- Alemi, M. & Razzaghi, S. 2013. Politeness Markers in English for Business Purposes Textbook. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 2(4): 109-123.
- Barron, A. 2016. Developing Pragmatic Competence Using EFL Textbooks: Focus on Requests. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal*, 7(1): 2173-2179.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge University Press. 2008. *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. 2008. Rethinking the Role of Communicative in Language Teaching. *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning Springer Netherland*, pp. 41-57.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. 2007. *Research Methods in Education* (6th Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Corbett, J. 2003. *An intercultural approach to English language teaching*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cunningsworth, A. 1995. *Choosing Your Coursebook*. London: Macmillan Heinemann.
- Cutting, J. 2002. *Pragmatic and Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Duff, P. & Hornberger, H. 2008. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. New York: Springer.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. 2012. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). San Francisco: McGraw-Hill.
- Garinger, D. 2001. Textbook Evaluation. *TEFL Web Journal*.
- Graves, K. 2003. Coursebooks. In Nunan, D. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
- Grice, H. P. 1989. *Studies in the Ways of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hahn, J. 2010. Learning Speech Acts and Politeness Strategies through EFL Textbooks in Korea. *The Linguistic Society of Korea*, 57: 145-164.
- Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A., & Ogino, T. 1986. Universal of Linguistic Politeness: Quantitative Evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10(3): 347-371.
- House, J. & Kasper, G. 1981. Politeness markers in English and German in F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational Routine: Exploration in Standardized Communication Situation and Patterned Speech*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. Pp. 157-186.
- Ide, S. 1989. On the Notion of Wakimae: Toward an Integrated Framework of Linguistic Politeness. *Mejiro Linguistic Society*, 298-305.
- Lakoff, R. 1973. The Logic of Politeness in J.D. Johansen and H. Sonne, (Ed.), *Pragmatics and Linguistics*. Odense: Odense University Press.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Lestari, D. P. 2014. An Analysis of Politeness Language Patterns in Request used in English Textbook of

- Second Grade of Junior High School. Thesis. Riau: University of Bengkulu.
- Mujiyanto, Y. 2017. The Verbal Politeness of Interpersonal Utterances Resulted from Back-Translating Indonesian Texts into English. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(2): 288-300.
- Mukundan, J., Nimehchisalem, V, & Hajimohammadadi, R. 2011. Developing an English Language Textbook Evaluation Checklist: A Focus Group Discussion. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1 (12), 100-106.
- Nozawa, Y. 2014. An Analysis of the Use of Modal Verbs in EFL Textbooks in Terms of Politeness Strategy of English. *Departmental Bulletin Paper*, 14: 19-28.
- O'Neil, R. 1993. Are textbooks of a disease? *Practical English Teaching*, 14/1, 12-14.
- Purwanto, S. & Soepriatmaji, L. 2013. Politeness Strategies in Model Conversations in English Textbooks for Elementary School Students. *Parole*, 3(1): 75-84.
- Richards, J. C. 2001. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rohim, A. 2015. A Study on the Expressions of Politeness in Senior High School English Textbooks. Thesis. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.
- Salimudin. 2015. Reading Material Model with Multicultural Content as An Effort to Foster Reading Skill in Elementary School. *The Journal of Education Development*, 3(2): 158-166.
- Saraswati, G. P. D. 2017. Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) in Teaching Speaking Material Used in English Department of Universitas Negeri Semarang. *Language Circle*, 11(2): 158-164.
- Sari, A. W. 2012. Politeness Strategies in Conversation Closing Displayed on a Vocational School's English Textbook Entitled English for SMK 1. Thesis. Semarang: Semarang State University.
- Satriani, I., Emilia, E., & Gunawan, M. H. 2012. Contextual Teaching and Learning Approach to Teaching Writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 2(1): 10-22.
- Scollon, R. & Scollon S. W. 2001. Discourse and Intercultural Communication. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 537-547.
- Septianingsih, T. & Warsono. 2017. The Types and Power Relation of Directive Speech Acts in Classroom Interaction. *English Education Journal*, 7(1): 26-33.
- Sofwan, A. 2015. An Analysis of Conversation Structure of Learners of English as A Foreign Language. Paper Presented at 4th ELTLT International Conference, Semarang, Indonesia, 10-15 October.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. 2002. Managing Rapport in Talk: Using Rapport Sensitive Incidents to Explore the Motivational Concerns Underlying the Management of Relations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(5): 529-545.
- Sutopo, D., & Mahardhika, S. M. 2016. The Use of Communication Strategies among Indonesian Young Learners of English in Early Total Immersion Program. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(3): 215-237.
- Suwartama, I. M. & Fitriati, S. W. 2017. The Socio-Cultural Constraints in the Implementation of Politeness Strategies in the Interactions among English Language Education Students. *English Education Journal*, 7(1): 19-25.
- Ur, P. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watts. R. J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yuka, A. 2009. Positive Politeness Strategies in Oral Communication I Textbooks. *The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics*, 52(1): 59-70.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zheng, S. 2015. A Study of Politeness Strategies in Persuasive English Business Letters from the Perspective of Londo's AIDA

Formula. Theory and Practice in  
Language Studies, 5(7): 1467-1475.