



The Compatibility of Speaking Politeness Introduced in Conversation Texts in MTs English Textbook Grade VIII With The Standard of Content

Ulin Nuha
IAIN Kudus, Kudus, Indonesia
nuha.kds@iainkudus.ac.id

Abstract

This study focuses on the issues: social contextual factors approach which analyzes the participants in the interaction and the communicative situation and politeness which analyzes the respect that an individual has for himself or herself, and maintaining the "self-esteem" in public or in private situations. This is a qualitative study. The data of this study are conversation texts. Units of analysis in this study are texts. The texts were analyzed based on the social contextual factors and politeness. In calculating the data and the final result of data percentage, quantification will be used to support this study. The result shows that there are two politeness strategies that occurred in the conversation texts, positive and negative. The speech functions of the transactional conversation texts are 54.5% matching the standard of content, the speech functions of the interpersonal conversation texts are 2.1% matching the standard of content, the linguistic feature applied in the transactional and interpersonal conversation texts uses the linguistic feature in functional literacy level, the speech functions of conversation texts introduced in EOS English on Sky 2 for junior high school grade VIII are less compatible with the standard of content based on the compatibility levels. This shows that this textbook's choice is less appropriate for users who emphasize interpersonal conversation texts.

Keywords: *Conversation Text, Social Contextual Factors, and Politeness*

*Corresponding Author

A. Introduction

Education includes teaching and learning specific skills, and also something less tangible but more profound: the imparting of knowledge, positive judgment and well-developed wisdom. Education has as one of its fundamental aspects the imparting of culture from generation to generation. Education means 'to draw out', facilitating realization of self-potential and latent talents of an individual. It is an application of pedagogy, a body of theoretical and applied research relating to teaching and learning and draws on many disciplines such as psychology, philosophy, linguistics, and anthropology. (NCIRT, 2014) One of the linguistics branches is foreign language. The development of foreign language especially English in Indonesia is mostly conducted in teaching and learning process. As language education, in Indonesia English is formally taught in the levels of education. The basic rules that regulate the education in Indonesia are government regulation No 22/2003 on National Education System and No 19/2006 on National Standard of Education. The implementation of those regulations is socialized into the curriculum that is conducted in the teaching and learning program in each educational institution from elementary and secondary schools to college.

In many countries, and also in Indonesia, English is now being introduced at primary rather than secondary level necessitating considerable new investment in textbooks (Richards 2000). The models of teaching and learning can be applied into a textbook which is made based on the standard of content. Textbook is a teaching tool (material) which presents the subject matter defined by the curriculum. A school textbook is required to contain the complete overview of the subject, including the theories, as well as to be of a more permanent character (CARNet, cited at 19:57, on 8 August 2007 (MEST)). In other words, use and production of a textbook is related to a "normal" instructional design problems and one can rely on various design methods and instructional design models, based in turn on underlying psychological and pedagogical theory. Textbooks are usually part of a pedagogical design, i.e. it can be the center piece of a course syllabus, it can be used for self-study (students and professionals), teachers can assign only parts for reading. Teachers are now able to examine and confront the underlying ideologies of texts and textbooks. Textbooks, no longer seen as indispensable

tools, are viewed as controlling instruments, hindering the creativity of the teacher, maintained in place through the pressure of publishers, and may result in the deskilling of teachers through their recycling of old, but tried and tested teaching techniques (Richards 2001). Functions of a textbook are not the same because there are different purposes of usage.

Recently, there are many English textbooks widely published and distributed both in junior and senior high schools. Those textbooks themselves claim to have conformed with the culture and politeness of our national life. Many teachers often use the textbooks as handbooks without paying attention to the core of the textbooks. The question is whether the textbooks published and distributed really conform with what the regulation of the Ministry of Education instructs or at least the textbooks contain good readings, proper pictures for the students, and polite conversation. (Ulin Nuha, 2020). In reality, there are still many textbooks that do not describe and reflect the Indonesian students' life. The content is not proper to the Indonesian students because it contains bad readings, pictures that are not proper to the students, and impolite conversation texts. That is why, I encouraged to analyze the English textbook entitled „EOS English on Sky 2 “ which was one of the most recommended English textbook for the students of junior high school (MTs) a couple years ago and now it is still used by some junior high schools. The objectives of this research are to find out how the social contextual factors and what kind of politeness are expressed in the conversation texts. In this study, described the social contextual factors which explain the participants in the interaction and the communicative situation, and politeness which describe the respect that an individual has for him or herself, and maintaining the "self-esteem" in public or in private situations.

B. Methods

In this study, I conducted the analyses to social contextual factors and politeness. Text describing participant's exchange was used to analyze the politeness. There are four types of politeness strategies as described by Brown and Levinson (1987). They are Bald On Record, Negative Politeness, Positive Politeness, and Off-Record-indirect

strategy. And then, context of the conversation texts is the unit of social contextual factors analysis based on the components of socio-cultural competence described by Celce-Murcia (1995).

This research focuses on gaining an understanding of human behavior, intentions, attitudes, experience, etc., based on the observation and interpretation of people in the textbook. That is why, qualitative analysis was used. Qualitative analysis is designed to be consistent with the assumptions of a qualitative paradigm as Cresswell (1994) explains that this study is defined as an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting. In other words, in terms of qualitative analysis, Mayring (2000) says that qualitative analysis is an approach of empirical, methodological controlled analysis of texts within their context of communication following analytical rules and step by step models, without rash quantification. Qualitative analysis in this study as explained above will be applied to describe social contextual factors and politeness. In calculating the data and the final result of data frequency, quantification was used to support this study.

Data refer to a collection of facts usually collected as the result of experience, observation or experiment, or processes within a computer system, or a set of premises. This may consist of numbers, words, or images, particularly as measurements or observations of a set of variables. Data are often viewed as a lowest level of abstraction from which information and knowledge are derived (Wikipedia). The data of this study are the total number of the written conversation texts were taken from 7 chapters presented in the textbook, EOS English on Sky 2 for junior high school students, grade VIII. In quantitative research, the total number of data analyzed is usually called population. The units of analysis of this study are texts. Text is the unit which can show the participants or speaker in order to exchange information and their relationship. Text can be analyzed to describe the politeness of the participants or speakers. Text is the unit of analysis that can be analyzed to describe the social contextual factors of the conversation.

This study was conducted in April - July 2021. The data of this study were conversation texts found in the EOS English in Sky 2. The units of analysis were texts. The data analyzed were collected with following processes:

1. Reading the materials of the English textbook
2. Classifying the sub-materials of speaking
3. Typing the conversation texts as the sub-materials of speaking
4. Classifying the conversation texts into social contextual factors and politeness analysis
5. Providing conversation texts as the data analysis of social contextual factors and politeness

The data of each analysis will be provided in a set of file and then they were encoded based on the purpose of analysis. Each number of the text was encoded by mentioning the chapter, number of text and page from the English textbook. In this study, the analysis was conducted in two phases. They are social contextual factors and politeness phases. The data were analyzed based on these steps: Social Contextual Factors: The texts were classified into each number of conversation texts. Each number of the conversation text was analyzed based on the picture setting which becomes the background of the conversation texts. From the picture background, it was known the participants like gender, office (profession, rank and public position), social distance from and relations to each other (both in terms of power and affect) and situational variables like place and social situation. The results of the analysis then were described in qualitative and quantitative ways. Politeness: The texts were classified into each the number of conversation texts. Each number of the conversation text was analyzed based on the picture setting which becomes the background of the conversation texts. From the picture background, it would be known office, social distance from and relations to each other (both in terms of power and affect). From these data, then they were provided with the texts which have the criteria of politeness analysis. The provided texts

then were analyzed based on politeness strategies. The results of the analysis then were described in qualitative and quantitative ways.

C. Results and Discussion

1. Socio-Contextual Factors

Socio-contextual factors are part of socio-cultural competence which refers to the speaker's knowledge of how to express messages appropriately within the overall social and cultural context of communication, in accordance with the pragmatic factors related to variation in language use. These factors are complex and interrelated, which stems from the fact that language is not simply a communication coding system but also an integral part of the individual's identity and the most important channel of social organization, embedded in the culture of the communities where it is used. Language learners face this complexity as soon as they first try to apply the L2 knowledge they have learned to real-life communication and these first attempts can be disastrous: the "culture-free", "out-of-context" and very often even "meaning-free" L2 instruction (Damen, 1987) which is still too typical of foreign language classes around the world, simply does not prepare learners to cope with the complexity of real-life language use efficiently.

The relevant socio-cultural variable in this study is social contextual factors. They concern the participants in the interaction and the communicative situation. The participants' age, gender, office (profession, rank and public position), status (social standing), social distance from and relations to each other (both in terms of power and affect) are known to determine how they talk and are talked to (Preston, 1989; Brown and Levinson, 1987). Situational variables involve the temporal and physical aspects of the interaction (time and duration, location) as well as the social dimension of the situation. The components of socio-cultural competence which is used as a base of the analysis is only social contextual factors. What Preston, Brown and Levinson explained above becomes setting criteria in a conversation text, they are: a. Participants variables; age, gender, office and status, social distance, relations (power and affective),b Situational variables: time, place, social situation.

2. Politeness

In daily conversation, there are ways to go about getting the things people want. When people are with a group of friends, they can say to them, "Go get me that plate!", or "Shut-up!" However, when they are surrounded by a group of adults at a formal function, in which their parents are attending, they must say, "Could you please pass me that plate, if you don't mind?" and "I'm sorry, I don't mean to interrupt, but I am not able to hear the speaker in the front of the room." They differentiate social situations and they are obligated to adjust their use of words to fit the occasion. It would seem socially unacceptable if the phrases above were reversed.

Politeness is an expression of concern for feeling of others. The term politeness describes behavior which is somewhat formal and distancing, where the intention is not to interrupt or impose. Being polite means expressing respect towards the person you are talking to an avoiding offending them. Goffman (1967) and Brown and Levinson (1987) in Holmes (1995) describe politeness as showing concern for people „face“.

Behavior which avoids imposing on others (avoid their „threatening their face“) is described as evidence of negative politeness, while sociable behavior expressing warmth towards an addressee is positive politeness behavior. Positive politeness generally involves emphasizing what people share, thus minimizing the distance between them, while negative politeness avoid intruding, and so emphasizes the social distance between people.

e.g. "It's very hot in here. Would you mind if I open a window."

"I'm sorry to disturb you but I think you may be in the wrong seat."

In the examples above, the speaker uses elaborated, qualified and

Politeness as a real-world goal is interpreted as a genuine desire to be pleasant to others, or as underlying motivation for an individual's linguistic behavior (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Deference is connected with politeness, it refers to the respect we show to other people by virtue of their higher status, greater age, etc. It is an obligatory choice among variants reflecting the speaker's sense of place or role in a given situation

according to social conventions and relationship. People cannot assess politeness reliably out of context, it is not the linguistic form alone which renders the speech act polite or impolite, but the linguistic form + the context of utterance + the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearers' "face." Face refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself, and maintaining that "self-esteem" in public or in private situations. Usually you try to avoid embarrassing the other person, or making them feel uncomfortable. Face Threatening Acts (FTA's) are acts that infringe on the hearers' need to maintain his/her self esteem, and be respected. Politeness strategies are developed for the main purpose of dealing with these FTA's. The examples below are the analysis of politeness from Brown and Levinson (1987). What would you do if you saw a cup of pens on your teacher's desk, and you wanted to use one, would you

say, "Ooh, I want to use one of those!"

say, "So, is it O.K. if I use one of those pens?"

say, "I'm sorry to bother you but, I just wanted to ask you if I could use one of those pens?"

Indirectly say, "Hmm, I sure could use a blue pen right now."

There are four types of politeness strategies, described by Brown and Levinson, that sum up human "politeness" behavior: Bald On Record, Negative Politeness, Positive Politeness, and Off-Record-indirect strategy.

If you answered **A**, you used what is called the [Bald On-Record](#) strategy which provides no effort to minimize threats to your teachers' "face."

If you answered **B**, you used the [Positive Politeness str](#)ategy. In this situation you recognize that your teacher has a desire to be respected. It also confirms that the relationship is friendly and expresses group reciprocity.

If you answered **C**, you used the [Negative Politeness str](#)ategy which is similar to Positive Politeness in that you recognize that they want to be respected however, you

also assume that you are in some way imposing on them. Some other examples would be to say, "I don't want to bother you but..." or "I was wondering if ..."

If you answered **D**, you used [Off-Record](#) indirect strategies. The main purpose is to take some of the pressure off of you. You are trying not to directly impose by asking for a pen. Instead you would rather it be offered to you once the teacher realizes you need one, and you are looking to find one.

Politeness strategies are „culture-dependent“ which means that what are felt to be appropriate vary across cultures. Politeness in conversation is also „culture-dependent, because the conversation texts made up in the English textbook can be seen as culturally speaking which is a conversation text that focuses on the importance that cultural elements play in communication. The text is designed to develop conversational fluency in a variety of situation.

3. Frame of the Ideas

Based on the theories explained above I want to conduct the analysis according to frame of the ideas below: For social contextual factors, I used the approach of Celce-Murcia et al's variables. They are concerned with the participants in the interaction and the communicative situation. The participants' age, gender, office (profession, rank and public position), status (social standing), social distance from and relations to each other (both in terms of power and affect) are known to determine how they talk and are talked to. Situational variables involve the temporal and physical aspects of the interaction (time and duration, location) as well as the social dimension of the situation. I did not use the age and status in participants variable and time in situational variables because their variables are not found and known in the conversation texts. For politeness analysis, I used the approach of Brown and Levinson's strategies. There are four types of politeness strategies, described by Brown and Levinson, that sum up human "politeness" behavior: Bald On Record, Negative Politeness, Positive Politeness, and Off-Record-indirect strategy.

4. Result of Social Contextual Factor

Social contextual factors analysis was used to analyze the participants and situational variables. The participants variables are gender, office or occupation, social distance and relations; and the situational variables are place and social situation. I found that from 75 conversation texts, the genders are male and female. There are 35 conversation texts whose participants are only female; 7 conversation texts whose participants are only male; and 33 conversation texts whose participants are both male and female.

Table 5. Gender

No	Gender	Conversation Texts
1.	Male	7
2.	Female	35
3.	Male and female	33

The offices or occupation of the participants are student and teacher only. There are 53 conversation texts whose participants are only students; 1 conversation text whose participant is only teacher; and 21 conversation texts whose participants are both student and teacher:

Table 6. Office

No.	Offices	Conversation Texts
1.	Students	53
2.	Teacher	1
3.	Students and teacher	21

For social distance and relations, there are 53 conversation texts to show the intimacy among the participants because they are among friends or peers, so for the relation they are in the same level and for the social distance, there are 21 conversation texts that are not intimate because of their relation among teacher and student. Teacher has higher position than students.

Table 7. Social Distance

No	Social Distance	Conversation Texts
1.	Intimate	54
2.	Not intimate	21

For situational variables, the places that are used in 75 conversation texts are classroom, school yard, party, home, field, garden, music studio and library. The specification for each environment in conversations are 23 classrooms, 43 school yards, 3 gardens, 2 libraries and 1 each for party, home, field and music studio.

Table 8. Places

No.	Places	Conversation Texts
1.	School yard	43
2.	Classroom	23
3.	Garden	3
4.	Library	2
5.	Party	1
6.	Home	1
7.	Field	1
8.	Studio	1

The social situation in the conversation texts are 21 formal and 53 informal. The formality can be identified through the participants between teacher and student, and informality can be identified through the participants among friends or peers.

Table 9. Social Situation

No.	Social Situation	Conversation Texts
1.	Formal	21
2.	Informal	54

5. Analysis Result on Social Contextual Factors

The conversations found in the English textbook are made up by the writers, so the information about data of social contextual factors are limited (see table 5 to 9). In these discussions, I try to enhance the factors that are not found in the analyzed data

from the conversation texts. From the participant variables, the gender is dominated by female (see table 5). I can present that 47 % are among female; 44 % are among female and male; and 9 % are among male. There are few conversations whose participants are only male. It is better if the percentage of genders of the participants are balanced. I can offer recommendation that 30 % gender are feminine; 30 % gender are masculine; and 40 % gender are both feminine and masculine. From offices or occupations, there are only teacher and student found as participants in the conversation texts. The offices or occupations presented from the participants are very limited. I can offer recommendation that the offices of participants involved in the social contextual factors can be increased based on the environment of conversations which are made up. The best environment for the material of conversations is at school because it is applied by students directly. There are some offices that are in school, except teacher and student, like staff, security, clening service, canteen keeper, etc. So, I suggest to the next English textbook writers to involve those offices or occupations in conversation texts.

From social distance, there are 53 conversation texts that show the intimacy of participants because they are among friends or peers and 21 conversation texts are not intimate because of their relation among teacher and student. By improving the factors explained above, The English textbook writers can enhance the social distance based on the gender and offices, so the conversations will be more dynamic and colourful. I offer recommendation that the percentage is fifty-fifty between intimate and not intimate participants. From places, there are inside and outside of school places (see table 8). As I explained above that the best environment is at school. I prefer to limit place that is just at school. There are many parts of places at school, besides the ones mentioned in table 8, like canteen, teacher room, headmaster room, laboratory, school clinic, security room, sport hall, staff or administration room, etc. So, the performance of English textbook will be more complete by those picture settings. Students will be more interested in following each material presented in the English textbook. From social situation, there are 21 formal and 53 informal conversations (see table 9). This discussion is almost the same as the discussion in social distance. I prefer to divide the formality into the same percentage, fifty-fifty, by improving the gender, offices and

social distance as I explained above. So, there will be balance between formal and informal conversations.

6. Result of Politeness

The conversation texts that are analyzed are taken from the conversations whose participants are in informal social situation and their offices or occupations are among student and teacher. There are 20 conversation texts that are analyzed in politeness strategies. For examples: Text two is taken from EOS English on Sky 1 unit I page 3. The politeness strategy is positive. It can be seen from their conversation:

1. Miss Ina : (i) Hello, what's your name?
2. Riko : (i) Hello Miss Ina, my name's Riko.

Text five is taken from EOS English on Sky 1 unit I page 5. The politeness strategy is positive. It can be seen from their conversation:

1. A : (i) Excuse me Miss Ina, I'd like you to meet Shanti, my classmate.
(ii) Shanti, this is Miss Ina.
2. B : (i) Hello Miss Ina, nice to meet you.
3. C : (i) Hello Shanti, nice to meet you, too.

Text six is taken from EOS English on Sky 1 unit I page 7. The politeness strategy is positive. It can be seen from their conversation :

1. Miss Ina : (i) Good morning, students
2. Students : (i) Good morning, ma'am
3. Miss Ina : (i) How are you?
4. Students : (i) We're fine, ma'am
(ii) Thank you
(iii) How are you?
5. Miss Ina : (i) I'm good. Thanks

Text nine is taken from the English textbook unit I page 8. The politeness strategy is positive. It can be seen from their conversation :

1. Miss Ina : (i) Well, students.
(ii) Time is up.
(iii) That's all for now
2. Students : (i) Yes, ma'am.
3. Miss Ina : (i) Goodbye and see you tomorrow
3. Students : (i) Thank you, mom.
(ii) Good bye.
(iii) See you tomorrow.

These conversations have politeness strategies because the participants have social distance and their relations show that teacher is higher than student. From 20 conversation texts, there are two politeness strategies, positive and negative, which occur in the conversation among the participants. There are 14 conversations with positive politeness; 4 conversations with negative politeness; and 2 conversations with positive and negative politeness.

Table 10. Politeness

No	Politeness Strategies	Conversation Texts
1.	Positive	14
2.	Negative	4
3.	Positive and Negative	2

In politeness analysis, I only found 20 conversation texts which can be analyzed into politeness strategies. These findings indicate that the writers of the English textbook only provide 20 conversation texts which perform the expression of respect among the participants. In other words I can say that only 20 conversation texts whose participants are between teacher and student. I think that they are very limited of 75 transactional and interpersonal conversation texts. It will be better if there are about 50

% conversation texts which perform the politeness strategies because student does not only interact with his / her friends but also with the people at school who need to be respected.

For the strategies, there are 14 positive; 4 negative; and 2 positive and negative politeness. From those findings, I can conclude that the writers of the English textbook want to show that the relation between student and teacher is familiar. That is good, but I want to offer recommendation that student will need to show more negative politeness strategies when he or she takes conversation with someone who needs respect like headmaster, or vice headmaster. The social contextual factors should be applied to all of the participants and social situations which are involved in conversation, and the presentations of those factors must be balanced. The politeness strategies that should be applied are positive and negative, and they should be presented in about 50% positive and 50% negative politeness strategies of all conversation texts. The transactional conversations found in the English textbook, EOS English on Sky 2 for junior high school grade VIII are 34 texts or 85 % from the total number of conversation texts. 54.5% of speech functions of the transactional conversation texts match the standard of content. The interpersonal conversation found in the English textbook is only 1 text or 2.5% from the total number of conversation texts. The speech functions of the interpersonal conversation texts are 2.1% which match the standard of content. Meanwhile, the combination of both transactional and interpersonal conversations are 5 texts or 12.5% from the total number of conversation texts. 16,8% of speech functions of the interpersonal conversation texts match the standard of content.

D. Conclusion

After having conducted the analysis on speech function and linguistic features in EOS English on Sky 2, it can be concluded that the transactional and interpersonal conversations found in the English textbook, EOS English on Sky 2 for junior high school grade VIII are not compatible with the standard of content because the percentage of the content are less than 50%. The participant variables in the conversation texts are male and female whose occupations are student and teacher. The social distances are

intimate and not intimate and the relation shows that teacher has higher position than student. The places of conversation are school yard, classroom, party, home, field, garden, studio music and library. School yard is the place where mostly becomes the setting of the conversations. The social situations in the conversation texts are formal and informal and informal situation is mostly occurred. There are two politeness strategies in the conversation texts. They are positive and negative. Positive politeness is presented most often in the conversation texts. Positive politeness will teach students to communicate well in carrying out relationships and working together to improve language quality. This shows that this textbook's choice is less appropriate for users who emphasize interpersonal conversation texts.

References

- Austin, J. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bailey, K.M., & Savage, L. (1994). "New ways in teaching speaking." Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages
- Blum-Kulka, S. Haouse J and Kasper G. 1989. Investigating Cross-Cultural Pragmatic : An Introductory Overview. In S.Blum-Kulka, J. Haouse and G. Kasper (Eds.). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Request and Apologies*. Norwood : NJ : Ablex.
- Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen. 1987. *Politeness; Some Universal in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). "Focus on speaking." Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Celce-Murcia M, Dornyei Z, Thurrell S. 1995. Communicative Competence: A Pedagogical Motivated Model with Content Specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6 (2), 5 – 35.
- Cook, V.J. 1985. Language Function, Social Factors, and Second Language Learning and Teaching. *IRAL*, 23, 177-198.
- Creswell, John W. 1994. *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*.

- California : Sage Publications, Inc.
- Damen, L. 1987. *Culture Learning : The Fifth Dimension in the Language Classroom*. Reading, MA : Addison-Wesley.
- Dixon, Robert J. 1960. *Practical Guide to the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language*. New York : Regents Publishing Company, Inc.
- Eggs and Slade (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation in Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. Malcolm Coulthard (ed.). London: Routledge.
- Genzel, Rhona B. and Cummings, Martha Graves. 1986. *Culturally Speaking: A Conversational and Culture Text for Learners of English*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Haase, Fee-Alexandra. "Intercultural Communication and Speech Style." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 7.3 (2005): <<https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.1268>>
- Hanik, E. U., & Baiturohmah, R. (2024). Pendidikan Karakter Di Era Society 5.0 Melalui Progam Tahfidz Al-Qurân™ an Di Mi Terpadu Tahfizhul Qurân™ an Al-Maâ€™™ shum Surakarta. *ILUMINASI: Journal of Research in Education*, 2(1), 63-74.
- Hanik, E. U., Choir, A., & Mubarok, H. (2023). The Management Living Values Education Program in Improving The Character of Religious Moderation in Achsaniyah Islamic Boarding School Kudus. *Al Hikmah: Journal of Education*, 4(2), 305-318.
- Hanik, E. U., & Agustin, I. N. (2023, October). Study Analysis of The Implementation of Socio-Cultural Literacy in Forming the Character of Religious Moderation in the Merdeka Curriculum for Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. In *Syekh Nurjati International Conference on Elementary Education* (Vol. 1, pp. 440-450)
- Kasper, G and Blum-Kulka, S. 1993. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: An Introduction*. In Kasper, G. and S. Blum-Kulka (Eds). *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Mukarto, dkk. 2007. *Eos English on Sky 1: for Junior High School Students Year VII*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), 2014. *Basics in Education Textbook for B. Ed. Course, 1st Edition*. NCERT Campus Sri Aurobindo Marg New Delhi

110 016.

Nolasco, R. & Arthur, L. 1987 *Conversation* Oxford University Press

Nuha, Ulin. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues*, 3 (2) page 145 – 158, 2020.
ISSN: 2615-3920 EISSN: 2685-4473 DOI: 10.21043/jetli.v3i2.8902

Nunan, David. 1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prestonn, D.R. 1989. *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell

Nunan, David. 1993. *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. Middlesex: Penguin Group.

Richards, J. 1990 *The Language Teaching Matrix* Cambridge University Press

Richards, J. 2001. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W.M. (1981). *"Teaching foreign language skills"* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Savignon, S.J. 1983. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Reading, MA. : Addison-Wesley.

Searle, J. 1969. *Speech Act: An Essay in the Philosophy Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. 1976. A Classification of Illocutionary Act. *Language in Society* 5 : 1 - 23

Scollon R, Scollon S.B.K. 1983. Face in interethnic communication. In Richards, J.C. and Schimdt, R. (eds.) *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.

Tarone, E. and Yule,G. 1989. *Focus on the Language Learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, Jenny. 1996. *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. London : Longman Group Limited.

Tuckman, B.W. 1978. *Conducting Educational Research*. New York: HBJ Publishers.

Weels,G. (1987) . Apprenticeship in Literacy. In *Interchange* 18, 1 /2: 109 – 123.

- Van Duzer, C. (1997). *"Improving ESL learners' listening skills: At the workplace and beyond."* Washington, DC: Project in Adult Immigrant Education and National Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1990. *Aspect of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford university Press.
- Wolfson, Nessa .1983. *Rules of Speaking*. In Richards, J.C. and Schimdt, R. (eds.) *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.
p.v5i3.492.
- Devyanti, Kartika Kandha. 2023. "Pembelajaran Tari Remo Bolet Melalui Metode Drill and Practice Pada Ekstrakurikuler Tari Di Smpn 43 Surabaya." *Jurnal Pendidikan Sendorasik* 12(1):61–75.
- Erisa, Okta, and Deasylina Da Ary. 2024. "Cendikia Pendidikan Pengembangan Media Booklet Dalam Muatan Bdp Berbantuan Permainan Tradisional Gobak Sodor Dan Lintang Alihan Siswa Kelas V Sekolah Dasar." *Sindoro: Cendikia Pendidikan* 3(12):16–26.
- Gunada, I. Wayan Agus. 2022. "Konsep, Fungsi Dan Strategi Pembelajaran Seni Bagi Peserta Didik Usia Dini." *Kumarottama: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini* 1(2):109–23. doi: 10.53977/kumarottama.v1i2.383.
- Hanik, E. U., & Laili, N. F. (2024, August). Implementation Of Differentiation Learning With The Project Based Learning Model In Primary School IPAS Learning. In *ICIE: International Conference on Islamic Education* (Vol. 4, pp. 245-258).
- Hatiningsih, S., & Hanik, E. U. (2023). Penerapan model discovery learning berbantuan audiovisual pada pembelajaran bahasa indonesia kelas iv mi nu islamiyah kaliwungu kudas. *Jurnal Jendela Pendidikan*, 3(03), 321-329.
- Hermanto, Ayub, Ammar Zainuddin, and Nurida Aini. 2024. "Strategi Branding SMP Berbasis Pesantren Amnatul Ummah Dalam Membangun Citra Program Unggulan." *Jurnal Al-Abshor: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam* 1(3):275–85.
- Kristanto, Alfa. 2017. "Memahami Paradigma Pendidikan Seni." *Jurnal Ardiel* 124.
- Latifah, F. (2023). *Penerapan model Problem Based Learning menggunakan pendekatan*

STEM untuk meningkatkan keterampilan pemecahan masalah siswa Pada Mata Pelajaran IPA Kelas IV MI An-Nur Daren (Doctoral dissertation, IAIN KUDUS).

- Lestari, Ni Wayan Ria, and I. Wayan Agus Gunada. 2021. "Pelatihan Seni Tari Pada Siswa Pasraman Sebagai Bentuk Transformasi Kebudayaan." *SELAPARANG Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Berkemajuan* 4(2):280. doi: 10.31764/jpmb.v4i2.4428.
- Magdalena, Ina, Fitri Ramadanti, and Nurul Rossatia. 2020. "Upaya Pengembangan Bakat Atau Kemampuan Siswa Sekolah Dasar Melalui Ekstrakurikuler." *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Sains* 2(2):230–43.
- Mazi, Sukron, Dadang Sundawa, Danang Prasetyo, and Novitasari Novitasari. 2022. "Penguatan Karakter Kewarganegaraan Melalui Kampung Dolanan Nusantara Borobudur." *Jurnal Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan* 7(2):47–52. doi: 10.24269/jpk.v7.n2.2022.pp47-52.
- Nugrahhu, Putra Andino, and Aldia Wulandari. 2023. "Perwujudan Manajerial Dan Kepemimpinan Dalam Ekstrakurikuler Seni Di Sekolah." *Danum Pabelum: Jurnal Teologi Dan Musik Gereja* 3(2):141–53. doi: 10.54170/dp.v3i2.232.
- Nurul, Annafi, Ilmi Azizah, Ariana Ayu Pitaloka, Devinta Septalavayza, and Liana Widiastuti. 2024. "Penanaman Karakter Pada Anak Melalui Tari Kreasi Rasa Sayange Di TK Aisyiyah Rating 1 Kartasura." *Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat* 1(1):36–47. doi: 10.62719/seulanga.v1i1.6.
- Rifhayati, Neli, Muniroh Munawar, and Dwi Prasetyawati. 2024. "Analisis Motorik Kasar Melalui Kegiatan Ektrakurikuler Pada Seni Tari Jaranan Anak Usia Dini 5-6 Tahun Di TK Janneta." *Jurnal Ilmiah PGSD* 15(1):37–48.
- Salam, Sofwan, Sukarman, Hasnawati, and Muhaimin. 2020. *Pengetahuan Dasar Seni Rupa*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM.
- Sativa, Nadia. 2024. "International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding Philosophical Meaning and Tolerance Value Javanese Dolanan Song Cublak- Cublak Suweng in Dilthey ' s Hermeneutic Analysis." *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding* (2019):149–57.
- Sinaga, Fajry Subhaan Syah, Emah Winangsit, and Agung Dwi Putra. 2021. "Pendidikan, Seni, Dan Budaya: Entitas Lokal Dalam Peradaban Manusia Masa Kini." *Virtuoso: Jurnal Pengkajian Dan Penciptaan Musik* 4(2):104–110. doi: 10.26740/vt.v4n2.p104-110.

Sugiyono. 2016. *Metode Penelitian*. Bandung: ALFABETA.CVV.

Suhaya. 2016. "Pendidikan Seni Penunjang Kreatifitas." *Jurnal Pendidikan Seni* Vol 1 No 1:2.

Utama, Windi Wulandari Iman, Yanuar Bagas Arwansyah, and Bayu Ananto Wibowo. 2022. "Nilai Filosofis Sestradi Puro Pakualaman Yogyakarta Sebagai Dasar Pendidikan Karakter Anak Usia Dini." *Jurnal Obsesi : Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini* 6(5):4820–30. doi: 10.31004/obsesi.v6i5.2641.