

HASIL CEK_Siswantara, Santoso_Pragmatic Content, Conversation, Indonesian ELT Textbooks.

by Eka Siswantara, Dwi Santoso An Analysis Of Pragmatic Content

Submission date: 06-Jul-2022 01:47PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1867215884

File name: 125962353.pdf (869.25K)

Word count: 6270

Character count: 34648

An Analysis of Pragmatic Content in the Conversation Sections in Indonesian ELT Textbooks

Eka Siswantara^{1*}, Dwi Santoso²

¹Master Program of English Language Education, Ahmad Dahlan University
Indonesia

²English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Ahmad Dahlan University
Indonesia

Corresponding author: dwiuad@gmail.com

ABSTRACT. This research applied content analysis by using descriptive approach. The object of the research is pragmatic content in the series of Indonesian ELT textbooks for high school issued by the Ministry of Education of Republic of Indonesia. Moreover, the documents were gathered from the conversation or speaking parts of all textbooks. The data collection was conducted through careful observation and inspection of the conversations in the textbooks as for the observation on the types of illocutionary acts, Searle's (1979) speech acts model was used as the reference. The results showed that there are 4 illocutionary acts found in the textbooks: 1) Directives 2) Assertives 3) Expressives and 4) Commissives. For Directives, there are 41 utterances found in grade X, 21 utterances in grade XI, and 50 utterances in grade XII. Assertives acts are found with 24 utterances in grade X, 14 in grade XI, and 33 in grade XII. While for Expressives, there are 41 utterances in grade X, 12 in grade XI, and 19 in grade XII. Commissives acts are recorded with 11 utterances in grade X, 13 in grade XI and 9 in grade XII. The illocutionary forces for each illocutionary act are also found with various frequencies that were discussed in discussion section of this research. Related to the third research question, it was concluded that there was limited information about context and meta-pragmatic provided in the three textbooks. The findings of this research can be used as reference for content design for future textbooks especially regarding pragmatic content. As for the teachers, the findings can expose the weaknesses of the textbooks for pragmatic aspect. Therefore, if they use these textbooks, they need to expand the materials to provide better pragmatic teaching in the classroom. Otherwise, the students' pragmatic competence is hard to acquire if they are not provided with pragmatic knowledge adequately. Consequently, the students' communicative competence is not developed either.

Keywords: Pragmatic Content, Conversation, Indonesian ELT Textbooks.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent trend of English education, communicative competence has been accepted widely as the main focus of English Language Teaching (ELT). Thus, in current ELT practice, communicative competence is the selling point offered to the English learners. The emergence of the importance of communicative competence in English education began in the 1970s, as stated by [1]. It was started when some educators found the weakness in the teaching methodology applied at that time. They observed that in lesson, students could produce sentence accurately but when it comes to the conversation outside of the classroom, they could not communicate appropriately. This observation then leads to the theory that being able to communicate requires more than linguistic competence; it requires communicative competence [1]. This communicative competence theory was introduced by [2] which later influenced the change of the language teaching approach from the structural approach which focuses on understanding

pattern and structure of the language to the communicative approach which focuses on both grammatical or linguistic competence and communicative competence. This communicative competence can be defined briefly as "how to use language in variety of communicative situations". Applying communicative competence as the target for ELT requires a comprehensive set of competence covering syntactic, semantic and pragmatic competence. One of the pivotal parts of communicative competence yet the most intricate one is pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence in general is related to the ability to interpret and convey meaning correctly and appropriately in social communication [2]. When the learners can employ pragmatic in communication, they are considered as fluent speakers. Otherwise, their lack of pragmatic competence leads them to misunderstanding and miscommunication [3]. The example of the analysis on cross-cultural pragmatics which shows the failure in communication was elaborated in the study by Wuryaningrum & Andanty (2008) about

the case when an Indonesian student have a conversation with a native speaker teacher of English for the first time in Jakarta, There is a misunderstanding in their conversation when the teacher wanted to close the conversation politely by saying "nice meeting you". Unfortunately, the student kept talking because he/she did not understand the function of that utterance which is used as a farewell expression or closing in English (Rianita, 2017). This shows the fact that some learners may know the literal meaning of an utterance. However, they fail to comprehend its contextual meaning.

This example is among plenty findings from previous research that shows how students fail to overcome the gap in understanding native speaker's pragmatic communication. Significant number of language learners could not identify the socio-cultural of the foreign language properly in the context of interaction. Thus, specific attention on pragmatic aspect is crucial in order to prevent pragmatic failure that leads to a complete failure in exchanging the information. Considering this fact, [6], [7] believed that pragmatic competence has to be the main objective for English teachers which at the same time becomes a challenge, too. Moreover, students must be provided with pragmatic topics for the development of their pragmatic knowledge.

Considering the fact, as the pivotal part of communicative competence, pragmatic knowledge has not been provided sufficiently in ELT. [8] stated that the English teachers provide lack of pragmatic knowledge in the teaching materials and little do they emphasize the pragmatic details in their teaching. In line with that, [9], [10] stated that despite its pivotal role in ELT, pragmatics is introduced in a limited extent in ELT textbooks, hardly ever provided as materials taught to EFL students, and still neglected by teachers.

Furthermore, one of the effective means to provide pragmatic content is ELT textbooks which also become a pivotal part in ELT teaching. Thus, ELT textbooks designers must also include pragmatic materials beside grammatical and lexical aspects in L2 classroom settings which are important for the successful of L2 learning. Vellenga (2004) emphasized that textbooks are the pivotal instructional material for ELT which is supposed to be considered as the essential material resource for the classroom activity. Furthermore, material designers have to provide special attention to ELT textbooks in regard to the pragmatic knowledge since the textbooks are the essential part of ELT so that they can promote learners' pragmatic knowledge in ELT classroom settings [12]–[14]. In other words, textbooks should not only provide grammatical and lexical competence but also pragmatic knowledge in order to achieve communicative competence.

In Indonesia, the curriculum applied nationally is the curriculum 2013. In this curriculum, pragmatics also becomes the main concern. The model of competence adopted in Curriculum 2013 is the concept of communicative competence [15]–[17]. There are six competences equipped in communicative competence which also become the learning aims in Indonesian curriculum 2013, they are: (1) sociocultural competence, (2) discourse competence, (3) linguistic competence, (4) formulaic competence, (5) interactional competence, and (6) strategic competence. From these six competences, pragmatic competence is a part of sociocultural competence which refers to the pragmatic knowledge of L2 learners in appropriately using L2 in a social and cultural context of communication. Moreover, pragmatics competence is also required for interactional competence that refers to the knowledge of how to perform speech acts, maintain conversations, and use non-linguistic components in interaction. Thus, pragmatic competence can be considered as one of the main target in Indonesian curriculum.

Despite its importance, pragmatics has not been explored a lot by Indonesian researchers especially in textbook analysis. Recent studies at least recorded a few researches about pragmatic analysis in Indonesian ELT textbooks such as Inawati (2016), Kusumo & Wardani (2019), and Pramono & Kurniawan (2020). Inawati (2016) analyzed how greetings are presented in 9 textbooks for grade VII and X. Moreover, she also analyzed the meta-pragmatic information presented in the textbooks to support the learning of greetings. The results showed that less various types of greetings are presented in the textbook and meta-pragmatic information is limited. Kusumo & Wardani (2019) researched more aspects of pragmatics which are illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces. Their research aims are to analyze the illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces; the direct and indirect acts realized in the spoken dialogs in the textbook Bahasa Inggris SMA/ MA/ SMK/ MAK grade XII; and whether the illocutionary forces fulfill the language functions in Basic Competence Curriculum 2013. It is concluded from the analysis that there are four types of illocutionary acts and fourteen types of illocutionary forces in the textbook. It also showed that the textbook has fulfilled the language functions as stated in basic competence. However, the spoken dialogs are dominated by direct speech which influences the English natural conversations becoming less authentic. In the recent research, the frequency of pragmatic content occurrence represented as speech acts of thanking and apologizing in two Indonesian ELT textbooks: a prescribed textbook published by Ministry of National Education and a commercial textbook for grade VII. The results indicated that a

number of speech acts of thanking and apologizing have sufficiently provided by both prescribed and commercial textbook. However, both textbooks failed to provide various strategies to perform thanking and apologizing.

From the previous researches mentioned above, we can see that mostly the pragmatic contents analyzed are limited to certain types. Moreover, the textbooks are also usually limited for one grade only. Thus, this research aims to analyze more variables in pragmatic scope with more textbooks for various grades (grade X, XI, and XII) to provide more comprehensive analysis. This study analyzes all illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces in the series of Indonesian ELT textbooks for high school issued by the Ministry of Education of Republic of Indonesia titled *Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas X*, *Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas XI*, and *Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas XII*. The analysis is also on how **contextual and meta-pragmatic information** presented in the textbooks. Grade X, XI, and XII are chosen because these grades are the highest in the level of school so that the materials are also more complex and challenging for the students compare to the junior high level. Moreover, more language functions are taught in these levels. For example, the basic competence for grade XII is “comprehending spoken and written text to get someone’s attentions, offering service, asking for attentions and their responses” (Kemdikbud, 2013). These language functions require more discussion on pragmatic level in order to achieve students’ pragmatic competence. Thus, the materials for grade X, XI and XII are relevant for this research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Pragmatics

How linguistics had been expanded into a broad scope from a narrow aspects of language dealing with physical data of speech to a wider range of scope covering form, meaning and context [21]. In relation with meaning, the branch of linguistics evolved through semantics and pragmatics. Despite their similarity in a study of meaning, semantics and pragmatics are defined differently. Leech (1983) described the difference by stating two different uses of the verb to explain briefly about the distinction: (1) *what does X mean?*; and (2) *what did you mean by X?*. Semantics is defined in (1), in which the meaning is purely as a property of expressions in a given language, while the meaning in Pragmatics is relative to the speaker, situation and hearer as in (2). Thus, pragmatics can be briefly defined as the study of meaning in relation to speech situations [21]. Furthermore, [22], [23] briefly elaborated the difference between Pragmatics and semantics with the illustration that

if it is only related to meaning without any context to think about, then you are dealing with semantics, but if you have to consider the context, then you are doing pragmatics [23]. Thus, since pragmatics deals with interpretation of meaning based on context unlike semantics which deals with literal and grammatical meaning, the study of pragmatics has become an important part of language and communication to explore.

The study of pragmatics has become more familiar and started to be an intriguing scope of research in linguistics nowadays. People do not always or even usually say what they mean. Speakers frequently mean much more than their words actually say. She then illustrated that people may say to someone that “It’s hot in here!”. However, the implied intention of that utterance might be *Please open the window!* Or *Is it all right if I open the window?* Or *You’re wasting electricity!*. In this case, People can have other intention and meaning behind what they actually say. This kind of issue is an example of a case studied in pragmatics. Pragmatics is defined as the study of communicative action in its sociocultural context. In further detail, [24] defines pragmatics into four definitions: 1) Pragmatics is the study related to the literal meaning of someone’s statement; it means that the analysis is more to do with what people mean by their utterance. 2) Pragmatics is the study related to the contextual meaning; it analyzes the way speakers organize their speech and what they intend to say by adjusting with who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances. 3) Pragmatics is the study of implicit meaning expressed in someone’s speech other than what it is said. 4) Pragmatics studies language related to the expression of relative distance.

2.2 Pragmatic competence

The above definition of pragmatics reveals the complexity of human communication related to meaning. It shows how people convey and interpret utterances in certain way to express as well as understand the true intention and meaning. This emphasizes that every human being is naturally equipped with language competence. The competence that related to the language in two definitions: linguistic competence which is related to grammatical competence (abstract knowledge of phonology, syntax and semantics) [25] and pragmatic competence defined as “the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context” [26].

Pragmatic competence is shown in how interlocutors express themselves through the choices of utterances in their spoken interaction for example how the speakers express a complaint or a compliment and how it affects the addressee

whether or not the complaint is answered appropriately or the compliment is successfully responded to. Moreover, the competence is also related to form's conventions and choices on following certain language strategy such as following or violating Grice's maxims. Pragmatic competence also often refers to how to choose social marking status and relationships such as close/distant/formal/informal, or ability to choose degree of politeness in the interaction.

According to [27] pragmatic competence comprises certain elements such as how someone acquires a knowledge related to the structure and forms of language; a set of vocabulary, register, and formulaic exchanges; and knowledge about the way to interact in particular social contexts. Moreover, she stated that acquiring a language is not enough by only having the ability to speak the language correctly in terms of grammar, lexical and phonology. More importantly, people should acquire communicative competence which requires a combination of social competence and linguistic competence in which considering other people's linguistic and social behaviour are needed. Moreover, being communicatively competent also needs an awareness regarding relative status, the roles and relationships they represent and an understanding of the cultural significance of the interlocutors [27]. It is crucial to acquire pragmatic competence in addition to the linguistic competence because when someone is lacking pragmatic competence, he certainly fails to convey an appropriate communication regardless his flawless sentence grammatically. There are several important aspects of pragmatic competence such as implicature, presupposition, and speech act.

2.3 *Communicative competence*

Communicative competence was introduced by Hymes to contrast his view to Chomsky's theory of competence [3]. Chomsky stated that linguistic theory is focused predominantly with a context of ideal speaker-listener occurring in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitation, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance. For Chomsky, the focus of linguistic theory was to characterize the abstract abilities speakers possess that enable them to produce grammatically correct sentences in a language.

As English has become more global, the emergence of communicative competence theory becomes more relevant and serves as a main goal for English teaching over the world. This leads to the popularity of Communicative language teaching approach in ELT. Communicative language

teaching sets as its goal the teaching of communicative competence.

2.4 *The importance of pragmatic competence in ELT*

In some curriculum, especially in Indonesia, the model of communicative competence based on Celce-Murcia is applied as the main competence's goal [28]. One of the important components in this model is the socio-cultural competence which refers to the pragmatic competence. In this part of competence, the important components are: 1) social contextual factors that includes the age, gender, status and social distance of the participants and the each other relation in power and affect, 2) stylistic appropriateness that involves politeness strategies, a sense of genres and registers, 3) cultural factors that include target language group's background knowledge, the difference of major dialects/regional, and the awareness of cross cultural.

2.5 *Contextual and meta-pragmatic information*

Since English has become a global language which is spoken by non-native speakers across the world with cultural differences. It is really easy to find some miscommunication due to the cultural gaps. One of the concerns in ELT is that the diversity of users' linguistic resources, the contextual use of these resources, and how the speakers themselves are positioned socially, economically and culturally. Thus Contextual and meta-pragmatic information are also crucial in ELT in order to lead the students to the fluency and appropriateness on their speech. Meta-pragmatics encompasses the study of displays of awareness on the part of users and observers of language about their use of language. Moreover, he argued that Meta-pragmatics is concerned with the study of reflexive awareness on the part of participants in interactions, and observers of interactions, about the language that is being used in those interactions. In other words, it involves analysing the ways in which we display awareness of our use of language through the various ways in which we use language to refer to our use of language. Meanwhile, Following [29], Contextual means 1) information about relationship between the speakers, for example, how close they feel to one another, how likely can one impose what one wants on the other. 2) Description of the contextual variables that might help to judge the degree of imposition of the speech act involved [7], [30].

Referring to the importance of the issue in pragmatic competence and meta-pragmatic information, the ideal means to present them is through ELT textbooks. Thus, many researchers concern on how ELT textbooks present pragmatic aspects. Eleven EFL course books content in Turkey related to requesting, rejecting and

complaining. The results showed that even though request was well distributed, however the rest two speech acts weren't sufficiently distributed. The course books additionally had a scarcity of varied methods. In another study, [31] investigated the features pertinent to communicative ability from the inter-cultural viewpoint within the international textbooks named Life A1 and A2 levels published by National Geographi. The tasks were examined in step with the four skills. To do so, a listing was used that centered on source, target and international cultural components. The findings showed that the textbooks were quite vary in terms of covering a range of cultures aside from direct reference to the specific culture, that is Turkish. In addition, English language textbooks used in Chinese universities focusing on pragmatic aspects specifically on the mention of pragmatic information, the treatment of speech acts, and the representation of intralingual pragmatic variation [32], [33]. The findings show that lack of pragmatic knowledge is presented in most textbooks. The range of speech acts presented are also limited, and the ways that speech acts are presented seem to be based on writers' intuition. There is a paucity of explicit metapragmatic information on speech acts. In addition, little attention is devoted to enhancing learners' awareness of intralingual pragmatic variation.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This research applied content analysis by using descriptive approach [34]. Content analysis as a research technique in creating replicable and valid inferences from texts or other resources to the contexts of the usage [35], [36]. This research analyzed the content of three ELT textbooks based on the research questions. Descriptive approach is employed to elaborate the analysis. The purpose of descriptive approach is to describe phenomena and their characteristics that can be analyzed through survey or observation [37]. Moreover, he added that the data are collected in a qualitative way but frequently analyzed quantitatively through frequencies, percentage and other statistics to define the conclusion about the relation.

Because this study investigates the pragmatic aspects, the information is analyzed by applying pragmatic identity technique [38]. This technique is applied to spot linguistic units in step with their linguistic units and also the effects performed by the speaker or according to the reaction and effect of the hearer when the utterances uttered or conveyed. [19]. The illocutionary acts are divided by using the concept of speech acts by Searle [279] [39] and supported by Yule (1996) [24]. The types of illocutionary acts researched are declarative, representatives, expressives, directives, and commissives. Moreover

some of types of illocutionary forces are also divided into some acts namely stating an opinion, informing, reporting, explaining, describing, agreeing, greeting, leave-taking, stating surprise, thanking, sympathizing, commanding, requesting, suggesting, wishing, questioning, promising, and offering. The conceptual framework is designed based on Searle's definition of Illocutionary acts and Illocutionary forces supported by Yule (1996) [24] as a theoretical basis in analyzing the conversations presented in the following table:

TABLE 1. Conceptual framework

No.	Illocutionary Acts	Illocutionary Forces
1	Assertives. The Illocutionary acts that state how things are which represents what speakers believe to be factual (true) or not (false).	stating facts, assertions, conclusions, descriptions; claiming, hypothesizing, insisting, and predicting
2	Directives. The Illocutionary acts that state how the speakers try to get the hearers to do things.	commands, orders, requests, and suggestions.
3	Commissives. The Illocutionary acts that state how the speakers commit themselves to doing things.	promises, threats, refusals, and pledges
4	Expressives. The Illocutionary acts that state how the speakers express their feelings and attitudes.	stating pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow; thanking apologizing, welcoming, praising, congratulating, deploring, and regretting
5	Declaratives. The Illocutionary acts that state how the speakers bring about changes in the world through their utterances	baptizing, marrying, and firing

4. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

4.1 The types and frequency of illocutionary act and illocutionary forces

The analysis shows that, all the three text books analysed contain only four illocutionary acts of directives, assertives, expressive and commissives. However, there are different types of illocutionary forces included in these acts in the three books analysed and with varying frequencies. The following sections will be analysed : a). types and frequency of illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces in the grade X textbook, b). types and frequency of illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces in the grade XI textbook, c). types and frequency of illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces in the grade XII textbook.

TABLE 2. Types and frequency of illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces in the grade x textbook

No	Illocutionary Acts	Illocutionary Forces	Frequency	total	Percentage	total
1	Directives	Questioning	28	41	23.93%	35.04%
		Wishing	4		3.42%	
		Commanding	2		1.71%	
		Inviting	6		5.13%	
		Suggesting	1		0.85%	
2	Assertives	Informing	14	24	11.97%	20.52%
		Stating opinion	3		2.56%	
		Describing	2		1.71%	
		Reporting	2		1.71%	
		Explaining	2		1.71%	
		Agreeing	1		0.85%	
3	Expressive	Congratulating	5	41	4.27%	35.04%
		Thanking	18		15.4%	
		Comforting	1		0.85%	
		Greeting	2		1.71%	
		Praising	12		10.26%	
		Leave-taking	3		2.56%	
		Refusing	4		3.42%	
4	Commissives	Accepting	2	11	1.71%	9.4%
		Promising	1		0.85%	
		Planning	4		3.42%	
		Offering	4		3.42%	
Total			117		100%	

TABLE 3. Types and frequency of illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces in the grade xi textbook

No	Illocutionary Acts	Illocutionary Forces	Frequency	total	Percentage	total
1	Directive	Questioning	10	21	16.67%	35%
		Commanding	2		3.33%	
		Inviting	5		8.33%	
		Suggesting	3		5%	
		Requesting	1		1.67%	
2	Assertives	Informing	1	14	1.67%	23.33%
		Stating opinion	5		8.33%	
		Agreeing	1		1.67%	
		Disagreeing	5		8.33%	
		Asserting	2		3.33%	
3	Expressive	Thanking	1	12	1.67%	20%

No	Illocutionary Acts	Illocutionary Forces	Frequency	total	Percentage	total
		Greeting	6		10%	
		Leave-taking	4		6.67%	
		Stating surprise	1		1.67%	
4	Commissives	Refusing	3	13	5%	21.67%
		Accepting	6		10%	
		Promising	1		1.67%	
		Offering	3		5%	
Total			60		100%	

TABLE 4. types and frequency of illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces in the grade xii textbook.

No	Illocutionary Acts	Illocutionary Forces	Frequency	total	Percentage	total
1	Directive	Questioning	25	50	22.52%	45.04%
		Wishing	2		1.8%	
		Commanding	7		6.3%	
		Suggesting	14		12.61%	
		Requesting	2		1.8%	
2	Assertives	Informing	10	33	9.01%	29.73%
		Stating opinion	3		2.7%	
		Describing	3		2.7%	
		Reporting	2		1.8%	
		Explaining	6		5.4%	
		Agreeing	9		8.1%	
3	Expressive	Thanking	6	19	5.4%	17.12%
		Greeting	3		2.7%	
		Praising	1		0.9%	
		Leave-taking	2		1.8%	
		Stating surprise	6		5.4%	
		Sympathizing	1		0.9%	
4	Commissives	Accepting	3	9	2.7%	8.11%
		Promising	1		0.9%	
		Planning	3		2.7%	
		Offering	2		1.8%	
Total			111		100%	

4.2 Discussions

The analysis shows that from 5 illocutionary act types, only 4 types were found, which are: Directives, Assertives, Expressives, and Commissive, while Declaratives was not found in any of the conversations in the 3 textbooks. In this section each illocutionary act is discussed under subchapter followed by the elaboration of the illocutionary forces identified in each speech act.

Coding system is applied in the discussion to provide the data presentation and example as well as point out the data in the data sheet, the coding system is designed as follows:

X/5/p1

Note :

X : the textbook (grade X/XI/XII)

5 : the number of the conversation in the respective textbook.

p1 : page of the textbook

5. CONCLUSION

This study analyzed three research questions:

(1) What are the types of illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces provided in conversation sections of Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas X, Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas XI, and Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas XII? (2) What is the frequency of illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces provided in conversation sections of the textbooks? (3) How are contextual and meta-pragmatic information presented in the textbooks? Regarding the first and the second research questions, it was found that there are four types of illocutionary forces identified in the three textbooks: 1) Directives; 2) Assertives; 3) Expressive; 4) Commissives. These four illocutionary acts showed different frequency for each textbook. For grade X, the frequency of directives acts is 41 (35.04%), Assertives with 24 utterances (20.52%), Expressive with 41 utterances (35.04%) and Commissives with 11 utterances (9.4%). The types and frequency of illocutionary forces found in grade X are Questioning (28), Wishing (4), Commanding (2), Inviting (6), Suggesting (1), Informing (14), Stating opinion (3), Describing (2), Reporting (2), Explaining (2), Agreeing (1), Congratulating (5), Thanking (18), Comforting (1), Greeting (2), Praising (12), Leave-taking (3), Refusing (4), Accepting (2), Promising (1), and Planning (4).

In grade XI, the analysis showed that directives acts provided 21 utterances (35%), Assertives with 14 utterances (23.33%), Expressive with 12 utterances (20%) and Commissives with 13 utterances (21.67%). The illocutionary forces and the frequency for each act found in this textbook are: Questioning (10), Commanding (2), Inviting (5), Suggesting (3), Requesting (1), Informing (1), Stating opinion (5), Agreeing (1), Disagreeing (5), Asserting (2), Thanking (1), Greeting (6), Leave-taking (4), Stating surprise (1), Refusing (3), Accepting (6), Promising (1), Offering (3).

Furthermore, in grade XII, the frequency found for Directives acts is 50 (45.04%), 33 or 29.73% for Assertives, 19 or 17.12% for Expressives, and 9 or 8.11% for Commissives. The illocutionary forces and the frequency analyzed under this category are:

Questioning (25), Wishing (2), Commanding (7), Suggesting (14), Requesting (2), Informing (10), Stating opinion (3), Describing (3), Reporting (2), Explaining (6), Agreeing (9), Thanking (6), Greeting (3), Praising (1), Leave-taking (2), Stating surprise (6), Sympathizing (1), Accepting (3), Promising (1), Planning (3), and Offering (2).

The data showed that the frequency of each illocutionary forces is not distributed equally in the conversation. Considering the data above, most of the frequency of illocutionary forces is below 10 in each of the textbook showing that there are not many variations of the illocutionary forces provided in each of the conversation in the textbooks. Thus, in terms of pragmatic aspect, the findings showed that the three textbooks do not provide many pragmatic strategies in the conversation. Moreover, the textbooks focus on some speech acts which can be seen clearly from the frequency above. The ones with higher frequency are the speech acts that become the main focus of the textbooks according to the curriculum 2013. Based on the data, all speech acts required based on the curriculum 2013 are already presented in the textbooks except refusing acts in grade XII which could not be found at all. In addition, from the three textbooks, Declaratives acts are not found at all making the textbooks even so lack of the examples for pragmatic aspects that it is hard to consider the textbooks adequate for the pragmatic aspects.

Beside the types and the frequency of the illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces, the analysis was also conducted on the contextual and meta-pragmatic information. The results showed that most of the contexts provided in every conversation are limited to the background information of the interlocutors and the setting. Meta-pragmatic information is rarely discussed in the three textbooks. The most relatable aspect of pragmatic found in the textbooks is the explanation of social function of certain speech acts or degree of formality of the speech acts. However, the explanation is only in terms of the list of expressions considered as formal or informal without any further explanation about what contexts are considered formal or informal. Moreover, there are not any conversation examples to show the communication strategy in a formal context or informal context. Furthermore, in most of speech acts discussed in the textbooks, the explanation is more on the semantic and syntactic aspects showing only the lists of expressions with the emphasis on the grammatical structure. Therefore, it can be concluded that contextual and meta-pragmatic information are not properly presented in the three textbooks.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Larsen-Freeman, *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*, 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, 2002.
- [2] J. Thomas, *Meaning in interaction. An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman, 2014.
- [3] D. Hymes, *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.
- [4] R. S. Wuryaningrum and F. D. Andanty, "Pragmatic Failure in Intercultural Learning," in *Fifth Conference on English Studies Center for Studies on Language and Culture-Atma Jaya Catholic University*, 2008.
- [5] D. Rianita, "Cross-Cultural Pragmatics and Its challenges in EFL context," pp. 1–10, 2017, doi: 10.31227/osf.io/degk.
- [6] S. Manik and J. Hutagaol, "An Analysis on Teachers' Politeness Strategy and Student's Compliance in Teaching Learning Process at SD Negeri 024184 Binjai Timur Binjai –North Sumatra-Indonesia," *English Lang. Teach.*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 152–170, 2015, doi: 10.5539/elt.v8n8p152.
- [7] S. Apriyanto and A. Nurhayaty, "Born In Social Media Culture: Personality Features Impact In Communication Context," in *icolit*, 2019, pp. 167–175.
- [8] J. Cotteril, "Language in the Legal Process," in *Criminal justice*, New York: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN, 2002.
- [9] J. A. Mendieta, "Narrative research: An alternative approach to study language teaching and learning," *Rev. Folios*, vol. 37, pp. 135–147, 2013.
- [10] B. Radic-Bojanic and J. Topalov, "Textbooks in the EFL classroom: Defining, assessing and analyzing," *Collect. Pap. Fac. Philos. XLVI*, vol. 3, pp. 137–153, 2016, doi: 10.5937/zrffp46-12094.
- [11] H. Vellenga, "Leaming Pragmatics from ESL & EFL Textbooks: How Likely?," *Test-Ej*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2004.
- [12] E. Hinkel, "Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning," *Handb. Res. Second Lang. Teach. Learn.*, vol. 2, pp. 1–998, 2011, doi: 10.4324/9780203836507.
- [13] J. P. Gee and M. Handford, *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 2012.
- [14] S. A. Crossley, D. Allen, and D. S. McNamara, "Text simplification and comprehensible input: A case for an intuitive approach," *Lang. Teach. Res.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 89–108, 2012, doi: 10.1177/1362168811423456.
- [15] Y. Okada, "Role-play in oral proficiency interviews: Interactive footing and interactional competencies," *J. Pragmat.*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 1647–1668, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2009.11.002.
- [16] shiamaa abd E. F. Torkey, "The Effectiveness of a Task- Based Instruction program in Developing the English Language Speaking Skills of Secondary Stage Students," Ain Shams University, 2006.
- [17] W. Grabe, "Key Issues in L2 Reading Development," *4th CELC Symp. Proc.*, pp. 8–18, 2014.
- [18] I. Inawati, "The Pragmatics of Greetings Reflected in the Textbooks for Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia," *Ahmad Dahlan J. English Stud.*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 1, 2016, doi: 10.26555/adjes.v3i2.4984.
- [19] D. W. Kusumo and D. K. Wardani, "An Analysis of Illocutionary Acts in Spoken Dialogs in an English Textbook," *ELT Echo J. English Lang. Teach. Foreign Lang. Context*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 147–157, 2019.
- [20] S. A. Pramono and E. Kurniawan, "A MICRO ANALYSIS STUDY OF PRAGMATIC CONTENT IN INDONESIAN ELT TEXTBOOKS," vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 92–102, 2020, doi: 10.31571/bahasa.v9i1.
- [21] G. N. Leech, *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman, 1983.
- [22] C. G. Santana, "Evidence and formal models in the linguistic sciences," *ProQuest Diss. Theses*, p. 174, 2016.
- [23] P. Griffiths, *Introduction to English semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburgh university press, 2006.
- [24] G. Yule, "Pragmatics," *Areal Features of the Anglophone World*. 1996, doi: 10.4324/9781315760483-11.
- [25] J. H. Lau, A. Clark, and S. Lappin, "Grammaticality, Acceptability, and Probability: A Probabilistic View of Linguistic Knowledge," *Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 1202–1241, 2017, doi: 10.1111/cogs.12414.
- [26] W. Ren and Z. Han, "The representation of pragmatic knowledge in recent ELT textbooks," *ELT J.*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 424–434, 2016, doi: 10.1093/elt/ccw010.
- [27] L. Thompson, *Children talking: The acquisition of pragmatics*. Multilingual Matters, 1997.
- [28] a Shehadeh, "Gender differences and equal opportunities in the ESL classroom," *ELT J.*, vol. 53, no. October, pp. 256–261, 1999, doi: 10.1093/elt/53.4.256.
- [29] P. Brown and S. Levinson, *Politeness*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [30] J. Amernic and R. Craig, "Critical Perspectives on Accounting CEO speeches and safety culture: British Petroleum before the Deepwater Horizon disaster," *Crit. Perspect. Account.*, vol. 47, pp. 61–80, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.cpa.2016.11.004.
- [31] A. B. Böcü and R. A. Z. I. Salim, "Evaluation of textbook series 'Life' in terms of cultural components," *J. Lang. Linguist. Stud.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 221–237, 2016.
- [32] J. Sunderland, "Gender in the EFL classroom Jane Sunderland," vol. 4611, no. January, pp. 81–91, 1992.
- [33] L. Sue, "A Study of Vocational High School Student's EFL Difficulties and The Solution," National Cheng Kung University, 2004.
- [34] S. Apriyanto, Dalman, and D. Santoso, "The urgency of forensic linguistics in a police interrogation process," *Int. J. Psychosoc. Rehabil.*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 4766–4772, 2020, doi: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I6/PR260467.
- [35] T. A. Syah, A. Nurhayaty, and S. Apriyanto, "Computerized Text Analysis on Self-Description Text to Get Student's Prevailing, Confidence, and Drives," *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, vol. 1764, no. 1, 2021, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1764/1/012056.
- [36] Y. Triana, I. F. Sari, and S. Apriyanto, "Language features and causes of suicide case from forensic linguistics point of view," *Int. J. Psychosoc. Rehabil.*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 7955–7966, 2020, doi: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I6/PR260803.
- [37] C. K. Chung and J. W. Pennebaker, "Revealing dimensions of thinking in open-ended self-descriptions: An automated meaning extraction method for natural language," *J. Res. Pers.*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 96–132, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2007.04.006.
- [38] Sudaryanto, *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa: pengantar penelitian wahana kebudayaan secara linguistik*. Duta Wacana University Press., 1993.
- [39] J. L. Mey, *Pragmatics: An Introduction (2nd ed)*, 2nd ed. United States: Blackwell Publishing, 2001.

HASIL CEK_Siswantara, Santoso_Pragmatic Content, Conversation, Indonesian ELT Textbooks.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

11%

SIMILARITY INDEX

9%

INTERNET SOURCES

5%

PUBLICATIONS

3%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	journalarticle.ukm.my Internet Source	3%
2	garuda.ristekbrin.go.id Internet Source	2%
3	www.britannica.com Internet Source	2%
4	Michael Haugh. "24. Corpus-based metapragmatics", Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2018 Publication	2%
5	journal.uad.ac.id Internet Source	2%
6	opac.fitk.uinjkt.ac.id Internet Source	2%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 2%

Exclude bibliography On