# A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH TEXTBOOK AT SECONDARY LEVEL IN PUNJAB

**Samia Iqbal,**
 Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University, Faisalabad
**Dr. Samina Ali Asghar,**
University of Education, Faisalabad Campus
**Kiran Rabbani ,**
 Lecturer Department of English, Government College University, Faisalabad
**Prof. Dr. Muhammad Asim Mahmood**,
(corresponding Author) Government College University, Faisalabd

## ABSTRACT

*Politeness is a significant aspect of pragmatics that involves the use of language and communication strategies to maintain harmony between interlocutors. The primary purpose of this study is the pragmatic analysis of politeness strategies used in English textbooks at the secondary level , published by the Punjab Textbook Board. The analytical framework was based on two approaches of pragmatic politeness described by Brown and Levinson (1987) and House and Kasper (1981). The primary data source was utterances taken in the form of words, phrases, and sentences in the content of textbooks. The data for the analysis is 9th and 10th grade English textbooks. Data was manually tagged, and frequencies were calculated. The results showed that the textbooks frequently used negative politeness (142) and politeness makers (126) to address, give deference, or use honorifics reflecting the cultural and religious values of Pakistan. The study offers insight into how students can apply politeness in everyday interactions.*
**Keywords:** Pragmatics, Politeness Strategies, English Books, Brown and Levinson Theory, Taxonomy of Politeness by House and Kasper

## INTRODUCTION

Humans use language as a means of communication to establish relationships with others, to share ideas, and to exchange information, thoughts, and feelings. According to Kramsch (2016), language is the primary means by which humans interact with one another in social situations. Studying how language is utilized by society is crucial to preserving strong relationships since language is an essential element of society. The study of pragmatics demonstrates how humans utilize language in a variety of contexts. The significance of context in pragmatics goes beyond the literal interpretations of what is spoken. It is the study of meanings other than literal meanings depending on different situations. According to Yule (1996), understanding language via pragmatics is crucial because it helps individuals comprehend the assumed meanings, assumptions, objectives, and types of behaviors that people engage in when they converse in everyday interactions.

In their daily encounters, people frequently employ certain strategies to successfully communicate with others. Being polite or nice is one of these communication strategies. Language and politeness go hand in hand; politeness is the quality that shows respect, regard, and kindness for others in social interactions (Kramsch & Hua, 2016). Politeness is an important aspect of pragmatics. Politeness is the use of communication strategies to promote interpersonal harmony between interlocutors. Leech defined it as "*a study about how language is used in a particular context or situation*" (1983). He further stated that in pragmatics, politeness is "*a behavior that is expressed in a good or ethical way*" (1983). Yule (1996) described politeness as a fixed concept in the form of '*polite social behavior'* in a particular culture.

In Pakistan, English is taught as a second language rather than as a foreign language, and this approach is called English as a Second Language or ESL. In this context, English is the language that holds the same value as the country's national language. In schools, students begin learning English from early grades and continue to study it as a subject throughout their learning career. For educational purposes, teachers require materials to use in their lessons, whether they originate from textbooks, the internet, or the teachers themselves. Textbooks are considered the foundation of teaching materials. Textbooks are the main source for language learning. They should be carefully picked with the program's objectives in mind, as they embody the curriculum entirely by themselves.

The selection of proper teaching materials is a pivotal aspect of the curriculum. Children are exposed to a variety of textual, multimedia, and visual materials since their early life and educational careers, so teachers should ensure that these educational materials are appropriate for their development and growth. The educational material selected by the researcher in this study is an *English textbook for grades 9th* (Malik, Bashir, & Hussain, 2012) *and 10th* (Kiyani, 2012) published by the Punjab Textbook Board or PTB. These textbooks are written according to Pakistan's national curriculum, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).

The current study applied two frameworks of politeness, "*Politeness Strategies* by Brown and Levinson (1987)*"* and "*Taxonomy of Politeness* by House and Kasper (1981)*",* to analyze the use of politeness in English textbooks at the secondary level in Punjab. The study employed both qualitative and quantitative research design to analyze the following research questions.

1. What types of politeness are found in English textbooks at the secondary level in Punjab?
2. Which linguistic devices are utilized to inculcate politeness strategies?
3. To what extent are those types of politeness realized in the content of English textbooks at the secondary level in Punjab?

## REVIEW OF EXISTING LITERATURE

Practicing good etiquette and good manners to not offend others is called politeness (Kádár & Haugh, 2013). It involves gestures, language, and actions that show respect, courtesy, and thoughtfulness toward others. In everyday usage, the term "politeness" describes behavior that is somewhat formal and distancing, where the intention is not to intrude or impose (Holmes, 1995, p. 4). According to Urdu Point (2024), word- *khalaq* is a quality or state of being polite. To be "polite" is to show respect for the person you are speaking to and to avoid upsetting them (Holmes, 1995).

Politeness is an important aspect of pragmatics and refers to the use of language and communication strategies to maintain harmony between interlocutors. It addresses the "use of a particular language to achieve successful communication." It is impossible to talk about politeness without referring to Stephen Brown and Penelope Levinson's theory.' Stephen Brown and Penelope Levinson introduced politeness as a "linguistic theory" in their book "*Politeness: Some Universal on Language Learning* (1987)*"*. This theory is drawn from Erving Goffman's concept of face. (Erlinda & Rahmi, 2015). According to Goffman, face is "the positive social value a person claims for himself" (1967). Noteworthy features of this concept of the face are as follows: first, "face is public"; second, "face is social"; third, "face is claimed"; and fourth, "face is something we want". Brown and Levinson defined "face" as the "public self-image that everyone wants to claim for him or herself. Face is connected to feelings of embarrassment and degradation because of losing face. According to Brown and Levinson, maintaining the "face" in

interactions requires constant attention since it is emotionally involved and can be lost, changed, or improved. They extended this idea of the face into politeness and classified two aspects of the face into "positive face (a desire to be attention and appreciation)" and "negative face (the desire to be free from imposition and freedom of action)." They classified politeness into two aspects: positive, which serves to satisfy positive face needs, and negative, which addresses the negative face needs of the interlocutors. Brown and Levinson identified four strategies of politeness to save the interlocutor's face. The names of these strategies are "bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record politeness." They claimed that these strategies. Politeness strategies help speakers avoid or lessen the impact of assertions on the face of the addressee through the use of requests, criticism, order, and apologies.

The politeness taxonomy is a framework of politeness proposed by House and Kasper (1981). This is the second politeness approach that was employed in this study; it consists of eleven categories.

**Prior Studies**

Tri Wijayanto (2014) conducted the same research in the Indonesian Course book. This study provides a comprehensive analysis of politeness strategies found in the coursebook. The researcher used a descriptive qualitative approach and content analysis in the study. The study identified 10 types of politeness strategies. The results showed that politeness markers were the most frequently occurring strategy in the coursebook. The coursebook, according to the researcher, is appropriate for both teaching and learning, although it needs to be modified to fit the requirements of the new curriculum. It highlights how crucial it is to teach students manners in the classroom.

Siri Astuti (2022) analyzed the various types of politeness strategies found in Indonesian textbooks by applying Brown and Levinson's framework. The results showed that positive politeness occurred most frequently (54 times) in the textbook. No data for the off-record strategy was found. The researcher concluded that the results of the study are influenced by Indonesian Basic Competence.

Jewad, H. G., et al. (2020) analyzed politeness strategies in two chapters of the Holy Quran. The data were taken specifically from the Surah of Prophet Yousaf and Surah of Cave, and the researchers used a qualitative approach to analyze the data. The data were analyzed following the framework of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson and Leech's politeness maxims. The results showed that the most common politeness strategy in the sura of the Cave was positive politeness; in the Surah of Yusuf, it was negative politeness. The results also revealed that negative politeness was more common in both suras than was positive politeness.

**METHODOLOGY**

This study employed a mixed-method approach that falls within the categories of descriptive-qualitative and quantitative research. The mixed method approach was chosen because it helps conceptualize and explain the results from one method to another and offers a better and more thorough understanding of the research problem or question. The types of politeness strategies utilized in the textbooks were analyzed and described using qualitative analysis, and the findings and results were validated, categorized, and given numerical frequencies using quantitative analysis.

The data consists of English textbooks for grades 9 and 10 published by the Punjab Textbook Board. The content of the textbooks was in the form of cultural text, dialogues,

personalities, poems, narrative text, poems, and biographies. The main instrument of the study was the researchers. The data were collected via the following steps. Initially, text was manually extracted from the web source as Word files, errors were fixed, and Word files were renamed so they could be easily identified. Second, Word files were converted into Notepad files, i.e., basic text files with no other data, such as fonts, photos, tables, diagrams, etc. This conversion was performed to deliver reliable and error-free data and it was easy to copy and paste a notepad file into the study's software. After observation and note-taking techniques, the data were broken down into words, phrases, and sentences. Subsequently, the researcher highlighted statements that incorporated politeness strategies. The researchers served as the primary instrument by designing, gathering, evaluating, and reporting the study data and conclusions. For data analysis, this study used two approaches to pragmatic politeness described by Brown and Levinson (1987) and House and Kasper (1981). The third instrument of this study was data sheets, which were used to put linguistic utterances found in the textbook. The analyzed data were classified as politeness strategies and were recorded following the data table or sheet.

| Code | Text | Context | Politeness Strategies | | | | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | BR | PP | NP | OR | |
| 01/Ch/P1 | | | | | | | |

*Table 1: Data Sheet of Politeness strategies found in English textbooks*

| Code | Text\Context | Type Of Politeness Strategies | | | | | | | | | | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pm | Pd | Cd | Hs | Us | Dt | Cm | Fw | Ht | Ss | Aa | |
| 01/Ch/P1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

*Table 2: Data sheet of Politeness strategies found in English textbooks.*

**Note:** (Coding for data sheet)
01: Data 1/Ch.: Chapter 1/P1: Page 1

| | Politeness Strategies | Coding |
|---|---|---|
| **By Brown and Levinson** | Bald on Record | BR |
| | Positive Politeness | PP |
| | Negative Politeness | NP |
| | Off-record Politeness | OR |
| **By House and Kasper** | Politeness markers | Pm |
| | Playdowns | Pd |
| | Consultative devices | Cd |
| | Hedges | He |
| | Understaters | Us |
| | Downtoners | Dt |
| | Committers | Cm |
| | Forewarning | Fw |
| | Hesitators | Hs |
| | Scope-staters | Ss |
| | Agent avoiders | Aa |

*Table 3: Codes for politeness strategies*

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The English textbooks of Punjab, Pakistan, for grades 9 and 10 were the subject of this research paper. The study's results comprised 382 utterances based on an analysis of the politeness types established by House and Kasper (1981) and Brown and Levinson (1987). As shown in the table below, of these 382 utterances, 205 were politeness strategies according to Brown and Levinson's theory, whereas 178 were politeness strategies according to House and Kasper's theory.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Politeness Types Identified by House and Kasper | 178 | 46.47% |
| Politeness Types Identified by Brown and Levinson | 205 | 53.52% |
| **Total** | **383** | **100%** |

*Table 4: Findings of Politeness Strategies Found in the Textbooks*

The Table 4 shows that there were 254 of instances of politeness in Grade 9 text book whereas 129 instances of politeness found in 10th book.

| | Politeness Types by House and Kasper | Politeness Types by Brown and Levinson | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade 9 Textbook** | 122 (48.03%) | 132(51.96%) | **254(66.49%)** |
| **Grade 10 Textbook** | 56 (43.41%) | 73(56.58%) | **129(33.76%)** |

*Table 5: Findings of politeness types*

The results showed that most of the politeness strategies are utilized in the textbooks. The table below shows the frequencies of occurrence of each politeness type present in both textbooks coded as shown in Table 3 above.

| | Politeness Types by Brown and Levinson | | | | Politeness Types by House and Kasper | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | BR | PP | NP | OR | Pm | Pd | Cd | He | Us | Dt | Cm | Fw | Hs | Ss | Aa |
| **Grade 9 Textbook** | 0 | 33 | 96 | 2 | 88 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| **Grade 10 Textbook** | 3 | 21 | 49 | 0 | 46 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **3** | **54** | **145** | **2** | **134** | **5** | **4** | **16** | **3** | **3** | **1** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **12** |

*Table 6:*

The results showed that all four types of politeness identified by Brown and Levinson were found in the textbook. There are 205 instances of politeness as proposed by Brown and Levinson's theory, 145 occurrences (69.71%) represented negative politeness The second most common strategy was positive politeness, which occurred 53 times (26.13%). Bald-on-record politeness occurred 3 times (1.51%), and the least common politeness strategy was off-record, which occurred 2 times (1.01%). Hedges were found 20 times (10.99%). Agent avoidance occurred 18 times (9.89%). Playdowns occurred 6 times (3.30%), and consultative devices occurred 5 times (2.75%). Understaters and downtoners were found 3 times (1.65%), while committers were found only once (0.55%). The findings showed that these textbooks did not cover the use of hesitators, forewarning, or scope stators. There were some chapters in which any explicit politeness techniques from either perspective were not found. Such chapters are written either in plain, descriptive language or as works of creative writing and like poetry that emphasize aesthetic imagery rather than formality. Therefore, chapters 5 and 8 of grade 9 and

chapters 5, 8, 11, and 12 of the grade 10 English textbook served as default data sources. The table below represents the chapter wise occurrence of politeness types in both textbooks.

| | BR | PP | NP | OR | Pm | Pd | Cd | He | Us | Dt | Cm | Fw | Hs | Ss | Aa | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade 9** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ch1 | | 2 | 24 | | 29 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | **57** |
| C2 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | **8** |
| C3 | | 11 | 8 | | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | **31** |
| C4 | | 3 | 36 | 1 | 33 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | **74** |
| C5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **0** |
| C6 | | 5 | 5 | | 6 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | **17** |
| C7 | | | 5 | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | **10** |
| C8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **0** |
| C9 | | 1 | 4 | | 6 | | | 6 | 1 | | | | | | | **18** |
| C10 | | | 6 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 3 | **10** |
| C11 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | **5** |
| C12 | | 2 | 5 | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | | | | | | | 2 | **13** |
| Activities | | 6 | 1 | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | **10** |
| **Grade 10** | 1 | | 18 | | 18 | | | | | | | | | | | **37** |
| C1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **0** |
| C2 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | **1** |
| C3 | | 5 | 2 | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | **10** |
| C4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **0** |
| C5 | | 7 | 2 | | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | **13** |
| C6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **0** |
| C7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **0** |
| C8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **0** |
| C9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **0** |
| C10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **0** |
| C11 | 2 | 9 | 26 | | 28 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | **68** |
| C12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | **3** | **54** | **145** | **2** | **134** | **5** | **4** | **16** | **3** | **3** | **1** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **12** | **382** |
| **%** | **1.4** | **27.8** | **69.7** | **0.96** | **75.2** | **2.8** | **2.2** | **8.9** | **1.6** | **1.6** | **0.56** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **6.7** | |

*Table 7:*

Moreover, exercises at the end of each chapter contained several grammar and language related activities and questions. Instructions and questions were included in the textbooks for students and teachers to discuss and respond to. Careful analysis revealed that these instructions and questions were neither kind nor courteous nor rude or unfriendly. They did not convey any urgency, authority, or closeness since they were neutral or objective. Therefore, pragmatic

politeness, which places greater emphasis on language in context to achieve polite communication, was not explicitly used in these exercises except for a few oral activities.

Furthermore, after thoroughly analyzing both approaches, the researcher found that both methods used various strategies that overlapped or occurred in identical scenario contexts. Most overlapped occurrences were sub strategies of negative politeness, i.e., *give deference* and politeness markers. The way politeness markers show deference to bid for cooperative behavior in a polite context is in alignment with the use of deference to minimize imposition using negative politeness. Both dealt with giving respect and showing deference to addresses. In both strategies, politeness was realized by respect, using identity markers, formal markers, and cultural forms of address, e.g., "Hazrat Muhammad ﷺ, the Rasool ﷺ, Allah Almighty, Quaid-e-Azam, Madam, Sir." Politeness markers also overlapped with positive politeness strategies, which were realized by using in-group identity markers of positive politeness and identity markers of politeness markers. The occurrence of hedges also overlapped between the two approaches. To avoid threatening the negative face or to tone down the assertion, politeness was used in both techniques, utilizing hedges that demonstrated uncertainty and ambiguity. Seeking agreement and consultative devices also performed similar functions. For a better understanding of the findings, some of the examples were provided that provided a detailed description of how these politeness types were realized.

**Realization of Bald on-Record Strategies**
**Strategy 5: Show little or no interest in saving someone's face.**

> Caliph: As you have confessed your crime, there is no need for witnesses. **You are, therefore, sentenced to death.**　(10th\OR\Ch13\P150)

In this utterance, the Caliph is holding a court session to punish a villager who was accused of murder. Upon his confession, Hazrat Umar gave him the punishment to be executed. The politeness type found here is bald-on-record. The Caliph passed a straightforward judgment without trying to mitigate the imposition or to empathize with the hearer. This strategy is realized in this utterance with the use of "**You are, therefore, sentenced to death**". Hazrat Umar is not attempting to minimize threats in this situation. This strategy is used when someone wants to show his/her anger or by someone of high authority.

**Realization of Positive Politeness Strategies**
**Strategy 4: Using in-group identity markers.**

> "**My dear uncle**, if they put the sun in my right hand and the moon in my left, even then I shall not abandon the proclamation of the Oneness of Allah.　(9th/PP/Ch1/P2)

This quote is attributed to Rasool □ when his uncle Abu Talib☬ confronted him. The Rasool □ uncle sent him a message upon a delegation sent by Arabs to tell him to restrain his nephew from preaching the oneness of Allah. In his reply, Rasool □ clarified to his uncle that he would not step back from his mission of preaching Islam even if severe hardships were to be inflicted upon him. □Rasool used a positive politeness strategy to respond to his uncle. He addressed his uncle Abu Talib ☬ as "**my dear uncle**" instead of calling him just uncle, which shows the closeness between the two. He □ rejected his uncle's request for this strategy so as not to offend him and save his positive face.

**Strategy 5: Seeking agreement**

> "**Shall we start**," she asks politely.
> "**Yes,**" students nod.　(9th/PP/Ch3/P22)

After entering the classroom, Miss Aysha used the utterance **"Shall we start"**, which shows that the teacher is asking for approval from students before starting a discussion. In response to the teacher's question, the students answered "yes". This shows that the teacher sought agreement from the students. The teacher is seeking her students' cooperation and avoiding any potential threat or imposition. The use of this strategy shows that they share the same opinions and points of view. She is respecting their positive face by asking for permission.

**Strategy 12: Including both the speaker and the hearer in the activity**

> **"We** must develop a sense of patriotism which galvanizes **us** all into one united and strong nation." (9th/PP/Ch2/P13)

Using the pronouns **"we"** and **"us",** interlocutors share the same interests and goals. This strategy is used by a speaker to show friendliness, solidarity, and closeness with the hearer. Quaid-e-Azam used this strategy because he wanted to make the distance between him and his addresses closer. He wanted to make them realize that they were fighting this freedom fight together and wanted the hearers to agree with him. He used this strategy to satisfy the positive face needs of listeners, showing them that they share a common goal.

**Realization of Negative Politeness Strategies**

**Strategy 3: Use questions and hedges**

> Student 4: **Can we say that the world is just a click away?**
> Teacher:   **Maybe, well, would any other student like to say something about it?**
> (9th PP/Ch3/P22)

The teacher uses hedges "**maybe**" and "**well"** to avoid being too direct in her response. She is using the modal hedge "maybe" to avoid disagreements with this statement. This strategy is used because the teacher does not want to impose her views on her students. Her question, "**Well, would any other student like to say something on it?"**, also shows that she is inviting other students to participate and share their perspectives; she is using the hedge "well" to show uncertainty, lowering the impact of her imposition.

**Strategy 5: Give deference**

> Once **Hazrat Umar,** sitting in the Masjid of the **Rasool☐,** was busy with the affairs of the state. They complained to **Hazrat Umar** that the person had murdered their old father. (10th/NP/Ch13/P150)

Giving deference or an address term is used to indicate that the speaker is aware of the social status of the hearer and is intimated by him. Generally, a formal address term is used by the speaker during formal conversations or to address someone who is not close to the speaker. Here, negative politeness is realized by "honorifics or cultural address forms". Using this strategy, the speaker tends to use a careful vocabulary and address form to minimize imposition. The author knows that Hazrat Umar and Hazrat Abuzar Ghaffari are superior to him or her, so he or she uses respectful and formal language to address them. Even within the quoted conversation, Hazrat Umar is being addressed respectfully by accusers, villagers, and other sahabas. The address forms used to address Hazrat Umar in this chapter are **"Commander of Faithful", "Hazrat Umar", and "Caliph".** The address form used at the mention of the Holy Prophet ☐ is **"the Rasool ☐".** "Give deference" was the most frequently occurring strategy, with 113 (77.93%) utterances. It was mostly realized using "cultural form of address, formal identity"; a few examples are "Hazrat Muhammad, Allah Almighty, Hazrat Asma, and Caliph." Politeness markers which show deference to the hearer or reader occurred most frequently in the textbook. It is one of the significantly found politeness strategy as there are 134 examples of deference

markers out of 178 occurrences in the data. The text book incorporates topics which are historical and religious and the most importantly the setting of the textbook is very formal and there are chapters written on 'historical and religious personalities. It is quite acceptable to find such politeness trends in the data. Moreover, House and Kasper's work on cross-cultural pragmatics emphasized that politeness is culturally specific and that different cultures have varying norms and expectations regarding polite behavior (House & Kádár, 2021). Politeness identified by House and Kasper highlights the importance of cultural context in understanding politeness. These results are acceptable because social power dynamics and distance between characters or figures significantly influence politeness.

**Realization of Off-Record Strategies**

**Strategy 1: Give hints**

> **If I were the president of a university, I would set up a course called "How to Use Your Eyes".** (9th/OR/Ch12/P124)

In the context of politeness, **off-record strategies** were used to convey indirectness. Here, politeness was realized using an "if clause," "**If I were the president of a university, I would set up a course called, How to Use Your Eyes".** The speaker was indirectly expressing her wish. She used a hypothetical scenario that allowed her to suggest or give her opinion without directly imposing it on the listeners. Hellen suggested introducing a course without making it a demand or command.

**Strategy 10: Rhetorical questions**

> Addressing Hazrat Asma,ؓ he demanded, "**Where is your father?"** She politely replied**, "How would I know? "** (9th/OR/Ch4/P34)

In this utterance, "How would I know" was an off-record strategy. Using this strategy instead of directly answering Hazrat Asma was implying that she did not have the information that the speaker wanted from her. She used a "rhetorical question" that implied that she did not want a response. This strategy was used here to minimize the negative reaction from Abu Jehl, who held more power and authority over her.

**Realization of Politeness Markers**

> 1) Student 5: **Madam**, in my opinion, media plays a very constructive role in society. (9th/Pm/Ch3/P23)

In this utterance, a formal marker was used by student 5 to show respect to his/her teacher. Politeness was realized using "Madam", which indicated the degree of formality between them. The author used an example of politeness from the daily life of the students, which was a classroom emphasizing its importance in this context.

> 2) Perhaps she wanted to say, "**Please** help me. " (9th/Pm/C9/P94)

Politeness was realized by using **"Please"** at the request "Please help me." The request was made to soften the tone of the requests and express respect or deference to the addresses.

**Play Downs**

> **1) If I were** the president of a university, **I would** set up a course called "How to Use Your Eyes".
> (9th/Pd/Ch12/P126)

In this utterance, politeness was realized by "if I were the president" and "I would set up", that is, "playdowns". An if-clause was used in this sentence to downplay the assertion and imposition. The speaker used this strategy to express her desire to show her audience how to enjoy her life without sounding too demanding, thus saving her negative face.

2) Teacher: **Now, I would invite one of you to sum up the discussion**. (9th/Pd/C3/P23)

Politeness was realized using the past modal verb "I would." The teacher used play-down to make her utterance less assertive or imposing. The teacher used playdown to create negative politeness, making them realize that they are not being forced to do something.

**Consultative Devices**

Teacher: Maybe, well**, would any other student like to say** something about it?

(9th/Cd\Ch3\p23)

This type is commonly used by people who have high status over the listener. The teacher used a consultative device **"would"** to invite other students to share their feedback or give their opinions. This stated that she did not want to impose her thoughts but rather asked for the cooperation of her students.

2) Caliph: **Do you agree to stand as surety?**

Hazrat Abuzar Ghaffari؆: Yes, I do. (10th/Cd/Ch13/P152)

Here, Caliph was asking Hazrat Abuzar Ghaffari, ؆ if he agreed to stand as surety for the accuser. Politeness was realized using "Do you agree", which is a consultative device. Caliph allowed him to decline the request, if he wanted to, by seeking his cooperation.

**Hedges**

Teacher: **Maybe**, **well, would any other student like to say** something about it?

(9th/Hs/Ch3/P23)

Here, politeness was realized using the hedge "maybe" and the consultative device "Would any other student like to try." The teacher was showing uncertainty in making her statement less forceful or assertive to avoid threatening student 4's negative face.

1) **I could read** her mind through her eyes. **Perhaps** she wanted to say, "Please help me."

(9th/Hs/Ch9/P94)

In the second sentence, the word **"perhaps"** added a sense of doubt and consideration of the patient's sentiments. This phrase was used to assume the patient's requirements; thus, the speaker toned down the assertion using uncertainty.

**Understaters**

1) Gradually, I could see her making a **slight recovery**. One day, I was thrilled to see her lift her little finger. All was not lost. (9th/Us/Ch9/P25)

The term **"slight"** minimized the extent of recovery in this phrase. This kind of understatement avoided assertive or excessively emphatic remarks about the recovery of the patient. Using this strategy, speakers softened the illocutionary force of their utterance, eventually avoiding imposition. Here, the nurse was not making a direct claim that her patient had started recovering, which lowered her illocutionary force.

2) Hazrat Abuzar Ghaffari؆: **Wait a little more, there is still time, if he doesn't come, I will give up my life instead of him.** (9th/Un/Ch13/P152)

Hazrat Abuzar was telling villagers to wait to show his willingness to sacrifice himself instead of the accuser. He used an adverbial modifier "wait a little more" to downplay the illocutionary effect of his utterance and to promote solidarity with the hearers. He knew they were worried for him, so he avoided rudeness by not acknowledging their concern.

**Downtoners**

They **may** also choose to omit certain aspects of the newspaper they are not interested in.

(10th/Dt/Ch6/P67)

**Downtoners** are used by speakers to mitigate the impact of their statements or to tone down the assertion of their speech acts. Here, it was realized by **"may",** which indicated uncertainty. The author suggested that many people tend to read just important news in the morning while skipping what they are not interested in. The use of "may" indicated that the author was not implying an absolute or certain statement; rather, it showed the uncertainty of these actions.

**Committers**

Student 5: Madam, **in my opinion**, media plays a very constructive role in society.

$$(9^{th}/Cm/Ch3/P23)$$

Committers were included in this sentence to show the opinion of student 5. By using committers, speakers commit to their propositional content. Here, it was used to form an opinion. Committees are necessary for students to agree or disagree. In this sentence, committers were realized through a clause "in my opinion" in which the student wanted to commit his opinion, using this clause student 5 was polite by toning down the impact of his utterance.

**Agent Avoiders**

Agent avoiders' deal with utterances in which the agent is suppressed while discussing sensitive topics or inflicting criticism. The author used this strategy to talk about sensitive topics such as drug addiction and the population in the environment.

1) **Drug addiction is a common problem all over the world today.**
2) **Long-term use of drugs causes permanent mental and physical sickness.**

$$(9^{th}/Aa/Ch10/P10)$$

This lesson discussed the seriousness of drug addiction and the dire need for rehabilitation to cure and help people with drug addiction. In the following sentences, the **agent avoiders** through the absence of a specific agent**.** The writer used personalization while discussing this sensitive topic. The focus of the writer was on the actions of drug addiction and how it was a serious threat to everyone without explicitly mentioning or specifying the addicts. The writer used a passive voice structure to avoid blaming an explicit person for a specific situation. Thus, the writer avoided FTA.

**CONCLUSION**

This study was conducted to analyze the use of pragmatic politeness in English textbooks at the secondary level in Punjab by applying two theories proposed by Brown and Levinson and House and Kasper. The results revealed seven types of politeness, as identified by House and Kasper, and all four types, as identified by Brown and Levinson, were found in the textbooks. According to the findings, the most frequent politeness types used in these textbooks are negative politeness (145) and politeness marker (134 times). These two types are used by people, including Pakistan, as a common way to use politeness in communication or to commit polite behavior in a society. In Pakistani and various other societies using honorifics, titles, and identity markers while communicating with seniors, a person with high authority or talking with an unfamiliar person is considered polite behavior. Using polite language such as "please, thank you, and sorry" is very common for the implementation of polite behaviors. These strategies occurred frequently because textbooks were written using very formal language specifically while mentioning religious and cultural personalities that focused on deference and respect. The purpose behind using careful language in textbooks was to familiarize students with their cultural and religious norms and teach them to be respectful and polite toward their religious and cultural figures.

Positive politeness was the second most frequently found type with data 52. The author employed this strategy in textbooks using the inclusive pronouns "we, us, and our" to show solidarity and friendliness between the interlocutors. This type was realized using "address form, endearments and diminutive", e.g., **dear uncle, Commander of the faithful, grandfather.** The strategy was also used to appreciate the hearers and give them compliments. The least common politeness strategies were *bald on record and off-record,* four types of politeness by Brown and Levinson. The findings also showed that out of eleven types of politeness by House and Kasper, the least occurring types were *committers, understaters, and downtoners,* while no data for the realization of *forewarning, scopestaters, or hesitators* were found in the textbooks. The study revealed that the highest number of politeness types used in Grade 9 textbooks consisted of 254 found data (66.46%).

The study's findings align with the curriculum's competency "ethical and social development," which includes utilizing proper language in various social contexts. This is demonstrated by the most frequently occurring frequencies of positive politeness, negative politeness, and politeness strategies. The National Curriculum of Pakistan (2006) states that the contents in these textbooks contained historical, narrative, religious, and biographical themes with an emphasis on cultural, historical, and environmental issues, which lends credibility to the study's findings. It was concluded that these textbooks employ politeness strategies that can be taught to students to use polite language in their daily communication.

## REFERENCES

Astuti, S. (2022). Politeness Strategies Represented In An English Textbook For Senior High School. (thesis).

Brown, P., & Levenson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erlinda, R., & Rahmi, M. M. (2015). Positive Politeness Strategies EFL Classroom. 378-383.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essay in Face-to-Face Behavior.* Chicago: Pantheon Books.

Goldsmith, D. J. (2008). *Politeness theory. Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives.* (L. A. Baxter, & D. O. Braithwaite, Eds.) Sage Publication, Inc.

Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness.* London: Longman.

House, J., & Kádár, D. Z. (2021). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics.* Cambridge University Press.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1981). "Politeness Markers in English and German". In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine* (pp. 157-186). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1981). *"Politeness Markers in English and German" In Volume 2 Conversatioan Routine.* (F. Coulmas, Ed.) Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Jewad, H. G., Ghabanch, Z., & Ghazanfari, M. (2020). Politeness Strategies and Maxims in English for Islamic texts: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Quran. *Arab World English Journals*, 90-110.

Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). The roots of politeness research. In: Understanding Politeness. In D. Z. Kádár, & M. Haugh. Cambridge University Press.

Kiyani, S. (2012). *English 10.* Lahore: Punjab Curriculum and Teextbook Board.

Kramsch, c., & Hua, Z. (2016). Language and Culture in ELT. In *The Routledge Handbook of English Language and Teaching* (pp. 38-50). Routledge.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatice.* London: Essex: Longman.

Malik, R. Z., Bashir, Z., & Hussain, S. (2012). *English 9.* Lahore: Punjab Curriculum and Textbbok Board.

Morris, C. W. (1938). Foundation of Theory of Sign. In *International Encyclopedia of United Science* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-59). Chicago University Press.

*Urdu Point*. (2024, june 27). Retrieved from UrduPoint. (n.d.): https://www.urdupoint.com/dictionary/english-to-urdu/politeness-meaning-in-urdu/70957.html

Wijayanto, T. (2014). A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGY IN THE COURSEBOOK: LOOK AHEAD 2 AN ENGLISH COURSE FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS YEAR XI(thesis).

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford University Press.