

An Analysis of Communicative Functions in Conversations in an English Textbook

Nisrina Nisrina

UIN Sultanah Nahrasiyah Lhokseumawe, Lhokseumawe
email: nisrina.nina1909@uinsuna.ac.id

Isti Komah

UIN Sultanah Nahrasiyah Lhokseumawe, Lhokseumawe
email: isti87577@gmail.com

Rahma Sarita

UIN Sultanah Nahrasiyah Lhokseumawe, Lhokseumawe
email: rahmahsok18@gmail.com

Oriza Sativa

Universitas Bumi Persada, Lhokseumawe
email: orizasativa@unbp.ac.id

Rahmad Ade Akbar

Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry, Banda Aceh
email: rahmadadeakbar@gmail.com

Article history: Received: 02 April 2026; Revised: 07 April 2026;
Accepted: 13 April 2026; Published: 30 April 2026;

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the variations of communicative functions in the conversations of an English textbook for Grade VIII Junior High School based on Michael Halliday's theory of communicative functions. Communicative competence is the primary goal in English language learning; thus, conversational materials in textbooks must reflect real-life communication situations. This study employed a descriptive qualitative method. The research data consisted of dialogue transcripts found in the textbook, which were then classified into seven

types of communication functions according to Halliday, namely instrumental conversation, social conversation, dialogue, expressive conversation, ritual conversation, discussion, and debate. The results indicate that only four types of communicative functions dominantly appear in the textbook, which include instrumental conversation (to obtain information/assistance), social conversation (to build interpersonal relationships), dialogue (two-way information exchange), and expressive conversation (expressions of emotion/admiration). Meanwhile, the other three functions ritual conversation, discussion, and debate were not found in the analyzed data. This shows that although the textbook has successfully supported basic everyday communication competence, the presented materials remain limited and under-facilitate students' higher-order thinking skills (HOTS), such as argumentation and problem-solving skills. Therefore, it is recommended that curriculum developers and future textbook writers integrate a more balanced variety of communication functions to comprehensively support students' cognitive and intercultural development.

Keywords:

Communicative functions; Conversations; Textbook analysis

Introduction

Language is one of the most important tools used by humans to communicate ideas, feelings, information, and social relationships in daily life. In the context of English language learning, communication becomes the main goal because students are expected not only to understand grammatical structures, but also to use language appropriately in real communication situations (Tarigan & Stevani, 2022). In junior high schools, English textbooks play an important role in helping students develop communicative competence through dialogues and conversations presented in learning materials (Dewantara, 2023). Therefore, analyzing conversations in English textbooks is necessary to understand whether the materials support communicative language learning effectively.

One important theory related to communication is the theory of communicative functions proposed by Halliday (1975). Halliday explains that language has several functions that are used by people to achieve different communicative purposes in social interaction (Halliday, 1975). These functions help learners understand how language works in real situations, especially in spoken conversations. Halliday states that communicative functions can be divided into several forms of communication, namely social conversation, expressive conversation, instrumental conversation, ritual conversation, dialogue, discussion, and debate.

Social conversation is commonly used to maintain social relationships, while expressive conversation is used to express feelings and emotions. Instrumental conversation functions to fulfill needs or requests, whereas ritual conversation is related to greetings, politeness, and social conventions. In addition, dialogue, discussion, and debate are forms of interaction that involve exchanging ideas, sharing opinions, and presenting arguments in communication. Through these communicative functions, students can learn how to ask for information, express opinions, give suggestions, refuse offers, and maintain social relationships appropriately in different contexts. According to recent studies, communicative functions are essential in English learning because they improve students' interactional competence and support meaningful communication in classrooms (Malik et al., 2025).

The first reason why communicative functions are important in textbook conversations is that they help students understand the purpose of utterances in communication. In many cases, language learners focus only on vocabulary and grammar (Dianti et al., 2026) without understanding why certain expressions are used in specific situations. By learning communicative functions, students can recognize the intention behind conversations, such as greeting, requesting, apologizing, or inviting. This understanding helps students use English more naturally in everyday interaction. According to (Sari & Putri, 2022) explains that communicative-based learning encourages students to connect language forms with communicative purposes, making language learning more meaningful and contextual (Fauzi & Ridwan, 2025).

The second reason is that communicative functions help students relate classroom conversations to real-life communication. Conversations presented in textbooks should reflect authentic situations that students may experience outside the classroom (Nakamura, 2023). When textbook dialogues contain communicative functions that are commonly used in daily life, students become more prepared to communicate in real social environments. For example, students may learn how to ask for help, offer assistance, or express agreement politely. According to Jasmih and Ngui (2026), authentic communication in textbooks supports students' confidence and speaking ability because learners feel familiar with the expressions used in social interaction.

The third reason is that communicative functions allow researchers and teachers to identify the types of language use found in textbook conversations. Through analysis, teachers can discover whether the textbook provides balanced communicative expressions or focuses only on limited interaction patterns. Different communicative functions such as requesting, suggesting, refusing, thanking, and complimenting are necessary for students' communicative competence. If textbooks provide only simple question-and-answer patterns, students may have difficulties understanding more complex social communication (Putra et al., 2020). Research conducted by Suadnyani et al., (2023) states that textbooks should contain varied communicative functions to support students in mastering interpersonal and transactional communication skills.

The fourth reason is that communicative function analysis helps researchers examine how language expressions are formed and delivered in conversations. Every communicative function can be expressed in different ways depending on context, politeness, and social relationships (Belamaric, 2025). For instance, requests can be expressed directly or indirectly depending on the speaker's intention. Through textbook analysis, researchers can evaluate whether the expressions used in conversations are appropriate for students' language level and cultural understanding (Miftakh, 2019). According to Faizatussholekhah and Hapsari, (2025) communicative function analysis is important because it helps identify whether

textbook language reflects natural communication patterns or artificial classroom language.

The fifth reason is that communicative function analysis can evaluate the completeness and organization of conversations in English textbooks. A good textbook should provide communicative functions systematically so students can gradually develop their communication skills (Nakamura, 2023). Textbooks that lack communicative variation may not fully support communicative language teaching objectives. In addition, textbook evaluation is necessary to ensure that learning materials support communicative competence and meaningful interaction in the classroom (Faisal, 2025). Therefore, analyzing communicative functions can help teachers, researchers, and curriculum developers improve textbook quality. As explained by Putra and Musigrungsi (2021), textbooks should integrate communicative competence components consistently in order to meet modern English learning goals.

In Indonesia, English textbooks are widely used as the main learning resources in junior high schools. However, not all textbooks provide communicative conversations that represent real-life interaction (Putra et al., 2020). Some dialogues may focus more on grammar exercises rather than meaningful communication. Speech acts and communicative expressions in textbooks are important to support students' interaction skills in classroom communication (Richard, 2006). This condition makes communicative function analysis important because it can reveal how conversations are designed to support students' speaking and interaction skills. Recent research by (Putra et al., 2020) found that many textbook conversations still lack authentic communicative elements that encourage active student participation in communication.

Furthermore, communicative function analysis is closely related to the implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) in English education. CLT emphasizes that language learning should focus on communication rather than memorization of structures. Therefore, textbooks are expected to provide dialogues that encourage interaction and communicative practice. According to Rosyida (2019), communicative textbooks can improve students'

motivation and speaking performance because learners are exposed to realistic communication situations.

Based on the explanations above, analyzing conversations based on communicative functions is important to determine whether English textbooks provide meaningful and appropriate communication models for students. This study focuses on analyzing conversations in an English textbook for Grade VIII junior high school students by using Halliday's communicative function theory. The analysis is expected to identify the types of communicative functions found in textbook dialogues and evaluate whether the conversations support communicative language learning effectively.

Methods

This study employed a descriptive qualitative research design to investigate the communicative functions embedded in the conversation texts of an English textbook for Grade VIII junior high school students. A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because the objective of the study was not to measure or quantify variables but to explore, classify, and interpret the communicative purposes represented in the textbook dialogues. According to Sugiyono (2019), qualitative research seeks to understand phenomena in their natural context by emphasizing meaning and interpretation, with the researcher functioning as the primary research instrument. Similarly, Abdullah (2018) explains that descriptive qualitative research aims to provide a systematic, factual, and accurate description of the characteristics and relationships of the phenomena under investigation without manipulating the data. Therefore, this approach enabled the researchers to examine how communicative functions are presented in authentic instructional materials and how they align with the intended learning objectives.

The object of this study was the English textbook *An English Course for SMP/MTs Grade VIII (Phase D)* written by Nur Zaida and published by Penerbit Erlangga under the Kurikulum Merdeka curriculum. This textbook was selected because it is designed to support the implementation of the Phase D English curriculum and contains numerous conversation texts intended to facilitate students' communicative competence. The unit of analysis consisted exclusively of dialogue or conversation texts found throughout the

textbook. Other components, such as grammar explanations, vocabulary lists, reading passages, and written exercises, were excluded from the analysis because they were not directly related to the research objective.

Data were collected using the documentation method, which is widely employed in qualitative content analysis to examine written documents and educational materials. The researchers carefully read the entire textbook to identify all conversation texts contained in each chapter. Every dialogue was extracted, numbered, and organized into a data corpus for analysis. To ensure systematic analysis, each conversation was coded according to its chapter, page number, and sequence within the textbook. The researchers then examined each utterance to identify its dominant communicative function.

The analysis was guided by Michael Halliday's theory of communicative functions. Based on this framework, each conversation was classified into one or more communicative function categories, namely instrumental, social, dialogue, expressive, ritual, discussion, and debate. During the coding process, the researchers interpreted the communicative purpose of each dialogue by considering the context of interaction, the speakers' intentions, and the linguistic expressions used. The classification process was conducted systematically to ensure consistency in assigning communicative functions to the textbook conversations.

The data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis. The analysis followed several stages: (1) familiarizing with the textbook by repeatedly reading the conversation texts; (2) identifying and extracting all dialogue passages; (3) coding each conversation according to Halliday's communicative function categories; (4) organizing the coded data into thematic categories; (5) interpreting the findings by explaining how each communicative function was represented; and (6) evaluating the extent to which the conversation texts support communicative language learning and correspond to the learning outcomes specified in the Phase D English curriculum of the Kurikulum Merdeka. The results were then presented descriptively using textual explanations supported by representative examples from the textbook.

To enhance the trustworthiness of the findings, the

researchers repeatedly reviewed the coding results and compared each classification with Halliday's theoretical descriptions to maintain consistency and minimize subjective interpretation. In addition, representative excerpts from the textbook were presented as evidence to support each identified communicative function, thereby increasing the credibility and transparency of the analysis.

Result and Discussions

First Subheading as the answer of Research Question 1

This section presents the findings of the analysis of the conversation texts in the textbook *An English Course for SMP/MTs Grade VIII (Phase D)*. The analysis was conducted using Halliday's framework of communicative functions to identify the communicative purposes represented in the dialogues. Each conversation was examined and classified according to its dominant communicative function, after which the findings were interpreted in relation to communicative language teaching and the learning objectives of the Kurikulum Merdeka. The results reveal that the textbook contains four communicative functions, Instrumental Conversation, Social Conversation, Dialogue Conversation, and Expressive Conversation, while Ritual Conversation, Discussion, and Debate were not identified in the analyzed conversation texts. Table 1 presents the instrumental conversations identified in the textbook.

Table 1. Conversations Representing the Instrumental Communicative Function

N o	Conversation Data	Purpose of the Conversation	Analysis
1	S: What are you doing, Tommy? T: I'm fixing the wheels of my skateboard!	Obtaining information.	This dialogue is classified as an Instrumental Conversation because the speaker asks about Tommy's current activity in order to obtain information. The response provides the requested information,

			showing that language is used to achieve a specific goal.
2	S: Do you need some help? I fixed the wheels on my skateboard yesterday. T: Thanks, but I can do it myself.	Offering assistance.	This dialogue is classified as an Instrumental Conversation because one speaker offers assistance to help achieve a practical goal, namely repairing the skateboard. The conversation is goal-oriented and focused on solving a problem.
3	S: Do you know how to do it? T: Well, it's my first time.	Obtaining information.	This dialogue is classified as an Instrumental Conversation because the speaker asks for information regarding Tommy's ability to perform the task. Tommy responds by providing the requested information.
4	S: Will you be careful? You might hurt yourself. T: Don't worry, I'm sure I can do it.	Giving advice and reassurance.	This dialogue is classified as an Instrumental Conversation because the speaker gives a warning to prevent potential harm while Tommy reassures the speaker about his

ability to complete the task safely. The interaction remains focused on achieving the practical goal of repairing the skateboard.

5	A: Ok, where are we going? N: We are going to the classroom. Miss Portman asked me to distribute the books for the class.	To carry out a task assigned by the teacher.	This dialogue is classified as an Instrumental Conversation because the speakers discuss a specific task assigned by the teacher. The conversation focuses on carrying out the activity of distributing books in the classroom, which reflects the instrumental function of language in achieving a practical goal.
6	N: Can he drive? E: Yes. He can drive. He is a good singer and dancer. And he can speak ten languages.	To get information	This dialogue is classified as an Instrumental Conversation because the speaker seeks information about a person's abilities. The response provides the requested information regarding the person's skills and talents, demonstrating the

instrumental use of language.

7	S: How was your vacation? B: It was great.	Obtaining information about the vacation experience.	This dialogue is classified as an Instrumental Conversation because the speaker asks about the listener's vacation experience. The response provides the requested information, demonstrating the instrumental function of language.
8	S: Where did you go? B: I went to Yogyakarta.	Obtaining information about the vacation destination.	This dialogue is classified as an Instrumental Conversation because the speaker seeks specific information regarding the place visited during the vacation. The response provides the requested information, demonstrating the instrumental use of language.
9	S: What did you see? B: I saw some temples.	Obtaining information about activities and experiences during the	This dialogue is classified as an Instrumental Conversation because the speaker asks for

vacation.	information about what the listener observed during the trip. The response supplies the requested information, indicating the instrumental function of language.
-----------	--

Instrumental Conversation refers to conversations that are intended to achieve specific goals, influence others, or obtain information. Based on the analysis above, the dialogues are classified as Instrumental Conversations because the speakers use language to accomplish particular purposes, such as obtaining information, offering assistance, giving advice, and carrying out assigned tasks. The conversations are direct, goal-oriented, and focused on achieving specific outcomes, which are the main characteristics of Halliday's instrumental function of language. Table 2 presents the social conversations identified in the textbook.

Table 2. Conversations Representing the Social Communicative Function

No	Conversation Data	Purpose of the Conversation	Analysis
1	P: Good morning, Hartlee. H: Good morning.	Greeting	This dialogue is classified as a Social Conversation because the speakers use greetings to build and maintain social relationships. The interaction reflects politeness and a friendly connection between the speakers.
2	N: Hi Alice, can you help	Simple social interaction	This dialogue is classified as a Social Conversation

	me? A: Sure.		because the speakers engage in a polite interaction that helps maintain social connection. The exchange reflects friendliness and willingness to respond, even though it includes a request for help.
3	E: My uncle, Anton, is a very skilful person. N: Really?	Showing interest.	This dialogue is classified as a Social Conversation because the speaker shows interest in the information shared. The response is used to maintain interaction and keep the conversation going in a friendly manner.
4	S: Hi Basyir. How was your vacation? B: It was great.	Starting a conversation.	This dialogue is classified as a Social Conversation because the speakers use casual talk to initiate and maintain social interaction. The conversation focuses on building a friendly relationship rather than exchanging important information.

Social Conversation refers to conversations that aim to build, maintain, or strengthen social relationships between individuals. Based on the analysis above, the dialogues are classified as Social Conversations because the speakers use greetings, casual questions, and responses that show interest and engagement. The main focus of these conversations is social connection and friendliness rather than the exchange of important information, which reflects the characteristics of social function of language. the third one was dialogue conversation and Table 3 presents the dialogue conversations identified in the textbook.

Table 3. Dialogue Conversations Identified in the English Textbook

No	Conversation Data	Purpose of the Conversation	Analysis
1	R: What do you sell, Herlee? H: I sell marbles. My customers are from many countries all around the world.	Providing and obtaining information	This dialogue is classified as a Dialogue Conversation because the speakers exchange information about Herlee's business. The interaction shows a two-way exchange of ideas and information to understand each other's situation.
	R: What do you usually do after school? H: Well, I'm back to business. I check my website to see the order.	Providing and obtaining information	This dialogue is classified as a Dialogue Conversation because the speakers engage in an exchange of information about daily routines and time management. The interaction helps both participants understand personal habits.
	R: What do you usually do after school? H: Well, I'm back to business. I check my website to see the order.	Providing and obtaining information	This dialogue is classified as a Dialogue Conversation because the speakers share and respond to information about daily activities after school. The exchange reflects mutual understanding through discussion.

Dialogue Conversation refers to two-way communication in which participants exchange ideas, information, and perspectives to understand each other more deeply. Based on the analysis above, the dialogues are classified as Dialogue Conversations because the

speakers engage in question-and-answer exchanges about business activities, time management, and daily routines. The interaction reflects mutual understanding through the sharing of information and experiences. he fourth category was expressive conversation. Table 4 presents the expressive conversations found in the textbook.

Table 4. Expressive Conversations Identified in the English Textbook

N o	Conversation Data	Expression	Analysis
1	R: Wow! How do you manage your time?	Admiration	This dialogue is classified as an Expressive Conversation because the speaker shows admiration for someone’s ability to manage time.
2	N: Wow!	Amazement	This dialogue is classified as an Expressive Conversation because the speaker expresses a spontaneous emotional reaction.
3	N: Interesting!	Interest	This dialogue is classified as an Expressive Conversation because the speaker shows interest in the information provided.
4	S: Wow! What did you see?	Enthusiasm	This dialogue is classified as an Expressive Conversation because the speaker shows enthusiasm and curiosity about the listener’s experience.
5	N: Really?	Surprise	This dialogue is classified as an Expressive Conversation because the speaker shows surprise or

			disbelief toward the information received
6	S: Gee! Thanks. It's cute.	Appreciation and happiness	This dialogue is classified as an Expressive Conversation because the speaker expresses feelings of happiness and gratitude toward something.

Expressive conversation is a type of conversation used to express a person's feelings, emotions, or attitudes toward something. Based on the analysis above, the dialogues are classified as Expressive Conversations because the speaker express various emotions such as admiration, interest, surprise, enthusiasm, amazement, and appreciation. This type of conversation is highly emotional and personal, in line with the characteristics of expressive language function.

The analysis revealed that no conversation texts in the textbook could be categorized as Ritual Conversation, Discussion, and Debate. According to Halliday's communicative function framework, ritual conversations consist of formulaic expressions conventionally used in specific social situations, such as greetings, leave-taking, congratulations, condolences, and other socially prescribed interactions. Although several dialogues begin with expressions such as "*Good morning*," these utterances function only as simple conversation openers and are not sufficiently developed to represent complete ritual interactions. Therefore, the textbook does not explicitly include conversations that fulfill the characteristics of Ritual Conversation.

Similarly, no dialogue was identified as representing the communicative function of Discussion. Discussion is characterized by the exchange of opinions, collaborative problem-solving, and the exploration of ideas to reach a shared understanding or decision. The conversation texts analyzed mainly focus on introducing people, sharing information, making requests, and expressing personal feelings rather than encouraging learners to exchange viewpoints or

negotiate ideas. As a result, none of the dialogues met the criteria for the Discussion category.

Likewise, the analysis found no evidence of Debate in the textbook. Debate involves presenting opposing viewpoints, defending arguments, and providing rebuttals with the aim of persuading others. None of the analyzed conversations contained conflicting opinions, argumentative exchanges, or attempts by the speakers to justify their positions. Instead, the dialogues were predominantly cooperative and informational, indicating that opportunities for argumentative communication are absent from the textbook.

Overall, the findings indicate that the conversation texts primarily represent Instrumental Conversation, Social Conversation, Dialogue Conversation, and Expressive Conversation, while Ritual Conversation, Discussion, and Debate are not represented. This suggests that the textbook emphasizes basic interpersonal communication and functional language use in everyday contexts (Nakamura, 2023) but provides limited opportunities for students to engage in more complex communicative interactions involving formal social rituals, collaborative discussions, or argumentative exchanges.

The findings show that four types of conversation are dominant in the data, namely Instrumental Conversation, Social Conversation, Dialogue Conversation, and Expressive Conversation. The findings reveal that four types of conversation are dominant in the textbook data, namely Instrumental Conversation, Social Conversation, Dialogue Conversation, and Expressive Conversation. The dominance of these conversation types can be explained by the objectives of English language teaching at the junior high school level, which emphasize the development of students' communicative competence and their ability to use language in everyday situations. Instrumental Conversation is frequently used because students are expected to obtain information, ask for help, and accomplish practical purposes. Social Conversation appears to help students build and maintain interpersonal relationships through greetings and casual interactions. Dialogue Conversation provides opportunities for learners to exchange ideas and information, while Expressive

Conversation enables students to express feelings, emotions, and personal attitudes.

According to Halliday, 1975, language serves various functions, including instrumental, interactional, and personal functions, which are closely related to everyday communication. Furthermore, Richard (2006) states that Communicative Language Teaching emphasizes meaningful interaction and the practical use of language in real-life contexts. Therefore, the predominance of these four conversation types indicates that the textbook is designed to prepare students to communicate effectively, develop social relationships, and express themselves appropriately in daily life.

The dominance of Instrumental, Social, Dialogue, and Expressive Conversations provides several benefits for junior high school students in learning English. Instrumental Conversation helps students develop functional communication skills to obtain information, ask for help, and accomplish everyday tasks (Wibowo & Wirza, 2025). Social Conversation enables students to build interpersonal relationships and practice politeness in communication (Belamaric, 2025). Dialogue Conversation improves students' ability to exchange ideas and achieve mutual understanding through interaction. Meanwhile, Expressive Conversation helps learners to express emotions, attitudes, and personal responses appropriately.

These four conversation types support the development of communicative competence because they provide meaningful interaction and real-life communication practice (Jasmih & Ngui, 2026). Through these conversations, students can improve their confidence, speaking ability, social awareness, and emotional expression (Richard, 2006). Furthermore, communicative and task-based interactions help learners use language effectively in authentic situations and enhance their overall communicative competence (Belda-Medina, 2021). Therefore, the predominance of these conversation types reflects the communicative orientation of English language teaching at the junior high school level, which emphasizes practical and authentic language use.

Although Instrumental, Social, Dialogue, and Expressive Conversations provide important benefits for developing communicative competence, their dominance also has some limitations. These conversation types mainly focus on everyday

communication, interpersonal interaction, and emotional expression. As a result, students may have limited opportunities to develop higher-order thinking skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and argumentation (Abraham, 2014). In addition, communicative activities may not equally accommodate all learners because students with lower proficiency levels or different learning preferences may require more structured language instruction (Karimah et al., 2025). Recent studies suggest that language teaching should combine communicative approaches with other instructional methods to address diverse learners' needs and promote balanced language development (Richard, 2006). Therefore, relying excessively on these four conversation types may restrict students' exposure to more analytical forms of communication, such as discussion and debate, which are essential for developing critical and reflective thinking.

On the other hand, Ritual Conversation, Discussion, and Debate were absent from the analyzed textbook. This finding suggests that although the textbook introduces several basic communicative functions, it does not fully represent the range of communicative interactions proposed in communicative language teaching. The inclusion of ritual conversations would familiarize students with socially and culturally appropriate expressions used in everyday interactions, while discussion and debate activities would provide opportunities for learners to express opinions, defend arguments, negotiate meaning, and develop critical thinking skills. According to Almujaivel (2018), these communicative functions are essential for enabling learners to understand social norms, cultural values, and contextually appropriate language use. Their integration would therefore contribute to a more balanced development of students' communicative competence, encompassing not only grammatical accuracy but also sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence.

In addition, Discussion and Debate can foster critical thinking, collaboration, problem-solving skills, and the ability to express and defend opinions logically. In the twenty-first century, language learning is expected not only to develop communicative competence but also to promote higher-order thinking skills and active

participation in society (Ilyas et al., 2025). Furthermore, critical thinking and argumentation are considered essential competencies for learners in modern education because they prepare students to face complex social and academic challenges. Therefore, the inclusion of Ritual Conversation, Discussion, and Debate in English textbooks would provide more balanced communicative experiences and better support students' cognitive, social, and intercultural development.

Overall, the findings indicate that the English textbook has successfully provided students with opportunities to develop basic communicative competence through Instrumental, Social, Dialogue, and Expressive Conversations. However, the absence of Ritual Conversation, Discussion, and Debate suggests that students are still exposed to limited varieties of communicative functions. In the context of twenty-first-century education, language learning should not only focus on everyday communication but also promote intercultural awareness, critical thinking, problem-solving, and argumentation skills. Therefore, future English textbooks should provide a more balanced representation of conversation types in order to support students' linguistic, cognitive, social, and intercultural development comprehensively. Such integration would better prepare learners to face the communicative demands and challenges of contemporary society.

Conclusion

This study examined the communicative functions represented in the conversation texts of *An English Course for SMP/MTs Grade VIII (Phase D)* using Halliday's framework of communicative functions. The findings indicate that the textbook incorporates four communicative functions, Instrumental Conversation, Social Conversation, Dialogue Conversation, and Expressive Conversation, which collectively support the development of students' basic communicative competence. Through these functions, learners are provided with opportunities to practice essential language skills required for everyday communication, including requesting and providing information, maintaining social relationships, participating in simple interactions, and expressing personal feelings and experiences. These findings suggest that the textbook reflects the fundamental principles of Communicative

Language Teaching (CLT), particularly in promoting meaningful communication within familiar and authentic contexts.

Despite these strengths, the analysis also revealed that three communicative functions, Ritual Conversation, Discussion, and Debate, are absent from the conversation texts. This finding indicates that the textbook places greater emphasis on basic interpersonal communication than on more cognitively demanding forms of interaction. The absence of discussion- and debate-oriented dialogues limits students' opportunities to develop higher-order communicative abilities, such as presenting and evaluating ideas, negotiating meaning, solving problems collaboratively, and constructing evidence-based arguments. Likewise, the lack of ritual conversations reduces learners' exposure to culturally appropriate and socially conventional expressions that are important for developing pragmatic and intercultural communicative competence.

Considering the objectives of the Kurikulum Merdeka, which emphasizes communicative competence, critical thinking, collaboration, creativity, and learner autonomy, a broader range of communicative functions would better support the intended learning outcomes. Incorporating discussion, debate, and ritual interactions into textbook dialogues would not only enrich students' linguistic repertoire but also encourage active participation, reflective thinking, and authentic communication in diverse social and academic contexts.

Bibliography

Abraham G Y. (2014). *CP origin, vision and practice* . 1-10.

Almujaiwel, S. (2018). *The Journal of Asia TEFL Culture and Interculture in Saudi EFL Textbooks : A Corpus-Based*. 15(2), 414-428.

Belamaric, E. (2025). The Interrelation of Politeness, Culture, and Speech Acts in Multilingual Corporate Communication. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 88(3), 528-539. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23294906231176516>

- Belda-Medina, J. (2021). Enhancing multimodal interaction and communicative competence through task-based language teaching (Tbtl) in synchronous computer-mediated communication (scmc). *Education Sciences*, 11(11), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11110723>
- Dewantara, K. A. K. (2023). Type Analysis of Speaking Performance Assessment Task in English for Nusantara Textbook. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha*, 11(1), 62-69. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v11i1.64928>
- Dianti, S. R., Hidayat, H., & Gaffar, M. A. (2026). The effect of grammar translation method and text-based instruction on students' vocabulary knowledge. *Journal of Research in Instructional*, 6(1), 17-29. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v6i1.813>
- Faisal. (2025). Communicative Competence: Its Implications for English-as-a-Foreign-Language Teachers in Indonesia. *Jurnal Varidika*, 37(1), 14-29. <https://doi.org/10.23917/varidika.v37i1.8226>
- Faizatussholekhah, A., & Hapsari, C. T. (2025). Analysis of Cultural Representation in English Language Books for the Merdeka Curriculum of Secondary School. *Literature and Translation*, 1(1), 445. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eltlt.v1i1.427>
- Fauzi, N. I., & Ridwan, R. (2025). The Impact of Communicative Language Teaching on English Speaking Skills. *DIJEMSS: Dinasti International Journal of Education Management And Social Science*, 6(3), 1774-1781. <https://doi.org/10.38035/dijemss.v6i3.3819>
- Ilyas, H. P., Solihati, N., & Hikmat, A. (2025). Pedagogies of Thought: Unpacking Indonesian EFL Teachers' Approaches to Critical Thinking in Language Skills Instruction Hamzah. *European Journal of English Language Studies*, 5(3), 179-190.
- Jasmih, J. I., & Ngui, W. (2026). Enhancing ESL learners' speaking

- confidence through real-life simulation: A qualitative case study. *Jurnal Pemikir Pendidikan*, 14(1), 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.51200/jpp.v14i1.6880>
- Karimah, A., Murtadho, N., Hasanah, U., & ... (2025). From Languages to Life Skills: What Students Think, What Digital Learning Needs. *International Conference of Research Innovation and Technology on Elementary Education*. <https://conference.um.ac.id/index.php/pses/article/view/10543>
- Malik, E., Rohmatillah, R., & Rahmawati, I. N. (2025). An Analysis of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Learners' Problems in Speaking Skills Based on Their Perception at Senior High School. *Edunesia: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 6(1), 190–206. <https://doi.org/10.51276/edu.v6i1.1106>
- Miftakh, F. (2019). Intercultural Teaching and Learning English through Reading Skill. *SALTeL Journal (Southeast Asia Language Teaching and Learning)*, 1(2), 27–31. <https://doi.org/10.35307/saltel.v1i2.12>
- Nakamura, K. (2023). Analysis of Model Conversations in Junior High School Textbooks. In P. Ferguson, B. Lacy, & R. Derrah (Eds.). *Learning from Students, Educating Teachers – Research and Practice*. JALT. <https://doi.org/10.37546/jaltpcp2022-17>
- Putra, T. K., Rochsantiningsih, D., & Supriyadi, S. (2020). Cultural representation and intercultural interaction in textbooks of English as an international language. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 10(1), 168–190. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v10i1.1766>
- Richard, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching*. In Cambridge University Press. Cambridge University Press. http://d.wanfangdata.com.cn/periodical_kzyyjs-s201110118.aspx

- Rosyida, U. F. (2019). Discourse Competence in English E-Book "Contextual Teaching and Learning" for 9th Grade Students of Junior High School. In *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues* (Vol. 2, Issue 1, p. 55). <https://doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v2i1.5099>
- Suadnyani, N. Ma. A., Tantra, D. K., & Dambayana S., P. E. (2023). Speech Acts In The Students' English Textbook For Junior High School. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 6(2), 71-75. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijll.v6i2.27661>
- Tarigan, K. E., & Stevani, M. (2022). English Teachers' Beliefs in Teaching English Grammar to Improve Students' Speaking Skill. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 7(1), 2022.
- Wibowo, E. P., & Wirza, Y. (2025). Analyzing Exercises in An English Textbook Entitled "Think" (CEFR A1) Based on Communicative Language Teaching. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, 10(2), 232-270. <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.v10i2.26333>