

Classroom Discourse Analysis in Algerian Secondary Education

Khadidja KHALILI^{1*}

¹ Kasdi Merbah University - English Language, Literature, Translation and Knowledge Production, Ouargla (Algeria); khalili.khadidja@univ-ouargla.dz

Receipt date : 17-01-2025 ; Acceptance Date: 2025-07-29

Abstract: Discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary approach that examines the use of language within written and spoken contexts to construct meaning. The process is critical for understanding and improving the dynamics of teaching and learning in the classroom setting, determining the communication patterns between teachers and students. The present paper explores the importance of classroom discourse analysis in language learning. The study examines how discourse occurs in language learning in the classroom and explores the teacher maintenance of students' engagement and motivation. In presenting the teachers' perspectives and attitudes according to these foci, a questionnaire survey is delivered to 30 teachers of English across different Algerian secondary schools. It is hypothesised that encouraging students to focus on communication rather than perfection and fostering their autonomy helps teachers better analyse the classroom.

Keywords: Classroom; Discourse Analysis; Education; Interaction; Secondary School.

* Khadidja KHALILI

1 – Introduction

Classroom discourse analysis is a focal point of significant importance for cultivating effective learning environments. It systematically examines the language used in educational settings to understand how communication shapes teaching and learning. The process involves examining classroom interaction between teachers and students and among students to uncover dialogue patterns, power dynamics, and learning strategies. By analysing linguistic features such as turn-taking, questioning techniques, and feedback mechanisms, researchers can gain insights into the effectiveness of instructional methods, participation organisation, and the development of cognitive skills within the classroom environment. Moreover, classroom discourse analysis sheds light on the complexities of communication within educational contexts and offers valuable guidance for improving teaching practices and fostering inclusive and engaging learning environments. Through this process, teachers can gain a deeper understanding of how language choices and instructional strategies impact student learning. This knowledge is a basis for improving teaching practices and promoting more inclusive and equitable learning environments. Ultimately, it enhances the overall quality of education by promoting effective communication and meaningful engagement between students and teachers.

The present study investigates and analyses secondary school students' communication and interaction inside the classroom. This examination involves a comprehensive exploration of the discourse, referring to the students' verbal and non-verbal communication during their academic activities. By focusing on secondary school students, the study aims to gain insights into the dynamics of classroom communication at this educational level. It seeks to explore various aspects of discourse, including the language used by students, the nature of their discussions, the patterns of interaction, and the overall quality of communication within the learning environment.

In light of the aforementioned lines, the present study aims to achieve the following three primary objectives:

- To highlight the concept of discourse analysis and how it was applied to educational settings.
- To demonstrate the importance of analysing the classroom discourse by Algerian secondary school teachers.
- To emphasise the role of discourse analysis in enhancing classroom interaction.

In an attempt to understand the topic under investigation, the following two questions are posed:

1. How do secondary school students' language and discourse patterns contribute to constructing knowledge and social dynamics within the classroom?
2. How does classroom interaction contribute to the learning environment?

In response to the research questions, we hypothesize that effective communication fosters a collaborative learning environment where perspectives are exchanged, and collective knowledge is built. Inclusive discourse encourages a sense of belonging, facilitating a positive learning atmosphere inside the classroom. It is also hypothesized that classroom interaction helps create a structured framework for learning, fostering student relationships and participation closely related to teacher support. Student-student interaction can also cultivate active participation by promoting peer cooperation and building a sense of leadership.

1.1– Discourse in Structuralism and Chomskyan Theory

The study of language has predominantly revolved around two main perspectives since the 1950s. Structuralism and Chomskyan theory have been the prevailing approaches to shaping an individual's language understanding. Although these approaches offer diverse perspectives on language analysis, they converge on a standard feature that significantly contributed to the less-than-ideal state of discourse analysis prior to the 1970s (Chomsky, 2006). Before introducing these theories to language use, linguists had focused on studying the history of language and emphasised the written words and texts more. In 1916, the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure distinguished a theoretical linguistic dichotomy named *Langue* and *Parole* in his lectures *Course in General Linguistics* (de Saussure, 1916). *Langue*, in Saussurean linguistics, refers to internalised communicative norms that govern a language's lexicon, syntax, and phonological structure. *Parole*, in contrast with the former concept, refers to the individual's actual and concrete instances of language use by speakers or writers in everyday communication. Following this established distinction, both the structuralist and Chomskyan approaches have been concerned with uncovering the deep structures of language and understanding the abstract rules and principles that govern linguistic phenomena. While they may acknowledge the importance of individual instances of language use (*parole*), their primary focus is the systematic study of language structure (*langue*).

Structuralism and Chomsky's theory are interested in the internal functioning of grammar as a largely independent system of language use. Both theories are characterised

by their interest in delving into the internal mechanics of grammatical systems, conceiving them as quasi-enclosed entities primarily isolated from the contingencies prevalent in everyday language usage. On the one hand, the structuralism view considers language as an autonomous system with interconnected elements, analysing its organisational principles and hierarchical structure. On the other hand, Chomskyan linguistics focuses on the innate cognitive structures influencing language acquisition, considering grammar as an abstract construct independent of real-world communication needs. To understand language, researchers explore consistent mechanisms, processes, or rules, particularly within the domains of phonology and syntax (Chomsky, 2006). According to Patry and Nespoulous (1990), the core concepts in these fields encompass units, positions, distributions, relations, and changes, serving as fundamental keywords guiding linguistic inquiry. The linguists of this period believe that the sentence is the definitive boundary of language study. This view has led to the widespread disregard of discourse analysis as a non-linguistic endeavour due to its close association with meaning, multi-layered nature, reliance on contextual evidence, susceptibility to individual variation, and holistic, beyond-the-sentence perspective. In its most general sense, discourse refers to any form of meaningful communication.

1.2– The Concept of Discourse Analysis

The term *Discourse Analysis* was first introduced by the American linguist Zellig Harris in his 1952 work entitled *Discourse Analysis*. The concept is defined as a method for analysing connected speech or writing, extending the boundaries of descriptive linguistics beyond the limits of simple sentences (Harris, 1952). Many linguists have acknowledged the challenge of formulating a comprehensive and complete definition for discourse analysis. However, a straightforward approach to simplifying the definition of the concept is to describe it as the analysis of discourse itself. Brown and Yule (1983) and Cook (1989) state that discourse can refer to language in use, suggesting that discourse analysis can follow the definition to mean the analysis of language in use. The approach extends beyond studying the formal properties of language; rather, discourse analysis encompasses language use within social and cultural frameworks (Kamalu and Tamunobelem, 2015). Therefore, discourse analysis examines the interplay between written and spoken language in various settings, such as everyday conversations and their surrounding contexts, prioritising coherence within the text. In addition, many researchers characterise discourse as a language to convey a sense of coherence, which may not necessarily align with grammatical correctness. According to Cook (1989), discourse analysis aims to identify the elements contributing to this coherence, taking

various forms from simple utterances to complex legal documents. Thus, what matters is the ability to convey meaning and be perceived as coherent by its audience rather than strict adherence to linguistic rules.

1.3– Classroom Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis can be applied to educational settings to examine the language use and interaction between teachers and students, as well as among students themselves. Language use and interaction between the educational community usually occur in the classroom, which directs readers to another critical type of discourse analysis, viz., *Classroom Discourse Analysis* (CDA). According to Rymes (2008), the subcategory of discourse analysis is an effective method for comprehending the variety of language repertoires in a classroom and analysing how these repertoires are utilised during various classroom activities. Conducting discourse analysis in the classroom is considered an optimal way to comprehend the range of language repertoires in a classroom setting (Walsh, 2006). It enhances the meta-discursive reflection of both teachers and students, a critical aspect of multilingual education within the globalised educational systems. Moreover, the process occurs not only in spoken discourse but also within written discourse (Nisa, 2016). Such a methodological framework investigates the spoken and written language from the conversations, interactions, discussions, texts and other negotiated activities inside the classroom. According to Dipta (2019), a successful classroom discourse analysis can be attributed to the effectiveness of teaching methods and teacher–learner negotiation. Thus, conducting such an analysis helps understand how well the teaching strategies work and how effectively teachers and students communicate and understand each other.

Classroom discourse is traditionally formed by an imbalanced power dynamic between the teacher and the students. The traditional role of the teacher involves imparting knowledge and skills through controlling the learning process. Teachers typically lead the lesson, take a prominent role in interactions, and set the direction of discussions in such a setting. In standard classroom discourse, as Kouti (2023) described, the typical pattern involves the teacher posing a question, followed by responses from one or several students. Then, it concludes with the teacher assessing these responses. Moreover, aspects of natural discourse, including turn-taking, intonation, and the nature of exchanges, are significantly modified in a classroom setting (McCarthy, 1991). Unlike in casual settings, where anyone can initiate a conversation or change the topic, such aspects are more structured and often controlled by the teacher in the classroom. Turn-taking is usually regulated by the teacher, who decides? who speaks? and when?

(Magalhães, 1995). Besides, the intonation in natural discourse can vary widely to express emotions or emphasise points, while it may be more controlled or instructional in a classroom. In addition, knowledge exchange is often less about spontaneous conversation and more about guided learning and responses to specific questions or tasks (Paterson, 2008). The discourse within a classroom can be described through different models, including the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) model. For Abeti (2022), such a model offers a framework for analysing teacher–student interactions within classroom settings:

[...] follows a fairly typical and predictable structure, comprising three parts: a teacher Initiation, a student Response, and a teacher Feedback, commonly known as IRF or IRE: Initiation, Response, and Feedback/Evaluation. IRE is preferred by some writers and practitioners to reflect the fact that, most of the time; teachers' feedback is an evaluation of a student's contribution. Teachers are constantly assessing the correctness of an utterance and giving feedback to learners. (p. 86)

1.4– Critical Discourse Analysis

The context in the classroom can extend beyond such a setting. Classroom contexts encompass various aspects, from the discussions during a lesson to a student's broader socialisation experiences over a lifetime and the educational system's historical background. Rymes (2016) reports that classroom discourse analysis examines the use of language within a classroom setting, acknowledging that it is also shaped by various social contexts, both inside and outside the classroom, to comprehend the interplay between the context and the spoken language. Accordingly, CDA transforms into *Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis* (CCDA) when researchers investigate classroom dynamics factors such as diverse and variable contexts in their analytical processes. Discourse analysis becomes CCDA when classroom researchers factor in the impact of various contextual elements during their analysis (Susanti, Sumarlam, Djatnika and Rohmadi, 2019). Such an approach recognises that the dynamics of classroom discussions are more comprehensive than the immediate educational setting. It includes various contexts inside and outside the classroom that impact what is communicated and how it is understood (Rymes, 2008). CCDA acknowledges that the language used in a classroom is shaped by various social contexts, extending beyond the physical boundaries of the classroom. In addition, Kumaravadivelu (1999) believes that the nature of classroom experiences is shaped by social constructs, influenced by political

agendas, and defined by historical contexts within CCDA. Students view the classroom environment as not merely an educational or neutral space but a setting deeply influenced by broader societal forces. In essence, CCDA makes the classroom a microcosm where broader factors converge and influence the educational experience.

2– Method and Tools

2.1– Participants

Sampling in research plays a pivotal role in collecting sufficient data to address research inquiries without the need to survey the entire population. According to Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun, research sample is *"the group on which information is obtained"* (91: 2012). The study comprised a sample of 30 Algerian secondary school teachers of English. The participants were selected through a random sampling technique. In the data collection vein, the participants were selected from an official Facebook group of Algerian secondary school teachers via a Google Forms link posted in the group. The study addressed novice and old teachers, aiming to collect diverse perspectives and points of view.

2.2– Materials and Instruments

The present research is descriptive in nature, encompassing both quantitative and qualitative methods. In other words, the study adopts a descriptive approach, incorporating a quantitative method to comprehensively understand the teaching practices and experiences of classroom discourse analysis. In other words, the data presented are numerical and descriptive in form. A key instrument adopted in this research is the teacher's questionnaire, meticulously designed to capture various dimensions of teaching. The questionnaire comprises seven multiple-choice closed-ended questions, offering a structured and flexible format for teachers to provide their insights. Such questions are designed to elicit precise responses, allowing for statistical analysis and comparison across different variables. Established instruments and validated scales are adapted and integrated where appropriate to ensure the questionnaire's validity and reliability. Prior to deployment, the questionnaire underwent rigorous piloting and validation processes, including feedback from experts in the field and a representative sample of teachers.

2.3– Questionnaire Analysis

The following section provides a detailed analysis of the teachers' responses to the research questionnaire.

Table (1): Teaching English Years of Experience

Years of Expérience	Numbers	Percentages
Less than 5 years	15	50%
5-10 years	8	26.7%
10-15 years	4	13.3%
More than 15 years	3	10%
Total	30	100%

Source: Author

The first question's responses indicate varied experience levels among the participants. Approximately half of the teachers (50%) reported having less than five years of teaching experience, while around a quarter of respondents (26.7%) reported teaching for 5-10 years. A smaller proportion of participants, around 13.3%, indicated teaching for 10-15 years, while only 10% reported having more than 15 years of experience.

Table (2): Classroom Discourse Strategies

Strategies	Numbers	Percentages
Asking open-ended questions	1	3.3%
Encouraging student participation	6	20%
Providing feedback and encouragement to students	0	0%
Incorporating cooperative learning activities	0	0%
All of the above	23	76.7%
None of the above	0	0%
Total	30	100%

Source: Author

Within the analysis of the second question, most respondents (76.7%) adopted all the strategies mentioned, indicating a prevailing tendency to use a comprehensive approach that includes all the listed strategies. Less than a quarter of the teachers (20%) selected encouraging student participation, while a small portion of respondents (3.3%) preferred asking open-ended questions as the most strategy employed in the classroom. The participants neither chose to provide feedback and encouragement to students nor to incorporate cooperative learning activities.

Table (3): Classroom Discourse Analysis Aspects

Aspects	Numbers	Percentages
Teacher-student and student-student interaction	20	66.7%
Response patterns of students	0	0%
Use of academic language	0	0%
Power dynamics within the classroom	0	0%
All above	10	33.3%
None	0	0%
Total	30	100%

Source: Author

Regarding the aspects of classroom discourse, attention is primarily directed towards identifying the main focal points of observation. The majority of respondents (66.7%) prioritise the analysis of teacher-student and student-student interaction, while a notable proportion (33.3%) opted to consider all aspects listed in the question. However, 0% of the total did not indicate a specific focus area for their classroom discourse analysis.

Table (4): Classroom Discourse Analysis Tools and Methods

Tools and Methods	Numbers	Percentages
Video/audio recordings of classroom sessions	0	0%
Transcriptions of classroom interactions	10	33.3%
Observation checklists or rubrics	7	23.3%
Peer or colleague feedback	5	16.7%
Student surveys or feedback forms	0	0%
All above	6	20%
None	2	6.7%
Total	30	100%

Source: Author

The data in the fourth question provide insight into the methods and tools used to analyse classroom discourse. Responding to the question, transcriptions of classroom interactions emerged as the most employed method among 33.3% of the participants. Observation checklists or rubrics also garnered significant usage, with 23.3% of teachers opting for this approach. A small portion of respondents claimed that they use the peer or colleague feedback method (16.7), while 20% chose to employ all the methods mentioned earlier. Notably, employing video/audio recordings of classroom sessions and student surveys or feedback forms received no preference among teachers. It is

worth mentioning that a minority of respondents (6.7%) reported not using any specific tools or methods for analysing classroom discourse.

Table (5): Classroom Discourse Analysis Improvement Support and Resources

Resources	Numbers	Percentages
Professional development workshops or training sessions	5	16.7%
Access to instructional materials and lesson plans	4	13.3%
Collaboration with other teachers	3	10%
Mentorship from experienced educators	3	10%
All above	14	46.7%
None	1	3.3%
Total	30	100%

Source: Author

The fifth question's data reveals valuable insights into participants' preferences regarding support or resources for enhancing classroom discourse practices. In that respect, a significant proportion (46.7%) indicated they would find all options helpful. 16.7% of the teachers expressed interest in professional development workshops or training sessions, while 13.3% preferred access to instructional materials and lesson plans. Collaboration with other teachers and mentorship from experienced educators were favoured among participants, garnering 10% for each. A small minority (3.3%) indicated a lack of interest in any support or resources listed in the question.

Table (6): Classroom Discourse Analysis Professional Development and Training

Options	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	15	50%
No	15	50%
Total	30	100%

Source: Author

In response to the sixth question, half of the participants (50%) engaged in professional development or training focused on classroom discourse analysis or discourse-based instruction. Similarly, the other 50% of teachers did not engage in professional development or training.

Table (7): Classroom Discourse Challenges

Challenges	Numbers	Percentages
------------	---------	-------------

Limited time for in-depth discussions	7	23.3%
Student reluctance to participate	4	13.3%
Language barriers among students	7	23.3%
Lack of training or resources	2	6.7%
Large class sizes	8	26.7%
All above	2	6.7%
Total	30	100%

Source: Author

The last question reveals several key challenges and barriers teachers face in implementing effective classroom discourse practices. In that respect, 26.7% of respondents identified large class sizes as a significant obstacle. Both language barriers among students and limited time for in-depth discussions were cited as prevalent issues among teachers, with 23.3% for each option. Another notable challenge is student reluctance to participate, with 13.3% of teachers selecting it as a hindering factor. Moreover, 6.7% of the participants found receiving training or finding relative resources challenging. Notably, 6.7% added the option “*all above*” to indicate that all the challenges listed above were encountered.

3– Results and Discussion

The primary objective of the present study is to investigate the secondary school teachers’ integration of discourse analysis strategies in the classroom. The study results reveal that half of the teachers are novices with less than five years of experience. Limited experience may indicate to the reader that teachers have not yet developed a wide range of instructional strategies, which could result in less engaging classroom discourse. Many novice teachers rely more on traditional teaching methods, focusing on the teacher as a stage guide and students as listeners. The general overview of the classroom is still based on the teacher-centred method of instruction, as these teachers are still accumulating pedagogical knowledge to create their classroom teaching method (Kouti, 2023). Hence, students may receive fewer opportunities to engage in critical thinking or in-depth discussions.

Despite being relatively new to teaching, many teachers today are exposed to modern teaching methods and pedagogical strategies. Such exposure makes them more competent in employing innovative instructional techniques to foster interactive and engaging classroom discussions. Experience alone does not determine a teacher's competence; instead, many factors contribute to effective teaching beyond the years spent in the profession. A teacher might have less experience but possess excellent

pedagogical skills, fostering open, engaging discussions, encouraging student participation, and promoting critical thinking skills. In contrast, a more experienced teacher might struggle in certain areas, rely on traditional teaching methods or struggle to adapt to changing classroom dynamics. Again, using traditional methods does not equate to teaching failure. Therefore, examining the interplay between teaching methods and teacher-learner negotiation leads to a successful classroom discourse analysis (Dipta, 2019). Thus, such an analysis helps teachers uncover communication patterns, student engagement levels, and effectiveness of instructional practices.

The participants' choice of classroom discourse strategies indicates a deliberate effort to create an interactive and engaging learning environment tailored to the learners' needs. By selecting all the strategies listed, most teachers reflect an understanding of student diversity. First, asking open-ended questions promotes critical thinking and engagement with the subject matter. Teachers use this strategy to welcome diverse perspectives and viewpoints among learners, which helps them develop their communication skills. Moreover, the teacher who actively encourages students creates opportunities for everyone to take ownership of their learning. In addition, providing feedback and reinforcement boosts students' confidence and motivates them to strive for more (Abeti, 2022). Incorporating cooperative learning activities further enhances their collaboration and teamwork. Teachers who use these kinds of activities encourage students to learn from one another and thus foster interpersonal skills. Indeed, classroom discourse strategies collectively exemplify a commitment to cultivating a dynamic classroom environment that supports students' diversity (Susanti *and ot*, 2019). However, it is worth noting that these strategies are not limited to the abovementioned list. Still, numerous strategies vary based on the teacher's style, subject matter, and learners' needs.

According to the participants, teacher-learner and learner-learner interaction are the most critical aspects of classroom discourse analysis. Their responses indicate that teachers directly influence knowledge transmission, student engagement, and collaborative learning processes essential for academic achievement. Interaction is a channel for knowledge transmission, with teachers delivering knowledge and providing feedback through direct instruction. At the same time, peer interaction facilitates student exchange of ideas and perspectives (Nisa, 2016). Teacher-learner and learner-learner interaction foster students' engagement, encourage active participation, and contribute to their social and emotional development (Rymes, 2016). Accordingly, transcriptions of classroom interactions are the most adopted tool in such a context. Teachers capture

and document verbal exchanges, nonverbal cues, and instructional strategies through classroom transcriptions. They can also gain valuable insights into the dynamics of communication and participation patterns, providing a deeper understanding of student learning needs.

Teachers improve their classroom discourse practices based on a multifaceted support system. The systems adopted include engagement in professional development workshops or training sessions, instructional materials, collaboration with peers, and mentorship from experienced educators. Professional development opportunities sharpen teachers' communication skills, provide new instructional techniques, and keep them updated with research-based practices. In addition, accessing instructional materials and lesson plans tailored to promote meaningful discourse facilitates the implementation of practical teaching strategies. Such a strategy would not be effective without collaboration, which allows for sharing ideas and perspectives with the teacher's colleagues and subject matter experts. More precisely, collaboration could be a form of mentorship from experienced educators, providing personalised guidance and invaluable feedback. This kind of collaboration fosters teachers' growth and confidence to create an engaging classroom discourse environment (Walsh, 2006). Overall, these strategies empower teachers to continuously enhance the quality of classroom discourse and promote learning outcomes.

Implementing effective discourse practices in the classroom can be a challenging task. When faced with large class sizes, limited time for in-depth discussions and language barriers among students, analysing the classroom discourse may not be effective. Time constraints within the instructional schedule limit opportunities for in-depth discussions, as teachers are supposed to balance the need to cover curriculum content with the desire to facilitate a rich discussion. Large classes further hinder equity in participation and meaningful engagement among all students, especially with the limited time for each subject. In such classes, classroom management to ensure everyone's voice is heard can be daunting and leads to some students feeling marginalised or disengaged. Language barriers also significantly challenge effective communication and comprehension, particularly in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. In a multilingual country like Algeria, students often get lost between languages when speaking or writing in a foreign language. Many students mix French and English due to the significant influence of French and similarities with some vocabulary. Learners who are not proficient in the language of instruction may struggle to fully understand

the discourse or express themselves effectively, limiting their ability to participate in discussions actively.

The research findings have validated the hypothesis, indicating that the proposed connection between the variables was accurate and providing strong evidence to support the initial predictions. Specifically, the results obtained from the survey questionnaire administrated to Algerian secondary school teachers have provided valuable insights into the topic. It has been proved that effective communication fosters a collaborative learning environment where perspectives are exchanged, and collective knowledge is built. These findings also confirm that inclusive discourse encourages a sense of belonging, facilitating a positive learning atmosphere inside the classroom. Furthermore, the results prove that classroom interaction fosters a structured framework for learning, promotes student relationships, and encourages participation closely linked to teacher support. In that vein, peer interaction among students can cultivate active participation by promoting peer cooperation and building a sense of leadership.

4– Conclusion

In a nutshell, a practical classroom discourse analysis allows teachers to make informed decisions about instructional strategies, curriculum design, and classroom management techniques. It enables them to foster more effective learning experiences for all learners equally. Such an analysis further helps teachers encourage students to focus on communication rather than perfection and enhance their autonomy and active participation inside and outside the classroom. Autonomy allows for a richer and more authentic assessment of language use and social interactions within the learning process. In light of the study's results, the following recommendations are hereby suggested:

- ✓ This research study suggests that education stakeholders must encourage professional development and training programs, equipping teachers with the tools to analyse and improve communication patterns within the classroom.
- ✓ Given the limited time of each session and the large size of the classroom, implementing techniques such as think-pair-share or structured group discussions around critical concepts to encourage student participation within shorter timeframes is essential. These techniques promote dialogue and interaction, which are central to discourse analysis.
- ✓ To keep pace with 21st-century innovation and prepare students for future digital demands, integrating technology tools such as online discussion boards or polling platforms extends discourse opportunities beyond traditional classroom

settings. This approach enables more flexible engagement among students, allowing them to contribute at their own pace.

- ✓ The flipped classroom model for more individualised interaction during face-to-face sessions can also enhance students' discourse quality, fostering more engaging and interactive educational experiences.

References and Referrals

1. Abeti, M. T. (2022). Classroom discourse analysis. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*, 5(3), 86-90.
2. Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and mind* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
4. Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
5. De Saussure, F. (1916). *Course in general linguistics*. Duckworth.
6. Dipta, D. (2019). Conversation analysis as a discourse approach to teaching speaking skill. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning (JETLE)*, 1(1), 1-9.
7. Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw Hill.
8. Harris, Z. S. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language*, 5(28), 1-30.
9. Kamalu, I., & Tamunobelem, I. (2015). *Issues in the study of language and literature: Theory & practice*. Kraft Books Limited.
10. Kouti, M. (2023). A discourse perspective to teaching the speaking skill in an EFL classroom. *ELWAHAT Journal for Research and Studies*, 16(2), 74-282.
11. Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 453-484.
12. Magalhães, M. I. (1995). A critical discourse analysis of gender relations in Brazil. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23(2), 183-197.
13. McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
14. Nisa, S. A. (2016). Meaning negotiation practice in a reading classroom: A classroom discourse analysis perspective. *ELT Echo: The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context*, 1(1), 83-94.
15. Paterson, D. (2008). Analysing classroom discourse using the Sinclair/Coulthard model. *Studies in Language and Literature*, 28(1), 68-94.
16. Patry, R., & Nespoulous, J.-L. (1990). *Discourse analysis in linguistics: Historical and theoretical background*. In Y. Joannette & H. Brownell (Eds.), *Discourse ability and brain damage*. Springer.
17. Rymes, B. (2016). *Classroom discourse analysis: A tool for critical reflection* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
18. Susanti, R., & others. (2019). Study of politeness strategy of speech act caring utterances: Discourse completion test (DCT) approach. *Utopía Y Praxis Latinoamericana*, 25(1), 282-290.

19. Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge.

Appendix

Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear Teachers,

This study aims to investigate classroom discourse analysis within Algerian secondary education. We kindly request your participation by completing this questionnaire. Please be assured that all your responses will remain completely anonymous and confidential. Thank you for your valuable contribution.

1. How many years of experience do you have teaching English?

- a) Less than 5 years ☐
- b) 5–10 years ☐
- c) 10–15 years ☐
- d) More than 15 years ☐

2. Which of the following classroom discourse strategies do you regularly use in your English teaching?

- a) Asking open-ended questions ☐
- b) Encouraging student participation ☐
- c) Providing feedback and encouragement to students ☐
- d) Incorporating cooperative learning activities ☐
- e) All of the above ☐
- f) None of the above ☐

3. Which aspects of classroom discourse do you focus on or observe most often during your English lessons?

- a) Teacher–student and student–student interaction ☐
- b) Response patterns of students ☐
- c) Use of academic language ☐
- d) Power dynamics within the classroom ☐
- e) All above ☐
- f) None ☐

4. Which tools or methods do you use (or are familiar with) for analyzing classroom discourse?

- a) Video/audio recordings of classroom sessions ☐
- b) Transcriptions of classroom interactions ☐
- c) Observation checklists or rubrics ☐
- d) Peer or colleague feedback ☐
- e) Student surveys or feedback forms ☐
- f) All above ☐
- g) None ☐

5. What types of support and resources have you received and used to improve your skills in classroom discourse analysis?

- a) Professional development workshops or training sessions ☐
- b) Access to instructional materials and lesson plans ☐
- c) Collaboration with other teachers ☐
- d) Mentorship from experienced educators ☐
- e) All above ☐
- f) None ☐

6. Have you received any professional development or training in classroom discourse analysis?

- a) Yes ☐
- b) No ☐

7. What challenges have you faced when engaging in or analyzing classroom discourse?

- a) Limited time for in-depth discussions ☐
- b) Student reluctance to participate ☐
- c) Language barriers among students ☐
- d) Lack of training or resources ☐
- e) Large class sizes ☐
- f) All above ☐