



Discourse Analysis of classroom Language and teaching strategies in Libyan EFL context

Amira Albebas

Albebas.amira@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3742-565X>

Nisrin Shawish

Aziza Sheeta

Shawishnisrin43@gmail.com

azzashita25@gmail.com

The Libyan Academy ,School of Language / Discourse Analysis

تاريخ الاستلام: 2026/05/05 - تاريخ المراجعة: 2026/05/28 - تاريخ القبول: 2026/06/07 - تاريخ النشر: 2026 /06/17

Abstract

This study analyzes classroom discourse and teaching strategies in a Libyan primary EFL classroom. It focuses on teacher–student interaction, turn-taking patterns, verbal and non-verbal scaffolding, and the role of teacher talk in promoting student engagement. Using a qualitative approach, the researchers observed and video-recorded an English lesson for second-year primary learners aged 8–9. A three-minute extract was analyzed through the Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) framework and cohesion theory. The findings show that the teacher used closed questions, repetition, positive reinforcement, visual aids, gestures, and choral responses to manage classroom interaction and support comprehension. The study concludes that teacher-centered discourse can effectively maintain lesson flow and reduce learner anxiety, but it may limit individual participation. Future research should examine longer lessons and wider samples across Libyan schools.

Keywords: Classroom discourse, EFL, teacher talk, IRF model, Libyan primary schools.

الملخص

تحلل هذه الدراسة الخطاب الصفّي واستراتيجيات التدريس في فصل ليلي لتعليم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية بالمرحلة الابتدائية. وتركز على تفاعل المعلم والطلاب، وأنماط تبادل الأدوار، والدعم اللفظي وغير اللفظي، ودور حديث المعلم في تعزيز مشاركة الطلاب. اعتمدت الدراسة المنهج النوعي من خلال ملاحظة وتسجيل درس لغة إنجليزية لتلاميذ الصف الثاني الابتدائي الذين تتراوح أعمارهم بين 8 و9 سنوات. وتم تحليل مقطع مدته ثلاث دقائق بالاعتماد على نموذج المبادرة–الاستجابة–التغذية الراجعة ونظرية الاتساق. وأظهرت النتائج أن المعلمة استخدمت الأسئلة المغلقة، والتكرار، والتعزيز الإيجابي، والوسائل البصرية، والإيماءات، والاستجابات الجماعية لإدارة التفاعل الصفّي ودعم الفهم. وتخلص الدراسة إلى أن الخطاب المتمركز حول المعلم قد يحافظ على سير الدرس ويقلل قلق المتعلمين، لكنه قد يحد من المشاركة الفردية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الخطاب الصفّي، الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، حديث المعلم، نموذج IRF، المدارس الابتدائية الليبية.

Introduction

Classroom discourse represents a basal medium through which learning and teaching occur in educational settings (Newcastle University, 2025). In primary school classrooms, the linguistic exchange between teachers and students constitutes communication, shapes cognitive development, constructs knowledge, and establishes social relationships that influence learning outcomes (Guides.libraries.uc.edu, 2025).

Understanding the patterns, structures, and functions of classroom discourse has become increasingly important for improving pedagogical practices and enhancing student engagement (Hadalearing.com, 2025). Extensive research can be found on classroom discourse across various contexts in the literature. In the Libyan context, there is paucity of research related to analysis of discourse taking place in educational settings, mainly at the primary level. Discourse analysis can be found in areas related to analyzing curriculum, educational policy, and the socio-political context (Zayed, 2020). It further appears in integrated discourse analysis of speaking and writing skills of secondary school learners (Aljawad, 2025).

Understanding that English learning is not only reliant on accuracy and grammar-based exercises, since the communicative proficiency is a key role in supporting learners' confidence and enhancing interactive skills (Elabbar, 2011). The changing needs for learning English have established alternatives for understanding, analyzing, and evaluating the teaching and learning discourse in classrooms. Discourse analysis as a framework has contributed widely to change focus from grammar and vocabulary to functions of language, cohesion, and meaning (Aljawad, 2025).

Research Questions

This research paper aims to explore and understand the nature of discourse taking place in a classroom of a primary level, and understand what kind of interactional patterns, and verbal and non-verbal features existent in the setting, that could influence English learning at school. This exploration could lead to more understanding of the nature of discourse present in classrooms and evaluate its utility and drawbacks on the experience of English learning at school. The research paper is thus directed by three research questions to achieve this aim:

1. How teachers use discourse to manage classroom interplay?
2. What non-verbal features support students' participation?
3. How does teacher's talk impact students' engagement?
4. What patterns emerge in the turn taking sequence?

Literature Review

Discourse analysis has been defined in different ways across the literature. The term was first introduced by Zelig Harris (1952), Who emphasized the importance of analyzing language beyond the sentence level, focusing on connected speech and concept of cohesion, in the context of classroom discourse cohesion is crucial for analyzing teacher language as it reveals how teachers use grammatical and lexical ties to connect their explanations signpost transitions between activities and scaffold information to insure lesson comprehensibility for learners. This concept was further explained by John Sinclair and Malcolm Coulthard (1975), who introduced the Initiation - Response - Feedback (IRF) Model to explain the patterns of classroom interaction. In educational contexts, classroom discourse analysis focuses on the language used between teachers and students during lessons. It examines how interaction is organized and how meaning is constructed through communication (Atmojo, et al., 2020). IRF model (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), Which describes the sequence of teacher initiation, student response, and teacher feedback can also evaluate teaching effectiveness.

Walsh (2011) points out that classroom discourse plays a key role in shaping learning opportunities and guiding student participation; teacher talk is therefore a central element in classroom discourse. It is through talk that instructions are given, questions are asked, and feedback is provided. In EFL contexts, teacher talk often represents the main source of

language input for learners, which makes its quality particularly important (Walsh, 2011). Paying attention to how language is used in the classroom can enhance learners' linguistic and interactional competence, motivate learners to express their thoughts and feelings, and empower them to perform more effectively (Duan, 2024).

Recent research by Stoffels and Charl Dorp (2020), highlights that choral responses are often triggered by specific teacher cues within the IRF cycle, such as deliberately incomplete utterances. While some scholars argue that chorusing can limit individual feedback, others suggest that it provides a safe interactional space that encourages collective participation and helps students build confidence in an EFL environment (Fallatah & Khasqun, 2022). Furthermore, as emphasized by McGraw Hill (2023, June14), leveraging choral or unison responses effectively boosts active student engagement and provides teachers with immediate, real time insight into classroom learning needs. This, in turn, allows for instantaneous error correction while maintaining a structured learning pace.

Methodology

This research applies a qualitative method. Explorative qualitative approach is relevant and effective in understanding the process by which an event takes place (Maxwell, 2012). Researchers of the study aim to explore and analyze classroom discourse, in order to identify patterns of interaction, turn-taking, and language use during the lesson and understand how meaning is situated through interaction in the target context (Creswell, 2012). The qualitative method approves relevant and beneficial in the literature for analyzing discourse in educational settings. Observation was applied in this research for data collection. Observation is utilized to display interaction, behavior, and actions as they occur in real settings, unlike other qualitative methods that could rely on what participants state (Dudovskiy, 2022). Video recording was employed as a tool for data collection, for accurate demonstration of classroom discourse, interaction, and relevant features that researchers may not notice during observation. This tool was further essential for the purpose of transcription and highlighting non-verbal features during the lesson.

The sample of the study is a teacher with learners at a primary school (year two, age 8/9 years). An interactive English lesson was attended and recorded for this study. A three minutes extract of video recording was selected for analysis, as it displays rich data of discourse, interaction, and other features that provide answers to the research question. The sampling technique used for this research is purposive. This technique is efficient when considering focus, cost, and speed (Newby, 2010). Additionally, it relies on researchers' familiarity with the context and judgement of convenient settings that could contribute to the research questions (Creswell, 2013).

The theoretical and analytical framework established in the literature review regarding classroom discourse analysis, more specifically the IRF cycle and cohesion theory are mainly operationalized for analysis of data. The choice of the IRF framework is justified by its comprehensive capacity to map the pedagogical cycle. Within an EFL interaction, the IRF represents an interdependent system where each phase (Initiation, Response, Feedback) is vital for instructional success (Sinclair&Coulthard,1975) Crucially, research indicates that a breakdown in any single phase of the IRF cycle creates an immediate pedagogical gap. Cohesion Theory was integrated alongside to analyze the internal linguistic links and discursive continuity. Recent studies, such as, Hidayatullah (2024) and Stoffelsma and Van Charldorp (2020), demonstrate that utilizing the IRF structure allows researchers to

effectively diagnose interactional gaps. By tracing these patterns, this study reveals how teacher's discourse strategies directly influence student interaction and output.

Data Analysis

The collected data were examined, classified, and analyzed in relation to the research questions using the IRF (Initiation–Response– Feedback) framework. The analysis focuses on teacher–student interaction, turn-taking patterns, and the types of responses produced during the lesson. The data are presented in extracts and organized according to the research questions, followed by explanations and interpretations of the observed patterns.

Observation scheme

TIME	SPEAKER	Text/ Quote Transcript	Non- Verbal	Teaching Strategies	Discourse Function
0.01	T.	Can we eat a lot of chocolate every day.?		Closed question	Scaffolding for beginners
0.02	S.	No Choral		Choral response	Responding closed question
0.05	T.	No. you like apple. Ok Is it healthy or unhealthy?	- Pointing to the picture	- Teacher repeated the answer No - Positive feedback - Forced choice	-Reinforcing the correct answer -maintaining the flow discourse. - Scaffolding providing options
0.07	S.	'Healthy. Individual response'	Nodding head double high five	positive and REINFORCEMENT	Answering oral production
0.08	T.	'Perfect'	Double high five-	Positive reinforcement	Encouraging oral production
0.10	T	'Here, with the board we have a lot of food ,some of them healthy the other not.'	Using visual aids the board with pictures	Direct instruction Multi modal scaffolding To facilitate comprehension and clarify the concept of healthy food .	-Set induction -Mentally preparing -Using visual aids/ board with pictures to facilitate comprehension and clarify the concept of healthy food.
0.19	T	'Ok we are going to learn more about healthy and unhealthy food. Ok. The first one what is this?'	holding up a picture of salad.	Ok, signaling, framing, visual scaffolding.	-Elicitation -Testing knowledge -Display question - Orientation phase

00.24	S.	'Salad Choral'		Choral response	-High engagement -Immediate response
oo.25	T.	'Salad is healthy or un healthy?'	Visual scaffolding thump up/down	Repeat 'salad' correct answer. Feedback forced choice	-positive reinforcement -scaffolding through option enhancing clarity
00.27	S.	'Healthy' choral.		Choral response.	Collective acknowledgment.
00.30	T.	Can we eat salad or drink salad?	The teacher uses gesture	To facilitate understanding forced choice	Facilitate comprehension and guide students' response
00.34	S.	Eat salad		Choral response	Energy and engagement to check class / wide comprehension.
0.36	T.	Where we should put it ,with healthy or unhealthy food?	Pointing to drawing fat man and thin man	Feedback. visual scaffolding. The teacher uses inclusive pronoun "We" [Penny , 1996]	Positive reinforcement Elicitation to avoid using Arabic creating a shared learning
0.40	S.	Healthy food .		Choral response	Energy and engagement.

0.43	T.	Healthy food great job excellent . student what about these ?		The teacher repeated "healthy food" as feedback and positive reinforcement. Multi model scaffolding .	Accepting the response. Elicitation.
0.46	S.	Bananas.		Choral response	Building confidence .
0.47	T.	Are they bananas or banana?	Holding up a picture of three bananas. Forced choice .	Visual scaffolding. Forced choice .	Visual literacy and avoiding using Arabic scaffolding through options .
0.51	S.	Bananas.		Choral response	Reinforcing pronunciation .
0.53	T.	What shall we say they are bananas or it is bananas ?	holding up a picture of bananas forced choice.	Visual scaffolding. forced choice. grammar focused.	Reinforcing grammatical plural and singular forms.
0.57	S.	They are bananas .		Choral response	Energy and engagement

1.00	T.	Excellent are they healthy or unhealthy ?		Positive reinforcement.	Elicitation.
1.03	S.	Healthy		Choral response	Building confidence
1.06	T.	can we eat a lot of bananas ?		Closed question. used inclusive pronoun "we".	Accuracy confidence. Reducing power distance.
1.07	S.	yes		Choral response	Energy and confidence

1.11 1.14	T.	Yes; excellent great job. Ok, what about chocolate? Can we eat chocolate or drink chocolate?		Positive reinforcement maintaining the flow of discourse.Sinclair,J.and Coulthrd[1975]. Walsh S. [2006] investigating classroom Discourse roulades. – forced choice question .	-elicitation -this function ensures that the interaction continues smoothly and helping the transaction to next - pedagogical - scaffolding through options
1.16	S.	Eat chocolate.		Choral response.	Immediate Feedback For Teacher.
1.18	T.	Is it Healthy or unhealthy?	The teacher holding up a picture of chocolate .	Visual Scaffolding; forced choice .	Elicitation scaffolding through option .

1.20	S.	Unhealthy .		Choral response .	Building confidence .
1.22	T.	Can we eat a lot of chocolate every day .	holding chocolate , eye contact .	Non -verbal scaffolding , leading question, non -verbal cueing .	Directing the response with eye contact the teacher avoided the anxiety , because the answer become clear with face expressions
1.25	S.	NO	with nodding head .	Choral response .	Building confidence .

1.27	T.	Where should we put it ? with unhealthy food or with healthy food ?	The teacher used a picture on the board "fat man " and "thin man " .	Non-verbal scaffolding ,forced choice .	Elicitation .Avoiding use of Arabic.
------	----	---	---	--	--

1.31	S.	Unhealthy food .		Choral response .	Building confidence .
1.33	T.	Unhealthy food "perfect".		Strategy feedback information.	Accepting the response .
1.35	T.	Who is ready to come to the board? Mariam Amina come to the board quickly	Looking at the class, the students raising hands. The teacher pointing to the student .	.Mehan[1979] Allocation of turns. The teacher dominance and classroom control by strictly nominating which student approaches the board .	Motivation and selecting nomination creating a safe environment "who is ready ?" .The teacher used direct nomination to maintaining the pace .
1.40	T.	OK,Amina ,What do you Like?	The teacher gestures to the board and asks	Amena direct nomination and expression personalization	Encouraging individual expression

1.41	S.1	I like apple	Individual response Pointing to the picture.		Expressing personal preference
1.44	T.	you like apple OK. Is it healthy or unhealthy?		Multimodal scaffolding .	Accepting,confirming.Eliciting information
1.47	S.1	Healthy	With "smiling, nodding a head.	Demonstrating achievement.	Answering \confirming .Lowering the affective filter
1.50	T.	Perfect	With "High five"	Positive reinforcement	Creating positive learning environment
1;51	S.2	Burger	Pointing at the burger image with a wide smile.		Energy and engagement

1:54	T	Burger. Ok. Is it healthy or unhealthy?	Gesture visual aids using thumb .	Positive reinforcement using thumb to simplify the concept. Forced choice.	Eliciting
1:55	S.2	Unhealthy.	Smiling and gesturing		Answering Lowering the affective filter.
1:57	T	Can we eat a lot of burger every day?	Leaning down with hand gestures	Closed question	Critical thinking prompter.
2:00	S.2	No .	With shaking head " No"		Energy and engagement.
2:02	T	Perfect. Clever girl. Well done.	Double High-five.	Double building. Self- efficacy. High-five.	Strong reinforcement motivation feedback.
2:07	T	Popcorn is it healthy or unhealthy?		Forced choice.	Elicitation
2:09	S.3	Healthy		Individual response	Giving information
2:13	T	Put it in its place. Excellent.	Visual aids. Student 3 put the picture of popcorn in the right place.	Visual aids	Visual literacy. Motivational feedback.

Analysis of Research Questions

1 How do teachers use discourse to manage classroom interplay?

The analysis reveals that the teacher manages classroom interplay primarily through the Initiation - Response - Feedback (IRF) pattern.

Instead of naturally ending conversation, the teacher structurally sustains the interaction using three main discursive strategies

Closed-Ended Questions: The teacher uses closed questions and multiple-choice options to initiate talk, making it easier for learners to respond immediately.

Repetition of Student Answers: By repeating the student's correct responses, the teacher validates their output and reinforces the language target for the whole class.

Positive Reinforcement: The teacher uses verbal encouragement in the feedback turn to prevent communication breakdown and ensure continuous discourse.

2 What non-verbal features support student's participation?

The analysis shows that the teacher uses various non-verbal features to facilitate comprehension and encourage learner participation. These features include:

Visual Aids: using the board, drawings, and pictures to make the meaning of words clear and easy to understand.

Hand Gestures: Using body language and hands movements to prompt students and invite them to speak. By integrating this visual and physical tools. the teacher simplifies the language input reduces learning anxiety, and increases students' engagement.

3 How does teacher's talk impact student's engagement?

The analysis shows that the teacher's talk directly increases students' engagement by minimizing through three strategies:

Choral responses: Using whole-class answers most of the time to encourage all students to participate safely.

Sil Questions: Asking basic questions that lead to immediate, successful responses.

Repetition and Parise: Repeating students' outputs and giving positive encouragement to build confidence.

4 What patterns emerge in the turn-taking sequence?

The analysis reveals highly centralized teacher -fronted turn-taking patterns, where the teacher strictly controls the floor. The main features include:

Teacher Dominance: The teacher initiates almost all turns, decides who speaks, and maintains primarily control over the classroom discourse.

Choral Turn-Talking: Turns are mostly allocated to the whole class simultaneously through collective group answers rather than individual students.

Time and Space Efficiency: This structured pattern serves as an effective pedagogical tool to save lesson time and manager interactions efficiently within a large class size.

Discussion

According to analyzed data, it is clear that the teacher focuses on creating a positive and supportive environment from the beginning. IRF (Initiation, Response Feedback) model as defined by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) with more personal and encouraging touch by starting with closed questions "Can we eat a lot of chocolate every day? While "Yes / No questions are often criticized in advanced discourse analysis for limiting conversational depth, they serve avital pedagogical function in early years EFL Context. For young learners with a developing lexical repertoire, closed questions provide a critical entry point to classroom interaction. Rather than closing the dialogue, these questions act as scaffolding mechanism that allows students to express comprehension without being overwhelmed by complex syntax demands. Osborne, M. (2018): The recurrent application of alternative-choice questions throughout the lesson for example "Is it healthy or unhealthy? " " Can we eat chocolate or drink chocolate?" According to Vygotsk's (1978), Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), this provides a "Safety net" for Young learners "ages 8-9". By Choral response the teacher tries to avoid anxiety and build confidence This is what performed by Mercer (1995) Calls (Recapping). Despite clear benefits of the choral response strategy in an EFL classroom such as: building confidence maximizing students talking time, reinforcing pronunciation and , immediate feedback for teacher, Hussain & Al- Mutawa (2021) .

The Masking Effect: Choral response may hide students who have not fully understood the lesson (e.g., the difference between healthy and unhealthy food.) as they blend in with the voices of their classmates and make it difficult for teacher to monitor individual students' pronunciation, as learners' voices overlap during collective participation. Conti,G (2025). This limitation could illustrate why the teacher transitioned to individual elicitation by calling students to the board. This shift allowed for more accurate assessment of personal

comprehension and ensured that no learner was left behind. It is also noteworthy that the teacher employed a questioning strategy that extended beyond the core topic of the lesson which focused on healthy and unhealthy food, for instance, while holding up a picture of three bananas the teacher asked, "What are these?" to which students responded corollary, 'bananas'. Rather accepting this brief response and moving forward, the teacher dynamic shifts her syntactic framing to ask an alternative- Choice question: Are they banana or bananas» this pedagogical move serves multiple strategic functions Implicit grammar scaffolding: instead of halting the lesson to deliver an explicit abstract rule about singular vs plural nouns- which would heavily tax the working memory of second-grade learners - the teacher uses a localized contextual prompt. This allows students to deduce grammatical correctness implicitly criticized immediate physical reference 'to a picture of three bananas". This strategy helps maintain the flow of discourse.

Walsh (2006), in investigating classroom discourse, notes that maximizing class time occurs as the teacher incorporates a focus on grammatical structures within the ongoing lesson, this interaction also illustrates the IRF (Initiation- Response- Feedback) pattern discussed earlier, where by the teacher initiates with a question, students respond correctly, and the teacher provides supportive feedback and encouragement (e.g. " Yes, Excellent great job.). . This also enhances collective confidence and fosters a positive emotional atmosphere within classroom (Hasan & Rahman 2026)

Effective teaching Strategies.

- Lowering the Affective filter and invitation to participate:

This transition to the board was marked by question (Who is ready to come to the board?). While such a question is crucial in an EFL Context, it creates a safe environment (Mehan, H.1979), the teacher actually used it to select specific students to participate. This demonstrates that the teacher maintains tight control over classroom discourse, by selected "Amina and Maryam" to come to the board, in pedagogical terms this show that the classroom is still teacher centered. Data further shows that when the teacher asked "Who is ready" selection happened among those who raised their hands with confidence, while shy students who appeared ensure of their abilities were overlooked. This reflects a common pitfall where teachers focus on active participants over hesitant learners. Through this approach The teacher effectively navigates the transition from collective response to individual Participation and motivated engagement. Serving as vital model for Libyan teachers and proving that pedagogical creativity and the strategic use of available resources are drivers of educational success.

(Castañeda & Pinos, 2024).Crucially,as highlighted by Le and Nguyen (2024),when verbal interaction is overly prioritized, silence is erroneously interpreted as inactivity, this Pattern suggests that teacher centered interaction, as observed, risks reinforcing the disengagement of students who need more processing time.

Contributions, Limitations, and Recommendations:

This study contributes to the field by providing a meticulous micro-analysis of verbal interaction patterns in early childhood education, shedding light on the context of Libyan schools. Although the video clip was brief (less than three minutes), the analysis clearly demonstrated how a teacher can successfully activate and manage a classroom. This was evident in her ability to diversify questions and seamlessly transition students from choral responses—which lower anxiety and boost engagement—to individual responses that assess independent understanding. The practical value of this research lies in providing an inspiring model for early-grade teachers in Libya, who constantly face real-world classroom

challenges, such as high student density, limited class time, and a lack of supportive educational resources. However, despite these insights, the study is limited by its reliance on a single short video, which restricts the generalizability of the findings. Consequently, future research is recommended to expand the sample by recording full lessons across various Libyan schools, investigate professional development needs for teachers in managing overcrowded classrooms through questioning strategies, and incorporate teacher interviews to further explore practical solutions to these field challenges .

References

- Ango, A., Saleh, M., & Widhiyanta, W. (2020). Implementing discourse analysis in classroom interaction to improve students' speaking skills. *Journal of English Language Teaching, 9*(2), 22– 34.
- Aljawad, A, S. H. (2025). Effects of Discourse Analysis-Integrated Approaches on EFL Speaking and Communicative Competence: A Quasi-Experimental Study at Al-Kadisia Secondary School, Kufrah. *Frontiers in English Language and Linguistics* (3, 60-70)
- Zayed, Samia. (2020). A Critical Discourse Analysis of a Libyan Secondary Educational Policy, Mount Saint Vincent University)
- Castañeda, L., & Pinos, V. (2024). Digital tools and active learning in an online university: Improving the academic performance of future teachers. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 61*(4), 885–907.
- Conti, G. (2025). *Target language first, but not at all costs: A research-informed case for strategic L1 use in beginner mixed-ability classrooms*. Language Applied Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Duan, Y. (2024). A discourse analysis of teacher-student interaction in online classroom environments. *International Journal of Linguistics and Education, 12*(1), 45–59.
- Dudovskiy, J. (2022). The Ultimate Guide to Writing a Dissertation in Business Studies: A Step-by-Step Assistance (6thed.). Research Methodology. <http://research-methodology.net/about-us/ebook/>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Harris, Z. S. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language, 28*(1), 1–30.
- Hasan, M., & Rahman, T. (2024). Exploring classroom discourse and teacher talk in secondary school EFL classrooms. *Language and Linguistics Journal, 7*(2), 112–128.
- Hidayatullah, M. (2024). Investigating classroom discourse patterns using the IRF framework: A video analysis. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(1), 89–104.
- Hussain, A., & Al-Mutawa, A. (2021). Classroom interaction and discourse analysis: Assessing teacher effectiveness in EFL lessons. *English Language Teaching, 14*(3), 67–82.
- Khasawneh, N. A. S., & Fallatah, R. H. M. (2022). The effectiveness of a proposed strategy based on repeated and choral reading in developing the reading fluency skills of primary school students. *Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6*(6), 1394–1404.

- Le, T. H., & Nguyen, M. V. (2024). Discourse analysis: A methodological tool for analyzing classroom interaction in EFL courses. *Vietnam TESOL Proceedings, 2024*, 206–218.
- McGraw Hill.(2023,June14). *Why unison response works in classroom. Inspired Ideas.medium.com*
- McLeod, S. (2019). *The sociocultural approach to classroom interaction and discourse.*
- Simply Psychology.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom.* Harvard University Press.
- Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and learners.*
- Multilingual Matters.
- Osborne, M. (2018). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (ZPD) in the modern classroom: A discourse perspective. *Educational Review, 70*(3), 312–325.
- Petty, R. (2025). Video-based discourse analysis: A practical guide for evaluating classroom interactions. *Research Methods in Education, 18*(2), 210–225.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils.* Oxford University Press.
- Stoffelsma, L., & Van Charldorp, T. C. (2020). A closer look at the interactional construction of choral responses in South African township schools. *Linguistics and Education, 58*, Article 100829.
- University of Cincinnati Libraries. (2025, October). *Researching discourse: Library guides and academic resources.* UC Libraries. uc.edu
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.*
- Harvard University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse.*
- Routledge. Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action.* Routledge.