# Social Dimension of Teacher-Students Interaction in Teaching English: CDA Approach

## Esi Audya Usaida[1*)], Ahmad Laut Hasibuan[2]

[1,2,3]Universitas Muslim Nusantara Al Washliyah, Medan, Indonesia
Email: hasibuan.esiau49@gmail.com[1], ahmadlauthsb@gmail.com[2]
Correspondence Authors: hasibuan.esiau49@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

*This research is driven by the significant shift in teacher roles from primary information providers to facilitators within student-centered learning models, which inherently alters classroom social dynamics. This study aimed to identify the types of social dimensions in teacher-student interactions, analyze their realization through a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) lens, understand the underlying ideologies, and compare theoretical frameworks with actual classroom implementation. Using a qualitative approach with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) based on the theories of Teun A. van Dijk and Norman Fairclough, this study focuses on interactions in an eleventh-grade English class (Class XI Plus D) in SMA Negeri 1 Kutacane. Data were collected through observations of the English teaching and learning sessions. The findings revealed four primary social dimensions: Power, Access, Dominance, and Control, which oscillate between hierarchical authority and collaborative engagement. While the teacher employs "soft power" and provides "access" to students, a "negotiated control" exists where the teacher remains the final arbiter, leading to a "mock democracy.'' The study concludes that a gap persists between the ideal student-centered model and practice, as interactions remain constrained by traditional patterns. Suggestions for future research include conducting longitudinal studies and incorporating "student voice" or multimodal analysis to gain a more holistic understanding of classroom power struggles.*

*Keywords: Social Dimension, Teacher-Student Interaction, Critical Discourse Analysis, English Teaching, Student-Centered Learning*

## I. INTRODUCTION

The social dimension refers to how humans behave within social groups, encompassing families, peers, and broader society, and how they are accepted within these groups. This emphasizes the importance of social relationships, social networks, trust, and norms. Moreover, the social dimension involves adapting to the demands of the social environment. In an educational context, the social dimension refers to the interactions between individuals such as students, educators, and the wider community, which play an important role in creating an inclusive and supportive learning environment.

The social dimension is inseparable from constantly changing interactions. These interactions are known as social dynamics. Social dynamics are processes of continuous interaction and changes that occur within a social group. Social dynamics explain the nature of community groups in society and the relationships between individuals (Mujiono, M., Haq, 2023). In other words, the dynamics of social interaction can describe the identity of relationships between individuals. In the school context, the social dynamics between teachers and students are strongly influenced by interactions between them. These interactions include various aspects, such as communication, interpersonal relationships, and norms that apply to the school environment (Yakin, 2023). Teacher-student interaction is an external factor to support a learning process in the classroom (Aminah, 2020). Inclusive and collaborative patterns of interaction and social communication between teachers and students significantly increase students' learning motivation. In this case, in classroom learning interactions, especially in English language learning, the teacher acts as a facilitator, motivator, and moral guide (Yakin, 2023).

In classroom learning, teachers use various strategies to engage students. A common approach involves student-centered learning, in which students actively participate in their education. This approach often mirrors real-world scenarios, encouraging deep engagement and a sense of responsibility toward learning. In this type of learning, students are often guided to examine and define challenges, explore existing knowledge, determine the information they need, evaluate potential solutions, and ultimately arrive at conclusions or solve problems. Consequently, the teacher acts as a facilitator and guide, rather than directly delivering all information.

When examining these general learning strategies, the social dynamics between teachers and students are crucial. Teachers often act as guides that support students throughout their learning journey, while students actively engage and collaborate to achieve understanding. These interactions include discussions, sharing ideas, and negotiating different perspectives to build a shared understanding. Positive social dynamics in the classroom are characterized by mutual respect, trust, and support between teachers and students, which fosters an inclusive and collaborative learning environment.

With the shift in the teacher's role as a facilitator in the classroom, and in this student-centered learning, according to several researchers, such as Khambatta (2025), it has been found that in traditional lecture-based learning, students are often passive, primarily listening and taking notes. In this learning, the main focus is the teacher, because students only listen passively. Meanwhile, in student-centered learning, the main focus shifts and is directed at students, so that students tend to be more active (Khambatta, 2025) .

Even so, teachers do not play a role in this learning model. Teachers in this learning model tend to actively facilitate students, whether they are in initiating interactions, managing the class, directing, correcting, and evaluating. The changes in the interaction between teachers and students then, according to several studies, such as those by Hadiyanto et al. (2024), Saputri et al. (2023), and Yakin (2023), cause changes in social dynamics within the class. According to these studies, when viewed from the teacher's perspective, teachers are central figures in shaping the learning environment. Their interaction style influences their motivation, engagement, and perceptions of learning. Furthermore, according to Yakin's study, if a teacher shifts from an authoritarian approach to a more facilitative one, this will impact how students interact with each other. In this case, the researcher is interested in analyzing the social dimensions that exist in classes that use the PBL learning model in which the teacher's role changes to become a facilitator during class (Hadiyanto, O., Pelupessy, P. J., 2024)(Saputri, 2023)(Yakin, 2023).

Responding to the changes in the teacher's role in the classroom, especially in English language learning, teachers in Indonesia who implement the student-centered learning model must be good at positioning themselves so as not to appear authoritarian, but must also be able to control learning effectively. How teachers control student activities in the classroom without appearing authoritarian is an interesting topic for research, especially by studying this: you will get an overview of teacher interactions where in a social dimension, the teacher as a "facilitator" can position himself as a "leader" in the classroom who at the same time is also a "collaborator" for students in the classroom. Studying and finding a picture of the process of positive interaction in the classroom is very important, considering that, along with the emergence of innovations in learning models, teachers, especially in Indonesia, must be able to adapt and be proficient in the application of new learning models. These difficulties are shown by several studies in Indonesia, such as in Nurlaily et al (2019), revealing that teachers find it difficult to direct students to problems that require solutions. A similar finding was found in the research of Utami and Wandini (2023), who found that, specifically in its implementation, the obstacle experienced by teachers in implementing problem-based learning is that teachers have difficulty in positioning themselves as facilitators, guiding, exploring deeper understanding, and supporting student initiatives (Utami, P. & Wandini, 2023)(Nurlaily et al., 2019).

Furthermore, to analyze the dimensions present in English language learning that use the student-centered learning model, the researcher uses a critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach. According to Wodak and Meyer (2009), discourse analysis is a comprehensive approach that combines linguistics and the social sciences to study how language is used. Its goal is to uncover the ways in which language constructs meaning, reinforces norms, and influences interactions within the society. Furthermore, Critical Discourse Analysis, as highlighted by Fairclough (1995), is a significant framework within the field of discourse analysis. CDA not only examines linguistic structures, but also explores power dynamics, social contexts, and underlying ideologies that both shape and are shaped by discourse.

The discourse analysis examines stretches of real language use beyond the sentence level. Approaches to discourse analysis can be divided into descriptive and critical categories. Both descriptive analysis (DA) and CDA study the correlation between form and function. However, CDA further explicates this correlation concerning particular social practices. These social practices are believed to be controlled by an uneven distribution of power and may be attributed to sociocultural and sociopolitical reasons that render one or more social groups dominant and others as dominated (Hewad Mal & Sen, 2025).

Several studies have explored social dimensions and dynamics using a critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach. Among them is the study by Lazhar et al. (2024). This study seeks to clarify the various aspects of power and ideology present in speech using Fairclough's Model of Critical Discourse Analysis as the analytical framework. By scrutinizing linguistic choices, rhetorical strategies, and discursive patterns, the analysis uncovers the ways in which language functions as a tool for constructing and disseminating political agenda. This study underscores the imperative of critically engaging with political speeches to foster an informed and

participatory citizenry, highlighting the language's pivotal role in shaping our collective political consciousness (Lazhar, S., 2024).

Hewad Mal & Sen (2025), in their research focusing on an attempt to test students' capacity to critically evaluate the information they receive, found that the participants showed a considerable level of improvement in using critical discourse analysis skills to approach news on social media. They developed an awareness of their roles as members of society in effecting positive changes. They also realized the power of language to critically evaluate and judge world events.

Furthermore, some research related to the social dimension within the education context, such as Egorychev et al. (2021), conducted a scientific and analytical study using systemic, integrated, culturological, and synergetic approaches along with theoretical methods such as analysis, synthesis, comparison, systemization, and generalization to examine the social dimension of modern higher school teachers' personalities. The study draws on philosophical, social-psychological, and pedagogical theories, including concepts of worldview (e.g., Rubinshtein, 1946), civic stance, and state social policy influences. Key findings define the social dimension as an integrated formation of personal and professional motivation shaped by Russian cultural values and state policy, essential for teachers' expertise across didactic, educational, scientific, cultural, psychological-pedagogical, and methodological functions; it identifies post-1991 value disruptions and a lack of civic stance as barriers to efficient higher education. The core argument emphasizes prioritizing teachers' social dimension formation to align professional activity with national identity, sustainable development, and state functions, such as specialist training and cultural propagation (Egorychev et al., 2021).

Nash (2022) employed a qualitative case study design within a larger participatory design-based study, analyzing ethnographic data from semi-structured interviews, zoom video recordings, field notes, artifacts, and chat transcripts of five middle school teachers during a semester-long synchronous online professional development (PD) program via a constant comparative method and thematic coding. This study integrates sociocultural learning theories (e.g., Vygotsky, 1978; Lave & Wenger, 1991) and teacher emotion frameworks (e.g., the control-value theory of achievement emotions). Findings reveal that online community-building through playful chat use despite connection challenges, co-occurrence of positive emotions (excitement, inspiration) with intellectual discourse, and emotional support fostering professional identity shifts toward agency and teacher-researcher roles. The key argument posits that socially-emotionally supportive online PD, emphasizing collaboration and autonomy, enhances teachers' learning, motivation, and curriculum design mirroring student experiences, and counters deprofessionalization amid burnout.

Panchenko et al. (2022) utilized a conceptual and analytical approach to review European policy documents (e.g., London Communiqué, Rome Communiqué), EUROSTUDENT data, and retention/engagement models (e.g., Tinto's integration model) to define social dimension indicators and propose curriculum integration for sociology students. Theories include student integration (Tinto, 1975 onward), retention models incorporating motivation (e.g., self-efficacy, attribution), and statistical modeling such as structural equation modeling (SEM). The findings outline the social dimension of ensuring diverse, equitable access/completion via underrepresented/disadvantaged/vulnerable student indicators; EUROSTUDENT data enables analysis of demographics, retention risks, and engagement; and models link integration to persistence. The central argument advocates student-led research using real datasets (e.g., EUROSTUDENT VII microdata, R, NodeXL) in courses like social statistics and SEM to build statistical literacy, motivation, and policy-relevant skills for Ukraine's higher education alignment with EHEA priorities (Panchenko, L. F., Korzhov, H. O., Khomiak, A. O., Velychko, V. Ye., & Soloviev, 2022).

Vasileiadis, Dadatsi, and Koutras (2020) in their article titled "The Social Dimension of Inclusive Education: Special Elementary School Pupils with Mild Intellectual Disabilities Talk about Their Experience from a Social Co-Existence Program" explored the outcomes of a social co-existence program implemented in two co-located schools (a general elementary school and a special education school). This study employed a qualitative method using semi-structured interviews for pre- and post-intervention assessments of pupils with mild intellectual disabilities. The theoretical framework underlying the intervention was the "non-directive intervention" method introduced by Michel Lobrot. The findings revealed significant differences in how students with intellectual disabilities understood social interaction and peer acceptance, acknowledging that participation in the program enhanced social interactions and improved peer acceptance. Their key argument is that the social dimension of inclusive education must be promoted systematically and sustainably to establish stable social interactions and eliminate prejudices and negative attitudes toward students with disabilities (Ilias et al., 2020).

Austral, Rosales, and Almazan (2023) in their study titled "Social-Emotional Learning and Social Dimensions of Pre-Service Teachers" discussed the level of Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and social dimensions among pre-service teachers and analyzed their relationships. This study utilized a descriptive correlational

quantitative method with a researcher-developed survey questionnaire. This research was grounded in Lev Vygotsky's Sociocultural Learning Theory, which emphasizes that social interaction and social experience are essential components of learning. The findings indicated that both SEL levels (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making) and social dimensions (school belonging, social learning experience, and relationships with teachers, peers, and parents) of pre-service teachers were in the "highly competent" category. Their key argument is that integrating SEL is highly feasible within the classroom setting as a central locus of learning, and developing these competencies is vital for pre-service teachers to support their future teaching careers in inclusive and diverse environments (Austral et al., 2023).

In addition, there also several studies regarding CDA in educational context such as Nurhayati (2007) in her study titled "Wacana Interaksi Kelas: Analisis Kritis dari Aspek Dimensi Sosial" employed a qualitative ethnographic method to describe the social dimensions within classroom interaction. This study was grounded in Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis framework. The findings indicated various social practices that illustrate teacher hegemony over students, including the manifestation of teacher authority as a disciplinarian and knowledge provider. Her key argument is that classroom interaction often involves an imbalance of power, where teachers dominate the discourse, sometimes showing inconsistency between wanting deep student responses and displaying impatience.

Santoso (2011) in the article "Studi Wacana Kritis, Pengajaran Bahasa Indonesia, dan Perspektif Emansipasi" explored the role of language as a determinant of hegemony in the global era. This study utilized the critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach. The author's key argument is that Indonesian language teaching should be developed based on the CDA principles to foster "critical language awareness" among learners. This perspective is rooted in emancipation theory, aiming to empower community members who are linguistically marginalized or "colonized.''

Sultan (2016) in the research titled "Teacher's Domination in Classroom Interactions: A Critical Analysis for Developing a Qualified Teacher-Students Relationship" used a qualitative method applying Fairclough's critical discourse analysis model. The study analyzed speech from secondary school teachers using the Miles and Huberman flow model for data analysis. The findings revealed that teachers control interactions through labeling, threatening, and emphasizing authority, as reflected in language features such as metaphors and imperative sentences. The key argument is that teachers should develop qualified interactions by avoiding language features that imply dominance.

Lester, Lochmiller, and Gabriel (2017) in their work "Exploring the Intersection of Education Policy and Discourse Analysis: An Introduction" introduced diverse perspectives on discourse analysis for education policy. They proposed a theoretical framework termed the "third generation of policy research," situated at the intersection of education policy and discourse analysis. Their key argument is that this approach provides a more nuanced understanding of how policies are produced and interpreted through discursive lenses.

Fylkesnes (2018) in the article "Whiteness in teacher education research discourses: A review of the use and meaning making of the term cultural diversity" conducted a review of 67 studies using critical discourse analysis and critical Whiteness studies. The findings showed that the term 'cultural diversity' is often undefined or used in binary oppositions that produce a "racialized Other". The key argument is that despite promoting social justice, researchers often act as agents who reproduce the discursive ideology of white supremacy by failing to explicitly define and situate diversity.

Santoso (2018) in the study "Examining a News Discourse of a Female Politician in Indonesia: Fairclough's Model of Critical Discourse Analysis and its Implication in English Language Teaching" utilized Fairclough's three-dimensional model within a qualitative research paradigm. This study analyzed textual, discursive, and social practices in news reporting. The findings revealed that patriarchal ideology was enacted through a comparison of a female minister's qualifications with its male counterpart. The key argument is that CDA should be integrated into English classrooms through "consciousness-raising questions" to enhance students' critical thinking and ability to reveal hidden meanings.

Allo, Rahman, and Sultan (2020) in their article "A Critical Discourse Analysis on Lecturers' Language Power in EFL Teaching" conducted an ethnographic study focusing on lecturers' language power. The study was framed within Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Speech Act theory. The findings highlight how misunderstandings occur in EFL classrooms when spoken speech acts are inappropriate for learners' contexts. Their key argument is that lecturers' language power significantly influences learners' understanding, and that pedagogical success depends on appropriate discursive strategies.

Perangin-angin, Sinar, and Zein (2020) in their research "Interaksi Guru dan Siswa dalam Proses Belajar Mengajar di SMA Negeri 1 Medan Perspektif Analisis Wacana Kritis van Dijk (1993)" employed a qualitative method with a descriptive-interpretive approach. The research used van Dijk's (1993) Critical Discourse

Analysis framework, focusing on the macro-structure, super-structure, and micro-structure. The findings showed specific interaction patterns, where the micro-structure was dominated by nouns (38%) and the macro-structure consisted of seven distinct topics, such as greetings and motivation. The key argument is that teacher-student interactions are structured by social contexts that define power dynamics in the classroom (Perangin-angin, A. B., Sinar, T. S., & Zein, 2020).

Sulistiyo, Supiani, Kailani, and Lestariyana (2020) in their study "Infusing moral content into primary school English textbooks: A critical discourse analysis" used critical discourse analysis (CDA) framed in Hallidayan Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). They analyzed three nationally-adopted textbooks through lexical choices and images. The findings showed that values like "helping others," "politeness," and "caring" were predominant. Their key argument is that textbook writers discursively infuse specific moral values to align with the government's mandate for character-based education from an early age (Sulistiyo et al., 2020).

While existing literature has extensively explored Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in various educational contexts, there remains a paucity of research specifically addressing the social dimensions manifested in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom interactions. Previous studies have largely focused on isolating CDA from pedagogical frameworks or on unrelated methods such as Problem-Based Learning. This study addresses this gap by synthesizing the CDA frameworks of van Dijk (1997) and Fairclough (1995) to provide a comprehensive analysis of the power dynamics and social interactions between teachers and eighth-grade students during English instruction.

Thus, the purpose of this study is to determine the description of the social dimension that exists in the interactions between teachers and students in the classroom during English lessons that implement certain learning models. Then, we critically analyze the interaction patterns using the approaches of Teun A. van Dijk (1997) and Norman Fairclough (1995) to see the social dimension created and the ideology behind it. This study also aims to compare the theory and the actual implementation of how the social dimension is applied through teacher-student interactions, and to analyze how the social dimension depicted in the observed learning situation can affect student learning.

## II. METHODS

A. *Research Design*

This research is planned to be conducted at SMA Negeri 1 Kutacane, located on Iskandar Muda Street no. 2. This location was chosen because this study aimed to understand the dynamics of social interaction between teachers and students in English language learning, with a focus on the social dimensions manifested in these interactions. SMA Negeri 1 Kutacane, as an educational institution, provides a rich and relevant context for studying social interactions in a classroom setting. The interaction between teachers and students in the learning process is the main focus of this research, and SMA Negeri 1 Kutacane has representative classes in which to observe these interactions directly.

In addition, SMA Negeri 1 Kutacane was chosen as the research location because of its ease of access and availability of the required data. Researchers may have established communication and obtained permission from the school to conduct the research at this location. In addition, the availability of research subjects, namely teachers and eighth-grade students involved in English language learning, is an important consideration when choosing this location.

B. *Data and Data Source*

This research will collect data relevant to the dynamics of social interaction between teachers and students in English language learning, especially the teacher that initiates interaction with the students. These data will include all interactions between teachers and students in class XI of SMA Negeri 1 Kutacane during English teaching and learning. The data source for this research was an English teacher who teaches in class XI of SMA Negeri 1 Kutacane.

C. *Research Method*

Sugiyono (2010) states that qualitative research is used to examine natural contexts and, according to this statement, researchers have a function as key instruments. As this research aims to deeply understand and analyze the dynamics of social interaction between teachers and students in the context of English language learning with a focus on the social dimensions manifested in these interactions, this understanding will be explored through a qualitative and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of discourse that views language as a form of social practice (Fairclough, 1989, 1995; van Dijk, 1993, 2001). Unlike traditional discourse analysis, which often focuses on describing linguistic features, CDA aims to uncover hidden power relations,

ideologies, and social inequalities embedded in language use. CDA analysts examine how language is used to construct, maintain, and challenge social structure and power dynamics. In the context of student-centered learning, CDA can be a valuable tool for understanding how social dimensions (e.g., identity, culture, power, equity) influence the learning process and outcomes. By analyzing the language used by students and teachers in PBL activities, researchers can gain insights into how these dimensions are negotiated, reinforced, or challenged. This understanding can inform pedagogical practices that promote equitable and empowering learning experiences.

### D. *Data Collection  Technique*

The data in this study will be primarily collected through direct observation in class XII of SMA Negeri 1 Kutacane and then supported by documentation, where the researcher will record the learning activities in a video. The other data collection technique used by the researcher was semi-structured interviews. The following is a description of each of these techniques.

Observation is a method for gathering data by observing phenomena and providing evidence. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2010), observation is a method by which the researcher can see and hear what naturally occurs at the research site. Observations will be conducted in the classroom during English language learning to record the direct interactions between teachers and students.

An interview is an interactive process in which someone asks questions to obtain specific information (Adhabi & Anozie, 2018). According Kvale (1996), interviews are an endeavor to comprehend the world from the perspective of the subject, clarify the significance of peoples' experiences, and expose their lived world prior to the development of scientific interpretations. According to Holloway and Wheeler (1996), qualitative research generally employs unstructured or semi-structured interviews. Based on these opinions, interviews with teachers and students in this study were conducted to explore their understanding of the interactions that occur and the social dimensions involved.

The documentation technique here is in the form of recordings of the English learning process using the PBL model in class XII of SMA Negeri 1 Kutacane. This recording technique will be used to record interactions between English teachers and students during the PBL process. According to Penn-Edwards (2004), video recording is a credible tool for qualitative research. Thus, this study used a video recorder to assist the researcher in data collection. The recording device used to record the entire English learning process in the classroom was a handphone camera. After recording, the next stage took notes on the recordings using transcription results.

### E. *Data Collection Instrument*

The collected data, consisting of observations, interviews, and documents, were analyzed using Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña's (2014) approach. This approach involves three primary stages: data condensation, display, and conclusion drawing/verification.

 First, the data will be reduced, meaning that the vast amount of raw data from observations, interviews, and documents will be condensed and organized. This involves selecting, coding, and categorizing the data based on emerging themes and patterns related to the research focus on social dimensions within teacher-student interactions. Furthermore, the data will be analyzed using CDA, especially with Teun A. van Dijk (1997), Norman Fairclough (1995), and Michel Faucault (1969).

Next, the reduced data were displayed. This involves presenting the data in a structured and meaningful manner, such as through matrices, charts, networks, or narrative descriptions. The goal is to make the data accessible and to facilitate the identification of relationships and patterns.

Finally, the researcher draws conclusions from the displayed data and identifies key findings and insights regarding the social dimensions of interaction. These conclusions will be verified through an ongoing analysis and comparison with existing literature. The analysis will be iterative, allowing for refinement of interpretations as the researcher moves back and forth between the data and the emerging understanding.

Throughout the analysis process, the researcher will remain attentive to potential biases and strive for reflexivity, acknowledging their role in shaping the research process and interpretations. The goal is to provide a rich and nuanced understanding of the social dimensions of teacher-student interaction in the English language classroom, grounded in the lived experiences of the participants.

## III.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. *Research Design*

This section presents the research findings organized objectively to address the two primary research questions. The analysis first identified the social dimensions—specifically Power, Dominance, Access, and Control—

emerging within the classroom discourse of class XI PLUS D at SMAN 1 Kutacane, utilizing Teun van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis framework. Subsequently, this study explores how these dimensions are realized through micro-level linguistic features, such as lexical choices, grammatical structures, and interactional control, based on Norman Fairclough's framework. By categorizing the data across four separate meetings, this section provides a structural foundation for understanding the underlying power dynamics between teachers and students.

1. The Social Dimensions in Teacher-Student Interaction

This section addresses the first research question (RQ1): "What are the social dimensions utilized in the classroom discourse?" The primary objective here is to identify and categorize the various social elements that emerge during the pedagogical process, providing a structural foundation for understanding the underlying power dynamics between teachers and students. To achieve this, the study focused on the Identification of Social Dimensions by mapping the collected data against Teun van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis framework. This analysis specifically scrutinizes elements such as Power, Dominance, Access, and Control. By applying these categories, the researcher can discern how social influence is distributed—whether the teacher maintains traditional authority (dominance) or whether there is a democratic shift that allows students greater participation and influence over the discourse (Access and Control). The Data Presentation in this session utilizes tables and interactional categories to visualize these dimensions across four meetings. This is crucial for highlighting the pedagogical transition observed in the field: a shift from the teacher's role. In this section, the data are presented separately for each of the four meetings.

- Power and Dominance: The teacher holds full control over the validation of subject matter accuracy and the management of student behavior in the classroom.
- Access: The teacher provides students with access to participate in the discourse by asking them to explain their answers on a whiteboard.
- Control: The teacher controls the discussion topics (grammar) and determines who has the right to speak.

Table 1. Identification of Social Dimension M1

| Interaction Category | Activity Description | Data Evidence (Quotes) |
|---|---|---|
| Instructional (Power) | Direct commands for classroom management and task completion. | "Work individually (Kerjakan masing-masing)." <br><br> "The rest of you, do numbers 2 to 10." |
| Evaluative (Dominance) | Correcting student errors and maintaining academic standard. | "Wrong. Does it mean 'night' or 'last night'?" <br><br> "If it's erased... I won't accept the answer. It means it's fake." |
| Facilitative (Access) | Shifting the role to allow students to explain and lead parts of the lesson. | "Explain to your friends, show your answer." <br><br> "You explain number [at the front]." |
| Motivator (Role Shifting) | Reducing social distance to encourage participation and comfort. | "No problem... Sometimes we use Indonesian... it's okay." <br><br> "The most important thing is that you want to learn." |

- Power & Dominance: The teacher exerts authority by determining the "absolute truth" of grammar rules and controlling student behavior through strict instructions.

- Access: The teacher provides students with access to the discourse by involving them in answering questions and explaining materials on a whiteboard.
- Control: The teacher maintains interactional control by deciding on the topic, managing the time, and selecting which students are allowed to speak.

Table 2. Identification of Social Dimension M2

| Social Dimension | Interaction Category | Data Evidence (Quotes/Context) |
|---|---|---|
| Dominance | The Examiner | "Wrong. Does it mean 'night' or 'last night'?" 5/ "If it's erased... I won't accept the answer." 6 |
| Power | The Dictator | "Work individually. You, come forward." 7/ "The rest of you, do numbers 2 to 10." 8888 |
| Access | The Facilitator | "No problem... sometime we use Indonesian... so it's okay." 99 |
| Control | The Motivator | "The most important thing is that you want to learn." 10 / Giving a thumbs up or patting a student's shoulder. |

In this meeting, the social dimensions, according to van Dijk's theory, shift towards a more collaborative but still structured environment. The teacher used social status and psychological support to manage the class. The following are the definitions of Social Dimensions:

- Power (Social Labeling): The teacher uses the students' social identity as "Kelas Plus" (advanced/superior class) to set high performance standards and exert a "soft power" which motivates them through expectations.
- Access: The teacher provides broad access for students to negotiate the terms of their performance (e.g., asking for more preparation time).
- Control (Moderation): The teacher acts as a moderator, controlling the "audience" (other students) to ensure a supportive environment for the speaker.

Table 3. Identification of Social Dimension M3

| Social Dimension | Interaction Category | Data Evidence (Quotes/Context) |
|---|---|---|
| Power (Identity) | The High-Expectation Leader | "Coba, kalian ini kan kelas 'plus' kan? ... kelas unggulan." (Using status to exert pressure/motivation). |
| Access (Negotiation) | The Negotiator | Student: "Can we prepare for few more time?" Teacher: "Oke. No problem. I will give you 10 minutes." |
| Control (Safety) | The Protector of Space | "Hargai temannya yang maju ke depan. Didengar temannya." (Ensuring the speaker's psychological safety). |
| Shifting Role | The Appreciative Facilitator | "I really appreciate that you all have try your best." (Shifting from an instructor to a supporter). |

In meeting 4, the social dimensions are characterized by a "negotiation of power." While the teacher remains the final decision-maker, there is a visible opportunity for students to negotiate. The following are the Social Dimensions identified in this interaction:

- Power (Decision Making): The teacher holds the ultimate authority to determine the format and difficulty of a quiz.

- Access (Voice): Students are given the "platform" to argue for their preferences (Multiple Choice vs. essay), showing an increase in discursive access.
- Dominance (sanction): The teacher uses "moral sanctions" or intellectual teasing to maintain dominance when students fail to meet academic expectations.

Table 4. Identification of Social Dimension M4

| Social Dimension | Interaction Category | Data Evidence (Quotes/Context) |
|---|---|---|
| Power/Authority | The Final Arbiter | "Yaudahlah ya, kita essay aja. 5 soal aja." (Finalizing the decision after negotiation). |
| Access/Negotiation | The Open Negotiator | "Give me clear example why you guys choose multiple choice over essay?" (Inviting students to argue). |
| Dominance/Status | The Intellectual Critic | "Kalau soal yakal gitu juga gak tau, aduh.. padahal sudah dipelajari." (Exercising dominance through knowledge). |
| Shifting Role | The Flexible Authority | The teacher shifts from a rigid tester to a flexible negotiator by reducing the number of essay questions to accommodate student concerns. |

As the second meeting progresses, the teacher shifts into the dual roles of "The Dictator" and "The Examiner". Here, the teacher is viewed as the arbiter of "absolute truth' regarding linguistic rules, providing strict instructions followed by rigorous evaluations of student output. While the teacher still maintains tight control over time management and student selection, a subtle shift begins to emerge through the newfound Motivator Role. By using psychological cues such as thumbs-up gestures or physical pats, the teacher begins to bridge social distance, although the underlying power structure remains largely hierarchical.

The third meeting marked a significant transition toward Social Identity and Psychological Support. Rather than relying on overt commands, the teacher employs "soft power" by leveraging the students' identity as an advanced "Kelas Plus" group to foster high expectations. This shift allows for Negotiation of Access, where students feel empowered to request more preparation time. Simultaneously, the teacher's role evolves into that of a protector, ensuring the "audience" space is a psychologically safe zone for students to express themselves without fear of peer judgment.

By the final meeting, the classroom had reached a stage of Negotiation of Power, specifically regarding assessments. While the teacher retains the ultimate authority over decision-making, such as the final format of a quiz, the floor is open for students to argue their preferences and provide examples to support their choices. This represents the peak in discursive access to students. However, teachers still assert intellectual dominance through "intellectual teasing" or direct criticism if academic standards are not met, ensuring that the balance of power remains anchored in professional expertise.

To summarize the data, we synthesize the findings into a summary table, capturing the evolution of social dimensions across the four meetings based on Teun van Dijk's framework.

The findings indicate a significant pedagogical transition in classroom discourse, characterized by three key synthesis points. First, a clear Power Shift is observed as the interaction moves from the teacher's unilateral control and strict management in the initial meeting toward a negotiated power dynamic in the final meeting, where the teacher remains the final arbiter but allows for student input. Second, there is an Access Evolution regarding how students participate in the discourse; while they are initially granted access only to explain technical answers at the whiteboard, they eventually progress to influencing pedagogical decisions—such as the format of their own assessments—through "Voice" and active "Negotiation.'' Finally, the data highlight Role Fluidity, where the teacher shifts from a figure of "Dominance" and intellectual criticism to that of an appreciative facilitator and supporter, who reduces social distance to encourage learning.

This section addresses the second research question (RQ2): "How are these dimensions manifested in practice?" To provide a comprehensive answer, the researcher employed Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework, specifically focusing on the micro-level (textual analysis). This level of analysis

examines the specific linguistic properties of classroom discourse to uncover how teacher-student dynamics and pedagogical shifts are constructed through language.

The analysis is categorized into three primary linguistic pillars:

a) Lexical Choices

The researcher examined the specific vocabulary and diction used by teachers while facilitating class. A key focus is placed on the use of inclusive pronouns, such as "we" or "us," which can bridge the gap between teacher and student. Furthermore, the analysis distinguishes between the use of suggestive language (e.g., "How about we try...") versus imperative commands (e.g., "Do this now"), revealing whether the teacher adopts the role of a collaborator or traditional authority figure.

b) Grammatical Structures

This pillar focuses on the technical construction of sentences to identify efforts toward a student-centered approach. This includes:

- Modality: Analyzing the frequency and context of modal verbs such as can, may, and must determine the level of certainty, obligation, or permission granted to students.
- Voice (Active vs. Passive): Investigating how sentence structures attribute agency. For instance, passive constructions might be used to soften directives, whereas active structures might be used to empower student actions.

c) Turn-taking and Interactional Control

Finally, the researcher examined the flow of communication in the classroom. By analyzing turn-taking patterns, this study identifies who initiates conversations, who holds the floor, and how interruptions or transitions are managed. This reveals the underlying power dynamics, and whether the interactional space is truly shared or remains dominated by the teacher.

The findings of this session demonstrate that teachers use Soft Power. Instead of immediately shutting down student protests, the teacher uses laughter (laugh) and verbal challenges to make the students feel heard, even though the structural power (the choice of Essay) remains firmly with the teacher. This reflects a "negotiated control," in which student-centeredness is used as a pedagogical tool to maintain classroom harmony.

*B. Discussion*

This section delves into the socio-cognitive dimension of classroom discourse, moving beyond textual description to explore the underlying mental models and ideologies that govern teachers' linguistic choices. By analyzing the 'interface' between national pedagogical mandates and the teacher's personal cognition, this discussion reveals how deeply ingrained beliefs about authority and accuracy shape the practical implementation of Student-Centered Learning (SCL)

1. The Socio-Cognitive Link: Teacher's Ideology and Practice

In Teun van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), social cognition acts as the interface between social structures and discourse. It encompasses mental models, beliefs, and ideologies that govern how an individual produces language. This section analyzes teachers' mental representation of Student-Centered Learning (SCL) and how it dictates the linguistic choices observed across four meetings.

Based on the interviews conducted after each session, the teacher's socio-cognitive framework can be summarized as follows:

- Ideology of SCL: The teacher defines SCL primarily as a student activity, such as coming to the front to explain answers, rather than a full shift in authority.
- Role Perception: The teacher views their role as an "protector of accuracy" (especially in grammar) and a "motivator" for students who lack confidence.
- Social Labeling: The teacher holds a mental model of the class as "Kelas Plus" (advanced class), which justifies the use of higher academic pressure and "soft power" to maintain standards.
- Adaptive Strategy: The teacher believes in being flexible with rules (e.g., allowing Indonesian or preparation time) to prevent student "trauma" and keep them engaged.

Furthermore, in meeting 1, the Ideology of "Active Participation" vs. Absolute Truth is shown. The teacher's interview revealed a belief that SCL simply means students "must be active" and "think for themselves" think for themselves. However, this is countered by the cognitive belief that the teacher must maintain "full control over formulas and grammar" to prevent errors. This cognitive tension explains why the findings show a shift to a "Facilitator" role (asking students to explain at the board) while simultaneously maintaining "Dominance" through strict evaluative language like "Wrong... If it's erased, I won't accept it". The teacher's mental model of being the "gatekeeper of correctness" overrides the democratic ideal of SCL.

In meeting 2, Scaffolding and the Fear of Misunderstanding were shown. The teacher admitted to dictating definitions because students "forgot" or gave "incomplete" answers. Cognitively, the teacher prioritizes "correct and uniform notes" over the student-led discovery. This explains the high frequency of "The Dictator" and "The Examiner's roles in the findings. The use of the modality of obligation ("We need to...") and immediate interruptions in pronunciation reflect the teacher's cognitive fear that student errors will lead to collective misunderstanding.

Meanwhile, in meeting 3, Social Identity and Soft Power" strategy are shown in the learning interaction. The interview highlighted the strategic use of the statement of "Kelas Plus" as an identity-based motivator. The teacher's cognition shifts from direct command to "soft power," believing that internal motivation is more effective for advanced students. The findings show a significant realization of "Access" and "Negotiation". Because the teacher cognitively views the students as "capable but needing a push," they allow students to negotiate preparation time while using the "Kelas Plus" label to ensure that academic rigor is not lost.

Finally, in Meeting 4, the researcher found Mock Democracy and Negotiated Control in the interactions. The teacher explained that being flexible with student protests (about quiz formats) is a way to maintain "classroom harmony.'' However, the teacher still cognitively holds the "final arbiter" status to ensure the validity of the exam. This explains the "Controlled Open Discussion" and "Intellectual Teasing" found in the discourse. The teacher invites students to argue (Access), but cognitively dismisses their excuses as "creative" (Sarcasm) to ultimately enforce the original "Essay" plan.

According to Rukmini et al. (2018), Student-centered Learning (SCL) is an active learning approach in which students become the focus of teaching and learning. These methods comprise group discussions, problem-solving using real cases, and more egalitarian student-teacher relationships. When compared to this definition of Student-Centered Learning, which emphasizes student autonomy, shared decision-making, and the teacher as a co-learner, the teacher in this study faced several mental barriers:

- Fear of Losing Control:
- The teacher's habit of "silencing" other students or interrupting immediately shows a cognitive struggle to let go of traditional authority.
- The "Native Speaker" Complex:
- The teacher's cognition is heavily influenced by the fact that students are not native speakers, leading to a "protective" but "dominating" stance that limits students' discursive freedom.
- Instructional Habituation:
- Despite intending to be a facilitator, the teacher's deeply ingrained mental model of the "Grammar Expert" leads to a rigid adherence to the IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) pattern, which restricts genuine student-led inquiry.

In conclusion, the relationship of power here is not a simple imposition of authority, but a complex interaction where the teacher's Socio-Cognition (desire for SCL vs. fear of error) creates a "Negotiated Control.'' The teacher uses student-centeredness as a pedagogical tool to manage the class, rather than as a complete shift in the power structure.

2. The Relationship of Power and Ideology in Student-Centered Learning

The analysis moves beyond textual features to explore how broader social structures and ideologies shape classroom interaction through the lens of Fairclough's socio-cultural practices. Central to this discussion is an examination of power dynamics, specifically questioning whether teachers truly relinquish their 'power' or merely shift the form of their control.

In this section, the analysis moves beyond textual features to explore how broader social structures and ideologies shape classroom interaction.

a) Power Dynamics (Disguising Control):

The findings reveal that the teacher does not truly relinquish power; instead, there is a "negotiation of power" where control is merely disguised. While the teacher provides "Access" by inviting students to argue their preferences, they remain the "final arbiter.'' This aligns with Nurhayati's (2007) research, which illustrates teacher hegemony through the manifestation of authority as a disciplinarian and knowledge provider, even when intending to be facilitative. Furthermore, the teacher's use of "soft power" through the "Kelas Plus" label echoes the key argument of Perangin-angin et al. (2020), who state that teacher-student interactions are fundamentally structured by social contexts that define power dynamics.

b) Ideology of Education (Internalization of SCL):

Indonesia's national curriculum policy, particularly through Kurikulum Merdeka implemented in 2022, places student-centered learning at its core to foster holistic student development. This approach shifts the educational paradigm from teacher-dominated instruction to one in which students actively drive their

learning process. Teachers transition from traditional lecturers to facilitators, encouraging daily classroom interactions that prioritize student engagement, curiosity, and creativity.

The curriculum mandates learning experiences tailored to student contexts, such as project-based activities addressing real-world problems and self-reflection practices. Students explore their interests through collaborative tasks, moving away from passive information absorption toward active knowledge construction. This internalization ensures that lessons connect directly to students' lives, promoting relevance and motivation in everyday school routines (Hidayat et al., 2025).

Moreover, according to Kemendikbud, in practice, teachers internalize this model by designing interactive daily activities such as group discussions, simulations, and hands-on experiments linked to students' real-life experiences. The process begins by observing students' interests, followed by formative assessments to adapt flexibly to instructions. These strategies embed student-centered principles into routine interactions, making learning dynamic and personalized rather than rigid and uniform. This policy transforms daily interactions into bidirectional dialogue, where students actively question, debate, and reflect on their experiences, building skills, and character. Furthermore, the ideology of Student-Centered Learning (SCL) is often internalized as a pedagogical tool to maintain harmony rather than a democratic shift in authority.

Based on the data, however, the teacher's cognitive tension—believing students "must be active" while remaining the "gatekeeper of correctness"—suggests that national curriculum mandates for SCL face "ideological friction.'' This supports Sultan's (2016) argument that teachers often control interactions through labeling and emphasizing authority, even when trying to develop qualified relationships. Teachers' focus on "moral sanctions" and "intellectual teasing" further reflects how language functions as a tool for constructing specific classroom agendas, as suggested by Lazhar et al. (2024).

3. Theory vs. Actual Implementation

This section compares the idealized framework of SCL with the practical reality observed in Class XI PLUS D.

a) Comparison with Ideal Theory:

Theoretically, SCL involve a more egalitarian relationship and shared decision-making. However, the data shows a "Mock Democracy" where the teacher invites discussion but ultimately enforces the original plan. This gap is evident in the persistent use of the IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) pattern, which restricts genuine student-led inquiry. This finding reinforces Nurhayati's (2007) observation of an imbalance of power, in which teachers dominate the discourse despite desiring deeper student participation.

b) The Cultural and Cognitive Barriers:

The gap between theory and practice is driven by the teacher's "Fear of Losing Control" and "Instructional Habituation.'' The teacher's cognitive fear that student errors will lead to collective misunderstanding results in a high frequency of "The Dictator" and "The Examiner" roles. This reflects a socio-cultural reality in which the teacher prioritizes "uniform notes" over discovery. These results mirror the findings of Egorychev et al. (2021), who identified value disruptions and deep-seated personal-professional motivations as significant barriers to efficient educational alignment. While SCL theory promotes autonomy, the actual implementation is anchored in the teacher's professional expertise and "protective" dominance.

Based on the synthesis of findings from four meetings, which indicate that teacher power is often reconfigured rather than truly relinquished, the following specific suggestions are provided to bridge the gap between Student-Centered Learning (SCL) theory and classroom practice:

1. Communication Strategies to Support Student Initiative

To move beyond "Pseudo-Democracy" and foster genuine student agency, teachers are encouraged to adopt the following strategies.

- Diversification of Lexical Choices:
  Teachers should reduce reliance on imperative verbs (commands) for task control (e.g., 'Write this down'). Instead, they should increase the use of suggestive and inclusive language, such as "we," to build rapport and frame the learning process as a collaborative journey.

- Shifting Modality from Obligation to Possibility:
  Teachers are advised to decrease the use of high-obligation modalities (such as "must" or "need to") which often reflect a cognitive fear of collective misunderstanding. Utilizing conditional modalities (such as "What if we...?") allows students to feel that their input can influence pedagogical decisions such as assessment formats.

- Moving Beyond IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) Patterns:
  Teachers must consciously break the rigid IRF cycle, where they consistently initiate and close every exchange. By providing space for student-initiated negotiation, teachers can transition from the role of

"Gatekeeper of Truth" to a true facilitator, giving students the opportunity to lead discussions without instant evaluative interruptions.

## 2. Interaction Patterns to Reduce Student Psychological Barriers

Research findings indicate that "intellectual teasing," sarcasm, and fear of making mistakes often act as barriers to student engagement. The following patterns are recommended for creating a safer discursive space:

- Institutionalizing the "Space Protector" Role:
  As observed in Meeting 3, teachers must actively serve as protectors of the psychological space by enforcing the rules of mutual respect (e.g., "Respect your friend"). This mitigates fear of peer judgment and allows students to express underdeveloped thoughts without social risk.
- Prioritizing Positive Reinforcement over Moral Sanctions:
  Rather than exercising dominance through sanctions or sarcasm when students fail to meet expectations, teachers should prioritize an appreciative lexicon (e.g., 'I really appreciate your effort'). This "soft power" should be used to motivate, rather than dismissing student excuses as merely being "creative."
- Constructive Utilization of Social Identity:
  The use of social labels such as "Plus Class" should be harnessed as a positive motivator for self-efficacy, rather than merely a tool for academic pressure. By viewing students as individuals who are "capable but in need of encouragement," teachers can foster a classroom culture where negotiation is a standard practice, not just a tool for maintaining temporary harmony.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) conducted on teacher-student interactions in the English classroom, the following conclusions are drawn to address the research objectives, The research identifies four primary social dimensions within the classroom discourse: Power, Access, Dominance, and Control. The analysis reveals that these dimensions do not operate in isolation but rather exist in a dynamic state of flux. Initially, the interaction is heavily characterized by traditional hierarchical authority, where the teacher exerts Power through a "Dictator" persona and Dominance through an "Examiner" role, particularly when enforcing rigid grammatical rules and behavioral standards. However, as the learning sessions progressed, there was a visible shift toward the dimensions of Access and Control. In this phase, the teacher transitions into the roles of a "Facilitator," "Negotiator," and "Motivator." This indicates that social dimensions in the classroom are not static; they oscillate between strict hierarchical authority and collaborative engagement, depending on the pedagogical goals of the moment. These social dimensions are realized through specific micro-level linguistic features and strategic interactional patterns. The dimensions of Power and Dominance are manifested through the frequent use of imperative sentences, direct commands, and the teacher's self-positioning as the sole arbiter of "absolute truth" regarding linguistic accuracy. Conversely, Access is realized when the teacher intentionally opens the "discursive floor," inviting students to express personal opinions, negotiate preparation timelines, or participate in choosing quiz formats. Control is exercised through a sophisticated blend of disciplinary measures and psychological support. The teacher utilizes "soft power" by leveraging the students' specific identity as an advanced "Kelas Plus" group, effectively using their high-status academic identity to set high expectations and maintain order without overt aggression. The realization of these dimensions is driven by the teacher's underlying socio-cognition and a fundamental tension between two conflicting ideologies: the pedagogical desire for Student-Centered Learning (SCL) and the professional fear of losing classroom control. The teacher employs a strategy of "negotiated control" due to deeply ingrained mental models, specifically the "Grammar Expert" role and the "Native Speaker Complex," which naturally leads to a protective and dominating stance over the language. Furthermore, the teacher views student-centeredness primarily as a functional pedagogical tool to maintain "classroom harmony, rather than a philosophical commitment to surrendering authority. This results in a state of "Mock Democracy," where the appearance of student agency is maintained, yet the teacher remains the final and undisputed arbiter of all classroom discourse. Finally, this study identified a notable gap between the theoretical framework of Student-Centered Learning (SCL) and its actual implementation in the classroom. While SCL theory emphasizes student autonomy and the cultivation of an egalitarian relationship, practical reality reveals that teachers often struggle to relinquish traditional authority. This struggle is evidenced by frequent "silencing" or interruption of students, a result of long-standing instructional habituation. Although the teacher successfully incorporated elements of collaboration, the interaction remained largely constrained by the traditional IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) pattern. This structure inherently limits genuine student-led inquiries compared with the ideal SCL model. Consequently, the social dimension in practice is best described as a hybrid, a complex overlap of traditional pedagogical hierarchy and modern facilitative techniques.

### Ethical Compliance

All procedures performed in this study involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

## Data Access Statement
No datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study

## Conflict of Interest Declaration
The authors declare that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

## REFERENCES

[1] Aminah, D. (2020). *Dinamika Interaksi Guru dan Siswa Pada Pembelajaran Produk Kreatif dan Kewirausahaan Kelas XI Akutansi di SMKN 3 Sukoharjo (Bachelor's Thesis, University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta).*

[2] Austral, N. T., A. Rosales, M. T., & Almazan, R. C. M. (2023). Social-Emotional Learning and Social Dimensions of Pre-Service Teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, *06*(06). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v6-i6-12

[3] Egorychev, A. M., Akhtyan, A. G., Ananishnev, V. M., Levina, I. D., Suyskaya, V. S., & Tyutchenko, A. M. (2021). Social dimension of modern higher school teachers` personality. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(S3), 1606–1618. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS3.1831

[4] Hadiyanto, O., Pelupessy, P. J.,  et al. (2024). *Dinamika Interaksi Sosial Dalam Pembelajaran Di Mtss Al Madinah Kecamatan Sirimau Kota Ambon. Jurnal Darma Agung, 32(4). 49-59.*

[5] Hewad Mal, M. R., & Sen, L. (2025). Breast Cancer in Afghan Women: A Systematic Review of Awareness, Screening Practices, and Risk Factors. *Journal of Epidemiology and Global Health*, *15*(1), 91. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44197-025-00427-5

[6] Ilias, V., Aikaterini, D., & Spyros, K. (2020). THE SOCIAL DIMENSION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION: SPECIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PUPILS WITH MILD INTELLECTUAL DISABILITIES TALK ABOUT THEIR EXPERIENCE FROM A SOCIAL CO-EXISTENCE PROGRAM. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.46827/ejse.v6i2.3236

[7] Khambatta, F. (2025). Classroom Questioning and Critical Thinking. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, *7*(5). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i05.58936

[8] Lazhar, S.,  et al. (2024). *Critical Discourse Analysis in English Language Teaching: The American President Speech at the 2023 National Safer Communities Summit. Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers JETT, 15(2). 85-92.*

[9] Mujiono, M., Haq, Z. (2023). *Dimensi Sosial Dalam Al-Qur'an (Studi Analisis Kitab al-Ḥayâh fî AlQur'ân al-Karîm Karya Ahzami Samiun Jazuli). Fassara: Jurnal Kajian Al-Qur'an, Tafsir dan Qiraa, 1(1). 70-92.*

[10] Nurlaily, V. A., Soegiyanto, H., & Usodo, B. (2019). ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER'S OBSTACLES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING MODEL IN MATHEMATICS LEARNING. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *10*(2), 229–238. https://doi.org/10.22342/jme.10.2.5386.229-238

[11] Panchenko, L. F., Korzhov, H. O., Khomiak, A. O., Velychko, V. Ye., & Soloviev, V. N. (2022). *Social dimension of higher education: Definition, indicators, models. In CTE Workshop Proceedings (Vol. 9, pp. 124–138). Academy of Cognitive and Natural Sciences.* https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.55056/cte.v9i1.2986

[12] Perangin-angin, A. B., Sinar, T. S., & Zein, T. T. (2020). *Interaksi guru dan siswa dalam proses belajar mengajar di SMA Negeri 1 Medan perspektif analisis wacana kritis van Dijk (1993). Linguistik.*

[13] Saputri. (2023). *Memahami Hubungan Interaksi Antara Guru dan Siswa Pada Siswa Kelas X SMA Muhammadiyah 4 Yogyakarta. Seminar Nasional Pengenalan Lapangan Persekolahan UAD, 4(1). 1728-1735.*

[14] Sulistiyo, U., Supiani, S., Kailani, A., & Lestariyana, R. P. D. (2020). Infusing moral content into primary school English textbooks: A critical discourse analysis. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(1), 251–260. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i1.25067

[15] Utami, P. & Wandini, R. R. (2023). *Kesulitan Penerapan Problem Based Learning Dalam*

*Pembelajaran Matematika Kelas V SDN 101767. Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai, 7(3). 30573-30577.*
https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v7i3.11946

[16]     Yakin, N. (2023). *Dinamika Interaksi Sosial Guru dan Siswa Dalam Pembentukan Karakter Islami di MTS. Miftahul Ulum Desa Desa Jarin Kabupaten Pamekasan. Bayan Lin Naas: Jurnal Dakwah Islam, 7(2). 99-114.*