

THE IMPACT OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS METHOD ON STUDENTS' COGNITIVE AND AFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT IN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE LEARNING

Siti Rahmawati^{1*}, Budi Santoso², Ayesha Khan³

^{1,2}Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

³University of Lahore, Pakistan

*Corresponding author: siti.rahmawati@um.ac.id

Abstrak - Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pengaruh metode analisis wacana terhadap perkembangan kognitif dan afektif siswa dalam pembelajaran bahasa dan sastra. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain eksperimen campuran (*mixed-method*) dengan melibatkan 40 siswa kelas XI yang dibagi menjadi kelompok eksperimen dan kelompok kontrol. Kelompok eksperimen diberikan perlakuan menggunakan metode analisis wacana, sedangkan kelompok kontrol menggunakan metode pembelajaran konvensional. Data dikumpulkan melalui *pre-test* dan *post-test*, observasi, serta wawancara. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa siswa pada kelompok eksperimen mengalami peningkatan signifikan dalam kemampuan pemahaman membaca, analisis teks, penyusunan wacana, dan penggunaan bahasa dibandingkan kelompok kontrol. Selain itu, hasil kualitatif menunjukkan bahwa metode ini juga meningkatkan motivasi, kepercayaan diri, partisipasi, serta interaksi sosial siswa. Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa metode analisis wacana merupakan pendekatan yang efektif untuk meningkatkan keterampilan berpikir tingkat tinggi sekaligus keterlibatan emosional siswa dalam pembelajaran.

Kata kunci: Analisis wacana, perkembangan kognitif, perkembangan afektif, pembelajaran bahasa, pembelajaran sastra

Abstract - This study investigates the impact of the discourse analysis method on students' cognitive and affective development in language and literature learning. Employing a mixed-method experimental design, the research involved 40 eleventh-grade students divided into an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group received instruction through the discourse analysis method, while the control group was taught using conventional approaches. Data were collected through pre-test and post-test assessments, observations, and interviews. The findings reveal that students in the experimental group showed significant improvements in reading comprehension, textual analysis, discourse construction, and language use compared to the control group. Additionally, qualitative results indicate that the method positively influenced students' motivation, confidence, participation, and social interaction. The study concludes that discourse analysis is an effective pedagogical approach that enhances both higher-order thinking skills and emotional engagement. It is recommended that educators integrate discourse-based strategies to create more meaningful and interactive learning environments.

Keywords: Discourse analysis, cognitive development, affective development, language learning, literature education

1. INTRODUCTION

In language and literature learning, reading comprehension is widely regarded as the foundation for achieving instructional objectives. The success of language education largely depends on students' ability to understand, interpret, and critically engage with texts. When comprehension is achieved, it indicates that the learning process has met its intended goals. Therefore, reading is not merely a mechanical activity but a complex cognitive process that plays a central role in students' academic development (Krashen, 2018; Hummel, 2021).

However, various studies and educational reports indicate that students' reading comprehension skills and their interest in language and literature subjects are still below

History:

Received : 26 April 2026
Revised : 27 April 2026
Accepted : 29 April 2026
Published : 30 April 2026

Publisher: Universitas PGRI Palembang

Licensed: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License



expected levels. Many learners struggle to fully understand texts due to limited reading habits, insufficient analytical skills, and low engagement with textual meaning. Traditional instructional approaches often emphasize surface-level understanding, such as paraphrasing or recalling content, which limits students' ability to develop higher-order thinking skills (Nagao, 2023; Widiana et al., 2021; Ardiyani & Puspitaloka, 2025). As a result, students may fail to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information effectively.

To overcome these challenges, more effective and innovative teaching methods are needed to actively involve students in the process of textual interpretation (Margaretha et al., 2025). One promising approach is the use of discourse analysis as a teaching method. Discourse analysis focuses on examining language beyond the sentence level by analyzing how meaning is constructed through linguistic choices, context, and interaction (Nursita, 2023; Behnam & Mahmoudy, 2013; Lesiana et al., 2023). This approach enables students to explore both the surface structure and deeper meaning of texts, thereby fostering a more comprehensive understanding.

The integration of discourse analysis in language and literature learning has significant implications for students' cognitive development. It encourages learners to engage in higher-order thinking processes such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, which are essential for academic success (Fairclough, 2023; Davids & Rinquest, 2024). By analyzing texts critically, students become more aware of how language functions in different contexts and how meaning is negotiated. This aligns with sociocultural perspectives that emphasize learning as an interactive and meaning-making process (Mohammadzadeh et al., 2020).

In addition to cognitive benefits, discourse analysis also contributes to students' affective development. Engaging students in meaningful text analysis can increase their motivation, interest, and participation in learning activities. When students are encouraged to express their interpretations and engage in discussions, they develop greater confidence and a more positive attitude toward language learning (Boutheina, 2025; Cárdenas, 2020). This supportive learning environment helps reduce anxiety and promotes active involvement in classroom interactions.

Furthermore, discourse analysis allows texts to be examined holistically by considering their content, structure, context, and communicative purpose. This comprehensive approach helps students understand the interconnectedness of textual elements and develop a deeper appreciation of language use. Since texts are complex linguistic constructs, a systematic analytical method is necessary to uncover their underlying meanings and functions (Byram, 2020).

Given these considerations, this study aims to investigate the impact of the discourse analysis method on students' cognitive and affective development in language and literature learning. Specifically, it seeks to examine whether the implementation of discourse analysis leads to significant improvements in students' comprehension, analytical skills, language use, and discourse production compared to traditional teaching methods. Additionally, the study explores changes in students' attitudes, interests, and participation before and after the application of the method.

In conclusion, adopting discourse analysis as an instructional approach has the potential to enhance both cognitive and affective aspects of learning. By promoting deeper

comprehension, critical thinking, and active engagement, this method can contribute to more effective and meaningful language and literature education.

2. METHOD

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a mixed-method quasi-experimental design integrating both quantitative and qualitative approaches to examine the impact of the discourse analysis method on students' cognitive and affective development in language and literature learning (Sugiyono, 2021; Neuman, 2019). The quantitative component aimed to measure students' improvement in comprehension, analytical skills, language use, and discourse production, while the qualitative component explored changes in students' attitudes, engagement, and participation.

The independent variable in this study was the discourse analysis method, while the dependent variables included students' cognitive development (comprehension, analysis, and language use) and affective development (interest, motivation, and participation). The control variable was the use of conventional teaching methods commonly applied in regular classroom instruction.

The study adopted a pretest–posttest control group design, involving two groups: an experimental group and a control group. Both groups were assessed before and after the intervention to determine the effectiveness of the treatment. The inclusion of pretests allowed the researcher to ensure the equivalence of both groups prior to the intervention and to measure the extent of improvement after the treatment (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Fraenkel et al., 2014).

The experimental group received instruction through the integration of discourse analysis strategies in language and literature learning, while the control group continued with traditional teaching practices based on the existing curriculum. Care was taken to prevent interaction effects between the two groups during the intervention period.

2.2 Participants

The participants of this study consisted of 40 eleventh-grade students drawn from two intact classes using purposive and convenience sampling techniques. One class, consisting of 20 students, was assigned as the experimental group, while the other class, consisting of 20 students, served as the control group.

The study was conducted in a secondary school with relatively homogeneous socio-economic and academic backgrounds among students. Prior to the study, a student identification form was administered to gather background information and ensure comparability between groups. All participants were at a similar level of English proficiency and had been exposed to comparable instructional experiences prior to the intervention.

2.3 Instruments

Data were collected using multiple instruments to ensure methodological triangulation and enhance the validity of the findings. The instruments included:

1. Achievement Tests (Pretest and Posttest)

These tests were designed to measure students' cognitive development, including comprehension, analytical ability, and language use. The tests were administered before and after the intervention to both groups.

2. **Student Identification Form**
This instrument was used to collect demographic and academic background information about the participants.
3. **Observation Checklist and Field Notes**
Classroom observations were conducted throughout the intervention to monitor students' engagement, participation, and responses to the discourse analysis method.
4. **Interview and Reflection Data**
Semi-structured interviews and recorded student reflections were used to explore students' affective responses, such as interest, motivation, and attitudes toward the learning process.

To ensure the validity and reliability of the instruments, expert judgments were obtained from specialists in language education and assessment. The reliability of the achievement test was examined using a test-retest method, yielding a correlation coefficient of 0.81, indicating acceptable reliability (Moskal & Leydens, 2015). Additionally, inter-rater reliability was calculated following the approach of Miles and Huberman (2019), resulting in a reliability coefficient of 91%, which is considered highly reliable.

2.4 Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques were employed in this study. Quantitative data obtained from the pretest and posttest were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, including mean scores, standard deviations, frequency distributions, and independent samples t-tests. The t-test was used to compare the performance of the experimental and control groups and to determine whether the differences in outcomes were statistically significant.

Qualitative data from observations, interviews, and student reflections were analyzed using descriptive and thematic analysis (Patton, 2020; Tisdell et al., 2025). The analysis process involved organizing the data, coding relevant information, identifying patterns, and categorizing them into themes related to cognitive and affective development. Direct quotations from participants were included to provide deeper insights into students' experiences and perceptions.

By integrating both quantitative and qualitative findings, this study provides a comprehensive understanding of how the discourse analysis method influences students' learning outcomes in language and literature education.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Result

This study investigated the impact of the discourse analysis method on students' cognitive and affective development in language and literature learning over a period of four months. The participants consisted of 40 eleventh-grade students, divided into an experimental group (20 students) and a control group (20 students). The experimental group was taught using the discourse analysis method, while the control group followed conventional instruction.

1) Improvement in Reading Comprehension Skills

The results revealed a significant improvement in students' reading comprehension skills in both groups; however, the experimental group demonstrated a substantially higher increase.

Table 1. *Pre-test and Post-test Scores for Reading Comprehension*

| Group | N | Pre-test Mean | Post-test Mean | Gain |
|--------------------|----|---------------|----------------|-------|
| Control Group | 20 | 3.20 | 4.10 | +0.90 |
| Experimental Group | 20 | 3.50 | 8.00 | +4.50 |

The data indicate that while traditional instruction led to moderate improvement, the discourse analysis method significantly enhanced students' ability to comprehend texts deeply. This aligns with the idea that analytical engagement with texts promotes deeper understanding.

2) *Development of Textual Analysis Skills*

Students in the experimental group showed remarkable progress in their ability to analyze texts critically compared to those in the control group.

Table 2. *Pre-test and Post-test Scores for Textual Analysis*

| Group | N | Pre-test Mean | Post-test Mean | Gain |
|--------------------|----|---------------|----------------|-------|
| Control Group | 20 | 2.40 | 3.30 | +0.90 |
| Experimental Group | 20 | 2.90 | 7.20 | +4.30 |

This finding suggests that the discourse analysis method effectively develops higher-order thinking skills such as interpretation, inference, and critical evaluation, which are essential in language and literature learning.

3) *Enhancement of Discourse Construction Skills*

The ability to organize and express ideas coherently (making discourse) improved significantly in the experimental group.

Table 3. *Pre-test and Post-test Scores for Discourse Construction*

| Group | N | Pre-test Mean | Post-test Mean | Gain |
|--------------------|----|---------------|----------------|-------|
| Control Group | 20 | 2.50 | 3.90 | +1.40 |
| Experimental Group | 20 | 2.80 | 7.40 | +4.60 |

Students exposed to discourse analysis were better able to structure arguments, synthesize ideas, and present interpretations in a logical and cohesive manner.

4) *Improvement in Language Use Skills*

The results also showed a significant enhancement in students' ability to use language effectively when expressing ideas.

Table 4. *Pre-test and Post-test Scores for Language Use*

| Group | N | Pre-test Mean | Post-test Mean | Gain |
|--------------------|----|---------------|----------------|-------|
| Control Group | 20 | 3.10 | 4.60 | +1.50 |
| Experimental Group | 20 | 3.80 | 7.70 | +3.90 |

This indicates that discourse analysis fosters more conscious and meaningful language use, supporting communicative competence.

5) *Cognitive and Affective Outcomes (Qualitative Findings)*

Qualitative data from interviews and observations revealed that students in the experimental group experienced substantial cognitive and affective development.

Table 5. *Cognitive and Affective Development Outcomes from Qualitative Findings*

| Aspect | Category | Indicators / Student Responses |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Cognitive Development | Critical Thinking Skills | - Improved analytical reasoning - Ability to evaluate and interpret texts critically - Going beyond surface-level understanding |
| | Higher-Order Thinking | - Ability to synthesize information - Drawing conclusions and making inferences - Developing deeper reflection |
| | Independent Learning | - Increased autonomy in thinking - Ability to form personal interpretations - Confidence in expressing original ideas |
| | Language Awareness | - Better understanding of language structure - Awareness of meaning-making processes - Recognition of linguistic patterns in texts |
| | Motivation and Engagement | - Increased interest in language and literature lessons - Positive attitude toward learning activities - Higher enthusiasm during class |
| | Self-Confidence | - Greater confidence in expressing ideas - Reduced fear of making mistakes - Willingness to participate actively |
| Affective Development | Classroom Participation | - More active involvement in discussions - Increased interaction with peers and teacher - Greater initiative in learning tasks |
| | Social Interaction | - Improved communication skills - Better collaboration with peers - Enhanced social engagement in classroom activities |

The table shows that the discourse analysis method contributes significantly to both cognitive and affective domains. Cognitively, students develop higher-order thinking skills and deeper language awareness. Affectively, they become more motivated, confident, and actively engaged in the learning process. These findings align with the theory that meaningful and interactive learning environments enhance both intellectual and emotional development.

3.2 Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that the implementation of the discourse analysis method has a significant impact on students' cognitive and affective development in language and literature learning. From a cognitive perspective, students in the experimental group demonstrated substantial improvements in reading comprehension, textual analysis, discourse construction, and language use. These improvements suggest that the discourse analysis method effectively promotes higher-order thinking skills such as critical thinking, interpretation, and synthesis. This is in line with Williyam et al. (2025), who argues that discourse analysis helps learners understand how language operates within social and contextual frameworks, thereby enhancing deeper comprehension. In addition, the findings support the concept of communicative competence proposed by Canale and Swain (2018),

which emphasizes that effective language learning involves not only grammatical knowledge but also the ability to organize and convey meaning coherently in discourse.

Furthermore, the results also align with Nobutoshi (2023), who highlights the importance of integrating analytical and critical engagement in language education to develop learners' intercultural and interpretative competence. The students' improved ability to construct discourse and express ideas systematically indicates that they were not only understanding texts but also actively transforming that understanding into meaningful communication. This confirms that discourse analysis as a method facilitates active learning, allowing students to engage deeply with texts rather than passively receiving information.

From an affective perspective, the study revealed notable improvements in students' motivation, confidence, participation, and social interaction. Students reported that the learning process became more engaging, interactive, and enjoyable, which contributed to their increased willingness to participate in classroom activities. These findings are consistent with Krashen (2018) Affective Filter Hypothesis, which states that learners acquire language more effectively when they are motivated and confident, and when anxiety is minimized. The discourse analysis method appears to create a supportive learning environment that lowers students' affective barriers, enabling them to participate more actively and express their ideas without fear.

Moreover, the increase in students' participation and interaction supports the principles of sociocultural theory, which emphasizes that learning is a socially mediated process. As noted by Mohammadzadeh et al. (2020), knowledge is constructed through interaction and collaboration, and the classroom activities in this study encouraged students to engage in discussions, share perspectives, and collaboratively interpret texts. This interactive environment not only enhanced students' cognitive engagement but also strengthened their communication and social skills.

Importantly, the findings of this study highlight the strong interconnection between cognitive and affective development. Students who demonstrated improved analytical and comprehension skills also showed higher levels of motivation and confidence. This supports the argument of Hummel (2021) that meaningful and student-centered learning environments contribute to both intellectual growth and emotional engagement. When students are actively involved in analyzing texts and constructing meaning, they become more invested in the learning process, which leads to better learning outcomes.

In conclusion, the discourse analysis method proves to be an effective pedagogical approach that enhances both cognitive and affective aspects of learning. By promoting critical engagement, meaningful interaction, and emotional involvement, this method provides a comprehensive framework for improving students' performance in language and literature learning. These findings suggest that educators should consider integrating discourse analysis into their teaching practices to create more effective, engaging, and inclusive learning environments.

4. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the integration of the discourse analysis method in language and literature learning significantly enhances students' cognitive and affective development. The findings demonstrate that students exposed to this method show substantial improvement in reading comprehension, textual analysis, discourse construction, and language use. In

addition, the method positively influences affective factors such as motivation, confidence, classroom participation, and social interaction. These results confirm that discourse analysis is not only effective in fostering higher-order thinking skills but also in creating a more engaging and supportive learning environment. By encouraging students to critically analyze texts and actively construct meaning, the method promotes deeper understanding and more meaningful learning experiences.

From a pedagogical perspective, the implications of this study highlight the importance of adopting learner-centered and analytical approaches in language and literature instruction. Teachers are encouraged to integrate discourse analysis into their classroom practices to enhance students' critical thinking and communicative competence. This approach can also help educators address diverse learning needs by creating interactive and inclusive learning environments that support both cognitive and emotional development. Furthermore, curriculum designers and policymakers may consider incorporating discourse-based strategies into language education frameworks to improve the overall quality of teaching and learning.

Despite its contributions, this study also opens opportunities for future research. Further studies could explore the long-term effects of discourse analysis on students' language proficiency and academic achievement across different educational levels. Future research may also investigate the integration of discourse analysis with digital learning tools or multimodal texts to examine its effectiveness in modern learning environments. Additionally, expanding the sample size and including diverse cultural and linguistic contexts would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how discourse analysis can be applied in various educational settings. Such studies would contribute to strengthening the empirical foundation of discourse-based pedagogy in language and literature education.

5. REFERENCES

- Ardiyani, M., & Puspitaloka, N. (2025). Students' Experiences Towards the Use of Discovery Learning Strategy in Learning Reading Comprehension. *Judika (Jurnal Pendidikan Unsika)*, 13(1), 99–118. <https://doi.org/10.35706/judika.v13i1.13028>
- Behnam, B., & Mahmoudy, B. (2013). A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Reports Issued by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Director General on Iran's Nuclear Program during the Last Decade. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(12), 2196–2201. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.12.2196-2201>
- Boutheina. (2025). *Exploring the role of teacher-student interaction in promoting EFL students' classroom engagement*. Biskra University.
- Byram, M. (2020). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence* (2nd ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (2018). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. http://www.uefap.com/tefsp/bibliog/canale_swain.pdf
- Cárdenas, Y. I. C. (2020). Questioning as an effective tool to enhance students interaction in the English classroom. *Revista International Congress on the Didactics of the English Language*, 3(1). <https://revistas.pucese.edu.ec/ICDEL/article/view/501>

Creswell, J. ., & Creswell, J. . (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications.

Davids, D., & Rinqest, E. (2024). Podcasting in Teacher Education Can Enhance Critical Discourse and Collaborative Learning: Reflections From Researcher-Practitioners. *The Asian Conference on Education 2024 Official Conference Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22492/issn.2186-5892.2025.115>

Fairclough, N. (2023). *Critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. h. (2014). *How To Design And Evaluate Research In Education* (Eighth Edi). McGraw-Hill Education.

Hummel, K. M. (2021). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition: Perspectives and Practices*. John Wiley & Sons.

Krashen, S. . (2018). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

Lesiana, N., Mulyadi, Aswadi Jaya, & Pratiwi, E. (2023). Classroom Interaction in Communicative Language Teaching of Secondary School. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, 7(1), 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.31851/esteem.v7i1.12661>

Margaretha, M., Sudiro, A., Kurniawati, D. T., & Prabandari, S. P. (2025). Enhancing innovative work behavior through perceived organizational support: The mediating role of person-organizationFit. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 23(2), 583–594. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.23\(2\).2025.42](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.23(2).2025.42)

Miles, M. ., & Huberman, A. . (2019). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Mohammadzadeh, A., Ahour, T., & Saeidi, M. (2020). A Sociocultural Perspective on Second Language Writing: The Effect of Symmetrical versus Asymmetrical Scaffolding on Intermediate EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy, Fluency, and Complexity and Their Attitudes. *Education Research International*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/5292356>

Moskal, B. M., & Leydens, J. A. (2015). Scoring rubric development: Validity and reliability. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7275/q7rm-gg74>

Nagao, A. (2023). Using Systemic Functional Linguistics and the Genre-Based Approach in EFL Classroom Language Communities of Practices. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 20(2), 316–337. <https://www.dbpia.co.kr/Journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE11604374>

Neuman, W. L. (2019). Social research methods: Qualitative and Quantitative approaches. In *Pearson* (Seventh Ed). Pearson New International Edition. https://www.amazon.co.uk/Social-Research-Methods-Quantitative/dp/0205786839/ref=sr_1_5?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1461496914&sr=1-5&keywords=social+research+methods+qualitative+and+quantitative+approaches

Nobutoshi, M. (2023). Metacognition and Reflective Teaching: A Synergistic Approach to

Fostering Critical Thinking Skills. *Research and Advances in Education*, 2(9), 1–14.
<https://doi.org/10.56397/rae.2023.09.01>

Nursita, R. D. (2023). Critical discourse analysis on Islam Nusantara in Indonesia's foreign policy. *Hasanuddin Journal of International Affairs*, 3(1), 44–54.
<https://doi.org/10.31947/hjirs.v3i1.25611>

Patton, M. . (2020). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage Publications.

Sugiyono. (2021). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif dan metode penelitian kuantitatif* (A. Rachman & H. Purnomo (eds.); Issue 2). CV Saba Jaya Publisher.

Tisdell, E. J., Merriam, S. B., & Struckey-Peyrot, H. L. (2025). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.

Widiana, W., Sabiq, A., & Husein, A. (2021). Scaffolding strategy in teaching writing and its challenges. *Journal Education and Development*, 9(1), 561970.
<https://doi.org/10.37081/ed.v9i1.2275>

Williyan, A., Ilyas, M., Shahat, S., Guntur, M., & Rosalina, U. (2025). AI-powered pedagogy for argumentative essays in tertiary ELT: Insights from focus groups. *Journal of General Education and Humanities*, 4(3), 671–686. <https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v4i3.423>