TEACHER TALK ON EXPANDING ESL PRIMARY CLASSROOM DISCOURSE

(A Case Study in an International School in Bandung)

Eneng Elis Aisah
(MTs. Negeri Ciranjang, Cianjur)

Deden Rahmat Hidayat
(Al-Irsyad Satya Islamic School, Padalarang)

Email: e_elisaisyah@yahoo.com
deden rh@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study aims to uncover teacher talk on expanding English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom discourse in lower primary level. This is to investigate discourse strategies a teacher apply to extend the classroom discourse and the impact of the teacher's discourse strategies on expanding classroom discourse. The study was conducted in a newly-established international school where there is a need to improve students' English speaking skills for everyday life.

This study uses a qualitative framework by employing characteristics of a case study. Data are video-recorded transcriptions of a 1st grade teacher's English class involving 18 students, in which English is their second language. The data are analyzed in the frame of discourse analysis that is examining the language produced spontaneously, focused on the interaction between and among speakers rather than on monologic talk (Lazaraton 2009) and by means of extended classroom discourse principles and characteristics proposed by Gibbons (2002; 2009) and expansion concept in Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday, 1994).

It is revealed that the teacher employed some strategies proposed by Gibbons (2002; 2009), Mercer et al., (1999); Mercer (2004) and Hanrahan (2005). The teacher established warm and challenging environment by having discussion-based activities and good rapport supported by the use of

many referential questions and rising-intonation feedback probe students' responses. The teacher directly corrected students' pronunciation errors, but ignored grammatical error to maintain the flow of students speaking and thinking. Extended wait time was provided to give opportunity for students to speak, though less effective on expanding the discourse. The strategies employed by the teacher most likely to expand the discourse indicated by the number of expanded exchanges reflecting students' comfort to open the conversation with questions or statements. It can also be seen from the use of conjunction comprising elaborating, extending and enhancing the discourse. Most of the conjunctions used by students were implicit indicating that the students were able to construct clause complex by exemplifying, adding information, giving details of conditions and reasons of the topic in an elliptical form. Hence, the teacher talk in the study has created good environment by which the teacher can improve students' thinking ability and cognitive capacity that in turn develop their English proficiency in social interaction.

Keywords: Teacher talk, extended classroom discourse, expansion system.

การพูดของครูในห้องเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาที่สอง (ESL) ที่มีการขยายในระดับประถมศึกษา
(กรณีศึกษาในโรงเรียนนานาชาติในบันดุง(

บทคัดย่อ

การศึกษานี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อแสดงให้เห็นถึงการพูดของครูในการขยายวาทกรรมในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาที่สองในระดับประถมศึกษาขั้นพื้นฐาน เพื่อศึกษากลยุทธ์ในการใช้วาทกรรมที่ครูนำไปใช้ในการขยายการพูดของครูในห้องเรียนและผลกระทบของกลยุทธ์การพูดของครูในห้องเรียน ในการขยายตัวของวาทกรรมในห้องเรียน การศึกษานี้ได้ดำเนินการในโรงเรียนนานาชาติที่จัดตั้งขึ้นใหม่ที่มีความต้องการที่จะพัฒนาทักษะการพูดของนักศึกษาหลักสูตรภาษาอังกฤษสำหรับชีวิตประจำวัน
การศึกษานี้ใช้กรอบการทำงานเชิงคุณภาพตามลักษณะของกรณีศึกษา ข้อมูลมาจากการถอดความจากการบันทึกวิดีโอ ของการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษที่ครูผู้สอนชั้นประถมศึกษาปีที่ 1 บันทึกจากนักเรียน 18 คนซึ่งเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาที่สอง มีการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลในกรอบของการวิเคราะห์วาทกรรมโดยการตรวจสอบ

ภาษาที่เกิดขึ้นเองโดยมุ่งเน้นการปฏิสัมพันธ์ระหว่างและในหมู่ผู้พูดมากกว่าในการพูดคุยแบบตรรกะเชิงเดี่ยว (monologic) (Lazaraton 2009) และโดยหลักการขยายวาทกรรมห้องเรียนและลักษณะต่างๆที่เสนอโดย *Gibbons*) 2002 ; 2009) และแนวคิดใน ระบบไวยากรณ์เชิงหน้าที่) Halliday, 1994)

ผลปรากฏว่าครูใช้กลยุทธ์บางอย่างที่เสนอโดย *Gibbons*) 2002; 2009), *Mercer* และet al.,, (1999); *Mercer*) 2004) และ Hanrahan (2005) ครูสร้างสภาพแวดล้อมที่อบอุ่นและมีความท้าทายโดยจัดกิจกรรมที่มีการอภิปราย และความรู้สึกที่ดีโดยการใช้คำถามพาดพิง (Referential questions) จำนวนมากและการใช้ทำนองเสียงขึ้นในการให้ผลสะท้อนกลับ เพื่อหยั่งการโต้ตอบของนักเรียน ครูแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดโดยตรงในเรื่องการออกเสียงของนักเรียน แต่เว้นข้อผิดพลาดทางไวยากรณ์เพื่อรักษาการลื่นไหลของการพูดและความคิดของนักเรียน ครูให้เวลาคอยเพื่อเพิ่มโอกาสสำหรับนักเรียนที่จะพูด แต่การขยายวาทกรรมได้ประสิทธิภาพน้อย กลยุทธ์ที่ครูผู้สอนใช้มีแนวโน้มที่จะขยายวาทกรรมเป็นส่วนใหญ่ซึ่งเห็นได้โดยจำนวนครั้งของการสนทนาของนักเรียนที่เปิดการสนทนาด้วยคำถามหรือคำสั่ง นอกจากนี้ยังสามารถเห็นได้จากการใช้คำเชื่อมซึ่งประกอบด้วยการขยายความและเสริมสร้างวาทกรรม สันธานส่วนใหญ่ที่นักเรียนใช้มีนัยที่แสดงว่านักเรียนสามารถสร้างที่อนุประโยคที่ซับซ้อนโดยการใช้คำสั่ง การยกตัวอย่าง การเพิ่มข้อมูล การให้รายละเอียดของเงื่อนไขและเหตุผลของหัวข้อแบบย่อ ดังนั้นการพูดของครูในการศึกษานี้ได้สร้างสภาพแวดล้อมที่ดีซึ่งทำให้ครูสามารถปรับปรุงความสามารถในการคิดของนักเรียนและความสามารถในการเรียนรู้เพื่อพัฒนาความสามารถทางภาษาอังกฤษในการปฏิสัมพันธ์ในสังคม

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Studies on classroom communication and interaction have found that almost more than half of classroom talk is dominated by teacher (Allwright and Bailey, 1991;) that provide even less opportunities for students to explore ideas and are less effective in developing students' language acquisition..

Meanwhile, some researchers have underlined the importance of teacher talk in determining the success of learning as it helps develop students' learning process and thinking (Hill, 2006; Brown and Hirst 2007; Lampert, 1998; Cobb, McClain and Whitenack, 1997 cited in Brownand Hirst 2007). It also provides opportunities to think critically and creatively, transform information, engage in challenging activities, scaffold learning and construct their own understanding (Christie, 2005; Gibbons, 2002; 2009; Barnes 1992 cited in Yang Zhang 2008).

In Indonesia, the quality of teacher talk is important for successful learning (Suherdi, 2008) as there is a new government rule for improving the

process of teaching and learning (PP No. 19, 2005). Moreover, the growing number of international schools in Indonesia has created the need for English teachers to produce strategies that initiate enable students to use English in real life.

Therefore, this research analyzes some characteristics of a teacher talk of an international school where English is a second language. The study investigates the discourse strategies employed by the teacher to have extended classroom discourse. Using expansion system of systemic analysis, this research discusses the impact of the teacher's strategies on expanding classroom communication that in turn may initiate learners to use English effectively.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Theories underpinning this study include principles and characteristics of extended classroom discourse especially proposed by Gibbon (2002, 2009) and concept of expansion in Systemic Functional Linguistics proposed by Halliday (1994).

The Nature of Expanded Classroom Discourse

The extended classroom discourse is originally from social-constructivism theory, particularly zone proximal development (ZPD) concept, of Vygotsky (Gibbons, 2002:8-9). The concept of ZPD has influenced the educators to scaffold learners so that students achieve success (Hill, 2006). Gibbons (2002; 2009), Hill (2006) and Emmitt and Pollock (1991) discuss some principles that extended discourse: (1) reflects social interaction; (2) develops students' knowledge and their language ability, and (3) develops critical thinking.

Reflecting social Interaction.

The increasing understanding of the socio-cultural view of learning as formulated by Vygotsky leads to the importance of social interaction in language acquisition as well language learning. Vygotsky (1978) proposed that cognitive development is engendered through participation in socially meaningful activities that are mediated by culturally constructed material and conceptual artifacts .In social interaction activities, the teacher encourages

students' to share experience in facing social problems collaboratively (Emmit and Pullock, 2005; Gibbons, 2009).

Involving language in learning.

Involving language as focus of making new meaning is the fundamental theory of systemic functional linguistics. Halliday assumes that language use is functional, whereas its function is to make meaning which is most likely influenced by social and cultural context exchanged and the process of using language is a process of making meaning by choice (Halliday, 1994). For Halliday, the system network is a theory about language as a resource of making meaning through process of negotiation (Christie, 2005; Emmitt and Pullock, 1995). Therefore, language has been the appropriate and vital medium to develop and articulate new meanings in students' world (Emmit and Pullock, 1991).

Developing thinking.

Thinking is a cognitive process in making sense of the world in working toward the goals, making informed decisions, analyzing the complex issues, and solving problems in daily life. The teachers' language in classroom interaction plays an important part in developing students' learning process and thinking (Hill, 2006; Brownand Hirst, 2007; Lampert, 1998; Cobb, McClain and Whitenack, 1997 cited in Brown, 2007). This applies through scaffolding students to learn and think for their life (Vygotsky 1978).

Discourse Strategies

Based on these principles, Gibbons (2002; 2009), Mercer et al. (1999); Mercer (2008) and Hanrahan (2005) here recommended five major discourse strategies: (1) Discussion based activity; (2) authentic questions; (3) extended wait time; (4) good rapport; and (5) meaningful feedback.
Discussion Based Activity.

Hanrahan, (2009), Groenke, and Paulus (2007), and Lipman (2003) have highlighted the importance of involving learners in learning and thinking by developing dialogue and discussion (Gibbons, 2009). The classroom as a social interaction setting in ensures all students are given opportunities and support to speak and think. She also highlighted the teacher may organize the classroom as a mix of whole-class work, group

work, pair work, and individual work, along with a mix of direct instructions and student-centered collaborative work to ensure learners involvement. This can be based on students' previous knowledge as Emmitt and Pullock (1991) state that learning occurs when teachers and students change or elaborate what is already known. Moreover, discussion is usually based on the problem since Gibbons (2009) argues that teaching activities that enhance students to solve problems are likely to extend students' contribution.

Referential Questions.

Referential questions among all types of questions asked by teachers is most likely to influence students' responses (Nunan and Bailey, 2009). Display questions and comprehending questions, are to acknowledge what students' think and know and how they differ from the teacher and other students. It is intended to challenge and develop students' knowledge (Groenke, and Paulus, 2007; Myhill, 2006; Mercer, 2008). Brock (1986; Nunan and Bailey, 2009) investigated the effect of referential questions – questions that the asker does not know the answer and learners who taught with more referential questions give significantly longer and more syntactically complex responses to those questions (Nunan, 1998; Richards and Lockhart, 1995).

Wait Time.

Gibbons (2002; 2009) stated that one way of allowing more thinking time for students is to increase "wait time", that is teacher wait between asking a question and getting a response (Nunan, 1998; Richards and Lockhart, 1995). Dillon's (1990 cited in Gibbons, 2009) research on "wait time" has shown that two or three seconds of extra wait time for students can lead to more extended, complex, and better answers. In addition, increasing wait time by a couple of seconds makes big differences to how much students say, how clearly they say it and how much they are able to demonstrate what they have understood (Gibbons, 1991, van Lier (1996), Nunan (1998), Richards and Lockhart (1995).

Rapport.

Harmer (2007) argues that to create a good learning environment, teachers need to establish an appropriate relationship with their students

which is called rapport, through some strategies: (1) Recognizing students as they will feel excited if their teachers have some understanding of their characters (Harmer, 2007: 114); (2) Listening to students as Chaudron (1988), van Lier, (1996), Gibbons (2002; 2009), Hanrahan (2005), Zhi Tan (2007), Mercer (2004), Harmer (2007) and Yani Zhang (2008) found that listening to the students and responding to their statements appropriately encourage students to participate and extend their talk; (3) Respecting students as Harmer (2007) argues is crucial to maintain rapport, particularly in dealing with problem behavior; (4) Being even-handed by treating students equally is necessary in establishing the rapport to make sure student has a chance to participate and talk in the classroom.

Feedback.

Feedback of teachers in Initiation- Response- Feedback so called IRF pattern has plays a crucial part in extending classroom communication. Meaningful feedback may promote extending classroom talk, Chaudron (1988), Richards and Lockhart (1994), Gibbons (2002; 2009), Walsh (2002), Richards (2006), Hellerman (2003), Dashwood (2005), Wolf, Crosson and Resnick (2005), Cullican (2005), Nakamura (2008), Hansen (2004) and Llinares- Garcia (2005)). Previous research has focused on some variety in giving feedback: First, in correcting errors directly, Walsh (2002) has found that keeping error correction to a minimum in oral fluency practice activities is to reduce interruption and 'maintain the flow'. Second, uptake that involve restating students' response or turning it into questions in order to encourage further elaboration .

Expansion System

The other theory is expansion concept as logico-semantic aspect in building experiential meaning proposed by Halliday (1994) in Systemic Functional Linguistics. Expanding the language include elaborating, extending and enhancement the text (Halliday, 1994) realized through the conjunction system (Halliday, 1994) to manage what language users expect to happen in a text (Martin and Rose, 2008) facilitate students to think logically and develop their language.

Elaboration.

An elaboration relation has been identified with the use of conjunction and the use of declarative as a default clause (Halliday, 1994). This relation

is categorized into apposition and clarification. The first is marked by *in other words, that is (to say), I mean (to say)* for expository and *for example, for instance,* and *thus* for exemplifying. The second is clarification which is not simply restated but reinstated, summarized and made more precise such as *at least, by the way, anyway, in particular, to resume, briefly,* and *actually.* However, in conversation, the conjunction always occurs implicitly (Eggins and Slade, 1991). To reveal the implicit conjunction, Halliday (1994) and Martin (1992) propose to test the clauses by inserting conjunctions.

Extension.

To extend the communication, teachers may initiate students to add the information to a phenomenon being discussed in the classroom, to provide some variation and alternative of information (Halliday, 1994). In prolonging moves, the student offer additional or contrasting information. Appending move is identified when the students offer additional or contrasting information to previous move after intervention by another speaker. And developing move is showed when the students expand on a prior speaker's move by adding further supporting or contrasting details. In addition the commonest conjunctions in conversation appeared explicitly are *and, also, moreover, in addition, nor, but, yet, on the other hand.*

Enhancement.

In enhancement, teachers may initiate students to develop the discourse by referencing it to the time, place, manner, cause and condition (Halliday, 1994). Prolonging enhancement is indicated with qualify previous move by giving details of time, place, cause, condition, etc. Appending is signified by previous move after intervention by another speaker. In addition, developing move describes that the students enhance on a prior speaker's move by providing a temporal, causal or conditional qualification (Eggins and Slade, 1997). Moreover, the default conjunction in conversation are *then, next, afterwards, until, at the same time, before, after, a while* for temporal relation, *Likewise, similarly, in a different way* for comparative relation, *so, then, therefore, consequently, hence, because of that, for, in consequence, as a result* for causal, *if, it, not, otherwise* for conditional and *yet, still, even though* for Concessive (Martin, 1992; Halliday, 1994; Halliday and Matheissein, 2004).

METHODOLOGY

The research is designed as a qualitative case study employing discourse analysis by Lazaraton (2009) and conversational analysis particularly under work of Eggins and Slade (1997). This research is conducted in lower primary class in a private school in Bandung that applying both national and international curricula. The participant of this study is an English teacher, with five years teaching experience for children in various contexts and was recognized as the best teacher in the school in 2009/2010 academic term.

Data are three audio tape recordings transcribed based on transcription convention of Eggins and Slide (1997). The data then are categorized and coded based on the discourse strategies of expanding classroom comprising *discussion based activity, type of questions, wait time, rapport and feedback strategies* (Gibbons, 2002; 2009; Mercer et al., 1999; Mercer, 2004 and Hanrahan, 2005). A specific pattern is investigated through paralleling or connecting comments, highlighting and contrasting view points (Nunan and Bailey, 2009) to show the discourse strategies of the teacher. Students' responses are also analyzed and classified based on speech function of *opening, continuing, responding* and *rejoining*. The responses are compared in terms of the number of turns, moves and clauses produced, and also the number of *elaboration, extension and enhancement in continuing,* and *responding* moves of students to be interpreted, with regard to the principles of expanded classroom discourse, whether discourse strategies employed by the teacher has expanded the classroom discourse.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Data show that the teacher employed particular discourse strategies comprising applying discussion based, using referential questions, providing extended wait time, giving good rapport, and challenging feedback. These discourse strategies are discussed then to find out the impact on expanding the discourse.

Discourse Strategies

Discussion Based.

The teacher used problem based learning and discussion with regard to the student's real life as their previous knowledge. This learning was a mix of individual work and whole class work along with teacher's direct instructions to create a good learning environment. The shift from individual to whole class work and sometimes in group work indicated that the school activities were dynamic like in small size classes (Harmer, 2007). This situation implied the teacher aimed to give plenty of opportunities for the students to involve in classroom discussions. (Gibbons, 2009).

As shown in the data, after looking at the picture of the grandpa's house which is full of animals, a student asked the question "Why the grandpa is not sleeping on the floor?" (2.94). The question indicated that students' thinking ability has developed since the teacher created disequilibrium which is opposite to the students' beliefs (Meyer, 1986). In their perceptions, sleeping can be in the bed, or in the floor, or in sofa, but the grandpa slept in the park in the text, which was unusual for the learners.

Moreover in data 3:127 and 3:295, the students also criticized and asked question to the teacher "Sir, why [is] your writing in PI [class name] is standing...?" (3:127) and "Sir, is [it] okay one hundred?" (3:295). Rojas-Drummond and Mercer, (2004 cf. Mercer, 2008) highlighted that the *school which creates real social interaction indicates that the students have opportunities to open and raise questions.* Moreover, Hanrahan (2005) argues that the classroom which involves students' initiative in the construction of knowledge is considered a discussion based classroom.

Referential Questions

Referential questions had a higher proportion in the classroom discourse. The data showed that there were 125 authentic questions or 64, 43 % of the total amount of questions. These authentic questions consisted of 111 referential questions and 14 questions to gain explanation. Sixty six referential questions (60, 11 %) were asked by the students and 45 questions (39, 89%) were produced by teacher.

The figures indicate that the environment set by the teacher has given opportunities for students to contribute in the class discussions. Although the teacher had raised only 45 questions, the questions initiated the students to get involved in the discussions and give complex responses through the questions. This finding is in line with a study by Brock (1986 cf. Nunan and Bailey, 2009). Brock found out learners who are taught with more referential questions give significantly longer and more syntactically complex responses to questions.

However, as the student had a limited ability in vocabulary, then almost all the student's referential questions centred around the meaning of words in English or in *Bahasa Indonesia*. Asking the meaning of words is an indication of strategic competence which is necessary in solving the problems of learning a foreign language (Harmer, 2007; Gebhard, 2009). In a classroom aimed at developing critical thinking, clarity and clarification are important. Moreover, the students also asked why-questions which required teacher's elaboration, is an evidence of developing thinking ability.

Wait Time

Data indicated that the teacher has provided wait time in order to give his students opportunity to think and do the assignments. There were four turns of wait time of the teacher in more than two seconds in the data 1. In data 2, there were 15 turns of two seconds and more wait. Moreover, data 3 indicated the teacher gave 14 extended wait times. However, the teacher also provided less than two seconds of wait time particularly in data 2 (3 times) and data 3 (1 time) respectively.

However, the wait time teacher provided did not extend the students' contribution and initiate students to expand the information. In data 1 and 2 the wait time was provided in individual work when the students did the writing assignment. The wait time was meant to provide time to do the assignment. In contrast, the activity in data 2, the wait time was found in oral discussion activity. Nevertheless, the extended wait time did not initiate students to expand the discussion. See the transcript below:

31	T	(i)	[Name 7], the hen==? The hen?
32	S_2	(i)	==see how they run, see how they run
2 (NV)	S_7		[pauses 1 second]
33	T	(i)	[Name 7], the hen?
3 (NV)	S_7		[pauses 4 seconds]

34	T	(i)	Umm,
		(ii)	Still remember the hen?
35	S_6	(i)	The cluck!

Source: Data 3

The teacher asked '[what is the sound of] the hen? (3:31)' the student to check her understanding of previous knowledge. Firstly the teacher gave I second of wait time (3:2NV), then the teacher extended the wait time to think (3:3NV). However, the student was not capable of answering the question. This situation indicates some factors. Firstly, maybe because of the interruption of other participants (3:32) or the teacher's turn taking (3:33).

Good Rapport.

The data showed that the teacher had developed good rapport with the students. The teacher recognized the students' name and never used pronouns when calling and asking students' to contribute in the activities. For instance, "please read, [name 9]!" (3:475), "[take] your note book please! [name 2] in your...and then [name 6]==[3]" (1:96) and "Wow...[your writing is] getting better, [name2], [it's] very good, [name 9], [it's] very good" (2:252). The data also found that the teacher listened to the students' comments and questions.

The classroom indicated that the teacher placed the students as active learners and cooperative community members. Hanrahan (2005) listed situation where the teacher answered personal questions from students. He also placed himself as an audience to be engaged and charmed, also as active thinkers and problem solvers. Moreover, Debra (2006) added that generating and extending pupils thinking require sensitive shaping of discourse and sensitive listening to pupils' responses.

However, the teacher in some circumstances did not listen to the students' contributions and questions as indicated in data 3 turn 233-235.

233	S_4	(i)	==What is *ke atas*? ...
		(ii)	Don't *Naik*, please!
27 (NV)	S_8		[smile]
234	T	(i)	One lamb, and then...
		(ii)	Going up the writing
28 (NV)			[pauses two seconds]

235	S4	(i)	(*naik terus*)
	T	(ii)	Like an escalator

Source: Data 3

In this sequence of the turn above, S4 asked the meaning of *ke atas* in English for commenting her friend's writing in the white board. The teacher did not directly answer the question but he commented on S8's work first and commented on the writing. Nevertheless, as S4 insisted to keep comment on her friend's writing, the teacher finally elaborated S4 contribution by exemplifying the condition. Therefore, the teacher also responded to the students' contribution and questions although it was indirectly.

Feedback.

The data showed that some particular feedback is likely to develop classroom discourse pattern. Data indicated that probing student's response and direct error correction placed crucial part in extended classroom discourse. In correcting errors, the teacher directly corrected students' errors without any explanation and before appending with other moves.

40	T	(i)	Where do you live?
		(i)	And the answer of question?
41	S9	(i)	I live in
42	T	(i)	I live at
43	S4	(i)	I live at *Jalan Jingga* No. 10 [name of the town] Indonesia
44	T	(i)	Hum, Ok. Good
		(i)	So. You have to remember to ask address, asking about...==
45	S6	(i)	==how? ==
46	T	(i)	==what?

Source: Data I

The decision to treat error directly was suitable since the direct error correction may not obstruct learner's involvement (Walsh, 2002; Chaudron, 1988; Allwright and Bailey, 1991). Walsh argued that in correcting the error the teacher may opt minimum costs by correcting students' errors. Moreover teachers may consider the effectiveness of error correction in maintaining the communication flow in the classroom (Hendrickson 1987 cf. Chaudron, 1988; Allwright and Bailey, 1991; Walsh, 2002). Therefore, correcting errors directly has fulfilled all criteria suggested.

The data also showed that the teacher used uptake strategies in feedback move. Data I indicated that the uptake was in declarative, polar declarative, open interrogative, minor clause, and elliptical open interrogative.

222	T	(i)	You don't like?
223	S8	(i)	I LIKE
224	T	(i)	That's good
.....			
306	T	(v)	Back to your chair
		(vi)	back to your seat
307	S4	(i)	I am a chair me
308	T	(i)	You are a chair?

Source: Data I

The transcript displayed that polar declarative and positive declarative of the teacher used in feedback move (I: 222; 308) were questions with the rising intonation indicated by question marks .In 3:308, the teacher followed up the student 4's response 'I am a chair me' (I:307). Although the student's clause was syntactically false, semantically the clause was understandable. The student basically intended to respond 'I am on my chair'. The teacher in the next section was intended not only to probe the student's idea reflected in clause but also to correct the errors. This uptake strategy has not only respected the students (Hanrahan, 2005; Tan, 2007) but also developed their thinking ability (Wolf, Crosson and Resnick, 2005).

Moreover, the teacher's uptake strategy had developed debate among students. In 3:327, the teacher clarified to the students by saying 'number what?' And as the student's voice could not be heard the teacher asked affirmation using paralinguistic 'Eh'? After student elaborated his previous move, the teacher followed up by using uptake strategy with an interrogative clause 'Oh? Butterfly is in the farm? Can you sell butterfly? This subsequent feedback the teacher probed the student's idea in selling butterflies. Although butterfly is a living creature, it was not common to sell butterflies in farm except in a butterfly farm. This type of question has developed debate among students. Student 2 argued that she could sell butterfly (3:329). In contrast student 6 said that it would be impossible to sell butterfly (3:330). This kind of debate although in small part of the turn could develop thinking ability (Lipman, 2003; Dashwood, 2005; Hellermann, 2003).

The Impact of Discourse Strategies on Expanding the Discourse

The strategies employed by the teacher are most likely to expand the discourse indicated by the number of expanded exchanges. The data shows that the students took 31.18% of their moves as expansion, 25.81% for answering questions and 7.35 % for asking questions. Moreover from 47 expanded exchanges, 26 exchanges were expanded as initiation of the teacher and 21 exchanges were initiated by the students which are elaborated below:

Teacher-Initiated Exchange.

The teacher initiated the conversation and probed the students' ideas in following up move. The students responded to the teacher's probing and also raised referential question which were questions on the meaning of words (2:54, 2:61:2:81) and questions for gaining explanation. (2:66 and 2:94). In this situation, limited vocabulary did not stop to think and talk. Moreover they used this strategic competence which is one of the strategies of social interaction (Gebhard, 2009; Nunn, 2007; Nunan, 1998). In addition the students used this strategy to expand the discourse, as in turn 63, the student expanded the discourse by explaning the condition of the 'hen' in the picture. This enhancement was developed after the student asked the teacher the meaning of *menelurkan* in English.

The second type of students' question was why-questions. The why-questions were characterized as questions for higher order thinking (Lipman, 2003; Gibbons, 2009). In two turns the students asked 'why [is] the grandpa sleeping on [hummock] (2:66) and 'why [is] the grandpa not sleeping on the floor?' (2:94). These questions appeared emerged after the teacher connected the lesson with their daily life such as 'usually people sleep on the bed, right?' (2:89) and when the talk did not fit with their daily life (Meyer, 1986).

Moreover, the teacher never solved the problem raised by the students. He just provoked the student's subconsious and let them solved and concluded it. It could be argued that in order to create a community in which learning and thinking are involved, the teacher may place himself as the facilitator, provoker, modulator, monitor and supporter for learners to develop their thinking ability not as knowledge transferring agent.

Student-Initiated Exchanges.

In student-initiated expanded exchange, the student most likely opened with asking referential questions, commenting on their friends' or others behavior and stating fact concerning their feelings to particular real life situations and conditions. In data I exchange 3, after the teacher greeted the students S2 asked the reason of her friend stocking (3:12). Hearing the question, teacher realized that the S2 intended not only to gain explanation but also to criticize S5. In responding the questions the teacher created good rapport for both students and also established the value among the students as indicated in turn 13. Likewise as the teacher's response involved new vocabulary 'sweaty', this alien word has developed discussion based activity.

Moreover, the teacher' probe has created peer collaboration among students. In turn I:19, when S9 tried to answer S5's question in turn I:17, S5 asked another question relating to the meaning of sweaty. Nevertheless S9 in turn 21 did not give up to develop her moves by restating the meaning of *setelah main* bola in English although it was not quite correct. Moreover, it was S2 who answered S5's question what sweaty is in English'. After hearing his rival response of the meaning of sweaty, S5 finally clarified directly to S2 the reason of his odor stocking by saying 'after football'. In this exchange also emerged that the problem based conversation most likely encourages discussion. Mercer et al. (1999), Zhi Tann (2007), and Hanrahan (2009) have discussed students work more effectively and actively on this problem.

This exchange also indicates that the teacher's follow up was crucial in maintaining the conversation similar with the research conducted by Llinares Garcia (2005), Cullican (2005) and Richards (2006). In addition, the students responded that deveponing with elaboration, extension and enhancement indicates that the discoussion based activity applied by the teacher has created a community of learning and inquiry (Lipaman, 2003).

Conclusion

The findings reveal that the teacher employed strategies proposed by Gibbons (2002; 2009), Mercer et al., (1999); Mercer (2004) and Hanrahan (2005). The teacher established a warm and challenging environment through discussion based activities and a good rapport in treating students as interlocutor in the conversation. The teacher also used many referential questions for feedback and used rising-intonation from students' statement

to probe students' responses. The teacher also directly corrected students' pronunciation and grammatical errors, but often ignored in order to maintain the flow of students thinking and speaking. The teacher also provided extended wait time to give opportunity for students to think and speak, though less effective on expanding the discourse.

The strategies employed by the teacher most likely expanded the discourse indicated by the number of expanded exchanges reflecting students' comfort to open the conversation with questions or statements. The influence of discourse strategies employed by the teacher can be seen on the use of conjunction by students in elaborating, extending and enhancing the discourse. Most of the conjunctions used by students were implicit and some were explicit indicating that the students were able to construct clause complex by exemplifying, adding information, giving details of conditions and reasons of the topic in an elliptical form. Hence, the teacher talk in the study has created a warm and challenging classroom environment in which the teacher can improve students' thinking ability and cognitive capacity in order to develop their English proficiency in social interaction.

References

Allwright, D., and Bailey, K. M. 1991. *Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers.* Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Bishop, P. E. 1991. Resources for "Asking the Right Questions: Teacher Talk and Critical Thinking. *ERIC Digest*.

Bolitho, R. 2008. Teacher Talk and Learner Talk. *European centre for Modern Language*.

Brown, R., and Hirst, E. 2007. Developing an Understanding of the Medaiting Role of Talk in the Elementary Mathematics Classroom. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, Vol. 41.2*.

Chaudron, C. 1988. *Second Language Classroom: Research on Teaching and Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christie, F. 2005. *Language Education in the Primary Years.* Sydney: UNSW Press Book.

Connole, H., Smith, B., and Wiseman, R. 1993. *Research Methodology I: Issues and Method in Research.* Victoria: Deakin University.

Cullican, S. J. 2005. *Troubling Teacher Talk: The Challange of Changing Classroom Discourse Pattern.* Melbourne: Deakin University.

Dashwood, A. 2005. Alternative Questioning: Teacher Role in Classroom Discussion. *Asian EFL Journal, Vol. 7, Issue. 4.*

Derewianka, B. 1990. *Exploring How Texts Work.* Australia: Primary English Teaching Association.

Doddington, C. 2007. Critical Thinking as a Source of Respect for Persons: A Critique. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 449-459.

Eggins, S. and Slade D. 1997. *Analysing Casual Conversation.* London: Equinox

Emmitt, M., and Pollock, J. 1991. *Language and Learning.* Melbourne: Oxford Univerity Press.

Gebhard, J. G. 2009. *Teaching English as a Foreigner or second Language: Self-Development and Methodology Guide.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Gibbons, P. 1991. *Learning to Learn in a Second Language.* Newtown: Heinemann.

Gibbons, P. 2002. *Scaffolding Language Scaffolding Learning.* Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Gibbons, P. 2009. *English Learners Academic Literacy and Thinking.* Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Groenke, S. L., and Paulus, T. 2007. The Role of Teacher Questioning in Promoting Dialogic literary Inquiry in Computer-Mediated Communication. *Journal of research on Teachnology in education, Vol. 40. No. 2*, 141-164.

Harmer J. 2007. *How to Teach English* London: Pearson ESL

Hanrahan, M. U. 2005. Highlighting Hybridity: A Critical Doscourse Analysis of Teacher Talk in Science Classroom. *Science Education* , -.

Hansen, C. C. 2004. Teacher Talk: Promoting Literacy Development Through Response to Story. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, Vol. 19. Iss. 2* , 130.

Hellermann, J. 2003. The Interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: Teacher Repetition in Feedback Moves. *Language in Society, Vol. 32* , 79-104.

Hill, S. 2006. *Developing Early Literacy.* Australia: Eleanor Curtain Publishing.

Hood, M. 2009. Case Study . In J. Heigham, and R. A. Crocker, *Qualitaive Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction* (pp. 66-90). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Huda, N. 1999. *Language Learning and Teaching.* Malang: IKIP Malang Publisher.

Lazaraton, A. 2009. Discourse Analysis. In J. Heigham, and R. A. Croker, *Qualitative Discourse in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction* (pp. 242-259). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Linares Garcia, A. 2005. The Effect of Teacher Feedback on EFL Learners' Functional Production in Classroom Discourse. *Anglogermanica Online*

Lipman, M. 2003. *Thinking in education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.Martin, J.R. 1972. English Text: System and Structure, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Martin, J.R. and Rose, D. 2008. *Genre Relations: Mapping Culture,* London Equinox.

Matsumoto, H. 2007 Students' Perception about Japanese Teacher Talk. *Academich Exchange Quarterly* .

Mercer, N. 2008. Talk and Development of Reasoning and Understanding. *Human Development, Vol. 51* , 90-100.

Mercer, N., Wegerif, R., and Dawes, L. 1999. Children's Talk and the Developments of Reasoning in the Classroom. *British Educational Research Journal, Vol. 25, No. 1*, 95-111.

Myhill, D. 2006. Talk, Talk, Talk: Teaching and Learning in whole Class Discourse. *Research Papers in Education, Vol. 21, No.1*, 19-41.

Myhill, D. and Warren, P. 2005. Scafolds or Straitjackets? Critical Moments in Classroom Discourse. *Educational Review, Vol.57, No. 1*, 55-69.

Nakamura, I. 2008. Understanding How Teacher and student talk with each other: An Exploration of How 'repair' displays the co-management of talk-in-interaction. *Language Teaching Research, No. 12*, 265.

Nunan, D. 1989. *Understanding Language Classrooms: a Guide for Teacher-Initiated Action.* Hemel Hempstead: Prantice Hall International.

Nunan, D. 1998. *Language Teaching Methodology.* Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.

Nunan, D., and Bailey, K. M. 2009. *Exploring Second Language Classroom Research: A Comprehensible Guide.* Boston: Heinle Cengange Learning.

Nunn, R. 2007. Competence and Teaching English as an International Language. *The Journal of English as an International Language, Volume 1*, pp: 11-28.

Prihartanti, P., and Yusuf, F. N. 2008. Teacher Talk in EFL Context. *International Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN) I* (pp. 200-204). Bandung: Andira.

Richards, J. C., and Lockhart, C. 1994. *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riddle, E. M. 2008. Lev Vygotsky's Social Development Theory. In B. Musthafa, *Teaching English to Young Learners: Principles and Techniques* (pp. 39-43). Bandung: UPI Publisher.

Silverman, D. 2005. *Doing Qualitative Research.* London: Sage Publication, Ltd.

Suherdi, D. 2008 *Mikroskop Pedagogik: Alat Analisi Proses Belajar Mengajar.* Bandung: UPI Press.

Tan, Z. 2007. Questioning in Chinese University EL Classrooms: What Lies beyond it? *RELC Journal, Vol. 38*, 87-103.

van Lier, L. 1996. *Interaction in the Language Curriculum.* New York: Longman .

van Lier, L. 1988. *The Classroom and the Language Learner: Ethnography and Second-Language Classroom Research* . New York : Longman.

Vygotsky, L.S. 1978. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walsh, S. 2002. Construction or Obstruction: Teacher Talk and Learner Involvment in the EFL Classroom. *Language Teaching Research, Vol. 6, No.1*, 3-23.

Wolf, M. K., Crosson, A. C., and Resnick, L. B. 2005. Classroom Talk for Rigorous Reading Comprehension Instruction. *Reading Psychology, Vol. 26*, 27-53.

Xiao-Yan. 2006. *Teacher talk and EFL in University Classroom.* China: School of Foreign Language and Literature Chongqing Normal University 7 Yangtze Normal University.

Yu, W. July 2009. An Analysis of College English Classroom Discourse. *Asian Social Science, Vol.5. No. 7*, 152-159.

Zhang, Y. September 2008. Classroom Discourse and student Learning. *Asian Social Science, Vol.4, No.9*, 80-83.