

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL REVIEW

In this chapter, three theories that underpin this research are discussed. The first section elaborates the principles of expanding classroom discourse originally derived from Vygotsky's view. The second section discusses discourse strategies on expanding classroom discourse. The last section elaborates the expansion system of systemic functional linguistics of Halliday (1994) who has a parallel view to Vygotsky vis-à-vis learning language as social activity (Mercer, 2008; Emilia, 2010).

2.1 Principles of Expanding Classroom Discourse

Expanding classroom discourse rises as a critique to the initiation-respond-feedback pattern that is steadily found in the classroom conversation (Rose, 2005; Gibbons, 2002; 2009; Lipman, 2005; Mercer & Wegerif, 1999; Zhi Tan, 2007; Weihua Yu, 2009; Mauréen, 2009). The term expanding itself is from the concept of logico-semantic in systemic functional linguistics in which the participants of the conversation elaborate, extend and enhance the conversation (Halliday, 1994; Eggins and Slade, 1997; Martin, 1992).

However, it is Gibbons (1991; 2002; 2009) who takes this language concept to the education in which the teacher focuses primary on the meaning of what the students said. On the other hand, she adds the teacher, at the same time,

ought to provide strong support to help their students to make more complete, explicit and grammatical meaning.

The most well-known example of expanding the discourse given by Gibbons (2009) is Nigel and his parent conversation that is taken from Halliday's research. It has been described that the father encourages Nigel to tell what he is referring to. Later the mother responds to Nigel's extended version by asking a question to extend the story and providing the wordings that the Nigel is attempting. In the end of the dialogue, Nigel does produce a retelling of the event that could be understood by someone although at this point he could not complete the dialogue. Therefore, Gibbons (2009) highlights that in expanding the discourse, the teacher's role is crucial in order to encourage the students to elaborate, extend and enhance their conversation. As the results, the way the students elaborate, extend and enhance the conversation is the indication of their language development.

Gibbons (2009), then, concludes that the basic premise of expanding the discourse is external dialogue. She also said that the external dialogue is major source of the development of thinking. Yet, this premise basically is derived from Vygotsky (see Mercer, 2008). Vygotsky believes that the cognitive development of an individual relates to the extent of how language culturally and psychologically is used in social meaningful activities (Riddle & Dabagh, 1999; Mercer, 2008).

This premise basically underlines two fundamental aspects. The first is social interaction and the second is cognitive development, which are interrelated. The first aspect, social interaction, may develop students' voluntary attention, logical memory and concept formation skills (Lawson, 2002). In return, the second aspect, students' cognitive development, depends on how the teacher interacts with the students in meaningful social activities.

The interrelation between those aspects may occur in the situation in which the teacher assists the students to develop their potential. In Vygotsky views, the situation is well-known as Zone Proximal Development (henceforth ZPD). ZPD is a point at which the students need the teacher's assistance to get the knowledge (Kozulin, 1986; Mooney, 2000). It helps the students to negotiate the knowledge that they have already had and the knowledge that they will get.

The concept of ZPD has underlined the importance of involving the process of negotiation of the students' concepts and social life in the classroom interaction. Vygotsky highlights that the process of negotiation needs the development of inquiry process in acquiring the knowledge (Mercer, 2008; Mercer, et al., 1999). Therefore, the teacher ought to create the classroom interaction where the inquiry is highly proposed in the process of social interaction. Gibbons argues

We learn and develop ideas through this collaborative talk. ..it follows, then, that the conversations learners have at school impact on how well they develop the kind of high-quality thinking (2009:15-16).

Therefore, in line with the emphasis of zone proximal development, this study focused on the aspects to enhance students' thinking and their involvement in English language learning. This research underlines two principles of teaching in expanding the classroom discourse. These principles are to create classroom that is reflecting social interaction and developing thinking.

2.1.1 Reflecting Social Interaction

The first principle is reflecting social interaction in the classroom. As mentioned earlier, social interaction has been the central of Social Development theory or Socio-cultural theory of Vygotsky. He proposed that cognitive development is engendered through participating in socially meaningful activities that are mediated by language (Mooney, 2000; Tasker et al., 2008). Riddle and Dabbagh (1999: 1) highlight

According to Vygotsky, humans use tools that develop from a culture, such as speech and writing, to mediate their social environments. Initially children develop these tools to serve solely as social functions, ways to communicate needs. Vygotsky believed that the internalization of these tools led to higher thinking skills.

Social interaction is necessary as students are as not only solely individuals but also social human being who needs others to accomplish their life and to share their experiences. Social interaction is defined as a process of sharing experiences among people through their language (Brown & Spang, 2007). In addition, Burns and Myhill (2004:36) define interaction as “to the kinds of exchanges believed to extend thinking and enhance learning”. Therefore,

regarding school as social interaction site means conducting process of sharing experiences between teacher and students in series of exchanges in order to extend thinking and enhance students' learning.

In classroom, the social interaction can be seen from two factors. The first is in the way teacher creates the classroom environment which ensure students to share experiences. The second is in the way the teacher builds activities, which give students plenty of opportunities to develop and create their experiences.

In creating environment, the teacher may regard students as interlocutors in conversation. Aziz (2005) argues that successful interaction most likely depends on how the speakers and hearers care of each other's feeling. Harmer (2007) argues that this feeling can be created in the way teacher recognizes students' names and listening their comments and questions. He also argued that teachers also need to show that they are interested in what students say. Moreover, the teacher also has to pay attention not only through listening but also through approaching them and making eye contact. Lipman adds,

To appreciate is to pay attention to what matters, to what is of importance. Never mind the seeming circularity: that what matters is of importance precisely because we pay attention to it. It is only partially true. Things in nature are neither better nor worse than other things, but when we compare and contrast them in particular perspective, we pay attention to and, therefore, values their similarities and differences (2003:265).

Furthermore, in developing social activities, the teacher may involve students' previous experiences and base activities on problems. Emmitt & Pullock (1991) said that learning occurs when teachers and students change or elaborate

what is already known. Teachers may bridge and connect students' knowledge by moving their discourse from everyday to subject discussion. Edwards and Westgate said:

Knowledge is constructed by the individual knower, through an interaction between what is already known and new experiences...talk is central to this view of learning and knowing...because it helps learners to make explicit to themselves and others what they know, understand and can do (as cited in Burns and Myhill, 2004: 36).

In addition, to develop social interaction, the teacher may base his activities on problems (Wilks, 1995). Facing problems can encourage the students to solve and discuss solutions. Meyers (1986:8) says "students must actively struggle with real problems". In other words, the students will involve and stay focus to the discussion if the discussion aims to uncover the problems that may appear in real social interaction. Meyers (1986:61) also argues "beginning a class with a problem or question related to the topic for that day also helps students settle down and focus their attention". Therefore challenging students with question or problem not only can reduce inattention and in return involve them in active discussion but also it is as indication that the teacher has reflected his classroom as social interaction site.

Therefore, in this research the characteristic of classroom that reflects social interactions are, first, the teacher recognize the students' name. Second, the teacher uses the students' name to call, invite and reduce the students' off-task behavior. Third, the teacher listens and responds to the students' command and

question. Fourth, the teacher involves the students' experiences in classroom discussion. Fifth, the teacher begins the classroom interaction with the problems.

2.1.2 Developing Thinking

The other principles of expanding classroom discourse are development of students thinking ability. The development of thinking has been the central aims of acquiring knowledge (Lipman, 2003). Dewey (as cited in Hill, 2006:2) argues "the process of inquiry as the way by which we attain knowledge, whether it be the commonsense knowledge that guides the ordinary affairs of our lives, or the sophisticated knowledge arising from scientific inquiry".

The term of thinking literarily means to use the mind to consider ideas and make judgments, to believe something or have something as an opinion (Oxford Dictionary, 1999: 539). This term has triggered some education experts, who believe the important of thinking in education, to develop the term of thinking in education. Some definitions of thinking that are adopted in this research are first, critical thinking is thinking that helps us to solve problems and make decision (Sternberg in Hay, 1987). Seconds, critical thinking is thinking that helps students understand the logical connectives of English (Adler in Hay, 1987). 2002). Last, thinking is reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or to do (Ennis, 1996).

Moreover, some research on thinking in education has underlines some characteristic of the development of the students' thinking. First, the students ask

the questions (Meyers, 1986; Brown & Hirst, 2007). Moreover, Morgan and Saxton argues

The classic concept of learning is that it occurs when the teacher asks the questions and the students can answer them, but the reality is that learning does not occur until the learner needs to know and can formulate the questions for himself (Bolitho, 2008: 2).

Second, the students' thinking is developed when they actively articulate their thought (Fawcett & Garton, 2005). Moreover, they add that the number of utterances used in interaction between participants indicate the cognitive development. Third, the development is characterized by the use of clause complex produced by the students (Punchard, 2002).

Basically, this principle is influenced by the first principle. Developing the students' thinking ability depends on the way the teacher creates the classroom environment and builds the classroom activities. The student's thinking mainly requires the use of particular strategies in regarding the students as individuals who have experiences. In other words, the teacher's strategy in respecting the students and involving them in the classroom discussion impacts the development of the students' thinking.

Therefore, in this research, the teacher's discourse strategy places crucial roles in applying both principles. As mentioned in the background of the chapter I, the teacher's strategy in expanding the discourse has been the trend topic of the latest research. The strategies that have been found can be categorized into four. The first relates to the way the teacher creates rapport with the students. The

second strategy is in connection with the way the teacher uses referential question. The third strategy is concerned with the importance of teacher's silence and pauses. The last strategy deals with uptake in feedback.

2.2 Discourse Strategies

Discourse strategy refers to verbal strategies that people employ to understand each other within the context of a particular conversation (Gumperz, 1982). In classroom context, discourse strategy is used by the teacher to ask students particular questions and to respond their statements and questions in classroom discussion. This study focused on four discourse strategies. Those are good rapport, referential questions, extended wait time and uptake strategy.

2.2.1 Good Rapport

Harmer (2007) argued that rapport is an appropriate relationship between students and teacher in order to create a supportive learning environment. The rapport depends on the way the teacher uses the verbal and nonverbal messages in his or her classroom. Kostelnik et al. said that "how much the teachers say, what they say, how they speak, to whom they talk, and how well they listen, all influence the students' estimation of self-worth" (as cited in Stanulis & Manning, 2002: 5).

The good rapport in this study is associated with the way the teacher regards and respects the students as active interlocutors in the classroom activities.

The good rapport is established with calling students by their name or proper noun and employing direct and indirect responses to the students' questions and statements.

The use of proper noun indicates that the teacher recognizes the students. Students want their teacher knows who they are. They want their teacher know their names. They will feel excited if their teacher knows them and has some understanding of their characters (Harmer, 2007). The use of proper noun in also functions to monitor the students' off-task and to involve all students in classroom activities. Bishop said:

Teachers should invest some class time in learning students' names, asking about other classes, inquiring about students' lives outside college, or sharing something about their own. These informal interactions offer a chance to use facilitative responses. It may seem like schmoozing, but studies indicate that this kind of hospitality pays off in higher student achievement (2000:1).

The use of direct and indirect responses to the students' questions and statements indicates that the teacher listens to the students attentively. The form of these responses depends on the degree of the students' questions and statements. The direct response, which is in the form of simple answer, is most likely for the type of questions and statements that needs confirmation or agreement. Moreover, the indirect response is likely in the form of uptake in which the teacher feels that the students' questions and statements need further enhancement. Chaudron (1988), van Lier, (1996), Gibbons (2002; 2009), Hanrahan (2005), Zhi (2007), Mercer (2004), and Yani (2008) agree that listening to the students and

responding their statements appropriately encourage students to participate and extend their talk.

The example of establishing good rapport in this study is shown in the following excerpt.

<u>No. Turn</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Talks</u>
65	S4	Can I write with this?
66	T	<i>Yes,</i>
67	S4	Thank you
68	T	<i>You are welcome</i>
69	S8	Sir, What is this?
70	T	<i>I don't know, what is that?</i>
NV	SS	[noisy]
72	S8	Mr. Look!
73	T	<i>I don't know, what is that?</i>
74	S7	Mr. Lupa!
75	T	<i>How can?</i>
78	T	<i>[name 5], [name 4], [name 3], Where is your note book?...Eh, [name 7]</i>

Taken from data 1 with some modification

The italic words in the transcription above are the examples of good rapport. There are three strategies. The first is the use of direct response as indicated in turn 61 and 68, which is used to give permission and accepting gratitude. The second is the use of indirect response as indicated in turn 70, 73 and 75, which is used to develop students thinking. The third is the use of proper noun as indicated in turn 78, which is functioned to and the teacher uses the direct response to the students' question and statement. All strategies show that the students have established good rapport to their students.

2.2.2 Referential Question in Initiation Moves

Referential question is a type of questions that is used to seek new information (Nunan, 1998; Richard & Lockhart, 1995; Nunan and Bailey, 2009).

In this study, this question is categorized into the teacher's and the students' questions. The teacher's referential question functions to acknowledge what students think and know, to challenge and develop students' knowledge, and to bridge the students' real world with their lesson (Meyers, 1986; Brown & Freeman, 2000; Groenke & Paulus, 2007; Myhill, 2006; Burns & Myhill, 2004; Mercer, 2008). It also indicates the students have developed their thinking ability (Nystard, 2006).

The referential question usually appears in initiation move (Brown, 1994). The default clause is full open interrogative (Zhi, 2007). However, in the conversation the clause usually is in the form elliptical, closed interrogative and open interrogative (Egins and Slade, 1997).

The significant contribution of this question to classroom interaction has been proved in previous research. First, the students who are taught with more referential questions give longer and more syntactically complex responses (Brock in Nunan and Bailey, 2009). Second, this question can help establish a climate of equal participation between students and teacher. It also can promote and sustain discussion (Groenke & Paulus, 2007; Apleebie et al., 2003). Third, teacher's referential question can encourage collaborative and student-centered dialogue (Nystard & Gamora in Groenke & Paulus, 2007).

The various contributions of the referential question above show that the referential question can initiate students to expand the classroom discourse. This

question not only generates the discussion (Groenker & Paulus, 2007; Apleebee et al., 2003) but also create ‘disequilibrium’ condition in which the students are provoked to involve in the discussion (Meyers, 1986). As this research’s concern on the expanded IRF pattern, therefore the referential question holds significance role in this research to initiate students to involve and contribute actively on expanding the classroom discourse.

The example of the use of referential question in initiation move is shown in the following excerpt.

<u>No. turn</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Talks</u>
67	T	Repeat. Number one, It is market day.==. It is market day. Number two...still number one It is market day. Number two, What does farmer Brown sell? <u>Who can tell me what the difference? [Name 2]?</u>
68	S ₂	==Yes, I know
12 (NV)		[Pauses three seconds]
69	S ₂	The sounds
70	T	The sounds? What’s the difference about the sound, [name 2]?

Source: data 3 with modification

In the transcription above, the underlined phrase indicates the referential questions. It is in the form of wh-question with *who* as the question mark. This question allows the range of the responses. It can signal the students to choose and give the reasons. It also can allow the students to contribute the discussion. This type of questions is referred to as higher cognitive questions. Cotton says that with this type of question, the students can manipulate information (Zhi, 2007). Applebee et al. (2003) add the referential question is functioned to explore differing understanding rather than to test what the students might already known.

2.2.3 *Extended Wait Time*

Extended wait time is two seconds or more of pauses provided by the teacher after explaining and or questioning (Nunan, 1998; Richad & Lockhart, 1995; Gibbons, 2009). The extended of wait time is to provide students a thinking time (Gibbons, 2009). It also provides the students a period of “private thought” (Moriber in Olajide & Adeoye, 2010).

Research on wait time shows that two or three second extra wait time for students can lead to more extended, complex, and better answers (Dillon as cited by Gibbons, 2009). Increasing wait time also makes students able to say much, clearly and demonstrate their understanding (Gibbons, 1990). Moreover, the extended wait time after teacher’s explanation most likely enhances students’ achievement (Olajide & Adeoye, 2010). It also increases not only the number of students’ response and more complex answer, but also student interaction (Walsh, 2005). However, another research shows that the number of pauses provided by the teacher much more relates to the type of questions the teacher asked. The higher-cognitive challenged questions need more than two or three wait time (Duell, 1992; Henning et al., 2008).

The numerous contributions of the study of extended wait time to this research reveals that the teacher needs providing sufficient wait time after explaining and asking question. The wait time also reflects that the teacher does not dominate the classroom (Bolitho, 2008). As this research focuses on the way

teacher shares control of the classroom with his students and the improvement of students' contribution on expanding classroom discourse, then providing extended wait time is importance in giving students' time to think and articulate their thought, as Meyers (1986) says "thinking demands periods of silence, reflection, and incubation that are uninterrupted by any words".

The example of extended wait time is shown in the following transcriptions.

<u>No. turn</u>	<u>participants</u>	<u>Talks</u>
67	T	Repeat. Number one, It is market day.==. It is market day. Number two...still number one It is market day. Number two, What does farmer Brown sell? <i>Who can tell me what the difference? [Name 2]?</i>
68	S ₂	==Yes, I know
12 (NV)		[Pauses three seconds]
69	S ₂	The sounds
70	T	The sounds? What's the difference about the sound, [name 2]?

Source: data 3 with modification

In 12 non verbal (henceforth NV) turn, the student pauses for three seconds. The student takes some times to think the reasons of the answer. Meanwhile, when the student thinks, the teacher does not interfere and interrupt the students. This condition is called extended wait time. Walsh (2002) says that for many teachers silence is threatening because it may be as sign of weakness. However, he adds, it increases oral fluency. Moreover research conducted by Rowe and Tobin show that when the teacher extends the pauses until 5 seconds, it gives certain positive behavior including the length of responses, offering alternative responses, asking more questions and interacting more with other students (cited in Olajide & Adeoye, 2010).

2.2.4 *Uptake Strategy in Feedback Moves*

Uptake is a strategy used by the teacher in following up move in the form of restating students' response or turning students' response into questions in order to encourage further elaboration (Johannessen & Kahn, 2005). It comes from the work of Marshall, Smagorinsky, and Smith and Nystrad (Nystard, 2006). Uptake involves restating students' response or turning it into questions in order to encourage further elaboration (Johannessen & Kahn, 2005).

In using uptake, teachers do not judge or evaluate students' responses by saying "good", "right" or "that's it". Evaluative comments of this type tend to imply closure and shut down further discussion (Cullen, 2005). Uptake is also the most effective when it is used with the strategy of asking broader, more open-ended questions that focus on a key issues or interpretive problems (Johannessen & Kahn, 2005).

The crucial contributions of the uptake strategy have been verified with a numbers of research. The uptake can create an environment in which is conducive to learning and is to promote students' involvement (Walsh, 2005; Dashwood, 2005). The uptake develops students' comment and sustains their discourse (Applebee et al., 2003; Hellermann, 2003; Richards, 2006). Moreover, through eliciting students' thought, the uptake may extend the discourse (Wolf et al., 2005).

The contribution of previous research mentioned above shows that the use of uptake strategy is necessary in promoting discussion. The uptake probes students' thought and belief. As this research concerning to the way teacher expands the classroom discourse, then the uptake strategy is most likely crucial on expanding the classroom discourse, as Cullen (Harmer, 2007) says that giving feedback to the students' responses plays a crucial part in clarifying and building students' knowledge.

The example of uptake in this research is shown in the following transcription.

<u>No. turn</u>	<u>participants</u>	<u>Speech Function</u>	<u>Talk</u>
42	T	Continuing (I)	Ok, good. Next We see two birds sleeping beside the window
43	S	R. Dev. Elaborate	There is much is two
44	T	<i>F: uptake</i>	<i>There are two birds, right?</i>
45	S	R. Answer	Yes
46	T	<i>F: uptake</i>	<i>Are you sure they are sleeping?</i>
47	Ss	R. Answer	Yes
48	T	<i>F: Uptake</i>	<i>Yes?</i>

Source: data 2

The italic phrases are the example of feedback in the form of uptake. In the turn 44, the teacher gives feedback to the student's response that states that the birds are more than two. The teacher's feedback, which is in the form of question tag, is intended to ask the student's clarification. Moreover, in turn 46, the teacher gives feedback to the student's response by asking certainty. Although both feedbacks are in the form of yes/no question or interrogative, it does not mean that this type of questions requires a simple replay of yes or not. The students need to think to

respond the question (Groenke, 2007:43) as the question is took up and built on their previous comments (Applebee et al., 2003).

2.3 Expansion System

Expansion system is a type of clause complex in logico-semantic relation of Systemic Functional Linguistics (see Halliday, 1994; Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004; Eggins, 2004). Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is developed by Halliday who got influenced from Firth's system-structure theory, from Prague Linguistics, from the glossomatic theory of Hjelmslev and from British and American anthropology linguistic tradition, i.e Malinowski, Sapir and Whorf (see Halliday, 1994; Painter, 1999; Christie, 2005; Emilia, 2005; 2009).

SFL also has similar view with socio constructivism's Vygotsky that believes that the cognitive development of individual much more relates to the extent of how language culturally and psychologically used in social meaningful activities. In SFL, learning and cognitive process are same things. Both are semiotic process, process of making meaning (Painter, 1999; Christie, 2005; Emmitt & Pullock, 1995). The process of making meaning will be happen in the present of mediums or resources for making meaning, which is language (Halliday, 1994). Painter says

[Cognitive and linguistic processes] are two different ways of looking at the same thing. We can interpret such process cognitively, as thought, or semantically, as meaning – as one aspect of the total phenomenon we call 'language' (1999:62).

Both Vyostky and Halliday place language in the highest level of hierarchy in social context. They believe that language is very important in developing human capacity to live the life. Language is not passive resources. Similar with cognitive process, the language develops dynamically, independently and interactively in conscious way (Painter, 1999). This view directly contradicts with the concept of acquisition in which language is much more effectively acquired in subconscious matter (Krashen, 1981). In other words, both Vygotsky and Halliday see through language, the cognitive development of individuals is brought about into conscious process (Jones, 2007).

The expansion system is one of indicators that language needs logic process in conscious way. Expansion builds up logic of natural language (Halliday, 1994). It consists of group of clauses in which one clause is expanded by other clauses (Halliday, 1994). The clause can be in the form of paratactic, independent clause, or hypotactic, dependent clauses (Halliday, 1994).

Moreover, the expansion would not work without the presence of conjunction. Inserting conjunctions to each move of talk in the transcription can be used as test to know whether the subsequent moves elaborate, extend or enhance the previous ones (Martin, 1992; Eggins and Slade, 1997).

Meanwhile, using basic conjunction for the lower primary students can be so complicated. Cameron (2001) says that in the age of 7 until 10, the children still have problems in relating using basic conjunctions as: *because*, *so*, and *and*

but. The conjunctions of *because* and *so* are used to give the detail of reasons and condition (Halliday, 1994; Martin, 1992; Eggins, 2004). Both are the conjunction that are used to link idea in the enhancement relationship. Moreover, the conjunctions of *but* and *and* are used to add or contrast the information in the extension relationship (Halliday, 1994; Martin, 1992; Eggins, 2004).

Therefore, this research is focused on how the students uses *because*, *so*, *and*, *but* in extending and enhancing their classroom discourse. This study also focuses on how the students elaborate the talk of previous contributions by giving the example and clarification. Moreover, in this study, the expansion systems are used as theoretical bases for finding out the linguistic features of how the classroom discourse has been elaborated, extended and enhanced.

2.3.1 *Elaboration*

The main premise of elaboration is explaining on the meaning of another by further specifying or describing the primary clause meaning (Halliday, 1994). Giving specification or describing the meaning can be in the form restating, clarifying or giving the examples (Halliday & Mattheissen, 2004). In this research context, the lower primary students may be able restating, clarifying and giving the example in different words, or using different form of clauses, or using their native language, Bahasa Indonesia in paratactic relation.

The elaboration relationship in this context may be in the explicit form by using the word *means* or *for example*. The use of explicit *mean* is exemplified in the following excerpt:

<u>No. turn</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Speech Functions</u>	<u>Talk</u>
13	T	Continuing: (I)	So that's why you are sweaty
14	S1	R: Question (R)	Sweaty?
15	T	Res: probe (F: uptake)	Sweaty?==
16	S1	<i>Pro: Elaborate (R)</i>	<i>==I mean What in Bahasa ==sweaty?</i>
17	S2	Res: answer (F)	<i>==Berkeringat</i>

Sources: Data 1 with modification

The italic turn above is the example of elaboration relation. This exchange begins with the teacher reinitiates his talk by continuing his previous move (turn 13). The student responds by asking the word of sweaty in elliptical question (turn 14). In return, the teacher gives feedback by turning the student's response into question/uptake (turn 15). The student, then, takes his teacher's turn (signified with ==). The student elaborates his 14 turn by restating his question using explicit *I mean* (turn 16).

Moreover, the clause in the turn 14 is as primary clause and the clause in turn 16 is as secondary one. The secondary elaborates the primary with using explicit *means*, as indication of apposition (Halliday, 1994: Halliday and Mattheissen, 2004). Both clauses are paratactic relation or independent clauses.

However, the implicit relation mostly appears in the conversation as shown by Eggins and Slade (1997). The example of this relation is shown in the following excerpts:

<u>No. turn</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Speech Functions</u>	<u>Talk</u>
40	T	C: question (I)	Where do you live? And the answer of question?
41	S	Res: Answer (R)	I live in
42	T	Rej: Probe (F)	I live at
43	S	Res:Dev. Elaborate (R)	I live at Jalan Jingga No. 10 Padalarang Indonesia

Sources: Data 1

In the excerpt above, the student elaborates his own previous move. In the turn 41, the student answers the question. However, the answer uses inappropriate preposition, as the teacher directly corrects the error. In return, the student restates his move using implicit conjunction, as indicated in turn 43. The student' clause in turn 41 is as primary clause, and his clause in turn 43 is as secondary clause. The secondary restates the information in the turn 41. Both clauses are paratactic in relation using implicit conjunction *mean* that indicates apposition (Halliday, 1994: Halliday and Mattheissen, 2004).

2.3.2 *Extension*

Extension basically indicates that one clause extends another by giving additional information (Halliday, 1994: Halliday and Mattheissen, 2004). In extending, secondary clause can add the information, contrast the information and give alternative to the primary clause by using coordinate conjunction as *or*, *and* and *but* (Halliday, 1994: Halliday and Mattheissen, 2004; Martin, 1994; Eggins, 2004).

The conjunction *or* indicates that the secondary clause gives alternative to the primary one (Halliday, 1994; Halliday and Mattheissen, 2004; Eggins, 2004).

Conjunction *and* indicates the secondary clause add the information to primary one (Halliday, 1994). It does not implicate clausal or temporal relationship between them (Halliday and Mattheissen, 2004). The last, *but* indicates the contrasting additives (Halliday, 1994). These three conjunctions presents implicitly and explicitly in paratactic form. However, the other additive conjunction comprising *like*, *so*, and *also* are usually indicated in non-symmetrical relation, hypotactic.

The example of extension relation is shown in the following excerpt.

<u>No. turn</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Speech Functions</u>	<u>Talk</u>
15	T	C:P:elaborate (I)	Please, open your text book at....
16	S	<i>Res:D:extend (R)</i>	<i>twenty three</i>
17	T	Rej:clarify (F)	Twenty two
18	S	Res:D:acknowledge (R)	<i>Ada</i>
19	T	Rej:resolve (F)	Good. Let me check one by one. Twenty two....ok...twenty two.
20	S	<i>Res:D:extend (R)</i>	<i>The title is "Grandpa's house"</i>

Sources: Data 2 with modification

The italic turns above shows how the students extend the discourse. In this exchange, the teacher reinitiates his previous move by prolonging his talk (turn 15). The student responds the teacher's move by adding the information (turn 16). In return, the teacher gives feedback by clarifying his student's move (turn 17). The student, then, responds by giving the acknowledgement (turn 18). The students, finally, extends the information by giving additional information of the title of story in the book (turn 20). The students' extensions as shown in turn 16 and 20 use the implicit conjunction. By testing the conjunctions, we can see that the most suitable conjunction that links the previous and the subsequent turn is

and. Therefore, this exchange has been extended in paratactic or independent relation.

2.3.3 Enhancement

The basic premise of enhancement is that one clause enhances the meaning of another by giving additional information which relates to the time, place, manner and cause or condition of the information that happened (Halliday, 1994). The conjunctions that are used to link this relation are *because* and *so*.

Both *because* and *so* are for causal conjunction (Halliday, 1994; Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). They can be indicated in the form explicit and implicit (Martin, 1994; Halliday, 1994). *Because* indicates effect and cause relation, whereas *so* shows cause and effect relation (Halliday, 1994: 234). However, *because* is usually in hypotactic relation and *so* is in paratactic relation (Martin, 1994). The use of these conjunctions is exemplified in the following excerpt:

- a) [4:56] Why did you win?
-**because** we trained hard
(Taken from Martin, 1994: 193).
- b) ///In her books, Tove Jansson spoke initially to children// **so** the hero is himself quite young///
(Taken from Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 414).

Both examples above show the use of *because* and *so* in the clauses. In the example (a) above, '**because** we trained hard' is dependent clause. It will be absent without the present of dominant clause 'why did you win?' This relation

is called hypotactic in which the dependent clause depends on the presence of dominant one (Halliday, 1994). In contrast, in the example (b) above, both clauses are independent. 'In her books, Tove Jansson spoke initially to children' is primary clause. 'So the hero is himself quite young' is secondary clause. The secondary enhances the primary one by giving the detail of reasons of something happened in particular information.

Therefore, in conjunction with this research, the expansion system is as a basic foundation of how the discourse is expanded. The expansion system may indicate the pattern of most exchanges that is more than Initiation-Response-Feedback pattern. The pattern characterizes the students' ability in elaborating, extending and enhancing the discourse. These three relations are featured with the use of implicit and explicit conjunction. Therefore, the use of conjunctions can be seen as the students' ability to link some clauses in previous moves to other clauses in subsequent turns.

The students' ability in linking the clauses may implicate two important aspects. First, it may indicate that the strategies employed by the teacher are expected to enable the students to connect their world to other world, to link their ideas to the topic discussion and to compound their new knowledge based on their own previous knowledge. In other words, through the strategies, the teacher most likely involves the students' social world to the classroom.

Second, it may indicate that the students optimize their higher thinking capacity. In the developing the discourse, as mentioned previously, the students most likely clarify their idea, add the information that they thought, and contrast their friends' or their teacher's idea that opposite with their own belief. The students may also give conditional and causal reasons of how the information is important as part of the topic discussion. Clarifying, adding, contrasting, and giving reasons are some indicators of critical thinking dispositions (Ennis, 1996; Fisher, 2001).

However, clause complexes developed by the students may not necessarily show that the students' thought have reached critical thinking. The critical thinking capacity needs the presence of arguments that fulfils all criteria in critical thinking disposition (see Emilia, 2005). In this study, the students' arguments are not analyzed and become the basis of the students' thinking capacity. This study only touches superficial facts that by using the conjunctions, the students may develop their thinking capacity. In other words, this study does not focus on whether or not the students' arguments are right. It only focuses on the presence of the arguments' indicators that may be used by the students in expanding the classroom discourse.