**Characteristics of Classroom Discourse in Physics Lessons**

**Abstract**

Discourse is the teacher’s principal pedagogical tool in class. The purpose of this study was to investigate characteristics of the classroom discourse in lessons on physics, an abstract and information-rich subject. The classroom discourse was studied in five classes at five high schools in Israel, 110 students in all. The discursive characteristics examined were patterns of discourse episodes and their frequency in each lesson, the initiator of discourse (teacher or student), and types, frequency, and initiators of questions asked. Altogether, seventeen lessons comprising 373 discourse episodes and 1,892 questions were analyzed. The findings show that despite variance in teachers’ and students’ traits, all lessons were similar in various discourse parameters. Most classroom discourse was dynamic and continual; many questions were asked and were of diverse types that induced large numbers of discourse episodes. The lessons differed mainly in the number of teacher-initiated higher-order thinking questions and the number of open discourse episodes—elements indicative of dialogic teaching. However, even among teachers who asked more higher-order thinking questions and initiated open discourse with higher frequency, the discourse episodes were brief and rarely led to meaningful discussions and deep thinking. Investing more in dialogic discourse may abet the building of knowledge and effective learning of abstract ideas in a challenging subject such as physics.
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**Introduction**

Enhancing the teaching of science and mathematics has been a major goal in many countries’ education policies since the early 1960s [1] and much effort has been invested in alternative proposals for the advancement of learning, teaching, and thinking in science education [2,3]. Teaching is an interactive process and classroom discourse is its operative mechanism. Studies stress the importance of research on discourse in science education and demonstrate its cruciality for understanding science [4--6]. Even though the importance of the quality of the classroom discourse and its utility for effective learning are widely acknowledged, not enough is being done to improve this discourse. The potential of classroom discourse is underused in most classrooms in most parts of the world and in most teaching time [7].

Various studies examine the effect of intervention programs on classroom discourse [8--10]. Fewer studies, however, track the kind of classroom discourse that ensues without outside intervention and describe discourse that occurs naturally in class. Studies that investigate the classroom discourse in physics lessons, a subject considered challenging, are also few. Not many students elect to “take physics” in high school or in higher education. Thus, investigating discourse in physics lessons is an important step that may help encourage youngsters to study physics.

Traditional frontal teaching is still commonplace in most classrooms in Israel and abroad [11,12], hence the immense importance of research on whole-class discourse. The purpose of this study is to investigate the characteristics of classroom discourse in frontal physics lessons—natural discourse in class without outside intervention, among students and teachers who exhibit a variety of traits.

**Characteristics of Classroom Discourse**

Research on classroom discourse has attracted growing interest in recent years and has demonstrated its importance in science education and its cruciality for understanding the nature of science [4--6,13]. The study of classroom discourse reflects a conceptual change in science education, in which it is considered important to relate not only to the individual student’s learning and comprehension but also to the dialogue and discourse that take shape in the social context of the science class [14]. The study of science is in fact a discursive process, in which the investigation of scientific ideas and ways of explaining them takes place in parallel processes of social interaction and individual activity. This convergence offers advantages for the learning process and the development of scientific understanding [15]. It has been found that the way teachers conduct the discourse may influence the manner in which students speak and interact as they learn and may also affect their ability to “talk science” [16]. Many studies have been written about teaching approaches based on the discourse that unfolds in a science classroom where students learn collectively, e.g., group learning and models of argumentation [17,18]. Fewer studies, however, concern themselves with discourse at the whole-class level.

Effective whole-class discourse is quite a challenge. Discourse between a teacher and a class may be examined in view of the extent of involvement in and leadership of the discourse by the teacher or the students as the lesson progresses. This range may begin with a “lecture” approach, in which the teacher controls the contents and progression of the lesson, via encouraging students to ask questions in order to stimulate discussion and elicit different viewpoints, to a model of teaching that allows students to contribute equally to constructing the course of the lesson [19,20]. The last-mentioned approach reflects the epitome of “dialogic teaching,” in which exchanges of ideas take place between the teacher and the students and among the students themselves. Dialogic teaching that encourages open classroom discourse has been described as a reflective and critical form of teaching and learning that promotes meaningful learning [21,22].

In dialogic teaching, special emphasis is placed on flexibility in the treatment of ideas. This model, in contrast to traditional teaching that focuses on the teacher and presents only his or her outlook, encourages a range of perspectives and ideas [23]. In science teaching, dialogic discourse has become a central characteristic. The widespread recognition of the importance of constructive learning and the realization that students develop alternative ways of grasping scientific concepts has led to emphasis on the need for dialogic teaching through which the teacher can influence the shaping of students’ conceptual outlooks [8].

According to Scott et al. [23], the teacher–student discourse features continual tension between the dimension of teacher authoritarianism and salience and that of dialogue. Any uninterrupted progression in a science lesson, they say, should accommodate both dimensions in order to induce meaningful learning tailored to the purpose of the learning. Authoritative interaction may induce dialogue or may have the opposite outcome. In certain situations, vibrant interaction may occur in which the teacher’s authoritarianism and viewpoint are definitively non-dominant (in what scholars call interactive/dialogic interaction). In other possible situations, however, a teacher presents various and diverse outlooks that typify dialogic teaching without engaging the students in discourse. Therefore, to attain a deeper understanding of classroom discourse, additional characteristics, such as the structure of the discourse, should be addressed.

**Structure of Classroom Discourse**

A conspicuous pattern of dialogue-building in science classes is the three-stage heuristic first described by Mehan [24], comprised of a point or a question being raised by a teacher, student’s response, and teacher’s feedback. This is known as IRE—I=initiates; R=student responds; and E=teacher evaluates. Gamoran and Nystrand (1991) sort teacher feedback into two levels: low and high. Low-level feedback is given, for example, by repeating the student’s words and affirming his or her response. In high-level feedback, the teacher integrates the student’s response into the continuation of her remarks and expands on it or asks a question pursuant to it. By basing their next statement on students’ responses, teachers send a message that identifies students’ contribution to the class discussion, to learning, and to the joint construction of knowledge that a dialogic discourse may elicit.

If so, in higher-order feedback, when the teacher responds to a student’s remarks with a question and the student reacts repeatedly to the teacher’s words, or when several students respond and the teacher instigates an open discussion, a multi-stage discourse continuum is produced [23]. This kind of dialogic discourse is typified by a chain of open continua and has fewer IRE sequences that stop once the teacher obtains the response that she expects—sequences that inhibit students in creating new knowledge on their own terms [26]. In the view of McNeill et al., science is learned through a process in which students participate in a discourse, challenge and criticize the ideas of the teacher and of their fellow students, and play an important role in the development of the discussion [27].

In a discourse grounded in numerous IRE iterations, the teacher is dominant, facilitates the class in the direction of his or her choosing, and focuses on eliciting right answers from students irrespective of the depth of their understanding. This closed pattern is highly common in high-school science classes, where many teachers strive to obtain fixed responses [28].

According to Wells [11], three-stage IRE sequences should not be characterized as desirable or undesirable forms of discourse; instead, they should be judged by their intended purpose in each stage of the lesson. These stages may have different goals that are determined in accordance with the goals of the classroom discourse [5]. Abundant use of IRE sequences, however, may suggest that the teacher perceives study as the memorization of sets of facts. Most questions asked in these three-stage sequences are short and entail memorization; the teacher uses the short answers to prime students to respond to questions for which the teacher knows the answer and to evaluate students’ knowledge [7].

**Questions Asked in Classroom Discourse**

The most common way of developing a classroom discourse is by asking questions. A teacher’s questions help to structure students’ knowledge and gradually to bring information into clear focus. They help students to focus and elucidate their thinking, develop their ability to present grounded arguments, and even whet their learning motivation [29]. Students’ questions, particularly those that look for depth, indicate their thinking about the topic and mark an attempt to link ideas with existing knowledge and seek comprehension [30]. Students’ questions also alert teachers to the quality of their knowledge, reveal their misapprehensions, indicate what they want to know, and may even change the direction of teaching in the lesson [31,32].

One way of sorting types and levels of questions is by the level of thinking that is needed to answer them. One familiar sorting method is predicated on Bloom’s taxonomy [33]; this places questions in a hierarchy that begins with knowledge questions, which express the lowest level of thinking, and ascends to comprehension questions followed by questions of application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Anderson et al. (2001) [34]revised this taxonomy by emphasizing the differences between the cognitive processes and classifying questions along an axis of remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluate, and create.

In another perspective on sorting questions, three categories are proposed, each capturing a distinct stage in the process of comprehension and conceptual change among students [32]: consolidation questions, in which students confirm and elucidate information in order to understand a new idea; exploration questions, in which they wish to broaden and examine their knowledge, and elaboration questions, in which they attempt to confront arguments, resolve conflicts, and examine ideas from all directions.

In another taxonomy, a general distinction is made between lower-order thinking questions, which examine factual knowledge—usually the kind retrieved from memory and related to something already learned—and questions that entail higher-order thinking. Questions of the latter type require comprehension and the ability to analyze, generalize, and synthesize [35]. In an earlier and very similar taxonomy, two broad categories of questions are presented: confirmation questions and transformation questions. Confirmation questions are those meant to elucidate information and define and explain concepts; transformation questions concern reconstructing and reorganizing the student’s knowledge and comprehension [36]. Transformation questions are high-order thinking questions that include the analysis, synthesis, and evaluation that appear in the taxonomies of Bloom and of Anderson and Krathwohl.

Transformation questions are of particular importance in creating fruitful classroom discourse. The more challenging a question is and the more subversive it is of existing views, the more likely it is to trigger debate and draw more students into classroom discourse [37]. Open discourse cannot be based only on rhetorical questions that resolve to one foreknown answer; it must include questions that elicit different responses and present the teacher’s stance as one of many [26]. Confirmation questions, in contrast, may crimp students’ discourse by entailing rapid recollection of facts and using IRE sequences [38].

Studies show that, notwithstanding their importance, high-order thinking questions are infrequent in frontal lessons [19]. Teachers do not often ask thinking questions [39], and most questions that students ask in class are confirmation questions about basic knowledge that entail repetition and clarification of information [40,41]. Nystrand et al. (2003) [42] find that fruitful dialogic classroom discourse is uncommon, lasts fifty seconds on average in eighth grade and fifteen seconds in ninth grade, and usually comes about after the teacher or the students ask authentic open-ended questions.

**Goals of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to learn about the characteristics of classroom discourse in physics lessons taught by five different teachers to students of differing characteristics. We analyzed various aspects of the traits of the classroom discourse, asking what common characteristics they share, despite the differences and diversity of the research participants. The discourse episodes in each lesson were investigated, sorted by initiator (teacher or student), and analyzed for their patterns. As most classroom discourse revolves around questions raised by teachers or students, the types and frequency of the questions were analyzed as well.

Our research questions were the following:

1. What classroom discourse patterns come to light and how frequently are they encountered? Who initiates the discourse episodes in each class and is there a significant similarity or difference among the classes?
2. What kinds of questions did the teacher and the students in each class and ask? Is there a significant similarity or dissimilarity among the classes?

**Methodology**

*Design*

We examined classroom discourse in high-school physics lessons as it unfolded naturally and without outside intervention. The study used a mixed quantitative-qualitative paradigm based on five case studies. Our quantitative and qualitative analysis of various aspects of discourse in five different classes yielded a broad picture of verbal interaction in class. The parameters that we examined were the number of words stated by teacher and students, the number of lesson segments in which students took part in discourse—discourse episodes—the identity of the instigator of each discourse episode in each lesson, a profile of the discourse pattern in each episode, and the number and type of questions that the teacher and the students asked in each lesson.

*Participants and Setting*

Five classes comprising five physics teachers and 110 students participated in the study. The classes were in five different high schools in central and southern Israel. Thirty physics teachers were contacted; only five of them agreed to participate in the study. These teachers gave us permission to use audio-recording to document their lessons in class but asked us not to film. The camera, they claimed, might affect the natural atmosphere and the class discourse. They did, however, tell their students that the lessons would be recorded for research purposes.

Table 1 itemizes each teacher’s characteristics. Three female teachers and two male teachers, aged 30–49, took part in the study. All had academic credentials in physics and at least four years’ experience in teaching the subject.

[Insert Table 1 here]

Table 2 presents the characteristics of each teacher’s students, class, and school. As may be seen, the students were aged 13–14 through 17–18 and attended schools of various characteristics. Two classes were gender-integrated and belonged to non-religious schools; in three classes there were girls only and the schools were part of the religious school system. Enrolled in the two integrated classes (taught by Nur and Asaf) were outstanding physics students who had been screened and chosen to be part of an advanced class. There was also variance in the topics of study: in each class, the topic chosen accorded with the students’ age, the curriculum, and the teacher’s decision. Common among all students was that they had elected to study physics at an expanded level.

The lessons were all frontal; there were no laboratory classes or exercise lessons in which most of the time would be devoted to students’ work. The students sat in rows.

[Insert Table 2 here]

**Data Analysis**

Seventeen lessons were recorded, three or four consecutive lessons with a class for each teacher (four lessons for Ger and Adi and three for Shem, Nur, and Asaf). Each lesson was forty-five minutes long and was fully transcribed in the following way: it was divided into one-minute segments and everything stated during that time interval was written down, with the speaker—teacher or student—identified. When more than one student took part in the discourse, the remarks of each were marked in different colors for differentiation purposes.

For every lesson, the words enunciated by each teacher and their students were counted; we calculated the average number of words said by each teacher and their students over the course of three or four lessons. The total number of words in a lesson ranged from approximately 3,000 to 5,000. Disciplinary remarks or procedural words were not counted; only words related to the content taught were included. We also counted discourse among students in several of the minutes; this allowed us to determine how continual the students’ speaking was.

In addition, we analyzed the discourse episodes that took place in each lesson. We defined a discourse episode as a speech event between the teacher and one or more students or between two or more students, associated with the topic taught. The discourse episodes identified are familiar and recurrent in most classes [43]. An episode may be one that exhibits the IRE pattern, i.e., a very brief episode in which, for example, a student asks a clarification question and the teacher answers and then immediately goes back to teaching; or a more protracted episode in which different students are involved in discourse. An episode was identified and counted when the dialogic or multi-participant discourse ended and the teacher continued to teach the topic at hand. The next episode related to a different topic or appeared after a lengthy spell in which only the teacher spoke. Each discourse episode was analyzed on the basis of two criteria: who initiated it—teacher or student—and the pattern of discourse [23]: a three-stage IRE sequence or a multi-stage pattern that comprised a chain of interactions or involved several students. We categorized the first pattern of discourse as closed, and defined all other episodes as open. We subjected the open discourse episodes to an additional analysis in order to distinguish between those in which only one or two students participated and those in which two or three students took part and that lasted more than thirty seconds. We categorized the latter as multi-participant open discourse episodes. There were dozens of discourse episodes in each lesson; we analyzed 373 episodes altogether. Again, it is important to stress that only discourse episodes associated with the content of the lesson were counted and analyzed.

As most of the classroom discourse episodes were outgrowths of questions and based on questions, we analyzed all questions in each lesson in order to check the frequency of all teacher questions and student questions and to define each question by type. To determine the types of questions, we used the taxonomy of Pedrosa et al. [36], who divided questions into two main groups: confirmation questions, meant to clarify, define, and explain information, and transformation questions, high-order thinking questions that blend comprehension and reconstruction of knowledge. Altogether, we analyzed 1,892 questions—912 confirmation and 980 transformation questions. Each of the two authors sorted the questions separately; afterwards, they compared the outcomes. They found an 85 percent fit between the sortings and discussed the others until they attained consensus.

To check variance among the classes in respect of the various parameters, we ran a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with three categories (low, high, medium). We then ran a post-hoc analysis to determine whether a statistically significant effect existed among any of the five classes, using a Duncan adjustment for multiple testing.

Findings

*Classroom Discourse Episodes*

The analysis of discourse episodes in each class is summarized in Table 3. Although the classes were quite different, we found, to our surprise, strong similarity in several parameters of the classroom discourse. For example, despite the differences among the classes in students’ background and age, type of school, topic of study, gender, teacher’s seniority, and other characteristics, we found no statistically significant difference in the number of words that students in the various classes uttered and the average number of discourse episodes per class. All five classes engaged in lively discourse, with 18–26 discourse episodes in each class on average.

[Insert Table 3 here]

As expected, teachers did more talking during the lessons than did students. In all five classes, however, students did quite a bit of talking. Since we divided each of the lessons into minutes and recorded what the teacher or the students said during each minute, we were able to determine the continuity of speech. We found that students in all classes spoke continuously in almost every minute of the lesson, except for a few minutes in which only the teacher spoke or only the students spoke. This finding gives evidence of uninterrupted and protracted student involvement in class.

In addition, despite perceptible differences among the classes in the average number of closed discourse episodes initiated by teacher or students, the differences were not found to be significant. The episodes were brief, at 3–5 seconds. Below are two examples of closed discourse episodes, one initiated by the teacher and another by a student:

1. Teacher: What’s your question?

Student: Why did you do “mg” for this one only?

Teacher: I did a sigma-F, adding powers; these are my equations. As always with this type of question, we’ll add up the powers and solve two equations with two unknowns (Ger, Lesson 3).

1. Student: Why is this magnitude on the Y-axis and not on the X-axis? It’s as though….

Teacher: You can call it X. It doesn’t matter, you can call it what you like; the definition of the X-axis is arbitrary. It’s dependent on us (Adi, Lesson 2).

In contrast to the closed discourse, we found statistically significant differences among the classes in open discourse episodes. Asaf’s and Shem’s classes led the way, with a high average of sixteen open episodes per class. Ger’s and Adi’s classes, in contrast, were in the middle with 8–10 episodes, significantly different from the first two classes mentioned (Table 3). Similarly, there were statistically significant differences among the classes as to the initiator of the open discourse: teacher or student. Asaf initiated more open discourse episodes than did the other teachers, and Adi initiated the fewest, by a statistically significant margin. The students in Asaf’s class also initiated more open discourse.

Most open discourse episodes, among all teachers, were typified by strong teacher dominance as the teacher integrated the students’ responses into his or her remarks in order to move the discussion along. As an example, part of an open discourse episode in Asaf’s class is presented below:

Teacher: Who can explain what we’re seeing here?

Student A: A reflection….

Teacher: What do you mean by “a reflection”?

Student B: What we’re seeing here is the image of the track….

Teacher: OK. We’re really seeing the laser, but there’s something strange here: in fact, the laser is trapped.

Student B: It’s cut off at the point where….

Student C: Every time it touches the water.

Student B: No, like every time it touches the color.

Teacher: When it comes out of the water?

Student D: Yes, when it comes out of the water.

Student B: It breaks up below and then the mirror… aha….

Teacher: And then it hits the color of the water, right?

Student C: Yes….

Teacher: And then it actually comes back. Look at it from overhead. You really see the mirror, okay? How can this happen? What phenomenon is actually taking place here?

Student E: Refraction?

Teacher: It’s refraction but there’s something more than that.

The large majority of open discourse episodes, among all teachers, were rather short—less than thirty seconds—and only one or two students took part in them. Despite this brevity, such episodes were classified as open and not as closed because they included high-order thinking questions that were not answered immediately and because an attempt was made to encourage thinking and comprehension. There were few open discourse episodes, among any of the teachers, that lasted more than thirty seconds and that included three or more students; furthermore, we found no significant differences among the teachers in the number of multi-participant open discourse episodes. Multi-participant episodes in which students led the discussion and the teacher was not heavily involved were especially rare. An example of part of such an episode, initiated by Adi, is presented below. The full episode lasted about three minutes:

Teacher: What’s the potential difference between A and B in the circuit?

Student A: I want to solve it! Okay, so I said that the difference, like it comes out to 12. So from the whole right-hand side I get 12 and then I said that the voltage falls on the same split twice and then the same voltage falls, so….

Student B: But who told you that every resistor consumes exactly 2 ohms?

Student A: No one told me.

Student B: Why isn’t there any voltage here?

Student A: I say there’s 12 here, up to here, and here there’s zero, up to here and then something here falls.

Student C: An open circuit! There’s no voltage!

Student A: So what? And here it’s, like, not supposed to consume power?

(Several students express disapproval in unison)

Student C: But what’s the voltage?

Student A: There’s no voltage! There’s no voltage!

Student C: Why is there no voltage?

Student A: If there’s no current, there’s no voltage!

Student C: So what have we got here?

Student A: Nothing! *Nada! Gurnisht!*

Student D: But there you don’t do it that way!

Student A: That’s right. There’s no voltage because there’s no difference. But there’s a potential here!

Student D: There’s no potential!

Student E: There’s a potential because it fell twice….

The discussion continued in this manner, with two additional students joining. Forty-five seconds later, the teacher participated in the discourse:

Teacher (turning to Student A): You explained something. It’s not perfect and I want to understand….

Student A: The voltage between this point and that point is 6 and the voltage between the other two is 6! Here it’s zero….

Student B (turning to Student A): But I want to tell you two things. First, how do you know it’s 6? That answer isn’t perfect. Second, it’s not if I have….

Student F: X times 2 VR.

Student A: What’s that got to do with it? We have to calculate on the basis of R! The resistor itself!

The lively debate continued tumultuously for another thirteen seconds. When it ended, the teacher tried to impose order on the discussion and summarized it by endorsing Student A’s response:

Teacher: I’ll continue to run the discussion in some manner (the students laugh)…. Voltage is a difference in potential. Potential is a trait in which it’s the same along the same conductor. So Dina [Student A—an alias] did it right here: Along the same conductor, there’s the same potential. (Adi, Lesson 3)

In the part of the discourse episode presented above, six students participated and the teacher largely stayed out, allowing the students to conduct most of the discussion. As stated, lengthy discourse episodes were uncommon and, in fact, occurred only in Adi’s class. In most discourse episodes in all classes, short and open alike, the students’ statements were very brief and were often cut short by other students or by the teacher. Hardly any time to think or rephrase was given; the discussion proceeded very rapidly.

*Characteristics of Questions in Class*

The analysis of the characteristics of questions in each class is summarized in Table 4. In all five classes, the total number of questions is highly impressive; plainly it was the questions that led to the classroom discourse. Teachers asked more than sixty questions per lesson on average; students asked 20–50 questions.

As in the profile of the classroom discourse, we found, to our surprise, similarity among the classes in terms of the questions asked in the classroom. We expected the variance in the teachers’ and students’ characteristics to cause differences in the characteristics of the questions asked in class. However, we found no significant differences among the classes in the total number of questions and the number of questions asked by teachers and students in each class. We also found no significant differences among the classes in the total number of confirmation questions asked in class. As stated, confirmation questions are lower-order thinking questions that are meant to clarify or examine existing knowledge. An example follows:

Teacher: I’m going to do normal less W. This minus [sign]: what does it signify?

Student: The direction.

Teacher: The direction, that’s exactly right (Ger, Lesson 4).

[Insert Table 4 here]

However, the questions were not similar in all of their characteristics. When we segmented the questions by types, we found significant differences among the classes in the total number of transformation questions. While many such questions were asked in Asaf’s class, it is important to note the proliferation of questions of this type in four of the five classes: between sixty and eighty per lesson! In Adi’s, Asaf’s and Ger’s classes, they even outnumbered confirmation questions (Table 4).

Transformation questions elicit higher-order thinking. Generally speaking, they lend themselves to more than one correct answer, encourage thinking, and may abet the creation of a fruitful discourse. For example:

Teacher: Everyone’s heard that you can burn ants using a magnifying glass. Is it true? If so, how does it happen? (Asaf, Lesson 4).

When we segmented the questions by their initiator—teacher or student—again we found significant differences among the teachers in the number of transformation and confirmation questions that they asked. Asaf and Ger asked significantly more transformation questions than did the other teachers. In contrast to the teachers, we found no statistically significant differences among students in different classes in the confirmation and transformation questions that they asked. Importantly, however, the average number of students’ questions varied widely. For example, Asaf’s students asked approximately forty transformation questions on average in each lesson, whereas Nur’s and Gar’s students asked only thirteen (Table 4). The large standard deviations in this parameter are indicative of sizable differences among lessons in the same class, which contributed to the lack of statistical significance.

**Discussion**

The underlying hypothesis in this study is that classroom discourse plays a meaningful role in students’ learning and comprehension processes. The goal of the study was to produce a profile of the discourse in five different physics classes.

The commonalities among all five classes that we investigated were that all students elected to take physics, the teachers had the education and training to teach the subject, and they engaged in frontal teaching in an ordinary classroom (as opposed to a laboratory). In all other characteristics, there were differences: teacher characteristics such as gender, age, and teaching experience; student characteristics such as, gender, age, class size, socioeconomic status; type of school (religious / non-religious); and topics of study. Since these factors influence the classroom discourse, we hypothesized that many discursive characteristics that we encountered in each class would be unique and typical to that class. The similarities that we found among the classes in various parameters are thought-provoking; they indicate that all five teachers had a similar outlook on teaching.

In all five classes, the discourse was lively and uninterrupted for almost the full duration of the lesson. In almost every minute of the lesson, in each of the seventeen lessons analyzed, at least one student in addition to the teacher spoke. Students participated in the discourse continually and teachers did not tend toward lengthy monologues. We found, on average, around twenty discourse episodes per lesson, and in each class that we investigated it was evident that the students spoke willingly amid mutual trust and respect. Their uninterrupted involvement in lessons should not be take for granted; it clashes with studies showing that teaching remains largely monologic—teachers talking and students listening [19,42,44].

We found, as expected, that teachers talked much more than students during the lesson. This, however, does not mean that one teacher who spoke more than another teacher was necessarily more dominant. Adi and Shem, for example, spoke much more than Nur did but allowed their students to initiate more discourse episodes than did Nur. Most discourse in all classes followed a question-and-answer pattern. The large number of questions asked by teachers—more than sixty per lesson on average—and by students yielded inexorably dynamic and rapid discourse in all classes. Our analysis of the types of questions showed that students in all classes primarily asked confirmation questions, whereas most questions put forward by teachers were transformational. This finding contradicts other findings showing that higher-order thinking questions appear very infrequently in class, notwithstanding their immense importance [35,45].

By eliciting higher-order thinking, transformation questions encourage students to think independently and abet the development of open discourse episodes. Still, it is important to emphasize the indubitable need for confirmation questions. These questions, most of which yield short answers, focus attention on the topic of the lesson and are important in developing links between previous material and discussion of a new topic [23]. However, when teachers base most classroom discourse on confirmation questions, they pose less of a challenge to students’ thinking, keep the discussion from broadening, and crimp open discourse. In addition, teachers who overuse these questions give evidence of their perception of teaching as its being the student’s job to memorize information and retrieve it from memory when needed [42]. Thus, the teachers in our study who asked numerous transformation questions along with confirmation questions seem to have a more participatory and dialogic outlook on teaching.

The most important differences that we found among the teachers in the characteristics of classroom discourse concern the number of transformation questions that they asked and the number of open discourse episodes that they or their students initiated. These are prime indicators of dialogic teaching and learning based on open and fruitful discourse. Dialogic learning generates a different kind of encounter between the teacher, the students, and the scholastic material; it even has a material effect on conceptual understanding [37,46]. Among the teachers, Asaf and Shem were those who treated closed discourse with particular paucity and initiated much more discourse of the open type.

However, even in Asaf’s class, where the largest number of transformation questions was asked, the use of IRE sequences was minimized, and open discourse episodes were the most common, we found that most discourse episodes lasted a few seconds and did not evolve into probing discussion, and that only one or two students took part. Among all teachers, in fact, few discourse episodes lasted more than thirty seconds and had more than two student participants. That is to say, even though the teachers asked higher-order thinking questions, the potential of these questions, which encourage deep thought and discussion, was not put to proper use.

One possible reason for the superficiality of discussion that typified most discourse in all classes is that even though teachers asked open-ended questions, they expected one correct answer and thus squandered the opportunity to elicit thinking and encourage additional students to contribute to the debate. Therefore, even an open-ended question may become a closed-ended one, as [44]claims, because students are used to the existence of one correct answer. Most teacher-initiated open discourse episodes in the classes that we studied flowed from a transformation question. In practice, however, the teachers limited the discourse by providing the answers themselves, thus forfeiting opportunities to develop discussion. Accordingly, these discourse episodes did not blossom into high-quality discourse and did not express epitomically dialogic teaching.

Another reason for the superficiality of classroom discourse is the heavy burden of material that teachers are required to teach. In the sciences, physics in particular, teachers have to cover many topics within a given time—a problem that stands out particularly in matriculation classes. The sheer quantity of information that teachers must present makes rapid-fire teaching unavoidable. Teachers cut discussions short, give answers themselves, and leave insufficient time for thinking and more meaningful learning.

In sum, one may say that most discourse in all classes was lively and continual, not lecture-like but also not dialogic. It was typified by a constant flow of questions and answers and superficial, brief discussion. The teachers strove to involve the students and asked many diverse questions, but the discourse episodes were too short and too numerous to induce meaningful discussions and deep thinking.

It is important to emphasize that although teachers face onerous pressure to present copious material rapidly, the students in almost all classes that we analyzed were continually involved and active, and the teachers generated interest and collaboration as they taught. Obviously, one cannot make a broad generalization on the basis of an analysis of five teachers’ lessons, particularly since only five of the thirty teachers whom we approached agreed to divulge their classes’ doings and have their lessons recorded. Even after we assured them that their names and those of their schools would stay confidential, most of the teachers remained apprehensive. Those who did agree to participate in the study were the ones who had strong self-esteem, were confident about their teaching, and enjoyed their colleagues’ appreciation. Therefore, the extent to which they are representative of the norm is even less clear. One presumes that discourse in classes run by less self-assured teachers would typically be more monologic than that found in this study.

Another limitation of the study was the confinement of our analysis to classroom discourse in general class lessons. Presumably, an analysis of classroom discourse in laboratory lessons would yield a different and broader depiction of the traits of discourse in all physics lessons.

In conclusion, this study sheds light on the characteristics of discourse in physics lessons. Enhancing awareness of the nature and quality of classroom discourse may promote better learning. Greater emphasis on dialogic discourse may improve classroom discourse and abet the construction of knowledge and effective learning. Therefore, it is worth contemplating ways to facilitate dialogic discourse specifically in subjects such as physics—challenging subjects that are rich in abstract information.
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**Table 1: Teacher Characteristics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pct. of full-time post** | **Education** | **Experience in teaching physics (years)** | **Age** | **Gender** | **Teacher** |
| 80 | Electronics engineer, masters in science education | 4 | 38 | Male | Ger |
| 100 | Master’s degree in physics | 26 | 49 | Female | Shem |
| 100 | Master’s degree in physics | 8 | 32 | Female | Adi |
| 100 | Engineer with master’s degree in science education | 7 | 35 | Female | Nur |
| 40 | Masters in neuroscience, Ph.D. in teaching physics | 6 | 30 | Male | Asaf |

**Table 2: Student, School, and Subject Characteristics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Class** | **Age** | **Students (N) and gender** | **Characteristics of students in class** | **Topics of study in lesson** | **Location and characteristics of school** |
| Ger | 16–17, 11th grade | 20 girls | High socioeconomic status, preparing for matriculation in physics at 5-point level | Newton’s laws, voltage, normal kinematics, friction | Religious girls’ high school in central Israel |
| Shem | 17–18,  12th grade | 8 girls | Medium socioeconomic status, preparing for matriculation in physics at 5-point level | Receptor discharge/load, in-line and parallel connecting of resistors, complex circuits | Religious girls’ high school in southern Israel |
| Adi | 17–18,  12th grade | 22 girls | High socioeconomic status, preparing for matriculation in physics at 5-point level | Kinematics, Newton’s laws, electrical circuits | Religious girls’ high school in central Israel |
| Nur | 13–14,  8th grade | 30 boys and girls | Middle-high socioeconomic status, scientific reserve class, outstanding students | Mechanical motion, Newton’s laws, kinetic energy, coils | Non-religious high school in southern Israel |
| Asaf | 15–16, 11th grade | 30 boys and girls | High socioeconomic status, class for outstanding physics students | Optics, refraction in various media, lenses | Non-religious scientific high school in central Israel |

**Table 3: Analysis of Classroom Discourse Episodes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Discourse episodes | *Mean (SD)* | | | | |
| Ger | Shem | Adi | Nur | Asaf | *f* | *Sig.* |
| Total student words | 796.75  (512.62) | 1225.33  (337.06) | 1401.25  (1489.62) | 922.00  (465.15) | 1407.33  (292.76) | .41 | .80 |
| Total teacher words | a2313.75  (452.43) | b3740.67  (279.19) | b3391.75  (367.79) | a2192.33  (591.76) | a2359.00  (468.89) | \*\*8.67 | .002 |
| Total discourse episodes | 20.00  (4.55) | 24.00  (2.65) | 22.00  (9.49) | 18.00  (5.57) | 26.33  (4.51) | .88 | .50 |
| Closed discourse episodes | 9.50  (2.65) | 8.33  (1.53) | 13.50  (13.48) | 12.00  (4.00) | 10.00  (4.31) | .28 | .88 |
| Open discourse episodes | a,b10.50  (3.00) | b15.67  (3.05) | a,b8.50  (8.74) | a6.00  (1.73) | b16.33  (1.53) | \*2.68 | .056 |
| Open multi-participant discourse | 2.50  (.57) | 4.67  (1.53) | 2.25  (2.87) | 1.33  (1.15) | 3.00  (1.00) | 1.58 | .24 |
| Teacher-initiated discourse | 11.75  (.96) | 10.33  (.58) | 13.75  (6.60) | 16.00  (4.0) | 12.67  (2.08) | .98 | .46 |
| Teacher-initiated closed discourse | 4.25  (1.50) | 1.67  (.58) | 8.25  (9.60) | 10.00  (2.67) | 2.33  (1.53) | 1.70 | .21 |
| Teacher-initiated open discourse | a,b7.50  (2.38) | a,b8.67  (1.15) | a5.50  (4.04) | a,b6.00  (1.73) | b11.33  (.58) | \*2.43 | .057 |
| Student-initiated discourse | a,b8.25  (4.19) | b13.67  (2.31) | a,b8.25  (5.68) | a2.00  (1.73) | b13.67  (3.21) | \*4.53 | .018 |
| Student-initiated closed discourse | 5.50  (3.11) | 6.67  (1.15) | 5.25  (4.99) | 2.00  (1.73) | 7.67  (3.05) | 1.26 | .34 |
| Student-initiated open discourse | a,b2.75  (1.26) | b7.00  (2.00) | a,b3.00  (4.76) | a.00  (.00) | b6.00  (1.73) | \*3.29 | .049 |

Post-hoc tests—homogeneous subsets by Duncan: a=Low Mean; b=High Mean; a,b=Medium Mean

**Table 4: Characteristics of Questions in Classroom Discourse**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | |
| Questions | |  | *Mean (SD)* | | | | | | ANOVA | | |
|  | Ger | | Shem | Adi | Nur | Asaf |  | *f* | *Sig.* |
|  | |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total questions | |  | 110.50  (19.33) | | 118.67  (25.38) | 116.25  (39.70) | 79.00  (22.07) | 130.33  (26.27) |  | 1.42 | .29 |
| Total teacher questions | |  | 91.50  (27.23) | | 68.33  (17.79) | 63.00  (17.51) | 61.00  (26.21) | 72.00  (34.87) |  | .89 | .49 |
| Total student questions | |  | 19.00  (13.19) | | 50.33  (12.05) | 53.25  (49.47) | 18.00  (5.57) | 58.33  (34.79) |  | 1.48 | .27 |
| Confirmation questions | |  | 51.75  (17.65) | | 61.00  (13.11) | 48.50  (26.04) | 58.00  (34.87) | 51.33  (30.02) |  | .14 | .96 |
| Transformation questions | |  | a,b58.75  (27.44) | | a,b57.67  (12.72) | a,b67.75  (17.35) | a21.33  (12.17) | b79.00  (18.74) |  | \*2.75 | .055 |
| Teacher confirmation questions | |  | b38.75  (21.36) | | a,b26.67  (2.08) | a15.75  (2.22) | a16.67  (4.51) | a10.33  (10.97) |  | \*3.29 | .049 |
| Teacher transformation questions | |  | b52.75  (23.12) | | a,b41.67  (19.55) | a,b47.25  (15.43) | a21.00  (12.53) | b63.77  (22.50) |  | \*2.85 | .052 |
| Student confirmation questions | |  | 13.00  (8.92) | | 34.33  (11.06) | 32.75  (17.22) | 13.67  (8.50) | 41.00  (22.38) |  | 1.34 | .31 |
| Student transformation questions | |  | 6.00  (5.03) | | 16.00  (13.59) | 20.50  (22.81) | 1.67  (1.53) | 17.33  (2.52) |  | 1.31 | .32 |
|  | |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Post Hoc Tests - Homogeneous Subsets by Duncan: a=Low Mean; b=High Mean; a,b=Medium Mean