

Dialogic/Authoritative Discourse and Modelling in a High School Teaching Sequence on Optics

Buty, Christian; Mortimer, Eduardo

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Buty, C., & Mortimer, E. (2008). Dialogic/Authoritative Discourse and Modelling in a High School Teaching Sequence on Optics. *International Journal of Science Education*, 30(12), 1635-1660. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690701466280>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.



**DIALOGIC/AUTHORITATIVE DISCOURSE AND MODELLING
IN A HIGH SCHOOL TEACHING SEQUENCE ON OPTICS**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Science Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSED-2006-0328.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	qualitative research, model-based learning, physics education, discourse, high school
Keywords (user):	



DIALOGIC/AUTHORITATIVE DISCOURSE AND MODELLING IN A HIGH SCHOOL TEACHING SEQUENCE ON OPTICS

Abstract

In this paper we aim at establishing a link between two theoretical frames: modelling and its use in the design and analysis of scientific teaching sequences, and the communicative approaches as they alternate in classroom activities. In this case study, we follow the interactions between the teacher and a pair of students during an entire teaching sequence in Optics (grade 11). We focus on the way the teacher managed the dialogicity and the modelling processes in the classroom discourse. A qualitative analysis shows some difficulties in such an achievement, and their consequences on students' meaning making.

Introduction

Recent years have seen a gradual development of interest in studies of how meanings are developed through language and other modes of communication in science classrooms (for example, Lemke 1990; Sutton, 1992; Ogborn, Kress, Martins & McGillicuddy 1996; Roychoudhury & Roth 1996; Mortimer, 1998; Scott, 1998; Candela, 1999; Kress, Jewitt, Ogborn & Tsatsarelis 2001; Kelly & Brown 2003; Mortimer & Scott 2003).

Another recent trend in science education research is the increasing prominence of studies of modelling processes (for example Grosslight, Unger, Jay & Smith 1991; Tiberghien, 1994; Devi, Tiberghien, Baker & Brna 1996; Gilbert & Boulter, 1998; Gobert & Buckley, 2000; Treagust, Chittleborough & Mamiala 2002; Besson & Viennot, 2004) and the development of this for teachers' professional development (Justi & Gilbert, 2002; Crawford & Cullin, 2004).

In this paper we bring together these two areas of research by addressing some questions concerning the ways in which dialogic discourse might help students to understand modelling

1
2
3 processes. We are also interested in investigating whether teaching activities explicitly based
4
5 on modelling processes favour the emergence of dialogic discourse in the classrooms. In
6
7 analyzing some episodes from a teaching sequence on Optics for 16/17 year-old French
8
9 students (grade 11), we draw on some aspects of the analytical framework proposed by
10
11 Mortimer and Scott (2003) and also on the conception of modelling proposed by Buty,
12
13 Tiberghien and Le Maréchal (2004).
14
15

16 17 **Theoretical Background**

18
19 In this section, we will present the main features of the two theoretical frames we are going to
20
21 use, on modelling and on discursive interactions.
22
23
24

25 26 **Modelling processes**

27 28 *Epistemological point of view*

29
30 From an epistemological point of view, science is a cognitive activity focused on thinking
31
32 about a given domain of the physical world, with the aim of explaining it, and predicting the
33
34 possibility of events and the consequences of actions we might carry out in this world. For
35
36 these purposes, it is necessary to establish models. 'Like other metascientific concepts, the
37
38 notion of model defies formal definition. One might say, perhaps, that a theoretical model is
39
40 an abstract system used to represent a real system, both descriptively and dynamically'
41
42 (Ziman, 2001: 147). Ziman argues that models are never constructed from direct perceptions,
43
44 but from pre-existing theories, which orient our perceptions by providing the theoretical 'lens'
45
46 that makes the perceived world meaningful. When constructing the "abstract system", some
47
48 elements of the "real system" are forgotten, and some are modified or described according to
49
50 the theory which is chosen to elaborate the model.
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 Using models is a continuous activity of scientists. This is an aspect of science which can be
58
59 considered as solved within the frame of 'normal science', and scientists, in the course of their
60
professional activity, feel 'an characteristic unconcern' (Kuhn, 1970: 47) for analyses of this

1
2
3 kind. It has not always been the case. Looking backwards in the history of science, we can
4
5 observe that one of the basic distinctions Science made from the birth of modern science –
6
7 what Kant called the Copernican revolution – was that between the subject matter and the
8
9 object of study. Galileo, for example, was not able to study a ‘real’ pendulum. He had to
10
11 detach his pendulum from the real world in order to make it an object of study. Science
12
13 cannot study the real world as it is; it has to simplify it in order to be able to model it. It has to
14
15 separate the object or phenomenon of interest from all the complexities that cannot be handled
16
17 within a theoretical framework.
18
19
20

21
22 We can observe too that scientists do reflect on the epistemological status of models each time
23
24 a revolution in science occurs (‘when the normal-scientific tradition change[s]’, Kuhn, 1970:
25
26 112), because a revolution generally leads to a new way of seeing the world. A major change
27
28 of this sort happened, for example, when Newton proposed a new way of seeing the world in
29
30 which all the objects on Earth behave in the same way as the planets and stars in the universe.
31
32
33

34 35 *Educational point of view*

36
37 Very often, science teachers do not appear to see the necessity of making explicit the
38
39 distinction between the “abstract system” (the model) and the “real system”, during science
40
41 instruction. They neither spend a lot of time to describe the way the model has been
42
43 established, under the control of a given theory.
44
45

46
47 On the contrary we, as researchers in science education, consider that an explicit
48
49 epistemological discourse is of great interest for students’ understanding, for several reasons.

50
51 The new way of seeing the reality to which students are being introduced and the learning
52
53 demands it represents (Leach & Scott, 2002) generally means a quite large change in their
54
55 way of thinking. We are not implying that learning science represents the same kind of
56
57 challenge as a scientific revolution; but we might assume that the demands imposed upon the
58
59
60

1
2
3 students would be lowered if we made clear to them the change that the new way of thinking
4
5 represents.
6
7

8 We cannot take into consideration all aspects of the real world when elaborating a
9
10 scientific model; it is important for the students to realise this from the start. This distinction
11
12 also helps students to become more and more autonomous as they get used to referring to it in
13
14 the daily classrooms activities.
15

16
17 We also consider it necessary to make explicit the distinction between theories and models, by
18
19 indicating the role of the theory in the elaboration of models.
20
21

22 In the remainder of this article, following Tiberghien (1994), by ‘world of objects and events’
23
24 we mean any element of knowledge which refers to the material world. By ‘world of theories
25
26 and models’ we mean the whole set of statements, more or less structured and explicit, which
27
28 are available for understanding a wide range of situations, and constitute explanatory systems.
29
30 These notions can be applied both in the context of everyday life and in the context of science
31
32 instruction. Of course, the nature of theory in one case and in the other is deeply different (see
33
34 the discussion in Vosniadou, 1994: 47), but in both cases the word ‘theory’ is justified by an
35
36 explicative power and a general validity.
37
38
39

40
41 We consider that it is necessary, during instruction, to introduce a clear distinction between
42
43 the world of objects and events and the world of models and theories, and to acknowledge that
44
45 the relations between these two worlds are not the same when we speak from an everyday as
46
47 opposed to a scientific point of view. In this way, we help students to make sense of a ‘world’
48
49 that sometimes is at odd with their commonsense view on the matter being considered.
50
51
52

53 **Meaning making in science classroom**

54 **The problem of representations: semiotic registers**

55
56
57
58
59 Another related, but distinct, point is the necessity to take into account the issue of
60
61 representations in analysing classroom discourse and practice; it stems from the consideration

1
2
3 that science discourse is multimodal (Lemke, 2002). Works on the area of multimodality
4
5 tends to be ‘oriented to the detailed description of speech, writing, gesture and action, and the
6
7 visual, and the description of their interaction in communicational ensembles and their use’
8
9 (Kress et al., 2001) in science classrooms. Duval (1995: 21) specifies some kind of semiotic
10
11 systems, which he calls semiotic registers, and which have three cognitive features: they can
12
13 constitute a perceptible trace of something which can be identified as a representation; they
14
15 are provided with rules allowing to transform some representations into others, so that the
16
17 new ones carry additional knowledge compared with the former ones; they can be converted
18
19 in representations into another register, so that this conversion allows to express new
20
21 meanings about what is represented. The main semiotic registers used in science classes are
22
23 natural language, mathematical symbolism, graphs, and diagrams.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 *Characterizing dialogic and authoritative discourse*

31 In this paper we shall use the analytical framework developed by Mortimer & Scott (2003) to
32
33 characterize classroom discourse. The framework is based on five linked aspects, which focus
34
35 on the role of the teacher, and are grouped in terms of Teaching Focus, Approach and Action:
36
37 teaching purposes, content, communicative approach, teacher interventions and patterns of
38
39 interactions (figure 1). For the purposes of the analysis presented here we shall focus our
40
41 attention on the Communicative Approach.
42
43
44
45

46
47
48
49 Insert figure 1 about here
50

51
52
53 The concept of Communicative Approach provides a perspective on how the teacher works
54
55 with students to develop ideas in the classroom. According to the authors, when a teacher
56
57 works with students to develop ideas and understanding in the classroom, their approach can
58
59 be characterized along a dimension, which extends between two extreme positions: either the
60

1
2
3 teacher hears what the student has to say from the student's point of view, or the teacher hears
4
5 what the student has to say only from the school science point of view.
6
7

8 We shall refer to the first position as a dialogic communicative approach, where
9
10 attention is paid to more than one point of view, more than one voice is heard, and
11
12 there is an exploration or 'interanimation' (Bakhtin, 1934/1981) of ideas (...) We
13
14 shall refer to the second as an authoritative communicative approach, where
15
16 attention is focused on just one point of view, only one voice is heard and there is
17
18 no exploration of different ideas (Mortimer & Scott, 2003: 33-34).
19

20 According to Mortimer & Scott (2003) an important feature of the distinction between
21
22 dialogic and authoritative approaches is that a sequence of talk can be dialogic or authoritative
23
24 in nature, independent of whether it is uttered individually or between people. What makes
25
26 talk functionally dialogic is the fact that different ideas are acknowledged, rather than whether
27
28 it is produced by a group of people or by a single individual. This point leads the authors to
29
30 present the second dimension to consider when thinking about the Communicative Approach:
31
32 that the talk can be interactive in the sense of involving the participation of more than one
33
34 person in the discourse, or non-interactive in the sense of involving the participation of only
35
36 one person.
37
38
39

40
41 As in this article the four episodes to be analysed are interactive, we shall restrain our analysis
42
43 to the dialogic/authoritative dimension. Although these aspects were developed in relation to
44
45 the teacher's role and actions, they can also be used to characterise student-student
46
47 interactions in the classroom.
48
49

50
51 In analysing the communicative approach we must be aware of the reserve made by Scott,
52
53 Mortimer and Aguiar (2006: 627) that "we cannot classify a single utterance as being dialogic
54
55 or authoritative. This is a criterion that applies to a number of utterances that constitute an
56
57 episode of meaning making." This is a consequence of the Bakhtinian principle that any
58
59 utterance is a link in the chain of speech communication.
60

1
2
3 An important point in identifying the communicative approaches is that their emergence in
4 science classroom is closely linked to the use of different social languages (at least everyday
5 and school science social languages) and speech genres in the instructional practices, a point
6 we shall develop on the next topic.
7
8
9
10
11

12 ***Speech genres, social languages and secundarisation attitude***

13
14 Bakhtin assumes that language is never unitary. 'It is unitary only as an abstract grammatical
15 system of normative forms, taken in isolation from concrete, ideological conceptualisations
16 that fill it, and in isolation from the uninterrupted process of historical becoming that is a
17 characteristic of all living languages' (Bakhtin, 1934/1981, p. 288). To model this
18 heterogeneity, Bakhtin proposes two forms of stratification of language: the notions of social
19 language and of speech genre.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 A social language is 'a discourse peculiar to a specific stratum of society (professional, age
30 group, etc.) within a given social system at a given time' (Bakhtin, 1934/1981, p. 430). All
31 social languages are 'specific points of view on the world, forms for conceptualising the
32 worlds in words, specific world views, each characterized by its own objects, meanings and
33 values (...) As such they encounter one another and co-exist in the consciousness of real
34 people' (Bakhtin, 1934/1981, p. 291-292). In Bakhtin's view, a speaker always produces an
35 utterance using a specific social language that shapes what he/she can say.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 On the other hand, 'a speech genre is not a form of language, but a typical form of utterance;
47 as such the genre also includes a certain typical kind of expression that inheres in it (...)
48 Genres correspond to typical situations of speech communication, typical themes, and,
49 consequently, also to particular contacts between the *meanings* of words and the actual
50 concrete reality under certain typical circumstances' (Bakhtin, 1953/1986, p. 87).
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Thus, whilst a social language is related to a specific point of view determined by a social or
58 professional position, the speech genre is related to the social and institutional place where the
59
60

1
2
3 discourse is produced. So, in orchestrating the ways talk is produced in classrooms, teachers
4
5 will resort to at least two different social languages – everyday life and school science social
6
7 languages – and to a variety of speech genres, which includes narratives, descriptions,
8
9 explanations, different patterns of interaction, etc.
10
11

12 Bakhtin also distinguishes ‘primary genres’ (‘simple’ ones), which ‘have taken form in
13
14 unmediated speech communication ... have an immediate relation to actual reality and to the
15
16 real utterances of the others’ (op.cit., 62); and ‘second genres’ (‘complex’ ones), ‘novels,
17
18 drama, all kinds of scientific research, major genres of commentary... [which] arise in more
19
20 complex and comparatively highly developed and organized cultural communication
21
22 (primarily written) that is artistic, scientific, socio-political, and so on’ (op.cit., 62). Bautier
23
24 and Goigoux (2004) have extended these categories. They define the ‘secondarisation
25
26 attitude’ as a response from the student to the demand of ‘constituting the world of academic
27
28 objects as a world of objects to be investigated, on which s/he can (and must) perform specific
29
30 thought activities and work’. In adopting this attitude the student become able to ‘establish a
31
32 circulation of knowledge and activities from one moment and from one academic object to
33
34 others’, what can result in the understanding that ‘a problem to solve looks like others which
35
36 have already been solved’ (Bautier & Goigoux, 2004: 91, our translation). They claim that
37
38 most of the students focus ‘on the ordinary, everyday meaning of tasks, objects or words
39
40 [which] seems to prevent them constructing the second academic dimension of these objects’
41
42 (ibid.).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Comments on the links between these theoretical elements**

52
53 We have explained four theoretical elements: a view of modelling processes in science and of
54
55 their explanation in science instruction; the interplay between semiotic registers; a
56
57 characterisation of communicative approaches in classroom; social languages and speech
58
59 genres. This section is devoted to the articulation between these elements.
60

1
2
3 The common core of these elements is the working hypothesis that understanding comes from
4 relationships between several descriptions or points of views, and consequently that the
5 process of understanding can be facilitated by making these relationships explicit.
6
7
8
9

10
11 In general terms, Mortimer and Scott assume that dialogic discourse is open to different
12 perspectives. Although the authors have used the dialogic-authoritative dimension to
13 characterize whether or not the teacher attends to the students' points of view as well as to the
14 school science view, we use this dimension to consider the dialogic potential of modelling
15 activities: situations in which the teacher pays attention to more than one point of view, even
16 when these different points of view were not taken from the students suggestions or ideas. In
17 talking about a material situation in terms of both the world of objects and events and the
18 world of theories and models a teacher offers an opportunity to the students to see things from
19 different angles, which has a potential to bring different points of view to the understanding
20 process. As Voloshinov (1929/1973: 102) says, any deep understanding, or meaning making,
21 is dialogic in nature because one lays down a set of one's own answering words for each word
22 of the utterance one is in process of understanding. More a teacher makes different points of
23 view available in the classroom, higher is the possibility for the students to lay down different
24 answering words, each one related to a different point of view. In this way, explicit modelling
25 process has a potential to increase dialogicality and understanding in classrooms.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Representational issues (the distinction between several semiotic registers and the conversion
48 from one register to another) must not be confused with epistemological issues (the
49 distinction between the two worlds): although perceptible, a schema on a textbook is not an
50 object, and an animation on a computer screen is not an event. Nevertheless, these
51 representations are connected to the two worlds because they are ways to represent, to work
52 on and to make public and subject to discussion, some elements of knowledge belonging
53 either to the world of objects and events or to the world of theories and models. Our main
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 concern when speaking about semiotic register in this paper is related to the potential of
4 establishing relationships between different points of view that the changes between semiotic
5 registers bring about.
6
7
8
9

10 In considering the potential that modelling and the use of different semiotic registers has to
11 favour the emergence of dialogic discourse we offer a way of expanding the dialogic-
12 authoritative dimension of classroom discourse proposed by Mortimer and Scott (2003).
13 Nevertheless, we are not suggesting that dialogic discourse emerges every time someone
14 makes explicit links between the world of theories and models and the world of objects and
15 events. For example, if the teacher establishes these links from the point of view of school
16 science the discourse probably will be located in the authoritative dimension. We suggest that,
17 when seeing things from different modelling points of view or using different semiotic
18 registers to represent a phenomenon, students enlarge their view on the phenomenon, which
19 potentially increases the number of answering words the students lay down in trying to
20 understand the situation.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 For the analysis of classroom discourse alongside the dialogic-authoritative dimension we are
37 interested in this paper, the distinction between primary and secondary speech genres and the
38 emergence of secundarisation attitudes are fundamental aspects to pay attention in the
39 discourse. The use of primary genres is closely linked to the use of the social language of
40 everyday life and the use of secondary genre will emerge as a consequence of the
41 “translations” between the semiotic register of natural language and other more specialized
42 semiotic registers – diagrams, graphics and equations, used in science. These translations also
43 have the potential to favour the emergence of different points of view, which characterize
44 dialogic discourse.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Research questions

These theoretical considerations allow putting forward the following general hypothesis, which could be a part of a global research program: dialogic discourse may help students to establish the relationship between the world of objects and events and the world of theories and models, which is a central feature of understanding modelling processes. In this perspective, it is relevant to investigate if the teacher presents different points of view, which is at the core of dialogic discourse: does s/he talk about the two worlds from the physics point of view on the one hand and from the everyday-life point of view in the other hand? In this articulation of two points of view, does s/he use and relate different social languages, different speech genres and different semiotic registers?

This hypothesis can be considered here as a working one, which cannot be (dis)confirmed by the data of a specific paper, but emerges as a consequence of articulating the two theoretical perspectives – modelling and dialogism.

In this paper, we begin to address these questions in a case study, by a qualitative analysis of classroom discourse, involving several episodes in different sessions of a complete teaching sequence. Thus, the data come from a single class, with a single teacher. By the qualitative analysis which follows, we do not pretend anything more than performing a first test of the fruitfulness of combining these two frameworks – modelling and communicative approach – for classroom discourse analysis.

In this context, we are interested in answering the following much more specific questions:

- How did the teacher manage the dialogicity and the modelling processes in the classroom discourse?
- What were the difficulties he encountered in linking the various points of view, relatively to modelling processes or to semiotic registers?
- What were the consequences of these difficulties for students' understanding?

Content and features of the teaching sequence, methods and samples

For many years, the previously exposed considerations on modelling have informed the way teaching sequences have been designed in a collaborative work with teachers (Tiberghien, 2000; Gaidioz, Vince & Tiberghien 2004). The teaching sequence in Optics (grade 11) which will be discussed in this article has been elaborated in the same way. It is grounded on the following learning hypotheses:

- In class activities, and particularly in practical sessions, students have to establish links between the theories/models they are supposed to learn and the experiments they are asked to carry out.
- The main difficulty they face to understand and learn science is to understand the world of theories and models and to establish the links between this world and the world of objects and events. In other words, a deep understanding of concepts and of the relations between concepts depends not only on the learning of models and theories but also on the construction by students of meaningful links between the two worlds.
- Students are likely to use their own previous ‘theory’ (normally implicit and constructed from everyday experience or previous teaching) for this purpose instead of the science theory they do not know yet or do not understand completely. For example, such a naïve theory can incorporate statements like “in order to set an object into motion I need to push or pull it” which, although wrong from a scientific point of view, may be considered by students as explicative in a given situation.

In line with the official curriculum, the teaching sequence on Optics, which has been elaborated, included the following topics: the rectilinear propagation of light, the image formation through a converging lens (real and virtual image), and the image through a plane

1
2
3 mirror. The whole teaching sequence is divided into fifteen activities. An activity is 'a
4 relatively self-contained, goal-oriented unit of activity, which is recognized as such by the
5 participants' (Wells, 1999: 172) and includes a coherent set of tasks students should do
6 (experiments, drawings, exercises, answers to questions) and of actions and verbalizations
7 from the teacher.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Some choices have been done about the use of some words in the texts given to students
16 coherently with our concern about modelling processes. The word 'ray' was reserved for an
17 element of the model, like the word 'beam' which indicates an infinite set of rays. The
18 phenomena these words model are referred to by the expression 'light flux'. This choice can
19 be considered as a consequence of the hypothesis about the necessity of making explicit the
20 modelling processes.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Nevertheless we are conscious that some words are unavoidably bivalent, and will be used by
31 students (and often also by teachers) to refer to the world of objects and events or to the world
32 of theory and models indifferently. This bivalence probably also helps students to understand
33 the relationship between the two worlds, because it may initiate the link between them.
34
35
36
37

38
39 The teaching sequence alternated lessons for the whole class (9 hours) and experimental
40 sessions (three of 2 hours each) with half of the class. Every episode analyzed here was part
41 of an experimental session. In the experimental sessions, the students worked in pairs. The
42 whole sequence was video recorded using two cameras. One of the cameras was placed on the
43 back of the room with a wide angle centred on the teacher, and the other focused on a pair of
44 male students, Mat and Ale, in a close-up. The video recordings were transcribed; the
45 transcripts include all the verbal productions that were understandable and a description of the
46 gestures that were considered as meaningful by the researchers. In doing the analysis we
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A rather important point is that the observed teacher had participated in elaborating the
4 teaching sequence; he was consequently aware of the epistemological issues underlining the
5
6 teaching sequence; he was consequently aware of the epistemological issues underlining the
7
8 design of the various activities, especially the positive effects expected from a clear separation
9
10 between the two worlds. But no indication had been given about communicative approaches,
11
12 and he himself chose his patterns of talk. To this regard, he was a “normal” teacher. The
13
14 present analysis is then a “natural” one regarding the communicative approaches but not
15
16 regarding the epistemological aspects.
17
18

19 20 **Results and Analysis**

21
22 Normally, the communicative approach in this curricular unit is almost all the time
23
24 interactive. The teacher tries to encourage students to express their opinions and listens to
25
26 what they have to say. In order to show dialogic potential of the modelling process and some
27
28 difficulties linked to the maintenance of dialogic communicative approach and its
29
30 relationships with the modelling processes, we present below the analysis of four episodes of
31
32 the sequence. These four episodes took place in the activities 1, 2, 6 and 14 respectively
33
34 (among 15).
35
36
37
38

39
40 A categorisation of the whole transcripts of the teaching sequence had been achieved for
41
42 another work by the authors, as regards to the communicative approach. The relevant episodes
43
44 for our present purpose were selected from the transcripts and checked for the categories of
45
46 communicative approach, and completed for the categorisation of modelling processes and
47
48 semiotic registers.
49
50
51

52 53 **Episode 1: explanation of the text of the model**

54
55 In the first activity, an introductory one, the students and the teacher read a text called ‘text of
56
57 the model’, which gave a number of theoretical statements to be used by students during the
58
59
60

1
2
3 activities of the sequence (see appendix 1). Students were explicitly expected to keep this text
4
5 with them during all the sessions and to refer to it when necessary.
6
7

8 Just before this episode the teacher had made a kind of association between the two worlds,
9
10 translating one into the other: the one from the geometrical optics theory and the other from
11
12 the world of objects and events that will be modelled which, in a large sense, coincide with
13
14 the world of everyday objects and events represented by sensible referents and expressed in
15
16 natural language; as the students read the text he recalled the elements presented in a simple
17
18 experiment of projecting a laser ray. He did so consistently for the word 'source' which was
19
20 associated to the laser pointer, for the word 'receptor', which was associated to the eyes, for
21
22 the word 'medium' which was associated to the 'air'.
23
24
25

26
27 During the episode (see transcription¹ table 1), the teacher explained the words
28
29 'homogeneous' and 'isotropic', and then dealt with the notion of light ray. He represented a
30
31 diagram of the current experiment on the blackboard (figure 2), drawing first the box for the
32
33 laser pointer and the line for the screen (before the beginning of the episode), and only latter
34
35 (turn 90) the representation of the ray.
36
37
38

39
40
41 Insert figure 2 about here
42
43

44
45
46 Insert table 1 about here
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 ¹ In the transcripts of the activities to be analyzed here, we numbered the turns of talk from the beginning of the
56 activity. In the second column we indicated the speaker (T for the teacher, NI for a student we could not
57 identify, CI for the whole class); in the third we indicated the transcription of the talk produced by the
58 participants, and if necessary, the person addressed in the talk (if no indication is given, the addressee is the
59 whole class); in the last column we gave indication of non verbal actions. In order to make the transcription
60 simple, we adopted a simplified code for transcribing the oral language: we kept the dot (.), the question mark (?)
and the exclamation mark (!), without the usual parentheses, to indicate a stress in the intonation, or a shift in the
tone indicating a question or an exclamation (these notations are thus inferences of researchers); a slash (/)

1
2
3 The teacher began this episode by making explicit the same sort of relationship for the word
4
5 'isotropic' (he considered the word 'homogeneous' as known by students). On turn 84 he
6
7 translated the word isotropic: "isotropic it means that if I make the experiment changing the
8
9 direction / of the LASER this will not change anything at all in this experiment / the light
10
11 behaves in the same way regardless of the direction of light propagation / this is not the case
12
13 of all the mediums". At the same time he moved his hand all over to change the direction of
14
15 the laser beam. In his talk he began with expressions from everyday language as 'changing
16
17 the direction' and 'this will not change anything at all in this experiment' and ended with an
18
19 expression that is closer to the words of the model: 'the light behaves in the same way
20
21 regardless of the direction of light propagation'. Through this set of language and gesture he
22
23 assured that each word of the model corresponds to a real object or event and to their
24
25 expression in the words of everyday language.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 It is worth noting that this "translation" involves the same sort of phenomenon we described
33
34 as secundarisation. The expressions in everyday language have a direct and unmediated
35
36 relationship with the objects and events they refer to, which characterize the primary speech
37
38 genres (Bakhtin, 1986). In the language of school physics this relationship is mediated by the
39
40 theoretical conceptual system and its particular expressions and this characterizes the
41
42 secondary speech genres. Thus, at the same time that he puts the two worlds in relation he
43
44 adopts explicitly a secundarisation attitude, by making clear the relationship between the
45
46 primary genre used to name objects and events of everyday life and the secondary genre of
47
48 school physics and of everyday life. In doing so he also presents two points of view, which
49
50 characterizes dialogic discourse: the point of view of geometrical optics and how it relates to
51
52 the point of view of everyday life, represented here by its natural objects and its expression in
53
54 everyday language.
55
56
57
58
59
60

indicates a small pause; when the pauses lasted longer, an approximate duration was indicated between parentheses (for example (2s)); brackets ([]) indicate simultaneous talk.

1
2
3 As the teacher was able to demonstrate the relationship between these two worlds and two
4
5 points of view we suggest that the modelling activity, in this case, has a potential to bring
6
7 dialogic discourse into being. Up to turn 84, the teacher used this potential very well.
8
9
10 Nevertheless, the teacher did not make the same sort of relationship between the worlds of
11
12 theories and models and the worlds of objects and events when he talked about the light ray.
13
14 In turn 85 a student read the statement of the model that introduced the concept of light rays:
15
16 ‘under the conditions of geometrical optics / the light is modelled by the light rays’. In the
17
18 following turns, instead of referring to the world of objects and events as he had done with all
19
20 the others features of the model, the teacher made sure that the students already knew the
21
22 words (turn 86) and focused on how to represent the light rays in the same semiotic register
23
24 than for the experiment with the laser beam (turn 88). For the rectilinear propagation of light
25
26 the teacher simply repeated the words of the models (turn 92), stressing the condition that the
27
28 medium should be homogeneous and isotropic if this principle was to be observed. Again, no
29
30 reference was made to the world of objects and events. Right after, a student read the counter
31
32 intuitive feature of the model that a light ray has a null width (turn 93). Again the teacher
33
34 made no reference to the world of objects and events but explained what it meant to represent
35
36 a ray with null width in a schema.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Remarkably, when he turned his attention to the colour as a perception, which the model
44
45 associated with the wave length (turns 101-102), the teacher returned to the link between the
46
47 two worlds; when he came back to the representation of a ray (turns 103-105), the teacher
48
49 went back to the representation only.
50
51
52

53 From these observations we can infer that the teacher did not used the dialogic potential of the
54
55 differentiation between the worlds of model and theories and the worlds of objects and events
56
57 when talking about the light rays as he did for the other features of the model. The text of the
58
59 model itself seemed, to a certain extent, to lead the teacher to do so. Referring to appendix 1,
60

1
2
3 we can see that the modelling of light fluxes as sets of rays, although present (lines 3 and 5),
4 is quite allusive. The issue of the shape and dimension of light areas which can be modelled
5 by rays and beams is not explicitly considered. A large amount of explanations remains
6 implicit and left as a work to be done by teachers, which can account for the problems
7 discussed in this paper.
8
9

10 What were the consequences of this lack of differentiation between the two worlds to the
11 ways the light rays were referred to throughout the sequence? For answering this question we
12 searched the words 'ray' and 'beam' (in French, 'rayon' and 'faisceau') throughout the
13 transcriptions to get a sense in the ways these words reappeared in the sequence. The word
14 'ray' reappeared in a far larger number than the word 'beam'. Generally speaking, the lack of
15 explicit differentiation between the worlds of model and theories and the worlds of objects
16 and events persisted throughout the sequence when the teacher talked, interactively or non-
17 interactively, of light rays. In what follows we are going to present some episodes which will
18 exemplify this issue.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Episode 2: what is the status of a ray?**

38
39
40 The second episode we are going to analyze (see transcription table 2) was taken from an
41 experimental activity aimed at providing evidence of, and discussing, the rectilinear
42 propagation of light. The episode happened in the end of the activity, when the teacher asked
43 the students to decide which lines in the 'text of the model' were at stake in the activity. The
44 teacher was talking to the whole class, and suddenly Ale interrupted him (turn 275), making a
45 comment related to the topic. The teacher engaged in a discussion with Ale, which could be
46 heard by the whole class.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58
59 Insert table 2 about here
60

1
2
3 The part of interest in this second episode comprises turns 275 to 289 and it shows an
4 interaction between the teacher and Ale. Ale initiated the talk sequence expressing the idea
5 that a light ray belongs to the world of objects and events, through his statement in turn 275
6 that 'but you cannot isolate [a ray]'. The teacher initially accepted the invitation to dialogue
7 and answered from the point of view of the theoretical model: 'no, but you can represent it'.
8
9 Nevertheless, in turn 280 the teacher introduced an ambiguity in his discourse by referring to
10 the ray using the deictic 'one' and the same expression used by Ale ('you can isolate'). It is
11 quite natural for a teacher to take the words his student offers in a verbal interaction and the
12 word 'ray' carries this unavoidable ambiguity of belonging to both the worlds of objects and
13 events and of theories and models. Nevertheless, by acting that way, the teacher
14 unconsciously contributed to blur the difference between his 'ray' as a model and the
15 student's 'ray' as an object, as he oscillated between the words 'represent' and 'isolate' to
16 refer to a ray. From this moment to the closure of the episode there was a tension between
17 dialogic and authoritative discourse as the teacher, at the same time that he took into account
18 Ale's objection, failed to explicitly differentiate between the two points of view. As a
19 consequence, he did not help Ale to realize that the isolated ray is an entity in a theoretical
20 model, not an object. This is confirmed by the final intervention from Ale, when he implicitly
21 asserted that one day one infinitely small pencil of light will be isolated, as he agreed only
22 'nowadays' with the teacher still ambiguous statement that 'a ray can be represented, so it can
23 be isolated'.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 This episode illustrates the difficulties the teacher faced to make explicit the differentiation
51 between the world of objects and events from the world of theories and models, when talking
52 about light rays. He failed to establish the relationships between the two worlds in the same
53 way as he had failed in the first episode, although in this second episode the point of view
54 which remained implicit in the first episode – what is a ray in the world of objects and events
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 – was made explicit by Ale, who treated the ray as an object and not as an element of the
4
5 model. This means that the dialogical potential of this episode was still higher, as the question
6
7 that remained implicit in the first episode (what is a light ray in the world of objects and
8
9 events?) was answered by Ale, but from a point of view that was not the scientific one.
10
11 Nevertheless, the answer to this question from the point of view of the physics remained
12
13 implicit. This episode also illustrates how a student trying to speak from the point of view of
14
15 school science can contribute to the dialogic differentiation between these two worlds. But
16
17 this also depends on the ability of the teacher to perceive the dialogic potential of these kinds
18
19 of initiative from the students.
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Episode 3: the masked lens**

26
27
28 The third episode (see transcription in table 3) came from an activity in which the students
29
30 had to predict what would happen if they put a mask in front of a converging lens giving a
31
32 real image from a real object (the light source in figure 3). Would the image be partly hidden?
33
34 As expected, in line with the literature in this domain, most of the students answered that part
35
36 of the image would disappear. This answer was a consequence of the ‘travelling image’
37
38 conception, and was in contradiction with the scientific point of view of ‘mapping point to
39
40 point’ between the object and the image (Galili, 1996). After having written their prediction,
41
42 students did the experiment, and tried to explain why their prediction was different from what
43
44 they observed.
45
46
47
48

49 The episode took place at the end of the activity, after the students had done the experiment.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Insert figure 3 about here
58
59
60

Insert table 3 about here

1
2
3
4
5
6 In this episode, the teacher was presenting an explanation for the experiment. He asked
7
8 students to draw a diagram on their logbooks (turns 241-251, not shown), and finally
9
10 projected his own diagram using an overhead projector. For simplification we presented only
11
12 the transcriptions of the final part of the episode, turns 251 to 262.

13
14
15 Looking at his verbalisations, we see that he used the word 'rays' only twice in the whole
16
17 episode (turn 249, not shown, for the whole class, and turn 261, in a private talk with a
18
19 student). When giving his explanations he used instead the words 'light' or 'luminous' (turns
20
21 253, 255, and 262 when dictating). He also used the word 'image' all along the episode.

22
23
24 Analysing this discourse in terms of modelling processes, and of semiotic registers, we can
25
26 consider that the teacher did not express himself at every possible levels, which are given in
27
28 table 4.
29
30

31
32
33
34 Insert table 4 here
35
36
37
38

39 Only cases A (world of objects and events, described in natural language) and D (schematic
40
41 register for representation of the world of theories and models) were used in this episode: case
42
43 A corresponds to the explanation given by the teacher by using the word 'light' (255); case D
44
45 corresponds to the diagram the students have done, and to the diagram projected by the
46
47 teacher.
48
49

50
51 We can observe that the teacher did not fully interpret his schema in terms of natural
52
53 theoretical language (case C). He never said things like 'a mask on the lens stops some rays,
54
55 but others rays in the beam coming from each point of the object can pass through the part of
56
57 the lens which is not masked, so these rays can gather in a point, which is the image point, so
58
59 the observed image is complete'. His interpretation was given only in terms of perceptible
60

1
2
3 events (that the image is less luminous), case A. Case B (schematic register representing the
4 world of objects and events) was excluded by the instructions, as the students were not asked
5
6 to draw a schema of the real objects. We can consider that the teacher did a ‘short-circuit’,
7
8 passing directly from D to A, without giving a theoretical explanation in natural language.
9
10 This kind of ‘short-circuit’ is quite common in science classrooms and has important
11
12 consequences for the development of secondarisation attitudes by students. Although
13
14 theoretical explanation in natural language already characterizes the use of a secondary genre,
15
16 in which the relationships between the words and the objects are not direct but mediated by a
17
18 conceptual system, it seems to be easier for students to move from primary to secondary
19
20 genres if both genres are firstly expressed in a less artificial semiotic register – that of natural
21
22 language. Translating the world of familiar objects and events – in this case the ‘image’ – in
23
24 diagrams seems to involve two sorts of transitions, each one offering some kind of difficulty:
25
26 the transition between primary and secondary genres, both expressed in the same semiotic
27
28 register of natural language; and the transition between the semiotic register of natural
29
30 language and that of the diagrams. The absence of any of these steps in the path between the
31
32 world of objects and events and the world of theories and models seems to make more
33
34 difficult to handle the situation. The teacher thus missed the dialogic potential of the
35
36 modelling activity for bringing two semiotic registers in contact, here the part of the concept
37
38 of image expressed in the natural language and the part expressed in the diagrammatic
39
40 register.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 It is also interesting to remark how the word ‘image’ was used in this exchange. This word is
51
52 typically a ‘bridge’ between two modelling levels and between primary and secondary speech
53
54 genres: in the world of objects and events, it indicates what students can perceive on the
55
56 screen (as in turns 251, last occurrence, and 262, two occurrences), and in this sense can be
57
58 used in both primary and secondary genres; in the world of theories and models, it indicates
59
60

1
2
3 an element of the model and can be used in different semiotic registers which belong to
4
5 secondary genres. In this particular case it was used only as a representation on the schema
6
7
8 (turn 251, first occurrence).
9

11 **Episode 4: what is a ray, what is a beam**

12
13
14 Episode 4 (see transcription in table 5) showed the consequence of all these missed
15
16 opportunities for putting the different notions, semiotic registers, speech genres and different
17
18 points of view in dialogue. In this episode we can see how Ale seemed to internalise and use
19
20 the concept of ray.
21
22

23
24 Episode 4 happened in the context of an activity about the image through a plane mirror.
25
26 Students had to perform an experiment, consisting of localising the image of a needle in a
27
28 plane mirror. For this purpose, they draw on a sheet of paper the directions in which, through
29
30 the mirror, they could see the needle. Students, in order to find the image, had to draw at least
31
32 two lines in two directions (figure 4), which coincided with two rays. The teacher emphasised
33
34 that the image was symmetrical to the needle in the mirror. Consequently, the discussion a
35
36 beam, being a set of rays between those two extremes, was introduced.
37
38
39

40
41
42 Insert figure 4 here
43
44

45
46
47 Insert table 5 here
48
49

50
51
52 This episode happened in the last but one activity of the sequence and showed Ale at ease
53
54 with the task of making diagrams. The episode is very illustrative because of Mat's question
55
56 at the very beginning (turn 200: 'a beam / what is a ray a ray and a beam') which means 'what
57
58 is the difference between a ray and a beam?' The question allowed for both Ale and the
59
60 teacher to express their partly coincident definitions. The meaning Ale expressed associated to

1
2
3 'ray' was just restricted to the schematic register: 'a ray is exactly this that you have
4 represented' (turn 201). To explain that a beam 'is the set of two rays' (turn 203) Ale asked
5
6 Mat to represent a second ray. In turn 211 the teacher made explicit his definition ('a beam of
7
8 light is a set of rays / these are all the rays coming from the point A in this case inside these
9
10 two rays'). The understanding of the notion of 'beam' by Ale seems restricted to the
11
12 schematic register, and to the extreme rays of a beam.
13
14
15

16
17 This episode confirmed that the schematic register had the priority in referring to rays and
18
19 beams. The status of such entities was never talked about in the register of natural language
20
21 after the 'incident' described in episode 2. Although Ale demonstrated that he had mastered
22
23 how to operate with the concept of ray and beam in the schematic register, which allowed him
24
25 to do all the diagrams in the activities on this sequence, it is not possible to know if he had
26
27 changed the status he had attributed to the ray in episode 2: something belonging to the world
28
29 of objects and events that 'we cannot isolate' 'nowadays'. In episode 4 the discourse was
30
31 clearly authoritative as the students and the teacher were talking from the same school science
32
33 point of view, yet, from a limited angle inside this conceptual horizon, the one of the semiotic
34
35 representation of entities.
36
37
38
39

40 41 **Discussion**

42
43 The analysis of the four episodes raises some questions related both to the nature of modelling
44
45 activities, of the use of various semiotic registers, and to their potential to bring dialogic
46
47 discourse into being in the classroom. The story being told by the four episodes is one of
48
49 missing this potential, offered by the differentiation between the two worlds. Even when a
50
51 student (Ale, in the second episode) offered a different point of view, bringing dialogicality
52
53 into the talk, the teacher failed to get the point. When the teacher did not explore every
54
55 possibilities of dialogism, some 'short-circuits' were operated: the teacher did not take all the
56
57 available steps to make the transition between primary and secondary speech genres. It led to
58
59
60

1
2
3 the situation where the student mastered the operational definitions of rays and beams, but his
4
5 achievement of secundarisation remained uncertain. School is always in a pressure for time
6
7 and once more this had as a consequence the emphasis in the operational aspects of science in
8
9 detriment of the conceptual ones.
10
11

12 Another point to be made relates to the first episode and the nature of modelling it suggests.
13
14 During this episode, in the flow of discourse in the class, two kinds of words appeared which
15
16 corresponded to two different mechanisms of modelling. The first one consists of words like
17
18 source, receptor, medium, which correspond to elements of the experiment (the laser pointer,
19
20 the screen, the air). These words referred to some objects in the real world, as expressed by
21
22 the primary genres used in everyday language, with their unmediated link to the objects.
23
24 These words had also a function in the secondary genres that are being introduced, of
25
26 modelling these elements in the real experiment. By considering only this kind of words and
27
28 by establishing a correspondence of each word of the model to an object or event, one could
29
30 implicitly consider that models always match the reality in a univocal way: each entity in the
31
32 world of objects and events is modelled by an entity in the model and each entity of the model
33
34 has a correspondent in the world of objects and events (Tiberghien & Megalakaki, 1995;
35
36 Collet 2000). But the entity 'rays' goes beyond this univocal relationship, like many other key
37
38 terms in science, and thus belongs to a second category of words. Although the idea of a 'ray'
39
40 is suggested by our experience with natural phenomena like 'solar rays', the ray as it is
41
42 defined into the model does not exist in the world of objects and events, it is imposed upon it
43
44 by the optical model: it is an idealization from real perceptions. Thus, in this second category
45
46 of words, the unmediated relationships these words have with the objects in primary speech
47
48 genres are problematic for their understanding in the context of school science. They begin to
49
50 exist in science classrooms as part of secondary speech genres, in which the relationship
51
52 between the words and the objects is always mediated by a conceptual system. The important
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 point here is that there are entities that go beyond this univocal and functional relationship
4
5 between the world of models and theories and the world of objects and events.
6

7
8 When we think about how the status of atoms and molecules changed alongside the history of
9
10 science, we can infer that science tends to ‘create reality’ from its models. Atoms and
11
12 molecules started as clear non consensual entities in a model in the beginning of the XIX
13
14 century, changed to consensual entities in a model in the beginning of the XX century to end
15
16 as real entities that can be manipulated in nanotechnology in the beginning of the XXI
17
18 century. So, it is not a surprise that Ale thought that a single ray might be isolated one day.
19
20

21
22 The second category of words (ray, image, force, power, current...) can be seen as ‘bridging
23
24 words’: they are used both in speech genres of everyday life for referring to elements of the
25
26 world of objects and events and in the school science speech genres for elements of the world
27
28 of theories and models, with different but correlated meanings. Consequently they present
29
30 both advantages as well as risks: the internalisation of their meaning in the school science
31
32 speech genres can be helped by the correspondences with their meaning in genres of everyday
33
34 life (it is the idea of founder notions, see Buty et al., 2004: 585); but the distinction between
35
36 the two different meanings can also be blurred. One of the instructional tasks when using
37
38 these words is to help students distinguishing when they may use them in one speech genre or
39
40 in the other.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 It is interesting to notice that these views are probably not limited to science learning and
49
50 understanding, and can be considered from a broader instructional point of view. In our point
51
52 of view, modelling processes in science teaching and learning could favour secundarisation
53
54 attitudes: a clear distinction between the worlds of objects and events allows students to
55
56 consider the theoretical construction of science and the scientific discourse as ‘second’
57
58 realities created by secondary speech genres (as Bakhtin explicitly said), in which the
59
60

1
2
3 relationships between words and objects are not direct but mediated by a conceptual system;
4
5 if, besides making clear the distinction between the two worlds, the teacher favours the
6
7 distinction between the points of view of school science and the everyday ones, this attitude
8
9 can favour a deep dialogic understanding of physical models and theories, as it becomes
10
11 possible for students to put the primary and second planes, and also the primary and
12
13 secondary genres in dialogue and to 'lay down a set of their own answering words for each
14
15 word of the utterance they are in process of understanding' (Voloshinov, 1929/1973: 102). The
16
17 generalisability, a major property of scientific models, precisely allows students establishing
18
19 'a circulation of knowledge and activities from one moment and from one academic object to
20
21 others' (Bautier & Goigoux, cf. supra, our translation), in the relevant area.
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Conclusions and implications**

28
29
30 Let us recall the research questions we have proposed at the beginning of the paper:

- 31
32 • How did the teacher manage the dialogicity and the modelling processes in the classroom
33
34 discourse?
- 35
36 • What were the difficulties he encountered in linking the various points of view, relatively to
37
38 modelling processes or to semiotic registers?
- 39
40 • What were the consequences of these difficulties for students' understanding?
41
42

43
44 Throughout the four episodes we have highlighted a complex interplay between success and
45
46 failure in the use of the dialogic potential of modelling process, or of semiotic registers. The
47
48 observed teacher, an experienced one, has for habit to give a large space for students'
49
50 expression and points of view; in this sense, he has acquired strong enough bases for
51
52 instituting dialogicity in his classes. From his participation to the elaboration of research-
53
54 based teaching sequences, he feels a strong concern for modelling processes and for the
55
56 clarification of these processes for students. Nevertheless, the lack of theoretical tools or
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 guidelines regarding the communicative approaches, comparable to those he masters for
4
5 modelling processes, sometimes lead him to miss some key steps:
6
7

- 8 • The distinction (episode 1) between the ray, seen as an object by the everyday language, and
9
10 the ray, seen as an element of a theoretical model by physics language; this might be the cause
11
12 of the problems (episode 2) the observed student had in understanding the status of a ray, and
13
14 his confusion between two models of light; a second consequence was that the teacher
15
16 suddenly shifted from dialogic to authoritative approach.
17
18
- 19 • The translation between semiotic registers (episode 3), which was incomplete; we found an
20
21 echo in the behaviour of students about rays and beams, only handled as drawing elements
22
23 (episode 4).
24
25

26
27 The analysis reported here confirms previous results (Mortimer & Scott, 2003) on the
28
29 difficulties of reaching a suitable balance between dialogic and authoritative discourse in
30
31 science classroom. At the same time it adds a new dimension to the problem, in taking into
32
33 account the difficult task of establishing meaningful relationships between the world of
34
35 objects and events and the world of theories and models; the teacher's capacity to sustain
36
37 dialogic discourse appears as a crucial point. A particularly important aspect is the necessity
38
39 to deal dialogically with words or expressions (rays, beams) which science inherited from
40
41 everyday language, in order to help students in the process of secundarisation. That teachers
42
43 explicitly refer to both everyday and scientific points of view in these matters seems, in a
44
45 dialogic communicative approach, to be crucial for allowing students to differentiate between
46
47 the two points of view and to recognize that these words can be expressed and thought about
48
49 in more than one semiotic register.
50
51

52
53
54
55 These results give some insights on possible direct implications for teaching practice and
56
57 teacher training. The analysis of episodes in which dialogic discourse is prematurely aborted,
58
59 when it still has a potential for the purpose of teaching modelling activities, can help teachers
60

1
2
3 to reflect on their practice in order to reach an appropriate balance between dialogic and
4
5 authoritative discourse in classrooms.
6

7
8 By this analysis, we claim we have contributed to the development of the two theoretical
9
10 frames, modelling processes and communicative approaches, in line with the previous
11
12 trajectory of these ideas.
13

14 15 16 **References**

17
18 Bakhtin, M. M. (1934/1981). *The dialogic imagination*. M. Holquist (ed.), C. Emerson & M.
19
20 Holquist (trans.), Austin, University of Texas Press.

21
22 Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*. Ed. by C. Emerson & M.
23
24 Holquist(eds.). Austin, University of Texas Press.

25
26
27
28 Bautier, E. (2004). Formes et activités scolaires, secondarisation, reconfiguration,
29
30 différenciation sociale. In *Hommage à V. Isambert-Jamati*. Presses Universitaires de
31
32 Provence.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Besson, H., & Viennot, L. (2004). Using models at the mesoscopic scale in teaching physics:
two experimental interventions in solid friction and fluid statistics. *International Journal
of Science Education*, 26(9): 1083-1110.

Buty, C., Tiberghien, A., & Le Maréchal, J-F. (2004). Learning hypotheses and an associated
tool to design and to analyse teaching-learning sequences. *International Journal of
Science Education*, 26, 579-604.

Candela, A. (1999). *Ciencia en la aula: los alumnos entre la argumentacion y el consenso*. Ciudad
de Mexico, Paidos Educador.

Collet, G. (2000). *Langage et modélisation scientifique*. Paris, CNRS éditions.

- 1
2
3 Crawford, B. A., & Cullin, M. J. (2004). Supporting prospective teachers' conceptions of
4 modelling in science. *International Journal of Science Education*, 26(11): 1379-1402.
5
6
7
8 Devi, R., Tiberghien, A., Baker, M., & Brna, P. (1996). Modelling students' construction of
9 energy models in physics. *Instructional Science*, n° 24, pp. 259-293.
10
11
12 Duval, R. (1995). *Sémiosis et pensée humaine*. Berne, Peter Lang.
13
14
15 Gaidioz, P., Vince, J., & Tiberghien, A. (2004). Aider l'élève à comprendre le fonctionnement
16 de la physique et son articulation avec la vie quotidienne. *Bulletin de l'Union des*
17 *Professeurs de Physique et de Chimie*, 98 (866), 1029-1042.
18
19
20 Galili, I. (1996). Students' conceptual change in geometrical optics. *International Journal of*
21 *Science Education*, 18, 847-868.
22
23
24
25
26
27 Gilbert, J., & Boulter, C. (1998). Learning science through models and modelling. In B.
28 Frazer and K. Tobin (eds.), *The International Handbook of Science Education*. New York,
29 Kluwer, 53-66.
30
31
32
33
34 Gobert, J. D., & Buckley, B. C. (2000). Special issue: introduction to model-based teaching and
35 learning in science education. *International Journal of Science Education*, 22(9): 891-894.
36
37
38
39 Grosslight, L., Unger, C., Jay, E., & Smith, C. (1991). Understanding models and their use in
40 science: conceptions of middle and high school students and experts. *Journal of Research in*
41 *Science Teaching*, 28, 799-822.
42
43
44
45
46 Justi, R. S., & Gilbert, J.K. (2002). Modelling, teachers' view on the nature of modelling, and
47 implications for the education of modellers. *International Journal of Science Education*,
48 24(4): 369-388.
49
50
51
52
53 Kelly, G. J., & Brown, C. (2003). Communicative demands of learning science through
54 technological design: Third grade students' construction of solar energy devices.
55 *Linguistics and Education*, 13, 483-532.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kress, G., Jewitt, C., Ogborn, J. & Tsatsarelis, C. (2001). *Multimodal teaching and learning*.
4
5 London, Continuum.
6
7
8 Kuhn, T.S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, The University of
9
10 Chicago Press.
11
12
13 Leach, J., & Scott, P. (2002). Designing and evaluating science teaching sequences: an
14
15 approach drawing upon the concept of learning demand and a social constructivist
16
17 perspective on learning. *Studies in Science Education*, 38, 115-142.
18
19
20 Lemke, J.L. (1990). *Talking Science*. Norwood, Ablex.
21
22
23 Mortimer, E.F. (1998). Multivoicedness and univocality in classroom discourse: an example
24
25 from theory of matter. *International Journal of Science Education*, 20(1): 67-82.
26
27
28 Mortimer, E.F., & Scott, P.H. (2003). *Meaning making in secondary science classrooms*.
29
30 Maidenhead: Open University Press.
31
32 Ogborn, J., Kress, G., Martins, I., & McGillicuddy, K. (1996). *Explaining science in the*
33
34 *classroom*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
35
36
37 Roychoudhury, A., & Roth, W.-M. (1996). Interactions in an open-inquiry physics laboratory.
38
39 *International Journal of Science Education*, 18(4): 423-445.
40
41
42 Scott, P.H. (1998). Teacher talk and meaning making in science classrooms: A Vygotskian
43
44 analysis and review. *Studies in Science Education*, 32: 45-80.
45
46
47 Sutton, C. (1992). *Words, science and learning*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
48
49
50 Tiberghien, A. (1994). Modelling as a basis for analyzing teaching-learning situations.
51
52 *Learning and instruction*, 4(1): 71-87.
53
54
55 Tiberghien, A. (2000). Designing teaching situations in the secondary school. In R. Millar, J.
56
57 Leach & J. Osborne (Eds.), *Improving science education: The contribution of research*
58
59 Buckingham, Open University Press, 27-47.
60

- 1
2
3 Tiberghien, A., & Megalakaki, O. (1995). Characterisation of a modelling activity for a first
4 qualitative approach to the concept of energy. *European journal of psychology of*
5
6 *education*, 10(4), 369-383.
7
8
9
- 10 Treagust, D. F., Chittleborough, G., & Mamiala, T. L. (2002). Students' understanding of the
11 role of scientific models in learning science. *International Journal of Science Education*,
12
13 24(4): 357-368.
14
15
16
- 17 Voloshinov, V.N. (1929/1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, M.A.,
18 Harvard University Press.
19
20
- 21 Vosniadou S. (1994). Capturing and modeling the process of conceptual change. *Learning*
22
23 *and Instruction*, 4(1), 45-70.
24
25
26
- 27 Wells, G. (1999). Putting a Tool to Different Uses: A Reevaluation of the IRF Sequence. In
28 Wells, G. *Dialogic Inquiry: Towards a Sociocultural Practice and Theory of Education*.
29 Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
30
31
32
33
- 34 Ziman J. (2001). *Real Science: What it is, and what it means*. Cambridge, Cambridge
35 University Press.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix 1: extract of the 'text of the model'

The following text was given to the students at the very beginning of the sequence.

1. Light propagates from a light source to a receptor through a transparent medium. It conveys energy from the source to the receptor.
2. The word 'medium' indicates the matter which is passed through by light. When its optical properties are the same everywhere, we say that the medium is homogenous. When its properties are the same whatever the direction of the light may be, we say that the medium is isotropic.
3. In the conditions of geometrical optics, light is modelled by light rays.
4. In an homogenous and isotropic medium, a light ray has:
 - a. A straight and unique direction ('principle of the rectilinear propagation of light')
 - b. No width
 - c. A given wave length or a given range of wave lengths, linked to the colour sensation

It is represented by a line, a half-line or a segment.


5. A light flux is modelled by a light beam, continuous set of rays (....)
6. The human eye is an important receptor (....) Our brain is trained to interpret light sensations according to the principle of the rectilinear propagation of light.

Figure 1: Mortimer and Scott (2003) analytical framework

<i>Aspect of Analysis</i>	
i. Focus	<i>1. Teaching Purposes 2. Content</i>
ii. Approach	<i>3. Communicative approach</i>
iii. Action	<i>4. Teacher interventions 5. Patterns of Interaction</i>


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 2: diagram on the blackboard during episode 1




For Peer Review Only

Figure 3: Diagram of the experiment in episode 3



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 4: expected students' drawings in the experiment of episode 4



1
2
3
4
5 **Table 1: transcription of episode 1, introduction of the double-faced word “ray”**
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

- 1
2
3 79 NI The word medium designates the matter which is NI reads the text of
4
5 crossed by the light / when its optical properties are the model
6
7 the same all over / we say that the medium is
8
9 homogeneous
10
11
12 80 T Homogeneous that is a word you know. Afterwards?
13
14
15 81 NI When its optical properties are identical with respect
16
17 to the direction of light propagation / we say that the
18
19 medium is isotropic
20
21
22 82 T Well do you know this word / isotropic?
23
24
25 83 NI ((T)) (inaudible)
26
27 84 T Isotropic this means that if I make the experiment T shows with his
28
29 changing the direction / of the LASER this will not fingers the
30
31 change anything at all in this experiment / the light experiment of
32
33 behaves in the same way regardless the direction of LASER
34
35 light propagation / this is not the case of all the T makes a
36
37 medium / so let's continue horizontal
38
39 movement with his
40
41 hand to show the
42
43 direction of light
44
45 propagation
46
47
48
49
50 85 NI Under the conditions of geometric optics / the light is
51
52 modelled by the light rays
53
54
55 86 T So. "light rays" these are words that you have already
56
57 used?
58
59
60 87 Cl ((T)) Yes

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 88 T Yes at least at grade 10 / if we wanted a ray become T points to the
visible on the diagram where would we put it? Where diagram of the
would we draw it on the diagram you have just drawn? experiment on the
board
- 89 NI ((T)) (inaudible)
- 90 T You would do / a line on this diagram here and then T draws a ray on the
we put an arrow to show the direction of light diagram of the
propagation (10s) is that okay? No question? So Mat experiment on the
let's continue with line number 4 board (see figure 2)
- 91 Ma ((T)) In a homogeneous and isotropic medium a light
t ray has / a unique rectilinear direction / this is the
principle of rectilinear propagation of light
- 92 T This is a principle you all know / light propagates in
straight line but pay attention now you should add/ if
the medium is homogeneous and isotropic / afterwards
- 93 Ma ((T)) null width
t
- 94 T Null width. Did we take this into account in the
diagram?
- 95 Cl ((T)) No
- 96 T No so what could we have done on the diagram to
translate the model?
- 97 NI ((T)) (inaudible)
- 98 T How can we draw something with null width?
- 99 NI ((T)) (inaudible)

- 1
2
3 100 T What does this mean? We cannot do anything better T makes a
4
5 than a straight line(.) this translate the fact that the movement with his
6
7 width is null / negligible / null means represented by a hand to indicates a
8
9 line / exactly as you do the straight line in math / or straight line
10
11 the segments / and then
12
13
14
15 101 Ma ((T)) A certain wave length or a certain range of wave
16
17 t length / linked with the colour sensation
18
19
20 102 T That's what you have seen in middle school and in
21
22 grade 10 you all knew that according to the wave
23
24 length the light / gives a sensation of colour which can
25
26 change / you know all these things / so let's continue
27
28
29 103 Ma ((T)) It is represented by a straight line / a semi
30
31 t straight line or a segment.
32
33
34 104 T Well on the diagram what did we represent it with?
35
36
37 105 NI ((T)) A segment
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2: transcription of episode 2, can we isolate a 'ray' or represent a 'ray'?

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	269.	T	You have instinctively well had the reflex to
8			represent rays and beams/ in which line is it?
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17	270.	Ale	((T)) Ah! it's the rays
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24	271.	Nl	((T)) On the five
25			
26	272.	T	That's it and the rays on the number three / you
27			have done whether rays or beams
28			
29			
30			
31	273.	Mat	((T)) Three four five
32			
33	274.	T	That's it / so you write
34			
35	275.	Ale	((T)) [but you cannot isolate]
36			
37			
38	276.	T	[We are referring to] / ((Ale)) Tell me?
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47	277.	Ale	((T)) You cannot isolate a ray, right?
48			
49	278.	T	((Ale)) No / but you can represent it
50			
51			
52	279.	Ale	((T)) Yeah
53			
54	280.	T	((Ale)) But in geometric optics you can isolate one /
55			We shall see this later for the moment let's consider
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			

- 1
2
3 281. Ale ((T)) (inaudible)
4
5 282. T ((Ale)) Where have you seen this?
6
7 283. Ale ((T)) No but that's that's not possible
8
9
10 284. T ((Ale)) Why?
11
12 285. Ale ((T)) Well I don't know it should have the size of a Ale makes a sign with
13 photon to get something / and still his fingers to show the
14 width of a ray
15
16
17
18
19 286. T ((Ale)) Well / this is complicated what you tell me
20 indeed / for the moment in geometric optics / we
21 don't ask this question / and we consider that we
22 can represent a ray / thus isolate a ray /
23
24 Yes? we do as if / even if nobody has never
25 succeeded I shall say
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 287. Ale ((T)) Nowadays Ale turns towards Mat
34
35
36 288. T ((Ale)) It doesn't preclude us to analyse well / by
37 making this hypothesis and by accepting that it is
38 possible
39
40
41
42
43 289. Mat ((Ale)) (inaudible)
44
45
46 290. T So you write / for the answer three a / we are T begins to draw a
47 referring / particularly to lines three and five diagram of the
48 (repeated) (2s) to represent the light (repeated) by situation on the
49 rays and light beams (6s) and (5s) to line four for blackboard
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Table 3: transcription of episode 3, explanation of the experiment of the masked lens**
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

- 1
2
3 251 T You should have proposed an answer by now (2s) you
4 have the same scale as yesterday you put an object AB
5 with 14,5 millimetres instead of 29 at 80 centimetres so
6 8 centimetres on the scale and the image 57 centimetres
7 (64s). Have you done this diagram? Right. Well I'm T looks at a diagram
8 going to project it / so does this properly express the drawn by a student.
9 fact that there is an image on the contrary of what you
10 have thought?
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 252 Al ((T)) Yes.
23
24 e
25
26
27 253 T Does it make clear the fact that it is less luminous?
28
29
30 254 Al ((T)) Yes.
31
32 e
33
34 255 T Yes / there is less light which arrives at the lens T projects the diagram
35 because we put a mask on it / then what I ask you to do and shows the screen
36 is to represent the the screen I put a real screen there. (a piece of white
37 You put A' and B' because if I mask them you are not paper) which masks
38 going to see them anymore and you should not put the part of the
39 light which passes (2s) look A' B' which are masked / transparency
40 this is the diagram that you should have done unless
41 you put the mask on the bottom which is the same thing
42 (inaudible)
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 256 NI ((T)) If we had put the mask (inaudible)
56
57
58 257 T ((NI)) Just behind you mean?
59
60 258 Al ((NI)) This doesn't change anything

- 1
2
3 e
4
5
6 259 NI ((T)) This doesn't change anything (3s)
7
8 260 T You must put the arrows indeed and then it is better to T refers to the
9
10 use two different colours for the points (inaudible) projected diagram
11
12 otherwise this makes a little (inaudible) (32s) Have you
13
14 done it? you have correctly placed A'B' because it is
15
16 masked and then you must get used to call A the point
17
18 that is on the axis (2s) this is a convention / A is on the
19
20 axis B isn't on the axis according to this convention
21
22 (4s) and then we are going to make a little sentence
23
24 with a comment
25
26
27
28
29 261 T ((NI)) First you should finish (inaudible) you have put
30
31 only one ray there for the moment (8s)
32
33
34 262 T ((CI)) If it isn't worthwhile you don't have to write but
35
36 if you are not sure yet you put that on the contrary to
37
38 what you have foreseen you observe an image that is
39
40 not at all cut short by the mask / if this is clear you
41
42 don't need to write it / but don't make this mistake
43
44 anymore and then you put *this diagram accounts well*
45
46 *for the fact that we still observe an image / in spite of* T starts to dictate (in
47
48 *the presence of the mask (2 repetitions) (7s) it is less* italics)
49
50 *luminous (inaudible) it is less luminous (2s) do you*
51
52 agree?
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 4: possible combinations of modelling processes and semiotic registers

	Natural language register	Schematic register
World of objects and events	A	B
World of theories and models	C	D

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3 **Table 5: transcription of episode 4, what is the relation between a beam and a ray?**
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

- 1
2
3 199 T ((Ale)) Then now you should have made a beam as I
4
5 have demanded
6
7
8 200 Mat ((Ale)) A beam / what is a ray a ray and a beam
9
10 201 Ale ((Mat)) A ray is exactly this / what you have
11
12 represented / do a second line / you should do a
13
14 second line
15
16
17 202 T ((Mat)) It is a set of rays (inaudible) of rays on the
18
19 extremity this is a beam
20
21
22 203 Ale ((Mat)) It is the set of two rays
23
24
25 204 Mat ((Ale)) Yes, agreed
26
27 205 T (inaudible) The children (inaudible)
28
29 206 Mat ((Ale)) How did you do that one
30
31 207 Ale ((Mat)) Take A prime
32
33
34 208 Mat ((Ale)) No but I don't need it / ah yes right right They talk while
35
36 doing the diagram
37
38
39 209 Ale ((Mat)) Take A prime
40
41 210 Mat ((Ale)) This makes fifteen not fourteen / fourteen is at They talk while
42
43 the other side (7s) it is true it is much simpler than the doing the diagram
44
45 way you said / and I had a good one also at the first
46
47
48 211 T A beam of light is a set of rays / these are all the rays T shows the diagram
49
50 coming from point A in this case between these two on the blackboard
51
52 rays
53
54
55 212 Mat ((Mat)) Ok
56
57
58 213 Ale ((Mat)) This yes it is like the billiards when you hit a
59
60 edge

1
2
3 214 Mat ((Ale)) Yes but it depends on how hard is the edge /
4
5
6 yes

7
8 215 Ale ((Mat)) Yes if you hit it well

9
10 216 Mat ((Ale)) Yes
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3 **DIALOGIC/AUTHORITATIVE DISCOURSE AND MODELLING IN A HIGH**
4 **SCHOOL TEACHING SEQUENCE ON OPTICS**
5

6
7 Christian Buty (1), Eduardo F. Mortimer (2)
8

9 (1) UMR ICAR – University Lyon 2 - CNRS – ENS-LSH – ENS Lyon – INRP, France

10 (2) Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil
11

12
13
14 **Postal address:** Christian Buty, UMR ICAR, ENS LSH, BP 7000, 15 parvis René Descartes,
15 69342 LYON CEDEX 7, FRANCE
16

17 **Email address:** Christian.Buty@inrp.fr
18

19
20 **Running head:** dialogic/authoritative discourse and modelling
21

22 **Acknowledgements**
23

24 This work was supported by CNPq and CAPES (Brazil), CNRS and INRP (France).
25

26
27 The authors wish to express their gratitude to the reviewers on one hand, and on the other
28
29 hand to Pr. Andrée Tiberghien (CNRS), to Pr. Maria-Pilar Jimenez-Aleixandre (University of
30
31 Santiago de Compostela), and to Pr. Robin Millar (University of York).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60