

Lefstein, Adam; Israeli, Mirit; Pollak, Itay; Bozo-Schwartz, Maya

Investigating dilemmas in teaching: towards a new form of pedagogical scholarship

Studia paedagogica. 2013, vol. 18, iss. 4, pp. [9]-36

ISSN 1803-7437 (print); ISSN 2336-4521 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/SP2013-4-2>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/129766>

Access Date: 22. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

INVESTIGATING DILEMMAS IN TEACHING: TOWARDS A NEW FORM OF PEDAGOGICAL SCHOLARSHIP

ADAM LEFSTEIN, MIRIT ISRAELI,
ITAY POLLAK, MAYA BOZO-SCHWARTZ

Abstract

This article investigates five dilemmas that emerge from analysis of a brief episode of classroom practice: issues concerning the design and management of the classroom discussion, the use of drama in teaching, teacher handling of pupil disturbances, and the advantages and drawbacks of competition. We argue that such dilemma-driven analysis is missing from current pedagogical scholarship, in which analyses tend to be theory-driven and narrower in their scope. Our aims are to (a) do justice to the richness and complexity of classroom activity and the work of teaching; (b) illustrate a means of working with representations of practice that is likely to facilitate the development of teacher professional judgment; and (c) uncover some of the central dilemmas experienced by Israeli primary teachers. The data are drawn from a sixth grade Hebrew language lesson in an Israeli state primary school.

Keywords

dilemmas in teaching, whole class discussion, use of drama in teaching, competition

Let me warn the reader immediately: there is no particular argument to this book – unless it’s, that the movement described within is well worth thinking about.

-- David Graeber, *Direct Action: An Ethnography*, 2009, p. viii

As pedagogical research grows in theoretical and methodological sophistication, it also becomes more narrowly focused and specialised. Alongside the obvious advantages of such specialisation, we pay a price: namely, widening the gap separating research on teaching from the lived experience of classroom practice. We offer in this unorthodox article an alternative form of pedagogical scholarship: rather than starting with a theoretical problem and using classroom data to investigate it, we start with a classroom event and work out from it to a discussion of pedagogical problems and dilemmas. The primary purposes of our analytic strategy are (a) to do justice to the richness and complexity of classroom activity and the work of teaching; (b) to illustrate a means of working with representations of practice that has the potential to facilitate the development of teacher professional judgment; and (c) to uncover some of the central dilemmas facing Israeli primary teachers.

Pedagogical research is not the only field of study facing this problem of theoretical specialisation. Anthropologist David Graeber (2009) prefaces his recent ethnography of the global social justice movement with a discussion of the unfortunate demise of the genre of classic ethnographies that seek to describe in detail a social group and set of cultural practices for its own sake – not only as a means of advancing a theoretical point. He laments the current convention in which anthropologists subordinate ethnographic description to theoretical discussion, yielding less rich or interesting monographs. He notes:

Anarchists and direct action campaigns do not exist to allow some academic to make a theoretical point or prove some rival’s theory wrong... and it strikes me as obnoxious to suggest otherwise. I would like to think that, as a result, the interest of this book might also endure... to ask the same sort of questions the actors in it were raising, about the nature of democracy, autonomy, and possibilities—or for that matter, dilemmas, limitations—of strategies of transformative political action. (2009, viii)

Likewise, rather than focusing (and limiting) our selection and analysis of data to one or two theoretical issues—or inventing some theoretical “hook” upon which to hang our analysis¹—we seek to do justice to the richness and complexity of what happened in one teaching episode. We do this because we believe that the richness and complexity of classroom practice are well worth thinking about (see epigraph).

The article is structured as follows: first, we briefly make the case for investigating pedagogic dilemmas. Second, we outline the research setting and method, and introduce the national context of our study. Next, we provide an overview of the lesson and event analysed. Fourth, in what is the heart of the article, we discuss five pedagogical dilemmas the episode poses. Finally, we reflect back on this process, clarifying what we—and hopefully our readers—have gained from it.

Why focus on dilemmas?

Teaching is, to quote Labaree (2000), “a difficult practice that looks easy.” Among the sources of difficulty he identifies are teacher dependence on pupil commitment and cooperation, exacerbated by the compulsory nature of pupil participation; managing pupils and one’s own emotions in the development of classroom relationships; and chronic uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of teaching. Uncertainty in teaching arises first and foremost from its complexity: the interaction of dozens of pupils, with differing levels of ability, interest and commitment; often sensitive social dynamics; multiple and conflicting educational goals; institutional pressures and requirements; and the need to balance these and other concerns in countless minor and major dilemmas teachers face throughout each and every school day.² Coping successfully with these dilemmas requires the development of sensitivity and understanding, to notice what is happening and make sense of it; a flexible repertoire of teaching techniques and strategies to respond to problems that arise; and the professional judgment to decide which of the alternative courses of action is wisest in any given moment. One way of developing teachers’ professional sensitivity, interpretation, repertoire and judgment is by reflecting upon authentic pedagogic events and deliberating with colleagues

¹ On the necessity in the current publishing climate to hang one’s analysis on a theoretical hook, see Snell & Lefstein (2014).

² Examples of useful analyses of problems and dilemmas in teaching include Alexander (1995), Berlak & Berlak (1981), and Lampert (2001).

about the dilemmas they pose.³ One aim of this article is to illustrate the sort of issues such a discussion might encompass through the case study of a sixth grade discussion of pupils' predictions of how a short story might unfold.

Research Site and Method

We present and analyse here the recording of a seven-minute episode from a sixth grade Hebrew lesson that took place in a state primary school in Jerusalem in the middle of the 2012–13 school year.⁴ The lesson was recorded as part of an ongoing study into Israeli culture and pedagogy, in which the research team observed and recorded 123 lessons taught by eight teachers in two schools (grades 4–6), collected samples of pupil work, interviewed teachers, and observed planning meetings. We selected the schools from within the general Hebrew sector, on the basis of principal and teacher agreement to participate and the lack of any special programs that might call into question the relevance of the practices observed.

Our project aims to inform policy and practice, and to this end we share our data and discuss initial interpretations with policy-makers and practitioners as an integral part of the research process. The episode analysed in this article was selected for such a discussion for a number of reasons. First, it runs approximately seven minutes, which we have found is about the maximum duration for working with teachers and, likewise, about the right length for a journal article. Second, the episode represents a complete, well-bounded activity, with a beginning, middle and end. Third, it reflects teaching that, while excellent in many respects, raises a range of important pedagogical problems. Nonetheless, it is also a relatively routine segment; like all the lessons in our corpus, this session was not prepared or orchestrated specifically for us, for example as a demonstration of best teaching practices. While the episode is dense with interesting interactions and issues, it generally reflects the day-to-day activity and discourse that we have witnessed in other Hebrew lessons in Israeli state primary schools. We make no claims to its representativeness – how could a seven minute episode stand for the multiple and varied forms

³ The ideas in this section are elaborated in Lefstein & Snell (2014), which also includes eight video-recorded episodes and accompanying analysis. See also Loughran (2010) for a similar approach.

⁴ The project team includes, in addition to the authors, Yariv Feniger, Hadar Netz, Aliza Segal, Miri Issasschar, Lidar Issasschar, and Gili David. We would like to take this opportunity to thank them, Yael Pulvermacher and Orna Heysman for helpful comments on the episode.

of pedagogy in Israeli schools? – only that it is not in any way a rare or exotic specimen of the practice we have encountered.

The teacher in the episode, whom we are calling Shlomit,⁵ has been teaching for more than 15 years, all in the same school. She is the homeroom teacher for the sixth grade class appearing in the episode, and has been teaching them since the beginning of the school year in September. The episode occurred in January, in our fourth of 12 observations of Shlomit and her class.

In analyzing the episode we transcribed it fully and engaged in a number of analytic passes, including:

a) Linguistic ethnographic micro-analytic brainstorming, in which we slowly moved through the video-recorded episode, moment-by-moment and line-by-line, asking at each instant what was happening, why and what possibilities it opened up for participants.⁶

b) During the brainstorming sessions, we compiled a running list of pedagogical issues that the episode raised for us, among them the visibility of teaching goals and success criteria, non-standard language use, teacher feedback, teacher role-switching, collectivist vs. individualist classroom cultures, the design and management of whole class discussions, the use of drama in teaching, the various ways the teacher handled pupil disturbances, and the advantages and drawbacks of competition. We selected from among these issues five dilemmas for deeper exploration. Our selection was guided by three considerations: we sought dilemmas that resonated with the rest of our data set, that involved multiple dimensions and goals of teaching, and that appeared to concern the teachers with whom we work.⁷

c) Focusing on each dilemma, we return to a micro-analytic investigation of the video-recorded episode asking at key points: What were the teachers' options here? What are the considerations in favor or against each possibility? Why did the teacher and pupils select that particular course of action? Are there any other situations in which the participants faced similar dilemmas? How did they respond?

⁵ This, like all other names in this document, is a pseudonym.

⁶ On linguistic ethnography, see Maybin & Tusting (2011) and Rampton (2007). For details about conducting linguistic ethnographic micro-analyses of classroom discourse and interaction, see Rampton (2006) and Lefstein & Snell (2014).

⁷ Note that we are not claiming that Shlomit was consciously concerned with these dilemmas while teaching, only that these are issues that Shlomit and other teachers face whether or not they are cognizant of them. Shlomit did raise some of these issues in discussions with us (especially, issues regarding student discipline and competition), and these and other issues have also emerged in conversations with other teachers in discussions of the episode video recording.

d) We discussed the episode and exchanged interpretations with a number of Israeli teachers and Ministry of Education officials (throughout the process of writing the article).

Finally, we should note that while our interpretations were not motivated by a specific theoretical frame, we of course do bring particular perspectives to bear on analysis of the data: i.e., Alexander's (2009) multi-dimensional conceptualisation of pedagogy, linguistic ethnographic concerns with identity and interpersonal relations, and interest in dialogic pedagogy, processes of knowledge building, and teacher feedback. We acknowledge that these perspectives have inevitably shaped our interpretations, but we have also attempted to approach the data with an open mind, disciplining our gaze by using group brainstorming practices to generate additional interpretations and by systematically testing our ideas against the available data.

Situating the Study: the Israeli School Context

Israeli education is free and compulsory from kindergarten to the end of high school. The centralised education system is governed by the Ministry of Education (MoE), which is authorised to set goals, curriculum and assessment, as well as to supervise schools, teacher professional development and learning materials. Public schools in Israel are divided between three main branches: state secular schools, state religious schools, and Israeli Arab schools. In recent years the system has increasingly undergone decentralisation processes, including the transfer of responsibilities to local municipalities and third sector organisations (Gibton, Sabar, & Goldring, 2000).

Israeli schools are accountable to multiple stakeholders, primarily because of the complex organisational structure of the MoE and municipalities. The MoE, for example, consists of different divisions that are responsible for different aspects of the educational process: for instance, the Pedagogical Secretariat bears primary though not exclusive responsibility for curricular content. Other departments in the MoE also offer such content in the form of specialised programs. The most dominant is the Pedagogic Administration Branch, which includes the primary and secondary school departments, the psychological services unit, and special needs units (including learning disabilities and disorders, gifted students, and immigrants). On top of this, the municipal education authorities are regulated by regional districts of the MoE. As a result, school staff are responsible to multiple agencies and are expected to enact multiple goals, agendas, programs and practices, which are not always well-aligned with each other.

To date, there has been scant research on classroom discourse in Israel. The few studies that have been conducted have found structures similar to those identified in Western countries (e.g., Cazden, 2001; Edwards & Westgate, 1994), i.e., the Initiation-Response-Evaluation pattern (Vardi-Rath & Blum-Kulka, 2005; Peled-Elhanan & Blum-Kulka, 2006). Though such a discourse pattern emphasises teacher authority (Yariv, 2010), we find in our classroom observations considerable evidence that teacher authority is being undermined, presumably through broader cultural influences. Israeli culture has been characterised by some in terms of honesty and straightforwardness (e.g., Yariv, 2010), by others in terms of audacity, informality, assertiveness and argumentativeness. Common to all of these is a distrust of and even resistance to hierarchical order and authority in both the private and public domains (Yair, 2011).

An Overview of the Lesson and Episode

The lesson from which the episode is excerpted is part of a social education unit appearing in the state sixth grade Hebrew curriculum. In this unit, the children are introduced to various stories and texts that raise social issues relevant to the pupils' daily lives. The explicit goal of the particular lesson was to develop pupils' argumentative writing skills, and—implicitly—to promote prosocial behavior.

The focal episode occurred 25 minutes into the lesson. Shlomit opened the lesson by presenting the story's title, "The Knights from the Fifth Grade" (by Ze'ev Vardi), and asked the pupils to write down their predictions for what the story might be about. Next, after briefly discussing pupil responses, Shlomit distributed the text to the class and read aloud the opening paragraphs, in which the author describes a group of Kibbutz children attending a regional sport competition. The group was expected to win the competition easily despite the fact one of its members, whom they call "Chubby Gila", is a burden on the team. Yet, though the group won most of their events, they left the tournament early without the trophy, standing tall with pride.

The story is structured such that the surprising outcome—the team's return to the kibbutz without the trophy but proud—is introduced at the very beginning, and then the rest of the story is devoted to explication of what had transpired. While reading the opening paragraphs, the class identified "initial clues" that the author planted to hint at the solution to the mysterious outcome. After reading the opening passage, Shlomit instructed the pupils to speculate in writing why the children returned early without the trophy but somehow proud. The episode analysed below begins with the teacher's explanation of the task. We divide the episode into six sections:

the first two are devoted to performing the task, the latter four to discussion of pupil answers. In what follows, we walk readers through each of these sections; a transcript of the entire episode may be found in the appendix.⁸

a. *Clarifying the task* (lines 1–31): The episode begins with a reiteration of the task the pupils are to perform: predicting the continuation of the story. After Shlomit’s presentation of the task, a number of pupils say they do not understand what they are supposed to do, and Shlomit clarifies:

Yes, I didn’t understand either.	Nimrod	9
<i>(to Ronen)</i> So I’m glad you’re saying you didn’t understand; I’m glad. Because that tells me you want to know, you want to learn, you want to succeed, and I’m proud of you. The “Yarden” kids returned two hours before they were supposed to. They won almost all the victories.	Shlomit	10
But why “almost”? <i>(clapping his hands)</i> I didn’t understand that “almost.”	Nimrod	11
Ah, it ruined everything for them.	Yoel	12
It could be in your imagination, just a moment.	Shlomit	13
Ah, I’ve understood.	Ronen	14
They returned without the trophy, but whoever saw them in their stance, erect, they returned with pride.	Shlomit	15
Ah... Because they thought they’d won.	Nimrod	16
You tell me now, why you think, what happened in your opinion? What happened, why did they return before they were supposed to, what happened there? <i>(Nimrod raises his hand; the teacher grasps it and lowers it)</i>	Shlomit	17
Just a moment, but did they return in anger or with pride?	Guy	18
It’s written right there. How did they return?	Shlomit	19
With pride.	Pupils (in unison)	20
With pride <i>(striding with her head held high to act out the way they returned).</i>	Shlomit	21

⁸ A note about transcription: the discussion was conducted in Hebrew, and our analysis was performed on a detailed transcription of the original (and the video of course). Here we have translated the text to English, and added punctuation to assist reader comprehension. The Hebrew transcript and soundtrack are available from the authors.

Most pupils begin writing, some begin to share their interpretations out loud; Shlomit stops them and tells them to record their answers in writing.

b. *Encouraging pupil engagement* (lines 32–42): The teacher notices that some of the pupils have not begun writing, and encourages them to give it a go, to not be afraid of tackling the task – the more they try, the easier it will become. The teacher then brings the class together to review their answers. Three responses are examined:

c. *Guy’s answer* (lines 43–55): Guy reads aloud his answer, which Shlomit praises as excellent, because it refers to most of the initial clues identified, including the outcome, the central characters and their emotional state.

In my opinion they returned two hours before the agreed time and even though they won all the games they didn’t return with the trophy because maybe “chubby Gila” wasn’t in form and she ran and got tired so they conceded and defended her, and for the time they wasted they lost, but they were pleased with their actions.	Guy	44
I think she must have been insulted...	Ronen	45
Your answer makes reference to what happened.	Shlomit	46
<i>(smiling)</i> Gila.	Keren	47
It makes reference to the initial clue – Gila – and to what else does it refer?	Shlomit	48
To how they came out.	Guy	49
To how they returned.	Shlomit	50
I did that also.	Michal	51
His answer makes reference not only to their returning two hours before schedule, but also to the state in which they returned. A very good answer.	Shlomit	52
Thank you.	Guy	53
Very good. Give yourself a tick mark. Very good. I’m proud of you.	Shlomit	54
But I’ve got an answer too, please...	Idan	55

d. *Nimrod’s answer* (lines 56–98): Next, the teacher nominates Nimrod. After Nimrod reads out his answer: “Their driver was late on purpose for the children’s last game so they would miss it.” Shlomit turns to the rest of the class and elicits their responses to his suggestion. The pupils say that his answer does not make sense in light of the plot; Shlomit confirms this criticism, and then goes on to explain the key problem as she sees it:

Wait a moment, and let's say he was late...	Shlomit	81
They lost with dignity	Yoni	82
I'm asking you a question: we've just now read a passage...	Shlomit	83
Why would he do that on purpose?	Unidentified pupil	84
In this passage what did we have?	Shlomit	85
That he drove without...	Yoni	86
(<i>emphatically</i>) What did we have in this passage?	Shlomit	87
Pride, [initial] clues...	Pupils (in unison)	88
Initial clues. Clues that hint to us what may happen in the plot. Let's see, did you mention the Chubby Gila character?	Shlomit	89
No.	Pupils (in unison)	90
No. Did you mention in your answer that they returned with pride?	Shlomit	91
No.	Nimrod	92
No. If their driver had really wanted to spite them, in what sort of mood would they have returned?	Shlomit	93
A bad mood	Pupils (in unison)	94
That's right. So first of all I'm pleased that you tried.	Shlomit	95

Shlomit concludes the exchange by attributing Nimrod's mistake to his over-exuberance (line 97).

e. "*You're blocking me*" (lines 99–114): As the discussion of Nimrod's answer begins to wind down, other pupils begin vying for the floor. Idan becomes angry at Hagit, who is sitting beside him and whose raised hand, he claims, is blocking the teacher's view of his own hand. He says, "You're blocking me, I can stand like that, too," and stands on his chair. Shlomit scolds Idan for his outburst, and then calms the situation and defuses the tension in the class by joking about the perfume that Idan's parents, who are currently abroad, will be bringing her. She then asks Hagit for her answer, reassuring Idan that his turn to speak will come later.

f. *Hagit's answer* (lines 115–135): The teacher interrupts Hagit in the middle of her answer because she thinks it merely repeats Guy's idea and does nothing to further the discussion.

In my opinion fat Gila got disqualified once and they went and came back because they didn't want her in the group...	Hagit	121
Stop there. (to the class) What would I have expected of Hagit? She says that Gila deliberately got them disqualified and that they came back anyway in order not to hurt her. What would I have expected, who is Hagit speaking like now?	Shlomit	122
Nimrod.	Pupils (in unison)	123
Like who?	Shlomit	124
Nimrod.	Pupils (in unison)	125
Who read out such an answer?	Shlomit	126
Guy.	Pupils (in unison)	127
Guy, so who's left? (<i>pupils laugh</i>)	Ronen	128
Guy. I would have expected of you, if you're really listening to each other, to say – I think the same as Guy. Because there's no benefit in repeating the same answers, it doesn't take us forward.	Shlomit	129

Guy disagrees, clarifying the difference between them. The teacher accepts his explanation as a possibility, but ends the discussion with a general conclusion regarding how the discourse in class should be conducted, emphasising that it is important the pupils listen to each other and refer to each other's answers.

Dilemmas Posed by the Episode

We now discuss select dilemmas raised by this passage: issues concerning the design and management of the classroom discussion, the use of drama in teaching, the various ways Shlomit handles disturbances, and the advantages and drawbacks of competition.

The Topic of Discussion: Reading Comprehension versus Formulating Complete and Correct Answers

Shlomit, the teacher in the episode, instructs the pupils to employ a popular reading comprehension strategy: predicting what will come next in the text. This strategy has been observed among skilled readers, and is also a proven strategy for developing reading comprehension among children (e.g., Duke & Pearson, 2002). Shlomit stops after reading part of the story and asks the pupils to speculate what might have happened. In the case analysed here, she also directs pupil attention to the initial clues (“chubby Gila” and the children’s early return to the kibbutz) that may help them in formulating intelligent and informed hypotheses. After each pupil has written down their conjecture, the teacher collects a few answers and discusses each of them separately.

What is the focus of the class discussion at this point? Shlomit and the pupils attend primarily to the extent to which the pupils’ answers conform to the formal criteria introduced for a correct and complete answer. The first answer, Guy’s, is praised because it refers to the initial clues as defined (lines 44–52). The second and third answers, on the other hand, are criticised for not conforming to the conventions for correct answers as established in this class. Nimrod’s answer is rejected because he did not refer to the initial clues that the class identified (lines 83–91), and Hagit’s answer was censored because she ostensibly repeated Guy’s answer, adding nothing further to the discussion (line 129). Both Nimrod and Hagit’s answers are found wanting for reasons that are essentially formal – the focus is on the *way* in which the answer is formulated rather than its content, as might have been expected given the nature of the assignment as a comprehension task. Form is important: pupils need to know how to answer questions, and teachers ought to teach such skills explicitly, as Shlomit does here.⁹ It bears mention, however, that there are additional foci which can and should be developed, and this tension between competing foci pose an interesting and productive dilemma.

To illustrate, let us more closely examine Nimrod’s answer. What is he actually saying? And to what is he responding? Nimrod’s answer—“Their driver was late on purpose for the children’s last game so they would miss it”—is indeed incorrect: read to the end of the story and you will find that that is not what happened. But Nimrod does respond to a clue that appears in that part of the story which the class has read: the children returned from

⁹ On the importance of making criteria explicit, see Hattie’s (2009) work on “visible teaching.”

the event before the scheduled time, indeed “the driver who was supposed to come and pick them up hadn’t even left the kibbutz yet.” Nimrod’s conjecture does not accord with other details in the story, as explained to him by Ilan (“If he were late they wouldn’t have had time to play the game”; line 79) and by the teacher (“If their driver had really wanted to spite them, in what sort of mood would they have returned?”; line 93). Nevertheless, elaborating an illogical conjecture is an excellent way to expose a misunderstanding.¹⁰ Consider, for example, in what mental picture would the driver’s tardiness have caused them to miss a game? And what has Nimrod missed in the story that might have helped him to construct a better image?

Developing an illogical conjecture is also an excellent way to deepen reading comprehension. Here its examination might also have helped pupils appreciate how the author has created mystery and uncertainty – a puzzle with clues that serves to engage readers in the story. Imagine, for example, a discussion in which the teacher juxtaposes the three conjectures (Guy’s, Nimrod’s and Hagit’s) and asks the class which they think is the likeliest and why; in other words, what in the text or in their knowledge of sports and stories supports one or another conjecture, or may help them to develop a fourth prediction? Such a discussion would likely have focused on the content of the conjectures and the story instead of on their formulation and presentation. The germs of such a discussion can be discerned in the spontaneous answers to Nimrod, and in his responses to them (lines 69–75). Such a discussion has advantages for developing a good understanding of the story and for deciphering pupils’ misunderstandings: understanding and misunderstanding are often interwoven, and the latter may sometimes be a necessary stage on the path to the former.

On the other hand, such a focus also has its drawbacks: it may require more time, and may not necessarily help pupils learn to formulate complete and correct answers to questions such as these. When we should prefer one focus or another, and when and how we should try to integrate them, are important questions worthy of discussion among teachers, programme designers and pedagogical researchers.

¹⁰ We are uneasy with lines of inquiry that posit hypothetical alternative courses of action (as here and below). Such speculation often leads to highly problematic spaces, since (a) we have no way of knowing what would have happened and (b) it distracts us from analysis of what actually did happen. Our purpose here is not to suggest that this alternative path would have been wiser, or necessarily would have achieved the ends we’ve set for it. Rather we use the example methodologically as a way of clarifying the competing goals at play.

Whole Class Discussion Structures

The episode can be divided into two stages: in the first, pupils prepare their contributions (sections a and b in our summary above), and in the second, the class discuss select pupil interpretations (sections c–f). In the preparatory stage, Shlomit asks the pupils to record their answers in writing. Writing down an answer prior to oral discussion is a useful strategy: it gives pupils time to think about the question; the act of writing is an important skill; and this strategy is a good way of allowing pupils, who may not want or get a chance to participate in whole class discussion, to be involved in the activity by comparing their own ideas with those developed later in the discussion. Alongside these advantages, this practice may also come at a price: pupils are liable to concentrate too much on their own answers, and to try to elicit feedback on them, instead of focusing on and contributing to the class's shared understanding.

For example, consider the discussion of Hagit's answer (lines 121–135). Although her answer—"fat Gila got disqualified once and they went and came back because they didn't want her in the group"—does make reference to the initial clues, Shlomit stops her mid-response because she recognises Hagit's answer as being very similar to Guy's (compare lines 44 and 121). The two answers are actually quite different: whereas Guy conjectured that the group showed solidarity towards Gila, Hagit speculated that they did not want her on their team. However, we can see from Shlomit's reaction to Hagit's opening, and from the way she reconstructs Hagit's remark ("They came back anyway in order not to hurt her"; line 122) that she interprets the answer as being very close to Guy's. She therefore scolds Hagit for making no reference in her remark to Guy's answer: "Because there's no benefit in repeating the same answers, it doesn't take us forward" (line 129). Up to this point, we have encountered two conditions posed by the teacher for acceptable answers: the first, which we have already discussed, is to refer to the previously identified initial clues; the second is to listen to and address other pupils' answers. There is, however, some tension between these two requirements: it is difficult to listen to the answers and think about them independently and at the same time to be oriented toward what the teacher expects to hear. That tension is evident in the other pupils' initial remarks to Nimrod, which were relevant to his conjecture, but irrelevant to the criterion Shlomit sought to promote (lines 70–82).

Shlomit's concerns here are understandable. In effect, the discussion is not advancing beyond Guy's first answer. It is partly a structural problem: the discussion keeps returning to the same initial question. The teacher develops the discussion around each of the answers, but the answers do not build on each other, and hence fail to construct any shared knowledge that

transcends the pupils' individual responses. As such, the discussion does not meet Alexander's (2008) cumulative principle of dialogic teaching, according to which "participants build on answers and other oral contributions and chain them into coherent lines of thinking and understanding." The episode's relatively non-cumulative structure arises in part precisely because of the requirement that pupils prepare their answers in writing, which we recognised above as in many respects a productive pedagogic strategy. However, it is unsurprising that pupils, after having invested time and energy in preparing answers, want to present them as such, regardless of what others have said in the meantime. The same teaching strategy which helped the pupils prepare their answers appears also to be a source of the problems the class encounter in chaining contributions into coherent lines of inquiry.

Taking the Stage: Advantages and Drawbacks of Dramatic Teaching

Shlomit asks the pupils to decipher what is happening in the story by means of clues planted in the opening of the story. She leaves the pupils in suspense and instructs them not to peek at the story continuation (line 23). In such a way, the classroom is transformed into a stage on which an intriguing drama is played out. Shlomit, who is also the school drama teacher, assumes the roles of storyteller and lead actor. She builds suspense around the story by means of physical gestures, changes of intonation and facial expressions. The pupils function as an engaged and active audience. What effect does dramatic teaching have on the pupils and on the course of the lesson? How does it shape learning opportunities, the pupils' involvement, their behavior, and the classroom discourse culture?

We identify in the episode numerous dramatic devices employed by Shlomit. She uses physical gestures as a tool to amplify the ideas she is conveying, for example by strutting tall and light-footed in order to illustrate the way the children in the story returned without the trophy but full of pride (line 21). Her facial expressions also convey her thoughts to the pupils. Her face seems grave while she listens to the pupils' answers, reflecting the seriousness with which she considers them; and lights up when she hears Guy's excellent answer (line 44). She also adjusts her intonation according to the situation, for instance speaking loudly and aggressively when she demands that pupils refer to the initial clues in their answers. Likewise, Shlomit adjusts her manner of speech, exclaiming, for example, "Let's do this!" (line 43) as the pupils would, in a colloquial register.¹¹ This is especially

¹¹ The term she uses, "Yalla", is an Arabic word used colloquially in Hebrew. It is not typical academic or teacher talk.

striking in light of the contrast between the enthusiasm of “Let’s do this!” and the serious demeanor that her face almost immediately assumes while Nimrod reads out his answer.

Shlomit uses these techniques to stimulate pupil interest and involvement in the lesson, and to help her develop and convey her ideas. She also employs them to good effect in managing the class. For example, after Shlomit has calmed down Idan, who stood on his chair, she gives the floor to Hagit, who was the object of Idan’s outburst (line 114). With this move she clarifies that Idan’s aggressive behavior is unacceptable, but she also reintroduces tension to the class after the comic interlude (the discussion of Givenchy perfume; lines 106–112). Shlomit seems to be aware that this may antagonise Idan, and playfully winks at him, reassuring him that he will also get a turn (line 114).

Shlomit’s dramatic teaching positions the pupils as audience, who are entitled and perhaps even expected to evaluate her performance (see Bauman & Briggs, 1990). The pupils express their admiration through their enthusiasm to participate (e.g., lines 24, 55 and 113), but they also pass critical judgments. One example is Guy’s criticism of the teacher’s assertion that Hagit’s answer is identical to his (“Why? It’s a little different from mine”; line 130). Note also the way in which Guy softens his criticism at the end of his remarks (“It’s similar but not exactly”; line 134). This could be seen as reflecting the limits of freedom to criticise the teacher. However, when we look at Shlomit’s critiques of pupil answers and actions, Guy’s critical style appears to reflect the critical culture practiced more generally in this classroom, first and foremost by the teacher. Shlomit, too, concludes her critiques with mitigation, for example in the explanation she provides to Nimrod for his mistake (“Because you know why you didn’t think of it, Daddy-o? Because you wanted so much to show your answer”; line 97), and from her attributing Idan’s outburst to his parents’ absence (line 104).

It seems, then, that Shlomit’s dramatic teaching does help generate interest and participation. However, her charismatic stage presence may also have drawbacks vis-à-vis pupil voice and positioning. An example can be seen in the incident involving Idan’s angry outburst (line 99). Here the teacher’s acting skills are particularly evident – she gently placates Idan, and then immediately tries to break the tension with humor, asking: “Did you tell her to bring me perfume?” At this point, the focus passes from Idan’s disruption (i.e., from Idan himself) to the teacher who amuses him and the rest of the class. Idan has managed to draw attention to himself, but only for a relatively short time.

This example, like others, demonstrates the teacher’s large presence on the classroom stage and her leading role throughout the lesson. She is one of the major reasons for the pupils’ great interest and intensive engagement in the lesson. At the same time, however, we may wonder how much space she

leaves for the pupils on the classroom stage, and to what extent they are able to express themselves in light of their teacher's larger-than-life presence? The relatively loud, extroverted boys seem to find a place next to Shlomit, but how amenable is this dramatic lesson for the quieter pupils' participation (in this class, mostly girls)? Does the dramatisation itself encourage extroverted and extreme behaviors, such as Idan's standing on his chair? Or perhaps it energises the pupils and increases their influence on what happens in class, since as audience they have greater freedom to criticise it – indirectly enhancing their independence and initiative, as well as their contribution to classroom discourse?

Dealing with Disturbances: Private vs. Public Responses

There are numerous disturbances throughout the episode, which Shlomit addresses in a variety of ways. Like all teachers, she must balance competing concerns: giving pupils space in which to make their voices heard, and making sure that no one pupil's voice drowns out others, i.e., that one pupil's participation does not interfere with others' opportunities to learn. Similarly, she must strike a balance between the need to clarify and enforce appropriate norms of classroom behavior, and the need to move the lesson along, since engaging in classroom management and discipline often takes time away from more academic pursuits. And another dilemma: should one censure a pupil publicly, in front of the entire class, or wait for a more private moment? Should one address the class generally, or direct one's comments at a specific pupil?

In our brief episode we can identify a variety of strategies employed by Shlomit to respond to what we interpret as numerous pupil disruptions to the flow of the lesson:

a) *Restraint*: Throughout the beginning of the episode Nimrod is rather busy trying to capture Shlomit's attention and to demonstrate his interest and desire to participate actively in the lesson. After Ronen says he has not understood, Nimrod also chimes in: "I didn't understand either" (line 9). Shlomit compliments Ronen on his question and begins explaining the task again, but Nimrod interrupts with another question ("But what is almost? I didn't understand that almost"; line 11), either having indeed not understood, or perhaps fishing for a compliment himself. Towards the end of the explanation, while the pupils are asking for further clarifications, Nimrod waves his arm, calling out "Me, me, me" (line 24) although the teacher is right beside him. At this stage, Shlomit exercises restraint. This strategy has three advantages: 1) the flow of the lesson is not interrupted; 2) the pupil creating the disturbance is not rewarded, i.e., by making him the center of attention; and 3) nor is that pupil subjected to the embarrassment of a public scolding. On the other hand, restraint also has three potential

drawbacks: 1) the pupil creating the disturbance may escalate her or his behavior until intervention is offered (in which case, the earlier the better); 2) other pupils may interpret the lack of response as a sign that the disruptive behavior is legitimate; and 3) the disruptions may disturb other pupils' concentration and learning. In Nimrod's case there may also be another consideration: his disruptions seem to stem from over-exuberance rather than lack of interest in the lesson. Perhaps Nimrod's enthusiasm spurs other pupils' engagement as much or even more than it disturbs them?

b) *Personal nonpublic response*: Later in the passage, teacher Shlomit employs a different strategy to deal with Nimrod's enthusiastic disruptions. When he raises and waves his arm at the teacher, she chooses to respond by grasping his hand and lowering his arm; i.e., the teacher responds to Nimrod personally and not publicly (it is reasonable to assume that most of the pupils did not notice her action, which took place as she spoke). The quiet gesture both soothes Nimrod and signals to him that it is not the right time to bid for a turn.

c) *Personal public comment*: Another strategy that Shlomit employs is a personal comment in the public class forum. Two examples of this strategy can be witnessed in the episode. One is the case of Hadas, who Shlomit observes to be doodling rather than writing an answer. Hadas is engrossed in what she is doing and not disturbing anyone else (likely enough the other pupils, who are working at that juncture, have not noticed her at all), but nonetheless the teacher chooses to single her out for public censure ("I see you're busy with your markers..."; lines 37–41). On one hand, such a comment is liable to embarrass Hadas (and perhaps for that reason Shlomit adds: "Thank Heaven, you're a very bright girl. Try."), but on the other hand it signals her expectations to all the pupils.

In the second instance, the teacher devotes a relatively long period of time to Idan. This occurs immediately after Nimrod has concluded his answer. The pupils recognise an opportunity to bid for a turn and raise their hands accordingly. Hagit, who is seated next to Idan, sits up straight in her chair, perhaps obstructing the teacher's view of him. A contest over the teacher's attention develops between them, and Idan protests and stands up on his chair (line 99). This time the teacher interrupts the flow of the lesson and addresses Idan assertively. She begins in a scolding tone of voice ("No, no, no, that reaction is very unpleasant to me. And even if you're angry with her, say it to her nicely"; line 102). Immediately afterwards, however, she pats him on the head and consoles him in a personal, even motherly, tone ("You miss them..."; line 106), thereby bringing Idan back into the lesson.

d) *General public comment*: In one case, as Hagit begins reading out her answer Shlomit chides the entire class about their apparent inattention ("Who's that talking over there?!"; line 116; "Pay attention to your classmate"; line 118). As opposed to the above instances, here the teacher employs the strategy

of addressing the class generally rather than turning to a specific pupil. The main advantage of this strategy is that it does not embarrass anyone in particular; its main drawback, though, is that responsibility is liable to be diffused among too many pupils.

Each strategy has its relative merits and raises different challenges for the teacher vis-à-vis responding to pupils' emotional, cognitive and social needs, advancing the lesson, maintaining classroom order and so forth. Deciding how to respond requires an astute understanding of the situation and actors involved, a rich repertoire of strategies, and the judgment to discern which strategy is best suited to the unique problems and opportunities posed by each situation.

Classroom Competition

We can observe in the episode a high degree of pupil involvement in the classroom discussion. Many pupils seem genuinely eager to participate actively in the lesson. That desire sometimes develops into a struggle over the teacher's attention and a turn at talk. One of the factors fuelling the pupils' desire to participate is the competitive classroom culture. Competition may help motivate pupil engagement, but unchecked it may also lead to disruptive behavior, be harmful for learning and undermine pupil solidarity.¹² How should teachers respond to the competitive climate in which they (and we) work? Should they seek to harness competition, using it to engage (and control) pupils, or seek to mitigate it?

In the episode we can observe a number of ways in which Shlomit colludes with her class's competitive culture, and both its positive (increased participation) and negative (disruptions) implications. The pupils compete first and foremost for Shlomit's attention and praise, and Shlomit appears to collude with them. For example, early in the episode she recognises that her instructions for the task have not been understood, and heaps praise upon Ronen, who confessed his misunderstanding ("So I'm glad you're saying you didn't understand; I'm glad! Because that tells me you want to know, you want to learn, you want to succeed, and I'm proud of you"; line 10). Likewise, Guy's correct and complete answer wins for him, too, extended and positive teacher evaluation ("Very good. Give yourself a tick mark. Very good. I'm proud of you"; line 54).

¹² Competition is a very common phenomenon in primary school classrooms in the West (Jackson, 1968), and it has drawn considerable criticism (see, for example, Kohn, 1986). It is not surprising that the Israeli classroom is competitive and individualistic – the classroom culture simply reflects the broader culture and the competitive structure of the educational system (Varenne & McDermott, 1998).

These positive evaluations appear to spur other pupils to seek Shlomit's praise as well. For example, after her praise of Ronen, Nimrod also poses a question (line 11), and after her praise of Guy, Idan says that he too has an answer (line 55). When Idan is not chosen he is audibly disappointed (line 57).

However, the pupils' desire to be heard upon the stage also generates tension within the classroom, and the competition among the pupils sometimes degenerates into exaggerated, even disruptive, behaviors whose primary purpose seems to be securing Shlomit's attention. The most striking example is Idan's angry outburst at Hagit after she has allegedly blocked the teacher's view of him. As Shlomit attends to him, another pupil explicitly demands: "Come on, leave him alone and let me speak" (line 113). The pupils eagerly compete over the right to participate, with the competition becoming stiffer as the discussion progresses. We can identify a few pupils who compete prominently throughout the episode, and in various ways they dominate the floor and their teacher's attention. This culture leaves many pupils by the wayside, because participation requires intense effort and exposure to a relatively high degree of judgmental evaluation, both by the teacher and their peers. These competitive conditions are better suited to some pupils than others, and it behooves us to consider how to establish a culture that gives all pupils the opportunity to participate on their own terms, without foregoing the advantages of competition for engaging and controlling the class.

Conclusion: Learning Through Investigating Dilemmas in Teaching

In a typical academic case study, one starts with one's favorite theory (Burawoy, 1998), and uses the case to refute or extend it. The value of the study is measured by the extent to which it has contributed to the development of a new theory, or to its new specification of an existing theory. We do not deny the importance of such studies. However, as we argued at the beginning of this article, the pedagogical field also needs studies that do justice to the complexity and richness of practice, without *a priori* reducing that complexity to a case of this or that pet theory. We have suggested that one way of accomplishing this task is to start with the data and focus on the dilemmas and problems it raises for practitioners.

To demonstrate the advantages of this approach, imagine we had focused on just one of the five dilemmas discussed here—the issue of whole class discussion structures, for example—and prefaced it with a thorough discussion of the relevant theoretical literature and empirical studies. Our analysis, then, would have been guided by the particular theoretical frame we adopted, e.g., Alexander's principles of dialogic teaching, especially the issue of cumulation,

and we would likely have ignored or overlooked all the other issues that have emerged as salient in this article. However, the other issues discussed here—the competing lesson aims, the different criteria employed to evaluate pupil responses, the competitive social dynamics of the classroom, gender roles, discipline and management, dramatic teaching, etc—all indirectly bear upon the dimensions of or conditions for dialogic teaching (Lefstein, 2010).

We contend that no one theoretical issue or dilemma can be fully appreciated without situating it among the others. Nor can we begin to comprehend the complexity of teaching without attending to the multiple factors and concerns that compete for teachers' attention. Theory-driven analysis risks producing a diluted version of classroom practice. Therefore we need to make space for more open and encompassing investigations, such as the dilemma-driven analyses we have offered here, which better approximate the sort of issues that do or should occupy practitioners.

The genre of dilemma-driven analyses we have proposed here also have their limitations, of course. Among other issues, how can we construct from them understandings that transcend the details of the specific situation and event analysed? Ultimately, pedagogical scholarship needs both theory-driven and dilemma-driven analyses, and also studies that combine both, that extend our understanding by showing how multiple theoretical issues inter-relate in the lived experience of teaching.

No less importantly, we argue that teachers' sensitivity and interpretive capacities can be usefully sharpened through the close analysis of episodes like this, and their repertoire and professional judgment can be honed through consideration of the sort of dilemmas raised, including the advantages and disadvantages of different courses of action. This is not about identifying *the* "best practice" for teaching reading comprehension (or some other topic), but about recognising that good practice is situation-dependent, and therefore dependent on teachers' flexibility and good judgment. Developing such professionalism is not easy, of course, and our initial attempts to use the materials discussed in this article with Israeli teachers and instructional leaders provided more questions than answers. But it also demonstrated the importance of capturing and maintaining the richness of the episode since most practitioners tended to focus on one issue and were quick to pass judgment on the practice based on such a narrow focus. The added value of a more complex analysis is that it problematises quick, narrow and shallow responses. We remain firmly committed to the idea that the complexity, richness and problems of practice are worth thinking about, and therefore worth discussing with teachers.

Finally, we hypothesise that instructional dilemmas are a defining quality of Israeli pedagogy. The dilemmas we discuss here (and, no doubt, others) reflect fundamental tensions between contradictory goals of education

(academic achievement vs. moral education, individual development vs. group solidarity, compliance with authority vs. critical and creative thinking, etc.) and between competing agencies within the Israeli educational system (see the above discussion on the Israeli context). Further research is required to elaborate and test this hypothesis, both with regard to Israeli education and vis-à-vis its relevance to other national systems.

References

- Alexander, R. J. (1995). *Versions of primary education*. London: Routledge.
- Alexander, R. J. (2008). *Towards dialogic teaching: rethinking classroom talk*. Osgoodby: Dialogos.
- Alexander, R. J. (2009). Towards a comparative pedagogy. In R. Cowen & A. M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International handbook of comparative education* (pp. 923–942). New York: Springer.
- Bauman, R., & Briggs, C. L. (1990). Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 59–88.
- Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. (1981). *Dilemmas of schooling: teaching and social change*. London: Methuen.
- Burawoy, M. (1998). The extended case method. *Sociological Theory*, 16(1), 4–33.
- Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (pp. 205–242). Newark: International Reading Association.
- Edwards, A. D., & Westgate, D. P. G. (1994). *Investigating classroom talk*. London: Falmer.
- Gibton, D., Sabar, B., & Goldring, E. (2000). Problems of implementing decentralization policies: A conceptual framework. *Educational Evaluation And Policy Analysis*, 22(2), 193–210.
- Graeber, D. (2008). *Direct action: an ethnography*. Oakland: AK Press.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London: Routledge.
- Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Kohn, A. (1986). *No contest: the case against competition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Labaree, D. F. (2000). On the nature of teaching and teacher education: Difficult practices that look easy. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 228–233.
- Lampert, M. (2001). *Teaching problems and the problems of teaching*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lefstein, A. (2010). More helpful as problem than solution: some implications of situating dialogue in classrooms. In K. Littleton & C. Howe (Eds.), *Educational dialogues: understanding and promoting productive interaction* (pp. 170–191). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Lefstein, A., & Snell, J. (2014). *Better than best practice: developing dialogic pedagogy*. London: Routledge.
- Loughran, J. (2010). *What expert teachers do: enhancing professional knowledge for classroom practice*. London: Routledge.
- Maybin, J., & Tusting, K. (2011). Linguistic Ethnography. In J. Simpson (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 515–528). London: Routledge.

- Peled-Elhanan, N., & Blum-Kulka, S. (2006). Dialogue in the Israeli classroom: Types of teacher-student talk. *Language and Education, 20*(2), 110–127.
- Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity: interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rampton, B. (2007). Neo-hymesian linguistic ethnography in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 11*(5), 584–607.
- Snell, J., & Lefstein, A. (in press). Some interpretive and representational dilemmas in a linguistic ethnographic analysis: Moving from „interesting data“ to publishable research article. In P. Smeyers, D. Bridges, N. Burbules, & M. Griffiths (Eds.), *International Handbook of Interpretation in Educational Research Methods*. New York: Springer.
- Vardi-Rath, E., & Blum-Kulka, S. (2005). The lesson as an asymmetric speech event: a study of the participant structure in the Israeli classroom. In I. Kupferberg & E. Olashtein (Eds.), *Discourse in education: Researching educational events* (pp. 385–417). Tel-Aviv: Mofer Institution.
- Varenne, H., & McDermott, R. (1998). *Successful failure: the school America builds*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Yair, G. (2011). *The code of Israeliness*. Jerusalem: Keter.
- Yariv, E. (2010). Positioning in classroom: Analysing teacher responses to behavioural problems. *Studies in Teacher Education, 12*, 9–30.

Corresponding authors

Adam Lefstein

Department of Education, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel
E-mail: lefstein@bgu.ac.il

Mirit Israeli

Department of Education, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel
E-mail: ismirit@gmail.com

Itay Pollak

Department of Education, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel
E-mail: itay_pollak@yahoo.com

Maya Bozo-Schwartz

Department of Education, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel
E-mail: mayasc@avneyrosha.org.il

Appendix – Episode transcript

So why did they return two hours ahead of schedule? (<i>speaks as she writes on the board</i>) The “Yarden” kids.	Shlomit	1
I didn’t understand.	Ronen	2
What didn’t you understand?	Shlomit	3
The question.	Ronen	4
Oh, I don’t know.	Yael	5
Stop. Faces toward me.	Shlomit	6
No, I have an idea.	Yael	7
I’ll say it again so that... Maybe my instruction was not clear enough.	Shlomit	8
Yes, I didn’t understand either.	Nimrod	9
(<i>to Ronen</i>) So I’m glad you’re saying you didn’t understand; I’m glad. Because that tells me you want to know, you want to learn, you want to succeed, and I’m proud of you. The “Yarden” kids returned two hours before they were supposed to. They won almost all the victories.	Shlomit	10
But why “almost”? (<i>clapping his hands</i>) I didn’t understand that “almost.”	Nimrod	11
Ah, it ruined everything for them.	Yoel	12
It could be in your imagination, just a moment.	Shlomit	13
Ah, I’ve understood.	Ronen	14
They returned without the trophy, but whoever saw them in their stance, erect, they returned with pride.	Shlomit	15
Ah... Because they thought they’d won.	Nimrod	16
You tell me now, why you think, what happened in your opinion? What happened, why did they return before they were supposed to, what happened there? (<i>Nimrod raises his hand; the teacher grasps it and lowers it</i>)	Shlomit	17
Just a moment, but did they return in anger or with pride?	Guy	18
It’s written right there. How did they return?	Shlomit	19
With pride.	Pupils (in unison)	20
With pride (<i>striding with her head held high to act out the way they returned</i>).	Shlomit	21
So somebody cheated.	Keren	22
No peeking.	Shlomit	23
Me, me, me.	Nimrod	24
The game was fixed.	Unidentified pupil	25
(<i>to Nimrod</i>) Have you written it?	Shlomit	26

No, but I know it by heart.	Nimrod	27
No, but I want you to write.	Shlomit	28
I'm finished.	Yoni	29
I don't know what to write.	Yael	30
I've also finished, this time for real.	Idan	31
<i>(Most of the pupils have started working already, engrossed in their notebooks)</i> Listen, anyone who says I don't know what to write, you've got to let go a little. It's not knowledge, that you have to read a chapter and say what you know about it. It's something you think.	Shlomit	32
But I don't know what I... What can I?	Yael	33
So try for a moment to conjecture, what in your opinion might have happened?	Shlomit	34
I've written it.	Noam	35
I'm finished.	Guy	36
Hadas, have you written an answer?	Shlomit	37
No.	Hadas	38
I see you're busy with your markers. You and I both know that if you take it upon yourself and say, now I'm writing it down...	Shlomit	39
But I don't have anything to write.	Hadas	40
You're not even trying. That's what I'm talking about. Thank Heaven, you're a very bright girl. Try. You try once, try again, and then it'll come to you naturally. Try. Have you written?	Shlomit	41
Yes.	Pupils (in unison)	42
Let's do this! Eh... Guy, what in your opinion happened?	Shlomit	43
In my opinion they returned two hours before the agreed time and even though they won all the games they didn't return with the trophy because maybe "chubby Gila" wasn't in form and she ran and got tired so they conceded and defended her, and for the time they wasted they lost, but they were pleased with their actions.	Guy	44
I think she must have been insulted...	Ronen	45
Your answer makes reference to what happened.	Shlomit	46
<i>(smiling)</i> Gila.	Keren	47
It makes reference to the initial clue – Gila – and to what else does it refer?	Shlomit	48
To how they came out.	Guy	49
To how they returned.	Shlomit	50
I did that also.	Michal	51

His answer makes reference not only to their returning two hours before schedule, but also to the state in which they returned. A very good answer.	Shlomit	52
Thank you.	Guy	53
Very good. Give yourself a tick mark. Very good. I'm proud of you.	Shlomit	54
But I've got an answer too, please...	Idan	55
Nimrod, did you write an answer?	Shlomit	56
<i>(disappointed)</i> Oooff	Idan	57
Yes.	Nimrod	58
Speak.	Shlomit	59
Their driver was late on purpose for the children's last game so they would miss it.	Nimrod	60
Nimrod wrote this answer. Listen to Nimrod's answer – I want you to comment to him.	Shlomit	61
What did he say?	Guy	62
It's not relevant.	Yoni	63
Nimrod, read it again. Comment to him in a respectful manner.	Shlomit	64
Their driver was late on purpose for the children's last game so they would miss the game on purpose.	Nimrod	65
The driver was late on purpose so they would miss the game...	Shlomit	66
The last game.	Pupils	67
The last game.	Shlomit	68
The final, that is.	Nimrod	69
What interest would he have in doing that?	Hadas	70
Just a moment, just a moment.	Shlomit	71
Maybe his son was in the second group.	Yoni	72
Just a moment, with... Just a moment.	Shlomit	73
But they returned two hours before they were supposed to.	Keren	74
Why would he do such a thing?	Sigal	75
Whoever has something to say, everything you've tossed out is fine, raise your hands and refer to what he said. He said the driver ret... their driver was late, and then they missed a game. Who would like to refer to what he said? Sigal...	Shlomit	76
You wrote that the driver was late, but if he'd wanted them to miss the game he would have arrived earlier.	Sigal	77
But he was late on purpose.	Nimrod	78
If he'd been late they wouldn't have had time to play the game.	Ilan	79
But what does it matter that he was deliberately late, they would have stayed for the final game... What, what	Michal	80
Wait a moment, and let's say he was late...	Shlomit	81

They lost with dignity	Yoni	82
I'm asking you a question: we've just now read a passage...	Shlomit	83
Why would he do that on purpose?	Unidentified pupil	84
In this passage what did we have?	Shlomit	85
That he drove without...	Yoni	86
<i>(emphatically)</i> What did we have in this passage?	Shlomit	87
Pride, [initial] clues...	Pupils (in unison)	88
Initial clues. Clues that hint to us what may happen in the plot. Let's see, did you mention the Chubby Gila character?	Shlomit	89
No.	Pupils (in unison)	90
No. Did you mention in your answer that they returned with pride?	Shlomit	91
No.	Nimrod	92
No. If their driver had really wanted to spite them, in what sort of mood would they have returned?	Shlomit	93
A bad mood.	Pupils (in unison)	94
That's right. So first of all I'm pleased that you tried.	Shlomit	95
I didn't think of that.	Nimrod	96
Because you know why you didn't think of it, Daddy-o? Because you wanted so much to show your answer. So I'm pleased that you're participating. Very pleased. OK? Leave that, now write here an answer that is connected to the initial clues.	Shlomit	97
So can I write what Guy wrote?	Nimrod	98
You're blocking me, I can stand like that, too!	Idan	99
If you identify with what he wrote, you can... She's not blocking you. Why are you angry, Daddy-O?	Shlomit	100
Because she's annoying. All day she's like this.	Idan	101
No, no, no, no. That reaction is very unpleasant to me. And even if you're angry with her, say it to her nicely.	Shlomit	102
I told her a hundred times.	Idan	103
So tell her a hundred and one. OK? Do you miss your mother? <i>(pats Idan's head)</i>	Shlomit	104
No. <i>(the pupils raise their hands)</i>	Idan	105
You miss her. Did you tell her to bring me perfume?	Shlomit	106
Yes	Idan	107
Yes? Which perfume did you tell her? Tell her Givenchy. <i>(to the researcher)</i> His parents are abroad. <i>(to Idan, whose hand is still raised)</i> I want Givenchy, OK?	Shlomit	108

What's that perfume?	Idan	109
Tell her, I'll write it down for you later.	Shlomit	110
I know it's French by the name.	Idan	111
So tell her French. Now be calm.	Shlomit	112
Leave him be already and let me speak.	Yoni	113
Hagit. (<i>to Idan</i>) Breathe in. Very good, dear. Afterwards I'll hear you as well. I promise you I see everyone.	Shlomit	114
In my opinion Fat Gila...	Hagit	115
Who's that talking over there?	Shlomit	116
Yes, really what...	Ronen	117
Pay respect to your classmate.	Shlomit	118
I've got a unique [answer]	Yoni	119
Please.	Shlomit	120
In my opinion fat Gila got disqualified once and they went and came back because they didn't want her in the group...	Hagit	121
Stop there. (<i>to the class</i>) What would I have expected of Hagit? She says that Gila deliberately got them disqualified and that they came back anyway in order not to hurt her. What would I have expected, who is Hagit speaking like now?	Shlomit	122
Nimrod.	Pupils (in unison)	123
Like who?	Shlomit	124
Nimrod.	Pupils (in unison)	125
Who read out such an answer?	Shlomit	126
Guy.	Pupils (in unison)	127
Guy, so who's left? (<i>pupils laugh</i>)	Ronen	128
Guy. I would have expected of you, if you're really listening to each other, to say – I think the same as Guy. Because there's no benefit in repeating the same answers, it doesn't take us forward.	Shlomit	129
Why? Why? It's a little different from mine.	Guy	130
Why?	Shlomit	131
I wrote that they like wasted time in order to help her, and that...	Guy	132
OK, so that very, very much reminded me of your answer.	Shlomit	133
It's similar, but not exactly.	Guy	134
Very, very similar. I want, when you're addressing – when you're addressing in the lesson, I want to feel that you're listening to one another.	Shlomit	135