

Computationally Identifying Funneling and Focusing Questions in Classroom Discourse

Sterling Alic¹ Dorottya Demszky¹ Zid Mancenido² Jing Liu³

Heather Hill² Dan Jurafsky¹

¹Stanford University ²Harvard University ³University of Maryland

{salic, ddemszky}@stanford.edu

Abstract

Responsive teaching is a highly effective strategy that promotes student learning. In math classrooms, teachers might *funnel* students towards a normative answer or *focus* students to reflect on their own thinking, deepening their understanding of math concepts. When teachers focus, they treat students' contributions as resources for collective sensemaking, and thereby significantly improve students' achievement and confidence in mathematics. We propose the task of computationally detecting funneling and focusing questions in classroom discourse. We do so by creating and releasing an annotated dataset of 2,348 teacher utterances labeled for funneling and focusing questions, or neither. We introduce supervised and unsupervised approaches to differentiating these questions. Our best model, a supervised RoBERTa model fine-tuned on our dataset, has a strong linear correlation of .76 with human expert labels and with positive educational outcomes, including math instruction quality and student achievement, showing the model's potential for use in automated teacher feedback tools. Our unsupervised measures show significant but weaker correlations with human labels and outcomes, and they highlight interesting linguistic patterns of funneling and focusing questions. The high performance of the supervised measure indicates its promise for supporting teachers in their instruction.¹

1 Introduction

Students are more engaged and learn more when teachers pose carefully chosen questions to draw out student thinking, and then attend closely to what students say (Blazar, 2015; Herbel-Eisenmann and Breyfogle, 2005). One way that teachers do this is by using focusing question patterns; i.e., “attending to what the students are thinking, pressing them to communicate their thoughts

¹Data and code are available at <https://github.com/sterlingalic/funneling-focusing>

Teacher: (0,0) and (4,1) are two points on a line. What's the slope?

(possible follow up questions)

Teacher: What's the rise? What's the run?



Students: 1, 4

Teacher: What do you think of when I say slope?



Student: The angle of the line.

Student: Fractions.

Student: How fast the line changes.

Figure 1: Example teacher utterance and possible student replies, illustrating the difference in funneling (top exchange) and focusing (bottom exchange). (Herbel-Eisenmann and Breyfogle, 2005)

clearly, and expecting them to reflect on their thoughts and those of their classmates” (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2014, hereafter NCTM). Focusing is often contrasted to the less effective yet more common question pattern of funneling, where teachers pose “a set of questions to lead students to a desired procedure or conclusion, while giving limited attention to student responses that veer from the desired path” (NCTM, 2014). The use of focusing questioning patterns has been linked to better student learning outcomes and confidence in mathematics (Hagenah et al., 2018; Franke and Kazemi, 2001).

Supporting teachers to use more focusing question patterns requires first helping them to identify the extent to which they are focusing or funneling in their own classrooms. However, the current methods of measuring funneling and focusing are resource intensive, requiring manual classroom observation (e.g., Hagenah et al., 2018). Developing computational methods for identifying funneling

and focusing thus present an opportunity to provide automated feedback for questioning patterns at scale. Recent tools that provide automated feedback to teachers on discourse moves have been effective at improving their uptake of student contributions and student outcomes (Demszky et al., 2021b) and helped raise awareness about different instructional talk moves (Jacobs et al., 2022b). One promising application of an automated measure of questioning patterns is to build a similar tool that encourages teachers to engage with their students by asking more focusing questions.

We propose several approaches for computationally identifying funneling and focusing questions, including supervised and unsupervised modeling. In order to develop our approaches, we create a dataset of 2,348 student-teacher exchanges sampled from elementary math classroom transcripts, each annotated by three domain experts for teachers' use of funneling and focusing questions, or neither. Then, we fine-tune a supervised RoBERTa model (Liu et al., 2019) on the annotated data. This model has the highest correlation of .76 with human judgments, among our proposed models.

We also explore several unsupervised learning approaches, in order to encourage domain-transferability, to account for the lack of labeled data in most educational settings, and to analyze the linguistic patterns that drive funneling vs focusing questions. Our first unsupervised model hinges on the assumption that the range of possible student responses are narrower for funneling questions than for focusing ones. In Figure 1, we see that the teacher's funneling questions about the rise and run are quantitative in nature, so we can more confidently predict that the student response will be a number. Conversely, focusing utterances, which encourages students to reflect on their own thinking, tend to have a wider range of valid responses. The teacher's focusing question in Figure 1 shows that the students can think about the slope in many different ways, so we can less confidently predict what the student reply will be. Following this intuition, we adapt Zhang and Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil (2020)'s measure of *forwards-range*, an unsupervised measure that quantifies the strength of our expectation of a reply to a given utterance.

We also use other linguistic features informed by educational theory as measures to identify funneling and focusing. Since focusing examples probe student thinking and understanding, we use the

count of *cognitive verbs* present in an utterance as one of the features. *Question words and phrases* also provide insight into classifying closed-ended and open-ended questions, so we include both the count of unigram and bigram question words as features. Table 2 shows the list of words we used for each feature. We find that while some of these features correlate significantly with human judgments (e.g. *forwards-range* and the use of "why"), these correlations are significantly weaker than those of the RoBERTa model.

To further validate our measures and to understand the link between funneling and focusing and educational outcomes, we correlate our measures with observation scores of instruction quality and student engagement and with value-added scores. Value-added scores are statistical estimates of a teacher's contribution to student test score growth, which serve important indicator of student learning and achievement. We find that our RoBERTa model correlates strongly with all of these outcomes, which is a significant finding in the context of educational measurement (Kraft, 2020), and it indicates the promise of this measure to support teachers and students.

2 Contributions

We make the following contributions in this paper.

1. We propose the task of identifying funneling and focusing questions in classroom discourse.
2. We create and release an annotated dataset of 2,348 teacher turns labeled for funneling or focusing questions or neither.
3. We propose supervised and unsupervised approaches to identify funneling and focusing questions. Our unsupervised approaches include counting lexical features (e.g. question words and cognitive verbs) and estimating the expected diversity of responses to a teacher utterance. Our best-performing approach, a RoBERTa model, has a correlation of .761 with human annotations.
4. We show that our estimates of funneling and focusing have a significant positive correlation with meaningful educational outcomes related to instruction quality and student achievement.

3 Related Work

Many researchers have measured the types of question patterns that teachers use in classrooms by hiring and training raters to manually code transcripts of teacher-student discourse (Boaler and Brodie, 2004; Kane et al., 2015; Gregory et al., 2017). While this measurement approach has been useful for identifying effective teaching practice in well-funded large-scale research studies, it is too costly to be scalable.

Computational methods for measuring question patterns in classrooms offer both the potential to undertake more research in this area, as well as the potential to support teachers to improve their classroom practice by automatically coding aspects of their classroom discourse for them to review.

Prior work in computationally analyzing classroom discourse has employed a variety of techniques to automatically detect teacher discourse variables. Recent advances in natural language processing has led to a larger presence of work applying neural methods with varying levels of success in detecting classroom discourse variables, such as semantic content, instructional talk, and elaborated evaluation (Jensen et al., 2021; Song et al., 2021). For unsupervised approaches, Demszky et al. (2021a), which is also most similar to our work in terms of approach and dataset, propose an unsupervised measure of teachers’ uptake of students’ contributions, and we use their sample in our annotation for funneling and focusing. Other computational work on questions in classroom discourse has focused on detecting questions in live classroom audio (Donnelly et al., 2017; Blanchard et al., 2016) and measuring the authenticity of questions in classroom discourse (Cook, 2018; Kelly et al., 2018). Our task closely relates to the task of detecting authentic questions but instead of using the CLASS framework used by prior work, we draw on the math education literature to develop our own coding instrument for funneling and focusing. In addition, while prior work in computationally analyzing questions uses feature-based classification, we also apply state-of-the-art neural machine learning models to solve this task.

Our proposed task of identifying funneling and focusing questions is situated among related dialogue tasks where the goal is to predict a label for a set of turns in dialogue. General approaches to this task have employed supervised classifiers in a variety of settings, such as to classify sarcasm

in social media dialogue and participant roles in cyberbullying (Lukin and Walker, 2013; Jacobs et al., 2022a). Similar to our approach of identifying patterns that generalize beyond annotated data, others in this domain have also found meaningful patterns and features in labeled data that successfully generalized to unlabeled data (Oraby et al., 2015a,b).

Our work is also closely related to the computational study of conversations. We build on Zhang and Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil (2020)’s unsupervised measure of forwards-range, which was originally developed to analyze strategies in counseling conversations.

4 Dataset

We create a new open-source dataset labeled for funneling and focusing questions with the help of domain experts. We recruit former and current math teachers and educators trained in classroom observation to annotate 2,348 examples of teacher-student exchanges. We use the same sample of exchanges as Demszky et al. (2021a) — they are sampled from transcripts of 45-60 minute long 4th and 5th grade elementary math classroom observations collected by the National Center for Teacher Effectiveness (NCTE) between 2010-2013 (Kane et al., 2015).² The transcripts represent data from 317 teachers across 4 school districts in New England that serve largely low-income, historically marginalized students. Transcripts are fully anonymized: student and teacher names are replaced with terms like “Student”, “Teacher” or “Mrs. H”.³

4.1 Annotation

Our annotation framework for funneling vs focusing is designed by experts in math quality instruction, including our collaborators, math teachers and raters for the Mathematical Quality Instruction (MQI) coding instrument, used to assess math instruction (Teaching Project, 2011). We prepare a dataset of utterance pairs (S, T) for annotation,

²The only difference between our sample and that of Demszky et al. (2021a) is that we include an additional 102 examples that were rated by all 13 raters, instead of only the examples rated by 3 raters.

³Parents and teachers gave consent for the study (Harvard IRB #17768), and for de-identified data to be retained and used in future research. The transcripts were anonymized at the time they were created.

where S is a student utterance and T is a subsequent teacher utterance following the approach of Demszky et al. (2021a). In the annotation interface, raters can see the utterance pair (S, T) , the lesson topic, which is manually labeled as part of the original dataset, and two utterances immediately preceding (S, T) for context.

A teacher utterance needs to meet three criteria in order to be categorized as funneling vs focusing: it needs to (i) relate to math, (ii) follow up on the previous student utterance, (iii) include a question. For example, a question such as “Can you sit down please?” cannot be classified as funneling or focusing because it does not relate to math. Similarly, if the teacher asks a question on a new topic, their question cannot be rated for funneling vs focusing, since it does not follow up on the previous student utterance. Therefore, annotators are first asked if a teacher utterance meets these three criteria. If so, raters are asked to indicate whether the utterance can be categorized as funneling or focusing. The coding protocol is included among the supplementary materials.

We recruited expert raters (with experience in teaching and classroom observation) whose demographics were representative of US K-12 teacher population. We followed standard practices in education for rater training and calibration. We conducted several pilot annotation rounds (5+ rounds with a subset of raters, 2 rounds involving all 13 raters), quizzes for raters, thorough documentation with examples, and meetings with all raters. After training raters, we randomly assign each example to three raters. Table 1 includes a sample of our annotated data, with majority rater judgments.

Post-processing. We create two datasets to separately measure our methods’ ability to identify funneling and focusing questions in naturally occurring data — i.e. including data that does not meet the criteria above — and its ability to separate funneling questions from focusing ones. We create a dataset called UNFILTERED, where we replace raters’ judgments for a teacher utterance not meeting the criteria above with 0, funneling with 1 and focusing with 2. We also create a dataset called FILTERED, where we replace raters’ judgments for a teacher utterance not meeting the criteria above with NaN, funneling with 0 and focusing with 1. Then, we z-score each raters’ judgments, and compute the average of z-scores across raters to obtain a single label for each example in each dataset. This

Example	Label
S: I disagree with Student A because if you skip count by 100 ten times, that will get you to 1,000. T: Let’s try it. You ready? Let’s start right here with Student F. S: A hundred.	focus
S: I first got 32 and then I got 48. T: And how did you find that? S: Because I did 16 times two is 32.	focus
S: We did 5 times 2 equals 10. T: No. We did 5 times 1 equals 5, darling. S: Oh, that’s to solve the whole –	funnel
S: 4 minus 2 equals 2. T: Two and eight tenths. Does everybody understand? S: Yes.	funnel
S: Are we gonna out in the hallway? T: Yeah. S: Please.	N/A
S: I’m not going to [keep it]. T: Why? When you’re ready to let me help you, please let me know. S: [Multiple conversations].	N/A

Table 1: Examples from our annotated data, showing the majority label for each example.

process yields 2348 unique examples for UNFILTERED and 1566 unique examples for FILTERED.

Rater agreement. We obtain an average inter-rater leave-out Spearman correlation of $\rho = .644$ for UNFILTERED (Fleiss $\kappa = .415^4$), and $\rho = .318$ for FILTERED (Fleiss $\kappa = .318$). Our interrater agreement values are considered high comparable to those obtained by Demszky et al. (2021a) for uptake, and those obtained in widely-used classroom observation protocols such as MQI and the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) (Pianta et al., 2008). The lower agreement value for FILTERED indicates that distinguishing funneling vs focusing questions is more subjective than evaluating if a teacher utterance meets the criteria for a follow-up question. This is expected, since the criteria are relatively straightforward and do not require domain expertise.

4.2 Educational Outcomes

In order to understand the relationship between funneling and focusing and instruction quality and learning outcomes, we leverage variables associated with the original transcript dataset described

⁴We prefer to use correlations because kappa has undesirable properties (see Delgado and Tibau, 2019) and correlations are more interpretable and directly comparable to our models’ results (see later sections).

above, from which we sampled our data. We use classroom observation scores from the MQI coding instrument (Hill et al., 2008) for the following items: (1) students provide explanations (scale: not present, low, mid, high), (2) overall student-participation and meaning making and reasoning (scale: not present, low, mid, high), (3) mathematical quality of instruction (5 point scale: low, low/mid, mid, mid/high, high). We chose these items as they relate most closely to questioning patterns and their effect on students discourse. We also use value-added scores, statistical estimates of a teacher’s contribution to student test score growth. Value-added models make statistical adjustments to account for differences in student learning that might result from student background or school-wide factors outside the teacher’s control. Numerous studies in education and economics have shown that value-added scores are an unbiased estimate of teacher impact on student achievement (e.g. Chetty et al., 2014). It has also been widely used in teacher evaluation systems around the country.

5 Proposed Methods

We use a variety of supervised and unsupervised methods to identify funneling and focusing questions.

RoBERTa. We fine-tune a RoBERTa-based regression model (Liu et al., 2019) on our annotated data. For our FILTERED and UNFILTERED subsets, we trained and evaluated separate models on their respective splits. We performed a small hyperparameter search over the number of epochs, which led to our best model trained over 10 epochs and with the default parameters from the Simple Transformers library (Rajapakse, 2019).

Forwards-range. The natural split in the diversity of responses to funneling and focusing utterances led us to adapt Zhang and Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil (2020)’s forwards-range measure for our task. The forwards-range is an unsupervised measure that quantifies the strength of our expectation of a reply to a given utterance. This measure was used in Zhang and Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil (2020)’s paper originally to analyze counseling conversations, and here we apply this measure to our dataset.

We use the implementation of the forwards-range from ConvoKit, an open-source toolkit for analyzing conversations (Chang et al., 2020). Con-

voKit transforms each utterance into a vector representation using TF-IDF re-weighting. Then, to calculate the forwards-range for a given word or phrase, it calculates the weighted average of the vectors for all utterances containing the word/phrase, which Zhang and Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil (2020) calls the central point. The forwards-range of the word is then calculated as the average cosine distance between the observations containing the word and the central point.

Before we calculate the forwards-range, we also apply an original pre-processing pipeline to adapt the forwards-range measure to best work in the context of educational data. We apply the following pre-processing pipeline to reduce the vocabulary size and better capture teachers’ rhetorical moves. We first delexicalize all nouns and numbers with “[NOUN]” and “[NUMBER]” tokens. Then, we keep either the last two sentences or the last twenty tokens, whichever one yields the most tokens, following the observation that teachers’ questions tend to be at the end of their utterance. We then clean the text by removing punctuation and converting to lowercase. Finally, using the Phrases module of the open-source NLP library Gensim, we find the most common pairs of words in our UNFILTERED split of the NCTE dataset (Rehurek and Sojka, 2011). We use a threshold of 1.0 to the default Phrases scoring function and a minimum count of 500. The module then joins the individual words in the bigrams by an underscore character. For example, "okay and how did you do that" becomes "okay and how_did you do that". We then apply the ConvoKit framework to our dataset to generate forwards-range scores.

Length and lexical features. We also explore the effectiveness of other features in measuring funneling and focusing. We look at (1) length, (2) the count of cognitive verbs, and (3) the count of question words. We calculate length as the number of tokens in a teacher utterance without any pre-processing; this serves as a baseline lexical feature with which to compare performance. In selecting other features, we saw that focusing utterances tended to contain cognitive verbs, which makes sense intuitively since focusing asks students to reflect on their own and/or their classmates’ thinking. For the count of cognitive verbs, we source our cognitive verbs from research in cognitive linguistics (Roque et al., 2018). We also include question words after exploratory data analysis, which revealed question words to be predictors of the di-

Features	
Cognitive verbs	understand, think, know, believe, figure out, find out, deduce, remember, imagine, realize, discover
Question Words - Unigrams	who, what, where, when, why, how, which
Question Phrases - Bigrams	how many, how do, what is, what else, etc.

Table 2: The list of our lexical features. We count the appearances of all cognitive verbs and each question word/phrase in an utterance as features to predict funneling and focusing.

versity of responses (e.g., a high range of responses to "why_did" versus a smaller range of responses for "how_many"). For question words and phrases, we take the most frequent unigram and bigram question words and phrases present in the NCTE dataset. Table 2 includes these features.

6 Experiments and Results

We evaluate the ability of our models to identify funneling and focusing questions on both the UNFILTERED and the FILTERED datasets. We train separate models on each dataset, the idea being that the model trained on the UNFILTERED set can help identify funneling and focusing questions in "in the wild" – i.e. in any teacher utterance, while the model trained on the FILTERED set can help categorize a dataset of questions as funneling or focusing.

The results are shown in Table 3. We find that the RoBERTa models have a strong positive Spearman correlation with human expert labels both on the UNFILTERED ($\rho = .761$) and the FILTERED ($\rho = .443$) sets. Given that the model’s score is in a similar range as human agreement⁵, it is unclear if our model has hit a ceiling, or if there is room for improvement above these correlations.

Only few of the unsupervised measures show significant correlations with human judgments. The forwards-range has a significant negative correlation for the UNFILTERED set ($\rho = -.130$), but it changes to a significant positive correlation for the FILTERED set ($\rho = .159$). The positive correlation on the FILTERED set validates our assumption that focusing questions receive a greater variety of student responses. The negative correlation of the UNFILTERED suggests that replies to follow-up questions are less varied than other student utter-

ances, which makes intuitive sense, since replies to follow-up questions may reuse words (e.g. "I think...", "Yes.") and they tend to stay within the same topic as the teachers’ question.

The correlation pattern for length is the opposite as that of the forwards-range, showing a positive correlation with human judgments on the UNFILTERED set and a negative correlation on the FILTERED set. This suggests that overall, teacher utterances containing follow-up questions tend to be longer but that focusing questions tend to be shorter than funneling ones.

As for the other linguistic features, we see a significant positive correlation between the use of "why", "how do", and "what else" on the FILTERED set, confirming our hypotheses that indicators of open-ended questions are also indicators of focusing. In contrast, the use of "when" has a negative correlation with focusing on the FILTERED set, indicating that that teachers tend to use "when" when they expect a normative answer. Interestingly, other question words do not show a significant correlation on the FILTERED set, indicating that question words in themselves are not strong indicators of funneling and focusing. Question words and cognitive verbs tend to have a positive correlation with humans on the UNFILTERED set, which is unsurprising, as these features are all indicators of questions. Overall, the trend that we see throughout the unsupervised measures is that there is not enough signal for them to reliably identify funneling and focusing questions.

To measure the practical utility of our models in classroom settings, we also calculated the correlations of our model outputs with educational outcomes (see Section 4.2). Table 4 show the results of this analysis. The observation scores are annotated at the transcript level, so, similar to (Demszky et al., 2021a), we first mean-aggregate each model’s outputs to yield a model score per transcript. We then use ordinary least squares re-

⁵Human agreement and model scores are not directly comparable. The human agreement values are averaged leave-out estimates across raters (skewed downward). The models’ scores represent correlations with an averaged human score, which smooths over the interrater variance of 3 raters.

Model	UNFILTERED (N=2348)	FILTERED (N=1566)
Forwards-range	-0.130***	0.159***
Length	0.153***	-0.149***
Question Words		
Who	0.015	-0.026
What	0.276***	0.002
When	0.026	-0.065*
Where	0.027	-0.020
How	0.189	-0.036
Why	0.188***	0.128***
How Many	0.065**	-0.040
How Do	0.104***	0.080**
What’s	0.051*	-0.035
What Else	0.116***	0.111***
Cognitive Verbs	0.193***	-0.027
RoBERTa UNFILTERED	0.761***	0.329***
RoBERTa FILTERED	0.374***	0.443***
Interrater correlation	0.619 [0.530, 0.694]	0.318 [0.220, 0.413]

Table 3: Spearman correlations of model outputs from the supervised RoBERTa model, unsupervised forwards-range model, and word phrase count features with the averages of human labels for question category. Asterisks indicate that the correlation is significant (p-value: *: <0.05, **<0.01, ***<0.001). The brackets for interrater correlation indicate the range of values for 13 raters, where each value represents leave-out correlation for a particular rater.

gression to compute the correlation of the models’ outputs and the outcome scores, controlling for the number of student-teacher exchanges in each transcript. We find that there is a positive linear correlation of the RoBERTa model output scores with all three educational outcome scores for the NCTE dataset. We also find that there is a significant, but weaker correlation between the forwards-range measure and the educational outcomes.

We conduct a similar analysis with value-added scores. Since value-added scores are linked to teachers, we mean-aggregate each models’ outputs at the teacher-level. Then, we compute the linear correlation between each feature and the outcome. The predictions from the RoBERTa model trained on the FILTERED dataset have a significant correlation with value-added scores, indicating that the

measure of funneling and focusing teacher questions captures meaningful variance in students’ academic outcomes.

7 Qualitative Analysis of Model Outputs

To better understand the performance of our models, we analyzed the predictions of our RoBERTa model fine-tuned on the FILTERED set and the forwards-range. Here, we choose to analyze performance on the FILTERED set to better understand the performance of our models in specifically distinguishing between funneling and focusing, rather than including the UNFILTERED set for the related but easier task of identifying if the teacher prompted the student. Some selected examples that we examined are shown in Table 5. For utterances without question phrases, the RoBERTa model and forwards-range model perform better than stand-alone question phrase features, as shown in the last example in Table 5. Many funneling teacher utterances do not actually include question words, but rather prompt the student to finish the teacher’s sentence. The complexity of these classes of sentences, covering a wide range of topics with unique vocabulary tokens, motivates the use of our forwards-range and RoBERTa models, which are able to correctly classify these examples.

The RoBERTa model was also able to classify more complex examples that include several different question phrases. For instance, the first example in the table, includes the question phrase “how many”, which correlates with funneling. But then the teacher also asks the student about their thinking, asking “what do you mean” by that, which makes the utterance an example of focusing. This suggests that the RoBERTa model is able to account for contextual factors and weigh the importance of different question phrases. On the other hand, the forwards-range predicted this example as “funneling”, which shows one of its weaknesses as a bag-of-words model that lacks context.

One area of improvement across all the models we found through manual inspection is a class of focusing examples where the teacher calls on students to reflect on other students’ contributions. For example, if a teacher asks a student Student B, “Is Student A correct?”, this is a closed-ended question that could be interpreted as funneling, but it is focusing since the student is reflecting on the thinking of another student. The second entry in Table 5 also illustrates this, as the teacher asks a

	Mathematical Quality of Instruction (MQI5) (N=1657)	Overall Student Participation in Meaning-Making and Reasoning (N=1657)	Students Provide Explanations (N=1310)	Value-Added Scores (N=304)
Forwards-range	0.111***	0.209***	0.134***	0.031
Length	0.039	-0.085*	-0.111***	-0.096
Question Words				
Who	0.063***	0.008	0.009	-0.361
How	0.098***	0.001	0.003	-0.101†
What	0.029	-0.006	-0.009	-0.012
Where	0.020	-0.007	-0.013	-0.091
When	0.049*	-0.016**	-0.0185†	-0.045
Why	0.095***	0.050***	0.0420***	-0.03
How Many				
How Do	0.054**	-0.008	-0.008	-0.117*
What's	0.076***	0.023***	0.012	0.072
What Else	-0.031†	-0.018**	-0.024**	0.027
Cognitive Verbs				
RoBERTa (unfiltered)	0.105***	0.070*	0.081**	0.003
RoBERTa (filtered)	0.315***	0.270***	0.350***	0.098†
	0.067**	0.388***	0.376***	0.124*

Table 4: Standardized coefficients showing the correlation between each measure, including RoBERTa, forwards-range, length and our lexical features, and the outcomes from the NCTE dataset. Each co-efficient comes from its own linear model, with the number of student-teacher exchanges in each transcript as a control variable (p-value: †: <0.1, *: <0.05, **<0.01, ***<0.001).

follow up to one student after receiving an answer from a different student. The RoBERTa model predicts this as funneling, likely because the utterance ends with a short, closed-ended question. However, this is an example of focusing, as the teacher calls on Student K to reflect on the previous student’s thinking. The forwards-range predicts this example as focusing, but we do not believe that, as a bag of words model, the forwards-range actually captures the nuance of this example. It instead might be unsure of the expected reply and default predicts focus since the majority of its scores are clustered around relatively high forwards-range scores.

8 Conclusion and Future Work

We propose several approaches for computationally measuring funneling and focusing, an important aspect of classroom discourse, and evaluate their strengths and weaknesses. Our supervised approach using the fine-tuned RoBERTa model has the strongest linear correlation of the models we tested with human expert ratings for funneling and focusing; it similarly had the strongest correlations

of the models with educational outcomes. This shows the potential of the RoBERTa model to be used in future feedback and professional development tools for teachers.

Still, our unsupervised measures show significant correlations with the expert labels for funneling and focusing, as well as with educational outcomes. This provides a foundation for future work combining different unsupervised approaches to build a robust measure of funneling and focusing. Other paths for future NLP work include using probing and attention weights to better understand the predictions of the RoBERTa model, improving the supervised approaches via an extensive hyperparameter search and by exploring models beyond RoBERTa, and importantly, improving and testing the generalizability of this measure to other classrooms and domains.

In education, there is potential for future work in exploring how this measure can best support instruction and learning outcomes for students across different educational settings. One possible avenue for this is examining discipline-specific ways of identifying focusing or funneling to provide more

Example Exchange	Human label	Models	
		RoBERTa	Forwards-Range
Student: To see how many twirls. Teacher: How many – what do you mean? Student: How many [inaudible] there are.	Focusing	focusing	funneling
Student: H-U-N-D-E-R-E-T-H? Teacher: Sh. Don't steal his knowledge. And Student K? Student: Thousandths.		funneling	focusing
Student: I put about, about is that about? Teacher: It is close. Student: What's the about sign?	Funneling	funneling	funneling
Student: Three twelfths also equals one quarter. Teacher: Yes, it does, and we'll talk about that in another lesson, okay? Number 10. Cover Shape B with – Student: Hexagons.		funneling	funneling

Table 5: Example model predictions from the forwards-range and our RoBERTa model fine-tuned on the FILTERED set. Correct predictions are in green, and incorrect predictions are in red.

fine-grained feedback to teachers. Another is investigating the extent to which it is helpful that teachers know quantitatively in feedback they receive how much they are focusing versus funneling, or if there's a qualitative element about focusing and funneling that could similarly be helpful to teachers if provided in feedback.

Acknowledgments

We thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback. We are also grateful for the generous support of the Stanford CURIS program (to S. Alic) and the Melvin and Joan Lane Stanford Graduate Fellowship (to D. Demszky).

References

- Nathaniel Blanchard, Patrick Donnelly, Andrew Olney, Borhan Samei, Brooke Ward, Xiaoyi Sun, Sean Kelly, Martin Nystrand, and Sidney K D'Mello. 2016. Identifying teacher questions using automatic speech recognition in classrooms. In *Proceedings of the 17th annual meeting of the special interest group on discourse and dialogue*, pages 191–201.
- David Blazar. 2015. [Effective teaching in elementary mathematics: Identifying classroom practices that support student achievement](#). *Economics of Education Review*, 48:16–29.
- Jo Boaler and Karin Brodie. 2004. The importance, nature and impact of teacher questions. *North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education October 2004 Toronto, Ontario, Canada*, page 774.
- Jonathan P. Chang, Caleb Chiam, Liye Fu, Andrew Z. Wang, Justine Zhang, and Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil. 2020. [Convokit: A toolkit for the analysis of conversations](#).
- Raj Chetty, John N Friedman, and Jonah E Rockoff. 2014. Measuring the impacts of teachers i: Evaluating bias in teacher value-added estimates. *American economic review*, 104(9):2593–2632.
- Connor Cook. 2018. An open vocabulary approach for detecting authentic questions in classroom discourse. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Educational Data Mining (EDM 2018)*.
- Rosario Delgado and Xavier-Andoni Tibau. 2019. Why cohen's kappa should be avoided as performance measure in classification. *PloS one*, 14(9):e0222916.
- D. Demszky, Jing Liu, Zid Mancenido, Julie Cohen, Heather Hill, Dan Jurafsky, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. 2021a. Measuring Conversational Uptake: A Case Study on Student-Teacher Interactions. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Dorottya Demszky, Jing Liu, Heather C Hill, Dan Jurafsky, and Chris Piech. 2021b. Can automated feedback improve teachers' uptake of student ideas? evidence from a randomized controlled trial in a large-scale online course. *EdWorkingPapers*.
- Patrick J. Donnelly, Nathaniel Blanchard, Andrew M. Olney, Sean Kelly, Martin Nystrand, and Sidney K. D'Mello. 2017. [Words matter: Automatic detection of teacher questions in live classroom discourse using linguistics, acoustics, and context](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference, LAK '17*, page 218–227, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.

- Megan Loef Franke and Elham Kazemi. 2001. Learning to teach mathematics: Focus on student thinking. *Theory into practice*, 40(2):102–109.
- A Gregory, E Ruzek, CA Hafen, A Yee Mikami, JP Allen, and RC Pianta. 2017. My teaching partner-secondary: A video-based coaching model. *Theory into practice*, 56(1):38–45.
- Sara Hagenah, Carolyn Colley, and Jessica Thompson. 2018. Funneling versus focusing: When talk, tasks, and tools work together to support students’ collective sensemaking. *Science Education International*, 29(4):261–266.
- Beth Herbel-Eisenmann and M. Breyfogle. 2005. Questioning our patterns of questioning. *Mathematics Teaching in the Middle School*, 10:484–489.
- Heather C Hill, Merrie L Blunk, Charalambos Y Charalambous, Jennifer M Lewis, Geoffrey C Phelps, Laurie Sleep, and Deborah Loewenberg Ball. 2008. Mathematical knowledge for teaching and the mathematical quality of instruction: An exploratory study. *Cognition and instruction*, 26(4):430–511.
- Gilles Jacobs, Cynthia Van Hee, and Véronique Hoste. 2022a. Automatic classification of participant roles in cyberbullying: Can we detect victims, bullies, and bystanders in social media text? *Natural Language Engineering*, 28(2):141–166.
- Jennifer Jacobs, Karla Scornavacco, Charis Harty, Abhijit Suresh, Vivian Lai, and Tamara Sumner. 2022b. Promoting rich discussions in mathematics classrooms: Using personalized, automated feedback to support reflection and instructional change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 112:103631.
- Emily Jensen, Samuel L. Pugh, and Sidney K. D’Mello. 2021. A deep transfer learning approach to modeling teacher discourse in the classroom. In *LAK21: 11th International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference*, LAK21, page 302–312, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- T Kane, H Hill, and D Staiger. 2015. National center for teacher effectiveness main study. icpsr36095-v2.
- Sean Kelly, Andrew M Olney, Patrick Donnelly, Martin Nystrand, and Sidney K D’Mello. 2018. Automatically measuring question authenticity in real-world classrooms. *Educational Researcher*, 47(7):451–464.
- Matthew A Kraft. 2020. Interpreting effect sizes of education interventions. *Educational Researcher*, 49(4):241–253.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. RoBERTa: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Stephanie Lukin and Marilyn Walker. 2013. Really? well. apparently bootstrapping improves the performance of sarcasm and nastiness classifiers for online dialogue. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Language Analysis in Social Media*, pages 30–40, Atlanta, Georgia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. 2014. *Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematical success for all*, pages 35–41. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Shereen Oraby, Lena Reed, Ryan Compton, Ellen Riloff, Marilyn Walker, and Steve Whittaker. 2015a. And that’s a fact: Distinguishing factual and emotional argumentation in online dialogue. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Argumentation Mining*, pages 116–126, Denver, CO. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shereen Oraby, Lena Reed, Ryan Compton, Ellen Riloff, Marilyn Walker, and Steve Whittaker. 2015b. And that’s a fact: Distinguishing factual and emotional argumentation in online dialogue. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Argumentation Mining*, pages 116–126, Denver, CO. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Robert C Pianta, Karen M La Paro, and Bridget K Hamre. 2008. *Classroom Assessment Scoring System: Manual K-3*. Paul H Brookes Publishing.
- T. C. Rajapakse. 2019. Simple transformers. <https://github.com/ThilinaRajapakse/simpletransformers>.
- Radim Rehurek and Petr Sojka. 2011. Gensim–python framework for vector space modelling. *NLP Centre, Faculty of Informatics, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic*, 3(2).
- Lila San Roque, Kobin H. Kendrick, Elisabeth Norcliffe, and Asifa Majid. 2018. Universal meaning extensions of perception verbs are grounded in interaction. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 29(3):371–406.
- Yu Song, Shunwei Lei, Tianyong Hao, Zixin Lan, and Ying Ding. 2021. Automatic classification of semantic content of classroom dialogue. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 59(3):496–521.
- Learning Mathematics for Teaching Project. 2011. Measuring the mathematical quality of instruction. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 14:25–47.
- Justine Zhang and Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil. 2020. Balancing objectives in counseling conversations: Advancing forwards or looking backwards. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5276–5289, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.