Communicative Patterns of Ccogenerative Dialogues between High School Students and Scientists



Anna Barbosa & Pei-Ling Hsu

College of Education, The University of Texas at El Paso



Research Motivation

- Scientists are normally deemed to be knowledgeable experts who hold higher status and power in society than do lay people/students
- The jargon and complex concepts of scientific language tend to be a barrier to communication

Study Context:

Participants: 2 Scientists, 3 science RAs, 2 education RAs,

Theoretical Framework (Labaree, 2003)

- **Normative Learning Culture:** Students who tend to remain passive learners, without agency and freedom in choosing the type of knowledge and skills they need/ want to learn. Students are usually perceived as immature, and are not used to communicating their wishes.
- Analytical Learning Culture: Promote the need for students to develop agency and critical analysis

18 high school students, 1 teacher of record

• Activities: 10 Saturdays afternoon (2 hours internship followed by 1 hour cogen)

No	Categories	Normative Is (58.33%, 42		Analytical Issu (41.66%, 30/72	Total		
		Example	%	Example	%	%	
1	Peripheral support	"The bus was not on time"	15.27 (11/72)	"Confused on proposal"	4.16 (3/72)	19.43	
2	Oral instruction	instructionconfusion"Group"Working in		_	0.00 (0/72)	15.27	
3	communicati			"We don't feel like a team"	4.16 (3/72)	8.32	
4	Personal needs	"No snacks"	2.77 (2/72)	"Weak presentation skills"	1.38 (1/72)	4.15	

towards knowledge presented in the literature of the field, construct cogent arguments to justify their scientific reasoning.

No	Categories	Normative Issues (58.33%, 42/72)		Analytical Issues (41.66%, 30/72)		Total	r	No	Categories	Normative Solutions (37.03%, 50/135)		Analytical Solutions (62.96%, 85/135)		Total
		Example	%	Example	%	%				Example	%	Example	%	%
1	Peripheral support	"The bus was not on time"	15.27 (11/72)	"Confused on proposal"	4.16 (3/72)	19.43		1	Peripheral support	"Get mentor's contact info"	11.85 (16/135)	"Clarify with bus driver"	9.62 (13/135)	21.47
2	Oral instruction	"RA's show confusion"	15.27 (11/72)	_	0.00 (0/72)	15.27		0	Oral	"Explain slower"	12.59 (17/135)	"Demonstrate technique for each group separately"	10.37 (14/135)	22.96
3	Group communicati	"Working in groups may not	4.16 (3/72)	"We don't feel like a	4.16 (3/72)	8.32		Ζ	instruction					
	on	be beneficial"		team"						"Meet with team	5.18	"Make sure	17.77	22.95
4	Personal needs	"No snacks"	2.77 (2/72)	"Weak presentation skills"	1.38 (1/72)	4.15		3	Group communicati on	members"	(7/135)	everyone gets turns by asking to switch to their peers"	(24/135)	
5	Scientific practice	"Not enough time in lab"	13.88 (10/72)	"Purpose of experiment not clear"	5.55 (4/72)	19.43		4	Personal needs	"Take breaks"	1.48 (2/135)	"Provide own [computer]"	6.66 (9/135)	8.14
6	Scientific knowledge	"Confused	4.16 (3/72)	"Not knowing the units of	15.27 (11/72)	19.43		5	Scientific practice	"Read textbook"	0.74 (1/135)	"More practice"	10.37 (14/135)	11.11
		calculations"	()	measurements and conversions"				6	Scientific knowledge	"Test [students]"	1.48 (2/135)	"Look at conversion charts"	4.44 (6/135)	5.92
7	Scientific equipment	"Not getting equal amount of turns using the EC and PH tool"	2.77 (2/72)	"Trouble mixing with pipettes"	9.72 (7/72)	12.49		7	Scientific equipment	-	0.00 (0/135)	-	0.00 (0/135)	0.00
8	Pedagogical materials	"Data was inconsistent"	1.38 (1/72)	—	0.00 (0/72)	1.38		8	Pedagogical materials	"Double check our work"	3.70 (5/135)	"preliminary run through"	3.70 (5/135)	7.40

This study is funded by National Science Foundation #DRL-1322600