

## **Characterizing Discourse Group Roles in Inquiry-based University Science Labs**

Tong Wan\*

Department of Physics, University of Central Florida, 4111 Libra Drive, Orlando, FL 32816,  
USA

Juliette Pimbert

Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, University of Central Florida, 12760  
Pegasus Drive, Orlando, FL 32816, USA

Ying Cao

School of Education and Child Development, Drury University, 900 N. Benton Ave.  
Springfield, MO 65802, USA

Pierre-Philippe A. Ouimet

Department of Physics, University of Regina, 3737 Wascana Parkway, Regina,  
Saskatchewan, S4S 0A2, Canada

\*Corresponding author

tong.wan@ucf.edu

## Abstract

Background: Group work is commonly adopted in university science laboratories. Prior research has characterized students' group roles in introductory physics labs with a focus on *what* students are handling (e.g., equipment, computer) and documented gender inequities in student division of labor. However, student discourse, another essential aspect for characterizing group roles, is rarely investigated in university science labs. We aim to bridge the gap in the literature by characterizing student discourse group roles in inquiry-based science labs. The instructional context for this study was a summer program hosted at a private research university in the eastern United States. The program was designed as a bridge program for matriculating students who were first generation and/or deaf or hard-of-hearing (DHH). Accommodations such as interpreters and technology were provided for DHH students. We analyzed 15 students' discourse moves in five lab activities from the video recordings, resulting in a total of 40 student-lab units. We developed codes to describe student discourse moves: *asking a question*, *proposing an idea*, *participating in discussion*, *chatting off-task*, and *talking to instructor*. We conducted a cluster analysis using those 40 student-lab units on our quantified discourse moves to characterize students' discourse styles (i.e., clusters). We examined the correlations between gender/hearing ability and students' discourse styles.

Results: We identified four discourse styles, *high on-task high social*, *high on-task low social*, *low on-task low social*, and *low on-task high social*. The results show that individual students tend to demonstrate varying discourse styles in different lab activities; students' discourse styles within the same groups tend to be aligned with their group members. Moreover, no difference was observed in discourse styles between genders, but DHH students were observed to participate significantly less in group discourse.

Conclusions: Student discourse styles varied in the extents to which students engaged in on-task and off-task discourse. Students' discourse styles appeared to be influenced by the lab activities and their group members. No gender inequity was observed but inequity was observed among DHH students compared to non-DHH students. Group-level interventions that specifically target discourse are needed to promote productive and equitable small-group discourse in university science labs.

**Keywords:** discourse, university science labs, group roles, gender, deaf or hard-of-hearing, equity

## **1 Introduction**

### **1.1 Group work in university science labs**

Group work is a typical format in university science laboratories, where students work in small groups to conduct experiments, perform analysis, and write up lab reports. Students collaborate and build on each other's ideas to construct scientific knowledge, develop reasoning and experimentation skills, and practice communicating scientific ideas.

Because of its potential benefits, group work is commonly integrated in many student-centered instructional approaches that are implemented beyond the lab setting. These approaches include but are not limited to guided inquiry, peer instruction (Crouch & Mazur, 2001), and project-based learning (Kokotsaki et al., 2016). Studies have shown that in a collaborative studio setting, a close attention to group dynamics can help instructors provide intermittent support to get students unstuck and develop and test ideas with their peers (M. Koretsky et al., 2018; M. D. Koretsky, 2015, 2017, 2018). Instructional strategies based on the instructor's attention to students' group interactions include making student thinking visible, noticing and re-voicing student ideas, supporting group interactions to include all students, and facilitating sharing resources (Cao & Koretsky, 2018; Horn, 2012; Windschitl & Calabrese Barton, 2016).

Despite the overall improvement in student learning that group work may have contributed to, affective risks (Conlin & Scherr, 2018; Cooper et al., 2018) and inequities (Dew et al., 2024; Doucette & Singh, 2023; Quinn et al., 2020; Theobald et al., 2017) in group work have been documented in the literature. For example, Cooper et al. (Cooper et al., 2018) found that students' anxiety increases when they don't feel comfortable, or they don't have a positive relationship with their work partners. Quinn et al. (Quinn et al., 2020) reported inequitable gender division of labor in inquiry-based labs. Theobald et al. (Theobald et al., 2017) found that students who perceived that they worked with a dominator had decreased performance.

### **1.2 Student discourse in collaborative science learning**

Although it is now a consensus that understanding group dynamics can increase learning and improve learning experience, categorizing specific aspects of group dynamics is still developing. Prior research on students' group roles using observation data in university science labs (Dew et al., 2024; Quinn et al., 2020) tends to focus on student non-verbal behaviors (e.g., handling equipment, using computer, writing on paper). Studies that explore student small-group discourse in university science lab settings are scarce.

Analyzing student discourse allows researchers to gain insights into how students interact with their group members and contribute to the group's cognitive (Cao & Koretsky, 2018;

Kaartinen & Kumpulainen, 2002; Osborne, 2010) and metacognitive (Chiu, 2009; Goos et al., 2002; Sayre & Irving, 2015) development. This is because cognition and metacognition processes are made visible through discourse. Cao and Korestky (2018), for example, examined students' discourse on shared resources in studios during interactive virtual labs on thermodynamics. They categorized conditions when sharing resources is likely to happen and found that interaction is necessary, and facilitating conditions include describing a discrepancy; requesting feedback; asking a general question; responding to a question by elaborating, rephrasing, or paraphrasing others' ideas; making ideas public; and providing an alternative idea.

In addition to socially distributed cognitive discourse, researchers are also engaged in examining social metacognitive discourse in small groups. As stated by Chiu (2009), social metacognition "distributes metacognitive demands among group members, it increases the visibility of one another's metacognition, improves individual cognition, promotes reciprocal scaffolding, and enhances motivation". Specifically in the field of physics education research, Sayre and Irving (2015) identified a new element in the physicist speech genre which they coined as brief, embedded, spontaneous metacognitive talk, or BESM talk. In Sayre and Irving's study, students use BESM talk to communicate their expectations in four ways: understanding, confusion, spotting inconsistencies, and generalized expectations.

We situate our study in the literature of studying students' collaborative learning in small groups and contribute to the body of research by examining students' group roles through analyzing students' discourse.

### **1.3 Current study**

The overarching goal of this study is to characterize the group roles students take on during discourse interaction in inquiry-based university science labs. Through video coding of coarse-grained student discourse moves (i.e., in-the-moment verbal actions) and clustering on those discourse moves, we aim to gain insights into how students engage in small-group discourse in labs. Specifically, we investigate the following research questions (RQs):

RQ1: How do students engage in small-group discourse in inquiry-based university science labs?

- a. What are the students' small-group discourse styles in inquiry-based university science labs?
- b. Do individual students tend to use the same or varied styles in different lab activities?
- c. Do group members' discourse styles tend to be aligned or diverse?

RQ2: Are historically under-represented students engaged in equitable small-group discourse in inquiry-based university science labs?

- a. Are female students engaged in equitable small-group discourse in inquiry-based university science labs?
- b. Are Deaf or Hard-of-Hearing (DHH) students engaged in equitable small-group discourse in inquiry-based university science labs?

## **2 Methods**

### **2.1 Instructional context**

#### 2.1.1 The IMPRESS program

The context for the current study was the Integrating Metacognitive Practices and Research to Ensure Student Success (IMPRESS) summer program hosted at a private research university in the eastern United States. It was a 10-day bridge program for matriculating students who were first generation and/or DHH (Franklin et al., 2018). This program was offered yearly at the university from 2014 to 2017.

The main objectives of the IMPRESS program were to engage students in authentic science practice, to facilitate the development of a supportive community, and to help the students reflect on the science and themselves in order to strengthen their learning habits and lead them to a stronger future in STEM fields. The program admitted up to 20 students each year. Students worked in small groups of three to four students.

In our study we focused our analysis on laboratory experiments conducted in small groups during the time span of IMPRESS. Specifically, we analyzed five lab activities from the year 2015.

#### 2.1.2 Lab activities

In what follows we describe the lab activities the students took part in as part of the program. We considered an activity a lab if it required experimental design, data collection, and data analysis. If an activity only required an observation of a phenomenon, it was not included in the analysis. Additionally, all the activities included occurred in a lab setting; the outdoor activities were not included.

The first four labs were a sequence of activities on climate change and the greenhouse effect. The goal was to build a physical model of the Earth and the Earth's atmosphere that could help conceptualize climate change through iterative experimentation.

**Lab 1: Greenhouse Effect Model Construction.** On the morning of day 2, students constructed their initial model for greenhouse effect using the equipment provided. They measured the temperature of their model during the heating and cooling processes. The students were given minimal guidance and were allowed to proceed as they desired. Following the data collection, students compared the results with their expectations.

**Lab 2: Greenhouse Effect – Thermal Absorption.** On the morning of day 3, students measured the temperature inside a “greenhouse” with and without a black mat present. The goal was to explore how the heat absorption of a black mat affects the micro-climate of the greenhouse.

**Lab 3: Greenhouse Effect – Albedo Effect.** On the morning of day 4, students measured the temperature inside a “greenhouse” with and without a white foam mat and mirrors present. The goal was to investigate how the reflection of solar radiation influences the micro-climate of the greenhouse.

**Lab 4: Greenhouse Effect – Thermal Absorption of CO<sub>2</sub>.** On the morning of day 5, students measured the temperatures of liquids in two flasks, one is pure water and the other contains dissolving tablets that would produce CO<sub>2</sub>. The goal was to look at how the heating and cooling of the atmosphere differs with and without CO<sub>2</sub> in the air. Students were also tasked to revise their greenhouse effect model incorporating what they had learned from all four labs on the greenhouse effect.

**Lab 5: Burning Model.** On the morning of day 7, students carried out a chemistry experiment. The purpose was to build an apparatus that would collect and measure the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> from burning material.

## 2.2 Video data and participants

In the year 2015, 20 students participated in the program. Among all the participants, 10 were self-identified female and nine were self-identified DHH, who were provided accommodations such as interpreters and computers. Students were divided into five groups, each with four members. The program activities were facilitated by a teacher and two teaching assistants (TAs), who were participants from the previous year. The teacher and TAs used questioning techniques to facilitate metacognitive discussion.

Most of the program activities, including the first four labs, took place in the IMPRESS classroom and the last lab was conducted in a chemistry laboratory. In day 4, at the beginning of Lab 3, students were required to change groups. Figure 1a shows the room setup in the first 3 days and Figure 1b shows the new grouping since day 4. The red dots indicate the placements of the cameras. The participants are indicated by white circles. All student names are pseudonyms.




Figure 1a. Classroom layout and group composition for days 1 to 3. Figure 1b. Classroom layout and group composition following the regroup on day 4. All student names are pseudonyms.

In our study, a total of 15 unique students were included in the analysis. Eight of them were female and five were DHH. Among five DHH students, two used speech to communicate, one used Computer-Speaking, one used Computer-Signing and Speech, and the other used Computer-Signing only to communicate. When a DHH student only used American Signed Language (ASL) to communicate with non-DHH students in their group, there was an interpreter sitting at their table and helped students interpret.

For each lab, 3-4 groups were recorded by the program facilitators, resulting in 17 recorded group-lab units. Among those, 5 group-lab units had students communicate in ASL without an interpreter present or via a computer (on which the conversations were not documented by the IMPRESS program). None of the authors know ASL, and thus we were not able to code those videos. Additionally, one group-lab unit had about two-fifths of the lab period missing in the recordings, and another group-lab unit had members from another group in the camera shot (in the chemistry lab) making it extremely difficult to code. As a result, a total of 10 group-lab units were coded and included in our analysis. The number of groups coded for each lab is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Number of groups coded in each lab activity and the approximate duration for each lab.

Lab activity	Number of groups coded	Approximate Duration (hours)
Lab 1: Greenhouse Effect Model Construction	2	1.5
Lab 2: Greenhouse Effect – Thermal Absorption	1	2
Lab 3: Greenhouse Effect – Albedo Effect*	3	2.5
Lab 4: Greenhouse Effect – Thermal Absorption of CO <sub>2</sub>	3	2
Lab 5: Burning Model	1	1

\*Students were regrouped at the beginning of Lab 3 and remained in the same groups for the rest of the labs.

Most (13 out of 15) of the students were coded in at least two different lab activities. It is also worth mentioning that instead of five, we had 10 groups in our data because students were regrouped at the beginning of Lab 3.

### 2.3 Development of codes for discourse moves in labs

Author T.W. developed the initial definitions of the codes that describe students' discourse moves in science labs. Authors T.W. and Y.C. first independently coded 10-min worth of videos for all four students in a group, documented the instances of discourse moves and took detailed notes. We then compared our coding, resolved inconsistencies, and then refined the code definitions.

The finalized codes for discourse moves are shown in Table 2. The codes for five different types of discourse moves include: *asking a question*, *proposing an idea*, *participating in discussion*, *chatting off-task*, and *talking with instructor*.

Inquiry-based labs often require students to make decisions throughout all phases. We intend to capture key discourse moves that help move the group forward towards shared group goals.

As pointed out by Goos et al. (2002), “producing mutually acceptable solution methods and interpretations thus entails reciprocal interaction, which would require students to propose and defend their own ideas, and to ask their peers to clarify and justify any ideas they do not understand.” Asking questions, proposing ideas, and participating in discussion are considered key discourse moves that contribute to the decision-making process. By asking a question, a student invites their group members to contribute, which



helps make sure the group members come to a consensus. When a student proposes an experiment-related idea, the entire group is given an opportunity to critique and consider alternatives. When a question has been asked or an idea has been proposed, it is expected that the group members respond and engage in meaningful discussion. The code *Participating in discussion* includes answering questions, providing feedback to other members' ideas, as well as justifying one's own ideas and making observations. We did not further differentiate these moves because it requires more in-depth qualitative analysis and is beyond the scope of this study. We chose to focus on the coarse grain-sized discourse moves as an initial step toward characterizing group roles.

Chatting off-task can also help group members build rapport with one another in a collaborative learning context. More importantly, prior research has shown several productive functions of off-task talks in relation to collaboration, such as “gaining access to collaboration for self”, “recruiting others into the collaboration”, and “resisting concentrated authority” (Hass et al., 2018; Hutchison, 2022; Langer-Osuna, 2018; Langer-Osuna et al., 2018).

Talking to the instructor is an indicator of a student's confidence about their own knowledge and skills, and their willingness to communicate their ideas with the instructor. This code can also indicate whether a student has built a rapport with the instructor. Therefore, this type of discourse move was also used to characterize group roles.

Table 2. Code definitions and examples for student discourse moves in inquiry-based university labs.

Code	Definition	Example
Asking a question	Student asks group member a task-related, non-rhetorical question	<i>“Now what are your ideas?”</i> <i>“How are we going to use this in our model?”</i>
Proposing an idea	Student proposes an idea regarding experimental design/procedures, or data collection or analysis. It may or may not be in the form of a question.	<i>“Let's use this as a representation of land.”</i> <i>“We can put holes in that and call it carbon dioxide.”</i>
Participating in discussion	Student participates in discussion, including answering questions, providing feedback to other's idea, and rhetorical questions	<i>“Because the matt is too big to fit in and there won't be room for ocean, so-”</i> <i>“So that doesn't retain heat but the black does.”</i>

Chatting off-task	Student talks with their group on topics not related to the task at hand, such as their personal life, jokes, pronunciation. Can be a statement or a question.	<i>“That takes some serious skill, drowning in the water.”</i> <i>“That’s why I’m not taking Bio.”</i>
Talking with instructor	Student talks with the teacher or a TA. It can be a statement or a question. It can either on-task or off-task.	<i>“Because the light can go through.”</i>

## 2.4 Video coding and inter-rater reliability

Typically, classroom observations of student and instructor behaviors (e.g., COPUS (Smith et al., 2013) and LOPUS (Velasco et al., 2016)) were coded in 2-min intervals. We decided to reduce the interval duration because, through an initial exploration of our video data, we noticed that a discourse move occurred more frequently than every 2 minutes. On the other hand, if the duration was too small, it would be very challenging for the coders to reliably capture all the discourse moves with the given quality of the video recordings. Therefore, we decided to code student discourse moves in 1-min intervals. If a particular type of discourse moves for a student *ever* occurred within a 1-min interval, a result of 1 was documented; otherwise, a 0 was documented. We were able to achieve a reasonable level of inter-rater reliability (IRR) for coding every minute.

The videos were coded by authors T.W. and J.P. in Behavioral Observation Research Interactive Software (BORIS), an event logging software. To investigate IRR, authors T.W. and J.P. independently coded a total of 100-min worth of videos for all group members from two different groups for Lab 1. We then compared the codes and obtained a Cohen’s Kappa of 0.71, indicating a substantial agreement (i.e., 0.61-0.80). To explore code-level IRR, we used Gwet’s AC1 because Gwet’s AC1 is less sensitive to trait prevalence compared to Cohen’s Kappa (Wongpakaran et al., 2013). In other words, Cohen’s Kappa does not accurately reflect the level of agreement when a code has low prevalence, which may be the case for certain codes (e.g., *proposing an idea*). The Gwet’s AC1 we obtained for each code is 0.89, 0.87, 0.61, 0.72, and 0.87, respectively.

## 2.5 Cluster analysis

To characterize student discourse styles, we conducted a cluster analysis using the five discourse move variables in R. Through clustering, objects that are similar to one another are grouped in the same cluster. The object or unit of analysis in our analysis is a student’s

profile, defined by the prevalences of the five discourse variables in a lab activity. Since we coded 10 group-lab units and each group had four students, the number of student profiles was 40.

To prepare data for a cluster analysis, we first determined the frequency (i.e., number of 1-min intervals) that each variable was coded. To account for different durations for the lab activities, we divided the frequency by the total number of minutes that the activity lasted for.

We used Ward's method, a hierarchical agglomerative clustering technique. This type of clustering technique works in a bottom-up manner. Each student profile was initially a cluster. The profiles that were most similar (i.e., closest in distance in a five-dimensional space determined by the five variables) were combined into a bigger cluster. This was repeated until all the profiles were combined in a single cluster. To determine the optimal number of clusters, we used the "elbow method" (Syakur et al., 2018). We found two kinks in the elbow plot, one at cluster number  $k = 2$  and the other at  $k = 4$  (see Figure 1 in Appendix). We decided to use four clusters because it gave a greater "resolution" and the follow-up statistical analysis confirmed that the four clusters were significantly different from one another in terms of all five variables with large effect (see Results section).

## **2.6 Statistical analysis**

To examine the ways in which the clusters are different, we first used Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test (Kruskal & Wallis, 1952). Effect size was calculated using eta-squared (Tomczak & Tomczak, 2014) with  $0.01 \leq \eta^2 < 0.06$  being small effect,  $0.06 \leq \eta^2 < 0.14$  being moderate effect, and  $\eta^2 \geq 0.14$  being large effect (Maher et al., 2013). We then conducted a post-hoc analysis using Dunn's multiple comparison test (Dunn, 1964) with Holm-Bonferroni corrections. Similarly, we used Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test to examine the correlations between gender and discourse moves, as well as between hearing ability and discourse moves. All the statistical analyses were conducted in R.

## **2.7 Limitations**

This study has a limitation in its sample size. A unique feature of the IMPRESS program is that a fraction of the participants was self-identified DHH. Out of 17 recorded group-lab units, we were only able to code 10 of them primarily because we do not know ASL.

Additionally, not every student was coded in an equal number of lab activities.

Nonetheless, our sample had a similar female to male ratio as the entire program (8 to 7 in our sample and 10 to 10 in the program). The DHH to non-DHH ratio in our sample, however, was somewhat smaller than the entire program (5 to 10 in our sample and 9 to 11 in the program).

Another limitation of the study is the coarse grain size of discourse codes. This allowed us to code the videos relatively quickly while focusing on the most prominent features in students' discourse styles. However, this decision may have omitted nuances in the characteristics of students' discourse styles.

### 3 Results

The distribution of fractions of 1-min intervals for all student profiles for each discourse code is shown in Figure 2. The three most prevalent but also widespread codes are *Participating in discussion* ( $M=0.33$ ,  $SD=0.20$ ), *Chatting off-task* ( $M=0.29$ ,  $SD=0.18$ ), and *Talking with instructor* ( $M=0.21$ ,  $SD=0.12$ ). The other two types of discourse move *Asking a question* ( $M=0.09$ ,  $SD=0.07$ ) and *Proposing an idea* ( $M=0.08$ ,  $SD=0.09$ ) occurred a lot less frequently.




Figure 2. Distribution of fractions of 1-min intervals for all student profiles for each discourse code. Data points represent the student profiles ( $N = 40$ ) generated from the video coding.

#### 3.1 RQ1a: characteristics of student discourse styles

The hierarchical structure and cluster memberships of the student discourse profiles are shown in Figure 3. The numbers of profiles in clusters A, B, C, and D are 9, 8, 9, 14, respectively.




Figure 3. Dendrogram showing the hierarchical structure of the student discourse profiles. Each box represents a cluster of student discourse profiles, each labelled by the student’s pseudonym name, the lab number, and the table number.




Figure 4. Distribution of fractions of 1-min intervals for each discourse code in each cluster. Dots represent median fractions.

The distribution of fractions of 1-min intervals for each discourse code in each cluster is shown in Figure 4. The Kruska-Wallis tests showed that the four clusters are distinct from one another in terms of all five discourse codes ( $p=0.001$  for *Asking a question*, and

p<0.001 for the others) with large effect. Therefore, we use all five discourse codes to describe the characteristics of the four discourse styles.

Table 3 shows a summary of the characteristics of student discourse styles in each cluster (see Table 1 in Appendix for detailed rankings of the clusters for each code). Interestingly, the distinctions among the four styles are identical for the three codes that describe on-task collaboration: *Asking a question*, *Proposing an idea*, and *Participating in discussion*. That is, clusters A and B had higher fractions for these three codes compared to clusters C and D. Moreover, the codes *Chatting off-task* and *Talking with instructor* (either on-task or off-task) can be used to describe the extent to which students are socializing with their group members and an instructor. Therefore, we combined the first three codes into a “on-task” dimension and the last two codes into a “social” dimension to summarize the characteristics of the discourse styles. Recall that prior research has suggested that “social” (or off-task talk) has productive functions for collaborative learning.

Table 3. Characteristics of student discourse styles in each cluster. Median fractions of 1-min intervals are shown in parentheses.

Cluster label	Discourse style	Asking a question	Proposing an idea	Participating in discussion	Chatting off-task	Talking with instructor
A	High on-task high social	High (0.15)	High (0.13)	High (0.47)	High (0.43)	High (0.34)
B	High on-task low social	High (0.15)	High (0.15)	High (0.57)	Low (0.09)	Medium (0.24)
C	Low on-task low social	Low (0.05)	Low (0.02)	Low (0.18)	Low (0.11)	Low (0.09)
D	Low on-task high social	Low (0.05)	Low (0.03)	Low (0.19)	High (0.41)	Medium (0.19)

The four discourse styles are represented on a two-dimensional space with four quadrants defined by the degree of on-task and social (see Figure 5). The characteristics of the styles are elaborated in the following paragraphs.




Figure 5. Quadrant plot showing the four discourse styles.

**High on-task high social.** Students who used the high on-task high social style asked more questions, proposed more ideas, and participated more often in discussions. They also chatted off-task and talked with instructors more often.

**High on-task low social.** Students who used the high on-task low social style asked more questions, proposed more ideas, participated more often in discussions, and talked more frequently with the instructors. However, they chatted off-task less frequently.

**Low on-task low social.** Students who used the low on-task low social style not only engaged in on-task collaboration less often, but they also chatted with their group and talked with instructors less often.

**Low on-task high social.** Students who used the low on-task high social style engaged in on-task collaboration less often, but they chatted more often with their group and talked with instructors more often.

### 3.2 RQ1b: individual students' discourse styles

We found that individual students tend to use a variety of discourse styles. As shown in Table 4, the number of labs in which an individual student was coded ranged from 1 to 5. For students who were coded in more than one lab, 12 out of 13 students used at least two discourse styles. Additionally, the results showed that an individual student could use up to three discourse styles.

Table 4. Distribution of numbers of discourse styles used by individual students.

Number of labs coded for an individual student	Number of styles observed	Number of students
1	1	2
2	1	1
	2	6
3	2	1
4	2	1
	3	3
5	3	1

Students' use of a variety of discourse styles appears to be associated with the lab activities they worked on (see Table 5). Students' on-task discourse moves started with high prevalences from the beginning, and then waned down in the middle, and finally increased. Recall that the greenhouse effect lab sequence spanned 4 days. Students constructed their initial model in Lab 1, and then they tested the effects of new materials in Labs 2-4 and revised their model. During the testing experiments, students recorded the temperatures for long periods of time. Lab 4 was the one in which they were asked to construct a final model based on the results from all previous testing experiments. It appeared that students spent most of the time taking temperature measurements in Labs 2 and 3, which may be why they used the low on-task styles more prevalently in those labs.

Moreover, students regrouped in Lab 3 and then they stayed in the same groups for the rest of the program. Students were asked to work with someone whom they had never worked with before. This may be a reason why the low on-task high social style was much more prevalent than the low on-task low social style in Lab 3. Students chatted off-task more frequently to socialize with the new groups, which could help them gain access to collaboration.

Table 5. Number of each discourse style observed in each lab activity.

Lab activity	Number of students coded	Number of each style observed			
		High on-task High social	High on-task Low social	Low on-task Low social	Low on-task high social
Lab 1	8	3	4	0	1
Lab 2	4	2	0	2	0
Lab 3	12	0	0	4	8
Lab 4	12	2	3	2	5
Lab 5	4	2	1	1	0



### 3.3 RQ1c: group members' discourse styles

The discourse styles used by students in the same groups had a low variety. Most (9 out of 10) of the group-lab units coded had only one or two discourse styles observed (see Table 6). There were two instances where all members used the same styles. Moreover, students' discourse styles within a group often shared at least one common feature (i.e., high on-task, low on-task, high social, low social) with only one exception observed (i.e., the group with styles AACC).

Table 6. Frequency of number of styles observed within a group.

Number of styles within a group	Frequency	Observed styles in a group
1	2	BBBB, DDDD
2	7	AAAD, AADD, AACC, CCDD, CCDD, CDDD, BBBC
3	1	AABC

We also examined students who were coded both before and after regrouping (see Figure 6). These students (Herb, Jakob, and Justin) appeared to use different styles in different activities, but their styles tended to remain aligned with their group members after regrouping.

Initial group	Lab 1	Lab 2	New groups	Lab 3	Lab 4	Lab 5
			BJ	C	C	
Brock	B	C	Brett	C	D	
<b>Herb</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Herb</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	
<b>Jakob</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Jakob</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	
<b>Justin</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Justin</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
			Brittany	D	A	A
			Jessica	D	D	C
			Pat	D	D	B

Figure 6. Discourse styles used by the three students (Herb, Jakob, and Justin) who were coded both before and after regrouping. Styles used by the group members of those three students are also shown. Herb, Jakob, Justin, and their styles are bolded.

### 3.4 RQ2a: gender vs discourse

Figure 7 shows the distribution of fractions of 1-min intervals for each code for different genders. The distributions appear very similar for female and male students. Kruskal-Wallis

tests confirmed that the difference between female and male students for each code is not statistically significant (see Table 2 in Appendix for complete results).




Figure 7. Distribution of fractions of 1-min intervals for each code for different genders. Dots represent median fractions.

We also compared the distributions of discourse styles for female and male students (see Table 7). Similarly, we did not observe a significant difference in discourse styles between female and male students.

Table 7. Distributions of discourse styles for female and male students.

	A: high on-task high social	B: high on-task low social	C: low on-task low social	D: low on-task high social
Female	5	4	4	7
Male	4	4	5	7

### 3.5 RQ2b: hearing ability vs discourse

Figure 8 shows the distribution of fractions of 1-min intervals for each code for students with different hearing ability. Overall, DHH students tend to have lower fractions compared to non-DHH students. The differences are significant for three codes: *Proposing an idea* ( $\chi^2(1) = 6.618, p=0.010$ ) with large effect, *Participating in discussion* ( $\chi^2(1) = 4.1445,$

p=0.042) with moderate effect, and *Talking with instructors* ( $\chi^2(1) = 8.5922, p=0.003$ ) with large effect (see Table 3 in Appendix for complete results).




Figure 8. Distribution of fractions of 1-min intervals for each code for students with different hearing ability. Dots represent median fractions.

The distributions of discourse styles for DHH and non-DHH students are shown in Table 8. It seems that DHH students are less likely to use the style high on-task high social compared to non-DHH students. Additionally, the use of the styles high on-task low social and low on-task high social is also somewhat less prevalent among the DHH students. This is consistent with the results of comparing distributions for individual discourse codes.

Table 8. Distributions of discourse styles for DHH and non-DHH students.

	A: high on-task high social	B: high on-task low social	C: low on-task low social	D: low on-task high social
DHH	1	2	5	5
Non-DHH	7	6	4	9

#### 4 Discussion

In this study, we characterized students’ small-group discourse styles in university science labs. A cluster analysis showed that students demonstrated four different discourse styles,

varying significantly from one another in all five discourse variables: *Asking a question*, *Proposing an idea*, *Participating in discussion*, *Chatting off-task*, and *Talking with instructor*. Characteristics of the discourse styles were then further summarized using the prevalences of engagement in on-task and off-task discourse, namely “high on-task high social”, “high on-task low social”, “low on-task low social”, and “low on-task high social”.

Students were observed to demonstrate different discourse styles in different lab activities. When the lab provided ample opportunities for decision-making (e.g., a significant portion of time on experimental design was required), more students demonstrated the two high on-task styles (with high prevalences of asking questions, proposing ideas, and participating in discussion). In contrast, when the lab did not require much decision-making (e.g., a significant portion of time on repeated measurements was required), more students demonstrated the two low on-task styles. This was consistent with findings by Quinn et al. (2020) who found that students in inquiry-based labs engaged in a variety of activities (e.g., worked on desktop or laptop, handled equipment, and wrote on paper), while students in traditional labs mainly worked on the worksheets.

Moreover, students’ use of discourse styles was also influenced by their group members. The discourse styles within a group in each lab often showed a low variety. Additionally, the discourse styles students demonstrated often shared common features with those of their group members. Since students’ discourse moves tended to be aligned with their group members, interventions for promoting productive group work should focus on the group level rather than the individual level. Students should be given opportunities to reflect and evaluate collectively as a group on how well the group has been functioning. This is in line with the intervention used by Dew et al. (2024) who tasked students, as a group, to complete partner agreement and reflection forms in addition to individual reflections.

We did not observe gender inequity in the prevalences of individual discourse variables or the distribution of discourse styles. An interesting feature of the 2015 IMPRESS program was that the self-identified female and male ratio was one to one, which was drastically different from many university science classrooms where male students are usually the majority. The equal number of female and male students may have been a reason why we did not observe a gender inequity. Future research should investigate discourse styles in different genders in typical university science labs to see if gender inequity is present in small-group discourse.

The results also showed that DHH students had lower engagement in three discourse variables: *Proposing an idea*, *Participating in discussion*, and *Talking with instructor*. Consistently, they were also less likely to demonstrate the *high on-task high social* discourse style. Note that DHH students’ engagement in off-task talks was comparable to

their non-DHH peers. This may suggest that DHH students were equally likely to use off-task talks to position themselves in order to gain access to on-task interaction. However, this had not helped them fully achieve the goal as DHH students still had lower engagement with some of the on-task discourse moves. To remind the reader, some DHH students only used silent communication methods (computer and signing-only) in their group without an interpreter, which were not included in our study.

This study used coarse grain sized discourse variables to characterize students' discourse styles in university labs. Future research should further decompose some of the discourse codes, such as *Participating in discussion*, to get a more precise description of students' discourse styles. Specifically, the code *Participating in discussion* can be broken down into *Answering a question*, *Making an observation*, *Providing feedback to others*, and *Elaborating on one's idea*. Additionally, a time-sequence log of codes for each group member can be used to examine group dynamics in greater detail.

Another future research avenue is to evaluate the effectiveness of group-level interventions on promoting equitable discourse for DHH students. An example of such interventions can include the same elements that were reported in Dew et al. (2024), an individual reflection, a partner agreement form, and a partner reflection form. However, these forms need be modified to reflect discourse moves since the original version primarily focuses on what students are handling rather than discourse.

## **5 Conclusions**

This study identified four discourse styles in group work of university science labs. Students' use of discourse styles was influenced by both the lab activities and their group members. We did not observe gender inequity, but DHH students were found to have lower engagement in discourse. We propose that group-level interventions that specifically target discourse are needed to promote productive and equitable small-group discourse in university science labs.

## Appendix




Figure 1. Elbow plot used to determine the optimal number of clusters. The total within sum of square is plotted as a function of the number of clusters.

Table 1. Kruskal-Wallis and Dunn's test results for each discourse code. Results of eta-squared for effect size are also shown.

Code	$\chi^2(3)$	$p_{k-w}$	$\eta^2$	Ranking by Dunn's test
Asking a question	15.536	0.001**	0.348 <sup>†</sup>	A=B>C=D
Proposing an idea	22.183	<0.001***	0.533 <sup>†</sup>	A=B>C=D
Participating in discussion	27.718	<0.001***	0.687 <sup>†</sup>	A=B>C=D
Chatting off-task	28.998	<0.001***	0.722 <sup>†</sup>	A=D>B=C
Talking with instructor	23.776	<0.001***	0.577 <sup>†</sup>	A>C, A>D, B>C, A=B, B=D, C=D

\*\*p<0.01. \*\*\*p<0.001. <sup>†</sup>Large effect.

Table 2. Kruskal-Wallis test results for female and male students for each discourse code.

Code	$\chi^2(1)$	$p$
Asking a question	0.1647	0.685
Proposing an idea	0.0029	0.957
Participating in discussion	0.1434	0.705
Chatting off-task	0.0183	0.892
Talking with instructor	0.3542	0.552

Table 3. Kruskal-Wallis test results for DHH and non-DHH students for each discourse code. Results of eta-squared for codes that are statistically significant are also shown.

Code	$\chi^2(1)$	$p$	$\eta^2$
Asking a question	3.3108	0.069	
Proposing an idea	6.618	0.010*	0.148 <sup>†</sup>
Participating in discussion	4.1445	0.042*	0.0827 <sup>‡</sup>
Chatting off-task	2.4772	0.116	
Talking with instructor	8.5922	0.003**	0.200 <sup>†</sup>

\* $p < 0.05$ . \*\* $p < 0.01$ . <sup>†</sup>Large effect. <sup>‡</sup>Moderate effect.

## References

- Cao, Y., & Koretsky, M. D. (2018). Shared resources: Engineering students' emerging group understanding of thermodynamic work. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 107(4), 656–689.
- Chiu, M. M. (2009). Social metacognition in groups: Benefits, difficulties, learning, and teaching Computer-assisted Collaborative Learning-Student Learning from Online Discussions View project Discourse Analytics View project. *Journal of Education Research*, 3(4), 1–19.
- Conlin, L. D., & Scherr, R. E. (2018). Making space to sensemake: epistemic distancing in small group physics discussions. *Cognition and Instruction*, 36(4), 396–423.
- Cooper, K. M., Downing, V. R., & Brownell, S. E. (2018). The influence of active learning practices on student anxiety in large-enrollment college science classrooms. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0123-6>
- Crouch, C. H., & Mazur, E. (2001). Peer Instruction: Ten years of experience and results. *American Journal of Physics*, 69(9), 970–977. <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.1374249>
- Dew, M., Hunt, E., Perera, V., Perry, J., Ponti, G., & Loveridge, A. (2024). Group dynamics in inquiry-based labs: Gender inequities and the efficacy of partner agreements. *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.20.010121>

- Doucette, D., & Singh, C. (2023). Making Lab Group Work Equitable and Inclusive. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 52(4), 3–5.
- Dunn, O. J. (1964). Multiple Comparisons Using Rank Sums. *Technometrics*, 6(3), 241–252.
- Franklin, S. V, Hane, E., Kustus, M. B., Ptak, C., & Sayre, E. C. (2018). Improving Retention Through Metacognition: A Program for Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing and First-Generation STEM College Students. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 48(2), 21–27.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/26616264>
- Goos, M., Galbraith, P., & Renshaw, P. (2002). SOCIALLY MEDIATED METACOGNITION: CREATING COLLABORATIVE ZONES OF PROXIMAL DEVELOPMENT IN SMALL GROUP PROBLEM SOLVING. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 49, 193–223.
- Hass, C. A., Genz, F., Kustus, M. B., Ouimet, P.-P. A., Pomian, K., Sayre, E. C., & Zwolak, J. P. (2018). Studying community development: a network analytical approach. *2018 Physics Education Research Conference Proceedings*.
- Horn, I. S. (2012). *Strength in numbers: collaborative learning in secondary mathematics*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Hutchison, P. (2022). Equity and off-task discussion in a collaborative small group. *Physics Education Research Conference Proceedings*, 243–248.  
<https://doi.org/10.1119/perc.2022.pr.Hutchison>
- Kaartinen, S., & Kumpulainen, K. (2002). Collaborative inquiry and the construction of explanations in the learning of science. In *Learning and Instruction* (Vol. 12).  
[www.elsevier.com/locate/learninstruc](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/learninstruc)
- Kokotsaki, D., Menzies, V., & Wiggins, A. (2016). Project-based learning: a review of the literature. *Improving Schools*, 19(3), 267–277.
- Koretsky, M. D. (2015). Program level curriculum reform at scale: Using studios to flip the classroom. *Chemical Engineering Education*, 49(1), 47–57.
- Koretsky, M. D. (2017). Cognitive and social aspects of engagement in active learning. *Chemical Engineering Education*, 51(4), 198–204.
- Koretsky, M. D. (2018). Towards a stronger covalent bond: Pedagogical change for inclusivity and equity. *Chemical Engineering Education*, 52(2), 117–127.
- Koretsky, M., Keeler, J., Ivanovitch, J., & Cao, Y. (2018). The role of pedagogical tools in active learning: a case for sense-making. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0116-5>



- Kruskal, W. H., & Wallis, W. A. (1952). Use of Ranks in One-Criterion Variance Analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 47(260), 583–621.
- Langer-Osuna, J. M. (2018). Productive disruptions: Rethinking the role of off-task interactions in collaborative mathematics learning. *Education Sciences*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci8020087>
- Langer-Osuna, J. M., Gargroetzi, E. C., Chavez, R., & Munson, J. (2018). Rethinking Loafers: Understanding the Productive Functions of Off-Task Talk During Collaborative Mathematics Problem-Solving. *13th International Conference of the Learning Sciences (ICLS)*, 745–751.
- Maher, J. M., Markey, J. C., & Ebert-May, D. (2013). The other half of the story: Effect size analysis in quantitative research. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 12(3), 345–351. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.13-04-0082>
- Osborne, J. (2010). Arguing to Learn in Science: The Role of Collaborative, Critical Discourse. *Science*, 328(5977), 463–466. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1182595>
- Quinn, K. N., Kelley, M. M., McGill, K. L., Smith, E. M., Whipps, Z., & Holmes, N. G. (2020). Group roles in unstructured labs show inequitable gender divide. *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PHYSREVPHYSEDUCRES.16.010129>
- Sayre, E. C., & Irving, P. W. (2015). Brief, embedded, spontaneous metacognitive talk indicates thinking like a physicist. *Physical Review Special Topics - Physics Education Research*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.11.020121>
- Smith, M. K., Jones, F. H. M., Gilbert, S. L., & Wieman, C. E. (2013). The classroom observation protocol for undergraduate stem (COPUS): A new instrument to characterize university STEM classroom practices. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 12(4), 618–627. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.13-08-0154>
- Syakur, M. A., Khotimah, B. K., Rochman, E. M. S., & Satoto, B. D. (2018). Integration K-Means Clustering Method and Elbow Method for Identification of the Best Customer Profile Cluster. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 336(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/336/1/012017>
- Theobald, E. J., Eddy, S. L., Grunspan, D. Z., Wiggins, B. L., & Crowe, A. J. (2017). Student perception of group dynamics predicts individual performance: Comfort and equity matter. *PLoS ONE*, 12(7). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0181336>

- Tomczak, M., & Tomczak, E. (2014). The need to report effect size estimates revisited. An overview of some recommended measures of effect size. In *TRENDS in Sport Sciences* (Vol. 1, Issue 21).
- Velasco, J. B., Knedeisen, A., Xue, D., Vickrey, T. L., Abebe, M., & Stains, M. (2016). Characterizing instructional practices in the laboratory: The laboratory observation protocol for undergraduate STEM. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 93(7), 1191–1203. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jchemed.6b00062>
- Windschitl, M., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2016). Rigor and Equity by Design: Locating a Set of Core Teaching Practices for the Science Education Community. In D. H. Gitomer & C. A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 1099–1158). AERA Press.
- Wongpakaran, N., Wongpakaran, T., Wedding, D., & Gwet, K. L. (2013). A comparison of Cohen's Kappa and Gwet's AC1 when calculating inter-rater reliability coefficients: a study conducted with personality disorder samples. *Medical Research Methodology*, 13(61). <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2288/13/61>