The role of language in students’ justifications of scientific phenomena
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Abstract: Constructing scientific arguments is an essential skill for members of society, especially in a world facing complex socioscientific issues. Educators can help students develop scientific argumentation skills; however, argumentation is a complex linguistic practice and little is known about how English language learners construct arguments in English. We investigated how undergraduate science students’ English language proficiency and history were associated with their level of reasoning in scientific arguments (N = 166). We found that participants’ English language experiences, including their proficiency and history, were associated with the level of reasoning demonstrated. These findings suggest a need to identify the associated barriers faced by students from diverse language backgrounds and design equitable educational supports and assessments.

Summary: The sophistication of students’ scientific arguments was correlated with their English language experience, suggesting a need to identify reasons for language barriers and design equitable supports for students whose first language is not English.
**Introduction**

Citizens need to be able to build arguments and reason with scientific evidence especially in a world facing complex socioscientific issues (e.g., climate change, viral pandemics) (National Research Council, 2013; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2006; Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, 2018; United Nations, 2015). As many students learn scientific argumentation skills in English settings, the active language production required can underestimate the abilities of students from English-as-an-additional language backgrounds (Eng+) (Abedi, Zhang, Rowe, & Lee, 2020; Afitska & Heaton, 2019; C. Buxton et al., 2014; Curtis & Millar, 1988). Eng+ students’ achievement in STEM has been found to be associated with language ability, regardless of students’ abilities to grasp and apply scientific concepts (Curtis & Millar, 1988; Maerten-Rivera, Myers, Lee, & Penfield, 2010; Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2003). For example, Eng+ students’ written responses can score lower on evaluations than those of English-as-a-first language (Eng1st) students due to evaluators’ implicit bias (Huang, 2008; Lindsey & Crus, 2011; Milnes & Cheng, 2008) and students’ challenges communicating their knowledge (Lyon, Bunch, & Shaw, 2012; Swanson, Bianchini, & Lee, 2014; Wolf et al., 2008). Educational researchers have analyzed written arguments to gain insight into students’ reasoning and ultimately improve science education (Becker, Noyes, & Cooper, 2016; Bodé, Deng, & Flynn, 2019; Cooper, Kouyoumdjian, & Underwood, 2016; Deng & Flynn, 2021; A. Moon, Stanford, Cole, & Towns, 2016; Alena Moon, Moeller, Gere, & Shultz, 2019; Osborne & Patterson, 2011; Russ, Scherr, Hammer, & Mikeska, 2008; Watts et al., 2020; Weinrich & Talanquer, 2016); however, much of this work has relied on analyses of responses constructed in a single language (usually English), without taking potential language barriers into account.

Given language’s potential barrier to learning an important societal skill and the importance of creating equitable, diverse, and inclusive educational environments (Abedi, 2002; Afitska & Heaton, 2019; C. A. Buxton, Salinas, Mahotiere, Lee, & Secada, 2015; Chin, 2010; Maerten-Rivera et al., 2010; National Academies of Science Engineering and Medicine, 2018; Pyburn, Pazicni, Benassi, & Tappin, 2013; Shaw, Bunch, & Geaney, 2010; Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2003; Sotelo-Dynega, Ortiz, Flanagan, & Chaplin, 2013; Wolf et al., 2008; Yore et al., 2004), language’s role needs to be better understood in educational contexts such as scientific argumentation (Lee & Stephens, 2020; National Academies of Science Engineering and Medicine, 2018). There are over 1,250,000 international students studying in North America, the majority of whom come from nations where English is not a primary language (Project Atlas, 2019). For example, in the United States, over 4.6 million Eng+ students make up 9.4% of all classrooms (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). Globally, the population of Eng+ students is rising. In the United Kingdom, the Eng+ student population has increased 3.7% since 2012 (21.2% of all students) (Oxley & de Cat, 2019); in the US, 38% of STEM graduate students are temporary visa holders from non-English nations, a number that has steadily increased since 2000 (National Science Foundation, 2020).

In this study, we investigated the potential association between English language proficiency and history with the sophistication of undergraduate postsecondary students’ written arguments in chemistry. Previous work on language and learning has been conducted in K–12 mathematics, biology, or general science contexts. Few investigations have been conducted in chemistry (Pyburn et al., 2013) and post-secondary contexts (LaCosse, Canning, Bowman,
Murphy, & Logel, 2020), despite reports that chemistry’s dependence on English-based nomenclature, models, and symbols may pose unique challenges for Eng+ learners (Childs, Markic, & Ryan, 2015).

Research questions

Our research questions were:

1. What differences in mode of reasoning might there in arguments constructed by postsecondary science students who have English-as-an-additional language (Eng+) and English-as-a-first language (Eng1st)?

2. In what ways might English language proficiency and history be correlated with the mode of reasoning postsecondary science students employ when constructing an argument in chemistry?

Methods

Context, recruitment, and sample

The study was conducted at the University of Ottawa, a bilingual institution in which students have the option to complete coursework in either English or French. With a diverse student population, many students speak a language other than English (University of Ottawa, 2021). We asked professors teaching chemistry courses at the University to forward a recruitment text to students in their courses via email. The final sample was composed of 166 participants who were students in chemistry courses across all four academic years. The institution’s Office of Research Ethics and Integrity approved the project prior to recruitment (H11-18-1363).

Instruments and data collection procedure

In an online format, participants were asked to construct an argument in response to a social media post related to ocean acidification using chemical equilibria data (Fig. 1) (Alena Moon et al., 2019). Participants were also asked demographic information, including whether they identified as Eng+ or Eng1st, the primary language in which they had learned chemistry, and their English language proficiency and history using the Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q) (Marian, Blumenfeld, & Kaushanskaya, 2007). The instruments and evidence for validity and reliability for measures can be found in the Supplementary Materials.
Participants were asked to construct an argument to the social media post (left) using relevant chemical equilibria (right).

Standardized, open-ended interviews were conducted with a subset of participants (n = 15) to gain additional insight into participants’ perceptions of how language contributes to learning and communicating in science.

Analysis

We analyzed each argument to identify the claim, evidence used, and mode of reasoning: descriptive, relational, linear causal, or multicomponent causal (Table 1) (Bodé et al., 2019; Carle, El Issa, Pilote, & Flynn, 2020; Caspari, Kranz, & Graulich, 2018; Deng & Flynn, 2021; A. Moon et al., 2016; Alena Moon, Stanford, Cole, & Towns, 2016; Moreira, Marzabal, & Talanquer, 2019; Sevian & Talanquer, 2014; Toulmin, 1958; Weinrich & Talanquer, 2016).

**Descriptive** arguments list or give features and/or the properties of entities (e.g., the reactants, products) without establishing connections. **Relational** arguments include connections between properties of the entities and their activities, but these relationships are discussed in a correlative fashion (i.e., lack causality). **Causal** arguments—linear and multi-component—include all features of a relational argument and additionally contain cause-and-effect relationships between the relevant properties of the entities and their activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of reasoning</th>
<th>Definitions, adapted to the prompt</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Argument describes explicit features of the graph or equations (e.g., as atmospheric CO₂ concentration goes up, pH goes down).</td>
<td>Based on the equations, H₂O⁺ is generated. Based on the graph, CO₂ goes up as pH goes down.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relational

Argument identifies that increased CO$_2$ concentrations (atmospheric or aqueous) are correlated with H$^+$ being generated, using the equations. Identifies that increased H$^+$ is correlated with decreasing seawater pH.

Based on the graph, CO$_2$ goes up as pH goes down. As is shown in the equations, increasing CO$_2$ produces more H$_2$O$^+$ ions.

Based on the equations, H$_2$O$^+$ is generated. Increasing H$_2$O$^+$ makes the seawater more acidic, so pH goes down.

Linear Causal

Argument uses Le Chatelier’s principal or $pK_a$ values to justify why atmospheric CO$_2$ concentrations influence the directions of the chemical equilibria and connects back to the impact that has on seawater pH.

Based on the graph, CO$_2$ goes up as pH goes down. Due to Le Chatelier’s principle, increasing CO$_2$ produces carbonic acid, which leads to increased concentration of H$_3$O$^+$ ions. This results in increased acidification of the seawater, and thus a lower pH.

To generate language profiles for each participant, we created English language proficiency and history indices for each respondent using the LEAP-Q data (Figure S1) (Krizman, Skoe, Marian, & Kraus, 2014; Marian, Chabal, Bartolotti, Bradley, & Hernandez, 2014; Reichle & Birdsong, 2014). Statistical tests were used to evaluate how participants’ language backgrounds correlated with their demonstrated mode of reasoning. All statistical tests were conducted in SPSS (details in SM). Fischer’s exact test was used to test independence of the modes of reasoning between Eng+ and Eng1st responses, followed by post-hoc pairwise Z-tests with Bonferroni adjusted $p$-values for multiple comparisons. Cluster analysis was conducted based on two clustering variables: relative English language history and relative English language proficiency. Full factorial multinomial logistic regression was used to evaluate the association between English language proficiency and history (independent covariates) and mode of reasoning (dependent categorical output). Academic year was included as a control variable (categorical predictor). A second logistic regression was conducted with mode of reasoning as the dependent variable and (a) time in English language country, (b) time in English language family, and (c) time in English language school/workplace as independent predictors. Lastly, we investigated the relationships between language group (Eng+, Eng1st), language of chemistry instruction (English, French), and reasoning demonstrated in participant’ arguments (descriptive, relational, causal).

Interviews were analyzed using educational research approaches (Cresswell, 2012; Lincoln & Guba, 1985), with particular attention to: (a) how participants perceived the role of language in their own learning experiences and (b) how they perceived the role of language in others’ learning experiences (peers, friends, classmates).

**Results**

*Eng+ participants constructed fewer causal arguments than Eng+ participants*

Eng+ participants constructed fewer causal arguments than Eng1st participants and instead gave more descriptive and relational arguments, $\chi^2 (1, N = 166) = 11.09$, $p < 0.01$, $\phi = 0.253$ (Fig. 2).
Participants with lower English history and proficiency scores produced the fewest causal arguments

LEAP-Q data analysis revealed heterogeneity in the Eng+ and Eng1st samples, which has been cited as a common challenge when categorizing individuals into language groups (Lee & Stephens, 2020; National Academies of Science Engineering and Medicine, 2018). For example, participants who were relatively new to English or experienced with English as an additional language are both considered Eng+. Therefore, to build categorizations from the data, we used cluster analysis to build groupings based on participants’ LEAP-Q data. This analysis uncovered four language clusters (Fig. 3).

Cluster 1 responses more frequently exhibited causal reasoning compared to Cluster 4, $\chi^2 (6, N = 166) = 14.02, p < 0.05, \phi = 0.284$ (Fig. 4). Cluster 1 had the highest proportion of participants who identified as Eng1st (98.8%), $\chi^2 (9, N = 166) = 94.97, p < 0.0001, \phi = 0.756$ (Fig. 4). Of those, 91% having learned chemistry in primarily English (EngCHM) and 8% having learned chemistry
primarily in French (FrCHM). In contrast, Cluster 4 had the highest proportion of Eng+ participants (79%), with 42% having learned chemistry in English and 37% in French.

Higher English history was associated with a greater proportion of causal arguments

English language history was a significant predictor of exhibiting causal reasoning relative to the reference category (relational reasoning), controlling for academic year, \( \text{Exp}(B) = 1.057, p < 0.05 \) (Table S2). That is, participants who had more experiences and time with English were more likely to produce a causal response compared to a relational response. More time in an English language family was a significant predictor of exhibiting causal reasoning relative to relational reasoning, \( \text{Exp}(B) = 1.085, p < 0.05 \) (Table S3).

Eng+ participants who had learned chemistry primarily in French did not demonstrate causal reasoning at all in their arguments (Fig. 5). The proportion of causal arguments increased as the alignment between language group and language of instruction increased: Eng+ participants in English chemistry (16.7% causal), Eng1st participants in French chemistry (37.0% causal), and Eng1st participants in English chemistry (44.1% causal). We note that there may be other variables in play here beyond language—for example, perhaps English and French chemistry courses expect different types of reasoning from students.
Language of preference for communicating chemistry was connected with general and chemistry-specific language experiences

Across the interview sample, participants’ preferred language for communicating chemistry often reflected the language they had learned chemistry in, regardless of their first language (Fig. 6, with examples in Table S7). Both Eng+ and Eng1st participants who had learned the majority of their chemistry in English said they preferred English in chemistry contexts and it would be difficult for them to communicate the same ideas in their first and/or home languages. In contrast, Eng+ participants learning chemistry in French stated greater comfort with French than English; they believed French allowed them to communicate more effectively and provide more detail than English.

Several Eng1st and Eng+ participants who had learned chemistry in English said they could also communicate chemistry effectively in French given the bilingual context; however, these participants noted they would mentally translate from English to French and preferred communicating chemistry ideas in English. Other Eng1st participants learning chemistry in French said they often could think about chemistry in both French and English and would be able to just as easily generate a response in French as in English.

Several participants who had mixed language experiences in chemistry (e.g., both French and English) added that their preference for communicating specific ideas could also depend on the language in which those ideas were taught. For example, if the student was taught their high school chemistry in French but university-level chemistry in English, they would prefer to communicate the high school ideas in French and the university-level ideas in English.
Fig. 6: Based on interview data, participants’ comfort with responding in English vs. French was connected both their general language background (Eng1st or Eng+) and their primary language of chemistry instruction (English or French).

Discussion

Supporting students’ reasoning abilities requires supporting both ability and expression

Three main findings emerge from this work: (1) Eng+ participants produced fewer arguments with causal reasoning compared to Eng1st participants; (2) participants with lower English language proficiency and history produced fewer causal responses compared to participants with higher English language proficiency and history; and (3) participants’ preferred language for communicating chemistry often reflected the language they had learned chemistry in.

Taken together, the findings suggest that language ability is correlated with students’ performance on written assessments in chemistry. Importantly, communicating in English is challenging for students from both non-English home and school backgrounds. This finding may have broader implications for equity within science. In many contexts, science may be taught entirely in a non-English language; for example, in Québec, Canada, students have the option to complete the entirety of their science education in French (Les CÉGEPs du Quebec, 2019). Individuals from these backgrounds may have little experience in communicating in English, either in general or scientific context, consequently limiting their participation in science or making participation much more challenging (Cheng et al., 2019; Elnathan, 2021; Ortega, 2021).

For example, non-English scientists face unique financial and career costs in having to navigate a scientific enterprise dominated by English (Cheng et al., 2019; Elnathan, 2021; Hanauer & Englander, 2011; Hanauer, Sheridan, & Englander, 2019; Ortega, 2021; Ramírez-Castañeda, 2020).

Limitations

This study used convenience sampling so self-selection bias may have been present; Eng+ participants in this study may not be representative of the full diversity within the Eng+ student population, although during recruitment, we included statements in our recruitment texts to explicitly invite students from linguistically diverse backgrounds. Based on interview and LEAP-
Q data, most of the Eng+ participants appeared to be long-term English learners and/or English/French bilingual students whose experiences may be distinct compared to English newcomers (Liamputtong, 2008). Future endeavors involving Eng+ students could employ alternative recruitment methods that invite participation from a diverse cohort of the Eng+ population (Liamputtong, 2008).

The low-stakes context (i.e., voluntary questionnaire) may have contributed to participants responding differently than in higher-stakes contexts (e.g., an exam). During the interviews, both Eng+ and Eng1st participants who demonstrated descriptive or relational reasoning stated that they would have either provided more detail or tailor their response to course expectations on an exam (Table S6). One Eng+ participant who produced a causal response explained how their self-perceived limitations with English often pushed them to provide greater detail and clarity on assessments to ensure they were being understood correctly. Despite this finding, we hesitate to make general claims about how Eng+ and Eng1st participants may have perceived the stakes differently given the limited sample size and lack of concrete evidence on how participants would respond in a higher-stakes context.

Other demographic factors may have contributed to how participants responded, including grade-point average, socioeconomic status, racial/ethnic background, immigrant/newcomer status, based on previous research (Afitska & Heaton, 2019; González-Howard & Suárez, 2021; LaCosse et al., 2020; Lee, 2005).

Conclusions

Constructing scientific arguments is an essential skill for members of society, especially in a world facing complex socioscientific issues. Scientific argumentation is a complex linguistic practice but there is limited research on how individuals from diverse language backgrounds construct those arguments. Therefore, we investigated how undergraduate science students’ English language proficiency and history were associated with their level of reasoning in scientific arguments, using an online data collection instrument that asked student participants to analyze data related to climate change.

We found that participants’ English language experiences, including their proficiency and history, were associated with the level of reasoning demonstrated. Fewer scientific arguments from English-as-an-additional language (Eng+) participants demonstrated causal reasoning compared to arguments from English-first language (Eng1st) participants. Participants with high English proficiency and history (Cluster 1) produced more arguments with causal reasoning than participants with low English proficiency and history (Cluster 4). English language history was a significant predictor of the reasoning exhibited in participants’ arguments.

The language of science instruction seemed to play an important role, as some participants described a greater preference for using their primary language of chemistry instruction when engaging with chemistry content, even if the language of instruction was not their preferred language in general contexts. Language background was associated with the reasoning demonstrated in participants’ arguments; no participant from an Eng+ background who had learned chemistry primarily in French demonstrated causal reasoning in their responses. The lack of causal responses could be due to language barriers or previous expectations in French courses where causal reasoning was not taught or assessed; more research is needed.
In an educational setting such as exams, the responses of Eng+ students may not accurately reflect their knowledge and reasoning capabilities. Language barriers could also hinder knowledge and skill acquisition. In later career settings, Eng+ professionals who have learned chemistry in a non-English language may not be able to fully express themselves in English. That gap between ability and expression can not only hinder a person’s career (Cheng et al., 2019; Elnathan, 2021), but also limits that benefit that the scientific (or other) community could gain from their expertise (Amano, González-Varo, & Sutherland, 2016; Ramírez-Castañeda, 2020).

Future research may determine whether the same findings are demonstrated in higher stakes settings (e.g., exams) and to identify other variables that may be at play (e.g., sophistication of arguments in French settings). Studies could investigate the specific challenges that exist, the nature and timing of barriers, and the approaches Eng+ students use to succeed in English environments, and the effects of equity-intended interventions. The results of these studies could be used to better support Eng+ students through interventions (e.g., educational opportunities), training for educators (e.g., designing inclusive assessments, mitigating implicit bias when evaluating work), and supports for Eng+ learners (e.g., translation software).

Creating a more equitable and inclusive society requires mitigating barriers that hinder participation of individuals from specific cultures and experiences, including individuals from diverse language backgrounds. By better understanding language-related barriers to learning in science (including on assessment), we can better support students and scientists throughout their careers, enhancing diversity and innovation in science (Bell, Villado, Lukasik, Belau, & Briggs, 2011; Harris, Mack, Bryant, Theobald, & Freeman, 2020; Hofstra et al., 2020; Impellizzeri & Coe, 2021; Lee, Quinn, & Valdés, 2013; McKinsey & Company, 2015; Valantine, Collins, & Verma, 2015).
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