

Dear Author

Here are the proofs of your article.

- You can submit your corrections **online**, via **e-mail** or by **fax**.
- For **online** submission please insert your corrections in the online correction form. Always indicate the line number to which the correction refers.
- You can also insert your corrections in the proof PDF and email the annotated PDF.
- For **fax** submission, please ensure that your corrections are clearly legible. Use a fine black pen and write the correction in the margin, not too close to the edge of the page.
- Remember to note the **journal title**, **article number**, and **your name** when sending your response via e-mail or fax.
- **Check** the metadata sheet to make sure that the header information, especially author names and the corresponding affiliations are correctly shown.
- Check the questions that may have arisen during copy editing and insert your answers/corrections.
- Check that the text is complete and that all figures, tables and their legends are included. Also check the accuracy of special characters, equations, and electronic supplementary material if applicable. If necessary refer to the *Edited manuscript*.
- The publication of inaccurate data such as dosages and units can have serious consequences. Please take particular care that all such details are correct.
- Please **do not** make changes that involve only matters of style. We have generally introduced forms that follow the journal's style.
- Substantial changes in content, e.g., new results, corrected values, title and authorship are not allowed without the approval of the responsible editor. In such a case, please contact the Editorial Office and return his/her consent together with the proof.
- If we do not receive your corrections within 48 hours, we will send you a reminder.
- Your article will be published **Online First** approximately one week after receipt of your corrected proofs. This is the **official first publication** citable with the DOI. **Further changes are, therefore, not possible.**
- The **printed version** will follow in a forthcoming issue.

Please note

After online publication, subscribers (personal/institutional) to this journal will have access to the complete article via the DOI using the URL:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11412-018-9290-1

If you would like to know when your article has been published online, take advantage of our free alert service. For registration and further information, go to: <u>http://www.link.springer.com</u>.

Due to the electronic nature of the procedure, the manuscript and the original figures will only be returned to you on special request. When you return your corrections, please inform us, if you would like to have these documents returned.

Metadata of the article that will be visualized in OnlineFirst

Please n	Please note: Images will appear in color online but will be printed in black and white.			
Article Title	Students' engagement with real-time graphs in CSCL settings: scrutinizing the role of teacher support			
Article Sub-Title				
Article Copyright Year	International S (This will be th	Society of the Learning Sciences, Inc. 2018 ne copyright line in the final PDF)		
Journal Name	International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning			
	Family Name Particle	Ingulfsen		
	Given Name Suffix	Line		
Corresponding Author	Division	Department of Teacher Education and School Research		
	Organization	University of Oslo		
	Address	P.O. Box 1099 Blindern, N-0317 Oslo, Norway		
	e-mail	line.inguitsen@lis.ulo.no		
	Family Name	Furberg		
	Particle			
	Given Name Suffix	Anniken		
Author	Division	Department of Teacher Education and School Research		
	Organization	University of Oslo		
	Address	P.O. Box 1099 Blindern, N-0317 Oslo, Norway		
	Family Name Particle	Strømme		
	Given Name Suffix	Torunn Aanesland		
Author	Division	Department of Teacher Education and School Research		
	Organization	University of Oslo		
	Address	P.O. Box 1099 Blindern, N-0317 Oslo, Norway		
	Received	13 June 2018		
Schedule	Revised			
	Accepted	14 November 2018		
Abstract	This paper reports on a study of teacher support in experimental computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL) settings where students engage with graphs in real-time labs within the context of			

	school science. Real-time labs are digital devices and software connected to student-controlled sensors or probes that can measure and visualize data graphically. The empirical setting was a science project about ocean acidification (OA) where lower secondary school students conducted measurements of the pH value of water with increased concentrations of CO2. The analytical focus is on student–teacher interaction during group-work activities where the students carried out, reviewed and reported on the real-time lab experiment. The analyses show that students needed additional support from the teacher in interpreting the real-time graphs and in making connections between the graphic representation, the practical undertakings of the experiment and the underlying scientific phenomena. Most importantly, the study demonstrates the complexity of teacher support in CSCL settings and how this type of support intersects with the support provided by digital resources,
Keywords (separated by '-')	peer collaboration and applied instructional design. Teacher support - Computer-supported collaborative experiments - Real-time labs - Graphical representations - Interaction analysis - Sociocultural perspective
Foot note information	Introduction
	In recent decades, several studies have provided important insight into students' learning processes in computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL). This research has highlighted several productive aspects of CSCL settings as means for enhancing students' conceptual learning, epistemic skills, and collaboration skills. However, studies have also shown that students face a range of conceptual, social, and emotional

challenges in computer-supported collaborative learning, especially when working in small-group settings (Järvelä et al. 2016). These findings suggest that, even in well-designed CSCL settings, "gaps" between the technology design, peer collaboration, and the surrounding instructional design often occur. Acknowledging that the teacher holds an important role in bridging these types of gaps, several studies within the field of CSCL have emphasized the significance of additional support provided by teachers (Ludvigsen 2016). However, most CSCL studies that have directed attention towards the role of the teacher have focused on how various forms of digital tools can support teachers' orchestration of learning activities (Dillenbourg 2013; Erkens et al. 2016; Schwarz et al. 2018). Few studies have analysed teacher support in the form of studentteacher interaction (Furberg 2016). By taking a holistic and multi-layered approach, this paper aims at contributing to the emerging body of literature focusing on the role of support provided by teachers in naturalistic CSCL settings (Ludvigsen and Arnseth 2017; White 2018). Following previous studies with a sociocultural approach to teacher support in CSCL settings (c.f. Furberg 2016; Strømme and Furberg 2015), the present study explores the significance of teacher support and how it intersects with the

digital resources in use, peer collaboration and the surrounding instructional design.

Our empirical point of departure is a CSCL setting involving students' engagement with digital learning devices often referred to as "real-time labs". Typically, real-time labs embed software and measuring devices, such as probes or sensors, to enable collection and graphical visualization of data from science experiments. The intention behind a real-time lab is to assist students in performing investigations and practical work similar to how scientists conduct experiments, as well as to support students in using graphical representations to interpret and communicate results from their experiments (Linn and Eylon 2011; Nakhleh 1994; van Joolingen et al. 2007). Because commonly used real-time labs are not designed as CSCL environments, support in the form of task design, peer collaboration, and teacher support must be facilitated through the instructional design. For that reason, a learning activity involving students' collaborative engagement with real-time labs forms an interesting analytical starting point for exploring the significance of support provided by teachers.

The empirical setting for this study was a science project about OA where lower secondary school students (aged 14–15 years) and their teacher performed an experiment involving a sensor-based real-time lab measuring the pH value of water with increasing concentrations of CO_2 . The analytical focus is on student–teacher interactions taking place as the teacher was making rounds (Greiffenhagen 2012) during group-work activities where the students carried out the real-time lab experiment, as well as when students processed and reported on their experiment results. The analytical attention is directed at student–teacher interactions taking place in settings where students summoned the teacher. We attend to these interactions because they display both the challenges faced by students and how the teacher responds to these challenges (Furberg 2016).

We argue for the value of adding a dialogic approach when examining student-teacher interaction (Linell 2009; Mercer 2004; Säljö 2010). The applied analytical procedure is interaction analysis involving a sequential analysis of the talk and interaction between interlocutors (Furberg 2016; Jordan and Henderson 1995). Based on microanalyses of student-teacher interactions during small-group work, we aim to demonstrate the complexity of facilitating students' development of conceptual understanding in these settings. On a general level, this study contributes to our understanding of teacher support in CSCL settings by displaying how teacher guidance intersects with support provided by the digital resources, peer collaboration, and the applied instructional design. On an empirical level, the study aims at providing insight into productive and challenging aspects of students' engagement with graphical representations in real-time labs, as well as the support provided by the teacher in this type of CSCL setting. In the following, we direct our focus on previous studies: Firstly, we present findings from studies focusing on students' engagement with graphical representations and real-time labs. Secondly, we present findings from relevant studies focusing on the role of teacher support in CSCL settings.

Previous studies: Students' engagement with graphs and teacher support in CSCL settings

Students' engagement with graphs in computer-supported science learning

Graphic representations are frequently used to display and explore statistical data, measurements, and calculations and to communicate scientific knowledge within educational settings and in socio-scientific discourses (Roth and McGinn 1997; Tytler et al. 2013). As such, being able to interpret, understand, and use graphs in ways specific to a scientific discipline are important aspects of developing scientific literacy (Knain 2015; Lemke 1998). Graphs are also important tools in inquiry-based activities where students explore trends and patterns in data collected during their own observations and experiments to learn about various phenomena (Wu and Krajcik 2006). Despite the central role of graphs in science learning, many studies have reported challenging aspects of students' comprehensions of graphs (Leinhardt et al. 1990). For instance, students often struggle to treat graphs as abstract representations, to connect graphs of experiment data to the physical event they represent, and to link graph patterns to the underlying concepts and phenomena (Glazer 2011).

The last decades' technological advances have provided digital tools designed to support students' graphing practices in science. Several studies have scrutinized how various forms of digital tools can support students' graphing skills and their understanding of the conceptual issue in focus (Ainsworth 2006; Ares et al. 2009; Mitnik et al. 2009; White and Pea 2011). Of particular interest for our research are studies focusing on students' engagement with graphs in real-time labs, which are studentcontrolled software connected to sensors that measure and visualize data. Many experimental and quasi-experimental studies have demonstrated positive effects of engaging with real-time labs on students' graphing skills and conceptual understanding of scientific phenomena (Friedler and McFarlane 1997; Linn et al. 1987; Mokros and Tinker 1987; Nicolaou et al. 2007). A quasi-experimental study by Mokros and Tinker (1987) involving middle school students' engagement with real-time labs in science experiments showed significant gains in the students' graphing skills, which were explained in terms of specific features of the real-time lab. Among the features highlighted as supportive of students' graph interpretation skills was the real-time pairing of the practical undertakings of the lab experiment and the graphic representation. This finding is supported by a qualitative study based on dialog-based interviews conducted by Nemirovsky et al. (1998) investigating primary school students' engagement with real-time labs about motion. Findings were that students developed graphing skills through exploring how the movements of the motion sensor materialized in the graph, which gradually enabled the students to predict and create intended and specific graph patterns. In an intervention study involving real-time labs in a physics unit about heat and temperature, Linn et al. (1987) investigated middle school students' graphing skills. Analyses of students' pre- and post-test scores showed significant gains in students' conceptions of graphical representations

related to heat and temperature. Most interesting, the results also showed gains in students' generic understanding of graphical representations, implying that they were able to apply their graphical skills to other science concepts.

Other studies have demonstrated that real-time labs are productive learning resources in collaborative learning settings (Kelly and Crawford 1997; Lindwall and Ivarsson 2011). In a comparative study conducted by Lindwall and Ivarsson (2011) involving science student teachers, two student groups were assigned to reproduce a specific motion graph: one group with a real-time lab with motion sensors and the other group with a simulation-based graphing tool. Analyses of student interaction showed that students in the real-time graph condition explicated and verbalized their conceptual reasoning to a greater extent than students in the simulation condition. The differences in the students' reasoning was explained by the features of the two graphing tools; specifically, producing graphs in real-time labs required that the students explicated the relationship between the actions undertaken with the motion sensor and the pattern generated in the graph display, whereas the simulation enabled a trialand-error strategy eliminating the need for explicit reasoning. Kelly and Crawford (1997) investigated secondary school students' collaborative engagement with real-time labs in a physics course and found that the graphs served as a "stand in" for the physical events of the experiments in the succeeding activity where the students were to interpret and discuss the results. However, Kelly and Crawford also found differences between groups concerning task performance and discussion quality and argued for the significance of teacher guidance to support peer collaboration and guide students in interpreting the real-time graphs.

Along with studies demonstrating the benefits of real-time labs in supporting students' graphing practices, researchers have also reported challenging aspects. One challenge concerns students' difficulty with interpreting trends in real-time graphs (Lindwall and Lymer 2008; Testa et al. 2002). In an interview study, Testa et al. (2002) investigated students' interpretation of real-time graphs and found that the high level of detail typical of real-time graphs was challenging for students and that many students perceived irregular curves as an indicator of poor graph quality or measurement errors. Based on analyses of physics student teachers' interactions during a real-time lab about motion, Lindwall and Lymer (2008) showed that many students experienced difficulties in separating the relevant pattern from "noise" in the graph display, which made it challenging to identify the graph patterns as representations of functional relationships. Another challenge arises from the real-time labs' automatic generation of graphs, which blackboxes central operations in graph production (e.g., plotting, organizing data and choosing scale) that are significant aspects of both graphing practices and students' understanding of graphs (Glazer 2011; Roth 1996). In an experimental study comparing secondary biology students' ability to construct and interpret line graphs after working in either a real-time lab condition or a traditional condition, Adams and Shrum (1990) found that students in the traditional condition outperformed students in the experimental group on graph construction skills.

The challenging aspects of students' learning with real-time labs documented in prior studies demonstrate the need for teacher support. In naturalistic classroom settings where students engage with real-time labs, teachers will usually be present, providing additional guidance in the intersection of digital resources, peer collaboration, and applied instructional design. In the following, we turn our attention to findings from previous studies focusing on teacher support.

Research on teacher support in computer-supported science learning

Few studies have explicitly scrutinized teacher support in real-time lab settings; therefore, we widen our scope to include studies focusing on the role of teacher support in CSCL settings in science more generally. The aforementioned study by Lindwall and Lymer (2008) explored studentteacher interaction during dyad work and found that the teacher provided crucial support in directing the students' attention towards specific features of the graph, which aided students in distinguishing relevant features and in coming to see the graph pattern as a linear relationship. Additionally, Kelly and Crawford (1997) explored the role of teacher support during an instance where one group of students struggled with identifying an acceleration curve during a real-time lab. The analyses showed that the teacher played an important role in guiding the students in making sense of the graphs. The teacher prompted, confirmed, and elaborated students' interpretations and explanations, thereby supporting students in reading the line graphs as representations and helping students link the physical events and the corresponding motion concepts.

Widening the scope of the review to include studies on teacher support in experimental CSCL settings involving representational forms other than graphs, several studies have shown the importance of procedural and conceptual support provided during whole-class sessions and during group work. Several studies have demonstrated the significance of procedural support, or helping students regulate their work processes, in students' exploratory work in CSCL settings (Strømme and Furberg 2015; Urhahne et al. 2010). In the context of inquiry-based CSCL in physics, Mäkitalo-Siegl et al. (2011) conducted an experimental study examining the influence of support in whole-class settings. Findings were that students receiving procedural instructions at the beginning of each inquiry phase, support during group work and evaluations in plenary sessions sought less help during group-work activities but showed higher learning gains than students assigned to the control group. In a study involving 12 middle school classrooms, Warwick et al. (2013) investigated student-teacher interaction taking place within various forms of CSCL settings in science where the digital resources was designed by the teacher. Analyses of instructional trajectories demonstrated the importance of procedurally oriented instructions provided by the teacher, both in the form of direct instructions given during whole class sessions prior to group-work activities and in the form of "indirect scaffolds" displayed on the board during group work, such as instructions, hints, and reminders of spoken instruction.

Other studies have demonstrated the significance of teacher support aimed at scaffolding students' conceptual understanding in experimental CSCL settings (Furberg 2016; Gillen et al. 2008; Jornet and Roth 2015). In a study on secondary school students' engagement of energy transformation conducted by Jornet and Roth (2015), analyses of student-teacher interaction showed that teacher-prompted questions in whole-class sessions succeeding a group-based experimental setting supported the students' sensemaking of their experiences from the practical experiments, providing important resources in subsequent group-work activities. Based on data from a similar context, Arnseth and Krange (2016) analysed studentteacher interaction in group-work settings and showed that important aspects of teacher support included prompting students to explain their reasoning based on the representations and linking the students' use of spontaneous terms to more scientific terms and concepts when attempting to explain the phenomena observed. Other studies have demonstrated the significance of conceptual teacher support in CSCL settings where students engage with inquiry learning and virtual labs. Strømme and Furberg (2015) investigated the role of teacher support in an inquiry project about heat loss where students' inquiry process was guided by various types of digital representations, including a simulation. Findings were that the teacher provided significant support by helping students to link the simulation and its underlying concepts. Furberg's (2016) study produced similar findings on the role of teacher support in a setting where secondary school students engaged with a virtual lab aimed at supporting their processing of a physical lab experiment. Analyses of student-teacher interactions during group activities displayed that teacher support was crucial for the students to link the practical procedures of the lab experiment, the reflection tasks and the experiment's underlying scientific principles.

The review of relevant previous studies offers a valuable background for understanding productive and challenging aspects of students' collaborative engagement with graphs in real-time labs and the significance of procedural and conceptual support from a teacher in CSCL settings. Nevertheless, the review also reveals that few studies have directed analytical attention to teacher support in the context of real-time lab work. Acknowledging the relevance of these studies and the gaps in the literature, this study aims to contribute to this body of research by examining the complexity of teacher support in a particular CSCL setting involving real-time labs and graphical representations and how this support intersects with digital resources, peer collaboration and applied instructional design.

The present study – Research questions

Based on the reported findings about the challenges experienced by students while working with graphic representations in real-time labs and our interest in exploring the significance of support provided by a teacher in these types of CSCL settings, we direct our analytical attention towards student-teacher interaction taking place during two group-work

activities in which students conducted and reviewed the results from their real-time lab experiments before they processed and reported on their findings. Firstly, analyses of student-teacher interactions taking place in these types of settings will provide insight into the challenges students faced and how the teacher responded. Secondly, analysing these types of interactions over time and across the two different activities will enable us to explore the specific possibilities and challenges occurring in the different phases of the real-time lab experiment. To both grasp the student and teacher perspective of student-teacher interactions and to understand the significance of teacher support, we have formulated the following guiding research questions:

RQ1: How do the students and the teacher make sense of the real-time lab experiment and its associated graphical representations, and what challenges are displayed in the student–teacher interactions? *RQ2:* How is teacher support enacted during the student–teacher interactions?

Before providing a discussion of methodological issues, we will briefly account for the theoretical premises underlying our understanding of digital resources and graphical representations, as well as our conceptual understanding of support provided by teachers.

Approaching teacher support from a sociocultural perspective

Sociocultural perspectives conceptualize learning as the appropriation of knowledge and skills through the adoption of cultural tools (Vygotsky 1978; Wertsch 1998). Teaching and learning are regarded as dialogic and dynamic processes of meaningful tool use taking place in the social interaction between interlocutors (Linell 1998, 2009). Among the cultural tools that can serve as mediational means in social interaction, language is assigned a special role, providing a "social mode of thinking" (Mercer and Littleton 2007; Wells 1999). Teaching and learning are also highly dependent on the use of material tools or artifacts where knowledge and social practices are inscribed and stored (Säljö 2010). These tools serve as important carriers of meaning potentials, developed and shaped over time through discursive practices (Ivarsson et al. 2009). In the context of schooling, instructional tools (e.g., textbooks, digital learning environments, worksheets, lab guidelines) are developed to support students' appropriation of specific subject content, methods and procedures. Other commonly used tools are disciplinary tools (e.g., technical equipment, inquiry procedures, scientific concepts, and representations) developed in the practices of particular subject domains. While both instructional and disciplinary tools serve as important resources in students' learning, their meaning potentials in relation to goal-directed activities are not readily available to students (Roth and McGinn 1998; Säljö and Bergqvist 1997). In particular, disciplinary tools need to be re-contextualized to support student learning processes in institutional settings like school science (Bezemer and Kress 2008; Roth and Tobin 1997).

In naturalistic CSCL settings, the teacher is responsible for selecting resources, designing learning activities and providing support that guides students' engagement in relation to specific purposes during classroom activities (Mortimer and Scott 2003; Wells 1999). Thus, the teacher holds an important position as an "expert" in the sense that he masters the tools and knows the purposes for which they are used. Vygotsky's (1978, 1986) notion of the "Zone of Proximal Development" (ZPD) provides a conceptualization of the window in which support of various kinds is needed and productive in students' learning processes. Vygotsky (1978) defined the ZPD as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). Following Wells (1999), we approach ZPD as being "created in interaction between the students and the co-participants in an activity, including the available tools and the selected practices" (p. 318). A CSCL perspective on ZPD stresses the value of both social resources in the form of collaboration between peers and technological resources in the form of designed digital artefacts as support measures that can lead students beyond what they can do alone (Pea 2004). Thus, the "limits" to what students can accomplish as individuals or as collaborating groups are constituted by the availability of social and material resources in the specific learning setting, but also the nature and quality of interactions. However, because students bring different experiences to the setting, their goals and orientations when engaging with social and technological resources might differ from those intended by the teacher or the instructional design (Furberg et al. 2013). Therefore, an important task of the teacher involves responding to students' concerns and orientations as these emerge in situ in the course of the goal-directed activities.

In sum, a sociocultural perspective provides a lens through which we can approach teacher support in CSCL settings as a situated and dialogic endeavour, constituted in the interaction between participants, purposes and available tools. Seen from this perspective, instances of tensions and breakdowns in students' collaborative sensemaking might provide valuable access points to scrutinize teacher support as it is initiated and enacted at the intersection of available support structures. Conceptualizing teaching and learning as mediated processes in goal-directed activities, this perspective implies that the teacher's position as expert and provider of institutional practices must be acknowledged in order to understand the role of teacher support in naturalistic CSCL settings.

Research design

Participants and educational setting

The data were produced during a science project about climate change, which took place in eight school lessons over the course of three weeks in October 2016. The participants were one class of 25 lower secondary school students, aged 14 to 15 years, and their science teacher. The project

comprised several subunits covering topics like the carbon cycle, OA, sea level rise, and the greenhouse effect. The activities within each subunit were designed around various forms of textual and visual digital representations, such as diagrams, models, simulations, and graphs. Throughout the project, students documented their work in online workbooks using the application Padlet.¹¹ The empirical basis for this study was a three-lesson unit about OA where the students performed and reported on a physical experiment. The science teacher team, which included the teacher in focus here, decided to organize this unit around the use of real-time labs, as the school had just bought digital pH sensors for their PASCO labs.²² In this unit, students used the sensors with an application called SPARKvue³³ to investigate the effects of CO₂ on pH levels of water. The students used SPARKvue as a real-time graphing tool to measure the changes in the pH level of water under two conditions. First, they measured the changing pH level in a glass of water while breathing through a straw placed in the water to infuse CO_2 (see Fig. 1). In a second glass, they performed a control measurement by measuring the pH of plain tap-water for 20 seconds. The intention behind the experiment was to simulate the process of OA due to the rising level of CO_2 in the atmosphere, as well as using the experiment as a starting point for discussing the environmental consequences of OA.

SPARKvue is a sensor-based data logging tool consisting of lab software for iPads and other platforms. SPARKvue allows users to collect, analyse and visualize different kinds of scientific data through wireless sensors, in this case, a pH sensor. The software offers several options for visualizing measurements. The students used a simple display of a graph showing pH as a function of time. The monitor displayed a graph of the pH value measured and the pH value as a decimal number next to the graph, which allowed students to monitor changes in real time. The students used the application's default mode, which had the graphical scale set to 0 to 100 seconds and pH from 0 to 13.5. The measurements were controlled (started and stopped) on a control panel in the graph display.

Table 1 provides an overview of the activities in the OA unit. The teacher began with a brief introduction to OA that connected increased concentrations of CO_2 in the atmosphere to the process of OA. The teacher also demonstrated the effects of OA on calcifying organisms. Submerging two eggs into two glasses containing water and vinegar, the teacher explained that the egg in vinegar represented a calcifying organism and that they were going to review it the next day. As homework, the teacher instructed the students to prepare themselves for the upcoming experiment by watching a teacher-produced instructional video showing how to use SPARKvue. The second lesson, taking place the next day, started with the students and the teacher examining the eggs and hypothesizing about what had happened to the egg in vinegar. The teacher then demonstrated how to use the application by measuring the pH value in the glass containing the egg and vinegar before showing students how to read the measured pH value from the graph display. Following this explanation, the teacher gave a short presentation of the pH scale before going through the practical instructions on how to perform the experiment. Before starting the experiment, the teacher distributed a handout with instructions

and asked students to read them carefully as well. The experiment was succeeded by four follow-up activities designed to help the students attend to the scientific processes underlying the experiment and to make connections between representations and real-world phenomena. Three of the follow-up activities concerned documenting and processing the results from the experiment. The fourth and most time-consuming follow-up activity took place in Lesson 3 where the student groups were to discuss and provide written answers to four reflection tasks (see Fig. 5) about the undertaken experiment and how the experiment was linked to the real-world phenomenon of OA.

The science project that contained the OA unit took place in the context of a larger intervention conducted as part of the research project Representations and Participation in School Science (REDE), where researchers (including the authors of this paper) and two science teachers (one of which is in focus here) collaborated on developing instructional units. However, the science teacher team, including the teacher in focus here, designed the OA unit as a first trial of the use of pH sensors with SPARKvue labs. In planning sessions, the researchers provided feedback on the design of the unit, but the teacher did not receive any specific instructions regarding his role as a teacher in this unit, and he was fully responsible for implementing the instructional design without interference from the observing researchers.

Data and analytical procedures

In this study, the main data material consisted of 95 minutes of transcribed video recordings of all student-teacher interactions during the OA unit. Ethnographically inspired observation notes from classroom observations, video-recordings of student-student interactions, transcripts from interviews, teacher-prepared instructional resources, and student-produced materials (photocopies or screengrabs) provided supplementary contextual data for the analyses of the participants' interactions (Derry et al. 2010). The video data was collected by the use of one hand-held video camera recording all student-teacher interactions during whole-class and groupwork activities, as well as three video cameras capturing interactions at the group level. Data from the group cameras complemented data from the hand-held camera by providing additional camera angles and sound sources.

During the two group-work activities related to the real-time lab experiment, a total of 49 instances of student-teacher interactions took place while the teacher was making rounds in the classroom. In his encounters with the student groups, the teacher either responded to questions or intervened by checking on the students' progression. Of these interactions, 22 took place during the activity where the students carried out the experiment, while 27 instances took place in the phase where the students processed and reported on their findings the next day. The length of the student-teacher interactional sequences ranged from a few seconds to 3 minutes. We conducted the analyses of the student-teacher interactions in two steps. The initial analysis involved an examination of all 49 studentteacher interactions, which made it possible to identify general patterns or,

in this case, the most frequently addressed challenges and issues addressed by the students and the teacher. To explore and understand these challenges and issues, as well as how the teacher addressed them, we selected three excerpts of student-teacher interaction for detailed interactional analysis, which constitutes the second step in the analysis. Two excerpts were from interactions that occurred during the activity where students carried out and reviewed the results from the pH experiment (Lesson 2): Excerpt 1 is from the initial part of the experimental setting, and Excerpt 2 is from the last part of the experiment setting. Excerpt 3 is from the setting where the students discussed the results from the experiment in the context of real-world issues (Lesson 3).

We selected the analysed student-teacher excerpts based on four criteria. Firstly, in line with our theoretical perspectives, we selected the excerpts to serve as empirical manifestations of the phenomena under scrutiny. Secondly, in accordance with our research questions, the selected sequences involved student-teacher interactions where the interlocutors focused on issues, challenges or concerns related to conceptual issues, experimental procedures, or understanding the graphic representations. A third criterion, which related to the internal validity of the study, was that the issues and challenges addressed in the selected excerpts should reflect the most frequent issues and challenges during the different phases of the targeted activity. The fourth criterion concerned interactional transparency in the sense that the interlocutors' verbal and physical contributions were characterized by a certain degree of explicitness (Linell 2009; Mercer 2004). Based on these criteria, the selected settings display typical interactional patterns of student-teacher interactions taking place during the group-work activities within this empirical setting.

The applied analytical procedure is interaction analysis involving sequential analysis of the talk and interaction between interlocutors also including the artefacts in focus (i.e., graphical representations or other representations; Jordan and Henderson 1995; Linell 2009). A sequential analysis implies that each utterance in a selected excerpt is considered in relation to the previous utterance in the ongoing interaction. As a result, the focus is not on the meaning of single utterances, but on how meaning is created within the exchange of utterances. To make sense of how the students and the teacher addressed and used digital and material artefacts, our analysis involved attending not only to discourse, but also to nonverbal modes and the conjunction of modes in interaction. In addition to the detailed examination of the interaction sequences, we used ethnographic information about the institutional setting as a background resource for understanding what was going on. This procedural guideline for analysis ensures that the participants' concerns and their actual activities-not only the researchers' intentions and predefined interests-are scrutinized. By analytically scrutinizing student-teacher interactions taking place during the lab activities, we can provide insight into challenges encountered when students collaboratively produced and interpreted graphs representing a scientific phenomenon as well as provide insight into how the teacher, in response to the challenges encountered, supported students' conceptual sensemaking when working with such representations.

We transcribed the video recordings according to an adaptation of Jeffersonian transcription notations (Jefferson 1984). Table 2 in Appendix provides a description of the transcript notations. We have translated the conversations, which took place in Norwegian, into English and given pseudonyms to the teacher and the students appearing in the excerpts. The data sequences and analyses have been presented in data analysis seminars with both national and international colleagues. Critical comments and joint analysis efforts from research colleagues have strengthened the validity of the empirical analysis.

Results

The following sections present and analyse three excerpts of studentteacher interaction. The excerpts are drawn from the three group activities in the OA unit. Excerpt 1 is from the setting where the students conducted the experiment. Excerpt 2 is also from the experimental setting, but at a later stage when the students were reviewing their results. The final excerpt, Excerpt 3, is from the follow-up activity taking place in Lesson 3. In this setting, the students reported on their results and discussed the findings in the context of environmental consequences of OA. During the group activities, the students worked in groups of four. Each group shared an iPad while conducting the experiment and reviewing the results. During group activities, the teacher circulated among the groups.

Activity 1: Conducting the experiment and exploring graphs

While the students prepared the experiment equipment and set up the SPARKvue lab, the teacher assigned one student in each group to read the instructions that the teacher had handed out before starting the experiment. Figure 2 provides an overview of the experiment instructions.

According to the instructions, the students were to produce two measurement curves; one representing the experiment measurement and one representing the control measurement. By blowing air into the cup with tap-water, the students infused CO_2 into the water, resulting in a gradual decrease in the water's pH level. Ideally, this should have produced a decreasing curve in the graph display. However, even though the students followed the detailed experiment instructions, their first measurement generated what appeared to be a straight line graph. Puzzled by this unexpected result, most groups summoned the teacher for help. This kept the teacher busy during the first part of the experiment, moving from group to group, attending to the encountered challenges. The teacher soon realized that the default setting in the SPARKvue setup displayed a much larger scale range in the y-axis than the pH data being represented, which caused the curve to appear like a straight line graph, and that zooming in would make the graph appear as a decreasing line. Furthermore, the prescribed 15 seconds of blowing into the water did not seem to be sufficient for the CO₂ induction to generate a considerable change in pH, and the teacher instructed the students to blow for a longer period, thus producing an additional measurement curve.

Excerpt 1 displays the challenges experienced by the students during this first phase of the experiment and how the teacher, John, addressed these challenges. Like most groups, Serena, Andy, Cory and Steven summoned the teacher when experiencing that the graph line appeared flat in the graph display.

Excerpt 1

- 1. Serena: John? We can't see (.) a difference ((showing the iPad to the teacher))
- 2. Teacher: Uhm you must- Don't give up (.) Just continue blowing ((*bending down facing the students at the end of their desks holding the iPad screen towards the students*))
- 3. Andy: ((holding the straw)) Should I blow?
- 4. Teacher: Yes just blow a little bit more ((*The students start another measurement with Andy blowing into the water, but the app seems to be lagging. When no curve appears in the graph while the second measurement is running, the teacher tells the students to stop, replace the water and start over again)*)
- 5. Teacher: But consider this ((*pointing at the screen*)) (2) Here you've got the whole pH scale ((*pointing up and down along the y-axis*))
- 6. Serena: Yes
- Teacher: It might be a good idea to zoom in a bit ((using his fingers to zoom in on the y-axis; see Fig. 3a and b))
- 8. Cory: Oh yes
- 9. Teacher: Because if we zoom in we can actually see that something has happened
- 10. Serena: Yes
- 11. Teacher: It's not completely straight ((indicating the curve)) (2.0)
- 12. Serena: [Right] ((looking at the curve))
- 13. Teacher: [And I-] What do we see if we look from there and onwards? ((*pointing at the last of the two peaks and slides his finger along the decreasing curve; see* Fig. 3c)) What do we see (.) actually? ((*using his fingers to zoom further in*))
- 14. Andy: It went up? ((referring to the peaks in the curve))
- 15. Teacher: If we look from there- ((pointing from the last peak and onwards)) It is kind of going down (.) Maybe these are your inhalations? ((Looking from Andy to the screen while pointing at the last peak, and demonstrates inhaling))
- 16. Andy: Oh yes
- 17. Teacher: And then you have started blowing again ((*pointing from the last peak and along the decreasing curve*)) (2) So what really happens when you start to add CO₂? ((*looking at all the students*))
 18. Cory: It rises again?
- 19. Serena: No it decreases
- 20. Teacher: ((nods at Serena)) Yes when you start to blow. So-
- 21. Andy: Oh yes ((mumbling inaudible))
- 22. Teacher: ((looking at Andy)) So if we give it some more time-
- 23. Serena: Oh there's the green one ((pointing at the iPad, where the second measurement curve has finally turned up in the graph display))
- 24. Teacher: There it is (.) Wow perfect (2) ((scrolling down to make the new curve visible)) Now you can go ahead and take a look at that ((leaves the group))

In the opening of Excerpt 1, Serena summons the teacher and tells him that they are not able to see a change in the graph as they blow. The teacher responds by demonstrating the zooming function on the touchscreen, which causes the apparently straight-line graph to fold out as a slightly decreasing curve with two small, yet visible, peaks (lines 1–4). Further, the excerpt displays some challenges the students experience when it comes to interpreting and making sense of the graph. In line 13, the teacher prompts the students to explain what they see and tries to orient the students' attention towards the slight decrease in the graph by leading his index finger from the last peak along the decreasing line (see Fig. 1c). Andy's response, "It went up" (line 14), signifies that his focus is on the peak instead of attending to the decreasing feature outlined by the teacher. Trying to reorient the students' attention, the teacher repeats his finger gesture along with providing a description of the decreasing pattern (line 15). He then turns the attention towards the peak (line 15) and suggests that the peak might represent Andy's inhalations. Although Andy confirms the teacher's interpretation of the peaks (line 16), the teacher prompts the students for an explanation, this time by asking, "So what really happens when you start to add CO₂?" (line 17). Cory's and Serena's divergent replies indicate that they focus on different graph features: Cory on the peak (line 18) and Serena on the decrease (line 19). By looking at Serena and nodding, the teacher once more tries to draw the students' attention towards what he finds the most salient and relevant graph feature: the decline (line 20). As the second measurement curve finally

appears in the graph and the teacher leaves the group, the students are left with interpretive resources to map between curve features and measurement actions (lines 22–24).

The analysis of the interaction in Excerpt 1 shows some interesting aspects of how the students and the teacher made sense of the graph and its features. Firstly, the analysis displays challenges related to generic features in graphing; in this case, adjusting the scale on the y-axis to a proper range to disclose features of the graph. Secondly, the analysis displays that the teacher and the students initially did not attend to the same graph features; the teacher was clearly attending to the decrease, while the students seemed to be attending to the peaks. This suggests that seeing the curve pattern as a decreasing line is not a straightforward action, but rather a matter of perspective. Thirdly, the analysis displays the challenge and significance of linking the particular features of the graph, its peaks and decline, to the actions undertaken in the experiment.

Shifting the analytical perspective to how the teacher responded to the challenges encountered, the analysis shows that he provided support in form of *eliciting the students' understanding of the graph*. As can be seen in the second half of Excerpt 1, he enacted this support by directing the students' attention towards salient features and prompting for student accounts of these. He used his gaze, pointing, and hand movements to indicate where the students should focus their attention, and these cues served as crucial resources when posing questions and elaborating on the students' responses. The teacher also provided important support in the form of *modelling how to link the graph features and practical undertakings* of the experiment, both by prompting and providing accounts of what was done during the measurement to produce the specific shapes in the curve.

Summing up, the analysed student-teacher interaction in Excerpt 1 illustrates typical challenges encountered in the initial phase of conducting the experiment. One aspect was the complex and dynamic nature of the graphing tool and the crucial role of scaling functions when exploring the graphs. A second aspect concerned making sense of the graph and the significance of establishing a shared perspective when attending to curve patterns. The analysis shows how the students and the teacher negotiated their orientations and how students needed a considerable amount of teacher support before they could attend to what the teacher emphasized to be the most important features. Furthermore, the analysis shows how the teacher balanced an eliciting strategy with providing relevant interpretations when supporting students in mapping between the curve features and the practical undertakings of the experiment. However, as we will see in the next excerpt, other conceptual challenges emerged once the experiment activity progressed into conducting comparative measurements and making sense of the final graphs.

Activity 2: Reviewing the results and comparing graph curves

Towards the end of Lesson 2, most groups had successfully conducted their measurements and were engaged in reviewing their final results. According to the original instructions, the students should have generated two measurement curves: one representing the experiment measurement and one representing the control measurement. In this phase, the students were to interpret the patterns displayed in their final graphs. To read the graph pattern as a difference between the experiment and the control measurement, the students had to construe the first measurement curve as decreasing and the control measurement curves in their final graph. However, due to the technical problems and the fact that the length of the measurements had to be adjusted, several groups ended up with three measurement curves in their final graph. As one can expect, marginal differences with regard to the condition of each measurement resulted in some inconsistencies that were also visible in the graph. For instance, students sometimes performed the measurements without replacing the water in the experiment glass or without rinsing the probe before submerging it into the control glass. As a consequence, some students ended up with control curves that did not appear as a flat line or with three measurement curves, none of which overlapped. These issues gave rise to some challenges when interpreting the results.

The following excerpt illustrates how the teacher and students attended to these issues in studentteacher interaction during this phase. The students were to compare the measurement curves they

produced and report their conclusions and findings. We enter the interaction in Excerpt 2 where the teacher is summoned by the students Nina, Marcus, Rachel, and Thomas.

Exce	erpt 2	
1.	Teacher:	((leaning over, looking at the iPad; see Fig. 4.)) Well look at this!
2.	Nina:	Uhm (.) We don't really get this because the green one is when we just put it in the water
3.	Teacher:	Yes that one is quite straight
4.	Nina:	The red one ((referring to the middle line in Fig. 4b)) is when I was blowing (.) And I blew much harder than Thomas
5.	Teacher:	Uhum (.) Yes ((leaning closer, resting his elbows on the desk))
6.	Nina:	And the red one ((referring to the upper line in Fig. 4b)) was when Thomas was blowing
7.	Marcus:	Or longer
8.	Nina:	Longer too
9.	Teacher:	Yes but this is- ((scrolling slowly towards the end of the measurements)) Wow this looks really good (3)
10.	Marcus:	But why did the green one ((referring to the lower line in Fig. 4b)) change?
11.	Nina:	Yes we were wondering about that too
12.	Teacher:	Yes what could've have happened? (2) ((looking from the iPad, pointing at it with his hand, to Marcus)) What could've happened?
13.	Marcus:	Moved it?
14.	Teacher:	Yes it might just be that you have moved it- Made it go slightly above the water- ((<i>gesturing moving the sensor above the water surface</i>)) Slightly above the water ((<i>locking at the students</i>)) That might be the cause () of such small changes ((<i>scrolling in the graph</i>)) but I think that
		in total it looks quite straight () But I think it is. The arrange here, (notice at the first and second measurement curves looks at Ning and
		<i>Rachel</i>)) What does this tell us?
15.	Marcus:	That it becomes more acidic
16:	Thomas:	First up a bit up and then it becomes more acidic
17.	Nina:	[I was blowing harder]
18.	Teacher:	[Yes and my guess is that] I guess that you started blowing here ((points at the graph at 20 seconds))
19.	Nina:	Oh (.) No I started blowing here ((scrolls left))
20.	Teacher:	Yeah maybe you took a breath
21.	Nina:	Yes I did (.) I had to breathe a little bit ((<i>laughs</i>))
22.	Teacher:	Yes that might be related to that jump (2) Still it is quite- When we zoom in enough there ((pointing up and down the y-axis)) I think there is a

considerable change here

Excerpt 2 shows that students were challenged in *attending to the relevant differences in the graph patterns*. In the opening of the excerpt, the students start to explicate the differences between the curves in terms of the practical undertakings of the lab experiment, emphasizing how Nina was blowing longer or harder than Marcus (lines 2, 4, and 6–8). The teacher confirms the students' remarks but does not pursue or elaborate on these issues. Instead, he concludes that their result "looks really good" (line 9). Marcus then attends to the change within the control measurement curve (lower curve in Fig. 4b) and asks for an account of this (line 10). The teacher and the students settle on the explanation that holding the sensor above water is a probable cause (lines 12–14) before the teacher restates that the control curve "looks quite straight" and invokes the first and second measurement curves as a contrast (line 14). The interaction in the first part of the excerpt indicates differences between the participants' orientation: The students' attention seems oriented towards irregularities in the control measurement curve and the differences between the first and second measurement curves. The teacher, conversely, emphasizes the overall trends of the curves and strives to foreground the differences between the control measurement curve and the other two curves.

Another challenge displayed in Excerpt 2 involves *making sense of what the graphs represent*. When being prompted to explain what the graph demonstrates, both Marcus and Thomas immediately suggest that "it becomes more acidic" (lines 15–16). Nina, however, does not attend to the teacher's prompt and continues focusing on curve patterns and practical undertakings by stating "I was blowing harder" (line 17). Thus, Nina does not display her understanding of what the graph represents scientifically. Although the teacher's response in line 18 can be seen as a confirmation of all the students' suggestions, he chooses to follow up on Nina's account about the relation between the graph and the practical undertakings of the experiment, rather than the underlying scientific principles. The students' eagerness to display their understandings of the relation between curve patterns and practical undertakings during the experiment can be seen in relation to the support provided by the teacher in the setting in Excerpt 1, where he modelled the strategy of mapping between graph features and practical undertakings as a means to interpret the graph. However, although the interaction in Excerpt 2 demonstrates students' uptake of this particular strategy, it also displays the limits to which the mapping strategy was productive, in the sense that it also pushed students' attention towards irregularities which are difficult to explain with reference to the practical undertakings of the experiment.

Shifting the focus towards how the teacher responded to the students' challenges, the excerpt shows how the teacher strove to guide the students in their sensemaking process in several ways. Firstly, he guided the students by trying to *orient their attention towards the salient features of the graphs*. For instance, he tried to lead the students' attention away from the details of single measurement lines or the differences between the first and second measurement towards the overall trends of the curves, thereby signalling which features were salient (lines 3, 14, and 23). Secondly, the teacher provided guidance by trying to enable the students to *make sense of what the graph represents*. This can be seen in his attempts to prompt the students to account for what the graphs' overall declining tendency might represent (lines 10–14). However, as also seen in Excerpt 1, the interaction taking place in Excerpt 2 displays the challenge that most teachers experience in *balancing scientific perspectives and concerns with the students' intuitive perspectives and concerns*. In this setting, the teacher was in the role of being an "expert" in interpreting graphs, and he knew the correct outcome of the experiment. This implies that he had a clear sense of the graphs' salient features and what they would represent. Nevertheless, to both address the students' intuitive concerns and guide them in a required direction, he also strove to balance the scientific concerns with the students' concerns.

Summing up, the analysis of the interaction in Excerpt 2 illustrates the challenges encountered in the phase where the students reviewed their experiment results. A central aspect concerned deciding which graph features were salient and attending to the relevant changes. The analysis shows how the students focused on interpreting the graph in terms of the practical undertakings of the experiment; however, the analysis highlights how the teacher balanced support for students' linking between the graph and measurement actions while also orienting their attention towards underlying scientific principles. As a response to the concerns encountered during this last phase of the experiment, the teacher decided to organize a recapping activity the following lesson to allow more time to develop a scientific perspective on the pH experiment. The final excerpt is from the follow-up activity where the students processed and reported their results from the experiment.

Activity 3: Processing and contextualizing the experiment results

The following day, Lesson 3 centred on recapping and contextualizing the results from the pH experiment. In this activity, the students worked in dyads with four questions aimed at facilitating reflections on how to link the experiment to real-world issues such as increasing CO_2 emissions, changes in ocean acidity and potential effects on calcifying organisms. The questions were displayed on the board during the whole activity, next to a picture of the graph that one of the groups had produced (see Fig. 5). The students discussed the four questions and formulated written responses which they would later review and rewrite in the original groups of four in their digital workbooks.

While the students worked, the teacher circulated, helped students and monitored the groups' progress. The teacher and students spent the most time on the second question: "What did we simulate? Can we connect what we did yesterday to a real challenge in nature?" (see Fig. 5). The question prompted students to reflect on the relation between the results of the experiment and the real-world phenomenon it was supposed to illustrate, as well as prompting a reflection about OA. However, students found it challenging to provide an account of these connections, not least because the teacher required them to produce a written account, something that demanded a high degree of verbal and scientific accuracy. The interaction in Excerpt 3 illustrates how student–teacher interactions addressed the challenge of making these connections. In the following setting, Steven and Andy have just started their work with the second question when they summon the teacher for guidance.

Excerpt 3

¹ Steven: What did we stimulate?

² Teacher: What we simulated?3 Steven: Yeah

³ Steven: Yeal

⁴ Teacher: Well that actually means- We did an experiment in the classroom (.) But we did it because we wanted to demonstrate something in nature

⁵ Steven: Yes but what did we demonstrate? ((*laughing*))

⁶ Teacher: What do you think the water represents?

7	Students:	The ocean
8	Teacher:	Right (.) And why did we blow into the straw? What was that supposed to illustrate?
9	Steven:	It-
10	Andy:	It is- (.) aciding of water ((referring to the term acidification))
11	Teacher:	Yes that it what it actually is
12	Andy:	Aciding
13	Teacher:	And when we blow into the water (.) what are we actually doing? What are we inducing?
14	Students:	CO ₂
15	Teacher:	Right ((pointing at Steven))
16	Steven:	And then (.) watch what happens
17	Teacher:	And what has that got to do with the ocean?
18	Andy:	Well if it goes down (.) it might endanger calcifying organisms
19	Teacher:	Yes that's right (.) That is number three there ((<i>pointing at the board, referring to the third question: "What are the consequences for calcifying organisms living in the ocean when this happens?"</i>)) But of course when the CO ₂ levels in the atmosphere increase- what happens to the CO ₂ level in the ocean?
20	Steven:	That- (.) The pH value goes down
21	Teacher:	Yes and the CO_2 level in the ocean will also increase (.) Right so when we blow into the straw into the water we demonstrate what actually happens when the CO_2 levels of the ocean increase (.) Are you with me on that?

22 Steven: ((nods)) Uhum

Excerpt 3 shows that the students were challenged by the task of *contextualizing the actions undertaken during the experiment.* The excerpt begins with Steven's probing for an account of what the experiment demonstrated from the teacher (lines 1-5). The teacher responds by posing a series of cued questions prompting the students to account for the objects and actions that comprised the experiment and what they signified (lines 6, 8, 13, and 17). The succeeding interaction (in lines 7-15 and 17-20) shows that the students successfully make connections between the central components of the experiment and their corresponding real-world phenomenon when elicited by the teacher's cued questions. The interaction in the second part of the excerpt shows that a more challenging aspect of accounting for the experiment concerns relating the experiment to real-world issues. This can be illustrated by the interaction taking place from line 17 and onwards, where the teacher requests an account of the link between CO₂ induction, acidification and the ocean, as identified by the students (lines 7, 10, 12, and 14). Andy's response in line 18 ("if it goes down, it might endanger calcifying organisms") suggests that he construes the experiment as a representation of the effects of acidification. However, his reply does not target changes in CO₂ level. The teacher's follow-up question (line 19) specifically prompts an account of the relation between CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere and CO₂ levels in the ocean. Looking at Steven's response (line 20), he again targets the decrease in pH, not an increase in CO_2 level. In line 21, the teacher confirms and elaborates, "And the CO₂ level in the ocean will also increase". The interaction in the last part of the excerpt suggests that the students, although demonstrating that they can link the experiment to the real-world issue of OA, are in fact bypassing the crucial aspect of understanding that an increase in CO_2 in the atmosphere will lead to an increase in CO_2 in the ocean. The teacher, conversely, strives to elicit an account of CO₂. Upon realizing that the students are not attending to the relationship between CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere and in the ocean, he explicates the relationship himself.

Looking at how the teacher responded to students' challenges, Excerpt 3 illustrates how the teacher supported the students in contextualizing the experiment. Firstly, the teacher provided support in *eliciting student understandings* of the experiment as representation of real-world phenomena. From line 6 onwards, the teacher prompted the students in linking the central elements of the experiment (tapwater, blowing through the straw and acidification of water) with a corresponding real-world phenomenon OA, thereby establishing the central connections needed to reason about the significance of the experiment. Secondly, the teacher provided support by trying to *guide the students' conceptual reasoning* by confirming and elaborating on student accounts and cueing questions to help students connect and integrate prior contributions. This can be seen in line 17 where the teacher, probing for accounts of the changing CO_2 levels in the ocean, challenged the students to connect the information they had provided in previous utterances. However, the following exchanges display that the guiding questions did not provide enough support for the students to attend to the change in CO_2 levels, and the teacher eventually provided the targeted information in line 21.

Summing up, the analysis of the interaction in Excerpt 3 shows the challenges encountered when students were working to produce written accounts of what was demonstrated by the experiment. An important aspect concerned establishing connections between elements in the experiment and the real-world phenomenon of OA. Another challenging aspect was establishing an understanding of the role of CO_2 in the pH experiment and the relation between CO_2 and pH levels. Altogether, the analysis of the three excerpts from the different phases of the students' engagement with the real-time lab and the graphical representations shows the crucial work of the teacher in eliciting students' understanding through probing and cueing questions, guiding students' reasoning, and targeting potential gaps in students' conceptual understandings. In the following section, we will discuss the main empirical findings of the analysis according to findings from previous studies.

Discussion

The aim of this study is twofold. On a general level, it aims to provide insight into the role of teacher support in naturalistic CSCL settings and examine how teacher support intersects with other available support structures. On an empirical level, the study aims to provide insight into productive and challenging aspects of students' engagement with graphical representations in real-time labs, as well as what kind of support the teacher enacts in this particular type of CSCL setting. In the following sections, we will discuss our central empirical findings in relation to previous research findings, as well as potential implications for teacher support and instructional designs in naturalistic CSCL settings.

In this article, we have chosen student-teacher interaction during small-group activities as our analytical access point for exploring the role and significance of support provided by a teacher. The main reason for this choice is that these types of settings provide insight into the various challenges students might encounter during their work with real-time labs, as well as how the teacher addresses and deals with these challenges. In a sense, this implies that we intentionally have been "looking for trouble" instead of focusing on all the settings where everything went smoothly. The focus on "trouble" does not, however, imply that the educational setting in focus here was unproductive or unsuccessful.

Before turning our attention towards teacher support, we discuss our findings in relation to prior research on students' engagement with real-time labs. Several studies have shown that students' engagement with graphic representations in real-time labs can be productive in the sense of enhancing students' development of graphing skills and conceptual understanding of scientific phenomena (Friedler and McFarlane 1997; Linn et al. 1987; Mokros and Tinker 1987; Nicolaou et al. 2007), as well as supporting students' shared reasoning (Kelly and Crawford 1997; Lindwall and Ivarsson 2011; Nemirovsky et al. 1998). Despite these promising findings, studies have also documented more challenging aspects of students' engagement with graphical representations in real-time labs, such as coping with the high level of detail typical of graphs from real-time experiments, identifying the relevant graph patterns and interpreting trends in real-time graphs (Lindwall and Lymer 2008; Testa et al. 2002). The empirical findings of this study confirm and supplement findings from previous research. In particular, our study provides deeper insight into challenging aspects concerning the interpretation of graphical representations. For instance, the analyses of student-teacher interactions show that students' attention tended to be oriented towards some of the less significant graph features, such as the peaks rather than the slopes (Excerpt 1) and insignificant differences within curves rather than the differences between the control and other curves (Excerpt 2). This tendency made it difficult for the students to identify relevant shapes and patterns within the graphs. Another interpretational challenge demonstrated by our analyses relates to the students' difficulty of seeing the connection between the graphic representations and the practical undertakings of the experiment (Excerpt 1 and Excerpt 2).

Another type of challenge displayed in our analyses of student-teacher interactions concerns the *contextualization of the undertaken experiment*. Prior studies focusing on lab work and other

experimental settings have documented that students often struggle to see the relation between experiments and their underlying scientific principles or corresponding real-world phenomena, a finding that is documented across different types of CSCL settings (Furberg 2016; van Joolingen et al. 2007). The present study yields similar findings in the context of engaging with graphic representations in real-time labs. Our analyses display that students were challenged by linking the declining pH curve produced during the experiment to the underlying scientific principles of pH change. Furthermore, the analysis reveals that the students struggled with linking the undertaken experiment to the overall scientific phenomena represented by the experiment; the issue of OA (Excerpt 3).

With these challenges as a backdrop, we turn our attention towards the support provided by the teacher. As seen in our review of prior research, several CSCL studies have demonstrated the significant role of procedural and conceptual support from the teacher in students' engagement in inquiry and lab work settings (Furberg 2016; Mäkitalo-Siegl et al. 2011). Concerning procedural support (i.e., guidance that aids students in regulating their work process), the initial analysis of student-teacher interactions during the lab work activities showed that rather few of these involved procedurally oriented issues. The reason might be that the teacher provided a broad range of instructional materials such as lab guideline sheets, descriptions of work distribution in the groups, an instructional video and reflection tasks. In addition, the teacher provided procedural instructions during whole-class sessions, demonstrating how to use the experiment equipment and explaining the guideline sheet. Taken together, these measures provided a considerable amount of support on a procedural level, and additional procedural support was required mainly in the first phase of the lab experiment activities. In particular, the teacher needed to provide support in how to utilize the scaling functions to adjust the scales in the graph display (Excerpt 1). Thus, our study demonstrates both the productive aspects of scaffolding devices in the form of material resources and instructions provided upfront, as well as the significance of the teacher providing support that fills in the gaps in the instructional design.

Previous studies focusing on students' engagement with lab experiments and representational resources in CSCL settings have also demonstrated the importance of *conceptual support* provided by teachersreferring to guidance that targets students' understanding of the scientific content and concepts (Arnseth and Krange 2016; Furberg 2016; Jornet and Roth 2015). The initial analyses of student-teacher interactions taking place in the course of the lab work activities show that most of the challenges expressed by the students concerned conceptually oriented issues. The microanalyses of the selected student-teacher interactions reveal that the teacher provided conceptual support by using an *eliciting* strategy and an *elaboration strategy*. The eliciting strategy became evident on the *representational level*, where the teacher guided students' attention towards specific features and elicited their perceptions of these, as well as on an inter-representational level, where the teacher prompted student ideas about connections between experiment and graphic representation to develop a shared understanding of this relation. As displayed in Excerpt 1 and Excerpt 2, eliciting at these levels was characterized by the use of discursive devices such as prompts and cued questions in conjunction with non-verbal devices such as gestures, gaze and hand movements to actively engage students in shared reasoning. In this sense, our analyses also demonstrate that the graphic representations served as productive shared resources from which students could make their interpretations, understandings and challenges visible and available to the teacher. Further, our analyses of interaction at the representational level also demonstrate the significance of the teacher's deictic movements as means to invoke disciplinary-relevant orientations towards the graphs. On a contextual level, where the teacher guided students' reasoning about the relation between the experiment and real-world issues, the teacher's eliciting strategy consisted mainly of cued questions, reframing, and elaborating on student accounts. This can be illustrated by the analyses of Excerpt 3, where the teacher resorted to discursive devices to elicit students' accounts of the links between the experiment and corresponding scientific phenomena and concepts due to the lack of visual representations of the lab experiment setup. Finally, our analyses also display instances across the three levels where the teacher refrained from the eliciting strategy and used an *elaboration strategy*, which implies that he elaborated on students' inquiries or his own guiding questions by providing the

crucial information himself. Examples of this strategy can be seen in Excerpt 2 where the teacher provided a final interpretation of the graph pattern as demonstrating a change in pH and in Excerpt 3 where the teacher elaborated on students' accounts of the experiment highlighting the role of increased CO_2 levels.

The shift in the teacher's guiding strategy aligns with the findings in other CSCL studies demonstrating that a central concern for teachers in CSCL settings is to balance their efforts in aiding students' in utilizing their own knowledge with the approach of taking a source position and providing crucial information (Strømme and Furberg 2015). The teacher's role in collaboration will always be influenced by the teacher's status as an expert and the provider of the instructional design (Wells 1999). In the present study, as is almost always the case in any experimental science setting, the teacher knew the results of a correctly performed experiment as well as what to look for when interpreting the graphs. Conversely, the students were in an "inquiry mode" because they did not know the expected results of their experiment or which graph features were salient. The shift in the teacher's strategy can be seen in light of what Mortimer and Scott (2003) referred to as the need for a balance between a dialogic approach to students' contribution where explorations into students' orientations and facilitating collaborative reasoning is central, and the need to provide authoritative support in the form of confirmations, validations and making information which was not attended to by students explicit.

Returning to the notion of the ZPD, a central aim in the context of CSCL is to design learning environments where peers, digital resources and instructional designs provide support that enables students to accomplish tasks they would not be able to solve alone (Pea 2004). However, several studies have demonstrated that even in well-designed CSCL settings, "gaps" between the technology design, peer collaboration and the surrounding instructional design do occur (Furberg 2016; Järvelä et al. 2016; Mäkitalo-Siegl et al. 2011; Strømme and Furberg 2015). These findings serve to demonstrate the significance of additional support from the teacher in bridging these gaps to keep students in the ZPD. The findings in the present study provide further insight into the functions of teacher support in CSCL settings, demonstrating that the teacher has an important role to play, both as an *orchestrator* who invokes and interweaves digital and social resources and as a *guide* who provides direction in students' collaborative reasoning.

Implications for instructional design

Regarding implications for teaching practice and instructional design in CSCL settings and real-time lab settings in particular, several points can be made on the basis of our findings. Firstly, the teacher in our study provided students with a considerable amount of *procedural support* prior to the lab experiment activities, in the form of both instructional materials designed to scaffold students' work during the lab experiment and direct instructions during whole-class sessions upfront. Our study serves to demonstrate the importance of designing scaffolding devices that provide structure in students' work. However, our analyses also show that students needed additional support in how to utilize the scaling function in the SPARKvue tool. Thus, we suggest that targeting the scaling function in instructional materials or in the demonstrations provided by the teacher prior to the lab experiment activities might have been beneficial for the students and released more time for other issues in student–teacher interaction during the first phase of the experiment.

Regarding *conceptual support*, the findings of the present study demonstrate that the material and digital resources did not provide nearly enough support for student groups to overcome conceptual difficulties without additional teacher support. Further, we found that conceptually-oriented support was mainly provided in the form of teacher-student interaction in group work settings. In line with studies that have shown the potential role of whole-class sessions aimed at consolidating students' experiences from group-work settings (Jornet and Roth 2015; Mäkitalo-Siegl et al. 2011), we argue that whole-class discussions might also have been an alternative means to address some of the conceptually oriented

issues that arose as part of conducting and reviewing the real-time experiment. We propose that wholeclass dialogues could be organized either as pauses in group work at points where several of the student groups are struggling with similar issues or as part of consolidation activities at the end of each activity, providing the opportunity to revisit and conclude on central issues. Either way, invoking contributions of several student groups might allow different student orientations to become resources in collaborative reasoning, which in turn might produce productive interactions and reduce the need to shift from an eliciting to an elaboration strategy.

A final point concerns the relation between support provided by digital and material tools in the CSCL setting and support provided by the teacher. As demonstrated by the analyses in our study, the SPARKvue lab did not provide support for students' processing and contextualizing of the results from the real-time experiment beyond displaying the graphic representation of the measurements. Further, beyond the representational support provided by the software tool, and the reflection questions displayed on the board, the instructional design provided few digital tools aimed at providing conceptual support. Thus, one implication might be to design digital support targeting some of the conceptually related issues that the teacher expects students to come across, as well as digital support that aids the students and the teacher in addressing typical challenges collaboratively (e.g., a representation of the lab experiment setup in the processing setting).

Concluding remarks

This study demonstrates the value of taking a closeup perspective on the challenges and opportunities in naturalistic CSCL settings, including settings where students engage with graphic representations in real-time labs. Attending to the processes in which students and the teacher encounter and strive to resolve challenges in student–teacher interaction provides a lens to elucidate the tensions that emerge from the differences in orientations and the demands this puts on the teacher to facilitate productive engagement. Further, closing in on teacher support as a dialogic process enables us to scrutinize the nuances in the teacher's support strategies, as enacted in response to student needs. In naturalistic CSCL settings, the teacher holds an important position as designer and facilitator of students' learning. However, as our study demonstrates, the teacher also plays an important role as a more knowledgeable other during group-work activities, which provides an important social resource in students' conceptual sensemaking with real-time labs. Overall, the present study demonstrates that, to understand the complexity of teacher support in CSCL settings, it is important to understand how this type of support intersects with the support provided by digital resources, peer collaboration, and applied instructional design.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

28

29

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-018-9290-1

Students' engagement with real-time graphs in CSCL settings: scrutinizing the role of teacher support

Line Ingulfsen¹ · Anniken Furberg¹ · Torunn Aanesland Strømme¹

Received: 13 June 2018 / Accepted: 14 November 2018 © International Society of the Learning Sciences, Inc. 2018

Abstract

This paper reports on a study of teacher support in experimental computer-supported collab-12orative learning (CSCL) settings where students engage with graphs in real-time labs within 13 the context of school science. Real-time labs are digital devices and software connected to 14student-controlled sensors or probes that can measure and visualize data graphically. The 15empirical setting was a science project about ocean acidification (OA) where lower secondary 16 school students conducted measurements of the pH value of water with increased concentra-17tions of CO2. The analytical focus is on student-teacher interaction during group-work 18 activities where the students carried out, reviewed and reported on the real-time lab experi-19ment. The analyses show that students needed additional support from the teacher in 20interpreting the real-time graphs and in making connections between the graphic representa-21tion, the practical undertakings of the experiment and the underlying scientific phenomena. 22Most importantly, the study demonstrates the complexity of teacher support in CSCL settings 23and how this type of support intersects with the support provided by digital resources, peer 24collaboration and applied instructional design. 25

KeywordsTeacher support · Computer-supported collaborative experiments · Real-time labs ·26Graphical representations · Interaction analysis · Sociocultural perspective27

Introduction

In recent decades, several studies have provided important insight into students' learning 30 processes in computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL). This research has highlighted 31 several productive aspects of CSCL settings as means for enhancing students' conceptual 32 learning, epistemic skills, and collaboration skills. However, studies have also shown that 33 students face a range of conceptual, social, and emotional challenges in computer-supported 34

Line Ingulfsen line.ingulfsen@ils.uio.no

¹ Department of Teacher Education and School Research, University of Oslo, P.O. Box 1099 Blindern, N-0317 Oslo, Norway

collaborative learning, especially when working in small-group settings (Järvelä et al. 2016). 35 These findings suggest that, even in well-designed CSCL settings, "gaps" between the 36 technology design, peer collaboration, and the surrounding instructional design often occur. 37 Acknowledging that the teacher holds an important role in bridging these types of gaps, several 38 studies within the field of CSCL have emphasized the significance of additional support 39 provided by teachers (Ludvigsen 2016). However, most CSCL studies that have directed 40attention towards the role of the teacher have focused on how various forms of digital tools can 41 support teachers' orchestration of learning activities (Dillenbourg 2013; Erkens et al. 2016; 42Schwarz et al. 2018). Few studies have analysed teacher support in the form of student-teacher 43interaction (Furberg 2016). By taking a holistic and multi-layered approach, this paper aims at 44 contributing to the emerging body of literature focusing on the role of support provided by 45teachers in naturalistic CSCL settings (Ludvigsen and Arnseth 2017; White 2018). Following 46 previous studies with a sociocultural approach to teacher support in CSCL settings (c.f. 47Furberg 2016; Strømme and Furberg 2015), the present study explores the significance of 48 teacher support and how it intersects with the digital resources in use, peer collaboration and 49the surrounding instructional design. 50

Our empirical point of departure is a CSCL setting involving students' engagement with 51digital learning devices often referred to as "real-time labs". Typically, real-time labs embed 52software and measuring devices, such as probes or sensors, to enable collection and graphical 53visualization of data from science experiments. The intention behind a real-time lab is to assist 54students in performing investigations and practical work similar to how scientists conduct 55experiments, as well as to support students in using graphical representations to interpret and 56communicate results from their experiments (Linn and Eylon 2011; Nakhleh 1994; van 57Joolingen et al. 2007). Because commonly used real-time labs are not designed as CSCL 58environments, support in the form of task design, peer collaboration, and teacher support must 59be facilitated through the instructional design. For that reason, a learning activity involving 60 students' collaborative engagement with real-time labs forms an interesting analytical starting 61point for exploring the significance of support provided by teachers. 62

The empirical setting for this study was a science project about OA where lower secondary 63 school students (aged 14–15 years) and their teacher performed an experiment involving a 64sensor-based real-time lab measuring the pH value of water with increasing concentrations of 65 CO_2 . The analytical focus is on student-teacher interactions taking place as the teacher was 66 making rounds (Greiffenhagen 2012) during group-work activities where the students carried 67 out the real-time lab experiment, as well as when students processed and reported on their 68 experiment results. The analytical attention is directed at student-teacher interactions taking 69 place in settings where students summoned the teacher. We attend to these interactions because 70they display both the challenges faced by students and how the teacher responds to these 71challenges (Furberg 2016). 72

We argue for the value of adding a dialogic approach when examining student-teacher 73interaction (Linell 2009; Mercer 2004; Säljö 2010). The applied analytical procedure is interac-74tion analysis involving a sequential analysis of the talk and interaction between interlocutors 75(Furberg 2016; Jordan and Henderson 1995). Based on microanalyses of student-teacher 76interactions during small-group work, we aim to demonstrate the complexity of facilitating 77 students' development of conceptual understanding in these settings. On a general level, this 78study contributes to our understanding of teacher support in CSCL settings by displaying how 79teacher guidance intersects with support provided by the digital resources, peer collaboration, and 80 the applied instructional design. On an empirical level, the study aims at providing insight into 81

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

AUTHOR'S PROOF

productive and challenging aspects of students' engagement with graphical representations in real-time labs, as well as the support provided by the teacher in this type of CSCL setting.

In the following, we direct our focus on previous studies: Firstly, we present findings from studies 84 focusing on students' engagement with graphical representations and real-time labs. Secondly, we 85 present findings from relevant studies focusing on the role of teacher support in CSCL settings. 86

Previous studies: Students' engagement with graphs and teacher support in CSCL settings

87 88

89

Students' engagement with graphs in computer-supported science learning

Graphic representations are frequently used to display and explore statistical data, measure-90 ments, and calculations and to communicate scientific knowledge within educational settings 91 and in socio-scientific discourses (Roth and McGinn 1997; Tytler et al. 2013). As such, being 92able to interpret, understand, and use graphs in ways specific to a scientific discipline are 93 important aspects of developing scientific literacy (Knain 2015; Lemke 1998). Graphs are also 94 important tools in inquiry-based activities where students explore trends and patterns in data 95collected during their own observations and experiments to learn about various phenomena 96 (Wu and Krajcik 2006). Despite the central role of graphs in science learning, many studies 97 have reported challenging aspects of students' comprehensions of graphs (Leinhardt et al. 981990). For instance, students often struggle to treat graphs as abstract representations, to 99 connect graphs of experiment data to the physical event they represent, and to link graph 100 patterns to the underlying concepts and phenomena (Glazer 2011). 101

The last decades' technological advances have provided digital tools designed to support 102students' graphing practices in science. Several studies have scrutinized how various forms of 103digital tools can support students' graphing skills and their understanding of the conceptual 104issue in focus (Ainsworth 2006; Ares et al. 2009; Mitnik et al. 2009; White and Pea 2011). Of 105particular interest for our research are studies focusing on students' engagement with graphs in 106 real-time labs, which are student-controlled software connected to sensors that measure and 107 visualize data. Many experimental and quasi-experimental studies have demonstrated positive 108effects of engaging with real-time labs on students' graphing skills and conceptual under-109standing of scientific phenomena (Friedler and McFarlane 1997; Linn et al. 1987; Mokros and 110Tinker 1987; Nicolaou et al. 2007). A quasi-experimental study by Mokros and Tinker (1987) 111 involving middle school students' engagement with real-time labs in science experiments 112showed significant gains in the students' graphing skills, which were explained in terms of 113specific features of the real-time lab. Among the features highlighted as supportive of students' 114 graph interpretation skills was the real-time pairing of the practical undertakings of the lab 115experiment and the graphic representation. This finding is supported by a qualitative study 116based on dialog-based interviews conducted by Nemirovsky et al. (1998) investigating primary 117 school students' engagement with real-time labs about motion. Findings were that students 118 developed graphing skills through exploring how the movements of the motion sensor 119materialized in the graph, which gradually enabled the students to predict and create intended 120and specific graph patterns. In an intervention study involving real-time labs in a physics unit 121about heat and temperature, Linn et al. (1987) investigated middle school students' graphing 122skills. Analyses of students' pre- and post-test scores showed significant gains in students' 123conceptions of graphical representations related to heat and temperature. Most interesting, the 124

results also showed gains in students' generic understanding of graphical representations, 125 implying that they were able to apply their graphical skills to other science concepts. 126

Other studies have demonstrated that real-time labs are productive learning resources in 127collaborative learning settings (Kelly and Crawford 1997; Lindwall and Ivarsson 2011). In a 128comparative study conducted by Lindwall and Ivarsson (2011) involving science student 129teachers, two student groups were assigned to reproduce a specific motion graph: one group 130with a real-time lab with motion sensors and the other group with a simulation-based graphing 131tool. Analyses of student interaction showed that students in the real-time graph condition 132explicated and verbalized their conceptual reasoning to a greater extent than students in the 133simulation condition. The differences in the students' reasoning was explained by the features 134of the two graphing tools; specifically, producing graphs in real-time labs required that the 135students explicated the relationship between the actions undertaken with the motion sensor and 136the pattern generated in the graph display, whereas the simulation enabled a trial-and-error 137strategy eliminating the need for explicit reasoning. Kelly and Crawford (1997) investigated 138 secondary school students' collaborative engagement with real-time labs in a physics course 139and found that the graphs served as a "stand in" for the physical events of the experiments in 140the succeeding activity where the students were to interpret and discuss the results. However, 141 Kelly and Crawford also found differences between groups concerning task performance and 142discussion quality and argued for the significance of teacher guidance to support peer 143collaboration and guide students in interpreting the real-time graphs. 144

Along with studies demonstrating the benefits of real-time labs in supporting students' 145graphing practices, researchers have also reported challenging aspects. One challenge concerns 146students' difficulty with interpreting trends in real-time graphs (Lindwall and Lymer 2008; Testa 147et al. 2002). In an interview study, Testa et al. (2002) investigated students' interpretation of real-148time graphs and found that the high level of detail typical of real-time graphs was challenging for 149students and that many students perceived irregular curves as an indicator of poor graph quality or 150measurement errors. Based on analyses of physics student teachers' interactions during a real-151time lab about motion, Lindwall and Lymer (2008) showed that many students experienced 152difficulties in separating the relevant pattern from "noise" in the graph display, which made it 153challenging to identify the graph patterns as representations of functional relationships. Another 154challenge arises from the real-time labs' automatic generation of graphs, which blackboxes 155central operations in graph production (e.g., plotting, organizing data and choosing scale) that 156157are significant aspects of both graphing practices and students' understanding of graphs (Glazer 2011; Roth 1996). In an experimental study comparing secondary biology students' ability to 158construct and interpret line graphs after working in either a real-time lab condition or a traditional 159condition, Adams and Shrum (1990) found that students in the traditional condition outperformed 160students in the experimental group on graph construction skills. 161

The challenging aspects of students' learning with real-time labs documented in prior studies 162 demonstrate the need for teacher support. In naturalistic classroom settings where students engage 163 with real-time labs, teachers will usually be present, providing additional guidance in the 164 intersection of digital resources, peer collaboration, and applied instructional design. In the 165 following, we turn our attention to findings from previous studies focusing on teacher support. 166

Research on teacher support in computer-supported science learning

167

Few studies have explicitly scrutinized teacher support in real-time lab settings; therefore, we 168 widen our scope to include studies focusing on the role of teacher support in CSCL settings in 169

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

science more generally. The aforementioned study by Lindwall and Lymer (2008) explored 170student-teacher interaction during dyad work and found that the teacher provided crucial 171support in directing the students' attention towards specific features of the graph, which aided 172students in distinguishing relevant features and in coming to see the graph pattern as a linear 173relationship. Additionally, Kelly and Crawford (1997) explored the role of teacher support 174during an instance where one group of students struggled with identifying an acceleration 175curve during a real-time lab. The analyses showed that the teacher played an important role in 176guiding the students in making sense of the graphs. The teacher prompted, confirmed, and 177elaborated students' interpretations and explanations, thereby supporting students in reading 178the line graphs as representations and helping students link the physical events and the 179corresponding motion concepts. 180

Widening the scope of the review to include studies on teacher support in experimental 181 CSCL settings involving representational forms other than graphs, several studies have shown 182the importance of procedural and conceptual support provided during whole-class sessions and 183 during group work. Several studies have demonstrated the significance of procedural support, 184 or helping students regulate their work processes, in students' exploratory work in CSCL 185settings (Strømme and Furberg 2015; Urhahne et al. 2010). In the context of inquiry-based 186 CSCL in physics, Mäkitalo-Siegl et al. (2011) conducted an experimental study examining the 187 influence of support in whole-class settings. Findings were that students receiving procedural 188 instructions at the beginning of each inquiry phase, support during group work and evaluations 189in plenary sessions sought less help during group-work activities but showed higher learning 190gains than students assigned to the control group. In a study involving 12 middle school 191classrooms, Warwick et al. (2013) investigated student-teacher interaction taking place within 192various forms of CSCL settings in science where the digital resources was designed by the 193teacher. Analyses of instructional trajectories demonstrated the importance of procedurally 194oriented instructions provided by the teacher, both in the form of direct instructions given 195during whole class sessions prior to group-work activities and in the form of "indirect 196scaffolds" displayed on the board during group work, such as instructions, hints, and reminders 197of spoken instruction. 198

Other studies have demonstrated the significance of teacher support aimed at scaffolding 199students' conceptual understanding in experimental CSCL settings (Furberg 2016; Gillen et al. 2002008; Jornet and Roth 2015). In a study on secondary school students' engagement of energy 201 transformation conducted by Jornet and Roth (2015), analyses of student-teacher interaction 202showed that teacher-prompted questions in whole-class sessions succeeding a group-based 203experimental setting supported the students' sensemaking of their experiences from the 204practical experiments, providing important resources in subsequent group-work activities. 205Based on data from a similar context, Arnseth and Krange (2016) analysed student-teacher 206interaction in group-work settings and showed that important aspects of teacher support 207 included prompting students to explain their reasoning based on the representations and 208linking the students' use of spontaneous terms to more scientific terms and concepts when 209attempting to explain the phenomena observed. Other studies have demonstrated the 210significance of conceptual teacher support in CSCL settings where students engage with 211inquiry learning and virtual labs. Strømme and Furberg (2015) investigated the role of teacher 212support in an inquiry project about heat loss where students' inquiry process was guided by 213various types of digital representations, including a simulation. Findings were that the teacher 214provided significant support by helping students to link the simulation and its underlying 215concepts. Furberg's (2016) study produced similar findings on the role of teacher support in a 216 setting where secondary school students engaged with a virtual lab aimed at supporting their217processing of a physical lab experiment. Analyses of student-teacher interactions during group218activities displayed that teacher support was crucial for the students to link the practical219procedures of the lab experiment, the reflection tasks and the experiment's underlying220scientific principles.221

The review of relevant previous studies offers a valuable background for understanding 222 productive and challenging aspects of students' collaborative engagement with graphs in real-223time labs and the significance of procedural and conceptual support from a teacher in CSCL 224settings. Nevertheless, the review also reveals that few studies have directed analytical 225attention to teacher support in the context of real-time lab work. Acknowledging the relevance 226of these studies and the gaps in the literature, this study aims to contribute to this body of 227 research by examining the complexity of teacher support in a particular CSCL setting 228229involving real-time labs and graphical representations and how this support intersects with digital resources, peer collaboration and applied instructional design. 230

The present study – Research questions

Based on the reported findings about the challenges experienced by students while working 232with graphic representations in real-time labs and our interest in exploring the significance of 233support provided by a teacher in these types of CSCL settings, we direct our analytical 234attention towards student-teacher interaction taking place during two group-work activities 235in which students conducted and reviewed the results from their real-time lab experiments 236before they processed and reported on their findings. Firstly, analyses of student-teacher 237 interactions taking place in these types of settings will provide insight into the challenges 238students faced and how the teacher responded. Secondly, analysing these types of interactions 239over time and across the two different activities will enable us to explore the specific 240possibilities and challenges occurring in the different phases of the real-time lab experiment. 241To both grasp the student and teacher perspective of student-teacher interactions and to 242understand the significance of teacher support, we have formulated the following guiding 243research questions: 244

RQ1: How do the students and the teacher make sense of the real-time lab experiment245and its associated graphical representations, and what challenges are displayed in the246student-teacher interactions?247RQ2: How is teacher support enacted during the student-teacher interactions?248

Before providing a discussion of methodological issues, we will briefly account for the249theoretical premises underlying our understanding of digital resources and graphical represen-250tations, as well as our conceptual understanding of support provided by teachers.251

Approaching teacher support from a sociocultural perspective 252

Sociocultural perspectives conceptualize learning as the appropriation of knowledge and skills 253 through the adoption of cultural tools (Vygotsky 1978; Wertsch 1998). Teaching and learning 254 are regarded as dialogic and dynamic processes of meaningful tool use taking place in the 255

231

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

social interaction between interlocutors (Linell 1998, 2009). Among the cultural tools that can 256257serve as mediational means in social interaction, language is assigned a special role, providing a "social mode of thinking" (Mercer and Littleton 2007; Wells 1999). Teaching and learning 258are also highly dependent on the use of material tools or artifacts where knowledge and social 259practices are inscribed and stored (Säljö 2010). These tools serve as important carriers of 260meaning potentials, developed and shaped over time through discursive practices (Ivarsson 261et al. 2009). In the context of schooling, instructional tools (e.g., textbooks, digital learning 262environments, worksheets, lab guidelines) are developed to support students' appropriation of 263specific subject content, methods and procedures. Other commonly used tools are disciplinary 264tools (e.g., technical equipment, inquiry procedures, scientific concepts, and representations) 265developed in the practices of particular subject domains. While both instructional and disci-266plinary tools serve as important resources in students' learning, their meaning potentials in 267relation to goal-directed activities are not readily available to students (Roth and McGinn 2681998; Säljö and Bergqvist 1997). In particular, disciplinary tools need to be re-contextualized 269to support student learning processes in institutional settings like school science (Bezemer and 270Kress 2008; Roth and Tobin 1997). 271

In naturalistic CSCL settings, the teacher is responsible for selecting resources, designing 272learning activities and providing support that guides students' engagement in relation to specific 273purposes during classroom activities (Mortimer and Scott 2003; Wells 1999). Thus, the teacher 274holds an important position as an "expert" in the sense that he masters the tools and knows the 275purposes for which they are used. Vygotsky's (1978, 1986) notion of the "Zone of Proximal 276Development" (ZPD) provides a conceptualization of the window in which support of various 277kinds is needed and productive in students' learning processes. Vygotsky (1978) defined the ZPD 278as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem 279solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under 280adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). Following Wells (1999), we 281approach ZPD as being "created in interaction between the students and the co-participants in an 282activity, including the available tools and the selected practices" (p. 318). A CSCL perspective on 283ZPD stresses the value of both social resources in the form of collaboration between peers and 284technological resources in the form of designed digital artefacts as support measures that can lead 285students beyond what they can do alone (Pea 2004). Thus, the "limits" to what students can 286accomplish as individuals or as collaborating groups are constituted by the availability of social 287and material resources in the specific learning setting, but also the nature and quality of 288interactions. However, because students bring different experiences to the setting, their goals 289and orientations when engaging with social and technological resources might differ from those 290intended by the teacher or the instructional design (Furberg et al. 2013). Therefore, an important 291task of the teacher involves responding to students' concerns and orientations as these emerge in 292situ in the course of the goal-directed activities. 293

In sum, a sociocultural perspective provides a lens through which we can approach teacher 294support in CSCL settings as a situated and dialogic endeavour, constituted in the interaction 295between participants, purposes and available tools. Seen from this perspective, instances of 296tensions and breakdowns in students' collaborative sensemaking might provide valuable 297access points to scrutinize teacher support as it is initiated and enacted at the intersection of 298available support structures. Conceptualizing teaching and learning as mediated processes in 299goal-directed activities, this perspective implies that the teacher's position as expert and 300 provider of institutional practices must be acknowledged in order to understand the role of 301 teacher support in naturalistic CSCL settings. 302

A UmbH422Rb \$200 Pro 06/12018

Ingulfsen L. et al.

303

304

Research design

Participants and educational setting

The data were produced during a science project about climate change, which took place in 305 eight school lessons over the course of three weeks in October 2016. The participants were one 306 class of 25 lower secondary school students, aged 14 to 15 years, and their science teacher. The 307 project comprised several subunits covering topics like the carbon cycle, OA, sea level rise, 308 and the greenhouse effect. The activities within each subunit were designed around various 309forms of textual and visual digital representations, such as diagrams, models, simulations, and 310graphs. Throughout the project, students documented their work in online workbooks using 311 the application Padlet.¹ The empirical basis for this study was a three-lesson unit about OA 312where the students performed and reported on a physical experiment. The science teacher 313team, which included the teacher in focus here, decided to organize this unit around the use of 314 real-time labs, as the school had just bought digital pH sensors for their PASCO labs.² In this 315unit, students used the sensors with an application called SPARKvue³ to investigate the effects 316 of CO₂ on pH levels of water. The students used SPARKvue as a real-time graphing tool to 317 measure the changes in the pH level of water under two conditions. First, they measured the 318changing pH level in a glass of water while breathing through a straw placed in the water to 319infuse CO₂ (see Fig. 1). In a second glass, they performed a control measurement by 320measuring the pH of plain tap-water for 20 seconds. The intention behind the experiment 321 was to simulate the process of OA due to the rising level of CO_2 in the atmosphere, as well as 322 using the experiment as a starting point for discussing the environmental consequences of OA. 323

SPARKvue is a sensor-based data logging tool consisting of lab software for iPads and 324 other platforms. SPARKvue allows users to collect, analyse and visualize different kinds of 325scientific data through wireless sensors, in this case, a pH sensor. The software offers several 326 options for visualizing measurements. The students used a simple display of a graph showing 327 pH as a function of time. The monitor displayed a graph of the pH value measured and the pH 328 value as a decimal number next to the graph, which allowed students to monitor changes in 329 real time. The students used the application's default mode, which had the graphical scale set 330 to 0 to 100 seconds and pH from 0 to 13.5. The measurements were controlled (started and 331stopped) on a control panel in the graph display. 332

Table 1 provides an overview of the activities in the OA unit. The teacher began with a brief 333 introduction to OA that connected increased concentrations of CO_2 in the atmosphere to the 334 process of OA. The teacher also demonstrated the effects of OA on calcifying organisms. 335 Submerging two eggs into two glasses containing water and vinegar, the teacher explained that 336 the egg in vinegar represented a calcifying organism and that they were going to review it the next 337 day. As homework, the teacher instructed the students to prepare themselves for the upcoming 338 experiment by watching a teacher-produced instructional video showing how to use SPARKvue. 339The second lesson, taking place the next day, started with the students and the teacher examining 340the eggs and hypothesizing about what had happened to the egg in vinegar. The teacher then 341 demonstrated how to use the application by measuring the pH value in the glass containing the 342 egg and vinegar before showing students how to read the measured pH value from the graph 343

¹ https://padlet.com/

² https://www.pasco.com/

³ https://www.pasco.com/sparkvue/

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning



Fig. 1 Students preparing to measure and monitor the pH levels of water infused with CO2

display. Following this explanation, the teacher gave a short presentation of the pH scale before 344 345 going through the practical instructions on how to perform the experiment. Before starting the experiment, the teacher distributed a handout with instructions and asked students to read them 346 carefully as well. The experiment was succeeded by four follow-up activities designed to help the 347 students attend to the scientific processes underlying the experiment and to make connections 348 between representations and real-world phenomena. Three of the follow-up activities concerned 349documenting and processing the results from the experiment. The fourth and most time-350consuming follow-up activity took place in Lesson 3 where the student groups were to discuss 351and provide written answers to four reflection tasks (see Fig. 5) about the undertaken experiment 352and how the experiment was linked to the real-world phenomenon of OA. 353

The science project that contained the OA unit took place in the context of a larger 354 intervention conducted as part of the research project Representations and Participation in 355 School Science (REDE), where researchers (including the authors of this paper) and two 356 science teachers (one of which is in focus here) collaborated on developing instructional units. 357 However, the science teacher team, including the teacher in focus here, designed the OA unit 358 as a first trial of the use of pH sensors with SPARKvue labs. In planning sessions, the 359

Lesson #	Activities	Time	Organization
1	Introduction to unit and setting up egg experiment	5 minutes	Whole class
2	Reviewing and discussing results from egg experiment Teacher demonstration of how to use SPARKvue by measuring the pH value of the vinegar glass and interpreting the results	7 minutes 7 minutes	Whole class
	Short introduction to pH and the pH scale	2 minutes	
	Instructions on materials and procedures	4 minutes	
	Conducting experiment	15 minutes	Group work
	Reviewing results	5 minutes	*
	Reviewing results of two groups	7 minutes	Whole class
	Discussing consequences of OA	3 minutes	Group work
	Reporting on pH experiment by answering questions	10 minutes	*
3	Recapping and contextualizing experiments by working with reflection tasks	20 minutes	Dyad work
	Comparing and re-writing answers	10 minutes	Group work

t1.1 **Table 1** Overview of activities and their duration in the unit

researchers provided feedback on the design of the unit, but the teacher did not receive any 360 specific instructions regarding his role as a teacher in this unit, and he was fully responsible for 361 implementing the instructional design without interference from the observing researchers. 362

Data and analytical procedures

In this study, the main data material consisted of 95 minutes of transcribed video recordings of 364all student-teacher interactions during the OA unit. Ethnographically inspired observation 365 notes from classroom observations, video-recordings of student-student interactions, tran-366 scripts from interviews, teacher-prepared instructional resources, and student-produced mate-367 rials (photocopies or screengrabs) provided supplementary contextual data for the analyses of 368 the participants' interactions (Derry et al. 2010). The video data was collected by the use of 369 one hand-held video camera recording all student-teacher interactions during whole-class and 370 group-work activities, as well as three video cameras capturing interactions at the group level. 371 Data from the group cameras complemented data from the hand-held camera by providing 372additional camera angles and sound sources. 373

During the two group-work activities related to the real-time lab experiment, a total of 49 374instances of student-teacher interactions took place while the teacher was making rounds in 375the classroom. In his encounters with the student groups, the teacher either responded to 376 questions or intervened by checking on the students' progression. Of these interactions, 22 377 took place during the activity where the students carried out the experiment, while 27 instances 378 took place in the phase where the students processed and reported on their findings the next 379day. The length of the student-teacher interactional sequences ranged from a few seconds to 3 380 minutes. We conducted the analyses of the student-teacher interactions in two steps. The initial 381 analysis involved an examination of all 49 student-teacher interactions, which made it possible 382 to identify general patterns or, in this case, the most frequently addressed challenges and issues 383 addressed by the students and the teacher. To explore and understand these challenges and 384issues, as well as how the teacher addressed them, we selected three excerpts of student-385 teacher interaction for detailed interactional analysis, which constitutes the second step in the 386 analysis. Two excerpts were from interactions that occurred during the activity where students 387 carried out and reviewed the results from the pH experiment (Lesson 2): Excerpt 1 is from the 388 initial part of the experimental setting, and Excerpt 2 is from the last part of the experiment 389 setting. Excerpt 3 is from the setting where the students discussed the results from the 390 experiment in the context of real-world issues (Lesson 3). 391

We selected the analysed student-teacher excerpts based on four criteria. Firstly, in line 392 with our theoretical perspectives, we selected the excerpts to serve as empirical manifestations 393 of the phenomena under scrutiny. Secondly, in accordance with our research questions, the 394selected sequences involved student-teacher interactions where the interlocutors focused on 395 issues, challenges or concerns related to conceptual issues, experimental procedures, or 396 understanding the graphic representations. A third criterion, which related to the internal 397 validity of the study, was that the issues and challenges addressed in the selected excerpts 398 should reflect the most frequent issues and challenges during the different phases of the 399 targeted activity. The fourth criterion concerned interactional transparency in the sense that 400the interlocutors' verbal and physical contributions were characterized by a certain degree of 401explicitness (Linell 2009; Mercer 2004). Based on these criteria, the selected settings display 402typical interactional patterns of student-teacher interactions taking place during the group-403work activities within this empirical setting. 404

363

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

AUTHOR'S PROOF

The applied analytical procedure is interaction analysis involving sequential analysis of the 405 talk and interaction between interlocutors also including the artefacts in focus (i.e., graphical 406 representations or other representations; Jordan and Henderson 1995; Linell 2009). A sequential 407analysis implies that each utterance in a selected excerpt is considered in relation to the previous 408utterance in the ongoing interaction. As a result, the focus is not on the meaning of single 409utterances, but on how meaning is created within the exchange of utterances. To make sense of 410 how the students and the teacher addressed and used digital and material artefacts, our analysis 411 involved attending not only to discourse, but also to non-verbal modes and the conjunction of 412 modes in interaction. In addition to the detailed examination of the interaction sequences, we used 413ethnographic information about the institutional setting as a background resource for understand-414 ing what was going on. This procedural guideline for analysis ensures that the participants' 415concerns and their actual activities-not only the researchers' intentions and predefined 416 interests—are scrutinized. By analytically scrutinizing student-teacher interactions taking place 417during the lab activities, we can provide insight into challenges encountered when students 418 collaboratively produced and interpreted graphs representing a scientific phenomenon as well as 419provide insight into how the teacher, in response to the challenges encountered, supported 420 students' conceptual sensemaking when working with such representations. 421

We transcribed the video recordings according to an adaptation of Jeffersonian transcription 422 notations (Jefferson 1984). Table 2 in Appendix provides a description of the transcript 423 notations. We have translated the conversations, which took place in Norwegian, into 424 English and given pseudonyms to the teacher and the students appearing in the excerpts. 425 The data sequences and analyses have been presented in data analysis seminars with both national and international colleagues. Critical comments and joint analysis efforts from 427 research colleagues have strengthened the validity of the empirical analysis. 428

Results

The following sections present and analyse three excerpts of student-teacher interaction. The 430excerpts are drawn from the three group activities in the OA unit. Excerpt 1 is from the setting 431where the students conducted the experiment. Excerpt 2 is also from the experimental setting, 432 but at a later stage when the students were reviewing their results. The final excerpt, Excerpt 3, 433 is from the follow-up activity taking place in Lesson 3. In this setting, the students reported on 434their results and discussed the findings in the context of environmental consequences of OA. 435During the group activities, the students worked in groups of four. Each group shared an iPad 436while conducting the experiment and reviewing the results. During group activities, the teacher 437 circulated among the groups. 438

Activity 1: Conducting the experiment and exploring graphs

While the students prepared the experiment equipment and set up the SPARKvue lab, the teacher440assigned one student in each group to read the instructions that the teacher had handed out before441starting the experiment. Figure 2 provides an overview of the experiment instructions.442

According to the instructions, the students were to produce two measurement curves; one 443 representing the experiment measurement and one representing the control measurement. By blowing air into the cup with tap-water, the students infused CO₂ into the water, resulting in a gradual decrease in the water's pH level. Ideally, this should have produced a decreasing curve in 446

429

439

461

- 1. Leave the sensor in water for 15 seconds before you start the measurement.
- Start the measurement. After 20 seconds, one student blows carefully into the water for approximately 15 seconds, using the straw.
- 3. Run the measurement until the pH stabilizes (does not change anymore)
- 4. Run a control measurement with water in which you do not blow CO_2 into it.

Fig. 2 Experiment instructions provided in a handout

the graph display. However, even though the students followed the detailed experiment instruc-447 tions, their first measurement generated what appeared to be a straight line graph. Puzzled by this 448 unexpected result, most groups summoned the teacher for help. This kept the teacher busy during 449 the first part of the experiment, moving from group to group, attending to the encountered 450challenges. The teacher soon realized that the default setting in the SPARKvue setup displayed a 451 much larger scale range in the y-axis than the pH data being represented, which caused the curve to 452appear like a straight line graph, and that zooming in would make the graph appear as a decreasing 453line. Furthermore, the prescribed 15 seconds of blowing into the water did not seem to be sufficient 454 for the CO₂ induction to generate a considerable change in pH, and the teacher instructed the 455students to blow for a longer period, thus producing an additional measurement curve. 456

Excerpt 1 displays the challenges experienced by the students during this first phase of the457experiment and how the teacher, John, addressed these challenges. Like most groups, Serena,458Andy, Cory and Steven summoned the teacher when experiencing that the graph line appeared459flat in the graph display.460

Exc	ernt 1		468
1.	Serena:	John? We can't see (.) a difference ((showing the iPad to the teacher))	466
2.	Teacher:	Uhm you must- Don't give up (.) Just continue blowing ((bending down facing the students at the end of their desks holding the iPad screen towards the students))	473 475
3.	Andy:	((holding the straw)) Should I blow?	478
4.	Teacher:	Yes just blow a little bit more	481
		((The students start another measurement with Andy blowing into the water, but the app seems to be lagging. When no curve appears in the graph while the second measurement is running, the teacher tells the students to stop, replace the water and start over again))	486 488 489
5.	Teacher:	But consider this ((<i>pointing at the screen</i>)) (2) Here you've got the whole pH scale ((<i>pointing up and down along the y-axis</i>))	493 494
6.	Serena:	Yes	496
7.	Teacher:	It might be a good idea to zoom in a bit ((using his fingers to zoom in on the y-axis; see Fig. 3a and b))	500
8.	Cory:	Oh yes	500
9.	Teacher:	Because if we zoom in we can actually see that something has happened	506
10.	Serena:	Yes	513
11.	Teacher:	It's not completely straight ((<i>indicating the curve</i>)) (2.0)	516
12.	Serena:	[Right] ((looking at the curve))	520
13.	Teacher:	[And I-] What do we see if we look from there and onwards? ((<i>pointing at the last of the two peaks and slides his finger along the decreasing curve; see</i> Fig. 3c)) What do we see (.) actually? ((<i>using his fingers to zoom further in</i>))	520 527 528
14.	Andy:	It went up? ((referring to the peaks in the curve))	530
15.	Teacher:	If we look from there- ((<i>pointing from the last peak and onwards</i>)) It is kind of going down (.) Maybe these are your inhalations? ((<i>Looking from Andy to the screen while pointing at the last peak, and demonstrates inhaling</i>))	536 537 538
16.	Andy:	Oh yes	540
17.	Teacher:	And then you have started blowing again ((<i>pointing from the last peak and along the decreasing curve</i>)) (2) So what really happens when you start to add CO ₂ ? ((<i>looking at all the students</i>))	546 547
18.	Cory:	It rises again?	550
19.	Serena:	No it decreases	555
20.	Teacher:	((nods at Serena)) Yes when you start to blow. So-	555

561

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

21.	Andy:	Oh yes ((mumbling inaudible))
22.	Teacher:	((looking at Andy)) So if we give it some more time-
23.	Serena:	Oh there's the green one ((pointing at the iPad, where the second measurement curve has finally
		turned up in the graph display))
24.	Teacher:	There it is (.) Wow perfect (2) ((scrolling down to make the new curve visible)) Now you can go
		ahead and take a look at that ((<i>leaves the group</i>))

In the opening of Excerpt 1, Serena summons the teacher and tells him that they are not able 583to see a change in the graph as they blow. The teacher responds by demonstrating the zooming 584function on the touchscreen, which causes the apparently straight-line graph to fold out as a 585slightly decreasing curve with two small, yet visible, peaks (lines 1–4). Further, the excerpt 586displays some challenges the students experience when it comes to *interpreting and making* 587sense of the graph. In line 13, the teacher prompts the students to explain what they see and 588tries to orient the students' attention towards the slight decrease in the graph by leading his 589index finger from the last peak along the decreasing line (see Fig. 1c). Andy's response, "It 590went up" (line 14), signifies that his focus is on the peak instead of attending to the decreasing 591feature outlined by the teacher. Trying to reorient the students' attention, the teacher repeats his 592finger gesture along with providing a description of the decreasing pattern (line 15). He then 593turns the attention towards the peak (line 15) and suggests that the peak might represent 594Andy's inhalations. Although Andy confirms the teacher's interpretation of the peaks (line 16), 595the teacher prompts the students for an explanation, this time by asking, "So what really 596happens when you start to add CO₂?" (line 17). Cory's and Serena's divergent replies indicate 597that they focus on different graph features: Cory on the peak (line 18) and Serena on the 598decrease (line 19). By looking at Serena and nodding, the teacher once more tries to draw the 599students' attention towards what he finds the most salient and relevant graph feature: the 600 decline (line 20). As the second measurement curve finally appears in the graph and the 601 teacher leaves the group, the students are left with interpretive resources to map between curve 602 features and measurement actions (lines 22-24). 603

The analysis of the interaction in Excerpt 1 shows some interesting aspects of how the 604students and the teacher made sense of the graph and its features. Firstly, the analysis displays 605challenges related to generic features in graphing; in this case, adjusting the scale on the y-axis 606 to a proper range to disclose features of the graph. Secondly, the analysis displays that the 607 teacher and the students initially did not attend to the same graph features; the teacher was 608 clearly attending to the decrease, while the students seemed to be attending to the peaks. This 609 suggests that seeing the curve pattern as a decreasing line is not a straightforward action, but 610rather a matter of perspective. Thirdly, the analysis displays the challenge and significance of 611 linking the particular features of the graph, its peaks and decline, to the actions undertaken in 612 the experiment. 613



Fig. 3 a The graph before zooming in; b the rescaled graph; c the teacher pointing at the peak, with the arrow indicating the direction of the subsequent finger movement

Shifting the analytical perspective to how the teacher responded to the challenges encoun-614 tered, the analysis shows that he provided support in form of *eliciting the students' under*-615standing of the graph. As can be seen in the second half of Excerpt 1, he enacted this support 616 617 by directing the students' attention towards salient features and prompting for student accounts of these. He used his gaze, pointing, and hand movements to indicate where the students 618 should focus their attention, and these cues served as crucial resources when posing questions 619 and elaborating on the students' responses. The teacher also provided important support in the 620 form of modelling how to link the graph features and practical undertakings of the experi-621 ment, both by prompting and providing accounts of what was done during the measurement to 622 produce the specific shapes in the curve. 623

Summing up, the analysed student-teacher interaction in Excerpt 1 illustrates typical 624 challenges encountered in the initial phase of conducting the experiment. One aspect was 625 the complex and dynamic nature of the graphing tool and the crucial role of scaling functions 626 when exploring the graphs. A second aspect concerned making sense of the graph and the 627 628 significance of establishing a shared perspective when attending to curve patterns. The analysis shows how the students and the teacher negotiated their orientations and how students needed 629 a considerable amount of teacher support before they could attend to what the teacher 630 emphasized to be the most important features. Furthermore, the analysis shows how the 631 teacher balanced an eliciting strategy with providing relevant interpretations when supporting 632 students in mapping between the curve features and the practical undertakings of the exper-633 iment. However, as we will see in the next excerpt, other conceptual challenges emerged once 634 the experiment activity progressed into conducting comparative measurements and making 635 sense of the final graphs. 636

Activity 2: Reviewing the results and comparing graph curves

Towards the end of Lesson 2, most groups had successfully conducted their measurements and 638 were engaged in reviewing their final results. According to the original instructions, the 639 students should have generated two measurement curves: one representing the experiment 640 measurement and one representing the control measurement. In this phase, the students were to 641 interpret the patterns displayed in their final graphs. To read the graph pattern as a difference 642 between the experiment and the control measurement, the students had to construe the first 643 measurement curve as decreasing and the control measurement curve as a flat line. However, 644 due to the technical problems and the fact that the length of the measurements had to be 645 adjusted, several groups ended up with three measurement curves in their final graph. As one 646 can expect, marginal differences with regard to the condition of each measurement resulted in 647 some inconsistencies that were also visible in the graph. For instance, students sometimes 648 performed the measurements without replacing the water in the experiment glass or without 649 rinsing the probe before submerging it into the control glass. As a consequence, some students 650ended up with control curves that did not appear as a flat line or with three measurement 651curves, none of which overlapped. These issues gave rise to some challenges when interpreting 652the results. 653

The following excerpt illustrates how the teacher and students attended to these issues654in student-teacher interaction during this phase. The students were to compare the655measurement curves they produced and report their conclusions and findings. We enter656the interaction in Excerpt 2 where the teacher is summoned by the students Nina, Marcus,657Rachel, and Thomas.658

637

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

Exc	erpt 2		6ð
1.	Teacher:	((leaning over, looking at the iPad; see Fig. 4.)) Well look at this!	66
2.	Nina:	Uhm (.) We don't really get this because the green one is when we just put it in the water	66
3.	Teacher:	Yes that one is quite straight	67
4.	Nina:	The red one ((<i>referring to the middle line in</i> Fig. 4b)) is when I was blowing (.) And I blew much harder than Thomas	67 68
5.	Teacher:	Uhum (.) Yes ((leaning closer, resting his elbows on the desk))	68
6.	Nina:	And the red one ((referring to the upper line in Fig. 4b)) was when Thomas was blowing	68
7.	Marcus:	Or longer	69
8.	Nina:	Longer too	69
9.	Teacher:	Yes but this is- ((<i>scrolling slowly towards the end of the measurements</i>)) Wow this looks really good (3)	69 70
10.	Marcus:	But why did the green one ((referring to the lower line in Fig. 4b)) change?	70
11.	Nina:	Yes we were wondering about that too	70
12.	Teacher:	Yes what could've have happened? (2) ((<i>looking from the iPad, pointing at it with his hand, to Marcus</i>)) What could've happened?	71 71
13.	Marcus:	Moved it?	71
14.	Teacher:	Yes it might just be that you have moved it- Made it go slightly above the water- ((<i>gesturing moving the sensor above the water surface</i>)) Slightly above the water ((<i>looking at the students</i>)) That might be the cause (.) of such small changes ((<i>scrolling in the graph</i>)) but I think that in total it looks quite straight (.) But I think it is- The graphs here- ((<i>points at the first and second measurement curves, looks at Nina and Rachel</i>)) What does this tell us?	72 72 72 72 72 72
15.	Marcus:	That it becomes more acidic	73
16:	Thomas:	First up a bit up and then it becomes more acidic	73
17.	Nina:	[I was blowing harder]	73
18.	Teacher:	[Yes and my guess is that] I guess that you started blowing here ((points at the graph at 20 seconds))	74
19.	Nina:	Oh (.) No I started blowing here ((scrolls left))	74
20.	Teacher:	Yeah maybe you took a breath	74
21.	Nina:	Yes I did (.) I had to breathe a little bit ((laughs))	75
22.	Teacher:	Yes that might be related to that jump (2) Still it is quite- When we zoom in enough there ((<i>pointing up and down the y-axis</i>)) I think there is a considerable change here	75 75
			- 7H

Excerpt 2 shows that students were challenged in attending to the relevant differences in the 763 graph patterns. In the opening of the excerpt, the students start to explicate the differences 764between the curves in terms of the practical undertakings of the lab experiment, emphasizing 765 how Nina was blowing longer or harder than Marcus (lines 2, 4, and 6-8). The teacher 766 confirms the students' remarks but does not pursue or elaborate on these issues. Instead, he 767 concludes that their result "looks really good" (line 9). Marcus then attends to the change 768 within the control measurement curve (lower curve in Fig. 4b) and asks for an account of this 769 (line 10). The teacher and the students settle on the explanation that holding the sensor above 770 water is a probable cause (lines 12-14) before the teacher restates that the control curve "looks" 771quite straight" and invokes the first and second measurement curves as a contrast (line 14). The 772 interaction in the first part of the excerpt indicates differences between the participants' 773 orientation: The students' attention seems oriented towards irregularities in the control mea-774 surement curve and the differences between the first and second measurement curves. The 775 teacher, conversely, emphasizes the overall trends of the curves and strives to foreground the 776 differences between the control measurement curve and the other two curves. 777

Another challenge displayed in Excerpt 2 involves *making sense of what the graphs represent.* 778 When being prompted to explain what the graph demonstrates, both Marcus and Thomas 779 immediately suggest that "it becomes more acidic" (lines 15–16). Nina, however, does not attend 780 to the teacher's prompt and continues focusing on curve patterns and practical undertakings by 781 stating "I was blowing harder" (line 17). Thus, Nina does not display her understanding of what 782 the graph represents scientifically. Although the teacher's response in line 18 can be seen as a 783 confirmation of all the students' suggestions, he chooses to follow up on Nina's account about the 784

A Urnib 11412 Rd \$290 Prot# 1 16/12018



Fig. 4 a Image displaying the final result and b the final graph. Upper line: first measurement; middle line: second measurement; lower line: control measurement

relation between the graph and the practical undertakings of the experiment, rather than the 785 underlying scientific principles. The students' eagerness to display their understandings of the 786 relation between curve patterns and practical undertakings during the experiment can be seen in 787 relation to the support provided by the teacher in the setting in Excerpt 1, where he modelled the 788 strategy of mapping between graph features and practical undertakings as a means to interpret the 789graph. However, although the interaction in Excerpt 2 demonstrates students' uptake of this 790 particular strategy, it also displays the limits to which the mapping strategy was productive, in the 791sense that it also pushed students' attention towards irregularities which are difficult to explain 792 with reference to the practical undertakings of the experiment. 793

Shifting the focus towards how the teacher responded to the students' challenges, the 794excerpt shows how the teacher strove to guide the students in their sensemaking process in 795 several ways. Firstly, he guided the students by trying to orient their attention towards the 796 salient features of the graphs. For instance, he tried to lead the students' attention away from 797 the details of single measurement lines or the differences between the first and second 798measurement towards the overall trends of the curves, thereby signalling which features were 799 salient (lines 3, 14, and 23). Secondly, the teacher provided guidance by trying to enable the 800 students to make sense of what the graph represents. This can be seen in his attempts to prompt 801 the students to account for what the graphs' overall declining tendency might represent (lines 802 10–14). However, as also seen in Excerpt 1, the interaction taking place in Excerpt 2 displays 803 the challenge that most teachers experience in *balancing scientific perspectives and concerns* 804 with the students' intuitive perspectives and concerns. In this setting, the teacher was in the role 805 of being an "expert" in interpreting graphs, and he knew the correct outcome of the experi-806 ment. This implies that he had a clear sense of the graphs' salient features and what they would 807 represent. Nevertheless, to both address the students' intuitive concerns and guide them in a 808 required direction, he also strove to balance the scientific concerns with the students' concerns. 809

Summing up, the analysis of the interaction in Excerpt 2 illustrates the challenges encoun-810 tered in the phase where the students reviewed their experiment results. A central aspect 811 concerned deciding which graph features were salient and attending to the relevant changes. 812 The analysis shows how the students focused on interpreting the graph in terms of the practical 813 undertakings of the experiment; however, the analysis highlights how the teacher balanced 814 support for students' linking between the graph and measurement actions while also orienting 815 their attention towards underlying scientific principles. As a response to the concerns encoun-816 tered during this last phase of the experiment, the teacher decided to organize a recapping 817 activity the following lesson to allow more time to develop a scientific perspective on the pH 818

821

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

AUTHOR'S PROOF

experiment. The final excerpt is from the follow-up activity where the students processed and 819 reported their results from the experiment. 820

Activity 3: Processing and contextualizing the experiment results

The following day, Lesson 3 centred on recapping and contextualizing the results from the pH 822 experiment. In this activity, the students worked in dyads with four questions aimed at 823 facilitating reflections on how to link the experiment to real-world issues such as increasing 824 CO_2 emissions, changes in ocean acidity and potential effects on calcifying organisms. The 825 questions were displayed on the board during the whole activity, next to a picture of the graph 826 that one of the groups had produced (see Fig. 5). The students discussed the four questions and 827 formulated written responses which they would later review and rewrite in the original groups 828 of four in their digital workbooks. 829

While the students worked, the teacher circulated, helped students and monitored the 830 groups' progress. The teacher and students spent the most time on the second question: 831 "What did we simulate? Can we connect what we did yesterday to a real challenge in nature?" 832 (see Fig. 5). The question prompted students to reflect on the relation between the results of the 833 experiment and the real-world phenomenon it was supposed to illustrate, as well as prompting 834 a reflection about OA. However, students found it challenging to provide an account of these 835 connections, not least because the teacher required them to produce a written account, 836 something that demanded a high degree of verbal and scientific accuracy. The interaction in 837 Excerpt 3 illustrates how student-teacher interactions addressed the challenge of making these 838 connections. In the following setting, Steven and Andy have just started their work with the 839 second question when they summon the teacher for guidance. 840

Exe	cerpt 3	
1	Steven:	What did we stimulate?
2	Teacher:	What we simulated?
3	Steven:	Yeah
4	Teacher:	Well that actually means- We did an experiment in the classroom (.) But we did it because we wanted to demonstrate something in nature
5	Steven:	Yes but what did we demonstrate? ((laughing))
6	Teacher:	What do you think the water represents?
7	Students:	The ocean
8	Teacher:	Right (.) And why did we blow into the straw? What was that supposed to illustrate?
9	Steven:	It-
10	Andy:	It is- (.) aciding of water ((referring to the term acidification))
11	Teacher:	Yes that it what it actually is
12	Andy:	Aciding
13	Teacher:	And when we blow into the water (.) what are we actually doing? What are we inducing?
14	Students:	CO_2
15	Teacher:	Right ((pointing at Steven))
16	Steven:	And then (.) watch what happens
17	Teacher:	And what has that got to do with the ocean?
18	Andy:	Well if it goes down (.) it might endanger calcifying organisms
19	Teacher:	Yes that's right (.) That is number three there ((pointing at the board, referring to the third question:
		"What are the consequences for calcifying organisms living in the ocean when this happens?")) But of course when the CO ₂ levels in the atmosphere increase- what happens to the CO ₂ level in the ocean?
20	Steven:	That- (.) The pH value goes down
21	Teacher:	Yes and the CO ₂ level in the ocean will also increase (.) Right so when we blow into the straw
		into the water we demonstrate what actually happens when the CO2 levels of the ocean
		increase (.) Are you with me on that?
22	Steven:	((<i>nods</i>)) Uhum

A Umin H42 RD 200 Pro 0 16/1 16/1 16/1

Ingulfsen L. et al.

920



Fig. 5 Reflection tasks for the experiment in Lesson 3 displayed on the board next to a screengrab of the final graph of one of the student groups

Excerpt 3 shows that the students were challenged by the task of *contextualizing the actions* 942undertaken during the experiment. The excerpt begins with Steven's probing for an account of 943 what the experiment demonstrated from the teacher (lines 1-5). The teacher responds by 944 posing a series of cued questions prompting the students to account for the objects and actions 945 that comprised the experiment and what they signified (lines 6, 8, 13, and 17). The succeeding 946 interaction (in lines 7–15 and 17–20) shows that the students successfully make connections 947 between the central components of the experiment and their corresponding real-world phe-948 nomenon when elicited by the teacher's cued questions. The interaction in the second part of 949 the excerpt shows that a more challenging aspect of accounting for the experiment concerns 950relating the experiment to real-world issues. This can be illustrated by the interaction taking 951place from line 17 and onwards, where the teacher requests an account of the link between 952 CO_2 induction, acidification and the ocean, as identified by the students (lines 7, 10, 12, and 95314). Andy's response in line 18 ("if it goes down, it might endanger calcifying organisms") 954suggests that he construes the experiment as a representation of the effects of acidification. 955However, his reply does not target changes in CO₂ level. The teacher's follow-up question 956 (line 19) specifically prompts an account of the relation between CO_2 concentrations in the 957 atmosphere and CO_2 levels in the ocean. Looking at Steven's response (line 20), he again 958 targets the decrease in pH, not an increase in CO₂ level. In line 21, the teacher confirms and 959 elaborates, "And the CO₂ level in the ocean will also increase". The interaction in the last part 960 of the excerpt suggests that the students, although demonstrating that they can link the 961experiment to the real-world issue of OA, are in fact bypassing the crucial aspect of under-962 standing that an increase in CO_2 in the atmosphere will lead to an increase in CO_2 in the ocean. 963 The teacher, conversely, strives to elicit an account of CO₂. Upon realizing that the students are 964not attending to the relationship between CO2 concentration in the atmosphere and in the 965 ocean, he explicates the relationship himself. 966

Looking at how the teacher responded to students' challenges, Excerpt 3 illustrates how the 967 teacher supported the students in contextualizing the experiment. Firstly, the teacher provided 968 support in *eliciting student understandings* of the experiment as representation of real-world 969 phenomena. From line 6 onwards, the teacher prompted the students in linking the central 970 elements of the experiment (tap-water, blowing through the straw and acidification of water) 971with a corresponding real-world phenomenon OA, thereby establishing the central connections 972needed to reason about the significance of the experiment. Secondly, the teacher provided 973 support by trying to guide the students' conceptual reasoning by confirming and elaborating 974 International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

AUTHOR'S PROOF

on student accounts and cueing questions to help students connect and integrate prior 975 contributions. This can be seen in line 17 where the teacher, probing for accounts of the 976 changing CO_2 levels in the ocean, challenged the students to connect the information they had 977 provided in previous utterances. However, the following exchanges display that the guiding 978 questions did not provide enough support for the students to attend to the change in CO_2 979 levels, and the teacher eventually provided the targeted information in line 21. 980

Summing up, the analysis of the interaction in Excerpt 3 shows the challenges encountered 981when students were working to produce written accounts of what was demonstrated by the 982experiment. An important aspect concerned establishing connections between elements in the 983 experiment and the real-world phenomenon of OA. Another challenging aspect was estab-984lishing an understanding of the role of CO₂ in the pH experiment and the relation between CO₂ 985and pH levels. Altogether, the analysis of the three excerpts from the different phases of the 986 students' engagement with the real-time lab and the graphical representations shows the crucial 987 work of the teacher in eliciting students' understanding through probing and cueing questions, 988 guiding students' reasoning, and targeting potential gaps in students' conceptual understand-989ings. In the following section, we will discuss the main empirical findings of the analysis 990 according to findings from previous studies. 991

Discussion

The aim of this study is twofold. On a general level, it aims to provide insight into the role of 993 teacher support in naturalistic CSCL settings and examine how teacher support intersects with 994other available support structures. On an empirical level, the study aims to provide insight into 995 productive and challenging aspects of students' engagement with graphical representations in 996 real-time labs, as well as what kind of support the teacher enacts in this particular type of 997 CSCL setting. In the following sections, we will discuss our central empirical findings in 998 relation to previous research findings, as well as potential implications for teacher support and 999 instructional designs in naturalistic CSCL settings. 1000

In this article, we have chosen student-teacher interaction during small-group activities as 1001 our analytical access point for exploring the role and significance of support provided by a 1002 teacher. The main reason for this choice is that these types of settings provide insight into the 1003 various challenges students might encounter during their work with real-time labs, as well as 1004 how the teacher addresses and deals with these challenges. In a sense, this implies that we 1005intentionally have been "looking for trouble" instead of focusing on all the settings where 1006 everything went smoothly. The focus on "trouble" does not, however, imply that the educa-1007 tional setting in focus here was unproductive or unsuccessful. 1008

Before turning our attention towards teacher support, we discuss our findings in relation to 1009 prior research on students' engagement with real-time labs. Several studies have shown that 1010students' engagement with graphic representations in real-time labs can be productive in the 1011 sense of enhancing students' development of graphing skills and conceptual understanding of 1012 scientific phenomena (Friedler and McFarlane 1997; Linn et al. 1987; Mokros and Tinker 1013 1987; Nicolaou et al. 2007), as well as supporting students' shared reasoning (Kelly and 1014 Crawford 1997; Lindwall and Ivarsson 2011; Nemirovsky et al. 1998). Despite these prom-1015ising findings, studies have also documented more challenging aspects of students' engage-1016 ment with graphical representations in real-time labs, such as coping with the high level of 1017 detail typical of graphs from real-time experiments, identifying the relevant graph patterns and 1018

992

interpreting trends in real-time graphs (Lindwall and Lymer 2008; Testa et al. 2002). The 1019 empirical findings of this study confirm and supplement findings from previous research. In 1020 particular, our study provides deeper insight into challenging aspects concerning the interpre-1021tation of graphical representations. For instance, the analyses of student-teacher interactions 1022 show that students' attention tended to be oriented towards some of the less significant graph 1023 features, such as the peaks rather than the slopes (Excerpt 1) and insignificant differences 1024within curves rather than the differences between the control and other curves (Excerpt 2). This 1025tendency made it difficult for the students to identify relevant shapes and patterns within the 1026graphs. Another interpretational challenge demonstrated by our analyses relates to the stu-1027 dents' difficulty of seeing the connection between the graphic representations and the practical 1028 undertakings of the experiment (Excerpt 1 and Excerpt 2). 1029

Another type of challenge displayed in our analyses of student-teacher interactions con-1030 cerns the contextualization of the undertaken experiment. Prior studies focusing on lab work 1031 and other experimental settings have documented that students often struggle to see the 1032 relation between experiments and their underlying scientific principles or corresponding 1033 real-world phenomena, a finding that is documented across different types of CSCL settings 1034(Furberg 2016; van Joolingen et al. 2007). The present study yields similar findings in the 1035 context of engaging with graphic representations in real-time labs. Our analyses display that 1036 students were challenged by linking the declining pH curve produced during the experiment to 1037 the underlying scientific principles of pH change. Furthermore, the analysis reveals that the 1038students struggled with linking the undertaken experiment to the overall scientific phenomena 1039represented by the experiment; the issue of OA (Excerpt 3). 1040

With these challenges as a backdrop, we turn our attention towards the support provided by 1041 the teacher. As seen in our review of prior research, several CSCL studies have demonstrated 1042 the significant role of procedural and conceptual support from the teacher in students' 1043engagement in inquiry and lab work settings (Furberg 2016; Mäkitalo-Siegl et al. 2011). 1044 Concerning procedural support (i.e., guidance that aids students in regulating their work 1045process), the initial analysis of student-teacher interactions during the lab work activities 1046 showed that rather few of these involved procedurally oriented issues. The reason might be 1047 that the teacher provided a broad range of instructional materials such as lab guideline sheets, 1048 descriptions of work distribution in the groups, an instructional video and reflection tasks. In 1049 addition, the teacher provided procedural instructions during whole-class sessions, demon-1050 strating how to use the experiment equipment and explaining the guideline sheet. Taken 1051together, these measures provided a considerable amount of support on a procedural level, 1052and additional procedural support was required mainly in the first phase of the lab experiment 1053activities. In particular, the teacher needed to provide support in how to utilize the scaling 1054functions to adjust the scales in the graph display (Excerpt 1). Thus, our study demonstrates 1055both the productive aspects of scaffolding devices in the form of material resources and 1056instructions provided upfront, as well as the significance of the teacher providing support that 1057fills in the gaps in the instructional design. 1058

Previous studies focusing on students' engagement with lab experiments and representational resources in CSCL settings have also demonstrated the importance of *conceptual* 1060 *support* provided by teachers– referring to guidance that targets students' understanding of the scientific content and concepts (Arnseth and Krange 2016; Furberg 2016; Jornet and Roth 2015). The initial analyses of student–teacher interactions taking place in the course of the lab work activities show that most of the challenges expressed by the students concerned conceptually oriented issues. The microanalyses of the selected student–teacher interactions

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

reveal that the teacher provided conceptual support by using an *eliciting strategy* and an 1066 elaboration strategy. The eliciting strategy became evident on the representational level, 1067 where the teacher guided students' attention towards specific features and elicited their 1068 perceptions of these, as well as on an *inter-representational level*, where the teacher prompted 1069 student ideas about connections between experiment and graphic representation to develop a 1070 shared understanding of this relation. As displayed in Excerpt 1 and Excerpt 2, eliciting at 1071 these levels was characterized by the use of discursive devices such as prompts and cued 1072 questions in conjunction with non-verbal devices such as gestures, gaze and hand movements 1073to actively engage students in shared reasoning. In this sense, our analyses also demonstrate 1074 that the graphic representations served as productive shared resources from which students 1075could make their interpretations, understandings and challenges visible and available to the 1076 teacher. Further, our analyses of interaction at the representational level also demonstrate the 1077 significance of the teacher's deictic movements as means to invoke disciplinary-relevant 1078 orientations towards the graphs. On a *contextual level*, where the teacher guided students' 1079 reasoning about the relation between the experiment and real-world issues, the teacher's 1080 eliciting strategy consisted mainly of cued questions, reframing, and elaborating on student 1081 accounts. This can be illustrated by the analyses of Excerpt 3, where the teacher resorted to 1082 discursive devices to elicit students' accounts of the links between the experiment and 1083 corresponding scientific phenomena and concepts due to the lack of visual representations 1084 of the lab experiment setup. Finally, our analyses also display instances across the three levels 1085where the teacher refrained from the eliciting strategy and used an *elaboration strategy*, which 1086 implies that he elaborated on students' inquiries or his own guiding questions by providing the 1087 crucial information himself. Examples of this strategy can be seen in Excerpt 2 where the 1088 teacher provided a final interpretation of the graph pattern as demonstrating a change in pH 1089and in Excerpt 3 where the teacher elaborated on students' accounts of the experiment 1090highlighting the role of increased CO₂ levels. 1091

The shift in the teacher's guiding strategy aligns with the findings in other CSCL studies 1092demonstrating that a central concern for teachers in CSCL settings is to balance their efforts in 1093aiding students' in utilizing their own knowledge with the approach of taking a source position 1094 and providing crucial information (Strømme and Furberg 2015). The teacher's role in collab-1095oration will always be influenced by the teacher's status as an expert and the provider of the 1096 instructional design (Wells 1999). In the present study, as is almost always the case in any 1097 experimental science setting, the teacher knew the results of a correctly performed experiment 1098 as well as what to look for when interpreting the graphs. Conversely, the students were in an 1099"inquiry mode" because they did not know the expected results of their experiment or which 1100 graph features were salient. The shift in the teacher's strategy can be seen in light of what 1101 Mortimer and Scott (2003) referred to as the need for a balance between a dialogic approach to 1102 students' contribution where explorations into students' orientations and facilitating collabora-1103 tive reasoning is central, and the need to provide authoritative support in the form of confir-1104mations, validations and making information which was not attended to by students explicit. 1105

Returning to the notion of the ZPD, a central aim in the context of CSCL is to design 1106 learning environments where peers, digital resources and instructional designs provide support 1107 that enables students to accomplish tasks they would not be able to solve alone (Pea 2004). 1108 However, several studies have demonstrated that even in well-designed CSCL settings, "gaps" 1109 between the technology design, peer collaboration and the surrounding instructional design do occur (Furberg 2016; Järvelä et al. 2016; Mäkitalo-Siegl et al. 2011; Strømme and Furberg 1112 teacher in bridging these gaps to keep students in the ZPD. The findings in the present study1113provide further insight into the functions of teacher support in CSCL settings, demonstrating1114that the teacher has an important role to play, both as an *orchestrator* who invokes and1115interweaves digital and social resources and as a *guide* who provides direction in students'1116collaborative reasoning.1117

Implications for instructional design

Regarding implications for teaching practice and instructional design in CSCL settings and 1119 real-time lab settings in particular, several points can be made on the basis of our findings. 1120 Firstly, the teacher in our study provided students with a considerable amount of procedural 1121support prior to the lab experiment activities, in the form of both instructional materials 1122designed to scaffold students' work during the lab experiment and direct instructions during 1123whole-class sessions upfront. Our study serves to demonstrate the importance of designing 1124scaffolding devices that provide structure in students' work. However, our analyses also show 1125that students needed additional support in how to utilize the scaling function in the SPARKvue 1126 tool. Thus, we suggest that targeting the scaling function in instructional materials or in the 1127demonstrations provided by the teacher prior to the lab experiment activities might have been 1128 beneficial for the students and released more time for other issues in student-teacher interac-1129tion during the first phase of the experiment. 1130

Regarding *conceptual support*, the findings of the present study demonstrate that the 1131material and digital resources did not provide nearly enough support for student groups to 1132overcome conceptual difficulties without additional teacher support. Further, we found that 1133 conceptually-oriented support was mainly provided in the form of teacher-student interaction 1134in group work settings. In line with studies that have shown the potential role of whole-class 1135sessions aimed at consolidating students' experiences from group-work settings (Jornet and 1136 Roth 2015; Mäkitalo-Siegl et al. 2011), we argue that whole-class discussions might also have 1137 been an alternative means to address some of the conceptually oriented issues that arose as part 1138 of conducting and reviewing the real-time experiment. We propose that whole-class dialogues 1139could be organized either as pauses in group work at points where several of the student groups 1140 are struggling with similar issues or as part of consolidation activities at the end of each 1141activity, providing the opportunity to revisit and conclude on central issues. Either way, 11421143 invoking contributions of several student groups might allow different student orientations to become resources in collaborative reasoning, which in turn might produce productive 1144interactions and reduce the need to shift from an eliciting to an elaboration strategy. 1145

A final point concerns the relation between support provided by digital and material tools in 1146the CSCL setting and support provided by the teacher. As demonstrated by the analyses in our 1147 study, the SPARKvue lab did not provide support for students' processing and contextualizing 11481149 of the results from the real-time experiment beyond displaying the graphic representation of the measurements. Further, beyond the representational support provided by the software tool, 1150and the reflection questions displayed on the board, the instructional design provided few 1151digital tools aimed at providing conceptual support. Thus, one implication might be to design 1152digital support targeting some of the conceptually related issues that the teacher expects 11531154students to come across, as well as digital support that aids the students and the teacher in addressing typical challenges collaboratively (e.g., a representation of the lab experiment setup 1155in the processing setting). 1156

1118

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

Concluding remarks

This study demonstrates the value of taking a closeup perspective on the challenges and 1158opportunities in naturalistic CSCL settings, including settings where students engage with 1159graphic representations in real-time labs. Attending to the processes in which students and the 1160 teacher encounter and strive to resolve challenges in student-teacher interaction provides a 1161 lens to elucidate the tensions that emerge from the differences in orientations and the demands 1162this puts on the teacher to facilitate productive engagement. Further, closing in on teacher 1163support as a dialogic process enables us to scrutinize the nuances in the teacher's support 1164strategies, as enacted in response to student needs. In naturalistic CSCL settings, the teacher 1165holds an important position as designer and facilitator of students' learning. However, as our 1166 study demonstrates, the teacher also plays an important role as a more knowledgeable other 1167during group-work activities, which provides an important social resource in students' con-1168 ceptual sensemaking with real-time labs. Overall, the present study demonstrates that, to 1169 understand the complexity of teacher support in CSCL settings, it is important to understand 1170how this type of support intersects with the support provided by digital resources, peer 1171collaboration, and applied instructional design. 1172

Acknowledgements We would like to thank our colleagues in the research project Representation and 11731174 Participation in School Science (REDE) and members of the REDE Advisory Board for discussions and 1175comments on earlier drafts that have benefited this article. We also like to thank our colleagues in the research 1176 groups TEPEC, MEDIATE and LinCS for their constructive feedback on earlier drafts. We are also grateful to 1177 Professor Andreas Lund, Associate Professor Kenneth Silseth and the anonymous reviewers for their valuable contributions. Special thanks are extended to the teachers and students taking part in the REDE project. This 11781179research was funded by the Department of Teacher Education and School Research, University of Oslo, and the Research Council of Norway (the FINNUT program, grant number 249872). 1180

Appendix

t2.1	Table 2 Transcript conventions		
t2.2		-	Halt or interruption in utterance
t2.3		(# of seconds)	A longer pause, length indicated in seconds
t2.4		(.)	A brief pause, usually under a second long
t2.5		?	Rising pitch or intonation
t2.6		Underline	Emphasized or stressed speech
t2.7		((italic text))	Annotation of non-verbal activity
t2.8		[text]	Overlapping speech

11831184Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations. 1185

References

- 1188 Adams, D. D., & Shrum, J. W. (1990). The effects of microcomputer-based laboratory exercises on the acquisition of line graph construction and interpretation skills by high school biology students. Journal of 1189 Research in Science Teaching, 27(8), 777-787. 1190
- Ainsworth, S. (2006). DeFT: A conceptual framework for considering learning with multiple representations. 1191 1192 Learning and Instruction, 16(3), 183-198.

1181

1182

1186

1187

🖉 Springer

JrnIID 11412 ArtiD 9290 Proof#1 - 16/11/2018

1198

1199

1200 1201

1202

1203

1204

12051206

1207

1209

12101211

1212 1213

1214 1215

1216

1217

1218 1219

12201221

1222

1223

1224 1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

12311232

12331234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240 1241

12441245

1246 1247

1248

1249

1250

Ares, N., Stroup, W. M., & Schademan, A. R. (2009). The power of mediating artifacts in group-level 1193development of mathematical discourses. Cognition and Instruction, 27(1), 1-24. 1194

1195Arnseth, H. C., & Krange, I. (2016). What happens when you push the button? Analyzing the functional dynamics of concept development in computer supported science inquiry. International Journal of 1196Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 11(4), 479–502. 1197

- Bezemer, J., & Kress, G. (2008). Writing in multimodal texts A social semiotic account of designs for learning. Written Communication, 25(2), 166-195.
- Derry, S. J., Pea, R. D., Barron, B., Engle, R. A., Erickson, F., Goldman, R., et al. (2010). Conducting video research in the learning sciences: Guidance on selection, analysis, technology, and ethics. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19(1), 3–53.

Dillenbourg, P. (2013). Design for classroom orchestration. Computers & Education, 69, 485–492.

- Erkens, M., Bodemer, D., & Hoppe, H. U. (2016). Improving collaborative learning in the classroom: Text mining based grouping and representing. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 11(4), 387-415.
- Friedler, Y., & McFarlane, A. E. (1997). Data logging with portable computers, a study of the impact on graphing 1208skills in secondary pupils. Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, 16(4), 527-550.
- Furberg, A. (2016). Teacher support in computer-supported lab work: Bridging the gap between lab experiments and students' conceptual understanding. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 11(1), 89–113.
- Furberg, A., Kluge, A., & Ludvigsen, S. (2013). Student sensemaking with science diagrams in a computerbased setting. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 8(1), 41-64.
- Gillen, J., Littleton, K., Twiner, A., Staarman, J. K., & Mercer, N. (2008). Using the interactive whiteboard to resource continuity and support multimodal teaching in a primary science classroom. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 24(4), 348-358.
- Glazer, N. (2011). Challenges with graph interpretation: A review of the literature. Studies in Science Education, 47(2), 183-210.
- Greiffenhagen, C. (2012). Making rounds: The routine work of teacher during collaborative learning with computers. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 7(1), 11-42.
- Ivarsson, J., Linderoth, J., & Säljö, R. (2009). Representations in practices: A socio-cultural approach to multimodality in reasoning. In J. Carey (Ed.), The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis (pp. 201-212). London: Routledge.
- Järvelä, S., Kirschner, P. A., Hadwin, A., Järvenoja, H., Malmberg, J., Miller, M., & Laru, J. (2016). Socially shared regulation of learning in CSCL: Understanding and prompting individual- and grouplevel shared regulatory activities. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 11(3), 263-280.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). Transcription notation. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), Structures of social interaction (pp. ix-xvi). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jordan, B., & Henderson, A. (1995). Interaction analysis: Foundations and practice. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 4(1), 39–103.
- Jornet, A., & Roth, W. M. (2015). The joint work of connecting multiple (re)presentations in science classrooms. Science Education, 99(2), 378-403.
- Kelly, G. J., & Crawford, T. (1997). An ethnographic investigation of the discourse processes of school science. Science Education, 81(5), 533-559.

Knain, E. (2015). Scientific literacy for participation - A systemic functional approach to analysis of school science discourses. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

- Leinhardt, G., Zaslavsky, O., & Stein, M. K. (1990). Functions, graphs, and graphing: Tasks, learning, and teaching. Review of Educational Research, 60(1), 1-64.
- Lemke, J. L. (1998). Multiplying meaning: Visual and verbal semiotics in scientific text. In J. R. Martin & R. Veel (Eds.), Reading science (pp. 87-113). London: Routledge.
- 1242Lindwall, O., & Ivarsson, J. (2011). Difference that make a difference: Contrasting the local enactment of two technologies in a kinematics lab. In S. Ludvigsen, A. Lund, I. Rasmussen, & R. Säljö (Eds.), Learning 1243across sites: New tools, infrastructures and practices (pp. 364-380). London: Routledge.
- Lindwall, O., & Lymer, G. (2008). The dark matter of lab work: Illuminating the negotiation of disciplined perception in mechanics. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 17, 180-224.
- Linell, P. (1998). Approaching dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspective. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Linell, P. (2009). Rethinking language, mind and world dialogically: Interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- 1251Linn, M. C., & Eylon, B.-S. (2011). Science Learning and instruction: Taking advantage of technology to promote knowledge integration. New York: Routledge. 1252

1255

1256

 $1260 \\ 1261$

1262

1263

1264

 $1265 \\ 1266$

 $\begin{array}{c} 1269 \\ 1270 \end{array}$

1271

1272

 $1273 \\ 1274$

1275

1276

1277

 $1278 \\ 1279$

 $\begin{array}{c} 1280 \\ 1281 \end{array}$

1282

 $1283 \\ 1284$

1285

1286

 $1287 \\ 1288$

International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

- Linn, M. C., Layman, J. W., & Nachmias, R. (1987). Cognitive consequences of microcomputer-based laboratories: Graphing skills development. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 12(3), 244–253. 1254
- Ludvigsen, S. (2016). CSCL towards the future: The second decade of ijCSCL. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 11(1), 1–7.
- Ludvigsen, S., & Arnseth, H. C. (2017). Computer-supported collaborative learning. In E. Duval, M. Sharples, & 1257
 R. Sutherland (Eds.), *Technology enhanced learning* (pp. 47–58). Chicago: Springer International 1258
 Publishing. 1259
- Mäkitalo-Siegl, K., Kohnle, C., & Fischer, F. (2011). Computer-supported collaborative inquiry learning and classroom scripts: Effects on help seeking processes and learning outcomes. *Learning and Instruction*, 21(2), 257–266.
- Mercer, N. (2004). Sociocultural discourse analysis: Analyzing classroom talk as a social mode of thinking. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 137–168.
- Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach. London: Routledge.
- Mitnik, R., Recabarren, M., Nussbaum, M., & Soto, A. (2009). Collaborative robotic instruction: A graph teaching experience. *Computers & Education*, 53(2), 330–342.
 1267
- Mokros, J. R., & Tinker, R. F. (1987). The impact of microcomputer-based labs on children's ability to interpret graphs. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 24(4), 369–383.
- Mortimer, E. F., & Scott, P. H. (2003). *Meaning making in secondary science classrooms*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Nakhleh, M. B. (1994). A review of microcomputer-based labs: How have they affected science learning? Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, 13(4), 368–381.
- Nemirovsky, R., Tierney, T., & Wright, T. (1998). Body motion and graphing. *Cognition and Instruction*, 16(2), 119–172.
- Nicolaou, C. T., Nicolaidou, I., Zacharia, Z., & Constantinou, C. P. (2007). Enhancing fourth graders' ability to interpret graphical representations through the use of microcomputer-based labs implemented within an inquiry-based activity sequence. *Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching*, 26(1), 75–99.
- Pea, R. D. (2004). The social and technological dimensions of scaffolding and related theoretical concepts for learning, education, and human activity. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 13(3), 423–451.
- Roth, W.-M. (1996). Where is the context in contextual word problems? Mathematical practices and production grade 8 students' answers to story problems. *Cognition and Instruction*, *14*(4), 487–527.
- Roth, W.-M., & McGinn, M. K. (1997). Graphing: Cognitive ability or practice? Science Education, 81(1), 91– 106.
- Roth, W.-M., & McGinn, M. K. (1998). Inscriptions: Toward a theory of representing as social practice. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(1), 35–59.
- Roth, W. M., & Tobin, K. (1997). Cascades of inscriptions and the re-presentation of nature: How numbers, tables, graphs, and money come to re-present a rolling ball. *International Journal of Science Education*, 19(9), 1075–1091.
- Säljö, R. (2010). Digital tools and challenges to institutional traditions of learning: Technologies, social memory and the performative nature of learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 26, 53–64.
- Säljö, R., & Bergqvist, K. (1997). Seeing the light: Discourse and practice in the optics lab. In L. B. Resnick, R. Säljö, C. Pontecorvo, & B. Burge (Eds.), *Discourse, tools and reasoning: Essays on situated cognition* (pp. 385–405). Berlin: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Schwarz, B. B., Prusak, N., Swidan, O., Livny, A., Gal, K., & Segal, A. (2018). Orchestrating the emergence of conceptual learning: A case study in a geometry class. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-018-9276-z.
- Strømme, T. A., & Furberg, A. (2015). Exploring teacher intervention in the intersection of digital resources, peer collaboration, and instructional design. *Science Education*, 99(5), 837–862.
- Testa, I., Monroy, G., & Sassi, E. (2002). Students' reading images in kinematics: The case of real-time graphs. International Journal of Science Education, 24(3), 235–256.
- Tytler, R., Prain, V., Hubber, P., & Waldrip, B. E. (2013). Constructing representations to learn in science. In Rotterdam. Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Urhahne, D., Schanze, S., Bell, T., Mansfield, A., & Holmes, J. (2010). Role of the teacher in computersupported collaborative inquiry learning. *International Journal of Science Education*, 32(2), 221–243.
- van Joolingen, W. R., de Jong, T., & Dimitrakopoulou, A. (2007). Issues in computer supported inquiry learning in science. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 23(2), 111–119.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). Thought and language. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Warwick, P., Mercer, N., & Kershner, R. (2013). "Wait, let's just think about this": Using the interactive whiteboard and talk rules to scaffold learning for co-regulation in collaborative science activities. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 2(1), 42–51.
- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry. Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1998). Mind as action. New York: Oxford University Press.

ç,0

- White, T. (2018). Connecting levels of activity with classroom network technology. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 13(1), 93–122.
- White, T., & Pea, R. (2011). Distributed by design: On the promises and pitfalls of collaborative learning with multiple representations. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 20(3), 489–547.
- Wu, H.-K., & Krajcik, J. S. (2006). Inscriptional Practices in Two Inquiry-Based Classrooms: A Case Study of Seventh Graders' Use of Data Tables and Graphs. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 43(1), 63–95.

FCI

🖄 Springer



AUTHOR QUERY

AUTHOR PLEASE ANSWER QUERY.

No Query.

Month