SUPPORTING ELEMENTARY STUDENTS IN SCIENCE WRITING USING CLAIMS, EVIDENCE AND REASONING

Katherine L. McNeill
Boston College

contact info:
kmcneill@bc.edu
617-552-4229

Dean Martin
Boston Public Schools

contact info:
dean.bpsscience@gmail.com

A more detailed handout and a copy of the powerpoint can be found at:

- http://www.katherinelmcneill.com/workshops.html

McNeill, K. L. & Martin, D. (2011, March). *Supporting elementary students in science writing using claims, evidence and reasoning*. Workshop presented at the annual national meeting of National Science Teachers Association. San Francisco, CA.

This research was conducted as part of the Supporting Grade 5-8 Students in Writing Scientific Explanations project supported in part by the National Science Foundation grant DRL 0836099. Any opinions expressed in this work are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent either those of the funding agency, Boston College or the Boston Public Schools.

Framework for Scientific Arguments

Why Scientific Arguments?

Science education reform efforts call for students to develop scientific processes and skills through inquiry (American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1993; National Research Council, 1996). One prominent inquiry practice in both the standards documents and research literature is the construction, analysis, and communication of scientific arguments. We believe that argument construction should be an important part of science class for multiple reasons. First, research into scientists' practices portrays a picture where scientists construct arguments or explanations including weighing evidence, interpreting text, and evaluating claims (Driver, Newton & Osborne, 2000). Second, previous research in science education has found that having students engage in argumentation may change or refine their image of science as well as enhances their understanding of the nature of science (Bell & Linn, 2000). Third, constructing arguments can enhance student understanding of the science content (Driver, Newton & Osborne, 2000) as well as their ability to write in science (McNeill & Krajcik, 2006). Finally, assessing students' scientific arguments can help make their thinking visible both in terms of their understanding of the science content and their scientific reasoning (McNeill & Krajcik, 2007; McNeill & Krajcik, 2008a).

What is a Scientific Argument?

A scientific argument is a written or oral response to a question that requires students to analyze data and interpret that data with regard to scientific knowledge. Our argument framework includes four components: claim, evidence, reasoning and rebuttal. While we break down arguments into these four components for students, our ultimate goal is to help students to create a cohesive argument in which all components are linked together. Yet we have found that first breaking arguments down into the components can ultimately help students create cohesive arguments. In the following section, we describe the four components of a scientific argument.

Claim

The claim is a testable statement or conclusion that answers the original question. The claim is the simplest part of an argument and often the part students find the easiest to include as well as to identify when they are critiquing other peoples' arguments. One of the purposes in focusing on scientific arguments is to help students include more than a claim in their writing.

Evidence

The evidence is scientific data that supports the student's claim. This data can come from an investigation that students complete or from another source, such as observations, reading material, archived data, or other sources of information.

The data needs to be both *appropriate* and *sufficient* to support the claim. When introducing evidence to students, we suggest discussing *appropriate* data in terms of whether the data supports the claim. A good argument only uses data that supports the claim in answer to the original question. Students should also consider whether or not they have *sufficient* data. When introducing this concept to students, we suggest discussing *sufficient* data in terms of whether they have enough data.

When students are selecting their data to use as evidence, they should consider both whether it is appropriate to support their claim and whether they have enough data to support their claim. We have found that this can be difficult for students. While they realize that they should include data as evidence, they are not necessarily sure which data to use or how much data to use.

Reasoning

Reasoning is a justification that shows why the data counts as evidence to support the claim and includes appropriate scientific principles. The reasoning ties in the scientific background knowledge or scientific theory that justifies making the claim and choosing the appropriate evidence.

We have found that students have a difficult time including the entire reasoning component. Often students simply make a general link between the claim and evidence. You want to help students learn to include the scientific background knowledge that allowed them to make that connection between claim and evidence.

Base or Generic Rubric

		Claim *A statement or conclusion that answers the original question/problem.*	Evidence *Scientific data that supports the claim. The data needs to be appropriate and sufficient to support the claim.*	Reasoning *A justification that connects the evidence to the claim. It shows why the data counts as evidence by using appropriate and sufficient scientific principles.*
LEVEL	**0**	Does not make a claim, or makes an inaccurate claim.	Does not provide evidence, or only provides inappropriate evidence (Evidence that does not support claim).	Does not provide reasoning, or only provides inappropriate reasoning.
	VARIES FROM 1 to 5	Makes an accurate but incomplete claim.	Provides appropriate, but insufficient evidence to support claim. May include some inappropriate evidence.	Provides reasoning that connects the evidence to the claim. May include some scientific principles or justification for why the evidence supports the claim, but not sufficient.
		Makes an accurate and complete claim.	Provides appropriate and sufficient evidence to support claim.	Provides reasoning that connects the evidence to the claim. Includes appropriate and sufficient scientific principles to explain why the evidence supports the claim.

This base or generic rubric (McNeill & Krajcik, 2012) is then adapted to a specific question and the number of levels depends on the question.

<u>Table 1: Specific Rubric: Does a lever make work easier?</u>

	Claim *A statement or conclusion that answers the original question/problem.*	**Evidence** *Scientific data that supports the claim. The data needs to be appropriate and sufficient to support the claim.*	**Reasoning** *A justification that connects the evidence to the claim. It shows why the data counts as evidence by using appropriate and sufficient scientific principles.*
0	Does not make a claim, or makes an inaccurate claim like – "Levers do not effect work."	Does not provide evidence, or only provides inappropriate evidence or vague evidence, like "the data shows me it is true" or "It would be a lot harder to move a piano without a lever"	Does not provide reasoning, or only provides inappropriate reasoning like "levers are used in lots of ways in our lives".
1	Makes an accurate but vague or incomplete claim like – "Levers make work easier." Or "Levers do not make work easier." (It can actually depend).	Makes a general statement about how in the investigations levers sometimes made the work easier and sometimes did not make the work easier. Does not include specific data.	Repeats evidence and links it to the claim, but does not include scientific principles.
2	Makes an accurate and complete claim like – "Levers sometimes make work easier."	Provides 1 of the following 2 pieces of evidence: • Specific data (e.g. numbers) from the investigation when the lever made the work easier. • Specific data (e.g. numbers) from the investigation when the lever made the work harder.	Provides 1 of the following 2 reasoning components: • A lever can make work feel easier depending on the position of the fulcrum, effort and load. • Doing work is the ability to move an object. If it takes less force, the work feels easier.
3		Provides 2 of the following 2 pieces of evidence: • Specific data (e.g. numbers) from the investigation when the lever made the work easier. • Specific data (e.g. numbers) from the investigation when the lever made the work harder.	Provides all 2 reasoning components: • A lever can make work feel easier depending on the position of the fulcrum, effort and load. • Doing work is the ability to move an object. If it takes less force, the work feels easier.

***Example 5^{th} Grade Student Sheet*:**
Can you create the strongest argument?

Directions

The 4^{th} graders have just finished a number of experiments testing how different variables affect the speed of a car. Mr. Martin asks them to write an argument that answers the following question: How can you design a car to go the fastest? Circle the choices below that you think would create the strongest argument.

CLAIM

Circle ONE of the following.

A. My car will go the fastest, because I will make it really strong.

B. The car with the lightest load being pulled by the largest force will go the fastest.

C. How fast a car goes is determined by how far it travels in a certain time.

EVIDENCE

Circle TWO of the following.

A. The car with only one block on the car took 1 second to travel across the table while the car with three blocks took 3 seconds.

B. We always built our cars carefully and they traveled really fast.

C. Car companies, like Ford, try to build light cars because they will travel faster.

D. The car that was pulled by 5 washers took 2 seconds to travel across the table while the car with 1 washer took 7 seconds.

E. Our group had a lot of fun building and testing our cars, except for the one day that our car kept breaking.

F. Our experiments showed that light cars travel faster.

REASONING

Circle ONE of the following.

A. The data from our experiments shows us how to build our car. Since the data shows that fast cars have a light load and fast cars are pulled by a large force then this is how we should build our car.

B. Since car companies and race cars have cars that are really light and have large engines this means we should design our car in the same way. It should have a light load and be pulled by a large force.

C. The speed was determined by how many seconds it took for the car to travel across the table. The car with less blocks had a lighter load and it traveled faster. The car that was pulled by more washers was pulled by a greater force and it traveled faster.

REFERENCES

American Association for the Advancement of Science. (1993). *Benchmarks for science literacy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

American Association for the Advancement of Science. (2008). *Benchmarks Online*. Retrieved on April 30, 2009 - http://www.project2061.org/publications/bsl/online/index.php

Bell, P., & Linn, M. (2000). Scientific arguments as learning artifacts: Designing for learning from the web with KIE. *International Journal of Science Education. 22*(8), 797-817.

DeBoer, G.E. (2005) Standard-izing test items. *Science Scope*, 28(4), 10-11.

Driver, R., Newton, P. & Osborne, J. (2000). Establishing the norms of scientific argumentation in classrooms. *Science Education. 84*(3), 287-312.

McNeill, K. L. & Krajcik, J. (in press). *Claim, evidence and reasoning: Supporting grade 5-8 students in constructing scientific explanations*. New York, NY: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.

McNeill, K. L. & Krajcik, J. (2008a). Assessing middle school students' content knowledge and reasoning through written scientific explanations. In Coffey, J., Douglas, R., & Stearns, C. (Eds.), *Assessing Science Learning: Perspectives from Research and Practice*. (pp. 101-116). Arlington, VA: National Science Teachers Association Press.

McNeill, K. L. & Krajcik, J. (2008b). Inquiry and scientific explanations: Helping students use evidence and reasoning. In Luft, J., Bell, R. & Gess-Newsome, J. (Eds.). *Science as inquiry in the secondary setting*. (p. 121-134). Arlington, VA: National Science Teachers Association Press.

McNeill, K. L. & Krajcik, J. (2007). Middle school students' use of appropriate and inappropriate evidence in writing scientific explanations. In Lovett, M & Shah, P (Eds.), *Thinking with data*. (p. 233-265). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

McNeill, K. L., Lizotte, D. J, Krajcik, J., & Marx, R. W. (2006). Supporting students' construction of scientific explanations by fading scaffolds in instructional materials. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15*(2), 153-191.

National Research Council. (1996). *National science education standards*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Research Council. (2000). *Inquiry and the national science education standards: A guide for teaching and learning.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.