

# HOW EQUITY AND INEQUITY CAN EMERGE IN PAIR PROGRAMMING

Paper by Colleen Lewis and Niral Shah  
Work Presented by Stephen MacNeil

HOW DO WE DEFINE EQUITY?



# HOW DO WE DEFINE EQUITY? AS STRUCTURAL.

## Access

Teacher, Books, School System

**Which disproportionately favors**

Gender, Race, SES

HOW DO WE DEFINE EQUITY? AND AS SOCIAL.

## Social Interaction

discuss, build, share, critique

**Which disproportionately favors**

?

# BACKGROUND FOR RESEARCH

## **Discursive benefits**

asking questions

explaining thoughts

adopting ideas

## **Pair Programming**

complementary dyads

# THE EXPERIMENT



**Aaron, Peter, Sam, Kim**

**Middle School**

Summer Session (12 days)



**Jason**

# METHODOLOGY

Ethnographic field notes (interpretation)

Coded audio recordings (identification)



Total Talk



Role-based



Commands



Questions

# QUANT RESULTS



	<b>Aaron</b>	<b>Samantha</b>	<b>Kim</b>	<b>Peter</b>
Total Talk	37% ( <i>N</i> = 772)	49% ( <i>N</i> = 526)	50% ( <i>N</i> = 419)	35% ( <i>N</i> = 311)
Jason as Navigator	50% ( <i>N</i> = 282)	55% ( <i>N</i> = 274)	55% ( <i>N</i> = 197)	45% ( <i>N</i> = 82)
Jason as Driver	33% ( <i>N</i> = 490)	47% ( <i>N</i> = 252)	46% ( <i>N</i> = 222)	31% ( <i>N</i> = 229)



# QUANT RESULTS



	<b>Aaron</b>	<b>Samantha</b>	<b>Kim</b>	<b>Peter</b>
Commands Issued	7% ( <i>N</i> = 116)	35% ( <i>N</i> = 68)	47% ( <i>N</i> = 44)	18% ( <i>N</i> = 37)
Questions Asked	63% ( <i>N</i> = 82)	59% ( <i>N</i> = 52)	75% ( <i>N</i> = 66)	65% ( <i>N</i> = 74)

# HYPOTHESES

**Friendship** - No Evidence to support

**Task Content** - Possible

**Content Knowledge** - No, equal differences in pairs

**Collab. Preferences** - Unclear

**Beliefs about collaboration** - Probable

# BONUS HYPOTHESIS. SPEED

## Command-clarify sequences

326 Peter: Not at the end!

327 Peter: Forward 1, RT 1.

328 Peter: Down there.

329 Peter: You're doing it wrong, there's another (unclear speech).

330 Jason: Here?

331 Peter: No, not that.

332 Jason: Here?

333 Peter: Yeah, basically.

# BONUS HYPOTHESIS. SPEED

## Short Cuts

- Jason describes Aaron's corner cutting as cheating
- Aaron uploads untested code, Jason objects, Aaron: "I don't care"
- Peter's shape has wrong orientation, Jason Objects, Peter: "Whatever", Jason: "Everything is whatever, whatever, whatever"

# BONUS HYPOTHESIS. SPEED

## Peer Comparisons

- Internal Competition (within dyad)
- External Competition (with other dyad)

# DISCUSSION

Assuming their results are conclusive - how might we align student values (speed) w/ pedagogical patterns?

In what other pedagogical patterns do you see social inequity being a problem?

Do self-paced curricula encourage competitiveness and lead to social inequity?

“How students treat students is how they will treat co-workers” - what are the moral implications?

# CONCLUSION

Structural Inequity has been studied in isolation; we should also consider other forms and **emergent forms** of inequity that may result from our pedagogical design choices.

If you want to talk more - find me. I just started a research project in this area and would love help.