
**(T-SEDA) - Editable Templates v9**

**Supplement to the TOOLKIT for SYSTEMATIC EDUCATIONAL DIALOGUE ANALYSIS (T-SEDA): A resource for inquiry into practice**

*©* ***The T-SEDA Collective A grey and black sign with a person in a circle

Description automatically generated with low confidence***

Logo

Description automatically generated **A picture containing logo

Description automatically generated**

**This file contains the main coding templates from the T-SEDA toolkit:**

**2A: Coding a transcript**

**2B: Time-sampling coding for groupwork**

**2C: Checklist for individuals in groups**

**2D: Rating group dialogue using codes**

**2E: Whole class participation overview rating scale**

**2F: Student participation and talk rules rating scales**

**2G: Group work assessments by learners and educators: Group work self-assessment and Group work observation rating scale**

**Coding templates**

**2A: Template for coding a transcript**

You can use this template to apply T-SEDA codes to individual speakers’ turns.

Guidance notes:

* Create a transcript from your video or audio recording in a table like the one below, adding as many rows as you need. Each “turn” row should include a speaker’s contribution before the next person speaks. You may prefer to work in Microsoft Word, or Excel, or similar.
* Numbering the turns makes them easily identifiable
* You can choose one or two codes from the coding scheme to look for, or use many, depending on what the focus of your inquiry. (Note that working with a lot of categories is more challenging at first).
* Read the transcript carefully and record the relevant category next to each turn.
* **It is important to note that some turns, maybe even most turns, will be left uncoded because none of the categories applies. This is to be expected, even in high-quality dialogue. T-SEDA only codes the most explicit dialogic contributions.**
* **Some speakers’ turns might have more than one code applied to them**. You can use two or three columns to list the observed categories.
* You could also add a Comments category to each row or at the bottom of the sheet to record your thoughts about how the dialogue is unfolding.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nº | Speaker | Turn | Code(s) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**2B: Time-sampling coding for groupwork**

‘Time sampling’ is a common technique used by researchers; it simply means sampling events at regular time intervals during an episode or whole lesson, rather than recording all the time. So, you don’t note down everything, but it will give you a general picture of what is going on. It also reduces the demand of live coding as your observation windows are short.

Guidance notes:

* Write the names of the learners in the group you are focusing on in the table below (add columns as needed)
* Observations have an ‘active’ and a ‘resting’ phase. Each active phase is the time window when you note down the codes that you hear
* You can decide how long you want the observation window to be, but they should be short to make sure that the observation isn’t too demanding; e.g., each window could be 1 minute: 40 seconds for close observation and simultaneous coding and 20 seconds for resting
* Tick the relevant coding box if the student uses that code during the observation window
* Instead of ticking, you could choose to tally *each time* the student uses the code, but be aware this is harder to do
* Use the comments box below to add any further relevant information not captured by the time-sampling coding
* You could choose to video the interaction as a ‘back up’ to watch later

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Time**  **Window** | **Teacher present** | **Student 1:**  [Name] | | **Student 2:**  [Name] | | **Student 3:**  [Name] | | **Student 4:**  [Name] | |
|  |  | **CH** | **B** | **CH** | **B** | **CH** | **B** | **CH** | **B** |
| **1** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Comments:** Please use this space to record any other insightful observations or anything that seemed to influence the discussion.

**2C: Checklist for individuals in groups**

This checklist can be used in two ways. Firstly, it can serve as a summary of 2B: you can record the results of students from multiple groups in this checklist, adding a rating of overall participation. Secondly, if it isn’t possible for you to carry out time sampling, you can use this instead: observing dialogue and ticking when you hear the categories you are interested in (in this example, B and CH). Again, you can give each student an overall rating.

Checklists of this type can’t capture everything, but they’re not designed to. However, it’s a manageable way of paying closer attention to students’ dialogue and identifying trends over time. This checklist can be repeated if the activity or the group changes.

Guidance notes:

* You can choose one or two categories that you’re interested in
* Tick the boxes if you hear those codes in a student’s dialogue at any point in their discussion contributions
* If a student participates a lot in the discussion, then they will have an overall rating of (3); a medium amount of participation would be (2), and low participation would be a rating of (1)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Students’ Names** | **CH** | **B** | **Rating of overall participation** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**2D: Rating group dialogue using codes**

This group rating tool is slightly different from 2B and 2C because it does not rate individual students’ contributions, but the nature of dialogue in the group as a whole. You can select different categories of dialogue to focus on (in this case Coordination of Ideas and Agreement (CA) and Connect (C). As with 2B, this group rating can be used at the end of each groupwork activity (and repeated if the activity or the group changes).

It also provides a context for judging individual student participation (e.g. if the whole group is not building well on each other’s ideas then it is harder for one student to opt out than in a group where ‘building on’ is well-established).

Guidance notes:

* Use a three-point rating scale for the frequency of each dialogue category within the conversation as a whole: 1 = low, 2 = medium, 3 = high. This is not an absolute scale, it depends on your judgment about what is typical in your setting
* Use the ‘Comments’ column to add any relevant information to the rating, such as whether the results are typical, or if they show progress
* You could repeat this to see if groups change their dialogue patterns or types over time
* You could use another tool afterwards for more systematic exploration

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Dialogue Code | **Rating (1-3)** | **Comments** |
| **CA** |  |  |
| **C** |  |  |

**2E: Whole-class participation rating scale**

This whole-class rating scale extends 2D to focus on whole-class talk. It is designed to support reflection on **student participation** in whole-class interaction. It allows you to understand more about how students are taking part in dialogue. You can focus on different aspects of student participation such as the length of contributions and how often students are taking part. You can do this during different types of whole-class activities to build up a bigger picture of dialogue in your learning setting.

**Guidance**

* Choose one or two categories that you want to focus on
* Decide which types of activity and lesson phase you want to focus your observations on, such as lesson introductions, whole-class discussions, or lesson conclusions / plenaries and list these in the first column (add/delete rows as needed)
* Use the following rating scale: 5 = all the time/as many students as possible, 4 = most of the time/most of the students,

3 = some of the time/some of the students, 2 = occasionally/a few of the students, 1 = never/none of the students

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity type** | **Category** | **How often are students doing this?** | **How many students are taking part in this?** | **Are these contributions extended or short?** |
| **1)** | (B) |  |  |  |
| (CH) |  |  |  |
| **2)** | (B) |  |  |  |
| (CH) |  |  |  |

**2F: Student participation and talk rules rating**

## This is another tool with which you can measure student participation. It also offers a way of assessing whether or not talk rules are being used, if applicable.

* This tool can be used across whole lessons or for different activities
* You could use it in your own classroom or when observing a colleague
* Read through the descriptors for each category and decide which best applies to the lesson you have just observed

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimension** | **0**  **Not evident** | **1**  **Teacher-led** | **2**  **Teacher-led with student involvement** |
| **Student participation** | Public exchanges in whole-class situation or group work consist in teacher questioning and succinct students' contributions  or  Students don't have opportunities to discuss their ideas publicly | Students express their ideas publicly at length in whole-class situation and group work, but **they don't engage** with each other’s ideas | Multiple students express their ideas publicly at length in whole-class situation and group work  **AND**  In doing so, they **engage with each other’s ideas,** for example by referring back to their contributions, challenging or building on them (e.g. ‘It’s a bit like what Shootle said but….’, ‘Sam had such a great idea, look [demonstrates]’). This includes spontaneous or teacher-prompted participation |
| **Talk rules** | No explicit focus on ground rules for dialogue or dialogic practices is apparent | The teacher introduces, models or reminds students of target dialogic practices, e.g. ground rules to be followed, inclusive turn taking. | Teacher and students or students themselves negotiate target dialogic practices, e.g. ground rules, perhaps along with reminders / modelling  It may also include students being given or taking responsibility for managing the dialogue, as well as students being involved in evaluating effectiveness of dialogic practices |

**2G: Group work assessments by learners and educators**

**Groupwork Self-Assessment**

This template is for a group of learners to rate their own dialogue. It can help learners to understand more about their own participation in dialogue and repeating the assessment can help them make groupwork more effective over time. It can also help you to understand what students are thinking about their own dialogue. You might find that you have different perceptions of their dialogue and group work than they do.

**Guidance notes:**

* The rating scale is: 1 = Not true; 2 = Partly true and 3 = Very true
* Learners can either complete one per group or one each. This can be interesting as different group members might have very different perceptions and this can lead to good discussion

**Group name(s):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Rating** |
| G1 –  Everyone in the group was involved |  |
| G2 –  We worked together as a single group and didn’t split up |  |
| G3 –  Most or all of our talk was about the task we were doing |  |
| G4 -  We shared our own ideas and built on each other's |  |
| G5 - We listened carefully when others were speaking and took on board what they were saying |  |
| G6 – We enjoyed working together in a group |  |
| G7 – When we made suggestions or agreed/disagreed with others, we gave reasons |  |
| G8 – We challenged or commented on each other’s ideas in a respectful and constructive way |  |
| G9 – If there was disagreement, we tried to reach agreement or find a compromise |  |
| G10 – Our discussions and disagreements helped us learn from each other |  |

**Groupwork observation rating scale**

This scale can be used by adults to rate the quality of groupwork when observing it. High ratings on these criteria have been shown to be strongly related to learning outcomes.

**Guidance notes:**

* **The rating scale is: 1 = Not true; 2 = Partly true and 3 = Very true**

**Group name(s):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Rating** |
| G1 – All learners were involved in the group work interactions |  |
| G2 – Groups did not split into sub-groups |  |
| G3 – There was a significant amount of on-task talk between learners |  |
| G4 – Learners showed a positive attitude towards working together |  |
| G5 - Group interaction involved sharing and building on each other’s ideas |  |
| G6 – Group interaction involved justified reasoning |  |
| G7 – Group interaction involved constructive evaluation of each other’s ideas |  |
| G8 – Learners tried to reach consensus or compromise when they disagreed |  |
| G9 – Group work involved productive discussion and/or conflict |  |
| G10 – Group work roles were not detrimental to learners’ group working |  |