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**4) Here are the main coding templates from the T-SEDA pack**

**Part A: Transcript coding template (see also separate spreadsheet file)**

**Part B: Time sampling**

**Part C: Checklist for individual students (groupwork)**

**Part D: Group rating (groupwork)**

**Part E: Whole-class participation overview (rating scale)**

**Part F Rating scales for talk rules and student participation**

**Part G: Student group Self audit and Adult rating of student groupwork quality**

**Coding templates**

**Part A: Transcript coding template**

Guidance notes:

* Once you have created a transcript from your video or audio recording, copy and paste it onto a table like the one shown below using the “speaker” and “turn” columns (adding rows as needed). 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.
* We suggest numbering the turns (left-hand column) so that they are easily identifiable.
* You can select some of the categories from the coding scheme to do your analysis (depending on your inquiry focus), or work with the all the categories at once (noting that working with all the categories is more challenging at first).
* Read the transcript carefully and record the relevant category next to each turn.
* Bear in mind that some turns could be left uncoded (without any categories) if none of the categories is applicable. This is to be expected, even in high-quality dialogue.
* Consider also that, in some cases, more than one category will be applicable to the same turn. You can use two or three columns to list the observed categories.
* Additionally, you might find it useful to add a Comments column like the one in the table below. Here you can record any relevant observations (e.g. doubts or ideas that come up while coding, or the way in which elements in the transcription relate to your inquiry focus or questions).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nº | Speaker | Turn | Code 1 | Code 2 | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**4) Part B: Time sampling**

**Time-sampling** **template**

Guidance notes:

* Write the names of the students of the group you are focusing on in the table below (you can add/delete columns)
* Each window is 1 minute: 40 seconds for close observation and simultaneous coding and 20 seconds for resting.
* For each window (minute), tick the box (√) if the identified student used Build on ideas (B) or Challenge (CH) in his/her contributions to the dialogue. Note that in some circumstances tally coding for each relevant contribution may be useful and appropriate; this offers more detail about frequencies but is harder to record accurately.
* If during the 40 seconds, the teacher, teaching assistant or similar adult was present or interacted with students, tick the relevant box (√)
* Use the comments box below to add any further relevant information not captured by the time-sampling coding

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Windows** | **Teacher/TA present** | **Student 1:**  …………………… | | **Student 2:**  ……………………… | | **Student 3:**  ……………………….. | | **Student 4:**  ………………………. | |
|  |  | **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.

**4) PART C: Checklist for individual students (groupwork)**

This checklist approach can be used at the end of a groupwork activity. It can serve as a summary of Part A, or if time-sampling is not possible, it can be completed independently. It aims to provide an indication of the overall participation of individual students in the given activity, focusing on the aspects of dialogue that are most relevant to the inquiry focus. This checklist can be repeated if the activity or the group changes, providing a record of different factors that may influence student participation in dialogue on different occasions. As in Part A (time-sampling) the idea is to consider the quality of students’ participation in relation to selected categories (in this case B and CH).

Guidance notes:

* Write the names of the students of the group you are focusing on (you can add/delete rows as appropriate)
* For each student, tick the box (√) if they have shown Build on ideas (B) or Challenge (CH) in their overall contributions to the group discussion
* Use the Rating column to indicate the extent of participation of each student in the overall discussion. Use the following three-point scale: 1=Low participation, 2=Medium participation, 3=High participation. These levels should be judged in relation to the general participation levels in this activity, not the typical or expected participation of individual students as judged from previous experience.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Students’ Names** | **CH** | **B** | **Rating of overall participation** |
| **1)** |  |  |  |
| **2)** |  |  |  |
| **3)** |  |  |  |

**4) PART D: Group rating (groupwork)**

As with Part B, this group rating can be used at the end of each groupwork activity (and repeated if the activity or the group changes). Its main purpose is to record judgements about the group as a whole, basing the ratings on the selected categories (in this case B and CH). This group rating can be helpful for establishing the general nature of dialogue in a group activity. The quality of dialogue can then be monitored for the group as a whole. 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 do this 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
* Use the ‘Comments’ column to add any relevant information to the rating, such as whether the results are typical, or if they show progress

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Rating quantity (1-3)** | **Comments** |
| **CH** |  |  |
| **B** |  |  |

**4) PART E: Whole-class participation overview (rating scale)**

This whole-class rating scale extends Part C to focus on whole-class talk. It is designed to support reflection on **student participation** in whole class interaction. This includes the frequency and length of contributions and the numbers of students involved in dialogue during particular types of whole-class activity, such as ‘lesson introduction’, ‘whole class discussion’, ‘plenary’, etc. (left-hand column). This overview can help to monitor the nature of dialogue during these whole-class activities, bearing in mind how the expectations for dialogue can vary even within a single lesson.

**Guidance**

* Select one or two coding categories that are central to your inquiry. The example below uses B and CH. If you are interested in invitations, then BI and Q may be a good combination. For other examples see Coding framework in Section 2.
* Add the types of activities taking place during the lesson in the first column (add/delete rows as appropriate). For each activity add your ratings in response to each question.
* Use the following rating scale: 5 = all the time/as many students as possible, 4 = most of the time/most of the possible students,

3 = some of the time/some of the possible students, 2 = occasionally/a few of the possible 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 rather than short?** |
| **1)** | Build on ideas (B) |  |  |  |
| Challenge (CH) |  |  |  |
| **2)** | Build on ideas (B) |  |  |  |
| Challenge (CH) |  |  |  |

**4) Part F: Student participation and Talk rules rating scales**

## Once you are familiar with the methods above, you might like to use these 3-point scales to make assessments across a whole lesson or for each activity – in your own classroom or when observing a peer.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimension** | **0**  **Not evident** | **1**  **Teacher-led** | **2**  **Teacher-led with student involvement** |
| **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. |
| **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 elaborating 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. |

**4) Part G: Group Work Audits**

**Student Self-audit: Group Work**

(Primary/elementary students)

A self-audit helps you to think about your group work. For each of the statements below, put a number in the box next to it. Everyone in the group should fill in their own self-audit.

If you think the statement is:

Not true – write ‘1’

A bit true – write ‘2’

Very true – write ‘3’

**Group name(s):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Rating** |
| G1 –  Everyone in the group took part |  |
| G2 –  We worked 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 to what others were saying |  |
| G6 – We enjoyed working together in a group |  |
| G7 – When we made suggestions or agreed/disagreed with others, we gave reasons |  |
| G8 – Even if we disagreed with someone’s idea, we talked about it in a helpful way that showed respect |  |
| G9 – If we disagreed with each other, we tried to work it out as a group |  |
| G10 – Our discussions and disagreements helped us learn from each other |  |

**Student Self-audit: Group Work**

(Secondary Students)

A self-audit helps you to think about your group work. For each of the statements below, put a number in the box next to it. Everyone in the group should fill in their own self-audit.

If you think the statement is:

*Not true – write ‘1’*

*Partly true – write ‘2’*

*Very true – write ‘3’*

**Group name(s):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Rating** |
| G1 –  Everyone in the group participated |  |
| G2 –  We worked 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 each other’s ideas in a respectful and constructive way |  |
| G9 – We tried to reach consensus or compromise if there was disagreement |  |
| 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. These criteria have been shown to be positively related to learning outcomes.

**Ratings:***1 = Not true, 2 = Partly true, 3 = Very true*

**Group name(s):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Rating** |
| G1 – All pupils were involved in the group work interactions |  |
| G2 – Groups did not split into sub-groups |  |
| G3 – There was a significant amount of pupil-pupil on-task talk |  |
| G4 – Children 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 – Pupils tried to reach consensus or compromise |  |
| G9 – Group work involved productive discussion and/or conflict |  |
| G10 – Group work roles were not detrimental to pupil group working |  |