Blue font is EAB original coding.

Red font is PJC’s original coding.

Cells marked in gray were originally in agreement.

Cells marked in green were in agreement after discussion

Cells were temporarily marked yellow if a coding was absent.

Strikethrough indicates a match after a coding absence was indicated.

Discussion notes

46:50 Michael: Because Michael is recommending a specific mathematical topic to Jeff, this does not qualify as generic, social collaboration.

Jeff: Is explaining a the board, which qualifies as informal presentation.

Romina: Is providing an explanation to Brian. One may argue that this is informal presentation, but when viewed in video context, she is actually developing upon Jeff's explanation, which is communication improvement.

Brian: PJC missed coding for Brian's behavior originally, but provided a matching coding when this was indicated.

48:10 Michael: Jeff is clarifying Romina's explanation, which falls into the definition of communication improvement.

Jeff: This was originally left blank by PJC. Because Jeff is not actively contributing, this segment was coded disengagement.

Romina: The description for Romina states she is presenting, so this qualifies for the more specific coding of informal presentation.

Brian: Because Brian is questioning a specific mathematical operation, this is not any type of generic colaboration. Answer checking best fits this description because he is attempting to check and accept the answer provided by Romina.

49:00 Ankur: The coding was originally missed by PJC, but provided when this absence was indicated.

Michael: This cell contains two descriptions. They are participating in presentation, but they are not actually presenting. Instead, they are attempting to improve Jeff's explanation.

Jeff: This cell contained two descriptions, but the coding was matched when this absence was indicated.

Brian: While Brian's interaction is minimalist, it is not generic. He is approving of Romina's answer, which fits the definition of answer checking.

49:30 Ankur: From watching this segment, it can be understood that Ankur is helping check Jeff's answer. This is a more specific coding than collaboration.

Michael: Providing a formula does not qualify as generic collaboration. Michael is assisting Jeff, building upon his idea.

Jeff: While at the board, Jeff is fulfilling the roles associated with presenting. Thus, informal presentation is a better overall fit to describe his engagement.

50:05 Ankur and Michael: These two are helping build upon Jeff's explanation. This qualifies as communication improvement. Because Ankur and Michael are leaving the official explaining to Jeff, this seems a more suitable coding.

Jeff: While at the board, Jeff is primarily engaged as the group's presenter. It can be said that he spent time checking his answer, but his primary role was group presenter or even discussion leader.

50:25 Romina: Her explanation includes mention of a specific mathematical function, and so her engagement cannot best be described as generic collaboration.

Brian: Coding for Brian's engagement was originally missed, but matched once this absence was indicated.

Segment Coding

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 00:46:10 | **Communication imrovement** (Not collaboration because Jeff is presenting an answer)  **Communication improvement** | **Disengagement**  **Disengage-ment** | **Informal presentation**  **informal presentation** | **Disengagement.**  **Disengage-ment** | **Disengagement.**  **Disengag-ement** |
| 00:46:50 | **Disengagement.**  **Disengagement** | **Communication Improvement**  **collaboration** | **Informal presentation**  **collaboration** | **Communication improvement** (adding to Jeff’s explanation)  **collaboration** | **Researcher guidance**  **Collaboration**  **Researcher guidance**  **~~Collaboration~~** |
| 00:48:10 | Not visible.  **N/A** | **Communication improvement.**  **collaboration** | **Disengagement.**  **???** | **Informal presentation**  **collaboration** | **Communication improvement**  **Communic-ation improvement** |
| 00:49:00 | **Researcher guidance; collaboration.**  **Researcher guidance**  **~~collaboration~~** | **Communication improvementX2.**  **collaboration** | **Researcher guidance; informal presentation.**  **Researcher guidance**  **~~Informal presentation~~** | **Disengagement.**  **Disengage-ment** | **Answer checking.**  **collaboration** |
| 00:49:30 | **Researcher guidance; checking answer (responding to Jeff asking for a check).**  **Researcher guidance; collaboration** | **Communication improvement (Stating the formula as Jeff writes).**  **collaboration** | **Informal presentation**  **Checking answer** | **Disengagement.**  **Disengage-ment** | **Disengagement.**  **Disengage-ment** |
| 00:50:05 | **Communication improvement.**  **Informal presentation** | **Communication improvement.**  **Informal presentation** | **Informal presentation.**  **checking answer** | Not visible.  N/A | Not visible.  N/A |
| 00:50:25 | **Disengagement.**  **Disengagement** | **Collaboration.**  **collaboration** | **Informal presentation.**  **Informal presentation** | **Informal presentation.**  **collaboration** | **Researcher guidance.**  **Collaboration.**  **Researcher guidance**  **~~collaboration~~** |
| 00:50:55 | **Disengagement.**  **Disengagement** | **Disengagement.**  **Disengagement** | **Informal presentation.**  **Informal presentation** | **Disengagement.**  **Disengage-ment** | **Communication improvement.**  **Communica-tion improvement** |

Group engagement type count

Checking answer 2

Communication improvement 3

Collaboration 11

Disengagement 11

Informal presentation 5

Researcher guidance 5

answer checking - 2

collaboration - 4

communication improvement - 11

disengagement - 12

informal presentation - 10

researcher guidance – 4

Match by count: 43-6/43 = 86%

Match by cell = 23 / 43 = 53%

Match after discussion 100%