Protocol for Team Discussion: First Coding Round

The following document contains a protocol of the team discussion regarding the first coding process. For the first coding process 100 text answers have been coded by **6(??!!)** coders and in a joint session possible ambiguities and difficulties have been discussed.

The protocol is presented in bullet points, with possible adjustments to the coding guide, based on discussion, highlighted in purple.

"Difficulties of assigned some words of the wordlist, such as 'work', to a category."

➢ If someone has gone through all the categories in the coding guidelines and cannot assign a term to a category, the word should be assigned to the 'rest category' (positive, negative, or ambivalent).

""Perceived usefulness" / "perceived uselessness" are too general, as almost any word could be placed in these categories." In that context, it was suggested to use "perceived usefulness" / "perceived uselessness" as positive and negative rest categories.

➢ Change the former categories of "perceived usefulness" / "perceived uselessness" in "rest category, pos.: perceived usefulness" and "rest category, neg.: perceived uselessness".

"Add anchor examples to the coding guidelines?"

➢ Yes, add anchor examples to the coding guidelines.

"It would be important for all raters to consider the valence of the words during coding."

➢ Highlight in the coding guidelines that explicit reference must be made to pay attention to the valence of words during rating.

"Difficulties to distinguish between "social impact" and "safety"? Societal vs. individual influences?"

➢ Difference between these two categories is explained in the coding guidelines.

"Add new categories "Technological possibilities", "Technological limitation" explicitly intended for technological possibilities (positive) and limitations (negative) in the coding guidelines."

> ➤ Yes, add new category "technological possibilities" and "technological limitation" to the coding guidelines.

"Could the residual category also be differentiated into "greater good" / "greater negative"?"

> ➤ No, because the rest categories contain concepts whose assignment is not entirely clear (they could be slightly positive / negative), thus "greater good / "greater negative" would be misleading.

"Add an ambivalent rest category. Ambivalence particularly arises from valences."

> ➤ Yes, add an ambivalent rest category to the coding guidelines.

"Use abbreviations for the coding process?"

> ➤ Yes, add abbreviations to the coding guidelines for the second coding process.

"Combine "Perceived usefulness" / "Perceived uselessness" into the category "usability""

> ➤ No, we need these two categories as "rest category, pos." and "rest category, neg."

"Mistrust as useless category?"

> ➤ No, complementary category to trust.

Further adjustments to coding guidelines:

- We added the column "Code", which contains abbreviations of the respective categories to avoid spelling errors