Agreement Procedure

Procedure for Coding

#	Instructions	Coder
0	Create whole transcripts and code definitions.	Author 1, with input from Author 2
1	Read agreement procedure and codebook definitions	Author 2

2	Code **Gideon's** and **Hannah's** based on understanding of the codebook definitions in "Study 2 Interview Analysis – Copy For Agreement.nvp[x]".
	
	Note thoughts on the codebook/interview data (e.g., definitions, interpretations of particular segments of the data, etc.) in the shared memos Google Doc
	
	My coding style:
	• I haven't coded themes that contain sub-themes.
	    o E.g. I haven't coded anything as "Barriers to successful debugging" or "program-related" as these contain sub-themes, but since "negative affect" does not have any sub-themes, I have coded some segments under this sub-theme.
	    o Themes containing sub-themes can easily be identified in NVivo.
	• Based on Braun and Clark (2006), I have tried to keep codes as modular as possible (i.e. containing as little surrounding information as possible), but don't worry about this too much as we're not calculating an IRR coefficient.
		Author 2

3	Identify disagreements via coding stripes: • Note positions of these (or create temporary "disagreements" code) where either of us code something that the other didn't	Author 1
4	Discuss disagreements and refine codebook/definitions.	Author 1 and Author 2
5	Refine any other weaknesses of codebook.	Author 1

Refinements to Steps 3-5 of Coding Procedure (*Added Mar 2025*)

Due to number of disagreements (partially due to the length of the transcripts), it would've taken too long to go over each individual disagreement. Therefore after going through Hannah's transcript, Author 1 noted sub-themes that were consistently disagreed upon. The codability of these was discussed and definitions/names consequently improved.

Ideally, all mentions of these codes in particular would be recoded across the whole transcript and the widespread-ness of these would be checked. The reliability of these refined codes could also be checked by Author 2 on either the same or different transcripts. However, because we were under time pressure, only the first of these took place.

After this refinement, the following questions were added for discussion to step 4:

- What was your overall impression of the two transcripts you read?
- How did you find coding the transcripts with the codebook?
  - Were there any codes that were particularly clear/unclear?
  - What codes were ambiguous?
  - What codes do you think need their names and/or definitions refined?
  - Discuss and refine these definitions appropriately.
- How significantly do you feel the codebook needs changing?