Ben Leschensky

COMA 342

Content Analysis

Black Fleet Brewing

The Brew Crew: Ben, Elissa, Jazzmin, Vernadette

The focus of this content analysis paper is to provide insight into our process of creating a codebook, applying it to the class's qualitative data, and analyzing the themes present in the data.

In the instrument papers leading up to the content analysis, we noticed a pattern in our guiding questions. The ethnography paper was focused on discovering the role of food at a brewery and took a wide approach to the topic of eating. The interview paper was more specific to Black Fleet Brewing (BFB), as Lori's perspectives and opinions were directly related to BFB. The survey returned to a wider approach, as we hoped to gain a sense of brewery expectations and what makes a brewery successful.

By assessing the themes of food, brewery expectations, and some specifics of Black Fleet itself, we have built a baseline for our final leading goal which ties them all together. Through the content analysis, we want to identify what people are saying about BFB. The threads present across all instrument papers will help us assess the common views and voiced priorities of the customers at Black Fleet. By identifying common themes that we've seen come through in our research, we can see how applicable they are to the rest of the class's data. This will help prove if our assumptions are correct across the business and other research, or if our findings are one-off and don't apply.

The themes identified within our codebook are based on assumptions from our previous research. As a group, we believe that each of these themes represents an important aspect of Black Fleet, and will drive our content analysis. Each code number has a corresponding theme (in bold), the definition of said theme (in italics), and our justification for why the theme is important.

1. **Food Consumption:** *The consumption of solid nutritional substances for energy or enjoyment at a brewery or restaurant.*

    a. **Justification:** The client expressed food as their main point of concern at the first meeting. Food has also been a central focus of our research both with the interview (what Lori expressed) as well as our survey (asking participants questions regarding food at breweries in general and at BFB).

    b. **Why:** A high number of responses to this code will show that the consumption of food is important at BFB. Conversely, if the code has a low number of responses, the consumption of food isn't a priority for customers.

2. **Food Availability:** *The food options present for customers to order at a brewery or restaurant.*

    a. **Justification:** The client initially expressed that food was an interesting aspect when it comes to a brewery because not many breweries cater to people in that category. In our interview with Lori, she mentioned that she really appreciated that BFB provided foods that other breweries didn't. She also talked about her experience with BFB's food and what she likes about it and what she wished to see. In our survey, we assessed the general expectation of food availability at

breweries and found that food is a driving factor when it comes to attending a brewery.

    b. **Why:** A high number of responses to this code will show that food availability is an important aspect at BFB. This will determine if Black Fleet's food availability meets customers' food standards. If the code has a low number of responses, it will show that the food availability at BFB is not a priority in the customer's minds.

3. **Food Expectations and Quality**: *The standard of excellence that a customer expects out of food obtained at a brewery or restaurant.*

    a. **Justification:** While the service and taste of the food weren't directly referenced in the survey, Lori did talk about the pros of and cons of the food at BFB. During our survey, we asked questions pertaining to the expectations when it came to BFB's food and service.

    b. **Why:** A high number of responses to this code will show that food expectations and quality are something that the customers pay attention to, which also determines what sort of role and prominence food plays at BFB. This helps us answer the client's original question about food at the institution and how they are faring. If the code has a low number of responses, it will show that food expectations and quality at BFB aren't at the front of the customer's minds.

4. **Family-Friendly Environment:** *An atmosphere that is considered to be suitable for all members of an average family and provides services to families that have young children.*

a. **Justification:** Upon completing the interview, we gained credible insight from Lori about how family is a critical component of why she attends and how the family-friendly environment is important at BFB. Lori expressed that an establishment's family-friendly feel was important to her. During the survey process, we focused on asking the participants questions about whether or not they value family and if family-friendly elements are important overall at BFB.

b. **Why:** A high number of responses to this code will show that a family-friendly environment is something that customers are looking for and value in an establishment. If the code has a low number of responses, it will show us that family-friendly isn't particularly important to the customers.

5. **Alcoholic Beverages:** *Black Fleet's alcoholic beverages (not necessarily consumed), and how customers interact with them.*

   a. **Justification:** Initially, the client had expressed to us that their beers are an essential component to the overall success and longevity of their business. Beer was referenced during the interview and survey portions of our research and carry importance to the customers. Since our goal is to find out what customers are saying about BFB, beer should be included as a factor since it was referenced throughout.

   b. **Why:** A high number of responses to this code will show that that beer is important at BFB. If the code has a low number of responses, it will show that beer is less important.

6. **Not applicable to Our Goal**

a. **Justification:** Throughout our research, we came across information that was uncategorizable, inconsistent, or not important to our research. These pieces don't necessarily fall under our core themes of food, family, and beer.

b. **Why:** Having a place to put all of the things that are not applicable to our goal will allow us to clearly navigate the information presented in the qualitative data.

In terms of how we'll apply the codebook, we decided to have our coding unit be a paragraph, rather than singular words or sentences. We chose to do this because of the broad nature of our themes in relation to our leading goal. Since we're looking for the common threads across all groups–rather than focusing on nitty-gritty specifics–we agreed that using a paragraph unit for our coding would best align with the generalized theme approach that we're taking.

After identifying our core themes, defining them, and justifying them in our initial codebook, we tested it on an interview to see if it was successful. We decided to test the code with four people (rather than just between two people), as we hoped that if there was a high intercoder reliability percentage between the different members, our codebook would be stronger as a result. We initially split the group into two pairs and worked together on coding, but shortly stopped, thanks to Dr. Eckstein clarifying that we were to code individually and then compare.

The first test run of our codebook was tainted from the start. In hopes of keeping our coding organized, we numbered each line of the interview we were coding, but a numbering discrepancy caused all of our numbers to be off. We didn't realize this until the next time we met and were running the intercoder reliability, so we decided to re-run the coding test. Ben, Elissa, and Jazzmin completed the second trial of the code (Vernadette was absent due to a prior

conflict, and thus couldn't participate) and had success. The results of the coding test are listed below:

- Ben & Elissa Intercoder Reliability Percentage: 96%

- Ben & Jazzmin Intercoder Reliability Percentage: 85%

- Elissa & Jazzmin Intercoder Reliability Percentage: 86%

In addition to running each members code against one another, we also found the intercoder reliability amongst all three codebooks, and had an agreeance percentage of 84%. All of our percentage results were above the 70% threshold, so our codebook passed.

After completing the intercoder reliability, we adjusted our wording of the sixth theme. Originally it was defined as "unsure," as we viewed this category as the code for all answers that didn't apply. After testing the codebook, we agreed to change the wording to "Not Applicable." We did this because it clarified that much of the data that we'll comb through will be fluff and won't apply (due to our coding unit being a paragraph). Example of these instances include one word responses or filler talk during interviews, blank answers on surveys, or data that has nothing to do with our research.

Upon completing the codebook, we divvied up the interviews and surveys amongst the group and ran the code on the data. We coded four interviews and four surveys total, and have the following takeaways based on our results.

The first takeaway we observed is the abundance of useless information within all of the data we coded. After tallying all of our numbers across all surveys and interviews, we had 1,973 "Not Applicable" results (to clarify, our "results" are each line of an interview or response on a survey). The following list shows total number of results for each code category:

1. Food Consumption: 25

2. Food Availability: 221

3. Food Expectations and Quality: 70

4. Family-Friendly Environment: 88

5. Alcoholic Beverages: 144

6. Not Applicable to Our Goal: 1,973

This tells us a couple things. For one, there is a lot of irrelevant data that doesn't help us see the common themes about Black Fleet. It would be unrealistic to assume that all the data will help us see common views and voiced priorities, but the major number of "6's" in the data limits the conclusions we can make about the data. While it may seem like our code didn't represent the data completely, we had no idea going into the analysis just how much information would be unrelated to our leading question.

Another takeaway that we can make about the results are that "Food Availability" and "Alcoholic Beverages" (codes 2 & 5) were the two categories that had the highest totals following the "Not Applicable" category. The higher result totals for these categories helps illuminate common views and voiced priorities of the customers. Based on these numbers, Black Fleet's food availability and alcoholic beverages are the strongest talking points across all data sets.

The final point that we observed is that there wasn't any consistency or pattern to the data. As shown by our results, there isn't a particular code result that outweighed the others (not counting the "Not Applicable" category). The various surveys and interviews that we coded had

a wide range of questions and results, and other than a couple similar themes, the content was spread too far and wide to draw any concrete conclusions.

In reflecting on this process, we agreed upon a couple limitations that hindered our analysis, the biggest one being an inconsistent level of professionalism across interviews and surveys. A couple of the interviews (ex. Queens, That's the Tea) and surveys (JACKson 5) were primarily comprised of information that had nothing to do with the project we've been working on. While it's understandable that some questions might prompt slight deviations from the general topic, these interviews and surveys had tangents that strayed completely off course or didn't pertain to the questions at all. Immature answers and unprofessionalism makes it really difficult to trust any of their data. If the respondents to the surveys or interviews aren't taking things seriously, can we believe that they represent the best possible customer base?

Another limitation and change we might have made relates to our codebook. We tested our codebook on our own interview, which meant we had previous knowledge of what the questions and responses implied. This meant that as we ran the codebook, our own bias may have interfered with our responses. Had we ran the codebook on a different group's survey or interview, we likely wouldn't have been influenced by our own biases. This could've impacted our final codebook design.

After reflecting and sharing the data we coded, we also found slight discrepancies between codebook definitions. An example of this was if a line talked about food, beer, and family, which code/category do we choose? Do we have a consistent process for identifying the correct code? We didn't think to cover these questions as we tested the codebook. While the overall outcome of our content analysis didn't change, we would've liked to have had more

clarity on defining some of our terms before coding all of the data. We may not have had this

problem if we test-ran our codebook on a different survey/interview and fine-tuned our

definitions then.

In conclusion, the content analysis is the culmination of all of the research we've

conducted on Black Fleet Brewing. We had the chance to sift through qualitative data, identify

general themes that the data tells us, and get a better sense of the general view of BFB. The

information we've coded–along with all of our previous research–will help guide us in the

synthesis paper, where we will draw conclusions about Black Fleet as a whole.