



**Postplagiarism**

Research Lab



UNIVERSITY OF  
**CALGARY**

**Ensuring Quality Assurance  
in Qualitative Research:  
Organising and Analysing Expert Reviewer  
Commentary for a Qualitative Interview Guide**

Sarah Elaine Eaton  
Postplagiarism Research Lab  
Werklund School of Education  
University of Calgary

April 2026

## Publication info

How to cite this guide (APA 7):

Eaton, S. E. (2026). Ensuring Quality Assurance in Qualitative Research: Organising and Analysing Expert Reviewer Commentary for a Qualitative Interview Guide. University of Calgary. <https://hdl.handle.net/1880/124431>

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.11575/PRISM/51225>

## Creative Commons - Licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) licence. You are free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) and adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material), provided you give appropriate attribution to the author, indicate if changes were made, and do not use the material for commercial purposes. To view a copy of this licence, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

## Abstract

This guide provides a 10-step process for organizing, classifying, and analyzing expert reviewer commentary collected during the quality assurance of a semi-structured interview guide. This process is for the GUIDE Project (Generative Understanding, Inclusive Design, and Ethical Assessment) at the University of Calgary's Postplagiarism Research Lab, but may have wider applications. Scholarly literature provides an evidence base for expert review of qualitative data collection instruments, but few sources provide procedural instructions for how research teams should handle the resulting commentary.

Research assistants are guided through step-by-step process for compiling raw reviewer feedback into a structured commentary log, mapping each comment to its corresponding interview item and thematic construct, classifying comments by appraisal dimension (relevance, clarity, specificity, and correspondence) and action code (retain, revise, rewrite, add, or remove), assessing convergence and divergence between reviewers, organizing findings by construct, building a revision frequency table, documenting the revision trail, identifying cross-construct patterns, and preparing materials for a second review round. Each step includes decision rules, worked examples, and instructions for populating a companion Excel workbook (the Expert Review Analysis Template).

The process operates within an interpretive qualitative paradigm. We do not employ numerical validity indices or psychometric scoring. Instead, we treat reviewer commentary as qualitative data and prioritize systematic organization, transparent classification, and an auditable decision trail. A dedicated section outlines permitted and restricted uses of generative AI tools within the process, consistent with the University of Calgary Faculty of Graduate Studies' Guidelines for Generative AI Use in Graduate Studies.

The intended audience is researchers and research assistants conducting quality assurance for qualitative interview guides, though the process may apply to other forms of expert review in qualitative research.

**Keywords:** qualitative research, interview guide, quality assurance, expert review, instrument development, research methodology, construct correspondence, question clarity, audit trail, generative artificial intelligence

**List of Abbreviations**

APA: American Psychological Association

CASP: Critical Appraisal Skills Programme

FGS: Faculty of Graduate Studies

GenAI: Generative Artificial Intelligence

GUIDE: Generative Understanding, Inclusive Design, and Ethical Assessment

OER: Open Educational Resources

PI: Principal Investigator

RA: Research Assistant

UDL: Universal Design for Learning

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
List of Abbreviations.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Permitted and Restricted Uses of Generative AI in This Task.....	2
Step 1. Compile the raw commentary into a single working document.....	5
Step 2. Map each comment to its interview item and thematic construct.....	6
Step 3. Classify each comment by appraisal dimension.....	7
Step 4. Classify each comment by action implication.....	8
Step 5. Identify convergence and divergence between reviewers.....	9
Step 6. Organise findings by construct.....	10
Step 7. Build the revision frequency table.....	11
Step 8. Document the revision trail.....	12
Step 9. Identify cross-construct patterns.....	13
Step 10. Prepare materials for a second review round.....	14
Additional Considerations.....	15
Works Consulted and Further Reading.....	16
Appendix A: Expert Review Analysis Template: Instructions.....	18
Appendix B: Expert Reviewer Commentary Log.....	19
Appendix C: Reviewer Convergence Analysis.....	20
Appendix D: Revision Frequency by Thematic Construct.....	21
Appendix E: Item Revision Trail.....	22
About the Postplagiarism Research Lab.....	23

## Introduction

This guide describes a 10-step process for organising, classifying, and analysing expert reviewer commentary collected during the quality assurance of a semi-structured interview guide. The process was developed for the GUIDE Project (Generative Understanding, Inclusive Design, and Ethical Assessment) at the University of Calgary's Postplagiarism Research Lab. It applies specifically to our project's quality assurance process for the data collection instrument, our semi-structured interview guide. The intended audience for this guide are researchers and research assistants working at the Postplagiarism Research Lab at the University of Calgary, though it may have utility for other researchers, too.

The GUIDE Project uses an interpretive qualitative research paradigm. This has direct consequences for how we handle expert feedback. We do not compute numerical validity indices (such as a Content Validity Index) or assign psychometric scores to reviewer judgments. We treat reviewer commentary as qualitative data: we organise it systematically, classify it according to defined categories, compare reviewers' assessments, and document all decisions. The goal is a transparent, auditable record of how expert feedback shaped the final interview guide.

Two key documents anchor this process. The first is the GUIDE Instrument Alignment Matrix, which maps each interview item to its thematic construct, research objective, supporting literature, and question wording. The second is the Expert Review Analysis Template (an Excel workbook with five tabs), which provides the structured workspace for each step described below (see Appendices A-E). The purpose of this guide is to help you work through the Expert Review Analysis.

Before beginning, familiarise yourself with the Instrument Alignment Matrix and the six thematic constructs of the Faculty Interview Guide: (1) Faculty Perceptions of GenAI for Inclusive Assessment, (2) Inclusion vs. Academic Integrity Tensions, (3) GenAI Applications for Assessment Accessibility, (4) Ethical Framework Development, (5) Co-Creation of Open Educational Resources, and (6) Institutional Policy and Implementation. The Alignment Matrix is not included in this guide, but we will refer to it during our project meetings.

Sarah Elaine Eaton  
Postplagiarism Research Lab  
Werklund School of Education  
University of Calgary  
April, 2026

## Permitted and Restricted Uses of Generative AI in This Task

The GUIDE Project addresses the ethical integration of GenAI into student assessment. The research team's own use of GenAI tools should reflect the standards we expect of others. This section outlines where GenAI may and may not be used when completing the 10-step process described in this guide, consistent with the University of Calgary Faculty of Graduate Studies' *Guidelines for Generative AI Use in Graduate Studies* (approved April 17, 2025). (See: <https://grad.ucalgary.ca/current-students/important-resources-and-supports/graduate-ai-guidelines>)

### Authorization

The FGS guidelines require written authorization from the appropriate faculty member before using GenAI tools in graduate work. Before using any GenAI tool for any step in this process, obtain written authorization from the PI (Dr. Eaton). Written authorization may take the form of an email or an instant message with a verifiable date. Preserve the record of this authorization. If the PI has already provided blanket authorization for specific tools or tasks, confirm that your intended use falls within the scope of that authorization. If you are unsure, ask before proceeding.

### Where GenAI tools may be used (with authorization and disclosure)

GenAI tools may assist with the following tasks, provided you have obtained authorization and you disclose the use in your work log.

Formatting and copy-editing. You may use GenAI tools (e.g., Grammarly, or a large language model) to check spelling, grammar, and formatting consistency in the construct-level narrative summaries you draft in Step 6, the revision rationale statements you write in Step 8, and the cross-construct pattern notes you produce in Step 9. The substantive content of these outputs must be your own.

Spreadsheet operations. You may use GenAI tools to assist with Excel formulas, sorting functions, or data organisation tasks when working with the Expert Review Analysis Template (e.g., writing a formula to count action codes by construct in Step 7). The structure of the template has already been built; GenAI assistance here is limited to execution, not to analytical decisions.

Literature retrieval. If, during Step 9, you identify a cross-construct pattern that requires additional reading, you may use GenAI tools to locate relevant sources. Verify every source independently before adding it to any project document. The FGS guidelines note that GenAI tools can fabricate citations.

## **Where GenAI tools must not be used**

The following tasks require your own judgment. Using GenAI for these tasks would compromise the analytical integrity of the quality assurance process and undermine your development as a qualitative researcher.

Classifying reviewer comments (Steps 3 and 4). The classification of each comment by appraisal dimension and action code requires you to read the comment, interpret its meaning in context, and make a judgment about what the reviewer intended. A GenAI tool cannot reliably make these interpretive judgments, and outsourcing them would remove the human analytical engagement that gives the classification its credibility. Do not input reviewer comments into a GenAI tool and ask it to classify them for you.

Assessing convergence and divergence (Step 5). Comparing two reviewers' assessments of the same item requires contextual understanding of both the item and the construct it addresses. This is interpretive work. Complete it yourself.

Drafting construct-level summaries from scratch (Step 6). You may use GenAI to polish your draft after you have written it, but do not prompt a GenAI tool to generate the summary from your coded data. The summary must reflect your reading of the reviewer commentary, not a model's synthesis of it.

Writing revision rationale statements from scratch (Step 8). The rationale for each revision must trace a specific path from reviewer comment to revised item. You are the person who can articulate that path because you did the classification and the analysis. Write the rationale yourself.

## **Privacy and data security**

Most GenAI tools retain user inputs for training purposes. The expert reviewer commentary you are working with was provided in confidence by named individuals. Do not input the verbatim text of reviewer comments into any GenAI tool, including cloud-based large language models. This restriction applies regardless of whether you are using the tool for classification, summarisation, or any other purpose. If you need to use a GenAI tool for a permitted task (e.g., copy-editing a summary you wrote), remove all identifying information about the reviewers before submitting any text.

## **Transparency and documentation**

The FGS guidelines require disclosure of three elements: (a) the specific GenAI tools used, (b) the purpose of their use, and (c) the extent of their influence on the content. Maintain a GenAI use log as a tab in your working file or as a separate document. For each instance of GenAI use, record the tool name, the date, the task, and a brief description of how the output was used. This log serves the same transparency function as the decision log in

Step 3: it allows the PI and other team members to verify that GenAI was used appropriately and within the bounds of authorization.

### **Accountability**

Regardless of whether you use a GenAI tool for a permitted task, you remain accountable for all content in the completed template and all narrative outputs. If a GenAI tool introduces an error (e.g., an incorrect formula, a misformatted citation, a grammatical change that alters meaning), the responsibility for catching and correcting that error is yours. Review every GenAI-assisted output before incorporating it into the working file.

If you have any questions about how AI tools can be used, consult with the PI.

### **Step 1. Compile the raw commentary into a single working document.**

The expert reviewers may have submitted their feedback in different formats. One reviewer might have used tracked changes and margin comments in a Word document. Another might have written responses in a separate file or returned an annotated copy of the interview guide. Your first task is to bring all of this material together.

Gather every piece of reviewer feedback: written commentary, annotated copies of the interview guide, margin notes, emails with observations, and any structured response forms. Do not leave anything out, even if a comment seems minor. At this stage, you are assembling the complete record.

Open the Commentary Log tab in the Expert Review Analysis Template. (See Appendix B.) This tab has one row per comment. For each distinct comment a reviewer made, create a new row and enter the following:

*Entry ID (Column A).* Assign a sequential number (001, 002, 003). This gives every comment a unique identifier you can reference later.

*Reviewer Code (Column B).* Use 'Reviewer A' or 'Reviewer B.' Do not use reviewers' names in the working file.

*Comment Text (Column F).* Copy the reviewer's exact words into this cell. Do not paraphrase, summarise, or edit the comment. Preserve the original phrasing, including any emphasis, questions, or suggestions the reviewer made. If a reviewer underlined or highlighted something, note that in the cell (e.g., "[reviewer underlined 'academic integrity']"). If a comment was handwritten, transcribe it and note that the original was handwritten.

Why preserve exact wording? Because your interpretation of a comment may differ from someone else's. If the PI or another team member needs to check your classification decisions later, they need access to the original language. This is part of maintaining the methodological transparency (Mays & Pope, 2000).

Leave Columns C, D, E, G, H, I, J, and K blank for now. You will populate them in Steps 2 through 5.

## **Step 2. Map each comment to its interview item and thematic construct.**

Now return to the beginning of your Commentary Log (see Appendix B) and work through each entry. For every comment, identify two things: which interview item the comment addresses, and which thematic construct that item belongs to.

*Item Number (Column C).* Refer to the Instrument Alignment Matrix. Each interview item has a number (e.g., 1.1, 1.2, 2.1). Enter the item number that the comment targets. If a reviewer made a comment about the interview guide as a whole (for example, “The guide is too long” or “Consider reordering the opening section”), there is no single item to assign. In that case, enter “Guide-level” in Column C.

*Item Label (Column D).* Copy the short item label from the Alignment Matrix (e.g., “Opening/Background: ‘Tell me about your teaching role...’”). This label makes the spreadsheet readable without having to cross-reference the matrix constantly.

*Thematic Construct (Column E).* Use the dropdown list to select the construct. The options are Theme 1 through Theme 6, plus "Cross-construct / Guide-level" for comments that do not belong to a single theme.

A few practical situations you may encounter:

If a reviewer’s comment addresses two items at once (e.g., “Questions 3.1 and 3.2 overlap”), create two rows, one for each item, and paste the same comment text in both. This ensures the comment appears in the correct place when you sort by construct later.

If a reviewer’s comment addresses the relationship between constructs (e.g., “The transition from Theme 2 to Theme 3 is abrupt”), tag it as “Cross-construct / Guide-level.” These comments matter for the guide's overall architecture, and you will return to them in Step 9.

If you are unsure which construct a comment belongs to, check the Alignment Matrix first. If the mapping is still unclear, flag the entry in Column K (Notes) and bring it to the PI's attention. Do not guess.

### **Step 3. Classify each comment by appraisal dimension.**

The expert reviewers evaluated each interview item along four qualitative dimensions. These four dimensions are defined elsewhere in our project documentation.

*Relevance.* Does the item address its mapped construct? A relevance comment is one where the reviewer says something about whether the question belongs under the construct it has been assigned to. Example: “This question is more about policy than about ethical frameworks. Consider moving it to Theme 6.”

*Clarity.* Will participants understand the question as intended? A clarity comment addresses wording, phrasing, jargon, ambiguity, or anything that could cause a participant to misinterpret the question. Example: “The term ‘inclusive assessment’ may not be familiar to all faculty. Consider defining it before asking the question.”

*Specificity.* Is the item focused on a defined aspect of the construct, or is it too broad? A specificity comment is one where the reviewer flags that a question tries to cover too much ground, or conversely, that it is too narrow to capture the construct. Example: “This question asks about both UDL and accommodations. These are different concepts. Consider splitting into two questions.”

*Correspondence.* Does the item align with the study's research objectives? A correspondence comment addresses the fit between the question and the project's stated goals. Example: “This item does not connect to any of the five research objectives listed in the project brief.”

For each entry in your Commentary Log, read the comment and select the appropriate dimension from the dropdown in Column G. Some comments will address more than one dimension. For example, a reviewer might write: “The wording is confusing, and I am not sure this question belongs under Theme 4.” That comment addresses both clarity (confusing wording) and relevance (possible construct mismatch). When this happens, create two rows with the same comment text, one coded for Clarity and one coded for Relevance. This allows you to count dimension frequencies accurately later.

Keep a brief decision log as you work. When a comment is difficult to classify, record your reasoning in Column J (Decision Rationale). Write one or two sentences explaining why you chose the dimension you chose. This log serves two purposes: it helps the PI verify your coding, and helps to ensure methodological transparency.

When you encounter a comment that identifies a construct mismatch, an embedded normative assumption, or a clarity problem that could alter participant interpretation, note it in Column K (Notes). Step 4 provides the decision rule for classifying these comments as substantive.

#### **Step 4. Classify each comment by action implication.**

For each entry, determine what the reviewer's comment means the research team should do with the item. Select one of the following codes from the dropdown in Column H.

*Retain.* The reviewer affirmed the item. The comment is positive or confirmatory, and no change is needed. Example: "This question is well-worded and covers the construct."

*Revise.* The reviewer identified a specific, bounded problem. The item needs modification, but its core intent and construct placement are sound. Most reviewer comments fall here. Example: "Rephrase to remove the assumption that faculty have used GenAI tools."

*Rewrite.* The reviewer identified a fundamental mismatch between the item and its target construct, or the item's framing is so problematic that a surface edit will not resolve it. The item requires substantive reconceptualization. Example: "This question presupposes that faculty view GenAI positively. It needs to be reframed as an open inquiry."

*Add.* The reviewer recommended a new item, probe, or follow-up question that does not exist in the current guide. Example: "You need a question that asks about experiences with students who use GenAI without disclosing it."

*Remove.* The reviewer recommended deleting the item from the guide. Example: "This question duplicates item 2.1. Consider removing it."

Two guidelines for this step. First, if a comment is ambiguous between Revise and Rewrite, default to Revise. Reserve Rewrite for cases where the reviewer explicitly identifies a construct mismatch or a structural problem that cannot be resolved by editing the wording. Second, a single reviewer comment may contain both an affirmation and a suggestion (e.g., "Good question, but consider adding a probe about..."). Code the affirmation as Retain and the suggestion as Add in separate rows.

Apply the following decision rule when the classification is ambiguous: treat any comment that identifies a construct mismatch, an embedded normative assumption, or a clarity problem that could alter participant interpretation as substantive. A substantive comment warrants a Rewrite code, regardless of whether one or both reviewers flagged the issue. A comment that addresses wording, terminology, or scope without questioning the item's premise or construct placement is not substantive under this rule and warrants a Revise code. If you are unsure whether a comment meets the substantive threshold, record your reasoning in Column J (Decision Rationale) and flag the entry for the PI.

### **Step 5. Identify convergence and divergence between reviewers.**

Once you have completed Steps 1 through 4 for all reviewer comments, open the Convergence Analysis tab (see Appendix C). This tab has one row per interview item. Your task is to compare what Reviewer A and Reviewer B said about each item.

For each item, read through all Commentary Log (see Appendix B) entries from both reviewers and write a brief summary of each reviewer's assessment in Columns C and D. Keep summaries to two or three sentences. Focus on the substance of the feedback, not on paraphrasing every word.

Then make a judgment: did the reviewers agree or diverge?

*Agree.* Both reviewers reached the same conclusion about the item. This could mean both affirmed it, both recommended the same type of revision, or both flagged the same problem.

*Diverge.* The reviewers reached different conclusions. One affirmed the item while the other recommended revision. They identified different problems. One recommended revision while the other recommended rewriting.

If the reviewers diverge, describe the nature of the divergence in Column F. Be specific. "Reviewers disagreed" is not a useful record. Instead, write something like: "Reviewer A affirmed construct correspondence but flagged unclear wording. Reviewer B questioned whether the item belongs under Theme 4 at all." If one reviewer's comment meets the substantive threshold defined in Step 4 (construct mismatch, embedded normative assumption, or clarity problem that could alter participant interpretation), flag the item for the PI's review regardless of whether the other reviewer raised the same concern.

Column G is for the resolution. You will not fill this column yourself. The PI will review divergent items and record the resolution decision and its rationale. Flag any items with divergent assessments for the PI's attention.

A note on why this step matters: when we report findings and mobilize knowledge from our project, we need to describe the pattern of expert feedback for each construct. Convergent critical commentary strengthens the case for revision. Divergent assessments require the PI to make a judgment call, and the record of that call is part of the study's audit trail. The Convergence Analysis tab is where that record lives.

Return to the Commentary Log and enter 'Agree,' 'Diverge,' or 'Single' in Column I for each entry.

**Step 6. Organise findings by construct.**

Sort the Commentary Log by Column E (Thematic Construct). This groups all comments for Theme 1 together, all comments for Theme 2 together, and so on.

For each of the six constructs, read through the grouped comments and draft a brief narrative summary. Address four questions in each summary:

First, what was the overall pattern of reviewer feedback for items in this construct? Were most items affirmed, or did the construct attract substantial critical commentary?

Second, which appraisal dimensions attracted the most commentary? For example, did reviewers focus primarily on clarity issues, or on relevance concerns?

Third, what specific issues did the reviewers identify? Name them concretely. “Reviewers raised concerns” is too vague. “Reviewers identified that item 3.1 assumed familiarity with UDL terminology” is concrete.

Fourth, what action did the research team take in response? This connects reviewer feedback to the revision decisions.

Write each summary in plain, direct prose. Avoid evaluative language about the reviewers' feedback (do not call it ‘excellent’ or ‘helpful’). Report what the reviewers observed and what the team did about it.

**Step 7. Build the revision frequency table.**

Open the Revision Frequency tab (see Appendix D). This tab is pre-formatted with one row per construct and columns for each action code (Retained, Revised, Rewritten, Added, Removed). A Totals row at the bottom calculates column sums automatically.

Return to the Commentary Log and count, for each construct, how many items received each action code. Enter these counts into the Revision Frequency tab.

A clarification on counting: count items, not comments. If an item received three comments from two reviewers and the resulting action was Revise, that item counts once as "Revised" for its construct. Do not count it three times because it attracted three comments. The table provide evidence about what happened to each item, not how many comments each item received.

**Step 8. Document the revision trail.**

Open the Revision Trail tab (see Appendix E). For each item coded as Revise, Rewrite, or Add, create a row that captures four elements.

*Original Item Wording (Column C).* Copy the exact wording of the item as it appeared in the pre-review version of the interview guide.

*Reviewer Comment(s) Prompting Change (Column D).* Copy or summarise the reviewer feedback that led to the revision. If both reviewers commented on the item, include both comments.

*Revised Item Wording (Column E).* Enter the new wording after revision. If the revision has not yet been made, leave this cell blank and return to it once the PI has drafted the revised language.

*Revision Rationale (Column F).* Write one to three sentences explaining why this specific revision was made. Connect the rationale to the reviewer's comment and to the relevant appraisal dimension. For example: "Reviewer A noted that the original wording assumed participants had direct experience with GenAI tools (clarity). The revised wording opens the question to participants with no prior experience, broadening the item's capacity to elicit data across varying levels of familiarity."

For items coded as Rewrite, state which element of the decision rule the comment triggered (construct mismatch, embedded normative assumption, or clarity problem affecting participant interpretation) and explain how the rewritten item addresses it.

**Step 9. Identify cross-construct patterns.**

Return to the full Commentary Log (see Appendix B) and read through the coded entries across all six constructs. Look for patterns that recur across themes rather than within a single theme.

Examples of cross-construct patterns you might find: clarity issues that appear in multiple constructs (e.g., several items across Themes 1, 3, and 4 use technical vocabulary that reviewers flagged); consistent recommendations about providing definitions before asking questions; a pattern in which one appraisal dimension (e.g., specificity) attracts more commentary than others across the guide as a whole; or structural observations about the guide's flow, pacing, or length.

When you identify a pattern, write a short note describing it: what the pattern is, which constructs it appears in, and how many items it affects. Collect these notes in a separate section of your working document or in the Notes column of the Commentary Log.

**Step 10. Prepare materials for a second review round.**

We might conduct a second review round for items that underwent substantive revision. Once the PI has approved the revised item wording (Column E of the Revision Trail – see Appendix E), prepare a second-round review package for the expert reviewers.

For each substantively revised item, the package should include: the original item wording, the reviewer's original comment(s), the revised item wording, and the revision rationale. Present these four elements together so the reviewer can assess whether the revision addresses their concern without having to search through multiple documents.

When second-round feedback arrives, code it using the same process described in Steps 1 through 4. Add new entries to the Commentary Log (see Appendix B) with a notation in Column K (Notes) indicating “Round 2.” Update the Revision Trail and Revision Frequency tabs if second-round feedback produces additional changes.

This step closes the quality assurance loop. It provides the evidence needed for knowledge mobilization, that revised items were reviewed a second time and confirmed as acceptable.

## **Additional Considerations**

Implement a consistent method for file-naming conventions. Save your working file with a version number each time you make a substantive update (e.g., GUIDE\_Expert\_Review\_Analysis\_v1, v2, v3). This maintains version control and allows the team to trace how the analysis developed. The version number increments increase with each completed step and/or each substantive analytical decision

If at any point you are unsure how to classify a comment, record your uncertainty in the Decision Rationale column and flag it for discussion at the next team meeting. Do not force a classification. An honest 'unsure' with a rationale is more useful than a confident but incorrect code.

The completed template, together with the Instrument Alignment Matrix and the revised interview guide, forms the audit trail for Method 2 of the quality assurance article. Treat these documents accordingly: save them in the project's shared documentation folder and do not delete earlier versions.

## Works Consulted and Further Reading

### Works Consulted

- Ahmed, S. K. (2024). The pillars of trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Journal of Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health*, 2, 100051. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glmedi.2024.100051>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2025). Reporting guidelines for qualitative research: A values-based approach. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 22(2), 399–438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2024.2382244>
- Elangovan, N., & Sundaravel, E. (2021). Method of preparing a document for survey instrument validation by experts. *MethodsX*, 8, 101326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2021.101326>
- Johnson, J. L., Adkins, D., & Chauvin, S. (2020). A review of the quality indicators of rigor in qualitative research. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 84(1), 7120. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7120>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE.
- Mays, N., & Pope, C. (2000). Qualitative research in health care: Assessing quality in qualitative research. *BMJ*, 320(7226), 50–52. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.320.7226.50>
- Rickinson, M., Cirkony, C., Walsh, L., Gleeson, J., Cutler, B., & Salisbury, M. (2022). A framework for understanding the quality of evidence use in education. *Educational Research*, 64(2), 133–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2022.2054452>
- Secolsky, C., Wentland, E., & Denison, B. (2011). The need for documenting validation transactions: A qualitative component of the testing validation process. *Quality & Quantity*, 45(6), 1303–1311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-011-9457-6>
- University of Calgary Faculty of Graduate Studies. (2025, April 17). *Guidelines for Generative AI Use in Graduate Studies*. <https://grad.ucalgary.ca/current-students/important-resources-and-supports/graduate-ai-guidelines>

## Further Reading

Buschle, C., Reiter, H., & Bethmann, A. (2022). The qualitative pretest interview for questionnaire development: Outline of programme and practice. *Quality & Quantity*, 56(2), 823–842. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01156-0>

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. (2024). *CASP qualitative studies checklist*. <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>

Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2008). Validity and validation in the making in the context of qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 18(7), 983–989. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732308318039>

Oliveira, H., & Bonito, J. (2026). Practical work in natural sciences education: Development and validation of a qualitative data collection instrument. *Youth*, 6(1), 10. <https://www.mdpi.com/2673-995X/6/1/10>

Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Teixeira, E., Silva, C., & Vicente, A. (2024). Development and validation of an interview guide for examining the effects of sports careers on the quality of life of retired Portuguese football players. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1374784>

## Appendix A: Expert Review Analysis Template: Instructions

### GUIDE Project — Expert Review Analysis Template: Instructions

<b>Purpose</b>	This workbook supports the systematic organisation and analysis of expert reviewer commentary for the GUIDE Faculty Interview Guide.
<b>Tab: Commentary Log</b>	Steps 1–4. Enter one row per reviewer comment. Each comment is mapped to its interview item (column C), thematic construct (column E), appraisal dimension (column G), and action implication (column H). Columns E, G, H, and I contain dropdown lists. Use the Decision Rationale column (J) to record reasoning for ambiguous classifications.
<b>Tab: Convergence Analysis</b>	Step 5. One row per interview item. Summarise each reviewer's assessment, record whether they agree or diverge, describe the nature of any divergence, and document the resolution. This tab feeds the dependability argument in the Methodology section.
<b>Tab: Revision Frequency</b>	Step 7 / Comment SE2. A summary table of revision counts by thematic construct. Cell values in columns B through F are entered manually from the coded Commentary Log. Column G (Total Items) is calculated by formula. The Totals row (row 11) sums each column. This table is designed for direct insertion into the Findings section.
<b>Appraisal Dimensions</b>	<p>Relevance: Does the item address its mapped construct?</p> <p>Clarity: Will participants understand the question as intended?</p> <p>Specificity: Is the item focused on a defined aspect of the construct?</p> <p>Correspondence: Does the item align with the study's research objectives?</p>
<b>Action Codes</b>	<p>Retain: Reviewer affirmed the item; no change needed.</p> <p>Revise: Reviewer identified a specific problem; item needs modification.</p> <p>Rewrite: Reviewer identified a fundamental mismatch; substantive reconceptualization required.</p> <p>Add: Reviewer recommended a new item or probe.</p> <p>Remove: Reviewer recommended deleting the item.</p>
<b>Decision Rule for "Substantive"</b>	Treat any comment identifying a construct mismatch, an embedded normative assumption, or a clarity problem that could alter participant interpretation as substantive, regardless of whether one or both reviewers flagged it.

## Appendix B: Expert Reviewer Commentary Log

### GUIDE Project — Expert Reviewer Commentary Log

Steps 1–4: Compile raw commentary, map to items/constructs, classify by appraisal dimension and action implication.

Entry ID	Reviewer Code	Item Number	Item Label (from Alignment Matrix)	Thematic Construct (Theme 1–6)	Comment Text (verbatim from reviewer)	Appraisal Dimension (Relevance / Clarity / Specificity / Correspondence)	Action Code (Retain / Revise / Rewrite / Add / Remove)	Convergence (Agree / Diverge / Single)	Decision Rationale (if ambiguous coding)	Notes
001	Reviewer A	1.1	Opening/Background: 'Tell me about your teaching role...'	Theme 1: Faculty Perceptions of GenAI for Inclusive Assessment	[Paste reviewer comment here]					
002	Reviewer B	1.1	Opening/Background: 'Tell me about your teaching role...'	Theme 1: Faculty Perceptions of GenAI for Inclusive Assessment	[Paste reviewer comment here]					
003	Reviewer A	2.1	Existing Tensions: 'Can you share a specific example...'	Theme 2: Inclusion vs. Academic Integrity Tensions	[Paste reviewer comment here]					

## Appendix C: Reviewer Convergence Analysis

### GUIDE Project — Reviewer Convergence Analysis

Step 5: Compare reviewer assessments for each item. Record convergence, divergence, and resolution.

Item Number	Thematic Construct	Reviewer A Assessment Summary	Reviewer B Assessment Summary	Convergence (Agree / Diverge)	Nature of Divergence (if applicable)	Resolution and Rationale
1.1	Theme 1: Faculty Perceptions of GenAI for Inclusive Assessment					
1.2	Theme 1: Faculty Perceptions of GenAI for Inclusive Assessment					
2.1	Theme 2: Inclusion vs. Academic Integrity Tensions					
2.2	Theme 2: Inclusion vs. Academic Integrity Tensions					
3.1	Theme 3: GenAI Applications for Assessment Accessibility					
3.2	Theme 3: GenAI Applications for Assessment Accessibility					
4.1	Theme 4: Ethical Framework Development					
4.2	Theme 4: Ethical Framework Development					
5.1	Theme 5: Co-Creation of OER					
5.2	Theme 5: Co-Creation of OER					
6.1	Theme 6: Institutional Policy and Implementation					
6.2	Theme 6: Institutional Policy and Implementation					



**Appendix E: Item Revision Trail****GUIDE Project — Item Revision Trail**

*Step 8: For each revised or rewritten item, record original wording, reviewer comment(s), revised wording, and rationale.*

<b>Item Number</b>	<b>Thematic Construct</b>	<b>Original Item Wording</b>	<b>Reviewer Comment(s) Prompting Change</b>	<b>Revised Item Wording</b>	<b>Revision Rationale</b>

**About the Postplagiarism Research Lab**

The Postplagiarism Research Lab receives funding and support from the Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary. Projects through our lab are supported through a variety of internal and external funding including the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), University of Calgary Teaching Grants, and the Werklund Research Professor programme.

More details on our work and publications can be found at [www.postplagiarism.com](http://www.postplagiarism.com)

**Contact Information**

Sarah Elaine Eaton, PhD

University of Calgary

[seaton@ucalgary.ca](mailto:seaton@ucalgary.ca)