
AI-Integrated Assignment Example

Assignment Title: Beginning Coding and Interpretation

Module #: Week 4

Description: This assignment introduces you to first-cycle qualitative coding and the interpretive process that follows. You will apply three coding methods to a mock interview transcript, develop your own categories and theme, compare your analysis to an AI-generated analysis, and reflect on what the comparison reveals about human interpretation. A faith reflection grounded in Micah 6:8 closes the assignment.

Complete the parts in order. Parts 1A and 1B must be finished before you open any AI tool. Your independent analysis is what makes the comparison in Part 3 meaningful. AI use before Part 2 undermines the learning this assignment is designed to build.

AI Level: ● Yellow (AI-Assisted Idea Generation & Editing) — with ● Red sections (No AI use permitted. This section must reflect your own thinking and writing.)

Learning Outcomes: After completing this lesson, students will be able to:

1. Apply first-cycle qualitative coding methods, using In Vivo, Descriptive, and Process Coding to analyze qualitative interview data.
 2. Differentiate among coding methods by selecting the coding approach that best represents participants' words, actions, and experiences while remaining close to the original data.
 3. Develop categories and themes by organizing codes into meaningful patterns and synthesizing those patterns into a coherent qualitative theme grounded in the data.
 4. Demonstrate inductive qualitative analysis by allowing categories and themes to emerge from the transcript rather than imposing preconceived ideas or assumptions.
 5. Critically evaluate AI-assisted qualitative analysis by comparing human-generated coding with AI-generated coding, identifying areas of alignment and divergence, and explaining how interpretation influences qualitative findings.
 6. Analyze the role of researcher interpretation by articulating the strengths and limitations of both human and AI coding in qualitative research.
 7. Reflect on the ethical responsibilities of qualitative researchers by connecting principles of justice, mercy, and humility (Micah 6:8) to the interpretation and representation of participants' lived experiences.
 8. Demonstrate responsible and transparent AI use by following assignment guidelines regarding when AI is and is not appropriate and documenting AI use through an AI disclosure statement.
-

AI Usage Statement: *Include a clear statement describing the level and purpose of AI use in this lesson.*

Instructions

Read the mock interview transcript below carefully. Then apply 5 to 7 first-cycle codes using all three of the following methods:

- In Vivo Coding: Use the participant's exact words as the code label. Put quotation marks around the label to signal that it comes directly from the transcript. Do not paraphrase, summarize, or change any words.
 - Descriptive Coding: Write a short phrase in your own words that summarizes what a segment is about. Name the specific idea in that segment, not what it means across the whole transcript.
 - Process Coding: Write a gerund-based label (-ing form) that captures an ongoing action or behavior. Keep the focus on what someone is doing, not what it means.
-

Mock Interview Transcript Excerpt

Participant ID: HS03

Topic Focus: Instructor Characteristics and Behaviors that Influence Student Learning and Motivation

Setting: High school student reflecting on their Algebra II teacher

“When I first walked into Mr. Lang’s class, I honestly didn’t expect much. Math had always been something I just tried to survive. But he changed that almost right away. He started the year by saying, ‘My job is not to teach math. My job is to teach you—and math is just how we get there.’ That got my attention.

He had a routine of starting every Monday with what he called a ‘check-in question.’ It could be as simple as ‘What’s one thing that made you laugh this weekend?’ or ‘What’s one challenge you faced?’ He always responded to what we wrote. I remember when I shared about my mom’s surgery—he followed up quietly after class and asked how she was doing. That small moment made a big difference.

Academically, he used lots of examples and real-world problems—like calculating loan interest or figuring out how much paint was needed for a wall. It made math feel less abstract. He encouraged collaboration, too. We’d solve tough problems in groups, and he’d walk around listening, asking questions—not giving us the answer, but nudging us in the right direction.

One thing that stood out was his ‘mistake board.’ He had a whiteboard where we were encouraged to write mistakes we made—and what we learned from them. Nobody got in trouble. It became normal to hear things like, ‘I misunderstood the formula, but now I get it.’ That environment made it easier to take risks.

He also offered feedback that went beyond grades. On one test, I got a 72%, but his comment said, ‘You showed growth on this concept—especially compared to two weeks ago. Let’s talk during office hours about the slope problems.’ That feedback made me feel seen, not judged.

Spiritually, he didn’t preach, but he modeled grace. He was patient, consistent, and made space for everyone, even the quiet kids. Once, when a student lashed out in class, he calmly said, ‘We all have

hard days. Let's reset and move forward.' That stuck with me.

I used to dread math. Now I'm thinking of majoring in business. A big reason is how Mr. Lang made me believe I could actually do this."

Assignment Guidelines

Part 1: Coding the Transcript, Categorizing, and Theme Development  Red — No AI (No AI use permitted. This section must reflect your own thinking and writing.)

1. Review the provided sample transcript titled Mock Interview Transcript Excerpt.
2. Select and code meaningful words, phrases, or passages from the transcript using one or more of the following first-cycle coding methods:
 - Descriptive Coding (summary word/phrase)
 - In Vivo Coding (exact words from participant)
 - Process Coding (uses "-ing" verbs to capture actions)
 - If any other codes are used, please cite the source where you learned it.
3. Your 5 to 7 codes should come from different segments of the transcript and should include a mix of all three methods. Anchor each code to a specific moment in the data, not to a general impression of the whole interview. First-cycle coding is about staying close to the data; interpretation comes later.
4. Categorize your codes into 2–3 categories based on patterns or similarities. Ask yourself: which codes seem to belong together, and what do they have in common? Give each category a label that captures the shared idea, then write 2 to 3 sentences explaining what connects the codes within it and what the category reveals about the data. Your categories should grow from your own codes, not from your general sense of the transcript. If a category label could apply to any interview about a good teacher, it is probably too broad. Aim for labels that are specific to what this participant said.
5. Suggest a possible theme that could emerge from your analysis. A theme is not a category label; it is a statement about what the data reveals as a whole. Look across all your categories and ask: what is the bigger story these categories are telling together? Write one clear, complete sentence that captures that story. A strong theme names both what the teacher does and what effect it has on the student.

Helpful Hint: Categories organize your codes. A theme synthesizes across your categories. If your theme sounds like a category label, push further. The theme should answer the question: what does this data ultimately tell us about this student's experience?

Part 2: AI Coding and Theme Development

- AI Coding ( Green — Required)
- Submit the following prompt and the full transcript to your AI tool of choice. Copy the complete AI output (codes, categories, and theme) into your document exactly as it was generated. Do not edit or summarize the AI response.
- AI prompt (copy exactly): "Apply first-cycle qualitative coding to the following transcript.

Identify 5–7 codes using descriptive, in vivo, or process coding methods. Organize the codes into 2 to 3 categories and suggest a theme." Copy and paste the AI's full response into your document and include the prompt you used.

- In your AI Disclosure Statement, identify which AI tool you used, the date you used it, and confirm that it was used only for Part 2.

Part 3: Comparison and Reflective Summary (150-200 words) (🔴 Red — No AI): This analysis must be your own.

In your summary, address:

- Compare your codes to the AI's codes.
- Identify at least one area of alignment between your analysis and the AI output.
- Identify at least one or two specific points of divergence. Name both your code or category and the AI code or category, and explain what each label preserves or loses about the participant's meaning.
- Analyze what the differences reveal about human interpretation versus AI pattern recognition. What can a human coder do that the AI cannot, and what does that tell you about qualitative research as a practice?

Helpful hint: A general statement like "humans are more interpretive than AI" will not earn full marks. The analytical payoff of this section comes from the specific examples. Name the codes, explain the difference, and conclude it.

Part 4: Faith Reflection (🔴 Red — No AI): This must be in your own voice.

- Reflect on Micah 6:8 in relation to your work as a qualitative researcher: "He has shown you, O mortal, what is good. And what does the Lord require of you? To act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God." As a qualitative researcher, how does this verse shape your responsibility to interpret participants' voices with justice, mercy, and humility?
- Cite how Creswell and Poth's framework connects to justice, mercy, and humility.
- Your reflection must address all three elements of the verse and connect each one explicitly to the responsibilities of the qualitative researcher:
 - Acting justly: What does it mean to represent participants' voices with honesty, accuracy, and completeness?
 - Loving mercy: What does it mean to approach participants' stories with genuine empathy and care for the person behind the data?
 - Walking humbly: What does it mean to acknowledge the limits of your own interpretation and remain open to what the data reveals?

Helpful Hint: A strong faith reflection names all three elements using the language of the verse and connects each one to a specific responsibility of the qualitative researcher.

AI Disclosure Statement [for students to complete]

Include a brief statement (2–3 sentences) describing how AI was used in this assignment, if at all.
AI Disclosure: [Insert AI disclosure statement here.]

Resources [Insert links, templates, rubrics, additional resources here]

Rubric	
Part 1: Coding the Transcript	Full Marks 5–7 first-cycle codes are clearly applied; demonstrates variety (Descriptive, In Vivo, Process); codes are accurate, relevant, and well-labeled. 5 pts
Part 2: Category and Theme Development	Full Marks Codes are organized into 2–3 meaningful categories with one clear, well-supported theme. 3 pts
Part 3: Reflective Summary	Full Marks 150–200 words; clearly explains coding choices, category development, and lessons learned; demonstrates insight and critical reflection. 4 pts
Part 4: Faith Reflection	Selected Full Marks Connects work to Micah 6:8 with thoughtful insight into justice, mercy, and humility in qualitative research. 3 pts