This document evidences the analytic steps taken to move from raw primary data (focus group transcript, two asynchronous interview responses, and Miro board artefacts) to three final findings (themes). It contains two layers of coding, the final three hemes with supporting verbatims, and the research limitations.

Data

Source	Date / format	Participants	What it contained
Focus group transcript ([see Post: ARP3](#))	Live group discussion	P1–P5 + moderator	Discussion prompted by 4 AI-generated outfits; participants wrote words/feelings/assumptions in Miro, then discussed context and comfort.
Asynchronous interview responses ([see Post: ARP3](#))	Post-session written responses (5 questions)	Participant 3 and Participant 4	Reflections on personal values and dress; what stood out; additional thoughts; sensitivity and self-monitoring.
Miro board artefacts ([see Post: ARP3](#))	During focus group	Same focus group participants	Participant-generated post-its and placements: Words Wall, Feelings, Assumptions, Identity Factors, Decoded Outfit maps, Intent maps, Comfort spectrum.

Analytic approach

I used a reflexive thematic analysis approach: iterative familiarisation, line-by-line coding, collating codes into candidate themes, and refining themes against the full dataset. Coding was primarily inductive (grounded in what participants said and did in the Miro tasks), while being informed by sensitising concepts from the project framing (inclusion vs belonging; shared-space ethics; interpretive judgement; self-monitoring).

The Miro outputs were treated as data rather than 'illustrations': they captured rapid first impressions (words, feelings, assumptions) that participants might soften or reframe in spoken discussion.

Thematic Analysis

1. Initial coding

I coded the focus group transcript line-by-line, focusing on: (a) interpretive moves (how meaning is attributed to outfits), (b) norm talk (what is 'appropriate' where, and why), and (c) talk practices (hesitation, hedging, humour, self-correction). Interview responses were coded using the same frame to identify whether private reflection produced different content. Miro artefacts supported coding by making visible first-association language (words/feelings/assumptions) and placements on the comfort and intent axes.

Table 1. Initial codebook

Initial code	What it captured	Verbatim
Context as governing frame	Participants justify judgements by relocating them to context (e.g., business school vs design school).	"It's very normal in fashion school or a creative setting, but then in a business school, many people come from convention, traditional or, you know, conservative backgrounds. This still would be a big statement is what I feel in like a business school." (P2, focus group)
Dress as code-of-conduct	Dress framed as part of formal conduct and respect in specific environments.	"Again, business settings are meant to be formal. There is a code of conduct with how people interact with one another and dressing is a part of it." (P1, focus group)
Social sanction / 'cancellation'	Imagined consequences for dress that violates context norms.	"Outfit number two, it would be very, it would be cancelled in a business context. Like they would not want that, them to come, yeah, completely cancelled is what I would say." (P2, focus group)
Fast identity inference	Outfits read as signals of identity and ideology (e.g., symbols, messages).	"there's messages written, there's the queer flag" (P2, focus group)
Shared-space belonging	Comfort/discomfort framed as relational and tied to belonging in shared space.	"when there is a space where you share with that person, It's a sense of belongingness and it's a sense of

		like, you know, you trying to be yourself." (P2, focus group)
Self-expression primacy	Discomfort resisted on grounds of individual expression rights.	"I personally don't believe in having a discomfort in like being around someone because at the end of the day, it's a matter of how they want to express themselves" (P4, focus group)
Fear of offending (self-monitoring)	Participants monitor speech and judgement to avoid harming/being seen as harmful.	"The fear of unintentionally offending someone was real, as I believe it could be a very sensitive topic" (P4, interview)
Group hesitation / softened critique	Reluctance to say negative things publicly; lack of disagreement.	"I think there was some amount of hesitation amongst the group to say negative things or things that might be perceived as negative, and that there wasn't any major disagreement based off of that fact." (P2, interview)
Faith as absence / imagined test case	Faith and religious dress appear as something missing and 'interesting to test'.	"it would be interesting to see more of a cultural aspect, like ethnic clothing or a religious aspect to the clothing and see how I and others respond to that." (P3, interview)

2. Themes

After initial coding, codes were clustered into candidate themes by asking: Which codes describe the same underlying pattern? Which are contextual conditions vs outcomes? Which relate most directly to the research question about intersection (dress-faith-modesty) and about surfacing experiences (how talk becomes possible or constrained)?

Table 2. Code-to-theme clustering

Candidate theme (working label)	Key contributing codes	How it was refined
Decoding and non-neutral interpretation	Fast identity inference; moralisation; stereotype activation; 'book by cover'	Merged overlapping codes (identity inference + moral judgement) into a single

	tension; post-it first impressions	pattern: rapid decoding with social stakes.
Contextual governance of acceptability	Context as governing frame; dress as code-of-conduct; social sanction ('cancelled'); professionalism/employability	Separated 'context talk' from 'comfort talk': this theme focuses on how acceptability is narrated as situational and institutional.
Faith/modesty as 'hard to say' (silence and self-monitoring)	Fear of offending; group hesitation; sensitivity framing; faith as absence/imagined test case; privacy/visibility axis	Reframed from 'faith content' to 'faith-discourse constraint': faith/modesty surfaced more via caution and omission than direct debate.

3. Reviewing and defining themes

Theme 1. Dress gets 'decoded' fast, and the decoding is rarely neutral

Interpretation happens as an immediate social practice. Even when participants attempt to stay 'respectful', they still infer identity, ideology, and social positioning from dress. The analytic emphasis is on the speed and confidence of decoding, and on participants' reflexive awareness that this decoding can be harmful.

Key supporting extracts:

Focus group (P2): "...there's messages written, there's the queer flag... It's very normal in fashion school or a creative setting, but then in a business school... this still would be a big statement..."

Interview (Participant 4): "linking a person's attire to their identity would be a very toxic thing to do (like judging a book by its cover)."

Interview (Participant 3): "if its someone with a Posh accent that was in the neon outfit, it would sort of break a certain stereotype..."

Theme 2. 'Anything goes' is more myth than reality, and context quietly governs what feels acceptable

Participants repeatedly used 'context' (business vs design school, professional vs creative settings) to justify what would be acceptable. This reveals that 'anything goes' operates as

a bounded norm, with different limits depending on imagined audiences and institutional expectations.

Key supporting extracts:

Focus group (P1): "Again, business settings are meant to be formal. There is a code of conduct with how people interact with one another and dressing is a part of it."

Focus group (P2): "Outfit number two... would be cancelled in a business context... completely cancelled..."

Interview (Participant 3): "they all felt fairly secular in nature... the sort of people that I would expect to see in a design school."

Theme 3. Faith and modesty showed up more through silence, self-monitoring, and sanction imaginaries than through open debate

Faith and modesty were not prominent as explicit content in the focus group discussion. Instead, they were present as a boundary around what is comfortably sayable: fear of offence, hedging, and the suggestion that religious/cultural dress would be a 'test case' for responses. The theme also incorporates imagined sanction routes (e.g., 'code of conduct', 'cancelled') that allow participants to imply boundaries without debating faith or modesty directly.

Key supporting extracts:

Moderator (focus group): "the reason why there's so much writing for you to do is because there are sensitive topics..."

Interview (Participant 4): "The fear of unintentionally offending someone was real, as I believe it could be a very sensitive topic..."

Interview (Participant 3): "there was some amount of hesitation amongst the group to say negative things or things that might be perceived as negative..."

Interview (Participant 3): "it would be interesting to see... a religious aspect to the clothing and see how I and others respond..."

How the Miro artefacts were used in analysis

The Miro board served two analytic functions. First, it captured 'first association' language (Words Wall; Feelings; Assumptions) before participants could collectively negotiate what was acceptable to say aloud. Second, the placement tasks (Decoded Outfit maps; Intent maps; Comfort Spectrum) externalised tacit judgments by requiring participants to locate outfits along axes such as social coherence vs disruption, visibility vs privacy, and discomfort vs no discomfort. These artefacts were used to triangulate and to check whether spoken discussion aligned with written impressions.

Limitations and integrity checks

- Small, exploratory dataset (one focus group and two interview responses) limits transferability; the aim is depth and pattern identification, not representativeness.
- 'Faith/modesty' appears more as a discursive constraint than as substantive first-person faith narratives in this dataset; future cycles would require deliberate sampling and prompts.
- Triangulation across three data forms (spoken transcript, written interviews, visual Miro outputs) increased analytic confidence where patterns repeated (context governance; hesitation).
- Reflexivity: the moderator's framing (explaining privacy/modesty and sensitivity) shaped what participants attended to; this is treated as part of the interactional context rather than a flaw to be 'removed'.