

## Erratum

In our Article "From Words to Numbers - How to Transform Qualitative Data into Meaningful Quantitative Results " published in Schmalenbach Business Review Vol. 59 (January), pp. 29-57 we have detected an error in Table 5 ("Inter-coder Consistency Matrix") on page 45. Mistakenly, the first row and column ("Other") have been deleted from the table.

We apologize for the mistake and provide the complete and correct table below.

Coder 1/ Coder 2	Other	Substantive	Task-oriented	Persuasive	Communic. Protocol	Tactical	Procedural	Affective	Private	Text-specific	Total
Other	1	3	9	1	0	2	0	2	0	1	19
Substantive	2	401	51	11	0	18	1	12	0	0	496
Task-oriented	6	23	430	44	0	25	2	18	1	1	550
Persuasive	0	5	114	85	0	12	0	6	0	0	222
Protocol	0	0	0	0	683	0	0	0	0	0	683
Tactical	2	9	61	62	0	86	3	12	0	2	237
Procedural	0	1	51	3	0	1	58	5	2	0	121
Affective	5	2	40	16	3	1	1	372	3	1	444
Private	2	1	14	2	2	0	2	6	121	0	150
Text-specific	3	4	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	82	101
<b>Total</b>	21	449	780	225	688	145	67	433	128	87	3,023
<b>Agreement %</b>	3%	74%	48%	23%	99%	29%	45%	74%	77%	77%	

When the inter-coder consistency matrix was created to check the validity of the categories developed, the "Other"-category (see p. 43 in the article), which is missing in the table, still existed. In the final coding run, which followed this step, the items preliminarily assigned to this temporary category were coded into one of the defined categories so that the "Other"-category was finally eliminated.

Inter-coder agreement rates indicated in the original table are correct and thus remain unchanged. They are calculated for each category by relating the number of identical codings indicated in the shaded field to the sum of all codings of both coders (identical and differing) indicated in the various fields in the category row and column. For the calculation, the following formula is applied:

$$\text{Inter-coder Percent Agreement} = \frac{\text{Identical Codings}}{[\text{Identical Codings} + (\text{Sum of Differing Codings by Coder 1}) + (\text{Sum of Differing Codings of Coder 2})]}$$

Example: Following this formula, for instance, the agreement rate of 74% for the category "substantive" is calculated as follows:  $401 / [401 + (2 + 51+11+18+1+12) + (3 + 23+5+9+1+2+1+4)]$

It needs to be noted that coding units in the table sum up to 3,023. As indicated in the article (p. 42), the final number of coding units totaled 3,560. The 537 units missing in the table were added before the final coding round was run, because they had been overseen by coders in the original data file.

We gratefully acknowledge the inquiry by Ms Ying Xu, which led to detection and correction of the error as well as identification of the need to clarify how inter-coder agreement is calculated.

For comparison, we add the original table published in the article.

Published in SBR									
Coder 1/ Coder 2	Substantive	Task-oriented	Persuasive	Communic. Protocol	Tactical	Procedural	Affective	Private	Text-specific
Substantive	401	51	11	0	18	1	12	0	0
Task-oriented	23	430	44	0	25	2	18	1	1
Persuasive	5	114	85	0	12	0	6	0	0
Comm. Protocol	0	0	0	683	0	0	0	0	0
Tactical	9	61	62	0	86	3	12	0	2
Procedural	1	51	3	0	1	58	5	2	0
Affective	2	40	16	3	1	1	372	3	1
Private	1	14	2	2	0	2	6	121	0
Text-specific	4	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	82
Total	446	771	224	688	143	67	431	128	86
Agreement (%)	74%	48%	23%	99%	29%	45%	74%	77%	77%