Now I'll zoom in on the process of icon-code development in greater detail. To develop these codes, I relied on the process of discovery through active visual arrangement that is the foundation for this project's approach to invention. I developed my particular approach idiosyncratically in June 2017, but I do want to point readers to Kendra Andrew's video essay "Multimodal Composing, Sketchnotes, and Idea Generation" in *Kairos* Journal's Spring 2018 issue for a parallel discussion of scholarly invention through image manipulation.

I began with the twelve reflection narratives generated in response to the question "Why is this draft arranged in that particular way?" Each reflection narrative described the influences behind salient changes in a draft's design across four key drafts for each of the three autoethnographic webtexts. All twelve reflection narratives are included in this project in the Case Study Hub.

While reading through the key drafts, I created an initial system of icon-codes to highlight influences that struck me as important throughout the drafts. This initial code set included people, navigation, documents, sources, breakdowns, metaphors, pieces, time, location, aesthetic experience, tools, ideas, and impact.

With these codes, I then sketched out visual representations of major influences on webtext design in each reflection narrative, to start to get a sense of emerging patterns and how the codes fit together in these narrative descriptions.

Here's an example of one of the initial icon-code sketches, from "Dancing Across Media" Key Draft 2. It's pretty messy and abstract, but you can see that several people appeared as important influences, that there were changes resulting from technological breakdowns, and that some kind of organizing metaphor was already starting to emerge.

This icon-code sketching was a good way to start seeing patterns in the narrative data that overlapped with the webtext drafts as developing documents. But it was far too much to discuss for the purposes of a single dissertation project. So I decided to narrow down and zoom in on a few key codes to start out my analysis of influences on webtext design invention, with the hopes of exploring the other codes in greater detail in future or successive versions of this project.

The codes I decided to zoom in on were "people", "tools", "metaphors", and "pieces." Specifically, I wanted to trace out and identify the different ways in which people, tools, and metaphors act on pieces of a webtext in ways that affect its inscape,

or the way its total components come together in a design that performs a unique argument. There were several reasons behind this decision. First these proved the most stable categories for grouping and consolidating the other codes mentioned previously. Second, I knew from reading other webtext composers' published invention narratives that these codes tended to emerge as important influences behind changes in their webtext designs across drafts as well. Third, these codes overlap with what Buehl identifies as three key domains of human experience—social, material, and cognitive—in developing methodologies for studying multimodal rhetoric (20-21). Finally, I relied to some degree on a "felt sense" (following Miles, Huberman, and Saldana) for which codes would yield the most productive analytical lens based on my dual immersion in the data as autoethnographic generator and analyzing researcher.

Also, the sketches were starting to get a little messy. At some point I fixed up the codes to look a little neater, easier to identify, and more aesthetically pleasing.

So now I had my data and I had my codes, and I wanted to trace out the relationship between forces, pieces, and influences on design. I started with the reflection narratives and read through them using each of the three main lenses—people, tools, and metaphors. With people, for example, I found all the instances in the narrative in which people directly influenced a concrete change in the draft. (I left out instances in which people appeared in the narrative but did not influence specific changes in the webtext draft, which I labeled a "contextual" influence and did not include in my analysis).

Here's an example from DM2; at the very end of the reflection narrative, there's a mention of people influencing a specific change in the webtext's design. In this case, the direct quote reads: "The sculptural image has also disappeared, and the videos represented are different because we'd gotten updated versions from Kerry and Amber by that point sometime in the interim." I encourage readers to visit the Case Study Hub to read the full narrative and see the draft for context, but basically there was a significant change on the webtext homepage in terms of featured images and videos because several collaborators sent me new, more polished versions of these files.

So I went through the twelve reflection narratives and identified all the instances in which people directly influenced a change in the draft. I condensed these direct quotes into one-sentence summaries, then grouped these summaries by types of influences. These types of influences are my findings, which I address in each chapter's discussion

section. After completing this process for people, I repeated the same steps for tools and metaphors.

At this point, I'd identified types of forces and types of influences; however, this still left me largely engaging just the alphabetic narrative, with minimal attention to the webtext draft itself. What I wanted was to be able to map the icon-codes onto the webtext drafts in ways that highlighted significant changes across time at a glance, while connecting each change to the appropriate influencing force. In other words, I needed to find a way to visualize forces and influences in relation to pieces.

As with the initial icon-code sketching process, early attempts at contextualized data representation were aesthetically and conceptually messy. My initial sketches visualized each page of a webtext draft by symbols representing the page's main components, which made it easy to spot changes at a glance in simplified form. However, that system proved too abstract to be practically useful.

Instead, I switched to screenshot thumbnails so each draft could be represented in full visual context. I then layered my icon-codes on top of these screenshots and created codes based on my data to represent the changes in pieces I wanted to highlight. These static icon-code representations can be viewed in the Case Study Hub alongside the live, interactive webtext draft.

I used this system to analyze twelve autoethnographic reflection narratives, three published narratives, and four interview narratives. My analysis generated multiple icon-code triads, or three sets of codes to represent influences behind changes in webtext design. These triads include types of forces, types of influences, and types of pieces. The full sets of triads are all presented in this project's appendix.

Here's an example of how one such icon-code triad looks in context. I began with the reflection narrative quote from "Dancing Across Media" Key Draft 2 mentioned earlier. After verbally summarizing the quote, I coded it by force, influence, and piece, which according to my code-system became "Collaborator | Give | Media."

There are now multiple ways I can work with this triad as an analytical representation. For example, I might go back to "Dancing Across Media" Key Draft 2 and take a closer look at how these influences are operating in the context of the narratively contextualized draft itself.

Or I can visually chart all the icon-code triads representing a specific force for the autoethnographic drafts to observe emerging patterns of influence, or compare triads from the reflection narratives to those from the published or interview narratives. Note our friend from "Dancing Across Media" Key Draft 2 tucked away there in the midst of the other people-based influences.