

# Project Guide to Coding in Nvivo and Codebook

Ashwin Ravikumar  
Rodd Myers  
Laura Kowler  
Jazmín Gonzales Tovar

Supplement document for

Ravikumar A, Kijazi M, Larson AM and Kowler L. 2015.

*Project Guide and Methods Training Manual*. Guideline. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.



## Guideline

© 2015 Center for International Forestry Research



Content in this publication is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0), <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISBN 978-602-1504-88-8

DOI: 10.17528/cifor/005542

Ravikumar A, Myers R, Kowler L and Tovar JG. 2015. *Project Guide to Coding in Nvivo and Codebook*. Guideline. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.

Corresponding author Ashwin Ravikumar – [ashwin.r@cgiar.org](mailto:ashwin.r@cgiar.org)

CIFOR  
Jl. CIFOR, Situ Gede  
Bogor Barat, 16115  
Indonesia

T +62 (251) 8622-622

F +62 (251) 8622-100

E [cifor@cgiar.org](mailto:cifor@cgiar.org)

## **cifor.org**

We would like to thank all donors who supported this research through their contributions to the CGIAR Fund. For a list of Fund donors please see: <https://www.cgiarfund.org/FundDonors>

Any views expressed in this publication are those of the authors. They do not necessarily represent the views of CIFOR, the editors, the authors' institutions, the financial sponsors or the reviewers.

# Contents

---

How to Code	1
Classifying your Interview	1
The Nodes	2
NVivo Code Table	2

---

# Guide to Coding

The purpose of this working document is to describe our system for importing, classifying, and coding your data from the field in Nvivo. The attached codebook provides information on the specific codes that were developed for this project. These codes must necessarily be altered somewhat to adapt to specific research questions and contexts. For a copy of the Nvivo node tree and further information on how to apply them, please contact the corresponding author (Ashwin Ravikumar – ashwin.r@cgjar.org).

## How to Code

Learning to code your data is an iterative process, and it will become much faster once you have coded several interviews. Especially towards the beginning, please consult with other team members – either your country supervisor or the Lima team – liberally as you become familiar with the procedures.

In general, the different nodes are labeled to describe their intent, and what types of responses should be coded at them. Otherwise, this document is your guide on how to code, and what each node is for. When I code qualitative data, I ask myself the following questions frequently as I proceed:

- What analytical questions might I ask myself later that this text would help me answer?
- When we are doing analysis later, and want to know about \_\_\_\_\_, is this text coded in such a way that we will be able to easily retrieve it with an obvious query?
- Are there any other analytical questions that we might have later that this question may be useful in answering besides my first instinct?

Below, the different nodes are described, followed by an important section on cross-coding with actors.

## Classifying your Interview

Before you get into substantive coding, you should code the entire interview on basic attributes: country, instrument used (key informant, benefit sharing survey, or ethnography), region/province, district/local administrative subdivision, interviewer (that's you), and case name. For the case name, name your cases systematically. We recommend that each case be assigned a number for reference. For example, we might name cases from San Martin SM1- Barranquita Oil palm, SM2- PNCA REDD+, etc. cases in Central Kalimantan might be CK1- KFCP REDD+, CK2- RMU REDD+, etc., and cases from Ucayali could be UCA1- Padre Abad Oil Palm, UCA2- AIDER REDD+, etc. The particular naming scheme that you choose is left to your discretion.

To classify each interview, highlight the entire text of the interview, and code it to the appropriate classifying nodes according to the procedure above.

## The Nodes

This section describes all current coding nodes, and how to use them. The blue nodes must be cross-coded with an actor from the “Actor Mention” section. Other nodes should NOT be cross-coded with an actor from Actor Mention. In general, if a piece of text from an interview seems to have multiple nodes that it could be coded to, the best practice is to code it at all relevant nodes. Moreover, try to think about all possible contexts in which a piece of text may be relevant. For example, text dealing with land use history might also be highly relevant to an analysis later that focuses on conflict between levels of government. Make sure to code it in such a way that you or someone else doing analysis later can retrieve it for any analysis that it is relevant for.

## NVivo Code Table

Name	Information
<b>Accountability</b>	Code responses where the respondent discusses accountability of land use decision-making processes here. This should be construed broadly, including mechanisms of accountability, and perceptions of accountability. However, it should NOT include accountability in processes BENEFIT SHARING – that must be coded LATER.
Actor Mention	This category is ONLY for cross-coding. Items in BLUE below should be cross-coded with the relevant actor under Actor Mention. It is important to ONLY cross-code the blue items below with actors, as otherwise the folks doing analysis will not know what to cross-query, and your coding may not be put to use.
ADAT Traditional Leadership	Indonesia only
CBC Community Based Committee	
CMFC Community Managed Forest Committee	
COAL Coalition of Actors	
CONCESSION Holder(s)	
CORP Private Company	
DONR Donors	
FARM Farmer org or coop	
GOV1 National	
GOV2 Province (Region)	
GOV3 District (Province)	
GOV4 Subdistrict	
GOV5 Village or Community	Village or community GOVERNMENT
GOV6 Actor below village level	
GOVG Multi-level Government Group	
IACT Independent Activist	
IND Indigenous Organization	
LOBY Private Lobbyist	

continued on next page

## NVivo Code Table - Continued

Name	Information
MSME Small Enterprise	Micro, small and medium enterprises can include small-scale miners, small agricultural businesses, and other small businesses. It is likely that a MSME actor is also a smallholder, although they may be a private firm - if necessary, double code
NGOI International NGO	
NGOL Local NGO	
NGON National NGO	
RINI International Research Institute	
RINN National Research Institute	
SMHOLD Smallholders	Smallholder farmers themselves
<b>Articulation and Communication</b>	Code responses, such as from KI 14, about articulation and communication between levels of government and other actors as below here, EXCEPT IN THE CONTEXT OF BENEFIT SHARING AS THAT HAS A SEPARATE NODE
AC Other	Code other descriptions of information flow and articulation between actors. THIS IS AN IMPORTANT CODE THAT SHOULD CAPTURE ALL COMMUNICATION AND ARTICULATION BETWEEN ACTORS APART FROM WHAT FITS IN THE OTHER SPECIFIC NODES ON INTER-LEVEL COMMUNICATION
AC RegDist	Code information about information flow and articulation between regional and local government here
AC RegNat	Code information about information flow and articulation between regional and provincial government here
AC RegProv	Code information about information flow and articulation between regional and national government here
<b>Authority</b>	Different roles, powers, responsibilities, and purviews related to land use and other areas are nested here. All must be cross-coded with the actor who the respondent describes as having that authority.
Authority- Horizontal	Issues of power relations and decision making authority among horizontal levels of government
Authority- Land use decisions	
• Authority- LUD- Agriculture	
• Authority- LUD- Concessions	Code here for concessions of all types
• Authority- LUD- Forest	
• Authority- LUD- Indigenous land	
• Authority- LUD- Industry	
• Authority- LUD- Infrastructure	
• Authority- LUD- Mining	Code here for NON-HYDROCARBON mining
• Authority- LUD- Oil	Code here for oil AND OTHER HYDROCARBONS

continued on next page

## NVivo Code Table - Continued

Name	Information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authority- LUD Planning and Zoning</li> </ul>	Code here for actors involved in any planning or zoning. If a response suggests an authority that involves planning and zoning, but also another sector or activity – such as titling, indigenous lands, or even agriculture – you should TRIPLE CODE it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authority- LUD- Plantations</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authority- LUD- Protected Areas</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authority- LUD- Ranching</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authority- LUD- REDD+ Policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Code here for actors involved in REDD+ POLICY (all levels)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authority- LUD REDD+ Project Planning or Implementation</li> </ul>	Code here for actors involved in REDD+ PROJECTS planning or implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authority- LUD Titling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Code here for actors involved in titling lands of any type. If an actor is noted as having responsibility over titling a PARTICULAR type of land – for example, concessions or indigenous lands – you should TRIPLE CODE it.</li> </ul>
Authority- Other	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authority- infrastructure</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authority- Permits</li> </ul>	
Authority- Traditional	Traditional authorities including adat in Indonesia, other traditional authority elsewhere
<b>Benefit Sharing</b>	
All nodes related to benefit sharing are nested here	
BS Accountability	Code all information dealing with accountability mechanisms and processes here, including recourses available to actors if another actor reneges on a contractual agreement. Conflict resolution mechanisms should also be coded here.
BS Aspirations	Hopes that people have from the BS arrangement that have not yet materialised
BS Capacity Change	The nodes representing the different types of 'capacity change' from the question on the BS survey are nested under this node. Code the responses to the appropriate node based on the response to the question.
BS Challenges	Specific challenges that the BS arrangement faces are nested here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Conflicts Among Actors</li> </ul>	Code responses that indicate any type of conflict among actors. This could be, for example, between households in a project village, between a private firm and communities, between levels or divisions of government, or between NGOs and other actors. Conflict can, of course, arise as a result of the other challenges. Lack of political will, lack of funds, or low capacity, for example, generate – or be inextricably linked – to conflict. Thus, cross-code conflict with other relevant challenges.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Different interpretations</li> </ul>	Code responses that indicate that there are issues arising from different actors having different interpretations of the purpose, nature, or activities of the arrangement. This includes issues arising from lack of clarity in laws, norms, and de facto rules, or overlapping roles and responsibilities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Lack of Funds</li> </ul>	Code responses that indicate insufficient funds for designing, managing, or implementing the BS arrangement here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Lack of Information</li> </ul>	Code responses that indicate lack of information among any actors as a challenge here. This can also include misinformation. Remember to double code

continued on next page

## NVivo Code Table - Continued

Name	Information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS Lack of Interest</li> </ul>	Code responses that indicate lack of interest among key stakeholders in the benefit sharing arrangement or associated activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS Lack of Political Will</li> </ul>	Code responses that indicate lack of political will, including for example lack of buy-in from participants
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS Low capacity</li> </ul>	Code responses that indicate lack of capacity here, such as insufficient trained personnel or human resources
BS Conflict Resolution Mechanism	Responses that deal with how conflicts are resolved when they arise, or how they play out. If there are conflicts in the design OR implementation of benefit sharing, they can be coded here.
BS Contract	Code responses detailing whether or not - and if so what sort - of contract exists
BS Contractual Recourse	Responses describing what one actor can do to respond if there is a breach of contract. If someone isn't paid what they are owed, what can they do about it, or example?
BS Dependency	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS Dependency - BSA</li> </ul>	Responses to question on peoples' dependence on the benefit sharing arrangement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS Dependency - Natural Resources</li> </ul>	Responses to question on peoples' dependence on natural resources in general
BS Information	Code responses related to how information is shared between actors. If information sharing or quality of information is flagged as a challenge, remember to double code under BS Challenges- Lack of Information (described below).
BS Interest Change	Code responses that indicate that actors' interests have changed related to or due to the benefit sharing arrangement (potentially as a result of exclusion or inclusion)
BS Law	Code responses that speak to the status of benefit sharing laws (nonexistent, in development, or community-based statute without formalized law by districts, regions, provinces, or national government).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS Law Exists</li> </ul>	Code here for descriptions of laws pertaining to benefit sharing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS Law In Development</li> </ul>	Descriptions of laws in development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS No law or norm</li> </ul>	Code here for responses that indicate that there is neither a law nor an informal arrangement/set of norms governing the rights and responsibilities associated with the benefit sharing arrangements. This includes mentions of laws being "in development," as they do not yet exist.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS Norm Exists</li> </ul>	Code here for descriptions of informal norms or arrangements that assign roles and responsibilities associated with the benefit sharing arrangement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community-based statute</li> </ul>	If there is a community-based statute, code here
BS Management	Nodes that describe the role of communities in management of the benefit sharing arrangement are nested here. Note that these categories were developed largely based on theory, and preliminary findings suggest that the distinctions may not be so clear in reality. If there is a description of how the benefit sharing arrangement is managed, code it to the category that BEST fits the description.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS Management-Community-based</li> </ul>	Code responses that suggest broad community control over management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS Management-Consigned</li> </ul>	Code responses that suggest communities engage in consigned management

continued on next page

## NVivo Code Table - Continued

Name	Information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Management-Consultation</li> </ul>	Code responses that suggest communities are consulted here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Management-Cooperative</li> </ul>	Code responses that suggest communities cooperatively participate in management with some responsibilities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Management- Other</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Management-Partnership</li> </ul>	Code responses that suggest communities jointly manage the arrangement with another actor
BS Negotiation	Code responses here dealing with WHO WANTED WHAT, and WHO GOT WHAT. This includes the process of how those outcomes were reached.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Negotiation difference of opinion</li> </ul>	Code negotiation issues that suggest differences of opinion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Negotiation resolutions to differences</li> </ul>	Code negotiation issues that detail how the difference of opinion was resolved
BS Participating Actors	Cross-code with actors who participated in the design, management, or implementation of the benefit sharing arrangement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excluded actors</li> </ul>	Cross-code with actors who were EXCLUDED or did NOT participate in the design, management, or implementation of the benefit-sharing agreement
BS Participation Level	
0. No BS Participation	
1. Low BS Participation	
2. Medium BS Participation	
3. High BS Participation	
BS Participation Mechanism	Code responses that deal with the mechanism for securing participation in the design or governance of the benefit sharing arrangement
BS Scale	Geographic extent of benefit sharing arrangement is discussed
BS Stage	Advancement of BS arrangement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Arrangement not yet completed</li> </ul>	Code indications that the benefit sharing arrangement has not yet been completed or is still in development here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS Completed</li> </ul>	Code indications that the benefit sharing arrangement is complete here - that is, it has been agreed upon by relevant parties
BS Sustainability	Code responses dealing with how sustainable the benefit sharing arrangement is. Are sources of funding secure for the long term?
BS Type	Code indications of the type of benefit being shared
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burden</li> </ul>	Any burdens that are shared - along with benefits - should be coded here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct Monetary Benefit)</li> </ul>	Indications of direct monetary benefits should be coded here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indirect (Non-Monetary Benefit)</li> </ul>	Indications of any non-monetary benefits, such as
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to resources</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity Building and Training</li> </ul>	

continued on next page

## NVivo Code Table - Continued

Name	Information
• Certification	
• Cultural protection	
• Ecosystem improvement	
• Forest Protection	
• Infrastructure	
• Jobs	
• Other	
• Technical Assistance	
• Tenure	
<b>Coalitions</b>	Code responses where respondents describe actors that they cooperate with or are in coalition with
<b>Drivers</b>	
Drivers of DD	Code responses where respondents describe drivers of deforestation and actors responsible for deforestation, forest degradation, and progress towards increasing emissions from land use change here. Cross-code with actor responsible for the driver of deforestation.
Drivers of improvement	Code responses where respondents note drivers of "improvement." Actors responsible for movement towards decreasing emissions from land use here such as reforestation, conservation, or other REDD+ activities
• Effectiveness	Code responses about how effective activities aimed at reducing deforestation and forest degradation are
1. Low Effectiveness	
2. Medium Effectiveness	
3. High Effectiveness	
• Required actions to reduce DD	Code respondents' perspectives on what would be required to really reduce deforestation and forest degradation here.
<b>General Highlights</b>	Key quotes on any topic
<b>Government and Context</b>	Nodes related to government activities, conflicts between levels and sectors of government, and changes in government roles and responsibilities in general – this category is for information about the overall context of government, not necessarily related to our case studies.
<b>Incentives for Behavior</b>	
Economic Incentive	Indications of Land use change incentivized economically
Legal Incentive	Code indications of decisions being motivated by law
Political Incentive	Code indications of political incentives including votes, coalition-building, securing more power, or being made to by political leverage
<b>Land Use</b>	
CURRENT Land Condition, Use, and Activities	Code descriptions of CURRENT land use

continued on next page

## NVivo Code Table - Continued

Name	Information
Direction of Land Use Change	Code indications of the direction of land use change
Land Ownership and Tenure	Ownership and tenure - any reference to the nested types
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="194 568 427 624">• Land Use Change Consequence</li> </ul>	Code responses describing the consequences of land use change. This is construed broadly. If they describe economic consequences, livelihoods consequences, environmental consequences, or governance consequences, or tenure consequences, these responses can be coded to this node. Further analysis can parse these finer distinctions later.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="194 736 427 763">• Land Use Conflict</li> </ul>	Code descriptions of land use conflict here. As with land use history, this is to be construed broadly, and may encompass longer texts describing conflicts in detail. These are very useful for reports later on, and more granular analyses can be conducted later.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="194 875 427 902">• Land Use History</li> </ul>	Code responses that generally describe history of land use at a site here. This comes out of all instruments, but often the ethnography. This node may have very long texts or sections of transcripts coded to it at once. This is okay, as the histories will need to be traced in later analyses, and are moreover useful for regional and country reports. Note that there are several items nested under this that are more specific, dealing with carbon emissions from land use. Where responses relate histories that speak specifically to such issues, code them there. Other responses dealing with land use history more generally should be coded here.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="194 1144 395 1171">• Land Use Scale               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="234 1182 403 1209">• Community</li> <li data-bbox="234 1220 389 1247">• Landscape</li> <li data-bbox="234 1258 389 1285">• Watershed</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Code the scale/geographic extent of the land use
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="194 1312 536 1368">• PREVIOUS Land Condition, Use, and Land Use Activities               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="234 1379 395 1406">• Agriculture</li> <li data-bbox="234 1417 408 1444">• Agroforestry</li> <li data-bbox="234 1456 491 1482">• Commercial forestry</li> <li data-bbox="234 1494 496 1520">• Community Forestry</li> <li data-bbox="234 1532 416 1559">• Conservation</li> <li data-bbox="234 1570 389 1597">• Drug trade</li> <li data-bbox="234 1608 341 1635">• Fallow</li> <li data-bbox="234 1646 347 1673">• Fishing</li> <li data-bbox="234 1684 523 1711">• Harvesting other NTFPs</li> <li data-bbox="234 1722 360 1749">• Hunting</li> <li data-bbox="234 1760 432 1787">• Illegal Logging</li> <li data-bbox="234 1798 416 1825">• Illegal mining</li> <li data-bbox="234 1836 464 1863">• Indigenous Lands</li> <li data-bbox="234 1874 421 1901">• Legal logging</li> <li data-bbox="234 1912 411 1939">• Legal mining</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Code descriptions of PREVIOUS land use

continued on next page

## NVivo Code Table - Continued

Name	Information
• Livestock	
• Oil palm	
• Other	
• Pasture	
• Plantation	
• Primary forest	
• Secondary forest	
• Tourism	
• Wood harvesting for domestic use	
<b>Legitimacy</b>	
Legitimacy- Outcome	Code responses that deal with outcome legitimacy of land use related decisions here
• Legitimacy- Outcome- trust and communication	
• Legitimacy- Procedural	Code responses that deal with procedural legitimacy of land use related decision processes here
Multilevel Governance Highlights	Key quotes and succinct notes on multilevel governance institutions and dynamics
Respondent Background	Information about the respondent's background including education, profession, and origin should be coded here
<b>Source Attributes</b>	
<b>Understanding of REDD+</b>	
• REDD+ Opinions and Perspectives	
• Understanding- A ( No Conditions)	For respondents who perceive REDD+ as about carbon emissions reductions without any conditions
• Understanding- B (With Safeguards)	For respondents who perceive REDD+ as about carbon emissions reductions with safeguards (social and otherwise)
• Understanding- C (Low C Emission with Livelihoods)	For respondents who perceive REDD+ as about carbon emissions reductions with BENEFITS to livelihoods also occurring
• Understanding- D (Livelihoods & Tenure Result in Lower C Emission)	For respondents who perceive REDD+ as a means supporting livelihoods, with a side-effect of carbon emissions reductions. If carbon doesn't even factor into their perception of REDD+, and they perceive it as purely livelihoods-related, code here as well. If such responses are very common, we can parse them out later. There is indeed a preliminary expectation that this livelihoods-centric view, with little to no consideration of carbon, will be quite common, and perhaps even dominant in some areas. Code all such responses here, and further detail can then be ascertained later.
• Understanding- Not Sure	



RESEARCH  
PROGRAM ON  
Forests, Trees and  
Agroforestry

This research was carried out by CIFOR as part of the CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (CRP-FTA). This collaborative program aims to enhance the management and use of forests, agroforestry and tree genetic resources across the landscape from forests to farms. CIFOR leads CRP-FTA in partnership with Bioversity International, CATIE, CIRAD, the International Center for Tropical Agriculture and the World Agroforestry Centre.

[cifor.org](http://cifor.org)

[blog.cifor.org](http://blog.cifor.org)



**Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)**

CIFOR advances human well-being, environmental conservation and equity by conducting research to help shape policies and practices that affect forests in developing countries. CIFOR is a member of the CGIAR Consortium. Our headquarters are in Bogor, Indonesia, with offices in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

