

Literature Review using NVivo:

A beginners guide

Here you will learn how to conduct a literature review using NVivo. This process makes the task of writing your background literature section simpler. Not only will all your articles all be in one place, but you can pull information from multiple articles relating to a specific point, rather than having to go through each article separately.

STEP 1: Import Articles

First open a new project in NVivo and import your initial set of articles.

HINT - rename the articles with the author and date so when looking at all articles relating to nodes you can see which paper it refers too. E.g., Williams_etal2020



STEP 2: Create Nodes

Start with thinking about the broad themes of your research topics and create sub nodes of more specific elements. These will only be initial nodes so do not need to be perfect, nodes can be added/changed later. **HINT** - create a node for methodology and analysis for evidence to support your methodological/ analytical choices.

STEP 3: Code Articles

Now all that is left is to read through each of your articles and code the relevant sections relating to your chosen nodes.

Adding more articles and nodes as you continue through your PhD/project.



STEP 4: Import Articles

Finally, when you need to write up your literature review you now have all articles coded and ready. To write certain paragraphs you can pull up the nodes relating to that area and have all the evidence from various articles ready at your disposal. This will speed your writing and make struggling through hundreds of articles, one at a time, a thing of the past.

The screenshot shows the NVivo software interface. On the left, the 'Nodes' list is visible, showing a hierarchy of nodes under '1. Method_Analysis' and '2. PrEP'. The 'Nodes' list includes: DAG, Demographics, Interviews, ITS, Limitations, CondomUse, NoImpactSTI, RiskSTIs, RiskCompensation, RiskPerception, Stigma, and Uptake. A large black arrow points from the 'Nodes' list to the right-hand screenshot. The right-hand screenshot shows a search result for 'PrEP' with a coverage of 0.81%. The search results include a list of references and a snippet of text from a reference: 'Brooks et al in 2012 found that 80% Beymer AM, et al. Sex Transm Infect. 2016;94(3):47-482. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2017-053377. Sex Transm Infect: first published as 10.1136/sextrans-2017-053377 on 27 February 2018. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/ on December 6, 2019 at Cardiff University. Protected by copyright. Behaviour of HIV-negative MSM surveyed (n=25) said they would either decrease or abandon condom the adoption of PrEP.22 However, other studies have found contrary results, with potential stating that they would not be likely to reduce condom use.23,24'.