

Table 4.1: Number of cases, by country

COUNTRY	NUMBER OF CASES
Brazil	16
South Africa	16
Bangladesh	10
India	10
Mexico	5
Nigeria	4
Kenya	3
UK	3
USA	3
Angola	2
Gambia	2
Argentina	1
Canada	1
Chile	1
Jamaica	1
Morocco	1
New Zealand	1
Philippines	1
Turkey	1
Zimbabwe	1
Multiple	17
Total	100

Once our sample had been identified, the coding phase began. Each of the 100 cases was imported as a text document into QSR NVivo⁷ before being read closely, taking note of emergent themes within and across cases. At first, ‘broad-brush’ codes were developed pertaining to observations or results in which the effects of citizen engagement were captured. Gradually and inductively, these developed into a system of hierarchical categories of four broad outcome types, each with various sub-categories and with the possibility of being coded as a ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ outcome within each type.⁸

A second stream of coding focused on contextual variables within cases. We were aware that mapping outcomes alone was not sufficient for understanding how changes occurred and why certain outcomes were produced. First, we attempted to capture the type of citizen engagement that produced the outcomes within

⁷ QSR NVivo is a qualitative data analysis software in which users can import text for the purposes of coding and tracking frequencies and relationships between data.

⁸ We recognise that ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ are of course normative judgements. However, we have used them in reference to whether an outcome does or does not, respectively, contribute towards development and democracy building goals.