Literature reviews

Dr Shivaun Weybury
s.weybury@unsw.edu.au
The Learning Centre, UNSW
Introductory questions:

• What are you studying?

• Has anyone written a literature review before?
Before we talk explicitly about lit reviews...

- Let us consider the *Notes for Examiners* regarding the marking of a PhD thesis:
1. **Principles underlying the degree**

1.2.2 [The award of the degree should also be taken to certify that a candidate has:] Become sufficiently familiar with a significant area of the discipline within which the candidate has worked to be able to assess critically the present state of knowledge in the subject and to conceive original ideas for further investigation with an increasing independence.

2. **Assessing the quality of a PhD thesis**

2.1 The writer of a thesis is, among other things, proving that they can conduct research, are capable of independent and critical thought, and can see the work in relation to the work of others.

2.2.1 [Examiners’ comments should be based on:] The ability of the candidate to demonstrate an awareness and understanding of literature relevant to the topic and the capacity to make considered judgements.

2.2.2 [Examiners’ comments should be based on:] The extent to which the thesis represents a significant contribution to knowledge and original thought.

2.3 No hard and fast criteria to assess what constitutes a "significant contribution to knowledge" are laid down. Nevertheless, the examiner must consider the timeliness of the thesis in relation to current research in the specific area.
• **Question**: What are the *key elements* upon which the candidate will be assessed?
1. **Principles underlying the degree**

1.2.2 [The award of the degree should also be taken to certify that a candidate has:] Become sufficiently **familiar with a significant area of the discipline** within which the candidate has worked to be able to **assess critically the present state of knowledge in the subject** and to **conceive original ideas** for further investigation with an increasing independence.

2. **Assessing the quality of a PhD thesis**

2.1 The writer of a thesis is, among other things, proving that they can **conduct research**, are capable of **independent and critical thought**, and can see the work in relation to the work of others.

2.2.1 [Examiners’ comments should be based on:] The ability of the candidate to demonstrate an awareness and understanding of literature relevant to the topic and the capacity to make considered judgements.

2.2.2 [Examiners’ comments should be based on:] The extent to which the thesis represents a **significant contribution to knowledge and original thought**.

2.3 No hard and fast criteria to assess what constitutes a "significant contribution to knowledge" are laid down. Nevertheless, the examiner must consider the **timeliness of the thesis in relation to current research in the specific area**.
Key elements of thesis examination

Research
- You must demonstrate that you understand the current state of knowledge in your subject.

Critical thinking
- You must assess the current state of knowledge – make considered judgements about it.

Originality
- You must understand the relationship between your work and the work of others.

Independence/Mastery
- You must convince the marker that you can function independently in the academic community.
The four points put slightly differently

You are a creator of knowledge

A creator of knowledge:

1. Demonstrates knowledge of their subject
2. Explores the complexities of their subject (demonstrates understanding)
3. Makes considered judgements about those complexities
4. Presents original perspectives

A LR, depending on the discipline and thesis:

- does a lot of [1]
- a fair amount of [2] and [3]
- a small amount of [4] – most of the original work is usually post-LR; however, the lit review functions to demonstrate where important issues and questions have not yet been addressed, and how your work fills that gap
Problems with LRs – examiners’ criticisms

**Knowledge without understanding:** ‘There does not appear to be any attempt to interpret the literature and provide a personal perspective on the information given. Rather it is a listing of known facts.’

**Student not locating herself in the field:** ‘She seems not to have been able to combine previous research with her own where this would show signs and degrees of originality. It is also not made clear just where the candidate agrees with and where she varies from the ideas she reviews: she fails to position herself in the group of scholars which she seeks to join.’
Some additional points about what might appear in an LR

- A LR contains synthesis: it is not just a matter of summary and critique, but of selecting, arranging and combining information for new uses—in other words, in most cases it is also formative and interpretive.

- A LR establishes some of the tools you will use in your analysis: terminology and theories.

- A LR can account for how information was sought (in systematic LRs).

- A LR can address methodological concerns – in that it can work to justify your choice of methodology.
Literature reviews will usually:

1) Establish the status quo in the field and provide a context for your work

2) Summarise, evaluate and synthesise the work of others

3) Formulate a problem and/or identify a gap based on that synthesis

4) Defend the value of pursuing the line of enquiry (occupy the gap and articulate the potential significance of the research)

5) Demonstrate what the research and synthesis of the work of others has accomplished, in terms of the direction and clarity of your own project
‘Systematic’ reviews

Definition

A systematic review is an appraisal and synthesis of primary research papers using a rigorous and clearly documented methodology in both the search strategy and the selection of studies. This minimises bias in the results. The SR is a quantitative ‘mapping’ strategy, which highlights the boundaries around generalisations derived from the literature, and the gaps that become visible as a result. The clear documentation of the process and the decisions made allow the review to be reproduced and updated.

Characteristics

- a clearly stated set of objectives with pre-defined eligibility criteria for studies
- an explicit, reproducible methodology
- a systematic search that attempts to identify all studies that would meet the eligibility criteria
- an assessment of the validity of the findings of the included studies, for example through the assessment of risk of bias
- a systematic presentation, and synthesis, of the characteristics and findings of the included studies.
Perceived differences between ‘systematic’ and ‘narrative’ literature reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Systematic Review</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Focused on a single question</td>
<td>Not necessarily focused on a single question, but may describe an overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td>A peer review protocol or plan is included</td>
<td>No protocol is included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Provides summaries of the available literature on a topic</td>
<td>Provides summaries of the available literature on a topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Clear objectives are identified</td>
<td>Objectives may or may not be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Criteria stated before the review is conducted</td>
<td>Criteria not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Strategy</td>
<td>Comprehensive search conducted in a systematic way</td>
<td>Strategy not explicitly stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Selecting Articles</td>
<td>Usually clear and explicit</td>
<td>Not described in a literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Evaluating Articles</td>
<td>Comprehensive evaluation of study quality</td>
<td>Evaluation of study quality may or may not be included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Extracting Relevant Information</td>
<td>Usually clear and specific</td>
<td>Not clear or explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results and Data Synthesis</td>
<td>Clear summaries of studies based on high quality evidence</td>
<td>Summary based on studies where the quality of the articles may not be specified. May also be influenced by the reviewer's theories, needs and beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Written by an expert or group of experts with a detailed and well grounded knowledge of the issues</td>
<td>Written by an expert or group of experts with a detailed and well grounded knowledge of the issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: Can you think of any problems with systematic literature reviews?
The standard scientific publication looks something like this:

- Introduction
- Literature review
  - Method
  - Results
- Discussion
- Conclusion

Brief context + problem + aim

Detailed context

Original work

Original work considered in context
Structure – the narrative approach

You can structure your literature review:

- Chronologically e.g. a history of ideas about national cinema
- By key studies e.g. developments in some aspect of quantum mechanics
- By themes within the topic e.g. different themes relevant to studying young female refugees
- By key debates e.g. key debates in Marxist tradition
- By theoretical / political perspective e.g. international relations theories
- By discipline e.g. perspectives on Aboriginal art: sociological, anthropological, art historical
- By key figures e.g. key figures in the development of a particular technology
- General to specific
- Using some (well-organised) combination of the above
• **Question:** How do you decide on which structure is right for your own literature review?

• **Answer:** Start by working out what you **need** to talk about to show understanding + establish the gap with respect to your subject area
Looking at some literature review structures

Let us consider:

- Where the LR sits in the thesis
- Why people may have chosen to structure things in this fashion
CHAPTER 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 INTRODUCTION

1.2 TEAR FILM

- 1.2.1 The Mucin Layer
- 1.2.2 The Aqueous Layer
- 1.2.3 The Lipid Layer

1.3 CONTACT LENS WEAR AND THE LIPID LAYER

- 1.3.1 Clinical Implications
- 1.3.2 Functional Implications
- 1.3.3 Biochemical Implications

1.4 LIPID LAYER SUPPLEMENTS

1.5 RATIONALE

1.6 THESIS OBJECTIVES

1.7 THESIS HYPOTHESES

1.8 THESIS OVERVIEW

CHAPTER 2. VALIDATION OF THE VAPOMETER
Negative Emotion in Music: What is the Attraction? (Garrido 2012)

- Chapter 1 – Introduction ............................................................... 1
  - 1.1 The Paradox of Tragedy .......................................................... 2
  - 1.2 A Historical Overview of the Study of Negative Emotions in Music .... 4
  - 1.3 The Questions Remaining .......................................................... 5
  - 1.4 The Aims of This Study ............................................................. 6
  - 1.5 Limitations/Delimitations ......................................................... 6
  - 1.6 Theoretical Framework of This Thesis ............................................ 7
  - 1.7 Plan of Thesis ......................................................................... 9
- Chapter 2 – Literature Review on the Study of Negative Emotions in Music ............................................................... 11
  - 2.1 The Philosophical and Psychological Discussion ............................... 12
  - 2.2 Individual Differences .................................................................. 34
  - 2.3 Dissociation: A Mechanistic Explanation ........................................ 37
  - 2.4 Imagination, Empathy and Fantasy-Proneness .......................................... 45
  - 2.5 Other Negative Emotions .......................................................... 51
  - Summary ................................................................................... 57
- Chapter 3 – Literature Review on Music in Mood Regulation........... 60
- Chapter 4 – Summary of the Literature Review ................................. 97
- Chapter 5 – Study 1 ......................................................................... 101
- Chapter 6 – Study 2 ......................................................................... 124
Politically Unbecoming Critiques of “Democracy” and Postsocialist Art from Europe (Gardner, 2008)

Introduction .................................................................................................................................................1

Chapter One: Assumptions of “Democracy” and Postsocialist Critique........... 22

Chapter Two: An Aesthetic of Emptiness: Ilya Kabakov’s Ten Characters....... 93

Chapter Three: Altered States and Retro Politics: Manifesta and NSK.........149

Chapter Four: Autonomy, Yes! “Democracy”, No! Thomas Hirschhorn’s Displays of Making Art Politically......................... 215

Chapter Five: “Democracy” under Destruction? Büchel and Motti, MNAC and Bucharest .................................................................264

Chapter Six: Dizzydence and the Archive: Dan and Lia Perjovschi ............309

Conclusion: The Unbecoming Politics of Postsocialist Aesthetics................359
Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Theoretical perspective

1.3 Research context

1.4 Summary of literature on organisations, ED work and persuasive rhetoric

1.5 Gaps in the literature and rationale for research

1.6 Scope of the research

1.7 Research design and methods

1.8 Objectives and research questions

1.9 Research overview

Chapter 2: Literature review: Organisational structures, processes and rhetoric in ED work
Engagement and voice in the LR

A failure of voice (a marker’s comments):

‘It is rare to find a reference in the thesis that has been critically appraised. This is particularly frustrating when references with conflicting findings are quoted in successive sentences. Often, it is not made clear which references represent primary research and which are themselves commentaries or views. As a reader, I was left in no position to judge how the various conclusions, especially when in conflict, were derived. Importantly, I was given no insight as to how the candidate weighted up and prioritized the conflicting sources of information.’
Making your voice heard

• **Question:** How will you make your voice heard in your literature review?

• **Answer(s):**
  - Have strong introductions (what, why, how) and conclusions throughout
  - Have good topic and concluding sentences. Be wary of starting paragraphs with evidence
  - Clearly differentiate between your voice and the voices of others, by indicating ownership
  - Engage with the ideas of others: compare, contrast, evaluate, synthesise (don’t just summarise or quote)
  - Mention your own work from time to time
  - Have a clear structure
  - Use meaningful transition signals
  - (Running through a lot of the above: **signposting** = make point + relate points)
Identify the transition signals

[1] As this thesis is not concerned with the narrow perspective I could have chosen to include any number of works. [2] I therefore need to explain why the above works were selected. [3] First, I wanted to present my own position both efficiently and thoroughly and I felt that the above combination of works would best facilitate this. [4] By ‘efficiently’ I mean that I wanted to develop my position using as few words as possible. [5] From this point of view each discussion of each work can be thought of as being a piece in the jigsaw puzzle of my overall position. [6] By ‘thoroughly’ I mean that I wanted to buttress each of my points several times. [7] From this point of view each discussion of each work is not entirely distinct from every other discussion. [8] Clearly ‘efficiently’ and ‘thoroughly’ are in conflict. [9] However, this conflict cannot be avoided or resolved because this thesis is concerned with developing a world view rather than defending a specific argument. [10] Altogether I have attempted to strike a balance between ‘efficiently’ and ‘thoroughly’: each chapter and section introduces some new ideas and at the same time reinforces the arguments that have gone before.
Identify the **transition signals**

[1] As this thesis is not concerned with the narrow perspective I could have chosen to include any number of works. [2] I **therefore** need to explain why the above works were selected. [3] **First**, I wanted to present my own position both efficiently and thoroughly **and** I felt that the above combination of works would best facilitate this. [4] By ‘efficiently’ I mean that I wanted to develop my position using as few words as possible. [5] From this point of view each discussion of each work can be thought of as being a piece in the jigsaw puzzle of my overall position. [6] By ‘thoroughly’ I mean that I wanted to buttress each of my points several times. [7] From this point of view each discussion of each work is not entirely distinct from every other discussion. [8] Clearly ‘efficiently’ and ‘thoroughly’ are in conflict. [9] However, this conflict cannot be avoided or resolved **because** this thesis is concerned with developing a world view **rather** than defending a specific argument. [10] **Altogether** I have attempted to strike a balance between ‘efficiently’ and ‘thoroughly’: each chapter and section introduces some new ideas **and at the same time** reinforces the arguments that have gone before.
Signposting: phrases/sentences

1. The purpose of this section is to give the reader a sense of...

2. In the previous section we saw...

3. This idea is also strongly supported by the following statement...

4. There are many more examples that could be cited which support this point. In the final one that I will mention...

5. Next, it is important to emphasise that alongside the above passages which appear to affirm..., we find...

6. In addition, it is clear that... . Similarly, evidence shows that...

7. Finally, there is a real need to address... . If this is not done, we face...
According to Eliot (1999), emotions are linked with the limbic system of the brain which lies on the border between the cerebral cortex and the brain stem. The lower limbic structures, those which lie outside the cerebral cortex, are involved in producing the physiological manifestations of emotion, while the upper limbic regions are concerned with conscious emotional experience. Since I do not want to rule out the possibility that emotional response to music involves more ‘primitive’ reactions arising in the brain stem, this thesis will use the word ‘emotion’ to cover both the phenomenological aspect alone, and when accompanied by the other elements presumed to be involved in emotions.
Another issue that has been the subject of much philosophical debate is whether or not it is possible for music to express emotion. Pieces of music, or performances of them, are standardly said to be happy, sad, and so on. However, this poses a philosophical problem since music itself is not a psychological agent capable of expressing emotion. Therefore, some philosophers of aesthetics argue that music is by its nature, not actually able to express anything. This is sometimes known as formalism, the idea that pure music contains no meaning outside of its own formal features (Robinson, 1997). The composer Igor Stravinsky, for example, claimed that the idea that music is expressing any kind of emotion is merely an illusion (cited in Cooke, 1963, p. 11).

While it may seem logical that music is incapable of expressing emotion in the same way a person would, most listeners would probably argue that they both perceive and experience some emotion in connection with music (Evans & Schubert, 2008). Numerous empirical studies also report that the body experiences physiological changes and activation of the autonomic nervous system when listening to music similar to those experienced in relation to emotions induced by other stimuli (Blood, Zatorre, Bermudez, & Evans, 1999; Rickard, 2004; Trainor & Schmidt, 2003). Therefore, although it is obvious that purely instrumental music cannot represent thoughts in the way that words do, the suggestion that it cannot express anything at all such as Stravinsky claims, seems to be rather an extreme viewpoint.
This chapter introduces the key spatial concepts at the core of our study, and identifies the interest in gesture as far as the expression of locative information is concerned. The chapter is divided into three parts. The first part introduces the spatial domain, paying particular attention to how static locative relationships are understood in the literature. This discussion also introduces spatial concepts which are pivotal to understanding static locative configurations, such as frames of reference, perspective, viewpoint, and origo. The second part of the chapter introduces the domain of gesture studies and specifies the types of gestures which are of interest in the current study. Finally, the third part of the chapter brings gesture and the spatial domain together by examining previous research into how speakers gesture when describing spatial information. This then sets the stage for the empirical investigation which follows.
Reading and note-making

- When conducting your research you should always:
  1. Read actively, with a clear purpose
  2. Make active, useful notes
Suggested reading strategy

**Before Reading**

1. Think about your reasons for reading the text - these will influence the way you read e.g. quickly or slowly, looking for fact or opinion.

2. Look at the title, any sub-headings, photos or illustrations. Use these to predict what the text will be about.

3. Think about what you already know on this topic.

4. Write down what you would like to find out from the text. You could write actual questions you would like answers to, or words/phrases connected with the topic that you hope to find in the text.
While Reading

1. WRITE:
   • What you think the main ideas are.
   • What your initial reaction to the text is. Do you find it interesting, informative, well-argued, boring, illogical, or inaccurate? WHY?

2. Mark any new words that are important for your understanding

3. Use an effective method for note-making
• Note-Taking = Appropriative and passive

• Note-Making = Creative and active
A Template for Setting Out and Writing Effective Notes from a Reading

Remember to use a new page for each new reading!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bibliographic Details</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
<th>Comments on Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Paraphrased notes
- Summaries of important information
- Direct quotes

- How does this information relate to other texts that I have read?
- What important links can be made to the topic/other research?
- How is the information relevant? (If it isn’t relevant, should I be pursuing it at this time?)
- How does this information relate to my assignment topic? How/where will I use it?
- Does the author say anything new or particularly interesting?
- Is there anything that I don’t understand that I need to follow up?
- Is the author saying anything that I disagree with? Why do I disagree?
- Is the author saying anything that contradicts the findings/opinions of other authors?
- What conclusions can I make from the points being made?

- Author’s surname and initial,
- The title of book/article,
- The title of the journal,
- Publisher,
- Place of publication,
- Page numbers of article,
- Internet site details, including web address etc.
- It is a good idea to include the library call number.

Paraphrases (i.e., rewriting somebody else’s ideas in your own words) and summaries should form the bulk of the information in this section.

When using a direct quote, be sure to put it between inverted commas, or write it in a different colour, to remind you that it is somebody else’s words copied verbatim (word for word).

In the comments section, you may write anything that indicates your response to the reading. The questions included in the template are a guide only. You don’t have to include a response to every paraphrase or quote but it is important to think about why you are including information and to jot down any reasons that seem relevant to why you are reading the text.
After Reading

1. Evaluate and reflect on what you have read: How does it fit in with what you already think and know? Does it confirm your ideas? Does it add to them? conflict with them? How? If there are opinions, do you agree or disagree with them? Why?

2. Make a list of the new words which you think will be useful for you in the future. Give:

- Clear definitions of the words
- An indication of whether they are nouns, verbs, adjectives etc.
- Examples of phrases in which the words occur
- Other words with the same meaning
- Other forms of the words

e.g. counsellor (noun)=a person who gives help and support to people who have problems, an adviser [counsel (noun), to counsel]
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