THE LITERATURE REVIEW IN THE DISSERTATION: The Language Education of Universitas Negeri Semarang

Dwi Rukmini
English Department
Universitas Negeri Semarang
Semarang, Indonesia
wiwidwirukmini@yahoo.com

Abstract - This research aims at explaining how the literature reviews (LR) are written by the post graduates of Universitas Negeri Semarang. It is a textual discourse study focusing on explaining the structural developments of the LRs and their quality. This is done since based on the preliminary study it was found that the LRs have various structural developments. Some of them are written one by one which means that they are not written economically; others contain only descriptions with no evaluation, furthermore the explanation of the relation between the previous study and the current one. The data of the study were LRs taken out of 5 dissertations in the years 2016-2017. The study used a qualitative method. It evaluated LR structural development by means of the instrument proposed by Jian (2010) which was the modification model of Swales (2002); it segments the previous study review into 4 (four) elements: establishing a thematic territory, surveying and summarizing previous research, creating a research niche (preparing for present research), and occupying the research niche. The quality of LRs was evaluated and scored based on the rubric proposed by Boote and Beile (2005) which consists of five categories: coverage, synthesis, methodology, significance, and rhetoric. The results show that all of of them tend to have incomplete structural developments and the scores show that they are likely to have unsatisfactory quality.

Key words: literature review, structural development

I.   INTRODUCTION

A LR is an essential part of a dissertation which gives readers an overview of the thorough scientific references of the writer. It provides a framework of empiric developments in the field of the current research topic. By reviewing LRs, the writer of a dissertation learns important concepts, research methods, and techniques that are used in the field of his/her study. Unlike the LR in general which joins the previous study and theoretical reviews in a same heading called literature review, based on the guidance of writing a dissertation at *Universitas Negeri Semarang* (UNNES), the literature review chapter is divided into three sub chapter; review of previous studies related to the topic, theoretical review, and theoretical

framework. The first contains the previous study reviews relevant to the current research topic, positive and negative evaluation, the comparison between the previous research and the current research, and also the gap between them. The theoretical review gives the foundation knowledge and references of the research. These underlying theories can help the researcher write the discussion of his/her research results. Considering its essential role as the backbone of the research, LR should be written systematically and effectively.

Based on the preliminary study, the researcher found that many literature reviews written by the post graduates of UNNES are not written completely. Some of them only present the summaries of previous studies without giving evaluation furthermore the gap between the previous and present studies. Reviewing does not merely mean summarizing, the reviewer should evaluate what is being reviewed, criticizing it and at the end judging it for its quality. The LR is also an indicator of the writer's ability to critically analyze his/her research area, seek out something new which has not been studied yet. If the LR and theoretical review are flawed, the remainder of the dissertation may usually be viewed as flawed, because a researcher cannot perform significant research without first understanding the literature in the field (Boote & Beille, 2005,p. 3). This implies that before conducting a research, a researcher has to know the empiric development, concepts, and key variables related to his research. According to Creswell (2005, p. 79), LR is a written summary of journal articles, books and other documents that describes the past and current state of information, organizes the literature into topics and documents need for a proposed study. It provides a framework of theories to support new findings in a present research. Cooper (1988,p.107) states that a literature review seeks to describe summarise, evaluate, clarify and/or integrate the content of primary reports. That is identifying and pinpointing documents of relevance (Rowley and Slack, 2004). Booth and Beile (2005) add that the LR is also to highlight the gaps in the literature,

distinguish what have already been achieved from what still needs to be understood and accomplished.

In line with the above explanation, Hart (1998) in Kwan (2006, p. 32) provides five reasons behind the need of doing literature review, namely: a) identifying work already done, b) preventing duplicating what has been done already, c) helping to avoid flaws in previous studies, d) informing research design, e) locating a gap in existing research and exploring a unique topic

A study which is quite similar to the topic of the current study was conducted by Kwan (2006). She analysed the structural development of literature review chapters of applied linguistics doctoral dissertations produced by native English speakers and compared the findings to the structural development of introductions. She found out that the structural development of literature review is different from that of introduction. This is logical since their purposes are different. The purpose of the literature review is to show an overview of the thorough scientific knowledge of the writer and confirm that the study has something new compared to the previous studies related to the topic whereas the introduction is for introducing the study; highlighting the unsatisfactory phenomena which raise problems that the writer wants to solve, the novelty, etc. However, as the writer has to expose the novelty of the study, h/she should highlight previous studies at a glance to confirm that the current study has something new.

In broad terms, a literature review can be considered as having the following constituent sections (Cooper, 1988, p. 1) introduction, including the research questions that the writer wishes to answer, 2) body, which can be organized in the following ways: chronologically—to highlight trends, thematically—to identify the scope and themes of groups of studies or methodologically—to identify the types of research methods used, and 3) conclusion, including a critique stating flaws and gaps in the literature to justify the author's own work, (Molina, 1995).

Related to the structural development of a text, Swales (1981; 1990) offered one approach to studying the discourse structure of the introduction section of research articles—the Create a Research Space (CARS) model which describes the structural development of introduction sections as the application of three "moves". Moves are rhetorical movements in a text that define its schematic structure and create a logical progression. Each move may employ several "steps" to achieve its purpose. Swales' model has been used by other researchers for discourse analysis of academic text.

Most recently, Kwan (2006) applied an extended CARS model developed by Bunton (2002) to propose a move structure for the "thematic units" or topics in the literature review. She identified the "strategies" in the text which were the ways employed to fulfill each rhetorical move. Kwan reported that the schema of a literature review chapter usually follows an Introduction-Body-Conclusion structure. Move 1 (Establishing one part of the territory of one's own research) and Move 2 (Creating a research niche) are usually recursively applied. Move 3 (Occupying the research niche) is rarely found to occur in the set of literature reviews considered by Kwan. A new type of move encountered by Kwan was the writer's affirmative stance towards the surveyed research. She also confirmed that literature review chapters are distinct from introduction chapters in structure, purpose none of the move elements followed a specific progression.

Jian (2010) used the instrument that is the modification model of Swales (2002). She added one move. Therefore, Jian (2010) model consists of four moves, (1) establishing a thematic territory, (2) surveying and summarizing previous research, (3) creating research niche includes and (4) occupying the niche.

Meanwhile, to evaluate the content quality of LR Boote and Beile (2005:8) have created a five-category rubric consisting of coverage, synthesis, methodology, significant, and rhetoric. Coverage consists of one criterion that was not in the Hart's (1999) rubric. It assesses how well the author of the dissertation justified criteria for inclusion and exclusion from review (Booth and Beile, 2005). Bruce (2001) suggests that coverage should be locked at more broadly. He proposes eight criteria: topicality, comprehensiveness, breadth, exclusion, relevance, currency, availability, and authority. Criteria A, coverage, justifies the inclusion and exclusion of the review.

Synthesis consists of criteria B through G and is designed to evaluate how well the author summarized, analyzed and synthesized the selected literature on the topic. The criteria are (B) distinguished between what has been done in the field and what needs to be done (C) placed the topic or problem in the broader scholarly literature (D) placed the research in the historical context of the field (E) acquired and enhanced the subject vocabulary (F) articulated important variables and phenomena relevant to the topic (G) Synthesized and gained a new perspective on the literature.

Methodology consists of criteria H and I. Criterion H measures how well the author identified the main methodologies and research technique that have been used in the field and analyzed their advantages and disadvantages. Criterion I evaluate how well the writer review related ideas and theories to research methodologies.

2

Significance includes criteria J and K which measure how well the dissertation rationalized the practical (J) and scholarly (K) significance of the research problem.

The final category is rhetoric that also consists of single criterion (L), with measures whether the literature review was written with a coherent, clear structure that supported the review.

With regard to the judging of the LR quality under study, the absolute grading scale offered by Brown (2004, p. 287) was used, as follows:

900-100	Excellent
80-89	Good
70-79	Adequate
60-69	Inadequate
<60	Poor

II. METHODOLOGY

The study uses a qualitative method to evaluate both the structural developments and their quality of LRs. The LR structural development evaluation is done by using the instrument proposed by Jian (2010) which was the modification model of Swales (2002). The LR quality was evaluated with the rubric suggested by Boote and Beile (2005:8) which is the modified model of Hart (1999).

The triangulation was done by the use of two instruments for analyzing the same data

The sources of data were 5 dissertations of UNNES English Language Department which were chosen randomly. The data are LRs taken out of those dissertations.

The steps of data analysis were evaluating the elements of LRs by segmenting them into Jian's (2010) four elements, evaluating the content based on the rubric proposed by Booth and Beile (2006). The next step was determining the quality of the LRs respectively with the absolute grading scale offered by Brown (2004). The last step was presenting the findings, discussion, and suggestion.

III. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

For the sake of practicality the findings and discussion are done integratedly

Findings and Discussion of the LR Structural Development

The LR structural development findings can be seen in table 1 that follows.

Table 1 Findings of the LR Structural Development

Elements	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5
1. Establishing thematic territory	10	7	7	27	13
2. Surveying and summarizing previous research	10	7	7	27	13
3. Creating research niche	0	0	1	1	0
4. Occupying the niche	3	2	3	0	0

It can be seen from table 1 above that all the writers of dissertations 1-5 have no problem in exposing the territory of the previous study reviews related to topics of their respective current studies. This is so in surveying and summarizing previous researches related to the topic of the current study as well as the grounding theories of it. These imply that all the writers tend to be aware that writing LR must have a complete and thorough explanation on exposing the scope, survey, and summary of them. This can be seen in the following example.

Choy and Delahaye (2002) investigated the learning approaches, study orientation, and readiness for self-directed learning of 266 youth aged 17-24 years old and enrolled in four Technical and Further Education Institutes. Three instruments were used, the Study Process Questionnaire (Biggs, 1988), SOQ (Christian, 1983), and the Learning Preference Assessment (Guglielmino, 1997). The data showed that most youth have a predominant surface approach to learning, a preference for an andragogical orientation, and a low level of readiness for self-directed learning. There was no statistically significant difference in the pedagogy scores by gender. (D2)

Here the writer explains a clear scope of the previous study (the underlined clause), and the whole paragraph is the summary of the study conducted by Choy and Delahaye.

In creating research niche (element three) only two of five writers provide it. Here what the writers have to elaborate is such an introduction related to the comparison, evaluation and gap between the previous studies and their current study which later be explained in detail in occupying the niche (element four).The writer of dissertation 1 (one) does not provide any creating research niche but explains in detail three out of the ten previous studies. This is also done by the writer of dissertation 2; he has no creating research niche but gives a bit explanation of the differences between the previous researches and his current research; like that follows.

*Hadley (1975) initiated the studies on andragogical and pedagogical orientations; **but his study was on adult educators' orientation in Boston University School**. The method he used in the study was taken up by other adult educators who adapted his Educational Orientation Questionnaire (EOQ; Hadley, 1975) in order to investigate the andragogical and pedagogical*

orientations of adult learners. The result showed that the adult educators tend to have the students to be oriented to andragogy.

Van Allen (1982) was the first person to use Hadley's questionnaire to measure student attitudes in eight North Carolina Community Colleges and discovered that full-time younger female and married students had higher andragogical orientations than other students. (D2)

In the first paragraph, the writer implicitly provides the difference between the previous study and his study (in bold) however he explains the previous study further, in terms of the method used and the results. Unfortunately, then, he moves to the other previous study without giving the evaluation of Hadley (1975) study. This kind of finding is also found in other dissertation LR.

The writer of dissertation 3 has similar strategy compared to that of dissertation writer 2, he also has no creating research niche but provides a little description on the previous study by not relating it with the current study.

The writers of dissertation 4 and 5 do not write any information in occupying the niche. The writer of dissertation 4 only states the comparison of previous and current researches with no explanation. However this is done to only one previous study review and not to the other 26 reviews. The writer of dissertation 5 does not provide any information for both creating research niche and occupying the niche for all 13 previous study reviews. The overall implication of LR structural development findings above is that the dissertation writers under study are likely to have a lack of knowledge of what to write when reviewing related previous studies and theories.

Findings and Discussion of the LR Content Quality

Below is the summary of the findings of the LR content quality. Boote and Beile (2005) give three ranges to evaluate every content criterion, 1 is the lowest and 3 is the highest.

The total score shown in the table below refers to the score of the content of each LR criterion done based on the scoring rubric. Whereas the quality score is done on the basis of Brown's absolute grading scale as explained in chapter 4 (methodology).

Table 2 Findings of the LR Content Quality

Criteria		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5
Coverage	A	2	2	2	2	2
Synthesis	B	2	1	2	2	2
	C	2	1	2	3	3
	D	1	1	1	1	1
	E	2	2	2	2	2
	F	2	1	1	1	2
	G	1	1	1	1	1
Methodology	H	1	1	1	1	1
	I	1	1	1	1	1
Significance	J	1	1	1	1	1
	K	2	1	1	2	1
Rhetoric	L	2	2	2	2	2
Total Score		19	15	17	19	19
Quality Score		53	42	47	53	53

Referring to the summary of content evaluation of LRs of five dissertations under study, all five writers achieve 2 score in criterion A (coverage), particularly in justifying the criteria for inclusion and exclusion from the reviews; they only discuss them without providing any justification.

There are only two writers (writers of dissertations 4 and 5) who gain 3 score for criterion C that is when writing on the explanation of placing the topic or problem in the broader scholarly literature. Unfortunately, all five writers get only 1 score for many criteria. For example, in writing criterion D where they should place the research in the historical context of the field, they do not do that; the history of the topic is not discussed at all. In criterion G, the writers should synthesize and gain a new perspective on the literature they choose. They accept literature only at face value – the lowest range. Furthermore, in methodology criterion which covers identification of the main methodology and research technique have been used in the field as well as the advantages and disadvantages (criterion H). In criterion I, when they should relate ideas and theories in the field to research methodologies, no writers discuss those two criteria at all.

In terms of significance, none of the five writers discusses the practical significances of the researches chosen by them.

The last criterion (L) is rhetoric. All the five writers only gain 50% coherence of their writing. Only some of the reviews have coherent structure.

After quantifying the quality of LRs, it can be stated that writer of dissertation 1 gets 53, writer 2, 42, writer 3, 47, writer 4, 53, and writer 5, 53.

The implications of the findings above are as follows. In the coverage criterion, the writers do not seem to have capability in justifying the inclusion and exclusion from the reviews. In regard to synthesizing (criterion B, C, D, E, F, G), the writer tends to have a lack of critical thinking in reviewing literature.

In writing methodology, all the writers are not likely able to produce claim. Furthermore, the discussion on the appropriateness nor criticism of the method used in their reviews of both previous studies and theoretical ones. Relating to cohesion of the review, the writers seem to have low awareness of the importance of coherence in their

4

writing. This is crucial for the readers need to read and reread to get the meanings conveyed.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion above, it can be concluded that the LR structural developments of five dissertations under study tend to have incomplete elements. Therefore, they are not likely to be well-written. In terms of the quality, all LRs have the quality of lower than 60 (<60). This means that the quality of the LR contents are likely to be unsatisfactory.

V. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATION

Based on the conclusions, it can be stated that the pedagogical implication is that the post graduate students need to have more trainings on writing LR particularly for dissertations. Furthermore, after completely writing the LR the writers should evaluate the structural development, content, and quality using those three instruments used in this current study.

References

[1] Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005), Scholars before researchers: On the Centrality of the Dissertation Literature Review in Research Preparation. *ProQuest Psychology Journals*, 34(6): 3-15.

[2] Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practice.* White Plains. New York: Pearson Education.

[3] Bunton, D. (2002). Generic moves in Ph.D. thesis introductions. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 57–75). London: Pearson Education.

[4] Cooper, H. (1988). The structure of Knowledge Synthesis. *Knowledge in Society Journal*, 1(1):104-126.

[5] Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a Literature Review.* London: Sage.

[6] Jian, H. (2010). The Schematic Structure of Literature Review in Research Articles of Applied Linguistics. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(5): 15-27.

[7] Kwan, B.S.C. (2006). The Schematic Structure of Literature Reviews in Doctoral These of Applied Linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25(2006): 30-35.

[8] Paltridge, B. (1994). Genre analysis and the identification of textual boundaries. *Applied Linguistics*, 15(3): 288–299.

[9] Rowley, D. J., & Slack, D. F. (2004). Conducting Literature Review. *Management Research News,* 27(6): 31.

[10] Swales, John M. (1990). Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[11] Swales, John M. (2004). Research Genres: Explorations and Applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

5