

BAB

WRITING A LITERATURE REVIEW

WEBSTER AND WATSON

Darius Antoni

Research Methodology

Pembuka



A review of prior, relevant literature is an essential feature of any academic project. An effective review creates a firm foundation for advancing knowledge. It facilitates theory development, closes areas where a plethora of research exists, and uncovers areas where research is needed

Overview

- Prospective authors and Topics
- Writing a Review Article
 - ▣ Identifying the relevant literature
 - ▣ Structuring the Review
 - ▣ Tone
 - ▣ Tense
 - ▣ Theoretical Development
 - ▣ Evaluating your Theory
 - ▣ Creating discussion and Conclusions
- The Review and Revision Process

Prospective Authors and Topics

Sudut Pandang pertama

- Pertama, mereka yang telah selesai atau membuat kemajuan besar pada aliran penelitian adalah posisi yang baik untuk memberitahu rekan-rekan mereka apa yang telah mereka pelajari dan di mana lapangan dapat paling yang bermanfaat langsung perhatiannya.
- Kedua, para sarjana yang telah menyelesaikan kajian literatur sebelum memulai sebuah proyek dan telah mengembangkan beberapa model teoritis berasal dari ulasan ini juga penulis potensial

Prospective Authors and Topics

- Dari sudut yang lain, dua jenis tinjauan ada. Pertama, penulis bisa berurusan dengan topik yang matang di mana akumulasi badan penelitian ada yang perlu analisis dan sintesis. Dalam hal ini, mereka akan melakukan tinjauan literatur menyeluruh dan kemudian mengusulkan model konseptual yang mensintesis dan meluas penelitian yang ada.
- Kedua, penulis bisa mengatasi masalah yang muncul yang akan mendapat manfaat dari paparan potensi dasar teoritis. Di sini, tinjauan literatur saat ini pada topik yang muncul akan, kebutuhan, lebih pendek. Penulis kontribusi ?? s akan muncul dari dasar-dasar teoritis segar yang diusulkan dalam mengembangkan model konseptual.

Writing a review article

Introduction

- Required to motive your topic
- Provide a working definition of your key variables
- Clearly the contributions of the paper
 - ▣ Providing a new theoretical understanding
 - ▣ Noting that little research has addressed the topic
- Suggesting important implication for practice

Writing a review article

Key Variables and Boundaries

- Level of analysis
- Temporal and contextual limitations
- Scope your review
- Your implicit values
- Example;
- Misalnya, Anda harus dengan jelas menyatakan unit atau unit analisa yang dilakukan dalam review; Namun, berhati-hatilah mencoba untuk melampaui satu unit kecuali jika Anda dapat memberikan alasan yang kuat untuk perspektif multilevel. Selanjutnya, jika teori Anda hanya berlaku untuk konteks tertentu (misalnya, jenis pekerjaan, organisasi, atau negara) atau untuk jangka waktu tertentu, ini harus diidentifikasi untuk pembaca. Anda juga perlu untuk mendukung lingkup ulasan Anda: Negara apa sastra dan bidang Anda akan memanfaatkan dan mengapa ini mendefinisikan batas yang sesuai untuk topik yang dipilih dan tingkat analisis.

Writing a review article

Identifying the relevant Literature

- Studi literatur IS telah secara konsisten terbatas dengan menggambarkan dari kecil sampel jurnal. Meskipun [yang] diselidiki di sini mungkin memiliki reputasi sebagai top jurnal, yang tidak alasan seorang penulis dari menyelidiki semua artikel yang dipublikasikan di lapangan. Aku hanya tidak bisa melihat pembenaran untuk mencari oleh jurnal bukan mencari berdasarkan topik di semua jurnal yang relevan, *said one of MISQ Reviewer*

Recommend structured approach to determine the source material for the review

- The major contributions are likely to be in the leading journals
- You should also examine selected conference proceedings, especially those with a reputation for quality
- IS is an interdisciplinary field straddling other disciplines, you often must look not only within the IS discipline when reviewing and developing theory but also outside the field
- *Go backward by reviewing the citations for the articles identified in step 1 to determine prior articles you should consider*
- *Go forward by using the Web of Science*

Structuring the Review

The two approaches are easily recognized,

Concept-centric	Author-centric
Concept X ... [author A, author B, ...]	Author A ... concept X, concept Y, ...
Concept Y ... [author A, author C, ...]	Author B ... concept X, concept W, ...

□ Concept Matrix

Articles	Concepts				
	A	B	C	D	...
1		✕	✕		✕
2	✕	✕			
...			✕	✕	

Untuk membuat transisi dari author konsep-centric, kami sarankan Anda menyusun matriks konsep saat Anda membaca setiap artikel (Tabel 2), ide kami telah diadaptasi dari Salipante et al. (1982). Ketika Anda membaca selesai, mempersatukan literatur dengan membahas setiap konsep diidentifikasi. Sebelum memulai langkah ini, mengambil beberapa waktu untuk mengembangkan pendekatan logis untuk pengelompokan dan penyajian konsep-konsep kunci yang Anda telah menemukan.

□ Concept Matrix Augmented with units of Analysis

Table 3. Concept Matrix Augmented with Units of Analysis

Articles	Concepts														
	A			B			C			D			...		
Unit of analysis	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I
1					✗				✗						✗
2	✗				✗	✗		✗							
...								✗	✗			✗			

Legend: O (organizational), G (group), I (individual)

Te'eni (2002) found that the concept “communication strategy” had different meanings when considered from the organizational, group, individual, and cognitive utterance levels. Isolating concepts by unit of analysis should result in a crisper review because it is easier to detect when you let a concept stray outside the scope of its domain

- DeLone and McLean (1992) include a set of tables summarizing the literature on IS success by level of analysis, type of study, and success measures. As another example, Bem (1995) describes a review in which past research is categorized by whether the studies support one of three competing models. by doing so, the authors are able to discover a recognizable pattern supporting one of the models.
- Alavi and Leidner.s (2001) table of knowledge taxonomies makes it easy for the reader to quickly determine the meaning of a particular knowledge type, which is especially useful in a long article. Finally, the six figures and 13 tables in Te'eni.s (2001 review article help to communicate his message more clearly.

Tone

The reason why some papers rejected

- ...another indicator of amateurism was an overly negative approach to the previous literature....Previous work is always vulnerable. Criticizing is easy, and of little value; it is more important to explain how research builds upon previous findings rather than to claim previous research is inadequate and incompetent.

Tense

- It gives the reader a greater sense of immediacy
- When discussing concepts, and in line with our concept-centric approach to literature reviews, it is logical to use the present tense because concepts are always here and now.
- The present tense is terser and thus faster for the reader to process. There is an exception to this recommendation

Theoretical Development in Your Article

- Theoretical Development are generally derived from variance (factor) or process theories (Markus and Robey 1988; Mohr 1982)
- Models and propositions capture relationships between variables, but do not, on their own, represent theory (Sutton and Staw 1995)
 - ▣ theoretical explanations for why,
 - ▣ Past empirical findings,
 - ▣ and practice or experience

Evaluating Your Theory

- Writers argue that good theories should be memorable and provide answers to why. They should explain, predict, and delight (Weick 1995)
- they should be interesting (Davis 1971) yet parsimonious, falsifiable, and useful (Sutton and Staw 1995)
- theories should be built from multiple paradigms (metatriangulation)
- Thus, they should exhibit creativity, relevance, and comprehensiveness (Lewis and Grimes 1999, p. 685).

Creating Your Discussion and Conclusions

- Justifying propositions
- Demonstrating how its work
- Extending past research, to suggest ways that theory can be empirically examined, and
- Drawing implications for practice and future theorizing.

The Reviewing and Revision Process

- it represents a benchmark for others conducting future research in your area
- You should reap the benefits of citations to your article for years to come because your work should hew a path for others
- comments of *MISQ Review papers*? *Whats new?*, impact (so what?), logic (why so?), and thoroughness (well done?)

Conclusion

- motivates the research topic and explains the review's contributions
- describes the key concepts
- delineates the boundaries of the research
- reviews relevant prior literature in IS and related areas
- develops a model to guide future research
- justifies propositions by presenting theoretical explanations, past empirical findings, and practical
- Examples
- presents concluding implications for researchers and managers.