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PURPOSE OF A LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of a literature review is to:

1. Enable the student to develop skills to search, read, interpret and summarize the literature on a particular subject.

2. Determine what is known and not known about a subject, concept or problem in the area of nursing.

3. Determine gaps, consistencies and inconsistencies in the literature about a subject, concept or problem.

4. Generate useful research questions/projects/activities for the discipline.

5. Determine an appropriate research design to answer the research question.

6. Promote development of protocols and policies related to nursing practice.

7. Identify a new practice intervention, or provide evidence for changing a practice intervention.
PRESENTATION OF A LITERATURE REVIEW

Total Word Count (4,500 words + Poster)

Title & Abstract (250 words – approx. not included in word count) (5% of mark)

- The title should provide the reader with a clear indication of the focus of the review.
- The abstract should summarise the content and conclusion of your review.
- You should leave the writing of the abstract until the end of the review, as you need to have completed it before you can summarise it.
- The abstract gives the reader an immediate idea of what the review is about.

Introduction (1000 words) (25% of mark)

- Introduce your question/issue with reference to the literature/research and state if it is has been widely researched or not. **The literature review must have a nursing focus.**
- State the purpose: e.g. The purpose of this literature review is to…
- Provide a rationale for choosing your question/issue.
- Provide a detailed search strategy including databases or other sources, search terms used, time and language parameters, (you may use the templates provided – see Appendices).
- Provide a flow chart of the process by which you selected literature for inclusion in the review.
- Provide a Summary Table of the literature included in the review (you may use the templates provided – see Appendices).
- Introduce the themes under which you are going to discuss the literature. The themes should reflect the recurring ideas that have emerged from your reading of the literature.
Main Body of Literature Review (3,000 words approx.)

(50% of mark)

- Define any key terms which appear in your analysis of the literature.
- Provide headings for each identified theme.
- Commence your discussion of each theme with a brief introduction.
- Critically review the relevant literature under each theme including any methodological patterns and study limitations.
- Anecdotal or opinion pieces may be used in the introduction to set the context but must not be used in the main body of the review.

Conclusion (500 words – approx.) (10% of mark)

- In your conclusion you may commence by stating the purpose of this literature review was to….
- Then provide a summary of all the different themes that were discussed.
- Remember you are recapping on the main points so you must not introduce any new research/themes.
- You must make suggestions for further research and/or identify implications for clinical practice.

In Literature Reviews it is not appropriate to:

- State your own opinions on the subject (unless you have evidence to support such claims).
- State what you think nurses should do (unless you have evidence to support such claims).
- Provide long descriptive accounts of your subject with no reference to research studies.
- Provide numerous definitions, signs/symptoms, treatment and complications of a particular illness without focusing on research studies to provide evidence and the primary purpose of the literature review.
- Discuss research studies in isolation from each other.

Literature Review assessment criteria (see Appendix 6.)
PRESENTATION OF AN ACADEMIC POSTER (10% of mark)

- Academic posters summarise and communicate key information and research concisely in a visually attractive way. They are an effective means of publicising academic work to a wide audience including peers, policy makers and service users.

- Your poster should be based on your literature review but it is not simply your review transferred to a poster.

- Your poster should have a clear purpose.
- It should use a blend of images and text
- It should have a well ordered and obvious sequence

Poster assessment criteria (see Appendix 5.)

Facilitation Arrangements

Introduction

You will be allocated a facilitator at the beginning of Senior Sophister year. Once you have been allocated a facilitator you should review your annotated bibliography in order to help you decide on your final choice of question for your literature review. For example, you may have already decided that the question you identified for your annotated bibliography is still pertinent and will remain the focus for the larger literature review. However, you may need to modify your question as a result of undertaking the annotated bibliography. This is acceptable but you should ensure that your new/modified/revised question remains within the original topic and problem area.

Role of Literature Review Facilitator

The role of the facilitator is to assist you in the development of your literature review. You are required to send an electronic copy of your annotated bibliography to your facilitator by **Week 12 (week commencing 11th November)**, which they will have read before their first meeting with you. Please note your facilitator will have access to the feedback sheet for your annotated bibliography.
You must provide your facilitator with a one-page summary of how you will use feedback from your annotated bibliography to improve the quality of your literature review.

Queries about the process of facilitation should be addressed to your course co-ordinator and not your literature review facilitator.

The summary must conform to the following:

- One A4 page
- Produced in Microsoft Word format

A sample format for the summary is provided below.

- What did you do well in the annotated bibliography that you need to take forward and continue to do in your literature review?
- Referring back to your annotated bibliography, what areas do you need to improve upon in order to produce a good quality literature review?
- What changes, if any, you propose to make to your question?

This summary must be submitted by e-mail to your facilitator in Week 14 (Week commencing 25th November 2013). Written feedback on your summary will be provided by your facilitator within 3 weeks.

In Week 23 (Week commencing 27th January 2014) you must submit a plan by email to your facilitator. The plan must include the following information:

- A detailed search strategy, which should include a flow chart and a Tabulation of the Database Search (see appendix 1.).
- Summary Table(s) of the literature to be included in the review (research & non-research literature). Templates can be adapted depending on the literature being used (see Appendices 2. & 3.).

Facilitation should happen within three weeks of your facilitator’s receipt of your plan.

A two hour (2.0 hours) group facilitation session will be provided that all group members are advised to attend. Any queries you may have about your plan should be addressed at the group supervision session.

Each group of students needs to do the following:

- Identify suitable dates and times for a group facilitation meeting with their supervisor.
One member of the group must then negotiate one of these dates, the time and venue with their supervisor.

The meeting should occur following feedback on the plans submitted.

N.B. It is the responsibility of each student to ensure that they attend this meeting.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Key Submission Dates

- Week 12 (week commencing 11th November, 2013) you must send your facilitator an electronic copy of your annotated bibliography.
- Week 14 (week commencing 25th November, 2013) you must submit a summary by email to your facilitator.
- Week 23 (week commencing 27th January 2014) you must submit a plan by email to your facilitator.
- Week 32 (week commencing 31st March, 2014) submit literature review and poster.

Submission Guidelines

Referencing and Academic Presentation (5% of mark)

Literature Review

- You are expected to adhere to the Harvard system of referencing, as adapted for use by the School of Nursing and Midwifery 2013-2014, and as per the School Handbook.
- The layout for the literature review should follow the regulations in the School Handbook regarding submission of written assignments.
- A minimum of 15 references are required for the literature review.
- It is expected that you will use a fluent writing style demonstrating clarity of thought with accurate grammar and spelling.

Poster
 ➢ You are expected to adhere to the Harvard system of referencing, as adapted for use by the School of Nursing and Midwifery 2013-2014, and as per the School Handbook.

 ➢ An electronic template will be provided to guide the poster layout.

 ➢ A hard copy of the poster should be submitted on normal A3 sized paper as per the regulations in the School Handbook regarding

 ➢ An electronic version of the poster should also be submitted by email to the Senior Sophister Executive Officer.

Summary of Marks

 ➢ Literature Review
   o Abstract 5%
   o Introduction 20%
   o Main Body 50%
   o Conclusion 10%
   o Academic 5%
   o Writing and Presentation 10%
   o Poster 10%

 100%
APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Tabulation of Online Database Search.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database &amp; Time Limits</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>Number of hits</th>
<th>Number discarded (unrelated title)</th>
<th>Number reviewed (title and abstract)</th>
<th>Number reviewed (full text)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Appendix 2. Summary Table for Research Literature included in Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Study Aims &amp; Objectives</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Findings relevant to the review.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3. Summary Table for Literature Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Research Question/ Purpose</th>
<th>Search Strategy/ Inclusion/ Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Search Terms</th>
<th>Detail of Literature/Study Selection</th>
<th>Quality Assessment (where applicable)</th>
<th>Data Synthesis (where applicable)</th>
<th>Findings/ Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4. Summary Table for Non-Research Literature (e.g. Policy Documents) included in Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type of literature</th>
<th>Peer-reviewed</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Key thoughts/comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5. Poster Assessment Criteria
(Adapted from George Hess - NC State University - Forestry Department)

Overall Appearance

0- Cluttered or sloppy appearance. Poor use of colour. Gives impression
1 of a solid mass of text and graphics, or pieces are scattered and
2 connectected. Little white space. Text too small to read from 1.5 metres
3 to look at. Reasonable use of colours. Text and graphics
4 balanced quite well although relationship between the two may not be
5 clear. Sections of the poster are separated from one another by
6 headings. Main text large enough to read from 1.5 metres.
7 to look at. Particularly good use of colours. Text and
8 graphics well balanced with clear relationship. Plenty of white space
9 and clear separation of sections using a range of devices e.g.
10 headings, numbering, columns. All text easy to read from 1.5 metres

Academic Structure

0-1 Academic structure is unclear and/or the purpose is absent.
1-3 The purpose is stated but not obviously e.g. presented as part of the
2 introduction or background but not stated explicitly as either a research
3 question or a statement e.g. the purpose of this poster is to...
4 The academic structure is fairly clear.
5 The purpose is presented explicitly as a research question or a
6 statement e.g. the purpose of this poster is to... The academic
7 structure with key sections explicitly labelled e.g. main points, themes,
8 summary, conclusion, lessons for practice.
## Appendix 6. Assessment Criteria for Literature Review
(Adapted from the grid developed by Margaret Price and Chris Rust, Oxford Brookes University.)

### Presentation & style

1. **Presentation**
   - I/70+ Polished & logically organised meeting all the presentation requirements perfectly.
   - II.1/65-69 Carefully & logically organised.
   - II.2/60-64 Shows organisation & coherence.
   - III/50-59 Shows some attempt to organise in a logical manner.
   - Fail Disorganised/incoherent.

2. **Clarity of expression (including accuracy, spelling, grammar, punctuation)**
   - I/70+ Fluent writing style appropriate to the assignment. Grammar and spelling accurate.
   - II.2/60-64 Language mainly fluent. Grammar and spelling mainly accurate.
   - III/50-59 Meaning apparent but language not always fluent. Grammar and/or spelling contain errors.
   - Fail Meaning unclear and/or grammar and/or spelling contain frequent errors.

### Conforming to instructions/clarity of objectives

3. **Conforming with instructions (e.g. word length)**
   - I/II.1/11.2 Work has been submitted within time boundaries and within prescribed parameters.
   - III/50-59 Deviates slightly from the required parameters.
   - Fail Deviates significantly from the required parameters.

4. **Attention to purpose**
   - I/70+ Purpose of the assignment addressed comprehensively and imaginatively.
   - II.1/65-69 Purpose of the assignment addresses coherently with some attempt to demonstrate imagination.
   - II.2/60-64 Has addressed the main purpose of the assignment.
   - III/50-59 Some of the work is focused on the aims and themes of the assignment.
   - Fail Fails to address the task set.

5. **Referencing**
   - I/70+ Referencing is consistently accurate.
   - II.1/II.2 Referencing is mainly accurate.
   - III/50-59 Some attempt at referencing with some inaccuracies.
   - Fail Referencing is absent/unsystematic and/or many inaccuracies.

6. **Clarity of objectives and focus of work**
   - I/70+ Objectives clearly defined and comprehensively addressed throughout work.
   - II.1/65-69 Objectives defined and addressed throughout work.
   - II.2/60-64 Objectives outlined and addressed at the end of the work.
   - III/50-59 Provides generalised objectives and focused the work on the topic area.
   - Fail No information provided.
Content and knowledge of subject

7. Use of literature/evidence of reading
   I/70+ Has developed and justified own ideas based on a wide range of sources which have been thoroughly analysed, applied and discussed.
   II.1/65-69 Critically appraises the literature from variety of sources, developing own ideas in the process.
   II.2/60-64 Clear evidence and application of readings relevant to the subject; uses indicative texts.
   III/50-59 Literature presented uncritically, in a descriptive way and indicates limitations of understanding.
   Fail Either no evidence of literature being consulted or irrelevant to the assignment set.

Thinking/ analysis/conclusions

8. Critical reasoning
   I/70+ Consistent critical analysis is well integrated in the text.
   II.1/65-69 Clear application of critical analysis/critical thought of the topic area.
   II.2/60-64 Demonstrates application of critical analysis of the topic area.
   III/50-59 Some evidence of critical thought/critical analysis and rationale for work.
   Fail Lacks critical thought/analysis.

9. Reflection/evaluation
   I/70+ Critically reviews evidence, supports conclusions/recommendations. Investigates contradictory information with possible rationale.
   II.1/65-69 Selects appropriate evaluation techniques. Evaluates the relevance and significance of data collected.
   II.2/60-64 Can evaluate the reliability of data using defined techniques and/or tutor guidance.
   III/50-59 Limited and only partially accurate evaluation of data using defined techniques and/or tutor guidance.
   Fail Fails to evaluate or use techniques of evaluation, or evaluations are totally invalid.

10. Conclusions
    I/70+ Analytical and clear conclusions well grounded in literature.
    II.1/65-69 Good development shown in summary of arguments based in literature.
    II.2/60-64 Evidence of findings and conclusions grounded in literature.
    III/50-59 Limited evidence of findings and conclusions supported by literature.
    Fail Unsubstantiated/invalid conclusions, or no conclusions.