A GENRE ANALYSIS OF LITERATURE REVIEWS IN DOCTORAL THESES

KWAN SIU CHU BECKY

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
AUGUST 2005

CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

香港城市大學

A Genre Analysis of Literature Reviews in Doctoral Theses

對於博士論文中文獻綜述之體裁分析

Submitted to
Department of English and Communication 英文與傳播學系
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
哲學博士學位

by

Kwan Siu Chu Becky 關小珠

> August 2005 二零零五年八月

Abstract

Research into thesis-writing began about a decade ago. However, theorizing and research into the task of literature reviewing (LR) to date is still underdeveloped. The two-part genre analysis presented in this thesis is an attempt to fill the theoretical and research voids. The first part of the study is a textual analysis (also called the thin analysis), which investigates the schematic pattern of LR chapters in doctoral theses organized in the traditional format (i.e., Introduction – Literature review – Methodology - Results - Discussion; abbreviated as ILrMRD). Based on the assumption that LRs and Introductions in research writing share similar rhetorical purposes—as alluded to in thesis instructional literature, the analysis employed, as a starting analytical framework, the 3-move CARS model (Swales 1990) and especially that posited for thesis introductions (Bunton 2001). The LR chapters analyzed are drawn from 20 theses which were produced by a group of Chinese doctoral students based in Hong Kong and cover a wide range of social science and humanity topics. It was found that many of the LR chapters display an Introduction-Body-Conclusion structure. The body segments of most chapters comprise thematic sections which display highly cyclical move patterns that suggest the presence of the 3 moves and their respective elements postulated in the CARS model. The occurrence of Move 1 and Move 2 is notably higher than that of Move 3. There is also a preponderance of Move 1-2 pairing. Elements within each of the moves do not co-occur regularly. When they do co-occur, they do not appear in any predictable order. Three new elements (making confirmative claims, relevancy claiming abstracting-synthesizing theoretical frameworks /theoretical positions) were also identified in some instances of Move 2. Taken together, the findings suggest that the CARS scheme for introductions may not be entirely applicable to describe the patterns found in the LR chapters. A revised model is thus postulated in the present thesis.

The second part of the study is a thick analysis of literature reviewing, which is a response to the recent calls for extending genre inquiries to probe into various processes of text production (Bhatia 1993, 2004; Brant 1990; Devitt 1993). It examines how doctoral students select literature for reviewing (e.g., themes, specific authors, specific sources and specific theoretical frameworks), which constitutes a major step of constructing LRs. One of the aims of the thick analysis is study how technical events such as the writing of LR and research activities implicate (construct) the selection of readings. This aim of analysis is motivated by calls from research writing theorists to deconstruct the demarcation view about reading, researching and writing and to restore the nexus among the three activities in theorizing about research writing. Part of the analysis is cognitive in its orientation and acknowledges doctoral students' agency in the selection of literature for reviewing. The study is complemented by an examination of the social processes involved in reviewing. The exploration has its theoretical underpinning derived from social constructivist theory and in particular Lave and Wenger's (1991) situated learning theory. It looks into how students develop their cognition of 'core literature' for reading by taking into consideration the social milieu in which doctoral students carry out their research studies.

Stories of RS and RLR were collected from sixteen doctoral student informants. The stories reveal that many of the informants developed their awareness of the key literature while working on the other parts of their studies, which include the pilot studies, data collection, data analysis and drafting of the literature review chapters for major official documents such as the proposal, the qualifying report and the thesis. Literature reviewing apparently served different purposes at various stages of their study journeys. Most of the students began the task as reading to learn for their studies (RS) through which they gained preliminary understanding about the research topics regarding their research focuses, conceptual contours, methodological concerns characteristic of the areas of study, and research design. Reading at this stage was the least focused, which began to resolve at the commencement of various research activities such as pilot studies, data collection and data analysis, in which some of the students grew aware of their immaturely formulated hypotheses, inadequacies in the adopted theoretical frameworks, or underdeveloped operational constructs. Realization of the shortcomings made the students become more critical about their own research and the literature they had reviewed, which at the same time steered the students away from the core literature consulted earlier and moved them to embark on new themes for reviewing.

Based on the recounted experiences provided by the student informants, the thesis argues that reading during the initial and research stages of study is less directed at the writing of LR. As the stories reveal, reading for the literature review chapter (RLR) became most marked and most intensive when the students started writing their LRs (WLR) usually during a time when institution-imposed deadlines of submission of major qualifying documents approached. Their LR drafts provided 'heuristic' forms that helped them identify gaps of information which guided reading for specific details. RLR during the final stage of the study journeys, as commented by some of the completing or graduated students, also served the purpose of updating citations in the draft literature review.

The stories also show that knowledge of what to read was partly acquired from experienced members in the fields of the students' studies through guided participation in various parts of the students' research studies. These members were primarily the students' supervisors and occasionally panel members, who oversaw the students' progress. Many students reported obtaining reading lists from their supervisors. Some recounted receiving instruction while discussing their research progress or written outputs with their supervisors or panel members at various stages of their studies. The stories suggest the importance of the students' interim outputs as springboards for RS and RLR supervision. Several informants provided accounts of acquiring theoretical frameworks, crucial readings and key authors' names for their RS from extrinsic networks of experts (Kaufer & Geisler 1989) whom the students met at conferences and seminars, during their participation in the supervisor's Project or during the experts' scholarly visits to their departments. The accounts suggest that peripheral participation in academic activities and establishing contacts with members of the field of study plays a crucial role in facilitating students' RS. As stories

provided by two of the informants also reveal, resorting to extrinsic networks can sometimes be implicated by the mismatch between the supervisor's expertise and the subject matter of the student's study.

The study offers rich insights into the complexity involved in literature reviewing as a rhetorical textual product and a socio-cognitive process, from which pedagogical and research implications can be drawn.

Table of Contents

Abstract Acknowledgements List of abbreviations		i iv ix		
Chapt	er 1 Introduction			
1.1 1.1.1 1.1.2 1.1.3 1.1.4	Research into the postgraduate thesis Needs analysis Structural analysis Studies of the thesis-writing process Literature reviewing as a critical site of research	2		
1.2 1.2.1 1.2.2 1.2.3	Genres as social processes			
1.3 1.3.1 1.3.2 1.3.3	2 Rhetorical purposes			
1.4	The site of study	26		
1.5 1.5.1 1.5.2	Research questions and the structure of the thesis Research questions Structure of the Thesis	30		
Chapt	er 2 A Review of the CARS Model			
2.1 2.1.1 2.1.2 2.1.3 2.1.4	Swales' CARS model CARS in RAs published in Anglo-American journals Contrastive studies of CARS Studies of dissertation introductions The validity of CARS	33		
2.2 2.2.1 2.2.2 2.2.3	Coding strategies Nomenclature and boundary demarcation Over-coding Implications for the study	50		

Chapter 3 Methodology of the Thin Analysis			
3.1 3.1.1 3.1.2	The semantic approach to text-coding Terminology: participants, claims and processes The semantic coding scheme	61	
3.2	The functional approach to text-coding	86	
3.3 3.3.1 3.3.2	Procedures of the thin Analysis The corpus Coding procedures	88	
Chap	ter 4 Schematic Patterns of Literature Reviews		
4.1 4.1.1 4.1.2	Chapter introductory and concluding texts Introductory texts Concluding texts	104	
4.2	Thematic units and the CARS structure	109	
4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.3 4.3.4	Establishing a thematic territory as a starting move Claiming centrality of the theme reviewed (Strategy 1.X) Surveying existing knowledge claims (Strategy 1.Y) Surveying existing research activities (Strategy 1.Z) Distribution of Move 1 strategies	112	
4.4 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3	Niche-establishing Negational strategies Affirmative strategies Distribution of Move 2 strategies	128	
4.5 4.5.1 4.5.2	Occupying the niche The three common strategies of Move 3 Distribution of Move 3 strategies	149	
4.6 4.6.1 4.6.2	Coherence of move structures Modular arrangement of move structures Nested structures in higher order structures	156	
4.7	Establishing theoretical frameworks	164	
4.8 4.8.1 4.8.2 4.8.3	Schematic modeling Knowledge claims surveyed Postulation of schematic models for LRs LRs and introductory chapters	166	

Chapt	ter 5 A cognitive and socio-cognitive approach to the study of literature reviewing	
5.1 5.1.1 5.1.2	RS, RLR and research processes Postulating a reading-research-writing nexus Implications for the study	175
5.2 5.2.1 5.2.2	Social construction of knowledge The sociological dimension of knowledge-making The social dimension of knowledge-making	183
5.3 5.3.1 5.3.2 5.3.3	Apprenticing and postgraduate academic literacy Three forms of participation Participation and postgraduate research literacy Implications for the study	198
Chapt	ter 6 Methodology for the thick analysis	
6.1 6.1.1 6.1.2 6.1.3	Narrative inquiry Stories and narratives Obtaining stories Quality of experience and the telling of it	212
6.2 6.2.1 6.2.2 6.2.3	Story collection The informants The interviews LR artifacts provided for text-based interviews	216
6.3 6.3.1 6.3.2	Treatment of data Transcription of interview data Coding and analyzing the stories	228
Chapt	ter 7 Accessing literature for RS and RLR	
7.1 7.1.1 7.1.2 7.1.3 7.1.4	RS and situated learning The points of entry: reading at the journey's start Guided participation in RS Accessing theoretical frameworks Strategic knowledge and LPP	235

7.2 7.2.1 7.2.2 7.2.3 7.2.4 7.2.5	Pilot stu RS, RL Refocus WLR as	g, researching and writing dies and RS R and the data analysis proper sing s a micro guiding force for RLR g for non-LR chapters	274
7.3	Exigen	cies of RS and RLR	309
Chap	ter 8	Conclusion	
8.1 8.1.1 8.1.2	The sch	najor contributions made to the understanding of LRs ematic pattern of LRs ng literature for RS and RLR	316
8.2 8.2.1 8.2.2			322
8.3 8.3.1 8.3.2 8.3.3 8.3.4	Process analysis Other aspects of literature reviewing		343
Refere	ences		351
Apper	ndices		
	dix I dix IIA dix IIB	The semantic scheme for move/step-coding Interview Guide (Student Informants in the initial stage of study) Interview Guide (Student Informants in their middle stage of study)	360 363 366
Appendix IIC Interview		Interview Guide (Completing/Graduated Student Informants) Interview Guide (Supervisor informants)	369 372

List of abbreviations

DA Data analysis

GP Guided participation **LR** Literature Review

ILrMRD The traditional thesis format which comprises the five sections of

Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results and Discussion

LPP Legitimate peripheral participation

RLR Reading for the literature review chapter

RS Reading for the study

SC Social construction or social constructivism

SL Situated learning

WLR Writing of the literature review chapter