**Literature Review**

Due Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

This will be a two to three page paper that will analyze your research and show connections and trends from one research source to another. It is recommended that you compare and contrast three sources at least. The focus of a literature review is to synthesize the arguments and ideas of others without adding new contributions. Therefore, pls do not list or only summarize your sources in this review (this is NOT an annotated bibliography), but use this opportunity to identify trends, methodologies, analyze evidence used by authors of your sources as you report on the literature relevant to a particular field or topic. Your report should give an overview of what has been said, the prevailing theories and hypotheses, the questions that have been asked and answered, and the issues that are being clarified on the subject.

**How to organize your Literature Review (A guideline):**

**Introduction** Defend the importance of the topic and state reasons for your choice. Give a broad overview of the scope of the work you are reviewing. Clarify whether you’re looking at the entire history of the field, or just a particular period of time. You could also point out overall trends, gaps and themes that emerge.

**Body** Discuss your sources. You can organize your discussion chronologically, thematically or methodologically.

**Conclusion** Summarize the major contributions, evaluating the current position, and pointing out flaws in methodology, gaps in the research, contradictions and areas for further study. Also predict where research in the field will go next.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rubric for Literature Review\* | | | |
| **Low** | **Middle** | **High** |
| Neither implicit nor explicit reference is made to the topic or purpose of the article. | Readers are aware of the overall problem, challenge, or topic of the article | The topic is introduced, and groundwork is laid as to the direction of the article. |
| The summary appears to have no direction, with subtopics appearing disjointed. | There is a basic flow from one section to the next, but not all sections or paragraphs follow in a natural or logical order. | The summary goes from general ideas to specific conclusions. Transitions tie sections together, as well as adjacent paragraphs. |
| Major sections of pertinent content have been omitted or greatly run-on. The topic is of little significance to the course. | All major sections of the pertinent content are included, but not covered in as much depth, or as explicit, as expected. Significance to the course is evident. | The appropriate content in consideration is covered in depth without being redundant. Sources are cited when specific statements are made. Significance to the course is unquestionable. |
| It is hard to know what the writer is trying to express. Writing is convoluted. Misspelled words, incorrect grammar, and improper punctuation are evident. | Writing is generally clear, but unnecessary words are occasionally used. Meaning is sometimes hidden. Paragraph or sentence structure is too repetitive. Few (3) spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors are made. | Writing is crisp, clear, and succinct. The writer incorporates the active voice when appropriate and supports ideas with examples. No spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors are made. |
| There is no indication the author tried to synthesize the information or make a conclusion based on the literature under review. No application to library media center program is provided. | The author provides concluding remarks that show an analysis and synthesis of ideas occurred. Some of the conclusions, however, were not supported in the body of the report. The application to library media center program is stated. | The author was able to make succinct and precise conclusions based on the review. Insights into the problem are appropriate. Conclusions and the application to library media center program are strongly supported in the review. |
| Citation for the article did not follow [MLA Format](http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/research/r_apa.html) and was missing essential information. | Citation for the article did follow [MLA format](http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/research/r_apa.html); however; a few (2) errors in essential information were evident. | Citation for the article did follow [MLA format](http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/research/r_apa.html). Essential information was accurate and complete. |