# ICT UNIVERSITY

**FALL 2015**

# Course: Theory Development with Systematic Literature reviews

## Course objectives

The single most prevalent research methodology employed by doctoral students in all fields of social science is the literature review, whether as the foreground to a research study, to their doctoral theses, or as a standalone study in its own right. While there are numerous guides on how to conduct literature reviews in different disciplines, none specifically describes how to develop a review explicitly focused on making a theoretical contribution from a social science perspective. This course will guide ICT University students to addresses this need by providing each student with a clear cut rigorous training in the systematic literature review methodology with a specific goal of making a valuable theoretical contribution. Students will be able to learn to employ systematic reviews of different forms at different stages of their academic career.

## Course description

This course trains students to synthesize past research systematically and rigorously such as to lay out, build or test theory, and to make a valuable theoretical contribution. Students will learn the nature of theory from a social science perspective and how to keep academic research focused on theory development. Students will learn the major stages of the systematic literature review methodology: specifying the purpose of the review; writing the study protocol and training the reviewers; the practical screen; the literature search; data extraction; quality appraisal; synthesis of the included studies; and writing the discussion and conclusions such as to make a theoretical contribution. This course is particularly tailored for doctoral students in ICT University, but it is sufficiently general and recommended to be valuable for graduate and post-graduate doctoral level students in any social science discipline.

## Systematic literature review pilot study

As the major project for the semester, each student will write the protocol for a systematic review and conduct a pilot study for that review. The protocol is a detailed study plan that describes step-by-step how a study will be conducted. The protocol will be submitted by midterm for feedback. The midterm protocol will be scored 5% of the 50% pilot study mark with three possible scores: 5% (complete and thorough); 2% (incomplete and inadequate); and 0% (no submission or unacceptable). Thorough feedback will be provided on the submission.

The completed pilot study will consist of a comprehensive (not exhaustive) literature search, and a summative synthesis approach. The final grade for the protocol and pilot study will be scored as one combined paper for 50% of the course grade.The feedback for the final submitted paper will include suggestions on what is needed to conduct a full-fledged study and recommendations on how to proceed.

There will be three submission steps:

* Early in the semester: First draft of protocol submitted for early (non-graded) feedback
* Around mid-semester: Complete protocol submission
* End of the semester: Final submission of revised protocol and completed pilot study

# Topics covered

* Objectives of theory-mining systematic reviews
  + What is theory?
  + Three kinds of theory-mining reviews: theory landscaping, theory contending and theory testing
  + Research questions
  + Dissemination
  + Rigour vs. Relevance
* Protocol and training for reviews
  + Research protocols
  + Training for team research
  + Reliability in team research
* Practical screen
  + Theory-guided considerations of which kinds of articles to include or exclude in the literature search
* Literature search
  + How and where to search the literature with a goal of developing theory
* Data extraction
  + How to extract data from identified studies with a goal of developing theory
* Quality appraisal
  + If and how to evaluate the quality of studies identified
* Synthesis
  + How to aggregate the studies identified with a goal of developing theory
* Presentation of theoretical contributions
  + How to argue and present the theoretical contributions of the review

# List of readings

Required reading before third class session *(All students are required to read this two articles presented by Dr. Chitu Okoli before the third class session).*

Okoli, Chitu. A Guide to Conducting a Standalone Systematic Literature Review. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems.* In press since August 2015.

Okoli, Chitu. The view from giants’ shoulders: guidelines for developing theory with theory-mining literature reviews. Working paper, 2015.

## Books (suggestions for book reviews)

Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., and Rothstein, H. R. 2009. *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*, (1st ed.) Wiley.

Campbell, J. P., Daft, R. L., and Hulin, C. L. 1982. *What to study: Generating and developing research questions*, Sage (Beverly Hills).

Collier, A. 1994. *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar’s Philosophy*, London: Verso.

Fink, A. 2005. *Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper*, (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Jaccard, J., and Jacoby, J. 2010. *Theory Construction and Model-Building Skills: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists*, (1st ed.) The Guilford Press.

Myers, M. D. 2008. *Qualitative Research in Business & Management*, (illustrated edition) Sage Publications Ltd.

Petticrew, M., and Roberts, H. 2006. *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*, Blackwell Pub.

Pope, C., Mays, N., and Popay, J. 2007. *Synthesizing qualitative and quantitative health evidence: a guide to methods*, McGraw-Hill International.

Ridley, D. 2008. *The Literature Review: A Step-by-Step Guide for Students*, Sage Publications Ltd.

## Introduction to systematic reviews

Okoli, Chitu. A Guide to Conducting a Standalone Systematic Literature Review. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems.* In press since August 2015.

Okoli, Chitu. The view from giants’ shoulders: guidelines for developing theory with theory-mining literature reviews. Working paper, 2015.

Paré, G., Trudel, M.-C., and Jaana, M. 2012. “Stand-Alone Literature Reviews in Information Systems Research: Development of a Taxonomy of Review Types and Assessment of Current Practices,” In *Proceedings of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada Conference*Presented at the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada Conference, St. John’s, Newfoundland, Canada: Administrative Sciences Association of Canada.

**Further readings**

Petticrew, M., and Roberts, H. 2006. “Why do we need systematic reviews?”, pp. 1-26, ch. 1 of*Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*, Blackwell Pub.

Kitchenham, B., and Charters, S. 2007. *Guidelines for performing Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering* (Technical Report No. EBSE-2007-01), Evidence-Based Software EngineeringKeele, UK: Keele University, pp. 65.

Pope, C., Mays, N., and Popay, J. 2007. “Stages in reviewing evidence systematically”, pp. 19-44, ch. 2 of*Synthesizing qualitative and quantitative health evidence: a guide to methods*, McGraw-Hill International.

## Purpose of a systematic review

Fink, A. 2005. “Reviewing the Literature: Why? For Whom? How?”, pp. 1-17, part of ch. 1 of*Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper*, (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Petticrew, M., and Roberts, H. 2006. “Starting the review”, pp. 27-56, ch. 2 of*Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*, Blackwell Pub.

Webster, J., and Watson, R. T. 2002. “Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review,” *MIS Quarterly* (26:2), pp. xiii-xxiii.

**Further readings**

Jaccard, J., and Jacoby, J. 2010. “Creativity and the Generation of Ideas”, pp. 39-74, ch. 4 of*Theory Construction and Model-Building Skills: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists*, (1st ed.) The Guilford Press.

Pope, C., Mays, N., and Popay, J. 2007. “Different types of evidence review”, pp. 3-18, ch. 1 of *Synthesizing qualitative and quantitative health evidence: a guide to methods*, McGraw-Hill International.

Alvesson, M., and Sandberg, J. 2011. “Generating Research Questions Through Problematization,” *Academy of Management Review* (36:2), pp. 247–271.

Dunne, C. 2011. “The place of the literature review in grounded theory research,” *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* (14:2), pp. 111–124.

Holton, J. 2006. “From the Editor,” *Grounded Theory Review* (5:2/3), pp. vii–x.

## Protocol and training for systematic reviews

Brereton, P., Kitchenham, B. A., Budgen, D., Turner, M., and Khalil, M. 2007. “Lessons from applying the systematic literature review process within the software engineering domain,” *The Journal of Systems & Software* (80:4), pp. 571-583.

Fink, A. 2005. “Doing the Review”, pp. 151-184, ch. 4 of*Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper*, (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Okoli, Chitu and Kira Schabram (2009). Protocol for a systematic literature review of research on the Wikipedia. *Proceedings of the International ACM Conference on Management of Emergent Digital EcoSystems (MEDES)*. Association for Computing Machinery. Lyon, France. October 27-30, 2009. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2291710>

**Further readings**

Turner, M., Kitchenham, B., Budgen, D., and Brereton, O. P. 2008. “Lessons learnt undertaking a large-scale systematic literature review,” In *Proceedings of EASE* (Vol. 8).

Elliot, S. 2011. “Transdisciplinary Perspectives on Environmental Sustainability:  A Resource Base and Framework for IT-Enabled Business Transformation,” *MIS Quarterly* (35:1), pp. 197-236.

Jasperson, J., Carte, T. A., Saunders, C. S., Butler, B. S., Croes, H. J. P., and Zheng, W. 2002. “Power and information technology research: a metatriangulation review,” *MIS quarterly* (26:4), pp. 397-459.

## Introduction to research synthesis

Petticrew, M., and Roberts, H. 2006. “Synthesizing the evidence”, pp. 164-214, ch. 6 of *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*, Blackwell Pub.

Pope, C., Mays, N., and Popay, J. 2007. “Approaches and assessment: choosing different methods and considering quality”, pp. 171-185, ch. 8 of*Synthesizing qualitative and quantitative health evidence: a guide to methods*, McGraw-Hill International.

Rousseau, D. M., Manning, J., and Denyer, D. 2008. “Evidence in management and organizational science: Assembling the field’s full weight of scientific knowledge through syntheses,” *The Academy of Management Annals* (2:1), pp. 475-515.

**Further readings**

Dixon-Woods, M., Agarwal, S., Young, B., Jones, D., and Sutton, A. 2004. *Integrative approaches to qualitative and quantitative evidence*National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence.

Pawson, R., Greenhalgh, T., Harvey, G., and Walshe, K. 2005. “Realist review-a new method of systematic review designed for complex policy interventions,” *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy* (10:Supplement 1), pp. 21-34.

Oliver, S., Harden, A., Rees, R., Shepherd, J., Brunton, G., Garcia, J., and Oakley, A. 2005. “An Emerging Framework for Including Different Types of Evidence in Systematic Reviews for Public Policy,” *Evaluation* (11:4), pp. 428 -446.

## Nature of theory and research epistemologies in information systems research

Burton-Jones, A., McLean, E. R., and Monod, E. 2011, February. *On Approaches to Building Theories: Variance, Process and Systems*, Working paper, University of British Columbia.

Weber, R. 2012. “Evaluating and Developing Theories in the Information Systems Discipline,” *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (13:1).

Whetten, D. A. 1989. “What constitutes a theoretical contribution?,” *Academy of Management Review* (14:4), pp. 490–495.

**Further readings**

Mingers, J. 2004b. “Real-izing information systems: critical realism as an underpinning philosophy for information systems,” *Information and Organization* (14:2), pp. 87-103.

Lee, A. S. 1991. “Integrating Positivist and Interpretive Approaches to Organizational Research,” *Organization Science* (2:4), pp. 342-365.

Doty, D. H., and Glick, W. H. 1994. “Typologies as a Unique Form of Theory Building: Toward Improved Understanding and Modeling,” *The Academy of Management Review* (19:2), pp. 230–251.

Barki, H. 2008. “Thar’s gold in them thar constructs,” *SIGMIS Database* (39:3), pp. 9–20.

Markus, M., and Saunders, C. 2007. “Looking for a Few Good Concepts…and Theories…for,” *Management Information Systems Quarterly* (31:1).

Bacharach, S. B. 1989. “Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation,” *Academy of Management Review* (14:4), pp. 496–515.

Jaccard, J., and Jacoby, J. 2010. “The Nature of Understanding”, pp. 6-21, ch. 2 of *Theory Construction and Model-Building Skills: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists*, (1st ed.) The Guilford Press.

Jaccard, J., and Jacoby, J. 2010. “Science as an Approach to Understanding”, pp. 22-38, ch. 3 of*Theory Construction and Model-Building Skills: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists*, (1st ed.) The Guilford Press.

## Practical screens and searching for IS literature

Fink, A. 2005. Part of “Reviewing the Literature: Why? For Whom? How?”, pp. 17-42, part of ch. 1 of*Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper*, (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Fink, A. 2005. Part of “Searching and Screening: The Practical Screen and Methodological Quality”, pp. 51-59, part of ch. 2 of *Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper*, (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Levy, Y., and Ellis, T. J. 2006. “A Systems Approach to Conduct an Effective Literature Review in Support of Information Systems Research,” *Informing Science* (9), pp. 181.

VomBrocke, J., Alexander Simons, BjoernNiehaves, Kai Riemer, Ralf Plattfaut, and Anne Cleven. 2009. “Reconstructing the giant: on the importance of rigour in documenting the literature search process,” In *Proceedings of the 17th European Conference on Information Systems*Presented at the European Conference on Information Systems, Verona, Italy: Association for Information Systems.

**Further readings**

Ridley, D. 2008. “Sources of information and conducting searches”, pp. 29-43, ch. 3 of*The Literature Review: A Step-by-Step Guide for Students*, Sage Publications Ltd.

Petticrew, M., and Roberts, H. 2006. “What sorts of studies do I include in the review?”, pp. 57-78, ch. 3 of *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*, Blackwell Pub.

Dubé, L., and Paré, G. 2003. “Rigor in information systems positivist case research: Current practices, trends, and recommendations,” *MIS Quarterly* (27:4), pp. 597–636.

Petticrew, M., and Roberts, H. 2006. “How to find the studies: The literature search”, pp. 79-124, ch. 4 of *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*, Blackwell Pub.

Wu, J., and Lederer, A. 2009. “A Meta-Analysis of the Role of Environment-Based Voluntariness in Information Technology Acceptance,” *Management Information Systems Quarterly* (33:2), pp. 419-432.

Joseph, D., Ng, K. Y., Koh, C., and Ang, S. 2007. “Turnover of information technology professionals: a narrative review, meta-analytic structural equation modeling, and model development,” *Management Information Systems Quarterly* (31:3), pp. 7.

Jasperson, J., Carte, T. A., Saunders, C. S., Butler, B. S., Croes, H. J. P., and Zheng, W. 2002. “Power and information technology research: a metatriangulation review,” *MIS quarterly* (26:4), pp. 397-459.

## Quality appraisal of IS research and data extraction

Bandara, W., Miskon, S., and Fielt, E. 2011. “A systematic, tool-supported method for conducting literature reviews in information systems,” In *Proceedings of the19th European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS 2011)*.

Klein, H. K., and Myers, M. D. 1999. “A set of principles for conducting and evaluating interpretive field studies in information systems,” *MIS quarterly* (23:1), pp. 67-93.

Petticrew, M., and Roberts, H. 2003. “Evidence, hierarchies, and typologies: horses for courses,” *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* (57:7), pp. 527 -529.

Spencer, L., Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., and Dillon, L. 2003. *Quality in Qualitative Evaluation : A framework for assessing research evidence A Quality Framework*London: National Centre for Social Research.

**Further readings**

***Quality appraisal***

Myers, M. D., and Klein, H. K. 2011. “A set of principles for conducting critical research in information systems,” *Management Information Systems Quarterly* (35:1), pp. 17-39.

Hart, C. 1998. “Argumentation Analysis,” In *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 79-108.

Petticrew, M., and Roberts, H. 2006. *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*, Blackwell Pub. Chapter 3

Fink, A. 2005. *Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper*, (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications. Chapter 2

Gregor, S., and Jones, D. 2007. “The Anatomy of a Design Theory,” *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (8:5).

Dubé, L., and Paré, G. 2003. “Rigor in information systems positivist case research: Current practices, trends, and recommendations,” *MIS Quarterly* (27:4), pp. 597–636.

Lee, A. S. 1989. “A Scientific Methodology for MIS Case Studies,” *MIS Quarterly* (13:1), pp. 33-50.

Hevner, A. R., March, S. T., Park, J., and Ram, S. 2004. “Design science in information systems research,” *MIS Quarterly* (28:1), pp. 75-105.

Davison, R., Martinsons, M. G., and Kock, N. 2004. “Principles of canonical action research,” *Information Systems Journal* (14:1), pp. 65-86.

Lau, F. 1999. “Toward a framework for action research in information systems studies,” *Information Technology & People* (12:2), pp. 148-176.

Urquhart, C., Lehmann, H., and Myers, M. D. 2010. “Putting the ‘theory’ back into grounded theory: guidelines for grounded theory studies in information systems,” *Information Systems Journal* (20:4), pp. 357–381.

***Data extraction***

Kitchenham, B., and Charters, S. 2007. “6.4 Data Extraction”, pp. 29-34,*Guidelines for performing Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering* (Technical Report No. EBSE-2007-01), Evidence-Based Software EngineeringKeele, UK: Keele University.

Fink, A. 2005. Methodological Quality (Part 2), pp. 103-141, ch. 3 of*Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper*, (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Petticrew, M., and Roberts, H. 2006. “Example data extraction form”, pp. 293-295, App. 4 of*Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*, Blackwell Pub.

## Informal qualitative synthesis methodologies

Barnett-Page, E., and Thomas, J. 2009. “Methods for the synthesis of qualitative research: a critical review,” *BMC Medical Research Methodology* (9:1), pp. 59.

Boxenbaum, E., and Rouleau, L. 2011. “New Knowledge Products As Bricolage: Metaphors and Scripts in Organizational Theory,” *Academy of Management Review* (36:2), pp. 272–296.

Mays, N., Roberts, E., and Popay, J. 2001. “Synthesising Research Evidence,” In *Studying the Organisation and Delivery of Health Services: Research Methods*, P. Allen, N. Black, A. Clarke, N. Fulop, and S. Anderson (eds.), (1st ed.) Routledge.

**Further readings**

Chen, D., Mocker, M., Preston, D. S., and Teubner, A. 2010. “Information Systems Strategy: Reconceptualization, Measurement, and Implications,” *MIS Quarterly* (34:2), pp. 233-259.

Piccoli, G., and Ives, B. 2005. “IT-dependent strategic initiatives and sustained competitive advantage: A review and synthesis of the literature,” *Mis Quarterly* (29:4), pp. 747–776.

Leidner, D. E., and Kayworth, T. 2006. “A review of culture in information systems research: Toward a theory of information technology culture conflict,” *Management Information Systems Quarterly* (30:2), pp. 9.

## Formal qualitative synthesis methodologies

Popay, J., Rogers, A., and Williams, G. 1998. “Rationale and Standards for the Systematic Review of Qualitative Literature in Health Services Research,” *Qualitative Health Research* (8:3), pp. 341 –351.

Pope, C., Mays, N., and Popay, J. 2007. “Interpretive approaches to evidence synthesis”, pp. 72-94, ch. 4 of*Synthesizing qualitative and quantitative health evidence: a guide to methods*, McGraw-Hill International.

Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., and Wilderom, C. P. M. 2011. “Using grounded theory as a method for rigorously reviewing literature,” *European Journal of Information Systems*.

**Further readings**

Shepherd, D. A., and Sutcliffe, K. M. 2011. “Inductive Top-Down Theorizing: A Source of New Theories of Organization,” *Academy of Management Review* (36:2), pp. 361–380.

Tsang, E. W. K., and Ellsaesser, F. 2011. “How Contrastive Explanation Facilitates Theory Building,” *Academy of Management Review* (36:2), pp. 404–419.

Jasperson, J., Carte, T. A., Saunders, C. S., Butler, B. S., Croes, H. J. P., and Zheng, W. 2002. “Power and information technology research: a metatriangulation review,” *MIS quarterly* (26:4), pp. 397-459.

## Meta-analysis

Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., and Rothstein, H. R. 2009. “How a Meta-Analysis Works”, pp. 3-8, ch. 1 of *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*, (1st ed.) Wiley.

Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., and Rothstein, H. R. 2009. “Why Perform a Meta-Analysis”, pp. 9-16, ch. 2 of *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*, (1st ed.) Wiley.

King, W. R., and He, J. 2005. “Understanding the Role and Methods of Meta-Analysis in IS Research,” *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (16:1), pp. 32.

Wu, J., and Lederer, A. 2009. “A Meta-Analysis of the Role of Environment-Based Voluntariness in Information Technology Acceptance,” *Management Information Systems Quarterly* (33:2), pp. 419-432.

**Further readings**

Viswesvaran, C., and Ones, D. S. 1995. “Theory Testing: Combining Psychometric Meta‐analysis and Structural Equations Modeling,” *Personnel Psychology* (48:4), pp. 865-885.

Smith, V., Devane, D., Begley, C., and Clarke, M. 2011. “Methodology in conducting a systematic review of systematic reviews of healthcare interventions,” *BMC Medical Research Methodology* (11:1), pp. 15.

Joseph, D., Ng, K. Y., Koh, C., and Ang, S. 2007. “Turnover of information technology professionals: a narrative review, meta-analytic structural equation modeling, and model development,” *Management Information Systems Quarterly* (31:3), pp. 7.

## Other quantitative synthesis methodologies

Dixon-Woods, M., Agarwal, S., Young, B., Jones, D., and Sutton, A. 2004. *Integrative approaches to qualitative and quantitative evidence,* National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence.

Pope, C., Mays, N., and Popay, J. 2007. “Quantitative approaches to evidence synthesis”, pp. 47-71, ch. 3 of *Synthesizing qualitative and quantitative health evidence: a guide to methods*, McGraw-Hill International.

Pope, C., Mays, N., and Popay, J. 2007. “Mixed approaches to evidence synthesis”, pp. 95-114, ch. 5 of*Synthesizing qualitative and quantitative health evidence: a guide to methods*, McGraw-Hill International.

**Further readings**

Oliver, S., Harden, A., Rees, R., Shepherd, J., Brunton, G., Garcia, J., and Oakley, A. 2005. “An Emerging Framework for Including Different Types of Evidence in Systematic Reviews for Public Policy,” *Evaluation* (11:4), pp. 428 –446.

Rihoux, B., and Ragin, C. C. 2008. *Configurational Comparative Methods: Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Related Techniques*, SAGE.

Hodson, R. 1999. *Analyzing documentary accounts*, Sage Publications, Inc. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412983372>

## Argumentation for theoretical contributions in academic writing

Belcher, Wendy Laura 2009. “Advancing your argument”, pp. 67-98, ch. Week 3 of *Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks: A Guide to Academic Publishing Success*. SAGE Publications: Thousand Oaks, California, USA.

Belcher, Wendy Laura 2009. “Strengthening Your Structure”, pp. 171-188, ch. Week 6 of *Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks: A Guide to Academic Publishing Success*. SAGE Publications: Thousand Oaks, California, USA.

Corley, K. G., and Gioia, D. A. 2011. “Building Theory About Theory Building: What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution?,” *The Academy of Management Review (AMR)* (36:1), pp. 12–32.

**Further readings**

Grover, V., Lyytinen, K., Srinivasan, A., and Tan, B. 2008. “Contributing to Rigorous and Forward Thinking Explanatory Theory,” *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (9:2).

Hirschheim, R. 2008. “Some Guidelines for the Critical Reviewing of Conceptual Papers,” *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (9:8).

Belcher, Wendy Laura 2009. “Reviewing the Related Literature”, pp. 139-170, ch. Week 5 of *Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks: A Guide to Academic Publishing Success*. SAGE Publications: Thousand Oaks, California, USA.

## Application of systematic reviews for the academic career

Association for Information Systems. 2011, December 6. “Senior Scholars’ Basket of Journals,” *Association for Information Systems*.

Saunders, C. 2006. “MIS Journal Rankings,” *Association for Information Systems*.

Boote, D. N., and Beile, P. 2005. “Scholars Before Researchers: On the Centrality of the Dissertation Literature Review in Research Preparation,” *Educational Researcher* (34:6), pp. 3.

Okoli, Chitu (2012). Propelling an Academic Career by Means of Systematic Reviews. Working paper, Concordia University, Montréal.

Van Slyke, Craig, Robert P. Bostrom, James F. Courtney, Ephraim R. McLean, Charles Snyder, and Richard T. Watson. "Experts' Advice to Information Systems Doctoral Students." *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* 12, no. 1 (2003): 28.

**Further readings**

Davis, G., and Parker, C.A. 1997. “The Need for a Different Approach to the Dissertation”, pp. 1-13, ch. 1 of *Writing a Doctoral Dissertation: A Systematic Approach*, 2nd ed., Barrons Educational Series.

Davis, G., and Parker, C.A. 1997. “An Overview of the Dissertation Management Approach”, pp. 14-24, ch. 2 of *Writing a Doctoral Dissertation: A Systematic Approach*, 2nd ed., Barrons Educational Series.

Petress, K. 2000. “How to Be a Good Advisee,” *Education* (120:3), pp. 598-599.