

**INSTRUCTION FOR
COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION
POLITICAL ISLAM-POLITICAL SCIENCES GRADUATE PROGRAM
UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH YOGYAKARTA**

1. Purposes

The purposes of comprehensive examination are:

- a. Examining student capability in conducting literature review
- b. Classifying student capability into different standard of thesis preparation
- c. Classifying student into related research topic

2. Literature Review

2.1. Definition

A literature review is both a summary and explanation of the complete and current state of knowledge on a limited topic as found in academic books and journal articles. There are two kinds of literature reviews you might write at university: one that students are asked to write as a stand-alone assignment in a course, often as part of their training in the research processes in their field, and the other that is written as part of an introduction to, or preparation for, a longer work, usually a thesis or research report

Literature writing a review (i.e., proof of knowledge, a publishable document, and the identification of a research family), the scientific reasons for conducting a literature review are many. Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) argue that the literature review plays a role in:

- delimiting the research problem,
- seeking new lines of inquiry,
- avoiding fruitless approaches,
- gaining methodological insights,
- identifying recommendations for further research, and
- seeking support for grounded theory.

2.2. Content of the Literature Review

2.2.1 Introduction

The introduction explains the focus and establishes the importance of the subject, provides background or history, concludes with a purpose or thesis statement and will sum up and evaluate the state of the art in this field of research.

2.2.2 Body

Taxonomy of Literature Reviews An effective method to begin planning a research review is to consider where the proposed review fits into Cooper's (1988) Taxonomy of Literature Reviews. As shown in Table 1, Cooper suggests that literature reviews can be classified according to five characteristics: focus, goal, perspective, coverage, organization, and

audience. Cooper (1988) identifies four potential focus: research outcomes, research methods, theories, or practices or applications.

Table 1. Cooper’s Taxonomy of Literature Reviews

CHARACTERISTIC	CATEGORIES (only some will apply)
FOCUS	Research Methods Research Outcomes Theories Practices or Applications
GOAL	Integration (a) Generalization (b) Conflict Resolution (c) Linguistic bridge-building Criticism Identification of Central Issues
PERSPECTIVE	Neutral Representation Espousal of Position
COVERAGE	Exhaustive Exhaustive with Selective Citation Representative Central or Pivotal
ORGANIZATION	Historical Conceptual Methodological
AUDIENCE	Specialized Scholars General Scholars Practitioners or Policymakers General Public

Source: “Organizing Knowledge Synthesis: A Taxonomy of Literature Reviews,” by H.M. Cooper, 1988, *Knowledge in Society*, 1, p. 109.

There are many formats in which to organize a review. Three of the most common are the historical format, the conceptual format, and the methodological format (Randolph, J.J. 2009).

2.3 Conclusion

The conclusion summarizes all the evidence presented and shows its significance. If the review is an introduction to your own research, it highlights gaps and indicates how previous research leads to your own research project and chosen methodology. If the review is a stand-alone assignment for a course, it should suggest any practical applications of the research as well as the implications and possibilities for future research.

Appendix

**Table 2. Criteria of Assessment
Boote and Beile's Literature Review Scoring Rubric**

Category	Criterion	1	2	3
1. Coverage	A. Justified criteria for inclusion and exclusion from review	Did not discuss the criteria for inclusion or exclusion	Discussed the literature included and excluded	Justified inclusion and exclusion of literature
2. Synthesis	B. Distinguished between what has been done in the field and what needs to be done	Did not distinguish what has and has not been done before	Discussed what has and has not been done	Critically examined the state of the field
	C. Placed the topic or problem in the broader scholarly literature	Topic not placed in broader scholarly literature	Some discussion of broader scholarly literature	Topic clearly situated in broader scholarly literature
	D. Placed the research in the historical context of the field	History of topic not discussed	Some mention of history of topic	Critically examined history of topic
	E. Acquired and enhanced the subject vocabulary	Key vocabulary not discussed	Key vocabulary defined	Discussed and resolved ambiguities in definitions
	F. Articulated important variables and phenomena relevant to the topic	Key variables and phenomena not discussed	Reviewed relationships among key variables and phenomena	Noted ambiguities in literature and proposed new relationships
	G. Synthesized and gained a new perspective on the literature	Accepted literature at face value	Some critique of literature	Offered new perspective
3. Methodology	H. Identified the main methodologies and research techniques that have been used in the field, and their advantages and disadvantage	Research methods not discussed	Some discussion of research methods used to produce claims	Critiqued research methods
	I. Related ideas and	Research methods not discussed	Some discussion of appropriateness of research	Critiqued appropriateness of

	theories in the field to research methodologies		methods to warrant claims	research methods to warrant claims
4. Significance	J. Rationalized the Practical significance of the research problem	Practical significance of research not discussed	Practical significance discussed	Critiqued appropriateness of research methods to warrant claims
	K. Rationalized the scholarly significance of the problem	Scholarly significance of research not discussed	Scholarly significance discussed	Critiqued scholarly significance of research
5. Rhetoric	L. Was written with a coherent, clear structure that supported the review	Poorly conceptualized, haphazard	Some coherent structure	Well developed, coherent

From "Scholars before Researchers: On the Centrality of the Dissertation Literature Review in Research Preparation," by D. N. Boote and P. Beile, 2005, *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), p. 8. Copyright 2005 by Sage Publications. Reprinted with permission of Sage Publications.