Policies and Guidelines for Review Articles*

<u>Rationale</u>

De La Salle University is in the process of establishing itself as leading learner-centered research University. In view of this commitment to doing research, faculty and students of the University strive to contribute to knowledge building and to have greater impact in terms of being reliable sources of scientific information. To achieve this end, the faculty can undertake projects aimed primarily to interpret meanings of information from primary sources in their disciplines. The preparation and publication of review articles would allow for a realization of this aim.

Scholars write review articles for the purpose of providing an update on a new area of study in the discipline. These articles attempt to frame recent information using a particular, or a set of perspectives. Review articles may also attempt to examine conflicting information in a specific area of study by providing a judgment on these conflicting ideas. On the basis of these aims, it is evident that support for the writing and preparation of review articles for publication will result in further advancing the scientific careers of faculty researchers in the University. Moreover, quality reviews are usually heavily cited and help increase the impact factor of journals.[1][2][3][4][5] Thus, University support for writing review articles will help enhance the impact of the faculty's intellectual output, increasing further the influence of our University faculty in the singular task of knowledge production.

<u>What is a review article?</u>

In his oft-cited paper on the publication of review articles, the social psychologist Daryl Bem (1995), citing the 1994 American Psychological Association (APA) Publication Manual, defined the review article as a "critical evaluation of material that has already been published." [6][7] Although the goals of writing a review article are no different from those of writing literature reviews for Masters and PhD theses, the output to be supported with the present set of guidelines are those outputs that aim at positioning the author's contribution to the scientific field.[8]

---

[1] Archambault, É., & Larivière, V. (2009). History of the journal impact factor: Contingencies and consequences. *Scientometrics*, *79*(3), 635-649.

[2] Ketcham, C. M., & Crawford, J. M. (2007). The impact of review articles. *Laboratory Investigation*, *87*(12), 1174-1185.

[3] Andersen, J., Belmont, J., & Cho, C. T. (2006). Journal impact factor in the era of expanding literature. *Journal of microbiology, immunology, and infection= Wei mian yu gan ran za zhi*, *39*(6), 436-443. (Abstract)

[4] Seglen, P. O. (1997). Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, *314*(7079), 498-513]

[5] Bornmann, L., Marx, W., Gasparyan, A. Y., & Kitas, G. D. (2012). Diversity, value and limitations of the journal impact factor and alternative metrics. *Rheumatology international*, *32*(7), 1861-1867.

[6] Bem, D. J. (1995). Writing a review article for *Psychological Bulletin. Psychological Bulletin, 118,* 172–177. (p. 172)

[7] American Psychological Association (2001). *Publication manual of the* American Psychological Association (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author

[8] See Danielsen (2008). A systematic review heuristic to literature review. In *The 31st Information Systems Research Seminar in Scandinavia (Workshop 3).*

Scholars' positioning in the field shall be realized if they attempt to achieve any of the following in a review article:[9]

- propose a new conceptualization or theory;
- provide a context with which to describe, elaborate, and evaluate an existing theory or model;
- summarize the evidence from previous works to draw conclusions about existing conceptualizations; and,
- provide a historical account of the development of theory and research on a particular topic.

These goals correspond to the types of review articles to be supported with the present set of guidelines. These types of reviews are those generally acceptable for journal publication:[10]

1. The narrative review
   - In this type of review, an attempt is made to link a large number of previous studies for the purpose of theory building and hypotheses generation.

2. The systematic or meta-analytic review
   - Findings from previous research testing the same hypotheses are analyzed statistically. The findings from previous work are transformed into a common metric to determine the magnitude of effect size.[11]

3. The historical review
   - Previous studies are examined in order to place knowledge gained from these studies within a socio-economic and cultural-historical context.[12]

<u>Why should support be given for the writing of review articles?</u>

Aside from the already mentioned possible consequence of scientific career advancement and the increase in the impact of research published by the faculty, other reasons for providing support are summarized as follows:[13]

- First and foremost, reviews help in directing the research efforts of individual or teams of researchers, while also providing journal editors with the guidance in determining which issues would be important to address in a given field.

- Review articles are usually directed to a wide variety of audiences, and will be consulted by a wide range of sectors, such as the government, non-government, the media and industry, thereby enhancing the prominence of the faculty and the institution.

---

[9] Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1997). Writing narrative literature reviews. *Review of general psychology*, *1*(3), 311-320.
[10] See Baumeister & Leary, 1997
[11] Durlak, J.A. (2010). Literature reviews and meta-analysis. In J.C. Thomas and M. Hersen (eds.). Handbook Clinical Psychology Competencies (pp. 484-499). USA: Springer
[12] Ríos, L. F., &Casal, G. B. (2009). Standards for the preparation and writing of Psychology review articles. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, *9*(2), 329-344.
[13] Bem, 1995; Baumeister & Leary, 1997; Rios & Casal, 2009.

- By providing conclusions of a scope and theoretical level not usually accomplished in individual studies, reviews provide a bridge between a wide array of studies and the reader who, under normal circumstances, would not have the resources to read all of these studies.

- Finally, a review article can take on the role of addressing the most pertinent, and sometimes the most provocative, questions in a discipline or an area of applied practice.

The Policies for Review Articles under the Faculty Research Program

1. The review article should be prepared by a single faculty proponent or a team of proponents. A single proponent will be receiving a maximum of 6-unit-deloading for one academic year. A team of proponents will be receiving a maximum of 9-unit-deloading to be shared among the proponents.

2. A review article project can be undertaken in addition to one on-going URCO Faculty Research Program project, subject to the approval of the College Research Council.

3. The proponent(s) should be able to demonstrate a track record in the research area of studies to be reviewed, primarily, through previous publications in the area

4. The review articles to be proposed are to be of the following types:

   a) Narrative review
   b) Systematic or meta-analytical review
   c) Historical review

5. Direct research funding for the writing of review articles will consist of the following:

   a) Materials and supplies
   b) Journal article downloading expenses
   c) Research assistantship
   d) Communication and transportation

6. The review article project shall be considered complete with the publication, or acceptance for publication, of the article in a refereed, abstracted journal. For completion of a review article project, the proponent is also required to present the review in a public forum to be arranged by the URCO.

7. The URCO monitoring guidelines shall apply for the proposal and implementation phases for review articles. However, the proposals of faculty who have been invited by a refereed and abstracted journal to contribute a review article need not undergo the internal evaluation process normally undertaken for proposals submitted to the URCO. The internal evaluation process shall also be waived for faculty who can present proof of initial interest from an editor in publishing a review article authored by the faculty.