ISVS e-journal
Guidelines for Writing a Literature Review
2022

The objectives of a research paper is to present a research conducted on an issue and present the findings. Research is aimed at producing new knowledge. This means that a research must be conducted on an issue about which there is no adequate knowledge. It may be that there is knowledge but there are gaps in that knowledge. It may also be that the world has changed so much that the knowledge that we have seems out of date.

Whatever the case may be, research is about creating new knowledge. This means, in order to claim that new knowledge is being produced through the research we publish, we must show what the current knowledge is.

Knowledge exists/resides in written form. It may also reside in the memories of people, videos, word of mouth etc. But such knowledge is not easily accessible. Knowledge published in research papers are accepted knowledge that exists in the form of writing. We call them literature.

Therefore, in order to understand what that knowledge is, an activity called 'a critical review of literature' is done. A critical review, as the word suggests involves few things.

1. Examining, listing and summarizing key ideas and findings of previous research.
2. Evaluating these ideas to locate patterns of agreements or disagreements among the scholars.
3. Evaluating these ideas and findings critically, to show inadequacies, irrelevancies or where new ides may make more sense.

Thus, one of the first tasks of any research is to write a 'review of literature'. Conducting a 'literature review' is not a research methodology. This is a task accomplished before a research method is decided. In fact, some research methods could be uncovered by means of doing a 'documentary survey' which is a research method. A literature review should not be mixed up with the 'documentary survey' method. A critical review of literature is written in an accepted way. Following principles are adopted.

1. In a review, a person's status does not make the ideas important. Thus we do not refer to professors, and Drs etc. or any positions.
2. Once knowledge and ideas are produced, they belong to those who produced them. Although others are free to use those ideas and findings, the original researchers must always be acknowledged. This is the standard practice. Hence whenever, research ideas and findings from others are written about, the authors must be mentioned. This is called 'citing'. In other words, in research, always, authors are referred to or 'cited'.
3. The time when such findings and ideas were generated is very important. For example, citing a 100-year-old document with regard to an issue of current nature is not very useful. Similarly, when looking at something that happened in the past, documents of the past are

more relevant. Moreover, authors can also change ideas from time to time. For this reason, citing must involve both the author and the year in which the finding has been made.

One of the most scientific ways of citing or referencing is called the Harvard system. According to the Harvard system, a reference is made as follows. ISVS e-journal uses a derivative o the Harvard system. There is no dot or comma after the bracket in the system used by the ISVS e-journal. We think this is unnecessary.

Indirect references

Heidegger (1960) argued that Man dwells poetically. (here the idea is indirectly quoted)

In referencing, if you refer to the idea only, then only the author and the year is mentioned. If you cite a direct quotation however, the page number where it appears must also be mentioned. If the direct quotation is longer than 20 words or two lines, it should be indented from both sides too; the references must be listed at the bottom of the quoted text.

> "Why are there beings at all instead of nothing? That is the question. Presumably it is not arbitrary question, "Why are there beings at all instead of nothing"- this is obviously the first of all questions. Of course it is not the first question in the chronological sense [...] And yet, we are each touched once, maybe even every now and then, by the concealed power of this question, without properly grasping what is happening to us. In great despair, for example, when all weight tends to dwindle away from things and the sense of things grows dark, the question looms."

Heidegger,1960:232

Note the comma and the colon.

If more than two are cited such as (Heidegger,1960;Dovey,1999), then a semi colon is used to separate. Don't place them separately in two separate brackets. These conventions must be followed. Having done that in the text, the full references must be listed at the end of the document following the Harvard system.

Following is a good literature review.

Although not well known internationally, a teaching experiment in Sri Lanka referred to as the "Moratwa Experiment" articulates a theory, its author claims an "Eastern Approach" (Nammuni, 1991a; 1991b; 1991c; 1991d). According to Nammuni, Eastern approaches internalize and search for insights in the solitude of mind, while Western approaches externalize and depend on quantified data. Thus, Nammuni argues that while facts are fruitful starting points in seeking solutions in fields such as architecture, solutions can only be conceived and synthesized through 'divine' inspirations (interpreted by Nammuni as a selfless state of being, the designer becomes at the time of designing) and intellectual articulations within the designer's own mind. This is in contrast to Alexander's timeless way of building, Hertzberger's observations of the real world, Habraken's supports or Hamdi's participatory design. Instead, Nammuni focuses on that part of the designer's internalized process through which the social dimensions are to be fused into the conceptions of architecture. Nammuni's arguments have similarities with those of Hertzberger, who accepts that "how one should go about processing all this facts...is a different story" (1991; 164). Hertzberger

does not elaborate on this 'different story' but accedes that, "to bring this variegated assortment of data to the surface, the architect has only one means at his disposal; *his imagination* (my italics). He must use his imagination to the full to be able to identify himself with the users and thus to understand how his design will come across to them and what they will expect from it". In a similar interpretation, Nammuni writes (says, points out) that "a design process must therefore take us beyond our ego and help us transcend the boundaries of the human condition - into divinity that exists within us and without us" (1991d: 18). According to Nammuni, architecture should primarily solve "architectural problems" defined as being "socio-spatial" in nature, rather than environmental or construction problems. Nammuni adopts an attitude of causality of human behavior where specific environments evoke specific human responses that the architect can manipulate through space. However, (Nevertheless) Nammuni remains aloof to employing 'research data' directly. Instead, he proposes developing an empathy with the user through internalization and imagination.

Please look at the text highlighted in red. These phrases outline the following principles.

1. Write a review of literature using the voice of the person as much as possible. For example, instead of writing "while facts are fruitful starting points in seeking solutions in fields such as architecture, solutions can only be conceived and synthesized through 'divine' inspiration" (Nammuni,1991), write, "Thus, Nammuni (1991) argues that while facts are fruitful starting points in seeking solutions in fields such as architecture, solutions can only be conceived and synthesized through 'divine' inspiration".
2. Write in the present tense: do not write Rapport 'reported'; instead write 'Rapoport reports'
3. Make sure that there are connecting phrases between sentences; comparing contrasting, agreeing, disagreeing, extending or strengthening the ideas. The review discussion must flow well as a discussion.
4. End with a comment on the most researched ideas and the least. This way you show where the research gaps are, and why your research is necessary. This is the context of your paper.

References
Alexander, C. & Kurokawa, K. (1977) A Pattern Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Augustin, S. (2009) Place advantage, Applied psychology for interior architecture, New Jersey: Wiley.
Bates, D. (2013) Lab Architecture Studio, at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lab_Architecture_Studio accessed on 19th April 2013.
Broady, M. (1966) 'Social Theory in Architectural Design' in Gutman, R. (ed.), People and Buildings. New York: Basic Books.
Canter, D. V. (1974) Psychology for Architects, The University of California: Applied Science Press
Goffman, E. (1963) Behavior in Public Places. London: The Free Press.
Fisher, T. (2004) Architects Behaving Badly: Ignoring Environmental Behavior Research, Harvard Design Magazine, 21.
Hall, E.T. (1966) The Hidden Dimension. London:Doubleday.
Habraken, J. (1972) Supports: An Alternative to Mass Housing. London: Architectural Press.
Hamdi, N. (1992) Housing without Houses. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
Hertzberger, H. (1991) Lessons for Students in Architecture, Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010

Note: There are commas after the surname and the first (or second) initial. After the second (or final) initial there is only a dot.

Year must be within brackets. There is no comma or dot after the bracket.

After the title of the paper or the article, there is comma. After the place of publication, there is a colon. After the publisher, there is a dot.