

# Revisão (sistemática) da literatura: o processo e o produto

Ângela Espinha

Cristovão Roia

Lívia Miranda

Marisa Machado

Vanessa Souza



# review

critical  
meta-analysis  
literature  
rapid  
narrative  
systematic  
comprehensive  
synthesis  
state-of-the-art  
overview  
scoping  
conceptual  
integrated  
bibliometric  
selective  
expert  
traditional  
thematic  
meta-ethnography

Anderson & Arsenault, 2002; Cardoso, Alarcão & Celorico, 2010; Coutinho, 2015; Creswell, 2007 (...)

- Literature review / revisão de literatura

Bryman, 2012

- Literature review
- Narrative review
- Systematic review

Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011

- Literature review
- Traditional review
- Systematic review

Yin, 2011

- Research literature
- Selective review
- Comprehensive review



Jesson,  
Matheson,  
Lacey,  
2011

- A method
- A report

Cardoso,  
Alarcão &  
Celorico,  
201

- *Como ponto de partida*
- *Como ponto de chegada*

Anderson  
&  
Arsenault,  
2002

- **Types of knowledge**
- Historical knowledge
- Axiological knowledge
- Theoretical and conceptual knowledge
- Prior research studies
- Reviews
- Academic debate



“Successful research is based on all the knowledge, thinking and research that precedes it, and for this reason a review of the literature is an essential step in the process of embarking on a research study”  
(Anderson & Arsenault, 2002, p. 76)



# Traditional review

O QUÊ?

“A literature review is a **re-view** of something that has already been written” (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p. 9)

“A review of literature is a **summary, analysis and interpretation** of the **theoretical, conceptual** and **research literature** related to a topic or theme.”  
(Anderson & Arsenault, 2002, p. 76)

“A revisão de literatura **não é** um processo **acrítico.**”  
(Cardoso, Alarcão & Celorico, 2010, p. 25)



# Traditional review

O PROCESSO

TOP  
SECRET

# Traditional review

## COMO?

Oliveira e Ferreira, 2014

1. Identificar palavras-chave
2. Consultar fontes secundárias
3. Fazer a pesquisa nas bases de dados e recolher fontes primárias
4. Ler de forma crítica e resumir literatura – é importante que faça uma leitura “ativa”, procure temas, questões e pontos comuns e divergentes entre os vários autores

Jesson, Matheson, Lacey, 2011

1. Formulate your draft research questions.
2. Search for information, using key words.
3. Skim, scan, read, reflect and search some more, defining key concepts.
4. Obtain articles and read some more.
5. Reassess your questions.
6. Formulate the final research question.



# Traditional review

O PRODUTO



# Traditional review

## PARA QUÊ?

1. Conhecer (e dar conhecer) o que já se sabe sobre um dado tema – o estado da arte (Anderson & Arsenault, 2002; Bryman, 2012; Cardoso, Alarcão, Celorico, 2010; Coutinho, 2015)
2. Argumentar a relevância e originalidade de um estudo (Bryman, 2012; Coutinho, 2015; Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011; Yin, 2011)
3. Situar o estudo na tradição de investigação na área (Bryman, 2012; Anderson & Arsenault, 2002; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2005; Coutinho, 2015; Creswell, 2007)
4. Identificar metodologias, definições, limitações (Anderson & Arsenault, 2002; Cardoso, Alarcão & Celorico, 2010; Coutinho, 2015)
5. Identificar resultados divergentes (Coutinho, 2015; Creswell, 2007)
6. Potencia a credibilidade do investigador (Anderson & Arsenault, 2002; Coutinho, 2015)



# Traditional review

“In research, we seek to be original and to make an **original contribution to knowledge**. In the literature review context that means creating a **new dimension** or **fresh perspective** that makes a distinct contribution.” (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p. 10)

“There are different types or reasons for reviewing:

- **Traditional review** (critical approach)
- **Conceptual review** (synthesise areas of conceptual knowledge)
- **State-of-the-art review** (most recent research on the topic)
- **Expert review**
- **Scoping review** (what is already known, gaps, points to way to the future” (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p. 10)



# Traditional review

## VANTAGENS

“On the other hand, one value of traditional reviews is that they often provide **insights** that can be neglected or passed over in the steps towards exclusion and quality control that are required in the systematic review model.” (Jesson, Matheson, Lacey, 2011, p. 15)

“The advantage of a traditional review, which is less formally prescribed than a systematic review, is that you can **add new thoughts and new themes** to your plan throughout the process.” (Jesson, Matheson, Lacey, 2011, p. 83)



# Traditional review

## LIMITAÇÕES

“Narrative reviews therefore tend to be **less focused** and **more wide-ranging in scope** than systematic reviews. They are also invariably **less explicit** about the criteria for exclusion or inclusion of studies.” (Bryman, 2012, p. 110)

“it may produce a **one-sided or even a biased argument.**” (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p. 15)

“there is **no formal methodology**, so there is a **lack of transparency** and **no academic rigour**” (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p. 75)

“since there is **no methodological audit trail**, the review cannot be replicated by others” (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p. 75)



“there is **no quality assessment** of the material included (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p. 75)

# Systematic review

## O QUÊ?

“a **replicable, scientific and transparent process...that aims to minimize bias through exhaustive literature searches of published and unpublished studies** and by providing an **audit trail of the reviewer’s decisions, procedures and conclusions**” (Tranfield et al., 2003, p. 209)

“Procura-se, de certa forma, tematizar a questão, de objetivar princípios que colaborem na definição de um pensamento conducente a uma **experiência afastada**, o mais possível, de convicções pessoais.” (Faria, 2016, p. 18)

“We therefore define systematic review as a review with a **clear stated purpose, a question**, a defined search approach, stating **inclusion and exclusion criteria**, producing a **qualitative appraisal of articles.**” (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p. 12)



# Systematic review

O PROCESSO



# Systematic review

## COMO?

**Bryman, 2012**

1. Define the purpose and scope of the review
2. Seek out studies relevant to the scope of the review
3. Appraise the studies from Step 2.
4. Analyse each study and synthesise the results.

**Faria, 2016**

1. Objetivos
2. Equações de pesquisa
3. Âmbito da pesquisa
4. Critérios de inclusão
5. Critérios de exclusão
6. Critérios de validade metodológica
7. Resultados
8. Tratamento dos dados e resultados

**Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011**

1. Mapping the field through a scoping review
2. Comprehensive search
3. Quality assessment
4. Data extraction
5. Synthesis
6. Write up



# Systematic review

O PRODUTO



# Systematic review

PARA QUÊ?

“This would enable researchers to ‘say something more precise and targeted’ about the effectiveness of specific interventions, or in other words to provide evidence about ‘what works’ (Evans and Benefield 2001: 538). Systematic reviews would thus help to make research evidence more usable.” (Bryman, 2012, p. 109)



# Systematic review

## VANTAGENS

“Proponents of systematic review also recommend the approach for its **transparency**; in other words, the grounds on which studies were selected and how they were analysed are clearly articulated and are potentially **replicable**.” (Bryman, 2012, p. 105)

“The appeal of this style of review lies in its claim to be a more **neutral, technical process**, which is **rational** and **standardized**, thereby demonstrating **objectivity** and a transparent process to the reader. These features sit easily in a scientific framework but less so in a more open qualitative, interpretative paradigm common in the social sciences.” (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p.



# Systematic review

## LIMITAÇÕES

“Another criticism of the approach is that it can lead to a **bureaucratization of the process** of reviewing the literature, because it is more concerned with the technical aspects of how it is done than with the analytical interpretations generated by it.”

(Bryman, 2012, p. 108)

The systematic approach assumes that an objective judgement about the **quality of an article** can be made. Particularly in relation to qualitative research, there is little consensus on how the quality of studies should be carried out” (Bryman, 2012, p. 108)

“One of the limitations of the systematic methodology is that to do a good systematic review takes **time, resources** and ideally **more than one researcher.**” (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p.

108)



(Adapted from Pilbeam and Denver, 2008 in  
Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p. 105)

# Traditional review vs systematic review

	<b>Traditional (scoping) review</b>	<b>Systematic review</b>
Aim	To gain a broad understanding, and description of the field	Tightly specified aim with a specific research question
Scope	Big picture	Narrow focus
Planning the review	No defined path, allows for creativity and exploration	Transparent process and documented audit trail
Identifying studies	Searching in probing, moving from one study to another, following up leads	Rigorous and comprehensive search for ALL studies
Selection of studies	Purposive selection made by the reviewer	Predetermined criteria for including and excluding studies
Quality assessment	Based on the reviewer's opinion	Checklists to assess the methodological quality of studies
Analysis	Content analysis	Meta-analysis, Meta-ethnography
Synthesis	Discursive	In tabular format and short summary answers
Methodological report	Not necessarily given	Must be presented for transparency

# Traditional review vs systematic review

“To work systematically simply means to work in an ordered or methodological way, rather than in a haphazard or random way. So, as a researcher, you have to take a **systematic approach to your learning and to your writing**. But taking an ordered approach to doing your literature review does not mean that the review can be called a “systematic review”. It is possible to claim that you have taken a **systematic approach to obtaining knowledge for your literature review**, but without working through the six key stages of a systematic review protocol it cannot claim to be a systematic review.” (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p. 12)



# Literature review

## DICAS

1. “An excellent beginning is to obtain a bibliography from a professor or other knowledgeable expert” (Anderson & Arsenault, 2002, p. 79)
2. There are topics where you may need to be more adventurous in your choice of material, maybe looking at the work of different academic disciplines” (Jesson, Matheson & Lacey, 2011, p. 20)
3. “In some instances, a great number of research studies appear to bear on the problem under investigation. Generally, this occurs when the research problem is not sufficiently focused.” (Anderson & Arsenault, 2002, p. 79)
4. “Regra geral, a experiência mostra que só se encontra um ou dois artigos por cada 10 ou 20 referências realmente interessantes para o problema que é o objeto de análise.” (Coutinho, 2015, p. 64)



# Bibliografia

- (1) Amado, J. D. S. (2009). *Introdução à Investigação Qualitativa em Educação (Relatório de Disciplina apresentado nas Provas de Agregação)*. Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra.
- (2) Anderson, G., & Arsenault, N. (2002). *Fundamentals of Educational research*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- (3) Bicudo, M.A.V. & Esposito, V.H.C. (1994). *A pesquisa qualitativa em educação: um enfoque fenomenológico*. São Paulo: Editora Unimep.
- (4) Bogdan, R. C, & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative Research for Education: An introduction to Theories and Methods (4th ed.)*. New York: Pearson Education group.
- (5) Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods (4th Edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (6) Cardoso, T., Alarcão, I., & Calorico, J. A. (2010). *Revisão da literatura e sistematização do conhecimento*. Porto: Porto Editora.
- (7) Carvalho, E.J. (2009). *Metodologia do Trabalho Científico «Saber-Fazer» da investigação para dissertações e teses*. Lisboa: Escolar Editora.
- (8) Castellan, C. M. (2010). Quantitative and Qualitative Research: A View for Clarity. *International Journal of Education*, 2(2), 1-14.





# Bibliografia

- (9) Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2005). *Research methods in education* (5th ed). UK: Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- (10) Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- (11) Coutinho, C. P. (2015). *Metodologias de Investigação em Ciências Sociais e Humanas: Teoria e Prática*. (2.ª Edição). Coimbra: Edições Almedina
- (12) Espírito Santo, P. (2015). *Introdução à metodologia das Ciências Sociais: gêneses, fundamentos e problemas*. (2.ed. rev. atual).
- (13) Faria, P. M. (2016). *Revisão Sistemática da Literatura: contributo para um novo paradigma investigativo. Metodologia e Procedimentos na área das Ciências da Educação*. Santo Tirso: Whitebooks.
- (14) Flick, U. (2005). *Métodos qualitativos na investigação científica*. Lisboa: Monitor.
- (15) Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research*. London: SAGE Publications.
- (16) Jesson, Jill K., Matheson, L., & Lacey, Fiona M. (2011). *Doing your literature review: traditional and Systematic Techniques*. London: SAGE Publications.



# Bibliografia

- (17) Luna, S.V. (1999). *Planejamento de pesquisa: uma introdução*. São Paulo: Educ.
- (18) Merriam, Sharan B. (2009). *Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco (CA): Jossey-Bass.
- (19) Oliveira, R. E., & Ferreira. (2014). *Métodos de Investigação. Da Investigação à Descoberta Científica*. Porto: Vida Económica-editorial, SA.
- (20) Pardal, L., & Lopes, E. S. (2011). *Métodos e Técnicas de investigação Social*. Porto: Areal Editores.
- (21) Vilelas, J. (2009). *Investigação. O Processo de Construção do Conhecimento*. Lisboa: Edições Sílabo. (Vanessa Souza)
- (22) Yin, R. (2011). *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish*. New York: The Guilford Press.

