

"Understanding Literature Reviews from Narrative to Meta-Analysis: Frameworks, Typologies, and Writing Styles"

Dr. Naiya s. Sajjan

IITE Gandhinagar Gujarat, India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2025.141000074>

Abstract: A literature review is a critical intellectual activity that highlights gaps in knowledge, places new research in the perspective of what is already known, and guides future study. The objective, technique, advantages, and disadvantages of the main categories of literature reviews—narrative, systematic, and critical reviews—are examined in this essay. While systematic reviews adhere to strict, repeatable protocols to reduce bias, narrative reviews offer comprehensive, descriptive summaries of findings. By combining quantitative results using statistical methods, meta-analyses expand on systematic reviews and improve the validity and generalisability of findings. Finding methodological or conceptual flaws in earlier research is the main goal of critical reviews. Along with discussing writing styles such as contextual, variable-based, and methodological organisation, the study highlights the significance of summarising local, national, and worldwide research to show its applicability.

I. Introduction

To be meaningful, new research must be contextualised in relation to current literature. A literature review is a thorough examination of existing knowledge on a specific topic that allows researchers to evaluate their current comprehension, identify gaps, and explain the need for further investigation (Hart, 2018). Literature evaluations provide a fundamental groundwork for promoting academic study (Lim, 2022)

In today's academic world, scientific papers have increased dramatically. However, not all publications are of equal reliability. Reviews of the literature play an important function in separating authentic scholarship from misinformation, protecting the integrity and quality of research output (Boote & Beile, 2005). (Rendolph, 2007)

II. Types of Literature Reviews

The particular kind of literature review chosen depends on by the subject matter of study, research surroundings, and researcher methodological inclinations (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). (Cresswell, 2000) Some commonly used kinds are given below:

Narrative Literature Review

A narrative literature review is a wide descriptive summary of a topic that lacks a clear methodological structure. It allows researchers to organise their different ideas, theories, and findings into a coherent narrative (Green et al., 2006). This method is particularly beneficial for investigating difficult or emergent fields of research. However, it has limits since subjective choices in study selection and interpretation can generate bias. (Kitsiou.)

Systematic Literature Review

In contrast to the narrative approach, a systematic literature review is a methodical and repeatable process. Researchers use established inclusion and exclusion criteria to explore numerous databases and methodically synthesise conclusions (Moher et al., 2009). This methodology assures openness, dependability, and comprehensiveness, making it one of the most stringent review methods. (Page, October 2021)

Meta-Analysis

Meta-analysis is a specialized form of systematic review that uses statistical techniques to combine data from multiple quantitative studies. By pooling results, researchers can identify patterns, reconcile conflicting findings, and generate stronger evidence-based conclusions (Glass, 1976; Bornstein et al., 2009). It is particularly valuable in disciplines with numerous empirical studies reporting varied outcomes. (Kang, 2018)

Scoping Review

A scoping study seeks to map the scope of current research on a topic rather than answering a specific issue (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005). This approach can help identify research gaps, clarify concepts, and inform future systematic reviews. Unlike meta-analyses, scoping reviews do not include mathematical interpretation. (O'Malley, 2005)

Critical Review

A critical review goes beyond description to engage in evaluation and critique of the literature. It assesses the strengths, weaknesses, and relevance of existing studies while providing fresh interpretations (Grant & Booth, 2009). Such reviews often highlight conceptual or methodological gaps and offer directions for future research. (Brouard, 2020)

Writing Styles of Literature Reviews

Literature reviews can be broadly classified as either “systematic” or “narrative”. Narrative reviews may be broader in scope than systematic reviews, but have been criticised for lacking synthesis and rigour. (Byrne, 2016) The presentation of literature reviews can follow different writing styles, depending on the research design (Webster & Watson, 2002):

Style 1: Contextual Focus**A. International research and studies in the chosen area.****Sample Paragraph**

International studies have widely highlighted the significance of foundational literacy in ensuring long-term academic success. For instance, Snow, Burns, and Griffin (1998) in the United States demonstrated that early reading proficiency strongly predicts future educational achievement, emphasizing the need for systematic interventions in the primary years. Similarly, in the United Kingdom, Torgerson, Brooks, and Hall (2006) conducted a large-scale review of literacy interventions and concluded that phonics-based instruction yielded substantial improvements in early reading skills. In Australia, Nicholson and Tschopp (2003) found that integrating numeracy with literacy in early childhood education enhanced cognitive development, supporting the view that foundational skills must be taught holistically. More recently, Tanaka (2021) in Japan examined curriculum reforms in primary schools and reported that structured literacy approaches significantly narrowed achievement gaps among disadvantaged students. Collectively, these studies underline a global recognition of the importance of early literacy and numeracy, while also illustrating varied pedagogical strategies across contexts. However, there remains a paucity of research focusing on localized community-driven initiatives in developing countries, a gap that the present study seeks to address.

After finding a study topic, it should be written a start paragraph. Mention the topic's worldwide relevance. In which you have to put evidence according to apa mal or many more. Add evidence. The researcher should summarise worldwide studies based on the study's requirements and needs by noting the author, year, country, key finding, variables, findings, and for critical evaluation. Compare two or more research and demonstrate similarities/differences across nations. It should also include a link explaining why your study is necessary.

Sample Improved Paragraph Template

This Topic has received increased international interest because to its significant implications for global issues such as educational fairness, public health, and sustainable development. For example, Author A (Year, Country A) examined Variables 1 and 2 and discovered the Key Finding. Similarly, Author B (Year, Country B) investigated Variables 3 and 4, and reported the Key Finding. In contrast, Author C (Year, Country C) examined Variable 5 and identified Key Finding. When these studies are compared, the most prevalent findings are Similarity 1 and Similarity 2, whereas Difference A and Difference B diverge, owing mostly to Contextual Factors. Despite this worldwide evidence, few research address Context or Population Understudied, especially in terms of Innovative Variable or Approach.

This gap suggests that research is needed to examine Your Specific Focus in Your Setting to understand how Variables interact under Conditions, and to develop context-specific interventions or policies.

Writing Example (Sample Paragraph)

International research has extensively explored the role of foundational literacy in early education. For instance, Smith and Lee (2020) in the United States demonstrated that phonics-based interventions significantly improved reading comprehension among first graders. Similarly, Brown (2019) in the United Kingdom highlighted the importance of continuous teacher training in sustaining literacy outcomes. In contrast, Tanaka (2021) in Japan emphasized curriculum integration as the key driver of literacy development. These cross-country findings indicate a global consensus on the importance of early literacy but reveal varied strategies for its implementation. However, limited international evidence addresses localized challenges faced in developing regions, underscoring the need for contextualized studies such as the present research.

B. National research and studies in the chosen area.**How to Write Local Research and Studies Section?**

1. Begin with Regional Importance: - Emphasise the issue's significance at the state, district, or municipal level. - Demonstrate how local conditions impact the topic.(Culture, socioeconomic condition, education system, and regional policies) make the study important.
2. Summarise local studies. Share findings from regional research undertaken by universities, NGOs, or government agencies. Include the author's name, year, region/district, variables, and key findings.
3. Local Critical Comparison: - Compare districts/states or urban/rural areas. - Determine local variations in approach, outcomes, or execution.

4. Close the Local Gap - Focus on understudied areas, including smaller districts, girls, tribal groups, and Anganwadi workers.
Directly connect the gap to your own study, demonstrating its practical value to the community.

An example of a template-style paragraph

The problem or Topic (Research Title) has drawn a lot of attention at the local level, especially in [State/Region/District], where it has a direct bearing on [Education, Health, Employment, Social Development]. For instance, Mehta (2020, Ahmedabad District) examined [Variable 1] and discovered [Key Finding], whereas Joshi (2021, Gandhinagar) emphasised how [Variable 2] influenced [Outcome]. Similarly, Rathod (2022, Rural Gujarat) looked at [Variable 3] and found that [Urban and Rural Populations] differed significantly. Comparing these local studies reveals a consistent focus on [Common Finding], but because of variations in socioeconomic and cultural contexts, they interpret [Specific Variable or Method] differently. Research on [Specific Local Gap] is still lacking in spite of these efforts.

C. Local research and studies in the chosen area:

Begin with why the topic is important in your specific state, district, or community. Connect it with regional challenges, demographics, policies, or cultural settings. Summarize Local Studies, Cite work from, universities, local researchers, NGOs, or district-level government reports, Include Author, Year, Region, Variables Studied, and Key Findings. Critical Comparison, Compare results across nearby districts or rural vs. urban settings. Point out similarities/differences in findings caused by local contexts. Close the Local Gap Identify what has not yet been studied locally (e.g., smaller villages, tribal communities, gender aspects, early childhood programs). Link it to your study, showing its necessity for evidence-based local planning and policy.

Sample Paragraph (Model Style):

Within the local context, research on Topic has primarily focused on State/Region/District, reflecting its significance for community-level development. For instance, Desai (2019, Gandhinagar District) examined Variable 1 and reported that Key Finding, while Rathod (2021, Ahmedabad) highlighted the influence of Variable 2 on Outcome among Target Group. Similarly, Patel (2022, Rural Gujarat) studied Variable 3 and found marked disparities between rural and urban populations in terms of Key Outcome. A comparison of these studies reveals consistent attention to Common Finding but variation in conclusions regarding Specific Variable, shaped by socio-economic and cultural differences within districts. However, despite this emerging body of work, there remains limited research on Specific Local Gap e.g., the role of Anganwadi workers in foundational literacy, technology use in semi-urban schools, or gender-specific barriers in education. To address this gap, the present study concentrates on Your Study Focus in Your Local Region, thereby offering evidence that is both contextually grounded and practically valuable for local stakeholders and policymakers. (Kwienk, 2020)

Style 2: Variable-Based Organization

- **Studies are arranged according to the key variables or constructs under investigation.**

Style 3: Methodological Organization

Literature is structured according to review types:

- **Narrative Literature Review**

An extensive, detailed, and interpretative synopsis of previous research on a certain subject is known as a narrative literature review. In contrast to systematic reviews, it arranges and synthesises research findings in a narrative flow rather than rigorously according to a set process. An introduction outlining the scope, goal, and importance of the selected issue usually comes first. The body of the review, which describes and interprets many researches in relation to one another, is often organised topically, chronologically, or philosophically. Connections are made to highlight parallels, inconsistencies, and new trends, and authors are credited with their contributions (Author, Year, Country, and Key Findings). In addition to summarising, a narrative review identifies research gaps, points out discrepancies, and critically evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of previous work.

- **Systematic Literature Review**

An systematic and rigorous technique to examining the body of research on a particular subject is known as a systematic literature review. An SLR minimises bias and guarantees thorough coverage of pertinent research by following a clear and reproducible method, in contrast to narrative reviews, which are descriptive and flexible. The process starts with a well-defined research topic, which is then followed by the creation of inclusion and exclusion criteria for choosing studies. Using predetermined keywords, databases are methodically searched, and all research found are vetted and evaluated for quality. After that, the chosen research is examined and synthesised, frequently with the use of quantitative or qualitative techniques like meta-analysis. Consistencies, variances, and gaps in the body of data are highlighted in the results, which are presented logically and systematically.

- **Meta-Analysis**

A statistical method called meta-analysis is used to aggregate and synthesise findings from several separate studies on a same research subject in order to provide conclusions that are more reliable and broadly applicable. It surpasses a systematic review in

that it integrates data using quantitative techniques in addition to summarising findings. Effect sizes or statistical findings from each research are then retrieved and examined. The procedure starts with a systematic review to find pertinent papers that satisfy inclusion criteria. A meta-analysis boosts the overall sample size and power through statistical aggregation, which aids in finding patterns, gauging the strength of associations, and resolving discrepancies between separate researches. Additionally, it frequently assesses consistency and publishing bias using methods like heterogeneity tests, forest plots, and funnel plots.

➤ Critical Review

A critical review is a kind of literature review that thoroughly assesses and examines previous research in addition to summarising it. A critical review looks at the advantages, disadvantages, assumptions, methods, and conclusions of earlier research, in contrast to narrative or systematic reviews, which are mainly concerned with summarising or reporting findings. It necessitates that the researcher approach the literature critically, challenging the trustworthiness, validity, and relevance of the data. This method highlights important contributions while enabling the identification of biases, gaps, and inconsistencies.

III. Conclusion

A literature review is more than a preliminary stage in research; it is an indispensable scholarly activity that establishes the foundation of inquiry. By discerning between different review types and adopting an appropriate writing style, researchers can produce literature reviews that are not only methodologically sound but also intellectually insightful.

Bibliography

1. **Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005).** Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616> (<https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>)
2. **Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005).** Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X034006003> (<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X034006003>)
3. **Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. R. (2009).** *Introduction to meta-analysis*. Wiley.
4. **Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018).** *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
5. **Glass, G. V. (1976).** Primary, secondary, and meta-analysis of research. *Educational Researcher*, 5(10), 3–8. [<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X005010003>] (<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X005010003>)
6. **Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009).** A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91–108. [<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>] (<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>)
7. **Green, B. N., Johnson, C. D., & Adams, A. (2006).** Writing narrative literature reviews for peer-reviewed journals: Secrets of the trade. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 5(3), 101–117. [[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3467\(07\)60142-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3467(07)60142-6)] ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3467\(07\)60142-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3467(07)60142-6))
8. Hart, C. (2018). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the research imagination* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
9. **Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & The PRISMA Group. (2009).** Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Medicine*, 6(7), e1000097. [<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>] (<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>)
10. **Ridley, D. (2012).** *The literature review: A step-by-step guide for students* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
11. **Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002).** Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2), xiii–xxiii.
12. **Brouard, F. (2020).** NOTE ON LITERATURE REVIEW. Sprott School of Business, Carleton University .
13. **Byrne, J. A. (2016).** Improving the peer review of narrative literature reviews. (A. n. 12, Ed.) *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, , volume 1.
14. **Cresswell. (2000).** *Research Design* . Retrieved from QUANTITATIVE , QUALITATIVE, MIXED METHOD THEORY : https://www.ucg.ac.me/skladiste/blog_609332/objava_105202/fajlovi/Creswell.pdf
15. Introduction to PRISMA 2020 and implications for research synthesis methodologists. (n.d.).
16. **Kang, A. E. (2018).** Introduction to systematic review and meta-analysis. (*Korean Journal of Anesthesiology*, Ed.) Retrieved 71(2), 103–112., from Introduction to systematic review a: [<https://doi.org/10.4097/kjae.2018.71.2.103>] (<https://doi.org/10.4097/kjae.2018.71.2.103>)
17. **Kitsiou, G. P. (n.d.).** *Handbook of eHealth Evaluation: An Evidence-based Approach*. Retrieved from *Methods for Literature Reviews: Chapter 9: National Library of Medicine* : <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK481583/>
18. **Kwienk, M. (2020).** Internationalists and locals: international research collaboration in a resource-poor system. (2020, Ed.) Springer Nature Link , Volume 124, pages 57–105.
19. **Lim, W. M. (2022, February).** Advancing knowledge through literature reviews: “what”, “why”, and “how to contribute”. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358814968> Advancing knowledge through literature reviews_what_why_and_how_to_contribute

20. **O'Malley, D. H. (2005)**. SCOPING STUDIES: TOWARDS A METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK. Social Policy Research Unit, University of York .
21. **Page, M. J. (October 2021)**. Introduction to PRISMA 2020 and implications for research synthesis methodologists, *Research Synthesis Methods* 13(1). Retrieved from Research Gate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355613756_Introduction_to_PRISMA_2020_and_implications_for_research_synthesis_methodologists
22. **Rendolph, J. (2007, Feb,)**. A Guide to Writing the Dissertation Literature Review. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251499995_A_Guide_to_Writing_the_Dissertation_Literature_Review