

CRITIQUE OF A THESIS
Using 'Argumentative Inquiry'

TITLE:
CANDIDATE:
EXAMINER:

What was the thesis, the argument (conclusion, knowledge claim) as identified by the examiner? Was it empirically falsifiable and sufficiently novel? Was an alternative argument considered?

Eg That knowledge is embedded in sociometric networks and cannot be captured in databases... blah blah... this is a viable argument... blah blah...

What (in the opinion of the critiquer) was the object, thing or phenomenon under study? The object of the argument? Was it well scoped, defined, and contrasted through a literature review (including prior research)?

Eg: Knowledge ... blah blah... insufficient review of the X literature ... blah blah...

From what perspective (frame) was the object studied? From what perspective was the object in the argument studied? What is the lens, theory, intellectual frame, concern, or worldview used on the object under study? Was it well scoped, defined, and contrasted, through a literature review (including prior research)?

E.g.: the social construction of creative knowledge vs explicit coded knowledge...blah... what of personal tacit knowledge blah blah...

Definitions and language? Were all key words defined with consideration of alternative interpretations?

Eg: Definitions of knowledge, sociometric, socially constructed and databases could have include how they have been used in the XX research literature ...blar... need to show more signs of significant scholarship... blar...blar...

Motivation For Study? Was the importance of the research to academics, practitioners and the researchers themselves, fully explained? What was the problem in need of research?

E.g. Many resources are mistakenly being put into so called knowledge databases... blah blah... yes this is an important topic blah blah...

Sufficient and convincing supporting evidence? What evidence was brought to support the argument/conclusion/knowledge claim, was it convincing, novel, insightful? Would it have stood

up in court? Were the counter evidence and arguments fully considered? Was all available empirical evidence sought? Were all those mentioned in the research given a voice?

Eg The reasoning (logical, algebraic) evidence was well... The empirical evidence was poorly ... Alternative evidence about databases was not... database managers and innovative managers had their say but ... blah blah...

Implications, so-what? What were the recommendations, how should people act differently as a result of this research? Has the research improved peoples' choices, how so?

Eg Stop investing so much in databases but rathe in managing knowledge sharing across small worlds networks... blah blah... could have recommended ZZ ... blah blah...

Other comments

Eg: Interesting... have you seen the book... perhaps publish in...

Mike Metcalfe, July 2004