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# Article summary:

1. This article examines ways of constructing research questions from existing literature, which are likely to promote the development of interesting and influential theories.

2. The most common way across paradigmatic camps is to spot various ‘gaps’ in the literature and, based on that, to formulate specific research questions.

3. The article proposes some ways of constructing research questions that move beyond gap-spotting, and discusses how these ways are likely to promote more interesting and significant theories.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article “Ways of Constructing Research Questions: Gap-Spotting or Problematization?” by Jörgen Sandberg and Mats Alvesson is a well-researched piece that provides an in-depth analysis of how researchers construct their research questions from existing literature in order to develop interesting and influential theories. The authors provide a comprehensive review of 52 articles in organization studies and develop a typology of how researchers construct their research questions from existing literature. They also discuss why assumption-challenging approaches are rare, identify social norms that favour gap-spotting, propose paths that move beyond gap-spotting, and discuss how these are likely to lead to more interesting and significant theories.

The article is generally reliable as it provides a thorough review of the relevant literature on the topic as well as an extensive discussion on the implications for theory development. Furthermore, the authors provide evidence for their claims through examples from previous studies which adds credibility to their arguments. Additionally, they acknowledge potential biases in their study such as the limited scope of journals reviewed (four US/European journals) which could potentially limit its generalizability.

However, there are some areas where the article could be improved upon such as providing more detail on the methodology used for selecting articles for review (e.g., criteria used). Additionally, while the authors acknowledge potential biases in their study due to its limited scope, they do not address other potential sources of bias such as researcher bias or publication bias which could potentially affect their results. Furthermore, while they provide evidence for their claims through examples from previous studies, they do not provide any empirical data or quantitative analysis which could further strengthen their arguments.

In conclusion, this article provides an insightful analysis into how researchers construct research questions from existing literature with implications for theory development but could be improved upon by providing more detail on its methodology and addressing potential sources of bias other than its limited scope such as researcher
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* Research question construction
* Assumption-challenging approaches
* Social norms in research
* Paths beyond gap-spotting
* Researcher bias in research
* Publication bias in research
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