

Review: The Confusion on Kuhn's Paradigm Theory

The idea of this paper is great; dissecting Kuhn's work to show why many misinterpreted it is interesting and fits within his parameters. However, I think your paper has a problem with executing your idea. To start off with, your thesis ("Why was Kuhn's seemingly straightforward theory so confusing? One explanation is rooted in the books' multitude of ambiguities.") is, well, ambiguous. You are not very explicit on which aspects of his work you are going to dissect and reveal confusion on. If you were to list off what topics you were going to talk about—the "shift" in his definition of paradigm, confusion surrounding his beliefs, etc—, it would be easier for the reader to see your point at the end of the paper.

In your arguments, you rely very heavily on quoting Hull. Putting things in your own words will make them more concise and easier to understand. It was very easy for me to get confused. After all, you are trying to prove this point, not Hull. Also, it might strengthen your arguments to actually quote Kuhn instead of quoting Hull quoting Kuhn. Overall with your arguments, it was difficult for me to identify the goal of the paragraphs. It would be good for you to start off the paragraphs with a more detailed topic sentence and later elaborate on it, instead of introducing more and more as the paragraph goes on. Slightly unrelated, but the sentence "On the most basic level, Kuhn's definition of a paradigm throughout his book shifted, not unlike the shifting of the paradigms themselves," which starts your second paragraph, is in the past tense whereas the rest of your argument is in

the present tense. Also, the start to your third paragraph, which says, “As earlier mentioned, a key unclear aspect of Kuhn’s work is whether or not he is a relativist,” confused me. Although it had a connection to the previous paragraph, the transition was not smooth, and did not really pertain to the information that followed. If you were to add stronger topic sentences and concluding sentences onto your arguments, the object of each paragraph would be a lot clearer.

Other than that, there are a few terms and other examples used that were not clear to me. When you write about relativism and social scientists, you don’t define them. Although these definitions may be obvious, including them will strengthen the point you are making.

Your use of language is very good, and your mechanics are great as well. There is no major issue with the conciseness of your language, but when you are rewriting I would think about using less words as opposed to more (Kaplan is a stickler about this). This will also clarify the intent of your sentences.

Essentially, I think your paper is a good idea that got lost in translation. Granted, I am a classmate that will probably get a bad grade on my own paper, so you shouldn’t really take all of my advice to heart. I think you should consider going to the writing center before you edit this, because I may have completely misinterpreted it (and those people get paid to do what they do).