

Title of article: Information Systems and Systems Thinking: Time to Unite?

Name of Authors: P.B Checkland

Title of journal, volume number, date, month and page numbers: International Journal of Information Management (1988), 8 (239-248)

Summary of Article:

The article attempts to examine the notion of Information Systems (IS) from a perspective of those that concerned with such systems ought to learn something from the whole body of ideas concerned with the notion of “systems”. The first section briefly examines an approach to understanding information systems through the information theory. The second section examines the fundamentals of system thinking from the 1950 onwards and the last section reviews the implications of these developments in IS in the future.

A. Quality of the Article

Item	Your Comments
<i>1. Is the title of the article appropriate and clear??</i>	I find the title of the article appropriate and clear. However, I would have preferred the title to be unacademic, this title of the article would need a professional or an academic to fully appreciate and understand its meaning, purpose and trajectory of the article.
<i>2. Is the purpose of the article made clear in the introduction?</i>	The introduction of the article attempts to give an overview of the beginning of information systems and system thinking, relating these notions to various systems i.e. evolution of the computer. I find that in the explanation of these notions, the author does not attempt to simplify their relationships, if not lacking at all.
<i>3. Do you find errors of fact and interpretation?</i>	I do not find any errors of fact or interpretation. All information is accurate.
<i>4. Is all of the discussion relevant?</i>	Some of the illustrations in this article are laborious, however, relevant to the discussion, for example, the explanation of the Soft System Methodology (SSM). It has the potential to mislead the reader if he/she is not technical. A more basic approach could have been used to illustrate the point at hand.

<p>5. Are there any ethical problems?</p>	<p>None from what I have found.</p>
<p>6. Has the author cited the pertinent, and only the pertinent, literature? If the author has included inconsequential references, or references that are not pertinent, suggest deleting them.</p>	<p>The author cited 9. Checkland P.B. (1986). The politics of practice. International Roundtable on the Art and Science of Systems Practice, IIASA, November 1986., noted that it is his work, however, I do not find the need, as he is merely indicating that another study on the social and political aspect of what we call culture, this has no importance to the discussion at hand.</p> <p>I would suggest that this citation be deleted.</p>
<p>7. Have any ideas been overemphasized or underemphasized? Suggest specific revisions.</p>	<p>Absolutely, the notion of Soft Systems Methodology was supposed to assist the illustration of system thinking, it somehow took over the discussion in itself. I find this aspect to have been overemphasized in this article.</p>
<p>8. Are the author's statements clear? Challenge ambiguous statements. Suggest by examples how clarity can be achieved, but do not merely substitute your style for the author's.</p>	<p>The authors statements have been so clear.</p>
<p>9. Has the author been objective in his or her discussion of the topic?</p>	<p>In the article the author mentions and goes far to prove that our perceptions inform our understanding in general, which I do agree with the author. In general, the author has been objective in discussing the subject at hand.</p>

B: Quality of Presentation

Item	Your Comments
<i>Is the work well presented?</i>	The work is well presented. I find no fault in its presentation.
<i>Is the paper well structured?</i>	Not well structured, though, I would have preferred, that ; firstly, the introduction gives a clear indication of the subject matter, secondly; Information Systems was going to be explored extensively before discussing system thinking, lastly, I would wanted to see more illustration when the two (2) concepts meet and united, as the title suggests. I did not find the two concepts point of unity. I expected this in the conclusion.
<i>Are symbols, terms, and concepts adequately defined?</i>	<p>The symbols, terms and concepts can be misleading due to similarity. In this article they are well defined.</p> <p>In improving the discussion on the concept of Information systems and System Thinking, Antonelli, Chiabert and Romagnoli (2013) suggest focusing on the resource preparation, such as training or up-skilling, when transitioning from these different stages such as from MRP to ERP.</p> <p>I would have expected the author to offer more of such pragmatic recommendations on the subject matter.</p>
<i>Would additional tables, figures help to clarify the work?</i>	Absolutely, more figures or tables would have improved the clarity on the subject or work.

C: Additional Notes

<i>Use this section to record additional notes on the paper. In particular you should identify any links to other topics and papers from the module</i>	<p>I would add the following link for further reading on the subject:</p> <p>D. Antonelli, P. Chiabert, V. Romagnoli, Information System and Systems Thinking: a Compulsory Marriage? IFAC Proceedings Volumes, Volume 46, Issue 9, 2013, pp. 1780-1785</p>
---	---

D. References

D. Antonelli, P. Chiabert, V. Romagnoli, (2013). *Information System and Systems Thinking: a Compulsory Marriage?* IFAC Proceedings Volumes, Volume 46, Issue 9, 2013, pp. 1780-1785