

# Review of: "Comparative Review of Sculpture Programmes in Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology and University Of Education, Winneba"

Sebastian Wróblewski<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wrocław University of Science and Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## **"Comparative Review of Sculpture Programmes in Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology and University of Education, Winneba"**

it is interesting however some improvements authors should introduce:

1. It is not clear in the terms of subject and further text why keywords: "Habit, Manipulate" are included
2. Introduction – is a brief summary of what the sculpture is, but it also requires further periphrasis in the main text.  
Have the two programs mentioned further in the text of article got the traditional Western style teaching of history of art as a part of studies (as Michelangelo and Picabia are mentioned in introduction)? Or have they been also equipped with local craftsman and artisanship workshop studies. Authors only once mention of unique, regional cultural heritage in quite enigmatic sentence: "In Ghana, ethnic groups such as the Akan and Ga-Dagbe carry their chiefs in palanquins, Sculptures", which gives no further information about it. In part 2.3. pr 4.4. that part of the teaching program should be also mentioned.
3. Methodology – presented in further chapters requires more explanation – for example in part "4.8.6. Habits students Formed" an in previous parts there is no sufficient data how many students works were analysed; in what way the research was conducted (questionnaires, official statistic data?) ...

In my opinion the authors should also revise their paper not only in terms of methodology but also in part of conclusions.