

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

Mei Lan Frame<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Northern Virginia Community College

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Introduction contains a brief definition of sculpture, along with very brief facts about its history in Ghanaian education, and finally, the school mission of UEW's Sculpture department and the post-graduation job choices among students at KNUST who study sculpture. Not only is this too broad for an introduction, but these together do not provide an overview the study, particularly from a comparative viewpoint. Why were these two schools chosen?

The research questions 1 and 2 are descriptive; only #3 provides an adequate basis for a research paper. However, #3 must be backed by justification for comparison, AND also present a justification for study. For example, ".....their resources have on the learning habits of KNUST and UEW Sculpture students." What is it about the learning habits that is important in this comparison? Are you comparing the efficacy of the program to create future teachers?

Research questions seem more based on themes that emerged from learning about the institutions and talking to participants in the study, rather than determined pre-research.

## Lit review

Basic definitions in each category. Lit review provides a justification for the study and must include prior literature (published) on the topic or area of study. Issues of effective teaching and teaching and learning are brought up, yet how does this relate to the study?

## Research methodology

"The rationale for the research methodology choice was to obtain in-depth knowledge about human resources, and material resources and ascertain the role of lecturers and non-teaching staff in the sections and students' academic achievement." – how does a mixed methods approach accomplish this?

This section is very much lacking; authors should look at methodology sections in published articles to see what information they are missing (interview process, methods used to analyze data, coding, to name a few).

## Discussion and Findings

Many sections are descriptive – these should be provided as background info for the study. Although they contain quotes,

they do not tie into a central topic of study.

The issue of lack of resources held the best use of participant feedback. How might you turn this into your central focus of study?

Overall, this paper was an interesting read, yet it is largely descriptive, and lacks necessary elements to make it a publishable paper:

- There is no central research question that necessitates research into a particular topic
- There is no justification for comparing two schools – what about the two schools necessitates comparison?
- It is missing a theoretical framework – with which lens (or theory) do you look at, or analyze data? This is the most important part of any research paper.
- The research methodology is not justified – why mixed methods?
- No quantitative data is presented, which is fundamental to a mixed methods approach.

My suggestion is that the authors completely revise their paper, and refer to published articles such as:

1. Attwell Mamvuto & Magdeline C. Mannathoko (2021) The changing African art and design curriculum: narratives from teacher education, Arts Education Policy Review, DOI: 10.1080/10632913.2021.1952675
2. William Charland (2010) African American Youth and the Artist's Identity: Cultural Models and Aspirational Foreclosure, Studies in Art Education, 51:2, 115-133, DOI: 10.1080/00393541.2010.11518796