

Review of: "Paulian Approach to Critical Thinking: Assessing an Intervention Program"

Tsedeke Abate

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. The paper was clearly written. Paul CT model was critically discussed in the paper. However, it would be very interesting if the author involves more CT model in comparison with the Paul approach of CT.
2. The researcher claimed that the previous studies (three studies were identified), have not “developed a well-structured intervention programme to address the component of Paul’s model of CT explicitly”. However, the researcher used a study conducted in 2013 (Islek & Hursen, 2013) to back his claim. The mentioned studies were conducted in 2016 and 2020, is it not contradictory? Or am I the one who missed the argument?
3. I think the author is criticizing previous studies for not using the component of Paul’s model. Is it wrong not to use other model than the Paulian model?
4. The author struggled to address all the constructs (Academic achievement, organisation of thoughts, thought connectivity, metacognitive skills, reflective abilities, conscious thinking processes, and reasoning skills...) in detail. It seems it is difficult to manage all these constructs in this small scale study.
5. Regarding sampling “*The Purposive Sampling technique is selected as per the research needs*” needs to be clarified.
6. The QUAN-qual approach was employed. Do you mean explanatory design? The result implies that your study is more align with QUAL-quant or exploratory? (Compare the results of qual. and quant.)
7. The qualitative findings were not presented in an organized way: What are the core themes? What are the evidence for the generated themes? What were the multiple cases? You need to present each case separately; you need to present each theme separately with evidence (or quotes).
8. The discussion section of current paper presents summary of results not discussion of results. Discussion of result involves you key findings vis-à-vis literature. In your discussion section there is no even a single literature.