

# Review of: "Mahasneh Theory 2023 to Develop Students' Vocational Attitudes and Inclinations"

Ermiyas Tsehay Birhanu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Woldia University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

In your introduction section, you have stated that "The theory of Mahasneh 2023 was based on the following philosophies:" however, you did not cite any source for your argument.

In scholarly writing, it is recommended to use paragraph style rather than bulleting. Therefore, your introduction needs to be restructured.

I am not clear on the term "Entities" in your theories. You need to redefine it. There are different forms of government structures in different parts of the world. Therefore, you have to redefine the entities and their respective roles. We may not have an entity named the "Ministry of Youth and Social Development or Ministry of Digital Communication," therefore, how can we understand your theory?

In Figure one, you need to write a caption explaining the figure. Furthermore, I am not clear if the blue color has different meanings for your theory or not.

I am surprised by your methodology section. The major quality of scientific papers is the replicability of the research process. However, your paper tells us a few things only about the methodology. How can it be replicable? It says "The researcher used the descriptive analytical method by reviewing the theoretical literature, previous studies, and the researcher's experience in the field of professional guidance and counseling, in order to answer the main study question:"

First of all, if you are developing a theory, there is a default research methodology of "grounded theory" which has its own scientific procedures to conduct. Therefore, you need to elaborate on your paper in the methodology section. What are your sources of information? What are your discrimination criteria? How was the data collection and analysis process? These and other similar questions should be answered in your methods and materials section.

You presented the results section and conclude by yourself with a single table. Why don't you discuss your results with previous literature and compare your theory to previous literature?

A conclusion does not mean a table. You should answer your basic question in the conclusion section after discussing your results.

The reference list is nonsense. You did not cite any of the references in the main body. Therefore, why do you need to include the reference section? It would be better to revise (rewrite the whole section) based on scientific research writing

procedures.

I recommend a major revision.