

Review of: "Factors contributing to labour unrest at the garment factories in Bangladesh: A cross-sectional study"

Koyin Chang¹

¹ Ming Chuan University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article discusses the causes of labor unrest at the garment factories in Bangladesh using survey questionnaires categorizing the causes into worker induced cause (WIC), owner induced cause (OIC), middleman induced cause (MMIC), and external influence (EI) factors. While the topic is important and interesting, there are many flaws that discredit the quality of the research. Most importantly, the aforementioned categories, are not thoroughly explained. There are literature review section in the article, in which some general past studies such as payment, benefit, and labor unrest incidents were discussed. But none of the research particularly address WIC, OIC, MMIC, etc. Since these categories are the center of the study, more systematic and structured reviewed should be focused on these issues.

In the section of 3.2 dependent variables, labor unrest score was mentioned. But how it is generated or created was lack of explanation. 17 items from the questionnaire were computed for Cronbach's alpha. It is puzzling what are these 17 items. Are they the questions exhibited in Table 4? There is no need to show Cronbach's alpha for these questions. It is not used this way. The 17 items are not dependent variable either. More over, these questions were asked with 5 point Likter scale. But Table 4 only show agree and disagree. Why?

Statistical analyses were using 5 stage modelling and hierarchical model. I would not use the term "stage" in here. Those are just 5 models with inclusion of different independent variables. When using the stage, it implies that these five regressions are internally and sequentially connected. But it is not the case here. The hierarchical linear multiple regression also seems to be misused in the article. There is no indication about how the data are hierarchically structured. The presentation of Table 5 is very hard to read. I would suggest that leave out CI and only use SD, or t score to indicate the significance level.