

# Review of: "Determinants of Employee Recruitment in Sidama National Regional State, Ethiopia"

Kindu Ayechew Ayenalem<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gondar University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Determinants of Employee Recruitment in Sidama National Regional State, Ethiopia

Debebe Dangiso<sup>1</sup>, Addisu Abebe<sup>1</sup>, & Kanbiro Orkaido<sup>1</sup>

Dear authors, I appreciate your thorough effort in a very worthy topic of interest. Studies on employee recruitment and selection practice in general and factors that affect those processes in particular, are essential both policymakers and HRM practitioners. I believe that your study will have many implications for the Hawassa City Administration HRM practice. In this regard, your paper provides important insights about the topic in concern. However, I also feel that there are some constraints of the paper that needs your reconsideration to improve the qualities of it. **For convenience and better understanding of my comments and suggestions, I organized them in such way as presented below.**

### 1. Title, Abstract and Introduction

1. **Title:** Your title is clearly stated; however, it lacks consistency throughout the paper. Including the title page and some other places (Figure 2 and 3 under pages 17 and 18), it seems that your topic is only recruitment. But, in the remaining sections and parts of the paper, you also told us you investigated both the practice and factors of recruitment and selection process. My suggestion here is, revise such inconsistencies
2. **Abstract:** Your abstract is more or less organized in a good way. However, it lacks the **conclusion** section of the study. I do also have a concern on that whether the recommendation in the abstract section is based on your finding or not. In addition, the abstract section has some typographical issues which I may raise later on.
3. **Introduction:** The introduction section generally seems well done. However, there are some problems that need reconsideration. First, the sentence in Paragraph 2, line 1-2, read as "**Similarly, Fathmath et al. (2020) noted that improper HR planning generally leads to issues in recruitment and selection policies and practices**", lacks clarity. Second, the ideas in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the same section, may not relevant for your study context. The cases of recruitment and selection practices in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and General Hayelom Araya Military Academy are quite different from the civil service HRM practices. Those organizations have different purposes than the government HRM purposes and objectives. They have to be studied by their own context. They could not be considered as relevant sources for your study. So, you better support your argument with other relevant sources that are done in similar context. Third, the problem of the study is not well defined, it is not supported with strong and convincing justifications. Simply declaring that "**there has been no study specifically focusing on employee**

**recruitment and selection in Hawassa city. Furthermore, the effects of factors on recruitment and selection have not been thoroughly researched**” is not enough to convince readers. What has been done so far about recruitment and selection either national or international or in both cases? In what way? What gap is your study sought to fill? What is unknown yet or what will be differently seen? I think those questions will be helpful to clearly and strongly justify your study.

**2. Objectives/Questions/hypothesis:** Your general objective is about the practices and factors that affect employee recruitment and selection. In this regard it is well stated. However, all of the six specific objectives are about determinant factors. So, which objective/s is/are designed to examine the practice? In addition, the six specific objectives are equivalent with the six hypotheses. What is the rationale then for such mere repetition the same point/issue in different headings? To me, either the hypothesis or the objectives are enough. Under the hypotheses heading, line 4, a sentence stated as **“Based on the research problem and questions, the following hypotheses have been developed and will be tested”**. My comments are: (a) in this study, there are not research questions except for objectives and hypotheses. Thus, please reedit such phrase to avoid confusion for readers. (b) I think, all the hypotheses were tested. Hence, please avoid future tense expressions here and in other parts of the paper. (c) In all the six hypotheses, I think your purpose is to examine the effect/influence/impact of independent variables on the dependent variable. However, Hypothesis three ( $H_3$ ) is not written in such a way. Please revise it.

**4. Significance of the study:** I think, this section is not relevant for your article. Instead please show us the implication of your study/finding under the conclusion section.

#### 5. Review literature and conceptual framework

The review literature and conceptual framework sections are sound with some minor modifications. Definitions of key terms under 2.1., is not a relevant section. Almost all the so called key terms common concepts except the last key term. Your definition for selection and recruitment is also found in the review literature. The definition for factors is also elaborated in specific objectives and hypotheses. So, you do not need to give such definitions as a key term. However, if you have operational definition, you're welcome. Your review literature has also some unnecessary repetitions. (**See 2.2.2. the concept of selection, lines 3-4 and 18-19 under page 7**).

**5. Methodology/Materials and Methods:** The method section is generally sound. Nevertheless, there are some problems, which need to be corrected or justified.

- There is no convincing rational why the researchers employed descriptive and explanatory research designs together. In other words, it is not clear that for which research objective researchers use descriptive and/or explanatory designs. The approaches of the study were not also directly communicated.
- Sampling for the managers/leaders was determined by purposive sampling. If that is so, the proportional and sample size determination issue should not be considered together with other sample groups.
- In relation to secondary data sources, the researchers stated that **“Document analysis was utilized to supplement the information obtained through primary sources. Different policy documents, national and regional decrees and guidelines, directives, frameworks, legal documents, suggestion books, and related documents were used as needed for the research activities”**. But, unfortunately, (a) researchers did not tell us how and for which research objective that those documents were reviewed; (b) where such documental data were presented and

analyzed.

- **Under 3.5. Tools and procedures of data collection** section, the researchers can tell us about item construction, validity and reliability issues including piloting, types of data collection tools, nature of items, data collection procedures and response rate. However, researchers fragmented some of the above information. For example, the pilot study issue is discussed in 3.5., 3.8., and the pilot data is presented in the results section under 4.2. It is unnecessary fragmentation that potentially creates confusion for readers.
- **Under 3.6. Method of data analysis and interpretation** section, there are many problems: (a) though researchers stated that ***"The data obtained through questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively, while the information obtained through interviews was analyzed qualitatively"***, I did not find the qualitative data analysis. The researchers also employed ***"Pearson correlations were used to test the relationship between factors (independent variables) and recruitment and selection (dependent variables)"***. My comment here is, data for the independent variables is collected through categorical scale. The dependent variable is not yet known by which level measurement is measured. Regardless of such confusion, my major concern is how Pearson correlation is relevant to see a relationship between a categorical variable and other continuous (*though not explicitly known*) variable?
- Another description of the authors stated that ***"Qualitative data obtained through interviews were analyzed by examining the words, statements, and narratives"***. Here, as I stated so far, although the qualitative data analysis was not found in the results section, there is also another issue, how the data obtained from document review was analyzed?
- For pilot purpose, the researchers took 10% of the 385 samples. In other places of the document, they tell us that 30 individuals in the pilot study. I think, 10% of 385 is approximately 39 participants, so why 30? Is it typographical error?
- I appreciate the researchers' effort in checking assumptions for regression test. But, such effort has to be part of the methodology section rather than the results section. With respect to assumption checking, I do not see whether the dependent variables are measured in interval or ratio scale (continuous variable). The researchers do not specify how they measure recruitment and selection as a dependent variable. This is the key point that needs to be clearly addressed. Otherwise, it is difficult to understand and trust the findings of the study.
- Under 4.4. and 4.4.3. sections, I found **unrelated expressions** such as.... ***"In this regard, a multiple linear regression analysis is particularly necessary to investigate the effects of individual and overall selected determinant factors on small and medium manufacturing enterprises, as explicitly stated in the hypothesis"*** (page,16) and ***"Table 4 below displays the independent variables, including management, finance, technology, training, and government"(page, 19) respectively.*** I think, your case is on the determinant factors of recruitment and selection and your independent variables are: vacancy advertisement, selection test, selection decision, pre-employment checkups, selection interview, induction and training. **If so, what are those issues, i.e. determinant factors on small and medium manufacturing enterprises and independent variables such as management, finance, technology, training and government?** How they were related to your study? Do they appear in mistake? If it is in the latter case, please erase out them.
- **6.Results/Data Analysis:** Generally, the data analysis/finding section is well written. However, there are some but serious flaws in this section. First, issues that should be discussed in the methods and materials sections such as,

response rate, reliability and piloting issues, and assumption checkups were mistakenly presented in the results section. Second, **although the researchers repeatedly told us that they collected qualitative data from interviewees and different documents, none of such data is found in the results section.** Third, the interpretation of the confidence interval is inversely communicated, i.e. instead of saying at 99% or 95% , researchers communicated that they are 1% or 5% confidence about their finding.

- **7. Interpretation/Discussion:** I think, this section is confused of authors. It is a place where researchers locate their finding within the context of other previous studies. However, researchers do not do that. Instead, they presented new findings about the practice and challenges of recruitment and selection in Hawassa City administration. I think, this findings might be obtained through qualitative data collection tools. If so, they have to be first analyzed in the results section and then discussed along with the qualitative findings in the discussion section. Even up to this section, I do not know whether dealing about challenges of recruitment and selection is the researchers' agenda or not. Because, it is not communicated either in the objectives or hypotheses section. If it emerges from the qualitative data, authors should have communicated about it in the "method of data analysis" section before they simply insert it in the discussion section. In general, the discussion section has serious problems that needs to be reconsidered.
- **8. Conclusions and recommendations:** The conclusion and recommendation sections need a revision based on the comments given in the paper.
- **9. References:** I have two concern regarding the reference section.
  - a. There are some inconsistencies at the time of in text citation
  - b. I do not exactly know which referencing style the researchers follow. It should be thus revisited to be adhered with a specific referencing style.
- c. **10.Compliance with Ethical Standards:** I appreciate the ethical consideration of the authors in their study, but it will be sounder if it is supported with source. **11.Writing/language issues:** The paper will be much benefited if authors consider many typological errors (which include missed words/letters, tense issues, subject verb agreement (the case of researcher although they are three in number), inconsistent expressions, e.g. city/town, office/department, subcity/subtown, fragmented information, insertion of unrelated issues)).
- d. **12. Overall comment to the authors:** Dear authors, I would like to thank you again for your valuable research work. As you see from my comments, I raised so many issues. This does not mean that your work has many limitations. I do not raise all those issues for the sake of indicating the limitations. Instead, I do that to show you to improve all such issues and come up with an excellent research work. I hope you understood me! In short, I want to say you did your best, the remaining are improvement issues and I hope you will fully and easily address them. Finally, I want to gently remind you that your work will be more benefited if you consider my concerns and comments. For more detail, you can find my comments in your paper that will be attached with this comment file.

**Thank you once again and wish you good luck!**