

Review of: "Assessing the Role of Consumer Cooperatives in Improving Livelihood of the Members of Hawassa Zuria Woreda, Sidama Regional State, Ethiopia"

Mufaro Dzingirai¹

¹ Midlands State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Although this paper captures an interesting issue of consumer cooperatives from an Ethiopian perspective, this study is associated with **serious scientific flaws** that are captured below:

Abstract: The researcher(s) reported that they used a descriptive research design, which is not in line with the mixed methods approach. I therefore recommend the author(s) to read widely on the mixed-methods approach. For instance, *Creswell J. W., Plano Clark V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). Sage*

Introduction: The introduction is full of claims and sweeping statements. Moreover, the research gaps were claimed since there are no scholarly citations that support such sweeping statements. Therefore, there is a dire need to support the research gaps by citing relevant scholars. Worryingly, there is an element of poor academic writing skills. For instance, the use of words like "In conclusion" in the introduction section.

Literature Review: This literature review section is below standard. In this regard, there is no discussion of the literature. Moreover, theoretical and conceptual frameworks are missing. Hypotheses for the quantitative phase were not formulated in this section. Please address these issues of great concern.

Methodology Section: This section is very weak and does not meet scientific rigor. The author(s) adopted the wrong philosophical perspective. The pragmatist philosophy must be used in mixed methods research. In this regard, read *Creswell J. W., Plano Clark V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). Sage* Surprisingly, the researcher(s) reported that "cross-sectional design" was used in the methodology section, but in the abstract section, "descriptive research design" was reported. Therefore, which is which? The researcher(s) used simple random sampling for the quantitative phase, but there is no sampling technique for the qualitative phase. How many people were interviewed? Why were those people interviewed? Data analysis methods for both quantitative and qualitative data were not reported in this study. Please note that SPSS is not a method to analyse data but a software to analyse data. Unfortunately, no scholarly citations were captured in the methodology section. Please support your arguments with scholars rather than focusing on sweeping statements. You can also read *Creswell, J. W. (2021). A concise introduction to mixed methods research. SAGE publications* and *Harrison, R. L., Reilly, T. M., & Creswell, J. W. (2020). Methodological rigor in mixed methods: An application in management studies. Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 14(4), 473-495* so as to have an understanding of mixed methods research.

Results Section: This is the weakest section of this study. The wrong data analysis tool (descriptive statistics) was used instead of inferential statistics. For inferential statistics to test hypotheses, one would expect Pearson correlation, regression analysis, and structural equation modelling (SEM). Please redo your results section using the correct data analysis tools, especially on inferential statistics. You can read: *Hair, J. F., LDS Gabriel, M., Silva, D. D., & Braga, S. (2019). Development and validation of attitudes measurement scales: fundamental and practical aspects. RAUSP Management Journal, 54, 490-507* and books on multivariate analysis or statistics. To make matters worse, the qualitative results were not reported in this section. NB. Discuss your results.