

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59139

Title: Reframing Generation Y Retention in the Digital Workplace: The Buffering Role of Immersive Technology

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance		✓		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-294

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript addresses a relevant and contemporary issue at the intersection of Generation Y, employee retention, human resource management, and immersive technology. The proposed model, which examines immersive technology as both a direct predictor and a moderator of the relationship between Generation Y characteristics and employee retention, provides a potentially useful contribution to the literature. The study is supported by a sample of 404 employees and uses PLS-SEM with bootstrapping to examine the proposed relationships. The reported measurement results generally demonstrate acceptable reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity.

However, several issues should be addressed before publication.

- 1. Conceptualization of Generation Y characteristics requires greater clarity.** The manuscript combines several work expectations and values—including meaningful work, learning opportunities, flexibility, innovation, recognition, social responsibility, and career aspirations—into a single construct. The authors should explain more clearly why these dimensions represent one reflective latent construct and provide stronger theoretical and empirical justification for this operationalization.
- 2. There appears to be conceptual overlap between the Generation Y and employee-retention measures.** Some employee-retention indicators include career advancement, recognition satisfaction, and work-life balance, while similar concepts are also included among the Generation Y characteristics. The authors should demonstrate that the constructs are sufficiently distinct conceptually and statistically and explain how possible item overlap was addressed.
- 3. The interpretation of the negative Generation Y–retention relationship should be moderated.** The study interprets the negative coefficient as indicating that Generation Y expectations reduce retention when organizational systems are inadequate. However, organizational-system inadequacy does not appear to have been directly measured as a separate construct. Therefore, this explanation should be presented as a theoretical interpretation rather than as a directly tested empirical condition.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **The sampling procedure requires further justification.** The study uses purposive, non-probability sampling, yet Cochran's formula is presented as the principal basis for determining the sample size. The authors should explain the appropriateness and limitations of applying this calculation to a non-probability sample and avoid implying that the resulting sample provides population-level representativeness.
5. **The measurement sources should be explained more carefully.** In particular, the manuscript states that the immersive-technology items were based on Laiman et al. (2023), while that reference concerns Generation Z employee engagement. The authors should explain how the original scale was adapted for Generation Y and specifically for the broader construct of immersive technology.
6. **Causal language should be reduced throughout the manuscript.** Because the study uses a cross-sectional survey design, the findings establish statistical associations rather than temporal causal effects. Terms such as "impact," "causes," "stimulates," or similar causal expressions should be replaced with more appropriate terms such as "association," "relationship," or "predictive effect" where appropriate. The manuscript itself recognizes the limitation of causal inference arising from the cross-sectional design.
7. **The statistical reporting should be checked carefully for consistency and accuracy.** Some statements are awkward or contradictory. For example, the discussion of demographic results includes the phrase "statistically and theoretically significant non-significant results are statistically significant," which is clearly inconsistent and should be corrected. The authors should carefully proofread all statistical interpretations and ensure that p-values, confidence intervals, coefficients, and conclusions correspond exactly.
8. **The PLS-SEM reporting can be strengthened.** The manuscript reports factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha, rho_A, composite reliability, AVE, HTMT, VIF, path coefficients, and predictive analysis. However, the authors should provide sufficient information to enable readers to evaluate the measurement and structural models, including a clearer presentation of the complete structural model and relevant effect-size measures where appropriate.
9. **The interpretation of the moderation effect should be presented more cautiously.** The interaction effect is statistically significant, and the conditional effects indicate that the negative association becomes weaker as immersive technology increases. However, statements suggesting that organizations can "greatly minimize" retention risk or that technology produces a particular percentage reduction should be framed carefully because the design does not establish a causal intervention effect. The moderation results themselves are useful and should be retained, but their practical interpretation should be appropriately qualified.
10. **The claim of novelty should be substantiated.** The manuscript describes the study as the "first" to establish immersive technology as a boundary condition in this context. Such a strong claim should either be supported by a systematic and sufficiently comprehensive literature search or be softened to a more defensible statement about the contribution of the present study.
11. **The discussion and practical implications should be better aligned with the empirical evidence.** Recommendations concerning large-scale investment in immersive technology, government-industry subsidies, and national digital transformation policies extend beyond what can be directly established from the cross-sectional sample. These implications can remain, but they should be presented as potential implications rather than direct policy prescriptions arising conclusively from the findings.
12. **Language and presentation require substantial proofreading.** There are several grammatical errors, awkward sentences, missing spaces, inconsistent punctuation, typographical errors, and incomplete phrases throughout the manuscript. Examples include "Click or tap here to enter text," formatting problems in tables, inconsistent use of "Generation Y," "Gen-Y," and "Gen Y," and an

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

incomplete statistical statement in the conclusion. These should be corrected carefully before publication.

13. **The conclusion should be revised for precision.** The conclusion currently contains strong statements regarding the effectiveness of immersive technology and includes at least one incomplete statistical expression. The authors should ensure that the conclusion accurately reflects the reported coefficients and significance levels and does not exceed the evidence provided by the research design.

Overall, the manuscript addresses a significant and timely research problem and presents an interesting moderation framework. The empirical analysis provides potentially useful findings, particularly regarding the relationship between immersive technology and employee retention and the reported buffering interaction. However, improvements are needed in construct conceptualization, methodological justification, statistical reporting, interpretation of findings, causal language, and manuscript presentation. Subject to satisfactory revision of these issues, the manuscript could be considered for publication.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision.