

Review of: "The Impact of Leadership and Talent Management: The Case of Generation Z in The Lebanese Retail Sector"

Syafruddin Chan¹

1 Universitas Syiah Kuala

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- 1. The author mentions the need for further exploration by stating, "The stated research statement is interesting to explore," suggesting a research gap. However, the explicit identification of the research gap and the novelty associated with it could be more clearly articulated to strengthen the foundation for the study. A more direct statement about what existing research lacks or where there is a need for further investigation would enhance the clarity of the research gap.
- 2. While the author mentions the development of a conceptual framework in the preliminary stage, there is a lack of detailed explanation about the key components of this framework and how it was derived from the literature. This omission weakens the foundation for the research design.
- 3. The section lacks a robust justification for choosing a quantitative approach. The author briefly mentions the suitability of quantitative methods for a hypothetic-deductive approach but fails to elaborate on why this approach is most appropriate for the research questions and objectives. A more thorough rationale is needed.
- 4. The use of snowball sampling is mentioned, but there is a lack of discussion on its potential limitations and biases. The author should address the drawbacks of this method and explain why it was chosen despite its limitations. Additionally, the justification for the sample size of 212 respondents should be elaborated.
- 5. While the author mentions the use of Cronbach's alpha coefficient for internal reliability and the Pearson coefficient for validity, there is no discussion on the specific values obtained or the criteria used to determine the adequacy of these measures. Providing these details would strengthen the methodological rigor.
- 6. The description of the multiple regression model is brief, and there is a lack of clarity on the variables included and the rationale behind their selection. A more detailed explanation of the variables, their operationalization, and their relevance to the research hypotheses is necessary.
- 7. Unclear Presentation of Hypotheses: The presentation of hypotheses, especially H1, H2, H3, and H4, lacks clarity. The author should provide concise and explicit statements for each hypothesis, specifying the expected relationships between variables.
- 8. Since the study involves complex relationships, latent constructs, measurement error considerations, or multiple dependent variables, SEM could offer advantages over simple regression. However, if your research questions are straightforward, and you have clear, specific hypotheses that can be tested with individual regressions, simple regression might be more straightforward and easier to interpret. It's essential to choose the statistical method that



aligns best with the goals and nature of your study.

- 9. In the finding section, there are lacks detailed interpretation of the means, standard deviations, skewness, and excess kurtosis of the manifest variables presented in Table 2. The author should provide insights into the significance of these statistics in relation to the research variables and their distributions.
- 10. The discussion on factor analysis results is brief, and the section could benefit from a more comprehensive explanation of the process and criteria used for factor extraction. Providing insights into why certain factors were retained and their relevance to the research variables would enhance clarity.
- 11. While the correlation matrix is presented in Table 8, the author does not thoroughly discuss the implications of the observed correlations between variables. A more in-depth exploration of these relationships and their alignment with theoretical expectations is needed.
- 12. The section does not address the limitations of the findings, such as the specific context of Lebanese retail companies and the age range of respondents (20 to 25). Moreover, there is no discussion on the generalizability of the findings to broader populations or industries.

Qeios ID: STE5LY · https://doi.org/10.32388/STE5LY