

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.:IJAR-55960

Title: EFFECTS OF CULTURAL ADJUSTMENT CHALLENGES OF NON-KERALITE PROFESSIONALS IN THE IT PARKS IN KERALA

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision YES

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*).....

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

Reviewer Name: Dr. Himanshu Gaur

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript addresses an important and contextually relevant issue by examining the cultural adjustment challenges faced by non-Keralite IT professionals working in Kerala, and it offers a broad descriptive account of personal, company-related, psychological, job-related, and organisational effects of culture shock, supported by primary data and statistical techniques such as percentages, mean scores, t-tests, and ANOVA; the topic is timely for HRM and diversity-management scholarship, and the findings regarding language barriers, food habits, workload, anxiety, job stress, and interpersonal difficulties provide potentially useful managerial implications for IT parks and policymakers. However, the paper requires substantial improvement in academic writing quality, grammar, and structure, as many sections contain repetitive phrasing, typographical errors, and unclear sentence construction that hinder readability and scholarly tone; the literature review is largely descriptive and loosely connected to the present study, and it should be reorganized to build a stronger theoretical framework and clearly justify the research questions and hypotheses. The methodology section lacks sufficient detail regarding sampling technique, sample size justification, respondent demographics, instrument development and validation, reliability testing, and ethical considerations, while the presentation of results is overly lengthy and narrative, with tables that should be more clearly formatted and interpreted concisely in relation to hypotheses rather than restated line-by-line. Greater analytical depth is needed in the discussion to link findings to prior research and to explain why certain factors—such as language or workload—emerge as dominant stressors, and the conclusions and recommendations should be more sharply derived from the data rather than broadly stated; limitations such as cross-sectional design, possible self-report bias, and restricted geographic scope also need explicit acknowledgement. Overall, while the study has practical relevance and a solid descriptive foundation, it would require major revision to strengthen theoretical grounding, methodological transparency, analytical rigor, and language quality before being suitable for publication.