

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57963

Title: Cultural Transformation in Jewellery Consumption: A Study of Changing Preferences among Generation Z in Gujarat.

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- 212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Overall Assessment:

This paper addresses a timely and relevant topic: the changing jewellery consumption preferences of Generation Z in Gujarat. The research question—whether this shift represents cultural erosion or transformation—is conceptually interesting. The study has several strengths, including a clear comparative framework (tradition vs. modernity), a reasonably structured questionnaire, and findings that align well with existing literature. However, the paper suffers from **methodological weaknesses** (particularly sampling and data presentation) that prevent it from being accepted without revision. With minor to moderate revisions, this paper could be publishable. Hence, my recommendation is "**Accept after minor revision.**"

Strengths of the Paper:

- Relevant and timely research question:** The exploration of whether changing preferences signify cultural erosion or transformation is nuanced and valuable.
- Clear connection to literature:** The paper effectively cites recent, credible sources (McKinsey, Deloitte, Djafarova & Bowes) and maps findings onto existing theories.
- Comprehensive objectives:** The five objectives are logical, sequential, and well-addressed in the analysis.
- Balanced conclusion:** The finding of "cultural transformation rather than cultural erosion" and "hybrid consumption patterns" is insightful and well-supported by the data presented.
- Good practical implications:** The paper offers actionable insights for marketers and jewellery brands.

Major Concerns Requiring Minor Revision:

- Sample size and sampling method are inadequately justified:**
 - The paper states a target of "approximately 100-200 respondents" but then reports exactly **155 responses** (p. 5, 6, etc.). Why 155? Was data saturation achieved?
 - Convenience sampling is acknowledged, but there is no discussion of its limitations (e.g., potential urban bias, age clustering within the 16-28 range, or over-representation of students).
 - Recommendation:** Add a paragraph acknowledging sampling limitations and suggesting caution in generalizing to all of Gujarat. Specify the cities/regions within Gujarat where data was collected.
- Missing demographic tables and figures:**
 - The paper references **Figure 1 (Occupation distribution)** and **Figure 2 (Income distribution)** but these images are not legible in the provided file (only raw image tags appear on p. 5).
 - Similarly, several other figures (e.g., Figure 3, 4, 5) lack clear, readable labels or data values.
 - Recommendation:** Replace all illegible images with properly formatted tables or high-resolution, clearly labeled charts. Include exact percentages within the text or in accessible table formats.
- Lack of statistical rigor:**

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- The analysis is entirely descriptive (percentages and frequencies). There are no tests of statistical significance (e.g., chi-square to compare differences across income groups or gender), no correlation analysis, and no regression to identify which factors most strongly predict preference for minimalist jewellery.
- **Recommendation:** Add at least basic inferential statistics (e.g., cross-tabulation with chi-square tests to examine whether preferences vary significantly by income, age, or occupation). This would strengthen the claim that "price is the most significant factor."
- 4. **Overlap between results, discussion, and conclusion:**
 - The "Result and Analysis" (p. 4-12), "Discussion" (p. 13-14), and "Conclusion" (p. 14-16) sections contain substantial repetition. For example, the point about lightweight jewellery preference is stated at least five times.
 - **Recommendation:** Condense the three sections. Keep "Results" for raw findings (with tables), "Discussion" for interpretation and comparison with literature, and "Conclusion" for a concise summary, limitations, and future research directions.

Minor Issues (Easily Correctable):

1. **Inconsistent figure numbering and references:**
 - On p. 9, the text references "Figure 10 - Usage pattern" but the image is not clearly labeled. On p. 11, "Figure 13 - Key influencing factors" appears before Figure 12 is properly placed. Renumber sequentially.
2. **Typographical and formatting errors:**
 - P. 4, line 99: "mixed analytical approach" is repeated from the previous sentence.
 - P. 12, line 216: "Lastly the paper deals with the last objective" is awkward. Revise to "Finally, the paper addresses the fifth objective..."
 - P. 13, line 230: The heading "Is Gen Z Redefining Jewellery Culture?" appears without a corresponding figure number or clear data presentation.
3. **Missing limitation on "Gujarat" representativeness:**
 - Gujarat has significant urban-rural and regional diversity (e.g., Ahmedabad vs. Kutch vs. Surat). The paper does not specify where in Gujarat data was collected. If data is only from urban centers, this should be explicitly stated as a limitation.
4. **JEL codes are provided but not explained:**
 - The JEL codes (D12, G51, M31, Z13) are listed but never referenced. Either remove them or add a brief note on why they are relevant.
5. **Reference formatting inconsistency:**
 - Some references have page ranges (e.g., Banerjee, 2019: 45-60), while others do not. Some have DOIs (Djafarova & Bowes has a DOI-like number 102345, but it's incomplete). Standardize to a single citation style (e.g., APA 7th).

Suggested Revisions for the "Minor Revision" Category:

Issue	Suggested Action
Illegible figures (1-16)	Replace with clear tables or high-contrast charts. Add exact percentages in captions.
Sample size justification	Add 1-2 sentences on why 155 responses are sufficient (e.g., "Based on similar published studies in consumer behaviour, a sample of 150+ allows for meaningful descriptive analysis").
Lack of statistical testing	Add chi-square tests for key comparisons (e.g., preference for lightweight jewellery by income level, age group). Report p-values.
Repetitive text	Reduce "Results + Discussion + Conclusion" from ~12 pages to ~8 pages by removing redundant statements.
Missing geographic detail	Specify cities/districts in Gujarat where data was collected (e.g., Ahmedabad, Vadodara, Rajkot, Surat).
Limitations section	Add a short paragraph acknowledging convenience sampling, potential urban bias, and self-report bias.

Specific Queries for the Author:

1. **What was the exact geographic coverage within Gujarat?** Were rural or semi-urban respondents included, or only urban?
2. **How was "Generation Z" operationalized?** The paper says 16-28 years (p. 4, line 94), which includes some older Millennials (born 1996-1997). Consider narrowing to 18-26 for a purer Gen Z sample.
3. **Were gender differences analyzed?** The paper does not report gender-wise results. Given that jewellery consumption is often gendered, this is an important gap.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **What is the reliability of the Likert-scale questions?** Was Cronbach's alpha calculated to ensure internal consistency?

Conclusion for Editor:

This paper makes a genuine contribution to understanding generational shifts in an important cultural and economic sector (jewellery) within a specific Indian context (Gujarat). The core argument—that change represents transformation rather than erosion—is compelling and well-supported by the descriptive data. However, the **methodological limitations** (convenience sampling, lack of statistical tests) and **presentation issues** (illegible figures, repetitive writing) prevent it from being accepted in its current form. The required revisions are **minor to moderate** and can likely be completed within 2-4 weeks. Therefore, "**Accept after minor revision**" is the appropriate recommendation