



Delhi Business Review Vol. 26, No. 2 (July - December 2025)

DELHI BUSINESS REVIEW

An International Journal of SHTR

Journal Homepage: <https://www.delhibusinessreview.org/Index.htm>
<https://www.journalpressindia.com/delhi-business-review>

DELHI BUSINESS REVIEW	
Vol. 26, No. 2, December, 2025	
Editorial Board	1-2
Editorial Note	3-4
Editorial Board	5-6
Editorial Board	7-8
Editorial Board	9-10
Editorial Board	11-12
Editorial Board	13-14
Editorial Board	15-16
Editorial Board	17-18
Editorial Board	19-20
Editorial Board	21-22
Editorial Board	23-24
Editorial Board	25-26
Editorial Board	27-28
Editorial Board	29-30
Editorial Board	31-32
Editorial Board	33-34
Editorial Board	35-36
Editorial Board	37-38
Editorial Board	39-40
Editorial Board	41-42
Editorial Board	43-44
Editorial Board	45-46
Editorial Board	47-48
Editorial Board	49-50
Editorial Board	51-52
Editorial Board	53-54
Editorial Board	55-56
Editorial Board	57-58
Editorial Board	59-60
Editorial Board	61-62
Editorial Board	63-64
Editorial Board	65-66
Editorial Board	67-68
Editorial Board	69-70
Editorial Board	71-72
Editorial Board	73-74
Editorial Board	75-76
Editorial Board	77-78
Editorial Board	79-80
Editorial Board	81-82
Editorial Board	83-84
Editorial Board	85-86
Editorial Board	87-88
Editorial Board	89-90
Editorial Board	91-92
Editorial Board	93-94
Editorial Board	95-96
Editorial Board	97-98
Editorial Board	99-100
Editorial Board	101-102
Editorial Board	103-104
Editorial Board	105-106
Editorial Board	107-108
Editorial Board	109-110
Editorial Board	111-112
Editorial Board	113-114
Editorial Board	115-116
Editorial Board	117-118
Editorial Board	119-120
Editorial Board	121-122
Editorial Board	123-124
Editorial Board	125-126
Editorial Board	127-128
Editorial Board	129-130
Editorial Board	131-132
Editorial Board	133-134
Editorial Board	135-136
Editorial Board	137-138
Editorial Board	139-140
Editorial Board	141-142
Editorial Board	143-144
Editorial Board	145-146
Editorial Board	147-148
Editorial Board	149-150
Editorial Board	151-152
Editorial Board	153-154
Editorial Board	155-156
Editorial Board	157-158
Editorial Board	159-160
Editorial Board	161-162
Editorial Board	163-164
Editorial Board	165-166
Editorial Board	167-168
Editorial Board	169-170
Editorial Board	171-172
Editorial Board	173-174
Editorial Board	175-176
Editorial Board	177-178
Editorial Board	179-180
Editorial Board	181-182
Editorial Board	183-184
Editorial Board	185-186
Editorial Board	187-188
Editorial Board	189-190
Editorial Board	191-192
Editorial Board	193-194
Editorial Board	195-196
Editorial Board	197-198
Editorial Board	199-200
Editorial Board	201-202
Editorial Board	203-204
Editorial Board	205-206
Editorial Board	207-208
Editorial Board	209-210
Editorial Board	211-212
Editorial Board	213-214
Editorial Board	215-216
Editorial Board	217-218
Editorial Board	219-220
Editorial Board	221-222
Editorial Board	223-224
Editorial Board	225-226
Editorial Board	227-228
Editorial Board	229-230
Editorial Board	231-232
Editorial Board	233-234
Editorial Board	235-236
Editorial Board	237-238
Editorial Board	239-240
Editorial Board	241-242
Editorial Board	243-244
Editorial Board	245-246
Editorial Board	247-248
Editorial Board	249-250
Editorial Board	251-252
Editorial Board	253-254
Editorial Board	255-256
Editorial Board	257-258
Editorial Board	259-260
Editorial Board	261-262
Editorial Board	263-264
Editorial Board	265-266
Editorial Board	267-268
Editorial Board	269-270
Editorial Board	271-272
Editorial Board	273-274
Editorial Board	275-276
Editorial Board	277-278
Editorial Board	279-280
Editorial Board	281-282
Editorial Board	283-284
Editorial Board	285-286
Editorial Board	287-288
Editorial Board	289-290
Editorial Board	291-292
Editorial Board	293-294
Editorial Board	295-296
Editorial Board	297-298
Editorial Board	299-300
Editorial Board	301-302
Editorial Board	303-304
Editorial Board	305-306
Editorial Board	307-308
Editorial Board	309-310
Editorial Board	311-312
Editorial Board	313-314
Editorial Board	315-316
Editorial Board	317-318
Editorial Board	319-320
Editorial Board	321-322
Editorial Board	323-324
Editorial Board	325-326
Editorial Board	327-328
Editorial Board	329-330
Editorial Board	331-332
Editorial Board	333-334
Editorial Board	335-336
Editorial Board	337-338
Editorial Board	339-340
Editorial Board	341-342
Editorial Board	343-344
Editorial Board	345-346
Editorial Board	347-348
Editorial Board	349-350
Editorial Board	351-352
Editorial Board	353-354
Editorial Board	355-356
Editorial Board	357-358
Editorial Board	359-360
Editorial Board	361-362
Editorial Board	363-364
Editorial Board	365-366
Editorial Board	367-368
Editorial Board	369-370
Editorial Board	371-372
Editorial Board	373-374
Editorial Board	375-376
Editorial Board	377-378
Editorial Board	379-380
Editorial Board	381-382
Editorial Board	383-384
Editorial Board	385-386
Editorial Board	387-388
Editorial Board	389-390
Editorial Board	391-392
Editorial Board	393-394
Editorial Board	395-396
Editorial Board	397-398
Editorial Board	399-400
Editorial Board	401-402
Editorial Board	403-404
Editorial Board	405-406
Editorial Board	407-408
Editorial Board	409-410
Editorial Board	411-412
Editorial Board	413-414
Editorial Board	415-416
Editorial Board	417-418
Editorial Board	419-420
Editorial Board	421-422
Editorial Board	423-424
Editorial Board	425-426
Editorial Board	427-428
Editorial Board	429-430
Editorial Board	431-432
Editorial Board	433-434
Editorial Board	435-436
Editorial Board	437-438
Editorial Board	439-440
Editorial Board	441-442
Editorial Board	443-444
Editorial Board	445-446
Editorial Board	447-448
Editorial Board	449-450
Editorial Board	451-452
Editorial Board	453-454
Editorial Board	455-456
Editorial Board	457-458
Editorial Board	459-460
Editorial Board	461-462
Editorial Board	463-464
Editorial Board	465-466
Editorial Board	467-468
Editorial Board	469-470
Editorial Board	471-472
Editorial Board	473-474
Editorial Board	475-476
Editorial Board	477-478
Editorial Board	479-480
Editorial Board	481-482
Editorial Board	483-484
Editorial Board	485-486
Editorial Board	487-488
Editorial Board	489-490
Editorial Board	491-492
Editorial Board	493-494
Editorial Board	495-496
Editorial Board	497-498
Editorial Board	499-500
Editorial Board	501-502
Editorial Board	503-504
Editorial Board	505-506
Editorial Board	507-508
Editorial Board	509-510
Editorial Board	511-512
Editorial Board	513-514
Editorial Board	515-516
Editorial Board	517-518
Editorial Board	519-520
Editorial Board	521-522
Editorial Board	523-524
Editorial Board	525-526
Editorial Board	527-528
Editorial Board	529-530
Editorial Board	531-532
Editorial Board	533-534
Editorial Board	535-536
Editorial Board	537-538
Editorial Board	539-540
Editorial Board	541-542
Editorial Board	543-544
Editorial Board	545-546
Editorial Board	547-548
Editorial Board	549-550
Editorial Board	551-552
Editorial Board	553-554
Editorial Board	555-556
Editorial Board	557-558
Editorial Board	559-560
Editorial Board	561-562
Editorial Board	563-564
Editorial Board	565-566
Editorial Board	567-568
Editorial Board	569-570
Editorial Board	571-572
Editorial Board	573-574
Editorial Board	575-576
Editorial Board	577-578
Editorial Board	579-580
Editorial Board	581-582
Editorial Board	583-584
Editorial Board	585-586
Editorial Board	587-588
Editorial Board	589-590
Editorial Board	591-592
Editorial Board	593-594
Editorial Board	595-596
Editorial Board	597-598
Editorial Board	599-600
Editorial Board	601-602
Editorial Board	603-604
Editorial Board	605-606
Editorial Board	607-608
Editorial Board	609-610
Editorial Board	611-612
Editorial Board	613-614
Editorial Board	615-616
Editorial Board	617-618
Editorial Board	619-620
Editorial Board	621-622
Editorial Board	623-624
Editorial Board	625-626
Editorial Board	627-628
Editorial Board	629-630
Editorial Board	631-632
Editorial Board	633-634
Editorial Board	635-636
Editorial Board	637-638
Editorial Board	639-640
Editorial Board	641-642
Editorial Board	643-644
Editorial Board	645-646
Editorial Board	647-648
Editorial Board	649-650
Editorial Board	651-652
Editorial Board	653-654
Editorial Board	655-656
Editorial Board	657-658
Editorial Board	659-660
Editorial Board	661-662
Editorial Board	663-664
Editorial Board	665-666
Editorial Board	667-668
Editorial Board	669-670
Editorial Board	671-672
Editorial Board	673-674
Editorial Board	675-676
Editorial Board	677-678
Editorial Board	679-680
Editorial Board	681-682
Editorial Board	683-684
Editorial Board	685-686
Editorial Board	687-688
Editorial Board	689-690
Editorial Board	691-692
Editorial Board	693-694
Editorial Board	695-696
Editorial Board	697-698
Editorial Board	699-700
Editorial Board	701-702
Editorial Board	703-704
Editorial Board	705-706
Editorial Board	707-708
Editorial Board	709-710
Editorial Board	711-712
Editorial Board	713-714
Editorial Board	715-716
Editorial Board	717-718
Editorial Board	719-720
Editorial Board	721-722
Editorial Board	723-724
Editorial Board	725-726
Editorial Board	727-728
Editorial Board	729-730
Editorial Board	731-732
Editorial Board	733-734
Editorial Board	735-736
Editorial Board	737-738
Editorial Board	739-740
Editorial Board	741-742
Editorial Board	743-744
Editorial Board	745-746
Editorial Board	747-748
Editorial Board	749-750
Editorial Board	751-752
Editorial Board	753-754
Editorial Board	755-756
Editorial Board	757-758
Editorial Board	759-760
Editorial Board	761-762
Editorial Board	763-764
Editorial Board	765-766
Editorial Board	767-768
Editorial Board	769-770
Editorial Board	771-772
Editorial Board	773-774
Editorial Board	775-776
Editorial Board	777-778
Editorial Board	779-780
Editorial Board	781-782
Editorial Board	783-784
Editorial Board	785-786
Editorial Board	787-788
Editorial Board	789-790
Editorial Board	791-792
Editorial Board	793-794
Editorial Board	795-796
Editorial Board	797-798
Editorial Board	799-800
Editorial Board	801-802
Editorial Board	803-804
Editorial Board	805-806
Editorial Board	807-808
Editorial Board	809-810
Editorial Board	811-812
Editorial Board	813-814
Editorial Board	815-816
Editorial Board	817-818
Editorial Board	819-820
Editorial Board	821-822
Editorial Board	823-824
Editorial Board	825-826
Editorial Board	827-828
Editorial Board	829-830
Editorial Board	831-832
Editorial Board	833-834
Editorial Board	835-836
Editorial Board	837-838
Editorial Board	839-840
Editorial Board	841-842
Editorial Board	843-844
Editorial Board	845-846
Editorial Board	847-848
Editorial Board	849-850
Editorial Board	851-852
Editorial Board	853-854
Editorial Board	855-856
Editorial Board	857-858
Editorial Board	859-860
Editorial Board	861-862
Editorial Board	863-864
Editorial Board	865-866
Editorial Board	867-868
Editorial Board	869-870
Editorial Board	871-872
Editorial Board	873-874
Editorial Board	875-876
Editorial Board	877-878
Editorial Board	879-880
Editorial Board	881-882
Editorial Board	883-884
Editorial Board	885-886
Editorial Board	887-888
Editorial Board	889-890
Editorial Board	891-892
Editorial Board	893-894
Editorial Board	895-896
Editorial Board	897-898
Editorial Board	899-900
Editorial Board	901-902
Editorial Board	903-904
Editorial Board	905-906
Editorial Board	907-908
Editorial Board	909-910
Editorial Board	911-912
Editorial Board	913-914
Editorial Board	915-916
Editorial Board	917-918
Editorial Board	919-920
Editorial Board	921-922
Editorial Board	923-924
Editorial Board	925-926
Editorial Board	927-928
Editorial Board	929-930
Editorial Board	931-932
Editorial Board	933-934
Editorial Board	935-936
Editorial Board	937-938
Editorial Board	939-940
Editorial Board	941-942
Editorial Board	943-944
Editorial Board	945-946
Editorial Board	947-948
Editorial Board	949-950
Editorial Board	951-952
Editorial Board	953-954
Editorial Board	955-956
Editorial Board	957-958
Editorial Board	959-960
Editorial Board	961-962
Editorial Board	963-964
Editorial Board	965-966
Editorial Board	967-968
Editorial Board	969-970
Editorial Board	971-972
Editorial Board	973-974
Editorial Board	975-976
Editorial Board	977-978
Editorial Board	979-980
Editorial Board	981-982
Editorial Board	983-984
Editorial Board	985-986
Editorial Board	987-988
Editorial Board	989-990
Editorial Board	991-992
Editorial Board	993-994
Editorial Board	995-996
Editorial Board	997-998
Editorial Board	999-1000

An empirical Investigation into Millennials Attitudes of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as Consumers, Employees, Investors, Entrepreneurs, and Philanthropists

Introduction

The new century (i.e., from the year 2000 onwards) has seen an increased emphasis by businesses to be socially responsible corporate citizens. Unlike the decades of the 20th century, it is clear that businesses cannot only rely on being profitable to be regarded favorably by society but also need to be considerate of the impact their actions have on all stakeholders ([Lauritsen & Perks, 2015](#)). The three P's of people, planet, and profit are regarded today as equally important. Gone are the days of the Milton Friedman attitude that a corporation's only responsibility is to make a profit ([Friedman, 2013](#)). In today's world, a corporation looking to be viable long-term needs to be mindful of its actions on all stakeholders ([Burke & Logsdon, 1996](#); [McWilliams & Siegel, 2000](#)).

This is even more the case with Generation Y, also called millennials. Born between 1980 and 1999, millennials are, in 2025, between 25 and 45 years old and are thereby the largest age-group in the workforce and the largest consumer demographic ([3 Man Factory, 2015](#)). Research and public opinion suggest that millennials are more attuned to, more aware of, and more mindful of corporations' social responsibility (CSR) than were previous generations (e.g., baby boomers). In fact, it has been shown that millennials consider a firm's CSR reputation when they take on the role of consumers, jobseekers, investors, entrepreneurs, and philanthropists ([Karanam & Shenbagavalli, 2019](#)).

Although there is considerable research covering the broad topics of corporate social responsibility and millennials separately, the literature is limited when it attempts to find connections between the two. Research is further narrowed when comparing millennial attitudes across divergent cultures.

This study, undertaken in 2023 and 2024, investigates the attitudes of 183 millennials in four cohorts from across the globe: East Coast USA, the West Bank (also known as Palestine), and India (in two distinct groups; 2023 & 2024). This investigation sought views on the degree of importance participants place on CSR when (i) purchasing a product, (ii) seeking employment, (iii) purchasing stock in public corporations, (iv) starting their own business, and (v) donating to charity. The instrument also asked participants what industry they

regarded as the best for CSR practices, the worst for CSR practices, their favorite corporation for positive CSR practices, and their least favorite corporation for CSR practices. Responses reveal some interesting and plausible responses.

This paper is arranged in the following format. The literature review will, first, provide a brief overview of CSR, providing evidence that it is an ever-evolving concept that often adopts different nomenclature. Second, the review will provide a brief description of millennials with regard to their attitudes as it relates to CSR. Then, the research methodology is described, followed by the findings of the survey. Conclusions from the findings are then drawn and explained. The paper concludes with an outline of some of the limitations of the research and calls for further research on this important topic.

Review of the Literature

Corporate Social Responsibility

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is a never-evolving paradigm that reflects society's current opinion as to how corporations should behave as they conduct business ([Carroll, 1999](#)). Clearly, what was regarded as reasonable CSR actions by companies from the 1950s through to the 1990s is now considered inadequate. Examples of this evolution include today's increasingly negative attitudes toward cigarette smoking, disposable plastics, leaded gasoline, and carbon emissions. Further, to draw out the increased importance of the environment, CSR is now evolving into other terms such as sustainability, ESG (environmental, social, and governance), and triple-bottom line ([Aslaksen et al., 2021](#)). The concept of CSR is rooted in the three P's of people, planet & profit, although recent variations include people, planet, and prosperity ([United Nations, 2015](#)). Clearly, CSR is an expectation that corporations should consider their economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities when conducting business. This would include resource usage, labor rights, waste management, the impact of their operations on the local community, product safety, and possibly strategies for generating shared value with stakeholders ([Formánková et al., 2019](#)). Corporations are recognizing the change in public expectations and appear to be including

the objectives of sustainability in their decision-making. It is common for public corporations to outline their sustainability endeavors on their website (e.g., Coca-Cola).

In India, the Companies Act (2013) mandates that companies meeting specified financial thresholds spend about 2% on CSR, thereby making it obligatory for companies to align social impact with profitability. The CSR actions under Section VII include promoting education, eradicating hunger and poverty, environmental sustainability, gender equality, and contributions to national heritage ([Gupta & Gupta, 2025](#)).

Research by [Cho & Park \(2015\)](#) indicates that firms that have positive CSR reputations perform well long-term. The concept of the balanced scorecard reinforces the view that if you have positive relations with your customers, employees, creditors, and other stakeholders, then long-term profitability will prevail.

The Generations

For more than 60 years, demographers have labeled different generations and have characterized their typical behavioural traits accordingly ([Twenge, 2023](#)). The generation born between 1940 and 1959 is called baby boomers because of the large increase in birth rates after the conclusion of World War II. They are now between 65 and 85 years of age and so are typically retired or about to retire from the workforce. Given their late stage in life, they are less likely to purchase big-ticket items (e.g., mortgages to buy a house). Noted characteristics of this generation include living a life with lots of opportunities ([3 Man Factory, 2015](#)).

The Boomer generation is followed by Generation X, those born between 1960 and 1979. They are now between 45 and 65 years and regarded as being the resourceful, independent, and rebellious generation ([3 Man Factory, 2015](#)).

Generation Y, or millennials, were born between 1980 and 1999. This generation is the focus of this study. They are typically technology savvy, progressive, and keen to impact

the world in a positive way, whether through their work or through social movements. They are regarded as civic and socially conscious. They are explicitly seen as more concerned with global issues such as climate change than earlier generations. They place importance on work-life balance. Notably, this generation is set to inherit large sums of money from their parents and will soon have more spending power than previous generations. Millennials feel personally responsible for making a difference in the world ([Chatzopoulou & de Kiewiet, 2021](#)).

Generation Z, born between 1999 and 2012, has been raised on computer screens and is technology confident. They have grown up with the internet, smartphones, and are technology savvy. According to [Paggi & Clowes \(2021\)](#), they are passionate about social justice, environmental health, and CSR. They are also fiscally conservative and cautious with debt.

Millennials

As noted previously, this study was undertaken to determine the importance millennials place on CSR when it comes to being a consumer, a jobseeker, an investor, an entrepreneur, and a philanthropist. This section of the paper discusses the research as it relates to those roles.

Research shows that 75% of millennials, when consumers, are willing to pay a premium if they feel that the product is from a company with a reputable CSR. Clearly, they expect businesses to pursue sustainability when producing goods and services ([Anderson et al., 2018](#)). Findings by [Mohr et al. \(2001\)](#) suggest that most respondents expressed the belief that being socially responsible ultimately pays off for companies. They also found that respondents indicated difficulty in integrating CSR into their buying decisions due to the lack of information, and therefore do not regularly use CSR as a purchasing criterion. However, they concluded that if consumers view their purchasing power as influential on CSR, then companies will take note.

As jobseekers, research indicates that 69% of Millennials would refuse to work for a company

that is not socially responsible ([Waples & Brachle, 2020](#)). [Rank & Contreras \(2021\)](#) provide evidence that Millennials are attracted to work for firms with positive CSR reputations. [Greening & Turban \(2000\)](#) and [Klimkiewicz & Oltra \(2017\)](#) also determined that job applicants are more likely to choose jobs from firms with positive CSR reputations. This view is supported by [Rank & Contreras \(2021\)](#), who found that millennials expect their work to be meaningful and fulfilling within an organization that is aware of its CSR. [Maignan & Ferrell \(2000\)](#) found that CSR reputation has a positive influence on employee commitment. Further, [Turban & Greening \(1997\)](#) stated that organizations send signals about their CSR attributes, such as working conditions, values, and norms, and use these attributes as clues to future employment relations. [Rank & Contreras \(2021\)](#) concluded that millennials are concerned about the CSR values of their employer corporation, to which human resources managers should be mindful for committed employees.

As investors, research by ([Formánková et al., 2019](#)) found the millennial generation to be leading the sustainable investing charge. Clearly, they want their investments to make a positive impact on the world, with 86% being interested in sustainable investing. They state that it is evident that millennial investors across countries, cultures, personal values, and moral development. Their findings reveal that 57% of respondents are willing to sacrifice part of their return for an investment in socially responsible instruments. Clearly, millennial investors, more so than previous generations, are starting to consider their CSR attitude about buying stock. This inference is supported by the recent growth of “green” mutual funds. The US stock market is aware of this phenomenon and has developed the American Dow Jones Sustainability Index, with many other international stock markets following suit (e.g., the Calvert Social Index & Brazil’s Corporate Sustainability Index). Further, the number of ESG (environmental, social, and governance) ETFs (exchange-traded funds) is on the increase ([Rompotis, 2023](#)).

The research is limited when it comes to

millennials as entrepreneurs, but inferring their behaviour as investors, we could conclude that millennials would want to create products and businesses that do not harm the environment but, instead, add value to the global environment and treat people fairly. They are likely to consider starting sustainable businesses that are good for society ([Camilleri, 2017](#)).

With regards to philanthropy, the research is limited and tends to lean towards millennials volunteering or donating to charitable organizations ([Maignan & Ferrell, 2000](#)). Charities that have a solid CSR reputation, e.g., the Red Cross, find donors to be more willing to contribute to their charities because of their CSR reputation ([Pyo & Lee, 2013](#)).

The motivation for this study is to determine the importance millennials place on a firm’s CSR reputation when they adopt the varying roles of consumers, jobseekers, investors, entrepreneurs, and philanthropists. Furthermore, to discover if there are differences in CSR attitude emanating from differing cultures.

Method

The survey instrument, developed by the present investigators, was administered to MBA students from four distinct cohorts: East Coast USA (2023), India (2023), West Bank/Palestine (2023), and India (2024). The instrument used a 5-point Likert scale of 1 = Not Important, 3 = Not sure, and 5 = Very Important. Participants were asked to indicate the level of importance they placed on CSR as it related to them (i) buying a product, (ii) seeking employment, (iii) purchasing stocks/shares, (iv) starting their own business, and (v) donating to a charity. Also, participants were asked to respond to four open-ended questions by nominating (i) the industry with the best CSR practices, (ii) the industry with the worst CSR practices, (iii) their favorite corporation for positive CSR practices, and (iv) their least favorite corporation for CSR practices. At the end of the instrument, participants had the option of adding any final thoughts on CSR.

Demographic data for the four cohorts are shown in Table 1. The total participants is 183. The age range of all participants is between 25 and 44 years, therefore satisfying the millennials’ condition. For

all 183 participants, the average age is 30 years. The number of males and females is almost equal, with 47% being females. East Coast USA's mean age is 29 years. The West Bank group had the highest average age of 35 years. The two Indian cohorts had an almost identical average age of 25 years.

that CSR considerations are deeply embedded in entrepreneurial and charitable thinking within this cohort. The India 2024 group followed closely, with similarly high scores in these areas but slightly lower consumer ratings ($X = 2.9$), suggesting a modest decline in CSR sensitivity when purchasing products.

Table 1: Demographic Information for the Four Cohorts

Group	USA ' 23	India ' 23	Palestine '23	India ' 24	Overall
<i>N</i>	27	75	18	63	183
Mean Age	29	25	35	25	26
Age Range	25-45	24-28	28-45	24-28	30

Results

Table 2 lists group responses to the level of CSR importance for the five roles, noting the mean, range, mode, and median scores for each role. The highest score for each cohort is shown in bold. Notably, for each of the five roles, the average score for each cohort individually was above three. This indicates that, regardless of role, CSR reputation is *Important*. Focusing on the mean scores for each group with regard to each of the five roles, we find that all four groups place the highest importance on CSR reputation on philanthropic activities ($X \Rightarrow 4.3$). In contrast, all four groups placed the lowest level of importance on the role of consumer ($X = 3.175$). In fact, the order of importance was quite consistent across all four groups, with the ranking from highest to lowest being Philanthropist, Entrepreneur, Stockholder, Employee, and then Consumer. The level of consistency could, on the one hand, be regarded as surprising, given that the participants come from diverse backgrounds, yet on the other hand, not surprising given that they are all millennials. The average score for all groups with respect to CSR as an entrepreneur was high at 4.2 out of 5.0, supporting the notion that millennials place importance on making a positive difference.

Across all groups, CSR reputation was consistently rated as important, with mean values above three on the five-point Likert scale. However, the degree of importance attached to specific roles varied slightly by region. Participants from India (2023) reported the highest overall ratings across most categories, particularly for the roles of entrepreneur ($X = 4.4$) and philanthropist ($X = 4.5$). This indicates

The USA cohort displayed the most pronounced contrast between roles, showing a relatively low mean score for consumer behavior ($X = 3.0$) yet a very high rating for philanthropy ($X = 4.6$). This pattern implies that while American participants may not heavily weigh CSR when buying goods, they strongly value corporate giving and social impact when engaging as donors. The Palestine (West Bank) group, on the other hand, demonstrated more moderate values across all categories, with less variation between roles and the highest overall average age (35 years). This even distribution suggests a balanced but pragmatic perspective toward CSR, shaped perhaps by local economic or institutional conditions.

In general, the order of importance remained consistent across all four cohorts: consumer, employee, stockholder, entrepreneur, philanthropist, but the magnitude of differences reflects each region's social and economic environment. Millennials in India placed the greatest emphasis on entrepreneurship and philanthropy, those in the USA on philanthropy, and those in Palestine exhibited steady but moderate CSR awareness across all roles. Together, these patterns reinforce the interpretation that while millennial attitudes toward CSR are universally positive, local context influences how strongly each role resonates with participants.

To determine whether meaningful differences existed among the four cohorts, USA, India (2023), Palestine, and India (2024), a series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) was conducted across the five roles examined in this study: consumer, employee, investor, entrepreneur, and philanthropist. While the sample sizes differed

Table 2: Group Responses to the Importance Placed on CSR Reputation for each Role

US '23	Consumer	Employee	Stockholder	Entrepreneur	Philanthropy
Mean	3.0	3.9	3.5	4.2	4.6
Range	1 to 5	1 to 5	1 to 5	1 to 5	1 to 5
Mode	3	5	5	5	5
Median	3	4	4	4	4
India'23	Consumer	Employee	Stockholder	Entrepreneur	Philanthropy
Mean	3.5	4.1	3.9	4.4	4.5
Range	1 to 5	1 to 5	2 to 5	2to 5	2 to 5
Mode	3	4	4	5	5
Palestine '23	Consumer	Employee	Stockholder	Entrepreneur	Philanthropy
Mean	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.9	4.0
Range	1 to 5	1 to 5	2 to 5	2to 5	2 to 5
Mode	4	5	4	4	5
Median	4	3.5	4	4	4.5
India ' 24	Consumer	Employee	Stockholder	Entrepreneur	Philanthropy
Mean	3.0	3.6	3.9	4.0	4.2
Range	1 to 5	1 to 5	2 to 5	2to 5	2 to 5
Mode	3	3	5	5	5
Median	3	4	4	4	4
All	Consumer	Employee	Stockholder	Entrepreneur	Philanthropy
Mean	3.1	3.7	3.7	4.2	4.3
Range	1 to 5	1 to 5	2 to 5	2to 5	2 to 5
Mode	3	3	5	5	5
Median	3	4	4	4	4

Note: 1 = Not important, 3 =Not sure, 5 = Very Important

modestly between groups, ANOVA was deemed appropriate due to its robustness to unequal group sizes and its ability to detect mean differences among independent samples ([Roberts & Russo, 1999](#)).

The analysis revealed that consumer behavior varied significantly among the cohorts ($p = 0.0286$, $\alpha = 0.05$). A follow-up Tukey post-hoc test indicated that this difference was primarily driven by variation between the two Indian groups ($p = 0.034$). This finding suggests that perceptions of CSR importance in purchasing decisions are not static, even within similar cultural contexts.

Shifts in local business environments, exposure to CSR initiatives, or evolving market expectations may contribute to this divergence.

For the employee, investor, and philanthropist roles, no statistically significant differences were observed ($p = 0.0773$, $p = 0.5264$, and $p = 0.1465$, respectively). These results imply that millennials, regardless of geography, tend to share comparable attitudes toward CSR when making employment choices, investment decisions, or philanthropic contributions. The consistency across these roles underscores the global nature of millennial values related to social and ethical responsibility.

However, a significant difference emerged in entrepreneurial attitudes ($p = 0.0334$, $\alpha = 0.05$), again driven primarily by the variation between the India 2023 and India 2024 cohorts ($p = 0.0362$). This outcome may reflect differing levels of exposure to sustainability education, local policy emphasis on responsible enterprise, or economic conditions that shape how emerging entrepreneurs integrate CSR principles into their ventures.

Taken together, these findings suggest that while millennials worldwide hold CSR in high regard, the intensity of that commitment varies most noticeably in their roles as consumers and entrepreneurs. In these two areas, where personal agency, choice, and innovation play central roles, contextual and cultural influences appear to shape attitudes more strongly. By contrast, in employment, investment, and philanthropy, millennial perspectives on CSR demonstrate a striking degree of global convergence, reflecting shared generational values that transcend geographic boundaries.

Open-ended questions invited participants to list the best and worst industries for CSR practices. The top three most mentioned responses are listed in Table 3.

It is clear from Table 3 that I.T. (Information Technology), healthcare, and financial services are most often regarded by all four cohorts as the best industries for CSR practices, with education and renewables also being mentioned frequently. Meanwhile, the tobacco/cigarette, oil, and chemical industries are the Top 3 for three of the four cohorts as being the worst industries for CSR practices. Interestingly, but maybe not surprisingly, the weapons industry and social media are listed by Palestinian participants as the worst industries for CSR practices.

Clearly, the healthcare industry is regarded positively, while the cigarette industry is classified negatively. The only cohort to not mention cigarettes in their Top 3 is the Palestine Group. Although not Top 3, gambling was also mentioned regularly.

Two questions on the survey asked participants to nominate one corporation they believed was the best at CSR practices and one that was the worst. As expected, responses tended toward firms that have a presence in their respective geographic locations of each cohort. For example, regular responses from the India participants in both cohorts mention the TATA group as highly regarded by many respondents, with 23 of 75 mentions for the India 2023 group and 14 of 63 from the India 2024 group. The firm nominated for the worst practices was the ITC (India Tobacco Company), with 10 mentions from the India 2023 group, and Marlboro being written six times for the India 2024 group. For the Palestine group, Google received two nominations for the best, while Marlboro received two mentions for the worst. The US cohort mentioned Chick-fil-A twice as the best, while Marlboro was mentioned five times as the worst. Clearly, Information Technology (IT) companies are highly regarded, while cigarette companies (e.g., Marlboro) are regarded poorly for CSR reputation across all cohorts.

The final question on the survey asked students for any final comments on CSR. A review of their responses indicates that participants have a solid understanding of CSR. They understand CSR to be more than firms merely donating money to charities. They believe that CSR should be a part of a corporation's culture. One respondent from the India 2023 cohort wrote, "CSR is a multifaceted approach that goes beyond philanthropy, integrating social and environmental considerations into business. It is about balancing economic

Table 3: Top 3 Listed Best and Worst Industries for CSR

Cohort	Best	Worst
US (n=27)	Healthcare, Finance, I.T.	Cigarettes, Oil, Fast food
Palestine (n=18)	Education, Healthcare, Finance	Cigarettes, Weapons, Social Media
India (2023) (n=75)	IT, Education, Healthcare	Gambling, Oil, Chemical
India (2024) (n=63)	Healthcare, IT, Renewables	Cigarettes, Soft Drinks, and Chemical

success with social and environmental responsibility for the benefit of stakeholders". Meanwhile, a respondent from the India 2024 cohort stated: "Most companies view CSR as an obligation rather than their duty, and only participate for tax breaks. This must be changed". Clearly, this respondent saw a need for increased government regulation on CSR, as did a respondent from the Palestine group when they wrote: "I think CSR visions should be imposed by governments based on areas of needs based on research on that country." Further, a respondent from the India 2023 group wrote, "CSR is more than just a business trend. Businesses that want to stay relevant to new generations and who want to help people in need around the world while increasing their own revenue and efficiency will benefit from embracing CSR". And another from India 2023; "CSR can help companies attract and retain talent in their workforce as it is considered at the organizational level as a strategic activity that contributes to a broad reputation". Finally, encompassing the customer perspective, a respondent from the US cohort wrote: "Companies that have invested in CSR attract more customers because of the image they create in the society".

It is clear from reviewing the responses to the last question that millennials view CSR as an important part of any business; they feel that it should be embedded in a corporation's culture, supported by government, and rewarded by consumers, employees, and stockholders. They feel that each business should consider the CSR consequences of any potential project. They also place importance on companies being transparent with respect to their CSR actions. This finding is in line with those of (Chatzopoulou & de Kiewiet, 2021) and (Andrea & David, 2019).

Conclusions

It is widely accepted today that firms looking for long-term success need to be cognizant of their corporate social responsibility (CSR) when making decisions. Research suggests that a firm's CSR reputation is especially important for millennials. Given that millennials comprise the largest demographic in the workforce and stand to inherit significant sums from their baby boomer parents, the attitudes of millennials toward corporations' CSR reputation are worthy of research, for it is the millennials who will be making important life decisions: that is, as a consumer, jobseeker, investor, entrepreneur, or philanthropist.

Also, CSR is an evolving concept. In fact, the concept and the term together are morphing into other terms. Terms such as sustainability, ESG, and triple-bottom line are often used interchangeably. Despite apparent progress being made on embedding CSR into the culture of corporations, there is still a significant way to go. Recent news exposes a situation in Ghana where workers are required to use poisonous mercury to extract gold. This work practice obviously pollutes the drinking water and farmland in nearby locations (Campbell, 2025). Millennials, and presumably the generations to follow, are aware of the benefits of CSR practices to the planet and aim to spend and invest accordingly.

Findings from this research support the general view that millennials are mindful of CSR when making decisions. It is worthwhile for this research to be expanded so as to determine if the CSR views extend to other generations (e.g., Generation Z) and to other cultures (e.g., populations in Africa, Europe, and Asia). Although it could be argued that this research is somewhat limited by not delving deeper into participants' CSR attitudes, opinions from 183 respondents across four cohorts and three countries answering ten questions is a credible beginning.

References

- 3 Man Factory. (2015). Who are Generation X/Y/Z & Millennials? <https://3manfactory.co.uk/2015/08/04/who-are-generation-xyz-millennials/>
- Anderson, R. L., Dahlquist, S. H., & Garver, M. S. (2018). Millennials' Purchasing Response to CSR Behavior. *Marketing Management Journal*, 28(1), 14-29. <https://doi.org/10.63963/001c.151120>
- Andrea Valente, & David Atkinson. (2019). Sustainability in Business: A Millennials' Perspective. *Journal of Modern Accounting and Auditing*, 15(6), 293-304. <https://doi.org/10.17265/1548-6583/2019.06.002>
- Aslaksen, H. M., Hildebrandt, C., & Johnsen, H. C. G. (2021). The long-term transformation of the concept of CSR: towards a more comprehensive emphasis on sustainability. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, 6(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-021-00063-9>
- Burke, L., & Logsdon, J. M. (1996). How corporate social responsibility pays off. *Long Range Planning*, 29(4), 495-502. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301\(96\)00041-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301(96)00041-6)
- Camilleri, M. A. (2017). Corporate sustainability and responsibility: creating value for business, society and the environment. *Asian Journal of Sustainability and Social Responsibility*, 2(1), 59-74. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41180-017-0016-5>

- Campbell, C. (2025). The new gold rush. Time Magazine. <https://gata.org/node/24189>
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate Social Responsibility. Business & Society, 38(3), 268-295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00076503903800303>
- Chatzopoulou, E., & de Kiewiet, A. (2021). Millennials' evaluation of corporate social responsibility: The wants and needs of the largest and most ethical generation. Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 20(3), 521-534. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1882>
- Cho, E., & Park, H. (2015). Is CSR Really Profitable? Evidence From Korea. Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR), 31(6), 2167. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jabr.v31i6.9474>
- Formánková, S., Trenz, O., Faldík, O., Kolomazník, J., & Sládková, J. (2019). Millennials' Awareness and Approach to Social Responsibility and Investment – Case Study of the Czech Republic. Sustainability, 11(2), 504. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11020504>
- Friedman, J. (2013). Milton Friedman Was Wrong About Corporate Social Responsibility. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/milton-friedman-was-wrong_b_3417866
- Greening, D. W., & Turban, D. B. (2000). Corporate Social Performance As a Competitive Advantage in Attracting a Quality Workforce. Business & Society, 39(3), 254-280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765030003900302>
- Gupta, P., & Gupta, M. K. (2025). Sustainability Through CSR and its Impact on Financial Performance (A Case Study of Tata Consultancy Services). DIAS Technology Review, 20(1), 49-53.
- Karanam, M., & Shenbagavalli, R. (2019). Investment pattern of Millennials: A Path Ahead. Research Journal of Social Science & Management, 09 (November), 24-29.
- Klimkiewicz, K., & Oltra, V. (2017). Does CSR Enhance Employer Attractiveness? The Role of Millennial Job Seekers' Attitudes. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 24(5), 449-463. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1419>
- Lauritsen, B. D., & Perks, K. J. (2015). The influence of interactive, non-interactive, implicit and explicit CSR communication on young adults' perception of UK supermarkets' corporate brand image and reputation. Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 20(2), 178-195. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-09-2013-0065>
- Maignan, I., & Ferrell, O. C. (2000). Measuring Corporate Citizenship in Two Countries: The Case of the United States and France. Journal of Business Ethics, 23(3), 283-297. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006262325211>
- McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. (2000). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: correlation or misspecification? Strategic Management Journal, 21(5), 603-609. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(200005\)21:5<603::AID-SMJ101>3.0.CO;2-3](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(200005)21:5<603::AID-SMJ101>3.0.CO;2-3)
- Mohr, L. A., Webb, D. J., & Harris, K. E. (2001). Do Consumers Expect Companies to be Socially Responsible? The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Buying Behavior. Journal of Consumer Affairs, 35(1), 45-72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.2001.tb00102.x>
- Paggi, R., & Clowes, K. (2021). Managing Generation Z: how to recruit, onboard, develop, and retain the newest generation in the workplace, 334. Quill Driver Books.
- Pyo, G., & Lee, H.-Y. (2013). The Association Between Corporate Social Responsibility Activities And Earnings Quality: Evidence From Donations And Voluntary Issuance Of CSR Reports. Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR), 29(3), 945. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jabr.v29i3.7793>
- Rank, S., & Contreras, F. (2021). Do Millennials pay attention to Corporate Social Responsibility in comparison to previous generations? Are they motivated to lead in times of transformation? A qualitative review of generations, CSR and work motivation. International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility, 6(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-020-00058-y>
- Roberts, M. J. ., & Russo, R. (1999). A student's guide to analysis of variance, 288, Routledge.
- Rompotis, G. G. (2023). The Performance of ESG ETFs in the U.S. Capital Markets Review, Malaysian Finance Association, 31(2), 89-101.
- Turban, D. B., & Greening, D. W. (1997). Corporate Social Performance and Organizational Attractiveness to Prospective Employees. Academy of Management Journal, 40(3), 658-672. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257057>
- Twenge, J. M. (2023). Generations: The Real Differences between Gen Z, Millennials, Gen X, Boomers, and Silents – and What They Mean for America's Future. Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith, 75(3), 212-214. <https://doi.org/10.56315/PSCF12-23Twenge>
- United Nations. (2015). Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transforming_ourworld/publication
- Waples, C. J., & Brachle, B. J. (2020). Recruiting millennials: Exploring the impact of CSR involvement and pay signaling on organizational attractiveness. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 27(2), 870-880. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1851>