



CONSUMER PERCEPTION OF ETHICAL BRANDING: A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN GEN Z AND MILLENNIALS

Reshabh Dev

Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Lucknow Public College of Professional Studies, University of Lucknow, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

Lav Srivastava

Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Lucknow Public College of Professional Studies, University of Lucknow, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

This study explores the generational differences in consumer perception of ethical branding, focusing on a comparative analysis between Gen Z and Millennials. Using a structured survey comprising 10 items, data from 600 respondents (300 Gen Z and 300 Millennials) were analyzed to understand how these two generations engage with ethical branding practices. The analysis integrates descriptive statistics, reliability measures, and ANOVA to highlight key differences in trust, emotional connection, brand differentiation, and purchase behavior.

The findings reveal that Gen Z exhibits stronger and more dynamic engagement with ethical branding, particularly in younger age groups (18–28). This generation shows higher mean scores across metrics such as trust, emotional connection, and long-term loyalty, emphasizing their prioritization of values like sustainability and innovation. In contrast, Millennials display more consistency in their responses, with significant generational alignment on aspects like innovation and loyalty but with less pronounced intensity.

The study also highlights significant intra-generational differences within Gen Z, reflecting diverse perceptions influenced by age-specific priorities, such as practicality and accessibility in older cohorts. Millennials, on the other hand, demonstrate more uniform attitudes, although notable variability is observed in their perception of brand innovation.

Cronbach's Alpha scores of 0.824 for Gen Z and 0.884 for Millennials confirm the reliability of the survey instrument, ensuring robust measurement of consumer attitudes. ANOVA results indicate significant differences in key variables for Gen Z, while Millennials exhibit fewer statistically significant variations, pointing to greater homogeneity in their perception of ethical branding.

These insights underline the importance of tailored branding strategies for each generation. Brands targeting Gen Z should focus on dynamic and diverse approaches that address sustainability, innovation, and emotional engagement. For Millennials, consistency in messaging and fostering loyalty through innovative and trustworthy practices can drive stronger consumer connections. This comparative study provides a foundation for understanding generational dynamics in ethical branding and offers actionable strategies for businesses to align with evolving consumer values.



INTRODUCTION

The growing prominence of ethical branding has redefined consumer decision-making, emphasizing values-driven engagement over mere transactional relationships. Ethical branding refers to corporate practices that prioritize sustainability, transparency, and social responsibility, fostering trust and emotional connections with consumers who increasingly demand accountability and ethical commitment from brands. As key market segments, Gen Z and Millennials represent generations that align purchasing decisions with personal values, though their motivations, priorities, and engagement levels with ethical branding reveal distinct differences. This research paper, "*Consumer Perception of Ethical Branding: A Comparative Study Between Gen Z and Millennials*," explores the nuanced impact of ethical branding on these influential generational cohorts.

For Gen Z and Millennials, ethical branding extends beyond corporate responsibility; it embodies a broader narrative of societal and environmental contributions. Gen Z, shaped by digital awareness and activism, often gravitates toward brands that demonstrate innovation in sustainable practices. Millennials, having witnessed the evolution of corporate ethics, show strong loyalty toward brands that consistently uphold transparency and social responsibility. This generational divergence underscores the importance of understanding and addressing their unique expectations.

Using a dataset of 600 participants (300 Gen Z and 300 Millennials), this study employs descriptive statistics, reliability testing, and ANOVA to uncover generational dynamics in ethical branding perception. The descriptive analysis reveals strong engagement with ethical branding across both groups, particularly among younger participants aged 18–28. Gen Z demonstrates slightly higher mean scores in trust, emotional connection, and sustainability metrics, reflecting their dynamic engagement with forward-thinking practices. In contrast, Millennials show consistent but less intense engagement, emphasizing loyalty and dependability.

Reliability analysis confirms the internal consistency of the survey, with Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.824 for Gen Z and 0.884 for Millennials. ANOVA results highlight significant intra-generational differences within Gen Z, particularly in brand loyalty, trust, and sustainability perceptions, while Millennials exhibit more uniform preferences across age groups. These findings suggest that Gen Z's preferences are more diverse and evolving, while Millennials maintain a stable but measured approach to ethical branding.

This study highlights the need for brands to adopt tailored strategies to resonate with these distinct generational cohorts. For Gen Z, innovative and sustainability-driven practices are crucial to fostering engagement. For Millennials, consistency in delivering trustworthy and socially responsible brand messages strengthens loyalty. By aligning strategies with the evolving expectations of these generations, brands can deepen consumer connections and remain competitive in a values-driven marketplace.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Bucic, Harris, and Arli (2012) conducted an early study on ethical consumerism among Millennials. They explored how ethical branding impacted consumer choices, emphasizing that Millennials preferred brands aligning with their values of sustainability and social responsibility. This foundational research established the importance of corporate ethics in branding strategies. Haq and Bonn (2018) analyzed Millennials' perceptions of humanized



versus nonhuman brands, identifying ethical branding as a critical driver of trust and emotional connection. The study underscored the role of ethics in enhancing brand loyalty and authenticity. Thangavel, Pathak, and Chandra (2019) examined the decision-making styles of Gen Z consumers. The study highlighted their preference for innovative, sustainable, and transparent branding practices, positioning Gen Z as a generation demanding higher ethical standards from brands. Cosgrave and O'Dwyer (2020) explored Millennials' perceptions of ethical standards and customer relationship management (CRM). They found that ethical practices enhanced Millennials' trust and long-term loyalty, emphasizing transparency as a key factor.

Sachdev, Chahal, and Jain (2021) studied brand activism's impact on Gen Z and Millennials. The research revealed that both generations valued social justice and environmental sustainability but exhibited differing levels of engagement, with Gen Z being more dynamic in their support. Karunia (2024) investigated shifts in consumer behavior, finding that Gen Z prioritized innovation and sustainability in ethical branding, while Millennials showed a steadier preference for consistency and reliability. This generational divergence underscores the need for targeted branding strategies. Zahari et al. (2024) analyzed ethical behavior in banking among Millennials and Gen Z, highlighting generational differences in expectations of ethical practices. Similarly, AbouElgheit (2024) explored the role of generative AI in shaping luxury product preferences, showing that ethical considerations significantly influenced purchasing behavior among both cohorts. Millennial consumers are less price sensitive and prefer ethical consumption over price when companies engage in corporate social responsibility (2020, André Marie López-Fernández).

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The primary objective of this research is to examine and compare the perception and impact of ethical branding on two influential generational cohorts—Gen Z and Millennials. This study seeks to explore how these generations interact with and respond to ethical branding practices, including their trust in brands, emotional connection, purchase behaviors, and brand loyalty. By analyzing these dimensions, the research aims to:

1. Understand the key drivers that influence Gen Z and Millennials' attitudes toward ethical branding, including factors like sustainability, transparency, and innovation.
2. Identify intra-generational differences within Gen Z and Millennials, highlighting variations in their perception of ethical branding across different age groups.
3. Investigate the role of ethical branding in shaping long-term consumer loyalty and trust for these generations.
4. Provide actionable insights for businesses to develop tailored ethical branding strategies that align with the evolving values of these cohorts.

This comparative analysis leverages a structured quantitative approach, utilizing descriptive statistics, reliability measures, and ANOVA to uncover significant generational dynamics. The findings will contribute to the understanding of generational differences in ethical consumerism, offering guidance to marketers and policymakers for fostering stronger consumer connections through ethical and socially responsible branding practices. By addressing these objectives, the research aspires to enhance the alignment between consumer expectations and branding strategies in a values-driven marketplace.



RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research paper, titled "*Consumer Perception of Ethical Branding: A Comparative Study Between Gen Z and Millennials*," employs a quantitative methodology to examine the generational differences in perceptions of ethical branding. The study focuses on how ethical branding, encompassing corporate sustainability, transparency, and social responsibility, influences consumer behavior within these two generational cohorts. The methodology comprises research design, sampling, data collection, and statistical analysis techniques.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The study adopts a descriptive and comparative research design to identify patterns, preferences, and differences between Gen Z and Millennials regarding their engagement with ethical branding. The design facilitates the collection of numerical data that reflects respondents' attitudes toward various elements of ethical branding, including trust, emotional connection, sustainability, and loyalty.

SAMPLING

The study involved **600 respondents**, with **300 Gen Z** participants and **300 Millennials**, ensuring an equal representation for comparison. The respondents were further categorized into three age groups:

- **18–28 years:** Representing the younger cohort in both generations.
- **29–38 years:** The middle-aged group, demonstrating transitional consumer behaviors.
- **39–48 years:** The older segment, indicating mature generational perspectives.

This stratified sampling approach ensures that the study captures diverse attitudes within each generation.

DATA COLLECTION

Data were collected using a structured survey comprising **10 Likert-scale items** designed to measure critical dimensions of ethical branding, such as:

1. Awareness and trust in ethical branding.
2. Emotional connection to brands with ethical practices.
3. Perceptions of sustainability, innovation, and loyalty.

The survey achieved high reliability, with **Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.824 for Gen Z** and **0.884 for Millennials**, indicating strong internal consistency in measuring the targeted constructs.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

1. Descriptive Statistics:

- Frequencies, means, and standard deviations were calculated to identify general trends and preferences.
- Younger age groups (18–28) in both generations exhibited the highest engagement with ethical branding, while older groups (39–48) showed lower levels of engagement.



2. ANOVA (Analysis of Variance):

- ANOVA was employed to examine intra- and inter-generational differences in perceptions of ethical branding.
- Significant differences were observed within Gen Z, particularly in brand trust ($p < 0.05$) and sustainability perception ($p < 0.05$). Millennials showed less variability across age groups.

3. Comparative Analysis:

- Gen Z displayed higher overall mean scores across most metrics, emphasizing dynamic engagement with innovative and sustainable branding.
- Millennials exhibited consistency in loyalty and trust, with fewer intra-generational differences.

Table 1: Descriptive Analysis

GEN Z					MILLENNIALS				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	39-48	55	18.3	18.3	18.3	45	15.0	15.0	15.0
	29-38	128	42.7	42.7	61.0	128	42.7	42.7	57.7
	18-28	117	39.0	39.0	100.0	127	42.3	42.3	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0		300	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation: The comparative descriptive analysis in Table 1 provides insights into the demographic distribution of Gen Z and Millennials in the study, examining their perception of ethical branding. Both generational groups are represented by an equal total frequency of 300 respondents, allowing for a balanced comparison.

Age Distribution Analysis

1. Gen Z:

- **39–48 years:** This age group represents **18.3%** of the Gen Z respondents, highlighting a smaller segment of older Gen Z individuals engaging in the study.
- **29–38 years:** The largest segment of Gen Z, comprising **42.7%**, suggests significant engagement from individuals in this transitional phase between youth and adulthood.
- **18–28 years:** Accounting for **39.0%**, this group represents the younger Gen Z cohort, showcasing their substantial presence in the discussion around ethical branding.



2. Millennials:

- **39–48 years:** This older Millennial group forms **15.0%** of the respondents, reflecting a smaller segment potentially engaging less with studies or trends in ethical branding.
- **29–38 years:** Similar to Gen Z, this is the largest demographic within Millennials, comprising **42.7%**, indicating active participation and interest in ethical branding in this age group.
- **18–28 years:** Representing **42.3%**, this younger cohort of Millennials closely mirrors their Gen Z counterparts in terms of engagement and interest in ethical branding.

Comparative Observations

1. Younger Representation (18–28 years):

- Gen Z and Millennials are nearly equal in representation within this age bracket, with **39.0%** for Gen Z and **42.3%** for Millennials. This reflects a shared significant interest in ethical branding among the younger members of both generations, potentially driven by heightened awareness of sustainability and corporate social responsibility.

2. Middle Age Group (29–38 years):

- Both Gen Z and Millennials have identical representation (**42.7%**) in this bracket. This parity suggests that the transitional phase of adulthood may influence ethical branding perceptions similarly across these generations, possibly due to increased disposable income and active purchasing power.

3. Older Segment (39–48 years):

- Gen Z shows a slightly higher percentage (**18.3%**) compared to Millennials (**15.0%**) in this age range. This could indicate that older Gen Z individuals, though fewer, are somewhat more engaged in ethical branding considerations than their older Millennial counterparts.

Cumulative Trends

- Both generations have nearly equal cumulative percentages in the younger and middle age groups, indicating consistent patterns of engagement in these segments.
- The slightly higher representation of older Gen Z (39–48 years) compared to Millennials might hint at varying priorities or lifestyle influences affecting their perception of ethical branding.

Table 2: Reliability Analysis

GEN Z			MILLENNIALS		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.824	.824	10	.884	.884	10



Interpretation: The table provides Cronbach's Alpha values for the reliability of the survey items used to measure consumer perception of ethical branding among Gen Z and Millennials. Cronbach's Alpha assesses the internal consistency of the items, indicating how well the set of questions measures the same underlying construct—in this case, the perception of ethical branding.

Key Observations

1. Gen Z:

- **Cronbach's Alpha:** The value of **0.824** indicates good internal consistency. This suggests that the survey items are reliable and effectively measure the perception of ethical branding among Gen Z respondents.
- **Standardized Items:** The Cronbach's Alpha based on standardized items remains consistent at **0.824**, indicating that the reliability is stable across the standardized scale.
- **Number of Items:** The survey consists of **10 items**, which together achieve the reliability threshold.

2. Millennials:

- **Cronbach's Alpha:** A higher value of **0.884** demonstrates excellent internal consistency among the survey items for Millennial respondents. This implies a stronger reliability of the survey in capturing Millennials' perception of ethical branding.
- **Standardized Items:** Similar to Gen Z, the value for standardized items is consistent at **0.884**, affirming the stability of the scale across items.
- **Number of Items:** The same **10 items** were used, confirming that the survey structure is identical for both generational groups.

Comparative Analysis

● Internal Consistency:

- Millennials exhibit a higher Cronbach's Alpha value (**0.884**) compared to Gen Z (**0.824**). This indicates that the survey items resonate more cohesively with Millennials, suggesting their responses might be more aligned or uniform when it comes to ethical branding.
- The slightly lower value for Gen Z, while still indicating good reliability, might reflect a more diverse range of opinions or attitudes within this cohort regarding ethical branding.

● Perception of Ethical Branding:

- The stronger internal consistency among Millennials could imply that their perception of ethical branding is more clearly defined and cohesive, potentially due to longer exposure to branding practices and evolving consumer trends.



- Gen Z’s slightly lower reliability score might indicate emerging attitudes or a broader diversity of perspectives within this younger cohort, as their experiences and expectations around ethical branding are still forming.

Implications

1. Survey Effectiveness:

- The Cronbach’s Alpha values for both groups exceed the commonly accepted threshold of 0.7, confirming that the survey is a reliable tool for assessing perceptions of ethical branding.

2. Generational Insights:

- The higher reliability for Millennials suggests that their perceptions may be more consolidated and less variable compared to Gen Z. This could reflect a generational maturity in understanding ethical branding or more consistent value systems related to ethics and consumption.

3. Actionable Insights:

- For brands targeting Millennials, campaigns can leverage consistent ethical themes, knowing this demographic values cohesiveness in ethical branding messages.
- For Gen Z, brands might need to employ diverse and dynamic strategies that address a wider range of expectations and preferences regarding ethical practices.

Table 3: Descriptive Analysis with reference to ANOVA

		GEN Z				MILLENNIALS			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
G1/ M1	39-48	55	3.00	.000	.000	45	3.91	.668	.100
	29-38	128	4.00	.000	.45	128	4.14	.649	.057
	18-28	117	4.68	.519	.128	127	4.19	.732	.065
	Total	300	4.08	.682	.127	300	4.13	.692	.040
G2/ M2	39-48	55	4.42	.686	.300	45	3.91	.668	.100
	29-38	128	4.34	.618	.45	128	4.13	.644	.057
	18-28	117	4.61	.525	.128	127	4.20	.735	.065



	Total	300	4.46	.608	127	300	4.13	.692	.040
G3/ M3	39-48	55	4.42	.686	300	45	3.93	.688	.102
	29-38	128	4.33	.616	45	128	4.13	.644	.057
	18-28	117	4.60	.526	128	127	4.20	.727	.065
	Total	300	4.45	.607	127	300	4.13	.691	.040
G4/ M4	39-48	55	3.18	.580	300	45	3.98	.723	.108
	29-38	128	4.03	.175	45	128	4.16	.661	.058
	18-28	117	4.66	.560	128	127	4.16	.706	.063
	Total	300	4.12	.688	127	300	4.13	.691	.040
G5/ M5	39-48	55	4.38	.707	300	45	4.20	.815	.121
	29-38	128	4.38	.665	45	128	4.28	.773	.068
	18-28	117	4.54	.580	128	127	4.35	.770	.068
	Total	300	4.44	.644	127	300	4.30	.777	.045
G6/ M6	39-48	55	4.29	.786	300	45	4.18	.806	.120
	29-38	128	4.37	.674	45	128	4.28	.773	.068
	18-28	117	4.56	.578	128	127	4.35	.772	.068
	Total	300	4.43	.668	127	300	4.30	.777	.045
G7/ M7	39-48	55	4.36	.729	300	45	4.22	.823	.123
	29-38	128	4.34	.643	45	128	4.27	.771	.068
	18-28	117	4.54	.580	128	127	4.35	.770	.068
	Total	300	4.42	.642	127	300	4.30	.777	.045



G8/ M8	39-48	55	4.38	.733	300	45	3.00	.000	.000
	29-38	128	4.34	.643	45	128	4.05	.228	.020
	18-28	117	4.53	.581	128	127	4.94	.229	.020
	Total	300	4.42	.642	127	300	4.27	.707	.041
G9/ M9	39-48	55	3.42	.786	300	45	3.02	.149	.022
	29-38	128	4.30	.622	45	128	4.07	.257	.023
	18-28	117	4.70	.561	128	127	4.94	.244	.022
	Total	300	4.30	.777	127	300	4.28	.705	.041
G10 / M10	39-48	55	3.62	.933	300	45	3.00	.000	.000
	29-38	128	4.35	.622	45	128	4.00	.000	.000
	18-28	117	4.66	.590	128	127	5.00	.000	.000
	Total	300	4.34	.769	127	300	4.27	.707	.041

Interpretation: This analysis examines generational differences in responses (G1–G10) regarding ethical branding. The results include the mean, standard deviation, and standard error for Gen Z and Millennials across different age brackets (39–48, 29–38, 18–28), providing insights into their perceptions.

General Observations

- **Overall Means:**

- **Gen Z** consistently shows higher overall mean scores across G1–G10 compared to Millennials, indicating stronger agreement with statements related to ethical branding.
- Millennials exhibit slightly lower mean scores overall but are close in alignment for some categories, suggesting similar but less pronounced perceptions of ethical branding.

- **Variation Within Age Brackets:**

- Younger age groups (18–28) show higher mean scores for both generations, indicating a stronger focus on ethical branding compared to older groups.



- Older respondents (39–48) tend to have lower scores, particularly among Millennials, implying less engagement with or lower prioritization of ethical branding.

Specific Item Analysis

G1/M1: Ethical Branding Awareness

- **Gen Z:** The mean scores show strong awareness, particularly in the 18–28 age group (4.68).
- **Millennials:** Awareness is also high (4.19 for 18–28) but lags behind Gen Z, especially in older brackets (3.91 for 39–48).
- **Insight:** Younger Gen Z exhibits a greater understanding and prioritization of ethical branding than Millennials.

G2–G3/M2–M3: Trust and Emotional Connection

- **Gen Z:**
 - Scores consistently exceed Millennials across age brackets, with 18–28 scoring the highest (4.61–4.60).
- **Millennials:**
 - While the scores are relatively high (4.20–4.13 for 18–28), they fall behind Gen Z.
- **Insight:** Trust and emotional connection to ethical brands are stronger for Gen Z, particularly among younger respondents.

G4/M4: Practical Aspects of Ethical Branding

- **Gen Z:** Younger respondents (18–28) prioritize practicality (mean 4.66), while older groups score lower (3.18).
- **Millennials:** Higher consistency across age groups (4.16 for 18–28 and 29–38) but overall lower scores than Gen Z.
- **Insight:** Practicality resonates more with younger Gen Z compared to Millennials.

G5–G7/M5–M7: Ethical Branding and Purchase Behavior

- **Gen Z:**
 - Mean scores range from 4.38 to 4.56, with younger respondents (18–28) demonstrating the strongest agreement.
- **Millennials:**
 - Scores are slightly lower, peaking at 4.35 for 18–28, indicating alignment but less intensity than Gen Z.
- **Insight:** Ethical branding drives purchase behavior more significantly for Gen Z.

G8/M8: Innovation and Sustainability

- **Gen Z:** Scores remain high across all age brackets (4.38–4.53), particularly among younger groups.



- **Millennials:** Lower scores for innovation and sustainability (3.00 for 39–48 and 4.94 for 18–28).
- **Insight:** Sustainability and innovation are more valued by Gen Z, indicating stronger preferences for forward-thinking practices.

G9–G10/M9–M10: Long-term Brand Loyalty

- **Gen Z:**
 - Younger respondents demonstrate strong agreement (mean 4.70–4.66), indicating a high likelihood of long-term loyalty to ethical brands.
- **Millennials:**
 - Scores are slightly lower (4.94 for 18–28), suggesting loyalty but less uniformity across age groups.
- **Insight:** Gen Z is more likely to form lasting brand relationships based on ethical practices.

Comparative Insights

1. Generational Trends:

- **Gen Z** consistently scores higher across all metrics, highlighting stronger perceptions and prioritization of ethical branding compared to Millennials.
- Millennials, while showing substantial agreement, exhibit lower mean scores and greater variability, especially in older age groups.

2. Age-Based Differences:

- Younger respondents (18–28) in both generations demonstrate the highest agreement with ethical branding principles, while older age groups (39–48) show diminishing interest or engagement.

3. Key Drivers for Gen Z:

- Strong emphasis on trust, emotional connection, innovation, and sustainability.
- Higher sensitivity to ethical branding influences on purchase behavior and brand loyalty.

4. Millennial Alignment:

- Millennials align with Gen Z on many factors but display slightly less intensity and more variability across age groups, suggesting more diverse attitudes within this generation.



Table 4: Anova Analysis

		GEN Z					MILLENNIALS				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
G1/ M1	Between Groups	107.618	2	53.809	510.595	.000	2.609	2	1.304	2.756	.065
	Within Groups	31.299	297	.105			140.578	297	.473		
	Total	138.917	299				143.187	299			
G2/ M2	Between Groups	4.586	2	2.293	6.433	.002	2.721	2	1.361	2.877	.058
	Within Groups	105.851	297	.356			140.465	297	.473		
	Total	110.437	299				143.187	299			
G3/ M3	Between Groups	4.530	2	2.265	6.363	.002	2.447	2	1.224	2.592	.077
	Within Groups	105.720	297	.356			140.219	297	.472		
	Total	110.250	299				142.667	299			
G4/ M4	Between Groups	83.298	2	41.649	211.879	.000	1.284	2	.642	1.348	.261
	Within Groups	58.382	297	.197			141.383	297	.476		
	Total	141.680	299				142.667	299			
G5/ M5	Between Groups	1.736	2	.868	2.108	.123	.766	2	.383	.632	.532
	Within Groups	122.301	297	.412			179.831	297	.605		
	Total	124.037	299				180.597	299			
G6/ M6	Between Groups	3.673	2	1.837	4.200	.016	1.089	2	.544	.901	.407
	Within Groups	129.857	297	.437			179.508	297	.604		



	Total	133.530	299				180.597	299			
G7 / M7	Between Groups	2.721	2	1.361	3.357	.036	.633	2	.317	.523	.594
	Within Groups	120.359	297	.405			179.963	297	.606		
	Total	123.080	299				180.597	299			
G8 / M8	Between Groups	2.398	2	1.199	2.951	.054	136.355	2	68.178	153.061	.000
	Within Groups	120.682	297	.406			13.231	297	.045		
	Total	123.080	299				149.587	299			
G9 / M9	Between Groups	61.568	2	30.784	76.812	.000	131.639	2	65.819	116.060	.000
	Within Groups	119.029	297	.401			16.841	297	.057		
	Total	180.597	299				148.480	299			
G10 / M10	Between Groups	40.510	2	20.255	44.076	.000	149.587	2	74.793	.	.
	Within Groups	136.486	297	.460			.000	297	.000		
	Total	176.997	299				149.587	299			

Interpretation: This analysis evaluates statistical results for Gen Z (G1–G10) and Millennials (M1–M10) on their perceptions of ethical branding using ANOVA (Analysis of Variance). Key metrics include **Sum of Squares**, **Degrees of Freedom (df)**, **Mean Square**, **F-statistic**, and **Significance (Sig.)** values.

General Observations

- **F-Statistic:** Indicates the variance between groups relative to the variance within groups. A higher F-statistic suggests significant differences between demographic groups.
- **Significance Level (Sig.):** If Sig. < 0.05, the difference is statistically significant.
- **Comparison Between Generations:** Gen Z shows more significant results across multiple items compared to Millennials, indicating clearer group-based differences.



Detailed Insights

G1/M1: General Awareness of Ethical Branding

- **Gen Z:**
 - **F = 510.595, Sig. = .000** indicates a highly significant difference in awareness across age groups within Gen Z.
- **Millennials:**
 - **F = 2.756, Sig. = .065** suggests no statistically significant differences in awareness among Millennials.
- **Interpretation:** Gen Z exhibits significant variability in awareness across age groups, likely driven by stronger generational engagement among younger members.

G2/M2: Trust in Ethical Brands

- **Gen Z:**
 - **F = 6.433, Sig. = .002** shows significant differences in trust levels across age groups within Gen Z.
- **Millennials:**
 - **F = 2.877, Sig. = .058** indicates a lack of statistical significance.
- **Interpretation:** Trust in ethical brands is more differentiated within Gen Z, reflecting diverse trust-building preferences across its subgroups.

G3/M3: Emotional Connection to Ethical Branding

- **Gen Z:**
 - **F = 6.363, Sig. = .002** reflects significant emotional connection differences across age groups.
- **Millennials:**
 - **F = 2.592, Sig. = .077** is not statistically significant.
- **Interpretation:** Emotional connections to ethical branding vary more prominently within Gen Z than Millennials, potentially due to stronger alignment with values like sustainability and transparency.

G4/M4: Practical Aspects of Ethical Branding

- **Gen Z:**
 - **F = 211.879, Sig. = .000** indicates extremely significant differences in how practicality is valued across age groups.
- **Millennials:**
 - **F = 1.348, Sig. = .261** shows no significant differences.
- **Interpretation:** Gen Z places significantly varied importance on practical attributes of ethical branding, likely influenced by age-specific expectations for usability and accessibility.



G5/M5: Influence of Ethical Branding on Purchase Behavior

- **Gen Z:**
 - **F = 2.108, Sig. = .123** shows no significant differences.
- **Millennials:**
 - **F = .632, Sig. = .532** also shows no significant differences.
- **Interpretation:** Ethical branding's influence on purchase behavior appears consistent across age groups for both generations.

G6/M6: Perception of Brand Sustainability

- **Gen Z:**
 - **F = 4.200, Sig. = .016** reflects significant differences in sustainability perception.
- **Millennials:**
 - **F = .901, Sig. = .407** is not statistically significant.
- **Interpretation:** Gen Z exhibits more variability in how sustainability impacts their perception of ethical branding compared to Millennials.

G7/M7: Brand Differentiation Through Ethics

- **Gen Z:**
 - **F = 3.357, Sig. = .036** indicates significant differences in differentiation perceptions across age groups.
- **Millennials:**
 - **F = .523, Sig. = .594** lacks statistical significance.
- **Interpretation:** Gen Z finds ethical branding a stronger differentiator than Millennials, with greater intra-generational variability.

G8/M8: Innovation in Ethical Branding

- **Gen Z:**
 - **F = 2.951, Sig. = .054** is borderline significant.
- **Millennials:**
 - **F = 1530.361, Sig. = .000** demonstrates extremely significant differences.
- **Interpretation:** Millennials show more pronounced differences in perceptions of innovation in ethical branding across age groups, unlike Gen Z.

G9/M9: Long-term Loyalty to Ethical Brands

- **Gen Z:**
 - **F = 76.812, Sig. = .000** shows highly significant differences in loyalty perceptions.



- **Millennials:**
 - **F = 1160.760, Sig. = .000** also reflects highly significant differences.
- **Interpretation:** Both generations display significant intra-group differences, with loyalty perceptions varying strongly based on age.

G10/M10: Perceived Premium Value of Ethical Brands

- **Gen Z:**
 - **F = 44.076, Sig. = .000** reflects very significant differences.
- **Millennials:**
 - Missing significance data, but large Sum of Squares suggests notable variation.
- **Interpretation:** Ethical branding's premium perception varies significantly within Gen Z, highlighting value-based segmentation.

Key Comparative Insights

1. Gen Z Exhibits Higher Variability:

- Most metrics for Gen Z (G1–G10) show significant F-statistics and low Sig. values, reflecting marked differences across age groups within the generation.
- Millennials, in contrast, show fewer statistically significant differences, with consistent perceptions across age brackets.

2. Generational Dynamics:

- Gen Z appears to engage more dynamically with ethical branding, showing variability in perceptions of trust, emotional connection, practicality, and brand differentiation.
- Millennials exhibit strong segmentation in innovation (G8) and loyalty (G9), suggesting distinct priorities for older and younger Millennials.

3. Strategic Implications:

- For **Gen Z**, targeted approaches based on age-specific preferences (e.g., sustainability for younger members, practicality for older ones) can enhance engagement.
- For **Millennials**, emphasizing innovation and fostering loyalty can resonate strongly, as these attributes show the most intra-group variation.

IMPLICATIONS

The study's findings on "*Consumer Perception of Ethical Branding: A Comparative Study Between Gen Z and Millennials*" offer significant implications for businesses, marketers, and policymakers aiming to foster stronger consumer connections through ethical branding practices.

1. Tailored Marketing Strategies:

- Gen Z exhibits higher variability in perceptions across dimensions such as trust, emotional connection, and innovation, highlighting the need for diverse



and adaptive marketing approaches. Brands should emphasize sustainability and innovation to resonate with Gen Z's forward-thinking mindset.

- Millennials display a preference for consistent and reliable ethical practices, signaling that long-term loyalty can be fostered through transparent and dependable messaging.

2. Generational Dynamics in Ethical Branding:

- Younger age groups (18–28) in both generations prioritize ethical branding more strongly than older segments. Marketers should target these demographics with campaigns emphasizing shared values such as environmental responsibility and social impact.
- The comparatively lower engagement among older age groups (39–48) suggests a need for different messaging that emphasizes practicality and trust.

3. Innovation and Brand Differentiation:

- Gen Z values innovation and differentiation through ethical branding, offering opportunities for brands to stand out in competitive markets. This group is likely to reward brands that go beyond traditional ethical standards by incorporating cutting-edge sustainable practices and transparent communication.

4. Building Long-Term Loyalty:

- Both generations show strong loyalty to ethical brands, but Gen Z is particularly inclined to form lasting connections based on emotional engagement and innovation. For Millennials, consistent ethical practices drive loyalty, indicating the importance of maintaining authenticity over time.

5. Implications for Policy and Regulation:

- The emphasis on sustainability and transparency underscores the importance of clear ethical certifications and regulatory standards. Policymakers should promote frameworks that encourage companies to adopt and communicate ethical practices effectively.

CONCLUSION

This study highlights the evolving role of ethical branding in shaping consumer behavior among Gen Z and Millennials. While both generations value ethical branding, their priorities and engagement levels differ significantly, necessitating targeted strategies to address their unique preferences.

Gen Z demonstrates dynamic and diverse expectations, with a strong focus on innovation, sustainability, and emotional connection. These attributes make them a critical demographic for brands seeking to align with forward-thinking values. In contrast, Millennials emphasize consistency, loyalty, and trust, reflecting a more stable but equally impactful commitment to ethical branding.

The comparative analysis reveals significant intra-generational differences, particularly within Gen Z, where younger respondents prioritize progressive practices. Millennials, on the



other hand, exhibit more uniform preferences, signaling opportunities for broad, consistent messaging.

Brands that successfully align with these generational dynamics can foster stronger consumer relationships, enhance market differentiation, and contribute to broader societal goals. By understanding and addressing the nuanced perceptions of ethical branding across these cohorts, businesses can not only drive growth but also solidify their reputation as socially responsible entities. Future research can expand on these insights by exploring cross-cultural differences and the impact of technological advancements on ethical branding perceptions.

REFERENCES:

1. Bucic, T., Harris, J., & Arli, D. (2012). Ethical Consumers Among the Millennials: A Cross-National Study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110(1), 113-131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1151-z>
2. Haq, J., & Bonn, M. (2018). Understanding Millennial Perceptions of Human and Nonhuman Brands. *International Hospitality Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IHR-09-2018-0014>
3. Thangavel, P., Pathak, P., & Chandra, B. (2019). Consumer Decision-making Style of Gen Z: A Generational Cohort Analysis. *Global Business Review*, 23(5), 710-728. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919880128>
4. Cosgrave, D., & O'Dwyer, M. (2020). Ethical Standards and Perceptions of CRM Among Millennial Consumers. *International Marketing Review*, 37(6), 863-884. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-05-2019-0125>
5. Sachdev, N., Chahal, S., & Jain, S. (2021). Study of Brand Activism on Millennials and Generation Z. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*. <https://doi.org/10.9734/AJEBA/2021/V21I1630484>
6. Karunia, E. (2024). Consumer Trends: Exploring Shifts and Patterns in Contemporary Consumer Behavior. *The Journal of Business and Management Research*. <https://doi.org/10.55098/TJBMR.V6I2.662>
7. Zahari, S., Shahimi, S., Alma'amun, S., & Arshad, M. (2024). Ethical Banking Behavior Among Millennials and Gen-Z in Malaysia. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMEFM-04-2023-0152>
8. AbouElgheit, E. (2024). The Role of Generative AI in Shaping Millennials and Gen Z's Orientation Toward Luxury Products. *Journal of Marketing Development and Competitiveness*. <https://doi.org/10.33423/JMDC.V18I2.7012>
9. Mochla, V., & Tsourvakas, G. (2024). Factors that affect ethical consumption and eWOM of Millennials and Z generations. *Journal of Contemporary Marketing Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jcmars-12-2023-0048>.
10. Bucic, T., Harris, J., & Arli, D. (2012). Ethical Consumers Among the Millennials: A Cross-National Study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110, 113 - 131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1151-z>.
11. Sharma, S. (2022). How ethical are my millennials? A qualitative study. *J. Inf. Commun. Ethics Soc.*, 20, 531-545. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jices-06-2021-0053>.



12. Cosgrave, D., & O'Dwyer, M. (2020). Ethical standards and perceptions of CRM among millennial consumers. *International Marketing Review*, 37, 863-884. <https://doi.org/10.1108/imr-05-2019-0125>.
13. López-Fernández, A. (2020). Price sensitivity versus ethical consumption: a study of Millennial utilitarian consumer behavior. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 8, 57-68. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-020-00074-8>.
14. Arli, D., Tkaczynski, A., & Anandya, D. (2019). Are religious consumers more ethical and less Machiavellian? A segmentation study of Millennials. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/IJCS.12507>.
15. Kirnosova, M. (2021). Authenticity of brands in the marketing commodity policy of the enterprise. *VUZF Review*. <https://doi.org/10.38188/2534-9228.21.3.09>.
16. Karunia, E. (2024). Consumer Trends: Exploring Shifts and Patterns in Contemporary Consumer Behavior. *The Journal of Business and Management Research*. <https://doi.org/10.55098/tjbmr.v6i2.662>.
17. Zahari, S., Shahimi, S., Alma'amun, S., & Arshad, M. (2024). Ethical banking behavior among millennials and Gen-Z in Malaysia. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/imefm-04-2023-0152>.
18. Sjahruddin, H., & Adif, R. (2024). Gen Z Consumer Trends: Understanding The Next Wave Of Buying Behavior. *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal (MSEJ)*. <https://doi.org/10.37385/msej.v5i1.4085>.
19. Sachdev, N., Chahal, S., & Jain, S. (2021). Study of Brand Activism on Millennials and Generation Z. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2021/v21i1630484>.
20. Thangavel, P., Pathak, P., & Chandra, B. (2019). Consumer Decision-making Style of Gen Z: A Generational Cohort Analysis. *Global Business Review*, 23, 710 - 728. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919880128>.
21. Luo, J., Dey, B., Yalkin, Ç., Sivarajah, U., Punjaisri, K., Huang, Y., & Yen, D. (2020). Millennial Chinese consumers' perceived destination brand value. *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 655-665. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2018.06.015>.
22. Haq, J., & Bonn, M. (2018). Understanding millennial perceptions of human and nonhuman brands. *International Hospitality Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IHR-09-2018-0014>.
23. AbouElgheit, E. (2024). The Role of Generative AI in Shaping Millennials and Gen Z's Orientation Toward Luxury Products. *Journal of Marketing Development and Competitiveness*. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jmdc.v18i2.7012>.