

## PERCEPTIONS OF MILLENNIALS' MEDIA ATTITUDES AND USE: A COMPARISON OF U.S. AND INDIAN MILLENNIALS

*RAJESH IYER, Bradley University*

*JACQUELINE K. EASTMAN, Georgia Southern University*

*HEATHER MONTEIRO, University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

*HEIDI ROTTIER, Bradley University*

*SEEMA SINGH ZOKARKAR, Balaji Institute of Telecom and Management*

---

*Previous research finds demographic characteristics affects perceptions of value and informativeness of advertising, thereby impacting the perception of media relevance. The purpose of this study is to update Wolburg and Pokrywczynski's (2001) work by comparing U.S. and Indian Millennials' perceptions of relatability of media depictions, ad informativeness, and differences by gender. We find multiple significant differences between the U.S. and Indian Millennial groups. Indian Millennials were significant more likely to be offended by ads, think ads increase prices, and dislike ads more than U.S. Millennials. U.S. Millennials, while not entirely positive in their attitude towards ads, perceived ads to be more informative and credible than their Indian counterparts. The managerial implications are that there are significant differences among Millennials between cultures that strongly impact their reaction to advertisements. These significant differences may affect the efficacy of advertisements to different groups.*

---

### INTRODUCTION

There are significant attitudinal and behavioral differences among generational cohorts typically attributed to pivotal events that occur in the developmental age of the group of individuals and the effect of current events on the same group (Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001; Norum, 2003; Moore & Carpenter, 2008) that are considered to persist for a lifetime (Jackson, Stoel, & Brantley, 2011). Schewe, Meredith, and Noble (2000) suggest that generational cohorts are a more efficient way to segment markets than just by age, as these different cohorts have been impacted in a similar way by external events. The most recent generational cohort to reach adulthood is Millennials (also called Generation Y), individuals born between 1977 and 1994 (Morton, 2002). In the U.S., they represent approximately 60 million (Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999) to 81 million individuals with an estimated spending power of \$1.3 trillion (Littman, 2008). Given their size and purchasing power, U.S. Millennials will have a significant impact on the economy (McCrea,

2011; Martin & Turley, 2004; Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001). As Millennials should not be considered one similar group, but a collection of unique submarkets (Debevec, Schewe, Madden, & Diamond, 2013), research is needed to gain a better understanding of their motivations and perceptions, especially for the submarket of college-aged Millennials (Noble, Haytko, & Phillips, 2009; Lodes & Buff, 2009).

In the U.S., there are many unique characteristics of the Millennial generation including a larger number of minorities, more racial diversity (Morton, 2002; Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999; Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001), diverse family structures, frequent and early computer literacy, and the ubiquity of media and marketing from a very young age (Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999; Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001; Morton, 2002). U.S. Millennials respond differently to ads than previous generations and have been exposed to ads through different media than past generations (Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999; Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001; McCrea, 2011). Additionally, media fragmentation and active channel surfing has made communicating with Millennials more difficult (Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999; Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001).

While the marketing literature discusses differences between generational cohorts (Eastman & Liu, 2012), there is little literature examining differences among a generational cohort in other countries, such as in the area of advertising. While Millennials in the U.S. make up approximately one-quarter of the U.S. population (McCrea 2011; Martin & Turley 2004), Millennials may be an even larger segment of the population in other countries, such as India, where 65% of its estimated population of 1.2 billion (CIA, 2014) is under the age of 35 (Arora, 2013) and 50% is under the age of 25 (Malik, 2012). The Indian Millennial market is critical for study as it is one of the largest market segments in the world (Malik, 2012). India is also relevant for study due to its transition from socialism to a market economy in the early 1990s (CIA, 2014; Khare, 2011; Lysonski & Durvasula, 2013). While the size and growth of the Indian marketplace alone would be of interest to marketers, the economic changes that have taken place during Indian Millennials' youth could have significant generational cohort effects with long-range impact (Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001; Norum, 2003; Moore & Carpenter, 2008; Jackson et al., 2011; Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999; Schewe et al., 2000).

Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) conducted an empirical investigation of relevance of depictions in media and the informational value of various media types (television, newspaper, magazine, Internet, radio, direct mail, posters, and billboards) for Millennial college students. They found that demographic characteristics such as gender affected perceptions of the value of advertising and the informativeness of advertising; thereby impacting the perception of relevance of various media sources (Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001). More specifically, depictions in advertising were overall rated significantly worse than depictions of television or movies (Wolburg and Pokrywczynski, 2001). Since Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) study, the Internet's reach has expanded. To better understand Millennials, researchers and professionals must devote more attention to the knowledge, attitudes and behavior of this generation (Kilian, Hennigs, & Langner, 2012) and beyond the U.S. Millennial.

The purpose of this study is to update Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) work by examining current college-aged Millennials' perceptions of media depictions, ad informativeness, and differences by gender. We extend their study by investigating Millennials' attitude towards advertising, and more specifically whether they are offended by ads, whether ads help in their purchase decision, the effect of ads on prices, and the perceived truthfulness, accuracy and credibility of ads. We also address the gap in academic research on the Indian Millennial. There is little literature examining Indian consumers' attitudes toward advertising (Hilliard, Matulich, Haytko, & Rustogi, 2012). As the Indian Millennial cohort represents significant global buying power, it is important to understand how they may differ from U.S. Millennials in their perceptions of advertising. This research contributes to the literature through updating Wolburg and Pokrywczynski's (2001) research to include newer forms of advertising (blogs and social media), and extends it through consideration of additional advertising variables, and by comparing U.S. and Indian Millennials. This paper will first discuss the literature and research questions, present the methodology and results, and finally address the marketing implications.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

We first discuss generational cohorts and the U.S. Millennial generation and the Indian millennial generation. Then we present the relevant literature on advertising informativeness, web advertising and social media, and our research questions relating to gender and Millennials' perceptions of advertising. We then discuss Indian perceptions of media. Finally, we present our research questions relating differences in media and advertising perceptions.

### Generational Cohorts and Millennials

Generational cohorts are often defined as individuals born in a span of 20-25 years; however, this varies in length and is often more affected by external events that have a defining power over a generation (Beldona, Nusair, & Demicco, 2009, Eastman & Liu 2012; Schewe et al., 2000). Wolburg and Pokrywczynski

(2001) suggest three major influences found in generational marketing research: life stage, current conditions, and cohort experiences. The varying characteristics between cohorts lead to differentiation in terms of market segmentation (Norum, 2003; Schewe et al., 2000; Eastman & Liu, 2012). Because each cohort exhibits unique characteristics, it is essential to study different generations at varying ages to develop accurate research and effective marketing to fit the needs of each generation (Roberts & Manolis, 2000).

### **U.S. Millennials**

U.S. Millennials are known for their technological expertise and are considered the first high-tech generation (Norum, 2003; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010; Lenhart, Purcell, Smith, & Zickuhr, 2010; Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010; Jackson et al., 2011; McCrea, 2011). Millennials are used to multitasking, which not only allow them to have an efficient and practical use of time, but also makes them more impatient (McCrea, 2011). They tend to be very pragmatic with short attention spans, a high need for structure, and low tolerance for ambiguity (Bell, Connell, & McMinn, 2011). U.S. Millennial characteristics include a very practical and realistic outlook on life including fiscal responsibility (Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999). They are also perceived as consumption-oriented and sophisticated shoppers (Jackson et al., 2011; Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001), that are media and technologically savvy, and able to see through advertising tactics (Noble et al., 2009; McCrea, 2011). They are also seen as the most protected and indulged generation, with an inability to delay gratification (McCrea, 2011). Finally, social networks are vital to Millennials (Hewlett, Sherbin, & Sumberg, 2009) as this group is socially motivated and have an immense need for affiliation (Borges, Manuel, Elam, & Jones, 2010).

### **Indian Millennials**

Indian Millennials share many characteristics with U.S. Millennials including optimism, an entrepreneurial nature (Telefonica, 2013), and generally are positive and enthusiastic (Express News Service, 2013). Like U.S. Millennials, Indian Millennials are considered digital natives who are much more skilled at the

Internet than their parents' generation (Mitra, 2011). Though the Indian millennial has acculturated to some Western ideals, such as professional dress (Mitra, 2011), they are struggling to balance consumerism while still observing the cultural ideal of self-denial (Dhillon, 2005; Jin, Chansarkar, & Kondap 2006). As the Indian Millennial cohort did not experience the poverty-stricken years of protectionist economy that existed until the start of the 1990s (Dhillon, 2005), they are starting to embrace consumerism causing an avalanche of shopping malls, luxury brand shops, and significant increases in brand variations (Dhillon, 2005). Khare (2011) suggests that while young people in India seem to endorse Western values, brand meanings continue to be determined by family traditions, national traditions, and group values. Assuming all consumers across the country of India are similar and will respond in a similar way to a marketing campaign, however, is a mistake (Jin & Son, 2013; Khairullah, 2011). There are many different sub-cultures within India, each with distinct beliefs, norms, values, and behaviors (Banerjee, 2008). Marketers trying to reach the Indian market need to take this into account when marketing to the Indian market (Jin & Son, 2013; Khairullah & Khairullah, 2009).

Finally, in comparing India to the U.S. and what cultural differences may mean for advertising, India is significantly higher in power distance than the United States, suggesting that India has a great acceptance of unequal rights and expect communication to be more top down than those in the U.S. would (Hofstede, 2016). While the U.S. scores much higher than India on individualism and India illustrates collectivist tendencies in their interdependence with family, friends and social networks, there is an aspect of individualism in India, as many believe that the individual is responsible for how they live their life (Hofstede, 2016). This would suggest the need to address this need for interdependence and belonging in advertising. A final cultural dimension that differs greatly from the U.S. is the indulgence dimension with India being a more restrained society focusing on social norms while the U.S. is more indulgent where there is less control of desires and impulses (Hofstede, 2016). These cultural differences

between the U.S. and India may be reflected in how Millennials in each of these countries perceive advertising.

### **Advertising to Millennials**

One difficulty in advertising to Millennials is getting their attention in an increasingly cluttered, fragmented media and keeping their attention (Littman, 2008). "The Millennials are one of the first generations to be targeted by advertisers since they were in Pampers; their parents have made them aware that they've been targeted, and have given them media education" (Littman, 2008, p. 80). Empirical research has shown that Millennials have overall negative attitudes of advertising, particularly in terms of believability and trustworthiness (Beard, 2003) with the most common attitude of Millennials being cynicism (Bennett & Lachowetz, 2004).

Research investigating this generation's attitude toward advertising commonly points to a belief that advertising is manipulative, untruthful (Beard 2003) and, in some cases, irritating (Chatterjee, 2008). Though they do have a more positive attitude towards advertising in general than their Baby Boomer parents (Loroz & Helgeson, 2013), other research shows that overall advertising is still an effective strategy to reach Millennials (Beard 2003; Chatterjee 2008). For Millennials, celebrity endorsements, even unfamiliar ones, can still lead to positive evaluations of advertising (McCormick, 2016). Thus, Millennials have reactions to media that differ from previous generations. Finally, gender has been shown to significantly effect attitude towards advertising (Brackett & Carr, 2001) and perception of advertising value (Shavitt, Lowrey, & Haefner, 1998).

The most effective form of advertising for Millennials is positive word of mouth (Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999; Morton, 2002), which today is often coming from social media and websites (Jackson et al., 2011; Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2011; Howe & Strauss, 2000). Compared to earlier generations (Lenhart et al., 2010), this generation is characterized by ubiquitous Internet and cell phone ownership and use (Lenhart et al., 2010; McCrea, 2011). Research suggests that Facebook advertising can have a positive influence on South African

Millennials purchase intentions and behaviors (Duffett, 2015). For marketers to be successful reaching Millennials, their efforts must respond to Millennials' specific tastes and close ties to the Internet (Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999; McCrea, 2011). Despite Millennials doubting the truthfulness of advertisements and believing that advertisements lead to higher product prices, research suggests that advertising remains to be an effective strategy for reaching them (Beard, 2003). In particular, this cohort seems to respond particularly well to ads displaying humor and a sense of local community (Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999; Gronbach, 2000). Bennett and Lachowetz (2004) suggest Millennials may have lost interest in traditional advertising and require unique marketing platforms such as lifestyle marketing (LM), large-scale events, tours or festivals. It becomes critical for marketers to engage Millennials wherever they are (Littman, 2008) as marketing opportunities via digital avenues are expanding (Loroz & Helgeson, 2013).

### **Advertising Informativeness**

There are four primary values that affect consumers' attitude toward any advertising medium: credibility, entertainment, irritation, and informativeness (Koo, Knight, Yang, & Xiang, 2012). This paper focuses on advertising informativeness, i.e., advertising which provides helpful information (Koo et al., 2012). Previous empirical studies have shown that ad informativeness leads to higher advertising value and attitudes toward advertising (Brackett & Carr, 2001) with significant differences in attitudes based on demographics and exposure amount (King, Reid, Tinkham, & Pokrywczynski, 1987).

Research has concluded that advertising informativeness is most closely related to the value of advertising by Millennials, with entertainment shown to be a close second (Ducoffe, 1995; McCrea, 2011). Perceptions of advertising informativeness may help decrease the perception of deceptiveness (Ducoffe, 1995) which is important given Millennials' concerns with advertising (Beard, 2003). Different media types including posters, newspapers, magazines, billboards, radio, television, internet, blogs, and social media, exhibit various

perceptions of advertising informativeness. Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) found television to be rated highest, followed by newspapers, magazines, the web and radio (with billboards and posters rated lowest). Brackett and Carr (2001) ranked television as first most informative media, magazines and newspapers as the second most informative media, and radio tied with internet for the third most informative media.

In looking at gender differences in advertising informativeness, few studies had looked specifically at Millennials. Wolin and Korgaonkar (2005) studied a wide age range sample, and found that males, compared to females see web advertising as more enjoyable, useful, informative, and enjoyable than newspaper ads, and more useful than radio ads. Phillip and Suri (2004) found that women were more favorable than men in considering marketers' emails as a source of product information. In terms of Millennials specifically, Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) found that females perceive some media (the web, posters, and radio somewhat) to be more informative than males do.

### **Attitude Towards Advertising**

There have been several research streams devoted to attitude towards advertising including emotions, product life cycles, believability and demographics. Emotions can create a more positive attitude toward advertisements which than can be transferred to the brand itself (Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Ray & Batra, 1983; Stout & Rust, 1993) and lead to more favorable attitudes and subsequent purchase intentions (Batra & Ray, 1986; Edell & Burke, 1987; Stout & Rust, 1993). Research reveals that current users of a product or brand maintain more positive attitudes than former users or those who never used that product or brand (Stout & Rust, 1993).

### **Digital Advertising and Social Media to Millennials**

The internet is a central element in the lives of Millennials (Lenhart et al., 2010). In this age group, two-thirds access the internet with a laptop/netbook, 53% with a desktop computer, and 93% of them own a cell phone (Lenhart et

al., 2010). While Tanyel, Stuart, and Griffin (2013) note that Millennials may be more negative towards Internet advertising, Smith (2012) suggests that Millennials have a preference for online advertising. Smith (2011) recommends the use of coupons, side-panel ads, YouTube ads, and email updates are preferred by a majority of Millennials surveyed. Keith and Bush (2010) suggest that the synergy of interactive online mediums (social networks, email, and text messages) combined with traditional media will be the most effective in targeting Millennials.

Millennials are also influenced by online reviews (Smith, 2012) and this form of word of mouth has been shown to be much more influential on the current generation than traditional recommendations (Senecal & Nantel, 2004; Smith, 2011; Smith, 2012). For example, 66% of heavy social media using Millennials have recruited their peers to visit favorite sites (Littman, 2008). Finally, one of the most significant advantages of electronic or online commerce is the ability to offer a more personalized offering and relationship (Wind & Rangaswamy, 2001). In looking at gender differences of Millennials with online marketing communications, McMahan, Hovland, and McMillan (2009) find that while there are no significant differences between genders in terms of cognitive needs online, women may be more responsive than men with emotional online content suggesting the need to customize online content by gender.

Millennials exhibit patterns of social media use unique from the preceding generation (Kilian et al., 2012). Social media networks are vital for Millennials (Hewlett et al., 2009) as this generation is particularly socially motivated (Martin & Turley, 2004). This generation is highly influenced by social media (Kilian et al., 2012) in that social media peer group influence has socialization and marketing impact (Lachance, Beaudoin, & Robitaille, 2003, Pate & Adams, 2013). Social networking on the Internet has been related to the need for self-efficacy, the need for belonging, cognition, and collective self-esteem particularly for college-aged individuals (Gangadharbatla, 2008). Millennials are more likely to purchase a product if it was "liked" by their friends on social networking sites (Pate & Adams, 2013).

Millennials consider social networking sites as providing unbiased, objective and comparative information about products (Truong & Simmons, 2010). While Millennials believe that social media is entertaining, interactive, and user-friendly, less than a quarter of them use it as a news source (Robinson, Keith, & Bush, 2010).

### The Indian Market and Media

Research shows multiple factors affect the Indian market response to advertising campaigns including brand origin (Jin, Chansakar & Kondap, 2006) and the consumer's level of acculturation (Khairullah, 2011). Television has been shown to exhibit a significant influence in the consumption behavior of Indians as television access and use is widespread to most Indian homes (Khairullah and Khairullah, 2013). Indian consumers have deeply embraced social media (Kulkarni, 2012). Consumers in India use social media for many marketing related activities including dealing with customer service needs, sharing service and product reviews with other consumers (Kulkarni, 2012), and networking through LinkedIn and Facebook (Mitra, 2009; Mitra, 2012). India has the largest LinkedIn membership outside the U.S. with about 2 million registered users (Mitra, 2009), while Facebook has roughly 45 million registered users in India (Mitra, 2012). As there is little in the literature examining Indian millennial media perceptions, we pose our research ideas as research questions, rather than hypotheses.

### Research Questions

*RQ1.* How do the U.S. and Indian Millennials evaluate the depictions by the media that they can relate to?

*RQ2.* Are there any gender differences about media depictions for U.S. and Indian Millennials?

*RQ3.* How do the U.S. and Indian Millennials evaluate ad informativeness?

*RQ4.* Are there any gender differences about ad informativeness for U.S. and Indian Millennials?

*RQ5.* How do the U.S. and Indian Millennials evaluate their attitude towards advertising?

*RQ6.* Are there any gender differences about attitude towards advertising for U.S. and Indian Millennials?

## METHODOLOGY

For the purposes of both studies, we looked at ten media sources (which included the eight media sources that Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) examined in their study, and added two new sources: blogs and social media. These media sources were scaled on a seven point Likert scale (not informative at all to very informative). To measure media depictions, we used the same four items as Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001), i.e., “\_\_\_\_\_ (movies, television, magazines, advertising) depict people in their 20s that I can relate to” but scaled it on a seven point Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree). Attitude towards advertising was measured using scales developed by Peterson, Wilson and Brown (1992), Beltramini (1982,1988), and Beltramini and Stafford (1993). These scales were adapted to fit the study.

### U.S. Sample

Similar to Babin, Hardesty, and Suter (2003) and Iyer and Muncy (2016), data were collected by students in a Social Media course as a part of course credit at a private Midwestern university of about 6,000 students. Each student administered the questionnaire to 10 respondents between the ages of 18 and 22 as a part of the project. The respondents filled out the questionnaire using Qualtrics (an online data collection) software. Further, the students submitted the first name and email address of each respondent to verify participation. This resulted in a non-probability convenience sample of 212 respondents. After excluding incomplete or unusable responses (those outside the range of 18-24), the final sample size for analyses was 204, a 96% usable response rate.

As illustrated in Table 1, our sample skewed female (65%) similar to other Millennial studies including Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) with 57% female, Beard (2003) with 63.8%

**TABLE 1:  
Sample Characteristics**

Age	Gender	Member of Greek Organization	Number of Hours Employed	Number of Handheld Devices
<b>USA Sample Characteristics</b>				
18 = 7%	Male = 35%	Yes = 36%	0 hours = 38%	1-2 = 93%
19 = 13%	Female = 65%	No = 64%	1-10 hours = 27%	3-4 = 7%
20 = 23%			11-20 hours = 18%	
21 = 39%			21-30 hours = 13%	
22 = 18%			30 + hours = 4%	
<b>Indian Sample Characteristics</b>				
20 = 4%	Male = 78%		Not Employed = 95%	
21 = 21%	Female = 22%		Employed = 5%	
22 = 28%				
23 = 24%				
24 = 14%				
25 = 9%				

female, and Koo et al. (2012) with 88% (USA) and 68% (Korea) female. The median age of our sample was 21. As our study was focused on college-aged Millennials, the use of a student sample was appropriate (Calder, Phillips, & Tybout, 1981). Noble et al. (2009) recommends examining a narrower group of Millennial subjects as college-aged Millennials (ages 18-22 years old) may consume differently than other Millennials and represent huge potential as a market segment (Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001).

**Indian Sample**

Following the same process as with the U.S. sample data collection, data were collected by students in a Business Management course as a part of course credit at a private university in the western part of India. Each student administered the questionnaire to 5 respondents between the ages of 18 and 25. The respondents filled out the questionnaire using Qualtrics (an online data collection) software. Further, the students submitted the first name and email address of each respondent to verify participation. This resulted in a nonprobability convenience sample of 174 respondents. After excluding incomplete or unusable responses (those outside the range of 18-25), the final

sample size for analyses was 154, an 88.5% usable response rate.

As illustrated in Table 1, our Indian sample was skewed male (78%) with a median age of 22, and most not employed (95%). While our study had a majority of male respondents, this is characteristic of an Indian college student population; nationally females make up 41.5% of Indian college population with the majority of Indian women majoring in the humanities (Najar, 2013). In terms of their Internet use, the majority used the Internet daily for at least five hours a week (only 25% used the Internet 5 hours or less). The majority of the sample uses Facebook, but they purchase online infrequently (the median response was one to two times a year).

**RESULTS**

**Media Depictions**

To address RQ1 (how do U.S. and Indian Millennials evaluate depictions by media that they felt they can relate to), the respondents rated how well advertising depicted people of their age group relative to other primary sources of entertainment and information (movies, TV programming, and magazines). As

shown in Table 2, the U.S. respondents rated TV programming (Mean=4.17, s.d. = 1.52) and movies (Mean=4, s.d. = 1.56) higher than magazines (Mean=3.46, s.d. =1.52) or advertising in general (Mean=3.50, s.d. =1.52). Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) also found that movies and television were rated significantly better than magazines or advertising in general for their depictions of people in their 20s that the respondents could relate to. In comparison, the Indian respondents rated advertising in general (mean = 4.41, s.d. = 1.54) higher than magazines (mean = 4.34, s.d. = 1.59), TV programming (mean = 4.30, s.d. = 1.62) and movies (mean = 4.30, s.d. = 1.62). Interestingly, 28% of the Indian respondents felt that movies did not depict their generation in ways they can relate to, while 25% were neutral. 27% of the respondents felt that TV programming did not depict their generation in ways they could relate to, while 25% were neutral. In comparison,

26% (23% neutral) of the Indian sample felt that magazines and 24% (21% neutral) of the sample felt that advertising in general did not depict their generation in ways they could relate to.

**Gender Differences for Media Depictions**

In response to RQ2 (gender differences in media depictions), there were no significant differences between males and females in terms of media depictions within country for either the U.S. or Indian Millennial sample (see Table 3). In comparison, Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) found gender differences only for TV depictions with females rating it higher than men.

**Country Differences for Media Depictions**

In looking at differences by country, Indian Millennials see magazines and advertising in

**TABLE 2:**  
**Differences between US and Indian Millennials on Media Depictions**  
**(7 point scale; 1=Strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)**

	n	US Mean	S.D.	n	India Mean	S.D.	t-values
Movie depictions	206	4.17	1.508	161	4.26	1.645	-0.58
TV depictions	205	4.00	1.558	158	4.29	1.637	-1.7
Magazine depictions	206	3.46	1.522	161	4.34	1.609	<b>-5.36</b>
Depictions of advertising in general	207	3.50	1.523	159	4.42	1.592	<b>-5.6</b>

t-values in bold denote significance at the 0.05 level.

**TABLE 3:**  
**Differences between US and Indian Millennials based on Gender on Media Depictions**  
**(7 point scale; 1=Strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)**

	Gender	n	US Mean	S.D.	n	India Mean	S.D.	t-values
Movie depictions	Male	72	4.13	1.491	130	4.23	1.616	-0.46
	Female	134	4.19	1.523	31	4.39	1.783	-0.64
TV depictions	Male	72	4.00	1.565	127	4.19	1.592	-0.81
	Female	133	4.01	1.559	31	4.71	1.774	<b>-2.2</b>
Magazine depictions	Male	72	3.42	1.508	130	4.28	1.550	<b>-3.81</b>
	Female	134	3.49	1.535	31	4.61	1.838	<b>-3.55</b>
Depictions of advertising in general	Male	72	3.56	1.500	128	4.45	1.556	<b>-3.93</b>
	Female	135	3.47	1.540	31	4.29	1.755	<b>-2.62</b>

t-values in bold denote significance at the 0.05 level.



general as depicting people like them more than U.S. Millennials and this relationship was stronger for both males and females. Indian females (not males) also saw TV depictions being more like them than U.S. females.

**Advertising Informativeness**

To address the RQ3 (what information does advertising hold for Millennials across different media), the respondents rated advertising informativeness across major media. Using ANOVA to test for the differences across media ratings for each country, Internet, TV and newspapers were the top three sources for the U.S. sample, in that order. Billboards and blogs were rated the lowest (see Table 4). This is similar to Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) who found TV to be rated the highest followed by newspapers, magazines, the web and radio, with billboards and posters rated lowest. For the Indian Millennials, Internet, TV and magazines were the top three sources, with posters, billboards and radio rated the lowest (see Table 4). For both the U.S. and Indian Millennial sample, the results emphasize the power of the Internet amongst Millennials regardless of country.

**Gender Differences about Advertising Informativeness**

To address RQ4 (evaluating gender differences in perceptions of advertising informativeness), ratings of advertising informativeness were

analyzed by gender for each country. U.S. females rated each medium more informative than males, except for posters. Significant differences between genders were found for magazines, radio, TV and direct mail (see Table 5). This differed from Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) who found females rated only the web and posters more informative than males, suggesting that perceptions of advertising informativeness by gender may have changed. Indian females rated each medium more informative than males. Significant differences among gender in India were found for posters, newspapers and billboards (see Table 5).

**Country Differences by Ad Informativeness**

As shown in Table 4, there were significant differences in ad informativeness between Indian and U.S. Millennials. While Indian Millennials saw posters, billboards, direct mail, and blogs as significantly more informative, U.S. Millennials saw magazines, TV, Internet, and social media as significantly more informative than Indian Millennials did.

**Attitude Towards Advertising**

In extending the examination of Millennials perceptions of advertising beyond Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001), this study evaluated Millennials attitude towards advertising in RQ5. As shown in Table 6, the U.S. respondents provided information about various

**TABLE 4:**  
**Differences between US and Indian Millennials on Ad Informativeness**  
**(7 point scale; 1=Strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)**

	n	US Mean	S.D.	n	India Mean	S.D.	t-values
Posters	205	4.84	1.304	160	3.83	1.768	<b>6.334</b>
Newspapers	205	5.40	1.251	160	5.24	1.789	1.05
Magazines	205	5.02	1.230	159	5.22	1.598	-1.32
Billboards	204	4.33	1.391	159	4.62	1.444	<b>-1.92</b>
Radio	204	5.10	1.288	158	4.74	1.485	2.483
TV	204	5.59	1.198	159	5.28	1.638	<b>2.125</b>
Directmail	205	4.70	1.605	160	5.05	1.663	<b>-2.05</b>
Internet	204	5.61	1.310	160	5.52	1.578	0.621
Blogs	205	4.35	1.509	157	4.94	1.588	<b>-3.6</b>
Social Media	204	4.74	1.413	160	5.02	1.710	-1.7

t-values in bold denote significance at the 0.05 level.

**TABLE 5:**  
**Differences between US and Indian Millennials based on Gender on Ad Informativeness**  
**(7 point scale; 1=Strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)**

	Gender	n	US Mean	S.D.	n	India Mean	S.D.	t-values
Posters	Male	71	4.96	1.325	127	3.92	1.811	<b>4.229</b>
	Female	134	4.78	1.294	33	3.45	1.563	<b>5.064</b>
Newspapers	Male	71	5.23	1.333	128	5.10	1.839	0.499
	Female	134	5.50	1.200	32	5.78	1.475	-1.14
Magazines	Male	71	4.85	1.411	126	5.14	1.648	-1.28
	Female	134	5.12	1.117	33	5.52	1.372	-1.74
Billboards	Male	70	4.24	1.498	126	4.52	1.484	-1.27
	Female	134	4.37	1.336	33	4.97	1.237	<b>-2.33</b>
Radio	Male	71	4.86	1.552	125	4.60	1.503	1.147
	Female	133	5.23	1.107	33	5.27	1.306	-0.18
TV	Male	71	5.45	1.422	126	5.19	1.609	1.136
	Female	133	5.67	1.057	33	5.61	1.731	0.266
Directmail	Male	71	4.68	1.795	127	5.05	1.637	-1.48
	Female	134	4.71	1.501	33	5.06	1.784	-1.16
Internet	Male	70	5.50	1.316	127	5.47	1.563	0.125
	Female	134	5.67	1.308	33	5.70	1.649	-0.09
Blogs	Male	71	4.30	1.562	125	4.87	1.571	<b>-2.47</b>
	Female	134	4.37	1.485	32	5.19	1.655	<b>-2.73</b>
Social Media	Male	71	4.55	1.491	127	4.97	1.713	<b>-1.73</b>
	Female	133	4.84	1.364	33	5.21	1.709	-1.32

t-values in bold denote significance at the 0.05 level.

**TABLE 6:**  
**Differences between US and Indian Millennials on Attitude towards Advertising**  
**(7 point scale; 1=Strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)**

	n	US Mean	S.D.	n	India Mean	S.D.	t-values
Offended by ads	209	2.18	.742	164	2.43	1.114	<b>-2.65</b>
Ads helping in purchase decision	208	2.82	.877	164	2.90	.922	-0.91
Confidence in purchase decision	208	2.59	.653	162	2.55	.756	0.572
Effects of ads on prices	208	2.62	.619	163	2.36	.837	<b>3.434</b>
Like/dislike advertising	207	3.14	.988	161	3.41	1.196	<b>-2.37</b>
Truthfulness of ads	206	3.69	1.265	162	3.82	1.470	-0.92
Accuracy of ads	206	3.79	1.258	161	3.94	1.333	-1.16
Credibility of ads	207	3.78	1.288	161	3.91	1.502	-0.93
Overall attitude towards advertising	207	3.71	1.22	154	4.21	1.2	<b>-3.88</b>

t-values in bold denote significance at the 0.05 level.

aspects of their attitude towards advertising: 28% of the respondents indicated that they were offended by advertisements, 32% of the respondents indicated that they never/seldom use information about advertising in their purchase decision, 37% of the U.S. respondents do not feel very confident to use the information that they see in the ad to make a purchase decision, 67% of the U.S. respondents believed that advertisements increased the prices of products, and 25% of the respondents dislike advertisements. Finally, 44% found ads not to be truthful, 42% found ads be not accurate and 24% found ads to be not credible.

Per Table 6, the Indian respondents also provided information about their attitude towards advertising: 10% of the respondents indicated that they were offended by advertisements, 21% of the Indian respondents indicated that they never/seldom use information about advertising in their purchase decision, and 39% of the Indian respondents do

not feel very confident to use the information that they see in the ad to make a purchase decision. 44% of the Indian respondents believed that advertisements increased the prices of products, 25% of the respondents dislike advertisements, and 22% found ads not to be truthful. 21% found ads to be inaccurate and 15% found ads to be not credible. While this suggests that Indian Millennials are wary about advertising, it does not suggest the same overall negative attitude towards advertising as for U.S. Millennials (Beard, 2003; Bennett & Lachowetz, 2004; Chatterjee, 2008).

**Gender Differences and Attitude Towards Advertising**

To address RQ6 (gender and attitude towards advertising), attitude towards advertising was analyzed by gender. No significant differences were found between U.S. males and females for attitude towards advertising (see Table 7). For the Indian sample, other than overall attitude

**TABLE 7:**  
**Differences between US and Indian Millennials based on Gender on Attitude towards Advertising (7 point scale; 1=Strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)**

	Gender	n	US Mean	S.D.	n	India Mean	S.D.	t-values
Offended by ads	Male	74	2.14	.746	131	2.47	1.105	<b>-2.35</b>
	Female	135	2.20	.741	33	2.27	1.153	-0.45
Ads helping in purchase decision	Male	73	2.75	.863	131	2.83	.921	-0.6
	Female	135	2.85	.885	33	3.18	.882	-1.92
Confidence in purchase decision	Male	73	2.59	.684	129	2.54	.760	0.432
	Female	135	2.59	.638	33	2.58	.751	0.131
Effects of ads on prices	Male	73	2.59	.620	130	2.35	.852	<b>2.069</b>
	Female	135	2.63	.620	33	2.36	.783	<b>2.093</b>
Like/dislike advertising	Male	72	3.01	1.000	128	3.34	1.213	<b>-1.96</b>
	Female	135	3.21	.978	33	3.67	1.109	<b>-2.35</b>
Truthfulness of ads	Male	72	3.71	1.192	129	3.78	1.468	-0.37
	Female	134	3.68	1.307	33	3.97	1.489	-1.11
Accuracy of ads	Male	73	3.93	1.182	129	3.88	1.338	0.254
	Female	133	3.71	1.296	32	4.19	1.306	-1.88
Credibility of ads	Male	73	3.84	1.247	129	3.82	1.487	0.068
	Female	134	3.75	1.313	32	4.28	1.529	<b>-2</b>
Overall attitude towards advertising	Male	72	3.644	1.236	126	4.28	1.15	<b>-3.61</b>
	Female	135	3.738	1.208	28	3.92	1.39	-0.71

t-values in bold denote significance at the 0.05 level.

towards advertising in which Indian Millennial males had a significantly more positive attitude towards advertising than females, there were no significant differences were found between males and females in terms of their attitude towards advertising

### Country Differences for Attitude Towards Advertising

Both Indian and U.S. Millennials tended to have somewhat negative attitude towards advertising, with Indians significantly more likely to be offended by ads, think ads increase pricing, and dislike ads. U.S. Millennials were significantly more likely than Indian Millennials to see ads as more credible, helping their purchasing decision, and giving them confidence.

## DISCUSSION

The results of this study suggest multiple managerial implications. First, in terms of media depictions (RQ1), there is a need for increased activity for product placement and tie-ins in television programming and movies for both U.S. and Indian Millennials. In both groups, approximately one-fourth of the sample that felt that among all media, advertisements are not relatable. Furthermore, there were no gender differences for media depictions (RQ2) in either country. Recognizing the unique response of Indian Millennials to advertising across media is valuable for marketers, because not all Millennial Indian consumers respond similarly to U.S. Millennials (Jin & Son, 2013; Khairullah & Khairullah, 2009).

Second, results suggest that Internet, television, and newspapers were the top three sources regardless of gender and nationality. Therefore, utilization of those media outlets is recommended, particularly with the use of informative type ads. Blogging was studied and was one of the lowest scoring media in terms of informativeness for U.S. Millennials. One explanation could be Lenhart et al.'s (2010) finding that blogging use for teens and young adults has decreased since 2006, suggesting Millennials no longer find this type of media informative.

Indian Millennials found Internet and TV to be the two most informative sources. These results make sense given the widespread access Indians have to television (Khairullah & Khairullah, 2013) and the growth of the Internet in India (Mitra, 2012). For marketers trying to reach Indian Millennials online, it is important to incorporate the importance of social media and networking sites (Kulkarni, 2012; Mitra, 2009; Mitra, 2012), and the use of social media to discuss discount retailers (Bapna, 2011). For both Millennial groups, marketers should incorporate digital media and television in their advertising strategy, taking into account cultural differences, level of acculturation, and language differences within the country (Jin & Son, 2013; Khairullah & Khairullah, 2009; Khairullah & Khairullah, 2013; Khairullah, 2011; Mitra 2012).

In looking at gender differences in advertising informativeness (RQ4), results show that U.S. females find magazine, radio, television, and direct mail significantly more informative than mail. For Indian Millennials, Indian females found all advertising mediums to more informative than males did, with significant differences for posters, newspapers and billboards (RQ4). Thus, for marketers trying to reach Indian Millennial females, broader use of advertising media would be appropriate. It is important for marketers to recognize that Indian consumers' level of acculturation may affect their response to cultural attributes presented in print advertising (Khairullah, 2011). Indian Millennials may be struggling to balance western-style consumerism with eastern cultural ideals (Dhillon, 2005; Jin et al., 2006), thus marketers need to be sensitive to this balance in their messaging.

Finally, in looking at attitude towards advertising (RQ5), both the U.S. and Indian Millennial samples were negative to neutral in terms of their attitudes. While the Indian sample had a somewhat better attitude towards advertising than the American sample, the Indian consumers were significantly more likely to be offended by ads, think advertising increases prices, and dislike advertising. Hilliard et al. (2012) with a broader age sample, likewise found Indian consumers believe advertising is misleading and passes its' costs onto consumers. This may be related to

cultural differences between India and the U.S. as the U.S. is more indulgent and short-term orientated than India (Hofstede, 2016). In terms of gender and attitude towards advertising (RQ6), Indian males were more likely to take a negative view than U.S. males, while Indian females were more likely to like advertising and see it as more credible than U.S. females.

### Limitations and Future Research

One limitation of our study was the majority of our respondents were female in the USA and male in India. Another limitation is that this study drew each sample from only one school in each country. Therefore, the results cannot be generalized (Khare & Sadachar, 2014). Future research is needed to include Millennials from multiple universities to try to capture the within country cultural differences. Additional research is also needed to compare college-educated versus less-educated Millennials. Finally, research is needed to look at cohort differences comparing Indian Millennials to earlier generational cohorts that grew up under the previous, more protectionist economy (Dhillon, 2005) to examine media cohort differences.

Future research with a more diverse sample would be needed to determine to generalize the findings. Future research may examine additional media sources of interest to Millennials, such as video games (Littman, 2008), online reviews (Smith, 2012) and m-advertising (Koo et al., 2012). Research could examine other means to promote to Millennials, such as cause marketing, to tap into the civic-minded nature of Millennials (Littman, 2008). Finally, research is needed to look at cohort differences (Loroz & Helgeson, 2013) and cultural differences in Millennials' perception of advertising and media (Koo et al., 2012).

As this exploratory study looked at media and general attitudes towards advertising, another area for future research is to examine what message may be appropriate for different segments of the Millennial market. Khare (2011) suggests that as brand associations need to relate to family and group identifications, research may evaluate the applicability of this

result to advertising communications. Banerjee (2008) stresses the role of culture (such as language, rituals and customs, symbols and signs, and traditions) and values (such as family, conformity, success, age, adaptability, and religion) in providing insights into messaging. Additional research would need to relate cultural differences, such as through Hofstede's (2016) dimensions with perceptions of advertising. Given the size and importance of the Indian Millennial market, this study intends to spur research on the Indian Millennial in addition to the U.S. Millennial. It is important to recognize that while this research makes a contribution by examining Indian Millennials' media and advertising attitudes, additional research is needed on Indian Millennial media attitudes and use.

### REFERENCES

- Babin, B. J., Hardesty, D. M., and Suter, T. A., (2003), "Color and shopping intentions: The intervening effect of price fairness and perceived affect", *Journal of Business Research*, 56: 541-551.
- Banerjee, S., (2008), "Dimensions of Indian Culture, Core Cultural Values and Marketing Implications: An Analysis", *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 15 (40): 367-378.
- Bapna, A., (2011). "Social media driving the growth of e-commerce", *Economic Times (India)*. Accessed at: [http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2011-10-26/news/30324062\\_1\\_social-media-e-commerce-travel-sites](http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2011-10-26/news/30324062_1_social-media-e-commerce-travel-sites).
- Batra, R., and Ray, M., (1986), "Affective responses mediating acceptance of advertising", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(September): 234-249.
- Beard, F. K., (2003), "College student attitudes toward advertising's ethical, economic, and social consequences", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 48(3): 217-228.
- Beldona, S., Nusair, K. and Demicco, F., (2009), "Online travel purchase behavior of generational cohorts: A longitudinal study", *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 18: 406-20.

- Bell, N. S., Connell, J. A., and McMinn, N. E., (2011), "How will the next generation vhnge the business world? A report on a survey," *Insights to a Changing World Journal*, (1): 45-55.
- Beltramini, R., and Stafford, E., (1993). "Comprehension and perceived believability of seals of approval information in advertising", *Journal of Advertising*, 22 (3): 3-14.
- Beltramini, R., (1982). "Response Television; Combat Advertising of the 1980's", *Journal of Advertising*, 11 (3): 47.
- Beltramini, R., (1988), "Perceived believability of warning label information presented in cigarette advertising," *Journal of Advertising*, 17(2): 26-32.
- Bennett, G., and Lachowetz, T., (2004), "Marketing to lifestyles: Action sports and Generation Y", *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 13(4): 239-243.
- Borges, N. J., Manuel, R. S., Elam, C. L., and Jones, B. J., (2010), "Differences in motives Between Millennial and Generation X medical students", *Medical Education*, 44 (6).
- Brackett, L. K., and Carr, B. N., (2001), "Cyberspace advertising vs. other media: Consumer vs. mature student attitudes", *Journal of Advertising Research*, 41(5): 23-32.
- Calder, B.J., Phillips, L.W., and Tybout, A.M., (1981), "Designing research for application," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 8 (2): 197-208.
- Chatterjee, P., (2008), "Are unclicked ads wasted? Enduring effects of banner and pop-up ad exposures on brand memory and attitudes", *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 9(1): 51-61.
- CIA, (2014), *The World Factbook*. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/in.html>.
- Debevec, K., Schewe, C.D., Madden, T.J., and Diamond, W.D. (2013), "Are today's Millennials splintering into a new generational cohort? Maybe," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 12: 20-31.
- Dhillon, A., (2005), "India's new rich go on spending spree", *The Sunday Times*, April 3.
- Ducoffe, R. H., (1995), "How consumers assess the value of advertising", *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 17(1): 1-18.
- Duffett, R.G. (2015), "Facebook advertising's influence on intention-to-purchase and purchase amongst Millennials," *Internet Advertising*, 25(4): 498-526
- Eastman, J. K., and Liu, J., (2012), "The impact of generational cohorts on status consumption: an exploratory look at generational cohort and demographics on status consumption", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 29(2): 93-102.
- Edell, J., and Burke, M., (1987), "The power of feelings in understanding advertising effects", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14 (December): 421-433.
- Express News Services, (2013), "For young India, life-work balance new mantra, work-life balance passé: survey", *Indian Express*, Accessed at <http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/for-young-india-lifework-balance-new-mantra-worklife-balance-pass-survey/>.
- Gangadharbatla, H., (2008), "Facebook me: Collective self-esteem, need to belong, and internet self-efficacy as predictors of the iGeneration's attitudes toward social networking sites", *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8(2): 5-15.
- Gronbach, K., (2000), "Don't underestimate Generation Y", *Business West*, 17(4).
- Hershatter, A., and Epstein, M., (2010), "Millennials and the world of work: An organization and management perspective," *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 25(2): 211-223.
- Hewlett, S.A., Sherbin, L. and Sumberg, K., (2009), "How Gen Y & Boomers will reshape your agenda", *Harvard Business Review*, July -August, 1-8.
- Hilliard, H. Matulich, E., Haytko, D., and Rustogi, H. (2012), "An International look at attitude towards advertising, brand considerations, and market expertise: United States, China, and India," *Journal of International Business Research*, 11 (1), 29-41.
- Hofstede, G. (2016), "What about India", Accessed at <http://geert-hofstede.com/india.html>.
- Howe, N., and Straus, W., (2000), *Millennial Rising: The Next Great Generation*, Random House, New York, NY.

- Iyer, R. and Muncy, J., (2016), "Attitude toward Consumption and Subjective Well-Being," *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/joca.12079>.
- Jackson, V., Stoel, L. and Brantley, A., (2011), "Mall attributes and shopping value: differences by gender and generational cohort", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer*, 18(1): 1-9.
- Jin, B., Chansakar, B., and Kondap, N., (2006), "Brand origin in an emerging market: Perceptions of Indian consumers", *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 18(4): 283-302.
- Keene, K., and Sackett, V., (1981), "An editor's report on the Yankelovich, Skelly and White 'Mushiness Index'", *Public Opinion* (April/May), 50-51.
- Khairullah, D., (2011), "Acculturation and its relation to Asian-Indian immigrants' perceptions of advertisements", *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 11(2): 55-66.
- Khairullah, D., and Khairullah, K., (2009), "Cross cultural analysis of gender roles: Indian and US advertisements", *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 21(1): 58-75.
- Khairullah, D., and Khairullah, K., (2013), "Cultural values in Indian television advertising", *Journal of Promotion Management*, 19: 265-281.
- Khare, A., (2011), "Impact of Indian cultural values and lifestyles on meaning of branded products: Study of university students in India", *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 23(5): 365-379.
- Khare, A., and Sadachar, A., (2014), "Collective self-esteem and online shopping attitudes among college students: Comparisons between the U.S. and India", *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 26: 106-121.
- Kilian, T., Hennigs, N. and Langner, S., (2012), "Do Millennials read books or blogs?", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 29(2): 114-124.
- King, K. W., Reid, L. N., Tinkham, S. F., and Pokrywczynski, J., (1987), "The perceived informativeness of national and retail advertising", *Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 10(1-2): 173-197.
- Koo, W., Knight, D. K., Yang, K., and Xiang, Z., (2012), "Generation Y Consumers' Value Perceptions toward Apparel Mobile Advertising: Functions of Modality and Culture", *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 4 (2): 56.
- Kulkarni, P., (2012), "Indian consumers who have turned social media savvy: U.S. Express survey", *The Economic Times* (New Delhi), May 3.
- Lachance, M.J., Beaudoin, P. and Robitaille, J., (2003), "Adolescents' brand sensitivity in apparel: influence of three socialization agents", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 27(1): 47-57.
- Lenhart, A., Purcell, K., Smith, A., and Zickuhr, K., (2010), "Social media and mobile internet use among teens and young adults," *Pew Research Center*, (February 3), Accessed at [www.pewresearch.org/millennials](http://www.pewresearch.org/millennials).
- Littman, S., (2008), "Welcome to the new millennials," *Response*, 16(8): 74-80.
- Lodes, M., and Buff, C.L., (2009), "Are Generation Y (Millennial) consumers brand loyal and is their buying behavior affected in an economic recession? A preliminary study," *Journal of Academy of Business and Economics*, 9(3): 127-135.
- Loroz, P., and Helgeson, J., (2013), "Boomers and their babies: An exploratory study comparing psychological profiles and advertising appeal effectiveness across two generations," *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 21(3): 289-306.
- Lyonski, S. and Durvasula, S., (2013), "Consumer decision making styles in retailing: Evolution of mindsets and psychological impacts", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 30 (1): 75-87.
- Malik, R., (2012), "Millennial generation in urban India: How marketers can tap them?", *Asian Journal of Research in Business Economics and Management*, 2 (8): 125-135.
- Martin, C. A., and Turley, L. W., (2004), "Malls and consumption motivation: an exploratory examination of older Generation Y consumers", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 32(10): 464-475.
- Martin, W. C., Ponder, N., and Lueg, J. E., (2009), "Price fairness perceptions and customer loyalty in a retail context," *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 588-593.

- McCormick, K. (2016), "Celebrity endorsements: Influence of a product-endorser match on Millennials attitudes and purchase intentions," *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 32, 39-45.
- McCrea, B., (2011), "Millennial Marketing 101," *Response*, (November): 34-37.
- McMahan, C., Hovland, R., and McMillan, S., (2009), "Online marketing communications: Exploring online consumer behavior by examining gender differences and interactivity within internet advertising," *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 10(1): 61-76.
- Milner, T., and Rosenstreich, D., (2013), "Insights into mature consumers of financial services," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 30(3): 248-257.
- Mitra, K., (2009), "Waking up to social media", *Business Today*, (July 12).
- Mitra, K., (2011), "Bringing up father", *Business Today*, (December 25).
- Mitra, K., (2012), "Sultans of social networking", *Business Today*, (April 29).
- Mitchell, A., and Olson, J., (1981), "Are product attributes the only mediator of advertising effects on brand attitude: A second look," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27: 109-219.
- Moore, M., and Carpenter, J., (2008), "Intergenerational perceptions of market cues among US apparel consumers", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 12(3): 323-337.
- Morton, L., (2002), "Targeting Generation Y", *Public Relations Quarterly*, 47(2): 46-48.
- Myers, K. K., and Sadaghiani, K., (2010), "Millennials in the Workplace: A Communication Perspective on Millennials' Organizational Relationships and Performance," *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(2): 225-238.
- Najar, N., (2013), "On India's campuses, female students speak out about "deep rooted" gender discrimination", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Accessed at <http://chronicle.com/article/Female-Scholars-Describe-Deep/138659/>.
- Neuborne, E., and Kerwin, K., (1999), "Generation Y", *Business Week Online*, Accessed at [www.businessweek.com/stories/1999-02-14/generation-y](http://www.businessweek.com/stories/1999-02-14/generation-y).
- Noble, S.M., Haytko, D.L., and Phillips, J., (2009), "What Drives College-Age Generation Y Consumers?" *Journal of Business Research*, 62: 617-628.
- Norum, P.S., (2003), "Examination of generational differences in household apparel expenditures", *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 32(1): 52-75.
- Pate, S. S., and Adams, M., (2013), "The Influence of Social Networking Sites on Buying Behaviors of Millennials", *Atlantic Marketing Journal*, 2(1): 7.
- Peterson, R.A., Wilson, W., and Brown, S.P., (1992). "Effects of advertised customer satisfaction claims on consumer attitudes and purchase intention", *Journal of Advertising Research*, 32(2): 34-41.
- Phillip, M.V., and Rajneesh, S., (2004), "Impact of gender differences on the evaluation of promotional emails," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 44(4): 360-368.
- Ray, M., and Batra, R., (1983), "Operationalizing involvement as depth and quality of cognitive response," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 10(1): 309-313.
- Roberts, J. A., and Manolis, C., (2000), "Baby boomers and busters: An exploratory investigation of attitudes toward marketing, advertising and consumerism", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 17(6): 481-497.
- Robinson, K., Keith, M., and Bush, V., (2010), "An investigation of social and traditional media interaction on Generation Y political intentions and behavior", *Society for Marketing Advances Proceedings*, 23-24.
- Schewe, C.D., Meredith, G.E. and Noble, S.M., (2000), "Defining moments: segmenting by cohorts", *Marketing Management*, 9(3): 48-53.
- Senecal, S., and Nantel, J., (2004), "The influence of online product recommendations on consumers' online choices", *Journal of Retailing*, 80(2): 159-169.
- Shavitt, S., Lowrey, P., and Haefner, J., (1998), "Public attitudes toward advertising: More favorable than you might think", *Journal of Advertising Research*, 38(4): 7-22.
- Smith, K. T., (2011), "Digital marketing strategies that millennials find appealing, motivating, or just annoying", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 19(6): 489-499.



- Smith, K. T., (2012), "Longitudinal study of digital marketing strategies targeting Millennials", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 29(2): 86-92.
- Stout, P., and Rust, R., (1993),"Emotional feelings and evaluative dimensions of advertising: are they related?" *Journal of Advertising*, 22(1): 61-71.
- Tanyel, F., Stuart, E., and Griffin, J., (2013), "Have millennials embraced digital advertising as they have embraced digital media?", *Journal of Promotion Management*, 19(5): 652-673.
- Telefonica, (2013), "Connected, yet divided: Telefonica survey of the millennial generation reveals digital natives are optimistic about their individual futures", June 4, Accessed at <http://blog.digital.telefonica.com/?press-release=telefonica-millennial-survey-findings>.
- Truong, Y., and Simmons, G., (2010), "Perceived intrusiveness in digital advertising: Strategic marketing implications", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 18(3): 239-256.
- Wells, W., Leavitt, C., and McConville, M., (1971), "A reaction profile for TV commercials," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 11(6): 11-17.
- Wind, J., and Rangaswamy, A., (2001), "Customerization: The next revolution in mass customization", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 15(1): 13-32.
- Wolburg, J.M. and Pokrywczynski, J., (2001), "A psychographic analysis of Generation Y college students," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 41(5): 33-52.
- Wolin, L. D., and Korgaonkar, P., (2005), "Web advertising: Gender differences in beliefs, attitudes, and behavior", *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 6(1): 125-136.