

Generational Convergence in Wealth Management Expectations

Srivathsan V, Shivaprasad G

Department of MBA, CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India
Associate Professor, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed-to-be
University), Bangalore, India

ABSTRACT: The wealth management industry faces the complex challenge of serving multiple generational cohorts—Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z—whose service expectations are commonly assumed to diverge significantly. This study examines whether generational cohort membership predicts meaningful differences in wealth management service expectations within the Indian investor context. Using a descriptive research design, primary data were collected from 263 retail investors across four generational groups through a structured 15-item Likert-scale questionnaire. Four constructs were operationalized—digital platform preference, ESG investing priority, advisory relationship preference, and transparency/financial education expectations—and tested using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Contrary to prevailing theoretical predictions drawn from Western market research, all four ANOVA tests yielded non-significant results ($p > 0.05$) with negligible effect sizes ($\eta^2 = 0.006$ – 0.017). All generational cohorts reported uniformly high expectations (mean scores $> 4.0/5.0$) across all constructs. Notably, Baby Boomers reported the highest digital preference scores, challenging conventional assumptions about a digital divide. These findings indicate a convergence of wealth management service expectations across generations in India, driven by digital infrastructure expansion, regulatory reforms, and post-COVID normalization of digital finance. The study contributes an emerging-market perspective to generational finance literature and offers actionable implications for wealth management firms to adopt universal service architectures rather than age-segmented strategies.

I. INTRODUCTION

The wealth management industry has historically relied on relationship-based, advisor-led service models targeting high-net-worth individuals. Over the past two decades, however, the sector has been profoundly reshaped by three converging forces: the increasing diversity of the investor base across generational cohorts, rapid technological transformation, and the democratization of capital market access. These forces have created a complex service environment in which Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z simultaneously participate in financial markets, each purportedly with distinct expectations, risk preferences, and communication styles.

The dominant theoretical and practitioner consensus, largely derived from Western market research, holds that generational cohort membership is a robust predictor of wealth management service preferences. Younger investors are typically portrayed as digital-first, ESG-conscious, and self-directed, while older cohorts are characterized as relationship-dependent, risk-averse, and skeptical of technology-driven solutions. This generational segmentation paradigm has significantly influenced how financial institutions design products, allocate technology investments, and structure client engagement strategies.

In India, these dynamics are further complicated by a unique socio-economic context: a rapidly expanding young investor population entering capital markets through fintech platforms, government-led financial inclusion initiatives such as Jan Dhan Yojana and the Unified Payments Interface (UPI), growing financial literacy, and a traditional cultural emphasis on trust-based advisory relationships. Understanding whether generational differences in wealth management expectations translate to the Indian context—or whether India-specific structural factors override such differences—has critical implications for financial institutions seeking to optimize their service architectures.

This study addresses a significant gap in the literature: the absence of empirically grounded, India-specific research examining generational wealth management expectations using an integrated, multi-dimensional analytical framework. The research investigates four key expectation dimensions—digital platform preference, ESG investing priority,

advisory relationship preference, and transparency/financial education expectations—across all four major generational cohorts simultaneously, using inferential statistical methods on primary survey data from 263 Indian retail investors. The central finding—a convergence rather than divergence of expectations across generations—challenges established assumptions and carries significant theoretical and practical implications.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH GAPS

The generational approach to investor behavior analysis rests on the foundational work of Howe and Strauss (2000), whose cohort theory posits that shared formative historical experiences produce enduring, cohort-specific values and behavioral dispositions. Applied to financial services, this framework predicts that different generations will display systematically different investment preferences, risk tolerances, and service expectations. Lusardi and Mitchell (2011) reinforced generational differentiation in financial contexts by documenting significant variation in financial literacy and advice-seeking behavior across age groups, with younger investors favoring digital self-learning and older investors relying on professional advisors.

Research specifically addressing generational wealth management preferences has produced several consistent findings in Western markets. Ng and Johnson (2015) identified strong Millennial preferences for digital platforms, transparent fee structures, and technology-driven solutions, noting lower loyalty to traditional financial institutions. Deloitte (2018) confirmed a pronounced generational digital divide in financial services, finding that younger investors readily adopted robo-advisory platforms while older cohorts preferred hybrid digital-human models. Baker and Ricciardi (2014), drawing on behavioral finance frameworks, documented greater risk aversion and capital preservation orientation among older investors, while younger cohorts displayed higher risk tolerance and openness to innovative products. Morgan Stanley (2020) further established that Millennials and Generation Z demonstrate significantly stronger ESG investing preferences compared to older generations, attributing this to generationally distinctive environmental and social values.

In the Indian context, Jain and Sharma (2020) found clear generational differences in technology adoption and advisor dependence among retail investors. Gupta and Kaur (2021) documented that trust and relationship continuity strongly influence older investors' advisor selection, while younger investors prioritize cost efficiency and digital access. SEBI (2021) and AMFI (2021) reports confirmed a surge in young investor participation through digital platforms and SIP-based investing. Kumar and Bansal (2021) identified emerging generational differences in ESG awareness, with younger urban investors showing greater sustainable investment interest.

Notwithstanding these contributions, the existing literature exhibits several critical gaps. First, most studies examine single generational cohorts in isolation, precluding systematic multi-generational comparative analysis within a unified framework. Second, the preponderance of research originates from developed Western economies, with its applicability to rapidly transforming emerging markets such as India remaining empirically unverified. Third, existing research typically analyzes digital adoption, ESG preferences, advisory relationships, and transparency expectations independently, without integrating these dimensions into a holistic framework of investor service expectations. Finally, there is a marked absence of practical, strategy-oriented frameworks translating generational findings into actionable wealth management guidance. The present study directly addresses these gaps.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is grounded in an integrated theoretical framework drawing on four complementary theories. Generational Cohort Theory (Howe & Strauss, 2000) provides the primary theoretical foundation, explaining why cohort-specific formative experiences shape enduring differences in financial values, risk perception, and service expectations. The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM; Davis, 1989) informs the analysis of digital platform adoption, explaining generational variation in technology acceptance as a function of perceived usefulness and ease of use—attributes that differ systematically across age groups shaped by varying degrees of digital exposure. Relationship Marketing Theory (Morgan & Hunt, 1994) contextualizes the importance of trust, commitment, and advisor-client relational quality, particularly for older investors who value continuity and personalized service. Finally, Behavioral Finance Theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979) addresses the psychological drivers of investment decision-making—including loss aversion, risk perception, and heuristic biases—that manifest differently across generational cohorts. Together, these

four theoretical perspectives provide a comprehensive and mutually reinforcing framework for analyzing multi-dimensional generational differences in wealth management service expectations.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design and Data Sources

This study adopts a descriptive research design, appropriate for systematically analyzing and comparing investor attitudes and expectations across defined demographic categories without manipulating variables. Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire administered to individual retail investors across four generational cohorts. Secondary data were drawn from peer-reviewed academic journals, industry reports (SEBI, RBI, AMFI, Deloitte, EY), and regulatory publications to establish the theoretical and contextual foundation.

4.2 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The target population comprised individual retail investors in India, either currently using or aware of formal wealth management services. A convenience sampling method was employed, drawing respondents from urban and semi-urban investor populations—consistent with the study's focus on digitally engaged, formally invested segments. The final sample comprised 263 valid respondents distributed across generational cohorts as follows: Generation Z (18–24 years, $n = 68$, 25.9%), Millennials (25–40 years, $n = 72$, 27.4%), Generation X (41–55 years, $n = 78$, 29.7%), and Baby Boomers (56+ years, $n = 45$, 17.1%). Gender composition was near-equal (54.8% male, 44.9% female), and occupational categories were well-distributed across salaried employees (28.9%), students (28.1%), self-employed/business owners (26.6%), and retired individuals (16.0%). This balanced distribution enhances the comparative validity of cross-cohort analyses.

4.3 Measurement Instrument

A structured questionnaire comprising 15 Likert-scale items (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree) was developed to operationalize four hypothesis constructs: (H1) Digital Platform Preference (Q1–Q5, 5 items); (H2) ESG Investing Priority (Q11–Q12, 2 items); (H3) Advisory Relationship Preference (Q6–Q8, 3 items); and (H4) Transparency and Financial Education Expectations (Q9, Q10, Q13, Q14, 4 items). Items were designed to capture investor preferences regarding digital access, sustainable investment orientation, human advisory dependence, and fee transparency/education needs respectively.

Internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha. The overall 15-item composite scale achieved $\alpha = 0.792$, indicating good reliability. Sub-construct alphas were moderate (Digital: $\alpha = 0.599$; Transparency: $\alpha = 0.465$) to low (Advisory: $\alpha = 0.319$; ESG: $\alpha = 0.228$), consistent with the known mathematical sensitivity of Cronbach's Alpha to short scale length (Cortina, 1993) and acceptable for exploratory research purposes.

4.4 Analytical Methods

Data analysis employed: (1) descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequency distributions) to characterize response patterns by cohort; (2) Cronbach's Alpha for scale reliability validation; (3) One-Way ANOVA to test for statistically significant between-group differences in construct mean scores across the four generational cohorts; (4) Eta-Squared (η^2) effect size estimation to assess practical significance; and (5) pairwise independent-samples t-tests for all six cohort combinations to examine directional trends. The significance threshold was set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

V. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

5.1 Item-Level Descriptive Patterns

The most striking pattern in the item-level descriptive statistics is the uniformly high mean scores across all 15 questionnaire items, with values ranging from 4.088 (Q12: Prefer socially responsible companies) to 4.264 (Q3: Use mobile apps to track portfolio performance). This extremely narrow range of only 0.176 points across all items signals a consistently high—and effectively undifferentiated—set of service expectations at the aggregate sample level. Standard deviations ranged from 0.829 to 0.929, indicating moderate within-item variability despite the high central tendency, with a pronounced ceiling effect (>80% of respondents selecting Agree or Strongly Agree on most items) that both reflects genuine investor demand and constrains the statistical power of between-group tests.

5.2 ANOVA Results and Hypothesis Testing

One-Way ANOVA was conducted for each hypothesis construct to test whether generational cohort membership predicted significant differences in mean expectation scores. Table 1 presents the consolidated ANOVA results.

Table 1: One-Way ANOVA Results — Summary Across All Constructs

Construct (Hypothesis)	F-value	df	p-value	η^2	Effect Size	Decision
H1: Digital Preference	1.488	3, 257	0.218	0.017	Negligible	H1 Not Supported
H2: ESG Investing	0.663	3, 257	0.575	0.008	Negligible	H2 Not Supported
H3: Advisory Preference	1.242	3, 257	0.295	0.014	Negligible	H3 Not Supported
H4: Transparency & Education	0.494	3, 257	0.687	0.006	Negligible	H4 Not Supported

The ANOVA results are consistent across all four constructs: no hypothesis achieved statistical significance at the 0.05 level, and all effect sizes were classified as negligible per Cohen's (1988) conventions. Generational cohort accounts for only 0.6%–1.7% of the total variance in wealth management service expectations, establishing that generation is a poor predictor of these expectations in the sampled Indian investor population.

5.3 Descriptive Statistics by Generational Group

Table 2 presents mean scores and standard deviations for each construct by generational cohort.

Table 2: Mean Construct Scores by Generational Cohort

Construct	Gen Z (n=67)	Millennials (n=72)	Gen X (n=78)	Baby Boomers (n=44)
H1: Digital Preference	4.24 (0.57)	4.09 (0.53)	4.24 (0.61)	4.27 (0.46)*
H2: ESG Investing	4.06 (0.69)	4.17 (0.70)	4.03 (0.60)	4.14 (0.71)
H3: Advisory Preference	4.21 (0.59)	4.14 (0.61)	4.07 (0.50)	4.24 (0.53)*
H4: Transparency & Education	4.16 (0.61)	4.19 (0.51)	4.15 (0.59)	4.27 (0.43)*

Several noteworthy patterns emerge from the descriptive data. First, Baby Boomers recorded the highest mean scores on three of four constructs—digital preference, advisory preference, and transparency expectations—directly contradicting the conventional assumption that these expectations are primarily younger-cohort attributes. Second, Millennials scored lowest on digital preference (4.09) despite being the cohort most commonly associated with digital financial services adoption. Third, the inter-cohort range of mean scores across all constructs is remarkably narrow (maximum 0.21 points on a 5-point scale), visually confirming the statistical non-significance of the ANOVA results. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons across all six cohort combinations revealed no statistically significant differences for any construct pair. The closest approach to significance was the Millennials versus Baby Boomers comparison on digital preference ($t = -1.898$, $p = 0.060$), in which Baby Boomers scored marginally higher—a directional reversal of theoretical predictions. Similarly, the Gen X versus Baby Boomers comparison on advisory preference approached marginal significance ($t = -1.815$, $p = 0.072$), with Baby Boomers scoring higher, as the literature would predict, though the effect remained below threshold.

VI. DISCUSSION**6.1 The Convergence Phenomenon**

The central finding of this study—that generational cohort does not significantly predict wealth management service expectations in the Indian context—represents a substantive departure from the prevailing literature and demands careful theoretical interpretation. The uniformly high expectations across all four constructs (means consistently above 4.0/5.0) and negligible inter-cohort variance suggest that the factors theorized to produce generational divergence in Western markets have been offset or overridden by powerful convergence forces in India's contemporary financial landscape.

Three primary mechanisms appear to account for this convergence. First, India's digital infrastructure transformation—catalyzed by Reliance Jio's market entry in 2016, the world's most extensive UPI payment network, and sub-cent per megabyte mobile data costs—has normalized digital financial engagement across all age demographics in a compressed timeframe. Unlike Western markets where digital adoption diffused gradually from younger to older cohorts over two decades, India's digital finance revolution has been effectively simultaneous across generations. Second, the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020–2021 served as a powerful accelerant of digital adoption among older investors, disrupting traditional branch-based and face-to-face advisory channels and compelling older cohorts to develop digital financial competencies within compressed timeframes. Third, regulatory reforms by SEBI, RBI, and AMFI—including the BRSR ESG disclosure framework, enhanced fee transparency mandates, and investor education campaigns—have raised financial awareness uniformly across the investor population, reducing information asymmetry that might otherwise manifest as age-differentiated expectations.

6.2 Interpreting Counter-Intuitive Findings

The finding that Baby Boomers report the highest digital preference scores ($M = 4.273$) warrants specific attention. Several contextual factors may explain this result. India's intergenerational family financial socialization—where younger family members assist older relatives in adopting digital investment platforms—may have created unusually high digital comfort among older investors, mediated by trusted family relationships. Additionally, the simplicity and accessibility of India's UPI infrastructure may have lowered the entry barrier to digital engagement for older cohorts in ways that have no parallel in more complex Western digital finance environments. The marginal 'digital disillusionment' hypothesis is also relevant: Millennials, having experienced digital platforms' limitations—security vulnerabilities, algorithmic errors, and platform outages—over a longer period, may have developed more critical and measured digital attitudes compared to younger Gen Z investors and older Baby Boomers encountering these platforms with fresh enthusiasm.

The near-equal advisory preference scores across all generational cohorts (range: 4.07–4.24) similarly challenge the binary 'digital-first versus advisory-first' characterization prevalent in practitioner discourse. These findings suggest that advisory relationships and digital platforms are experienced as complementary rather than substitutive by Indian investors across all generations. Baby Boomers' high advisory preference aligns with the trust-based relationship literature (Singh & Gupta, 2022), while Generation Z's comparably high score likely reflects financial inexperience and the genuine informational value of expert guidance at the onset of an investment journey—motivation qualitatively different from, but practically equivalent to, the trust-based motivation of older investors.

6.3 Implications for Generational Cohort Theory

The null findings across all four hypotheses suggest that generational cohort theory, while robustly supported in Western contexts, may have limited predictive validity in rapidly transforming economies where the temporal sequencing of digital adoption and financial market development differs fundamentally from the Western paradigm in which the theory was developed. When digital financial services, ESG investment products, and transparency regulations are introduced simultaneously to all investor segments—rather than diffusing sequentially from younger to older cohorts—the generational sequence of adoption is disrupted and convergent expectations may emerge even where cohort theory predicts divergence. This finding supports Rogers' (2003) technological convergence thesis: as digital technologies achieve universal accessibility and trust, adoption ceases to be primarily age-driven.

VII. PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The convergence finding has direct and actionable implications for wealth management firms, regulators, and technology providers in India.

Universal Service Architecture: Wealth management firms should invest in a unified, digital-first service platform that simultaneously delivers digital accessibility, ESG product integration, embedded human advisory support, and transparent communication to all clients—treating these as non-negotiable baseline standards rather than age-segmented product features. Firms maintaining resource-intensive separate service tracks for 'Millennial clients' and 'Boomer clients' may be incurring unnecessary costs based on empirically unwarranted assumptions about generational differences.

Phygital Service Model: The simultaneous high demand for both digital platforms and personal advisory relationships across all cohorts calls for investment in a 'phygital' hybrid model—seamlessly integrating digital efficiency with human advisory touchpoints. Financial advisors should develop dual competency: digital tool proficiency alongside deepened skills in personalized coaching, ESG product knowledge, and transparent fee communication. The emerging Indian wealth manager profile is neither purely a relationship manager nor a digital specialist, but an integrated professional fluent in both dimensions.

Mainstream ESG Integration: ESG-integrated products—including screened mutual funds, green bonds, and SRI-aligned portfolio services—should be positioned as mainstream offerings accessible to the full client base, not niche products for younger investors. Given the near-uniform ESG awareness documented across cohorts, ESG education, impact reporting, and sustainability-linked product innovation should be core elements of standard client communication strategies across all age segments.

Proactive Transparency: The universally high—and in Baby Boomers, highest—demand for fee transparency and financial education mandates that proactive, plain-language disclosure of fees, risks, and performance be embedded as a universal service standard. Firms should implement multi-channel transparency communication (mobile, web, in-person, printed statements) to ensure that all clients receive consistent, accessible fee and performance information regardless of preferred engagement channel.

Regulatory Implications: The uniform transparency expectations documented across all cohorts—particularly their strength among Baby Boomers who manage significant accumulated wealth—provide empirical support for regulatory strengthening of fee disclosure, suitability assessment, and investor education mandates. Regulatory protections targeting older investors with complex planning needs can simultaneously serve universal investor expectations, enhancing both investor welfare and market integrity.

VIII. LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study's findings are subject to several limitations that circumscribe their generalizability and precision. The convenience sampling approach targeting urban and semi-urban investors limits external validity to India's broader investor population, which includes substantial rural and lower-income segments with potentially different expectations. The sample size of 263, while adequate for the techniques employed, may be insufficient to detect small but genuine generational differences; the possibility of Type II error cannot be excluded. Sub-construct reliability was moderate to low ($\alpha = 0.228-0.599$), attributable in part to short scale lengths but nonetheless raising measurement precision concerns. The cross-sectional design prevents disentanglement of cohort, age, and period effects, and self-report data are susceptible to social desirability and acquiescence biases, potentially contributing to the ceiling effect observed.

Future research should address these limitations through several avenues. Larger, probability-based nationally representative samples (1,000+ respondents) encompassing rural, lower-income, and Tier-2/3 city investors would provide greater statistical power and broader generalizability. Longitudinal panel designs tracking the same investors over 3–5 years would enable rigorous separation of cohort, age, and period effects and illuminate how expectations evolve with life-stage transitions and market developments. Integration of behavioral data from financial platforms—actual investment choices, platform usage patterns, ESG fund allocations—would complement stated preferences with

revealed behavior, mitigating self-report limitations. Mixed-methods designs combining quantitative ANOVA testing with qualitative interviews would provide explanatory depth for the convergence phenomenon. Comparative international studies across other rapidly developing economies (China, Brazil, Indonesia, Nigeria) would determine whether India's convergence pattern reflects a universal emerging-market phenomenon or a context-specific outcome. Finally, extended construct development incorporating risk tolerance, retirement planning needs, AI advisory acceptance, and cybersecurity expectations would provide a more comprehensive mapping of generational investor expectations.

IX. CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine whether generational cohort membership significantly predicts differences in wealth management service expectations among Indian retail investors. Drawing on primary data from 263 respondents across four generational cohorts and employing One-Way ANOVA across four carefully operationalized hypothesis constructs, the study arrives at a clear and internally consistent finding: generational cohort does not significantly predict wealth management service expectations along any of the four dimensions examined—digital platform preference, ESG investing priority, advisory relationship preference, or transparency and financial education expectations.

Rather than the divergence predicted by generational cohort theory and documented in Western market research, the data reveal a pattern of convergence: all cohorts report uniformly high expectations across all constructs, with negligible inter-group variance. This convergence appears driven by India-specific structural forces—rapid digital infrastructure expansion, post-COVID normalization of digital finance, government financial inclusion initiatives, and regulatory transparency reforms—that have compressed generational adoption sequences and homogenized investor expectations in ways that have no parallel in the Western contexts where the prevailing theoretical paradigm was developed.

These findings make two primary scholarly contributions. First, they provide empirical evidence challenging the generalizability of Western-derived generational finance frameworks to emerging market contexts, suggesting the need for context-sensitive theoretical and empirical approaches. Second, they document a convergence of investor expectations in India's rapidly evolving wealth management landscape that has significant implications for how financial institutions design services, allocate resources, and engage clients. The practical implication is actionable and unambiguous: Indian wealth management firms should pursue universal service architectures delivering digital access, ESG integration, hybrid advisory models, and proactive transparency to their entire client base—not as features differentiated by generation, but as fundamental standards expected by all.

REFERENCES

1. Baker, H. K., & Ricciardi, V. (2014). *Investor behavior: The psychology of financial planning and investing*. John Wiley & Sons.
2. Chen, H., & Volpe, R. P. (2016). An analysis of personal financial literacy among college students. *Financial Services Review*, 7(2), 107–128.
3. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
4. Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 98–104.
5. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334.
6. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
7. Deloitte. (2018). *The future of wealth management: Imperatives for asset managers*. Deloitte Insights.
8. George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
9. Gupta, R., & Kaur, H. (2021). Financial decision-making patterns among Indian households: A generational perspective. *Indian Journal of Finance*, 15(4), 21–35.
10. Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. Vintage Books.
11. Jain, S., & Sharma, P. (2020). Investment behaviour among Indian retail investors: A generational analysis. *Journal of Commerce and Accounting Research*, 9(3), 45–58.

Volume 15, Issue 4, April 2026**| DOI: 10.15680/IJRSET.2026.1504253 |**

12. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–292.
13. Kumar, A., & Bansal, M. (2021). ESG awareness among Indian investors: An emerging generational divide. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 25(1), 12–24.
14. Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2011). Financial literacy around the world: An overview. *Journal of Pension Economics and Finance*, 10(4), 497–508.
15. Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 20–38.
16. Morgan Stanley. (2020). Sustainable signals: Individual investor interest driven by impact, conviction and choice. Morgan Stanley Institute for Sustainable Investing.
17. Ng, E. S. W., & Johnson, J. M. (2015). Millennials: Who are they, how are they different, and why should we care? In R. Burke, C. Cooper, & A. Antoniou (Eds.), *The multi-generational and aging workforce*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
18. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
19. Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
20. Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). (2021). Business responsibility and sustainability reporting (BRSR) framework. SEBI Circular No. SEBI/HO/CFD/CMD2/P/CIR/2021/562.
21. Singh, R., & Gupta, V. (2022). Trust and advisor-client relationships in Indian financial services. *IIMB Management Review*, 34(1), 56–69.
22. Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. William Morrow.



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

 9940 572 462  6381 907 438  ijirset@gmail.com



www.ijirset.com

Scan to save the contact details