New Games, Different Rules – Millennials Are In Town

Janice Witt Smith, Winston-Salem State University, USA
Gloria Clark, Winston-Salem State University, USA

ABSTRACT

This study provides an ethical and socio-cultural context within a turbulent economic and multicultural global environment in which to examine the values and beliefs of a racioethnic group of Millennials. Our results describe what this group's intentions are about fabricating their qualifications for their job search, which qualifications they intend to fabricate, and what their attitudes are concerning immigration and the entry of additional racioethnic workers into the extremely competitive U.S. workforce. These attitudes may impact organizations' ability to take advantage of strategic opportunities in a global environment.

Keywords: Workforce diversity, generations, race, immigration, resume fabrication, job search

INTRODUCTION

With the presence of four generations of workers in the United States workforce, there is increased potential for values conflict, different world views, and a myriad of approaches to decision-making and ethical behavior. Much has been written about the "Silent" or "Great Generation," with approximately 50 million total members born between 1925 and 1942, as well as about the 78.2 million Baby Boomers (born between 1945 and 1964) and the 51 million Generation Xers (born between 1965 and 1976). There is less written and understood about the 75 million people classified as Generation Y or the "Millennials" who were born between 1977 and 2000. Generation Y is the second largest generation in the workforce, but far less is known about them than their predecessors. All four generations are currently experiencing and impacting the workforce, and it is not clear what this influx of Millennials into the workforce will mean for organizations.

According to Jennifer Deal (2007), employees from all generations present in the workplace have similar values, but they may differ in their behaviors around those values. Many individuals in the C-suite (Chief Executive Officers, Chief Financial Officers, Chief Information Officers, etc.) are either Baby Boomers or members of the Silent Generation. A number of middle managers are Baby Boomers or Generation Yers. Most of the Millennials are just entering the labor force and occupy lower positions in the organization. They are, in fact, the future of the organization. Therefore, it is imperative that we understand more about the Millennials, the way they think, what their values are, how they view themselves and others in the workforce.

What is currently known about this Generation Y or Millennial group is that they are accustomed to constant feedback and compliments; expect to be promoted frequently and to have fast career progression. They are open to the use of mentors and have high expectations of themselves and a higher value of self fulfillment than the other three generations. In addition, this group prefers to work in teams whenever possible, is tolerant toward diversity, and is comfortable working with innovative technology (www.vlerick.be.2006). The Millennials are also the first generation to believe that they will not match or exceed the success of their parents. In addition, Millennials are experiencing higher levels of education-related debt than their parents did.

Parents of Millennials are sometimes referred to as "helicopter parents" who are unable to allow their children to resolve their own problems and to work out solutions. Instead, the parents fly into the situation to "handle" the issue for their student-children and then fly out again. This approach may render the Millennial less able to analyze situations and to come up with workable solutions independently.

Even with the opportunity to be "Baby Boomerangs" (where both Generation Xers and Millennials are returning to live with their parents after college graduation or marriage failure). Millennials could feel sufficient pressure from economic concerns to be more tolerant than they might have been of less-than-ethical behavior. Certainly today's young people see unethical behavior all around them. It is natural to wonder whether coming of age bombarded by news of grand-scale corporate ethics scandals would make Millennials more or less likely than older generations to cheat or lie in the workplace. The popular press has cited some of the better-known misdeeds of corporate leaders, including the deliberate mis-reporting of financial data (a number of companies are having to "re-state" their data); the sub-prime mortgage debacle (Wall Street Journal, Business Week, USA Today, NY Times and others September 2009 to present), which has impacted a number of financial services organizations (including Merrill Lynch, AIG, Wachovia, Bank of America, and others); corporate spying on executives and members of Boards of Directors (e.g., Hewlett-Packard); insider trading (e.g., Martha Stewart) and other unethical practices (e.g., Enron); sexual misconduct (e.g., former presidential candidate John Edwards); accepting bribes and racketeering (indicted Detroit mayor); fraudulent credentials, and the like. The collateral damage of such individual misconduct has also been significant, particularly to the company and its shareholders. While in some instances, criminal legal action has been pursued (Enron, Bernard Madoff and others); in others, further legal action may also be pursued. Sarbanes-Oxley and other federal legislation have been passed to legislate ethical behavior in the workplace as a result of these and other scandals. While the Founding Fathers of the United States supported the "pursuit of happiness," it is doubtful that they intended the pursuit to be the result of the cessation of moral and ethical behaviors and attitudes.

Even in the bastion of elitist sports where "sportsmanship" is an underlying and often-lauded component, dishonesty is tolerated, both on and off the playing field. Tiger Woods' extramarital affairs, steroid use by Mark McGwire, drug use by Andre Agassi to gain a competitive advantage are the latest in a long list of sports scandals (see tabloids, People Magazine November 2009 to present). In addition, 82% of CEOs said that they lie about their golf scores (USA Today, 2008). While this may seem insignificant, it does suggest that there is a slippery slope when it comes to honesty – little acts of dishonesty may push the envelope and blur the boundaries. New entrants to the workplace, such as Millennials, may be tempted to engage in acts of dishonesty which could become more significant over time.

Beyond what is going on in business and politics, recent reports suggest that students' ethics may not be that strong either. HR Magazine (2008) reported that a Jr. Achievement/ Deloitte & Touche USA LLP Survey found that 1/3 of teens have goal of succeeding at all costs – 38% of the teens aged 13-18, said that lying, cheating, plagiarizing or behaving violently sometimes is necessary. Perhaps this helps to explain the article in the Raleigh, NC, *News and Observer* (May 1, 2007) that reports a high level of cheating in the college classroom, even at "better institutions" of higher learning such as Duke University.

One of the ways educators are attempting to facilitate formation of ethical thinking (which will result in ethical behavior) is an initiative by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business/International Association for Management Education (AACSB-IME). In 1979 AACSB-IME made ethics instruction mandatory for all students in business education programs. Since that time, AACSB-IME has encouraged all schools of business to provide even more attention to the breadth and depth of the ethical education and training to which their students are exposed. This organization encourages member schools to ramp up their commitment to and focus on ethics awareness and development. While this renewed focus on ethics is intended to help students formulate high ethical standards and to become better corporate citizens, students' own family backgrounds, media, and the high-profile, negative behavior of corporate leaders may undermine this initiative.

Given the AACSB-IME mandate regarding ethics instruction, business students may be presented with information in the classroom to suggest a higher moral standard, while their personal observation of current events and media reports indicate a much different picture in the "real world." There may, then, be a disconnect between what the business students are being taught and what they observe or personally experience.

The above-referenced reports point to the cultural and ethical contexts in which Millennials formulate their ethical thinking and develop intentions concerning their behavior. Millennials are just entering the workforce in full numbers, and their intentions to cheat in order to get into graduate schools or to get jobs. These few studies indicate

that students are reporting their actual cheating behaviors in classes, matriculation toward a degree, and overall attitudes toward cheating. Similar to other self-reports of behavior, particularly negative or dysfunctional behaviors, there may be a pattern of under-reporting, but students are being at least somewhat "honest" in admitting cheating. Don McCabe, Professor of Management and Global Business at Rutgers University argues that we should care about cheating because it can affect people's behavior in later life (*News and Observer*, Mar 23, 2008). In addition in his 2005 study of over 18,000 U.S. and Canadian business school students, McCabe reported that between 47% and 71% of students reported cheating. He also found that compared to students in other majors, business school students were especially likely to engage in academic misconduct.

In a study conducted by Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, in which 2,001 members of the 2001 graduating class were surveyed by phone, researchers found that Millennials are selective in how they evaluate what is right or wrong (cite source). For example, this group reported a slightly weaker belief than the general population that lying on one's taxes or resume is morally wrong. In instances where there is little chance of being caught, chastised and punished, their moral standard is even more lenient. Only 23% of Millennials are likely to disapprove of stealing office supplies compared to 52% of the general population. Only 13% disapprove of telling "white lies" on occasion and 39% disapprove of keeping more change from purchases than they should, compared to 29% and 66%, respectively, in the general population.

FABRICATION ON RESUMES

Misrepresenting their achievements in their job search may be the next place, after cheating in school that questionable ethics manifest. Brown (2004) and Sabatini (2006) found that people lie on their resumes for various reasons – some want to portray themselves in the best possible light; others see it as a competitive advantage; still others think it is a "little white lie," and no real harm is done. Some individuals utilize career counseling and resume writing assistance in developing their portfolios and resumes, and may represent their credentials to these vendors, resulting in exaggeration and outright lying about their backgrounds and accomplishments.

Some of the high-profile examples of individuals lying or providing misinformation about their backgrounds, particularly their level of education, include David Edmondson, CEO of RadioShack (Sabatini, 2006); Ronald Zarrella, CEO of Bausch & Lomb and Ken Lonchar, CFO at Vertitas Software (now Symantec) (cite source). David Swanson, CEO of R.H. Donnelley Corporation, was found to have created misleading news releases stating that he had a college degree (*Wall Street Journal*, September 12, 2006). The revelation of this information resulted in some of these individuals being fired or resigning, while others remained in their position with less-than-stellar reputations. These cases are in the newspapers and are used as examples in texts and supplemental materials to which undergraduate business students are exposed.

In the general population the rate of lying or misrepresenting oneself in the job search seems to be quite high. The Risk Advisory Group's findings in 2003 indicated that 65% of curriculum vitae submitted by job applicants contained lies, which was a rise of 16% over those reported in 2002 (Hartley, 2004). The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) conducted an on-line survey, reported by the New York Times, in which 44% of the 2.6 million respondents said they had misstated their work experience (Vinocur, 2006). Furthermore, a resume-writing business, ResumeDoctor.com, found one or more "significant inaccuracies" in 43% of resumes it screened over a six-month period (Cullen, 2006).

Individuals lie about a number of different factors on their resume and through their interviews. In a 1998 survey, SHRM found that 90% of respondents said that they found fabricated references during reference checks. In addition, more than 50% of the applicants they checked either regularly or sometimes lied about length of employment (53%) and past salaries (51%). Others lied about criminal records (45%), former employers (44%), former titles (44%), their driving record (33%), academic degrees (30%), credit history (25%), schools attended (22%), and social security number (14%). One background-checking service, InfoLink Screening Services, estimates that 14% of job applicants lie about their educational background (Haskell, 2006). These studies that a significant percentage of the population misrepresents themselves in their job search, including fabricating information on their resumes.

CULTURAL CONTEXT

Another reason that ethics are a topic of interest in today's workplace is globalization, along with other demographic changes. Values differ along cultural and environmental lines, and where values differ, interpretations of what is ethical behavior will differ. Millennials are also coming of age in a more multicultural, multilingual, and global environment than prior generations did. Many of the Millennials studied to date have been Caucasian students in predominantly white educational institutions. The growth of the Hispanic population has resulted in this group being the largest racial minority in the United States (U.S. Census, 2006). The latest census demographics indicate that by 2042, Hispanics will be the majority group in the United States, followed by Caucasians, African-Americans and Asian-Americans (U.S. Census, 2007). There are wide variations within the Latino (Hispanic) culture, as well as great cultural differences between Latinos and both African-Americans and Caucasians.

A multilingual poll conducted by HR Magazine (February 2008) of African-Americans, Hispanics and Asian-Americans suggests that considerable tensions exist among these ethnic groups, including mistrust and stereotyping—feelings that may spill over into the workplace. Interestingly, each of these groups indicated that they were more trusting of Caucasians than each other. In fact, 61% of Hispanics, 54% of Asians and 47% of African-American respondents in this sample would rather do business with Caucasians than members of the other two groups. Approximately 46% of Hispanics and 52% of African-Americans believe that "most Asian business owners do not treat them with respect." Furthermore, 50% of African-Americans feel threatened by Latin American immigrants because "they are taking jobs, housing, and political power away from the African-American community". Finally, 47% of Asians and 44% of Hispanics say that are "generally afraid of African-Americans because they are responsible for most of the crime" (HR Magazine, March 2008).

One might argue that it is in the best interests of the majority population to create discord among minority groups. In this way, the majority retains its power base and ability to make decisions which impact all groups. If the racioethnic minorities distrust each other and prefer to work with Caucasians, then even when Caucasians are the numerical minority they will be in power. This dynamic played out in South Africa, where the minority group (white South Africans) controlled the factors of production and the economy.

In connecting the cultural context with ethics, it may be argued that individuals at the lowest strata of society (including racial minorities) are more impacted by unethical behaviors they observe and see rewarded than other groups, since they occupy the lowest positions of power and have fewer options available. Civil and human rights groups have also argued that the media portrayals of racioethnic minorities who are individuals "of interest" to law enforcement are far more negative than that of Caucasians similarly situated. The criminal justice literature is rife with examples of inequitable punishment based on race and ethnicity, coupled with financial resources. For example, African-Americans and Latinos have found themselves in the position of being charged with crimes more frequently than Caucasians; having the legal system differentially impose prison sentences; experiencing lower incidents of plea bargaining where community service is a component; and spending more time in prison for the same sentences for which whites are paroled (Esqueda, Espinoza, & Culhane, 2008; The Sentencing Times, 2008). This phenomenon may lead racial minority Millennials to believe that there is a greater cost for their getting caught in unethical and/or illegal behavior than their white counterparts.

Information from the Department of Labor (2009) indicates that the wage/salary levels for women and racial minorities, while improving, still lag behind their Caucasian (male) counterparts. Racial minorities tend to have a lower return on their investment in their own futures than the corresponding investment among their white counterparts and have a less positive impact on their careers because of organizational interventions such as mentoring (Smith & Calasanti, 2005; Calasanti & Smith, 1998, 2002). Given the negative opinions and cultural inequities reported above, students from racial minority groups face additional pressures and worries which are likely to affect their job search upon leaving college. With this framework, the reported study looks at intentions to fabricate on one of the most utilized tools for the job search, the resume and examines attitudes of our Millennials of interest to other racial minority groups.

It is a turbulent cultural and ethical context in which all Millennials are developing their professional identities; they know that there is a need for them to demonstrate leadership and contribute to rebuilding the U.S.

economy. When new entrants to the workforce have grown up with such vivid exposure to blurred ethical boundaries and such deep feelings of threat and mistrust among cultures, there is the potential for significant, probably negative, implications for them and the organizations which employ them.

Our study centers on a single group of college-educated African-American Millennials, a racial minority group which has not been widely studied. Researchers set out to learn their likelihood to fabricate their qualifications for their job search as well as their attitudes concerning immigration and media image of different racioethnic groups. Little, if any research has been conducted to explore what factors increase the likelihood of Millennials' fabricating on the job search, and none specifically about African-American Millennials at a predominantly African-American higher educational institution (HBCU) and their intention to engage in job search misinformation/cheating. What one discovers about this group might provide additional insight into their future experiences in the workplace, how they may work concomitantly with other racial groups, and what impact their increased presence may have on whites in the workplace.

Consistent with the research done by Kisamore, Stone, and Jawahar (2007), this study looks at the intersection of the cultural factors (both institutional and environmental) and individual factors (age, race, and their own ethical framework) and the interaction between them to better understand the intent of Millennials to fabricate on their job search.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. To what extent, if any, does this sample of Millennials report their intent to enhance their qualifications through fabrication or lies? If they intend to fabricate, in what areas would they be more likely to fabricate during their job search?
2. What view do the Millennial respondents have toward the workplace presence and/or immigration of other racial and ethnic groups?

STUDY SAMPLE

The sample consisted of a group of 245 undergraduate management, marketing, accounting, and liberal arts students from a single Master-Level 1 HBCU in the southeastern United States. Approximately 90% of the students at the school are African-American. One hundred percent of the surveys were usable for at least partial analysis based on number of responses, completion of demographic data, and verification check. Individuals were asked to self report their race, gender, major, grade point average and date of birth. All of the respondents were aged 17-24, which is considered the "traditional" undergraduate and identifies them as Millennials. There were 97 men and 148 women. The grade point average (GPA) for the 71 males who provided GPA data was 2.907; the GPA for 62 African-American males was 2.841. The GPA for the females overall was 3.004658, for 92 African-American females who provided GPA data, 3.073. Sixteen of the respondents were Caucasian; 2, Hispanic; 2, Asian, 7, "Other"; and 3 "Not applicable. Twelve individuals did not respond to the "race" question. The remainder of the respondents (203) were self identified as African-American. Only the data from the 203 African-American respondents will be utilized because of small cell sizes for other racial groups.

RESEARCH MEASURES AND METHODS

The students responded to a pen-and-paper survey and were given course credit for its completion and extra credit for having other students across the campus complete the survey. The respondents provided contact information, since they were told that the faculty member might check to confirm that they had filled out a survey but that no individual would be linked to a particular survey. When the surveys were returned, they were combined as a group and the surveys were numbered in sequential order by the researcher. Then the lead researcher randomly selected 20% of the names of the "other/non-administering" students to confirm that they had, in fact, completed the survey. No one in the validation sample denied having completed the survey.

The survey asked students to identify what, if anything, they would lie about as they pursue professional career opportunities. In particular, they were asked to rank several items in order in which they would be most

likely to embellish the truth. They were given a list of eight possible variables on which employment decisions were made and were asked to respond in terms of how likely they would be to fabricate information about that item in their job search.

The respondents were also able to add a ninth category in which they might fabricate on their resume. The items for potential fabrication were: Grade point average, work experience, extracurricular activities, organizational activities, awards and honors, references, career objectives and previous salary.

The response categories were 1 = very unlikely to fabricate; 2 = (un)likely to fabricate; 3 = would probably not fabricate; 4 = likely to fabricate; and 5= very likely to fabricate. There were also three open-ended questions asked about respondents' view on U.S. immigration policy and media portrayals of minorities. Those questions were (1) There are many attempts to reform immigration policy in the United States. Which groups do you feel should be restricted in terms of entering the United States?" (2) "Which group(s) do you feel would be most disadvantaged by any increase in restrictions around immigration?" and (3) "Which race has the highest favorable media coverage in the United States?" Question three was analyzed, but it is not linked to the literature review.

There were insufficient numbers of white students to be able to compare the results to African-American students and to have a strong degree of certainty that the results are meaningful. The remaining surveys were analyzed using descriptive statistics for race, gender, major, year in college, GPAs, likelihood of fabricating, categories of fabrication. Qualitative analyses were used for the open-ended questions. There was no statistically significant difference in the reported GPAs of males (2.907) and females (3.005).

RESULTS

Question 1

Only about 20% of the respondents were either likely or very likely to fabricate their GPA, while 41.35% were very unlikely to fabricate the GPA. Approximately 12% were likely to fabricate the GPA, while almost 8% were very likely to fabricate the GPA. A total of almost 80% stated they were not likely to fabricate their GPAs ("very unlikely, unlikely, or probably would not" fabricate GPA). Slightly over 21% were likely to embellish their work experience, while 79% were unlikely. Less than 20% of respondents were likely to modify their extracurricular activities (~18%); 27.5%, their organizational activities, 24%, their awards and honors; 20% their references, and 21% their career objectives. Less than 20% (19%) were likely to fabricate their salary history. Even omitting response category "2" from analysis, where 20% of the responses resided, overall, less than half of the students were willing to fabricate on any of the items.

Table 1

Race	Gender	N	GPA	Gender	GPA
African-Americans	Male Female	62 92	2.841 3.073	Female	3.005
Caucasians	Male Female	4 4	3.013 3.081	Male	2.907
Latinos	Male Female	1 1	N/A N/A	N = 97 Males; 148 Females – Not all disclosed GPA	
Asians	Male Female	4			
Others (Lumped)	Male Female	2.598 3.246			

Question 1b

For the purposes of this research, "subjective variables" are "Work experience, references, career objectives, extracurricular and organizational activities." "Objective variables" are GPA, awards and honors, and

salary. The results are shown in Table 2. Hypothesis 2 is partially supported. The students are less likely to fabricate GPA, References and Salary than other listed factors. However, "Awards and Honors" was the second most likely area that students were likely to fabricate. GPA and salary are easily verified. Formal institutional awards and honors are verifiable, but students may "create" other awards and honors for which verification might be extremely problematic.

Table 2: Frequencies and Percentages of Responses

Response ➔ Question	1 very unlikely to fabricate	2 = (un)likely to fabricate	3 = would probably Not fabricate	4 = Likely to fabricate	5 = very likely to fabricate	Total
GPA	98 = 41.35%	28 = 11.81%	65 = 27.43%	28 = 11.81%	18 = 7.59%	237
Work Experience	88 = 35.63%	40 = 16.19%	67 = 21.13%	32 = 12.96%	20 = 8.1%	247
Extracurricular Activities	78 = 25.74%	45 = 14.85%	60 = 19.8%	32 = 10.56%	22 = 7.26%	303
Organizational Activities	82 = 34.74%	37 = 15.68%	54 = 22.88%	39 = 16.53%	24 = 10.17%	236
Awards and honors	95 = 40.08%	25 = 10.55%	62 = 26.16%	25 = 10.55%	30 = 12.66%	237
References	91 = 38.4%	43 = 18.14%	55 = 23.21	26 = 10.97%	22 = 9.28%	237
Career Objectives	88 = 35.63%	46 = 18.62%	61 = 24.7%	29 = 11.74%	23 = 9.31%	247
Salary	81 = 32.66%	45 = 18.14%	73 = 29.43%	27 = 10.89%	22 = 8.87%	248

Columns do not total 100% because of rounding. Students could choose more than one category.

Ethics instruction for all students was conducted in small portions in humanities and social science courses included in the general education curriculum. The ethics instruction for business students did not occur until their junior or senior year. Our survey had a cross-section of individuals at different academic levels. Therefore, we cannot know what impact, if any, the AACSB-required ethics education had on the formation of ethical values versus discussions of ethics in literature, political science, humanities and other courses.

Question 2a

The qualitative results were very interesting and are reported here. A little more than half of the sample provided responses to the open-ended questions. There were 124 responses to Question 2a, "There are many attempts to reform immigration policy in the United States. Which groups do you feel should be restricted in terms of entering the United States?" The racial or national origin categories were not provided for the students. Their qualitative responses were analyzed based on the terms they used to describe their own or other racial groups. Fifty-three of the students or 42.7% felt that Latinos or Mexicans should be restricted in terms of entry to the United States. Fifty-eight students or 46.77% felt that no restrictions should apply. Three students (2%) felt that Middle Easterners should be barred, one that terrorists be barred. Two (or 1.6%) thought that Japanese or Asians should not be allowed into the United States. The other students left this answer blank.

A second question (Question 2b) asked "Which group(s) do you feel would be most disadvantaged by any increase in restrictions around immigration?" The one hundred responses were similar, with Hispanics/Mexicans making up 75% or seven-five responses; Asians, 10% (10 responses), and African-Americans, 11% (11 responses), and Haitians identified three times or (3%).

The third question (Question 2c) asked which race had the highest favorable media coverage in the United States. There had been a major incident in the local news concerning the way that certain groups were categorized by the media. This question tested their knowledge of current events and their perceptions of how the media viewed them as racial minorities. Over 179 students responded to this question, and 117 (65.4%) felt that Caucasians received the most favorable media coverage, followed by 54 (30.2%) for African-Americans, 6 (3.3%) Asians and 2 (1.11%) for Hispanics. African-Americans were identified as the group having the lowest level of favorable media coverage, followed by Hispanics, Caucasians, Native Americans, Asians and Middle Easterners (116, 27, 11, 6, 4, and 3, respectively). A total of 167 responses were recorded, and the percentages in the same order are 69.5% for

African-Americans; 16.2% for Hispanics; 6.6%, Caucasians; Native Americans, 2.4%; and Middle Easterners, 1.8%.

DISCUSSION

Our results were inconsistent with other studies that looked at cheating behavior by Millennials. The reported values of these respondents as self-revealed indicate that despite the competitive environment and perhaps because of what they see in terms of corporate America, they are less likely to engage in these specified fabrications than the literature indicated about job seekers in general. This university is located in the "Bible Belt" and many students have expressed strong, active religious practices (particularly Christian beliefs and values).

Many of the items listed for potential fabrication are those that are easily verifiable as well. Students were asked for their names and contact information, and that may have predisposed them to respond in particular ways. The Office of Career Services is able to check GPAs for students who wish to apply for specific positions on campus. Finally, the Academic Integrity Code at the University is also strongly enforced, and the penalty for cheating is significant.

It is possible that either we did not sample enough individuals to determine a pattern of lying among the administering students; the use of the list of student names, e-mails and phone numbers was a deterrent; or the students truly did not have a predisposition to lie about having administered the survey. It is equally possible that the students responded truthfully and that their knowledge of the consequences of untruthful behavior having a differential impact for them versus their Caucasian counterparts served as a deterrent for them. Because we did not have a sufficient sample of other races, we cannot definitively state if our sample's responses were unique to African-Americans or consistent with students who self selected this particular institution. The numbers of other groups (Caucasians, Latinos, and Asians) was so small, that their presence in the table for Questions 1a-1c did not make a difference in the results.

As expected based on the currency of the news blitz targeting Hispanic and African-American suspects, African-Americans readily identified the negative media portrayals of themselves and Hispanics. In addition, they were in tune with the difficulties that Hispanics have, but they did feel that immigration should be restricted for this group. When Hispanics became the largest minority group in the United States, this displaced African-Americans as the largest minority group (and with it the associated attention, political clout, and funding) and changed the balance of power. Additionally, while African-Americans and Hispanics had previously enjoyed more collegial relationships, there seems to be a different attitude toward each other now. The push toward adding Spanish as a national language after the negative publicity concerning "Ebonics" and the requirement to learn Spanish to gain entrée into the business world are two factors that widen the chasm between African-Americans and Hispanics.

This is preliminary data from a demographically restricted sample. It does provide additional insight into this population and their attitudes toward the world of work and other groups within the workplace.

This research provides an additional lens through which to view the attitudes and intentions of Millennials. It adds data to the current literature and provides more depth as it relates to one racioethnic minority group. In addition, it provides a cultural context to which other researchers may not be privy, that of the Historically Black College or University (HBCU) from which the majority of African-American college graduates hail and are a key source of applicants for employers.

Finally, this research provides insight into attitudes of new entrants to the workforce who are part of the second largest racioethnic minority population. This insight might provide guidance in framing initiatives to successfully manage issues with which employers are grappling, such as employee engagement, organizational commitment, unplanned turnover, and performance management.

This study will be replicated at several majority institutions, where there will be high numbers of Caucasians and at least 10% African-American population as well as 10% minority population. If the sample represents that distribution, we would be able to make the cross-race, cross-cultural comparisons. In addition, the response category "2" will be corrected to reflect the researcher's intentions. Furthermore, we will need to control

for academic level and student's matriculation in other courses which have an ethical component as well. A pre-test, post-test type model could be helpful with a longitudinal study. However, maturation effects may also obfuscate or intensify the impact of ethical training. That in itself is a research question.

From a practical standpoint, it is interesting to note if any differences exist. If the group of respondents who are not African-American and who did not self-disclose race are combined, 42 students would fall into that category, with the remaining 203 students self-identified as African-American. A second question arises, do the values of the Caucasian students more closely mirror those of the African-American students, since the Caucasian students selected an HBCU and interact predominantly with African-American students in the classroom, athletics and student organizations. This is an interesting question for future research.

This research can be extremely useful for business organizations as they begin to embrace the Millennials in their workplace. This research provides additional insight that despite Millennials' desire to work in groups and to be mentored, cross-cultural considerations still are a factor. As the minority composition continues to grow and change, the organization needs to be prepared for cross-cultural conflict that might look very different from racioethnic minority group versus Caucasian conflict. The legacy of slavery which still impacts African-American and Caucasian interactions are not relevant for Latinos. Power and privilege dynamics still operate as long as Caucasian males dominate the leadership in organizations. Finally, both the ways of motivating and rewarding individuals in organizations may also need to be reevaluated. What is viewed as excellence from one cultural perspective may not apply equally in another cultural context. The need for excellent communication in which individuals are valued becomes increasingly important for continued organizational success in an increasingly diverse and turbulent economic environment.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Dr. Janice Witt Smith, SPHR, is founder and chief consultant with J.W. Smith and Associates, LLC, a human resource, leadership and organizational development and executive coaching company. She also is Professor of management at Winston-Salem State University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Dr. Smith consults in leadership development, team development, career development, change management, strategic planning, and human resource consulting, and issues related to workforce diversity. She is a published author whose work examines the experiences of racio-ethnic minorities and women in organizations.

Dr. Gloria Clark, CPA, is an associate professor of accounting in the Department of Accounting and MIS, at Winston-Salem State University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Dr. Clark consults in public and tax accounting and is a published author and motivational speaker. Dr. Clark has won numerous teaching and leadership awards and serves on the boards several prestigious organizations and honorary associations.

REFERENCES

1. AACSB International. (2004). *Ethics Education in Business Schools*.
2. Armor, S. (2006, November 6). Generation Y: They've arrived at work with a new attitude. usatoday.com. http:///www.usatoday.com/money/workplace/2005~11-06-gen-y_x.htm.
3. Armstrong, M. (1987). Moral development and accounting education. *Journal of Accounting Education* 5(Spring): 27-43.
4. --- (1993). Ethics and professionalism in accounting education: A sample course. *Journal of Accounting Education* 11(Spring): 77.
5. Barnett, T.,K. Bass, Brown, G. , and Herbert, F.J. (1998). Ethical ideology and the ethical judgments of marketing professionals. *Journal of Business Ethics* 17: 715-723.
6. Brown, D. (2004). Waterloo forced to fire top bureaucrat weeks after hiring. *Canadian HR Reporter*. October 11, 17(17), p. 3.
7. Buckley, W.F., Jr. (2006). *National Review*, "Simple Moral Arithmetic,11/20/2006, Vol. 58, Issue 21, p. 54.
8. Calasanti, T. & Smith, J.W. (December 2002). Latina Faculty. In Ana M. Martinez Aleman & Kristen A. Renn (Eds.). *Women in higher education: An encyclopedia*. ABC-CLIO Press: Santa Barbara, CA.

9. Calasanti, T. & Smith, J.W. (1998). A critical evaluation of the experiences of women and minority faculty: Some implications for occupational research. In Helena Z. Lopata (Ed.), *Current research on occupations and professions*. Vol. 10, 239-258. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
10. Cullen, L.T. (2006) Getting wise to lies. *Time*. New York: May 1, 167(18), p. 59.
11. Deal, J.J. (2007). *Retiring the Generation Gap: How Employees Young & Old Can Find Common Ground*, Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA.
12. Dougherty, K., Harder, R., Hill M., Kirk, H., & Miller, T. (2006). The Echo Boom: What Generation Y has in Store for the HR Community. Retrieved November 21, 2006, from University of North Carolina, Wilmington website: www.uncw.edu/stuaff/career/documents/EchoBoom.pps.
13. Daft, R.L. (2005). *Leadership Experience* (3d Edition). Thomson/Southwestern: Mason, OH.
14. Esqueda, C.W., Espinoza, RKE, and Culhane, S.E. (2008). The effects of ethnicity, SES, and crime status on juror decision making: A cross-cultural examination of European American and Mexican American Mock jurors. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 30, 181-199.*
15. Flynn, F.J., Chatman, J.A., and Spataro, S.E. (2001). Getting to know you: The influence of personality on impressions and performance of demographically different people in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 3, pp. 414-446.
16. Forsyth, D. (1980). A taxonomy of ethical ideologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39 (July): 175-84.
17. "For which reasons does Generation Y work?" 13 Oct. 2006: http://www.vlerick.be/news/more/2006/20061013_pressrelease_generationy_en.htm.
18. --- (1992). Judging the morality of business practices: The influence of personal moral philosophies. *Journal of Business Ethics* 11(5): 461-470.
19. Generation Y." 21 Nov. 2006. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generation_Y.
20. Gilligan, C. (1982) *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
21. Hartley, H.R. (2004). The truth may be out there, but not on most CVs. *Personnel Today*, July 27, p. 14.
22. Haskell, K. (2001). Liar, liar, you're not hired: Even white lies hurt job hunters. *New York Times*, May 30, p. G1.
23. *HR Magazine* (February 2008:26). Current Issues in Human Resource Management.
24. Human Rights Watch (2008). Targeting Blacks: Drug law enforcement and race in the United States.
25. Kail, R.V. and Cavanaugh, J.C. (2000). *Human Development: A Lifespan View*, 2d Edition, Stamford, CT: Wadsworth Press.
26. Kisamore, J.L., Stone, T.H., and Jawahar, I.M. (2007). Academic integrity: The relationship between individual and situational factors on misconduct contemplations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 75:381-394.
27. Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on moral development: Vol. II The psychology of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
28. Kohlberg, L. (1987). The development of moral judgment and moral action. In L. Kohlberg (Ed.), *Child psychology and childhood education: A cognitive-developmental view* (pp. 259-328). New York: Longman.
29. Lei, T. (1994). Being and becoming moral in a Chinese culture: Unique or universal? *Cross Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science, 28* 59-91.
30. Mabe, D.L. (2005). *Promoting Academic Integrity in Business Schools,* Professional Development Workshop (Academy of Management, Hawaii).
31. Mangan, K. (2006). Most MBA Student Believe Companies Should help improve society, survey finds. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* November 3, 2006, Vol. 53, Issue 11, p. 36.
32. McGuire, M. (2006). *Amid growing scrutiny, numerous fraudulent resume claims are exposed*. Knight Ridder Tribune Business News. Washington: Mar 6, p. 1.
33. Pomery A. (2005). Liar, liar, pants on fire. *HR Magazine*, Sep. 50(9), p. 16-17.
34. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 126, No. 4, pp. 530-555.
35. Righton, B. (2006). Hey, boss, your pants are on fire. *Macleans*. Toronto: Jun 5, 119(23), p 42.
36. Sabatini, P. (2006). Fibs on resumes commonplace. *Knight Ridder Tribune Business News*. Washington: Feb. 24, p. 1.
37. The Sentencing Project (2008). Reducing racial disparity in the criminal justice system: A manual for practitioners and policymakers.

38. Snarey, J. R. (1985). Cross-cultural universality of social-moral development: A critical review of Kohlbergerian research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 202-232.
39. Smith, J.W., Smith, W.J. and Markham, S.E. (2000). Diversity issues in the mentoring of academic faculty. *Journal of Career Development*, Vol. 26(4).
40. Smith, J.W. and Calasanti, T. (2005). The influence of gender, race, and ethnicity on workplace experiences of institutional and social isolation: A study of faculty in the Academy. *Sociological Spectrum.*
41. U.S. Census (2005). U.S. Department of Labor.
42. Vinocur, M.R. (2006). Can you separate fact from fiction? *American Printer*. Chicago: May, 123(5), p. 51.
43. *Wall Street Journal*. R.H. Donnelley corrects details on CEO's college background. New York, NY: Sep. 12, 2006, p. A12.

NOTES