ABSTRACT
Although Millennials are increasingly discussed in popular media, little research has been conducted on how Millennials' beliefs about social responsibility - concerns with such things as fair business practices and community involvement - affect their choice of employer and experiences in the working world. We surveyed a random sample of alumni and current undergraduates from a small, private liberal arts college in the Midwest to examine the degree to which Millennials’ attitudes towards social responsibility affect the workplace. First, we explore the importance of social responsibility to college-age Millennials during job selection. Second, we compare beliefs across Millennials, Gen Xers, and Baby Boomers regarding social responsibility and its impact on the workplace.

“The first generation to reach adulthood in the new millennium,” (Keeter et al. 2010:4) or the “Millennial” generation, is receiving increasing attention in the media. From popular literature to Facebook newsfeeds, discussion of the Millennial generation is everywhere. Academic research is just beginning to explore trends associated with Millennials entering the workplace such as helicopter parents (Gardner 2007; Schneider 2007), the need for feedback (Gursoy, Maier, and Chi 2008), work-life balance, etc. (Nicholas 2007). As they enter into the workforce with Generation Xers (Gen X) and Baby Boomers (Boomers), their unique perspectives manifest themselves in their civic behavior and ethical values.

A generation is “an identifiable group that shares birth years, age location, and significant life events at critical developmental stages” (Smola and Sutton 2002:364). Our study focuses on the three generations that make up the majority of the current workforce: Baby Boomers, Gen Xers, and Millennials. Although the exact age range that defines each generation varies within the academic literature. our study relies on the dates commonly used and outlined by the Pew Research Institute. The Millennial cohort includes those born between 1981 and 1996, the Gen X cohort includes those born between 1965 and 1980, and the Baby Boomer cohort includes those born between 1946 and 1964 (Keeter et al. 2010).
Locus of Control: Generational Changes

The Internal-External Control of Reinforcement Scale or I-E Scale has frequently been used to study individual worldviews (Twenge, Liquing, and Im 2004). The I-E Scale measures the degree to which an individual believes the outcome of an event is within her personal control, also called the locus of control or LOC (Rotter and Mulry 1965). The scale runs on a continuum from highly internal to highly external. “Internals” believe outcomes are determined by their actions and abilities, while “externals” feel forces beyond their control determine outcomes (Rotter and Mulry 1965).

According to a study by Twenge and colleagues (2004), increasing numbers of young adults have an external LOC. Compiling data from 97 studies conducted between 1960 and 2002, the study compared I-E scale scores from 18,310 American undergraduates (Twenge et al. 2004). The average college student in 2002 had a more external LOC than 80% of college students in the early 1960’s (Twenge et al. 2004). Differences between the generations may be partially attributed to differences between “internals” and “externals”. I-E Scale studies have found behavioral variation among “internals” and “externals” in areas such as entrepreneurial orientation (Mueller and Thomas 2001) and ethical decision making (Guthrie 1985; Terpstra and Rozell 1993; Twenge et al. 2004).

Entrepreneurial orientation, or an individual’s propensity to act on their decisions, is correlated with an internal LOC (Mueller and Thomas 2001). These studies suggest that, as externals, Millennials may not have the same propensity to act as previous generations. Ethical decision-making also correlates with internal LOC (Guthrie 1985; Terpstra and Rozell 1993; Trevino and Youngblood 1990). In a study of insider trading tendencies, externals were more likely to engage in unethical trades than internals (Terpstra and Rozell 1993). Recent studies suggest that Millennials are hesitant to assert their ethical beliefs but do have a desire to act ethically (Curtin et al. 2011; Gursoy et al. 2008). Based on the LOC literature and its strong correlation to ethical attitudes and actions, we developed our first hypothesis.
H1: There is a relationship between student Millennials’ LOC and their attitudes and actions regarding social responsibility (SR) in the workplace.

Social Responsibility: Actions and Attitudes

Studies that explore Millennial attitudes characterize Millennials as a “liberal, tolerant, and socially responsible” generation (Keeter et al. 2010). Potentially influenced by their Baby Boomer parents who placed a strong emphasis on civil rights, empowerment and diversity, Millennials strongly believe in environmental issues and equal rights for those of different genders, sexualities, and ethnicities (Claps 2010; Keeter et al. 2010). Millennials seem to take their beliefs seriously. When asked what is most important in their life, 21% of Millennials selected “helping others” (Keeter et al. 2010). In a series of interviews conducted with students at a university in China, participants identified a “sense of responsibility” as their primary motivation for volunteering (Luping 2011).

Researchers who focus on Millennial actions rather than attitudes have come to the opposite conclusion. These studies have found that Millennials are less involved in social issues than their parents’ generation. In 2009, The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) compared civic and political activity among young adults (20-29) across generations (1970s to 2000s). Using data from a collection of surveys, CIRCLE (2009) found a decline in nine of the ten forms of civic engagement. While 51% talked about current affairs often, 26% voted regularly, and 36% volunteered in the last year, a total of 58% of this age group were not engaged in civic or political activities on a regular basis (CIRCLE 2009:3). In 2010, Millennials age 16-24 had the lowest rate of volunteer participation (21.9%) when compared to older generations (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2010). Due to the inconsistencies in research on Millennials, we developed our second and third hypotheses to gain a clearer picture of Millennials’ attitudes and actions regarding social responsibility.
H2: Millennial Alumni and GenX/Boomers differ in their emphasis on social responsibility in the workplace.

H3: There is a gap between Millennials' views of social responsibility in the workplace and GenX/Boomers perceptions of Millennials' attitudes.

**Social Responsibility in the Workplace**

Millennials have high expectations for their workplace. Millennials place more value on the satisfaction gained from their work, including ethical satisfaction, than on pay increases and promotions (Tamm et al. 2011:3). Accordingly, they seek companies that support corporate social responsibility (CSR) and promote values that match their own. Corporations and businesses may need to embrace socially responsible behavior in order to retain Millennial employees; 86% of Millennials would consider leaving an employer who they did not deem socially responsible (Keeter et al. 2010). Businesses that advertised elements of CSR received heightened interest from Millennials and a wider recruitment pool (den Hond 2007:12). To find out what aspects of social responsibility Millennials value most in their employer, we developed our fourth hypothesis.

H4: There is a difference between Millennial Students’ and Millennial Workers’ expectations for their future employers regarding social responsibility.

**Critique of Literature**

There are several gaps in the literature on Millennials that create problems for effective research. First, generational boundaries vary across studies, which limits cross-study comparisons (Parry and Urwin 2011; Smola and Sutton 2004; Twenge et al. 2010). Second, the concept of generations is highly criticized and many researchers contend that what we call “generational” differences are actually differences in development due to age. While longitudinal studies would help counteract the generation versus development debate, few such studies
have been conducted. This makes it difficult to accurately determine if Millennials are different from their predecessors. Given that many Millennials are not in the workforce, researchers should also be wary of making generalizations about Millennials. As of 2010, 41% of Millennials worked full-time, 24% worked part-time, and 35% did not work (students or unemployed) (Keeter et al. 2010). Additionally, very little information was found for Millennials of varying socio-economic backgrounds as most studies focus on college students and professionals, groups that tend to be from the upper-middle class instead of working classes. This results in an unbalanced view of the Millennial generation’s demographics and calls into question the use of the term “Millennials” to describe a subset of an entire generation.

Our research addressed the following four hypotheses:

H1: There is a relationship between student Millennials’ LOC and their attitudes and actions regarding social responsibility (SR) in the workplace.

H2: Millennial Alumni and GenX/Boomers differ in their emphasis on social responsibility in the workplace.

H3: There is a gap between Millennials' views of social responsibility in the workplace and GenX/Boomers perceptions of Millennials' attitudes.

H4: There is a difference between Millennial Students’ and Millennial Workers’ expectations for their future employers regarding social responsibility.

METHODS

Conducted in the fall of 2011, our study focused on the social responsibility beliefs and behaviors of Millennial, Generation X and Baby Boomer generations. Three self-administered questionnaires were given to different populations taken from alumni and current undergraduates of St. Olaf College, a private Lutheran liberal-arts college in the Midwest. Our data was gathered through a larger study on Millennials in the workplace and was sponsored by the St. Olaf College Sociology/Anthropology Department as part of the course Foundations of
We developed our surveys using information provided through a review of relevant literature, a focus group of St. Olaf juniors and seniors, and informal conversations with Baby Boomers and Generation Xers currently working with Millennials. Our survey questions were combined with three other research teams. In addition to our topic, the larger survey explored areas of hiring and promotion, work/life balance, and parental involvement in the workforce. These surveys were each available online using the survey software, Formcreator, for 5 to 7 days during the fall of 2011.

Our accessible population was limited to St. Olaf alumni (GenX/Boomers and Millennials) and current students (juniors and seniors). The accessible alumni population was further restricted to only those for whom the alumni relations office had records (email address, class year, title, employer and occupation, and if they were listed as currently engaged in civilian employment). We also excluded alumni in the following occupational categories: student, member of the armed services, homemaker, retired, volunteer, unemployed, or disabled.

We collected a simple random sample of alumni from class years 1964 to 2000 for the GenX/Boomer Alumni survey and years 2001 to 2011 for the Millennial Alumni survey. For the undergraduate survey we included full-time juniors and seniors only and excluded students from the two sections of SOAN 371, those who participated in our preliminary focus groups, participants in off-campus study programs, and students under 18 or older than traditional college age students.

In selecting our sample size, we employed Neuman’s (2007) “Rule of Thumb.” The accessible population for the GenX/Boomer survey totaled 9,747 individuals. Neuman (2007) considers this a “moderate population size,” for which a sample size of 10% (975) is reasonable. The Millennial alumni and undergraduate surveys had smaller accessible populations, 3,071 and 1,295 respectively. For the Millennial alumni survey, a sample size of 536 was adequate and the undergraduate survey required a sampling ratio of slightly less than 30% (647) (Neuman 2007:162).
The GenX/Boomer survey was sent to 858 individuals and 14.2% (122) completed the survey. Of those who responded 58.2% identified as female, 41.8% identified as male, 27.5% were from Generation X and 72.5% were from the Baby Boomer generation. The Millennial Alumni survey was sent to 536 individuals, 19.4% (104) of who completed the survey. 79.6% identified as female and 20.3% identified as male. Our undergraduate survey was sent to 647 students, 41.1 % (266) completed the survey. Of those students, 65.4% identified as female and 32.3% identified as male. 44.4% were juniors and 53.8% were seniors.

VARIABLES AND PROCEDURES

Locus of Control

The literature suggests there is a relationship between Millennials’ locus of control and their actions regarding social responsibility. We created our locus of control index by adapting five relevant questions from Rotter’s I-E Scale (Rotter and Mulry 1965). The response categories were binary; one represented an “internal” LOC such as, “Being in the right place at the right time largely determines how successful I am”, and the other response choice represented an “external” LOC such as, “Success has more to do with hard work than with luck.”

Social Responsibility in Attitudes

Our social responsibility attitude variable was adapted from the “Voluntary International Standard for Social Responsibility” put forth by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO 26000). Social responsibility in the workplace can be divided into six categories: business ethics, human rights, consumer well being, involvement in the local community, environmental sustainability, and employee wellbeing (ISO 2010). Due to space constraints we omitted “consumer responsibility,” which we incorporated into human rights. The scale included five questions (one for each subtopic) such as, “Employees are mainly
responsible for their own health and safety on the job.” These were measured with a four-point Likert scale. Each index was coded from 5-25, 5 indicating strong disagreement with social responsibility values and 25 indicating strong agreement. We also used this scale to measure GenX/Boomers’ perceptions of Millennials’ values.

Additionally, in each Millennial student survey we asked respondents to pick the most important attribute they would look for in a future employer out of seven potential choices. The response categories included: “salary for affluent lifestyle”, “promotes ethical practices”, “produces environmentally beneficial products”, “values employee health/safety over profit”, “works to improve local community”, “works to reduce discrimination in the workplace”, and “other.” This multiple-choice question effectively determined which aspect of social responsibility they would prioritize, if any.

Social Responsibility Actions

We asked undergraduate Millennials a series of questions regarding how they would behave in a hypothetical workplace. Examples included whether they would stretch the truth to protect an employer or would implement a recycling program at work. These questions correspond to the aforementioned subtopics of social responsibility. These questions determine Millennials’ willingness to act in a socially responsible manner using a 4-point Likert scale.

Validity and Reliability

We used several methods to ensure validity (measurement actually measures our conceptual definition) within our survey. Through the completion of a focus group, informal interviews, and the guidance of our professor, we believe that we achieved face and content validity. We achieved face validity when we asked qualified others, including our professor, to review our survey. We established content validity (e.g. the survey measures all aspects of the conceptual definition) by using the five categories of social responsibility from the ISO 26000
document within each social responsibility index created.

Social responsibility is a nebulous concept, and we considered content validity to be extremely important. Because we measured several aspects of social responsibility and developed different types of questions to assess socially responsible actions, we felt that we effectively constructed our measure of social responsibility in an exhaustive and accurate manner (Nardi 2006:57). Finally, because our scale for LOC is based on established standards, namely the I-E scale, we also achieved concurrent validity.

We also worked to increase our reliability in several ways. Through our use of multiple research methods (focus group and survey), our use of pretests with other members of our SOAN 371 research methods course, and our use of interval/ratio (I/R) variables, we obtained measurement reliability. By clearly conceptualizing our definitions at the beginning of each survey and using precise methods of measurement, we ensure consistency in our results. We also have inter-item reliability from our use of scale items and diverse measurements of social responsibility actions, specifically through use of alternating positively and negatively worded questions. Given the time limitations of our study, we were unable to use test-retest methods to obtain reliability.

**Ethical Considerations**

In preparing and conducting our research we made conscious efforts to maintain ethical practices. We informed participants of the purpose of the survey and approximate completion time. We avoided infringing on participants’ autonomy and consent by emphasizing that participation was voluntary, that they were permitted to skip over questions and that they could stop at any point without pressure to submit the questionnaire. To show the potential benefit and mitigation of harm to participants, we assured them of their anonymity, informed them of the dates and locations of public presentations, and provided contact information in case of further questions or comments. Participants received an introductory cover letter
electronically and logging onto Formcreator was a demonstration of their consent.

Another ethical concern for our research included appropriate procedures for subject selection, which we obtained through random sampling and minimal exclusions. In selecting the sampling pool we excluded all vulnerable subjects. We protected participant anonymity through the use of randomly assigned user names and passwords. The director of the Institutional Review Board was the only individual to have access to the names of the participants. Furthermore, demographic questions that might endanger the anonymity of the participant were not asked. Our questions avoided potentially offensive or sensitive topics and aimed to be value-neutral, which encouraged honest answers from participants. We complied with all appropriate institutional and governmental ethical standards by receiving approval from the St. Olaf College Institutional Review Board. The topics assessed for approval involved risk/benefit ratio, procedures, privacy, and informed consent.

RESULTS

H1a: There is a relationship between student Millennials’ LOC and their attitudes regarding social responsibility (SR) in the workplace.

Frequency analyses of the LOC Index and SR index variables revealed that more respondents had an internal LOC (67.5%) and 19.6% ranked highly internal. The mean SR index score was 10.69. While the LOC index was normally distributed, the SR index was left skewed due to a high mean score. Therefore, we conducted a Mann-Whitney U test and

Figure 1 shows the mean SR index score for individuals with a High Internal LOC and a High External LOC.
found a significant relationship between Millennial students’ LOC and their SR scores ($U=1157.000, p<.05$). In Figure 1, it is evident that highly internal individuals have a higher SR index score ($\mu=12$). This suggests that individuals who are highly internal are more likely to support SR Ethics in the workplace than highly external individuals.

**H1b: There is a relationship between student Millennials’ LOC and their actions regarding social responsibility (SR) in the workplace.**

Figure 2 shows the percentage of respondents (within the LOC categories High Internal and High External) who selected “somewhat agree” or “strongly agree” for each respective SR Action item. Item 3 discussed giving back to the local community, “If my employer organized volunteer opportunities in the local community, I would participate,” and Item 4 dealt with human rights, specifically anti-discrimination, “I would try to change my employer’s policies if they discriminated against a certain group of people.” Both items 3 and 4 received the strongest support from both highly internal (95.5%, 98.2%) and highly external (85.7%, 78.6%) groups (Figure 2). Item 2 referred to
business ethics, “I would be willing to stretch the truth when talking to a customer/client in order to protect my employer,” and had the least support from both high internals (69.5%) and high externals (57.1%) as well. Using a series of Spearman’s rho tests we found significant relationships between the LOC index and SR Action items 1, 3, and 4. Item 1 addressed environmental action: “If my employer lacked a recycling program, I would start one in my workplace” ($p<.05$). Item 3 discussed giving back to the local community: “If my employer organized volunteer opportunities in the local community, I would participate” ($p<.01$). Item 4 dealt with human rights, specifically anti-discrimination, “I would try to change my employer’s policies if they discriminated against a certain group of people” ($p<.01$). The only SR Action item that was not significant was on the topic of business ethics ($p>.05$).

**SR Index and SR Action Items**

While we did not develop a hypothesis to explore the relationship between SR attitudes and SR actions, we determined that testing those variables was a logical extension of H1. Due to the skewedness of the SR index, we conducted a Kruskal-Wallis test on each of the SR Action items (each response category was treated as an independent group). We identified significant relationships between SR scores and 3 of the SR Action items: the “environmental” item ($H(3)=20.214, p<.000$), the “local community” item ($H(3)=18.52, p<.000$), and the “anti-discrimination” item ($H(3)=34.454, p<.000$). As in H1b, the “business ethics” item was not significantly related to SR ($p>.05$).

**H2: Millennial Alumni and GenX/Boomers differ in their emphasis on social responsibility in the workplace.**

We compared Millennial and GenX/Boomer responses to five social responsibility items. We found that both indexes were normally distributed (separately and merged). We ran an independent samples t-test, with the SR indexes as our dependent variable and generation as
the independent variable. The results indicated no significant difference in SR scores between generations (p>.05). To explore the data further, we used Cramer’s V to test individual items from the social responsibility index such as “Employees are responsible for their own safety at work” and their association with generational differences. No significant relationships were found (p>.05).

**H3: There is a gap between Millennials' views of social responsibility in the workplace and GenX/Boomers perceptions of Millennials' attitudes.**

We asked GenX/Boomers to rank Millennials’ attitudes on the five social responsibility items. We then created a perceived Millennial SR index. To test our hypothesis, we compared the perceived Millennial SR Ethics Index to the Millennial SR index (used in H2). Both indexes were normally distributed, so we ran an independent samples t-test using generation as the independent variable. Our results were not statistically significant (p>.05).

To explore our hypothesis further, we used Cramer’s V to test the individual social responsibility items. Item 4, which asked about environmentalism, had a significant, positive relationship (V=.192, p<.05; Table 1). Item 5, which asked about anti-discrimination policies had a significant, yet weak positive relationship (V=.178; p<.05; Table 2). This indicates that GenX Boomers underestimate the amount of support Millennials give to anti-discriminatory policies. Cramer’s V tests on the four other SR items produced no significant results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Symmetric Measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Phi</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Symmetric Measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Phi</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H4: There is a difference between Millennial Students’ and Millennial Workers’ expectations for their future employers regarding social responsibility.

To test this hypothesis, we compared Millennial worker and Millennial student responses to our survey question, “Imagine you are looking for a full-time job and have begun comparing potential employers. Pick one attribute that is most important to you in a future employer.” The response categories included the five ISO 26000 social responsibility factors, one regarding monetary incentives, and an option for “other.” We ran frequency tests to determine which attributes were most important to both sets of Millennials; the top three attributes were “Promotes ethical practices”, “Works to improve local community”, and “Values employee health/safety over profit” (Figures 3 and 4).

We used a Cramer’s V test to compare generation to the “most important attribute” variable. No significant relationship was found (V=.144; p<.05), therefore we rejected our fourth hypothesis.
The analysis showed that the Millennial workers and undergraduates share similar expectations for their employer regarding social responsibility. We encountered a source of error during this test in that many cells within the cross tabulation had less than 5 instances recorded from the data.

DISCUSSION

Characteristics of Millennials

H1 indicated that the LOC of Millennial students correlated with their social responsibility actions and beliefs as found when we compared the SR index and the four individual SR Action items. These results support the literature that suggests individuals with an internal LOC would be more likely to have strong beliefs regarding social responsibility and act on those beliefs. We found that St. Olaf students’ LOC scores (primarily internal LOC) diverged from larger national trends indicating that college students tend to have a more external LOC (CIRCLE 2009; Twenge et al. 2004). St. Olaf students with an internal LOC reported strong beliefs about social responsibility and indicated they would act on their beliefs. Students with an external LOC also had relatively strong beliefs, but their responses to the SR Action items did not suggest they would act on their beliefs. Thus in this study LOC and action were the most strongly related items.

Results from H4 were not significant, indicating that Millennials’ expectations for their employers do not differ after entering the workforce. This survey also highlighted that a company that “promotes ethical practices”, “works to improve the local community” and “values employee health/safety over profit” is more desirable to Millennial students and Millennial workers. These shared values indicate that the developmental transition from college to the workforce does not alter Millennials’ social responsibility beliefs.

Social Responsibility Across Generations
There were no significant differences between the two generations regarding their views on social responsibility. Our findings conflicted with previous literature stating that generational differences influence employee retention and business recruitment strategies (Alsop 2009). We conclude that authors of popular literature on this topic, many of whom are GenX/Boomers, are introducing inaccurate perceptions of Millennials to potential employers.

These inaccurate perceptions of Millennials may explain discrepancies between GenX/Boomers’ perceptions of Millennials regarding anti-discrimination and the environment when compared with Millennials’ self-perceptions. Millennials view themselves to be more adamant about anti-discriminatory policies and more environmentally conscious than their older counterparts believe them to be. As previously mentioned, Millennials may take for granted anti-discrimination policies; GenX/Boomers may interpret this as apathy towards workplace discrimination. There is also a discrepancy between Millennials environmental attitudes and GenX/Boomers perceptions of these attitudes. Our sample of Millennial students may have been influenced by their college which has strong environmental policies. Thus these Millennials may be more proactive in promoting environmental sustainability. It is unclear whether Millennials overated their support for anti-discrimination and environmental issues or whether GenX/Boomers underestimated Millennials’ attitudes.

CONCLUSION

Our study investigated beliefs, behaviors, and cross-generational perceptions between GenX/Boomers, Millennial workers and Millennial students in regards to social responsibility in the workplace. We found that Millennial students with an internal LOC were more likely to support social responsibility. We also found that Millennial students’ and Millennial workers’ expectations for future employers do not vary significantly, indicating that entrance into the workforce does not greatly affect Millennials’ values and expectations. While we did not find any differences between GenX/Boomers’ and Millennials’ views on social responsibility, we did
find that GenX/Boomers perceived Millennials’ values of anti-discrimination and environmental sustainability differently than Millennials.

We believe that each of these findings has significant practical applications for understanding intergenerational interactions in the workplace. We proved that LOC is an important predictor of behavior at work, especially regarding ethical decision making and implementation of socially responsible programs. Administering LOC tests would be useful for both college administrators and potential employers in understanding how to best accommodate and manage students/employees. Because we found that St. Olaf Millennials have a higher number of people with internal LOCs than the general population, we believe the Center for Experiential Learning should educate students on the value and marketability of an internal LOC. In a broader sense, we believe these findings are important to any Millennial entering the workforce. Although there may not be significant differences between generations, perceived differences do exist, and it is important that Millennials recognize these stereotypes and adjust their interactions with older colleagues accordingly.

One of the strengths of our study was our consistent use of the ISO 26000 definition of Social Responsibility in operationalizing our SR questions. This enables us to have a consistent measurement on each survey. Additionally, conducting multiple and varied tests on our hypotheses eliminated statistical errors and revealed relevant information beyond our hypothesis testing.

Our survey also had several limitations. Due to space constraints, we were not able include all of our questions on the survey, most specifically questions regarding “Consumer Safety” (one of the six aspects of the ISO definition of Social Responsibility). This limited the accuracy of our SR index. Because of the nature of survey research, we were unable to measure actions and could only measure self-reported estimations of behavior. Due to the potentially sensitive nature of questions about SR values, there may have been a tendency amongst respondents to over- or under-report certain attitudes and actions.
Additionally, our accessible populations were limited to St. Olaf College. Because of its more homogeneous racial and socio-economic composition when compared to the general population of the United States, we cannot generalize our findings beyond St. Olaf College. Within the St. Olaf population, our generalizability is also limited by our low response rates (14.2% for GenX/Boomer survey, 19.4% for Millennial Alumni, 41.1% for Current Students), gender imbalance of respondents (58.2% of GenX/Boomer female, 79.6% of Millennial Alumni, and 65.4% of Current Student respondents were female), and generational imbalance (only 27.5% of GenX/Boomer respondents were Generation X).

Besides seeking increased generalizability, we have several suggestions for future research. We believe that few tensions arise in the workplace regarding social responsibility because people with similar values may be attracted to the same field. An analysis of social responsibility scores, career choices and generational variance would be useful in testing this hypothesis. Further analysis of the effects of LOC on social responsibility could be useful for understanding how LOC impacts the workplace. This would inform employers of how to best utilize their employee’s LOC. Finally, we feel our study and current literature failed to address socio-economic diversity. Because previous studies have focused on colleges and white-collar jobs, we believe lower economic classes and many sectors of the economy (industrial, service, etc.) have been left out of the discussion. Future study of excluded classes and businesses would result in a more holistic analysis of social responsibility in the workplace.
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