Nova Southeastern University
NSUWorks

HCBE Faculty Articles

H. Wayne Huizenga College of Business and Entrepreneurship

1-1-2012

Generational Differences in Values between Hispanics in the United States and Four Latin American Countries

Regina A. Greenwood
Nova Southeastern University, rgreenwo@nova.edu

Edward F. Murphy

Julia Teahen

Sergio Madero

Silvia Monserrat

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: http://nsuworks.nova.edu/hcbe_facarticles

🔵 Part of the Business Commons

Author(s)

Regina A. Greenwood, Edward F. Murphy, Julia Teahen, Sergio Madero, Silvia Monserrat, Miguel Olivas-Lujan, Jaime Ruiz-Gutierrez, and Neusa Santos

Generational Differences in Values between Hispanics in the United States and Four Latin American Countries

Regina A. Greenwood
Nova Southeastern University

Edward F. Murphy
Embry Riddle Aeronautical University

Julia Teahen
Baker College

Sergio Madero
Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, México

Silvia Ines Monserrat
Universidad Nacional del Centro, Argentina

Miguel Olivas-Luján
Clarion University of Pennsylvania

Jaime Ruiz-Gutierrez
Universidad de los Andes, Colombia

Neusa Maria Bastos F. Santos
Pontificial Catholic University of São Paulo, Brazil

We examined similarities and differences in generational values and value orientation of 4,952 working adults in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico as compared to those of US Hispanics. US Hispanics demonstrated a primary value orientation of High Social/High Moral that is different from the four Latin American countries but closer to respondents from Argentina and Brazil. Values of generations across countries were more similar than values between generations in each country. Additionally, generational value schema was more similar in Latin American countries than in the US. Implications of these findings, study limitations and recommendations for further research are also discussed.

INTRODUCTION

The increased flow of goods and services and knowledge across borders, increased international marketing and trade, increased communications and transportation, increased use of the internet in developed and developing countries and increased movement of employees around the globe indicate that globalization is taking place (Norris & Inglehart, 2009). Such activities make it imperative that companies understand the values, attitudes, and behaviors across generations of their customers and employees and the cultures of countries in which they do business. A question of significant importance to managers and organizations throughout the world is: Are values and value orientation types converging or diverging across generations and cultures? Managers and companies operating globally need to identify and understand the similarities, as well as the differences, in the values of their global customers and stakeholders in order to meet the demands for faster, better and cheaper quality products (Bailey & Spicer, 2007; Leung et al., 2005). Scant research on Latin American values and value systems and even fewer studies on the values and value orientation types of Hispanics in the United States (US) pose a significant problem. This study fills these research gaps by exploring generation and cross-cultural differences in values and value orientation types in four Latin American nations (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico) as compared to Hispanics living in the US.

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

This study compared cross-cultural values and value orientation types across Hispanic generations in the US and in Latin America. The topic has extreme importance as companies develop global production processes, hire employees in the global marketplace, and market their products globally (Gustavo, 2004; McGuire et al., 2006; Neelankavil, Mathur & Zhang, 2000; Triandis & Suh, 2002). Few studies have explored cross-cultural generation–based similarities in values and the four value orientation types originally proposed by Rokeach (1973, 1979), further developed by Weber (1990, 1993) and Musser and Orke (1992). Even fewer have done so comparing the generations of Hispanics in the US as compared to generations in Latin America. The research gap is addressed in this paper by studying the values of Generation Y, Generation X and Baby Boomer working adults in four Latin American nations (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico) as compared to the same three generations of Hispanics in the US.

Culture and Generations

Culture is a socialized set of values, attitudes and behaviors of a particular society, generation, organization, group, or sub-group (Rokeach, 1973). More recently, Hofstede (2001, p. 1) called culture the "collective programming of the mind." Connor and Becker (2003) and Connor et al. (2006) explained that this interrelated set of values, attitudes and behaviors not only form cultures, but also value schemas, value systems or value orientation types.

Rokeach's (1973) research on values, attitudes and behaviors contributes to the understanding of the groundbreaking studies of Karl Mannheim (1953, 1970), whose work set the stage for research on generations. Historical and societal events or "cultural upheaval" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 37) impact people's values, attitudes and behaviors throughout their lifetimes. Feather (1979, p. 111) noted that generations "reflect historical events and other effects that occur because different generations belong to different age cohorts and are subject to different influences (e.g., differences in education, war and its aftermath, economic frustrations)."

A generational cohort is a grouping of individuals who were born and raised in a time period when they faced similarly unique social and historical environments which created their value systems. For instance, Mannheim (1953) and Shuman and Scott (1989) explain that we can understand each generation by exploring the significant events that took place during their formative years, because those formative years influence the development of certain values, attitudes, behaviors and characteristics that differentiate one generation from another. Each generation is impacted by the unique economic, social, sociological and demographic circumstances they all faced together. For example, each generation is

impacted by the music, heroes, passions, headlines, national catastrophes and common history developed during these formative years (Inglehart, Nevitte & Basanez, 1996; Zemke, Raines & Filipczak, 2000).

Although not every member of a generation feels the impact of the historically important events equally, "all members of a particular generation are typically recognized as having a shared awareness of or an appreciation for the events common to that generation" (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007, p. 351). This concept, like other demographic variables, can be used to give researchers and managers an insight into the values, attitudes and behavioral tendencies of cultures/societies, generations, organizations, and groups or sub-groups of people (Murphy et al., 2009). As researchers and managers, we have learned that not all people are exactly alike; instead, people have generalized tendencies that can be seen in the differences and similarities in their values, attitudes and behaviors at work, at home, and in the global marketplace. An understanding of these tendencies will help practitioners, managers and marketers lead, motivate and retain their employees and develop products and advertising campaigns to meet the needs of their local, regional and international customers (DeMooij, 1998, 2004; Murphy et al., 2007).

Generations in the Workplace

Concerning the various generations seen in the research and public media today, we limited our study to the generational bands proposed by Strauss and Howe (1997, 2000): Baby Boomers, born 1946 to 1964; Generation X, born 1965 to 1979; and Generation Y, born 1980-2003. These generations are our focus because they make up the majority of employees and managers in the workforce and global marketplace (Pew Research Center, 2007). We will compare generational similarities and differences in cross-cultural values between four Latin American countries and US Hispanics.

Latin American Culture

Latin American culture is based on a set of values that emphasize that the most important goals in life are taking care of your family and extended family and having close companionship and friendship with significant others. Children are allowed and encouraged to live longer at home and sometimes remain living with parents until age 25 or older. The extended family includes grandparents, parents, and other relatives. Also, Latin Americans have close friends or significant others who become part of their extended families (Garcia-Gonzalez, 2002).

Latin American countries have undergone significant economic, political and social change over the past 30 years. Many Latin American countries have moved from centralized control by dictators to democratic forms of government. Such changes provided opportunities for Generation X and Generation Y that were not available to Baby Boomers (World Youth Report, 2007). As the countries industrialize, women and urban youth have made great inroads into the workforce, at the expense of the rural and urban poor. For example, approximately 18 percent of 15 to 19 year olds and 27 percent of 20 to 24 year olds in the countries are not working or pursuing their education (World Youth Report, 2007). Generation Y in Latin America has increased to close to 100 million strong, almost 18 percent of Latin America's population. With increased prosperity, education is now the key to success in Latin American countries.

The most significant characteristic of our four Latin American countries is their "predominantly Catholic religious values mixed with a distinct corporatist authoritarian culture" (Norris & Inglehart, 2008, p.140). In terms of Hofstede's (2001) cultural value dimensions, Mexico ranks first out of the four Latin American countries studied on the masculinity index (6), followed by Colombia (11/12), Argentina (20/21) and Brazil (27). In comparison, the US has an index of 15. Latin American countries are generally male dominated societies, where the masculine values are more highly valued than feminine values. In terms of the Power Distance index, Mexico (5/6) is first, followed by Brazil (14), Colombia (17), Argentina (35/36) and the US (38). This suggests that respondents from Mexico, Brazil and Colombia tolerate more authoritarian than Argentineans and respondents from the US. Latin Americans do not like uncertainty in their lives as shown in the Uncertainty Avoidance Index. Respondents from Argentina (10/15) lead the group, followed by Mexico (18), Colombia (20), and Brazil (21/22), and the US (43). Finally, for the Individualism/Collectivism Index, the US is first (1), followed by Argentina (22/23),

Brazil ((6/27), Mexico (32) and Colombia (49). Therefore, Colombia is the most collectivistic of the four countries.

Blancero, DelCampo and Marron (2007, 2008) and Murphy, Olivas-Lujan and Greenwood (2009) conducted two of the only known research studies on Hispanic generations, by exploring differences between Hispanics from Generation Y, as compared to Generation X and Baby Boomers. Their studies of working professional adults suggested that Generation Y was more similar to Baby Boomers than to Generation X. Murphy, Olivas-Lujan and Greenwood's (2009) study also suggested that Generation Y could be divided into a younger high school cohort and older working adult generational cohort.

Blancero et al. (2007, 2008) and Murphy, Olivas-Lujan and Greenwood's (2009) studies suggest that Hispanic Generation Y adults were dedicated and hard working (*ambitious*) but wanted work and life balance in order to spend time with family (*family security*) and friends (*true friendship*) and they were more likely to live with their family as compared to the other generations. Further, Hispanic Generation Y adults participated in numerous charity programs (*helpful*) and they felt more valued (*self-respect*) by their employers and parents. Finally, their studies indicate that Hispanic Generation Y adults are impatient and want promotions and more responsibility now (*equality*) and they possess lower levels of commitment (*loyalty*) as compared to Generation X and Baby Boomers.

Value Orientation Typology

Rokeach's value orientation typology (1973) was used to explore similarities and differences in values across the generations and cultures. Rokeach (1986) believed that most societies will possess similar values and, as such, they can be used to explore similarities and differences across cultures, generations, and across most demographic sub-groups. He then classified values as terminal or instrumental values. The 18 terminal values are end-state of existence values or the most important goals in the lives or respondents; the 18 instrumental values are the means-based values or the behavioral means respondents might use to obtain their terminal value goals (Rokeach, 1979). Terminal and instrumental values are rank ordered in a hierarchy of importance separately; each person, generation, sub-cultural group, or societal cultural group possesses a unique hierarchical arrangement of these two sets of values from (1) most to (18) least important. The hierarchy is called a value schema, value system or value orientation type (Rokeach, 1986).

To use the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS), 36 values across each culture and each of the three generations must be explored. For three generations in five countries there would be a total of 540 values to examine and such numbers would undermine developing a clear portrait of value structures that managers and researchers would find useful. Using a value orientation typology reduced the 36 values to 4 value orientation typologies.

To create a value orientation topology the terminal and instrumental values were divided into two value orientation types, suggested by Rokeach (1973). Terminal values can be divided into two orientation types: personal or social values. The personal values are self-centered and intrapersonal (individualism) and the social values are society-centered and interpersonal (collectivism). The instrumental values are subdivided into two value orientation types: moral (collectivism) and competence values (individualism). Moral values have an interpersonal focus and "when violated, arouse pangs of conscience or feelings of guilt for wrongdoing" (Rokeach, 1973: 8). Competence or achievement values have an intrapersonal (individualism) orientation because, when violated, they cause "feelings of shame about personal inadequacy" (8).These four value orientation types are shown in Figure 1.

Weber's (1990, 1993) research expanded Rokeach's value orientation typology by indicating that people could be classified by their value orientation or preference for one of the personal or social terminal values and one of the moral and competence instrumental value types. For example, each person could prefer: (1) personal terminal and competence instrumental values or (2) personal terminal and moral instrumental values or (3) social terminal and competence instrumental values or (4) social terminal and moral instrumental values. While Weber and his associates validated this typology for the RVS in the US and in several cross-cultural studies, Musser and Orke (1992) extended the typology further by developing a two by two matrix that classified each person's value orientation type. This study has

combined Rokeach's, Weber's and Musser and Orke's typologies together to form an RVS Value Orientation Typology (Figure 2).

Greenwood et al. (2009) explored the values and value orientation typologies of males and females in Latin America as compared to the US. Their study suggested that females placed higher importance on social and moral values and males placed higher importance on personal and competence values. In addition, respondents from the US, Argentina and Brazil had High Personal and High Moral value orientation typologies, while respondents from Mexico and Colombia had High Personal and High Competence value orientation typologies. Santos et al.'s (2009) and Monserrat et al.'s (2009) studies of value orientations in the US as compared to Latin American countries found similar results.

Finally, Murphy, Olivas-Lujan, and Greenwood's (2009) study of the Hispanic generations in the US suggested that the Hispanic generations in the US have a primary collectivist culture combined with a secondary emphasis on individualism, which would suggest a primary social and moral value orientation typology (collectivism/collectivism) and secondary personal and moral individualism/collectivism. As a result, the following research hypotheses were developed:

H1: US Hispanics have a primary High Social and High Moral value orientation typology.

H2: Respondents from Argentina have a primary High Personal and High Moral value orientation typology.

H3: Respondents from Brazil have a primary High Personal and High Moral value orientation typology.

H4: Respondents from Colombia have a primary High Personal and High Competence value orientation typology.

H5: Respondents from Mexico have a primary High Personal and High Competence value orientation typology.

H6: Generation Y and Baby Boomers have a primary High Social and High Moral value orientation typology.

H7: Generation X have a High Personal and High Moral value orientation typology.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The RVS, the instrument in our research study, measures values and value orientation typologies. An integration of Rokeach's (1973) value orientation types, and Weber (1990, 1993) and Musser and Orke's (1992) expansion of the typology, was used to explore cross-cultural and generation-based similarities and differences among Hispanic working adults from four Latin American nations (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico) and the US.

Survey Instrument

Cross-cultural generational similarities and differences in values and value orientation types were investigated using the RVS, the most commonly used instrument for the measurement of values (Kamakura & Novak, 1992). The RVS was selected instead of other valid and reliable value instruments because research the past 18 years indicates that the RVS is much simpler and easier to use, is shorter, and is easier to statistically analyze than other comparable instruments (Connor & Becker, 1994)

The reliability and validity of the RVS have been established in hundreds of research studies over the past 30 years (Connor & Becker, 2003, 2006). Rokeach and Ball-Rokeach (1989) reported test-retest reliability for each of the 18 terminal values considered separately, from seven weeks to eighteen months later, ranged from a low of .51 for *a sense of accomplishment* to a high of .88 for *salvation* and for instrumental values the reliabilities ranged from .45 for *responsible* to .70 for *ambitious*. Employing a 14-16 month test interval, median reliability was .69 for terminal values and .74 for instrumental values.

A native speaker in each country translated the RVS into the local language and another native speaker translated the instrument back to English, making an independent confirmation of the translation. For clarification, the English version was left beside the translated version (Adler, 1983; Sekaran, 1983). Survey instructions are standard, with each respondent rank ordering the terminal and instrumental values

from one (most important) to 18 (least important) "in order of importance to you, as guiding principles in your life" (Obot, 1988, p. 367).

First, the means and medians for terminal and instrumental values were calculateed. The terminal values were divided into personal and social terminal values and instrumental values into moral and competence values as shown in Figures 1 and 2. As values range in ranking from one (most important) to 18 (least important), the lowest means signifies the more important value orientation type. In order to develop the value orientation typology, the mean scores were summed for each value orientation typology and then the grand means were developed for each generation across each culture. This allowed categorization of each generation and culture by value orientation priorities, which formed the following value orientation types: (1) higher importance on personal and competence values; (2) higher importance on personal and moral values; (3) higher importance on social and competence values, or (4) higher importance on social and moral values (Figure 2)

Research Population

As part of a larger set of studies exploring values, attitudes and behaviors in 20 countries, the surveys were administered from 2004 to 2009 to convenience samples of working adults living in major cities in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico and in the US in California, Texas, and Florida. The researchers chose adults who were working because their values represent the values of working professionals in those countries. The demographic questionnaire asked the respondents to self-select their race. All US respondents who did not classify themselves as Hispanics were eliminated in this study.

The final sample consisted of 1,207 adult respondents from Argentina, 900 from Brazil, 1,258 from Colombia, 1,018 from Mexico and 569 were US Hispanics. The sample consisted of 2,323 males and 2,629 females, for a total sample size of 4,952.

Statistical Analysis Techniques

Since the RVS is a ranking instrument that produces non-normative data, data was first analyzed using the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA median test non-parametric statistical analysis technique. This was followed by hierarchical regression analysis in order to explore the possible impact of other demographic variables. Research by Rokeach (1973, 1979, 1986), Schwartz and Bilsky (1990), Kamakura and Novak (1992), Connor and Becker (1994, 2003), and Murphy, Olivas-Lujan and Greenwood, (2009) support these techniques for statistical analysis of the RVS value systems and value orientations.

RESEARCH RESULTS

We first explored whether there were cross-cultural and generation differences in values and then value orientation types, with culture and generation as the independent variables and values and value orientation types as the dependent variables. Since studies have shown that age, sex, education, and occupation can impact values, we used hierarchical regression analysis to explore the impact of culture, generation, sex, education and occupation together on the constructs. The Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (Table 1) showed statistically significant cross-cultural differences for all 18 terminal and all 18 instrumental values. The regression analysis beta scores indicated that generation and culture together produced the majority of the variance, but for some values sex, education and occupation contributed to some of the statistically significant cross-cultural generational differences.

Next, differences in the value orientations types were explored with culture as the independent variable and value orientation types as the dependent variables with the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (Table 1); there were statistically significant cross-cultural differences across all four value orientation types. The regression analysis indicated that culture and generation interacted to produce the majority of the variance, but some value orientation types were slightly influenced by sex, education and occupation.

Cross-cultural rankings for Hispanics in the US as compared to Latin American countries as combined groups were developed. The Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA indicated 13 terminal and 16 instrumental values were statistically different between the Hispanics in the US and Latin Americans

(Table 2). The four value orientation types were also statistically significant for differences across the cultures (Table 3).

Comparing all Latin American respondents to US Hispanic respondents reveals that US Hispanics had a primary value orientation type of High Social (mean of 9.42) and High Moral (mean of 8.36), while Latin Americans had primary orientations of High Personal (mean of 8.93) and High Competence (mean of 9.22) (Table 3). The value orientation types were explored by classifying each country for primary and secondary value orientation types (Tables 4 and 5).

As predicted in **H1**, US Hispanics had a primary value orientation type of High Social and High Moral which classified them as Virtuous Advocates. US Hispanics secondary value orientation type was High Social and High Competence, or Independent Maximizer (Table 5). Respondents from Argentina and Brazil had primary value orientation types of High Personal and High Moral or Honorable Egoists and they had secondary orientation types of High Social and High Moral or Virtuous Advocates, allowing acceptance of **H2** and **H3**. Colombia and Mexico were classified as High Personal and High Competence, or Independent Maximizers (Table 5) and the possessed secondary orientation types of High Social and High Competence or Effective Crusaders, allowing acceptance of **H4** and **H5**.

All three generations from Argentina and Mexico have primary orientation types of High Personal and High Moral or Honorable Egoists, while the three generations in Colombia and Mexico are High Personal and High Competence or Independent Maximizers. US Hispanics were not the same across generations. Generation Y and the Baby Boom generation were classified as High Social and High Moral or Virtuous Advocates, while Generation X were High Personal and High Moral or Honorable Egoists (Table 6). **H6** was rejected because only US Generation Y and Baby Boom Hispanics possessed High Social and High Moral value orientation types, while the three generations in Argentina and Brazil were classified as possessing High Personal and High Moral value orientation types, and the three generations in Colombia and Mexico possessed High Personal and High Competence value orientation types (Table 6). **H7** was partially accepted because while Generation X in the US, Argentina and Brazil possessed High Personal and High Moral value orientation types, Generation X in Colombia and Mexico were classified as High Personal and High Competence for value orientation types (Table 6).

DISCUSSION

The findings were unique because Rokeach's Value Orientation Typology was operationalized demonstrating generational differences for US Hispanics and regional differences in value orientation types in Latin America (Argentina and Brazil differed from Mexico and Colombia).

US Hispanics were closer in value orientation types to Argentina and Brazil, because US Hispanics had primary High Social and High Moral value orientation types which was identical to Argentina and Brazil's secondary value orientation types. In addition, Argentina and Brazil's primary orientation type of High Personal and High Moral was the US Hispanics secondary value orientation type. The results are similar to the pattern in Greenwood et al.'s (2009) study, which found that males and females in Argentina and Brazil were closer in value orientation types to non-Hispanics in the US. These results could be because the US is a major trading partner with Argentina and Brazil, and Argentina and Brazil are major trading partners with each other. Although the US is a major trading partner with Mexico and Colombia, Mexico and Colombia are not major trading partners with Argentina and Brazil (CIA, 2009).

Greenwood et al.'s (2009) findings also suggested that respondents from Argentina and Brazil are a mix of individualism (personal terminal values) and collectivism (moral instrumental values), but they retain a collectivism (social terminal values and moral instrumental values) secondary value orientation. On the other hand, respondents from Colombia and Mexico had primary high personal (individualism) and high competence (individualism) value orientation types and high social (collectivism) and high competence (individualism) secondary value orientation types (Table 5). While the GLOBE project (Chhokar, et al., 2007) clustered all four countries into a Latin American cluster, our current results indicate that the four Latin American countries can be broken into a Southern cluster of Argentina and Brazil and a Northern cluster of Colombia and Mexico.

Moving from the value orientation level of analysis to the individual value level, we find that Latin American generations have more value similarities than the US Hispanic generations (Tables 7 and 8). For instance, 12 the terminal values and 8 instrumental values were all ranked similarly across the generations in Latin America. In contrast, US Hispanic generations only similarly ranked 7 terminal values and 8 instrumental values.

Tables 7 and 8 allow for comparison of individual values across the cultures and generations. Some similarities exist in all three generations: their most important goals are seeking inner peace, taking care of their families, having independence and free choice and close companionship, and they would pursue these goals by standing up for their beliefs, being self-reliant, self-sufficient, sincere and truthful, being dedicated to their families, friends and organizations, and by being dependable and reliable.

Values were also grouped to find which generation is more similar across the cultures. Generation Y across all cultures ranked similarly six terminal and six instrumental values. Generation X similarly ranked 12 terminal and 9 instrumental values. Baby Boomers similarly ranked 11 terminal values and 5 instrumental values. Thus, Generation X is more similar across the cultures, followed by Baby Boomers and then Generation Y. In fact, generations across these countries are more similar to each other than they are to different generations in their own culture. This is a significant finding in the study.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

US Hispanics have characteristics that managers value in the global marketplace. They have primary collectivistic goals directed as a concern for others that is tempered with moral collectivistic group-oriented means to obtain those goals. Such individuals will work for the welfare of the organization over their personal welfare, and they will do so morally and honestly. They have a secondary individualistic concern for themselves that is tempered with a moral collectivistic societal orientation. Their goals are interpersonal, societal and group oriented and they are morally or interpersonally focused on society, their organizations, supervisors, co-workers and customers as means to obtain those goals.

Argentineans and Brazilians were motivated primarily by high personal and high moral value orientations and this classification implies that respondents have a self-centered or intrapersonal focus for their most important goals in life that is tempered with a moral or interpersonal focus, which means they will use other-centered values to obtain their goals. These are positive characteristics for organizations because, although respondents are internally focused to obtain their goals, they are morally focused on society, their organizations, supervisors, co-workers and customers as means to obtain those goals.

Inglehart and Welzel's (2006) worldwide studies of generations suggest that generational differences will become more prominent the longer a country is in post-industrialization. Since Latin American countries just recently entered post-industrialization, there will be fewer generational differences. Our study supports their work. In contrast, US Hispanics showed more generational differences in keeping with Ingelhart and Welzel's (2006) thesis: since the US has been in post-industrialization much longer than Latin America, there will be more generational differences in the US as compared to Latin America. In the US, Generation X had primary High Personal and High Moral value orientation types, matching the primary value orientation types of all generations in Argentina and Brazil. On the other hand, Generation Y and Baby Boom Hispanics held primary High Social and High Moral value orientation types, matching the secondary value orientation types in Argentina and Brazil.

Our results suggest that Generation Y and Baby Boom US Hispanics value collectivism first and individualism second, while Generation X US Hispanics and all three generations in Latin America are individualistic first, tempered with collectivism. The quantity of collectivism is stronger in Argentina and Brazil as compared to US Generation X Hispanics and the generations in Mexico and Brazil.

The results of our study will help managers and practitioners recruit, retain and lead their employees and will help employees and managers interact with and meet the needs of customers and key stakeholders around the world. Employees, managers and customers across the generations in Argentina and in Brazil will primarily focus on their own goals, but they will temper that with a focus on societal or organizational goals; while employees, managers, and customers across the generations in Colombia and

Mexico will focus on themselves in personal goals and the means to obtain them. In contrast, Generation Y and Baby Boom Hispanics will focus on social and moral group-oriented goals while Generation X Hispanics will focus on personal goals tempered with social means to obtain their personal goals.

This research indicates that exploring similarities across generations and cultures using a value orientation typology is a worthwhile endeavor. Based on our research results, generations in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico and US Hispanics have many similarities in their value orientations. A key finding is that generations in these different cultures are more like one another than they are like different generations within their own culture. Also important is the finding that Mexico and Colombia form one cultural cluster and Argentina and Brazil another. This confirms Hofstede's (2001) findings that clustered Mexico and Colombia together and Argentina and Brazil together on many bipolar dimensions.

Similar to the work of Olivas-Lujan et al. (2009), Santos et al. (2009), and Murphy, Olivas-Lujan and Greenwood (2009), our findings immediately give managers, practitioners and marketers a point from which to start their relationship with employees, customers and other key stakeholders in Latin America. Understanding values and value orientation types will allow them to gain insight into what is important to their employees, trading partners and customers. This study will also help practitioners and managers who supervise foreign nationals or Hispanics in the US understand what motivates them; it will help companies operating globally develop international human resources management strategies that not only meet company needs but also the cultural needs of their organizational members. Marketing managers can use these values and value orientation types as major themes that could help bring economies of scale to their advertising and marketing campaigns (DeMooij, 1998, 2004). Thus, by understanding values and value orientation types across the generations and cultures, companies should be able to achieve better performance outcomes that positively impact their profitability.

LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

The limitations of this study include the research populations as they were generally convenience samples of working adults from the capitals or major cities in each country. Sample sizes were also limited by the larger number of 18 to 39 year olds in comparison to those over 40 years old. Hierarchical regression analysis controlled for this, which indicated that age did impact some of the values and their significance. Another limitation is trying to compare these results to other studies published in the research literature. Many studies use the RVS but do not report the means and rankings for their populations, possibly due to the publishing constraints imposed by many journals, making comparison difficult. Further, many researchers examine only terminal or instrumental values portions of the RVS, not the entire RVS. It is recommended that researchers using the RVS report the means, medians and rankings for each value and for each demographic variable studied, thereby allowing future researchers to compare their results across the globe.

Future research needs to compare these results to other studies of working adults throughout the world. Other studies of working adults should be conducted, comparing the public versus private sector for example. Finally, further research with the Rokeach, Weber and Musser and Orke value orientation typology should also be conducted with other demographic sub-groups and in different cities in the US, Argentina, Brazil, Columbia, and Mexico.

REFERENCES

Adler, N. (1983). A typology of management studies involving culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14, 29-47.

Bailey, W., & Spicer, A. (2007). When does national identity matter? Convergence and divergence in international business ethics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6), 1462-1480.

Blancero, D. M., Del Campo, R. G., & Marron, G. F. (2007). Hired for diversity. Rewarded for conformity. Retaining Hispanic talent in corporate America. *The Business Journal of Hispanic Research*, 1(1), 12-25.

Blancero, D. M., Del Campo, R. G., & Marron, G. F. (2008). Ready or not: Hispanic Millennials are here: The business leaders of the future. *The Business Journal of Hispanic Research,* 2(1), 50-60.

Chhokar, J., Brodbeck, G., & House, R. (2007). *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Connor, P. E., & Becker, B. W. (1994). Personal values and management: What do we know and why don't we know more? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 3(1), 67- 73.

Connor, P. E., & Becker, B. W. (2003). Personal values and decision-making styles of public managers. *Public Personnel Management*, 32: 155-181.

Connor, P., Becker, R., Moore, L., & Okubo, Y. (2006). Public-sector managerial values: United States, Canada and Japan. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 9(2), 147-173.

Crumpacker, M., & Crumpacker, J. M. (2007). Succession planning and generational stereotypes: Should HR consider age-based values and attitudes a relevant factor or a passing fad? *Public Personnel Management*, 26(4), 349-369.

DeMooij, M., (1998). *Global marketing and advertising: Understanding cultural paradoxes.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

DeMooij, M. (2004). *Consumer behavior and culture: Consequences for global marketing and advertising.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Feather, N. T. (1979). Values, expectancy, and action. *Australian Psychologist,* 14, 243-260.

Garcia-Gonzalez, J. 2002. Latin American youth. *Advertising and Marketing to Children*, Jan-Mar, 17-24.

Giacomino, D. & Eaton, T. (2003). Personal values of accounting alumni: An empirical examination of differences by gender and age. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 15,369-380.

Greenwood, R., Murphy, E., Madero, S., Monserrat, S., Olivas-Luján, M., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J., Santos,N., Woodhull, M., Teeple, W., & Khilji, S. (2009). *Values of males and females in Latin America and the US: Are they similar or dissimilar?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.

Gustavo, C. (2004). Religiosity, values and horizontal and vertical individualism-collectivism: A study of Turkey, the U.S. and the Philippines. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 12/1,1-25.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Cultures consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd Ed). London, Sage Publications.

Inglehart, R. F., Nevitte, N., & Basanez, M. (1996). *The North American Trajectory: Cultural, economic and political ties among the United States, Canada and Mexico*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter Publishers.

Inglehart, R. F., & Welzel, C. (2006). *Modernization, cultural change and democracy: The human*

development sequence. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kamakura, W.E. A., & Novak, T. P. (1992). Value-system segmentation: Exploring the meaning of LOV. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(1), 119-132.

Leung, K., Bhagat, R. S., Buchan, N. R., Erez, M., & Gibson, C. B. (2005). Culture and international business: Recent advances and their implications for future research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(4), 357-380.

Mannheim, K. (1953). *Essays on sociology and social psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mannheim, K. (1970). The problem of generations. *Psychoanalytic Review*, LVII, 378-403.

McGuire, D., Garavan, T., Saha, S., & O'Donnell, D. 2006. The impact of individual values on human resource decision-making by line managers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(3), 251-273.

Monserrat, S., Santos, N., Murphy, E., Greenwood, R., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J., Olivas-Luján, M., Madero. (2009). Democracy's Children: Changing Values in Argentina and Brazil? *Proceedings of the Eastern Academy of Management*, Rio de Janeiro, June 21-25, 2009.

Murphy, E., Chaturvedi, S., Greenwood, R., Ruiz-Gutierez, J., Khilji, S., Olivas-Luján, M., Luk, D., Manyak, T., Mujtaba, B., Madero, S., Santos, N., Uy, A., & Woodhull, M. (2007). *An investigation of Type A behavior pattern and personal values: A cross-cultural study between developed and developing countries*. Paper presented at annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Philadelphia, PA

Murphy, E., Olivas-Luján, M., & Greenwood, R., (2009). What does the incoming generation of Hispanic workers value? Comparing Hispanic high school student values to those of other generations. *Academic Meeting of the National Society of Hispanic MBAs*, Minneapolis, MN.

Musser, S. J., & Orke, R. A. (1992). Ethical value systems: A typology. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 28(3), 348-362.

Neelankavil, J. P. Mathur, A., & Zhang, Y. (2000). Determinants of managerial performance: A cross-cultural comparison of the perceptions of middle-level managers in four countries. *International Business Studies*, 31(1), 121-130.

Norris, P. & Inglehart, R. (2008). *Sacred and secular: Religion and politics worldwide*. New York: Cambridge Press.

Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2009). *Cosmopolitan communications: Cultural diversity in a globalized world.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Obot, I. (1988). Value systems and cross-cultural contact: The effect of perceived similarity and stability on social evaluations. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 12, 363-379.

Olivas-Luján, M., Monserrat, S., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J., Greenwood, R., Madero, S., Murphy, E., Santos, N. (2009). Attitudes towards Women and Values in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico. *Employee Relations,* 31(3), 227-244.

Pew Research Center (2007). *A portrait of Generation Next: How young people view their lives, futures and politics*. The Pew Hispanic Center Report, Washington, DC.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York: Free Press.

Rokeach, M. (1979). *Understanding human values: Individual and societal.* NY: Free Press.

Rokeach, M. (1986). *Beliefs, attitudes and values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rokeach, M., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1989). Stability and change in American value priorities. *American Psychologist*, 44, 775-784.

Santos, N. Greenwood, R., Murphy, E., Monserrat, S., Madero, S., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J., Olivas-Luján, M., Khilji, S., Luk, D., Mujtaba, B., Manyak, T., Uy, A., Woodhull, M., Christoforou, P., Teeple, W., & Chaturvedi, S. (2009) Workplace generations: An analysis of US and Latin American generational values. *Proceedings of the 10th International Human Resources Management (IHRM) Conference*, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Schwartz, S., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 58, 878-891.

Sekaran, U. (1983). Methodological and theoretical issues and advances in cross-cultural research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14: 61-73.

Strauss, W. & Howe, N. (1997). *The fourth turning: What the cycles of history tell us about America's next rendezvous with destiny.* New York: Broadway Books.

Strauss, W. & Howe, N. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York: Vintage.

Triandis, H. C. & Suh, E. M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 2002, 133-150.

Weber, J. (1990). Managerial value orientations: A typology and assessment. *International Journal of Value Based Management*, 3(2), 37-54.

Weber, J. (1993). Exploring the relationships between personal value and moral reasoning. *Human Relations,* 36, 435-364.

World Youth Report. (2007). Latin American youth: In an era of socio-economic and political change. *Chapter Two, World Youth Report*. www.un.org.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (1999). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in your workplace*. New York: Amacom.

FIGURE 1
SOCIAL AND PERSONAL TERMINAL VALUES AND
MORAL AND COMPETENCE INSTRUMENTAL VALUES.

Social Terminal Values	Personal Terminal Values
World at Peace	Comfortable Life
World of Beauty	An exciting life
Equality	Accomplishment
Family Security	Health
Freedom	Inner harmony
Mature love	Pleasure
National security	Salvation
Social recognition	Self-respect
True friendship	Wisdom
Moral Instrumental Values	**Competence or self-actualization Instrumental Values**
Broadminded	Ambitious
Forgiving	Capable
Helpful	Clean
Honest	Courage
Loving	Imaginative
Loyal	Independent
Obedient	Intellectual
Polite	Logical
Responsible	Self-controlled

Note. From J. Weber (1993), Exploring the relationship between personal values and moral reasoning. *Human Relations*, 1993, 46: 435-463.

FIGURE 2
RVS VALUE ORIENTATION TYPOLOGY

		Terminal Values	
		High Personal	High Social
Instrumental Values	High Competence	Preference for Personal-Competence Values **Independent Maximizer (IM)** Concern for self Competence for personal goals	Preference for Social-Competence Values **Effective Crusader (EC)** Concern for others Competence for social goals.
	High Moral	Preference for Personal-Moral Values **Honorable Egoist (HE)** Concern for self Moral reasons for personal goals	Preference for Social-Moral Values **Virtuous Advocate (VA)** Concern for others Moral reasons for social goals

Adapted from M. Rokeach (1973), J. Weber (1993), S. Musser and E. Orke, (1992), and Giacomino and Eaton (2003).

TABLE 1
KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANOVA, CHI-SQUARE AND REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR GENERATIONS AND CROSS-CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

		H	Alphas	ChiSqr	Alphas	Culture	Gen	Sex	Educ	Occup
NATNL & COMFOR		404	***	148	***	.032	.035			
NATNL & EXCITLIF		244	***	195	***		.032	.038	.10	
NATNL & ACCOMP		350	***	147	***	.067	.03	.049		.27
NATNL & WRLDPE		382	***	142	***	.05		.12	.06	.02
NATNL & WRLDBE		150	***	79	***	.04	.04	.11		
NATNL & EQUAL		193	***	167	***		.053	.06	.049	.02
NATNL & FAMSEC		244	***	154	***		.09	.06	.049	.02
NATNL & REEDOM		259	***	231	***	.146	.10	.02		
NATNL & HEALTH		260	***	113	***	.14	.12		.034	
NATNL & INHARM		373	***	184	***	.19	.14	.08		.02
NATNL & MALOVE		275	***	295	***	.17	.11	.04	.13	
NATNL & NASEC		300	***	158	***	.031	.04			
NATNL & PLEAS		352	***	258	***		.082	.046		
NATNL & SALV		850	***	725	***	.022	.10	.048	.049	.039
NATNL & SERESP		260	***	155	***		.046	.07	.04	
NATNL & SORECOG		269	***	149	***		.147			.03
NATNL & TRUFRIE		245	***	119	***	.038	.094	.068	.033	
NATNL & WISD		266	***	156	***	.034	.029	.039	.03	
NATNL & AMBIT		342	***	181	***	.14	.103		.032	
NATNL & BMINDED		242	***	116	***	.034	.084		.03	
NATNL & CAPABLE		205	***	179	***	.044	.02	.03	.02	
NATNL & CLEAN		296	***	233	***	.15		.10		
NATNL & CRGEN		164	***	93	***	.09		.056	.08	
NATNL & FORGIVE		450	**	329	**	.129	.07		.039	.023
NATNL & HELPFUL		259	***	146	***	.026	.05	.07	.024	
NATNL & HONEST		231	***	195	***	.127	.11	.054		.028
NATNL & IMAGIN		343	***	283	***	.05	.033	.02	.09	
NATNL & INDEPEN		139	***	104	***	.079	.022	.07		
NATNL & INTELLE		302	***	271	***	.13	.047	.041	.08	
NATNL & LOGICAL		249	***	215	***	.043	.03	.073	.04	.02
NATNL & LOVING		343	***	238	***	.052		.05	.096	
NATNL & LOYL		242	***	175	***	.065	.07	.052	.033	
NATNL & OBEDIEN		343	***	264	***	.12	.051	.077	.08	.03
NATNL & POLITE		414	***	398	***	.09		.025		.04
NATNL & RESPONS		180	***	123	***	.035	.09	.04	.05	
NATNL & SLFCONT		246	***	136	***	.02	.05	.049		
PERSONAL VALUE	10.0	184	***	131	***	.15	.07	.04	.035	.027
SOCIAL VALUES	8.88	152	***	118	***	.08	.074		.06	.03
MORAL VALUES	9.88	771	***	486	***	.128	.07		.103	.04
COMPETENCE VLS	9.11	754	***	531	***	.10	.069	.02	.10	

*= p < .05; **= p < .01; ***= p < .001; Note. All regression beta scores significant at p<.001.

TABLE 2
TERMINAL AND INSTRUMENTAL VALUES US HISPANICS VERSUS LATIN AMERICA

	US Hispanics	Latin America			US Hispanics	Latin America	
Personal Values	**9.55**	**8.93**	***	**Competence Values**	**10.08**	**9.22**	***
Comfortable	16	3	***	Ambitious	18	4	***
Exciting	13	14		Capable	17	5	***
Accomplishment	12	11	***	Clean	12	12	
Health	4	1	***	Courage	8	6	*
Inner Harmony	7	5		Imaginative	16	14	**
Pleasure	8	12	***	Independent	14	8	***
Salvation	3	17	***	Intellectual	13	3	***
Self-respect	15	4	***	Logical	5	13	***
Wisdom	11	7		Self-controlled	3	10	***
Social Values	**9.42**	**9.93**	***	**Moral Values**	**8.36**	**9.63**	***
World Peace	14	10	***	Broadminded	15	7	***
World Beauty	18	18		Forgiving	9	17	***
Equality	5	13	***	Helpful	4	15	***
Family Security	2	2	***	Honest	7	1	***
Freedom	1	9	***	Loving	2	11	***
Mature Love	17	8	***	Loyal	11	9	***
Nat Security	10	15	***	Obedient	10	18	***
Soc Recognition	9	16	***	Polite	6	16	***
True Friendship	6	6		Responsible	3	2	

Note. Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA H-Values; *=$p<.05$; **=$p<.001$; ***=$p<.0001$

TABLE 3
VALUE ORIENTATION TYPES US HISPANICS VERSUS LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES COMBINED

	US Hispanics	**Latin Americans**
Primary Value Orientation Type	High Social + High Moral Virtuous Advocate	High Personal + High Competence Independent Maximizer
Secondary Value Orientation Type	High Personal + High Competence Independent Maximizer	High Personal + High Moral Honorable Egoist

TABLE 4
GRAND MEANS AND CLASSIFICATIONS FOR CROSS-CULTURAL SIMILARITIES IN TERMINAL AND INSTRUMENTAL VALUE ORIENTATIONS

Terminal Values	Argentina N=1207	Brazil N=900	Colombia N=1258	Mexico N=1018	US Hispanics N = 569
Social Values	9.723	9.437	10.039	10.233	9.420
Personal Values	9.246	9.149	8.837	8.752	9.555
Instrumental Values					
Moral Values	9.130	8.598	10.463	9.802	8.360
Competence Values	9.813	9.968	8.408	9.185	10.080

TABLE 5
VALUE ORIENTATION TYPE CLASSIFICATION

	Primary	**Secondary**
Argentina	High Personal + High Moral Honorable Egoist	High Social + High Moral Virtuous Advocate
Brazil	High Personal + High Moral Honorable Egoist	High Social + High Moral Virtuous Advocate
Colombia	High Personal + High Competence Independent Maximizer	High Social + High Competence Effective Crusader
Mexico	High Personal + High Competence Independent Maximizer	High Social + High Competence Effective Crusader
US Hispanics	High Social + High Moral Virtuous Advocate	High Personal + High Moral Honorable Egoist

TABLE 6
VALUE ORIENTATION TYPES ACROSS GENERATIONS

Orientation Type	Generation Y	Generation X	Baby Boom
Argentina Primary	High Personal High Moral	High Personal High Moral	High Personal High Moral
Argentina Secondary	High Social High Moral	High Social High Moral	High Social High Moral
Brazil Primary	High Personal High Moral	High Personal High Moral	High Personal High Moral
Brazil Secondary	High Social High Moral	High Social High Moral	High Social High Moral
Colombia Primary	High Personal High Competence	High Personal High Competence	High Personal High Competence
Colombia Secondary	High Social High Competence	High Social High Competence	High Social High Competence
Mexico Primary	High Personal High Competence	High Personal High Competence	High Personal High Competence
Mexico Secondary	High Social High Competence	High Social High Competence	High Social High Competence
US Hispanics Primary	High Social High Moral	High Personal High Moral	High Social High Moral
US Hispanics Secondary	High Social High Competence	High Personal High Competence	High Personal High Moral

TABLE 7
CROSS-CULTURAL GENERATIONS DIFFERENCES IN TERMINAL VALUES

	US Hispanics			Argentina			Brazil			Colombia			Mexico		
	Gen Y 255	Gen X 141	BB 173	Gen Y 532	Gen X 214	BB 461	Gen Y 491	Gen X 182	BB 227	Gen Y 540	Gen X 228	BB 490	Gen Y 517	Gen X 243	BB 258
Personal Values	**9.9**	**9.5**	**9.8**	**9.2**	**9.2**	**9.3**	**9.2**	**8.9**	**9.3**	**8.6**	**8.9**	**9.0****	**8.7**	**8.6**	**8.9**
Comfortable	16	6	13**	4	5	4***	5	7	7	1	3	3**	4	5	4***
Exciting	8	14	15***	13	12	14***	15	16	14	15	17	16***	13	12	15***
Accomplish	13	12	11*	14	13	12***	14	12	15**	10	7	6***	14	13	12***
Health	9	1	3**	1	2	1***	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1***
IHarmony	7	3	12**	7	6	3***	11	10	8*	5	4	4	7	6	3***
Pleasure	2	10	18***	12	14	15***	12	14	13**	8	9	13***	12	14	14***
Salvation	5	`2	2*	17	17	17	16	15	16	18	18	17***	17	17	17
Self-respect	18	4	8***	5	4	6***	6	4	6**	4	5	5***	5	4	6**
Wisdom	15	7	10**	9	7	8	4	3	4*	9	8	11***	9	7	8
Social Values	**9.1**	**10.3**	**9.1****	**9.7**	**9.7**	**9.6**	**9.4**	**9.4**	**9.4**	**10.2**	**9.9**	**9.7****	**10.2**	**10.4**	**10.0**
World Peace	17	11	4***	11	10	9*	7	8	9	12	12	9***	11	10	9*
World Beauty	12	17	17**	18	18	18	18	18	18	17	15	15***	18	18	18
Equality	1	16	6***	10	11	10	9	5	11*	14	13	14***	10	11	10
Fam. Security	10	2	1**	2	1	2	2	2	2*	3	2	2***	2	1	2
Freedom	3	5	5*	6	9	7*	8	11	3**	7	11	8**	6	9	7*
Mature Love	14	9	14**	8	8	11	10	9	10	6	6	7	8	8	11
Nat Security	11	15	9***	15	15	13**	17	17	17	13	14	10***	15	15	13**
SRecognition	4	18	16***	16	16	16	13	13	12	16	16	18***	16	16	16
TFriendship	6	8	7*	3	3	5	3	6	5	11	10	12***	3	3	5**

Note. Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA; *=p<.05; **=p<.001; ***=p<.0001

TABLE 8
CROSS-CULTURAL GENERATIONS DIFFERENCES IN INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

	US Hispanics			Argentina			Brazil			Colombia			Mexico		
	Gen Y 255	Gen X 141	BB 173	Gen Y 532	Gen X 214	BB 461	Gen Y 491	Gen X 182	BB 227	Gen Y 540	Gen X 228	BB 490	Gen Y 517	Gen X 243	BB 258
Comp Values	**9.2**	**10.0**	**11.3****	**9.8**	**9.8**	**9.7**	**10.0**	**9.8**	**9.7**	**8.2**	**8.7***	**8.6*****	**9.2**	**8.5**	**9.3***
Ambitious	16	11	18**	3	6	3	13	18	17*	1	7	7***	3	6	3*
Capable	14	8	15***	10	9	9	8	6	2	5	4	5	10	9	9
Clean	18	16	6***	12	12	8**	18	17	15**	10	15	8***	12	12	8***
Courage	12	6	8**	8	8	10	7	10	8	7	6	4	8	8	10*
Imaginative	17	14	17*	17	15	15	14	13	12	11	12	12	17	15	15*
Independent	8	5	13***	9	10	11	12	11	10	6	5	6	9	10	11*
Intellectual	15	4	16***	4	4	5	10	5	9*	3	2	3*	4	4	5
Logical	11	12	9*	15	13	14	15	15	13	9	10	11	15	13	14*
Self-control	5	17	4***	16	17	17	6	9	6	12	9	13***	16	17	17
Moral Values	**8.4**	**8.9**	**7.6****	**9.1**	**9.2**	**9.2**	**8.5**	**8.4**	**9.1***	**10.7**	**10.2**	**10.2****	**9.8**	**10.5**	**9.7****
Broadminded	13	9	14**	5	3	4	9	8	4*	8	8	10	6	3	4*
Forgiving	6	15	2***	18	18	18	11	12	14*	16	16	16***	18	18	18
Helpful	7	13	10**	14	14	12	17	14	16	14	14	14***	14	14	12
Honest	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1*	4	3	1***	1	1	1
Loving	3	2	11***	6	5	6	5	7	11	15	13	15***	5	5	6
Loyal	2	7	12***	7	7	7	4	4	3	13	11	9***	7	7	7
Obedient	9	18	3***	13	16	16**	16	16	18***	18	18	18	13	16	16**
Polite	10	10	7*	11	11	13	3	3	7	17	17	17**	11	11	13*
Responsible	4	3	5*	2	2	2**	2	2	5***	2	1	2	2	2	2

Note. Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA; *=p<.05; **=p<.001; ***=p<.0001