Nova Southeastern University
NSUWorks

HCBE Faculty Presentations

H. Wayne Huizenga College of Business and Entrepreneurship

11-1-2012

Workplace Generations in Latin America: An Examination of Value Similarities and Differences

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

Julia Teahen

Jaime Ruiz-Gutierrez

Edward F. Murphy

Sergio Madero

See next page for additional authors

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

Part of the Business Commons

This Conference Proceeding has supplementary content. View the full record on NSUWorks here:
http://nsuworks.nova.edu/hcbe_facpres/81

Presenter(s)

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

Workplace Generations in Latin America:
An Examination of Value Similarities and Differences

Practitioners, particularly human resource managers, must recruit, train and manage an increasingly diverse and global workforce. Competition is fierce for globally effective workers and managers as resources are scarcer and more costly. It has been predicted that by the year 2010 more than 25% of the working population in the US and Latin America will reach retirement age (Lockwood, 2003). As the Baby Boom generation retires, a potential shortfall of millions of experienced employees could result as older workers are replaced by a younger generation which is smaller in number, less skilled, possesses different values and motivational tendencies (Critchley, 2004). Competition for desirable workers will become more intense and an organization's ability to attract and retain workers will be a source of competitive advantage.

One recurrent theme in practitioner-oriented literature as well as the popular press concerns differences in the values, attitudes and behaviors of members of different generations in the workforce. Such generational differences present additional challenges to the tasks of today's managers. Research has shown that the job-related factors that attract members of one generation are different from the job-related factors that attracted another generation (Armour, 2005; Patota, Schwartz & Schwartz, 2007; Trunk, 2007). Additionally, the difficulties of leading and managing such an age-diverse workforce with its conflict-potential are often cited (Weil, 2008; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 1999). The remedy is better understanding of what the different generations want (Crampton & Hodge, 2007; Martin & Tulgan, 2001). Crumpacker and Crumpacker (2007) argue that managers must understand the multigenerational workplace, because awareness of the different values, attitudes and behavior of each generation could improve a firm's ability to attract and retain employees across the generations.

Despite widespread attention given to the topic of generational differences in the US, few studies have explored generational differences in Latin America. In addition, not all researchers have found that generations have different needs and require different leadership styles in the workplace. For example, in their examination of generational research, Johnson and Lopes (2008) note that some research found that generational stereotypes were not always accurate and that motivational differences were not necessarily significant. Since few studies have explored generational value similarities and differences in Latin America, we ask: Are the values of the Latin American generations different?

Researchers have long acknowledged that values influence attitudes which in turn affect behavior (Rokeach, 1973). This research seeks to determine if significant value and value orientation differences exist in Latin America between Baby Boom, Generation X and Generation Y managers and employees, with a specific focus on working adults in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Honduras and Mexico. This is one of only a handful of studies to explore value orientation types across the generations in Latin American countries. If there are significant values and value orientation type differences between the generations and cultures, then generations would also have different attitudes and display different behaviors, and this would impact a manager's ability to lead those employees. If no such significant value orientation type differences exist, then there is little basis for the belief that generations in Latin America have different attitudes and behaviors in the workplace.

Literature Review

Determining Generations

The modern study of generations is founded on the work of Karl Mannheim (1953) who in the early 1950s defined generations as a group of individuals born and raised in the same

chronological, social, and historical environment. Because of the similarities of age and experience, Mannheim believed that common generational values could be expected (1970). Patota, Schwartz and Schwartz (2007: 2), stated "The collective memories of a generation lead to a set of common beliefs, values and expectations that are unique to that generation."

Three generations, commonly called the Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y, are of most interest to those now studying values in the workplace as they together make up the vast majority of current employees in the workforce throughout the world. The researchers chose to use the generation bands defined by Strauss and Howe (1997) and Egri and Ralston (2004) for Baby Boomers and Generation X: Baby Boomers are born from 1946 to 1964, Generation X are born from 1965 to 1979. Generation Y (millennial generation) are those individuals born from 1980 to the present (Eisner, 2005).

The Baby Boomers

The Baby Boom generation is the largest cohort currently in the workplace (Trunk, 2007) and the one with the most power by virtue of their high numbers in leadership positions. Baby Boomers are loyal and competitive workaholics (Crampton & Hodge, 2007) whose dedicated attitude toward work has been influenced by the economic prosperity following World War II (Patota, Schwartz & Schwartz, 2007). Such prosperity may account for their reputed self-absorption (Weil, 2008) and a feeling of entitlement (Lyons, 2005). Boomers experienced much social change in their early years and therefore embrace change and growth (Crampton & Hodge, 2007). In addition, Massey (1979) says the Boomers value success, teamwork, inclusion and rule-challenging. In Latin America Boomers grew up under pre-democratic or authoritarian leaders in Argentina and Brazil (Monserrat et al., 2006) and in Colombia and Mexico Boomers grew up under narco-terrorism (Olivas-Lujan et al., 2009; Ruiz-Gutierrez, 2005). The

descriptions of Boomers indicate they highly value accomplishment, capability, self-control and loyalty.

Generation X

Many Generation X adults grew up in dual worker families which gave rise to the new term, "latch-key kids." Thus, they are self-reliant, fun-loving, and independent (Lyons, 2005). They are also less loyal than the Boomers having witnessed higher numbers of divorces and corporate downsizing (Crampton & Hodge, 2007). Unable as a generation to enjoy the career success of their predecessors, the Generation X'ers are more concerned with career options, balance of work and non-work lives, and express cynicism toward big business (Crampton & Hodge, 2007). At work, they are computer literate and want a fun environment (Patota, Schwartz & Schwartz, 2007) but they are far more mobile, moving from job to job to improve their careers (Johnson & Lopes, 2008).

Generation Xers experienced economic uncertainties, the beginning of the AIDS epidemic and the end of the Cold War, as well as corporate and government scandals, all feeding into their distrust of authority (Johnson & Lopes, 2008). In Latin America Xers grew up during the beginnings of democracy and narco-terrorism (Monserrat et al., 2006; Olivas-Lujan et al., 2009; Ruiz-Gutierrez, 2005). They demand fulfilling work (Merrill, 2008) but may be seen by Baby Boomer bosses as "slackers" who lack loyalty (Rottier, 2001), indicating they highly value freedom, capability courage and logic.

Generation Y

Generation Y, also termed Millennials, saw the insecurities of the Cold War replaced by 9/11 and celebrity scandals. They were raised with television, cell phones, IPods, and computer games and are totally at home with instant communication and social networking. This digital

generation is optimistic, realistic, globally aware, and inclusive by nature (McNamara, 2005). Less indulged than the X generation, the Millennials accept diversity and different types of families (Alch, 2008); they are civic-minded and prone to volunteerism (Leyden, Teixeira & Greenberg, 2007).

In Latin America Generation Y grew up under democracy and less narco-terrorism (Monserrat et al., 2006; Ruiz-Gutierrez, 2005). Like the generation before them, they value work/family balance and independence (Yeaton, 2008) but they are also curious, questioning (Kehrli & Sopp, 2006) and results-oriented (Streeter, 2007). In the workplace, Millennials can try the patience of their Baby Boomer bosses and their Gen X colleagues. Their entrepreneurial, answer-seeking behaviors coupled with their sense of personal responsibility and need for feedback (Martin, 2005) can be diminished by their dissatisfaction with entry-level jobs and their tendency to change jobs frequently (Wallace, 2001 As a result of the literature on Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y we developed the following hypotheses:

H1: There are significant differences in the terminal values held by Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y. Baby Boomers will place higher importance on accomplishment, equality, world peace, family security, freedom, health, and national security, Generation X on mature love, and salvation, and Generation Y on true friendship, comfortable life, exciting life, pleasure social recognition, and self-respect.

H2: There are significant differences in the instrumental values held by Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y. Generation Y will place higher importance on ambition and independent, and intellectual, Generation X on forgiving, capable, polite, and responsible, and Baby Boomers on capable, courageous, helpful, honest, logical, and loyal.

Latin American Culture and Generations

What is meant by "Latin American"? Although the term is commonly used it is difficult to know specifically what the concept means, whether a group of countries on the American continent conforms to a "Latin American culture" will depend on the possibility that people living on the region are able to share a common culture: (when) "a group tends to share an entire worldview, manifesting a coherent and distinctive pattern of values across a wide range of topics" (Inglehart & Carballo, 1997: 34). As difficult as it is to specify what exactly is meant by the concept, Latin American's studies and their centers are based on the assumption that the nations in the region can be studied, surveyed and taught of as a homogenous group (Lenartowicz & Roth, 2001; Lenartowicz & Johnson, 2002). According to Hofstede (2001), Latin American countries share some cultural similarities: high power distance and collectivism and a masculine orientation. When surveying national culture and industrial buyer-seller relationships, Hewett and Sharma (2006) used data gathered from managers in the US and in six Latin American countries, as if the culture of the managers from those six countries would be homogeneous enough to be tested as a whole sample against the US. Other researchers propose that Latin America cannot be studied as a homogenous group. Maxfield (2004) states that between Latin American nations, "heterogeneity is the only possible generalization" (249).

We propose that Latin Americans will have not only similarities in their value orientations, but also differences. These differences in their values, attitudes and behaviors (culture) are based on the different socialization processes in each country. What has value research shown us?

Value Research

Values are commonly accepted to be the gut-level beliefs that people use to ascertain what is right and wrong, what is good and bad, what is normal and abnormal. According to Kluckhohn (1951) and Rokeach (1979), individuals value program not only during the first 20 years of life,

but throughout their lives. Research on socialization by Kluckhohn (1951, 1962) and moral

development by Kohlberg (1970) indicate that while immediate family is the most important

source of values during the first five years, school, media, church, friends, and organizations

become increasingly influential. Environmental factors including social, economic, and political

factors have an undeniable impact on one's value programming. Understanding values is

important in that they are a primary underlying factor that determines attitudes and behavior

(Kluckhohn, 1951; Rokeach, 1973). A personal value system has been defined as "a relatively

permanent perceptual framework which shapes and influences the general nature of an

individual's behavior" (England, 1967: 54).

Over the years, a number of well-known values models and instruments have emerged. The

Rokeach Value Survey (RVS), however, has been the most popular values instrument and has

been used in a wide variety of settings (Feather & Paye, 1975; Braithwaite & Law, 1985).

Accepting Rokeach's (1979) assertion that these are universal values and can be applied to any

group of people in any culture, it is easy to compare and contrast relative value groupings

according to given demographic variables.

A large number of studies have explored cross-cultural differences in values, attitudes and

behaviors, but few studies have specifically focused on generational similarities and differences,

and even fewer have done so either in Latin America or with a specific focus on value

orientation types.

In terms of generational research, Feather's (1979, 1999) research studies covering

Australia, New Zealand, and Papua New Guinea indicated significant cross-cultural generational

differences in values. For example, using the RVS, Feather pointed out that regardless of culture,

the teenage generation ranked *true friendship* much higher in importance than parents did; *family security* increased in importance for each succeeding generation, particularly for parents.

Bond's (1994) and Bond and Smith's (1996) studies using the RVS and the Chinese Value Survey (CVS) revealed that age and generational differences exist in the value structures of respondents from Hong Kong, Singapore and China. More recently, Ayguen and Imamoglu's (2002) longitudinal studies suggested that Turkish students' individualistic values increased in importance across the generations from the 1970s to the 1990s. Ralston et al.'s (1992) studies of the different generations in China indicated, "The generation in which one grew up appears to be crucial to understanding the values." (421) Gibson, Greenwood and Murphy (2008) and Greenwood, Gibson and Murphy (2008) explored generational differences in the workplace in the US, finding that Generation X, Y and Baby Boomers could be distinguished through different value structures. Murphy, Gordon and Anderson (2004) explored generation differences in values between Japan and found that the RVS distinguished Japanese and US differences and similarities in values across the generations, across the cultures and within the cultures and within the generations.

More recently, Murphy et al. (2006), Khilji et al., (2008), and Uy et al. (2008) explored generational value change by means several cross cultural empirical tests in studies of three generations across several cultures. Their research results indicated that there are more cross-cultural generational similarities than cross-cultural differences in values. These studies are some of the first to identify values that are similarly ranked across cross-cultural generations in Western, Eastern, South American and European cultures.

In additional Latin American research, Monserrat et al. (2009) explored generational differences in values between the generations in Argentina and Brazil, finding similarities in the

values of working adults in Argentina and Brazil. Murphy et al. (2011) explored value

similarities and differences between private sector managers in former Spanish colonies and

Portuguese colonies. Managers from the Philippines, Argentina and Brazil were more alike while

managers from Colombia and Mexico were more alike.

Value Orientation Typology

The RVS consists of 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values (Figure 1). The terminal values

are subdivided into two value orientation types: personal or social and the instrumental values

are divided into two value orientation types: moral or competence (Figure 2). This provides us

with a total of four personal value orientation types (Weber, 1990, 1993).

Weber (1990, 1993) and Musser and Orke (1992) extended Rokeach's personal value

orientation typology. Weber's and Musser and Orke's research indicated that people could be

classified by their overall value orientation or preference for one of the personal or social

terminal values and one of the moral and competence instrumental value types. For instance, a

person could show a tendency to 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. Weber and

Musser and Orke (1992) validated and tested this typology for the Rokeach Value Survey in the

US and in several cross-cultural studies.

In one of the first non-western studies using the Rokeach, Weber and Musser and Orke

typology, Giacomino, Fujita and Johnson (1999) explored sex differences in Japanese managers.

In their study, males and females placed higher importance on personal as compared to social

terminal values; females placed higher importance on the social terminal as compared to the

males, and females placed higher importance on moral instrumental values and males placed higher importance on competence instrumental values.

More recently, Murphy et al. (2007) explored Rokeach's value orientation typology in a study that compared the value orientation types of four western versus four eastern countries. The research results indicated that eastern and western countries possessed similar primary value orientation types, but western countries had a high social and high moral secondary orientation type and eastern countries had high persona and high competence secondary orientation types. Finally, Monserrat et al. (2009) explored generational differences in value orientations of working adults in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico. Their study suggested there might be a northern and southern cone of sub-culture in Latin American countries. While much research has described the behavior of Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y, this paper specifically explores generation differences in Rokeach's value orientation typology. We extend the analysis to another Central American country Honduras in addition to Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico.

Since values affect attitudes that influence behavior, if different generations have different value priorities and value orientation types, then there is support for their attitudes and, consequentially, their behavior, being distinct one from the other. If there is no difference between their value systems, then there is little support for the belief that different generations have different attitudes that affect their behavior in the workplace. The research will, therefore, test the following additional hypotheses:

H3: Argentina and Brazil will possess High Personal and High Moral Value Orientation types and Colombia and Mexico will possess High Personal and High Competence value Orientation types.

H4: Honduras will possess similar value orientations to Colombia and Mexico, which our previous research found might be in a northern cone of Latin American countries.

Methodology

As part of a much larger study of values, attitudes and behaviors in 15 countries, for which data was gathered between 2004 and 2010, the researchers conducted a stratified random sample of each country's database to ensure an equal number of working adult men and women were selected from each generation and from each country in our sample.

Survey Instrument

We used the Rokeach Value Survey because it is simpler, shorter and easier to use; it has shown its reliability and validity in research; it is much easier to statistically analyze (Connor & Becker, 2003); the RVS is "the most commonly used instrument for the measurement of values" (Kamakura & Novak, 1992) and many experts feel that "the Rokeach Value Survey is the best value system measuring device available" (Sikula, 1973, p. 16). Moreover, for current value surveys, "their theoretical arguments are based mainly on Rokeach's (1973, 1986) considerations of human nature, motivation, and personality" (Grunert & Scherhorn, 1990, p. 98).

Value Orientation Typology

Rokeach related that the 18 terminal values are divided into two types: self-centered (personal terminal values) and society-centered (social terminal values); instrumental values are divided into two types: moral and competence. Instructions to those taking the survey are standard. Each individual is asked to order the termnal and then the instrumental values "in order of importance to you, as guiding principles in your life" (Obot, 1988: 367), from one (most important) to 18 (least important).

We first developed the means and medians for terminal and instrumental values. We then divided the terminal values into personal and social terminal values and instrumental values into moral and competence values as shown in Figures 1 and 2. In order to develop the value orientation typology, we summed the mean scores for each value orientation typology (personal and social terminal values and moral and competence instrumental values), and then developed the grand means for each sex, each culture, and for US and Latin American countries combined, and for each generational group in each culture. This allowed us to classify each group by whether they placed higher importance on personal and competence values; higher importance on personal and moral values; higher importance on social and competence, or higher importance on social and moral values. As values range in ranking from one (most important) to 18 least important, the lowest grand means signify the more important value orientation type.

We then developed the grand means for each group and value orientation category. This allowed us to categorize each group as to where they placed their value orientation priorities, forming their 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, or (4) higher importance on social and moral values. The same procedures were use for each generation in each country.

The values research literature indicates that since the RVS is rank ordered it produces non-normative data. Sample reliability tests for normative data, cannot be used with the RVS because first, there are slight inter-correlations among the variables and second, the RVS values are rank ordered, so they produce ipsative or non-normative data. Instead of normative reliability data procedures, reliability of the RVS was established by Rokeach (1973, 1979) and Rokeach and Ball-Rokeach (1989) who used test-retest reliability for the survey instrument. They 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*. Comparable test-retest reliability scores for instrumental values ranged from .45 for *responsible* to .70 for *ambitious*. Employing a 14-16 month test interval, median reliability was .69 for terminal values and .61 for instrumental values. While these reliabilities may seem low when compared to normative data, they are well within the norm for rank ordered non-normative data and for value instruments.

Research Population

The Latin American respondents were working adults in large cities in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Honduras and Mexico. The total sample consisted of 1,731 Generation Y, 1256 Generation X, and 1,044 Baby Boomers. The generations were broken down as follows: Argentina (429 Generation Y, 353 Generation X, 316 Baby Boomers); Brazil (221 Generation Y, 150 Generation X, 200 Baby Boomers); Colombia (585 Generation Y, 171 Generation X, 231 Baby Boomers); Honduras (86 Generation Y, 192 Generation X, 47 Baby Boomers), and Mexico (420 Generation Y, 380 Generation X, 250 Baby Boomers.

Analysis of the Data

Since respondents rank order the values, the data produced are ordinal and must be analyzed for statistical significance using nonparametric techniques like the Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA median test (Connor & Becker, 2003; Stackman, Connor & Becker, 2005), followed by multivariate regression analysis in order to explore the impact on generations of culture, sex, education and occupation. The values were explored with a Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA median test with generations as the independent variables and values and value orientation types as the dependent variables (Olivas-Lujan et al., 2009; Murphy et al., 2011).

Research Results

The rankings, standard deviations and Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA H-values and their levels of significance are shown in Table 1. We explored differences across the generations in value priorities. There were generation differences for 16 of 18 terminal values and 10 of 18 instrumental values (Table 2). Baby Boomers will place higher importance on *accomplishment, equality, world peace, family security, freedom, health,* and *national security*, Generation X on mature love, and salvation, and Generation Y on *true friendship, comfortable life, exciting life, pleasure social recognition*, and *self-respect*, allowing us to accept **H1.** Generation Y did place higher importance on *ambition*, *independent*, and *intellectual*, Generation X on *forgiving, capable, polite,* and *responsible*, and Baby Boomers on *capable, courageous, helpful, honest, logical,* and *loyal*, allowing us to accept **H2.**

We next explored value orientation types across the generations in each country (Table 2), finding that personal and social terminal values and moral and competence value orientation types were statistically different across the generations**.** As shown in Tables 3 and 4, Argentina and Brazil respondents possessed High Personal and High Moral Value Orientation Types and respondents from Colombia and Mexico possessed High Personal and High Competence Value Orientation Types, allowing us to accept **H3.** We predicted and found that Hondurans would possess High Personal and High Competence Value Orientation Types like Colombia and Mexico, allowing us to accept **H4.**

Discussion

Divergence of Values between Baby Boom, Generation X and Generation Y

Baby Boomers will place higher importance on *accomplishment, equality, world peace, family security, freedom, health,* and *national security*. This explains that the most important

goals in the lives of Baby Boomers. Baby Boomers also highly valued *capable, courageous, helpful, honest, logical,* and *loyal*, meaning they felt capability was more important that ambition. Boomers were willing to stand up for their beliefs, willing to help others, being sincere and truthful, being logical and dedicated to their organizations (Table 2).

Generation X place higher priority on *mature love* and *salvation*, indicating they would pursue their more important goals of having sexual and spiritual intimacy and being saved and having eternal life. Generation X also highly valued *forgiving, capable, polite*, and *responsible*, (Table 2).

Generation Y more highly valued *true friendship, comfortable life, exciting life, pleasure social recognition*, and *self-respect*, meaning Generation Y would pursue their more important goals of having close companionship, prosperity, a stimulating and active life, an enjoyable and leisurely life, self-esteem, and being recognized by their peers. They also place higher importance on *ambition*, *independent*, and *intellectual* (Table 2).

We reconfirmed earlier research (Monserrat, 2009) which indicated a northern and southern cone of value orientations; our research indicates that Honduras belongs to a northern orientation with Colombia and Mexico.

We next explored the full spectrum of value orientation types for terminal and instrumental value orientation types across each Latin American generation as a combined group (Tables 5 + 6). All three Latin American Generations possessed a primary value orientation type of High Personal Terminal and High Competence Instrumental Value Orientation Types. Finally, we explored the value orientation types for each generation in each country (Tables 7 + 8). As expected, Generation Y, X and Boomers from Argentina and Brazil possessed High Personal and High Moral value orientation types with a preference for personal-moral values and concern for

self-or moral reasons for obtaining their personal goals. On the other hand, Generation Y, X and Boomers from Colombia, Honduras and Mexico possessed High Personal and High Competence value orientation types, with a preference for personal-competence values and concern for self-competence for personal goals (Tables 6 + 7).

Convergence of Values between Baby Boom, Generation X and Generation Y

The primary value orientation types for the generations in Argentina and Brazil were High Personal and High Moral Value Orientation Types, meaning they had a preference for personal moral values and concern for self, based on moral reasons for personal goals. On the other hand, the generations in Colombia, Honduras and Mexico were classified as High Personal and High Competence with a preference for personal-competence values and concern for self, based on competence for personal goals. Comparing to previous research (Murphy et al., 2011), it is interesting that the countries of Argentina and Brazil, which are furthest away from the US are more similar to the US value orientation type, as compared to Mexico, Honduras and Colombia which are closer in distance to the US, yet are more dissimilar in their value orientation types.

<div align="center">

Conclusions, Implications for Management, Limitations and Recommendations

</div>

The authors asked if there are significant cross-cultural generational similarities and differences that managers must understand in order to more effectively recruit, lead, and retain employees and compete in the global marketplace (Bailey and Spicer, 2007). Our findings suggest that the answer is yes. Generational value similarities do exist; within the countries we examined, the value orientation types were the same across generations within countries. Thus, no "generation gap" exists in the Latin American countries studied. Differences did exist between countries, however.

Some values were important for all. Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y in Latin America are all motivated to take care of their families (*a comfortable life),* being free from sickness (*health*), want self-esteem (*self-respect*), and take care of their families (*family security*), and they are sincere and truthful (*honest*) and dependable and reliable (*responsible*).

 Other values differentiated the generations. Baby Boomers are motivated by making a lasting contribution in their lives (*a sense of accomplishment*), having inner peace (*inner harmony*), seeing the world free from conflict, war and terrorism (*a world at peace*), they feel competent and effective (*capable*), the value being restrained and self-disciplined (self-*controlled*) and by giving loyalty to their organizations (*loyal*). Baby Boomers are more concerned with *salvation* than other generations. Baby Boomers want *respect* and *esteem* from co-workers, subordinates and managers. Managers can expect more organizational commitment from the Baby Boomers. They can also expect these workers to be more *forgiving* and *polite* in demeanor.

Generation Y more highly valued close companionship (*true friendship*). Millennials also place a higher value on being hard working and aspiring (*ambitious)* over being competent and effective *(capable)*. They are self-reliant and self-sufficient (the *independent* value) as well as valuing intelligence and reflection (*intellectual*). Generation Y is also searching for affection and tenderness in relationships (*loving*) and they are dutiful and respectful (*obedient*), and they are dependable and reliable (*responsible*). Such characteristics imply that Millennials like to be in charge, like to work either alone, or with others if they can develop close companionship with their co-workers; they like excitement in their jobs; they want to be hard working and have the chance of promotions and they want to be treated as equals. These young people are reputed to want to be treated as middle-level managers, despite not having moved up through experience.

This poses a challenge to Generation X and Baby Boomers because these generations had to get their experience first, before being promoted to the top positions.

Our most interesting finding was that the Argentina and Brazil were classified as having high personal and high moral value orientation types while Colombia, Honduras and Mexico had high personal and high competence value orientation types (individualism and individualism).

Only by understanding the similarities and differences in values and attitudes across the generations will practitioners, managers and HR managers be able to create programs to meet the differing motivation needs of each generation in order to recruit, retain, and promote them (Crumpacker and Crumpacker, 2007). Managers should be cautioned that within generations, there is a wide range of individual differences; however, recognizing group values and value orientation types and the fact that values underlie attitudes and behavior can be most helpful in understanding and managing the generation gaps in a given workplace, should any exist.

Further studies are needed to explore why the value orientation types in Argentina and Brazil are more similar to the US, and those in Colombia, Honduras and Mexico, which are in closer proximity to the US, are more dissimilar to the US. Further studies of the values of generations need to be conducted in other Latin American geographic areas. The surveys were administered to working adults in the major cities in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Honduras and Mexico. Generational research should be conducted in other nations as well in order to identify the values that are important for all generations worldwide. Longitudinal studies, cross-cultural studies, and studies with a larger variety of populations are suggested. The populations that the authors used were from larger cities. Do the same value structures apply for individuals in smaller towns? Only further research will confirm and extend the findings in this study.

References

Alch, M. L. June 2008. Get ready for a new type of worker in the workplace: the net generation. *Supervision* 69(6), 18-21.

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., and Lindzey, G. 1960. *Study of values: A scale for measuring the dominant interests in personality,* Houghton Mifflin, Boston.

Armour, S. 2005. Generation Y: They've arrived at work with a new attitude, *USA Today*, 11 November.

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

Bond, M. H. 1994. Finding universal dimensions of individual variation in multicultural studies of values: The Rokeach and Chinese value surveys. In B. Apuka (Ed.),*New research on oral development: Moral development a compendium* (385-391). NY: Garland Publishing.

Bond, M. H. and Smith, P. B. 1996. Cross-cultural social and organizational psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47: 205-220.

Braithwaite, V. A. and Law, H. G. 1985. Structure of human values: Testing the adequacy of the Rokeach Value Survey, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 49(1): 250-163.

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

Crampton, S. M. and Hodge, J. W. 2007. Generations in the workplace: Understanding age diversity. *The Business Review, Cambridge*, 9(1), pp 16–23.

Critchley, R. K. 2004. *Doing nothing is NOT an option: Facing the imminent labor crisis*, Thomson Southwestern Publishing, Mason, OH.

Crumpacker, M. and 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,* 36(4): 349-369.

Egri, C. and Ralston, D. 2004. Generation cohorts and personal values: A comparison of China and the US, *Organization Science*, 15, pp. 210-220.

Eisner, S. P. 2005. Managing generation Y. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 70(4): 4-8.

England, G. W. 1967. Personal value system of American managers, *Academy of Management Journal,* 10: 53-68.

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

Feather, N. T. 1986. Value systems across cultures: Australia and China, *International Journal of Psychology,* 21: 697-715.

Feather, N. T. 1999. *Values, achievement and justice: Studies in the Psychology of Deservingness*. New York: Academic/.Plenum Publishers.

Feather, N. T. and Paye, E. R. 1975. The structure of terminal and instrumental values: dimensions and clusters, *Australian Journal of Psychology,* 27(2): 151-164.

Giacomino, D., Fujita, A., and Johnson, T. M. 1999. Are the effects of age and gender changing the personal values of Japanese executives? *Business Forum*, 24(1/2): 15-21.

Gibson, J. W., Greenwood, J. W. and Murphy, E. F. Jr. 2008. *Generational difference in the workplace: Personal values, behaviors and popular beliefs*. 2008 International Business and Economics Research Conference. September 29-October 2, 2008, Las Vegas, NV.

Gordon, L. V. 1967. *Survey of personal values manual,* McGraw-Hill/London House, Rosemont, IL.

Greenwood, R. A., Gibson, J. W., and Murphy, E. F. Jr. 2008. *An analysis of US generational value differences in the workplace*. Global Academy of Business and Economic Research (GABER), September 17-19, 2008, Orlando, Fl.

Grunert, S. C. and Scherhorn, G. 1990. Consumer values in West Germany: Underlying dimensions and cross-cultural comparison with North America. *Journal of Business Research*, 20(2): 97-107.

Hewett, M. and Sharma, S. 2006. National culture and industrial buyer-seller relationships in the United States and Latin America. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34 (3), 386-402.

Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations.* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Inglehart, R. and Carballo, M 1997. Does Latin American exist? (And is there a Confucian Culture?): A global analysis of cross-cultural differences. *Political Science and Politics*, 30 (1), 34-47.

Johnson, J. A. and Lopes, J. 2008. The intergenerational workforce revisited, *Organizational Development Journal,* 26, (1), pp. 31 – 37.

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

Kehrli, S. and Sopp, T. 2006. Managing generation Y, *HR Magazine*, 51(5): 113-117.

Khilji, S. E., Murphy E. F. Jr., Mujtaba, B., Greenwood, R. A., Ruiz,-Gutierrez, J. A., Olivas-Lujan, M. R., Luk, D. M., Madero, S., Monserrat, S. I. L., Santos, N., Uy, A., Woodhull, M. D., and Teeple, W. 2008. *Intergenerational value change: A Cross cultural empirical test*. Eastern Academy of Management Meeting, Washington, D.C.

Kluckhohn, C. 1951. The study of values, In Barrett, D. (Ed.), *Values in transition*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN, pp. 17-45.

Kluckhohn, C. M. 1962. Values and value-orientations in the theory of action. In T. Parsons and E. A. Shils Eds., *Toward a general theory of action* pp. 388-433. NY: Harper and Row.

Kohlberg, L. 1970. *Stages in the development of moral thought and action*. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Lenartowicz, T., and Roth, K. 2001. Does subculture within a country matter? A cross-cultural study of motivational domains and business performance in Brazil. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(2): 305-320.

Lenartowicz, T., and Johnson., J. 2002. Comparing managerial values in twelve Latin American Countries: An exploratory study. *Management International Review*, 42(3): 279-307.

Leyden, P., Teixeira, R. and Greenberg, E. 2007. The progressive politics of the millennial generation. *New Politics Institute*. Retrieved May 8, 2008 from http://www.newpolitics.net/node/360?full_report=1

Lockwood, N. 2003. The aging workforce: the reality of the impact of older workers and eldercare in the workplace, HR *Magazine* [Online]. Available at http://findarticles.com.

Lyons, S. November 2005. Are gender differences in basic human values a generational phenomenon? *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research.* Retrieved May 13, 2008 from http://wwwfindarticles.com/

Mannheim, K. 1953. *Essays on sociology and social psychology*, Oxford University Press: NY

Mannheim, KI. 1970. The problem of generations,   *Psychoanalytic Review,* Vol LVII: 378-403.

Martin, C. A. 2005. From high maintenance to high productivity: What managers need to know about Generation Y. *Industrial and Commercial Training,* 37(1), 39-44.

Martin, C. and Tulgan, M. 2001. *Managing Generation Y*, Human Resource Development Press, Amherst, MA.

Massey, M. 1979. *The people puzzle.* Brady, NY.

Maxfield, S. 2004. Modifying best practices in women's advancement for the Latin American context, *Women in Management Review,* Vol. 20, No.4, 2005 249-261

McNamara, S. A. June, 2005. Incorporating generational diversity. *AORN Journal.* Retrieved May 20, 2008 from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/ mi_mOFSL/_is_6_81/ai_n15394405

Merrill, D. May 2008. Boomers pass the workplace torch. *The Lane Report,* 23(5): 34-40.

Monserrat, S., Lassaga, G., and Dannunzio, D. 2006. Argentina: returning to its glorious past. In B. J. Punnett; J. A., Duffy; S., Fox; A. Gregory; T. R. Lituchy; S. I. Monserrat; M. R. Olivas-Luján; and N. M. B. F. Santos (Eds). *Successful Professional Women of the Americas: From Polar Winds to Tropical Breezes.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Monserrat, S., Santos, N., Olivas-Luján, M., Madero, S., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J., Greenwood, R., Khilji, S., Murphy, E., Luk, D., Mujtaba, B., Uy, A., Woodhull, M., Christoforou, P., Teeple, W., & Chaturvedi, S. 2009. *Generation in the workplace: An analysis of US and Latin American generational value similarities and differences between baby boomers, generation X and generation Y*. Paper presented at the 10th International Human Resources Management (IHRM) Conference, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Murphy, E. F. Jr., Gordon, J. D., and Anderson, T. 2004. An examination of cross-   cultural age or generation-based value differences between the United States and Japanese. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, *9*(1), 21-48.

Murphy, E. F. Jr., Greenwood, R. A., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J. A., Manyak, T. G., Mujtaba, B., and Uy, O. O. A. 2006. *Generational value changes: Their history and a cross-cultural empirical test*. Academy of Management Meeting August 11-17, 2006, Atlanta, Georgia.

Murphy, E., Chaturvedi, S., Greenwood, R., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J., Khilji, S., Olivas-Lujan, M., Luk, D., Manyak, T., Mujtaba, B., Madero, S., Santos, N., Uy, A., & Woodhull, M. 2007. *The values of males and females in the east and west: Are they diverging or converging?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management Meeting, Philadelphia.

Murphy, E., Uy, A., Greenwood, R., Monserrat, S., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J., Santos, N., Olivas-Lujan, M., & Madero, S., 2011. *An exploration of private sector manager value orientations in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico as compared to the Philippines.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management meeting, San Antonio, Texas.

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

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

Patota, N., Schwartz, D. and Schwartz, T. 2007. Leveraging generational differences for productivity gains. *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*, 11(2), pp. 1-11.

Ralston, D., Gustafson, D., Elsas, P., Cheung, F. and Terpstra, R. 1992. Eastern values: A comparison of managers in the U.S., Hong Kong and PRC. *Journal of Applied Psychology,*77: 664-671.

Rokeach, M. 1973. *The nature of human values*, Free Press, NY.

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

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

Rokeach, M. and Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (May, 1989) Stability and change in American value priorities. *American Psychologist*, 44(5), pp. 775-784.

Rottier, A.(October 2001. Generation 2001: Loyalty and values – Generation X and work. *Workforce.* Retrieved July 29, 2008 from http://findarticles.com/

Ruiz-Gutierrez, J. 2005. *Change and organizational demography: The case of 30 Colombian companies*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, HI.

Schwartz, S. 1992. Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.

Sikula, A. F. 1973. The values and value systems of governmental executives. *Public Personnel Management*, January-February 1973: 16-22.

Stackman, R. W., Connor, P. E., and Becker, B. W. 2005. Sectoral ethos: An investigation of the personal value systems of female and male managers in the public and private sectors, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol 16, pp. 577-597.

Strauss, W. and Howe, N. 1997. *The Fourth Turning: What the Cycles of History Tell Us About America's Next Rendezvous with Destiny*. New York: Broadway Books.

Streeter, B. December 2007. Welcome to the new workplace. *ABA Banking Journal, 99*(2), 7,

Trunk, P. 2007. What Generation Y really wants, *Time.* http://www.time.com.

Uy, O. O. A., Murphy, E. F. Jr., Greenwood, R., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J. A., Manyak, T. G., and Mujtaba, B. 2008. A preliminary exploration of generational similarities and differences in values between the US, UK, Iceland, Japan, Korea, Colombia and the Philippines. *DLSU Business and Economics Review, 18(1): 29-46*

Wallace, J. April, 2001. After X comes Y—echo boom generation enters workforce. *HR Magazine.* Retrieved July 29, 2008 from http://findarticles.com.

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.

Weil, N. 2008. Welcome to the generation wars: As Boomer bosses relinquish the reins of leadership to Generation X both are worrying about Generation Y. For the good of the enterprise, everyone needs to do a better job of getting along. *CIO,* 21(8).

Yeaton, K. April 2008. Recruiting and managing the 'why?' generation: Gen Y. *The CPA Journal,* 78(4) 68-73.

Zemke, R., Raines, C. and Filipczak, B. 1999. *Generations at Work: Managing the clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in Your Workplace*, AMACOM, NY.

Figure 1
Social and personal terminal values and moral and self-actualization 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 M. Rokeach (1973), *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.

Figure 2
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 J. Weber (1993), S. Musser & E. Orke, (1992), and Eaton & Giacomino (2001).

TABLE 1
Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA, and Multivariate regression analysis for cross-cultural and generation differences

	ANOVA		Multivariate Regression Beta Scores				
	H	Alphas	Culture	Generation	Sex	Education	Occupation
Comfortable life	14	***		.055	.033		
An exciting life	52	***		.097	.046	.033	
Accomplishment	42	***	.087	.067			
World at peace	25	***		.069	.041	.059	
World of beauty	39	***		.08			
Equality	17	***	.045	.05		.06	
Family security	41	***		.082	.05		
Freedom	N/S	N/S	.091				
Health	8.6	**	.03	.05	.037		.002
Inner harmony	9	**	.127	.047	.062	.066	
Mature love	N/S	N/S	.038				.015
Nati security	67	***		.126	.03	.05	
Pleasure	34	***		.089	.069	.045	
Salvation	30	***	.059	.039	.039	.061	
Self-respect	13	**		.064	.068	.061	
Soc Recog	26	***		.074	.08		
True friendship	37	***		.087	.041		.05
Wisdom	11	**	.033	.058		.04	
Ambitious	32	***	.075	.073	.047	.043	
Broadminded	8	**	.093		.041		
Capable	7	*		.035	.047	.129	
Clean	N/S	N/S	.14		,066	.047	
Courageous	8.5	**	.044	.033	.039		
Forgiving	N/S	N/S	.126		.033	.036	
Helpful	12	**		.047			
Honest	32	***	.05	.073			
Imaginative	12	**		.056	.087	.08	.036
Independent	N/S	N/S	.082		.044		
Intellectual	18	***	.079	.084		.126	
Logical	N/S	N/S			.069	.071	
Loving	N/S	N/S			.047	.077	
Loyal	N/S	N/S		.034	.039		
Obedient	28	***	.082	.052		.18	
Polite	N/S	N/S	.079			.055	.045
Responsible	N/S	N/S				.064	.061
Self-controlled	39	***	.079	.077	.032	.031	

*= p < .05; **= p < .01; ***= p < .001

Table 2
Generation differences in Latin American Values

	Gen Y N=1,741	Ranking	Gen X N=653	Ranking	Boom N=1,044	Ranking	p<.05
Comfortable life	7.05	3	7.60	3	7.66	4	***
An exciting life	11.02	14	12.01	16	12.07	15	***
Accomplishment	10.03	11	10.08	11	8.78	6	***
World at peace	10.22	12	9.87	10	9.19	8	***
World of beauty	13.71	18	13.31	18	12.76	16	***
Equality	10.64	13	10.44	12	9.81	12	***
Family security	5.97	2	5.29	2	5.05	2	***
Freedom	9.03	8	9.31	9	8.95	7	N/S
Health	5.26	1	4.86	1	4.76	1	***
Inner harmony	8.08	5	8.35	5	7.62	3	***
Mature love	9.16	9	9.10	8	9.30	11	N/S
Nati security	12.03	16	10.92	14	10.71	13	***
Pleasure	9.97	10	10.56	13	11.09	14	***
Salvation	11.90	15	10.92	15	12.77	17	***
Self-respect	7.61	4	7.81	4	8.24	5	***
Soc Recog	12.11	17	12.64	17	12.92	18	***
True friendship	8.23	6	8.70	6	9.28	9	***
Wisdom	8.59	7	8.82	7	9.29	10	***
Ambitious	7.16	3	8.07	3	8.42	4	***
Broadminded	9.43	9	9.29	9	8.81	7	***
Capable	8.95	5	8.61	4	8.45	5	***
Clean	9.88	12	9.82	10	9.42	10	N/S
Courageous	9.41	8	9.15	5	8.80	6	***
Forgiving	11.98	18	11.77	17	12.01	17	N/S
Helpful	10.82	14	10.46	14	10.16	12	***
Honest	6.63	1	6.30	1	5.51	1	***
Imaginative	11.22	15	10.86	16	10.56	15	***
Independent	9.06	6	9.22	7	9.06	8	N/S
Intellectual	7.54	4	9.97	11	8.29	3	***
Logical	10.46	13	10.45	13	10.24	13	N/S
Loving	9.47	10	9.65	8	9.70	11	N/S
Loyal	9.55	11	9.21	6	9.16	9	N/S
Obedient	11.54	17	11.98	18	12.55	18	***
Polite	11.35	16	10.82	15	11.04	16	N/S
Responsible	6.94	2	6.71	2	7.18	2	N/S
Self-controlled	9.32	7	10.14	12	10.50	14	***

Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA: *= p < .05; **= p < .01; ***= p < .001

TABLE 3
Cross-Cultural Terminal and Instrumental Value Orientations
Latin American Countries

Terminal Values	Argentina N=1098	Brazil N=571	Colombia N=987	Mexico N=1050	Honduras N=325
Social Values interpersonal focus	9.723	9.533	10.039	10.233	10.392
Personal Values intrapersonal focus	9.246	8.942	8.837	8.752	8.607
Instrumental Values					
Moral Values interpersonal focus	9.130	8.633	10.463	9.802	10.376
Competence Values intrapersonal focus	9.813	9.781	8.408	9.185	8.625

TABLE 4
Cross-Cultural Value Orientation Type Classifications

Latin American Countries	Primary	Secondary
Argentina	High Personal + High Moral	High Social + High Competence
Brazil	High Personal + High Moral	High Social + High Moral
Colombia	High Personal + High Competence	High Social + High Competence
Mexico	High Personal + High Competence	High Social + High Competence
Honduras	High Personal + High Competence	High Personal + High Moral

TABLE 5
Cross-Cultural Terminal and Instrumental Value Orientations
Latin American Countries

Terminal Values	Generation Y N=1,731	Generation Y N=1,256	Baby Boomers N=1,044
Social Values interpersonal focus	10.122	9.95	9.76
Personal Values intrapersonal focus	8.83	8.99	9.13
Instrumental Values			
Moral Values interpersonal focus	9.73	9.58	9.56
Competence Values intrapersonal focus	9.22	9.36	9.29

TABLE 6
Cross-Cultural Value Orientation Type Classifications

Latin America	Primary	Secondary
Generation Y	High Personal + High Competence	High Personal + High Moral
Generation X	High Personal + High Competence	High Personal + High Moral
Baby Boomers	High Personal + High Competence	High Personal + High Moral

TABLE 7
Cross Cultural Generation Differences In Value Orientation Types

	Arg Gen Y	Arg Gen X	Arg Boom	Brazil Gen Y	Brazil Gen X	Brazil Boom			
Social Values	9.74	9.71	9.70	9.43	9.46	9.43			
Personal Values	9.21	9.28	9.27	9.26	9.05	9.06			
Moral Values	9.07	9.20	9.15	8.68	8.25	8.69			
Comp Values	9.84	9.79	9.80	9.76	10.21	9.81			
	Mex Gen Y	**Mex Gen X**	**Mex Boom**	**Col Gen Y**	**Col Gen X**	**Col Boom**	**Hon Gen Y**	**Hon Gen X**	**Hon Boom**
Social Values	10.19	10.39	9.44	10.16	9.76	9.73	10.63	10.33	10.22
Personal Values	8.79	8.62	9.55	8.74	9.10	8.94	8.38	8.69	8.78
Moral Values	9.80	10.35	9.40	10.50	9.67	10.04	10.53	10.31	10.35
Comp Values	9.19	8.63	9.64	8.45	9.15	8.57	8.46	8.69	8.65

TABLE 8
Cross-Cultural Generation Differences in Value Orientation Type Classifications

	Primary	Secondary
Argentina Gen Y	Personal + Moral Values	Social + Moral Values
Argentina Gen X	Personal + Moral Values	Social + Moral Values
Argentina Boomers	Personal + Moral Values	Social + Moral Values
Brazil Gen Y	Personal + Moral Values	Social + Moral Values
Brazil Gen X	Personal + Moral Values	Social + Moral Values
Brazil Boomers	Personal + Moral Values	Social + Moral Values
Colombia Gen Y	Personal + Competence Values	Social + Competence Values
Colombia Gen X	Personal + Competence Values	Personal + Moral Values
Colombia Boomers	Personal + Competence Values	Social + Competence Values
Honduras Gen Y	Personal + Competence Values	Personal + Moral Values
Honduras Gen X	Personal + Competence Values	Personal + Moral Values
Honduras Boomers	Personal + Competence Values	Social + Competence Values
Mexico Gen Y	Personal + Competence Values	Personal + Moral Values
Mexico Gen X	Personal + Competence Values	Personal + Moral Values
Mexico Boomers	Personal + Competence Values	Personal + Moral Values