CHAPTER 3

Cultural Influences of Latin American and Caribbean Perceptions on Inclusion and Diversity

Ronald R. Rojas

Introduction

The Latin America and Caribbean regions remain an appealing market for global competitive expansion (Aguilera, Ciravegna, Cuervo-Cazurra, & Gonzalez-Perez, 2017; Bamrud, 2011). They possess a set of unique conditions that still make it one of the most attractive contexts worldwide for doing business, notwithstanding some severe challenges that underscore these opportunities. Multinationals (Sissell, 2012), services (Rubalcaba, Aboal, & Garda, 2016), and telecommunications (Mayor, Davo, & Martinez, 2015) are among the those that have been successful in establishing a global footprint within these regions despite the argument that Latin America and the Caribbean will never be a developed region because of sociocultural reasons (Bamrud, 2011). Others doing business in Latin America have already met some of these sociocultural challenges, mainly

R. R. Rojas (✉)
St. Vincent de Paul Regional Seminary, Boynton Beach, FL, USA
e-mail: rrojas@svdp.edu

C. T. E. de Aquino and R. R. Rojas (eds.),
Diversity and Inclusion in Latin American and Caribbean Workplaces,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35419-0_3

related to workplace practices. For example, some of the newer management practices prevalent in North American have achieved some success in Latin America and the Caribbean, but they also show inadequacies (Celaya & Swift, 2006). Among these newer management practices recognized for enhancing operational efficiency, innovation, and global competitiveness are the leveraging of Diversity and Inclusion in the workplace (Cho, Kim, & Mor Barak, 2017). Understandably, a majority of Diversity and Inclusion modeling comes from a North America and European worldview (Rojo & Beauregard, 2017) and is therefore representative of their own cultures. Accounting for cultural nuances in the Latin American workplace is essential (Raineri, 2018), and in doing so, the region has a better chance of fulfilling the expectations of becoming a significant contributor in the evolving global market (Gomes, Robertson, & Dale, 2012).

It is well established in the literature that workplace practices and perceptions of Diversity and Inclusion are shaped by national cultures and subcultures (Peretz, Levi, & Fried, 2015): "If individuals bring different views about diversity to the same workplace, we should not be surprised to find significant variations in their perceptions of the firm's diversity climate" (Hostager & De Muse, 2002, p. 190). Despite the significance of perceptions as a topic within cross-culture studies (Kastanakis & Voyer, 2014), finding related research is daunting (Otaye-Ebede, 2018). For the most part, perceptions are formed by national cultures, and perceptions affect workplace behaviors.

> It is within our (various) cultures that we have practiced and learned how to behave, and what to believe and feel, in accord with prescriptions and proscriptions that were transmitted to us across time from significant others. Cultural influences continue to mold the specifics of development, beginning before birth, influencing subtle and also clear and obvious ways of doing things. (Lott, 2010, p. 13)

More importantly, perceptions have a direct effect on inclusion and diversity behaviors in the workplace (Stoermer, Bader, & Froese, 2016), especially when considering the cognitive-emotional biases related to both social stereotyping and prejudice as "blind spots" within the organization (Raineri, 2018).

Then it is understandable that within the variety of cultural differences even among the Latin American and Caribbean countries, there would

also be multiple perceptions of workplace values, and more specifically, perceptual viewpoints on Diversity and Inclusion (Griffin, Guedhami, Kwok, Li, & Shao, 2017). Any assumption that Hispanics are all defined by a few cultural factors—whether from Central America, South America, Mexico, or the Caribbean—is misguided (Lee, Martin, & Hall, 2017). Although there are shared values among the cultures and subcultures within the Latin American region, there are also significant differences stemming from history, traditions, and social dynamics (Kline, Wade, & Wiarda, 2018). The relevance of perceptual differences in designing and implementing Diversity and Inclusion strategies in the Latin American and Caribbean workplace is the primary objective of this chapter. This chapter builds upon previous research on comparing and relating cultural values affecting race, ethnicity, generational, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability, social status, and other categories. This chapter also expands the scope of previous research to address all Latin American and Caribbean countries and suggest avenues to explore the influence of cultural perceptions in the workplace further.

Paradigm Shifts from Diversity to Inclusion

A first step in building this chapter's approach to understanding the Latin American perception of inclusion is to provide evidence of inclusion as a distinct construct, different than diversity. Once this distinction is presented, the next step is to address some of the main factors that moderate inclusion, namely, organizational climate and culture, followed by a discussion on the relationship between national cultures and inclusion in organizations. Once these preliminaries are established, then the conversation can turn to the attributes of Latin American cultures and their impact on organizational inclusion and diversity.

In reviewing the literature, there seems to be a shift toward a lessening interest in the traditional forms of diversity management as an obligation to focus on researching the benefits of inclusion as a tenet of organizational advancement (Roberson, 2006). Traditionally, diversity is recognized as "the varied perspectives and approaches to work that members of different groups bring" (Thomas & Ely, 1996, p. 80) and is associated with behavioral or identity differences among groups (Larkey, 1996).

Inclusion reflects the extent to which individuals can access organizational resources and become active participants in organizational decision-making processes (Mor-Barak & Cherin, 1998). Although still interrelated, it is now possible to identify these two constructs as distinct fields of inquiry. On the one hand, the traditional interpretation of diversity is viewed within a "compliance-legitimacy" paradigm, where equal opportunity, fair treatment, and anti-discrimination are topics that characterize the published research. On the other hand, an "enrichment-performance" paradigm is emerging, where research on leveraging employee differences into enhancing organizational performance as a competitive advantage is becoming more evident in the literature. Despite this distinction between constructs, Diversity and Inclusion are so interrelated that one leads to the other: "In the context of the workplace, diversity equals representation. The durableness of diversity is a function of inclusion. Without inclusion, however, the crucial connections that attract diverse talent, encourage their participation, foster innovation, and lead to business growth won't happen" (Sherbin & Rashid, 2017, p. 2).

More specifically, the "compliance-legitimacy" paradigm represents the original diversity viewpoints, which came to the forefront of corporate policies and practices during the 1970s primarily in response to the federal enforcement of equal opportunity employment and affirmative action programs (Kelly & Dobbin, 1998). In many ways, the implementation of these diversity programs represented a hardship for organizations (Rosen & Lovelace, 1991) and it was not until the 1990s that it became a highly debated and researched as an organizational theory topic (Seymen, 2006). Under this paradigm, diversity is seen as an obligation (Demuijnck, 2009), as a crusade to confront discrimination (Hemphill & Haines, 1998), a responsibility to recognize biases (Watts, 1987), and as an added component to the management function (Grant & Kleiner, 1997). Essentially, the "compliance-legitimacy" paradigm forced organizations to evaluate inequities in light of social demands (De Valk, 1993) and compelled them to accommodate this new demand into organizational dynamics.

Undoubtedly, anti-discrimination legislation first compelled changes to internal practices and promoted programs that were primarily measured using hiring and placements data, surveys, and focus group outcomes (Majors & Sinclair, 1994). Over time, businesses began discovering more valuable applications of diversity and started promoting it—even voluntarily—as a measurement of business performance (Jayne &

Dipboye, 2004; Richard, McMillan, Chadwick, & Dwyer, 2003). In some cases, diversity was measured as a perception of performance by employees (Choi & Rainey, 2010) or sometimes by way of a manager's own perceptions (Garib, 2013). In other cases, measurements of diversity effects in organizational performance included using outcomes related to employee tenure (Steffens, Shemla, Wegge, & Diestel, 2014), through the merits of workforce skills (Turnbull, Greenwood, Tworoger, & Golden, 2010), by using correlates between diversity and financial performance (Hassan, Marimuthu, & Kaur Johl, 2015) or by measuring completion of specific diversity goals and objectives (Stutz & Massengale, 1997). Despite these efforts, there were still apparent inconsistencies among empirical findings between diversity initiatives and organizational performance (Ali, Kulik, & Metz, 2011).

Nonetheless, interest in diversity did not remain static along the "compliance-legitimacy" paradigm. Factors such as immigration (Lamphere, Stepick, & Grenier, 1994), globalization (Martin, 2014), disability rights (Ball, Monaco, Schmeling, Schartz, & Blanck, 2005), spirituality in the workplace (Hicks, 2002), religious values at work (Ball & Haque, 2003), sexual orientation (Lubensky, Holland, Wiethoff, & Crosby, 2004), and shifts in public opinion regarding the relevance of workplace diversity (Stockdale & Crosby, 2004) broadened the views on diversity as set the stage for the emergence of inclusion.

There are two noticeable turning points in the literature that support the outgrowth of inclusion from diversity and the formation of separate—albeit related— constructs. When searching the scholarly databases with keywords addressing the "value" of diversity, it is not until about 2001 that the research literature increases substantially, even though it was during the 1990s that diversity became an interest in organizational theory. A second transition point occurred during the same timeframe, where the topic of "performance" further propelled a distinction between Diversity and Inclusion. The same factor that drove scholarly attention to diversity studies—the interest in using "performance" as a measurement of diversity effectiveness— generated momentum into further defining the inclusion construct. Consequently, an "enrichment-performance" paradigm emerged where research on leveraging employee differences into enhancing organizational performance as a competitive advantage became more evident in the literature. Whereas diversity's first drive was primarily aimed

at managing demographics, inclusion emerged as a concept emphasizing employee contributions to organizational development and innovation (Mor-Barak & Cherin, 1998).

What remains uncertain from the literature is evidence of this paradigm shift also taking place in other nations, and more specifically, within the Latin American regions. Whether this shift is a natural progression of just the North American-European view of Diversity and Inclusion, or if the models resulting from this view apply in a broader global sense and readily transferable to other cultures remains unclear. The momentum of inclusion as a value-added and performance enhancer of effectiveness should not overshadow a comprehensive analysis of the adaptability or potential resistance that may be encountered when using these constructs in other countries.

In order to provide a framework for better understanding the possibilities and limitations of applying these concepts to Latin America and the Caribbean, a discussion on how climate and culture moderate organizational values is necessary. Organizations exist within national cultures and understanding the permeability of national values into the climate-culture system of organizations provides insights into recognizing the similarities and differences of Diversity and Inclusion perceptions between the North American and Latin America regional cultures.

The Climate-Culture System

Along with the turning points of "value" and "performance" discussed above, scholars and practitioners also began to focus more on the impact of inclusion on organizational climate and culture, two other concepts already well developed in the management and leadership disciplines. With the climate-culture connection, it became promising to weave the views of Diversity and Inclusion into other research threads. Among the possibilities, the evolving research on how values affect performance within the climate-culture system of an organization offers a path to evaluate the significance of Diversity and Inclusion values as they are portrayed in Latin American cultures.

The fact that climate and culture are critical dimensions of organizational life is widely accepted in the literature (Glisson, 2000). Organizational climate is viewed as the employee's shared perception of with workplace environment (Zacher & Yang, 2016) and is considered a source of employee involvement and empowerment (Ninan, Jose, & John, 2017).

More to the point of this chapter, a climate that is inclusive promotes a shared disposition toward organizational values (Nishii & Rich, 2014), fosters a perception of fairness and trust (Downey, Werff, Thomas, & Plaut, 2015) resulting in performance measurables such as retention and job satisfaction (Brimhall, Lizano, & Barak, 2014), innovation, and process effectiveness (Glisson, 2015). On the other hand, culture refers to an organizational trait that addresses "…the basic assumptions about the world and values that guide life in organizations" (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013, p. 361). Culture provides a shared understanding of the identity of an organization (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006) and is also considered a significant factor in optimizing performance (Boyce, Nieminen, Gillespie, Ryan, & Denison, 2015). In simpler terms, if climate can be associated with the prevalent "mood" within the workplace, then culture refers to the "character" of the organization. Although in different ways, both constructs are associated with organizational performance.

Whether culture affects climate or climate affects culture, it is evident that both result in organizational outcomes through the behaviors, perceptions, and attitudes of employees. What is relevant to this chapter is that both climate and culture are linked to a dynamic web of interpersonal relationships, and these relationships have an impact on the levels of employee commitments (Denison, 1996). Therefore, it is understandable that reducing relational biases and fostering a workplace conducive to fuller use of employee capabilities enhances performance and makes the organization more competitive (Zacher & Yang, 2016). Carefully designed climate-culture systems that thrive on inclusion as a value are more likely to achieve higher possibilities of relational performance to the benefit of the organization.

On an operational-relational spectrum of preferences or styles, the literature already shows Latin American countries with strong interpersonal orientations (Sanchez-Burks, Nisbett, & Ybarra, 2000). If North Americans are considered more "task-than-relationally oriented," then Latin Americans tend to be more "relationally-than-task oriented" (Guerrero & Posthuma, 2014; Ruiz, 2005). Here, a sensitivity toward relational performance activities as a contribution to overall organizational effectiveness is the most common approach to comprehend the effects of the Latin American cultural landscape. Just as organizations have operational performance indicators, they also have relational performance indicators (Moran, 2005). Operational performance refers to the execution of tasks defined by the organization's structure to achieve its tangible goals

(Neely, 2002)—and although they vary for different types of organizations—they are primarily quantitative (Rodriguez, Saiz, & Bas, 2009). In manufacturing, measurements of yield, units per hour, and defects per million would be examples of performance metrics. For healthcare, some operational performance measures include patient wait time, staff to patient ratio, average treatment charge, or medication error rate. In retail, the number of customers, average purchase value, items per purchase, and gross margin are examples of operational performance. Traditionally, financial metrics include the balance sheet, income statement, cash flow statement, and measurements of inventory movements. The common attributes expected from operational performance metrics include easy interpretation, quantitative in nature, address critical business processes, sensitivity to process adjustments, and are relatively easy to collect.

In a similar fashion, relational performance measures also have an impact on organizational effectiveness and are best measured by qualitative means (Ramani & Kumar, 2008; Sun, Aryee, & Law, 2007). Although some relational performance measurements, such as satisfaction surveys, employee turnover rates, complaints, participation in events, absenteeism, are quantifiable, they are just manifestations or consequences of deeper relational dynamics. More difficult interpersonal measurements such as work-family balance, trust, innovation, resilience, adaptability, conflicts in values, tension levels among workers—and of course, Diversity and Inclusion—are relevant to the organization's performance and are harder to assess adequately. The value of relational performance relates to the concept of "guanxi," a Chinese society construct which integrates an organism of relational networks into business activities that complements operational performance (Luo, Huang, & Wang, 2012). In a business setting, the internal relational performance indicators (i.e., soft metrics, human capital metrics) are traditionally the responsibility of the Human Resources function (Wright, Gardner, & Moynihan, 2003).

However, from a cultural perspective, how can this distinction of relational performance be measured? There is an abundance of research to recognize relational performance measurements with customers (Anton & Petouhoff, 2002), yet finding publications that highlight the value of relational vigor within an organization is quite scarce. What little is available in the literature on methods for assessing relational performance are tools such as climate surveys, forming affinity groups, and establishing forms of positional responsibility with the organization's hierarchy that are commissioned to provide a sense of employee interpersonal health. Climate

surveys do carry a "snapshot in time" and seem suitable to measure the inclusion-diversity climate (Herdman & McMillan-Capehart, 2010), but they also carry the classic disadvantages of quantitative research in that collected data is superficial and easy to generalize, there is a reduction of extraneous variables that may be significant, and they are less time-consuming than qualitative approaches (Vogt, 2007). A better technique is that of focus or special interest groups. In forming special interest groups within the organization—such as Employee Resource Groups (ERG)—these informal, affinity-driven, voluntary gatherings easily collect common concerns and experiences related to the workplace and can judge an organization's responses to Diversity and Inclusion strategies (Welbourne & McLaughlin, 2013). Assessing relational performance can also be determined by creating a position within the hierarchy to manage the Diversity and Inclusion responsibility. Although typically this task falls under the Human Resources function (Bierema & D'Abundo, 2004), other possibilities include the public relations functions (Bowen, 2008), diversity officers (Williams & Wade-Golden, 2007) and even corporate chaplains (Meyer & Davis, 2002). Mostly, relational performance metrics such as Diversity and Inclusion as an organizational value are primarily qualitative—and despite the relevance to the organization's vitality—they remain challenging to assess.

The discussion above on relational performance within an organization's climate-culture system although valuable may prove insufficient when investigating Diversity and Inclusion perceptions in Latin America. While the interaction between climate and culture is complex and beyond the intent of this paper, the focus here is to illustrate the impact of interpersonal relationships within a climate-culture system as it relates to the Hispanic values in the US workplace environment and its insufficiency to address Diversity and Inclusion issues at a deeper level when addressing the Latin American countries. An organization's awareness and efforts to sustain the climate-culture values—including Diversity and Inclusion—presume a mature level of cultural competency that maintains organizational performance and promotes competitiveness. And yet definitions and approaches to cultural competency vary widely depending on worldview (Fisher-Borne, Cain, & Martin, 2015) and the abundance of literature on this topic suggests a dominant North American perspective again. Therefore, a comprehensive approach to cultural sensibility in favor of workplace Diversity and Inclusion beyond just the relational orientation is essential if an organization's perceptual awareness is expected to succeed.

The Influence of National Cultures

Discussing the effects of organizational culture and national culture upon each other within the context of Diversity and Inclusion means facing another controversy contained within the scholarly literature. On the one hand, researchers that support Institutional Theory (IT) argue that national cultures have a significant effect on organizational cultures (Kostova, Roth, & Dacin, 2008). Conversely, Organizational Culture (OC) scholars posit that well-defined corporate cultures can minimize many of the national culture effects (Lee & Kramer, 2016). Understandably, organizations that are deliberate in their Diversity and Inclusion values tend to develop cultures that protect against opposing influences of national culture, whereas organizations that hold fragmented or inconsistent Diversity and Inclusion objectives within their organization are more susceptible to the effects of societal values. A possible path to accepting both views is to suggest a continuum, with each one of these positions at the opposite end of the spectrum. Such a model allows for the study of Latin American cultural perspectives on Diversity and Inclusion within organizations, albeit in different degrees. This approach allows room for national cultures to affect organizational cultures and for organizations to act as agents of cultural change within nations.

Having somewhat settled the climate-culture debate and the Institutional Theory (IT)-Organizational Culture (OC) controversies, what follows is an analysis of Latin American and Caribbean cultures and the attributes affecting the perception of Diversity and Inclusion in the workplace. Latin America here is defined as Mexico, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean (Lenartowicz & Johnson, 2003)—and although the list of countries involved suggest a wide variety of cultural and subcultural nuances—the cultural analysis of Latin American countries provided by the dimensions noted by Hofstede (2011) offers a framework that serves the purpose of this chapter.

A widely used method for comparing and analyzing the effects of national cultures is that of Hofstede's cultural dimensions, which examines national cultures along six dimensions, namely, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism/Collectivism, Masculinity/Femininity, Long-Term/Short-Term Orientation, and Indulgence/Restraint (Hofstede, 2011). It is important to remember that cultural values, like any human attribute, fall along a continuum and rarely are enacted at the extreme ends of the continuum. The establishment of

a society's cultural patterns is a generality, a broad view of a country's values, and is not intended as a determinant of individual behaviors. It should also be noted that scholars have indicated that some of the findings used by Hofstede may require updates (Bergiel, Bergiel, & Upson, 2012). A brief description of each dimension is presented in the following paragraphs.

The first dimension—Power Distance (PD)—refers to the degree of whether a leader, manager, or supervisor's power is either concentrated in that person or distributed within the organization. If considered as a relational performance indicator, Power Distance describes a climate-culture context that is determined by varying degrees of hierarchical and transactional relationships. A high value of Power Distance means subordinates highly depend on their superiors. Superiors are expected to make all the hard choices, and subordinates will comply rather than challenge the decision. Whereas a low Power Distance value represents a situation where power is more distributed, there is a preference for consultation, and subordinates are comfortable challenging decisions made by the superior. Of all the dimensions of culture, Power Distance (PD) is most directly connected to organizational culture by means of how power is exercised (Fikret, 2000; Hewett, Money, & Sharma, 2006). This means that organizations influenced by high Power Distance cultures, diversity, and inclusion are practically forced—albeit there are kinder ways, such as through paternalistic approaches—to achieve equality and inclusion. For organizations affected by low Power Distance values, Diversity and Inclusion emerge through a mutual interest in achieving optimal performance (Van der Vegt, Van de Vliert, & Huang, 2005).

The Individualism/Collectivism (I/C) dimension represents a continuum where Individualism is defined by self-reliance, personal interests, and individual goals over groups' goals and personal pride from individual accomplishments. Collectivism is associated with interdependence, affiliation, group harmony, and hostility toward out-group members. The Individualism/Collectivism (I/C) dimension directly affects workplace attitudes, pro-social behaviors, and levels of team commitment (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000; Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2002). From a relational performance view, Individualism/Collectivism (I/C) within the climate-culture context addresses degrees of interdependence. A high Individualism/Collectivism value reflects a condition where the individualistic person focuses more on himself-herself with minimal interest in others. Interpersonal relationships have value, only within the context of

reinforcing the individualistic view. Consequently, inclusion in the workplace has value if it enhances the individual, thus making it more difficult to associate inclusion with organizational performance as a whole. On the other hand, in a low Individualism/Collectivism condition, people tend to define the self as an interdependent part of a social group rather than independent of others. Collectivistic individuals seek what is best for the group over personal ambitions. The extent of interdependence is relevant since it enhances working relationships and provides a more conducive environment to understand and eventually accept the value of inclusion as an organizational enhancer (Anderson, 2006). However, the collectivistic organization is also subject to in-group out-group tensions that could make Diversity and Inclusion approaches somewhat awkward.

As a third dimension, the Masculinity/Femininity (M/F) dimension expresses another continuum of preferences, this time portrayed by gender roles. Interpreted through a relational lens, the Masculinity/Femininity attribute within the climate-culture context coveys a choice along a task-relationship spectrum, where the masculine cultures are about ego, feminine cultures are about relationships. In a high Masculinity/Femininity (M/F) setting, attributes such as assertiveness, toughness, and focus on material achievement are examples of expected dominant behaviors, whereas a low Masculinity (M/F) setting is associated with cooperation, nurturing, and quality of life. The implications of this dimension for Diversity and Inclusion suggest that masculine influenced organizations are skewed toward promoting men in careers and believing it as an option for women or others. More explicitly in Latin America, a high Masculinity/Femininity orientation may lead to "machismo"—or a sense of male superiority—where organizational Diversity and Inclusion efforts for LGBT, disabled, younger generations, and indeed women are stifled (Segrest, Romero, & Domke-Damonte, 2003).

Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) refers to a measure of a culture's tolerance for ambiguity, uncertainty, and unstructured situations. As a relational performance indicator, Uncertainty Avoidance within the climate-culture context is a function of trust. An organization influenced by high Uncertainty Avoidance values tends to depend on procedures, rules, laws, regulations, and behavioral norms to manage uncomfortable ambiguous situations. Conversely, cases of low Uncertainty Avoidance values display higher levels of trust, allowing affected organizations to comfortably manage ambiguity or navigate through unstructured situations, therefore allowing more opportunities for risk-taking and innovation. Thus, in a

climate-culture context with low Uncertainty Avoidance, trust emerges as a mediating factor that facilitates Diversity and Inclusion through innovation and employee engagement (Doney, Cannon, & Mullen, 1998; Schoorman, Mayer, & Davis, 2007).

A Long-Term/Short-Term (LT/ST) orientation measures the degree to which the "now" is either more or less significant than the "future." As a relational performance indicator, this dimension is an indicator of connectedness with traditions and receptivity to change. Organizations that are influenced by a Long-Term orientation are characterized by persistence, lasting relationships, and a better ability to integrate traditions to change. Whereas a Short-Term influence tends to be normative in their thinking, deeply rooted in customs, and show a preference for quick results that are better aligned with established practices and ritual. An outlook focused on the past sustains stagnation; a positive view of the future is more conducive to acquiring diverse talent. The Long-Term/Short-Term influence within the climate-culture context of an organization positively affects its readiness to accept Diversity and Inclusion as a business strategy (Vallario, 2006).

Finally, Indulgence/Restraint (I/R) is associated with degrees of gratification. High levels of Indulgence/Restraint refer to cultures that are inclined toward enjoying life and having fun, whereas, in low levels of Indulgence/Restraint (I/R), gratification is curtailed. Here, the relational lens is influenced by gratification and where positive emotions are freely expressed. Research is available suggesting that high Indulgence/Restraint influences are conducive to fostering a climate-culture context of Diversity and Inclusion (Stoermer et al., 2016).

Having presented a method of analyzing national cultures along six dimensions, offered a description of each dimension, and discussed some of the potential implications to Diversity and Inclusion, the next step is to obtain dimensional data on Latin American countries and conduct an analysis that would shed light on the perceptions of these countries. Fortunately, Hofstede Insights Web site (https://www.hofstede-insights.com/product/compare-countries/) contains data on many of these dimensions for Mexico, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean, albeit some limitations and cases of incomplete or missing data. What follows is a presentation and analysis of the country data.

Data Analysis and Implications of Cultural Dimensions

In attempting to simplify the analysis, the 29 Latin American countries are grouped into three regions: Central America and Mexico, South America, and the Caribbean. Table 3.1 illustrates specifics values of Power Distance (P/D), Individualism/Collectivism (I/C), Masculine/Feminine (M/F) and Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) for each Latin American country and the averages for each of the Latin American regions compared to the United States (US) and to China (CHN). The data for the Long-Term/Short-Term (LT/ST) and Indulgence/Restraint (I/R) dimensions although relevant to this study are excluded from due to a large amount of missing data.

In collecting the data for Latin America from the Hofstede Insights Web site, it is necessary to make a few overall observations before conducting the analysis and continuing the discussion. First, data on all six dimensions are missing for some countries, like Nicaragua, Bolivia, Paraguay, and the Bahamas. Also noted is incomplete data along all dimensions where Long-Term/Short-Term (LT/ST) and Indulgence/Restraint (I/R) values are available for only 18 of the 29 Latin American countries. Therefore, to minimize the impact of incomplete information, the analysis of the data on Latin American countries will exclude these two dimensions. Note also that data is lacking for most of the entire Caribbean region, except for Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic. To properly frame the analysis and address Latin American differences in perceptions of inclusion in the workplace, the analysis will focus on the data presented in Table 3.1.

In agreement with published studies, the most significant cultural difference affecting perceptions between the US and Latin American countries is the Individual-Collectivistic (I/C) dimension, where the US has a value of 91 and Latin America shows values below 30, a fact that reinforces the already noted differences in operational-relational preferences of each country discussed earlier. This Latin American preference for relational approaches has a direct bearing on the design and execution of inclusion and diversity initiatives. Holladay and Quiñones (2005) suggest that trainees from collectivistic countries are less receptive toward Diversity and Inclusion training. It seems that employees in high Individualistic-Collective (I/C) influenced organizations tend to have more harmonious alignment with current designs of diversity-inclusion

Table 3.1 Hofstede's cultural dimensions for Latin American countries and regions compared with the US

	P/D	*I/C*	*M/F*	*UA*
United States	40	91	62	46
Central America and Mexico Region				
Costa Rica	35	15	21	86
El Salvador	66	19	40	94
Guatemala	95	6	37	99
Honduras	80	20	40	50
Mexico	81	30	69	82
Nicaragua	**	**	**	**
Panama	95	11	44	86
Averages this region	75	17	42	83
Caribbean Region				
Bahamas	**	**	**	**
Cuba	**	**	**	**
Dominican Republic	65	30	65	45
Haiti	**	**	**	**
Guadalupe	**	**	**	**
Martinique	**	**	**	**
Puerto Rico	68	27	56	38
Saint Barthelemy	**	**	**	**
Saint Martin	**	**	**	**
Averages this region	67	29	61	42
South American Region				
Argentina	49	46	56	86
Bolivia	**	**	**	**
Brazil	67	38	49	76
Chile	63	23	28	86
Colombia	67	13	64	80
Ecuador	78	8	63	67
French Guiana	**	**	**	**
Guyana	**	**	**	**
Paraguay	**	**	**	**
Peru	64	16	42	87
Suriname	85	47	37	92
Uruguay	61	36	38	99
Venezuela	81	12	73	16
Averages this region	68	27	50	83

Note **no data available

Source Compare countries, Hofstede-Insights, https://www.hofstede-insights.com/product/compare-countries/

training, whereas in low Individualistic-Collective (I/C)-oriented organizations the relationship between working beliefs and training is less aligned. A difficulty here arises in the design and delivery of US training programs for Latin American organizations, where the design is typically based upon the US experience (Dussell, 2001) and is further complicated by the differences in training practices (Latham, 1988), although this difference is not as significant when compared with China (CHN). Additionally—at play with more force in Latin American than in the US culture—is the in-group/out-group dynamics, where members within low Individualistic-Collectivistic (I/C) orientations perceive out-group members less favorably (Triandis, 1995). While studying in-group and out-group dynamics between samples from the US and Chile, Peru, Colombia, Venezuela, Fiedler, Hellmann, Dorrough, and Glöckner (2018) saw that Latin Americans showed stronger national in-group favoritism compared to US Americans. In a weak Individualistic-Collectivistic (I/C) setting (i.e., strong collectivistic influences), the in-group and out-group undercurrents create a series of perceptions of inclusion that are less clear in the US setting where many of the training programs are developed. This dimension suggests that recognizing training design and delivery inconsistencies as well as in-group and out-group dynamics are relevant factors when addressing Diversity and Inclusion in Latin America.

The Peace Corps offers an example of managing inclusion in such an environment. Specifically, Peace Corps for Guatemala familiarizes their volunteers with many in-group firmly held perceptions on Diversity and Inclusion, such as gender roles, race, LGBT, disabilities, religion, and age (Joshua-Gojer, Allen, & Huang, 2016).

A second observation affecting the perceptual difference between the US, China, and Latin American countries is Power Distance (PD). Compared with the US, all three regions have higher PD values. The US shows a value of 40 and China shows a value of 80, whereas Mexico and the Central America Region is 75, South America Region is 68, and the Caribbean Region is 67. A high value of Power Distance means subordinates highly depend on their superiors, which suggests that organizations under these conditions are best effective in achieving inclusion and diversity employing hierarchical relationships. Power Distance is the dimension most directly associated with organizational cultures (Hewett et al., 2006), and rather than the organization being influenced by national culture, organizations can serve as agents of social change. Whether by design or by accident, business organizations in many ways have already

been acting as positive change agents (Bies, Bartunek, Fort, & Zald, 2007; Smith, Gonin, & Besharov, 2013). It is not unheard of that businesses—especially US global corporations—institute inclusion and diversity recognizing a role as social change agents (Nishii & Özbilgin, 2007). Remarkably, this is not the case of Chinese global enterprises. In the case of high Power Distance values, Diversity and Inclusion strategies are most effectively implemented as agents of social change. Rather than organizational structures that unilaterally impose Diversity and Inclusion, a paternalistic form of governance has been suggested as an optimal approach (Fikret, 2000).

A third cultural difference affecting perceptions of Latin American countries is the Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) dimension. The value of Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) for the South American region is 83 compared to a 46 for the US and 30 for China (Table 3.1). As pointed out earlier, organizations influenced by high Uncertainty Avoidance values tend to rely more on procedures, rules, laws, regulations, and behavioral norms to manage uncomfortable ambiguous situations. This situation suggests a high dependency on government interventions. Poynter (1982) found that trust and support of national governments in developing countries such as Latin America are essential to business strategies. Within South America—for instance—Uruguay shows the highest Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) value of 99, indicating a very high trust in government. Unsurprisingly, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (2014) notes that among 18 South American countries, Uruguay shows the highest confidence in its government. However, high reliance on government intervention generates nationalism, and nationalism fosters xenophobia, a consideration NMC's face in Latin American countries (Bourgeois III & Boltvinik, 1981). Mostly, high numbers of Uncertainty Avoidance are directly proportional to levels of government reliance, which is a factor to consider when managing Diversity and Inclusion topics in the region, especially within the context of government credibility and skepticism of NMC transplanted programs. Under this dimension, governments play a crucial role in fostering Diversity and Inclusion, a condition favorable to US companies operating in Latin America.

Finally, although the Masculinity/Femininity (M/F) values in Latin America are comparable to the US, they are worth mentioning because of its significant impact on the role perceptions of women. From Table 3.1, the US shows a value of 62 for this dimension of culture, with Mexico

and Central America at 42. In a high Masculinity/Femininity (M/F) setting, assertiveness, toughness, and an obsessive orientation toward tasks over relationships are dominant behaviors, whereas in a low Masculinity (M/F) environment, cooperation, nurturing, and quality of life are dominant interests. The immediate consequence of high M/F values for Diversity and Inclusion is a limited value of women in the workplace. In lower M/F values, feminine attributes appear with more ease resulting in a better climate-culture context for women. To illustrate the point, consider Costa Rica, which has the region's lowest Masculinity/Femininity (M/F) value of all the Latin American countries (Value of 21). Although the gender gap in Costa Rica still exists, the country is fifth in the region, behind Nicaragua, Bolivia, Cuba, and Barbados, according to the 2016 World Economic Forum's Global Report on Gender (WEF, 2016). Costa Rica is recognized throughout Latin America as a leader in sustainability and ecotourism, analogous to the female attributes of collaboration and nurturing (Howitt & Mason, 2018). Nevertheless, it's evident that low Masculinity/Femininity (M/F) numbers are associated with a more favorable climate-culture setting directly affecting Diversity and Inclusion prospects for women in the workplace.

From the Hofstede dimensional data by country, it is also possible to assess the degree to which each Latin American and Caribbean country cultural dimensions compare with other countries. For example, Table 3.1 shows correlation values between each Latin American and Caribbean country—albeit the incomplete data—compared with the US and China. Assuming correlation values serve as a cultural "similarity score," notice that all Latin American and Caribbean countries have a negative correlation value with the US dimensions, showing how dissimilar the dimensional patterns are between countries. This cultural difference serves to support the argument of disparate perceptions of workplace values, more specifically, the values of Diversity and Inclusion. On the other hand, the pattern of similarities with China shows positive correlations in various degrees, with the exception of Costa Rica, Argentina, and Uruguay. Although the dimensional high and low patterns of many Latin American and Caribbean countries better track the Chinese than the US dimensions of culture, other factors affect the comparison and shape potential implications with China. For example, Puerto Rico has a very high correlation with China (0.99), and yet political, legal, religious, and language constraints affect the way perceptions and behaviors are enacted. China's gains throughout Latin America countries are hard to ignore:

> *China scored some notable triumphs in its relations with Latin America and the Caribbean in 2018. First signaled by Trinidad and Tobago in May, countries throughout the region embraced China's flagship global trade and infrastructure programme, the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). By the end of the year, Bolivia, Antigua, and Barbuda, Guyana, Uruguay, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Chile, and Ecuador had been added to the tally of those signing BRI agreements, along with El Salvador, which was first obliged to shift its diplomatic recognition from Taiwan to the People's Republic. Each new subscriber to the initiative, large or small, was warmly welcomed aboard what Beijing presented as the investment and development project* that would define Latin America's future. (Hilton, January 9, 2019, p. 1)

Notably, China seems to have less interest than the US in managing Diversity and Inclusion in the workplace as a global competitive advantage. So, having dimensional similarities with Latin America may be attractive to China in a different way. It seems China has more interest in competitive outcomes than with innovation and organizational performance, which are the drivers of the US global competitiveness. China's current Latin American interests are in oil supplies, minerals, and agricultural products (Lafargue, 2006) and China's form of financial lending emphasizes nonintervention and imposes fewer oversight restrictions than Western counterparts (Kaplan, 2018). Plus, China has less historical baggage rather than the "imperialistic overtones" associated with the US in Latin America (Rosenfeld, 2015). A non-interventional approach and less of a negative historical footprint may suggest a strategy independent of Diversity and Inclusion efforts.

Nevertheless, the value of these comparisons resides more in the possibility of discovering more profound layers of moderating variables affecting workplace perceptions. Although China's presence represents a boost for economic development, the interventionist approach of Western corporations has a social transformation effect in terms of overcoming biases in the workplace that is hard to ignore. Regardless, the desirability of social transformation in the form of Diversity and Inclusion in the workplace becomes an organizational decision.

When considering the differences in cultural dimensions between the US, China, and the regions of Latin America, it is evident there are some significant differences, and accordingly, a variety of perceptions on race, ethnicity, generational, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability, social status, and other categories. Based on the higher collectivistic values, the relational over task-oriented approach is a noted difference,

but other cultural influences widen the gap, particularly between the US and Latin American ways of acknowledging inclusion and diversity. Differences in the relationships between working beliefs and training, national in-group favoritism, the credibility and trust in government and the skepticism of outsiders, paternalistic structures, and machismo, all further the point of cultural sensitivity when designing and implementing programs in Latin America. Naturally, other research threads to challenge or validate these observations are necessary. For example, an analysis of external forces in each country (political, economic, social, technical, religious) as well as a country by country search of multinational company successes and challenges in Latin America. An alternative thread is assessing if the widespread use and validation of Hofstede's model in the literature are enough to evaluate the implications of workplace Diversity and Inclusion between countries. Also, relevant is the search and recognition of other sociocultural values beyond Hofstede that may have a more direct relationship with Diversity and Inclusions, such as the cultural subdimensions of religiosity-secularism, affectivity-neutrality, ethnocentrism-xenocentrism, or the degree of social inclusion. These and other possible sub-dimensions of culture may allow the discovery of more definitive indicators of Diversity and Inclusion favorability. Of course, gaps in the Hofstede data impede a more definitive view of the entire Latin American and Caribbean landscape. To some degree, these findings also have implications for understanding the behaviors of Diversity and Inclusion of Latin American workers within the US economy, albeit a topic for another study.

Although the analysis of Hofstede's cultural dimensions for the three Latin American regions has established that Diversity and Inclusion are perceived differently than in North America, an additional step is taken to provide insights into a particular case within Latin America. More specifically, out of all the 29 Latin American countries discussed above, Puerto Rico stands out as a unique case. In looking at the four Hofstede dimensions for Puerto Rico and attempting to find similar Latin American and Caribbean countries within a plus five and minus five range of values, the data shows that Puerto Rico stands alone. This variance begs the question of whether Puerto Rico's perspective on inclusion and diversity is significantly affected by North American culture or its Latin American heritage. What factors make Puerto Rico a particular case and are the perceptions of Diversity and Inclusion more aligned with the North American or the

Latin American view? To address these the question of perceptual differences, a study was designed to compare Diversity and Inclusion perceptions between the US and the Caribbean island of Puerto Rico is presented in the next section.

Puerto Rico's View of Inclusion and Diversity

As a background, it is essential to recognize that Puerto Rico is considered bilingual, has close ties with mainstream American social practices, workplace ethics, and culture, and anyone born in Puerto Rico has US citizenship. There are US Federal offices operating on the island, and the island celebrates US holidays. Puerto Rico's economy is very dependent on US businesses and trade into and out of the island and is controlled by the US Federal government. Yet Puerto Rico—like many Latin American cultures—retains many of the traditions originating from Spain: Spanish is still the primary language, religion has a more profound presence in everyday life, art and music retain a Hispanic flavor, and there are significant traces of African and native Indian (Taino) influences in language and values. Despite the direct influence of North American culture, Puerto Rico shows a significant difference in perceptions on Diversity and Inclusion.

A comparative study between the US and Puerto Rico perceptions of inclusion and diversity from the Rojas and Seda-Cuevas (2018) study were assessed using the Reaction to Diversity Inventory (De Meuse & Hostager, 2001). This tool focuses on five perceived outcomes, categorized as affective, behavioral, cognitive, personal, and organizational. Each of these factors is represented by seven positive words and seven negative words expressing a range of positive and negative responses to workplace diversity. The summary score identifies a participant's overall orientation toward workplace diversity, and as an estimate, is valuable in assessing diversity perceptions as being "pessimistic," "realistic," or "optimistic." The population for this study was analogous to that originally selected for the validation of the RDI in the earlier De Meuse and Hostager (2001) study, namely, undergraduate and graduate business students. A statistical analysis of the scores, comparing those of the US business students in the earlier De Meuse and Hostager (2001) study against those of the Puerto Rico business students, was carried out. An analysis of variance was performed using SPSS software to test for significant differences in the samples at the $p < .05$ level. Statistically significant differences between means

would suggest a significant difference in perceptions of diversity between the two sample populations.

Despite the intensity of US cultural influences, the results of this study note significant differences in perceptions of Diversity and Inclusion between the US sample used in the De Meuse and Hostager (2001) study and an analogous sample from Puerto Rico. These results show that Puerto Rican perceptions of inclusion and diversity are quite different from the US in areas such as accepting the broader meanings of inclusion and diversity (e.g., LGBT, Islam, African American differences), a more apparent separation of what happens at work and at home, and a undercurrent of resistance to changes that may affect Puerto Rico traditions. Other studies analyzing differences in employee perceptions between the US and Puerto Rico are also aligned with and supplement these results (Alvarado-Zayas, 2005; Niedziolek, 2005; Ortiz Rivera, 2010). Again, the argument is that if despite the direct influence of North American values even Puerto Rico demonstrates a significant difference in perceptions on Diversity and Inclusion, then it could be argued that the difference is even more so with the Latin American countries that possess more autonomy and are more distanced from US cultural and economic influences.

After all that has been addressed so far in this chapter, many questions remain. For instance, what can be said about workplace Diversity and Inclusion perceptions of those Latin American and Caribbean countries for which the Hofstede data is incomplete or missing? Which of the Hofstede dimensions of culture best characterizes a country's capacity for accepting Diversity and Inclusion in the workplace, or are there other dimensions to consider? What are contextual variables or guiding principles for designing and implementing Diversity and Inclusion initiatives for Latin America? What kind of management and leadership styles better align with the Latin American perspectives? Is the non-interventionist approach (China) or the US approach (organizations as a social change agent) a factor? Is social inclusion an indicator of workplace inclusion? What are the contributions of governments and higher education institutions in addressing race, ethnicity, generational, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability, social status, and other categories? What lessons can be derived by analyzing the effects of country culture on those counties with high acceptance of workplace Diversity and Inclusion? I'll attempt to respond to some of these questions in the next section.

Optimizing Diversity and Inclusion for Latin America

Certainly, a relational approach to Diversity and Inclusion is a step in the right direction, but if cultural dimensions frame perceptions and perception is a consideration in formulating a Diversity and Inclusion approach for the workplace, then it is understandable that methodologies framed around US cultural values would face inefficiencies in Latin America. Masculinity/Femininity (M/F) values notwithstanding, Latin America—in general—is at odds with the US along with three of the four dimensions of culture, namely, Power Distance (P/D), Individualism/Collectivism (I/C), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UA). Therefore, it is in the best interest of any national, multinational, or government agency attempting approaches Diversity and Inclusion in the workplace to address worker perceptions along with these cultural experiences. Nevertheless, without a fuller view of Hofstede's cultural dimensions (missing data) and a lack of research pointing to other relevant possibilities beyond Hofstede's dimensions, the exploration of cultural perceptions of workplace Diversity and Inclusion offered here are limited to these four dimensions.

From a management perspective, if high Power Distance (P/D), low Individualistic/Collectivistic (I/C) orientations and High Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) represent the most significant differences been the US and the Latin American cultures as noted in Table 3.1, then it follows that a management and leadership style that best aligns with the corresponding attributes would also correlate with an approach leading to improved organizational performance and key for designing proper inclusion and diversity initiatives. More specifically, if a high Power Distance (P/D) value represents a situation where power is less distributed, then a similar management style that emphasizes deference yet compliance and fosters employee loyalty would be in the best interest of Latin American employees. However, add to this environment a low Individualism/Collectivism (I/C)—or highly collective condition—where individuals seek what is best for the group over personal ambitions. Then an optimal management style also allowing the influence of social views and needs are being nurtured, respective of feelings, and where overall happiness of workers sought, would also be a crucial ingredient. Does such a blend of cultural values as an approach exist in the management and leadership literature?

Fortunately, there is an approach that encompasses these disparate set of attributes. Among the traditionally discussed management styles—namely, autocratic, democratic, and paternalistic (Hodgetts, Luthans, & Doh, 2006)—a paternalistic style for leaders and managers seems best fit for these cultural differences. Pellegrini and Scandura (2008) summarize the essence of paternalistic styles of management and leadership: "Not unlike the father in the family, management is believed to exercise its power within the constraints of protecting and improving the lives of its employees which relives considerable tension on the part of the employees" (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008, p. 567). This relationship is designed along family roles, where the manager or leader is expected to protect members of the group and help them to grow. Consequently, a paternalistic approach seems a better fit for high Power Distance (P/D) and low Individualism/Collectivism (I/C) environments. This approach—although quite unpopular in North America—provides a benevolent form of hierarchical structure that is more in line with the historical, social, and economic realities of Latin American and Caribbean countries. The literature demonstrates the effectiveness of paternalistic styles in countries such as Chile (Liberman, 2014), Mexico (Martínez, 2003), Nicaragua and Costa Rica (Osland, Snyder, & Hunter, 1998), Brazil (Nery-Kjerfve & McLean, 2015), Colombia (Ostau de Lafont de León, 2011), Bolivia (Kruse, 2001) and even in Puerto Rico (Rodríguez & Gómez, 2015), to mention just a few.

If a paternalistic management approach sounds somewhat condescending, then maybe an Emotional Intelligence (EI) approach to Diversity and Inclusion would seem more palatable. Fundamentally, Goleman and Boyatzis (2017) recognize elements of Emotional Intelligence (EI), such as providing a sense of emotional harmony between the self (self-awareness and self-management) within a social and relational context (teamwork, inspirational leadership). These elements of EI are supportive of the high M/F, low I/C, and high UA values noted throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. Plus, Emotional Intelligence (EI) is also a value cultivated in the North American work environment, is well researched in the literature, and there is an abundance of assessment, practical resources, and trained specialists available. Emotional intelligence consists of five components, namely, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill (Ahmad, Bangash, & Khan, 2009). If properly managed, the self-awareness, self-regulation components inform the Uncertainty Avoidance dimension by providing structure and norms, and the empathy and

social skill components would serve the low Individualism/Collectivism attributes. Therefore, Emotional Intelligence (EI) is suggested as another possible strategy to help optimize workplace Diversity and Inclusion.

If asked which of the Latin American and Caribbean cultural dimensions could have the most negative impact on Diversity and Inclusion based on the Table 3.1 data, this study would point to the dimension of Power Distance (P/D). Studies show that organizations that have the best records for promoting women outperform their competition on every measure of profitability (Cox, 2017; Johns, 2013). And yet, a High PD climate is associated with gender stereotypes that impede the advancement of females and female values (Désert & Leyens, 2005). As a further aggravation for Latin America, high Masculinity/Femininity (M/F) values tend to discourage feminine values in the workplace further. To demonstrate this argument, Costa Rica has the lowest Power Distance (P/D) and Masculinity/Femininity (M/F) values in Table 3.1 and was recognized by the 2018 World Economic Forum's Global Report on Gender (WEF, 2018) as the second best Latin American country with the smallest gender gap behind Nicaragua (a country for which Hofstede data is lacking). If the Costa Rica case is any indication, workplace climates that manage Power Distance (P/D) and Masculinity/Femininity (M/F) are likely to be more favorable to Diversity and Inclusion. Furthermore, Costa Rica is also taking advantage of the Chinese non-interventionalist approach to global competition. Costa Rica was the first Latin American country to establish direct relations with China, an agreement allowing fuller trade and investments in transportation, energy, and telecommunications (The Tico Times, September 5, 2018). Although there is evidence that multinationals in Latin America have initiated programs for gender equality, such as mentoring groups, home office hours, flextime, maternity and paternity leave, and audits to deal with the "double burden" syndrome—the balancing of domestic and workplace responsibilities—there is still much to be done.

Whether a multinational business opts for an interventionist (US) or non-interventionist (China) strategy as a global competitive advantage, governments and higher education institutions play a significant role in Latin America. Indeed, the workplace effect of high Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) values may be addressed within the organization, but national governments also play a key role in minimizing levels of uncertainty by implementing strict rules, laws, policies, and regulations. For example,

Colombia is recognized as one of the Latin American countries favorable to LGBT workplace equality, where gender identity and same-sex marriage have been legalized, notwithstanding religious and feeble anti-discrimination laws (Out & Equal, 2017). From a higher education perspective, the continuing formation of future professionals with courses, workshops, seminars, and internships is an essential contribution. Another significant impact of higher education in Latin America is for universities and colleges to seek international accreditation, which for the most already emphasizes Diversity and Inclusion, both social and in the workplace. Similarly, national accreditation agencies can contribute by raising their Diversity and Inclusion standards and reporting requirements (Rubaii, 2016). At a deeper level, the question for the Latin American and Caribbean governments is not whether its country prefers economic development or social change originating from the workplace, but how can both approaches in a concerted effort along with higher education and multinational efforts best serve the needs of the country.

In concluding, the values-structure of national culture—either directly or indirectly— has an impact on business operations (Morden, 1995). Perceptions are formed by these same national cultures, and at the same time, they have a direct effect on workplace behaviors (Lott, 2010). Culture and perceptions form attitudes and behaviors that facilitate or hinder workplace practices. Additionally, cognitive-emotional biases related to both social stereotyping and prejudice (Raineri, 2018) also impact Diversity and Inclusion dynamics (Stoermer et al., 2016). In the case of Latin American regions and the Caribbean, practices considering the workplace as family guided by paternalistic management and leadership approaches, an abundance of courtesy and diplomacy, establishing social relationships based upon personal communications and empathy, high regard for teamwork, allowance for the celebration of popular festivities, and recognizing a high dependency on government and social institutions seem better responses to the data provided by Hofstede. Social institutions supportive of Diversity and Inclusion efforts include Business Women's Network, PROSPERA-Latin American Women's fund, Pride@SAP, and the Latin American Network of Non-governmental Organizations of Persons with Disabilities and their Families (RIADIS), to mention just a few. Practices that obstruct Diversity and Inclusion efforts are training programs inconsistent with local values, effects of historical baggage, deep in-group and out-group divides, as well as the prevalence of stereotypes and prejudices.

If anything, more careful research and the practice of Perceptions Management as a component of Diversity and Inclusion approaches are key to successful implementation. Although many of these observations are contrary to the views of workplace practices in the US, they are foundational for promoting Diversity and Inclusion as a global competitive advantage in the Latin American regions and the Caribbean.

Summary and Conclusions

For sure, the literature on global competitiveness is showing a shift of emphasis from diversity as a mandate toward inclusion as an organizational value. Although this shift may not be all that evident in Latin American and the Caribbean, it certainly has created renewed interest in the region. The most common approach to Hispanic values in general—and Diversity and Inclusion in particular—has been an emphasis on a relational over task orientation (Sanchez-Burks et al., 2000). But in dealing with the variety of cultures and subcultures within the Latin American and Caribbean countries, this simplistic approach may prove insufficient, and therefore, discovering more profound layers of moderating variables affecting workplace perceptions in the region is essential to optimizing Diversity and Inclusion.

Throughout this chapter, the author argued that beyond just a relational approach to Diversity and Inclusion, perceptions derived from national cultures within Latin American and Caribbean countries play a significant role in formulating inclusion and diversity strategies. The method used to approach this question consisted of comparing national cultures within the context of Hofstede's cultural dimensions, which analyzes along six dimensions, namely, Power Distance (P/D), Uncertainty Avoidance (UA), Individualism/Collectivism (I/C), Masculinity/Femininity (M/F), Long-Term/Short-Term Orientation (LT/ST), and Indulgence/Restraint (I/R) (Hofstede, 2011). The analysis suggests that the Power Distance (P/D) and the Individual-Collectivistic (I/C) dimension are the most significant cultural tendencies affecting the perceptional difference between the US and Latin American regions. From these data alone, it is evident that Latin American and Caribbean cultures form perceptions in many ways are opposite those of the US and yet with proper perception management techniques they can be harnessed to facilitate workplace Diversity and Inclusion efforts. These differences point to

cultural settings where sensitivity in the design, training, and implementation of workplace Diversity and Inclusion programs are better served when a perception management component is considered.

The Latin American and the Caribbean regions may be an appealing area for global competitive expansion (Aguilera et al., 2017), yet some serious challenges underscore these opportunities. The fact that only four dimensions of culture—or possibly six in some cases—are available to conduct a comparison provides just a glimpse into the effects of Latin American and Caribbean perceptions. Much still needs to be done to better understand the implications of perceptions across race, ethnicity, generational, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability, social status, and other differences. Business enterprises capable of harnessing these cultural nuances are considerably better poised to capitalize on the competitive advantages these regions have to offer.

References

Aguilera, R. V., Ciravegna, L., Cuervo-Cazurra, A., & Gonzalez-Perez, M. A. (2017). Multilatinas and the internationalization of Latin American firms. *Journal of World Business, 52*(4), 447–460.

Ahmad, S., Bangash, H., & Khan, S. A. (2009). Emotional intelligence and gender differences. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture, 25*(1), 127–130.

Ali, M., Kulik, C. T., & Metz, I. (2011). The gender diversity–performance relationship in services and manufacturing organizations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(7), 1464–1485.

Alvarado Zayas, I. L. (2005). *Puerto Rico: Clasificación cultural del modelo de Hofstede y su impacto en la adaptación cultural y desempeño organizacional de las empresas multinacionales* (Disertación Doctoral). Universidad Interamericana de Puerto Rico. OCLC Number 60687495.

Anderson, D. W. (2006). Inclusion and interdependence: Students with special needs in the regular classroom. *Journal of Education and Christian Belief, 10*(1), 43–59.

Anton, J., & Petouhoff, N. L. (2002). *Customer relationship management: The bottom line to optimizing your ROI* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ball, C., & Haque, A. (2003). Diversity in religious practice: Implications of Islamic values in the public workplace. *Public Personnel Management, 32*(3), 315–330.

Ball, P., Monaco, G., Schmeling, J., Schartz, H., & Blanck, P. (2005). Disability as diversity in Fortune 100 companies. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 23*(1), 97–121.

Bamrud, J. (2011). Latin America: World-class potential. *Latin Trade, 19*(4), 10.

Bergiel, E. B., Bergiel, B. J., & Upson, J. W. (2012). Revisiting Hofstede's dimensions: Examining the cultural convergence of the United States and Japan. *American Journal of Management, 12*(1), 69–79.

Bierema, L. L., & D'Abundo, M. L. (2004). HRD with a conscience: Practicing socially responsible HRD. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 23*(5), 443–458.

Bies, R. J., Bartunek, J. M., Fort, T. L., & Zald, M. N. (2007). Corporations as social change agents: Individual, interpersonal, institutional, and environmental dynamics. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(3), 788–793.

Bourgeois III, L. J., & Boltvinik, M. (1981). OD in cross-cultural settings: Latin America. *California Management Review, 23*(3), 75–81.

Bowen, S. A. (2008). A state of neglect: Public relations as 'corporate conscience' or ethics counsel. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 20*(3), 271–296.

Boyce, A. S., Nieminen, L. R., Gillespie, M. A., Ryan, A. M., & Denison, D. R. (2015). Which comes first, organizational culture or performance? A longitudinal study of causal priority with automobile dealerships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36*(3), 339–359.

Brimhall, K. C., Lizano, E. L., & Barak, M. E. M. (2014). The mediating role of inclusion: A longitudinal study of the effects of leader–member exchange and diversity climate on job satisfaction and intention to leave among child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review, 40,* 79–88.

Celaya, L., & Swift, J. S. (2006). Pre-departure cultural training: US managers in Mexico. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal, 13*(3), 230–243.

Cho, S., Kim, A., & Mor Barak, M. E. (2017). Does diversity matter? Exploring workforce diversity, diversity management, and organizational performance in social enterprises. *Asian Social Work and Policy Review, 11*(3), 193–204.

Choi, S., & Rainey, H. G. (2010). Managing diversity in U.S. federal agencies: Effects of diversity and diversity management on employee perceptions of organizational performance. *Public Administration Review, 70*(1), 109–121.

Clugston, M., Howell, J., & Dorfman, P. (2000). Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment? *Journal of Management, 26*(1), 5–30.

Cox, C. (2017). *When women thrive, businesses thrive: Challenges and opportunities in Latin America* (Mercer Report). Retrieved from http://edge-cert.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Mercer-WWT-LatAm-Report.pdf.

De Meuse, K. P., & Hostager, T. J. (2001). Developing an instrument for measuring attitudes toward and perceptions of workplace diversity: An initial report. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12*(1), 33–51.

Demuijnck, G. (2009). Non-discrimination in human resources management as a moral obligation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 88*(1), 83–101.

Denison, D. R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(3), 619–654.

Désert, M., & Leyens, J. (2005). Social comparisons across cultures I: Gender stereotypes in high and low power distance cultures. In S. Guimond (Ed.), *Social comparison and social psychology: Understanding cognition, intergroup relations, and culture* (pp. 303–317). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511584329.016.

De Valk, S. (1993). Holding up a mirror to diversity issues. *Training & Development, 47*(7), 11–13.

Doney, P. M., Cannon, J. P., & Mullen, M. R. (1998). Understanding the influence of national culture on the development of trust. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(3), 601–620.

Downey, S. N., Werff, L., Thomas, K. M., & Plaut, V. C. (2015). The role of diversity practices and inclusion in promoting trust and employee engagement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 45*(1), 35–44.

Dussel, I. (2001). What can multiculturalism tell us about difference? The reception of multicultural discourses in France and Argentina. In C. A. Grant & J. L. Lei (Eds.), *Global constructions of multicultural education: Theories and realities* (pp. 93–114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. (2014). *Social Panorama of Latin America*. Retrieved from https://www.cepal.org/en/publications/37627-social-panorama-latin-america-2014.

Fiedler, S., Hellmann, D. M., Dorrough, A. R., & Glöckner, A. (2018). Cross-national in-group favoritism in prosocial behavior: Evidence from Latin and North America. *Judgment and Decision Making, 13*(1), 42–60.

Fikret, P. S. (2000). Leadership influence in a high-power distance and collectivist culture. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 21*(8), 414–426.

Fisher-Borne, M., Cain, J. M., & Martin, S. L. (2015). From mastery to accountability: Cultural humility as an alternative to cultural competence. *Social Work Education, 34*(2), 165–181.

Garib, G. (2013). Diversity is in the eye of the beholder: Diversity perceptions of managers. *The Psychologist Manager Journal, 16*(1), 18–32.

Glisson, C. (2000). Organizational climate and culture. In R. J. Patti (Ed.), *The handbook of social welfare management* (pp. 195–218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Glisson, C. (2015). The role of organizational culture and climate in innovation and effectiveness. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance, 39*(4), 245–250.

Goleman, D., & Boyatzis, R. (2017, February 6). Emotional intelligence has 12 elements. Which do you need to work on. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 2–5.

Gomes, A. M., Robertson, S. L., & Dale, R. (2012). The social condition of higher education: Globalisation and (beyond) regionalisation in Latin America. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 10*(2), 221–245.

Grant, B. Z., & Kleiner, B. H. (1997). Managing diversity in the workplace. *Equal Opportunities International, 16*(3), 26–32.

Griffin, D., Guedhami, O., Kwok, C. C., Li, K., & Shao, L. (2017). National culture: The missing country-level determinant of corporate governance. *Journal of International Business Studies, 48*(6), 740–762.

Guerrero, L., & Posthuma, R. A. (2014). Perceptions and behaviors of Hispanic workers: A review. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 29*(6), 616–643.

Hassan, R., Marimuthu, M., & Kaur Johl, S. (2015). Diversity, corporate governance and implication on firm financial performance. *Global Business & Management Research, 7*(2), 28–36.

Hemphill, H., & Haines, R. (1998). Confronting discrimination in your workplace. *HR Focus, 75*(7), S5–S6.

Herdman, A. O., & McMillan-Capehart, A. (2010). Establishing a diversity program is not enough: Exploring the determinants of diversity climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(1), 39–53.

Hewett, K., Money, R. B., & 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.

Hicks, D. A. (2002). Spiritual and religious diversity in the workplace: Implications for leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(4), 379–396.

Hilton, I. (2019, January 9). China and Latin America: A relationship transformed. *Diálogo Chino*. Retrieved from https://dialogochino.net/17027-china-and-latin-america-a-relationship-transformed/.

Hodgetts, R. M., Luthans, F., & Doh, J. P. (2006). *International management: Culture, strategy, and behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2*(1), 8–26.

Holladay, C. L., & Quiñones, M. A. (2005). Reactions to diversity training: An international comparison. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 16*(4), 529–545.

Hostager, T. J., & De Meuse, K. P. (2002). Assessing the complexity of diversity perceptions: Breadth, depth, and balance. *Journal of Business & Psychology, 17*(2), 189–206. https://doi-org.libproxy.edmc.edu/10.1023/A:1019681314837.

Howitt, J., & Mason, C. W. (2018). Ecotourism and sustainable rural development in Pérez Zeledón, Costa Rica. *Journal of Rural and Community Development, 13*(1), 64–84.

Jayne, M. E., & Dipboye, R. L. (2004). Leveraging diversity to improve business performance: Research findings and recommendations for organizations. *Human Resource Management, 43*(4), 409–424.

Johns, M. L. (2013). Breaking the glass ceiling: Structural, cultural, and organizational barriers preventing women from achieving senior and executive positions. *Perspectives in Health Information Management/AHIMA, American Health Information Management Association, 10*(Winter), 1e.

Joshua-Gojer, A. E., Allen, J. M., & Huang, T.-Y. M. (2016, January 1). Workforce diversity in volunteerism and the peace corps. In J. Prescott (Ed.), *Handbook of research on race, gender, and the fight for equality* (pp. 453–471). Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.

Kaplan, S. (2018, January 24). China is investing seriously in Latin America. Should you worry. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2018/01/24/china-is-investing-seriously-in-latin-america-should-you-worry/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.3d94dbf7c658.

Kastanakis, M. N., & Voyer, B. G. (2014). The effect of culture on perception and cognition: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Business Research, 67*(4), 425–433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.03.028.

Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. (1998). How affirmative action became diversity management: Employer response to Antidiscrimination Law, 1961 to 1996. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41*(7), 960–984.

Kline, H. F., Wade, C. J., & Wiarda, H. J. (2018). *Latin American politics and development*. New York: Routledge.

Kostova, T., Roth, K., & Dacin, M. T. (2008). Institutional theory in the study of multinational corporations: A critique and new directions. *Academy of Management Review, 33*(4), 994–1006.

Kruse, T. (2001). Transición política y recomposición sindical, reflexiones desde Bolivia. In E. de La Garza Toledo (Ed.), *En Los Sindicatos frente a los procesos de transición política* (pp. 153–191). Buenos Aires, Argentina: CLASCO. Retrieved from http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/clacso/gt/20101107032823/garza3.pdf.

Lafargue, F. (2006). China's presence in Latin America: Strategies, aims and limits. *China Perspectives, 68*, 2–11. Retrieved from https://journals.openedition.org/chinaperspectives/3053.

Lamphere, L., Stepick, A., & Grenier, G. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Newcomers in the workplace: Immigrants and the restructuring of the US Economy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Larkey, L. K. (1996). The development and validation of the workforce diversity questionnaire: An instrument to assess interactions in diverse workgroups. *Management Communication Quarterly, 9*(3), 296–337.

Latham, G. P. (1988). Human resource training and development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 39*(1), 545–582.

Lee, B. A., Martin, M. J., & Hall, M. (2017). Solamente Mexicanos? Patterns and sources of Hispanic diversity in U.S. metropolitan areas. *Social Science Research, 68,* 117–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2017.08.006.

Lee, Y., & Kramer, A. (2016). The role of purposeful diversity and inclusion strategy (PDIS) and cultural tightness/looseness in the relationship between national culture and organizational culture. *Human Resource Management Review, 26*(3), 198–208.

Lenartowicz, T., & Johnson, J. P. (2003). A cross-national assessment of the values of Latin America managers: Contrasting hues or shades of gray? *Journal of International Business Studies, 34*(3), 266–281.

Liberman, L. (2014). The impact of a paternalistic style of management and delegation of authority on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in Chile and the US. *Innovar, 24*(53), 187–196.

Lott, B. (2010). *Multiculturalism and diversity.* Oxford: Wiley.

Lubensky, M. E., Holland, S. L., Wiethoff, C., & Crosby, F. J. (2004). *Diversity and sexual orientation: Including and valuing sexual minorities in the workplace* (J. Faye, Ed.) (pp. 206–223). Malden: Blackwell.

Luo, Y., Huang, Y., & Wang, S. L. (2012). Guanxi and organizational performance: A meta-analysis. *Management and Organization Review, 8*(1), 139–172.

Majors, G., & Sinclair, M. (1994). Measure results for program success. *HR Magazine, 39*(11), 57–59.

Martin, G. C. (2014). The effects of cultural diversity in the workplace. *Journal of Diversity Management, 9*(2), 89–91 (Online).

Martínez, P. G. (2003). Paternalism as a positive form of leader–subordinate exchange: Evidence from Mexico. *Management Research: Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management, 1*(3), 227–242.

Mayor, M. G. O., Davó, N. B., & Martínez, F. R. (2015). Ventajas competitivas de las empresas de telefonía móvil en América Latina. Análisis desde la perspectiva de los grupos estratégicos. *El Trimestre Económico, 82*(325), 89–116.

Meyer, J., & Davis, E. (2002). Workplace chaplains: Filling a need traditional EAPs can't meet. *Benefits Quarterly, 18*(3), 22–26.

Moran, P. (2005). Structural vs. relational embeddedness: Social capital and managerial performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 26*(12), 1129–1151.

Mor-Barak, M. E., & Cherin, D. A. (1998). A tool to expand organizational understanding of workforce diversity: Exploring a measure of inclusion-exclusion. *Administration in Social Work, 22*(1), 47–64.

Morden, T. (1995). National culture and the culture of the organization. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal, 2*(2), 3–12.

Neely, A. (2002). *Business performance measurement: Theory and practice*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Nery-Kjerfve, T., & McLean, G. N. (2015). The view from the crossroads: Brazilian culture and corporate leadership in the twenty-first century. *Human Resource Development International, 18*(1), 24–38.

Niedziolek, R. C. (2005). *National culture and work-related values of Puerto Rico* (Dissertation). Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños, Capella University, New York.

Ninan, G. S., José, A., & John, T. (2017). A Study to assess the organizational climate of selected hospital, Chennai as perceived by staff nurses. *International Journal of Current Trends in Science and Technology, 7*(11), 20176–20178.

Nishii, L. H., & Özbilgin, M. F. (2007). Global diversity management: Towards a conceptual framework. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*(11), 1883–1894.

Nishii, L. H., & Rich, R. E. (2014). Creating inclusive climates in diverse organizations. In B. Ferdman & B. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion* (pp. 330–363). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ortiz Rivera, E. (2010). Los índices culturales de Hofstede y su impacto en los estilos de liderazgo en empresas extranjeras que operan en Puerto Rico. In *Forum Empresarial* (Vol. 15, No. 2). Centro de Investigaciones Comerciales e Iniciativas Académicas.

Osland, J. S., Snyder, M. M., & Hunter, L. (1998). A comparative study of managerial styles among female executives in Nicaragua and Costa Rica. *International Studies of Management & Organization, 28*(2), 54–73.

Ostau de Lafont de León, F. R. (2011). *Estudio histórico del derecho laboral colombiano: el discurso paternalista en la formación de la norma laboral*. Bogotá: Universidad Libre.

Otaye-Ebede, L. (2018). Employees' perception of diversity management practices: Scale development and validation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 27*(4), 462–476.

Out & Equal. (2017). *Perspectives on LGBT workplace equality in Colombia*. Workplace Advocates, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved from http://outandequal.org/event/perspectives-on-lgbt-workplace-equality-in-colombia/.

Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2008). Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management, 34*(3), 566–593.

Peretz, H., Levi, A., & Fried, Y. (2015). Organizational diversity programs across cultures: Effects on absenteeism, turnover, performance and innovation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 26*(6), 875–903.

Poynter, T. A. (1982). Government intervention in less developed countries: The experience of multinational companies. *Journal of International Business Studies, 13*(1), 9–25.

Raineri, A. (2018). Diversity management in three Latin American countries: An institutional theory perspective. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración, 31*(2), 426–447.

Ramamoorthy, N., & Flood, P. (2002). Employee attitudes and behavioural intentions: A test of the main and moderating effects of individualism–collectivism orientations. *Human Relations, 55*, 1071–1096. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726702055009020.

Ramani, G., & Kumar, V. (2008). Interaction orientation and firm performance. *Journal of Marketing, 72*(1), 27–45.

Ravasi, D., & Schultz, M. (2006). Responding to organizational identity threats: Exploring the role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(3), 433–458.

Richard, O., McMillan, A., Chadwick, K., & Dwyer, S. (2003). Employing an innovation strategy in racially diverse workforces: Effects on firm performance. *Group and Organization Management, 28*(1), 107–126.

Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. *Group and Organization Management, 31*(2), 212–236.

Rodríguez, H. A. V., & Gómez, L. P. (2015). Disposiciones y el tipo de razonamiento ético utilizados por una muestra de gerentes de los sectores públicos y privado de las áreas sur y oeste de Puerto Rico. *Revista de Administración Pública* (Etapa IV-Colección completa), *41*(1), 79–97.

Rodriguez, R. R., Saiz, J. J. A., & Bas, A. O. (2009). Quantitative relationships between key performance indicators for supporting decision-making processes. *Computers in Industry, 60*(2), 104–113.

Rojas, R. R., & Seda-Cuevas, N. M. (2018). Assessing diversity across cultures: A US-Hispanic perspective. *World Journal of Social Science Research, 5*(3). https://doi.org/10.22158/wjssr.v5n3p225.

Rojo, G. F., & Beauregard, T. A. (2017). A Latin American perspective on diversity management: What does "inclusion" mean in a Peruvian context? In M. Ozbilgin & J. F. Chanlat (Eds.), *Management and diversity: Perspectives from different national contexts* (pp. 9–31). UK: Emerald Publishing Limited.

Rosen, B., & Lovelace, K. (1991). Piecing together the diversity puzzle. *HR Magazine, 36*(6), 78–82.

Rosenfeld, E. (2015, January 29). *China's new playground: America's backyard*. CNBC. Retrieved from https://www.cnbc.com/2015/01/29/the-motivations-behind-chinas-moves-into-latin-america.html.

Rubaii, N. (2016). Promoting social equity, diversity, and inclusion through accreditation: Comparing national and international standards for public affairs programs in Latin America. *Quality Assurance in Education, 24*(4), 541–561.

Rubalcaba, L., Aboal, D., & Garda, P. (2016). Service innovation in developing economies: Evidence from Latin America and the Caribbean. *The Journal of Development Studies, 52*(5), 607–626.

Ruiz, E. (2005). Hispanic culture and relational cultural theory. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health, 1*(1), 33–55.

Sanchez-Burks, J., Nisbett, R. E., & Ybarra, O. (2000). Cultural styles, relationship schemas, and prejudice against out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(2), 174–189.

Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64,* 361–388.

Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (2007). An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 344–354.

Segrest, S. L., Romero, E. J., & Domke-Damonte, D. J. (2003). Exploring the role of machismo in gender discrimination: A comparison of Mexico and the US. *Equal Opportunities International, 22*(1), 13–31.

Seymen, O. A. (2006). The cultural diversity phenomenon in organisations and different approaches for effective cultural diversity management: A literary review. *Cross Cultural Management: an International Journal, 13*(4), 296–315.

Sherbin, L., & Rashid, R. (2017, February 1). Diversity doesn't stick without inclusion. *Harvard Business Review.*

Sissell, K. (2012). Latin America: Regional players jockey for position. *Chemical Week, 174*(27), 17.

Smith, W. K., Gonin, M., & Besharov, M. L. (2013). Managing social-business tensions: A review and research agenda for social enterprise. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 23*(3), 407–442.

Steffens, N. K., Shemla, M., Wegge, J., & Diestel, S. (2014). Organizational tenure and employee performance: A multilevel analysis. *Group and Organization Management, 39*(6), 664–690.

Stockdale, M. S., & Crosby, F. J. (2004). *The psychology and management of workplace diversity.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Stoermer, S., Bader, A. K., & Froese, F. J. (2016). Culture matters: The influence of national culture on inclusion climate. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management, 23*(2), 287–305.

Stutz, J., & Massengale, R. (1997). Measuring diversity initiatives. *HR Magazine, 42*(12), 85–88.

Sun, L. Y., Aryee, S., & Law, K. S. (2007). High-performance human resource practices, citizenship behavior, and organizational performance: A relational perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(3), 558–577.

The Tico Times. (2018, September 5). *Costa Rica and China sign agreement to encourage investment and commerce.* Retrieved from https://ticotimes.net/2018/09/05/costa-rica-and-china-sign-agreement-to-encourage-investment-and-commerce.

Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter. *Harvard Business Review, 74*(5), 79–90.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Turnbull, H., Greenwood, R., Tworoger, L., & Golden, C. (2010). Skill deficiencies in diversity and inclusion in organizations: Developing an inclusion skills measurement. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 9*(1), 1–14.

Vallario, C. W. (2006). Creating an environment for global diversity: Global diversity in the workplace is not just a human resources issue, but a business strategy that embraces many elements. Here's how 10 multinationals are successfully managing the process. *Financial Executive, 22*(3), 50–53.

Van der Vegt, G. S., Van de Vliert, E., & Huang, X. (2005). Location-level links between diversity and innovative climate depend on national power distance. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(6), 1171–1182.

Vogt, W. P. (2007). *Quantitative research methods for professionals*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Watts, P. (1987). Bias busting: Diversity training in the workplace. *Management Review, 76*(12), 51–54.

WEF. (2016). *World Economic Forum's Global Report on Gender*. Retrieved from https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-gender-gap-report-2016.

WEF. (2018). *World Economic Forum's Global Report on Gender*. Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2018.pdf.

Welbourne, T. M., & McLaughlin, L. L. (2013). Making the business case for Employee Resource Groups. *Employment Relations Today, 40*(2), 35–44.

Williams, D., & Wade-Golden, K. (2007). The chief diversity officer. *CUPA HR Journal, 58*(1), 38–49.

Wright, P. M., Gardner, T. M., & Moynihan, L. M. (2003). The impact of HR practices on the performance of business units. *Human Resource Management Journal, 13*(3), 21–36.

Zacher, H., & Yang, J. (2016). Organizational climate for successful aging. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7,* 1007. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01007.