Correspondence concerning this chapter may be directed to Bernardo
M. Ferdman, California School of Organizational Studies, Alliant
International University, 6160 Cornerstone Court East, San Diego, CA
92121 U.S.A. Tel. (858) 623-2777 x362; Fax (858) 642-0283;
email: bferdman@alliant.edu

14

Culture and Identity Among Hispanic Managers in an Anglo Business

BERNARDO M. FERDMAN
ANGELICA C. CORTES

Hispanics[1] constitute one of the fastest growing segments of the United States population (Davis, Haub, & Willete, 1988) and are becoming increasingly represented at all levels of organizations. In spite of these changes, little has been written about how United States Hispanics at the managerial level experience their work roles and how these experiences reflect, in combination, aspects of Hispanic culture, majority-minority relations, and within-group diversity. This chapter reports on research that investigated expressions of culture and identity among Hispanic managers in a largely Anglo organization in the Northeastern United States. The study explored aspects of the presence and perception of Hispanic cultural features in the management styles of Hispanic managers and some of the factors that related to the expression of these features in the work context. The goal was to learn more about how group-level cultural patterns translate into individual behavior and how Hispanic managers think about this process in the context of a multiethnic workplace.

A shared culture is cited widely as one of the primary features that demarcates Hispanics as a group (e.g., Albert, 1986; Marger, 1991; Moore & Pachon, 1985; Nelson & Tienda, 1988; Ramirez, 1988). This culture differs in many important respects from that of other ethnic groups in the United States, in particular the dominant Anglo[2] group. As a group Hispanics also share the experience of minority status in the context of American society. Historically, Hispanics have been the targets of prejudice and discrimination and on average occupy a lower rung in the United States system of ethnic stratification than do Anglos. Minority status also has meant that many aspects of Hispanic culture have been devalued by other groups. In spite of these commonalities and the corresponding differences from the surrounding society, a great deal of diversity occurs within the Hispanic group (Cortina & Moncada, 1988; Klor de Alva, 1988). The term *Hispanic* incorporates people with a multiplicity of backgrounds and ethnic experiences, encompassing Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, and Central and South Americans. Moreover Hispanics have assimilated to the surrounding culture to varying degrees and place a wide range of values on their ethnicity (e.g., Buriel, 1987; Comas-Díaz, 1989; Keefe & Padilla, 1987; Triandis, Kashima, Hui, Lisansky, & Marín, 1982). Thus individual Hispanics vary widely in their adherence to group-level cultural patterns and in the way they think about their Hispanic identity.

Hispanics who work in largely Anglo organizations share the label *Hispanic* with each other, but they also share role identifications and an organizational affiliation with their Anglo co-workers. This, together with the factors mentioned above, leads us to expect both commonalities and variations in how Hispanic managers handle their work roles and in how they experience their culture and ethnicity at work. These themes are developed below.

Cultural Diversity

Inquiries into the dynamics of ethnic diversity in heterogeneous organizations often emphasize the important role of cultural differences (Ferdman, 1992). This perspective sees culture as consisting of the "styles" (Kochman, 1981; Jones, 1988; Royce, 1982) characteristic to an ethnic group, including patterns of behaviors, values, and beliefs widely shared by its members. Thus culture includes both specific behavioral characteristics typifying a group and the underlying views of social reality guiding those behaviors (Heller, 1987; Triandis, 1972). The work of such authors as Hofstede (1980), Hall (1959, 1966), and Adler (1983; 1991; Adler, Doktor, & Redding, 1986)

highlights the ways in which people with different ethnic or national back-grounds can vary extensively in the values, attitudes, and behaviors they bring to the workplace. Laurent (1983), for example, showed that managers in different countries had widely divergent views of the managerial role and of what constitutes an appropriate response in typical work situations. These differences were larger when comparing managers working within the same multinational company than employees of domestic companies in the same countries (Adler, 1991). Hofstede (1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1984), in a study spanning 40 countries, observed notable cultural variations on a number of work-related values. He discovered four major dimensions along which national value systems could be arrayed, terming these *power distance, un-certainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism,* and *masculinity/femininity.* Similarly important cultural differences have been described as distinguish-ing the various ethnic groups within the United States (e.g., Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991; Jones, 1988; Kochman, 1981; Marín & Triandis, 1985; Ramirez, 1988; Triandis, Marín, Hui, Lisansky, & Ottati, 1984; Triandis, Marín, Lisansky, & Betancourt, 1984).

On the basis of this work, Hispanics in the United States, as well as in Latin American societies, have been described as being more collectivist than Anglos, such that the group is emphasized over the individual, the need for consensus is greater, and interpersonal behavior is stressed over task achieve-ments (e.g., Hofstede, 1980; Marín &. Triandis, 1985; Triandis, Marín, Lisansky, & Betancourt, 1984). For example Triandis, Marín, Lisansky, and Betancourt (1984) describe evidence for the prevalence among Hispanics of what they call a "*simpatía* script," which leads Hispanics to expect dignity and respect in interpersonal relations, and to emphasize positive and de-emphasize negative behaviors. Latin American societies also have been described as having high-context cultures, which value communication based on personal trust and interpersonal relationships over formal, imper-sonal communication. Hofstede (1980) found Latin American managers, relative to those in the United States, to be high on both uncertainty avoidance and power distance, suggesting a preference for clear delineation of formal rules, and relatively autocratic, paternalistic leadership styles. Similarly Triandis and his colleagues (Triandis, Marín, Hui, Lisansky, & Ottati, 1984; Triandis, Marín, Lisansky, & Betancourt, 1984) also report evidence for greater power distance among Hispanic than non-Hispanic Navy recruits.

Based on such findings, as well as investigations of situations involving cross-cultural encounters, the prevailing wisdom in fields such as intercul-tural communication suggests that when people of different nationalities or

ethnicities interact with each other in the course of work, it is the divergence in their cultures that often leads to misunderstandings or conflicts. A good deal of research and theory has addressed various aspects of intercul-tural contact in organizations (Adler, 1991; Bochner, 1982; Brislin, 1981; Ferdman, 1992; Ferraro, 1990; Kochman, 1981; Shaw, 1990), as well as the ways in which people can be better prepared so as to make such encoun-ters more effective (e.g., Albert, 1986; Albert & Triandis, 1985; Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Brislin, Cushner, Cherrie, & Yong, 1986; Hughes-Weiner, 1986; Landis & Brislin, 1983a; 1983b).

Some of this interest derives from a desire to understand and enhance the experience of members of ethnic minorities in the workplace. The level of analysis in much of this literature, however, has tended to be the group or the nation. Moreover, suggestions and conclusions regarding Hispanic cultures in the United States are based often on evidence regarding people in Latin America. Although such lines of theory and investigation have aided thinking about the role of cultural differences in ethnically diverse organizations (Ferdman, 1992), empirical research rarely has considered the precise ways in which the cultural features of ethnic minorities are expressed in work contexts or how cultural differences interact with other variables to affect individual work experiences and behavior. While cultural differences from the dominant Anglo majority certainly can comprise an important influence on the organizational behavior and experience of Hispanics, we know little about the texture of this relationship or about how Hispanics at work think about their cultural features. In part this is because the cultural difference literature gives little attention to the link between group-level cultural features and their manifestation by individuals in the context of specific situations. This connection should be especially complex in the context of a heterogeneous society such as the United States, in which individual mem-bers of ethnic minorities make widely divergent choices regarding the degree to which they will assimilate to the dominant culture. Even when an individ-ual's behavior can be traced to group-level cultural features, he or she may not be conscious of such sources or be inclined to recognize them.[3] Moreover we cannot be sure to what extent generalizations about Latin American cultures apply to specific groups of Hispanics in the United States. Further complicating the picture is the organizational context where newcomers of any ethnicity are socialized to new roles and behavioral expectations. Orga-nizations can communicate expectations regarding the relevance and accep-tance of cultural differences in workplace behavior that go beyond or differ from the views present in society at large.

The research questions emanating from these concerns are two-fold: (a) Do commonalities exist in the work behavior and experience of Hispanic managers that reflect shared cultural features, and how are these commonalities related to previous accounts of Hispanic cultural features? (b) To what extent and in what ways do Hispanic managers connect their work behavior and experience to their ethnic and cultural identities?

Ethnic and Cultural Identity

The concepts of ethnic and cultural identity[4] permit exploration of how group-level features are perceived by individual group members. *Ethnic identity* (see Phinney, 1990, for review) as one aspect of a person's *social identity* (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) has to do with an individual's awareness of belonging to an ethnic group, together with the value and feelings that this membership evokes. An individual's *cultural identity,* in contrast, refers to the person's particular image of the behaviors, beliefs, values, and norms that characterize the culture of the ethnic group to which she or he belongs.

While ethnic identity refers to the symbolic aspects of ethnic categories—the boundary between in-group and out-group and the associated affect—cultural identity refers to the perceived behavioral and attitudinal bases or consequences of these categories—that which is "inside" the boundary. Thus ethnic identity has to do with the strength and value of a person's identification with an ethnic category. For individual Hispanics this would be the extent to which they perceive "Hispanicity" as important to them and how they feel about this. Cultural identity is the individual's internalized view of the cultural features that are representative of the group. For a Hispanic this would be her or his particular view regarding what "Hispanicity" implies in terms of behavior, values, and norms.

This distinction between cultural and ethnic identity parallels that made by Keefe and Padilla (1987) between the processes of acculturation and ethnic identification. Acculturation has to do with how groups change their cultural patterns when they come into contact with one another. In ethnic identification, in contrast, "the particular assemblage of cultural traits becomes less important than the attitudes of members towards the people and culture of in-group versus out-group as well as members' self-identification" (Keefe & Padilla, 1987, p. 41). Thus an individual may maintain a strong identification with a particular group while adopting new cultural traits. Herman (1977) made a similar differentiation in his discussion of the nature of Jewish identity. He suggested that its analysis at the individual level must address both "a) the nature of the individual's relationship to the Jewish group as a membership group; and b) the individual's perception of the attributes of the Jewish group, his feeling about them, and the extent to which its norms are adopted by him as a source of reference" (Herman, 1977, p. 39). The first component involves aspects of the person's ethnic identity, while the second has to do with the ways in which that affiliation is represented—the person's cultural identity (Ferdman, 1990).

What this means is that two people who perceive their identification as Hispanics as central to their ethnic identity can define its meaning very differently. For example a Puerto Rican living in New York and one living in Puerto Rico may share an ethnic identification but have dissimilar experiences and ways of looking at the world, with resulting differences in their cultural identities. For one, minority status and ethnic distinctiveness in an urban environment play a relatively focal role; for the other, the Spanish language and living on the island will be relatively more important (e.g., Flores, 1985; Ginorio, 1987; Safa, 1988). Similarly some Hispanics more than others may perceive certain values or behaviors, such as balancing work and family life or maintaining close relations with extended family, to be culturally linked.

Thus the type and degree of ethnic identity held by members of a minority group can be distinguished from their awareness and expression of cultural differences. The lack of research on Hispanics in managerial roles means that we know little about how they might think about their ethnic and cultural identities in the context of work. The investigation reported here was motivated by the desire to better understand this, as well as the different ways in which Hispanic managers link their ethnicity to their work roles and behavior. More generally the investigation addressed the question of how cultural features are manifested and perceived at the individual level by members of an ethnic minority in the context of their work roles in a multiethnic organization.

Methods

Overview

Given the relative paucity of research and theory on the questions of interest, a qualitative methodology was adopted for the study to facilitate

generation of hypotheses worthy of further investigation. Interviews with Hispanic managers were conducted by Ferdman as part of a larger study (Ferdman, 1987, 1989) designed to investigate aspects of intergroup dynamics in organizations. Interviews were transcribed later and coded, and recurring thematic strands were extracted.

Setting

The research was conducted in 1986 at the XYZ corporation,[5] a medium-sized organization in New England. At the time, this company had more than 13,000 employees, including approximately 3,000 at the managerial level. Among the managers were 46 self-identified Hispanics. The research was carried out under the auspices of the organization development and management training unit of the company, which became interested in the study in part as a result of increasing pressure from a Hispanic managers' group to address issues of cultural diversity in the company's management training programs.[6]

Two relevant attributes of the XYZ corporation should be noted. First, it is a highly bureaucratic organization, allowing limited flexibility for deviation with respect to procedures. Though this does vary somewhat by department, it is a potent aspect of the company's history and culture. For example XYZ has entire units whose responsibilities are solely to develop and write up procedures, not only for technical aspects of jobs but also for steps to be followed in handling customers and in resolving problems. While such procedures apply especially to nonmanagerial employees, they influence the general atmosphere in which managers operate. Second, XYZ is highly hierarchical. Levels of management are well defined, and employees are encouraged by rule and custom to follow the chain of command. When problems arise, the norm is generally to resolve them at peer level or to bring them to one's supervisor, who then is expected to address the issue at his or her own level or in turn pass it up to the next level. In general, skipping supervisory levels is viewed negatively.

Participants

Interviewees were recruited by randomly selecting two thirds of the male and two thirds of the female Hispanic managers in the company, from a list provided by the organization development unit.[7] In all, 26 invitations to participate in individual interviews were mailed, followed up by phone calls.

After individual interviews were conducted, those participants who had indicated an interest, as well as Hispanic managers who had not been recruited initially, were invited to participate in group interviews.

A total of 27 Hispanic junior and middle-level[8] managers participated in 23 individual and 2 group interviews. Of these, 7 took part in both individual and group interviews, 16 were interviewed individually only, and 4 attended a group interview only. The final sample included 13 men and 14 women, representing a broad range of functions and number of years at XYZ. These managers were also diverse with regards to the source of their Hispanic identity. The group included Puerto Ricans (from both the mainland and the island), Colombians, Dominicans, Cubans, Venezuelans, Mexican Americans, and Portuguese.[9]

Interviews

The individual interviews were held at various locations in the company, convenient to each participating manager. Interviews lasted 1 hour each and followed a semistructured format. If the interviewee consented, the session was tape-recorded. Otherwise the interviewer took notes. The open-ended questions used were designed to discover typical situations that the managers encountered in their work and the ways in which they handled them, as well as to obtain a general sense of the work environment at XYZ. Discussion focused on the managers' jobs and on their ideas about what constituted typical and appropriate behavior in their everyday tasks, especially those involving interactions with other people. Interviewees were asked to re-create dialogues or to explain what their reactions might be in specific situations. Interviewees were asked also whether ethnicity ever arose as a topic or issue in their work group or in their own thinking. (For more details on the interview questions and process, see Ferdman, 1987).

The two group interviews—one with five participants, the other with six—were conducted after the individual interviews had been completed. These sessions were designed to enable discussion of issues in a forum in which the extent of agreement or disagreement within the group could be assessed. In part the group interview questions were based on information gathered in the individual interviews. Because these managers generally tended to be isolated from each other in the course of work, they often did not perceive particular aspects of their behavior as culturally related. The extent to which behavior patterns or perspectives on work were shared could become more evident in a group discussion.

Analysis

Through use of a computer database program, the transcription made from each interview tape was subdivided into thematic units that then were summarized and coded. Each interview segment was coded using keywords to identify one or more salient themes. In coding the interview segments, we tried to avoid imposing an a priori structure on the data. Thus we first generated a list of topical keywords[10] through an initial examination of the transcripts but then added new keywords during coding when it seemed necessary.

Once all the segments were coded, we were able then to pull out all those addressing a given topic within and across interviews and to look for patterns extending across people and situations. As tentative summary statements were generated, these were critically evaluated by looking for examples and counterexamples and assessing the degree to which they fit with patterns observed for other topics. Through recursive applications of this method, broad recurring themes could be discerned. We were interested in detecting common patterns indicative of shared cultural features, as well as variations that could help us understand the range of diversity present among the Hispanic managers and the factors influencing individual expressions of cultural features.

Results and Discussion

As a group the Hispanic managers interviewed for the study exhibited a great deal of variation in their responses to the interview questions and in the experiences they reported on and off the job. Nevertheless a number of unifying themes emerged that could be interpreted as cultural features, in the sense that they reflected important shared ways of understanding and approaching work. The Hispanic managers' preferred styles were quite often connected to their experiences of being different from their Anglo peers in the organization.

The managers also varied in how they perceived the relationship of their ethnicity to their work and to the organization. To assess how they thought about their identity in the context of their jobs, we looked at discussions of ethnicity by the managers both in response to questions about work in general and to questions more directly targeted at this issue. The managers' individual behavioral accounts, together with their reflections on their ethnic identity and its implications for their experiences at XYZ, helped shed light on how culture in a broad sense is enacted and experienced in specific work situations and organizational contexts.

Cultural Themes

What were some of the features characteristic of how the group of Hispanic managers approached their work? What kind of leadership styles did the Hispanic managers tend to report? The inductive process used to analyze the interview data permitted identifying various unifying themes that described general features common to the group of Hispanic managers. Below we discuss these under three categories: orientation to people, direct approach to conflict, and flexible attitude toward hierarchy. After presenting the themes, these are discussed in relation to previously reported accounts of Hispanic cultural features.

Orientation to People

A dominant theme throughout the interviews was the Hispanic managers' emphasis on attention to other people and to interpersonal relationships at work. Combined with this was a strong belief in the importance of respect for oneself and for others. In reporting their preferences regarding how to go about their work, most of the Hispanic managers stressed the value of attending to the feelings of others. Thus they could be described as working at getting along with people, evidenced explicitly by their philosophies for dealing with subordinates, peers, and supervisors and implicitly by how they reported reacting in particular situations. Related to these issues, flexibility, both in judging others and in handling work situations, emerged as another important value. To the extent that these features characterized individual managers, they experienced themselves as being different from their co-workers and from the dominant styles in the organization.

The Hispanic managers, on the whole, tended to prefer a participatory, open-door leadership style to a distant, autocratic manner. They reported making themselves readily available to subordinates who had questions or even personal problems. For example a number of the managers felt that when a person walks into their office and has a question, he or she should receive an answer. Even if they are busy, they reported, they would try to make time to address the problem or question. One manager, for example, said: "I'm always there, I'm available, I'll stop what I'm doing. I'll always stop what I'm doing because they want an answer or they wouldn't be standing there." Another reported: "I try to make myself available to

everybody so that they feel comfortable when they see me around." Yet a third responded:

> I'll let them know if I'm running into a personal problem with a time constraint. "I got only 30 minutes to finish preparing before the next meeting," but generally I will try to answer that question or if I can't, I'll make arrangements to either come back, or to direct them where the answer is or to get to them the next day to answer that particular question.

Many of the Hispanic managers, both men and women, tended to mention the importance of "touching" other people, both literally and figuratively. This could be expressed in such ways as trying to go beyond "just business" in conversations, such as with a joke or a personal comment. For example one man explained, "I am the kind of guy who likes to touch. I'm friendly, I like to shake hands." Another described the barriers he felt were put up by everyone in the company with whom he dealt because, he said, they always talked strictly business, without any jokes, humor, or side comments. He preferred to make interactions more "semiformal" by bringing up personal topics, such as children, and then getting back into the main topic of discussion. In the group interview, another manager said that he preferred "close contact with people as people, more than as a business acquaintance or a business associate."

These preferences for personal contact with other people usually were portrayed as contrasting with the typical styles found at XYZ. Many of the managers reported differences from or difficulties with the predominant styles that they found in their environment. For example, in the group interview one woman reported her frustration with how other people treated each other:

Betty: You know what's interesting, I was sitting in the lobby one day, in the morning. And I saw countless people walking in and out, walking in in the morning, and just walking past the guard without saying

Laura: saying hello, yeah

Betty: one word, no good morning no—the man's been standing there for years, and no one. I mean I can't. Just a handful of people that would say, "Hi Ron, how're you doing?" And I looked at him and I said, "Ron, I can't believe how many people will pass you and won't even say good morning." And he said, "Betty, it's unbelievable. They don't even bother to give you the right time of day."

An exchange that took place in the other group interview touched on a similar point:

Arturo: I think that I, I project myself as a, as a very, very friendly individual. As a friendly kind of guy, and I feel that my co-workers, the guys . . . in my own level, . . . they might give the subordinates the cold shoulder. And I come as a friend . . . .

Eddie: Hmm.

Arturo: When I see one guy in the morning, I feel like shaking hands, and I do. That over here is,

Eddie: It's a very Latino . . .

Arturo: is no. That's something that you don't do around here. If you know the guy you shake hands with him once and that's it. Don't do it anymore.

Eddie: I shake hands, but only with blacks, and other Hispanics. . . . I would say mostly with blacks, because I don't interact with a lot of Hispanics, ah, but I see 'em, and, and, just you know, it's the morning, and I come in, and ah, Joe, how are you, you know, shake hands in the elevator, and haven't seen him in a couple of days, and shake hands, and I think that's strange to some people.

Arturo: Even the guy that is at the door when I come in in the morning and I say good morning, and I shake his hand, when I come in. To a lot of people this is unusual. What the hell is he doing? But that's the way that I come.

Thus behavior that to many Hispanic managers felt natural or appropriate could be misunderstood or misinterpreted by their Anglo co-workers. What to the Hispanics seemed the normal way to handle typical situations was often experienced as marking them as "different," as being in contrast with the predominant views of normality in their environment.

In most cases the Hispanic managers reported a preference for face-to-face communication over use of the telephone or written memos. Even though writing memos was judged as a preferred mode of communication within the organization, most interviewees felt that this was an overly formal means of contact with others. It was only when they could meet someone in person that they saw themselves as most effective. Here is what two managers said on this issue:

Mgr. 1:   I think if you got a lot of back-and-forth written communication documenting all the stuff, that's too formal. I like to just sit down and talk, sit down and discuss the issue and if something needs writing and following [up] that's fine.

Mgr. 2:   I usually never call. . . . I don't like calling. I find that for me it works better if I go directly to the person, and I find that even in other departments here within the company. If I need something, I go talk to them. . . . I'd rather deal with the person.

In explaining the rationale for this type of approach, a third manager said:

[When] the person is talking, you can see how that person is, you can study the person so if you ever have to deal with that person you know more or less something about the person. . . . any kind of job, it's not only how much you know about the job but how much you know about a person.

This last quote suggests that the concern for and involvement with other people is perceived as a vital aspect of getting work done. It is viewed as an approach that can bring with it both professional and personal rewards. By giving respect to others and demanding it for themselves, managers can create a more hospitable and therefore a more productive environment. For example, in responding to a question about how to succeed as a leader, one manager responded:

Oh, being reachable, acceptable, doing a good job, being respected, being known as someone you can go to if you have a question, if you have a problem, if you want someone to listen. I view myself as all of those things, being cooperative with people, if someone does you a favor, you either send him a memo of thanks to that person's boss, or, if it's in the routine part of their job, maybe take them out for lunch now and then, just as a, you know as a nicety. Ah, being personable with that person, maybe in many instances asking about . . . family, those type of things, to make them more at ease.

This type of treatment was something that many managers expected but did not often get. They wanted to be respected and appreciated for being able to do the job, while being given the freedom and autonomy to do it in the way that they saw fit. To the extent this was done, they could feel that they were being treated as competent and professional.

Respecting people for the Hispanic managers also meant seeing them as complex and treating them fairly. Thus when asked during the group inter-

view to discuss both the qualities important to managers in general and his own management style, one manager reported:

Prejudging people, I think too many people are guilty of that, when they make evaluations, snap judgments. My manager is guilty of that, when someone will walk in he'll form an opinion in the first 5 minutes. To me I don't like that, I like to always give the person a chance. The other important element is to give feedback, whether it's negative or positive, especially positive. We tend to give negative feedback too many times to our people, and the way we deliver it is not the best way. We get 'em in a corner, we beat 'em up, we tell 'em, "hey, geez, you're not doing the job," rather than pointing out, you know *what* you're displeased about that person's performance, we're not too clear about that sometimes.

This desire for fairness was connected also to the Hispanic managers' experience of being different from others in the organization. In the second group interview, for example, another manager said that an important managerial quality was to "try to appreciate differences." Yet a third responded: ". . . being able to tolerate different levels of understanding of what the job is, and how it should be done. Try to get behind what it is that people bring with them."

Related to this, many of the Hispanic managers saw an important element of their managerial responsibilities to be the development of motivation in their subordinates. To allow autonomy and participation, to encourage decision making from below, and to earn their subordinates' trust were viewed as critical. Thus those managers who directly supervised or were responsible for training others reported that they sought to inspire employees to give the best of themselves. Instilling motivation and autonomy, combined with giving positive feedback when appropriate, were described as favored means of developing subordinates. This type of treatment was desired also from their superiors:

The managers that have been most effective in terms of dealing with me have been managers that treated me with respect as a person . . . and the managers that have gotten the most work out of me have been the managers that have caught me doing things right.

Showing personal involvement and concern with others could bring intrinsic rewards as well, as illustrated by the following quote:

I think that your attitude of willingness to help people is rewarded. Your attitude of caring is definitely rewarded. If you show some concern for them not just on

the job but on a personal level . . . because they look at you as a person. Not as a peer, not as a competitive peer; you are just a friend. I think a lot of people don't want to deal on a personal level. They are very competitive and they are just not people-oriented . . . they are task oriented. So I find that, overall, it's unusual for people to want to get personal and I think if you do it in the right way, it could be very rewarding.

The Hispanic managers' people orientation was not expressed as unconditional acceptance of others, however. An important condition of respect for co-workers, supervisors, and subordinates was that they be considerate of personal feelings and both individual and collective needs. One interviewee said, for example, "I don't think there's anyone in my chain of command that doesn't work as hard as I do, and I respect that." Another manager, talking about the people he worked with day to day, reported, "I give them all my friendship, and I expect them to do the same." The same person, when asked about situations that would make him irritated or angry, responded: "When I feel that I'm being taken advantage of. When I feel that a person is working, like for example, overtime to complete his or her job when they could have done it in the regular time." Another manager described his frequent encounters with people who do not "do their homework" and therefore become obstacles. To handle this, they would be "canceled out," ignored, and even discredited. This same manager, however, expressed the importance of maintaining flexibility and being open to people's positive aspects, at least until interactions with them prove this approach impossible. Thus a person who was either uncooperative and refused to help, especially when asked, or who was basically unfriendly could easily lose the Hispanic managers' respect.

Many of the Hispanic managers considered commitment to the goals of the organization or their work group as important, both for themselves and for co-workers. Even though they preferred a good deal of freedom in carrying out their jobs, they understood this to be in the context of working toward common objectives. For example, one manager commented, referring to her immediate work group: "We all work together, we understand each other's situations . . . it's important for us to work as one." Another manager, explaining what made for effective working relations, said, "Everybody's got their own thing, and it's a matter of just cooperating and really, living together. Like with a family." A third manager stated, "I was paid to do a job when I work here."

The value of flexibility emerged not only in relation to how others should be perceived and treated but in other contexts as well. Some of the managers

expressed the view that it was very important to learn from every situation. For example, when asked what their normal reaction was when they were asked to go to useless meetings, many of the managers responded that they felt that it was always possible to learn something new. In many cases survival and success on the job meant being able to adapt to different types of supervisors or their varying demands.

Direct Approach to Conflict

A large proportion of the Hispanic managers expressed a preference for confronting interpersonal conflicts and work-related disagreements openly, directly, and immediately. They considered it more professional to deal with such issues as soon as possible than to ignore them.

One Hispanic manager said, for example, "I can blow up and 2 minutes later feel fine," while another stated, "I have a quick temper." A third manager said: "If I have a problem with somebody, I'm more apt to say to them, 'Let's go talk about it.' They're [referring to Anglo co-workers] more apt to put it away in a drawer, and do something with it later on." A fourth manager said, "I'm very vocal; if I don't agree, I'll tell you." Some of the Hispanic managers reported incidents in which their Anglo colleagues perceived them as overly emotional or as confrontative.

Nevertheless direct handling of conflict did not necessarily mean a display of strong negative emotions. In many cases the Hispanic managers' accounts of situations that might get them angry suggested that they consciously worked to maintain control while addressing the situation. For example, one young manager said:

> I realize that when I am at work . . . I can't lose my cool like you can do at home, you know, if you just threw everything on the floor and said 100 bad words, well, you can't at work, you see, you have to keep certain composure, certain politeness about you, certain education.

This same manager, however, continued by expressing a preference for immediately confronting people who treated her negatively. Even though she suggested that it is not viewed as professional to lose control, she gave an example of a situation in which she got very upset and talked quickly and angrily:

> I remember once getting upset and starting talking fast and . . . he could see I was angry and this guy said, "Well, take it easy, take it easy." I said, "What do you

mean take it easy? Explain to me, you just did this and that and you want me to take it easy?" No, but I confront them and I really got "look, you are going to do something like that and then get out, you better explain it to me." If it's against me, that's my attitude. So I remember once getting angry but I don't scream or I don't do anything but, I mean, my face says "I'm angry" and they know it. I mean, if you just confront them . . . they don't have any place to go.

Other managers with longer tenures at XYZ reported that they had changed over the years. One person, for example, said: "I don't got that temper any more, I just don't." This same manager, however, readily gave examples of giving his frank opinion in task-related situations even when it differed from that of his supervisor or colleagues.

This direct approach to conflict was related to the themes of self-respect, professionalism, and commitment to the job. Because these managers wanted to feel competent and useful, they considered it important to provide their input if they felt the situation warranted doing so. When providing their perspective was viewed as necessary to get a job done correctly, they did not hesitate to speak up. As one manager, Simón, put it, "You get paid to do the best you can and that's what I do, the best I can." Often this included pointing out faults in current or planned procedures or ways in which things could be improved. In line with this preference for directness, some of the managers reported difficulties with others who were not open with them. For example, one supervisor had a hard time dealing with people who did not give her straight answers to resolve problems related to the project at hand.

In general this approach also meant that the Hispanic managers did not hesitate to disagree openly with their supervisors. Ultimately they reported doing what the supervisor wanted, but they pressed their point when they felt that it was valid or that it was for the benefit of the organization. For example, one manager commented:

> Why should I buy your party line when I don't see it that way, I'm talking about the future of this particular division and you people [referring to his immediate boss] are more concerned [with] your own personal advancement and playing political games, and I am not into that. I am into getting the job done the best way I know.

In a case reported by Simón, he disagreed with his supervisor on the capacities of a computer program. Even though he was eventually proven correct in his view of the task, Simón had to go along with his supervisor's instructions. The incident cost him a negative assessment in his performance

review, but Simón felt that it would have been unprofessional to go along quietly with faulty instructions.

Given a prevalent organizational culture at XYZ that rewarded following instructions and toeing the line, many of the Hispanics often seemed to find themselves in the position of differing with those around them. While in some cases this eventually resulted in recognition and promotion, in others it meant frustration and a feeling of not being sufficiently heard or appreciated.

Flexible Attitude Toward Hierarchy

A common theme linking the Hispanic managers was a preference for getting work done even when this meant ignoring the chain of command. As mentioned earlier, XYZ is a very level-conscious organization, and most managers are encouraged to work at their own level when dealing with other departments or to work through immediate supervisors when necessary to shift levels. One interviewee described it this way: "I've had supervisors that said don't ever talk to anyone above your level without letting me know about it." Most of the interviewees considered it more important, however, to accomplish the task, to carry out their job, and to maintain positive relationships than to follow "proper" channels. This was consistent with the themes discussed above. As one Hispanic manager put it: "I think I tend not to follow those corporate rules as much, with the rules being rules of decorum or how to deal with things. I deal with people." Another manager stated:

> And I don't play games with level. I never have and never will. I don't care what level you are, if I'm going to talk to you, I'm going to talk to you, whether you're nonmanagement, or you're [the company president] in the elevator, I really don't care. Levels do not impress me.

In several cases interviewees reported that they had jumped one or two levels above their own supervisor in the hierarchy because they felt that this was necessary to get a job completed. Many of the managers reported often feeling frustrated by the lack of action and the long delays that resulted when they followed the regular chain of command.

This relatively lax attitude toward the organizational hierarchy seemed to be related to the Hispanic managers' preference for autonomy in their work. The interviewees tended to see their supervisors as consultative sources, for example to discuss priorities for projects or other situations related to the nature of their jobs, but they did not like to be specifically directed what to

do and they reported giving this type of autonomy to their own subordinates. The following quotes are good illustrations of this preference:

Mgr. 1:   I was given more responsibilities, and, like this committee I'm chairing it's my own project. I don't have to depend on a few people that I had to depend on before for information and for help. Now, I'm on my own and that makes me feel really good because I don't like to be dependent on people. So that gives me a boost, like if I'm learning something and [I say to myself] "Look, if other people can do it" my attitude is "so can I." . . . I was given two projects on my own and that makes me feel very good.

Mgr. 2:   No one felt we could do it, . . . we invented from the procedures to the methods to the products, called people, got everything together and before anybody knew it was done. Well, that was very exciting to me because that was creating something from nothing and following it through . . . and the customer being eminently satisfied and the corporation getting their revenue, my getting, you know, my satisfaction out of doing something that no one has ever done before. So that, that's very exciting to me, very exciting to me.

Being trusted and being able to use their own initiative and creativity on projects was rewarding to these managers, and this often took precedence over organizational norms when these were experienced as overly constraining.

Relationship to Other Accounts of
Hispanic Cultural Features

Some of the features that characterized the Hispanic managers at XYZ are consistent with prior accounts of Hispanic cultural features, but other features diverge from or contradict previous findings. In general, regardless of how well such prior accounts fit the managers at XYZ, the findings described here suggest that the application of group-level descriptions to individual behavior is complex and indirect.

A common strain in characterizations of Latin American cultures is their depiction as more collectivist than Anglo American culture (e.g., Hofstede, 1980; Marín & Triandis, 1985; Triandis, Marín, Lisansky, & Betancourt, 1984). Indeed the Hispanic managers at XYZ seemed to fit this description in the sense that they felt connected to their various membership and work groups and to the organization as a whole and that they valued positive

interpersonal behavior. In line with Triandis's findings (Triandis, Marín, Lisansky, & Betancourt, 1984), our interviewees also highly valued dignity and respect in their dealings with others. Nevertheless the XYZ managers were concerned also with individual achievement and succeeding in the organization. They wanted to be noted and respected not only as group members but also as individuals. Similarly, while these managers valued personal trust and face-to-face communication, consistent with descriptions of Latin Americans as having relatively high-context cultures, they also generally functioned well in the corporate environment and were capable of learning and adapting to its rules.

Our findings contrast to some extent with Hofstede's (1980) description of Latin American managers as being high in power distance, which implies an autocratic and paternalistic manner and great respect for authority. The XYZ managers preferred a participatory, open-door leadership style, showed concern with feelings, valued flexibility, and did not like overly close supervision either for themselves or their subordinates. Moreover they were willing to challenge their superiors and to cut across hierarchical levels when necessary. Similarly, although Hofstede (1980) described managers in Latin America as being high in uncertainty avoidance, thus preferring clearly delineated rules and aversion for risk taking, the Hispanic managers at XYZ welcomed risks, did not necessarily follow the hierarchy, preferred to use their own judgment rather than have everything strictly spelled out, and tended to resolve conflicts directly.

In attempting to make sense of some of these differences with previous findings, it must first be noted that many prior accounts of Hispanic cultural features are based on investigations of Hispanics in the context of largely Hispanic organizations, primarily in Latin America. Here we looked at Hispanics working in a predominantly Anglo context in the United States. Our findings in this latter context point to the danger of directly applying group-level findings abroad to minority experiences in the United States. Prior accounts derived from group-level analyses of people in their native cultures do not allow us to predict readily individual behavior in the context of minority roles. In the present research, the approach was to look at individuals and extract common themes. Even when we found commonalities with previous accounts, we could see broad individual variation in how general themes were expressed through specific behaviors. It was only when a set of individual behaviors was considered that general patterns emerged. These were not necessarily evident by looking at isolated behavioral incidents. Thus, although it is possible through an inductive process to derive general themes that can shed light on characteristic or distinctive Hispanic

approaches to work and can facilitate explication of behavior after the fact, it is a much different matter to use such characterizations to predict individual behavior in specific situations.

An important factor contributing to the differences with prior accounts is the minority status of the Hispanic managers at XYZ. For people who are in the dominant group, culture is simply the normal way of doing things. The Hispanic managers, however, because they were working in a largely Anglo environment, often experienced their styles as contrasting with the styles of their co-workers and with the preferred styles at XYZ. This may have led them in many cases to find ways to adapt these styles to their environment and its demands by either assimilating or modifying behavior in ways that seemed to be more accepted. In the role of minority group members, many of the Hispanic managers also felt particular pressures to prove themselves and to do well in their jobs. One manager described it this way during the group interview: "If a Hispanic manager or even a black manager gets promoted, I think there's a burden on him to prove himself more than, say someone who's not from a minority group." For many of the interviewees this type of pressure meant that even if they did not assimilate, success or even survival implied developing familiarity with the predominant norms in the organization. Finally the minority role gave some of the Hispanic managers a unique vantage point from which to understand the organization and its members. In a discussion during one of the group interviews, for example, one of the participants talked about the ways in which nonmanagement at XYZ are "treated like second-class citizens." Referring to this, she said: "Maybe because of my culture I'm more sensitive to the way they feel. Because I understand what it's like to be treated differently, and be ignored." In saying this, she was connecting her people orientation not so much to a particularly Hispanic cultural feature but rather to the experience Hispanics acquire through their minority status. To the extent that a group's minority status results in unique perspectives and characteristics that go beyond its cultural features or modulate their expression, we should expect variations among subgroups of Hispanics associated with such differential social and societal roles.

It was clear from the data as well that in spite of the common themes reported here, not every Hispanic manager fit into the general pattern. Some of the managers diverged from the approaches described above. Others had only some degree of fit. Some of these variations can be attributed to assimilation pressures in the organization. For example many interviewees reported receiving subtle hints or being told quite directly during their tenure at XYZ that they had to change in some way or generally to modify their style. One manager reported that when she first arrived at XYZ, "people were constantly trying to mold me into an XYZ type of person." As a consequence, she said, "I've learned to be less emotional, friendly and outgoing. . . . I have changed a lot in the 13 years I'm here." Another manager described how he handled the differences between himself and his co-workers:

> That upsets me a lot when people don't say good morning or they don't talk to each other. But sometimes I bring it to other people, and they said, "Well, that's the way it is, you are just too sensitive." So, how do I deal with it, is I just try to say well that's something that I have to learn, myself, and don't let those things touch me so much, because it does affect me.

Although all newcomers into organizations go through a socialization process (Van Maanen, 1976, 1983), these quotes hint at the degree to which this experience can be particularly potent for those whose culture is different from the majority's.

Particular or unique experiences within the organization also led to some of the individual variations. For example, one person who was part of a research unit and reported being very well adjusted to its working style was very surprised during the group interview at others' reports of the difficulties they had faced as Hispanics and the differences they experienced from their co-workers. In considering her divergent experience, the manager attributed it to her relative isolation in a unit that operated very differently from others in the organization in terms of norms, procedures, and type of work.

An interesting aspect of individual variation had to do with the ways in which cultural features interacted with or were adapted to contextual factors. This was illustrated by some of the managers' replies to the question, What do you do when you have good news? Many responded that usually they immediately shared good news with their co-workers. When asked more directly about specific situations, however, it turned out that work-related information, for example about an upcoming promotion, was not so readily divulged. To explain this, one interviewee said, "You have to be careful." The managers were affected in this behavior by conditions at XYZ— promotions were few or infrequent—as well as by the resentment they sensed around them toward members of minority groups, especially those receiving promotions. Even though people orientation was still evident in the general inclination to interact with co-workers, the expression of this cultural feature was modified to meet situational demands.

Cultural Identity

Beyond looking for general patterns that characterized the group of Hispanic managers, we were interested in learning about how respondents thought about Hispanic cultural features. What level of awareness did the managers have of the existence of group-level patterns? To what extent did they see their individual styles as representative of or somehow related to such broader cultural patterns? What were the interviewees' images of "Hispanic culture" and its relationship to the workplace?

We found that even though many of the managers did have a sense of belonging to a larger group that shared more than simply a label and occasionally were able to relate their perspectives on the group's features, few managers explicitly labeled specific behavior patterns as "Hispanic." Overall their cultural identity tended to be somewhat fuzzy and ambiguous. Much of their sense of group-level characteristics focused on such attributes as accents or shared experiences of discrimination. In spite of frequent reports of feeling as if they did not fit in—as one man put it, "I for one will never be part of the old boys network"—the Hispanic managers found it difficult to pinpoint their source of discomfort.

Yet many were quite clear about their sense of being different from the other managers. For example, one manager said: "Sometimes [it's] a different you when at the job and away from the job." Another said that her "family wouldn't recognize me here," while explaining how difficult it was to talk about these issues after forcing herself not to think about them for 20 years. A third interviewee, explaining why he found little in common with the usual networks in the company, said, "The things which other people [at XYZ] think are important are not the same things I think are important." Thus much of the sense of commonality with other Hispanics tended to be conceived of in terms of difference from the dominant norms and from the dominant groups.

At the same time, this sense of opposition or difference led to an aversion and resistance to being stereotyped or typecast, together with a desire to disprove negative images of Hispanics they experienced as commonplace among Anglo co-workers. One manager, Daniel, described his views this way:

> My experience as a Hispanic is . . . atypical of most, I feel, only because people are surprised when they find that I am Puerto Rican or Hispanic because I don't look it, I don't act it. . . . So my appearance draws a comment, "Gee, I never would've known if you hadn't mentioned it to me."

After affirming that he does not see ethnicity as coming up in the "day-to-day business environment," Daniel went on to say:

> I view myself as a role model, the more people I come in contact with, both at work and out in industry, the better their image will become of Hispanics in general. . . . Too many people have a stereotypical view of what Hispanics are and I, just through normal day-to-day activity, contact, give them visible proof that . . . it's not necessarily true, it doesn't have to be the case. I don't seek to hide it or avoid it.

Daniel's view of Hispanic characteristics is based primarily on a caricature that he attributes to the members of other groups and that he would like to change. His role is to be the exception to that image. Even though he believes that ethnicity and culture are not relevant for understanding what happens in work situations, he seems to expend a good deal of energy in addressing these very issues. Thus for many of the managers the notion of making generalizations about the group had negative associations; the way to combat these was to avoid making categorical statements in the first place. To illustrate, Lucy, another manager, reported: "And I've been told very nicely, 'gee, you're Puerto Rican? You don't look Puerto Rican.' And my answer to that is, 'What do Puerto Ricans look like?'" Early in the group interview, Lucy also said, "I hate to be stereotyped. . . . You judge me for me, not what I am, and not what my cultural background is." For the Hispanic managers at XYZ, the consequence of feeling that they had to fight negative stereotypes was that they had difficulty in articulating positive and differentiated visions of what it meant to be Hispanic.

A factor contributing to this difficulty seemed to be the Hispanic managers' small numbers and their relative isolation within the organization. They rarely met as a group and even less frequently discussed the positive features that they had in common as Hispanics. Thus it was primarily when they met in the group interviews and they heard each other talk about their perspectives and experiences that their views of Hispanics as a group began to become more articulated and validated. Essentially, developing a cultural identity involved a shared process of discovery.

The predominant themes that characterized the Hispanic managers' emergent views of their group-level cultural features revolved around sensitivity to others and emotionality. When one participant in a group interview said, "I think as Hispanics we are more the touchy-feely type, we are more emotional," and later added "I think that perhaps, being Hispanics, we may be a little more compassionate," she elicited wide agreement within the group. Both preceding these statements and following them, many of the

other managers recounted situations that supported and illustrated these assertions. Nevertheless during this discussion one manager felt it necessary to ask: "Is that 'cause of our experience, or is it just because of us as individuals, 'cause, I don't know."

The clarity of the Hispanic managers' cultural identity could be enhanced by experiences that helped them make connections between their individual behavior and their identity as Hispanics in such a way that these generalizations were not value laden. Occasionally even interactions with Anglos could provide such an experience. An account provided during a group interview by Maria, a manager who had been at XYZ for over 10 years, helps illustrate this quite nicely:

> I went to Puerto Rico with a peer of mine. . . . She didn't want to read, so she would sit there for hours watching television and not knowing what they're saying. And at one point she looks at me and she goes, "Maria, I finally figured out why you are so outgoing and you talk with the hands and all. All of you are like that." I said, "I beg your pardon." She goes, "Yeah, you know, I always thought you were kind of friendly and everything. . . . You and [another Puerto Rican co-worker], when you talk you're always with the hands and everything, you're very expressive and emotional." I started laughing, but I said, "Wow, that's interesting." She goes, "All of you are like that," from watching TV. It wasn't a negative statement to her. She was just saying that she realized that it was all of us. . . . I started watching Puerto Rican television, and sure enough, the hands are going crazy.

Maria's narrative suggests that the connection between group-level cultural features and individual behavior was in many ways as surprising to Maria as it was to her Anglo co-worker. Simply being a Hispanic does not mean that one will see group-level patterns. Maria's experience also highlights how cultural features are often defined and interpreted in an intergroup context. Even though the trip to Puerto Rico helped both Maria and her co-worker better understand the Puerto Ricans at XYZ, Maria's behavior had a different flavor and was experienced quite differently in the context of XYZ than in Puerto Rico. Moreover her recounting of the event served to reinforce the emergent consensus during the group interview that Hispanics are perceived as emotional and that there is some truth to that.

In sum the Hispanic managers found it difficult to articulate a positive and differentiated vision of the cultural features associated with being Hispanic. When they were asked to talk about how ethnicity was relevant to their work, they usually talked about negative experiences, their attempts to combat stereotypes, or in somewhat vague terms, their differences from the people around them in the organization. It was only when they came together in

group discussions as Hispanics that they began, albeit with some resistance and still influenced by the stereotypical views held by their Anglo co-workers, to attribute some general features to themselves deriving from their group membership.

Ethnic Identity and the Experience of Ethnicity

A final objective of the study was to learn more about how the Hispanic managers thought about their ethnicity in the context of their work, beyond the issue of cultural features. More specifically, what was the range of ethnic identity represented among the managers, and how was this connected to their workplace experiences? In what ways did ethnicity arise as an issue in the course of work? These questions merit more extensive treatment than is possible in this chapter and so are addressed here only in broad, summary strokes.

Some of the issues related to ethnic identity are similar and quite related to those discussed in the previous section. While they had a broad range of views and experiences, in general, the Hispanic managers did not like to be stereotyped, and they did not want to feel that how they were treated—either positively or negatively—was connected to their ethnicity. At the same time, most of them valued being Hispanic and deeply desired positive recognition. They wanted to maintain their individuality but without losing their identity. Thus being identified as Hispanic could be problematic when it meant that they were being pigeon-holed or treated unfairly; however, this led many of them to de-emphasize their ethnicity in work situations and resulted in feeling somewhat stifled. Individually the managers included those not seeing ethnicity in any way as being an issue or impacting on their experience, those who saw it as quite problematic, those who felt quite positively about it, and finally those who expressed a great deal of pride yet were ambivalent about its impact on their XYZ experiences.

The Hispanic managers reported varied degrees of awareness of their ethnic background on the part of co-workers. A number of the respondents had Anglicized their names or had permitted co-workers to do so. Others reported only occasionally discussing their background on the job, but only in relation to personal matters—never in terms of how particular situations were handled. Their degree of self-identification as Hispanic also varied. It ranged from those who said that they had allowed the company to classify them as Hispanic essentially because they thought it might help the company but that they did not think of themselves in those terms, to those who were quite active in XYZ's Hispanic managers' association. Even among the latter

group, however, it was not considered appropriate to highlight that activity among co-workers.

Even though they expressed a preference for being treated as individuals, many of the Hispanic managers did not feel that they could blend in easily and reported difficulties when they had first joined the company. Indeed a number of managers told stories of being the butt of ethnic jokes or being the targets of discrimination. While they did not want to be categorized or singled out unfairly, they also wanted their background acknowledged and accepted. In some situations, for example those involving promotions or special recognition, many Hispanic managers reported that they could never be sure whether they were being treated as they were because of their particular individual features or because of their group membership. This was true both in positive and negative instances. One manager active in the Hispanic managers' association expressed it this way:

> Even though you consider yourself one of the guys, American, and a professional, a manager, you have a lot of different statuses outside your Hispanicity, people have subtle ways of letting you know that when they look at you they see a Señor first or a Hispanic first. Maybe not first, but at least . . . one of the first things, they look at you, and they say, "Well, he's a manager, but he's also a Hispanic." . . . I've been called Jose, and I've been called San Juan.

Much of the difficulty that many of the Hispanic managers experienced in reconciling their need for individualized treatment with the importance they gave to their ethnicity could be related to their adoption of a general view that sees ethnic identification as incompatible with individuality. As Lucy put it:

> I would not want to be put in a position that I could not handle, simply because I'm a Hispanic and I have to fill a quota. I'd resent that, cause you're not being fair to me. However, don't take anything away from me because I'm Hispanic. . . . And I think a good manager should just look at people as individuals.

In this statement Lucy seems to be accepting the idea that being an individual does not include being Hispanic. This is a view that seemed to be shared widely among the Hispanic managers. The difference among them was in how they handled the tension that it engendered. For a few it meant avoiding their ethnic identification altogether or seeing it as just an interesting fact. For another set of Hispanic managers it meant experiencing their role as involving disproving stereotyped views of the group. And finally for others

it meant feeling trapped in what they experienced as a constant struggle to maintain a positive sense of ethnic identity while being accepted within XYZ for their excellence as managers.

Conclusion

One of the major implications of the findings described in this chapter is that they highlight some of the ways in which the individual expression of group-level cultural features is modified by and interacts with other variables. Some of these include organizational demands, minority roles, specific situations, and both organizational and individual perceptions of ethnicity. For both the Hispanic managers at XYZ, as well as for organizational researchers, it is difficult to "see" culture at the individual level. Nevertheless, as the patterns we found indicate, group-level patterns are present in individual behavior. That we can abstract such group-level features, however, does not mean that we can then directly apply them back to individuals. The Hispanic managers at XYZ varied widely in their specific behavior and outlook, as well as in how they thought about culture.

Even though we could find characteristic patterns among the Hispanic managers, these had only some degree of correspondence with other accounts of Hispanic cultural features. Both researchers and managers must exercise care in the kinds of generalizations they make about specific individuals or subgroups of Hispanics from such accounts. Even though group-level findings can be quite useful in generating initial explanations for helping us understand individual behavior, they should be tested and verified.

Notes

1. Although the term *Hispanic* is used throughout this chapter, it should be noted that many members of this group now prefer to be called *Latinos* because this latter term better reflects their roots in and connection with the peoples and cultures of Latin America, as well as their blend of indigenous, African, and European influences.

2. The term *Anglo* is used broadly here to denote white, non-Hispanic Americans. Although it could be argued that this term is not fully apt for those many whites who are descendants of non-English immigrants, historians and sociologists have pointed to the predominant influence of middle-class, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon culture on the core culture of the United States (Feagin, 1989; Gordon, 1964). Moreover the term *Anglo*, when used in juxtaposition to *Hispanic*, is preferable to *white* because it highlights the ethnocultural, rather than racial, basis for the distinction.

3. Some patterns of behavior that are culturally based from an ethnographic perspective may not be obviously so to members of the group or may not be considered by in-group and out-group members as explicitly tied to ethnic group membership. In discussing this issue, Kochman (1987) distinguishes between emblematic and nonemblematic ethnic indicators: "Emblematic indicators are those racial and cultural features that serve an identity function or otherwise mark and maintain social boundaries" (p. 220) between in-group and out-group. These are features that in-group and/or out-group members will tend to think of as "ethnic." Nonemblematic indicators are those cultural patterns that do not serve such functions and of which in-group and out-group members may or may not be aware. As Kochman (1987) puts it, "outgroup members are too far removed from the context in which such distinctive ingroup cultural patterns are displayed. Ingroup members, on the other hand, are often too close to their own culture to be able to see it" (p. 224). (See also Ferdman, 1990).

4. This section is based largely on a similar but lengthier discussion in Ferdman (1990).

5. The company's name, as well as the names of specific managers, have been changed for reasons of confidentiality.

6. Workshops designed to improve black/white relations had been a part of such programs for a number of years; Hispanics felt that their identity and their culture were overlooked by the assumptions and format of these events. In particular they objected to being asked to choose one of the two groups, black or white, for same-race sessions. Hispanics considered themselves to be a third, distinct group not classifiable simply on the basis of race.

7. This list was compiled using the self-assigned employee racial codes contained in the company's personnel files.

8. At the time the research was conducted, XYZ had no senior-level Hispanic managers.

9. At XYZ, people of Portuguese background could choose to identify themselves as Hispanics.

10. Some examples of these keywords are: communication style, leadership style, working conditions, socialization process, perception of own ethnicity, ethnicity in relation to work group, and ethnicity in relation to organization.

References

Adler, N. J. (1983). Cross-cultural management research: The ostrich and the trend. *Academy of Management Review, 8,* 226-32.

Adler, N. J. (1991). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (2nd ed.). Boston: Kent.

Adler, N. J., Doktor, R., & Redding, S. G. (1986). From the Atlantic to the Pacific century: Cross-cultural management reviewed. *Journal of Management, 12,* 295-318.

Albert, R. D. (1986). Conceptual framework for the development and evaluation of cross-cultural orientation programs. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10,* 197-213.

Albert, R. D., & Triandis, H. C. (1985). Intercultural education for multicultural societies: Critical issues. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 9,* 319-337.

Black, J. S., & Mendenhall, M. (1990). Cross-cultural training effectiveness: A review and a theoretical framework for future research. *Academy of Management Review, 15,* 113-136.

Bochner, S. (1982). The social psychology of cross-cultural relations. In S. Bochner (Ed.), *Cultures in contact: Studies in cross-cultural interaction* (pp. 3-44). Oxford: Pergamon.

Brislin, R. W. (1981). *Cross-cultural encounters: Face-to-face interaction.* Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Brislin, R. W., Cushner, K., Cherrie, C., & Yong, M. (1986). *Intercultural interactions: A practical guide.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Buriel, R. (1987). Ethnic labeling and identity among Mexican Americans. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 134-52). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Comas-Díaz, L. (1989). Puerto Rican women's cross-cultural transitions: Developmental and clinical implications. In C. T. Garcia Coll & M. L. Mattei (Eds.), *The psychosocial development of Puerto Rican women* (pp. 166-199). New York: Praeger.

Cortina, R. J., & Moncada, A. (Eds.). (1988). *Hispanos en los Estados Unidos.* Madrid: Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana.

Cox, T. J., Lobel, S. A., & McLeod, P. L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative versus competitive behavior in a group task. *Academy of Management Journal, 34,* 827-847.

Davis, C., Haub, C., & Willete, J. L. (1988). U.S. Hispanics: Changing the face of America. In E. Acosta-Belén & B. Sjostrom (Eds.), *The Hispanic experience in the United States: Contemporary issues and perspectives* (pp. 3-55). New York: Praeger.

Feagin, J. R. (1989). *Racial and ethnic relations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ferdman, B. M. (1987). Evaluating people in intercultural interactions (Doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 49/04,* 1431B.

Ferdman, B. M. (1989). Affirmative action and the challenge of the color-blind perspective. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *Affirmative action in perspective* (pp. 169-176). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Ferdman, B. M. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review, 60,* 181-204.

Ferdman, B. M. (1992). The dynamics of ethnic diversity in organizations: Toward integrative models. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Issues, theory and research in industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 339-384). Amsterdam: North Holland.

Ferraro, G. P. (1990). *The cultural dimension of international business.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Flores, J. (1985). "Que assimilated, brother, yo soy asimilao": The structuring of Puerto Rican identity in the U.S. *Journal of Ethnic Studies, 13*(3), 1-16.

Ginorio, A. B. (1987). Puerto Rican ethnicity and conflict. In J. Boucher, D. Landis, & K. A. Clark (Eds.), *Ethnic conflict: International perspectives* (pp. 182-206). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Heller, M. (1987). The role of language in the formation of ethnic identity. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 180-200). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Herman, S. N. (1977). *Jewish identity: A social psychological perspective.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1984). Hofstede's culture dimensions: An independent validation using Rokeach's value survey. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15,* 417-433.

Hughes-Weiner, G. (1986). The "learning how to learn" approach to cross-cultural orientation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10,* 485-505.

Jones, J. M. (1988). Racism in black and white: A bicultural model of reaction and evolution. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 117-135). New York: Plenum.

Keefe, S. E. & Padilla, A. M. (1987). *Chicano ethnicity*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Klor de Alva, J. J. (1988). Telling Hispanics apart: Latino sociocultural diversity. In E. Acosta-Belén & B. Sjostrom (Eds.), *The Hispanic experience in the United States: Contemporary issues and perspectives* (pp. 107-136). New York: Praeger.

Kochman, T. (1981). *Black and white styles in conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kochman, T. (1987). The ethnic component in Black language and culture. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 219-238). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Landis, D. & Brislin, R. W. (Eds.). (1983a). *Handbook of intercultural training. Vol. 1: Issues in theory and design*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Landis, D. & Brislin, R. W. (Eds.). (1983b). *Handbook of intercultural training. Vol. 2: Issues in training methodology*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Laurent, A. (1983). The cultural diversity of Western conceptions of management. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 8*(1/2), 75-96.

Marger, M. N. (1991). *Race and ethnic relations: American and global perspectives* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Marín, G. & Triandis, H. C. (1985). Allocentrism as an important characteristic of the behavior of Latin Americans and Hispanics. In R. Guerrero (Ed.), *Cross-cultural and national studies in social psychology* (pp. 85-104). New York: Elsevier North-Holland.

Moore, J. & Pachon, H. (1985). *Hispanics in the United States*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Nelson, C., & Tienda, M. (1988). The structuring of Hispanic ethnicity: Historical and contemporary perspectives. In R. D. Alba (Ed.), *Ethnicity and race in the U.S.A.: Toward the twenty-first century* (pp. 49-74). New York: Routledge.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 499-514.

Ramirez, A. (1988). Racism toward Hispanics: The culturally monolithic society. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 137-158). New York: Plenum.

Royce, A. P. (1982). *Ethnic identity: Strategies of diversity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Safa, H. I. (1988). Migration and identity: A comparison of Puerto Rican and Cuban migrants in the United States. In E. Acosta-Belén & B. Sjostrom (Eds.), *The Hispanic experience in the United States: Contemporary issues and perspectives* (pp. 137-150). New York: Praeger.

Shaw, J. B. (1990). A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural management. *Academy of Management Review, 15*, 626-645.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup relations. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: John Wiley.

Triandis, H. C., Kashima, Y., Hui, C. H., Lisansky, J., & Marín, G. (1982). Acculturation and biculturalism indices among relatively acculturated Hispanic young adults. *Revista Interamericana de Psicologia, 16*(2), 140-149.

Triandis, H. C., Marín, G., Hui, C. H., Lisansky, J., & Ottati, V. (1984). Role perceptions of Hispanic young adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15*, 297-320.

Triandis, H. C., Marín, G., Lisansky, J., & Betancourt, H. (1984). *Simpatía* as a cultural script of Hispanics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*, 1363-1375.

Van Maanen, J. (1976). Breaking in: Socialization to work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of work, organization, and society* (pp. 67-130). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Van Maanen, J. (1983). People processing: Strategies of organizational socialization. In R. W. Allen & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Organizational influence processes* (pp. 240-259). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.