Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

# From Distance to Rupture to Bridging: Linguistic–Cultural Risk Mapping and Data-Intelligent Governance Mechanisms in Chinese Enterprises' Expansion into Latin America

Xin Wei
College of International Studies, Shenzhen University

**Author Note**

The author declares no conflicts of interest to disclose. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Xin Wei, College of International Studies, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, Guangdong 518060, China. Email: profeweixin@szu.edu.cn

**Abstract**

In the course of Chinese enterprises accelerating their expansion into Latin American markets, capital and productive capacity have achieved an unprecedented hard landing, yet language and culture are increasingly emerging as an implicit soft barrier. Existing studies mostly focus on institutional environment, political risk and macro-level strategic deployment, while discussions of linguistic and cultural factors tend to remain at a principled level and have not yet formed a systematic framework that can be incorporated into enterprise risk management systems. Adopting a conceptual research design, this study develops an analytical framework and a governance model to address this gap. Building on a review of research on language in international business and on language risk, this article establishes linguistic–cultural risk as an independent risk category and identifies four interrelated risk domains: institutional–compliance, organizational–coordination, market–narrative and data–algorithmic risk. The article introduces the dynamic analytical framework of distance–rupture–bridging and, from the perspectives of linguistic distance, distance in cultural memory and cognitive–narrative distance, constructs a linguistic–cultural risk map for Chinese enterprises entering Latin America. Further, the article conceptualizes generative artificial intelligence and intelligent language services as a new form of infrastructure for data-intelligent language governance, and proposes a closed-loop governance mechanism of identification–assessment–early warning–intervention–review, together with corresponding pathways for organizational embedding at the strategic, functional, project and cooperation levels. It argues that upgrading linguistic and cultural factors from a soft issue to a measurable and manageable, independent risk category not only helps enhance the business resilience of Chinese enterprises operating in Latin America, but also offers new theoretical perspectives and practical directions for the language services industry's transformation from translation processing to risk-oriented language governance, and for foreign language education's shift from single language competence cultivation to a tripartite curricular system of language

Received 21 June 2025, Revised 26 July 2025, Accepted 15 December 2025.

**Citation:** Wei, X. (2025). From Distance to Rupture to Bridging: Linguistic–Cultural Risk Mapping and Data-Intelligent Governance Mechanisms in Chinese Enterprises' Expansion into Latin America. *Journal of Language*, *1(2)*, 32-67. https://doi.org/10.64699/25ODMK2092

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

competence + risk literacy + data-intelligent tool literacy.
*Keywords:* Chinese enterprises going global, Latin America, linguistic and cultural risk, intelligent language services, data-intelligent governance

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Macro Context and Practical Dilemmas: Capital Hard Landing and Linguistic–Cultural Soft Barriers

In recent years, ties between China and Latin America in the fields of trade, investment, and capacity cooperation have continued to deepen. Chinese enterprises have been steadily expanding their presence in infrastructure construction, energy transition, and the digital economy, thereby weaving a multi-level, multi-industry network of economic and trade relations (Lou, 2024). At the macro level, Chinese companies have achieved a marked hard landing of capital and productive capacity in Latin America, becoming an important force in driving local industrial upgrading and improving infrastructure conditions.

In sharp contrast, the soft landing at the level of language and culture has significantly lagged behind (Rouvinski, 2024). Most Latin American countries designate Spanish or Portuguese as their official language, and in some areas, these co-exist with multiple indigenous languages, forming a complex multilingual ecology. Enterprises interacting with government agencies, financial institutions, labor unions, and communities must navigate multilayered linguistic regimes and historical memories. Colonial history, North–South asymmetries, and disputes over development models together constitute a deeply sedimented narrative distance, such that the same set of discourses—understood in China as "win–win cooperation" or "infrastructure-driven development"—may be interpreted by some Latin American social groups as new dependency or resource extraction, sowing seeds of potential cognitive conflict (Janna, 2025).

Research in international business and cross-cultural management has long shown that

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

language is not a neutral communication tool, but deeply embedded in organizational power structures, trust relations, and knowledge flows (Brannen et al., 2014). Choices of language and differences in language proficiency subtly shape who is entitled to speak, who controls information, and who is excluded from decision-making cores. For Chinese enterprises venturing into Latin America, such asymmetries at the linguistic level can aggregate into systemic risks across multiple links, including contract negotiations, compliance communication, internal management, and external public opinion.

Despite this, domestic studies on Chinese enterprises "going global" still tend to subsume linguistic and cultural factors under soft skills or localization, often remaining at the level of exhortations such as "attach importance" or "strengthen", without developing an analytical framework embedded within enterprise risk management systems. Particularly in the Latin American context, policy reports and academic works often use broad categories like "political risk" or "social risk" to describe phenomena such as community protests, media controversies, and contractual disputes, rarely examining to what extent these are triggered or amplified by linguistic misalignment, narrative collisions, or cultural misinterpretation (Atlantic Council, 2024).

Simultaneously, machine translation, large language models (LLMs), and other intelligent technologies are rapidly proliferating in cross-linguistic communication. On the one hand, they significantly reduce cross-language communication costs and provide technical support for SMEs going global with leaner configurations. On the other hand, they generate new sources of risk, such as overreliance on automatic translation, diffusion of algorithmic bias, and lack of rigorous human review of critical texts. Preventing techno-optimism in solving language problems from sliding into a paradox where technologies amplify risk is becoming a shared managerial and industry challenge.

Against this backdrop, this article seeks to address three core questions:

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

**RQ1:** How can the linguistic and cultural issues encountered by Chinese enterprises in Latin America be abstracted from scattered phenomena into identifiable and classifiable linguistic–cultural risks?

**RQ2:** How can we construct a risk map with both explanatory power and operational value that presents the logic of risk generation and evolution through the lens of distance–rupture–bridging?

**RQ3:** In an era of rapidly developing data-intelligent technologies, how can we design a governance mechanism for linguistic – cultural risk that balances technological capabilities with organizational governance?

### 1.2 Clarification of Core Concepts and Research Questions

To avoid conceptual conflation and theoretical vagueness, this article clarifies several key concepts.

First, linguistic–cultural risk. This is defined as the composite set of risks in cross-border operations whereby language differences, mismatched discursive conventions and cultural cognitive biases lead to information distortion, erosion of trust, flawed decision-making and reputational damage (Brannen et al., 2014; Tenzer et al., 2014). Compared with traditional political risk or legal risk, linguistic–cultural risk is both a distinct category and highly coupled with other types of risk: it often plays the role of an amplifier or trigger embedded in political events, compliance disputes and social conflicts (Harzing & Pudelko, 2013).

Second, distance. Rather than understanding distance simply as quantifiable linguistic distance or scores on cultural dimensions, this article distinguishes three interwoven dimensions:

Linguistic distance: differences between the enterprise’s dominant language and the

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

host-country language in terms of structure, domains of use and symbolic status (Dow & Karunaratna, 2006);

Distance in cultural memory: differences in the long-term narrative practices within the two societies concerning history, development models and the image of the Other (Shenkar, 2001; Zaheer et al., 2012);

Cognitive–narrative distance: differences in how media, elite discourse and policy documents frame the meaning of cooperation projects (Ocasio et al., 2015).

Third, data-intelligent governance mechanism. This is understood as a comprehensive governance arrangement that takes data and intelligent algorithms as its foundation and organizational processes and institutional arrangements as its carriers (Mikalef & Gupta, 2021). It encompasses not only technical components such as terminology management, translation and revision, and discourse monitoring, but also institutional design elements such as language strategy formulation, allocation of responsibilities and cross-departmental coordination (Piekkari et al., 2014).

## 2. Theoretical Foundations: From Distance to Rupture

### 2.1 Language in International Business: From Tool to Structure

In Early research in international business tended to treat language as a neutral instrument for transmitting information, focusing mainly on the impact of language proficiency on negotiation efficiency and communication costs. As multinational corporations have become more networked, teams more diverse, and global value chains more complex, language has gradually shifted from being an ancillary variable to an important lens for analysing organizational structures and power relations (Brannen et al., 2014).

On the one hand, when firms choose a corporate language and a working language, they are in fact delineating who is central and who is peripheral (Piekkari et al., 2014). Those

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

who command the dominant language are more likely to influence agenda-setting and to control the interpretation of information (Neeley et al., 2012). On the other hand, translation practices in multilingual environments are not a neutral intermediary, but a critical site where informational content and affective tone may be reshaped (Pym, 2025). In the Latin American context, the movement between Spanish/Portuguese and English or Chinese involves not only lexical equivalence, but also issues of political sensitivity, politeness strategies and social identity, among many other factors.

Therefore, a view of language as merely a communication tool is no longer sufficient to explain the complexities of cross-border business operations. This article argues that it is necessary to introduce a language risk perspective into research on language in international business, and to regard language as a structural factor that may lead to information distortion, power imbalances and erosion of trust (Tenzer et al., 2014).

### 2.2 Language Risk: Conceptual Evolution and Typology

In terms of conceptual evolution, language risk first appeared mainly in legal and compliance contexts, referring primarily to legal risks arising from vague contractual wording or divergent understandings of clauses. With the development of research on cross-border team collaboration and global supply chains, the meaning of language risk has gradually expanded to encompass internal communication, knowledge transfer, team conflict and leadership, among other domains (Harzing & Pudelko, 2013).

Synthesizing existing studies, language risk can at least be divided into the following categories:

**Institutional–compliance risk**: misinterpretation of laws, standards and policy documents that may result in incomplete compliance or misjudgement of regulatory red lines (Salacuse, 2003);

**Organizational–coordination risk**: significantly increased coordination costs

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

between departments and regions—and even decision-making delays—caused by differences in language proficiency, information asymmetries or translation errors (Tenzer & Pudelko, 2017);

**Market–narrative risk**: misreading of brand names, advertising slogans and corporate narratives in the target society, triggering media controversies, public outcry or boycotts;

**Data–algorithmic risk**: overreliance on the outputs of machine translation and large language models, in the absence of rigorous human review and local contextual judgement, leading to severe mistranslations or ambiguities in sensitive settings (Vieira et al., 2021; Asscher & Glikson, 2023).

These types of risk often intersect in real-world situations and are difficult to identify separately in advance. To incorporate them into a systematic risk management framework, it is necessary to construct a higher-order analytical model capable of encompassing the above-mentioned risk types.

### 2.3 Linguistic–Cultural Specificities and Structural Distance in the Latin American Context

Compared with other regions, Latin America exhibits several linguistic–cultural features that merit special attention:

First, there is a coexistence of relative surface-level linguistic unity and deep-level diversity. At the level of official languages, Spanish and Portuguese cover the vast majority of countries, which appears to lower the linguistic threshold for cross-border deployment by enterprises. At the level of deep practice, however, countries differ significantly in phonology, vocabulary, register and discursive conventions, and many states maintain indigenous languages in important positions within judicial, educational and community spheres, resulting in a configuration of surface unity and deep diversity (Lipski, 2008). Over 400

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

distinct indigenous languages thrive in Latin America today, with languages such as Quechua, Guaraní, and Nahuatl holding official status in several countries (Mar-Molinero, 2000).

Second, there are pronounced tensions between historical memory and development narratives. Colonial history, Cold War memories and global North–South relations make Latin American societies highly sensitive to foreign capital and major power involvement (Lasso, 2007; Quijano, 2000). In such a context, expressions such as win–win cooperation and community of shared future, which are viewed as positive terms within the Chinese discursive system, may be perceived by some Latin American audiences as requiring more contextualized explanation in order not to be equated with the rhetoric of previous external actors.

Third, there is a marked gap between elite discourse and popular public opinion. In government documents and high-level dialogues, diplomatic rhetoric and economic–trade cooperation discourse are often highly professionalized, whereas at the community level, on social media and among grassroots organizations, discussion around specific projects tends to focus on employment, the environment, land and cultural identity. If enterprises confine themselves to technical communication at the elite level while neglecting the broader arena of public opinion, they are prone to producing a situation in which communication appears smooth at the top but fractured at the grassroots in linguistic–cultural terms.

Under the influence of these features, Chinese enterprises in Latin America face a multidimensional form of distance: not only visible linguistic distance (West & Graham, 2004), but also implicit distances in historical memory and narrative frameworks. Only by fully revealing the structural significance of these distances at the theoretical level can we further explain the recurrent communicative ruptures observed in practice.

## 3. Constructing a Linguistic–Cultural Risk Map: The Distance–Rupture–Bridging Analytical Framework

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

This study is primarily a theory-building and framework-design inquiry. Rather than estimating or predicting risks through quantitative modelling, it seeks to construct a conceptual map and a governance model of linguistic–cultural risk in Chinese enterprises' engagement with Latin America. The aim is to clarify how risks emerge, how they evolve, and how they can be governed, instead of measuring their statistical frequency or probability.

### 3.1 Risk Dimensions and Situational Typology

To systematize the complex and diverse forms of linguistic–cultural risk, this article constructs the basic dimensions of a risk map from three angles: situation–actor–consequence. This logic is compatible with mainstream enterprise risk management frameworks, which similarly start from contexts/events, risk owners and impact profiles, and thereby facilitates integration of linguistic–cultural risk into existing risk registers.

**Situational dimension**: this includes policy communication (interactions with governments and regulatory bodies), business negotiation (interactions with partners and suppliers), community communication (interactions with local residents and social organizations), and media narratives (interactions with traditional media and social media platforms), among others. In practice, these situations differ in stakes, time pressure and public visibility: policy communication and major negotiations tend to be high-stakes and low-tolerance for error, whereas community interaction and social media exchanges are often more frequent and diffuse but can rapidly escalate into reputational crises.

**Actor dimension**: this includes headquarters management, local subsidiary teams, local partners, professional language service providers and intelligent language tools. Each actor occupies a distinct position in the information and decision chain: headquarters teams often control strategic narratives and contractual language; local subsidiaries and partners mediate those narratives on the ground; language professionals and intelligent tools handle

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

textual and oral mediation; and regulators, media and communities react to the resulting actions and messages. Mapping who speaks, who translates, who approves and who bears responsibility is thus a precondition for attributing and managing risk.

**Consequence dimension**: this ranges from the informational level (misunderstandings, delays in information flow), to the relational level (erosion of trust, escalation of conflict), and up to the institutional level (compliance failures, project obstruction). Informational consequences are often the earliest and easiest to detect (e.g. repeated clarification emails, inconsistent documents); relational consequences are reflected in deteriorating cooperation climates, increased reliance on back channels, or growing scepticism among stakeholders; institutional consequences involve formal sanctions, investigations or project suspensions, and are typically where linguistic–cultural risk fully materializes as political, legal or financial loss.

On this basis, linguistic–cultural risks can be grouped into several core categories, such as misinterpretation of institutional documents, internal communication rupture, misalignment of public narratives, and amplified mis-translation through algorithms. These categories cut across situations and actors—for example, misinterpretation of regulatory texts may involve headquarters legal teams, local counsel and external translators, while public narrative misalignment may centre on marketing departments, PR agencies and online influencers. The typology therefore lays the groundwork for subsequent cartographic representation and for aligning linguistic–cultural risk with existing operational and legal risk domains.

An important refinement is to overlay the three forms of distance identified earlier—linguistic distance, distance in cultural memory and cognitive–narrative distance—onto the situation–actor–consequence grid. For instance, a relatively low linguistic distance but high narrative distance (as may occur between Chinese and Latin American actors communicating

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

in English or Spanish) can still generate severe misunderstandings in the framing of development, environment or sovereignty. Conversely, high linguistic distance combined with dense networks of trusted intermediaries may produce fewer ruptures than one would expect from macro-level indicators alone. This multi-layered mapping helps to avoid simplistic assumptions that more distance automatically translates into more risk, and instead directs attention to the specific configurations of distance, actors and situations that are most hazardous.

### 3.2 Distance–Rupture–Bridging: The Dynamic Pathway of Risk Generation

Building on the risk map, this article introduces the distance–rupture–bridging framework to model dynamically the generation and evolution of linguistic–cultural risk. This framework complements static measures of cultural or linguistic distance commonly used in international business research (West & Graham, 2004; Dow & Karunaratna, 2006) by explicitly tracing how latent differences translate into observable incidents over time.

**Distance stage**

At the initial stages of project launch or market entry, there exist multiple latent distances between the enterprise and the host country, including differences in language use habits, historical memories, discursive frames and value orientations. These distances may not be salient in day-to-day interactions, where goodwill and routine procedures can temporarily mask misunderstandings. Yet, as macro-level studies on language distance and FDI or trade volatility suggest (Ly et al., 2018; Tenzer et al., 2017), such structural misalignments reduce the margin for error and make shocks more likely to propagate across borders. In the Latin American setting, for example, legacies of colonialism and dependency (Quijano, 2000) may colour how terms like development or modernization are heard, even when no overt disagreement is voiced at the outset.

**Rupture stage**

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

When confronted with high-intensity situations—such as major negotiations, project approvals, emergencies or public opinion crises—latent distances may, through a specific trigger, transform into manifest ruptures. Triggers can be lexical (a term whose legal meaning differs in the two systems), symbolic (images or slogans linked to traumatic memories), procedural (perceived bypassing of customary consultation channels), or technological (a machine-translated statement that inadvertently conveys disrespect). At this point, linguistic–cultural risk shifts from a static background condition to a dynamic event: actors experience a breakdown in mutual intelligibility, begin to question each other's intentions, and may mobilize legal or political resources to defend their positions.

From a managerial perspective, the rupture stage corresponds to incident detection and first response in risk management. Precisely because the root causes lie in long-standing distances, ad hoc PR statements or simple clarifications often fail to fully restore trust. The framework therefore encourages managers to treat ruptures as symptoms of deeper misalignment rather than isolated communication errors.

**Bridging stage**

In the face of an already manifest rupture, enterprises can pursue bridging through multiple pathways. Social forms of bridging include bringing in professional language and cultural mediators, re-opening channels of dialogue with community leaders, or revising contractual language in ways that acknowledge local concerns (Pym, 2025). Technological forms of bridging involve using discourse and public opinion monitoring, sentiment analysis and corpus tracing to gauge how messages are being received across different linguistic communities, and to adjust subsequent communication accordingly. Recent advances in cross-lingual sentiment analysis and multimodal monitoring of social media (Vilares et al., 2017) highlight both the potential and the challenges of this strategy: while it is possible to track issue salience and affect across languages, preserving fine-grained cultural nuances

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

remains difficult.

The distance–rupture–bridging framework thus elevates linguistic–cultural risk from a series of isolated incidents to a traceable evolutionary trajectory. It links macro-level structures (historical narratives, linguistic systems) with meso-level organizational choices (language policies, staffing, reliance on technology) and micro-level events (specific misunderstandings, tweets or press conferences). By making these linkages explicit, the framework helps enterprises undertake risk anticipation at the front end—asking where do our distances lie, and under what conditions might they turn into ruptures?—and experience-based review at the back end—asking which bridging strategies worked, for whom, and why?.

### 3.3 Conceptual Approach to Constructing a Linguistic–Cultural Risk Map

The linguistic–cultural risk map proposed in this study is not generated through large-scale data mining or algorithmic modelling. Instead, it is derived from a structured qualitative synthesis of existing academic research, policy reports and publicly documented cases. Through iterative comparison and abstraction, recurrent patterns of situations, triggers, linguistic manifestations and consequences are identified and organized into an analytical framework. The map therefore functions as a theory-driven interpretive device, rather than as a statistically predictive tool. Based on the above framework, this article proposes a general approach to constructing a linguistic–cultural risk map for Chinese enterprises expanding into Latin America.

#### Clarifying dimensions and designing a coding framework

Drawing on a comprehensive review of existing research, policy reports and publicly available cases, the study distils basic coding units such as situation, actor, triggering event, linguistic manifestation, type of distance and consequence. Each unit is operationalized through a set of indicators: for instance, situation may be coded by formality level, time pressure and audience scope; linguistic manifestation by the presence of contested terms,

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

silence, hedging or emotional expressions; and distance type by references to history, identity or institutional norms. A transparent coding manual helps ensure inter-coder reliability and enables comparisons across countries and sectors.

**Classifying and abstracting event materials**

Instances of linguistic–cultural conflict found in news reports, interview data and enterprises' internal summaries are classified, not by detailing the specific firms and projects involved, but by abstracting them into a set of event templates, such as semantic ambiguity in contract clauses → dispute over responsibility, omission of sensitive clauses in translation → regulatory suspicion, and brand naming evokes cultural associations → public opinion storm. This strategy is consistent with best practices in legal and compliance-oriented language risk assessment, which seek to identify recurring patterns of vulnerability without exposing confidential firm-level information.

**Linking templates to distance and governance variables**

Each event template is then linked back to the underlying distances and governance arrangements: Which forms of distance were salient? Which actors were involved? Was there a language policy or terminology system in place? Were intelligent language tools used, and if so, how? This relational coding makes it possible to see whether certain combinations—for example, high narrative distance plus heavy reliance on raw machine translation in community communication—systematically correlate with more severe consequences.

**Visual representation of the risk map**

Nodes in the map are constructed along the axes of situation–trigger–form of rupture–consequence, while edges are constructed around types of distance and bridging strategies, thereby producing a visualized risk spectrum (Aven, 2016; Hollnagel et al., 2015). This map does not aim to provide precise numerical probabilities of risk, but rather serves as a cognitive tool for enterprises to identify potential risks and design governance mechanisms.

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

In practice, such maps can be embedded into digital dashboards (Fraser & Simkins, 2021) that integrate real-time data—e.g. media sentiment indicators or internal incident reports—so that managers can track whether the organization is moving closer to or further from known risk patterns.

In this way, linguistic–cultural risk ceases to be an elusive and ill-defined notion. Instead, it can be systematically presented in the form of a map, connected to concrete organizational variables, and incorporated into enterprises' risk discussions and decision-making processes. While the proposed data-intelligent governance framework offers a systematic way to manage linguistic–cultural risk, its practical implementation is subject to several constraints. These include the financial and organizational costs of building language infrastructure, the difficulty of cross-departmental coordination, and the limitations of current AI tools in handling multilingual and culturally sensitive contexts, especially in the highly diverse linguistic environment of Latin America. These constraints suggest that the framework should be understood as a guiding architecture rather than a turnkey solution, and that its application will require contextual adaptation and gradual organizational learning.

## 4. Data-Intelligent Governance Mechanisms: From Ad Hoc Translation to Embedded Language Governance

### 4.1 Intelligent Language Services: A New Infrastructure for Risk Governance

Against the backdrop of the rapid development of generative artificial intelligence and large language models (Bommasani et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2023), intelligent language services are evolving from auxiliary tools into a form of core infrastructure for enterprises going global. National and regional initiatives to build intelligent language service platforms—such as language resource centres for Belt and Road languages and programmes in digital and intelligent language services in South China—explicitly frame language

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

technologies as part of the basic infrastructure for international cooperation and trade.

For Chinese firms expanding into Latin America, technologies such as machine translation, intelligent writing, and speech recognition and synthesis can, to some extent, alleviate language gaps and enhance communication efficiency. They lower entry barriers for small and medium-sized enterprises, allow rapid generation of multilingual drafts and support 24/7 monitoring of diverse information sources.

However, if these technologies are viewed merely as faster and cheaper substitutes for translation, while issues such as training corpora, algorithmic bias and sensitivity to context are ignored, new linguistic–cultural risks are likely to accumulate imperceptibly. Recent work on cross-lingual analytics shows that model performance varies widely across languages and domains (Adelani et al., 2021), and that subtle shifts in sentiment or politeness are especially hard to capture. In Latin America, where national and regional varieties of Spanish and Portuguese co-exist with indigenous languages and hybrid online registers, domain mismatch between training data and actual usage can easily lead to misreadings of public opinion or misphrasings of sensitive statements.

Moreover, as industry practice in legal and financial translation warns, even small inaccuracies in wording can have outsized legal effects; language risk in contracts and regulatory filings is increasingly recognized as a form of operational and legal risk requiring proactive control (Cao, 2007; Pym, 2025). In this context, relying uncritically on GenAI outputs in high-stakes settings—without robust human review and clear allocation of responsibility—effectively shifts risk from visible labour costs to less visible but potentially much larger compliance and reputational losses.

Therefore, this article argues that intelligent language services should be incorporated into enterprises' overall risk governance architecture, with their functional role clearly defined at each stage of identification–assessment–early warning–intervention–review, rather

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

than being simply outsourced to external vendors or relegated to isolated technical departments. The key is to treat intelligent language services not as stand-alone apps, but as socio-technical systems (Orlikowski & Scott, 2008) whose design, usage rules and oversight mechanisms are themselves objects of governance.

### 4.2 A Closed-Loop Governance Mechanism of Identification–Assessment–Early Warning–Intervention–Review

Building on the linguistic–cultural risk map, this article proposes the following data-intelligent closed-loop governance mechanism:

**Risk identification**

By means of multilingual corpus construction, cross-lingual sentiment analysis and discourse pattern recognition, enterprises can continuously monitor policy texts, media reports and discussions on social platforms, identify potential sensitive issues and risk triggers, and provide early-warning signals for upstream decision-making. In the Latin American context, this may involve tracking debates on infrastructure, environment, labour rights or sovereignty across Spanish- and Portuguese-language media, as well as monitoring how Chinese projects are framed in comparison with those of other foreign actors. Advances in cross-lingual and multimodal sentiment analysis (Vilares et al., 2017)—combining text, images and videos—offer promising tools for such monitoring, while also underlining the importance of human validation in ambiguous or culturally charged cases.

**Risk assessment**

Drawing on the risk map, internal assessment sheets can be developed which, by combining event type, actors involved and possible consequences, categorize the levels of linguistic–cultural risk across different projects and communicative scenarios, and thereby support contingency planning at high, medium and low levels. Such sheets can be aligned with overall enterprise risk matrices and can include both inherent risk (based on distance

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

indicators, stakeholder complexity and issue sensitivity) and residual risk (after taking existing governance measures into account). Systematic language risk assessment frameworks in the translation and legal sectors already provide examples of how such scoring can be implemented in practice (Pym, 2025).

**Risk early warning**

At critical junctures when public opinion is rapidly intensifying or negotiations have reached an impasse, automated public-opinion monitoring tools and multilingual discourse analysis models can be deployed to track sentiment trends and issue evolution in real time, thereby providing timely and actionable information for management. For example, alerts can be generated when negative sentiment around a project exceeds a predetermined threshold, when certain keywords associated with protest or litigation begin to cluster, or when discrepancies emerge between official narratives and grassroots discourse. Early-warning outputs should be routed not only to PR teams, but also to legal, compliance and local management units, so that responses can be coordinated rather than fragmented.

**Risk intervention**

At the technical level, terminology management, sensitive-word screening, multi-version comparison and human–machine collaborative review can be used to improve the semantic precision and cultural appropriateness of key texts. Shared multilingual terminology bases—covering legal, financial, technical and socio-political terms—can reduce ambiguity and support consistent framing across documents and platforms. At the organizational level, positions such as language-and-culture advisor or localization coordinator can be established to strengthen cross-departmental coordination and local embeddedness. These roles should have clear mandates, direct access to decision-makers and the authority to halt or revise communication that poses unacceptable risk.

**Risk review**

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

Linguistic–cultural conflict incidents that have already occurred can be systematically reviewed, converted into structured cases, and used to update the risk map and refine assessment indicators, thereby enabling enterprises to deepen their understanding of the Latin American context and enhance their response capacity through ongoing learning. Review procedures should document not only what went wrong at the surface level (e.g. a problematic phrase), but also which distances, organizational blind spots and technological limitations contributed to the incident (Vanmassenhove et al., 2021; Savoldi et al., 2021). Lessons learned can then feed back into training, tool selection, terminology policies and stakeholder engagement strategies.

This closed-loop mechanism emphasizes translations that can be verified, algorithms that can be explained, and processes that can be traced. At the level of translations, there should be clear sources of reference and version histories; at the algorithmic level, interpretable rules and threshold settings; at the process level, well-defined chains of responsibility and review mechanisms. Together, these features serve to enhance the transparency and controllability of overall governance, and to align intelligent language services with broader regulatory expectations around algorithmic accountability and data governance (Wachter et al., 2017).

### 4.3 Organizational Embedding and Governance Scenarios: From Translation Posts to Language Governance Units

For the above mechanisms to be effectively implemented, organizational structures and process design are crucial. At least the following modes of embedding can be considered:

**Strategic level**

Linguistic–cultural risk should be incorporated into the enterprise's overall risk management framework, with a dedicated linguistic–cultural risk module established alongside political risk and legal risk, and special assessments conducted prior to major

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

investment decisions. Board-level risk committees and senior management should receive regular briefings on linguistic–cultural risk exposure in key markets, and performance indicators—such as the frequency and severity of language-related incidents—can be included in enterprise-wide risk dashboards (Fraser & Simkins, 2021).

**Functional level**

At headquarters or regional hubs, cross-departmental language and culture governance groups can be created, bringing together representatives from legal affairs, public affairs, human resources, local subsidiaries and language service professionals, thus breaking the isolation of traditional translation departments (Piekkari et al., 2014). These groups can oversee language policy development, approve major terminology decisions, coordinate training plans and supervise the procurement and evaluation of intelligent language tools. Their remit should explicitly include Latin American markets, where the interplay of language, politics and social contestation is particularly pronounced.

**Project level**

For major projects, a clearly designated language governance lead can be appointed to coordinate translation resources, terminology management, local media communication and community engagement, ensuring a healthy interaction between technological tools and human judgement. Project-level language governance plans can specify which documents and interactions require mandatory human review, which can rely on machine assistance, and how feedback from local stakeholders will be collected and acted upon. This helps to avoid the common situation in which language tasks are informally assigned to whoever speaks some Spanish without clear recognition, support or authority.

**Cooperation level**

Long-term partnerships can be established with professional language service providers, local universities and research institutes. Through joint R&D, multilingual corpus

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

sharing and talent-training initiatives, enterprises can elevate their case-based experience into reusable knowledge assets. In recent years, Chinese and Latin American institutions have begun to explore intelligent language service cooperation under broader Belt and Road and South–South frameworks; connecting corporate practices with these emerging platforms can help both sides co-develop standards, tools and curricula that respond to real-world risk governance needs.

Through such forms of organizational embedding, linguistic–cultural risk governance no longer relies on a handful of employees who know foreign languages or on ad hoc outsourcing. Instead, it becomes a systemic capability that runs through the entire process of strategy formulation, project implementation and brand building. More importantly, it creates the institutional space in which data-intelligent tools and human expertise can be combined in a principled way—leveraging automation for scale and speed, while reserving critical judgement and responsibility for human actors who understand both the Latin American context and the broader strategic interests of Chinese enterprises.

## 5. Discussion

Returning to the three research questions posed in the introduction, this section discusses how the article responds to each in turn, and situates these responses in the broader literature on language in international business, linguistic security and intelligent language services.

### 5.1 Addressing RQ1: From Scattered Phenomena to a Distinct Category of Linguistic–Cultural Risk

The first research question asks how the linguistic and cultural issues encountered by Chinese enterprises in Latin America can be abstracted from scattered phenomena into identifiable and classifiable linguistic–cultural risks.

Existing research on language in international business has convincingly shown that

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

language is not a neutral conduit but a structural factor that shapes power, identity and knowledge flows in multinational corporations. Feely and Harzing's work on language barriers, for example, demonstrates how language choices affect HQ–subsidiary relations, status hierarchies and information asymmetries (Feely & Harzing, 2003; Harzing & Feely, 2008). More recent syntheses highlight the multifaceted role of language across strategy, organization and performance (Tenzer, Terjesen & Harzing, 2017), yet they still treat language issues as a broad analytical background rather than as a distinct category of risk.

This article advances the debate in three ways. First, it elevates linguistic–cultural factors from a diffuse background condition to an independent risk category. By defining linguistic–cultural risk as a composite of information distortion, trust erosion, decision failures and reputational damage caused by language differences, discursive misalignment and cultural misperception, the article renders language analytically commensurable with political, legal and financial risk. This resonates with emerging Chinese scholarship on linguistic security in trade and the Belt and Road, which similarly argues that language-related threats are often more concealed yet no less consequential than traditional economic or geopolitical risks (Li, 2015).

Second, the typology of four interrelated risk domains—institutional–compliance, organizational–coordination, market–narrative and data–algorithmic risk—provides a structured lens through which phenomena that are usually treated separately can be analysed together. In existing work, contract misinterpretation, internal communication breakdowns and branding mishaps are often studied in different sub-fields; here they are reassembled as manifestations of a common underlying mechanism: the ways in which language and culture mediate meanings, expectations and responsibilities. This responds directly to the first research question by offering a coherent vocabulary and set of categories that managers and researchers can use to name and compare linguistic–cultural risks across cases.

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

Third, by embedding the notion of distance into the definition of risk—distinguishing linguistic distance, distance in cultural memory and cognitive–narrative distance—the article links micro-level communicative events to macro-level structures of history and discourse. While quantitative research on linguistic distance has documented its impact on FDI stocks, trade flows and entry modes (Dow & Karunaratna, 2006; Melitz & Toubal, 2014; Selmier & Oh, 2013), it says relatively little about how those distances are experienced in day-to-day interactions. The tripartite conceptualization proposed here thus complements metric-based approaches with a qualitatively grounded account of how distance is enacted and felt in concrete interactions.

Taken together, these moves transform linguistic–cultural issues from soft background noise into a clearly delineated, multi-dimensional risk category. Conceptually, they answer RQ1 by showing that linguistic–cultural risk can be identified, classified and linked to existing risk management frameworks without collapsing into generic culture or communication problems.

### 5.2 Addressing RQ2: The Distance–Rupture–Bridging Model as a Dynamic Risk Map

The second research question asks how a risk map with both explanatory power and operational value can be constructed, using the distance–rupture–bridging lens to capture the dynamics of risk generation and evolution.

Language-related studies in international business have long recognised that distance matters, yet they have often treated distance as a static parameter: a given level of cultural or linguistic distance is assumed to increase transaction costs, uncertainty or the likelihood of failure (Beugelsdijk et al., 2018; Zaheer, Schomaker & Nachum, 2012). The distance–rupture–bridging framework proposed here adds a temporal and processual dimension that has been largely missing from this literature.

At the distance stage, the model foregrounds the layered, latent nature of risk.

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

Linguistic distance, cultural-memory distance and cognitive–narrative distance do not automatically produce conflict; rather, they create a risk substrate that remains dormant until activated by specific triggers. In the Latin American context, this includes the historical and geopolitical sensitivities around external capital and the symbolic weight of certain terms or images that may appear innocuous from a Chinese perspective.

At the rupture stage, the model conceptualizes language-related incidents—such as a mistranslated clause, an unfortunate slogan or a misjudged social media interaction—not as isolated mistakes but as moments in which underlying distances suddenly crystallize into visible fractures. This is consistent with work that views cross-cultural misunderstandings as episodes of sensemaking breakdown in multinational collaboration (Weick, 1995; Tomlinson & Egan, 2002), but the model goes further by specifying the mechanisms through which rupture emerges from accumulated distance in high-pressure contexts such as negotiation, regulatory review or crisis communication.

At the bridging stage, the framework incorporates both social and technological forms of repair: from the role of interpreters, local advisors and community leaders as human mediators to the use of discourse monitoring, sentiment analysis and corpus-based diagnostics as data-intelligent tools. This move is closely aligned with recent calls in Chinese policy and academic circles to build multilingual risk case libraries, early-warning mechanisms and rapid-response systems for language security in Belt and Road settings (Ning, 2020).

Methodologically, the coding scheme and visualization logic outlined in Section III show how the model can be turned into a practical risk map: nodes structured by situation–trigger–rupture–consequence, and edges annotated by distance types and bridging strategies. Rather than estimating precise probabilities, the map serves as a cognitive and organizational device that allows managers to see how potential risk trajectories might unfold, and where

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

intervention points might lie. In this sense, the article answers RQ2 by demonstrating that the distance–rupture–bridging triad is not only a descriptive metaphor but a workable architecture for mapping and anticipating linguistic–cultural risk.

### 5.3 Addressing RQ3: Balancing Technological and Organizational Governance in the Data-Intelligent Era

The third research question concerns the design of governance mechanisms that balance technological capacities with organizational arrangements in managing linguistic–cultural risk.

In the GenAI era, the temptation to treat intelligent language services as a universal solution to language problems is strong. Yet emerging research on translation ethics, intelligent emergency language services and AI-assisted language industries repeatedly warns that automation can create new forms of risk—ranging from bias and hallucination to opaque decision pathways and accountability gaps—if it is not embedded in robust governance structures (Moorkens, 2020; Martindale & Carpuat, 2018; Hagendorff, 2020).

This article contributes by relocating intelligent language services from the periphery of tools to the centre of risk governance architecture. The closed-loop mechanism of identification–assessment–early warning–intervention–review operationalizes this shift along three lines:

First, it assigns diagnostic functions to data-intelligent tools. Multilingual corpora, cross-lingual sentiment analysis and discourse-pattern recognition are positioned as instruments for scanning policy shifts, media climates and online debates in real time—particularly important in Latin America’s highly mediatized and politicized public sphere.

Second, it embeds control and safeguard mechanisms in the use of GenAI. Terminology management, sensitive-term filtering, multi-version comparison and human–machine collaborative review function as brakes against the uncritical adoption of machine

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

output in high-stakes domains such as contracts, financial disclosures or crisis statements.

Third, it links organizational design to technological capabilities through the creation of language-and-culture governance units at strategic, functional, project and cooperation levels. This mirrors broader discussions of language management maturity in Chinese debates on Belt and Road enterprises, where the presence of formal language policies, regular audits and dedicated roles is seen as a key indicator of a firm's ability to cope with linguistic–cultural risk.

By weaving these elements together, the article answers RQ3 with a clear proposition: intelligent language services can reduce risk only when they are treated as infrastructure, governed through explicit rules, roles and review processes; when treated as stand-alone tools, they are as likely to amplify risk as to mitigate it.

### 5.4 Implications for the Language Services Industry and Foreign Language Education

The re-conceptualization of linguistic–cultural risk also has broader implications beyond corporate governance. For the language services industry, the analysis suggests a shift from translation processing to risk-oriented language governance. In line with Chinese policy documents that call for building national language security systems and comprehensive language-service chains for foreign trade[1], providers can develop region- and sector-specific risk diagnostics, narrative consulting and multilingual reputation management services, rather than competing solely on speed and price.

For foreign language education—especially in Spanish and Portuguese programmes—the article points towards a curricular triad of language competence + risk literacy + data-

[1] National Language Commission. (2016). 国家语言文字事业“十三五”发展规划[The 13th Five-Year Plan for the Development of National Language and Script Affairs]. 北京[Beijing].

State Council. (2007). 关于加快发展现代服务业的若干意见[Several Opinions on Accelerating the Development of Modern Service Industries]. 北京[Beijing].

Ministry of Education & National Language Commission. (2020). 国家语言文字事业“十四五”发展规划 [The 14th Five-Year Plan for the Development of National Language and Script Affairs]. 北京[Beijing].

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

intelligent tool literacy. Recent proposals for intelligent language service education highlight the need to combine CAT/MT training, corpus skills and project management with legal, ethical and policy awareness (Bowker & Buitrago Ciro, 2019; Kenny & Doherty, 2014; Mellinger & Hanson, 2017). Building on this, the Latin American case underscores the importance of integrating modules on linguistic–cultural risk, narrative contestation, and AI-assisted monitoring into language and business curricula. Graduates who understand how language interacts with law, regulation, media and technology will be better positioned to serve as language governance professionals for enterprises going global.

In sum, the discussion section has clarified how the article's conceptual and practical proposals speak directly to the three guiding research questions, while connecting them to ongoing debates in international business, linguistic security and the evolving ecosystem of intelligent language services.

## 6. Conclusion

This article set out to explore how linguistic–cultural risk can be conceptualized, mapped and governed in the context of Chinese enterprises' expansion into Latin America. Building on the preceding analysis, this conclusion explicitly revisits the three research questions and outlines a multi-layered agenda for future work.

### 6.1 Main Answers to the Three Research Questions

First, regarding how to abstract linguistic and cultural issues from scattered phenomena into identifiable and classifiable risks, the article proposes linguistic–cultural risk as a distinct category that is analytically parallel to political or legal risk yet deeply entangled with them. It defines this category in terms of four interrelated domains—institutional–compliance, organizational–coordination, market–narrative and data–algorithmic risk—and anchors them in three types of distance: linguistic distance, distance in cultural memory and cognitive–narrative distance. This provides both scholars and practitioners with a structured

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

vocabulary for diagnosing where and how language and culture become risk-bearing in cross-border operations, particularly in the sensitive and historically loaded Latin American context.

Second, with respect to constructing a risk map that captures the logic of risk generation and evolution, the article offers the distance–rupture–bridging framework as a dynamic model. In this model, latent distances constitute the background conditions of risk; ruptures mark moments when those distances turn into visible conflict under pressure; and bridging denotes the array of social and technological responses through which enterprises attempt to repair relationships and re-stabilize meaning. The corresponding mapping approach—based on situation–actor–trigger–rupture–consequence nodes and distance/ bridging-labelled edges—translates this model into a visual and analytic tool that can guide anticipatory risk assessment, scenario planning and ex post learning.

Third, concerning the design of governance mechanisms that balance technological and organizational dimensions, the article argues for treating intelligent language services as data-intelligent infrastructure embedded in a closed-loop mechanism of identification–assessment–early warning–intervention–review. It specifies how multilingual corpora, sentiment analysis and discourse monitoring can be harnessed for early detection; how terminology systems, sensitive-term filters and human–machine review can raise the reliability of critical texts; and how dedicated governance units and cross-departmental committees can institutionalize responsibility for linguistic–cultural risk. In so doing, it offers a concrete blueprint for aligning emerging GenAI-based tools with existing enterprise risk management and compliance systems.

Taken together, these answers suggest that language and culture are neither marginal soft issues nor intractable black boxes, but governable domains that can be made visible, mapped and managed—provided that organizations adopt the right conceptual and institutional lenses.

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

### 6.2 Limitations

Notwithstanding these contributions, the study has several limitations that should be acknowledged.

First, the analysis is primarily conceptual and exploratory. While it draws on a range of academic literature, policy documents and public reports on Chinese enterprises in Latin America and on Belt and Road linguistic security, it does not systematically test the proposed typology or framework against large-scale empirical data.

Second, the Latin American focus, though deliberate and analytically rich, may limit the generalizability of some insights. The historical experience of colonialism, the strong presence of Spanish and Portuguese as lingua francas, and the region's vibrant protest and media cultures combine to produce specific patterns of narrative contestation that may differ from those in, for example, Southeast Asia or Eastern Europe. The distance–rupture–bridging model may need recalibration when applied to regions where linguistic diversity, institutional environments or geopolitical dynamics follow different logics.

Third, the discussion of intelligent language services necessarily rests on a moving technological target. As large language models evolve in capability, accessibility and regulation, the balance between automation and human oversight will shift. The governance mechanisms recommended here should therefore be understood as principle-based rather than technology-specific and will need updating in step with advances in GenAI and evolving norms around algorithmic transparency and data protection.

### 6.3 Future Research Agenda

Building on these limitations, future research can proceed along several interrelated lines.

(1) Event databases and mixed-method risk modelling.

One priority is to construct a cross-country, cross-industry database of linguistic–

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

cultural risk events involving Chinese enterprises in Latin America and beyond. Such a database could code events along the dimensions proposed in this article (distance types, triggers, rupture forms, consequences, bridging strategies), enabling both qualitative comparative analysis and quantitative modelling of risk trajectories. Combining process tracing with methods such as event history analysis or fuzzy-set QCA would help to identify which combinations of distance and contextual factors are most likely to produce serious ruptures, and which bridging strategies are most effective under what conditions.

(2) Longitudinal studies of intelligent language services in practice.

A second avenue involves in-depth, longitudinal case studies of how particular firms implement intelligent language services over time: which tools they adopt, how workflows evolve, how responsibilities are negotiated and how incidents are reviewed. Ethnographic observation of multilingual project teams, combined with log data from translation platforms and sentiment-monitoring systems, could reveal the micro-dynamics of human–machine collaboration in risk-sensitive scenarios. This would not only test the feasibility of the closed-loop mechanism proposed here, but also illuminate the organizational learning processes through which language governance capabilities are built—or undermined.

(3) Comparative research across investing countries and host regions.

Third, comparative work could juxtapose Chinese enterprises with firms from other major investing countries (e.g., Spain, the United States, Brazil) in their approaches to linguistic–cultural risk in Latin America. Are there systematic differences in how these firms frame distance, anticipate rupture and design bridging strategies? Do home-country language regimes, corporate languages or prior colonial ties shape their governance practices? Similarly, cross-regional comparisons—e.g., between Latin America, Africa and Central Asia—could clarify which aspects of the distance–rupture–bridging framework are globally robust and which are region-specific.

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

(4) Integrating linguistic–cultural risk into policy and education.

Fourth, future research might explore how national and regional policies, as well as university curricula, can incorporate the notion of linguistic–cultural risk more explicitly. For instance, studies could examine how language-security strategies for the Belt and Road, language-service development reports and urban language governance policies translate into concrete support for enterprises and training programmes.

This would help to connect micro-level corporate practices with macro-level efforts to build language-service platforms, risk case libraries and intelligent language-education systems.

(5) Normative and ethical dimensions of GenAI-mediated language governance.

Finally, more work is needed on the normative implications of delegating parts of linguistic–cultural governance to GenAI. Questions of fairness, bias, accountability and transparency—already pressing in emergency language services and public-sector translation—acquire additional weight in corporate settings where decisions can affect livelihoods, environmental outcomes and community relations.

Future research could therefore combine ethical analysis with experimental and survey-based studies of stakeholder trust in AI-mediated communication, particularly in contested or high-stakes projects.

Ultimately, the core message of this article is that linguistic–cultural risk is neither an inevitable cost of doing business abroad nor a purely technical nuisance to be fixed by better translators or more powerful algorithms. It is a structurally produced and historically conditioned field of vulnerability and possibility, in which meanings, identities and power relations are constantly negotiated. By conceptualizing this field through the lenses of distance, rupture and bridging, mapping its contours and proposing concrete governance mechanisms, the study aims to provide both a theoretical scaffold and a practical roadmap for

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

Chinese enterprises facing the opportunities and frictions of Latin America—and, by extension, for the evolving ecosystem of language services and foreign language education that supports them.

**Funding**

This work was supported by Shenzhen Philosophy and Social Sciences Project (2025) "Innovative Language Service Practices and Talent Development Pathways for Supporting SMEs Expansion into the Latin American Market" and Shenzhen University 2035 Excellence Research Initiative Young Scholars Project "Research on the Optimization and Adaptation Strategies of Language Teachers' Roles in the Era of Artificial Intelligence" (Grant No. ZYQN2412)

## References

Adelani, D. I., Abbott, J., Neubig, G., et al. (2021). MasakhaNER: Named entity recognition for African languages. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistic*s, *9*, 1116–1131.

Asscher, O., & Glikson, E. (2023). Human *evaluations* of machine translation in an ethically charged situation. *New Media & Society*, *25*(6), 1480–1504.

Atlantic Council. (2024). *China Pairs Actions with Messaging in Latin America*. Atlantic Council Issue Brief.

Aven, T. (2016). Risk assessment and *risk* management: Review of recent advances on their foundation. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *253(1)*, 1–13.

Beugelsdijk, S., Kostova, T., Kunst, V. E., Spadafora, E., & van Essen, M. (2018). Cultural distance and firm internationalization: A meta-analytical review and theoretical implications. *Journal of Management*, *44(1)*, 89–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317729027

Bommasani, R., Hudson, D. A., Adeli, E., et al. (2021). *On the opportunities and risks of foundation models*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258.

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

Bowker, L., & Buitrago Ciro, J. (2019). *Machine Translation and Global Research: Towards Improved Machine Translation Literacy in the Scholarly Community*. Emerald Publishing.

Brannen, M. Y., Piekkari, R., & Tietze, S. (2014). The multifaceted role of language in international business: Unpacking the forms, functions, and features of a critical challenge to MNC theory and performance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *45*(5), 495–507.

Cao, D. (2007). *Translating Law*. Multilingual Matters.

Lou, Y. (2024). *China and Latin* America's *joint construction of the Belt and Road: Progress, challenges, and prospects*. CSIS Interpret.

Dow, D., & Karunaratna, A. (2006). Developing a multidimensional instrument to measure psychic distance stimuli. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *37*(5), 578–602.

Feely, A. J., & Harzing, A.-W. (2003). Language management in multinational companies. *Cross Cultural Management*, *10*(2), 37–52.

Fraser, J. R. S., & Simkins, B. J. (Eds.). (2021). *Enterprise risk management* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Hagendorff, T. (2020). The ethics of AI ethics: An evaluation of guidelines. *Minds and Machines*, *30*(1), 99–120.

Harzing, A.-W., & Feely, A. J. (2008). The language barrier and its implications for HQ-subsidiary relationships. *Cross Cultural Management*, *15*(1), 49–60.

Harzing, A.-W., & Pudelko, M. (2013). Language competencies, policies and practices in multinational corporations. *Journal of World Business*, *48*(1), 87–97.

Hollnagel, E., Wears, R. L., & Braithwaite, J. (2015). From Safety-I to Safety-II: A white paper. The Resilient Health Care Net. https://www.healthcarenet.org/safety-1-to-safety-2-white-paper

Janna, D. (2025). *Understanding* China *and Latin America: The future speaks Mandarin* [Lecture]. Tsinghua University.

Kenny, D., & Doherty, S. (2014). Statistical machine translation in the translation curriculum: Overcoming obstacles and empowering translators. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *8(2)*, 276–294.

Lasso, M. (2007). *Myths of Harmony: Race and Republicanism during the Age of Revolution, Colombia 1795–1831*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Lipski, J. M. (2008). *Varieties of Spanish in the United States*. Georgetown University Press.

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

Ly, A., Esperança, J. P., & Davcik, N. S. (2018). What drives foreign direct investment: The role of language, geographical distance, information flows and technological similarity. *Journal of Business Research*, *88*, 111–122.

Li, Yuming. (2015). “一带一路”需要语言铺路[*The Belt* and *Road needs language to pave the way*]. 人民日报[People’s Daily].

Mar-Molinero, C. (2000). *The Politics of Language in the Spanish-speaking World: From Colonisation to Globalisation*. Routledge.

Martindale, M. J., & Carpuat, M. (2018). Fluency over adequacy: A pilot study in measuring user trust in imperfect MT. Proceedings *of the 13th Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas, 1*, 13–25.

Melitz, J., & Toubal, F. (2014). Native language, spoken language, translation and trade. *Journal of International Economics*, *93(2)*, 351–363.

Mellinger, C. D., & Hanson, T. A. (2017). Quantitative *research methods in translation and interpreting studies*. Routledge.

Mikalef, P., & Gupta, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence capability: Conceptualization, measurement calibration, and empirical study on its impact on organizational creativity and firm performance. *Information & Management*, *58(3)*, 103434.

Moorkens, J. (2020). “A tiny cog in a large machine”: Digital Taylorism in the translation industry. *Translation Spaces*, *9*(1), 12–34.

Neeley, T. B., Hinds, P. J., & Cramton, C. D. (2012). The (un)hidden turmoil of language in global collaboration. *Organizational Dynamics*, *41(3)*, 236–244.

Ning, Q. (2020). 提升多语种语言服务能力，消除”一带一路”建设中的文化隔阂 [Enhancing multilingual language service capacity to eliminate cultural barriers in the Belt and Road Initiative]. 中国日报[China Daily].

Ocasio, W., Loewenstein, J., & Nigam, A. (2015). How streams of communication reproduce and change institutional logics: The role of categories. *Academy of Management Review*, *40*(1), 28–48.

Orlikowski, W. J., & Scott, S. V. (2008). Sociomateriality: Challenging the separation of technology, work and organization. *Academy of Management Annals*, *2*(1), 433–474.

Piekkari, R., Welch, D. E., & Welch, L. S. (2014). *Language in international business: The multilingual reality of global* business *expansion*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Pym, A. (2025). *Risk management in translation*. Cambridge University Press.

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South*, *1*(3), 533–580.

Rouvinski, V. (2024). *China's soft* power *in Latin America*. Diálogo Político.

Salacuse, J. W. (2003). *The global* negotiator*: Making, managing, and mending deals around the world in the twenty-first century*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Savoldi, B., Gaido, M., Bentivogli, L., Negri, M., & Turchi, M. (2021). Gender bias in machine translation. *Computational Linguistics*, *9*, 845–874.

Selmier, W. T., & Oh, C. H. (2013). The power of major trade languages in trade and foreign direct investment. *Review of* International *Political Economy*, *20*(3), 486–514.

Shenkar, O. (2001). Cultural distance revisited. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *32*(3), 519–535.

Tenzer, H., Pudelko, M., & Harzing, A.-W. (2014). The impact of language barriers on trust formation in multinational teams. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *45*(5), 508–535.

Tenzer, H., Terjesen, S., & Harzing, A.-W. (2017). Language in international business: A review and research agenda. *Management International Review*, *57*(6), 815–847.

Tenzer, H., & Pudelko, M. (2017). The influence of language differences on power dynamics in multinational teams. *Journal of World Business*, *52(1)*, 45–61.

Tomlinson, F., & Egan, S. (2002). Organizational sensemaking in a culturally diverse setting. *Management Learning*, *33*(1), 79–107.

Vanmassenhove, E., Hardmeier, C., & Way, A. (2021). Machine translationese: Effects of algorithmic bias on linguistic complexity in machine translation. *Computational Linguistics*, *47*(3), 689–739.

Vieira, L. N., O'Hagan, M., & O'Sullivan, C. (2021). Understanding the societal impacts of machine translation: A critical review of the literature on medical and legal use cases. *Information, Communication & Society*, *24*(11), 1515–1532.

Vilares, D., Alonso, M. A., & Gómez-Rodríguez, C. (2017). Supervised sentiment analysis in multilingual environments. Information *Processing & Managemen*t, *53*(3), 595–607.

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the general data protection regulation. *International Data Privacy Law*, *7*(2), 76–99.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage Publications.

Vol.1 No.2 2025
DOI:10.64699/25ODMK2092

West, J., & Graham, J. L. (2004). A linguistic-based measure of cultural distance and its relationship to managerial values. *Management International Review*, *44*(3), 239–260.

Zhao, W. X., Zhou, K., Li, J., et al. (2023). *A* survey *of large language models*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223.

Zaheer, S., Schomaker, M. S., & Nachum, L. (2012). Distance without direction: Restoring credibility to a much-loved construct. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *43*(1), 18–27.