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It is often assumed that adjustment to the local working environment is essential for expatriate assignments. As such, it is surprising there is little empirical research identifying how skill, ability, and personality requirements might differ between expatriate and domestic jobs and how cultural values are related to expatriate behaviors. In a large sample of professionals ($N = 1,312$) working in comparable jobs in 156 different countries, we found higher social and perceptual skill requirements in expatriate jobs. In two sub-samples ($n = 420$ and 468), we found that expatriate jobs also have higher reasoning ability and adjustment and achievement orientation personality requirements than domestic jobs. We also found that expatriate behavioral requirements vary in theoretically meaningful ways with the host country's culture.
Expatriate Assignments:
Understanding the Skill, Ability, Personality, and Behavioral Requirements of Working Abroad

Economic globalization and the need to operate in locations around the world has become a fact of organizational life. Typically, international operations of U.S. organizations are staffed by a mix of employees from the host country and expatriates from the U.S. Such expatriate assignments pose unique challenges for U.S. workers because of differences in such things as language, cultural values, and expectations. These differences likely influence the manner in which work is done and the underlying capabilities needed for success. Although scholars have implicitly recognized these differences and the importance of preparing U.S. workers for foreign assignments (Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Tung, 1981), there is still a high failure rate for expatriate assignments (Black, Gregersen, Mendenhall, & Stroh, 1999; Swaak, 1995; Tung, 1982). This is particularly problematic given the costs of expatriate failure, both in terms of individual career outcomes as well as direct financial costs to the organization (Adler, 1983; Black et al., 1999; Tung, 1987).

Expatriate failure usually results from failure to adapt to the new and unfamiliar working environment (Aykan & Kanungo, 1997). There are at least three explanations for expatriates’ adaptation failures (Aykan, 1997). First, in the pre-departure stage, organizations prepare their assignees for expatriate work. If expatriate jobs have a different profile of skill, ability, and personality requirements than domestic jobs due to the differences in working context and attention is not given to the differences, expatriates are likely to have unsuccessful assignments. Unfortunately, there is little systematic empirical research that describes how these requirements may differ between domestic and international assignments.

Second, in the post-arrival stage, when expatriate workers interact with host country nationals (HCNs), some behaviors may be more culturally appropriate than others. That is, to
adjust to and perform expatriate work, expatriates have to engage in culturally appropriate behaviors. If an expatriate fails to behave in culturally appropriate ways, his or her effectiveness is likely to be reduced. By engaging in culturally appropriate behaviors, expatriates better adapt to the new working environments. Third, organizations have a tendency to emphasize the technical requirements of work to the exclusion of the social requirements when conducting expatriate training. This may result in a focus on performing the work itself when adapting to the social and cultural aspects of the work environment may be essential to successful expatriate assignments (Dunbar, 1992; Tung, 1987). This is particularly critical in cultures that place great importance on the social and interpersonal elements of the workplace.

To begin to examine these issues, we first investigate how skill, ability, and personality requirements differ between domestic and international work. Second, we explore behavioral requirements in expatriate assignments by describing and examining the relationship between behavioral requirements and host nations’ culture. By systematically examining how skill, ability, and personality requirements differ between domestic and international assignments and how cultural values relate to expatriate behavioral requirements, we extend the expatriate literature in two important ways.

First, this research represents the first attempt to empirically describe how requirements differ between domestic and international work. Although some have suggested that cross-cultural skills, abilities, and personality characteristics are important for expatriate adjustment (e.g., Black, 1990; Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Tung, 1987), few studies actually measure these worker requirements and then match them to a comparable domestic sample. Second, by examining whether expatriate behavioral requirements are related to the host nation’s cultural values, this study empirically tests one of the basic hypotheses of expatriate adjustment. That is, the bulk of the expatriate literature has assumed that expatriates
are required to adjust their behaviors to be congruent with the host culture (Brewster, 1995). However, there have been no empirical studies that actually test whether behavioral requirements systematically vary with cultural values. We provide an empirical test of the relationship between work behavior and culture.

How Expatriate Worker Requirements Might Differ from Domestic Worker Requirements

Researchers have argued that inadequate adjustment to the new culture is a primary cause of high expatriate failure rates and low work performance (Kraimer, Wayne, & Jaworski, 2001; McEvoy & Parker, 1995). Toward that end, much of the expatriate literature has focused on the factors that impact adjustment, such as expatriates’ personality (Caligiuri, 2000; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997, 1999), previous overseas experience (Black, 1988), pre-departure training (Black & Mendenhall, 1990), and non-work factors (Black & Stephens, 1989; Takeuchi, Yun, & Tesluk., 2002). Yet there have been few empirical studies examining the underlying skill, ability, and personality requirements needed in expatriate work in order to adjust to culturally different situations (Hechanova, Beehr, & Christiansen, 2003).

Scholars have suggested that expatriate work has different skill, ability, and personality requirements than domestic work because of the need to adapt to differences in culture. In particular, in reviewing the cross-culture adjustment literature, Black and Mendenhall (1990) and Mendenhall and Oddou (1985) suggest there are three critical dimensions for expatriate adjustment: (1) the relationship dimension, (2) the perceptual dimension, and (3) the self-dimension. The relationship dimension refers to skills related to the fostering of relationships with host nationals. For successful expatriate adjustment, developing good relationships with HCNs is essential (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Hechanova et al., 2003). By maintaining proper relationships with HCNs, expatriate workers are able to interact with them appropriately, to overcome their problems, and to perform assignments effectively. Abe and Wiseman (1983)
provided evidence for the importance of establishing close relationships with HCNs in successful expatriate adjustment. In addition, Cui, van den Berg, and Jiang (1998) found significant relationships between communication competence, cultural empathy, social interaction, and cross-cultural adaptation. Arvey, Bhagat, and Salas (1991) suggested that relationship dimensions such as cultural empathy and interpersonal skills become important when dealing with cultural differences. Finally, in a meta-analytic review, Hechanova et al. (2003) found that better interpersonal skills were associated with greater adjustment to the general environment.

Although these studies do not compare skill requirements between expatriate and domestic workers, they do imply that expatriates need to have strong social skills so they can successfully adapt to the local culture and work through any cultural differences. This facilitates their adjustment to the new culture and promotes positive relationships with HCNs. Given the importance of social interaction and relationship development for cross-cultural adjustment, expatriate work will have higher social skill requirements than domestic work.

Hypothesis 1: Expatriate work will have higher social skill requirements than U.S. domestic work.

Mendenhall and Oddou’s (1985) perception dimension refers to skills related to the correct attribution and interpretation of host nationals’ behaviors. Difficulties may arise when expatriates interact with HCNs who have different culturally based behaviors and beliefs. Because expatriates’ interpretations of HCNs’ behavior are based on their own cultural beliefs, incorrect attributions or interpretations are likely to be made about HCNs’ behaviors (Bochner, 1982). Furthermore, to reduce uncertainty in interpersonal relationships in an intercultural context, it is very important for expatriates to properly interpret HCNs’ behaviors (Oddou & Mendenhall, 1984). For instance, Speitzer, McCall, and Mahoney (1997) showed that sensitivity to cultural differences was significantly related to job performance. Also, Yiu and Saner (2000) suggested that perceptual characteristics of expatriate managers might influence their adaptation
to new settings. In sum, perceptual skill is a basic skill that enables individuals to better understand and interpret HCNs' behavior and cultural differences. Although this does not imply any direct understanding of cultural differences, it does provide the basis for learning about those cultural differences once in an international setting. In other words, expatriate workers need perceptual skills to correctly interpret HCNs' behavior so they can reduce uncertainty in interpersonal relations, interact efficiently with HCNs, and perform their jobs effectively. Thus, expatriate work will have higher perceptual skill requirements than domestic work because of culturally different contexts of international work.

**Hypothesis 2:** Expatriate work will have higher perceptual skill requirements than U.S. domestic work.

Mendenhall and Oddou’s (1985) self-dimension refers to the characteristics related to self-confidence and tolerance of stress, which are closely related to individuals' ability and personality. This includes confidence in one’s ability to deal effectively with foreigners and new surroundings (Black et al., 1999) as well as resistance to stress that results from uncertainty and anxiety about unfamiliar situations (Chao & Sun, 1997; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985). For example, using a longitudinal design, Anderzen and Arnetz (1999) showed that expatriates experienced increased psychosocial stress as compared with controls.

The stress literature has identified cognitive abilities as particularly important in the stress coping process (Payne, 1994). For example, a number of studies have found a positive relationship between cognitive failure (failures of memory, reasoning, and perception in everyday life) and stress vulnerability (Mahoney, Dalby, & King, 1998; Matthews & Wells, 1988). In addition, it has been shown that problem-solving ability is negatively related to stress level (Fraser & Tucker, 1997; Priester & Clum, 1993). In a similar vein, uncertainty can be caused by an individual’s inability to adequately structure or categorize information (Bunder, 1962). In turn, such perceived uncertainty may lead to intolerance of anomalies and incongruities
and a strong need for explanation of cause-and-effect-relationships (Bonaiuto, Biasi, Giannini, Bonaiuto, & Bartoli, 1992). Thus, these kinds of reasoning abilities would be a particularly important set of cognitive abilities for expatriate work. This suggests that expatriate work will have higher reasoning ability requirements than domestic work because of the stress, uncertainty, and anxiety associated with unfamiliar situations.

**Hypothesis 3:** Expatriate work will have higher reasoning ability requirements than U.S. domestic work.

In terms of personality, Caligiuri (2000) found that extroversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability were negatively related to the expatriates' desire to terminate their assignments. Ones and Viswesvaran (1999) found that conscientiousness was perceived as the most important personality factor for expatriate success. In addition to these broad personality factors, Harrison, Chadwick, and Scales (1996) found that expatriates high in self-efficacy and self-monitoring displayed greater adjustment. Arthur and Bennett (1995) found that flexibility and motivation ranked second and third in importance for expatriate success after family situation. Finally, Aycan (1997) argued that such things as willingness and commitment might make the adjustment less difficult.

This personality research suggests that successful expatriates need to be well adjusted and highly motivated individuals. Given the higher levels of stress and uncertainty associated with working abroad, expatriate work involves greater adjustment-related personality requirements than domestic work. This would include such things as self-control, stress tolerance, and flexibility. In addition, to overcome the temptation of leaving their expatriate assignment early due to the difficulties associated with working in an unfamiliar and stressful environment, expatriate work has higher achievement-orientation personality requirements. Otherwise, they might simply give up when faced with adjusting to a difficult work environment. Thus, because
of the degree of persistence needed when working abroad, expatriate work has more achievement
orientation requirements, such as effort, persistence in the face of obstacles, and initiative.

**Hypothesis 4:** Expatriate work will have greater adjustment and achievement orientation
personality requirements than U.S. domestic work.

Relationships between Cultural Values and Behavioral Requirements

In addition to differences in skill, ability, and personality requirements, expatriate work is
also likely to have different behavioral requirements. This is due to the fact that cultural values
are likely to influence the appropriateness of different work behaviors. For example, Vance and
Paik (2002) found that workforces from different countries had different perceptions of
behaviors positively and negatively affecting work performance.

A variety of cross-cultural leadership studies have investigated the interaction between
managerial behavior and cultural values (Bass, 1997; Dorfman, 1996; Dorfman et al., 1997; Jung
& Avolio, 1999; Smith, Peterson, Misumi, and Bond, 1992). This research has tended to examine
the generalizability of leadership behaviors across cultures, however, rather than focusing on the
relationship between expatriate behavior and cultural values. Put another way, this research has
focused on the consistency of managerial behaviors across cultural contexts, whereas the focus
of the present research is on how expatriate behaviors might vary along with the cultural context.

Another body of research has examined how cultural differences influence leadership
prototypes (Den Hartog et al., 1999; Gerstner & Day, 1994). For example, Gerstner and Day
(1994) asked international and American students enrolled in graduate programs to rate 59
attributes relevant to leadership. They found considerable differences in perceptions of business
leader characteristics among members of the 8 countries sampled, thus supporting the idea that
there are relationships between culture and leader traits. Den Hartog et al. (1999) tested whether
there are culture-specific or generalizable implicit leadership theories. With data from middle-
level managers from 60 countries, they found that perceptions of several leadership attributes
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were different among the countries. Although these studies focused on leadership prototypes and not actual behavior, it does suggest that different behaviors would be expected to occur naturally in societies that have different cultural values because these values reflect how the society operates (Hofstede, 1993).

The mechanisms through which expatriate workers are influenced by cultural values can be explained from both value/belief theory of culture (Hofstede, 1980; House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997) and social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) perspectives. According to the value theory of culture (Hofstede, 1980, 1993), cultural values impact individual values, and individuals’ behaviors depend on the cultural values to which they are exposed. To fit in and perform their assignment effectively, expatriates will need to behave in ways that are consistent with prevailing cultural values. This is particularly important because expatriates typically work with a large number of HCNs (such as supervising a large group of employees) and working well with these HCNs is often essential to job success (Black, 1988; Gregersen & Black, 1990).

In addition, social learning theory suggests that individuals learn from experience, and future behaviors are guided by the consequences of past behavior (Bandura, 1977). For example, Weiss (1977) showed how other people in the social context conditioned, in part, first-level supervisors’ work behavior. This suggests that expatriates could learn culturally appropriate and inappropriate behaviors by observing HCNs’ culturally successful behaviors. In fact, this may be one of the most important influences on behavior given the oftentimes-extensive interaction between expatriates and HCNs. This experience can serve to shape behavior over time, thereby altering work behavior to be congruent with the prevailing cultural values. In other words, as they socially learn and develop cognitive maps appropriate to the local cultural values, expatriate behaviors will tend to follow the values emphasized by the HCNs.
Given the potential influence of culture on expatriate behavior, it is important to outline exactly how specific values affect work behavior. Perhaps the most commonly investigated cultural value is individualism-collectivism (Earley, 1989, 1993; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988). Individualism-collectivism is the degree to which people define themselves as individuals or as members of groups (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis et al., 1988). Individualist cultures assume the importance of ‘personal and family life’ and the unimportance of ‘cooperative colleagues’ and ‘good working relations’ (Singh, 1990). Cultures high in individualism tend to emphasize calculative involvement with companies, loose ties between co-workers, self-orientation, autonomy, individual initiative, and achievement (Hofstede, 1980). On the other hand, collectivist cultures emphasize interdependence, group embeddedness, in-group harmony, and personalized relationships (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000). This suggests that individualistic cultures will emphasize more self-oriented behaviors, whereas collectivistic cultures will focus on behaviors centered on interpersonal relationships. Consequently, expatriates working in countries high in collectivism will focus more on relationship development with others, and show more relationship-oriented behaviors such as coordinating team members, encouraging and building mutual trust, respect, and cooperation among team members, and coaching and developing others.

*Hypothesis 5:* Expatriates working in countries high in collectivism will focus more on relationship-oriented behaviors than those in countries high in individualism.

Another cultural dimension likely to impact expatriate behavioral requirements is masculinity-femininity (Hofstede, 1980). Femininity emphasizes affiliation and social relationships and concerns for people and quality of life, whereas masculinity assumes the dominant values in society are assertiveness, acquisition, advancement, recognition, and less caring for others or people. That is, masculine society’s dominant values are performance, material success, and assertiveness, whereas the dominant values in feminine societies are...
quality of environment, interpersonal relationships, and concern for others (Hofstede, 1984; Peterson et al., 1995). In particular, people in high-femininity cultures tend to be much more concerned about working environments and caring for coworkers. This suggests that expatriates working in countries high in femininity will engage in more communication and interactions with others and perform more interaction-related activities.

Hypothesis 6: Expatriates working in countries high in femininity will focus more on interaction-related behaviors than those working in countries high in masculinity.

Another cultural dimension likely to be related to expatriate behavioral requirements is power distance. Power distance is "the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions accept and expect that power is distributed unequally" (Hofstede, 1988, p. 10). Power inequality is more accepted in countries high in power distance than those low in power distance (Hofstede, 2001). With 180 managers in 5 countries, Pavett and Morris (1995) found a negative relationship between power distance and worker participation. In addition, Nasierowski and Mikula (1998) suggest that close supervision is more accepted (or tolerated) by subordinates in countries high in power distance than those low in power distance. This suggests that HCNs in cultures high in power distance would expect greater administrative behavior, which would include managing and directing activities, general administrative activities, and monitoring and controlling resources. Therefore, in countries high in power distance, expatriates are likely to engage in more administrative behavior.

Hypothesis 7: Expatriates working in countries high in power distance will focus more on administrative behaviors than those working in countries low in power distance.

Method

Sample

The sample consisted of 1,312 mid-career professional employees in an international agency of the United States Government. The respondents had all been on at least one expatriate
assignment, as well as working domestically. Many of the respondents have been on multiple expatriate assignments, with the majority of the sample having a similar amount of expatriate experience (given their similar career stage). These employees were generalists who were working in five different career specialties in 156 different countries, including the United States. These specialties involve working with the U.S. and foreign public, government officials, and members of the business community to fulfill the mission of the U.S. government. These five specialties can be thought of as five distinctly different jobs, with unique tasks and duties (one of the career specialties is a generalist combination of the other four). The distribution of individuals in the different career specialties was similar across domestic and international jobs.

Employees received questionnaires asking about the skill, ability, personality and behavioral requirements of work. All respondents received skill and behavioral requirement surveys (as described below). Because of survey length concerns, a subset of this group also received either the ability or personality requirements surveys. Useable surveys were returned by 64% of the employees. Although some aspects of these jobs might vary from location to location, they have common job descriptions in the agency’s operations manual. As such, the jobs held by these individuals (within a career specialty) are functionally equivalent.

Measures

Two different measurement sources were used. For the measurement of expatriate skill, ability, and personality, and behavioral requirements we used survey data collected from the employees. For the survey, job analysis consultants along with organizational representatives and subject matter experts chose to use skill, ability, work style, and generalized work activity surveys from the Occupational Information Network (O*NET). O*NET was developed for the Department of Labor as a comprehensive job analysis system designed to replace the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (Peterson et al., 2001). It contains a variety of domains that describe the
world of work and were designed to be applicable to all jobs. The scales used in the present research were selected from O*NET because they appropriately operationalize the hypotheses developed earlier. The scales used were identical to the scales outlined in Peterson, Mumford, Borman, Jeanneret, and Fleishman (1999) except where noted. For the measurement of cultural values, we used Hofstede’s (1988) 47 national and 3 regional cultures’ relative indexes. Three of the original 53 national indexes had no sample and were excluded.

**Tasks Performed.** In order to determine whether domestic and international jobs were the same, information on the tasks performed was collected for each career specialty. This resulted in five distinct career specialty task surveys. These surveys have to be considered separately because the tasks across career specialties are different. A task level comparison enables a direct assessment of the similarity of domestic and international jobs. Each survey contained between 42-52 different task dimensions, with between 3-26 tasks per dimension. This resulted in surveys that ranged from between 246-319 individual ratings on the time spent performing the tasks. Incumbents were instructed to rate the time spent performing the tasks in his or her current position on a 5-point response scale, where 1 = much less time than most tasks and 5 = much more time than most duties. The reliability estimate averages for the five career specialties ranged from .84 to .91.

**Skill Requirements.** The 1,312 mid-career workers rated the level of skills required in the job on 7-point Likert-type scales. Behavioral anchors were provided for the high, medium, and low points of the scale. For example, the anchors for active listening are, “presiding as judge in a complex legal disagreement” (high), “answering inquiries regarding credit references” (medium), and “taking customers’ orders” (low). Social skills are defined as the skills needed for developing and maintaining good interpersonal relationships. The *social skill* measure was comprised of five related skills: Coordination (adjusting actions in relation to others’ actions),
persuasion (persuading others to approach things differently), negotiation (bringing others together and trying to reconcile differences), instructing (teaching others how to do something), and service orientation (actively looking for ways to help people). Internal consistency reliability was .77. Perceptual skills are defined as the skills for correctly perceiving reasons and causes of other’s behavior in order to make correct attributions. The perceptual skill measure was comprised of three related skills: Active listening (listening to what other people are saying and asking questions as appropriate), monitoring (assessing how well one is doing when learning or doing something), and social perceptiveness (being aware of others’ reactions and understanding why they react the way they do). This measure was created by taking the social perceptiveness item from the social skills domain, and the active listening and monitoring items from the process skills domain. Internal consistency reliability was .69.

**Ability Requirements.** The level of reasoning abilities required in the job was rated by 420 employees on 7-point Likert-type scales. Behavioral anchors were provided for the high and low points of the scale. For example, anchors for inductive reasoning are, “diagnosing a disease using the results of many different lab tests” (high), and “determining clothing to wear on the basis of the weather report” (low). Reasoning ability is defined as an individual capability for making assumptions, interpreting, and making sense of situations or causal relationships. The reasoning ability measure was composed of seven related abilities: fluency of ideas (coming up with a number of ideas about a given topic), originality (coming up with unusual and clever ideas), problem sensitivity (recognizing there is a problem), deductive reasoning (applying general rules to specific problems to come up with logical answers), inductive reasoning (combining separate pieces of information to form general conclusion), information ordering (following a given rule in order to arrange things in a certain order), and category flexibility (the ability to generate rules
so that each rule tells how to group a set of things in a different way). Internal consistency reliability was .85.

**Personality Requirements.** The level of personality characteristics required in the job was rated by 468 employees on 7-point Likert-type scales. Behavioral anchors were provided for the high, medium, and low points of the scale. For example, anchors for stress tolerance are, “the job requires being extremely calm and tolerant of stress imposed by other people or by circumstances” (high), “the job requires being moderately calm and tolerant of stress imposed by other people or by circumstances” (medium), and “this job does not involve much stress” (low). Adjustment is defined as being calm, composed, and rational even when confronted with unfamiliar and stressful situations (Borman, Kubisiak, & Schneider, 1999). The adjustment measure consisted of three related personality requirements: self-control (maintaining composure, keeping emotion, controlling anger, and avoiding aggressive behavior), stress tolerance (dealing with high stress situations), and flexibility (being open to change). Internal consistency reliability was .78. Achievement orientation is defined as valuing working hard, persisting in the face of obstacles, and wanting to get ahead (Borman et al., 1999). The achievement orientation measure was composed of three related characteristics: achievement/effort (maintaining challenging goals and exerting effort), persistence (persistence in the face of obstacles on the job), and initiative (willing to take on job responsibilities and challenges). Internal consistency reliability was .82.

**Behavioral Requirements.** The 1,312 employees rated the frequency of their work behaviors on a 7-point scale that asks, “How often is this activity performed on this job?” Scale anchors ranged from “hourly or more often” to “once per year or less.” The frequency of work behavior reflects the kinds of behaviors required in the job. The relationship-oriented behavior measure was comprised of five related items: coordinating teams (coordinating members of a
work group to accomplish tasks), developing and building teams (encouraging and building mutual trust, respect, and cooperation among team members), teaching others (identifying educational needs and teaching others), coaching and developing others (identifying development needs of others and coaching or otherwise helping others to improve their knowledge or skills), and providing consultation and advice to others. Internal consistency reliability was .80.

The *interaction-related behavior* measure was comprised of eight related activities: Interpreting the meaning of information for others, communicating with supervisors, peers, or subordinates, communicating with persons outside the organization, establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships, assisting and caring for others, selling or influencing others, resolving conflicts and negotiating with others, and performing for or working directly with the public. Internal consistency reliability was .82. The *administrative behavior* measure was composed of three activities: managing (providing guidance, direction and motivation to subordinates), performing administrative activities, and monitoring and controlling resources. The administrative behavior measure was the same as reported in Peterson et al. (1999), except for the addition of “managing” and the exclusion of “staffing organizational units.” We included the managing item from the relationship-oriented behavior measure because it concerned providing instructions and monitoring the behavior of subordinates. We did not include the staffing behavior item because this is not something that most respondents in this sample perform and it is not a day-to-day administrative activity as the other items in this scale are. Internal consistency reliability was .66.

**Confirmatory Factor Analyses.** Given the intercorrelations among the skill, personality, and behavioral requirement measures (see Table 1), a series of confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted to examine discriminant validity. These analyses were conducted
separately for each type of measure (e.g., skill, personality, and work behavior) because different subsets of respondents provided the measures. We developed a series of 1-factor, 2-factor, and 3-factor models standing in nested sequence (depending on the hypothesized factor structure of the measures) and conducted chi-square difference tests to test which model better fit the data (Kelloway, 1998; Netemeyer, Johnston, & Burton, 1990).

We found that the hypothesized factor structures provided a better fit to the data than any reduced model. For example, a 2-factor (social and perceptual) model of skill requirements provided a better fit than a 1-factor model ($\chi^2_{\text{difference}}(1) = 105.03$). A 2-factor (achievement orientation and adjustment) personality requirements model provided better fit than a 1-factor model ($\chi^2_{\text{difference}}(1) = 36.05$). Finally, a 3-factor (relationship-oriented, interaction-related, and administrative) work behavior model provided a better fit than a 2-factor model (combining relationship-oriented behavior and interaction-related behavior; $\chi^2_{\text{difference}}(1) = 181.51$) and a 1-factor model (after constraining all interfactor correlations to equal 1.0; $\chi^2_{\text{difference}}(3) = 210.27$).

Notwithstanding the intercorrelations among the measures, these CFAs indicate that the measures should not be combined. The full results of the CFAs are available on request.

Cultural Values. Hofstede's (1980, 1988) dimensions for work values are probably the most frequently used in cross-cultural studies (Dorfman et al., 1997; Gerstner & Day, 1994; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985). Although there has been a great deal of debate about these measures (see Hofstede, 2002; Spector & Cooper, 2002), they have shown acceptable validity and have been empirically supported and widely used (Dorfman & Howell, 1988; Elangovan, 1995; Hofstede, 1980; Peterson et al., 1995; Shackleton & Ali, 1990). Furthermore, several previous studies have supported the use of Hofstede's cultural index (Merritt, 2000; Smith, Dugan, Peterson, & Leung, 1998). We employed national scores for Hofstede's (1988) cultural dimensions as proxies for cultural influence on expatriate behaviors. Each dimension indicates
the extent to which certain values characterize a culture. If a nation is high in individualism, masculinity, or power distance, the national scores for individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, or power distance are high.

**Analysis Strategy.** To test Hypothesis 1, 2, 3, and 4, we conducted analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) to examine mean differences between domestic and international jobs. These hypotheses are tested at the individual level. Because the work requirements might depend on career specialty (and there are five different career specialties in this organization), we included career specialty as a covariate. As mentioned, all jobs were at the same level (mid-career workers). To test the relationships between cultural values and expatriate behavior, we examined the correlations of national cultures’ index with scores of the three behavior scales. To get the scale measures, we aggregated the measures of the respondents to the nation level, and then to Hofstede’s index level. The measures of national averages in the region of East Africa, West Africa, and Arab countries were aggregated into each region to be matched to Hofstede’s regional indexes (Hofstede, 1988).

Because the work behaviors were aggregated, it is necessary to provide empirical justification for the aggregation (Morgeson & Hofmann, 1999). To do so, we estimated both interrater reliability (via the intraclass correlation; ICC(2); Shrout & Fleiss, 1979) and interrater agreement (rwg; James, Demarce, & Wolf, 1984). The interrater reliability estimates represent the reliability of the mean rating of the work behaviors within a given nation compared to other nations. The interrater reliabilities were as follows: Relationship-oriented behavior, .60; interaction-related behavior, .32; and administrative behavior, .65. All the interrater reliability estimates were statistically significant at the p < .05 level (within a one-way analysis of variance with nation as the grouping variable).
Interrater agreement reflects the absolute level of agreement across raters and thus assesses the extent to which raters within a given nation make similar mean-level ratings. This differs from interrater reliability estimates in that it does not depend upon the amount of between nation variance. The median interrater agreement estimates were as follows (similar results were obtained with mean estimates): Relationship-oriented behavior, .90; Interaction-related behavior, .93; and administrative behavior, .77.

Although the interrater reliability of interaction-related behavior was lower than we would have preferred, this measure evidenced good interrater agreement. In fact, as a group these levels of interrater reliability and agreement meet or exceed the levels of reliability and agreement found in previous research that has dealt with aggregation issues (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993). In addition, it is consistent with common rules of thumb about the levels of interrater reliability needed to justify aggregation (Ostroff & Schmitt, 1993).

In the ANCOVAs at the individual level (n's range from 420 to 1,312), statistical power was more than 99% to detect an $\eta^2 = .04$ (medium effect size) and 66% to 97% for an $\eta^2 = .01$ (small effect size; $p < .01$, two-tail; Cohen, 1977). In the correlational analyses at the culture level ($n = 50$), statistical power was 81% to detect an $r = .30$ (medium effect size) and 55% for an $r = .20$ ($p < .10$, one-tail; Cohen, 1977). Because of the modest power to detect correlations in the .20-.30 range and to balance Type I and Type II errors in the correlational analyses, we interpreted significance levels up to $p < .10$.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Potential Differences in Domestic and International Jobs. Even though the domestic and international jobs shared common job descriptions, it is still possible that the tasks performed in the United States differed from those performed in international jobs. Because some of our
hypotheses involve comparing domestic to international jobs, it is necessary to show that the jobs are largely the same. This is essential because if the tasks performed in the job are the same, any observed differences could be attributed to differences in cultural context. Using the task survey data described earlier, we examined differences in tasks between domestic and international jobs.

To do this, we conducted a number of analyses on this task data to determine whether there were differences in time-spent ratings across the different tasks. It should be noted that examining differences at the task level represents the strongest possible test for differences because it occurs at the finest-grained level of analysis possible (i.e., the task level). To summarize these analyses, an average of only 13% of the task scales were significantly different across the 5 different career specialties. The fact that, on average, 87% of the tasks are the same suggests the jobs are more similar than different. Another way to examine the magnitude of the difference is to examine the mean differences of those found to be significantly different. The average mean difference was .24. Thus, even when differences are found, they tend to be relatively small in magnitude, especially when compared to the average standard deviation of the task measures, which was .83.

Finally, we examined whether the tasks found to differ between domestic and international jobs are actually related to skill, ability, and personality requirement ratings. If the task ratings are unrelated to these requirement ratings, then differences in tasks are not responsible for differences in requirements. Only 22% of the possible correlations between tasks and worker requirements were significant ($p < .05$). Thus, of the 13% of the tasks that showed a significant difference, only 22% of them are significantly correlated with the worker requirements. In addition, the average correlation of the task scales that were significantly different between the domestic and the international jobs with the job requirements is just .14.
In total, these results suggest that, (1) there were relatively few task differences, (2) when found, differences were small in magnitude, (3) most of the tasks that were different were unrelated to the worker requirements, and (4) the relationships between the tasks and the worker requirements were small in magnitude. This suggests that differences in tasks are not responsible for differences in skill, ability, and personality requirements.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics and correlations between all the variables are reported in Table 1. Means for the worker and behavioral requirements range between 4.05 and 5.86 (on a 7-point scale). Standard deviations range between .81 and 1.12. The skills and the abilities are highly related, and relationship-oriented behavior and interaction-related behavior are also highly related. Finally, adjustment, and achievement orientation are moderately related to the skills and abilities, but less related to the behavioral requirements. The strong relationship between individualism-collectivism and power distance is a spurious one. Hofstede’s research (1984) has shown this is due to the relationship of both dimensions to national wealth.

Differences in Worker Requirements between Expatriate and Domestic Jobs

The first four hypotheses concern whether expatriate jobs have higher social and perceptual skill, reasoning ability, adjustment, and achievement orientation requirements than domestic jobs. Table 2 shows means, standard deviations and the results of ANCOVAs for these requirements by job location (domestic vs. international job), controlling for career specialty.

Hypothesis 1 suggested that expatriates have higher social skill requirements than domestic workers because their social skills are important for cross-cultural adjustment. We found that international jobs had significantly higher social skill requirements than domestic jobs (mean difference = .30). Closer inspection of the individual skills indicated that service orientation (mean difference = .51) and instructing (mean difference = .41) evidenced the largest
differences. The other social skills showed smaller differences (although still significant) between international and domestic jobs. These results support the hypothesis that expatriate work has higher social skill requirements than domestic work.

Hypothesis 2 proposed that expatriate work requires higher perceptual skill requirements so expatriates can better understand HCNs' behaviors. We found that expatriate work had significantly higher perceptual skill requirements than domestic work (mean difference = .37). An examination of the individual skill items indicates that the largest differences were in social perceptiveness (mean difference = .49), with active listening and monitoring showing smaller, but still significant, differences. These results support the hypothesis that expatriate work has higher perceptual skill requirements than domestic work.

Hypothesis 3 suggested that expatriate work requires higher levels of reasoning ability than domestic work because expatriate work entails more uncertainty due to cultural unfamiliarity. We found that expatriate work had significantly higher reasoning ability requirements than domestic work (mean difference = .30). Among the individual items, originality showed the largest differences (mean difference = .39), with problem sensitivity, inductive reasoning, information ordering, and fluency of ideas showing smaller, but still significant, differences. These results support the hypothesis that expatriate work has higher reasoning ability requirements than domestic work.

Hypothesis 4 suggested that expatriate work has a higher level of adjustment and achievement orientation personality requirements than domestic work because it facilitates adaptation to foreign assignments. We found that expatriate work had significantly higher adjustment personality requirements than domestic work (mean difference = .36). An examination of the individual scale items indicates that the largest difference was in self-control (mean difference = .52). In addition, we found that expatriate work required significantly higher
achievement orientation than domestic work (mean difference = .35). As expected, the three individual items showed significant differences between international and domestic work (mean differences between .27 - .40). These results support the hypothesis that expatriate work has higher adjustment and achievement orientation personality requirements than domestic work.

Supplemental Analyses. In making comparisons between domestic and international work, we have dichotomized the nation-level data. In so doing, it is possible that some important information about differences between nations has been lost. This would serve to reduce the amount of variance explained by the dichotomized variable. Because of this, we have conducted several supplemental analyses to examine nation- and region-level differences. These analyses were conducted on the social and perceptual skills only, because this was the only worker requirement data available across the entire sample.

The first supplemental analysis examines the amount of variance explained by nation-level differences. This is the most fine-grained analysis of culture differences in skill requirements, and will yield an upper estimate on the amount of variance attributable to national culture. The regression analyses showed that when examining social and perceptual skills at the nation level of analysis (utilizing a series of dummy variable codes for nation; Cohen & Cohen, 1983), significantly more variance was explained than was explained in the domestic and international analyses previously conducted ($\Delta R^2 = .15, p < .05$, and $\Delta R^2 = .17, p < .01$). The change in R-squared reflects the increase in R-squared when dummy variables for nations were entered after the career specialty dummy variables. Although virtually every country showed higher skill requirements than the U.S., some countries were particularly high. For example, the mean difference for social and perceptual skill requirements between Kuwait and the U.S. was .92 and .79, respectively. The mean difference was even higher between Bulgaria and the U.S., with differences of 1.24 and 1.19 for social and perceptual skill requirements, respectively.
These differences are much greater than those found with the domestic versus international dichotomy (cf. Table 2).

One of the problems with the nation-level analyses, however, is the sheer number of comparisons that must be made. This complexity makes it difficult to interpret any differences that are found. As such, it may be useful to investigate an intermediate level of analysis. Fortunately, Ronen and Shenkar (1985) have grouped nations into relatively homogeneous regions. In addition to those regions, we added several regions (e.g., Africa, Eastern Europe, Russia, China, an Caribbean) that were not included at their study. Using these region codes, we conducted another set of regression analyses. As expected, the amount of variance explained by region was smaller than that explained by nation ($\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .01$, and $\Delta R^2 = .06, p < .01$ for social and perceptual skills, respectively), but it was greater than that explained by the domestic versus international dichotomy (cf. Table 2). In particular, working in Eastern Europe (Bulgaria, Hungary, and Poland) and Nordic (Denmark, Netherlands, and Sweden) regions required much higher levels of social and perceptual skills than working in U.S. The mean difference for social and perceptual skill requirements between Eastern Europe and the U.S. was .58 and .59, and between Nordic and the U.S. was .61 and .58, respectively.

Relationships between Cultural Values and Expatriate Behavioral Requirements

Hypotheses 5, 6, and 7 concern the relationship between cultural values and expatriate behavioral requirements. Table 3 reports the number of respondents in each nation or region (using Hofstede’s (1988) groupings). The average number of respondents per nation was 19 if the U.S. is included, 11 if the U.S. is not included. Table 4 provides correlations between the cultural and work behavior measures.

Hypothesis 5 suggested that expatriates working in nations high in collectivism would focus more on behaviors related to relationship development because collectivism emphasizes
interpersonal relationships. In the individualism-collectivism scale, lower scale values indicate a more collectivistic culture, and negative correlations indicate support for the hypothesis. We found a significant negative correlation between individualism-collectivism and relationship-oriented behavior \((r = -0.36, p < .01)\). Except for one individual item (providing consultation and advice to others), all items were significantly related, with correlations ranging from -0.25 to -0.39. Based on these findings, it appears that expatriates working in countries high in collectivism engage in more relationship-oriented behaviors.

Hypothesis 6 suggested that host nations' masculine cultures would be negatively related to expatriates' interacting with others. The correlation between interaction-related behavior scale and masculinity-femininity was not significant \((r = -0.12)\). However, the sign of correlation was negative, as expected, and two of the individual items (communicating with persons outside the organization, and performing for or working directly with the public) were significant \((r = -0.20, p < .10)\). Overall, the hypothesis regarding masculinity-femininity received little support.

Hypothesis 7 suggested that host nations' cultures high in power distance would be positively related to expatriates' administrative behavior. We found a significant positive correlation between the administrative scale and power distance \((r = 0.22, p < .10)\). Both performing administrative activities \((r = 0.26, p < .05)\) and monitoring and controlling resources \((r = 0.24, p < .05)\) were significant. Managing was not significant \((r = 0.14)\). Therefore, Hypothesis 7 was largely supported.

Discussion

The results for comparisons between domestic and expatriate work reveal that expatriate work had higher social and perceptual skill, reasoning ability, and adjustment and achievement orientation personality requirements than domestic work. In addition, expatriates working in countries high in collectivism tended to engage in more relationship-oriented behaviors than
those working in countries high in individualism and that expatriates working in countries high in power distance were more likely to engage in various administrative behaviors.

Several methodological strengths increase our confidence in these findings. First, the study was conducted in one large, multi-national organization. This eliminates the potentially confounding effects that organizational factors might have on the results (Hofstede, 1980). Second, common method variance cannot be responsible for the results because two different sources of data were used: A survey for the measure of worker requirements and Hofstede’s indexes for the measures of cultural values. Finally, the data set is large (N=1,312) and comprehensive (156 countries), thereby providing adequate variance in study measures.

There are a number of implications for the literature. Several studies have argued for the relationship between various worker requirements and expatriate adjustment (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Arvey et al., 1991; Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Caligiuri, 2000; Cui et al., 1998; Harrison et al., 1996; Mendenhall and Oddou, 1985; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1999). Few studies have actually measured these requirements and then matched them to a comparable group working domestically. In other words, although previous research has found relationships between skill, ability, and personality characteristics and expatriates’ adjustment or performance, it has not been able to establish whether those characteristics are more important for expatriate workers, in part, because these characteristics are likely to be important for domestic workers as well. By empirically testing differences in requirements between domestic and international work of the same type in the same organization, we can conclude these skill, ability, and personality requirements are greater for expatriate than domestic workers. Thus, our findings imply that expatriate jobs have higher worker requirements to better adapt to (or adjust themselves to) the new and unfamiliar cultural settings.
Also, drawing from both value/belief theory of culture and social learning theory, this study suggests that expatriates may adjust their behavior to the host culture (Brewster, 1995; Hofstede, 1993). In other words, by showing that expatriate behavioral requirements vary with the host nations’ cultural values, this study encourages future research to investigate the process through which expatriates adjust themselves to the host nation’s culture. This study, with the measures defined at a broad level and the large number of respondents working in 156 different countries, provides some evidence on the influence of cultural differences on expatriates’ requirements and behaviors.

The results of this study have several practical implications for both pre-departure and post-departure stages of expatriation. U.S. multinational companies have been criticized for neglecting the role of cultural adjustment in selection and training (Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991). This may be due to a lack of knowledge of what skills, abilities and personality traits to emphasize in expatriate selection and training (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Oddou, 1991). For example, if an expatriate has high levels of social and perceptual skills then he or she will better adjust to the culturally unfamiliar working environment because of skill in building social relationships and correctly perceiving and attributing the causes of HCN behavior. With a high level of reasoning ability, expatriates will be better able to deal with uncertainties and stress caused by cultural unfamiliarity. Furthermore, expatriates high on adjustment or achievement orientation will be more tolerant of or motivated to tolerate the uncertainty or discomfort produced by being in unfamiliar cultures. By recognizing the skill, ability, and personality requirements of expatriate work, multi-national organizations can design and implement better selection and training tools for expatriates in the pre-departure stage.

In addition, by considering the relationships between cultural values and work behaviors in the post-departure stage, organizations may be able to select or train expatriates so they can
adjust themselves to the host culture more quickly, have closer relationships with HCNs, and perform more effectively. For example, if an organization needs to send expatriates to Eastern Asian countries where HCNs emphasize interpersonal relationships, it should consider sending individuals who are prone to engage in relationship-oriented behaviors, or, at the very least, emphasize the importance of these behaviors when interacting with HCNs. Furthermore, the idea that certain sets of behaviors should be learned for a certain cultural value may be very useful for post-arrival training, which is often behaviorally-based (Selmer, Torbiorn, & de Leon, 1998; Selmer, 2001). Thus, by studying the relationships between cultural values and desirable expatriate behaviors, organizations can select and train expatriates more appropriately for different cultures.

Limitations and Future Directions

The current study used Hofstede's measures of cultural values, which are the most comprehensive, publicly available measures. Notwithstanding the strengths noted earlier, legitimate concerns have been raised about Hofstede's measures, including a lack of exhaustiveness, adequacy of the sample of nations, generalizability, possible historical changes, and some validity problems (Schwartz, 1994; Spector, Cooper, & Sparks, 2001). Notwithstanding these concerns, there have been several studies indicating that Hofstede's cultural index has an acceptable level of predictive validity (Hofstede, 2001; Smith et al., 1998). Future research should directly measure cultural values held by HCNs, which may provide more accurate information about cultural dimensions. This is likely to produce stronger relationships than those obtained in our study.

It should also be acknowledged that we had relatively modest effect sizes, particularly in terms of differences in domestic and international jobs. As we noted, in dichotomizing the nation-level data, we likely lose some information about differences between the nations. Future
research can take a more fine-grained approach by investigating other potential factors (e.g., specific differences in religion, social, and political systems) that may be responsible for differences in expatriate work. It is also important to keep in mind that one of the primary purposes of this research is to empirically test whether differences in skill, ability, and personality requirements exist between domestic and international assignments due to the general unfamiliarity with foreign working environments, which would include cultural values, language and religion differences, and a host of other differences. We view our study as an initial attempt to demonstrate that these differences exist, given that no existing research has empirically compared domestic/international differences with comparable groups. Clearly, additional research directly examining more proximal reasons for the differences will help us better understand why certain countries have higher skill, ability, and personality requirements.

In addition, because these data were cross-sectional in nature, it is impossible to determine whether expatriate behavior is influenced by culture, or whether certain types of individuals are assigned to countries with a certain set of cultural values that suit their behavioral style. The fact that the organization studied does not have an assessment and placement system centered on behavioral style suggests that this latter explanation is unlikely. It might be possible, however, that certain types of individuals self-select into expatriate roles. Research is clearly needed on this issue.

Finally, we did not examine the process by which host nations’ culture influences expatriates’ behavior. Although the present study does not allow us to directly investigate the adjustment process, our findings do suggest some of the worker requirements needed for expatriates’ adaptive job performance. To better understand how the host culture influences expatriates’ behavior, it would be important to examine the interaction process between expatriates and HCNs and how cultural values are enacted (Dubin, 1978).
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Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Worker Requirements, Behavioral Requirements, and Cultural Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean a</th>
<th>SD a</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Mean b</th>
<th>SD b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social skills</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceptual skills</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reasoning ability</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adjustment</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Achievement orientation</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Relationship-oriented behavior</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Interaction-related behavior</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Administrative behavior</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Individualism-collectivism</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43.98</td>
<td>25.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Masculinity-femininity</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49.44</td>
<td>18.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Power distance</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>22.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Individual-level.
b Nation-level.
* p < .05 (one-tailed). ** p < .01 (one-tailed).

Note. Individual-level correlations below the diagonal. Nation-level correlations above the diagonal.
Table 2

Mean Differences and Standard Deviations for Domestic and International Jobs Controlling for Career Specialty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Domestic Mean (SD)</th>
<th>International Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>4.76 (0.94)</td>
<td>5.06 (0.88)</td>
<td>37.39**</td>
<td>1,1307</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>5.09 (1.24)</td>
<td>5.37 (1.16)</td>
<td>21.99**</td>
<td>1,1294</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>5.27 (1.25)</td>
<td>5.48 (1.13)</td>
<td>20.51**</td>
<td>1,1298</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>4.99 (1.29)</td>
<td>5.17 (1.21)</td>
<td>18.16**</td>
<td>1,1291</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructing</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>3.91 (1.20)</td>
<td>4.32 (1.07)</td>
<td>26.34**</td>
<td>1,1237</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>4.50 (1.36)</td>
<td>5.01 (1.30)</td>
<td>31.15**</td>
<td>1,1241</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual Skills</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>5.14 (0.91)</td>
<td>5.51 (0.79)</td>
<td>61.48**</td>
<td>1,1309</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Listening</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>5.75 (0.95)</td>
<td>6.03 (0.87)</td>
<td>31.63**</td>
<td>1,1304</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>4.62 (1.09)</td>
<td>4.97 (1.08)</td>
<td>32.95**</td>
<td>1,1286</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Perceptiveness</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>5.06 (1.22)</td>
<td>5.55 (1.08)</td>
<td>57.80**</td>
<td>1,1298</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning Ability</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>4.70 (0.92)</td>
<td>5.00 (0.85)</td>
<td>8.74**</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency of Ideas</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>4.76 (1.28)</td>
<td>5.05 (1.21)</td>
<td>4.36*</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>4.54 (1.30)</td>
<td>4.92 (1.10)</td>
<td>7.81**</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Sensitivity</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>5.04 (1.25)</td>
<td>5.43 (1.09)</td>
<td>7.26**</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductive Reasoning</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>5.10 (1.08)</td>
<td>5.35 (0.98)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive Reasoning</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>4.99 (1.29)</td>
<td>5.35 (1.10)</td>
<td>6.59*</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Ordering</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4.29 (1.29)</td>
<td>4.60 (1.23)</td>
<td>4.78*</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Flexibility</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>4.19 (1.38)</td>
<td>4.29 (1.21)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>5.61 (1.04)</td>
<td>5.97 (0.96)</td>
<td>16.15**</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>5.44 (1.38)</td>
<td>5.96 (1.18)</td>
<td>21.18**</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Tolerance</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>5.66 (1.15)</td>
<td>6.01 (1.11)</td>
<td>12.52**</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>5.75 (1.25)</td>
<td>5.95 (1.12)</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement orientation</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>5.59 (1.13)</td>
<td>5.94 (0.94)</td>
<td>16.22**</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement/effort</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>5.42 (1.28)</td>
<td>5.76 (1.15)</td>
<td>15.16**</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>5.74 (1.14)</td>
<td>6.01 (0.99)</td>
<td>9.60**</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>5.65 (1.45)</td>
<td>6.05 (1.12)</td>
<td>11.66**</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05. ** p < .01. (two-tailed).
### Table 3

**Number of Respondents per Nation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yugoslavia 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* This table includes only the 50 nations and regions into which work behavior measures were aggregated. Only these nations and regions could be matched with Hofstede’s (1988) cultural index.
Table 4

Correlations between Cultural Values and Behavioral Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial Behaviors</th>
<th>Cultural Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship-oriented Behavior</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating teams</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and building teams</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching others</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching and developing others</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing consultation and advice to others</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction-related Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting the meaning of information</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with supervisors, peers, or subordinates</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with persons outside the organization</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting and caring for others</td>
<td>-.22†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling or influencing others</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving conflicts and negotiating with others</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing for or working directly with the public</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing administrative activities</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and controlling resources</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.20†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p < .10 (one-tailed). * p < .05 (one-tailed). ** p < .01 (one-tailed).

n = 50.