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Cultural Identification and Global Mobility: Exploring the Impact of Monoculturalism and Biculturalism on Willingness to Work Internationally and Effectiveness While on International Assignments

Michael Isichei

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the effect of cultural identification on global mobility. Specifically, it examines the impact of self-identification as monocultural or bicultural on a person’s willingness to work internationally, and their effectiveness while working internationally. It also considers how, the degree of integration between the cultural identities of bicultural individuals, known as bicultural identity integration, influences these outcomes. The study of bicultural individuals continues to move beyond its origins in the psychology literature as business and management scholars increasingly recognize the significance of bicultural experiences and skills within organisations. Culturally diverse individuals, such as biculturals, who are poised between two cultures, multiple languages, and several cultural traditions, are increasingly seen to represent a significant source of value for multinational organisations. Given the consistent increase in the need for globally mobile employees, this thesis considers the suitability of bicultural individuals for international roles.

Empirically, the thesis reports two studies. The first study analyzes the impact of cultural identification on the willingness of third-level students to undertake an international assignment in the future. The second study analyzes the impact of cultural identification on the effectiveness of international assignees while on assignments. Data for the studies are drawn from 285 third-level students in Ireland and 356 international assignees working for a multinational food corporation respectively. The results indicate that bicultural individuals are more willing to work internationally than monocultural individuals. Further, the results reveal that bicultural international assignees exhibit higher levels of cultural intelligence, and greater levels of contextual performance than monocultural assignees but do not differ in their work-role adjustment or knowledge transfer while on assignments. Although bicultural identity integration does not appear to impact the willingness of bicultural individuals to undertake an international assignment, it does impact their effectiveness while on an assignment. This thesis provides empirical evidence that culturally diverse individuals, such as biculturals, can make unique contributions within multinational organisations.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

“I personally believe that being bi-cultural gives me a very strong advantage over someone that is only of a single culture, in all areas of my life, especially in education and when it comes to work. I believe multicultural people have more of an awareness and understanding of different people and situations... We've had the challenge of adapting to a different culture and have succeeded and I personally am confident, I can do it again in different situations and jobs. I like that I can relate to a lot of people”.

“I am very efficient at delineating the two (cultures) in areas such as communication. For example, I can be talking to a Nigerian in pidgin English and if approached by an Irish person or other national, I can immediately change - very swiftly to speaking in the Irish tone of voice. It is a skill others noticed that I have. Something I originally didn't realise I was doing myself”.

“I moved to Ireland at the age of five, having previously lived in Germany and Algeria. My parents made sure to speak Arabic to me as I was constantly learning English...in school. Growing up I practised my own culture at home, eating traditional dishes, celebrating our own celebrations, and practicing our religion, Islam. However that did not stop me from experiencing the Irish culture around me...in everyday life. I learnt Irish, as well as English, and I made Irish friends- and had my own Algerian friends and friends of other arab nationalities. I got the best of both and I believe this is what defines me today. I don't have complications and I am not stuck between two 'worlds' or cultures as such because I learnt to balance the two, and in turn be open to balancing all the other cultures, making me develop an interest in others like myself”.

(Accounts provided by bicultural individuals that participated in the research presented in this thesis)

The accounts above were provided by bicultural individuals. Bicultural individuals are those who identify with, have been exposed to, and have internalised two cultures (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002). Biculturalism refers to “the ability to comfortably understand and use the norms, ways of thinking and attitudes common within two cultural systems” (Friedman and Liu, 2009: 333). Monocultural individuals on the other hand are those who identify with and have internalised only one culture.
The study of biculturalism and bicultural individuals is moving beyond its origins in the psychology literature. Business and management scholars are increasingly recognizing the significance of bicultural experiences and skills within organisations (e.g. Dau, 2016; Fitzsimmons, 2013; Brannen and Thomas, 2010; Hong, 2010). Bicultural individuals, who are poised between two cultures, multiple languages, and several cultural traditions (Hong et al., 2016), are increasingly seen to represent a significant source of value for multinational organisations that operate across multiple geographic boarders (Fitzsimmons, 2013).

Look no further than corporate giants PepsiCo, Renault, and Nissan for examples of multinational organisations that understand the value of bicultural individuals. Born in India in 1955, Indra Nooyi moved to the US in 1978 to pursue a MBA at Yale University’s Graduate School of Management. Nooyi joined PepsiCo as chief strategist in 1994. In 2006 Nooyi became PepsiCo’s first female CEO, as well as its first CEO not born in the US. Born in 1954 to immigrant parents in Brazil, Carlos Ghosn a Brazilian-Lebanese businessman spent his formative years in two different countries before relocating to several others. Ghosn speaks more than four languages fluently. Ghosn is currently the Chairman and CEO of France-based Renault and Chairman and CEO of Japan-based Nissan. He is also the Chairman and CEO of the Renault-Nissan Alliance and Chairman of Mitsubishi Motors, which is owned by the two companies. Ghosn was the first non-Japanese president of a Japanese automaker. In an interview with Detroit News Ghosn spoke of how his cultural difference impacts his managerial ability. Ghosn stated “Because you are different, you try to integrate, and that pushes you to try to understand the environment in which you find yourself. That tends to develop one's ability to
listen, to observe, to compare—qualities that are very useful in managing” (Detroit News, 2005).

Both Nooyi and Ghosn have not only leveraged their bicultural competence in the development of their careers, but continue to use this competence to lead globally competitive organisations. It’s evident that culturally diverse individuals, such as biculturals can make significant contributions to global organisations.

Bicultural individuals are a distinctive source of talent for global mobility which multinational companies can leverage, as organisations continue in a “war for talent” (Chambers, Foulon, Handfield-Jones, Hankin, and Michaels, 1998).

1.2 RATIONALE FOR THE RESEARCH

As organisations become more global, the relative importance of their international subsidiaries increases. Organisations with large scale global operations are heavily dependent on the willingness of their employees to work outside of their home country (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, 2016). Despite the consistent increase in the need for internationally mobile employees (Brookfield GRS, 2016; 2014), many multinational companies have been faced with unwillingness amongst their employees to relocate internationally (Kim and Froese, 2012; Society for Human Resource Management, 2010; Hippler, 2009; Collings et al., 2007; Konopaske and Werner, 2005). This has made it difficult for such companies to fill international assignment positions.
International assignments involve the temporary relocation of an employee by their organisation to another country to complete specific tasks and accomplish organisational goals (Shaffer et al., 2012). The term “global mobility” and the term “international assignment” are often used interchangeably. Specifically, from an organisational perspective, the term “global mobility” is often used to describe the function of deploying employees internationally.

International assignments play a critical role in the success of multinational organisations, as assignees enable their organisations to function more effectively across national borders (Takeuchi, 2010; Caligiuri and Colakoglu, 2007). When used effectively, international assignments can be a source of competitive advantage for an organisation (Carpenter et al., 2001, 2000).

Although international assignments play a critical role in the success of multinational organisations, the unwillingness of employees to work internationally, has seen some companies resort to sending any employee that is willing, on an international assignment, with little regard for their suitability (Selmer, 2001a). Companies that resort to this may indeed solve a problem, by filling international assignment positions, but they also create a problem, by deploying individuals that have inadequate skill sets. There is therefore a need to secure adequate talent that is globally mobile. Bicultural individuals may represent a source of such talent.

The wider management literature is increasingly focused on identifying how the deployment of bicultural employees can help to address challenges that organisations face in their international operations (Doz, 2016). The growing interest in bicultural individuals within the
workplace has occurred due to a rise in the number of bicultural employees in the labour market. Between 1990 and 2013, the number of international migrants increased globally by 50% to 232 million (United Nations, 2013). By 2015 this figure had risen to 244 million (United Nations, 2015). The significant flow of migrants between national borders has resulted in an increasing number of bicultural individuals. Many workforces subsequently have a rising number of bicultural employees and managers (Brannen and Thomas, 2010).

Bicultural individuals, unlike the majority of the world’s inhabitants, have in depth experiences of two different cultures. They possess two distinct sets of knowledge structures consisting of the meaning systems and behavioural repertoires associated with their respective cultures (Hong et al., 2000). Due to their possession of two distinct sets of knowledge structures, bicultural individuals, unlike monocultural individuals, have an understanding of the norms, attitudes, and beliefs which exist in more than one culture. From an organisational perspective, a value of bicultural employees is that they can apply their cultural knowledge across different cultural contexts (Kane and Levina, 2016). More specifically, bicultural individuals have cultural skills which may have positive implications for global mobility. For instance, research has found that bicultural individuals are able to differentiate between competing cultural perspectives and integrate differing world views (Tadmor et al., 2009). This ability is particularly useful for international assignees, who are regularly required to work in foreign environments. Furthermore, the cultural awareness and openness of bicultural individuals may make them more receptive to working internationally as research tells us that cultural sensitivity and flexibility are strong predictors of a person’s willingness to relocate internationally for work purposes (Mol et al., 2009).
This thesis responds to a call in the international human resource management literature for research that considers culture specific differences when examining willingness to undertake an international assignment (Froese et al., 2013).

The willingness of an employee to undertake an international assignment can have implications for the success of an assignment. Therefore considering the willingness of employees prior to assignments is important. Research indicates that employees who feel pressured or forced to accept an international assignment experience difficulties in adjusting to their assignment, and less willing to advice peers to accept an international assignment (Pinto et al., 2012; Feldman and Thomas, 1992). Conversely, assignees who feel that they have a free choice in deciding whether to accept an assignment have been found to adjust well to their international assignment and display a greater level of commitment while on the assignment (Kraimer and Wayne, 2004).

Of equal importance to the need to consider the willingness of employees to accept an international assignment is the need to consider their suitability for assignments. As multinational organisations become increasingly global in their scope, and indeed deploy more international assignees, there is rising need for employees who possess the competencies to operate globally (Caligiuri et al., 2009). The ability of bicultural individuals to integrate differing world views and switch between cultural frames of reference (Tadmor et al., 2009; Hong et al., 2000) may make them particularly suitable for international assignments. Although bicultural individuals are a distinctive source of talent for global mobility, there is a need to examine and
understand their willingness to working internationally and their effectiveness while on international assignments, before prioritizing them for international roles.

This thesis has two main aims. The first aim is to examine how biculturalism might impact a person’s receptiveness to working internationally. The second aim is to examine the impact of biculturalism on an individual’s level of effectiveness while working abroad. The thesis set out to achieve these aims by considering how, cultural identification, which refers to a person’s sense of identification with, and internalisation of, a national culture, influences an individual’s willingness to undertake an international assignment and their effectiveness while on assignments. While the term “cultural identification” may cover a broad spectrum of identity types, for the purpose of this research, cultural identification refers to whether an individual identifies as monocultural or bicultural. The thesis will therefore compare bicultural and monocultural individuals in order to identify differences which may exist in their willingness to work internationally, and also in their effectiveness while on assignments.

1.3 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES AND MODEL

A review of the international assignment literature (chapter 2) and the biculturalism literature (chapter 3), followed by a synthesis of both literatures led to the proposition of three research questions. All of the research questions had a number of hypotheses related to them. The first research question is related to the first study in the thesis while the second and third research questions are related to the second study. The first and second research questions are analysed using independent sample t-tests. The presentation of figure 1.1 and 1.2 reflects this.
Independent sample t-tests compare groups on particular variables rather than the relationship between variables. The final research question explores the relationship between variables rather than groups, and therefore is supported by a research model. All of the research questions and hypothesis are represented graphically below.
First Research Question and Related Hypotheses

Q1 Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact willingness to undertake an international assignment?

H1: Bicultural individuals will be more willing to accept an international assignment than monocultural individuals.

H2: Bicultural individuals who experience cultural conflict will have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those who experience cultural harmony.

H3: Bicultural individuals who compartmentalize their cultural identities will have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those who blend their cultural identities.

H4: Bicultural individuals who have a high level of bicultural identity integration (BII) (that experience cultural harmony and cultural blendedness) will be more willing to accept an international assignment than bicultural individuals who have a lower level of bicultural identity integration (that do not experience both cultural harmony and cultural blendedness).

H5: Bicultural individuals are more culturally intelligent than monocultural individuals.

H6: Cultural intelligence is positively related to an individual’s willingness to undertake an international assignment.

H7: Cultural intelligence mediates the relationship between cultural identification (monoculturalism or biculturalism) and willingness to undertake an international assignment.
Figure 1.2 Research Question 2 and Related Hypotheses

Q2 Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact the effectiveness of international assignees while they are on an assignment?

**H1:** Bicultural international assignees are more culturally intelligent than monocultural international assignees.

**H2:** Bicultural international assignees are better adjusted to their work roles than monocultural international assignees.

**H3:** Bicultural international assignees do not differ from monocultural international assignees in their family role adjustment.

**H4:** Bicultural international assignees engage in a greater level of knowledge transfer than monocultural international assignees.

**H5:** Bicultural international assignees do not differ from monocultural international assignees in their task performance.

**H6:** Bicultural international assignees perform better within their context than monocultural international assignees.
Figure 1.3 Research Question 3 and Associated Model

**Third Research Question and Associated Model**

**Q3 Does bicultural identity integration (BII) impact the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees?**
1.4 CONTRIBUTIONS OF RESEARCH

The studies presented in this thesis make significant theoretical, empirical, methodological, and contextual contributions to the international assignment and biculturalism literatures. The second study makes a significant theoretical contribution to research by proposing and testing a model of the impact of bicultural Identity Integration on the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees. The model indicated that bicultural identity integration influences the effectiveness of assignees.

Both the first and second studies make significant empirical contributions. The first study in this thesis is the first to empirically demonstrate that bicultural individuals are more willing to work internationally than monocultural individuals. Both studies provided empirical support for the claim that bicultural individuals are likely to possess high levels of cultural intelligence (Moore, 2005). In both studies bicultural individuals had higher levels of cultural intelligence than monocultural individuals. Previous research has proposed a conceptual relationship between cultural intelligence and knowledge transfer. The second study provided empirical support for this relationship.

Both studies also make methodological contributions. In both studies a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to confirm the factor structure of the BIIS-2 scale. In both instances, the factor structure of the scale was not supported. Unlike previous research, this research administered the scale to bicultural individuals from a diverse range of cultural backgrounds. The factor structure requires further assessment using diverse samples of bicultural individuals. Both studies also conducted a confirmatory factor analysis on the newly developed short form
measure of cultural intelligence (SFCQ). In both instances the factor structure of the scale was supported. The studies presented in this thesis are the first to use the measure and validate its factor structure.

Finally, the research presented in this thesis also made a contextual contribution to biculturalism research. Very little biculturalism research has focused on bicultural individuals in Europe. The first study is the first in the biculturalism literature to examine biculturalism in Ireland.

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THESIS

This thesis consists of eight chapters. This section provides a brief overview of each chapter.

Chapter one provides an introduction to the thesis.

Chapter two provides a review of the international assignment literature. The chapter begins by defining what international assignments are and discussing the significance of international assignments. The chapter then considers the motives for sending employees on international assignments. After discussing the motives for sending employees on assignments, the chapter discusses the selection of international assignees. The chapter considers the assignment stage by discussing assignee adjustment and performance. The chapter then considers the cost of international assignments and their return on investment. Finally, the chapter discusses the willingness of employees to undertake international assignments.
Chapter three reviews the biculturalism literature. The chapter begins by defining biculturalism. It then discusses acculturation, which is the theoretical background of biculturalism. To date the biculturalism literature has presented several different approaches to the management of cultural identities. The chapter discusses these approaches, with a particular focus on bicultural identity integration, which is a central theory in the thesis. After discussing bicultural identity integration, the chapter discusses cultural frame switching and the outcomes of biculturalism. The chapter then draws a conclusion in synthesizing the international assignment and biculturalism literatures to develop a number of hypotheses.

Chapter four integrates the international assignment and biculturalism literatures. The chapter begins by arguing that bicultural individuals may be particularly well suited to working internationally. After this, the chapter presents three research questions. The chapter then proceeds to develop hypotheses related to each of the research questions.

Chapter five outlines the research methodology. The chapter begins by discussing the philosophical approach that underpins the research methodology used in this thesis. Specifically, the chapter outlines the appropriateness of the positivist approach. The chapter proceeds to discuss the research design, outlining the survey design, research sample, and data collection process. The chapter concludes by outlining the statistical approaches used to analyse the survey data.

Chapter six presents the first study in the thesis. The chapter introduces the study by outlining the research question and hypotheses. The study set out to examine whether cultural identification as monocultural or bicultural impacts the willingness of students to work
internationally. The study was based on a sample of 285 students. The chapter then briefly discusses the research methods which were used in the study. Specifically, the chapter provides an overview of the participants, procedures, and the measures used. The chapter then provides the results for the proposed hypothesis. Finally, the results are discussed.

Chapter seven presents the second study in the thesis. The chapter introduces the study by outlining the research questions and hypotheses. The study set out to examine whether biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism impacts the effectiveness of international assignees while they are on international assignments, and whether bicultural identity integration impacts the effectiveness of international assignees. The study was based on a sample of 356 international assignees from a multinational food corporation. The chapter then briefly discusses the research methods which were used in the study. Specifically, the chapter provides an overview of the participants, procedures, and the measures used. The chapter then provides the results for the proposed hypothesis. Finally, the chapter discusses the results.

Chapter eight provides a discussion and conclusion for the thesis. The chapter begins by providing a summary of the results. It then discusses the contributions of both studies to research. These contributions are theoretical, empirical, methodological, and contextual. The chapter then outlines the practical implications of the research. After outlining these implications, the chapter addresses the limitations of the research and provides recommendations for future research. Finally, the chapter draws a conclusion to the thesis.
2.1 INTRODUCTION

International assignments play a key role in the implementation of an organisation’s international strategy. International assignments involve the temporary relocation of an employee by their organisation to another country to complete specific tasks and accomplish organisational goals (Shaffer et al., 2012). The traditional international assignment is typically one to three years long, but can last up to five years (Dowling et al., 2008). International assignments traditionally involve the relocation of the assignee and their family (Collings et al., 2011). Despite the emergence of alternative forms of international assignments (Mayerhofer et al., 2004), and predictions that the traditional international assignment would become less dominant over time (Harris, 1999) it appears that the relevance of the traditional international assignment for multinational organisations is not waning. The 2015 Brookfield Global Mobility Trends Survey found that the number of international assignments is not decreasing. Of the 143 global mobility professionals that responded to the survey, 88% stated that their assignment population will either increase or remain the same (Brookfield GRS, 2015).

Business growth is central to the increase in the volume of international assignments (Brookfield GRS, 2016) because as firms become more global in their reach, their number of international subsidiaries increases (Caligiuri and Bonache, 2016) and so too does their number
The terms international assignment, global assignment, and expatriation are often used interchangeably to describe the temporary international relocation of an employee by their organisation for the purpose of fulfilling organisational objectives. Similarly, the terms international assignee and expatriate are used interchangeably to describe employees that relocate internationally for a time bound period, to work in foreign subsidiaries and offices owned by their organisation.

This chapter provides a review of the international assignment literature. The review consists of four sections. The first section outlines the key reasons for using international assignments. The second section examines the selection of international assignees. The third section reviews international assignee adjustment and performance as well as the return on investment of international assignments. The key factors influencing the willingness of employees to undertake an international assignment are outlined in the final section. The following chapter focuses on corporate assignees (those sent on an assignment by their employers) rather than self-initiated assignees (those who relocate internationally of their own accord for work purposes). This is not to downplay the significance of self-initiated assignees for multinational organisations, but rather to provide a boundary for the chapter and the present study.

2.2 MOTIVES FOR USING INTERNATIONAL ASSIGNMENTS

Edstrom and Galbraith’s (1977) study has strongly influenced research relating to the motives for using international assignments. They outlined three key motives for using international assignments. Firstly, international assignments may be used for the purpose of filling key
positions were there is a lack of qualified nationals in the subsidiary country. This may be the case if the subsidiary is in an underdeveloped or developing country. Secondly, international assignments may be used as a means of developing the global management competencies of individual managers.

Indeed it has been suggested that “an international assignment is the single most powerful experience in shaping the perspective and capabilities of effective global leaders” (Black et al., 1999:2). International assignments are considered to be one of the most important methods of management development (Stroh et al., 2005). Finally, international assignments may be used for the purpose of organisational development, control and coordination. An example of which, may include transferring knowledge between subsidiaries and maintaining or enhancing the organisational structure.

A recent industry survey found that the primary objectives for sending employees on international assignments are to fill managerial skills gaps, to fill technical skills gaps, and for international management experience (Brookfield GRS, 2016). Almost 40 years after Edstrom and Galbraith’s (1977) study, two of the three key motives for using international assignments they identified remain amongst the main reasons for the deployment of international assignees (i.e. filling key positions and management development). Our understanding of the motives for using international assignments is further enhanced by Sparrow and colleagues (2004), who identified six reasons why organisations use international assignments. These reasons included career development, to create an international cadre of managers, to make up for the
unavailability of local expertise, to transfer expertise, to maintain control of local operations, and to ensure the coordination of global policy.

It’s been noted by Collings and Scullion (2006) that previous theoretical research on the motives for using international assignments has distinguished between demand driven and learning driven motives (Evans et al., 2011; Pucik, 1992). International assignments for the purpose of filling positions or maintaining control may be categorised as demand driven while those undertaken for the purpose of managerial or organisational development may be categorised as learning driven.

A more systematic approach to understanding the reasons for using international assignments is provided by Evans et al. (2002), who outline four core reasons for using international assignments. These reasons are based on the duration of the assignment and the purpose of the assignment, as proposed by Pucik (1992). These four reasons are corporate agency, problem solving, competence development, and career enhancement. Demand driven assignees act as corporate agents by transferring knowledge between an organisation’s headquarters and its subsidiary operations. They also maintain control of subsidiary operations during their infancy, by solving the problems of the subsidiary operations based on expert knowledge and experience gained from the headquarters (Evans et al., 2002). Assignments for the purpose of knowledge transfer and control tend to be long term (three or more years) and encompass a range of roles and responsibilities. A key objective of demand driven assignments for the purpose of control may be the alignment of the practices of the subsidiary with those of the headquarters (Delios and Bjoorkman, 2000).
Assignments for the purpose of problem solving involve more specified and narrowly defined objectives that are achievable over a shorter period of time than those related to assignments for the purpose of knowledge transfer and control. These assignments usually occur during the initial development of a subsidiary and when there are short term problems within a subsidiary that need to be resolved (Collings and Scullion, 2006).

Learning driven assignments may be premised on competence development or career enhancement. These assignments, unlike demand driven assignments, focus less on teaching and more on learning and are completed over a longer period of time (ibid). Assignments for the purpose of individual or organisational development are generally long term and have the
objective of developing a global mindset within managers and the organisations as a whole. A
global mindset refers to an orientation of the world that allows one to scan the world from a
broad perspective, seeing certain things that others don’t, such as unexpected trends and
opportunities (Rhinesmith, 1993).

Learning driven and demand driven assignments may also differ in terms of the frame of
reference and behaviour of assignees and host country nationals. It’s proposed that in learning
driven assignments assignees adapt their frame of reference and behaviour to that of the host
environment, whereas in demand driven assignments assignees maintain the frame of
reference and behaviour of the home environment while subordinates in the host environment
are expected to align with the expatriate manager’s behaviour and expectations (Shay and
Baack, 2004).

In examining the role of expatriates in controlling foreign subsidiaries, Harzing (2001)
developed a typology of expatriate roles, which has further enhanced our understanding of
international assignments. Harzing’s study is of particular significance because it transcends the
usual question of why MNCs use international assignments and points towards the importance
of recognising the differences that exist in the roles of international assignees. The roles
adopted by expatriates in controlling foreign subsidiaries identified by Harzing (2001) are the
bear, the bumble bee and the spider. Expatriates that adopt the ‘bear’ role closely observe the
operations of the subsidiary on behalf of the home organisation. These expatriates are
authorised to make decisions concerning the subsidiary and thus decentralise decision making
from the home organisation. Expatriates that adopt the ‘bumble-bee’ role flexibly move from
one subsidiary to another with the goal of establishing and strengthening the subsidiaries informal communications network through the socialisation of host employees. Expatriates adopting the ‘spider’ role maintain control by connecting the informal communications networks within the MNC. Harzing argues that expatriates generally adopt the bear role and that the roles of the bumble-bee and the spider depend strongly on the given context. The bumble-bee and the spider roles appeared to be more relevant and significant in subsidiaries that had been established for longer than 50 years. The bumble-bee role was also found to be significant in newly formed subsidiaries.

Research has highlighted the significance of knowledge of the host culture in effectively controlling the foreign subsidiary (Paik and Sohn, 2004). That is, expatriate managers with significant knowledge of the host culture are more likely to effectively act as agents of control on behalf of the parent company than expatriate managers with a low level of cultural knowledge on the host culture who may in fact harm the parent company’s ability to control the subsidiary (Collings and Scullion, 2006).

While many different motives for using international assignments have been proposed by scholars, it appears that many of the motives can be categorised based on their focus. The motives for using international assignments listed above may fall into the categories of filling positions where there is a shortage of skills; employee development; and organisational development and control. The motives which drive the use of international assignments are also typically learning driven or demand driven. The different roles which international assignees may assume, while on assignment, suggests a need to select assignees that can
suitably fulfil the requirements of a given role. Furthermore, the significance of knowledge of
the host culture also points to the importance of selecting appropriate candidates for
international assignments.

2.3 SELECTING INTERNATIONAL ASSIGNEES

Selecting the best candidates for international assignments is of key importance to MNCs as it
influences their future success (Scullion and Collings, 2006). Selection systems for international
assignments differ from those for local positions as greater emphasis should be placed on
predicting a candidate’s success in the job context (i.e. foreign location) rather than their
success in a given role (Caligiuri and Bucker, 2015). Although greater emphasis should be placed
on predicting a candidate’s success in the international job context, in practice this rarely seems
to be the case. Almost 80% of companies do not assess the adaptability of international
assignment candidates prior to assignments and less than 30% use self-assessment tools to help
prepare assignees for assignments (Brookfield GRS, 2016).

Traditionally, technical competence has been a key criterion in the selection of international
assignees (Collings et al., 2011; Harris and Brewster, 1999). Although technical competence
may be used as a general marker to identify suitable international assignees, organisations
often over emphasise technical competence during the selection process (Anderson, 2005;
Mendenhall and Oddou, 1988; Tung, 1981). While technical competence is important for
international assignment selection, of equal importance is an assignee’s ability to comfortably
operate in foreign environments and work with people of different cultural backgrounds
(Caligiuri, Tarique, and Jacobs, 2009). The importance of the latter abilities is seen in the positive relationship between assignee success and the competencies of cultural intelligence, cultural agility, and global mindset (Caligiuri and Bucker, 2015). Cultural intelligence refers to one’s ability to adapt to varying cultural contexts (Earley and Ang, 2003), while cultural agility relates to one’s ability not only to work in different cultures, but also to comfortably and effectively work with people from different cultures (Caligiuri and Bucker, 2015:280). Like cultural intelligence and cultural agility, global mindset is based on cultural adaptability, but refers specifically to an orientation that allows one to scan the world from a broad perspective and identify unexpected trends and opportunities (Rhinesmith, 1993).

Other predictors that have been identified as relevant in the selection of international assignees are foreign language skills and international assignment experience. A number of meta-analytic studies have revealed that language skill is a positive predictor of international assignee success (e.g. Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Mol et al., 2005). Similarly, research has found that previous international assignment experience can positively influence an individual’s ability to function effectively in a foreign country (e.g. Takeuchi, Tesulk, Tun and Lepak, 2005; Selmer, 2002).

Best practices relating to the selection of international assignees, which are identified in the academic literature, include realistic previews, self-selection, and candidate assessment (Caligiuri and Bucker, 2015). Realistic previews help assignees develop realistic expectations of the assignment, prior to, or during the assignment. Providing realistic job previews prior to an international assignment has been found to increase an assignee’s self-efficacy for an
international assignment and facilitate their cross-cultural adjustment while on assignment (Caligiuri and Phillips, 2003; Searle and Ward 1990). Self-selection affords assignees with the opportunity to determine whether an assignment is right and or suitable for them. Self-selection tools allow potential assignees to assess themselves along the dimensions of personality and individual characteristics; career issues; and family issues (Caligiuri and Bucker, 2015). Candidate assessment involves a formal selection program that takes place after potential assignees have been deemed to possess the technical competence required for the assignment. Assessment may involve the use of cognitive ability or job knowledge tests, or supervisor evaluations (Caligiuri and Bucker, 2015).

While in the host country, international assignees may face several challenges including culture shock, difficulties with the host country language, and difficulties interacting with host country nationals (Caligiuri and Tarique, 2012), all of which can impact their level of adjustment and performance while on assignment. A key indicator of the effectiveness of selection is an assignee’s adjustment and performance when on assignment. It is therefore important to explore the broader issues of adjustment and performance.

2.4 INTERNATIONAL ASSIGNEE ADJUSTMENT AND PERFORMANCE

2.4.1 Assignee Adjustment

The international assignment literature has often linked assignee adjustment with assignment success, suggesting that when assignees are unable to adjust to their new environment, their
assignments generally end in failure (Caligiuri, 2000; Shaffer and Harrison, 1999). Indeed, one of the most commonly cited reasons for the premature termination of international assignments, is cross-cultural adjustment difficulty (Takeuchi, Yun, and Tesluk, 2002). Recent industry research has found that almost 1 in 5 assignees struggle to adapt to the host location. The inability of assignees to adapt to the host location is among the three most commonly cited reason for unsuccessful assignments (Brookfield GRS, 2016), indicating that the adjustment of assignees is an ever present challenge in international assignments. In their seminal work on assignee adjustment, Black and Gregersen (1991a: 463) suggested that assignee adjustment relates to an assignee’s “perceived degree of psychological comfort with various aspects of the host country”. Adjustment has also been defined as an individual’s general satisfaction with life in their new setting (Hippler, 2000).

The construct of assignee adjustment is complex and has been somewhat contested in the academic literature to date (Haslberger, Brewster, and Hippler, 2013). Consequently, several different antecedents of assignee adjustment have been identified in the adjustment literature. One such factor is previous international experience. Previous international experience has been empirically found to be related to expatriate adjustment (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). Previous international experience allows an assignee to anticipate problems related to cultural transitions and react accordingly, facilitating the assignees adjustment in the assignment location (Black et al., 1991). Previous international work and non-work experiences may also encourage the development of accurate expectations about international relocations (Black et al., 1991).
Language ability has also been found to be related to expatriate adjustment (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). Knowledge of the host country language eases an assignee’s transition into the foreign environment (Mendenhall and Oddou, 1986). Integrating and developing relationships with host country nationals may also positively influence an assignee’s level of adjustment (Torbiörn, 1982) as having friends in the host country can significantly enhance an assignee’s ability to understand local behaviours and social cultures (Searle and Ward, 1990). The provision of host country mentors can influence the likelihood of assignees interacting with host country nationals and has also been found to positively influence their adjustment within the work context (Feldman and Bolino, 1999). As well as the aforementioned factors, a host of other factors have been found to influence assignee adjustment such as withdrawal cognition, job satisfaction, spousal adjustment (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005), Self-efficacy, and family support (Hechanova et al., 2003).

A conceptual model of expatriate adjustment which proposes that expatriate adjustment consists of two key components, namely, anticipatory adjustment and in-country adjustment, was developed by Black et al. (1991). Anticipatory adjustment relates to the degree to which the assignee believes that they will adjust to the new environment, prior to the relocation. Anticipatory adjustment is based on the expectations that the assignee develops for the international assignment. These expectations are strongly influenced by the assignee’s previous international experience and the extent of cross-cultural training received prior to the relocation. An Organisations selection criteria and mechanisms will also influence the assignee’s anticipatory adjustment. Anticipatory adjustment can positively influence in-country adjustment (Black et al., 1991).
In-country adjustment relates to individual adjustment, job adjustment, adjustment to organisational culture, non-work adjustment, and organisational socialization. Shaffer et al. (1999) expanded on Black et al.’s. (1991) expatriate adjustment model by including the two moderating variables, previous assignments, and language fluency. They found that role clarity and role discretion positively influence work adjustment. Role conflict and role novelty on the other hand were found to have a negative influence on work adjustment. Support from the assignee’s co-workers and logistical support positively influenced adjustment to interacting with host country nationals (interaction adjustment). Cultural novelty and the adjustment of the assignee’s spouse strongly influenced general adjustment and also influenced interaction adjustment. The two moderating variables of previous assignments and language fluency were found to positively affect interaction adjustment.

Despite the widespread acceptance and support of the expatriate adjustment model posited by Black and colleagues, over time it has received increasing amounts of criticism. Although, for a considerable period of time, the measure of expatriate adjustment established by Black and Stephens (1989) was a mainstay in expatriate adjustment research, theoretical concerns surrounding the dimensions of adjustment included in the measure (Hippler et al., 2014; Lazarova and Thomas, 2012) have led to the birth of alternative conceptualisations of expatriate adjustment (e.g. Haslberger, Brewster, and Hippler, 2013; Lazarova, Westman, and Shaffer, 2010). Building on the work of Lazarova et al. (2010), the most recent reconceptualization of expatriate adjustment has been put forward by Shaffer et al. (2015). In contrast to the seminal conceptualisation of expatriate adjustment, Shaffer and colleagues
sought to develop a measure which transcends the traditional form of expatriation (i.e. corporate expatriation) and considers wider forms of global work.

The recent conceptualisation of expatriate adjustment posited by Shaffer et al’ (2015) is based on role theory (Katz and Kahn, 1978; Kahn et al., 1964). The use of role theory as a theoretical underpinning for the conceptualisation of expatriate adjustment allowed Shaffer et al. (2015) to develop a measure that considers adjustment across the different roles and life domains of global professionals. Based on five interrelated studies which consisted of a sample of 1231 corporate, self-initiated expatriates, international business travellers, and global domestics, Shaffer et al. (2015) developed a multidimensional scale of work and family role adjustment of global professionals. Their studies found that both work and family role adjustment consist of task and relationship elements, shedding more light on the concept of expatriate adjustment and providing direction for future research on the topic.

2.4.2 Assignee Performance

Unlike assignee adjustment, which, although contested, has often been defined in a consistent manner in the international assignment literature, assignee performance has been defined and conceptualised in a multiplicity of ways. The lack of theoretical consensus on what constitutes assignee performance has resulted in the use of indirect measures when examining the concept. Commonly used indirect measures of performance include intention to remain on assignment, interaction with host country nationals, and job attitudes (Thomas and Lazarova, 2006).
In practice, meeting task requirements is considered to be a primary component of assignee performance (Lee and Sukoco, 2010). Although quiet significant, the assessment of the performance of international assignees should not be limited to the effective execution of tasks alone, but should also consider the development of the assignee, and the development and management of relationships (Collings, 2014; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Ones and Viswesvaran, 1997). An assignee’s ability to effectively interact with culturally different host country nationals is a factor that can influence their performance while on an international assignment (Lazarova and Thomas, 2012). In fact, it has been noted that it has become so important to understand individual differences in the capacity to effectively interact with culturally different individuals that a new stream of research known as cultural intelligence (Thomas and Inkson, 2004; Earley and Ang, 2003) has emerged (Lazarova and Thomas, 2012).

An assignee’s level of international work experience can be a strong predictor of their performance while on assignment, as previous experiences refine an assignee’s ability to communicate, and work with host country nationals (Richard, 2000; Mendenhall and Oddou, 1985). Assignee adjustment and performance have often been found to be related to one another. For instance, in a study based on a survey of global executives, Pomeroy (2006) found that up to 51% of assignees struggled to perform effectively in the host country because of their inability to adapt to the host country. Similarly, several other studies have found an empirical relationship between assignee adjustment and performance (e.g. Malek and Budhwar, 2013; Takeuchi, Yun and Tesluk, 2002; Kraimer et al., 2001). It has however, been suggested that the relationship between cross-cultural adjustment and performance is not
conclusive and requires further investigation (Lazarova and Thomas, 2012; Thomas and Lazarova, 2006; Tucker, Bonial and Lahti, 2004).

Despite the lack of agreement concerning the direct relationship between assignee adjustment and performance, both factors influence the success of an assignment, as poor adjustment or performance can result in failure to meet assignment objectives and the subsequent failure of the assignment. Failed assignments can have both direct and indirect costs for organisations. Direct costs can include training, salary, travel and relocation expenses, while indirect costs, which are less tangible, may include damaged relationships with host country business partners and a loss of market share. The cost of international assignments, and their value, remains a consistent concern for organisations (McNulty and Tharenou, 2004; Welch, 2003). The following section will examine the cost of international assignments and the return on investment of international assignments.

2.5 INTERNATIONAL ASSIGNMENT COSTS AND RETURN ON INVESTMENT

In the past, deploying international assignees was said to cost an organisation between three and five times the cost of deploying them at home (Selmer, 2001a; Forster, 2000). Companies have attempted to resolve cost issues by reducing assignment benefits. Despite a move towards more standardised compensation packages, a recent industry survey found that 98% of responding organisations feel that the pressure to reduce costs had increased or remained the same over the preceding year (Brookfield GRS, 2015). Although the pressure to reduce costs remains constant, few organisations appear to have a true understanding of the cost associated
with expatriation (Sparrow et al., 2004). In the aforementioned survey, only 42% of organisations required a cost benefit analysis at the start of the assignment and only 67% prepared cost estimates for all assignments. Based on these findings it appears that the ability of many MNCs to determine the value of international assignments is questionable. The Brookfield 2011 Global Mobility Survey indicated that only 8% of participating companies formally measured the return on investment (ROI) of international assignments. Several years later very little has changed as the 2015 Brookfield Global Mobility Survey indicated that 95% of MNCs don’t measure the ROI of international assignments (Brookfield GRS, 2015). It must however be noted that on both occasions the staggeringly low level of ROI measure was not due to the fact that measuring ROI isn’t a priority, but rather because companies generally don’t know how to measure the ROI of assignments.

The uncertainty concerning the measurement of international assignment success has led to the establishment of a branch of research on the return on investment of international assignment (Johnson, 2005; McNulty and Tharenou, 2004). Although no two ROI calculations are the same, owing to the differing objectives and durations of international assignments, calculating the ROI of international assignments can provide MNCs with an insight as to the current utility of their assignments and allows for the enhancement of assignment practices and policies. In order to calculate the ROI of an international assignment MNCs should consider the financial investment made in the assignment (costs) and the expected returns (outcome of the assignment) (Johnson, 2005).
While some costs associated with an international assignment are tangible and easily quantifiable (e.g. housing, salary, relocation) other costs such as the administration costs of the assignment aren’t as tangible or easily quantifiable (Collings and Scullion, 2006). Recently, McNulty (2013) posited that expatriate return on investment (ROI) is based on a combination of both individual and corporate benefits and costs. Expatriate return on investment (eROI) is the sum of corporate return on investment (cROI) plus individual return on investment (iROI). Mathematically this is presented as cROI + iROI = eROI. cROI and iROI differ in that cROI focuses on the benefits that MNCs receive from expatriation, whereas iROI focuses on the motives of individual assignees to undertake international assignments and the benefits which they perceive will accrue to them as a result of undertaking an assignment (McNulty, DeCieri, 2016). In the academic literature, eROI has also been defined as a “calculation in which the financial and non-financial benefits to the firm are compared with the financial and non-financial costs of the international assignment, as appropriate to the assignment’s purpose” (McNulty and Tharenou, 2004: 73).

Although considerable progress has been made over the last number of years in relation to the conceptualisation of the ROI of international assignments and the development of practical approaches to measuring ROI, few organisations have formal procedures in place to measure eROI and many depend on informal corporate data when assessing the ROI of assignments (McNulty et al., 2009). Hence the debate on ROI has remained rather academic.

Attaining return on investment from international assignments begins with selecting the right individuals to send on assignment. While a candidate for an international assignment may have
the technical competence, experience, and interpersonal skills necessary to succeed while on assignment, if they are not willing to undertake an international assignment or feel compelled to accept an assignment, the assignment may yield little ROI for their organisation. This is because the perception of free choice in deciding whether or not to accept an international assignment influences the success of the assignment (Feldman and Thomas, 1992). The individual willingness of assignees to accept an international assignment therefore plays an important role in the overall success of an assignment and influences the ROI of an assignment for an organisation.

2.6 WILLINGNESS TO UNDERTAKE INTERNATIONAL ASSIGNMENTS

Multi-National Companies (MNC) are finding it increasingly difficult to find suitable and willing individuals to undertake international assignment (Society for Human Resource Management, 2010; Collings, Morley and Scullion, 2007; Konopaske and Werner, 2005; Schuler et al., 2004). Willingness to undertake an international assignment may be defined as “the likelihood of accepting a job offer that requires living and working in a foreign country for a temporary period” (Mol et al., 2009:2). There is evidence that corporate leaders with international work experience lead more effectively than those who haven’t worked internationally (Dragoni et al., 2014; Carpenter, Sanders, and Gregersen, 2001). Thus willingness to undertake an international assignment is a key selection criterion for multinational organisations (Caligiuri and Bonache, 2016). Up to 77% of organisations consider an individual’s willingness to undertake an international assignment during the selection process (Brookfield GRS, 2015).
Although the demand for international assignees is increasing as MNCs are becoming increasingly global, there has been no concomitant increase in the number of employees willing to undertake an international assignment (Adler, 2002; Caligiuri and Cascio, 1998). A shortage of international managers can have adverse effects on the implementation of a MNC’s business strategy (Gregerson et al., 1998; Scullion, 1994, 1992) and on the international growth of the MNC. The shortage in willing international assignment candidates, has led some companies to resort to sending any employee that is willing, on an international assignment, with little regard for their suitability (Selmer, 2001a). Understanding why employees may or may not be willing to relocate to undertake an international assignment is particularly important for MNCs as willingness to relocate can strongly predict an employee’s decision to accept or reject a job transfer (Brett and Reilly, 1988). MNCs can therefore determine the likelihood of employees accepting or rejecting an international job transfer based on information about their willingness to relocate.

An analysis of the willingness to relocate and the international assignment willingness literature suggests that there are five categories of factors that influence willingness to accept an international assignment. These are, personal factors, family related factors, career related factors, organisational support factors, and host country factors. The following section will outline these factors and the extent to which they influence the willingness of employees to relocate for the purpose of undertaking an international assignment.
2.6.1 Personal Factors

Personal factors influencing one’s willingness to undertake an international assignment include age, gender, international experience and exposure, personality and education.

First, I will consider the impact of age on willingness to undertake an international assignment. Several studies have found that age negatively predicts willingness to undertake an international assignment (e.g. Stilwell et al., 1998; Aryee et al., 1996; Gould and Penley, 1985). The negative relationship between age and willingness to accept international assignments is consistent in relation to assignments in both culturally similar and dissimilar host countries (Wan et al., 2003). Older employees have been widely found to be less willing to relocate and undertake international assignments, while younger employees have been found to be more willing (Brett et al., 1993; Noe and Barber, 1993; Veiga, 1983; Anderson et al., 1981). A study of 1,648 managerial and professional employees revealed that age remained negatively related to willingness to relocate even when the primary objectives of international assignments was career enhancement and the fulfilment of organisational needs (see Landau et al’s., 1992). These findings suggest that as employees get older their willingness to accept international assignments, for any reason, significantly decreases. This may be explained by the level of stability and routine that is developed in a person’s life as they grow in age and the lack of comfort associated with the disruption of their stability and routines.

Furthermore, older employees may have family considerations that younger employees do not have. Unlike younger employees, older employees may have adolescent children in secondary school that have established strong relationships with their peers, their spouses may have
established career or non-work routines, and they may have ageing parents. Therefore a request requiring an older employee to uproot their family and move to a new location is likely to be met with scepticism and a low level of willingness. Contrary to previous findings, Selmer (2001b) found that older European individuals that have experience working abroad are more likely to undertake international assignments. Given that the majority of studies on the willingness to undertake an international assignment have been conducted within an American context, Selmer’s findings may suggest that the negative relationship between age and willingness to accept international assignments may be influenced by the geographic region in which studies have been conducted. However, on balance, literature suggests that age is negatively related to willingness to undertake an international assignment. Like in the case of age, empirical research on the impact of gender on willingness to undertake an international assignment is generally in agreement, but has some detractors.

Research suggests that women are less willing to relocate than men (Turban et al., 1992). In their study of gender differences in the willingness to undertake international assignments, Van der Velde et al. (2005) found that among dual career couples male employees were more willing than female employees to accept an international assignment. Male employees were also more willing than female employees to follow their spouses abroad on an international assignment. These findings are consistent in relation to relocating for career development. Research indicates that women are less willing than men to relocate for career enhancement (Landau et al., 1992). Furthermore, women whose spouse’s jobs were of equal or more importance to their own were less willing to relocate for career enhancement or to remain employed than men in the same situation.
The expatriation experiences of men and women generally differ. While the reasons for this may be quite nuanced in nature, differences in family roles and responsibilities may contribute to the contrast in experiences (Tharenou, 2008). The unwillingness of women to undertake international assignments may be explained by perceived gender role differences which commonly exist within the home. Women generally perceive a greater responsibility than men to nurture their children (Allen and Hawkins, 1999). The perceived family role of women may subsequently act as a barrier to their international mobility. Women without children and spouses however, aren’t restricted by family responsibilities and therefore may be more willing to accept international assignments.

Women that are willing to undertake international assignments may differ from men in their willingness to work in specific countries. A study found that in 36 of 41 countries males and females consistently differed in their willingness to work in specific referent overseas countries (see Lowe et al., 1999). While much of the literature suggests that women are less willing to undertake international assignments then men, it has been argued that a number of organisational factors play a role in the underrepresentation of women in expatriate management positions. Such factors include, but are not limited to, the perception that senior home country managers’ have of the suitability of women in international positions; the perception that senior home country managers’ have of the response of foreigners to women as international managers and problems relating to women’s marital status; and the impact of informal process within organisations which determine the participation of women in international management (Linehan and Scullion, 2004). Indeed it has been argued that a lack of organisational support and the ‘glass ceiling’ explains the scarcity of female international
assignees (Linehan and Scullion, 2001). In contrast to gender, more conflicting findings have been presented on the influence of previous international assignment experience on the willingness to accept an international assignment.

Some studies have found that previous international assignment experience will positively influence willingness to undertake future international assignments (Noes, Steffy and Barber, 1988; Forbes, 1987). Other studies however, have found no correlation between previous international assignment experience and willingness to go on international assignment (Brett, Stroh and Reilly, 1993; Gould and Penley, 1985; Veiga, 1983). Although the findings on the influence of previous international assignment experience on willingness to accept an international assignment are mixed, on balance the literature points to the significance of previous international assignment experience for willingness to undertake an international assignment.

In a study of the expatriation willingness of job candidates, using a student sample, Froese et al. (2013) found that foreign travel, foreign contacts and language skills had a direct effect on expatriation willingness. These findings suggest that international exposure may influence willingness to undertake an international assignment. It has been argued that having relocated once before does not necessarily predicts one’s willingness to relocate again (Brett and Reilly, 1988). The nature of previous relocation experiences may impact future relocation decisions. It appears that even the experiences of co-workers can influence an individual’s relocation decisions. International assignees that have not been on an international assignment before may determine whether or not to go on an international assignment based on discussions with
other assignees about their experiences and through direct observation of these assignees (Tung, 1988). Like previous international assignment experience, certain personality traits predict willingness to undertake an international assignment.

A number of personality traits have also been found to be related to the willingness to undertake an international assignment. Research has found that an adventurous personality is associated with an individual’s willingness to undertake an international assignment (Konopaske et al., 2009; Konopaske et al., 2005). Individuals with an adventurous personality may seek opportunities to work internationally. A study of 745 Dutch military peacekeepers found adventurism to be an important factor in explaining self-seeking of future international assignments (Emmerik and Euwema, 2009). This suggests that individuals that are willing to accept international assignments are more inclined to taking risks and engaging in new experiences. An entrepreneurial personality has also been found to be positively related to the decision to accept an international assignment (Shaffer et al., 2012; Chew and Zhu, 2002).

Individuals that are willing to undertake international assignments may do so for the purpose of gaining experience and developing an international network that will be useful to them at a later stage in their professional career. Extraversion appears to be related to the willingness to accept an international assignment. In a sample of 228 Singaporean managers, Aryee et al. (1996) found that extraversion was significantly positively related to the willingness to accept an international assignment in both culturally similar and culturally dissimilar locations. This suggests that as well as extraverted individuals being more likely to accept international assignments, they may also be more willing to accept international assignments in culturally
distant locations. Using a sample of 299 penultimate and final year masters students, Mol et al. (2009) found that in addition to extraversion, participants with higher levels of emotional stability, openness and conscientiousness expressed higher levels of willingness to undertake international assignments. Tolerance for ambiguity, cultural flexibility, intercultural sensitivity and cultural adaptability were also positively related with expatriation willingness. High performing individuals with a need for achievement may also be likely to accept an international assignment (Zhu et al., 2006). While personality traits do indeed influence openness to working internationally, so too does education.

Conflicting findings have been presented on the influence of education on willingness to undertake an international assignment. Some studies have found that the more educated an individual is the more likely they are to accept an international assignment (Stroh, 1999). This may be explained by the fact that education may enhance an individual’s perspective of difference and encourage them to be more open to different people and different environments. In this sense education may influence a person’s willingness to accept an international assignments as the assignment will expose the person to different people and a different environment. Furthermore, there is a suggestion that understanding a widely spoken language matters in relation to willingness to accept an international assignment. It has been suggested that mastery of a universal language, that is a language that is spoken and understood widely across the world (e.g. English) may influence decisions to work internationally (Chen and Shaffer, 2015). Some studies however, have found no significant relationship between education and willingness to accept an international assignment (Brett and Reilly, 1988).
On balance the literature suggest that education, including knowledge of a widely spoken language, positively impacts an individual’s willingness to accept an international assignment. It is evident that personal factors have diverse effects on a person’s willingness to undertake an international assignment. Research indicates that family related factors can also have diverse effects on a person’s willingness to accept an international assignment.

2.6.2 Family Related Factors

Family related factors influencing an individual’s willingness to undertake an international assignment include the career characteristics of their spouse, the attitude of their spouse towards migration, and whether they have children.

Research has provided mixed findings concerning the effect of a spouse’s career on their partner’s willingness to accept an international assignment. A spouse’s attitudes towards their career may play a significant role in their partner’s willingness to relocate internationally (Harvey, 1997). For instance, spouses that are highly committed to their own careers are unlikely to be willing to relocate internationally. Indeed some research has indicated that the job involvement of a spouse is negatively correlated with their willingness and the willingness of their partner to relocate (Brett and Reilly, 1988). In contrast, however, research has also found a positive relationship between a spouse’s career and their partner’s willingness to accept an international assignment (Gould and Penley, 1985), suggesting that employees with working spouses are more likely to be willing to accept an international assignment than those with non-working spouses. In this sense Gould and Penley’s findings suggest that dual career couples may be more willing to relocate than single career couples. Conversely, it has been
argued that employees in dual career couples are less willing to relocate because of the impact of the relocation on a spouses earning potential (Maynard and Zawacki., 1979).

Several studies have failed to demonstrate a relationship between the career of a spouse and their partner’s willingness to accept an international assignment (Dupuis et al., 2008; Noe and Barber, 1993; Noe et al., 1988). However, on balance the literature suggests that the career of a spouse negatively impacts their partner’s willingness to accept an international assignment. Research also implies that the attitude of a spouse towards migration will influence assignment decisions. This suggests that if an assignee’s spouse has a positive attitude towards migration, their spouse’s career characteristics may have less of an impact on the final decision to accept or reject an international assignment. Therefore the attitude of an assignee’s spouse towards migration is a family related factor which may influence assignment decisions.

Indeed, research suggests that the attitude of an international assignee’s spouse towards migration will influence whether or not the assignee accepts the assignment and their level of adjustment while on the assignment (Konopaske et al., 2009; Konopaske et al., 2005; Brett and Stroh, 1995). Expatriates often fail to adjust to the international relocation when their spouses find it difficult to adjust (Black and Gregersen, 1991a, 1991b; Black and Stephens, 1989; Black, 1988). A commonly cited reason given by expatriates for their early return is the difficulty faced by their spouse and family in adjusting to the international relocation (Tung, 1982). A spouse’s attitude towards an international relocation has been found to be a predictor of the expatriate’s adjustment (Black and Gregersen, 1991a; Black and Stephens, 1989).
Spouses that are willing to relocate with their partner for an international assignment have been found to have higher levels of intercultural interaction and to be more adventurous (Konopaske et al., 2005; Black and Gregersen, 1991a). Furthermore, such spouses may also be older, highly educated, minority, positive about moving in general, willing to relocate domestically, and have no children (Brett and Stroh, 1995). While the characteristics of a spouse’s career and a spouse’s attitudes towards migration are significant factors which may influence an employee’s willingness to accept an international assignment, an equally significant factor is having children in the home.

While some research has found that having children in the home does not impact a manager’s willingness to undertake an international assignment (Brett et al., 1993; Landau et al., 1992), studies have generally shown that employees who have children are often unwilling to relocate (Konopaske et al., 2009; Brett and Reilly, 1988). This is particularly the case for dual career couples. Amongst dual earners, research has found a significant negative relationship between having children and willingness to go on international assignments (Dupuis et al., 2008). They also found that having children was significantly related to being less willing to undertake an international assignment in a highly culturally distant location. Concerns about the potential difficulty for children to adapt to the new cultural environment may explain this finding.

The age of a child appears to influence the relationship between having children and willingness to accept an international assignment. Studies have shown that having children of school age (4+) negatively impacts willingness to undertake an international assignment (Van der Velde et al., 2005; Wan et al., 2003). However, in a study of the expatriation willingness of Korean
employees, Froese et al. (2013) found that the age of a child positively affected an employee’s expatriation willingness. However the cultural context within which this study was set appears to have influenced this finding. Koreans generally want their children to speak good English and therefore are generally more willing to accept opportunities to move their family to English speaking nations (Froese et al., 2013). On balance it appears that having children negatively impacts an individual’s willingness to accept an international assignment. It is evident that family related factors can indeed influence an assignees willingness to accept an international assignment. Like family related considerations, for many assignees career related consideration also influence their willingness to accept international assignments.

2.6.3 Career Related Factors

Career related factors influencing one’s willingness to undertake an international assignment include career ambition and development, job involvement and commitment, and compensation and benefits.

An individual’s career ambition and their concern with career development may positively influence their willingness to undertake an international assignment. Previous research has found that an employee's attitude towards their career, their level of ambition, and expectations, influence their decisions to accept an international assignment (Suutari and Taka, 2004; Brett and Stroh, 1995; Brett et al., 1993; Miller and Cheng, 1978). These findings suggest that employees with predefined career goals and objectives may be more willing to accept international assignments.
International assignees value the career development opportunities that international assignments provide (Tung, 1998). Their decision to accept an international assignment is often driven by the perceived opportunity to develop global career competencies in their field (Doherty et al., 2011; Dickman and Mills, 2010; Tharenou, 2008; Richardson and Mallon, 2005; Suutari, 2003). In a study of 310 individuals working in an MNC Dickman et al. (2008) found that, ‘potential for leadership skills’ and ‘career progression’ were among the top five most influential factors when deciding whether to accept an international assignment. For early career employees, such as young graduates, and early stage professionals, whose position may not meet their expectations, career progression may be a salient factor influencing their willingness to undertake an international assignment. Research suggests that early career stage employees who perceive little congruence between their actual position and their ideal position have little desire to remain in their current position and are more willing to accept mobility opportunities (Noe et al., 1988).

Today, an increasing number of young professionals view international work experiences as a standard component of their professional careers. Millennials, who are individuals that entered the workforce from the year 2000 onwards, are more willing to work internationally than any other generation, so much so that international work experience has become a rite of passage for them (PWC, 2010). Employees whose career goals are aligned with the international assignment opportunity are likely to be more willing to accept an international assignment. This is illustrated by the fact that career fit has been found to be positively related to a manager’s willingness to accept an international assignment (Konopaske et al., 2009). Unlike research on the impact of career ambition and development on willingness to accept assignments, research
on the impact of job involvement and commitment on willingness to accept assignments provides more diverse findings.

Research has provided mixed findings on the influence of job involvement on willingness to relocate. Some studies have found job involvement to be negatively related to willingness to relocate (Gould and Penley, 1985) while others have found it to be positively related to willingness to relocate (Brett and Reilly, 1988). These mixed findings suggest that the extent to which an employee is actively engaged in their job may not necessarily influence their willingness to accept an international assignment.

Job commitment on the other hand, appears to positively influence willingness to relocate. Several studies have found that longer serving employees are more willing to undertake international assignments (Gould and Penley, 1985; Anderson et al., 1981). Given that higher commitment amongst employees is correlated with lower intentions to leave the organisation (Kuean et al., 2010), longer serving employees may experience higher levels of job commitment. Research does however indicate that longer serving employees may be unwilling to accept international assignments (Landau et al., 1992). In such instances longer serving employees may experience lower levels of commitment to their jobs.

Indeed, willingness to relocate and to accept an international assignment has been found to be positively influenced by career and occupational commitment (Kim and Froese, 2012; Markham and Pleck, 1986). Employees who are more satisfied with their career and professional identity are more likely to accept an international assignment for the purpose of advancing their career (Boies and Rothstein, 2002). Willingness to relocate may vary across different functional areas
within an organisation (Brett and Reilly, 1988). In a sample of 827 employees from 20 fortune 500 companies, Brett et al. (1993) found that managers in sales and marketing were more willing to relocate than managers in engineering and IT. Overall it appears that an employee’s level commitment to their job positively impacts their willingness to accept international assignments. However, an employee’s level of satisfaction with their job, and their specific job function, can also impact their willingness to accept international assignments. While intrinsic career related motivators may influence an employee’s decision to accept an international assignment, so too may extrinsic motivators.

Extrinsic motivators for international assignments include monetary rewards and benefits (Warneke and Schneider, 2011; Boies and Rothstein, 2002; Chew and Zhu, 2002; Richardson and McKenna, 2002). Research suggests that financial reward may positively influence willingness to undertake an international assignment. Income has been found to be a significant predictor of willingness to relocate, with lower earning managers more willing to relocate than higher earning managers (Brett et al., 1993). This finding suggests that for lower earning managers, income may be a salient factor influencing their willingness to undertake an international assignment.

Some studies however have found that financial reward does not influence the decision to relocate (Markham and Pleck., 1986). Over the last 20 years financial packages tied to international assignments have become less substantial, with companies moving away from foreign service premiums. Between 1992, 2000 and 2011, the number of companies paying a foreign service premium has decreased from 72% in 1992, to 61% in 2000, to 36% in 2011 (PWC,
This may explain why financial rewards have become less of a motivating factor for present day international assignees. In a study of 310 employees at a financial services organisation in the UK, Dickman et al. (2008) found that ‘personal financial impact’ was ranked eighth out of twenty eight items influencing the decision to accept an international assignment.

Further illustrating the diminishing emphasis organisations place on financial incentives for international assignments, the KPMG 2012 International Assignment Policies and Practices Survey indicated that 50% of responding organisations did not offer any cash incentives to its international assignees. Only 6% of respondents offered cash incentives to all assignees as a percentage of base salary for the duration of the assignment.

The substantial cost of deploying international assignees may explain the continuous decline in foreign service premiums and cash incentives. Where cash incentives are not offered, MNCs may offer alternative benefits. Such benefits may include an overseas healthcare plan, tax equalisation, housing allowance, spouse job search assistance and a child education fund. Indeed research indicates that benefits are an important factor in persuading managers to accept an international assignment and play a pivotal role in increasing managerial willingness to undertake an international assignment (Konopaske and Werner, 2005). It is evident that career related factors can influence an individual’s willingness to accept an international assignment. The support that an employee receives from their organisation can have an equally significant impact on their willingness to accept an international assignment.
2.6.4 Organisation Support Factors

Organisation support factors influencing one’s willingness to undertake an international assignment may include pre-departure training, mentoring, and relocation support.

Support provided to international assignees by their organisations may significantly influence their willingness to accept an international assignment (Kirschenbaum, 1991). Certain types of organisational support, such as pre-departure training and the provision of a domestic mentor, are provided after a candidate has accepted an international assignment. Although these types of organisational support are provided after the decision to undertake an assignment is made, the consideration of the impact of these supports on willingness to accept an assignment is necessary. This is because candidates for international assignments may determine whether or not to accept an assignment based on discussions with other assignees about their experiences and through direct observation of these assignees (Tung, 1988).

Although preparation for an international assignment should ideally begin well in advance of the assignment, some international assignees have expressed concerns about the lack of pre-departure training provided for themselves and their spouses (Feldman and Thomas, 1992; Black and Gregersen, 1991b; Oddou and Mendenhall, 1991; Black and Mendenhall, 1990). Research suggests that pre-departure training can positively influence adjustment in the international assignment location (Earley, 1987). Furthermore, research has identified that managers consider pre-departure training an important form of organisational support (Gregersen and Black, 1992). Once abroad, international assignees may feel that because they are ‘out of sight’ they are also ‘out of mind’ (Tung, 1988).
The provision of a domestic mentor may influence an employee’s willingness to undertake an international assignment because it enables them to remain connected to the home office. The use of mentors has also been found to be positively related to assignee adjustment and assignment success (Feldman and Thomas, 1992). Relocation support services such as housing assistance, spouse job search assistance and assistance in finding schools for children may be positively perceived by assignees as facilitating the adjustment of their families. Relocation support services may therefore influence the willingness of employees to accept international assignments. Research suggests that a company’s relocation policy will have a strong influence on an individual’s willingness to undertake an international assignment (Wan et al., 2003). It is evident that organisational support can influence assignment decisions. The final type of factors identified in the international assignment literature which can influence the willingness of employees to accept international assignments are those related to the host country.

2.6.5 Host Country Factors

The location of an international assignment and the economic development of that location are host country factors which influence an individual’s willingness to accept an international assignment.

The location of an international assignment appears to influence the willingness of individuals to accept an international assignment (Kim and Froese, 2012; Doherty et al., 2011; Konopaske et al., 2009; Dickmann et al., 2008; Carr, Inkson, and Thorn, 2005). Research suggests that employees are more willing to accept international assignments in culturally similar, rather than culturally dissimilar countries (Wan et al., 2003; Aryee et al., 1996). Cultural similarity appears
to be as important at the regional level as it is at the national level, in the sense that employees prefer to relocate to cities that are similar to the ones that they were initially in (Noe and Barber, 1993). It has been contended that cultural distance, which is the extent to which cultures are similar or different (Shenkar, 2001), negatively impacts the success of international assignees (Tung, 1998; Aryee et al., 1996; Church, 1982). This may be explained by the impact of cultural distance on the adjustment of the assignee and their family and the subsequent impact of adjustment on assignment success.

Although cultural distance has been found to influence the decision to accept an assignment, the geographic distance between an individual’s home location and the assignment country appears to be less influential. One study found that among employees ‘distance away from home location’ was the least influential factor of twenty eight factors influencing the decision to accept an international assignment (see Dickman et al., 2008). This suggests that geographic distance may not be as strong of a deterrent to international assignment acceptance as cultural distance. An international assignment candidate from the United Kingdom may therefore be more willing to accept an assignment in Australia or New Zealand rather than an assignment in France, which is geographically closer, but culturally, more distant.

Attractive benefits such as, competitive financial rewards, or assignments in locations perceived by assignees as being of a good international reputation or prestigious (Doherty et al., 2011; Dickman and Mills, 2010;) may mitigate the negative impact of cultural distance on willingness to undertake an international assignment. Research suggests that the economic development of the host country influences an individual’s willingness to accept an international assignment.
Using 41 referent countries to examine the willingness to work overseas, Lowe et al. (1999) found that the referent country’s level of development was a significant predictor of willingness to accept an international assignment in that country. Studies have found that employees are more willing to accept international assignments in economically developed countries (Kim and Froese., 2012; Harvey et al., 2000).

Perceptions of the assignment location also play a role in the decision making process. In a study of 515 technical personnel, using hypothetical international assignment offers in emerging markets, De Eccher and Duarte (2016) sought to identify how country image influences willingness to accept an international assignment. They found that perceptions of the host country’s safety and cultural attraction played a critical role in influencing the decision to undertake an international assignment. MNCs may therefore face difficulties in finding employees willing to accept international assignments in developing countries with emerging economies.

Organisations with large scale global operations are heavily dependent on the willingness of their employees to work outside of their home country (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, 2016). Considering the willingness of employees to undertake international assignments prior to assignments is important because willingness has implications for the assignment. Employees who feel pressured or forced to accept an international assignment, experience difficulties in adjusting to their assignment, and are less willing to advise peers to accept an international assignment (Pinto et al., 2012; Feldman and Thomas, 1992). Conversely, assignees who feel that they have a free choice in deciding whether to accept an assignment have been found to adjust
well to their international assignment and display a greater level of commitment while on the assignment (Kramer and Wayne, 2004). The feeling of having a free choice in the decision to accept an international assignment also has implications for how employees respond to requests to undertake assignments (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, 2016). The importance of freedom of choice for international assignments should encourage organisations to consider how personal characteristics may influence the willingness of employees to undertake international assignments. For instance, research suggests that cultural sensitivity and flexibility are strong predictors of willingness to relocate internationally (Mol et al., 2009).

2.7 CONCLUSION

The literature on willingness to undertake international assignments, suggest that it may be beneficial for multinational organisations to identify employees who may be more receptive to working internationally, and who also possess the skills necessary to perform effectively while on assignments. Recent research has identified a cultural characteristic known as biculturalism which may be particularly relevant for global mobility. Bicultural individuals are those who identify with, have been exposed to, and have internalised two cultures (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002). Recent research has found that bicultural individuals are able to differentiate between competing cultural perspectives, integrate differing world views, and switch between different cultural frames of reference (Tadmor et al., 2009; Hong et al., 2000). Bicultural individuals may therefore represent suitable international assignment candidates. The following chapter will review the literature on biculturalism and bicultural individuals.
CHAPTER 3

REVIEW OF BICULTURALISM LITERATURE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Bicultural individuals are those who identify with, have been exposed to, and have internalised two national cultures (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002). Through their in-depth experiences of two different cultural systems, bicultural individuals develop an understanding of the norms, attitudes, and beliefs which exist in these systems. Bicultural individuals internalise their two cultures when the norms, attitudes and beliefs associated with both cultures begin to shape their way of being and understanding. Internalisation, therefore takes place as two different cultural systems, consciously or subconsciously, impact the nature of an individual.

Between 1990 and 2013 the number of international migrants increased globally by 50% to 232 million (United Nations, 2013). By 2015 this figure had risen to 244 million (United Nations, 2015). The significant flow of migrants between national borders has resulted in an increasing number of bicultural individuals. The concept of biculturalism has subsequently grown in relevance. In the following chapter I provide a review of the biculturalism literature. The chapter is divided into five sections. The first section outlines the theoretical background of the concept of biculturalism. The second section examines the typologies of bicultural individuals that have significantly influenced our understanding of biculturalism. The theoretical construct of Bicultural Identity Integration (BII) is analysed in the third section. The concept of cultural
frame switching and how it relates to biculturalism is discussed in the fourth section. Finally, the outcomes of biculturalism and their implications for bicultural individuals are outlined in the fifth section.

3.2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF BICULTURALISM

3.2.1 Acculturation

Since the early 1990s there has been a dramatic increase in the number of international migrants (United Nations, 2015). The extensive relocation of people across national borders has resulted in an increasing number of bicultural individuals, that is, individuals who identify with, have been exposed to, and have internalised two different national cultures (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002). Individuals who are likely to have internalised more than one cultural profile that may be classified as bicultural include immigrants, refugees, indigenous people, sojourners, ethnic minorities, individuals in interethnic relationships, individuals of mixed ethnicity (Berry, 2003; Padilla, 1994), children and grandchildren of foreign born migrants (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2013). Such individuals are faced with the challenging task of integrating their ethnic and mainstream (host country) national cultural identities.

As will be illustrated below, biculturalism and bicultural identity integration can result in several work related outcomes which are relevant for global mobility and international management. As multinational organisations become more global in their reach, it’s becoming increasingly important to understand why some individuals perform more effectively in culturally diverse
situations than others. Given that differences in the characteristics of an individual (e.g. personality and ability) can predict job performance (see Schmidt and Hunter, 1998; Barrick and Mount, 1991), the study of biculturalism and the theoretical construct of bicultural identity integration (BII) provide a lens through which we can understand the differential performance standards of some employees while they work in culturally diverse settings. The study of biculturalism and the theoretical construct of bicultural identity integration (BII) were born out of the concept of acculturation. In order to fully understand the concept of biculturalism we must first become acquainted with its forbearer, acculturation.

Acculturation may be defined as the change in cultural patterns that occurs when groups of individuals from different cultures come into continuous first hand contact (Redfield, Linton and Herskovits, 1936:149). At the individual level, acculturation encompasses the psychological change and outcomes that occur as a result of adapting to a new culture (Berry, 1997). Much of the acculturation research has been conducted on Hispanic and Asian-Americans in the US. At its inception, acculturation was viewed as an irreversible one directional process in which one had to relinquish their ethnic culture in order to adopt the dominant culture (Trimble, 2003). Early work on cultural transitions and adaptation argued that an attempt to integrate two different cultures would result in confusion (Stonequist, 1937; Park, 1928).

The unidirectional model of acculturation focuses on the assimilation of migrants into the mainstream culture. Building on earlier work, Gordon (1964) proposed that there are seven different types of assimilation, namely, cultural assimilation; structural assimilation; marital assimilation; identificational assimilation; attitude receptional assimilation; behavioural
receptional assimilation; and civil assimilation. Under the unidirectional model it is not possible to integrate ethnic and mainstream cultures, as taking on a new culture simultaneously involves shedding an old culture (Flannery, Reise and Yu, 2001: 1035). In recent years numerous acculturation studies have moved away from this one-way unidirectional conception of acculturation towards a two-way, bidirectional conception (e.g. Schwartz et al., 2007; Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005; Ryder et al., 2000). The bidirectional model of acculturation describes acculturation in relation to a home culture (ethnic culture) and a host culture (dominant culture). This conceptualisation of acculturation allows for several different acculturation approaches. Evidence has been provided to support the psychometric validity of the bidirectional model of acculturation (Flannery, Reise and Yu, 2001; Ryder et al., 2000).

It’s been suggested that acculturating groups such as immigrants are faced with two key issues upon entry into a new cultural environment, namely cultural maintenance and contact and participation (Berry, 1997). Cultural maintenance refers to the degree to which acculturating groups are motivated and allowed to maintain their ethnic culture (also known as their culture of origin). Contact and participation refers to the extent to which acculturating groups are motivated and allowed to participate in the dominant culture (also referred to as the mainstream or host country culture). The simultaneous consideration of these issues results in four acculturation strategies. These are assimilation, separation, integration and marginalisation (ibid).

Individuals that adopt the assimilation strategy do not seek to maintain their ethnic culture but instead seek to participate solely in the dominant culture. In contrast, those adopting the
separation strategy seek to maintain their ethnic culture and do not seek to participate in the dominant culture. The integration strategy is adopted when individuals simultaneously seek to maintain their ethnic culture and participate in the dominant culture. Those that do not wish to maintain their ethnic culture or participate in the dominant culture subsequently adopt the marginalisation strategy. Schwartz and Zamboanga’s (2008) study of the acculturation of Hispanic students provided partial support for Berry’s model. Three of Berry’s acculturation strategies (separation, assimilation and integration) emerged from Schwartz and Zamboanga’s latent class analysis of 436 students. Integration is the strategy adopted by bicultural individuals.

3.2.2 Biculturalism and Integration

Biculturalism may be defined as “the ability to comfortably understand and use the norms, ways of thinking and attitudes common within two cultural systems” (Friedman and Liu, 2009: 333). The term ‘biculturalism’ emerged from the integration strategy posited by Berry (1997). The integration strategy involves maintaining one’s ethnic culture while also seeking to participate in the host country culture. The term ‘biculturalism’ has come to be associated with the integration of two different cultures. In this sense, bicultural individuals are those who try to maintain their ethnic culture while simultaneously seeking to participate in the host country culture.

Indeed Berry (1997:11) himself states that the term ‘bicultural’ closely corresponds with the acculturation strategy of integration. Numerous other researchers stand in agreement with Berry that the term ‘bicultural’ represents integration (e.g. Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2007;
Flannery, Reise and Yu, 2001). Over time the terms ‘integration’ and ‘bicultural’ have become synonymous with one another within the acculturation literature. In examining the concept of acculturation, Berry (1997) and Flannery, Reise and Yu (2001) used the terms integration and bicultural interchangeably when referring to acculturation strategies, whereas Schwartz and Zamboanga (2008) only used the term ‘bicultural’ when referring to acculturation strategies. This illustrates how the acculturation strategy of integration and the term ‘bicultural’ have come to be considered as one in the same.

Biculturalism (integration) has been found to be the most common acculturation strategy adopted by immigrant groups, followed by separation, marginalisation, and assimilation (Berry et al., 2006; Sam and Berry, 2006). Some have contended that biculturalism is the most effective acculturation approach and leads to the greatest benefits (Phinney et al., 2001; Berry, 1997). Others, however, have argued that biculturalism can have negative psychological impacts, such as stress and isolation, on acculturating groups (Rudmin, 2003; Vivero and Jenkins, 1999). However, the extent to which biculturalism leads to benefits or disadvantages will be determined by how a bicultural individual manages their cultural identities.

Berry’s conceptualisation of integration has come under some scrutiny and alternative conceptions have emerged. Boski (2008:145) for example, argues that Berry’s conceptualisation of integration as an acculturation strategy is a ‘paradigm that operates with a limited concept of integration’. Boski believes that the meaning and scope of integration changes as one progresses in life. He subsequently proposed a five level model of integration to illustrate this change.
The first level, ‘acculturation attitudes’, relates to the initial conceptions and ideas held by an individual about how to adapt to a new culture. The second level, ‘culture perception and evaluation’, relates to how an acculturating individual uses their experiences in and their knowledge of their new environment to evaluate the differences and similarities between their two cultural worlds. After developing an awareness of the differences and similarities between their two cultures, acculturating individuals move to the third level of the model, ‘functional specialisation’, at which point they delineate areas of their lives in which their culture of origin and the host culture dominate, respectively. As acculturating individuals experience and learn more about the host culture they may begin to integrate both of their cultures, if their acculturation experiences have been positive. This represents the fourth level of the model ‘becoming a bicultural person’. The final level of the model ‘cultural heteronomy’ relates to the increasing autonomy of the bicultural individual in which they become “‘less bound to the conditions of both worlds” (Boski 2008:151).

Boski’s conceptual model of integration suggests that integration is in fact a time bound process in which one progressively works their way towards integration. This differs from Berry’s (1997) model, which does not have any significant temporally related characteristics. However, unlike Berry’s conceptualisation of integration, Boski’s conceptualisation lacks empirical support.
Figure 3.1: Boski’s Five Levels of Integration in Acculturation Process.

Whether acculturating individuals adopt an integration strategy and become bicultural depends heavily on the external environment, particularly the extent to which the host country facilitates the integration of the acculturating individual’s ethnic culture with the host culture. At the individual level, host country nationals can facilitate the integration of acculturating individuals by personally accepting their differences and embracing the diversity that they bring. At a national level, integration can be facilitated through multiculturalism policies which encourage diversity. A limited number of countries (e.g. Canada, Australia, and Sweden) have official multiculturalism policies which facilitate the integration strategy, enabling acculturating individuals to maintain their ethnic culture and participate in the host culture (i.e. dominant culture). Integration can be successfully pursued by acculturating individuals when the host society is one that is inclusive and encourages diversity (Berry, 1991) and when there is a significant ethnic contingency within the host society with whom an acculturating individual can maintain their ethnic culture (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2010).

Countries that have had little direct exposure to other cultures may perceive ethnic minorities and their cultural customs as a threat to their national identities. In such countries ethnic minorities and other immigrants are forced to assimilate to the dominant culture. Attempts made by acculturating individuals to integrate their ethnic culture with the host culture can have negative psychological impacts, such as stress and feelings of isolation (Sam, 2000; Van Oudenhoven, 1998;). Conversely, integrating an ethnic and dominant culture in a multicultural society can be particularly advantageous for acculturating individuals. Such advantages will be expounded on later in this chapter.
Long before the work of Berry and numerous other scholars that have contributed to the acculturation literature, cultural adaptation was viewed rather negatively. Indeed, the study of cultural adaptation has developed greatly over the last 90 years. In 1928, Park argued that an attempt to live in two diverse cultures, resulting from migration, would result in an unstable character. Park used the term “marginal man” to describe an individual who was condemned to living with the confusion of two different cultures as a result of attempting to fuse them.

Park’s conception of the marginal man was supported by Stonequist (1937), who further developed it. He posited that a person who moved away from their culture of origin to join another culture but failed to adjust to the new culture would find themselves in a marginal position whereby they were a member of neither culture. Unlike Park (1928) and Stonequist (1937), proponents of biculturalism believe that bicultural individuals can live and successfully operate between two cultures (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002; Hong et al, 2000; Phinney and Devich-Navaro, 1997; Birman, 1994; LaFromboise et al., 1993). This is to say, that one individual can have two different cultural identities.

The term “cultural identity”, which is subjective in nature, refers to the sense of belonging that people feel towards a particular cultural group (Berry, 1980). For individuals that identify with more than one culture, the subjective nature of cultural identity means that more often than not, there aren’t clear boundaries around how these individuals consider and manage their multiple cultural identities. Proponents of biculturalism have identified various types of bicultural identities, providing an insight into how bicultural individuals negotiate their bicultural identities.
3.3 NEGOTIATING BICULTURAL IDENTITIES

At some point in their lives bicultural individuals are likely to experience what Du Boise (1961) referred to as “double-consciousness”, which is the awareness of coexisting feelings of membership or non-membership of two different cultures. For bicultural individuals this double-consciousness affects their sense of identity (“what group do I belong to?”), which in turn effects how they define themselves (“who am I?”). Several researchers have proposed typologies that attempt to explain how bicultural individuals negotiate their bicultural identity (LaFromboise et al., 1993; Birman, 1994; Phinney and Devich-Navaro, 1997). These typologies have made a considerable contribution to our understanding of how bicultural individuals manage their cultural identities and the variation that exists in bicultural identities. This section outline’s the bicultural typologies proposed by LaFromboise et al. (1993), Birman (1994) and Phinney and Devich-Navaro, (1997), while also introducing studies of bicultural individuals to illustrate these typologies.

In their study of the psychological impact of biculturalism, LaFromboise et al. (1993) examined five models of second culture acquisition, namely, assimilation, acculturation, multiculturalism, alternation and fusion. While the assimilation, acculturation and multiculturalism models had been previously examined in considerable detail, LaFromboise et al. (1993) expanded our knowledge of biculturalism by shedding light on the conceptual alternation and fusion models. The alternation model describes the movement of bicultural individuals between their two cultural profiles. Bicultural individuals categorised as “alternating” understand both cultural contexts and can appropriately alter their behaviour to fit social situations in either cultural
context. The fusion model describes the synthesis of two cultures which share geographic, political or economic territories to form an emergent single culture. An example is “Chicano” culture, which is a fusion of Mexican and American culture.

In examining biculturalism and identity frameworks, Birman (1994) proposed four conceptual types of biculturals, namely, blended, instrumental and integrated biculturals as well as identity explorers. Blended biculturals amalgamate their two cultures to form one hyphenated culture (e.g. Asian-American). Instrumental biculturals are involved in their two cultures behaviourally but do not psychologically identify with either of them. Integrated biculturals are involved in their two cultures behaviourally and identify with their ethnic culture only. Identity explorers are behaviourally involved with the dominant culture, in that they engage with the people and practices related to the culture, and not the ethnic culture. Identity explorers strongly identify with the ethnic culture and not the dominant culture.

In examining the ways in which minority adolescents dealt with their involvement in two different cultures, Phinney and Devich-Navaro (1997) identified three empirical patterns of bicultural identification; blended, alternating and separated biculturalism. Blended biculturals were found to have a strong sense of identification with the dominant culture while also identifying with and affirming their ethnic culture.

Alternating biculturals were able to operate in both cultures but felt a stronger sense of attachment to their ethnic culture than to the dominant culture. Although they have some form of association with two different cultures, separate biculturals did not believe that they were bicultural.
An analysis of these typologies has identified two themes which seem to be apparent across the typologies. These themes are situational, and, synthesized biculturalism. The typologies identified above have been categorised across these two themes (figure 3.1). The proceeding discussion will analyse these typologies across these themes. A third category (“other”) has been included in Figure 3.1 but is not pertinent to the current discussion as the typologies included in this category do not involve the simultaneous recognition of two different cultures, in terms of behaviour or identification. Therefore this category will not be expanded on.

Figure 3.2 Negotiating Biculturalism Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Author(s) and Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>LaFromboise et al. (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birman (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phinney and Devich-Navaro (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesized</td>
<td>Alternation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Fusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explorer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 Situational Biculturalism

Bicultural individuals, who have internalised two different cultures, possess two distinct sets of knowledge structures consisting of the meaning systems and behavioural repertoires associated with their respective cultures (Hong et al., 2000). In bicultural typologies that emphasize the situational nature of bicultural identity, bicultural individuals continuously move
between their cultural profiles and utilize their cultural knowledge structures as situations require.

These biculturals adapt their behaviour to suit their situation at a specific point in time. For example, they may speak their ethnic language in social contexts in which their ethnic culture is salient and the host country language in social contexts in which the host culture is salient. Similarly, they may alter their mannerisms to suit their social context. Although the situational typologies all refer to the capability of bicultural individuals to involve themselves in their ethnic culture and the dominant culture in different ways, various other similarities and differences exist between the typologies.

LaFromboise et al’s. (1993) alternation model describes the flexible movement of bicultural individuals between their two cultural profiles and is based on the assumption that an individual can know and understand two different cultures and is free to determine the extent to which they associate with either of these two cultures. Although Birman’s instrumental biculturals are involved in both of their cultures, unlike alternating biculturals, this involvement is limited to behavioural participation only and does not include a psychological sense of identity (Birman, 1994).

Birman’s integrated biculturals, like the instrumental biculturals, are behaviourally involved in both of their cultures; however, unlike instrumental biculturals they feel some sense of cultural identification as they strongly identify with their ethnic identity. Phinney and Devich-Navaro’s (1997) alternating biculturals were involved in both of their cultures but their ethnic culture and
the dominant culture remained distinct from one another, and like integrated biculturals, they identified more strongly with their ethnic culture than with the dominant culture.

LaFromboise et al. (1993) argue that alternating biculturals feel a sense of attachment and belonging to both of their cultures and do not feel that this compromises their cultural identity. Conversely, instrumental biculturals do not feel a sense of attachment or belonging to either of their cultures. These biculturals feel torn about their sense of identity. This may because they equate identification with one of their cultures with a lack of identification with the other. Hence, instrumental biculturals may struggle with the simultaneous activation of both of their cultural knowledge structures.

Integrated biculturals and Phinney and Devich-Navaro’s alternating biculturals both acknowledge and associate with the dominant culture, however they feel a stronger sense of attachment and identification with their ethnic culture. Indeed it has been suggested that integrated biculturals often display a strong sense of self. Birman (1994) provides the example that among immigrant groups, integrated biculturals may speak English with an accent without feeling embarrassed. While instrumental, integrated and Phinney and Devich-Navaro’s alternating biculturals don’t fully identify with both their ethnic culture and the dominant culture like LaFromboise et al’s alternating biculturals, they all possess the capability to operate effectively across both cultures. Although instrumental biculturals do not psychologically identify with either of their cultures, they are able to pass as being a member of both societies. Similarly, although integrated and Phinney and Devich-Navaro’s alternating biculturals identify
more strongly with their ethnic culture, they are able to comfortably operate in the dominant culture.

These situational typologies have been evident in the literature. One such example being a study of the bicultural life experience of black (African-American) career oriented professional women who were employed in dominant culture (Anglo-American) organisations (Bell, 1990). Bell found that black, career oriented women were boundary spanners as they were simultaneously active in the dominant white culture and in the black community. While at work they were able to effectively operate according to the norms of the dominant Anglo-American culture and when at home they maintained a sense of identification with the African-American community in their neighbourhood. These African-American career oriented women displayed the ability to switch between cultural profiles and utilize cultural knowledge structures as situations required. Career oriented, black women compartmentalized their cultural identities to stop them from interweaving and to avoid the identity conflict associated with belonging to two worlds. Although standing on the border of two cultures may potentially result in feelings of stress or isolation, for the career oriented black women in Bell’s study, compartmentalization provided a means of continuously traversing, and effectively operating, across both cultural boundaries.

LaFromboise et al. (1993) contend that alternating biculturals will experience less anxiety than individuals that assimilate to the dominant culture. Recent research seems to support this claim as the association between dual cultural involvement and adjustment has been found to be
significantly stronger than the relationship between single culture involvement (ethnic or dominant) and adjustment (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2013).

3.3.2 Synthesized Biculturalism

While some groups of biculturals delineate their two cultural identities and utilise the cultural knowledge structures associated with each identity as situations require, others synthesize their cultural identities to form an emergent or hyphenated culture. In bicultural typologies that emphasize the synthesis of cultural identities, bicultural individuals amalgamate their ethnic and dominant cultures to form an emergent third culture or a hyphenated culture. These biculturals consider their cultural identities to be equal and do not make distinctions between them. It has been proposed that in order to be truly bicultural one must synthesize their two cultures into a personalized blend (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002)

LaFromboise et al’s (1993) fusion model is based on the assumption that cultures sharing key institutional structures and geographic territories will merge to form an emergent third culture that is unrecognisable from the ethnic and dominant culture. In contrast, Birman’s (1994) blended typology is not based on the merging of cultural identities that result from the sharing of institutions or geographic areas. Rather, Birman’s blended typology posits that blended bicultural individuals are highly identified with both of their cultures and subsequently synthesize them into a hyphenated culture. An example being Asian-Americans who may be highly identified with both of their cultures and define themselves as being both Asian and American simultaneously. Thus their cultural identity is a blend of both Asian and American culture.
Like Birman’s blended typology, Phinney and Devich-Navaro’s (1997) blended biculturals identified with their ethnic culture and the dominant culture. Phinney and Devich-Navaro’s blended biculturals however, felt a strong sense of inclusion in the dominant culture. Fused and blended bicultural may be found within ethnic enclaves in places such as New York (Harlem, Queens) London (Peckham, Brixton) and Dublin (Tallaght, Blanchardstown). Although they inhabit similar areas, the manner in which these individuals develop their synthesized identities may differ.

Unlike Birman’s and Phinney and Devich-Navaro’s blended typologies in which biculturals are likely to have a greater level of autonomy in the development of their synthesized identity, LaFromboise et al.’s fusion typology may not necessarily be adopted as autonomously in a society in which there is an emergent third culture. For example, in Californian ethnic enclaves where Chicano (Mexican-American) culture is the dominant culture, inhabitants of the enclave may feel compelled to adopt the culture in order to associate with other individuals in the community. In this regard individuals that identify with the fusion typology may in certain instances face similar experiences to those who identify with the assimilation typology (LaFromboise et al., 1993).

Although blended biculturals, as described by Birman, may have a greater level of autonomy in terms of the development of their synthesized identity, they generally seek the companionship of other biculturals that have adopted a hyphenated identity. Blended biculturals, as described by Phinney and Devich-Navaro, were open to groups from their ethnic culture and the
dominant culture, however, they reported that they often felt pressured by non-blended bicultural friends to be more ethnic.

While the studies discussed above do not explicitly build on one another, they do however speak to one another. Across all three typologies, the ethnic culture and the dominant culture are considered equal. Second-generation immigrant youth, that is children of individuals that have migrated to the host country, often define themselves based on their membership in both the dominant culture and their ethnic culture (Giguere et al., 2010) and generally use hyphenated tags to describe themselves. Second-generation immigrant youth may therefore be a likely group of individuals with synthesized bicultural identities.

Although the typologies outlined above have significantly enhanced our understanding of biculturalism, they have received criticism for confounding identity and behaviour (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2010). Some of the typologies are related to identity (e.g. “blended and “fused”) while others are related to behaviour (e.g. “alternating”). It may therefore be argued that these typologies have not necessarily identified different types of biculturals but rather have outlined different elements of the bicultural experience (Huynh et al., 2011). In an attempt to develop an identity specific construct and enhance our understanding of bicultural identity, Benet-Martinez and colleagues (2002, 2005) developed the theoretical construct of Bicultural Identity Integration (BII).
3.4 BICULTURAL IDENTITY INTEGRATION

3.4.1 Bicultural Identity Integration Explained

Owing to the various conceptualisations of bicultural identity that have been put forward there is little consensus among researchers about how bicultural identity is negotiated. Following an extensive review of the literature, Benet-Martinez and colleagues (2002) developed the theoretical concept of bicultural identity integration (BII), which examines individual differences in managing dual cultural identities based on subjective perceptions of the extent to which one’s cultural identities converge and overlap. They define (2002: 9) bicultural identity integration as the extent to which “biculturals perceive their mainstream and ethnic cultural identities as compatible and integrated vs. incompatible and difficult to integrate”. Bicultural individuals often differ in the degree to which they perceive their cultural identities to be integrated. A study of the identity integration of Chinese Americans, found that of 179 young adults that participated, 58% endorsed an integrated sense of self while 42% felt that their multiple selves felt more fragmented than integrated (Kiang and Harter, 2008).

Individuals with a high degree of bicultural identity integration consider both of their cultural identities to be compatible and are easily able to integrate them. In contrast, individuals with a low degree of bicultural identity integration consider both of their cultural identities to be distinct from one another. They believe that their cultural identities are incompatible and even oppositional, often feeling that they have to choose one or the other (Haritatos and Benet-Martinez, 2002). Although bicultural individuals that perceive their two cultural identities to be compatible and integrated (i.e. those with a high BII), and those that perceive their two cultural
identities to be incompatible and difficult to integrate (i.e. those with a low BII) both identify with the dominant culture and their ethnic culture, they differ in the degree to which they are able to intersect their two cultures.

Although BII was initially conceived as a unitary construct that explained identity integration among bicultural individuals, it has been shown that BII is not a unitary construct and in fact consists of two components; cultural distance (vs. blendedness) and cultural conflict (vs. harmony) (Haritatos and Benet-Martinez, 2002). Cultural distance (vs. blendedness) relates to the degree to which a bicultural individual perceives their two cultural identities as overlapping or as distant and compartmentalized. Cultural conflict (vs. harmony) on the other hand relates to the degree to which the bicultural feels torn between their two cultures or perceives their cultures to be compatible (Haritatos and Benet-Martinez, 2002).

In the most recent measure of BII, the BIIS-2 (Huynh and Benet-Martinez, 2010), these two components have been renamed. The cultural distance (vs. blendedness) component is now referred to as cultural blendedness (vs. compartmentalisation), for the purpose of focusing on the degree of disconnection (i.e. compartmentalisation or blendedness) that exists between two cultures rather than the objective difference (i.e. distance). The cultural conflict (vs. harmony) component is now referred to as cultural harmony (vs. conflict) for the purpose of drawing attention away from the negative dimension of the component (Huynh et al., 2011). Cultural blendedness is said to capture the arrangement of a bicultural’s cultural profiles (ibid) while cultural harmony provides an indicator of their emotional perception of these cultural profiles (Haritatos and Benet-Martinez, 2002).
Confirming the earlier findings of Haritatos and Benet-Martinez (2002), Benet-Martinez and Haritatos’ (2005) study of Chinese Americans and the differences in how they integrate their dual cultural identities revealed that the two components of BII, cultural blendedness and cultural harmony, are independent of one another. Therefore a bicultural individual can experience a high level of blendedness (feeling that both of their cultures are overlapping), while also experiencing a low level of harmony (feeling that both of their cultures are clashing and there is tension between them). Likewise they can experience a low level of blendedness (feeling that both their cultures are compartmentalised), while also experiencing a high level of harmony (feeling that both of their cultures are compatible). Hence, biculturals can have any combination of the two components.

The concept of identity integration appears to be dynamic as several different approaches have been adopted in studying the concept. For instance, a study of identity integration in terms of gender and profession found that female engineers with a high gender and professional identity integration developed more creative technologies for women. The identity integration of multiracial individuals has also been examined (Cheng and Lee, 2009). The concept of bicultural identity integration may be considered equally dynamic as it has been found that BII is not only relevant to individuals that come into contact with another culture as a result of physical relocation, but is also relevant to individuals that come into contact with a second culture as a result of globalisation (Chen et al., 2008). This illustrates the wider relevance of the BII construct in that it is not limited to acculturating groups such as immigrants but also applies to non-migrated individuals that come into continuous first hand contact with another culture.
While research has explored the nature of BII, we have a poorer understanding of the antecedents of BII.

### 3.4.2 Antecedents of Bicultural Identity Integration

To date, there has been very little empirical evidence of the antecedents of BII. A limited number of studies however have identified some antecedents of BII. Factors such personality, generational status, freedom of choice in becoming bicultural, linguistic ability, and social environment can impact one’s level of BII (Huynh, Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2011).

In a study of Chinese American individuals, Benet-Martinez and Haritatos (2005) found that personality variables can predict BII. Biculturals that experience cultural conflict have been found to have high levels of neuroticism (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). These biculturals may experience feelings such as anxiety, anger or depression which may be the result of on-going cultural conflicts that exist within them (Nguyen and Benet-Martínez, 2007). The agreeableness personality dimension was found to influence the level of stress reported in intercultural relationships. Agreeable bicultural individuals reported less stress related to their intercultural relationships. Biculturals that experience less stress in their intercultural relationships may also experience less tension between their two cultural identities and therefore may be more likely to experience cultural harmony and blendedness, rather than cultural conflict and compartmentalisation.

Biculturals that experience cultural compartmentalisation have been found to be less open minded than those that experience cultural blendedness (Benet-Martínez and Hong, 2014; Nguyen and Benet-Martínez, 2007; Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). The lack of open
mindedness among these biculturals may be explained by the dominance of one of their cultural orientations over the other and the subsequent influence of the dominant cultural orientation on their cognitive processes. Hence, these biculturals may hold single perspectives rather than multiple perspectives. Research suggests that extroverted bicultural individuals may adjust well to culturally unfamiliar environments.

The extroversion personality dimension has been found to influence the level of comfort that bicultural individuals feel when operating in culturally distant social environments. Extroverted bicultural individuals are less likely to feel strained when operating in culturally distant social environments (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). This finding suggests that extroverted biculturals may be comfortable with the ambiguity and uncertainty which may arise when operating in culturally unfamiliar environments. The comfort that such individuals exhibit when dealing with ambiguity and uncertainty may positively impact the extent to which they experience harmony between their two cultures.

Aside from personality, other individual level factors which may act as antecedents to BII include generational status, freedom of choice in becoming bicultural, and bilingualism and linguistic concerns. Comparing three groups of Chinese-Americans (those that migrated to the US before age 12, after age 12, and those born in the US), Tsai, Ying and Lee (2000) found that the patterns of relationship between the cultural engagement and cultural identification of these biculturals differed. Second generation biculturals have been found to possess higher levels of BII than first generation biculturals (Huynh, 2009). For first generation biculturals their level of cultural blendedness is related to their length of time in the dominant culture (i.e. the
culture of the country in which they presently live) as well as their level of proficiency in the
dominant language (Huynh, 2009; Benet-Martinez and Hartitatos, 2005). These findings suggest
that bicultural experiences differ across generational groups.

It has been suggested that freedom of choice in becoming bicultural can also influence how a
bicultural individual experiences their two identities (Cheng et al., 2014). Ascribed biculturals,
such as voluntary migrants who choose to live in another country of their own accord may
experience more freedom and independence in their interactions with culturally different
others and while participating in different cultures, compared to prescribed biculturals, such as
non-voluntary migrants (e.g. asylum seekers) (Cheng et al., 2014). The autonomy experienced
by ascribed biculturals may cause them to perceive less conflict between their two cultures,
compared to prescribed biculturals.

Research has found that concerns relating to linguistic ability are related to bicultural identity
integration. Bicultural individuals that experience cultural conflict and cultural
compartmentalisation have been found to generally have linguistic concerns (Benet-Martinez
and Hartitatos, 2005). The linguistic concerns of these biculturals may relate to their level of
fluency in the language of each of their cultures or how their level of fluency in one language
influences the other (e.g. speaking with an accent). Research suggests that the manner in which
bicultural individuals learn the languages associated with their two cultural identities will affect
how they integrate these identities. For example Nguyen and Ahmadpanah (2014) found that
bicultural individuals who learned two languages simultaneously were more likely to blend their
two cultural identities. In contrast, bilingual individuals who learned their two languages separately were more likely to separate and compartmentalise their two cultural identities.

How a bicultural individual experiences their bicultural identity, as well as the level of integration between their two cultural identities, is influenced by their social environment. Research has found that bicultural individuals that experience cultural conflict have at some stage experienced discrimination and strained intercultural relationships (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). For biculturals that are members of visible minorities (minorities that have visible differences that tell them apart from the dominant culture group such as skin colour) discrimination may be in the form of racism. The strained intercultural relationships that these biculturals experience may be founded upon feelings of pressure to meet the conflicting expectations of different culturally centred social groups. For example, a Nigerian-Irish adolescent may experience pressure from ethnic peers to be less mainstream (i.e. like the dominant culture) while at the same time feeling pressured by dominant culture friends to conform to the norms of the dominant culture.

Indeed social relationships can significantly influence the extent to which bicultural individuals integrate their cultural identities. Research has found that the patterns of a bicultural individual’s social relationships can influence their degree of BII. In a study of the relationship between the identity structure of bicultural individuals’ and their friendship network, Mok et al. (2007) found that bicultural individuals with a high BII had more friends who were of a different ethnicity than bicultural individuals with a low BII. Furthermore, individuals with a high BII also exhibited a higher degree of interconnectedness between these friends. These findings suggest
that bicultural individuals who possess diverse and interconnected social networks may have a higher level of BII than those that don’t. Bicultural individuals that experience cultural compartmentalisation have been found to have concerns regarding the environment that they live in and the weak presence of their own ethnic group in that environment (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). The concerns that these biculturals have regarding the weak presence of their ethnic group in the environment in which they live emphasizes the proclivity of culturally compartmentalized biculturals to perceive one of their cultural identities as more dominant than the other.

Culturally blended biculturals may differ from culturally compartmentalized biculturals in that they have synthesized representations of themselves and their in-groups (Miramontez et al., 2008). The extent to which biculturals are able to develop synthesized representations of themselves and their in-groups may be influenced by the history and current perception of their culture of origin in the dominant culture (Nguyen et al., 2011). If a bicultural individual’s culture of origin is perceived negatively in the dominant culture or if it has a negative history within that culture, they will be restricted in the extent to which they can integrate their two cultural identities. Research has found that a high level of BII is positively correlated with a greater number of years spent in the dominant culture, a stronger dominant culture identity, and a high degree of dominant culture language proficiency (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005).

The biculturalism literature suggests that antecedents of bicultural identity integration can emerge at the individual level and the societal level. Factors emerging at the individual level
and societal level such as personality, generational status, freedom of choice in becoming bicultural, linguistic ability, and the social environment, all appear to affect the integration of two cultural identities in unique ways. It appears however that identity integration is not an irreversible process. Research has suggested that the degree of identity integration can change after participants recall positive or negative past experiences. For example Cheng et al. (2008) found that identity integration increased when positive experiences were recalled, reducing the perception of racial distance and conflict, and decreased when negative experiences were recalled, increasing the perception of racial distance and conflict. These findings illustrate the malleability of identity integration and have recently been extended to bicultural identity integration (Cheng and Lee, 2013).

Bicultural identity integration has been found to be higher when biculturals recall positive culturally related experiences and lower when they recall negative culturally related experiences. Recent studies have further illustrated the malleability of bicultural identity integration by finding that BII can be situationally induced (Mok and Morris, 2012) and that both oppositional (i.e. low BII) and compatible (i.e. high BII) bicultural identities can co-exist within bicultural individuals simultaneously and come to the fore when required. The ability of bicultural individuals to situationally induce their cultural identities is explained by the concept of cultural frame switching. Cultural frame switching, which sheds light on the malleability of bicultural identity integration and the cognitive flexibility of bicultural individuals, will be discussed in the next section.
3.5 CULTURAL FRAME SWITCHING

3.5.1 Cultural Frame Switching Explained

The following section outlines the process of cultural frame switching which occurs when a bicultural individual shifts between meaning systems rooted in different cultures in response to cues in the social environment (LaFromboise et al., 1993). Cultural frame switching has also been referred to as the “two cultural minds” theory of biculturalism (Cheng et al., 2014). A cultural frame may be considered a way of being that is associated with a particular cultural setting (Briley et al., 2005).

Having internalised two different cultures, bicultural individuals possess two distinct sets of cultural knowledge structures which consist of different behavioural repertoires and meaning systems. These cultural knowledge structures are born out of their comprehensive experiences in their two cultures. In contrast, monocultural individuals only possess one cultural knowledge structure which is related to their single culture. While monocultural individuals may possess second hand knowledge of another culture, they lack the cultural experience which forms the foundation upon which cultural knowledge associated with that culture is developed. These cultural knowledge structures, which are deeply anchored within bicultural individuals, direct their everyday functioning. Through the process of cultural frame switching biculturals are able to switch between cultural knowledge structures and meaning systems, adopting culturally appropriate behaviours as situations require. For instance, Asian American individuals may be able to respond to situations in a manner that is stereotypically individualistic or collectivist, depending on the nature of the situation.
Biculturals subsequently have two different strategic frames that they can switch between to resolve different problems (ibid). The concept of cultural frame switching is based on the dynamic constructivist approach to culture. In order to understand cultural frame switching among bicultural individuals Hong et al. (2000:710) posited a dynamic constructivist approach to culture in which culture is internalised in the form of domain specific knowledge structures as opposed to highly general structures. Under the dynamic constructivist approach an individual can internalise more than one cultural meaning system even if the cultural meaning systems are conflicting. Although these meaning systems can be accessed at the same time, the approach is based on the assumption that they cannot simultaneously guide cognition.

Building on the work of Burner (1990), Hong et al. (2003:454) state that the difference between the trait approach to culture, in which culture is based on differences across territorial boundaries, and the dynamic constructivist approach to culture is that the later assumes that “culture is internalized in smaller pieces, in the knowledge structures or mental constructs that social perceivers use to interpret ambiguous stimuli”. The dynamic constructivist approach helps us to understand how multicultural knowledge influences cognition by allowing “us to examine the concrete details of and circumstances under which specific cultural differences appear” (Hong et al., 2003: 461).

Cultural frame switching allows bicultural individuals to act accordingly across different cultural contexts, applying the appropriate behaviours associated with a particular culture in a timely manner based on an initial observation of their surroundings and the cultural cues present in
the social environment. Biculturals may automatically switch between cultural frames as they move from one setting to another.

Although cultural frame switching involves utilizing different internalised cultural knowledge structures, Hong et al. (2003) note that internalised knowledge structures do not continuously guide thinking just because they have been internalised, but rather only guide cognition when they are activated. The activation of a cultural knowledge structure involves the shift of the knowledge structure to the forefront of an individual’s mind. This shift in knowledge structure occurs when a bicultural individual is exposed to a cultural cue.

Cultural cues increase the accessibility of knowledge structures related to a cultural identity by increasing the salience of the culture in the individual’s mind. Once the culture becomes salient in the individual’s mind, they use the norms, values and meaning systems associated with the culture as an interpretative frame (Hong et al., 2000). The key aspect of this process is the accessibility of knowledge structures. Although not all knowledge is equally accessible, knowledge that has been recently used, such as culturally related knowledge which is used on a daily basis, becomes increasingly accessible. Highly accessible knowledge is more likely to be salient in an individual’s mind and guide interpretation (Hong et al., 2000). Research on the topic of cultural frame switching has examined ways in which cultural knowledge structures can be activated or made salient in a bicultural individuals mind, this literature is now examined.

3.5.2 Cultural Frame Switching

Cultural frame switching research has generally used cultural priming as a method of activating cultural knowledge structures and meaning systems. Priming involves showing individuals
images that represent particular constructs for the purpose of causing these constructs to influence cognitive processing (Higgins et al., 1977). Priming one of a bicultural individual’s two cultures increases the accessibility of knowledge associated with that culture. Several researchers have used iconic cultural symbols as cultural primes (e.g. Chiu, 2007; Fu et al., 2007; Benet-Martinez et al., 2002; Hong et al., 2000).

Iconic cultural symbols are symbols strongly associated with a given culture, such as the statue of liberty, the ying-yang sign or the harp. Iconic cultural symbols activate cognitive representations of the culture in question (Chui, 2007). In a seminal cultural frame switching study, Hong et al. (2000) illustrated that exposure to cultural icons can activate cultural knowledge systems. In their study, Hong Kong and Chinese American biculturals exhibited western behaviours (e.g. individualism) when primed with western cultural icons and eastern behaviours (e.g. collectivism) when primed with eastern cultural icons. Hong et al. (2000) also illustrated that multiple cultures can direct cognition within an individual’s mind.

Bicultural individuals have been found to differ in how they switch between cultural frames. Bicultural individuals with a high level of bicultural identity integration (BII) switch between cultural frames of references in a seemingly effortless way. In contrast, bicultural individuals with a low level of BII exert more effort in their approach to processing cultural information (Benet-Martinez et al., 2006) and hence are likely to switch between cultural frames with less ease. Bicultural individuals with a high BII are comfortable operating within both of their cultural contexts and as a result can more easily switch between their cultural frames. Conversely, because bicultural individuals with a low BII aren’t equally comfortable operating
within both of their cultural contexts, they are more rigorous when analysing cultural cues (such as cultural primes) and may consider the conflicting aspects of their two cultures (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002).

Biculturals with a low BII are subsequently less flexible when switching between their two cultural frames of reference. However, the systematic nature of the cultural frame switching process of bicultural individuals with a low BII has been found to enhance their cognitive complexity (Benet-Martinez et al., 2006). BII has been found to moderate the cultural frame switching process by influencing the response of bicultural individuals to cultural cues (Haritatos and Benet-Martinez, 2002).

Cultural frame switching studies have shown that bicultural individuals react to cultural cues in an assimilative manner. These studies have shown that biculturals generally respond congruently to the cued culture. For example, in a study of Hong Kong-Chinese individuals, Chen and Bond (2010) found that Hong Kong Chinese participants demonstrated higher levels of extraversion when speaking in English as compared to when speaking in Chinese. One might expect this outcome because the English language and western culture are more strongly associated with extraversion than Chinese culture, which is more strongly associated with introversion. Similarly, in a study of Asian-American immigrants in the US it was found that participants made more individual attributions than group attributions after exposure to an American cultural prime (Hong et al., 2000). Again, one might expect this outcome because American culture is individually oriented whereas Asian culture is more collectively oriented.
Bicultural individuals are said to react in an assimilative manner because cultural knowledge becomes increasingly accessible after it has been primed and therefore more likely to influence behaviour (ibid). However, some research has found that bicultural individuals do not always react to cultural cues in an assimilative manner.

Some biculturals have been found to react in a contrasting manner in that they react incongruently to the cued culture. Several different explanations have been provided for why biculturals may react to cultural cues in a contrasting manner. Benet-Martinez et al. (2002) found BII explained the differences in reaction to cultural cues. Biculturals with a low BII were found to react contrastingly to cultural cues in that they made group attributions after American culture priming and individual attributions after Asian culture priming. Bicultural individuals with a high BII on the other hand reacted in an assimilative manner, in that they made individual attributions after the American prime and group attributions after the Asian prime.

It has been argued that some studies of the moderating effect of BII on cultural frame switching have used measures that make cultural differences salient and subsequently result in contrastive responses as participants become aware of the experimental hypothesis (Mok and Morris, 2011). Using a cultural priming task that was less obvious than those used in previous studies, Mok and Morris (2011) still found BII to have a moderating effect on cultural frame switching, disaffirming previous findings which argued that participant awareness of the experimental hypothesis explained the contrast effect. Some research has proposed that an individual’s perception of being dissimilar from a cultural prime may explain contrasting
responses to cultural cues (e.g. Cheng et al., 2006). This research found that the valence of the
cultural prime and the respondent’s level of BII both influenced their response to the prime.
Individuals with a low BII responded in a contrasting manner to cultural primes with a positive
valence (highly related to the primed culture) and in an assimilative manner to cultural primes
with negative valence (not related to the primed culture).

It has been argued that primes that are inconsistent with a bicultural individual’s cultural
associations lead to over processing of cultural cues (Cheng et al., 2006). It has also been
proposed that the motivation to defend the self from perceived threats explains contrasting
responses to cultural primes. In examining the effect of BII on cultural priming in a consumer
context, Mok and Morris (2013) found that contrastive responses are a subconscious defence
mechanism adopted by bicultural individuals to protect themselves from losing their non-cued
cultural identity. They found that bicultural individuals with a low BII compared to those with a
high BII, perceived situations that cued only one of their cultural identities as being threatening
because one of their identities was excluded.

A further proposition regarding contrasting responses to cultural primes is that bicultural
individuals respond to cultural primes based on their identification motives towards the culture
in question. Zou et al. (2008) found that identification motives were related to an assimilative
shift towards the norms of the primed culture while dis-identification motives were related to a
contrastive shift away from the norms of the primed culture. Hence, bicultural individuals that
wanted to identify with the dominant culture reacted to the cultural prime in an assimilative
manner while those that didn’t want to identify with the dominant culture reacted in a contrastive manner.

The cultural frame switching literature enhances our understanding of the influence of language on bicultural individuals. Several studies have explored how language acts as a cultural cue that activates different cultural frames. It has been proposed that exposure to a particular language could increase the accessibility of cultural knowledge associated with that language. In this sense a bicultural’s ethnic or mainstream cultural identity will become more salient when they receive communication in a language associated with their ethnic or mainstream culture (Briley et al., 2005).

In exploring the impact of language on behavioural decisions, Briley et al. (2005) found that the language used to communicate to bicultural consumers affected their use of decision guidelines and their choices. When experiments were conducted in Chinese, participants adopted a prevention focus (i.e. sensitivity to negative outcomes of their behaviour) which reflected their preference for compromise alternatives and their tendency to defer choices when the option may result in negative consequences. It appears that a bicultural individual’s cultures may also become salient when they communicate in a language related to their cultures. Ross et al. (2002) found that Chinese-Canadian biculturals reported higher agreement with their Chinese beliefs when speaking Chinese. Furthermore, Research suggests that mental frames may be more strongly activated by one of a bicultural individual’s languages compared to the other (Luna et al., 2008). Recent research has found that even accent of speech can act as a cultural prime which affects cognition, with biculturals adopting culturally congruent frames of
reference when hearing an accent which represents either of their two cultural identities (see Dehghani et al., 2015).

Although the cultural frame switching process appears to generally result in positive outcomes, negative outcomes may arise if shifting between two cultural frames feels fragmented, disjointed or uncomfortable (Kiang and Harter, 2008). Bicultural individuals who view their two cultures as distinct entities with impermeable boundaries are likely to experience such difficulties when trying to switch between cultural frames. For instance, bicultural individuals who endorse essentialist beliefs about race (i.e. believe that racial groups have underlying essences) experience cognitive difficulty when required to switch between cultural frames (Chao et al., 2007). For bicultural individuals with highly integrated cultural identities, cultural frame switching is a rapid process which may occur unbeknownst to them individuals on a daily basis. The ability to access and use knowledge structures that are deeply rooted in different cultures, in response to cues in the environment, is unique to individuals that have internalised at least two different cultures and have comprehensive experiences relating to the two cultures. The ability to apply different behavioural repertoires and understand meaning systems associated with multiple cultures results in outcomes which are particularly relevant within multinational organisations and international work settings. These are outcomes are now explored.
3.6 OUTCOMES OF BICULTURALISM

Although bicultural individuals appear to possess unique characteristics related to the possession, and integration of two cultural identities, there is a need to understand the implications of biculturalism and bicultural identity integration within a work setting. One might ask that compared to individuals that possess only one cultural identity, what specific work related advantages may accrue to individuals that possess two cultural identities? This section outlines several outcomes of biculturalism and the advantages accruing to bicultural individuals, which may be relevant within multinational organisations, as a result of integrating their two cultural identities. While there are a range of possible outcomes of biculturalism, which are both positive and negative, I outline four positive outcomes in particular. As well as previously mentioned cultural frame switching, positive outcomes associated with biculturalism include high capability in cognitive complexity, creativity, adjustment and adaptability, and cultural intelligence.

3.6.1 Cognitive Complexity

An analysis of the literature suggests that bicultural individuals possess a high level of cognitive complexity. This complexity may significantly benefit them in their professional lives. Individuals that integrate two cultural identities have been found to be integratively complex (Tadmor et al., 2009). Integrative complexity relates to one’s ability to acknowledge competing perspectives on a particular issue and establish conceptual links between those perspectives (Tadmor et al., 2009; Suedfeld, Tetlock and Streufert, 1992). Within a cross-cultural context integrative complexity specifically relates to how people accept clashing cultural perspectives.
on how to live and the degree to which they try to develop cognitive schemas that integrate differing world views (Tadmor et al., 2009).

A study of Asian-American students and Israeli-American working professionals found that individuals that integrated their two cultures were more integratively complex than assimilated and separated individuals in culturally related domains and that this relationship extended to other domains as well (Tadmor et al., 2009). These findings suggest that not only are bicultural individuals capable of resolving conflict between competing perspectives in culturally related domains but they are also capable of resolving such conflict in non-culturally related domains.

The benefits associated with biculturalism are not limited to biculturals with highly integrated cultural identities. Bicultural individuals with a low level of integration between their cultural identities may also possess a high level of cognitive complexity. The conflict that exists between their cultures causes them to carefully analyse cultural cues and consider more thoroughly their cultural environment. The systematic nature of their processing leads to the development of greater cognitive complexity (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002).

Bicultural individuals in general (those with a high or low level of BII) have been found to have more cognitively complex cultural representations than monocultural individuals (Benet-Martinez et al., 2006). In a mixed sample of 179 monocultural and bicultural individuals at an American university bicultural individuals described cultural representations for both of their cultures more densely and abstractly than monocultural individuals (Benet-Martinez et al., 2006). The difference in the complexity of cultural representations between the two groups was attributed to the consistent cultural frame switching that biculturals engage in. This
suggests that compared to monocultural individuals, bicultural individuals may be more capable of understanding and articulating the nuances associated with their cultures.

It has been proposed that bicultural individuals are likely to have higher levels of attributional complexity than monocultural individuals (Lakshman, 2013). Lakshman (2013:6) defines attributional complexity as “high levels of differentiation, articulation, abstraction, and integration in individuals’ causal reasoning”. Lakshman (2013) argues that, attributionally complex individuals generally perform better in tasks that involve making judgements and decisions in social situations, are better able to assign causes to the behaviour of others, and display a greater level of information processing. Furthermore, Lakshman proposes that attributional complexity is particularly valuable in cross-cultural leadership as it ensures that accurate and unbiased attributions are made. Like cognitive complexity, research also points to the link between biculturalism and creativity.

3.6.2 Creativity

Research conducted on multicultural and bicultural individuals has identified links between biculturalism and creativity. Creativity refers to the ability to come up with ideas that are novel and useful (Maddux and Galinsky, 2009). Multicultural experience and the integration of two cultural identities have been shown to encourage creativity (see Leung and Chiu, 2010; Cheng, Sanchez-Burks, and Lee, 2008).

Exposure to unfamiliar cultures and experiences acquired during time spent abroad can encourage ideation as they introduce individuals to ideas, practices, and ways of life that are unfamiliar to them and were formally inaccessible (Leung and Chiu, 2010; Tadmor et al., 2010;
Length of time abroad positively influences creativity. Extensiveness of multicultural experiences has been found to influence receptivity to foreign cultural ideas and to result in better performance in insight learning, creative metaphor generation and, creative story writing (Leung and Chiu, 2010). Individuals that have spent a longer period of time abroad have also been found to be more likely to find hidden solutions to problems (Maddux and Galinsky, 2009). However, it should be stated that not everyone that spends a considerable amount of time abroad will be creative. Although research has demonstrated the relationship between spending time abroad and creativity, spending time abroad and being exposed to a new culture alone, will not automatically enhance creativity (ibid). Rather, it is one’s ability to juxtapose original and new cultures while simultaneously being exposed to both that will enhance creativity (Cheng et al., 2008). That act of juxtaposing both cultures provides original insight based on harmonious and disharmonious elements of both cultures.

While living abroad, the degree to which an individual adapts to the new culture has been found to mediate the relationship between living abroad and creativity (Maddux and Galinsky, 2009). Individuals that identify with both their home and host culture have been found to exhibit greater levels of creativity and to succeed more professionally (Tadmor et al., 2012). In a sample of MBA students, biculturals demonstrated high levels of novelty, flexibility, and creativity on a creative uses task and were more innovative at work than individuals adopting an assimilated or separated strategy to cultural identification (see Tadmor et al., 2012). Tadmor et al. (2012) found that integrative complexity was a mediating variable across the three studies that they conducted. Integrative complexity may therefore provide an insight as to why some
individuals are more successful than others while abroad. Their success may lie in their acute information processing ability which allows them to consider a diverse range of perspectives, including those contrary to their culture of origin, and combine these perspectives to gain original and creative insight. The link between multicultural experience and creativity has been found to be stronger when individuals are more open to experience (Leung and Chiu, 2008).

Recent research has identified direct links between biculturalism and creativity. In a study of Chinese American students, Saad et al. (2013) found that the BII component of cultural blendedness significantly predicted the originality and fluency of ideas and that dual cultural activation does not only enhance creativity in domains related to the cultures of bicultural individuals, but also in more general domains as well. Although research has found a relationship between biculturalism and creativity, it should be noted that bicultural individuals aren’t all equally creative. Research has found that the performance of bicultural individuals in complex tasks that require creativity is moderated by their level of BII (e.g. Cheng, Sanchez-Burks, and Lee, 2008).

The findings outlined above suggest that bicultural individuals with a high level of BII may be particularly creative. This may be so because of the length of time that they have spent abroad, the multicultural experience that they have gained during that time, their openness to experience, and the highly blended nature of their cultural identities. In addition to cognitive complexity and creativity, adjustment and adaptability are also outcomes of biculturalism.

**3.6.3 Adjustment and Adaptability**
The biculturalism literature has identified links between biculturalism, psychological and sociocultural adjustment. A meta-analysis of 141 biculturalism studies revealed that the association between biculturalism and psychological and sociocultural adjustment is significantly stronger than the individual associations between a heritage culture (culture of origin) and adjustment and a dominant culture (host country culture) and adjustment. This meta-analysis suggests that bicultural individuals tend to be better adjusted than monocultural individuals (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2013).

Further research has shown that for bicultural individuals’ identification with and integration of, both of their cultures positively predicts psychological adjustment, while stress associated with integrating their cultural identities negatively predicts psychological adjustment (Chen et al., 2008). Bicultural individuals that experience a greater level of psychological adjustment make more purposeful efforts to understand and accept the values and the norms of their new cultural environment. As biculturals develop an increased understanding of those around them they also develop a finer understanding of their culture of origin and themselves (Korne et al., 2007) which further enhances their sense of psychological and sociocultural stability within their new cultural environment.

Given their ability to integrate different cultural identities (Haritatos and Benet-Martinez, 2002) and to rapidly switch between cultural frames in response to social and environmental cues (Hong et al., 2000), biculturals may exhibit high levels of adaptability. It is proposed that biculturalism enables individuals to adapt much more easily in the areas of cognition, emotion and behaviour (Friedman and Lui, 2009). This adaptability may extend to cultural contexts other
than that of their ethnic or mainstream culture because of previous experiences of accepting and internalising a new culture.

The psychological and sociocultural adjustment and adaptive capabilities of bicultural individuals may enable them to become equally adept at navigating situations in the dominant culture as they are in their ethnic culture. Bicultural individuals may therefore be considered to be capable boundary spanners. Their ability to effectively communicate with and function in different groups will enable them to connect disparate groups (Friedman and Lui, 2009). As is seen to be the case with the outcomes outlined thus far, literature also points to the link between biculturalism and cultural intelligence.

3.6.4 Cultural Intelligence

In the past it has been suggested that groups of people, such as bicultural individuals, from culturally diverse countries are likely to possess a high level of cultural intelligence (Moore, 2005). Cultural intelligence has been defined as “a system consisting of cultural knowledge, cross cultural skills and cultural metacognition that allows people to interact effectively across cultures” (Thomas et al., 2015:10). Consistent with Schmidt and Hunter’s definition of general intelligence as “the ability to grasp and reason correctly with abstractions (concepts) and solve problems” (2000:3), cultural intelligence encompasses one’s ability to “function and manage effectively in culturally diverse settings” (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008:3).

Given that the development of cultural intelligence is influenced by successful cross-cultural interactions (see Earley and Ang, 2003), bicultural individuals may differ in their level of cultural intelligence based on the manner in which they integrate their bicultural identities. Indeed
while not all bicultural individuals will automatically exhibit a high level of cultural intelligence by virtue of their identification as being bicultural, research does suggest that as an individual’s number of multicultural experiences and level of international exposure increases, so to should their level of cultural intelligence (Takeuchi, Tesluk, Yun, and Lepak, 2005).

Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), which involves the process of focusing on a particular situation, attaining knowledge of behavioural skills from that situation, implementing the behavioural skills attained, and receiving feedback regarding the effectiveness of implementation, suggests that multicultural experiences and international exposure can enhance cultural intelligence because people learn from others around them. Indeed previous research has found that international work, non-work, and study related experiences are all related to higher levels of cultural intelligence (Wood and St. Peters, 2014; Crowne, 2008; Takeuchi and Tarique, 2008). However, international experiences which involve extensive cultural exposure such as living, studying and working abroad have been found to result in higher levels of cultural intelligence than experiences which involve less extensive cultural exposure such as vacationing (Crowne, 2008). It is believed that extensive periods of international exposure encourage the development of more complex cultural understanding because of the continuous observation of the behaviour of others and their reaction to one’s own behaviour (Earley and Peterson, 2004).

While individuals that identify with a single cultural identity can indeed exhibit high levels of cultural intelligence, the empirical link between international exposure, multicultural experiences, and higher levels of cultural intelligence suggest that bicultural individuals who
identify with, and have been extensively exposed to, two different cultures may exhibit high levels of cultural intelligence.

3.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter has provided an extensive review of the biculturalism literature, beginning with its foundations in the acculturation literature, right up to the outcomes of biculturalism that are relevant for multinational organisations. In a broader sense, the chapter has shed light on how the study of cultural identity and adaptation has advanced significantly since the early work of Park (1928) and Stonequist (1937). Initially it was proposed that any attempt made by an individual to try and identify with more than one culture would result in an unstable character (Park, 1928) and marginalisation in both cultures (Stonequist, 1937). Today however, we understand that an individual can identify with more than one culture without experiencing negative psychological consequences, and that variations exist in how individuals integrate their cultural identities.

Research on the theoretical concept of bicultural identity integration (BII), which examines individual differences in managing dual cultural identities based on subjective perceptions of the extent to which one’s cultural identities converge and overlap, has provided significant insights into the variation that exists in the integration of cultural identities. The extent to which bicultural individuals experience the BII components of cultural harmony or conflict and cultural blendedness or compartmentalisation determines the degree to which their cultural identities are integrated. Indeed, bicultural individuals that experience cultural harmony and blendedness will possess a higher degree of BII than those that experience cultural conflict and
compartmentalisations. The biculturalism literature has identified characteristics and outcomes of biculturalism which appear to be relevant for multinational organisations, particularly in relation to international assignments.

### 3.8 CONCLUSION TO LITERATURE REVIEW

Although international assignments have been a central research topic within the international human resource management field for several decades (Collings, Morley and Scullion, 2007), there are few studies which have explored why an individual would accept an assignment (See Dickman et al., 2008 and Doherty et al., 211 for an exception). As multinational companies expand globally and their number of international subsidiaries continues to increase, the demand for international assignees also continues to rise (Caligiuri and Bonache, 2016; Brookfield GRS, 2015, 2014). Despite the rise in demand for international assignees, many MNCs face difficulties in finding employees who are both suitable and willing to accept international assignments (Kim and Froese, 2012; Tharenou, 2008; Konopaske and Werner, 2005). The continued demand for international assignees and the concurrent lack of willingness to accept assignments makes the need for research on why individuals would accept an international assignment more pronounced. Moreover, the demand versus willingness challenge faced by MNCs makes research that aims to identify potential talent pools for international assignments particularly relevant.

To date, very few studies have examined the impact of culturally related individual level factors on willingness to accept an international assignment, and on an assignees level of effectiveness
while on an assignment. Similarly, there has been a paucity of research on bicultural identity integration (Huynh et al., 2011). Although one previous study has provided an insight into the impact of bicultural competence on adjustment while on international assignments (e.g. Bell and Harrison, 1996), there has not yet been any attempt to empirically investigate how biculturalism and bicultural identity integration influences an individual’s willingness to work internationally and an assignee’s level of effectiveness while on an assignment. Within the international human resource management (IHRM) field there has been a recent call for future research to consider culture specific differences when examining international assignment willingness (Froese et al., 2013). This call is both valid and timely considering the evolving cultural demographics of many nations. OECD International Migration Outlook reports have found that Immigration accounted for 40% of total population growth in the OECD area over the period of 2001-2011 (OECD, 2013). The foreign born population in OECD countries in 2013 stood at 117 million, and permanent migration flows to OECD countries increased by 6% to 4.3 million between 2013 and 2014 (OECD, 2015).

These findings underscore the significance of the advancement of theoretical constructs associated with multiculturalism. The rise in immigration in the OECD region in recent times attests to the need for MNCs in the OECD region, and indeed beyond, to consider culture specific differences for international assignments. In an increasingly globalized world MNCs require individuals that can traverse cultural boundaries and implement organisational strategy in far reaching and disparate locations. The integrated study of biculturalism and international assignments will provide novel insights on the potential international impact of culturally diverse individuals within multinational companies.
CHAPTER 4

HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

4.1 BICULTURALS AS INTERNATIONAL ASSIGNEES

Multicultural individuals, such as bicultural employees, who identify with and have internalised two different national cultures, may represent a significant source of value for multinational organisations that operate across multiple geographic boarders (Fitzsimmons, 2013). A review of the international assignment and the biculturalism literatures suggests that bicultural individuals may be particularly well suited to working internationally and may be effective international assignees. Such individuals may be able to draw on their multiple cultural identities for work related outcomes such as leading multicultural teams, solving complex problems, and negotiating across cultures (Fitzsimmons et al., 2011).

Having internalised two different cultures, bicultural individuals possess two distinct sets of cultural knowledge structures which consist of different behavioural repertoires and meaning systems. Through the process of cultural frame switching bicultural individuals are able to switch between cultural knowledge structures and meaning systems in response to cultural cues in their environment (Hong et al., 2000). Monocultural individuals in contrast only possess one cultural knowledge structure which is related to their home culture. While monocultural individuals may possess second hand knowledge of another culture, they lack the cultural experience which forms the foundation upon which cultural knowledge structures associated
with that culture are developed. Bicultural international assignees may therefore possess a wider array of behavioural repertoires and understand a greater number of cultural meaning systems than monocultural international assignees.

The cognitive complexity of bicultural individuals suggests that they are capable of functioning effectively in international and cross-cultural managerial roles. Bicultural individuals are integratively complex, possess complex cultural representations, and are attributionally complex (Lakshman, 2013; Tadmor et al., 2009; Benet-Martinez et al., 2006). Individuals that integrate two different cultural identities have been found to be integratively complex (Tadmor et al., 2009). Integrative complexity relates to one’s ability to acknowledge competing perspectives on a particular issue and establish conceptual links between those perspectives (Tadmor et al., 2009; Suedfeld, Tetlock and Streufert, 1992). Within a cross-cultural context integrative complexity specifically relates to how people accept clashing cultural perspectives on how to live and the degree to which they try to develop cognitive schemas that integrate differing world views (Tadmor et al., 2009).

Bicultural individuals may therefore be more comfortable when working and dealing with foreign employees and colleagues in cultural environments that differ from their own because they are able to accept and understand different cultural perspectives. The ability of bicultural individuals to integrate competing perspectives may enable them, as international assignees, to understand the competing ideologies of disparate cross-cultural groups and establish conceptual links between these ideologies that bring forth potential solutions to conflict that arises as a result of conflicting perspectives.
Bicultural individuals possess boundary spanning abilities which are particularly relevant for international assignments (Friedman and Liu, 2009; Bell, 1990). Boundary spanning refers to “the ability to serve as a conduit between cultural groups” (Friedman and Liu, 2009: 334). The ability to act as boundary spanners will enable bicultural international assignees to effectively transfer knowledge between home and host subsidiaries, which is a common reason for deploying international assignees (Park and Mense-Petermann, 2014; Zaidman and Brock, 2009). Bicultural individuals have been found to have more cognitively complex cultural representations than monocultural individuals because they describe their cultures more densely and abstractly than monocultural individuals (Benet-Martinez et al., 2006). Therefore, compared to monocultural international assignees, bicultural international assignees may be more capable of understanding and articulating the nuances associated with the culture of the host country. A greater level of understanding of the host country culture will enhance their ability to effectively work in the host country and manage host country nationals.

It has been proposed that bicultural individuals are likely to have higher levels of attributional complexity than monocultural individuals (Lakshman, 2013). Attributional complexity is defined as “high levels of differentiation, articulation, abstraction, and integration in individuals’ causal reasoning” (Lakshman, 2013:6). Lakshman (2013) argues that, attributionally complex individual’s, generally perform better in tasks that involve making judgements and decisions in social situations, are better able to assign causes to the behaviour of others, and display a greater level of information processing. It may be expected that bicultural international assignees may manage host country employees better than monocultural international assignees because of their ability to make correct attributions about why host country nationals
behave the way that they do. An international assignee’s ability to understand the behaviour of host country nationals will enable them to better predict the future behaviour of host country nationals and respond accordingly (Mendenhall et al., 1987). Attributional complexity is particularly valuable in cross-cultural leadership as it ensures that accurate and unbiased attributions are made (Lakshman, 2013).

Research suggests that bicultural individuals with a high level of BII may be particularly creative due to the length of time that they have spent abroad, the multicultural experience that they have gained during that time, their openness to experience, and the highly blended nature of their cultural identities (Saad et al., 2013; Leung and Chiu, 2010; Maddux et al., 2010; Leung et al., 2008; Maddux and Galinsky, 2009). Bicultural international assignees may be able to juxtapose their ethnic culture, their home country culture, and the subsidiary country culture to gain original insights and develop creative solutions to problems that arise in the subsidiary. Research suggests that the link between multicultural experience and creativity can have important implications for international assignments (Leung et al., 2008).

The inability of an international assignee to adjust to their new cultural environment has been a key reason for the early return of international assignees and the subsequent failure of international assignments. Research suggests that compared to monocultural individuals, bicultural individuals that integrate their two cultural identities are better able to adjust psychologically and socioculturally. Nguyen and Benet-Martinez (2013) found that the association between biculturalism and adjustment is stronger than the association between a single cultural identity and adjustment. Therefore, because of their previous success in
adjusting to a new culture, bicultural international assignees with highly integrated cultural identities are unlikely to face the adjustment problems faced by monocultural international assignees. By drawing on their bicultural life experiences bicultural international assignees will be able to quickly adapt to new cultural contexts. International assignees that are culturally flexible will be more able to immerse themselves in the host environment and thus less likely to leave the host country prematurely (Chen and Shaffer, 2015). Selecting international assignees that are less likely to return home early from international assignments is of key importance for MNCs as failed assignments can have both direct and indirect costs.

Given their ability to integrate different cultural identities and to rapidly switch between cultural frames in response to social and environmental cues, bicultural individuals may exhibit high levels of adaptability. Adaptability refers to “the ability to shift one’s actions to the demands of a particular cultural audience” (Friedman and Liu, 2009: 334). The adaptability of bicultural international assignees will allow them to adapt their behaviour to suit the host country. They may be able to do so more easily than monocultural international assignees because from their past experiences they have “learned how to learn another culture” (Sikkema and Niyekawa, 1987:8). The findings presented in this literature review suggest that bicultural individuals may be willing to undertake international assignments and may perform effectively while on assignment.

Theoretically biculturals seem like suitable candidates for international roles. However, an empirical understanding of the variations that may exist in the potential contributions of bicultural employees, within international roles, is necessary prior to prioritizing such
individuals for global roles (Fitzsimmons, 2013). In order to determine the potential contribution of bicultural individuals in global roles three research questions relating to the impact of biculturalism on global mobility have been developed. These are:

1. Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact willingness to undertake an international assignment?
2. Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact the effectiveness of international assignees while they are on an assignment?
3. Does bicultural identity integration (BII) impact the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees?

The second and third research questions in this thesis refer to the “effectiveness” of international assignees. Assignee effectiveness has long been an important outcome variable in global mobility research (e.g. Bruning, Sonpar, and Wang, 2012; Coperland and Griggs, 1985; Shaffer et al., 2006). In the past there has been little consensus on what constitutes effectiveness for international assignees (Shaffer et al., 2006). It’s argued that after early attention was drawn to the importance of assignee effectiveness as an important outcome variable by Coperland and Griggs (1985), many subsequent studies erroneously assumed that adjustment is synonymous with effectiveness (Shay and Baack, 2004). This thesis adopts a broader perspective of assignee effectiveness. To date multiple indicators of assignee effectiveness have been identified in the international assignment literature (Chen et al., 2010). Within the context of this thesis, assignee effectiveness relates to the extent to which assignees adjust to their work roles; exhibit the cultural intelligence necessary to function effectively
across cultural boundaries; engage in knowledge transfer; and exhibit high levels of task and contextual performance. As will be illustrated in the remainder of this chapter, these variables can influence how well an assignee functions while on assignment.

Each research question has several related hypotheses. Figure 1.1 and 1.2 in the introduction to this thesis provide a graphical representation of the first and second research question and the associated hypothesis. Figure 1.3 outlines the model related to the third research question. The hypotheses are outlined below underneath their respective research question.

4.1.1 Hypothesis Development

Research Question 1: Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact willingness to undertake an international assignment?
First Research Question and Related Hypotheses

**Q1 Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact willingness to undertake an international assignment?**

**H1:** Bicultural individuals will be more willing to accept an international assignment than monocultural individuals.

**H2:** Bicultural individuals who experience cultural conflict will have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those that experience cultural harmony.

**H3:** Bicultural individuals that compartmentalize their cultural identities will have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those that blend their cultural identities.

**H4:** Bicultural individuals that have a high level of bicultural identity integration (BII) (that experience cultural harmony and cultural blendedness) will be more willing to accept an international assignment than bicultural individuals that have a lower level of bicultural identity integration (that do not experience both cultural harmony and cultural blendedness).

**H5:** Bicultural individuals are more culturally intelligent than monocultural individuals.

**H6:** Cultural intelligence is positively related to an individual’s willingness to undertake an international assignment.

**H7:** Cultural intelligence mediates the relationship between cultural identification (monoculturalism or biculturalism) and willingness to undertake an international assignment.
All bicultural individuals have at least two different sets of cultural knowledge structures and meaning systems and can therefore access two different cultural frames of reference (Hong et al., 2000). In contrast monocultural individuals only have a single cultural knowledge structure and meaning system and therefore can access only one cultural frame of reference. Given their possession of two different sets of cultural knowledge structures, bicultural individuals may be more culturally flexible than monocultural individuals and subsequently more receptive to working internationally.

Recent studies have shown that there are several migration and culture related factors which may influence an individual’s decision to accept an international assignment (Doherty et al., 2011; Dickman et al., 2008). Such factors include perceived intercultural adaptability to the host culture, successful previous experience in a foreign environment, and confidence in personal ability to work/live abroad. Many bicultural individuals have at some stage in their lives left a country of residence or birth, and immigrated to another country (Berry, 2003; Padilla, 1994). These individuals therefore have experience in having to adapt to a different culture. While it is certainly true that not all immigrants will adapt to the culture of the country that they have migrated to, bicultural individuals tend to. Indeed the term “biculural” refers to the integration of an ethnic culture and the dominant culture, in contrast to assimilation or separation which refer to either identifying with the dominant culture or an ethnic culture only (Berry, 1997). Bicultural individuals that perceive their integration experience to have been positive may have the self-efficacy to live and work abroad. Cognizant of their previous cultural adaptation experiences, and the fact that they possess comprehensive knowledge of more than one
culture, bicultural individuals may feel more comfortable operating internationally than monocultural individuals.

**Hypothesis 1**: Bicultural individuals will be more willing to accept an international assignment than monocultural individuals.

Bicultural individuals that experience cultural conflict feel torn between their two cultural identities. These bicultural individuals have been found to have high levels of neuroticism (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). Such individuals may experience feelings such as anxiety, anger or depression which may be the result of on-going cultural conflicts that exist within them. Furthermore it has been found that these bicultural individuals have at some stage experienced discrimination and strained intercultural relationships and generally have linguistic concerns (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). The negative cultural experiences of these bicultural individuals are likely to substantially decrease their motivation to relocate internationally and undergo another cultural transition. In contrast bicultural individuals that experience cultural harmony feel that their two cultural identities are compatible. These bicultural individuals may have low levels of neuroticism, experience less discrimination, have stronger intercultural relationships and have less linguistic concerns. The harmony that exists between their two cultural identities suggests that they perceive their cultural experiences as having been positive. Their positive perception of their cultural experiences may increase their receptivity to relocating internationally.
Hypothesis 2: Bicultural individuals who experience cultural conflict will have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those who experience cultural harmony.

Bicultural individuals that experience cultural compartmentalisation perceive their cultural identities to be distant and separate. These bicultural individuals have been found to be less open minded, have linguistic concerns and have concerns regarding the environment that they live in and the weak presence of their own ethnic group in that environment (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). The close mindedness of these bicultural individuals and their need to be around other people that are like them suggests that they may feel uncomfortable when operating in culturally distant environments and therefore less receptive to relocating internationally. In contrast to culturally compartmentalized biculturals, culturally blended biculturals perceive their cultural identities to be overlapping. These bicultural individuals may be more open minded, have less linguistic concerns and less concerns about the presence of their ethnic group in the environment in which they live.

Hypothesis 3: Bicultural individuals who compartmentalize their cultural identities will have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those who blend their cultural identities.

Hypothesis 4: Bicultural individuals who have a high level of bicultural identity integration (BII) (i.e. that experience cultural harmony and cultural blendedness) will be more willing to accept an international assignment than bicultural individuals who have a lower level of bicultural
identity integration (i.e. that do not experience both cultural harmony and cultural blendedness).

Research suggests that bicultural individuals that integrate their two cultural identities are integratively complex in that they are able to acknowledge competing perspectives on a particular issue and establish conceptual links between those perspectives (Tadmor et al., 2009; Suedfeld, Tetlock and Streufert, 1992). Within a cross-cultural context integrative complexity specifically relates to how individuals accept clashing cultural perspectives on how to live and the degree to which they try to develop cognitive schemas that integrate opposing world views (Tadmor et al., 2009). Cultural intelligence relates to one’s ability to interact effectively across diverse cultural settings (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008). Given that bicultural individuals who integrate their two cultural identities are integratively complex, they may be more comfortable when working and dealing with foreign employees and colleagues in cultural environments that differ from their own because they are able to accept and understand different cultural perspectives. It has been argued without empirical support that groups of people, such as bicultural individuals, from culturally diverse countries are likely to possess a high level of cultural intelligence (Moore, 2005).

While not all bicultural individuals will automatically exhibit a high level of cultural intelligence by virtue of their identification as being bicultural, research tells us that as multicultural experiences and international exposure increases, there should be a concurrent increase in a person’s level of cultural intelligence (Takeushi, Tesluk, Yun, and Lepak, 2005). Although
individuals that identify with a single cultural identity can indeed exhibit high levels of cultural intelligence, the integrative complexity of biculturals and the empirical link between international exposure, multicultural experiences, and higher levels of cultural intelligence suggest that bicultural individuals who identify with, and have been extensively exposed to, two different cultures will exhibit higher levels of cultural intelligence than monocultural individuals.

Hypothesis 5: Bicultural individuals have higher levels of cultural intelligence than monocultural individuals.

Cultural intelligence has been defined as a system consisting of cultural knowledge, cross cultural skills and cultural metacognition, which enables individuals to interact effectively across cultures (Thomas et al., 2015: 1102). The ability to interact effectively across cultures is important for positions within MNCs that require employees to spend time abroad. Of equal importance however, is an employee’s willingness to spend time working abroad as part of their role within their organisation. Willingness to accept an assignment which requires an employee to relocate internationally may be defined as “the likelihood of accepting a job offer that requires living and working in a foreign country for a temporary period” (Mol et al., 2009:2). Individuals that perceive themselves to be culturally intelligent may be confident in their ability to interact and function effectively while on an international assignment and therefore may be more receptive to accepting an assignment. Indeed previous research has identified that cultural flexibility is positively related to willingness to accept an international assignment (Mol et al., 2009).
Hypothesis 6: Cultural intelligence will be positively related to an individual’s willingness to undertake an international assignment.

While it is proposed that cultural identification, which refers to a person’s sense of identification with, and internalisation of, a national culture (and for the purpose of this study, relates specifically to whether an individual identifies as monocultural or bicultural), will influence the level of willingness to undertake an international assignment, it is also proposed that cultural intelligence will influence willingness to accept an assignment. The second proposition suggests that regardless of whether an individual is monocultural or bicultural, their level of cultural intelligence will influence their willingness to undertake an international assignment. Although it has been suggested that bicultural individuals will be more willing to accept an international assignment, it’s important not to equate their greater level of willingness with the unwillingness of monocultural individuals. Like bicultural individuals, there may be certain factors which influence the receptivity of monocultural individuals to working internationally. Given the suggested impact of cultural intelligence on the willingness to undertake an international assignment it is proposed that cultural intelligence will mediate the relationship between whether an individual is monocultural or bicultural (i.e. cultural identification) and their willingness to accept an international assignment.

Hypothesis 7: Cultural intelligence mediates the relationship between cultural identification (i.e. whether an individual identifies as monocultural or bicultural) and willingness to undertake an international assignment.
Research Question 2: Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact the effectiveness of international assignees while they are on an assignment?
Second Research Question and Related Hypotheses

Q2 Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact the effectiveness of international assignees while they are on an assignment?

H1: Bicultural international assignees are more culturally intelligent than monocultural international assignees.

H2: Bicultural international assignees are better adjusted to their work roles than monocultural international assignees.

H3: Bicultural international assignees do not differ from monocultural international assignees in their family role adjustment.

H4: Bicultural international assignees engage in a greater level of knowledge transfer than monocultural international assignees.

H5: Bicultural international assignees do not differ from monocultural international assignees in their task performance.

H6: Bicultural international assignees perform better within their context than monocultural international assignees.
Similar to a hypothesis related to the first research question, the initial hypothesis related to the second research question proposes that bicultural individuals will possess higher levels of cultural intelligence than monocultural individuals. In this instance however, the focus is specifically on international assignees. This distinction is relevant because compared to most people, international assignees often possess a much greater level of international experience. This is so, because of the nature of their work. The integrative complexity of bicultural individuals may facilitate the development of a high level of cultural intelligence. Their acceptance of different cultural perspectives and ability to integrate conflicting worldviews (Tadmor et al., 2009), in itself reflects cultural intelligence, which relates to the ability to function effectively across diverse cultural settings (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008).

Nonetheless, monocultural individuals can have equally high, if not higher levels of cultural intelligence than bicultural individuals. Research demonstrates that as a person gains more international exposure and multicultural experience, their level of cultural intelligence should increase (Takeushi, Tesluk, Yun, and Lepak, 2005). The increase occurs as extensive periods of international exposure encourage the development of more complex cultural understanding because of the continuous observation of the behaviour of others and their reaction to one’s own behaviour (Earley and Peterson, 2004). Each time an international assignee interacts in a particular culture they acquire knowledge and understanding about that culture and the ways in which it differs from their own. The cognitive comparison of one’s own culture and the culture of a foreign environment allows an individual to identify cultural differences which in turn may allow them to increase their level of cultural intelligence.
It is proposed that bicultural international assignees will be more culturally intelligent than monocultural international assignees because they have two base cultures for cognitive comparisons rather than just one. As bicultural assignees acquire knowledge and understanding about other cultures, they may consider how the culture differs to both of the cultures that they have internalised and identify with. This would allow for the development of a greater level of cultural general knowledge which is based on the abstraction of their previous cultural experiences.

**Hypothesis 1**: Bicultural international assignees will have higher levels of cultural intelligence than monocultural international assignees.

Cross-cultural adjustment difficulty is a commonly cited reason for the premature termination of international assignments (Takeuchi, Yun, and Tesluk, 2002). In fact, the successful adjustment of international assignees is such a central concern that the international assignment literature considers the impact of adjustment on an assignee’s performance (e.g. Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Takeuchi, Yun and Tesluk, 2002; Kraimer et al., 2001). Assignee adjustment has traditionally been defined as an assignee’s “perceived degree of psychological comfort with various aspects of the host country” (Black and Gregersen, 1991a: 463). This thesis however, applies a newer conceptualisation of adjustment which focuses on the adjustment of an assignee to specific roles. Focusing on the work and family domains of global professionals Shaffer et al. (2015: 3) define role adjustment as “the degree of psychological
comfort the role incumbent feels toward the tasks and responsibilities of a particular role and toward navigating relationships with other actors in the role”.

It is proposed that cultural identification (identifying as monocultural or bicultural) may influence the work-role adjustment of an international assignee. The relationship between biculturalism and sociocultural adjustment has been found to be stronger than the relationship between monoculturalism and sociocultural adjustment (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2013). This may have implications for work-role adjustment in that poor adjustment to both social and cultural aspects of the assignment location may impinge on the assignee’s psychological comfort towards the tasks and responsibilities of their role. For instance, an assignee’s work-related tasks and responsibilities may be impacted by sociocultural factors such as their understanding of cultural norms, behaviours and attitudes in the host country, and their relationships with host country workers. Indeed sociocultural adjustment can positively impact work-related outcomes (Joslin et al., 2007). The impact of sociocultural adjustment on work-related outcomes, suggests that an assignee’s sociocultural adjustment could impact their work-role adjustment. Based on the relationship between sociocultural adjustment and work-related outcomes, and the differential impact of biculturalism and monoculturalism on sociocultural adjustment, it’s suggested that cultural identification will impact work-role adjustment.

Given that international assignments have traditionally involved the relocation of an assignee’s family (Collings et al., 2011) an assignee’s family-role adjustment is just as important as their work-role adjustment. If an assignee relocates internationally with their family, it is likely that
family members will expect them to maintain their standard of performance in their various family-roles while on assignment (e.g. spouse, parent, guardian, caregiver etc.). However, factors specific to the assignment may challenge an assignee’s ability to meet family related responsibilities. For instance, for many assignees, work responsibilities infringe on their private lives, particularly their family life (Grant-Vallone and Ensher, 2001). This spill over can lead to family related issues, which has been considered by assignee’s themselves to be amongst the main causes of premature departure from international assignments (GMAC, 2012).

Although it is proposed that cultural identification will influence work-role adjustment, it is also proposed that cultural identification will not influence family-role adjustment. While certain factors which are empirically supported, such as sociocultural adjustment (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2013), may provide a basis upon which to propose that cultural identification will influence work-role adjustment, there is no basis upon which to suggest that cultural identification should influence an assignees family-role adjustment. There is no empirical or theoretical reason why bicultural and monocultural international assignees should differ in their family-role adjustment.

**Hypothesis 2:** Bicultural international assignees will be better adjusted to their work roles than monocultural international assignees.

**Hypothesis 3:** Bicultural international assignees will not differ from monocultural international assignees in their family role adjustment.
International assignments are a valuable platform for sharing knowledge within multinational companies (Makela, 2007; Manev and Stevenson, 2001). Knowledge transfer is a common reason why many companies send employees on international assignments (Park and Mense-Petermann, 2014; Zaidman and Brock, 2009). Knowledge transfer can be defined as the deliberate movement of knowledge between sub units within an organisation or across organisational boundaries, through activities and processes (Argote, 2012). It is proposed that cultural identification (identifying as monocultural or bicultural) will influence the extent of knowledge transfer amongst international assignees. Specifically it is proposed that bicultural international assignees will engage in a greater level of knowledge transfer than monocultural assignees. Research points to explanations of why bicultural assignees may engage in a greater level of knowledge transfer than monocultural assignees. For instance, previous research has found that language and culture can influence the knowledge transfer process (Welch and Welch, 2008). Furthermore it’s been recently proposed that individual characteristics such as being bilingual and having bicultural competence can positively impact the knowledge transfer process (Liu et al., 2015). Indeed research recognises the role of employees with dual language skills in circumventing language problems within multinational organisations (Harzing, Koster, and Magner, 2011; Harzing and Feely, 2008). Although many bicultural individuals speak more than one language, the applicability of their bilingual skills for knowledge transfer is dependent on whether either of their languages is used in the host country.

Unlike language skills, cultural skills are more widely applicable. Although bicultural assignees may not possess a great deal of knowledge about the culture of a specific host country, they’re able to quickly adapt to the host country by drawing on cultural general knowledge and cultural
skills developed through their bicultural life experiences (Bell and Harrison, 1996). Bicultural individuals are considered to possess specific cultural skills, such as boundary spanning and effective cross-cultural communication, both of which may be particularly relevant for knowledge transfer (Friedman and Liu, 2009; Fontaine and Richardson, 2003). Utilizing their cultural knowledge and skills, bicultural assignees can function as boundary spanners who act as “bridge individuals” that connect culturally disparate subsidiaries and facilitate the flow of knowledge within an organisation (Brannen and Thomas, 2010). It is therefore proposed that compared to monocultural assignees, bicultural assignees will engage in a greater level of knowledge transfer.

Hypothesis 4: Bicultural international assignees will engage in a greater level of knowledge transfer than monocultural international assignees.

International assignees can contribute to the success of multinational organisations by helping their organisation to function more effectively across national borders. An evaluation of the job performance of international assignees provides an insight into the extent to which assignees fulfill specific assignment objectives and contribute to the attainment of broader organisational goals. Job performance is often an outcome variable used to determine the success of an international assignment (Takeuchi et al., 2009). Broadly speaking, job performance refers to how the actions and behaviours of an individual contribute the fulfillment of their organisation’s goals (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002). Job performance is a multidimensional construct which consists of both a task and contextual element (Motowidlo, and Van Scotter, 1994).
Within the context of international assignments, task performance refers to an assignee’s performance in achieving job objectives and fulfilling technical facets of the job. Contextual performance on the other hand refers to an assignee’s performance on facets of the job that go beyond the assignee’s specific job duties, such as developing good relationships with host country nationals and adapting to existing customs in a foreign facility (Kraimer and Wayne, 2004). Task performance is closely aligned to the requirements of an assignee’s role while contextual performance is more discretionary in nature (Motowidlo, and Van Scotter, 1994). Task performance is said to impact an organisation’s technical core by supporting the execution of technical processes and the maintenance of technical requirements. Contextual performance on the other hand impacts an organisation’s broader social and psychological environment (Motowildlo, Borman and Schmit, 1997; Motowidlo, and Van Scotter, 1994).

Thus cultural identification may impact job performance. However, research indicates that experience is more highly correlated with task performance than contextual performance (Motowidlo, and Van Scotter, 1994). The stronger correlation between experience and task performance suggests that as an assignee attains more international work experience their level of task performance is likely to increase. Indeed it has been suggested that variations in task performance are explained by differences in the proficiency of individuals in carrying out activities related to tasks (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993). Assignees with a greater degree of assignment experience are likely to be more proficient in carrying out the activities related to their role, regardless of their cultural identification (identifying as monocultural or bicultural). It is therefore proposed that cultural identification will not influence task performance.
The contextual performance dimension of job performance is characterised by interaction with host country employees, adapting to foreign business customs and norms, and the development and management of relationships (Kraimer and Wayne, 2004). Bicultural individuals possess attributes that may enable them to attain higher levels of contextual performance than monocultural individuals. One such attribute is extensive multicultural experience. Given their exposure to, and internalisation of, two different cultures, as well as their exposure to other cultures while on international assignments, the multicultural experience of bicultural assignees is ongoing. Extensiveness of multicultural experiences has been found to influence receptivity to foreign cultural ideas and to result in better performance in insight learning (Leung and Chiu, 2010). The extensive multicultural experience of bicultural assignees may enable them to, gain insights which help them to develop relationships with host country employees and, to understand foreign cultural ideas which influence business customs and norms. Furthermore, research indicates that multicultural experience and the integration of two cultural identities, both of which apply in the case of bicultural individuals, encourages creativity (see Leung and Chiu, 2010; Cheng, Sanchez-Burks, and Lee, 2008). Like extensive multicultural experience, creativity may also facilitate higher levels of contextual performance.

Bicultural individuals are considered to be attributionally complex. Attributional complexity refers to “high levels of differentiation, articulation, abstraction, and integration in individuals’ causal reasoning” (Lakshman, 2013: 6). Moreover, bicultural individuals are more attributionally complex than monocultural individuals. Attributionally complex individuals exhibit higher levels of performance in tasks that involve making judgements and decisions in social situations and are able to assign causes to explain the behaviour of others. Such attributes are particularly
relevant for contextual performance, which has the development and management of social relationships at its core. It is therefore proposed that cultural identification will impact the contextual performance of international assignees.

*Hypothesis 5*: Bicultural international assignees will not differ from monocultural international assignees in their task performance.

*Hypothesis 6*: Bicultural international assignees will exhibit better contextual performance than monocultural international assignees.

**Research Question 3**: Does bicultural identity integration (BII) impact the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees?
Q3 Does bicultural identity integration (BII) impact the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees?
Bicultural identity integration (BII) is a concept which considers differences amongst bicultural individuals in the management of their dual cultural identities. The concept is based on subjective perceptions of the extent to which the cultural identities of bicultural individuals converge and overlap. Specifically, bicultural identity integration has been defined as the extent to which “biculturals perceive their mainstream and ethnic cultural identities as compatible and integrated vs. incompatible and difficult to integrate” (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002: 9).

The cultural harmony dimension of bicultural identity integration (BII) relates to the degree to which a bicultural individual feels torn between their two cultures or perceives their cultures to be compatible (Haritatos and Benet-Martinez, 2002). This dimension considers both harmony and conflict in the integration of two cultural identities. Bicultural individuals at the higher end of this dimension experience cultural harmony while those at the lower end experience cultural conflict (Huynh et al., 2011).

Cultural conflict has been found to be associated with experiences of discrimination and strained intercultural relationships (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). The past experiences of bicultural individuals that perceive their cultural identities to be conflicting rather than harmonious, may impact their work-role adjustment while on an assignment. A central aspect of work-role adjustment is navigating relationships with other individuals within the context of a particular role (Shaffer et al., 2015). Insecurities or negative emotions related to previous experiences of discrimination, such as racism, and to uneasy intercultural relationships may challenge the ability of a bicultural assignee to develop and navigate relationships in, what might be an unfamiliar cultural environment, with host country employees.
Furthermore, cultural conflict is related to higher levels of neuroticism (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). Neuroticism refers to “the tendency to experience frequent and intense negative emotions in response to various sources of stress” (Barlow et al., 2014: 344-3445). Such negative emotions may include anxiety, anger or depression. The negative emotions ensuing from the stress associated with cultural conflict may become more pronounced while on an assignment, and negatively impact work-role adjustment. This may be because the need to understand and adapt to cultural elements of an assignment location, may represent an additional source of culturally related stress. The negative emotions related to cultural conflict may also challenge a bicultural assignee’s ability to develop and navigate relationships. Cultural conflict, which is synonymous with a low level cultural harmony, may therefore impact the work-role adjustment of a bicultural international assignee.

The first path of the model therefore proposes that the cultural harmony component of BII will be positively related to work-role adjustment. It’s expected that as cultural harmony increases, work-role adjustment will also increase, and as cultural harmony decreases, and a bicultural individual experiences cultural conflict, work-role adjustment will decrease.

The cultural blendedness dimension of bicultural identity integration (BII) relates to the degree to which a bicultural individual perceives their two cultural identities as overlapping or being distant and compartmentalized (Haritatos and Benet-Martinez, 2002). This dimension considers both blendedness and compartmentalisation in the integration of two cultural identities. Bicultural individuals at the higher end of this dimension experience cultural blendedness while those at the lower end experience cultural compartmentalisation (Huynh et al., 2011).
Like cultural harmony, the cultural blendedness component of BII may also impact work-role adjustment. Cultural blendedness has been found to be predicted by open mindedness (Benet-Martínez and Hong, 2014; Nguyen and Benet-Martínez, 2007; Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). As previously stated, navigating relationships with other individuals within the context of a role is a central element of work-role adjustment (Shaffer et al., 2015). Across an MNCs international subsidiaries, there may be differences in business practices and norms, which are informed by the wider environment. For international assignees, openness to work practices in the host country, which differ from their home country, and an open mind as to how such practices influence their specific role, may impact their adjustment to their work-role. The second path of the model therefore proposes that the cultural blendedness component of BII will be positively related to work-role adjustment.

Hypothesis 1: Cultural harmony is positively related to work-role adjustment.

Hypothesis 2: Cultural blendedness is positively related to work-role adjustment.

The association of higher levels of neuroticism with cultural conflict (or lower levels of cultural harmony) (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005) may have implications for the effect of cultural harmony on cultural intelligence. The emotions which result from the stress associated with cultural conflict may negatively impact a bicultural assignee’s ability to function effectively in cross-cultural settings. Bicultural assignees that experience cultural conflict may be less receptive to different cultural perspectives because of the tension that exists between the perspectives related to their own cultural identities. Indeed the cultural harmony component of
BII provides an indication of a bicultural individual’s emotional perceptions of their cultural profiles (Haritatos and Benet-Martinez, 2002). Given that the ability to function effectively in culturally diverse settings and receptivity to different cultural perspectives are central to the concept of cultural intelligence (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008; Ang et al., 2006), it is proposed that cultural harmony will positively impact cultural intelligence. It is foreseen that high levels of cultural harmony will be associated with higher levels of cultural intelligence, while lower levels of cultural harmony (or cultural conflict) will be associated with lower levels of cultural intelligence.

Like cultural harmony, it is proposed that cultural blendedness will be positively related to cultural intelligence. Research provides a basis for proposing that blending cultural identities will positively impact cultural intelligence while compartmentalising them will negatively impact cultural intelligence. Cultural blendedness requires bicultural individuals to be open minded as blending their cultural identities involves consciously trying to reconcile differences in values, norms and attitudes between their two cultures.

Open mindedness is considered to be an antecedent to cultural blendedness (Benet-Martínez and Hong, 2014; Nguyen and Benet-Martínez, 2007; Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). Bicultural individuals that experience cultural blendedness are more open minded than those that experience cultural compartmentalisation (or low levels of cultural blendedness). This finding is quite significant with regard to cultural intelligence because openness to experience has been found to predict cultural intelligence (Ang et al., 2006). The open mindedness of bicultural individuals that experience cultural blendedness may make them more receptive to
different cultural perspective and ultimately, more culturally intelligent. Open mindedness is important for cultural intelligence as cultural intelligence is based on one’s ability to see beyond value differences (Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars, 2006). Furthermore the experience that such individuals possess in reconciling the cultural norms, attitudes and values related to both of their cultural identities may facilitate the development of high levels of cultural intelligence.

Bicultural individuals that experience cultural compartmentalisation on the other hand, may be less receptive to different cultural perspectives, because they’re less open minded. Such individuals have been found to have lower levels of cultural competence, and typically live in a community that is not culturally diverse (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). Less open mindedness, lower cultural competence, and the tendency to gravitate towards cultural enclaves, suggests that bicultural individuals that experience cultural compartmentalisation or lower levels of cultural blendedness, may have lower levels of cultural intelligence. It is proposed that cultural blendedness will positively impact cultural intelligence.

*Hypothesis 3:* Cultural harmony is positively related to cultural intelligence.

*Hypothesis 4:* Cultural blendedness is positively related to cultural intelligence.

Difficulties experienced by assignees in adjusting while on an international assignment are likely to impact the overall success of the assignment (Caligiuri, 2000; Shaffer and Harrison 1999). Indeed, psychological stress associated with maladjustment has negative implications for assignee performance (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Caligiuri, 1997). Although the
performance of assignees has been a salient topic in the international assignment literature, there has been a lack of consistency as to what constitutes assignee performance (Thomas and Lazarova, 2006). The lack of consensus on what constitutes assignee performance has led to the use of several indirect measures of performance.

A small number of previous studies have considered assignee performance in terms of both task and contextual performance (e.g. Malek and Budhwar, 2013; Kraimer and Wayne, 2004; Kraimer, Wayne, and Jaworski, 2001). Like these previous studies, the present study also considers assignee performance in terms of both task and contextual performance. This conceptualisation of assignee performance provides a more direct approach to measuring the performance of assignees. Meeting task requirements is considered to be a primary component of assignee performance (Lee and Sukoco, 2010). Some research indicates that work adjustment is related to task performance (e.g. Malek and Budhwar, 2013; Kraimer et al., 2001). In line with this research, the present study proposes that the work-role adjustment of bicultural international assignees will be positively related to their task performance. The assessment of the performance of international assignees should not be limited to the effective execution of tasks alone, but should also consider the development and management of relationships (Collings, 2014; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005).

A main focus of the contextual element of job performance is the development and management of relationships with host country employees. While work-role adjustment relates to the degree to which an assignee feels comfortable with the tasks and responsibilities related to their role, it also considers the comfort assignees feel in navigating relationships with other
individuals within the context of their role (Shaffer et al., 2015). Both work-role adjustment and contextual performance have at their centre the development, and management of relationships. Therefore assignees that adjust poorly to their work-role may also exhibit lower levels of contextual performance than their counterparts that are well adjusted to their work-role. It is therefore proposed that work-role adjustment will be positively related to contextual performance.

*Hypothesis 5:* Work-role adjustment is positively related to task performance.

*Hypothesis 6:* Work-role adjustment is positively related to contextual performance.

The continued growth of cultural intelligence as a stream of academic research is reflected in the increasing importance placed on understating individual differences in capacity to effectively interact with culturally different others (Lazarova and Thomas, 2012). Understanding cultural intelligence and its impact on work outcomes is particularly significant for both the global mobility function and research on international assignments more broadly. The inability to understand the cultural nuances in a host country can adversely affect an assignee’s performance. Indeed, when working in culturally different environments, assignees who do not understand cultural differences required to play an expected role, and to meet role expectations, perform poorly (Stone-Romero et al., 2003). It appears that being culturally competent can positively impact the effectiveness of assignees while they are on an international assignment (Li-Yueh, and Alfiyatul, 2015).
Several studies have examined the impact of cultural intelligence on job performance and have found that cultural intelligence is positively related to job performance (e.g. Malek and Budhwar, 2013; Chen et al., 2011; Lee and Sukoco, 2010; Rose et al., 2010; Ang et al., 2007).

Given that individuals with high levels of cultural intelligence are more easily able to understand, and operate in unfamiliar cultures; theoretically it is appropriate to propose that such individuals will also perform more effectively when working in foreign countries (Ang et al., 2007; Earley and Ang, 2003). Based on previous research on the impact of cultural intelligence on job performance it is proposed that cultural intelligence will be positively related to contextual performance. This is to say that international assignees with higher levels of cultural intelligence will exhibit stronger contextual performance, while those with lower levels of cultural intelligence will exhibit weaker contextual performance.

Hypothesis 7: Cultural intelligence is positively related to contextual performance.

When cultural intelligence is absent from cross-cultural interactions individual cultures may serve as frames of reference through which these interactions are directed and understood. For multinational organisations that operate across numerous cultural boundaries, this can be quite problematic. An ethnocentric approach, which refers to adopting a home country orientation when operating in a foreign country (Perlmutter’s, 1969), may limit the ability of international assignees to effectively engage with host country employees. Effective engagement between international assignees and host country employees is critical for knowledge transfer, which is a
common reason for sending employees on assignments (Park and Mense-Petermann, 2014; Zaidman and Brock, 2009).

At its core, knowledge transfer refers to how individuals and groups communicate and learn from each other (Javidan et al., 2005). Cultural competence may allow assignees to engage more effectively with host country employees as culturally competent assignees may be less likely to adopt an ethnocentric approach (Shaffer and Miller, 2008). Such assignees may instead adopt a geocentric approach, which refers to the management of a multinational company’s business units based on the acceptance of a global orientation (Isichei and Collings, 2016). Cultural competence may therefore influence the knowledge transfer process within multinational organisations.

In recent times research has considered the impact of culture on knowledge transfer (e.g. Li et al., 2014; Fong Boh et al., 2013; Khalil and Seleim, 2010; Sarala and Vaara, 2010). More specifically, how cultural variations hamper knowledge transfer has been explored. Such research indicates that cultural differences between a parent company and its subsidiaries can present challenges during the transfer of knowledge (Javidan et al. 2005; Bhagat et al. 2002). Such cultural differences may lead to cultural conflict and misunderstandings which decrease the flow of information and learning during the knowledge transfer process (Lyles and Salk, 2007). Indeed when there are cultural differences between the source and recipient of information, knowledge transfer can become difficult (Fong Boh et al., 2013).

Cultural intelligence may help circumvent the challenges that cultural differences often pose to knowledge transfer. Characteristics associated with cultural intelligence may encourage the
transfer of knowledge between assignees and host country employees. For instance, Individuals with high levels of cultural intelligence take more of an interest in other cultures, and are more motivated to develop relationships with individuals from other cultures, than those with lower levels of cultural intelligence (Emerson et al., 2002). High levels of cultural intelligence can therefore encourage assignees to engage in closer interactions with host country nationals. This is particularly relevant for knowledge transfer because through close interactions with host country nationals assignees can, acquire social skills which relate specifically to the host country culture, and become more embedded into the host country culture (Ren et al., 2014; Selmer, 2006).

Culture specific social skills and embeddedness in that culture can help to mitigate cultural misunderstandings which occur during cross-cultural interactions. Communication skills can also help to mitigate challenges to cross-cultural interactions. Research indicates that cultural intelligence increases communication skills (Bücker et al., 2014). Cultural intelligence may therefore support the flow of knowledge between assignees and host country employees. Indeed it is apparent that characteristics associated with cultural intelligence can influence the transfer of knowledge between international assignees and host country employees. It is therefore proposed that cultural intelligence will be positively related to knowledge transfer.

*Hypothesis 8:* Cultural intelligence is positively related to knowledge transfer
4.2 CONCLUSION

The research questions and hypotheses presented in this section have been proposed in order to help the researcher to achieve the aims of this thesis. The thesis has two main aims. The first is to examine how biculturalism might impact a person’s receptiveness to working internationally. The second is to examine the impact of biculturalism on an individual’s level of effectiveness while working abroad. By comparing bicultural and monocultural individuals, the first research question and the related hypotheses will provide insights on how biculturalism and monoculturalism differ in their impact on willingness to accept international assignments. Similarly, by comparing bicultural and monocultural international assignees, the second research question and the related hypotheses will provide insights on how biculturalism and monoculturalism differ in their impact on the effectiveness of international assignee. The third research question and the related hypotheses explore in greater depth the impact of biculturalism on international assignments, by proposing a model which considers whether bicultural identity integration impacts the effectiveness of bicultural assignees. The proposed hypotheses are tested in two separate studies. Before these studies are presented the research methodology is outlined.
CHAPTER 5
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines the research methodology used to address the hypotheses which are presented in this thesis. The chapter begins by presenting the philosophical foundation of the research. The chapter then discusses the research design. In discussing the research design, the survey design, research sample, and data collection approach are all outlined. The chapter ends by discussing the data analysis strategy used in the thesis.

5.2 RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY

All research is influenced by assumptions about how the world is perceived and how it can best be understood (Uddin and Hamiduzzaman, 2009).

These assumptions are referred to as philosophical perspectives or paradigms. Research paradigms have been defined as “patterns of beliefs and practices that regulate inquiry within a discipline by providing lenses, frames and processes through which investigation is accomplished” (Weaver and Olson, 2006: 460).

Understanding philosophical research paradigms is important. Several reasons as to why an understanding of research paradigms is important are provided by Easterby-Smith et al. (2008). Firstly, it provides an insight into how researchers should gather their required evidence, how
they should explain their data, and how they should answer the questions in their research. Indeed, the exploration of research paradigms encourages in-depth thinking and the generation of further questions relating to the topic of inquiry (Crossan, 2003). Secondly, an understanding of research paradigms helps researchers to decide what kind of research design is most appropriate for their study. Finally, an understanding of research paradigms helps researchers to operate their research design.

There are a number of different research philosophies which undergird social science research. Table 5.1 provides an example of some of these philosophies. In the international human resource management literature, no one research philosophy is dominant. Rather, several different philosophical paradigms have been employed, such as positivism, interpretivism, and critical postmodern perspectives (Rynes and Gephart, 2004). Such a broad mix of philosophies have been used in the international human resource management literature, that is has been suggested that the boundaries between philosophical paradigms are often blurred (Harris, 2012). The positivism paradigm is often used in conjunction with a quantitative research approach in which variables are measured and hypotheses are tested. Positivism refers to an “approach to science which assumes that scientific activity produces (and should aim to produce) knowledge about objectively present and knowable features of the world” (Haslam and McGarty, 2003: 361). The present research adopts a positivist perspective. The term positivism was originally coined in the nineteenth century by the French philosopher August Comte. Comte established the perspective for the purpose of scientifically examining social phenomena. These phenomena were examined within the framework of empiricism (Benton and Craib, 2001). Empiricism refers to the verification of facts of reality through observation.
and examination. Comte’s assumptions suggest that society can be analysed empirically, like other subjects of enquiry, and that social laws and theories can be based on psychology and biology (Walliman, 2005). Comte argued that the best way to understand society and human behaviour was through reasoning and rigorous experimentation.

The positivist perspective has a number of advantages. Firstly, the quantitative research methodology which often supports the positivist paradigm allows for the comparison of data. Results attained in research that uses this perspective can be compared on the bases of variables such as groups, locations and times. Secondly, the positivist perspective allows for research conducted on smaller groups to provide a reliable indication of the views of a larger population as the perspective attempts to identify casual mechanisms. Thirdly, the perspective allows for the economic collection of large amounts of data, through the use of research tools such as surveys. Furthermore, it’s been argued that the focus on testing relationships and the attainment of reliable results which exhibit internal and external validity highlights the methodological rigour of positivism (Gephart, 1999).
Research paradigms often differ in their ontology (i.e. understanding of reality), epistemology (i.e. understanding of how we come to know reality) and methodology (i.e. understanding of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Philosophy</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Data collection techniques most often used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Research is undertaken in a value-free way, the researcher is independent of the data and maintains an objective stance</td>
<td>Highly structured, large samples, measurement, quantitative, but can use qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realism</td>
<td>Research is value laden; the researcher is biased by world views, cultural experiences and upbringings. These will impact on the research</td>
<td>Methods chosen must fit the subject matter, quantitative or qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretivism</td>
<td>Research is value bound, the researcher is part of what is being researched, cannot be separated and so will be subjective</td>
<td>Small samples, in-depth investigations, qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatism</td>
<td>Values play a large role in interpreting results, the researcher adopting both objective and subjective points of view</td>
<td>Mixed or multiple method designs, quantitative and qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

how we attain knowledge of reality) (Saunders et al., 2007; Guba, 1990). The following section will explain each of these terms in greater detail, specifically discussing how they relate to the positivist paradigm.

Ontology refers to the nature of reality (Bem and De Jong, 2006). It has been defined as “the study of the essence of phenomena and the nature of their existence” (Gill and Johnson, 1997: 178). Ontological assumptions may be subjective (e.g. reality as a projection of human imagination) or objective (e.g. reality as a concrete structure) in nature (Morgan and Smirch, 1980). Indeed, subjectivity and objectivity underpin the two main perspectives which exist in the study of ontology. These perspectives are nominalism and realism. Nominalism argues that “it is the labels and names we attach to experiences and events which are crucial” (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008: 62). Realism on the other hand argues for mind-independence (Jenkins, 2010) in which facts of ontology are objective and reality exists outside of our minds.

Positivism adopts a realist ontology, in that it assumes that the world exists objectively and can be represented by verifiable concepts and propositions (Lincoln and Guba, 2000). Like in the physical and natural sciences, positivism assumes independence and objectivity between the researcher and the object of research (Remenyi et al., 1998; Guba and Lincoln, 1994). A characteristic of research supported by the positivism paradigm is that it is undertaken in a value free way to maintain objectivity (Saunders et al., 2007). In such research precautions are taken to avoid bias (Creswell, 1994).

While ontology is concerned with what reality is, epistemology focuses on the nature of knowledge (Sanunders et al., 2007). Epistemology has been defined as “the branch of
philosophy concerned with the study of the criteria by which we determine what does and does not constitute warranted or valid knowledge” (Gill and Johnson, 1997: 177).

Within the positivist paradigm, when determining what does and does not constitute acceptable knowledge, the focus is very much on an understanding of universal laws and causality between variables. In the positivist paradigm knowledge about the world is explored using the scientific method (Benton and Craib, 2001). The scientific method is an approach to acquiring knowledge which involves observing and describing phenomenon, followed by the formulation and testing of hypotheses about the phenomenon (Aguinis, 1993). Positivism aims to refine descriptions of phenomenon into hypotheses than can be empirically tested (Creswell, 2003; Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Within the positivist paradigm, knowledge is established through the verification of hypotheses.

Epistemology often influences the use of specific instruments of investigation because it is concerned with “the best ways of inquiring into the nature of the world” (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008: 60). Epistemology therefore influences methodology, which relates to how research is carried out. Methodology considers the theoretical and philosophical assumptions which provide the basis for a study and the implications of these assumptions for the methods that are adopted (Sanders et al., 2007). The positivist paradigm argues that structured methodological mechanisms such as surveys or experiments, which provide data for statistical analysis, should be used to operationalize social phenomena in an objective manner (Breakwell et al., 2012; Sanunders et al., 2007; Carlson et al., 2004).
Given its focus and objectives, this thesis is guided by the ontological, epistemological and methodological principals of positivism. The research design, specifically the tools used to collect the data and the process involved in the collection of the data are discussed in the next section.

5.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

Research design involves the identification and application of procedures which are appropriate for solving a research problem. The research design for a study acts as a blue print for carrying out the study (Malhotra and Birks, 2007). The present research adopts a survey research design. This type of research design is generally associated with a deductive approach to research (Collis and Hussey, 2009) in which researchers deduce research hypotheses, test those hypotheses, analyse the results, and make conclusions, and where appropriate, make modifications to theory (Saunders et al., 2009). Survey research design is commonly used in business and management research. A survey research design may be used for both explanatory research, in which theory is tested and further developed, and exploratory research, in which new phenomena are empirically explored. Surveys may be used as a means of both testing and exploring phenomena because the data collected from surveys are represented statistically and assessed using correlational techniques. Correllational techniques aim to identify relationships that exist between variables. This thesis consists of two studies. Both studies employed a survey design. In the first study a survey design was used to explore the impact of cultural identification on willingness to undertake an international assignment. In
the second study, the same type of research design was used to explore how cultural
identification impacts the effectiveness of international assignees while they’re on international
assignments. The following sections will outline the survey design, the samples used in both
studies, and the process involved in collecting the data.

5.3.1 Survey Design

A survey may be defined as a “structured method of asking the same questions in the same
order, to different respondents, and creating a database of answers for analysis” (Taheri et al.,
2014: 165).

A survey design may be descriptive or analytical in nature (Oppenheim, 2000). Descriptive
surveys identify demographic characteristics (‘who’), activities (‘what’), and social and
economic status (‘how’). Analytical surveys on the other hand set out to examine relationships
and differences that exist within a sample of a population (‘why’) (Taheri et al., 2014). While
data from descriptive surveys provide an insight into how characteristics of respondents explain
variability in phenomena, analytical surveys are generally used to test hypothesis and set out to
describe cause-and-affect relationships (Taheri et al., 2014). Surveys used in social science
research are often both descriptive (e.g. the collection of demographic or background
information) and analytical (e.g. the collection of data on main variables in the study) in nature.
This thesis uses a survey method that is both descriptive and analytical.

A cross-sectional survey methodology was employed in both studies in this research. Cross-
sectional surveys collect data from a single respondent at a single point in time. A cross-
sectional survey methodology provides insights about relationships among different variables.
The terms ‘survey’ and ‘questionnaire’ are often used interchangeably. They are however not one in the same. Rather, questionnaires are a type of survey. Generally speaking, surveys are a method of collecting data through which information is attained either orally or in writing. Oral questioning is known as an interview, whereas written questioning is known as a questionnaire (Sarantakos, 1988). The present research employs the use of questionnaires. Questionnaires establish patterns of association between multiple variables (Bryman and Bell, 2007). The use of questionnaires is deemed particularly appropriate when the theory involved is attitudinal or perceptual (Schmitt, 1994; Spector, 1994), as is the case in the present research.

The choice of survey method may vary based on the interests, approaches and objectives of researchers (Haslam and McGarty, 2003). Data for both studies was attained using a self-completion questionnaire. A supervisor feedback questionnaire was also used to collect data from supervisors for the second study. The purpose of this questionnaire was to attain data that provides convergent validity evidence for making inferences from the initial self-reported data that was collected from employees (Chan, 2009). Self-completion questionnaires are widely used in social science research and there are a number of advantages associated with their use (Walliman, 2005). One such advantage is that they are easy to administer and represent an efficient, inexpensive and accurate means of collecting data from a sample of a population (Bryman and Bell, 2007; Saunders et al., 2007). The use of self-completion questionnaires allows researchers to retain control of the research process (e.g., through standardisation of survey instruments) and also allows for the generalization of results from a group of respondents to a larger population (Dilman, 2007). Self-completion questionnaires are more anonymous and less intrusive than other data collection methods (Tourangeau and Smith,
1996). A significant advantage of self-completion questionnaires is that they limit interviewer bias. Once respondents agree to participate in a self-completion questionnaire, the researcher has no other involvement in the process, thus allowing participants to feel more comfortable in their reporting. A further advantage of self-completion questionnaires is that they allow for the identification of inter-correlations which may point to causal relationships that can provide a basis for further empirical research.

While self-completion questionnaires have several advantages, it should also be noted that there are disadvantages associated with the approach. A main disadvantage of self-completion questionnaires concerns response rates. These questionnaires often yield low response rates. Self-completion questionnaires can yield response rates as low as 6% (Harzing, 2000). A key challenge in survey research is often the maximization of response rates (Harzing et al., 2013). However, the problem of low response rates is mainly a limitation of postal and online self-completion questionnaires (Bryman and Bell, 2007). In the first study presented in this thesis, a pen and paper self-completion questionnaire was administered to the target population by the researcher. The researcher remained present until questionnaires were completed and submitted. This has been shown to result in a higher response rate (Lucas, 1997). Another disadvantage of self-completion questionnaires is the possibility of ‘socially desirable’ responding. Social desirability, also referred to as ‘faking good’, is a criticism often leveled against self-reported measures. Social desirability maybe defined as the “tendency for an individual to present him or herself, in test-taking situations, in a way that makes the person look positive with regards to culturally derived norms and standards” (Ganster et al., 1983: 322).
Social desirability has been said to “confound the interpretation of the correlation between two self-report measures by being the source of artificial covariance” (Chan, 2009: 319). Artificial covariance is also known as common method variance. Common method variance, which can be a source of measurement error in self-report research, is variance that results from the measurement method rather than the constructs that the measure represents (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Common method variance is also argued to have the effect of inflating or deflating correlations between variables (Spector, 2006). Although social desirability and common method variance are indeed potential issues which may arise in self-report research, such issues have often been exaggerated and distorted (Spector, 2006), causing many to view cross-sectional self-report research negatively. In agreement with the view that issues associated with self-report data have often been exaggerated and distorted, Chan (2009: 309) states that “despite the prevalent use of self-report data in empirical studies, there is a widespread belief among researchers that there are severe threats to its validity which serve to weaken the intended substantive inferences to be drawn from such data” (Chan, 2009: 309).

Despite much criticism, it is argued that there is no strong evidence to lead us to assume that self-report data is inherently flawed and will stop us from drawing meaningful interpretations about correlations and other estimates obtained from the data (Chan, 2009; Spector, 2006). Nonetheless, negative perceptions concerning self-report data are deeply entrenched in the academic community, particularly at the higher echelons of management research. To ease peer related concerns about self-report data, procedural and statistical methods can be employed. Procedural methods can be applied prior to data collection to diminish potential common method bias in the data. An example, which was used in this research, is placing
strong emphasis on the anonymous and confidential nature of the research (Chang et al., 2010), in order to encourage honest responses and avoid socially desirable responses. Statistical methods can be used before the data are analyzed to determine the actual extent of common method bias in the data (Chang et al., 2010; Podsakoff et al., 2003). A number of different methods can be used to assess the extent of common method bias. The most widely used method is Harman’s single factor test (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The assumption of Harman’s single factor test is that common method bias is present in a data set when a single factor emerges from an unrotated factor analysis or when one factor accounts for more than 50% of the variance of the items in the factor analysis. The results of Harman’s single factor test for the first and second study of this thesis confirmed the absence of a single factor and indicated that no factor accounted for more than 50% of the variance of the items in the factor analysis. The results for the first study indicated that one factor accounted for only 14.67% of the variance, while the results for the second study indicated that one factor accounted for only 16.57% of the variance. These findings indicate that common method bias was not an issue in the present research. The following section will discuss the questionnaires used in this research.

**Questionnaire Details**

Data used in this research were attained via questionnaires that were developed to collect data for wider use than this thesis alone (i.e. future academic publication). Therefore, each questionnaire consists of items which measure constructors that were not addressed in either of the studies in this thesis. The questionnaires used for the first and second study can be found in appendix B. The remainder of this section, and indeed the following chapters of the thesis
will focus on the data collected for the variables which are central to the research questions posed in this thesis. In total three questionnaires were administered. One questionnaire was administered for the first study, while two questionnaires were administered for the second study.

**Pilot Study**

In order to improve the validity of each survey (Robson, 2002), all of the questionnaires were subjected to a pilot study. A pilot study involves testing a questionnaire on a small sample of participants in order to identify potential problems and address them prior to launching the full survey (Bryman and Bell, 2007). Details considered during a pilot study include the content of the questionnaire, its wording, its sequence, its layout and its timing. Since the first study was based on a sample of students, the pilot study consisted of a small group of students. Seven students agreed to complete the questionnaire and provide feedback to the researcher. Students also timed themselves while completing the survey. Upon completion of the pilot study, minor amendments were made to the questionnaire in relation to wording, based on feedback received from pilot study participants. Although the second study is based on a sample of international assignees, the pilot study was conducted on a group of 22 professionals with international work experience, given the limited access to international assignees. Similar to the previous pilot study, respondents were asked to time themselves while completing the questionnaire so that the researcher could include an accurate estimation of the questionnaire duration in the introduction to the questionnaire. Upon completion minor amendments were made to the wording and structure of the questionnaire, based on feedback from pilot study participants.
participants. The second study also consisted of a second questionnaire which aimed to collect feedback from supervisors about the international assignees that report to them. This questionnaire was also subjected to a pilot study. A smaller group of the 22 professionals with international work experience completed this questionnaire and provided both written and verbal feedback. Similar to the previous pilot studies, minor amendments were made to the questionnaire based on feedback from pilot study participants, upon completion of the pilot study. The following section lists the variables from the questionnaire which were used in the present research and outlines how they were measured.

*Measurement of Variables*

Each questionnaire collected demographic information from each respondent such as age, gender, educational background, international travel or work related experience, work position, work experience etc. As previously stated, the questionnaires used in this research were developed to collect data for wider use, than this thesis alone (i.e. academic publication). Therefore, not all of the variables measured in the questionnaire were explored in the present research. The variables explored in the first study include cultural identification, bicultural identity integration, cultural intelligence and willingness to accept an international assignment. The variables explored in the second study include cultural identification, bicultural identity integration, cultural intelligence, assignee adjustment, knowledge transfer, and job performance. A description of each of these variables and how they were measured in the research is provided below.
Cultural Identification

Cultural identification refers to a person’s sense of identification with, and internalisation of, a national culture. For the purpose of this research, cultural identification refers to whether an individual identifies as monocultural or bicultural. Bicultural individuals are those who identify with, have been exposed to, and have internalised two cultures (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002). Monocultural individuals on the other hand, are individuals who identify with and have internalised only one culture.

In the student sample questionnaire (study 1) and the international assignee sample questionnaire (study 2) respondents were asked if they identify with more than one national culture. This question was used to differentiate between bicultural respondents and monocultural respondents. Respondents who stated that they identify with more than one national culture were then asked to state their national culture of origin and a second national culture that they identify with. Where respondents identified with several different national cultures, they were asked to state a second national culture that they identify most strongly with. Soon after this, these participants responded to a number of items which measured bicultural identity integration, a concept specific to bicultural individuals.

Bicultural Identity Integration

Bicultural identity integration refers to the degree to which ‘biculturals perceive their mainstream and ethnic cultural identities as compatible and integrated vs. oppositional and difficult to integrate’ (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002, p.9). The concept considers differences that exist at an individual level in the management of dual cultural identities. It is based on
subjective perceptions of the extent to which one’s cultural identities converge and overlap. The concept consists of two components; cultural blendedness (vs. compartmentalisation) and cultural harmony (vs. conflict) (Huynh and Benet-Martinez, 2010). Cultural blendedness (vs. compartmentalisation) relates to the degree to which a bicultural individual perceives their two cultural identities as overlapping or being distant and compartmentalized. Cultural harmony (vs. conflict) on the other hand relates to the degree to which the bicultural feels torn between their two cultures or perceives their cultures to be compatible (Haritatos and Benet-Martinez, 2002).

Various approaches to measuring biculturalism have been adopted by researchers. The variety and inconsistency of these approaches may be explained by the complexity associated with the experience of managing dual cultural identities and the difficulties involved in capturing the fullness of such experiences. Approaches to measuring biculturalism have evolved, from the use of one-dimensional scales to the use of two-dimensional scales. Traditionally, biculturalism was measured using one-dimensional scales. Mid-point scores on such scales represented biculturalism, low scores represented separation and high scores represented assimilation (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2007). Researchers are now advised to avoid using one-dimensional scales as they equate identification and involvement with one culture to a lack of identification and involvement in another (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2007). Furthermore, it was reported that these scales made bicultural and marginalized individuals indistinguishable from one another. Unlike one-dimensional scales, two-dimensional scales measure identification and involvement in the ethnic and dominant culture using two separate multi-
item scales (ibid). The two components of bicultural identity integration are independent of one another and generally have correlations of between 0.02 and 0.40 (Cheng et al., 2014).

To date three different measurement instruments have been created for the purpose of measuring bicultural identity integration, namely, the BIIS-P, the BIIS-1 and the BIIS-2. The first measurement instrument, the Bicultural Identity Integration Scale-pilot version (BIIS-P), measures bicultural experiences on an 8-point Likert scale (where 1= definitely not true and 8= definitely true) using a short descriptive statement. The measure was used in the first study on bicultural identity integration, in which Benet-Martinez et al. (2002) examined the impact of oppositional and non-oppositional identities on cultural cues. The measure was found to have high face validity with respondents (Huynh et al., 2011). A factor analysis of the second measurement instrument, the BIIS-1, revealed two independent components of bicultural identity integration, cultural distance (vs. blendedness) (now known as cultural blendedness (vs. compartmentalisation) and cultural conflict (vs. harmony) (now known as cultural harmony (vs. conflict). The BIIS-1 consists of four cultural blendedness items and four cultural harmony items which are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree). The scale items yielded reasonable reliability scores (Cronbach’s alpha scores: cultural blendedness = .69, cultural harmony = .74) (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). Huynh (2009) improved on the BIIS-1, by developing the BIIS-2, which contains 20 items and allows for a more detailed assessment of bicultural identity experiences. The twenty items in the measure are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree). The BIIS-2 scale items yielded significant reliability scores (Cronbach’s alpha scores: cultural blendedness = .86, cultural harmony = .81). The BIIS-2 was used in the present research. The measure was
modified slightly to allow participants to respond to the items based on the two cultures that they identify with (i.e. the use of blank spaces, in which the participants wrote their cultures e.g. “Irish” and “Nigerian”, or were automatically populated in the case of online questionnaires). This is in contrast to other studies on bicultural identity integration (e.g. Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005 and Nguyen and Ahmadpanah 2014) which focus solely on single combinations of cultures (e.g. Chinese-American and Mexican-American).

For the purpose of this research bicultural individuals that score above the mid-point on the cultural blendedness (vs. Compartmentalisation) scale are considered to experience cultural blendedness while those that score below the mid-point are considered to experience cultural compartmentalisation. Similarly, bicultural individuals that score above the mid-point on the cultural harmony (vs. conflict) scale are considered to experience cultural harmony, while those that score below the mid-point are considered to experience cultural conflict. Bicultural individuals that experience cultural blendedness and cultural harmony are considered to have a high level of bicultural identity integration while those that experience cultural compartmentalisation and cultural conflict are considered to have a low level of bicultural identity integration. For the remainder of this thesis cultural blendedness (vs. Compartmentalisation) will simply be referred to as cultural blendedness, while cultural harmony (vs. conflict) will simply be referred to as cultural harmony. The BIIS-2 scale was used in both the first and second study presented in this thesis.
Cultural Intelligence

Cultural intelligence has been defined as one’s ability to ‘function and manage effectively in culturally diverse settings’ (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008:3). The most widely embraced conceptualisation of cultural intelligence suggest that cultural intelligence is a multidimensional construct which consist of four underlying factors, namely, cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, and behavioural cultural intelligence (Earley and Ang, 2003). Cognitive cultural intelligence refers to knowledge about other cultures such as norms, practices and beliefs, which has been acquired through both personal experience and education (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008). Metacognitive cultural intelligence refers to an individual’s conscious cultural awareness during cross-border interactions (ibid). Motivational cultural intelligence relates to an individual’s ability to direct attention and energy towards learning about and functioning in culturally different situations. Behavioural cultural intelligence on the other hand relates to an individual’s ability to use appropriate verbal and nonverbal behaviour when interacting with people from different cultures.

Since the introduction of cultural intelligence to the academic literature, the 20 item self-report questionnaire developed by Ang et al. (2007) has been the most popular and widely used instrument to measure the construct. The measure has however been criticised for not reflecting the theoretical uniqueness of the construct of cultural intelligence (Thomas et al., 2015). It’s also been criticised for limitations in its incremental validity (Ward et al., 2009). In an attempt to address the weaknesses of the four-factor model and its associated 20 item self-report questionnaire, a new short form measure of cultural intelligence (SFCQ) has been
developed by Thomas et al (2015). This conceptualisation defines cultural intelligence as “a system consisting of cultural knowledge, cross cultural skills and cultural metacognition that allows people to interact effectively across cultures” (Thomas et al., 2015:10).

Cultural intelligence, as theorised by Thomas et al. (2015) consists of three underlying components, which are, cultural knowledge, cultural skill, and cultural metacognition. The cultural knowledge component is concerned with content specific knowledge and general process knowledge relating to the effect of culture on one’s actions and the actions of others. The cultural skills component relates to an individual’s ability to exhibit skills related to cultural intelligence such as relational skills, perceptual acuity, empathy, tolerance of uncertainty, and adaptability. The cultural metacognition component refers to an individual’s knowledge of and control over their culturally related thinking and learning. The short form measure of cultural intelligence consist of 10 items which are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= not at all and 5= extremely well).

The two conceptualisations of cultural intelligence have much in common (ibid). Both conceptualisations identify individual differences which predict and explain cross-cultural effectiveness. Neither construct is related to a specific cultural context, and thus is culture independent. Both constructs are also multidimensional. The conceptualisation of cultural intelligence which supports the recently developed short form measure of cultural intelligence does however differ in some important respects to the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. Firstly, unlike the four-factor model, the short form measure of cultural intelligence does not include a motivational component. It’s argued that suggesting that there
is a motivational facet to cultural intelligence is problematic because cultural intelligence and motivation are not components of each other (ibid). Secondly, it’s suggested that the short form measure of cultural intelligence improves on the theoretical shortcoming of the four-factor model and “captures the original theoretical intent of a multifaceted culture general form of intelligence” (Thomas et al., 2015: 1100). While the factors in the four-factor model show good internal reliability (Van Dyne et al., 2008; Ang et al., 2007), and have been found to be related to a number of different outcome variables (Ang et al., 2007), little can be said about the relationship of the model as a whole, which represents cultural intelligence, with outcome variables (Thomas et al., 20015). Thomas and colleagues argue that the four-factor model “does not reflect a theoretically based multidimensional type of intelligence, but a loosely aggregated set of facets and is thus similar to other inventories of this type with somewhat marginal utility” (2015: 1101).

The short form measure of cultural intelligence was developed based on a 10 year long research program which consisted of 3526 participants, across five language groups. Across 14 samples the average Cronbach’s alpha score was 0.85. The results attained from the research program showed that cultural intelligence is a single latent factor reflected by three related facets. The short form measure of cultural intelligence was used in both the first and second study in the present research.

**Willingness to Accept an International Assignment**

International assignments, involve the temporary relocation of an employee by their organisation to another country to complete specific tasks and accomplish organisational goals
(Shaffer et al., 2012). Willingness to accept an international assignment may be defined as “the likelihood of accepting a job offer that requires living and working in a foreign country for a temporary period” (Mol et al., 2009:2).

Since the early 1990s several different instruments have been used to measure willingness to accept an international assignment. These instruments have differed with regards to their focus and length. Some scholars have used relatively short measures, consisting of a single item or two items, to measure willingness to accept an international assignment (e.g. Van der Velde et al., 2005; Brett and Stroh’s, 1995; Brett and Reilly, 1988), while the majority have generally used measures that consist of at least 4 items (e.g. Aryee et al., 1996; Bret and Stroh, 1995; Noe and Barber, 1993). Some measures have focused specifically on location, assessing the willingness of employees to accept an assignment in a specific city or country (e.g. Dupuis, 2008; Gould and Penley, 1985). While all of the measures used by the scholars cited above showed good reliability, the present research used a different measure, which was deemed more appropriate. Willingness to undertake an international assignment is the dependent variable in the first study in this thesis. This study used a student sample. It was deemed more appropriate to use a measure of willingness to accept an international assignment which has been previously used in a study conducted using a student sample. This research therefore used the measure employed by Mol et al. (2009) in their study of 299 Dutch students. The measure consists of 7 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree). The measure was used to predict the willingness to accept an international assignment amongst prospective domestic entry-level job applicants. The measure was adapted slightly for the present research. Two of the items in the initial measure that were related specifically to
Dutch students were removed. In Mol et al. (2009) the measure showed good reliability with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .87. Items from the measure have since been used in other studies on willingness to undertake an international assignment (Froese et al., 2013; Kim and Froese, 2012). In these studies the full instruments used to measure willingness to accept an international assignment also showed good reliability with Cronbach’s alpha scores between .83 and .87.

**Assignee Adjustment**

Assignee adjustment may be defined as an assignees ‘perceived degree of psychological comfort with various aspects of the host country’ (Black and Gregersen, 1991a: 463). The construct considers an assignee’s general satisfaction with life in their new setting (Hippler, 2000). To date assignee adjustment has often been assessed through the use of a 14 item measure created by Black and Stephens (1989). The measure consists of three factors. The first factor focuses on adjusting to interaction with host country nationals. The second factor focuses on adjusting to general, non-work related, conditions in the host country. The third factor focuses on adjusting to one’s work role. For a considerable period of time, the measure of expatriate adjustment established by Black and Stephens (1989) was widely accepted and supported in expatriate adjustment research. However, in recent times an increasing amount of criticism has been levelled against the measure. There have been theoretical concerns surrounding the dimensions of adjustment included in the measure (Hippler et al., 2014; Lazarova and Thomas, 2012), which have subsequently led to the birth of alternative
conceptualisations of expatriate adjustment (e.g. Haslberger, Brewster, and Hippler, 2013; Lazarova, Westman, and Shaffer, 2010).

The most recent conceptualization of expatriate adjustment has been put forward by Shaffer et al. (2015). In contrast to Black and Stephen’s (1989) conceptualisation of expatriate adjustment, Shaffer and colleagues developed a measure which is more encompassing, in that it transcends the traditional form of expatriation (i.e. corporate expatriation) and considers wider forms of global work. The measure developed by Shaffer et al. (2015) considers adjustment across the different roles and life domains of global professionals. The measure consists of 12 items which are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= very uncomfortable and 5= very comfortable).

Focusing specifically on the work and family domains of global professionals Shaffer et al. (2015: 3) define role adjustment as “the degree of psychological comfort the role incumbent feels toward the tasks and responsibilities of a particular role and toward navigating relationships with other actors in the role”.

The measure was developed based on a sample of 1231 corporate, self-initiated expatriates, international business travellers, and global domestics, across five interrelated studies. The multidimensional scale of work and family role adjustment was found to also consist of task and relationship elements. The scale therefore consists of two second order factors (work-role adjustment and family-role adjustment) and four first order factors, two of which are related to each second order factor (work-role task adjustment and work-role relationship adjustment, and family-role task adjustment and family-role relationship adjustment). The measure shows good internal reliability with Cronbach’s alpha scores of between .79 and .89 across four
studies. Although the adjustment measure developed by Black and Stephens (1989) is still quite popular, despite the criticism levelled against it, the present research uses the work and family role adjustment measure developed by Shaffer et al. (2015) because it is more theoretically grounded than the popular Black and Stephens (1989) measure.

**Knowledge Transfer**

Knowledge transfer may be defined as the deliberate movement of knowledge between sub units within an organisation or across organisational boundaries, through activities and processes (Argote, 2012). More simply put, knowledge transfer refers to how individuals and groups communicate and learn from each other (Javidan et al., 2005). In the empirical study of international assignments and knowledge transfer, several different approaches have been taken to measuring knowledge transfer. In assessing the extent of knowledge transfer, some studies have focused on the outward transfer of subsidiary knowledge to other units within multinational companies (e.g. Björkman et al., 2004). Contrastingly, in other studies knowledge transfer has been assessed based on the utilization of knowledge by recipients (e.g. Minbaeva, 2003). In some cases, knowledge transfer has been measured less directly, with a focus on knowledge application and access to knowledge (e.g. Hocking, 2007).

Theory suggests that motivation is an important factor in explaining both the creation and transfer of knowledge (Argote et al., 2003). The present research therefore focuses on the motivation of international assignees to transfer knowledge. Motivation to transfer knowledge refers to the willingness of international assignees to devote time and to persist in solving difficulties in transferring knowledge (Chang et al., 2012). Assessing the motivation of
international assignees to transfer knowledge in multivariate analysis may allow researchers to provide an insight into factors and characteristics which may impact the future knowledge transfer behaviour of assignees. Furthermore it is suggested that the motivation of international assignees to transfer knowledge may play a critical role in the successful transfer of knowledge (Chang et al., 2012). The present research used a measure of motivation to transfer knowledge developed by Chang et al. (2012). The measure consists of five items, which international assignees are asked to rate based on the extent to which the items describe assignees as a whole in the subsidiary. The measure shows good internal reliability with a Cronbach’s Alpha score of .86. The measure was adapted slightly for the present research. Rather than asking international assignees to rate the extent to which the items in the measure described assignees as a whole in their subsidiary, the present research asked them to rate the extent to which the items in the measure described them on a scale of one to five where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

**Job Performance**

Job performance relates to how the actions and behaviours of an individual contribute the fulfillment of their organisation’s goals (Rotundo and Sackett 2002). Within the context of international assignments, there has been a lack of consensus as to what constitutes assignee performance and thus several different indirect measures of performance have been used (Thomas and Lazarova, 2006). It has however been argued that job performance is a multidimensional construct which consists of both a task and contextual element (Motowidlo, and Van Scotter, 1994). A small number of previous studies have adopted this view of job
performance, considering both task and contextual elements of assignee performance (e.g. Malek and Budhwar, 2013; Kraimer and Wayne, 2004; Kraimer, Wayne, and Jaworski, 2001).

Task performance considers an assignee’s performance in achieving job objectives and fulfilling technical facets of the job. Contextual performance on the other hand considers an assignee’s performance on facets of the job that go beyond the assignee’s specific job duties, such as developing good relationships with host country nationals and adapting to existing customs in a foreign facility (Kraimer and Wayne, 2004). In line with previous studies, the present research also considers assignee performance in terms of both task and contextual performance. This conceptualisation of assignee performance provides a more direct approach to measuring the performance of assignees. The present research used the task and contextual performance measure created by Kraimer, Wayne, and Jaworski (2001).

The task and contextual performance measure created by Kraimer, Wayne, and Jaworski (2001) consists of 6 items. The items were developed based on the results of interviews conducted with 17 former international assignees. The items were also informed by previous research (Caliguiri, 1997; Gregersen et al., 1996; Feldman and Thomas, 1992). A principal components analysis using varimax rotation was conducted to assess the factor structure of the scale. The results indicated two distinct factors. The measure showed good reliability with a Cronbach’s Alpha score of .81 for the 6 items. Scholars further developed this measure by adding 3 additional items and creating two subscales which separately measured task performance and contextual performance (see Kraimer and Wayne, 2004). This version of the measure has also shown good reliability with Cronbach’s alpha scores of .86 and .84 respectively (e.g. Kraimer and Wayne, 2004). The present research used the 9 item measure of task and contextual
performance. The measure is a rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= very poor and 5= very good).

5.3.2 Research Sample

The studies included in this research are based on data collected from two different samples. Data for the first study was collected from college students, while data for the second study was collected from international assignees within a multinational company, and their supervisors.

The first study in this thesis examines willingness to undertake and international assignment. Specifically, the study focuses on the impact of cultural identification on willingness to undertake an international assignment. Data for the first study were collected from students across 12 Irish colleges.

Previous research suggests that a student sample is appropriate for this study. Student samples have been widely used in the biculturalism (e.g. Chiou, 2016; Ng et al., 2016; Nguyen and Ahmadpanah, 2014) and willingness to undertake an international assignment literature (e.g. Presbitero and Quita, 2017; Bozionelos et al., 2015; Froese et al., 2013). Furthermore, a number of justifications have been made for the need to study the receptivity of students and young graduates to working internationally (Tharenou, 2003). Firstly, understanding the receptivity of those soon to enter the jobs market (i.e. students) to working internationally will provide multinational companies with a means of identifying talent that is willing and capable of operating globally. Secondly, understanding the receptivity of students to working internationally will allow multinational companies to identify potential international managers.
and global leaders at an early stage and to develop these individuals to function in these positions. Finally, companies are sending workers on international assignments at much younger ages (Forster and Johnsen, 1996; Scullion, 1992) and thus the receptivity of students to working internationally has become increasingly relevant. Within two or three years of graduating, students working in multinational firms may find themselves undertaking international assignments (Tharenou, 2003).

The second study in this thesis examines the effect of cultural identification on the effectiveness of international assignees while they are on international assignments. In this study the effectiveness of assignees is assessed using variables such as assignee adjustment, cultural intelligence, knowledge transfer, and job performance. Data for the second study were collected from international assignees working in a large multinational food-products corporation which operates in over 120 countries across five continents. Data were also collected from their supervisors. The chosen sample is appropriate for this study as global mobility research has generally focused on large multinational corporations, particularly those headquartered in developed economies (McNulty and De Cieri, 2014).

5.3.3 Data Collection

Prior to collecting data the researcher received formal approval, from the Dublin City University Research Ethics Committee, to conduct the research which is presented in this thesis. Access to the sample used in the first study was attained through several means. Firstly, the researcher collected data from first year undergraduate business school students whom he taught at Dublin City University. Secondly, data were collected from second year and final year
undergraduate business school students at Dublin City University by contacting lecturers in the business school. Finally, data were collected from students in different years and disciplines across several different Irish colleges by contacting college based cultural societies. Data were collected using a pen and paper questionnaire and an online questionnaire. Pen and paper questionnaires were completed during class time by students in the Dublin City University Business School in the presence of the researcher. Administering pen and paper questionnaires in person allows the researcher to assist participants who may be having difficulties with the questionnaire (Bryman and Bell, 2007). Students were informed that their participation was voluntary and they were reassured of the confidentiality of the study. The introduction to the questionnaire included a cover letter which provided further details on anonymity and confidentiality, as well as details on the purpose of the study, and instructions on how to respond. The cover letter was formatted according to the suggestions of Dillman (2007). A clear title was used to make the cover letter interesting, subtitles were used for clarity and a logo was used to make the cover letter more attractive. Furthermore, the researcher’s name and contact details were provided so that participants could contact him if necessary. In line with university regulations the contact details of the secretary of the university’s research ethics committee were provided, so that participants could contact an independent person if needed.

After completing the administration of the pen and paper questionnaire, the researcher reviewed the responses to determine the number of monocultural and bicultural participants. Only 20% of participants identified as being bicultural. The research requires a balanced number of bicultural and monocultural participants as both groups are compared along a
number of variables to determine how monoculturalism and biculturalism impact international assignments. In order to increase the number of bicultural participants the researcher spoke to several cultural societies in Dublin City University about the study, such as the Africa, Chinese and Japanese society. Cultural societies were specifically targeted because of the cultural diversity of many of their members. Many cultural society members join the society because they identify with the culture(s) of the country or continent that the society represents. Furthermore, many cultural society members have attended secondary, and often, primary school in Ireland. Many therefore identify with their culture of origin as well Irish culture. Such individuals may consider themselves to be bicultural.

Each Dublin City University cultural society that was contacted was interested in participating in the study but found it difficult to get their society’s members to come to a room at a specified time to complete the questionnaire. In order to attain an adequate number of responses from bicultural individuals, the study was extended beyond Dublin City University. Presidents and secretaries of several college cultural societies around Ireland were informed about the study. Many agreed to participate. In order to facilitate the collection of additional data from students residing in numerous locations, an online version of the questionnaire was launched. Web based surveys can be used alongside pen and paper surveys to increase response rates and mitigate the drawbacks of either approach (Dillman, 2007).

A cover email which included a link to the online questionnaire was sent to the president or secretary of participating cultural societies. They subsequently sent this email to their society’s
mailing list. Society representatives also agreed to send a reminder email to their members at an agreed interval.

Access to the sample used in the second study was attained through a multinational food corporation. An informal invitation to participate in the study was sent by the researcher’s supervisor to the organisation’s head of global mobility. Following a positive response from the organisation’s head of global mobility, a formal invitation was sent to the organisation. This invitation was accepted. The researcher subsequently had access to a population of international assignees. All information relating to the study was sent by the organisation to its international assignees.

An introduction to the study was sent by the organisation to its international assignees. In the introduction, the purpose of the study, the benefit of participating in the study and the benefits of the study for the organisation were all stated. Assignees were also informed that they would receive an email to complete a survey in one week. A week later a cover email which included a link to the online questionnaire, was sent to the assignees. The cover email reiterated the purpose and benefits of the study to both employees and the organisation. Assignees were also informed that as part of the survey process, feedback would be sought from their supervisors on aspects of their international role. The anonymity and confidentiality of the survey was emphasised. Assignees were informed that neither the organisation nor their supervisor would see their response and that they would not see the response of their supervisor. Supervisors received an automatic invitation to participate in the study once an assignee who reports to
them completed the questionnaire. This was facilitated by the ‘piped text’ and ‘email trigger’
features on Qualtrics, the online survey platform used to administer the questionnaire.

The emailed invitation sent to supervisors stated that the supervisor had received the email
because a specific assignee who reports to them (the name of the assignee was included in the
email) had recently completed the questionnaire. The invitation also stated the purpose of the
study, the purpose of supervisor feedback, and the benefits of the study to the organisation.
The invitation included a link to a separate questionnaire which was designed specifically for
supervisors. Several outcome variables were assessed in the questionnaire. The measures for
these variables are the same as the ones outlined in the previous section. However, the
wording of the measures was adapted to reflect a supervisor providing feedback on an
assignee. A week after a cover email with a link to the survey had been sent to the international
assignee population a reminder email was sent by the organisation. Qualtrics allowed the
researcher to resend the automatic invitation email that supervisors received. The invitation
was only resent to supervisors who had not already completed the questionnaire. Although the
overall response rate for the supervisor questionnaire was quite good, with 38% of supervisors
providing feedback on assignees, the total number of responses was not sufficient for the
intended statistical analysis. In total, 134 supervisors completed the questionnaires. The
researcher therefore had 134 dyads (pairs of assignee and supervisor responses). While this
would appear to be a strong dataset in many instances, it was not suitable for the present
research. Given that the present research focuses on two different groups of individuals (i.e.
monocultural and bicultural individuals) a much larger number of dyads were required for
statistical analysis. Within the dyad data set there were only 60 responses from supervisors of
bicultural international assignees and 74 responses from supervisors of monocultural international assignees. These numbers were too small for structural equation modelling or path analysis, the intended data analysis approach for the supervisors rated variables. Due to time constraints, it was not possible to try and collect additional supervisor data from the participating organisation, nor was it possible to collect such data from another organisation. The supervisor data was therefore omitted from this thesis. The researcher and his supervisors will attempt to collect additional dyad data (paired assignee and supervisor data) from a similar organisation in the future, for the purpose of academic publication. The next section outlines the data analysis strategy used.

5.4 DATA ANALYSIS STRATEGY

A number of different statistical techniques were used to analyze the data in this research. These techniques include correlation analysis, independent sample t-test, regression analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, and path analysis.

The relationship between the variables examined in the research was investigated using correlation analysis. Correlation analysis describes the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient statistic was used to examine the relationship between variables in both studies (for correlational matrices, see Appendix C). The statistic is represented by the letter $r$. Pearson correlation coefficient ($r$) can only have values
between -1 and +1. A Pearson correlation coefficient value of 1 represents a perfect correlation while a value of zero indicates that there is no correlation between the variables in question. Generally, the correlation coefficient is never equal to exactly 1 or 0. It’s often somewhere between the two. The closer the correlation coefficient is to 1, the stronger the relationship between the variables in question. The following guidelines for interpreting the strength of correlation coefficients has been proposed by Cohen (1988: 79-81).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>r = .10 to .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>r = .30 to .49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>r = .50 to 1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bicultural and monocultural individuals were compared in both studies along a number of variables using the Independent sample t-test. The independent sample t-test is used to assess the statistical significance of the difference between the mean scores of two different groups or conditions. In this research it is used to assess the difference in mean scores between two groups (i.e. monocultural and bicultural individuals). In statistical terms, the independent sample t-test enables a researcher to test the probability that the scores for both groups (monocultural and bicultural individuals) came from the same population (Pallant, 2010). There is a statistically significant difference between the two groups if the significance value for the t-test is equal to or less than .05. If there is a statistically significant difference between two groups, the magnitude of the difference should be ascertained. Effect size statistics provide
researchers with an indication of the magnitude of the difference in means scores between two groups. These statistics verify that the difference between the two groups has not occurred by chance. There are a number of different effect size statistics available to researchers. A commonly used effect size statistics is eta squared. Eta squared expresses the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent group variable (e.g. cultural identification). Eta squared results can be interpreted as follows (Cohen, 1988):

.01 = Small effect

.06 = Moderate Effect

.14 = Large effect

Multiple regression analyses were employed to test the mediation hypotheses in Study 1. Multiple regression, which is based on correlation, allows for a more sophisticated analyses of the relationships amongst sets of variables (Pallant, 2010). Unlike the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient statistic, multiple regression analysis is not limited to two variables but rather allows researchers to explore the interrelationships between a larger number of variables. The approach examines how well sets of variables (independent variables) are able to predict a particular outcome (dependent variable).

In order to test the mediation hypothesis the four step approach proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986) was followed. This approach has been widely used in the social science literature. As of the 12th of December 2016, the original Baron and Kenny (1986) article which proposed the
four step approach had been cited 28,560 times. The four steps proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986) to assess mediation are:

1. The independent variable should be directly related to the dependent variable (X->Y) also known as total effect.
2. The independent variable should be related to the mediator (X->M).
3. The mediator should be related to the dependent variable (M->Y).
4. The direct relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable should become non-significant (full mediation) or weaker (partial mediation) when accounting for the effect of the mediator (XM->Y).

Baron and Kenny (1986) propose that a variable can be confirmed as a mediator if it follows the four steps above (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The purpose of the first, second and third steps are to establish the existence of relationships among the variables (Mackinnon, Fairchild and Fritz, 2007; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). If one or more of these relationships are not significant, it can be concluded that mediation is not possible or likely. If however these relationships are significant, the possibility of partial or full mediation can be assessed (Baron and Kenny, 1986).

By itself, the four step approach has certain limitations, namely that the indirect effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable is not tested. Sobel (1982) proposed a method which circumvents this problem by testing the difference between the total effect and the direct effect (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The Sobel test has gradually become an essential supplement to Baron and Kenny’s (1986) approach. Indeed, Baron and Kenny themselves advise
the use of the Sobel test in mediation analysis (Wood et al., 2008). Like the four step approach, the Sobel test also has limitations. The main criticism of the approach is that it has been found to be too conservative as it assumes the sampling distribution of the indirect effect is normal (Zhao, Lynch and Chen, 2010; Preacher and Hayes, 2008). This however is often not the case with sampling distributions often being non-normal, exhibiting a level of skewness and kurtosis (Hayes, 2009).

An alternative to the Sobel test (Sobel, 1982) is bootstrapping which is argued to be a more powerful test of the indirect effect (Preacher and Hayes, 2004; Shrout and Bolger, 2002). Bootstrapping is a process whereby statistics such as regression weights are generated over a large number of replications, with samples drawn with replacement from a data set (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The bootstrap test provides an estimate of the indirect effect, standard error and 95% confidence intervals (Preacher and Hayes, 2004). In this approach, the indirect effect is significant if the 95% bias corrected and accelerated confidence intervals for the indirect effect do not include zero (Preacher and Hayes, 2004).

The main strength of the bootstrap method which makes it a stronger approach than the Sobel test is that its inferences are based on an estimate of the indirect effect itself and makes no assumptions about the sample distribution (Hayes, 2009; Preacher and Hayes, 2008). In the present research, direct and indirect effects of mediation were assessed using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) mediation method, the Sobel test (Sobel, 1982) and bootstrapping method (Preacher and Hayes, 2008). SPSS-21 in conjunction with the PROCESS macro code for SPSS was used to conduct the mediation analysis.
As in any credible research, the reliability of all of the instruments used to measure variables in this research was assessed. The reliability of a measurement instrument (i.e. scales) indicates how free it is from random error. The most commonly assessed aspect of reliability is internal consistency. Internal consistency refers to the degree to which items in a scale all measure the same underlying attribute. Measures of internal consistency indicate the degree to which various items in a scale are inter-correlated. The most widely used statistic for assessing internal consistency is the Cronbach’s coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951). It’s recommended that the Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of a scale should be above .70 (DeVillis, 2003). Although the Cronbach’s alpha is a suitable measure of internal consistency, its value may vary based on certain factors. Such factors include; the number of items in a measure, with more items implying higher estimates; item inter-correlation, with higher inter-correlations imply higher estimates; and dimensionality, with more than one construct being measured in a scale leading to lower alpha scores (Cascio, 2012).

It is suggested that before researchers conduct tests of internal consistency such as the Cronbach’s alpha, they should first determine the dimensionality of a measure by using a factor analytic technique (Cascio, 2012). Confirmatory factor analysis is one such technique. Confirmatory factor analysis can be used to determine the construct validity of a scale (DiStefano and Hess, 2005). The technique is used for verification. Specifically, the technique verifies the factor structure of a set of observed variables. Confirmatory factor analysis enables researchers to determine whether there is a relationship between observed variables (or items) and their underlying latent constructs. In contrast to exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis allows researchers to hypothesize that there are a specific number of underlying
dimension and that certain variables (or items) belong to certain dimensions. In order for a variable (or item) to belong to a dimension it must have a minimum factor loading of 0.40 as recommended by Nunnally (1978). While factor loadings provide an indication of the dimensionality of a scale, model fit statistics evaluate the extent to which the model (the factor structure, in the case of confirmatory factor analysis) is supported by the data (Blunch, 2012).

Traditionally, the chi-square statistic ($\chi^2$) has been used to evaluate the extent to which the model is supported by the data. However, the $\chi^2$ statistic has some limitations. Firstly, it assumes multivariate normality, meaning that a lack of normality in the distribution of a sample may result in a model being rejected even if the model is correctly specified (McIntosh, 2006). Secondly, it is very sensitive to sample size. It is therefore no longer relied upon as an independent basis for the acceptance or rejection of a model (Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003, Vandenberg, 2006). A large number of model fit statistics have been developed to address the weakness of the $\chi^2$ statistic. The model fit indices used in this research are the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Standardised Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR).

The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) statistic which was introduced by Bentler (1990) is a revised version of the NFI statistic which takes sample size into account and performs well even with small sample sizes (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007; Byrne, 1998). The CFI is a relative fit measure. Relative fit measures assess the fit of different models on a common basis (Blunch, 2012). Values for the CFI statistic range from 0.0 and 1.0. Values closer to 1.0 indicate good fit. A cut-off point of .95 has been suggested as a criterion for determining good model fit (Hu and
Bentler, 1999). However, a cut-off of point of .90 has also often been referenced in the academic literature, based on an earlier recommendation by Hu and Bentler (1998). The CFI is one of the model fit indices least effected by sample size, thus making it one of the most popularly reported model fit indices (Fan et al, 1999).

The Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) statistic was initially introduced by Jöreskog and Sorbom (1993, 1996) as an alternative the Chi-Square test. GFI is an absolute fit measure. Absolute fit measures assess the fit of a model without reference to other models which could be relevant (Blunch, 2012). The statistic determines the proportion of variance that is accounted for by the estimated population covariance (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). A visual analysis of the variances and covariances explained by the model indicates how closely the model comes to replicating the observed covariance matrix (Diamantopoulos and Siguaw, 2000). Values for the GFI statistic range from 0.0 and 1.0. Values closer to 1.0 indicate good fit. Larger samples do however increase the value of GFI. In sample sizes greater than 100, a GFI of .95 and above is an indicator of good model fit (Shevlin and Miles, 1998).

The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) statistic indicates how well a model would fit the population’s covariance matrix. The RMSEA is fit measure based on the non-central chi-square distribution. Fit measures based on the non-central chi-square distribution assume that no model is correct but rather can only be approximately correct (Blunch, 2012). The RMSEA is considered to be amongst the most informative fit indices because of its sensitivity to the number of estimated model parameters (Diamantopoulos and Siguaw, 2000). The statistic favours models with fewer numbers of parameters. Values for the RMSEA statistic
range from 0.0 and 1.0. An RMSEA value of .06 or less is an indicator of good model fit (Hu and Bentler, 1999).

The Standardised Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) statistic reflects the square root of the difference between the residuals of the sample covariance matrix and the hypothesised covariance model. Values for the SRMR statistic range from 0.0 and 1.0. An SRMR value of .08 or less is an indicator of good model fit (Hu and Bentler, 1999). The SRMR statistics is however influenced by the number of parameters in the model and the sample size. The statistic decreases when there are a larger number of parameters in the model and when models are based on larger samples.

In international human resource management research there has often been a very strong reliance on Cronbach’s alpha as a sole indicator of the reliability of a measurement instrument (i.e. scale) (Cascio, 2012). The use of confirmatory factor analysis provides a further means of assessing the reliability of scales. In both studies, AMOS version 21 was used to conduct confirmatory factor analysis. An understanding of the reliability of scales allows researchers to consider the true impact of variables, measured by the scales, in the research.

The final data analysis technique used in the research is path analysis. Path analysis was used to examine the impact of bicultural identity integration (BII) on the effectiveness of international assignees.

Path analysis is a component of Structural Equation Modelling which allows a researcher to specify a model and the relationship between variables within the model. Path analysis differs from structural equation modelling in that it does not include latent variables. Latent variables
are variables that are not directly measured but rather are inferred from variables that are measured (e.g. personality). Latent variables may be referred to as common factors which connect observed variables. In structural equation modelling latent variables are taken into consideration using confirmatory factor analysis. Confirmatory factor analysis tests relationships between latent variables and observed variables, which are indicators of latent variables. Structural equation modelling therefore consists of both path analysis and confirmatory factor analysis. Structural equation modelling was not used in this research as the sample size was not big enough. Many researchers have suggested that a minimum sample size of 200 is required for structural equation modelling (e.g. Kline, 2011; Weston and Gore, 2006). It has also been suggested that when thinking about the minimum sample size for structural equation modelling, researchers should think in terms of the ratio of cases (N) to the number of model parameters that require statistical estimates (q). An ideal sample size-to-parameters ratio is said to be 20:1 (Jackson, 2003). The sample size for the path analysis that was conducted in the second study was $N = 150$, which is less than 200. The path analysis model consisted of 19 parameters. Based on Jackson’s (2013) recommendation of a 20:1 ratio, a minimum sample size of 380 was required for structural equation modelling.

Path analysis tests models and relationships between observed variables. Observed variables are variables that are directly measured. When conducting path analysis, researchers use their knowledge of theory and empirical research to develop a model which is tested statistically. A model may be described as a statistical statement about the relationships between variables. Models are represented graphically, by path diagrams. Path diagrams consist of rectangular boxes, single or double headed arrows, and error terms which are represented by a small circle
with the letter ‘e’ and a number inside of it. The boxes represent observed variables, while the arrows can represent direct relationships (arrow with a single head) or covariance or correlation (arrow with a double head). Error terms (e.g. (e1)) denote the error associated with observed variables. After a model is constructed the parameters of the model are statistically estimated. AMOS version 21 was used to construct and statistically estimate the path analysis included in the second study. In order to determine how well a model fits the data (or the strength of a model) a number of model fit indices can be assessed. AMOS calculates a wide number of model fit statistics when estimating the parameters of the model. The model fit indices that are used to assess how well the model fit the data are the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the Standardised Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). Each of these model fit indices are explained above in greater detail. A good model fit can be indicated by a RMSEA that’s equal to or less than .06, a SRMR that’s equal to or lower than .08 and a CFI of .95 and above (Hu and Bentler, 1998, 1999). In sample sizes greater than 100, a GFI of .95 and above is also an indicator of good model fit (Shevlin and Miles, 1998)

This chapter discussed the research philosophy and methodology employed in this thesis. The chapter began by establishing positivism as the underlying philosophical framework for the research. The chapter then discussed the research design, specifically the survey design, the research sample, and data collection. Finally, the chapter outlined the data analysis strategy used. The next two chapters will present the results for the first and second study respectively.
CHAPTER 6

STUDY 1:

CULTURAL IDENTIFICATION AND GLOBAL MOBILITY: EXPLORING THE WILLINGNESS OF MONOCULTURAL AND BICULTURAL INDIVIDUALS TO WORK INTERNATIONALLY

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The first study in this thesis sought to answer the first research question, which is “Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact willingness to undertake an international assignment?” The study aimed to identify how biculturalism and monoculturalism impact the willingness of individual’s to undertake an international assignment. Specifically, the study set out to identify, whether there is a difference in the willingness of bicultural and monocultural individuals to undertake an international assignment; how bicultural identity integration impacts the willingness of bicultural individuals to undertake and international assignment; and how cultural intelligence may impact the willingness of bicultural and monocultural individuals to undertake an international assignment. Several hypothesis related to the research question were developed. Each hypothesis is explained in the hypotheses development section at the end of the third chapter. For the purpose of providing clarity to the reader the hypotheses are re-sated below.

Hypothesis 1: Bicultural individuals will be more willing to accept an international assignment than monocultural individuals.
Hypothesis 2: Bicultural individuals who experience cultural conflict will have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those who experience cultural harmony.

Hypothesis 3: Bicultural individuals who compartmentalize their cultural identities will have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those who blend their cultural identities.

Hypothesis 4: Bicultural individuals who have a high level of bicultural identity integration (BII) (i.e. that experience cultural harmony and cultural blendedness) will be more willing to accept an international assignment than bicultural individuals who have a lower level of bicultural identity integration (i.e. that do not experience both cultural harmony and cultural blendedness).

Hypothesis 5: Bicultural individuals have higher levels of cultural intelligence than monocultural individuals.

Hypothesis 6: Cultural intelligence will be positively related to an individual’s willingness to undertake an international assignment.

Hypothesis 7: Cultural intelligence mediates the relationship between cultural identification (i.e. whether an individual identifies as monocultural or bicultural) and willingness to undertake an international assignment.
6.2 METHOD

6.2.1 Participants and Procedures

Profile of Participants

A total of 285 students across 18 Irish colleges participated in the study. 42% of the participants (119) were male while 58% (166) were female. Of the 285 participants, 93% were between the ages of 17 and 23, while the remaining 7% were 24 years of age or older. The majority of the sample was made up of undergraduate students (94%). However, a small number of postgraduate students also participated in the study (6%). Undergraduate participants were drawn from different academic years. 36% of participants were first years students, 25% were second year students, 25% were third year students, 7% were fourth years students, and .7% were fifth year students (applicable to engineering and medicine students). Participants were also drawn from a number of academic disciplines including Business and Management, Humanities, Social Science, Engineering, Natural Science, Formal Science, Human Health and Performance, Medicine, and Education.

A greater number of participants were not employed (65%) at the time of completing the questionnaire compared to those that were. However, the majority of participants had attained work experience prior to completing the questionnaire. Only 14% of participants had not attained any work experience. Almost all of the participants were single (97%) while a very small number were married or engaged. Similarly, almost all of the participants had no children.
(98%). Like in the case of children, only a small number of participants stated that they had dependents (i.e. individuals for whom they are responsible, excluding biological or adopted children) (5%).

58% of participants had at some point in their lives lived outside of the country that they were born in. Of the participants that stated that they had lived outside of the country they were born in, 34% had lived in two or more countries for more than one year, while 9% had lived in three or more countries. A majority of participants stated that they were of Irish nationality (58%). A number of participants stated that they were dual nationals by listing two nationalities separated by a hyphen (e.g. Nigerian-Irish, Filipino-Irish etc.) (12%). The remaining participants were of several different nationalities. 46% of participants stated that they had lived in Ireland since birth. Of those that had not lived in Ireland since birth, 8% moved to Ireland between the ages of 0 and 4, 31% between the ages of 5 and 11, 12% between the ages of 12 and 19, 2% between the ages of 20 and 24, and 2% from the age of 25 onwards. A strong majority of participants stated that they identify with Ireland and Irish culture (92%). 46% of participants also stated that they identify with a second country and the culture of that country. However a greater number of participants stated that they did not identify with more than country and national culture (54%). Therefore 46% of respondents were bicultural while 54% were monocultural.

Procedures

Data were collected from college students via a pen and paper questionnaire and an online version of the same questionnaire in order to increase response rates and mitigate the
drawbacks of either approach (Dillman, 2007). The introduction to the questionnaire included a
cover letter which outlined the aims and objectives of the research, and emphasized that
participation was voluntary. Participants were also assured of the anonymity and confidentiality
of the questionnaire, which had received ethical approval from the Dublin City University
Research Ethics Committee. Furthermore, in line with university regulations the contact details
of the secretary of the university’s research ethics committee were provided in the
introduction, so that participants could contact an independent person if needed.

The pen and paper questionnaire was administered by the researcher to undergraduate
students in the Business School at Dublin City University. The researcher spoke to groups of
first, second and final year undergraduate students about the research during class time and
invited them to participate in the study. Students that agreed to participate in the study spent
15 to 20 minutes completing the questionnaire. When the questionnaires were completed they
were returned to the researcher for analysis.

The researcher contacted college cultural society representatives (e.g. secretaries or
presidents) to inform them about the research and invite their society to participate in the
research. College cultural societies (e.g. ‘Chinese society’, ‘African society’ etc.) were targeted
because of the cultural diversity of many of their members. Many cultural society members join
the society because they identify with the culture(s) of the country or continent that the society
represents. Such individuals may identify as being bicultural. Societies that agreed to
participate in the research sent the link to the online version of the questionnaire, which was
proceeded by an invitation to participate in the study, to their registered members.
Participating societies also sent a reminder email to their registered members at an agreed interval. The overall response rate for study was 11%.

6.2.2 Measures

The variables explored in this study include cultural identification, bicultural identity integration, cultural intelligence and willingness to accept an international assignment. A description of how each of these variables was measured, as well as their reliability (internal consistency and construct validity) is provided below.

*Cultural Identification* was determined using a single item. Participants were asked if they identify with more than one country and national culture. In this study, cultural identification is a categorical variable which refers to a person’s sense of identification with a national culture. The question was used to differentiate between bicultural participants and monocultural participants. Participants who stated that they identify with more than one country and national culture were categorised as bicultural, while those that stated that they don’t identify with more than one country and national culture were categorised as monocultural. For the purpose of this study, cultural identification refers to whether an individual identified as monocultural or bicultural.

*Bicultural Identity Integration* (BII) was measured using the 20-item BIIS-2 scale developed by Huynh (2009). The twenty items in the scale are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree). The measure consists of two subscales which measure cultural harmony and cultural blendedness respectively. The measure was modified slightly to allow participants to respond to the items based on the two cultures that they identify with (i.e.
the use of blank spaces, in which the participants wrote their cultures e.g. “Irish” and “Nigerian”, or were automatically populated, in the case of online questionnaires). This is in contrast to other studies on bicultural identity integration (e.g. Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005 and Nguyen and Ahmadpanah, 2014) which focus solely on single combinations of cultures (e.g. Chinese-American and Mexican-American). In prior research (e.g. Huynh, 2009) the scale has demonstrated good internal reliability scores (Cronbach’s alpha scores: cultural harmony = .81, cultural blendedness = .86). In the present study the Cronbach’s alpha was .78 for cultural harmony and .76 for cultural blendedness.

To examine construct validity of the BIIS-2 scale a confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) was performed. Previous research has shown that the BIIS-2 scale consists of two separate factors, cultural harmony and cultural blendedness (Huynh, Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2011). While the majority of the items related to each factor exceeded the minimum factor loading of .40 as recommended by Nunnally (1978), a few of the items were below this cut off. Two of the eleven items related to the cultural harmony factor had factor loadings below .40. These loadings were .39 (item 1) and .09 respectively (item 5). Three of the nine items related to the cultural blendedness factor had factor loadings below .40. These loadings were .25 (item 17), .34 (item 19) and .39 (item 20) respectively. The correlation between the two factors ($r = -.12$) was non-significant. The examination of a number of model fit statistics ($\chi^2 = 389.221$, $df = 169$, $N = 131$, $p < .000$, $CFI = .64$, $RMSEA = .068$, $CI: .059 - .077$) showed that overall the two factor model did not fit the data well. A good model fit can be indicated by a RMSEA that’s equal to or less than .06 and a CFI of .95 and above (Hu and Bentler, 1998, 1999). Although it has been argued that an RMSEA value equal to or lower than .07 indicates good model fit (Steiger, 2007),
the particularly low score of the CFI and the number of items which did not load unto the hypothesised factors suggests that the two factor model did not fit the data well. The CFA did not support the suggested two factor structure of the BIIS-2 scale.

*Cultural Intelligence* was measured using the 10-item Short Form Measure of Cultural Intelligence (SFCQ) scale developed by Thomas et al. (2015). The ten items in the scale are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1 = not at all and 5 = extremely well). In prior research (e.g. Thomas et al., 2015) the scale has demonstrated good internal reliability scores (across 14 samples the average Cronbach’s alpha score was .85). In the present study the Cronbach’s alpha was .87.

To examine construct validity of the SFCQ scale a confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) was performed. Previous research has shown that the SFCQ scale consists of one second-order factor (cultural intelligence) and three first-order factors (knowledge, skills, metacognition) (Thomas et al., 2015). All of the items related to each first-order factor exceeded the minimum factor loading of .40 as recommended by Nunnally (1978). Factor loadings for the knowledge factor were .80 and .87, loadings for the skills factor were between .49 and .73, and loadings for the metacognition factor were between .53 and .74. The correlations between the first-order variables (knowledge, skills and metacognition) and the second order variable (cultural intelligence) were \( r = .78, .95 \) and \( .90 \) respectively. The examination of a number of model fit statistics (\( \chi^2 = 60.966, df = 34, N = 285, p < .05, \) CFI = .97, RMSEA = .053, CI: .030 - .074) showed that overall the model (one second-order factor (cultural intelligence) and three first-order factors (knowledge, skills, metacognition)) fit the data well as the CFI score was above .95 and
the RMSEA was less than .06 (Hu and Bentler, 1998, 1999). The CFA supported the suggested factor structure of the SFCQ scale.

*Willingness to Undertake an International Assignment* was measured using 5 items adapted from Mol et al. (2009). The five items in the scale are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree). The full 7-item measure (Mol et al., 2009) has demonstrated good internal reliability (Cronbach’s alpha score: .87). Items from the measure have since been used in other studies on willingness to undertake an international assignment (Froese et al., 2013; Kim and Froese, 2012). In these studies the scales used to measure willingness to accept an international assignment also showed good reliability with Cronbach’s alpha scores between .83 and .87. In the present study the Cronbach’s alpha was .84.

To examine construct validity of the Willingness to Undertake an International Assignment scale a confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) was performed. Previous research has shown that the scale consists of a single factor structure (Mol et al., 2009). All of the items related to the factor exceeded the minimum factor loading of .40 as recommended by Nunnally (1978). Factor loadings were between .47 and .82. The examination of a number of model fit statistics ($\chi^2 = 12.046, df = 5, N = 285, p < .05$, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .070, CI: .018 - .122) showed that overall the model fit the data well. A good model fit can be indicated by a RMSEA that’s equal to or less than .06 and a CFI of .95 and above (Hu and Bentler, 1998, 1999). While the RMSEA was not equal to or lower than .06 in this instance, it has been argued that an RMSEA value equal to or lower than .07 indicates good model fit (Steiger, 2007). The CFA supported the suggested single factor structure of the willingness to undertake an international assignment scale.
Table 6.1 Study 1 Summary of Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for Measurement Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RMSEA CI 90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>389.221***</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.059 - .077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration (BIIS-2)</td>
<td>Cultural Harmony</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Blendedness</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Form Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>60.966*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.030 - .074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Scale (SFCQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Undertake an</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>12.046*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.018 - .122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .001, *** p < .0001

Note. $\chi^2$ = Chi-Square, df = Degrees of Freedom, CFI = Comparative Fit Index, RMSEA = Root Mean-Square Error of Approximation, RMSEA CI 90 = Root Mean-Square Error of Approximation 90% Confidence Interval.

6.3 RESULTS

To examine whether bicultural individuals are more willing to undertake an international assignment than monocultural individuals (hypothesis 1), an independent sample t-test was conducted. The test showed that there is a significant difference in the willingness of monocultural ($M = 3.8144$, $SD = .79$) and bicultural ($M = 4.3099$, $SD = .65$; $t (282) = -5.71$, $p = 0.00$, two-tailed) individuals to undertake an international assignment. The magnitude of the difference between the two groups (mean difference = -.50, 95% CI: -.67 to -.32) was moderate.
(Eta Squared = .104) according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988: 284-7) for interpreting effect size values. Expressed as a percentage, 10.4% of the variance in willingness to undertake an international assignment is explained by whether an individual is monocultural or bicultural. The statistically significant difference in the mean scores on willingness to undertake an international assignment for bicultural ($M = 4.3109$) and monocultural ($M = 3.8144$) individuals and the moderate effect size (Eta Squared = .105) of this difference between the two groups suggests that bicultural individuals are more willing to undertake an international assignment than monocultural individuals. The results support hypothesis 1.

An independent sample t-test was used to examine whether bicultural individuals who experience cultural conflict have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those that experience cultural harmony (hypothesis 2). Bicultural individuals that experience cultural conflict or cultural harmony were identified using a mid-point split, and categorised based on their score on the cultural harmony (vs conflict) bicultural identity integration subscale. The test showed that there was not a significant difference in the willingness of bicultural individuals that experience cultural conflict ($M = 4.2581$, $SD = .77$) and those that experience cultural harmony ($M = 4.3333$, $SD = .61$; $t (128) = .562$, $p = .575$, two-tailed) to undertake an international assignment. The magnitude of the difference between the two groups (mean difference = -.08, 95% CI: -.19 to .34) was very small (Eta Squared = .0078), according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988: 284-7) for interpreting effect size values. The statistically non-significant difference in the mean scores on willingness to undertake an international assignment amongst bicultural individuals that experience cultural conflict ($M = 4.2581$) and those that experience cultural harmony ($M = 4.3333$), as well as the very small
effect size (Eta Squared = .0078) of the difference between the two groups, suggests that there is no significant difference in the impact of cultural conflict and cultural harmony on willingness to undertake an international assignment. The results did not support hypothesis 2.

An independent sample t-test was used to examine whether bicultural individuals who experience cultural compartmentalisation have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those that experience cultural blendedness (hypothesis 3). Bicultural individuals that experience cultural compartmentalisation or cultural blendedness were identified using a mid-point split, and categorised based on their score on the cultural blendedness (vs compartmentalisation) bicultural identity integration subscale. The test showed that there was not a significant difference in the willingness of bicultural individuals that experience cultural compartmentalisation ($M = 4.3000$, $SD = .60$) and those that experience cultural blendedness ($M = 4.3055$, $SD = .66$; $t(128) = .034$, $p = .973$, two-tailed) to undertake an international assignment. The magnitude of the difference between the two groups (mean difference = .00545, 95% CI: -.31 to .32) was very small (Eta Squared = .0078), according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988: 284-7) for interpreting effect size values. The statistically non-significant difference in the mean scores on willingness to undertake an international assignment amongst bicultural individuals that experience cultural compartmentalisation ($M = 4.3000$) and those that experience cultural blendedness ($M = 4.3333$), as well as the very small effect size (Eta Squared = .0078) of the difference between the two groups, suggests that there is no significant difference in the impact of cultural compartmentalisation and cultural blendedness on willingness to undertake an international assignment. The results did not support hypothesis 3.
To examine whether bicultural individuals with a high level of bicultural identity integration are more willing to accept an international assignment than bicultural individuals that have a lower level of bicultural identity integration (hypothesis 4), an independent sample t-test was conducted. Using a mid-point split, bicultural participants were categorized based on their scores on both of the bicultural identity integration subscales (i.e. cultural harmony (vs conflict) and cultural blendedness (vs compartmentalization)). Bicultural individuals that experience cultural harmony and cultural blendedness were categorized as having a high level of bicultural identity integration. Bicultural individuals that do not experience a combination of cultural harmony and cultural blendedness were categorized as having a lower level of bicultural identity integration.

The test showed that there was not a significant difference in the willingness of bicultural individuals with a high level of bicultural identity integration ($M = 4.3106, SD = .62$) and bicultural individuals with a lower level of bicultural identity integration ($M = 4.3091, SD = .70$; $t(127) = .012, p = .990$, two-tailed) to undertake an international assignment. The magnitude of the difference between the two groups (mean difference = .00150, 95% CI: -.24 to .24) was extremely small (Eta Squared = .00000113385). The statistically non-significant difference in the mean scores on willingness to undertake an international assignment amongst bicultural individuals with a high level of bicultural identity integration ($M = 4.3106$) and bicultural individuals with a lower level of bicultural identity integration ($M = 4.3091$), as well as the extremely small effect size (Eta Squared = .00000113385) of the difference between the two groups, suggests that there is no significant difference in the impact of a high level of bicultural
identity integration and lower levels of bicultural identity integration on willingness to undertake an international assignment. The results did not support hypothesis 4.

To examine whether bicultural individuals are more culturally intelligent than monocultural individuals (hypothesis 5), an independent sample t-test was conducted. The test showed that there was a significant difference in the cultural intelligence of monocultural \((M = 3.4124, SD = .55)\) and bicultural \((M = 4.0412, SD = .59; t (282) = -9.51, p = 0.00,\) two-tailed\) individuals. The magnitude of the difference between the two groups (mean difference = -.63, 95% CI: -.76 to -.50) was large (Eta Squared = .243) according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988: 284-7) for interpreting effect size values. Expressed as a percentage, 24.3% of the variance in cultural intelligence is explained by whether an individual is monocultural or bicultural. The statistically significant difference in the mean scores on cultural intelligence for bicultural \((M = 4.0412)\) and monocultural \((M = 3.4124)\) individuals and the large effect size (Eta Squared = .243) of this difference between the two groups suggests that bicultural individuals are more culturally intelligent than monocultural individuals. The results support hypothesis 5. Table 6.2 provides a summary of results for all of the independent sample t-tests that were conducted.
### Table 6.2 Study 1 Summary of Results for Independent Sample T-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Group Statistics</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Willingness to undertake international assignment</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.8144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.3099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Willingness to undertake international assignment</td>
<td>Experiences Cultural Harmony</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiences Cultural Conflict</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.2581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiences Cultural Compartmentalization</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Willingness to undertake international assignment</td>
<td>Highly Integrated Bicultural Identity</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.3106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>5 Cultural Intelligence</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.4124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Highly Integrated Bicultural Identity</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.3091</td>
<td>.70143</td>
<td>.10575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.0412</td>
<td>.55814</td>
<td>.04876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to examine whether cultural intelligence and willingness to undertake an international assignment are positively related to one another (hypothesis 6). Based on guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988: 79-81) for interpreting the strength of correlations, there was a moderate (medium) positive correlation between cultural intelligence and willingness to undertake an international assignment, $r = .46$, $n = 283$, $p < .01$. High levels of cultural intelligence were found to be associated with high levels of willingness to undertake an international assignment. The coefficient of determination for the relationship is 0.2116. Expressed as a percentage, cultural intelligence helps to explain 21% of the variance in respondents’ willingness to undertake an international assignment. The results support hypothesis 6.

To examine the mediation effect of cultural intelligence on the relationship between cultural identification (i.e. whether an individual identifies as monocultural or bicultural) and willingness to undertake an international assignment (hypothesis 7) a multiple regression analysis using SPSS version 21.

Before conducting the mediation analysis the variance inflation factors (VIFs) and the Durbin-Watson test (Durbin and Watson, 1950) was used to detect the potential effect of multicollinearity and the autocorrelation of residuals. The values of the average VIF associated with the predictors ranged from 1.00 to 1.32, which was less than the threshold of 5 recommended by Haan (2002). This suggests that there is no concern with respect to multicollinearity. The values of the Durbin-Watson test associated with the predictors ranged
from 1.81 to 1.96, which falls within the acceptable limits of between 1 and 3 (Field, 2009), suggesting that there is no need for concern about the autocorrelation of residuals.

Baron and Kenny (1986) suggest that when testing mediational hypothesis, four conditions should be met. The first of the four conditions suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986) requires a significant relationship between the independent variable (cultural identification) and the dependent variable (willingness to undertake an international assignment). This condition was met as there was a significant and positive relationship between cultural identification and willingness to undertake an international assignment ($\beta = .32, p < .001$). The second condition requires a significant relationship between the independent variable (cultural identification) and the proposed mediator (cultural intelligence). The beta coefficient for the association between these two variables was significant ($\beta = .49, p < .001$), satisfying the second condition. The third condition requires a significant relationship between the proposed mediator and dependent variable. This condition was met as the beta coefficient for the association between cultural intelligence and willingness to undertake an international assignment was significant ($\beta = .40, p < .001$). The forth condition requires a reduced effect between the independent variable and dependent variable after adding the mediator variable. The beta coefficient for the association between cultural identification and willingness to undertake an international assignment was reduced but still significant after adding cultural intelligence (i.e. from $\beta = .32, p < .001$ to $\beta = .13, p < .05$), suggesting that cultural intelligence partially mediates the relationship between cultural identification and willingness to undertake an international assignment.
Although widely supported, the four step approach recommended by Baron and Kenny (1986) has certain limitations. Therefore, three additional statistical techniques were used to further test the mediation effect of cultural intelligence on the relationship between cultural identification and willingness to undertake an international assignment. These statistical techniques included a Sobel test; Bootstrapping; and standardized effect size (kappa-squared ($k^2$)). These statistics were computed using SPSS version 21 in conjunction with the PROCESS macro code for SPSS (Hayes, 2013) (see appendix D for output from analysis).

A significant limitation of Baron and Kenny’s four step approach is that the indirect effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable is not tested. Sobel (1982) proposed a method which circumvents this problem by testing the difference between the total effect and the

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Predictors} & \text{Outcomes} \\
\hline
\text{X} & \text{C (.32***)} & \text{A (.49***)} & \text{C’ (.13*)} \\
\text{Mediator} & \text{B (.40***)} & \\
\text{Adjusted R2} & .10 & .24 & .21 & .22 \\
\Delta R2 & .10 & .24 & .21 & .12 \\
\Delta F & 32.495*** & 90.507*** & 75.954*** & 43.674*** \\
\text{VIF} & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1.32 \\
\text{DW} & 1.96 & 1.81 & 1.95 & 1.96 \\
\end{array}
\]

Note: N = 285. Standardized coefficients were reported. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. All tests were two-tailed.

X = Cultural Identification, Y = Willingness to Undertake an International Assignment, Mediator = Cultural Intelligence
direct effect (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The Sobel test has been commonly used in mediation.

A Sobel analysis shows that the mediation effect of cultural intelligence was significant ($Z_{\text{Sobel}} = 5.424, p < .001$). Although the Sobel test is often used for testing mediation, it has been argued that it erroneously assumes normality in the distribution of the indirect effects (Hayes, 2009). Preacher and Hayes (2004, 2008) recommend using bootstrap confidence intervals, which do not make assumptions about the shape of the sampling distribution. Bootstrapping is argued to be a more powerful test of the indirect effect (Preacher and Hayes, 2004; Shrout and Bolger, 2002). The results showed that a 95% bias-corrected confidence interval from 1000 bootstrap samples did not contain zero, meaning that the indirect effect was significant. The bias-corrected confidence intervals of Boostrapping were between .200 and .451. Preacher and Kelley (2011) suggest using a standardized effect size to represent the strength of the indirect effect of the independent variable, on the dependent variable, through a mediator variable. Their effect size, kappa-squared ($k^2$), represents the proportion of the total possible effect that is shown by the sample. They suggest that 0.01, 0.09 and 0.25 represent small, medium and large effects respectively. In this instance $k^2$ was equal to 0.18 which represents a medium effect size and its 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals were between .130 and .261.

Based on these findings, it can be concluded that cultural intelligence mediates the relationship between cultural identification and willingness to undertake an international assignment. The results support hypothesis 7. The mediation model and results are shown in Figure 6.1. Table 6.4 lists the supported and unsupported hypothesis in this study.
Figure 6.1 Mediation Model

**Independent Variable (X)**
- Cultural Identification (Monocultural/bicultural)

**Mediator (M)**
- Cultural Intelligence

**Dependent Variable (Y)**
- Willingness to Undertake an International Assignment

\[ \begin{align*}
A & : X \rightarrow M: \beta = .49, p < .001 \\
B & : M \rightarrow Y: \beta = .40, p < .001 \\
C & : X \rightarrow Y: \beta = .32, p < .001 \\
C' & : X \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y: \beta = .13, p < .05
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
& .49^{***} a \\
& .32^{***} c \\
& .40^{***} b
\end{align*} \]
Table 6.4 Study 1 Supported and Unsupported Hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Unsupported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bicultural individuals will be more willing to accept an international assignment than monocultural individuals.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bicultural individuals who experience cultural conflict will have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those who experience cultural harmony.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bicultural individuals who compartmentalize their cultural identities will have a lower level of willingness to accept an international assignment than those who blend their cultural identities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bicultural individuals who have a high level of bicultural identity integration (BII) (i.e. that experience cultural harmony and cultural blendedness) will be more willing to accept an international assignment than bicultural individuals who have a lower level of bicultural identity integration (i.e. that do not experience both cultural harmony and cultural blendedness).</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bicultural individuals have higher levels of cultural intelligence than monocultural individuals.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cultural intelligence will be positively related to an individual’s willingness to undertake an international assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cultural intelligence mediates the relationship between cultural identification (i.e. whether an individual is monocultural or bicultural) and willingness to undertake an international assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 DISCUSSION

This study examined the impact of biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism on willingness to undertake an international assignment. The study proposed that biculturalism would have a greater impact on willingness to undertake an international assignment than monoculturalism. The study also proposed that bicultural identity integration and cultural intelligence would impact willingness to undertake an international assignment.

The present study is the first in the academic literature to consider the impact of biculturalism on willingness to undertake an international assignment. The study responds to a call in the international human resource management literature for research that considers culture specific differences when examining international assignment willingness (Froese et al., 2013). The continued demand for international assignees (Brookfield GRS, 2016; 2014) coupled with the difficulties faced by multinational organisations in finding employees who are both suitable and willing to undertake international assignments (Kim and Froese, 2012; Tharenou, 2008; Konopaske and Werner, 2005) puts a premium on research that aims to identify potential talent pools for international assignments. Although a review and synthesis of both the international assignment, and biculturalism literature provides a theoretical basis for proposing that bicultural individuals will be willing to undertake international assignments, the present study provides empirical evidence of this willingness.

As predicted, bicultural individuals were found to be more willing to undertake an international assignment than monocultural individuals. This finding contributes to an emerging body of literature which indicates the benefits of bicultural individuals for multinational companies (e.g.
Fitzsimmons 2013; Fitzsimmons et al., 2011; Brannen and Thomas, 2010; Friedman and Liu, 2009). This finding extends our understanding of the characteristics of bicultural individuals in that it points to their openness to work internationally. Although the sample used in this study weren’t full-time professionals, investigating the willingness of college students to undertake international assignments in the future provided a means of exploring international assignee career intentions (Presbitero and Quita, 2017). Exploring career intentions can be a particularly fruitful undertaking as theory suggests that intentions influence behaviour (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Indeed, within the context of international assignments, willingness to relocate has been seen to predict actual decisions to accept or reject job transfers (Brett and Reilly, 1988). The first finding in this study indicates that when employed, bicultural students will be more likely to accept international assignments than their monocultural counterparts.

Despite the significance of the finding for international human resource management research and practice, it does not necessarily come as a surprise. The greater willingness of bicultural individuals to undertake international assignments compared to monocultural individuals may be explained by factors such as deep cultural knowledge and international relocation experience.

While cultural knowledge may be possessed by bicultural and monocultural individuals alike, bicultural individuals possess a deep level of knowledge of at least two different cultures. Having internalised two different cultures, bicultural individuals possess two distinct sets of cultural knowledge structures which consist of different behavioural repertoires and meaning systems (Hong et al., 2000). Through the process of cultural frame switching bicultural
individuals are able to switch between cultural knowledge structures and meaning systems in response to cultural cues in their environment (LaFromboise et al., 1993). Unlike bicultural individuals, monocultural individuals possess only one cultural knowledge structure which is related to their home culture. While monocultural individuals may possess second hand knowledge of other cultures, they lack the life experience which forms the foundation upon which cultural knowledge structures associated with these cultures are developed. The possession of two distinct sets of cultural knowledge structures, and the process of switching back and forth between cultural frames of references may make bicultural individuals more culturally flexible and receptive to operating in different cultures.

There are several different categories of individuals who may have internalised more than one culture and identify as being bicultural (e.g. immigrants, refugees, indigenous people, ethnic minorities, individuals in interethnic relationships, individuals of mixed ethnicity, children and grandchildren of foreign born migrants; Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2013; Berry, 2003; Padilla, 1994). Individuals in some of these categories (e.g. immigrants and refugees) have international relocation experience which may make them more receptive to relocating in the future for work purposes. In the present study 96% of bicultural students stated that they had lived outside of their country of birth, compared to only 26% of monocultural students. Only 5% of bicultural students stated that they had lived in Ireland since birth, while 14% moved to Ireland between the ages of 0 and 4, 62% between the ages of 5 and 11, and 18% between the ages of 12 and 19. Furthermore 18% of the bicultural students had lived in three or more countries for more than one year and 66% had lived in Ireland for ten or more years. Having relocated at an early age, and having spent several years in more than one country, the bicultural sample in this
study had considerable international relocation experience. Indeed research suggests that students who have more intense international experiences are more likely to seek international work opportunities after they graduate (Felker and Gianecchini, 2015; Norris and Gillespie, 2009; Wiers-jenssen, 2008). Cognizant of their comprehensive knowledge of more than one culture and their previous international relocation experiences, bicultural students may have felt more confident and comfortable about operating internationally than monocultural students.

In the past it has been argued without empirical support that bicultural individuals are likely to possess a high level of cultural intelligence (Moore, 2005). The present study indicated that bicultural individuals do possess high levels of cultural intelligence (with a mean score of 4.0412 on a 5-point scale) and are more culturally intelligent than monocultural individuals. This study is the first to empirically consider the impact of monoculturalism and biculturalism on cultural intelligence. As with the first finding discussed, this finding was also in line with expectations. The difference in cultural intelligence between bicultural and monocultural individuals may be explained by integrative complexity and cultural exposure.

Integrative complexity may increase cultural intelligence through its effect on underlying components of cultural intelligence, namely cultural knowledge and cultural metacognition. Within a cross cultural context, integrative complexity refers to the ability of bicultural individuals to accept clashing perspectives on life and integrate opposing worldviews (Tadmor et al., 2009). The ability to accept clashing perspectives and integrate opposing worldviews may encourage the development of cultural knowledge which in turn increases cultural intelligence.
Cultural knowledge refers to an individual’s understanding of different cultures and the complexity of their understanding. Openness to accepting cultural perspectives that clash with one’s own culture may encourage a person to become more accommodating of different cultural ideas (Fowers and Davidov, 2006). Over time this may cause the breadth and width of the person’s cultural knowledge to expand. Integrating different worldviews involves consolidating cultural perspectives despite how seemingly disparate they are. The process of consolidating opposing cultural views may encourage the development of more complex cultural understanding, as consolidation involves detailed consideration of cultures, their similarities, and their differences. Through its impact on a bicultural individual’s cultural knowledge, integrative complexity may cause an increase in cultural intelligence.

Integrative complexity may also cause an increase in cultural intelligence through its impact on cultural metacognition. Cultural metacognition refers to an individual’s knowledge of and control over their culturally related thinking and learning activities (Thomas et al., 2015). The act of integrating opposing worldviews, which is central to integrative complexity within a cross-cultural context, may enhance cultural metacognition. In integrating differing cultural perspectives, an individual considers their knowledge of the cultures in question. The more a bicultural individual tries to integrate differing cultural perspectives, the more they consider their own knowledge of the cultures. This subsequently leads to an increase in cultural metacognition which is concerned with an individual’s conscious awareness of, and control over their culturally related thoughts and actions.
Like integrative complexity, cultural exposure may also increase cultural intelligence through its effect on underlying components of cultural intelligence, namely cultural knowledge and cultural skills.

Cultural exposure may be defined as “experiences related to a region that aid in developing a familiarity or understanding of the norms, values and beliefs of that region” (Crowne, 2013:7). Exposure to multiple cultures provides an opportunity to gain first-hand experiences which develop an individual’s understanding of the cultures. The more exposure a person has to different cultures the more opportunities they have to acquire cultural knowledge, and subsequently become more culturally intelligent. In the present study 74% of biculturals had lived in two or more countries for more than one year, compared to only 13% of monocultural individuals. Furthermore only 5% of bicultural students were born in Ireland yet 66% had lived in Ireland for 10 or more years suggesting that they had extensive exposure to at least two different cultures. This cultural exposure is likely to have facilitated the acquisition of cultural knowledge which has contributed to their higher levels of cultural intelligence.

As a result of time spent in multiple countries and cultures, the bicultural individuals in the study are likely to have developed cultural skills which may also contribute to their higher levels of cultural intelligence. Cultural skills refer to skills such as relational skills, perceptual acuity, empathy, tolerance of uncertainty, and adaptability (Thomas et al., 2015). For almost the entire bicultural sample, cultural skills have been developed early in life due to international relocation at a young age. These skills are used on a daily basis at school, in their community, and for some, at work. Although monocultural individuals may possess cultural skills, bicultural
individuals often find themselves in a position whereby they have to use these skills frequently, as they move back and forth between environments in which one or the other of their cultural identities are dominant (e.g. culture of country of residence at school and culture of country of origin at home) (e.g. Bell, 1990). Research also supports the present claim that cultural exposure increases cultural intelligence (e.g. Crowne, 2008; Tarique and Takeuchi, 2008). Given that cultural intelligence indicates a person’s ability to function effectively in culturally diverse settings (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008), it can affect the overall success of an international assignment (Kim et al., 2008; Shaffer and Miller, 2008). The high levels of cultural intelligence amongst bicultural individuals may point to their suitability to work internationally.

In the past research has rarely considered the impact of culturally related constructs on willingness to undertake an international assignment (See Froese et al., 2013 for an exception). The present study is the first to consider the direct relationship between cultural intelligence and willingness to undertake an international assignment. It was proposed that cultural intelligence, which enables individuals to interact effectively across cultures, is an important consideration for positions within multinational companies that require employees to work abroad. As predicted, cultural intelligence was positively correlated to willingness to undertake an international assignment. Furthermore the strength of the correlation between the two variables was moderate. This indicates that as an individual becomes more culturally intelligent their willingness to undertake an international assignment increases. Although there may be several explanations for this finding, one possible explanation is that high levels of cultural intelligence increase an individual’s willingness to interacting in foreign cultures with foreign people. Indeed, some scholars believe that there is a motivational facet to cultural intelligence
which is concerned with an individual’s ability to direct attention and energy towards learning about and functioning in culturally different situations (Early and Ang, 2003). It is argued that this facet is a source of drive which sees energy directed towards functioning in unfamiliar cross-cultural situations (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008). An increase in cultural intelligence may therefore also mean an increased drive to function in culturally different environments.

Given that it was proposed that bicultural individuals are more willing to undertake an international assignment than monocultural individuals and that cultural intelligence is positively related to willingness to undertake an international assignment, the study tested the effect of cultural intelligence on the relationship between cultural identification (whether an individual identifies as monocultural or bicultural) and willingness to undertake an international assignment. While the study found that bicultural individuals were more willing to undertake an international assignment than monocultural individuals, this greater level of willingness should not be equated with the unwillingness of monocultural individuals. Moreover, the relationship that was found between cultural intelligence and willingness to undertake an international assignment suggests that an individual can exhibit a high level of willingness to undertake an assignment regardless of whether they are bicultural or monocultural. It was therefore proposed that cultural intelligence would mediate the relationship between cultural identification (whether an individual is bicultural or monocultural) and willingness to undertake an international assignment.

As hypothesized, cultural intelligence did indeed mediate the relationship between cultural identification and willingness to undertake an international assignment. Recommended
methods of analysis and statistical tests for mediation such as Baron and Kenny's four step approach, a Sobel test, Bootstrapping, and kappa-squared ($k^2$) showed that cultural intelligence partially mediated the relationship. The direct effect of cultural identification on willingness to undertake an international assignment decreased when cultural intelligence was taken into consideration.

The result indicates that cultural intelligence plays a role in the willingness of both bicultural and monocultural individuals to accept international assignments. This finding indicates that although the present study has found bicultural individuals to be more willing to undertake international assignments, their willingness shouldn’t be assumed by virtue of the fact that they are bicultural. Instead, cultural intelligence should also be considered when attempting to identify candidates that may be willing to accept international assignments. This is to say that an individual that has internalized and identifies with only one culture yet has a high level of cultural intelligence may be more willing to accept an international assignment than an individual that has internalized and identifies with two cultures and has a lower level of cultural intelligence. While monocultural individuals can be just as culturally intelligent and willing to accept international assignments as bicultural individuals, this study indicates that on balance, bicultural individuals are more culturally intelligent and also more willing to undertake international assignments.

The study also sought out to examine the impact of bicultural identity integration on the willingness of bicultural individuals to undertake international assignments. Specifically, the study assessed the influence of the components of bicultural identity integration, namely
cultural harmony and cultural blendedness on willingness to accept assignments. It was proposed that bicultural individuals that experience cultural harmony and cultural blendedness would be more willing to undertake an international assignment than those that experience cultural conflict and cultural compartmentalization. Contrary to expectations the findings indicated that the components of bicultural identity integration did not influence willingness to accept an international assignment. One might have thought that bicultural individuals who perceive their experience of integrating their two cultures as negative rather than positive (e.g. that experience cultural conflict and cultural compartmentalization) may be less open to relocating and having to understand, and manage the influence of another national cultural. This however, didn’t appear to be the case in the present study.

The findings from this study indicate that biculturalism does impact willingness to undertake an international assignment. The findings suggest that individuals that have internalized and identify with two cultures are more willing, and possibly be more suitable to undertake international assignments than individuals that have internalized and identify with only one culture. These findings are significant because willingness to relocate for work can predict actual decisions to accept or reject job transfers (Brett and Reilly, 1988). This study has identified a category of individuals soon to enter the jobs market who are receptive to working internationally and may be particularly well suited for global roles. The high levels of cultural intelligence possessed by bicultural students, and the relevance of cultural intelligence for international assignments (Kim et al., 2008; Shaffer and Miller, 2008), points to the suitability of bicultural student for international assignments.
The next chapter presents the second study in this thesis, which builds on this study. While this study has identified that bicultural individuals are indeed willing to undertake international assignments, the next study will consider the effectiveness of bicultural individuals while they’re on international assignments.
CHAPTER 7

STUDY 2:

CULTURAL IDENTIFICATION AND GLOBAL MOBILITY: EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF MONOCULTURALISM AND BICULTURALISM ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERNATIONAL ASSIGNEES

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The second study in this thesis sought to answer the second and third research questions, which are “Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact the effectiveness of international assignees while they are on an assignment?” and “Does bicultural identity integration (BII) impact the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees?” The study aimed to identify how biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism impacts a number of variables which may influence the overall success of an international assignment. Specifically, the study focused on, whether there are significant differences in the work-role adjustment, cultural intelligence, knowledge transfer, task and contextual performance of bicultural and monocultural international assignees. The study also aimed to identify how the two components of bicultural identity integration, cultural harmony and cultural blendedness, impact the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees. Several hypothesis related to the research questions were developed. The theoretical underpinning of the hypotheses was outlined in the third chapter. For the purpose of providing clarity to the reader the research questions and hypotheses are re-sated below.
Research Question 2: Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact the effectiveness of international assignees while they are on an assignment?

Hypothesis 1: Bicultural international assignees will have higher levels of cultural intelligence than monocultural international assignees.

Hypothesis 2: Bicultural international assignees will be better adjusted to their work roles than monocultural international assignees.

Hypothesis 3: Bicultural international assignees will not differ from monocultural international assignees in their family role adjustment.

Hypothesis 4: Bicultural international assignees will engage in a greater level of knowledge transfer than monocultural international assignees.

Hypothesis 5: Bicultural international assignees will not differ from monocultural international assignees in their task performance.

Hypothesis 6: Bicultural international assignees will exhibit better contextual performance than monocultural international assignees.

Research Question 3: Does bicultural identity integration (BII) impact the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees?

Hypothesis 1: Cultural harmony is positively related to work-role adjustment.

Hypothesis 2: Cultural blendedness is positively related to work-role adjustment.

Hypothesis 3: Cultural harmony is positively related to cultural intelligence.
Hypothesis 4: Cultural blendedness is positively related to cultural intelligence.

Hypothesis 5: Work-role adjustment is positively related to task performance.

Hypothesis 6: Work-role adjustment is positively related to contextual performance.

Hypothesis 7: Cultural intelligence is positively related to contextual performance.

Hypothesis 8: Cultural intelligence is positively related to knowledge transfer.

7.2 METHOD

7.2.1 Participants and Procedures

Profile of Participants

A total of 356 international assignees participated in the study. 69% of the participants were male (244) while 31% were female (112). The average age of assignees was 43. Assignees occupied a number of different roles including head of department, specialist, director, managing director, and project manager. A significant majority of the sample had 10 or more years of work experience (81%). Less than 1% of the sample had less than 3 years of work experience. 12% of the sample had between 7 and 9 years of work experience. Across the 356 participants, 46 different countries were cited as the current assignment location. The countries with the most assignees posted to them included the Netherlands, France, the United States of America (USA), Singapore, Mexico, Spain, Indonesia, China, Russia, and Japan. Assignees had
been on their international assignments for different lengths of time. 31% of assignees had been on their assignment for less than a year, 39% had been on their assignment for 1 to 2 years, 23% of had been on their assignment for 3 to 4 years, and 7% had been on their assignment for 5 or more years.

Almost the entire sample possessed a college degree. The highest academic qualification possessed by 14% of the sample was a bachelor’s degree. 75% of the sample possessed a master’s degree and 4% possessed a doctorate degree. The majority of the sample were married (67%). 18% of the assignees were single, 5% were engaged, 6.5% were in civil partnerships, 3% were divorced, and .5% were separated. 61% of the assignees had children. 11% of the participants had one child, 32% had two children, 14% had three children, and 4% had four or more children. Of the assignees who stated that they had children, 23% had children between the ages of 0 and 4, 20% had children between the ages of 5 and 11, 13% had children between the ages of 12 and 19, 3% had children between the ages of 20 and 24, and 2% had children that were 24 years of age or older. 83% of participants stated that they did not have any dependents (i.e. individuals for whom they are responsible, excluding biological or adopted children).

Only 10% of the participants had not lived in another country for more than one year. 20% had lived in another country for more than one year, 26% had lived in at least two other countries for more than one year, 23% had lived in at least three other countries for more than one year, and 21% had lived in four or more other countries for more than one year. The assignee population consisted of assignees from 45 different nationalities. 43.5% of the assignee
population stated that they identify with more than one national culture, while 56.5% of the population stated that they do not identify with more than one national culture. Therefore 43.5% of respondents were bicultural while 56.5% were monocultural.

Procedures

Data were collected from international assignees working in a multinational food corporation via an online questionnaire. A general introduction, including an invitation to participate in the study was sent by the organisation to its international assignee population. A week later assignees received a further email which included a link to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire included a cover letter which outlined the aims and objectives of the study, and emphasized that participation was voluntary. Participants were also assured of the anonymity and confidentiality of the questionnaire, which had received ethical approval from the Dublin City University Research Ethics Committee. Furthermore, in line with university regulations the contact details of the secretary of the university’s research ethics committee were provided in the cover letter, so that participants could contact an independent person if needed. In total 391 assignees completed the questionnaire. However, a number of assignees did not complete a host of items on key outcome variables. These responses were omitted from the present study. The final number of respondents in this study is 356. The overall response rate for study was 39%.
7.2.2 Measures

The variables explored in this study include cultural identification, bicultural identity integration, cultural intelligence, family role adjustment, work role adjustment, knowledge transfer, task performance, and contextual performance. A description of how each of these variables was measured, as well as their reliability (internal consistency and construct validity) is provided below.

*Cultural Identification* was determined using a single item. Assignees were asked if they identify with more than national culture. In this study, cultural identification is a categorical variable which refers to a person’s sense of identification with a national culture. The question was used to differentiate between bicultural assignees and monocultural assignees. Assignees who stated that they identify with more than one national culture were categorised as bicultural, while those that stated that they don’t identify with more than one national culture were categorised as monocultural. For the purpose of this study, cultural identification refers to whether an international assignee identifies as monocultural or bicultural.

*Bicultural Identity Integration* (BII) was measured using the 20-item BIIS-2 scale developed by Huynh (2009). The twenty items in the scale are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree). The measure consists of two subscales which measure cultural harmony and cultural blendedness respectively. The measure was modified slightly to allow participants to respond to the items based on the two cultures that they identify with (i.e. the use of blank spaces which were automatically populated once assignees stated the two cultures that they identify with). This is in contrast to other studies on bicultural identity
integration (e.g. Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005 and Nguyen and Ahmadpanah 2014) which focus solely on single combinations of cultures (e.g. Chinese-American and Mexican-American). In prior research (e.g. Huynh, 2009) the scale has demonstrated good internal reliability scores (Cronbach’s alpha scores: cultural harmony = .81, cultural blendedness = .86). In the present study the Cronbach’s alpha was .83 for cultural harmony and .76 for cultural blendedness.

To examine construct validity of the BIIS-2 scale a confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) was performed. Previous research has shown that the BIIS-2 scale consists of two separate factors, cultural harmony and cultural blendedness (Huynh, Nguyen and Benet-Martínez, 2011). While the majority of the items related to each factor exceeded the minimum factor loading of .40 as recommended by Nunnally (1978), a few of the items were below this cut off. Two of the eleven items related to the cultural harmony factor had factor loadings below .40. These loadings were .39 (item 8) and .34 (item 10) respectively. Two of the nine items related to the cultural blendedness factor had factor loadings below .40. These loadings were .33 (item 12) and .09 (item 17) respectively. Similar to the CFA for the BIIS-2 in study 1, the correlation between the two factors ($r = .12$) was non-significant. The examination of a number of model fit statistics ($\chi^2 = 458.439$, $df = 169$, $N = 155$, $p < .000$, $CFI = .68$, $RMSEA = .069$, $CI$: .062 - .077, $SRMR = .131$) showed that overall the two factor model did not fit the data well. A good model fit can be indicated by a RMSEA that’s equal to or less than .06, a SRMR that’s equal to or lower than .08 and a CFI of .95 and above (Hu and Bentler, 1998, 1999). Although it has been argued that an RMSEA value equal to or lower than .07 indicates good model fit (Steiger, 2007), the particularly low score of the CFI and the number of items which did not load unto the
hypothesised factors suggests that the two factor model did not fit the data well. The CFA did not support the suggested two factor structure of the BIIS-2 scale.

*Cultural Intelligence* was measured using the 10-item Short Form Measure of Cultural Intelligence (SFCQ) scale developed by Thomas et al. (2015). The ten items in the scale are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= not at all and 5= extremely well). In prior research (e.g. Thomas et al., 2015) the scale has demonstrated good internal reliability scores (across 14 samples the average Cronbach’s alpha score was .85). In the present study the Cronbach’s alpha was 85.

To examine construct validity of the SFCQ scale a confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) was performed. Previous research has shown that the SFCQ scale consists of one second-order factor (cultural intelligence) and three first-order factors (knowledge, skills, metacognition) (Thomas et al., 2015). All of the items related to each first-order factor exceeded the minimum factor loading of .40 as recommended by Nunnally (1978). Factor loadings for the knowledge factor were .78 and .77, loadings for the skills factor were between .47 and .71, and loadings for the metacognition factor were between .66 and .76. The correlations between the first-order factors (knowledge, skills and metacognition) and the second order factor (cultural intelligence) were \(r = .66, 1.01, .84\) respectively. The correlation between one of the first-order factors (skills) and the second order factor (cultural intelligence) was 1.01 due to a negative variance. In order to resolve the problem the error variances within the factor were constrained to be equal (McDonald, 1985). The examination of a number of model fit statistics (\(\chi^2 = 101.317, df = 35, N = 356, p < .000, CFI = .94, GFI = .95\) RMSEA = .073, CI: .057 - .090, SRMR = .045) showed that
overall the model (one second-order factor (cultural intelligence) and three first-order factor (knowledge, skills, metacognition)) fit the data well.

A good model fit can be indicated by a RMSEA that’s equal to or less than .06, a SRMR that is equal to or lower than .08, a GFI of .95 and above, and a CFI of .95 and above (Hu and Bentler, 1998, 1999). In specifying values of model fit indices that indicate good model fit, Hu and Bentler (1999: 1) suggested ‘a cutoff value close to .95’ for CFI. A CFI value of .94 may be judged to be ‘close’ to .95. Furthermore, based on an initial recommendation by Hu and Bentler (1998) research has regularly used the .90 cut-off value for CFI (e.g. Bayazit and Bayazit, 2017; Fletcher et al., 2016; García-Chas et al., 2014). This suggests that a CFI value of .94 is acceptable. While the RMSEA was not lower than .06 in this instance, it was less than .10, a maximum cut-off point for accepting a model (Blunch, 2012; MacCallum et al, 1996). It has been argued that models with RMSEA values which are larger than .10 should not be accepted (Blunch, 2012). As in the case of study 1, the CFA supported the suggested factor structure of the SFCQ scale.

Assignee Adjustment was measured using the 12-item Work and Family Role Adjustment scale developed by Shaffer et al. (2015). The twelve items in the scale are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= very uncomfortable and 5= very comfortable). The measure consists of two subscales which measure work-role adjustment and family-role adjustment respectively. In prior research (e.g. Shaffer et al., 2015) the scale has demonstrated good internal reliability scores (across 4 studies the Cronbach’s alpha score for was between .78 and .89). In the present study the Cronbach’s alpha was .80 for work-role adjustment and .87 for family-role adjustment.
To examine construct validity of the Work and Family Role Adjustment scale a confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) was performed. Previous research has shown that the Work and Family Role Adjustment scale consists of two second-order factors (work-role adjustment and family-role adjustment) and four first-order factors. Two of the first-order factors are related to work-role adjustment (work-role task adjustment and work-role relationship adjustment) while the other two are related family-role adjustment (family-role task adjustment and family-role relationship adjustment) (Shaffer et al., 2015). All of the items related to each first-order factor exceeded the minimum factor loading of .40 as recommended by Nunnally (1978). With the exception of a single item related to the first order factor, work-role task adjustment, which had a factor loading of .46, all of other factor loadings were between .72 and .96. The correlations between the first-order factors work-role task adjustment and work-role relationship adjustment and the second order factor work-role adjustment were $r = .80$ and $r = .58$ respectively. The correlations between the first-order factors family-role task adjustment and family-role relationship adjustment and the second order factor family-role adjustment were $r = .63$ and $r = .87$ respectively. The correlation between the two second-order factors ($r = .47$) was significant.

The examination of a number of model fit statistics ($\chi^2 = 286.869, df = 51, N = 356, p < .000, CFI = .90, RMSEA = .114, CI: .101 - .127, SRMR = .114$) showed that overall the model (two second-order factors (work-role adjustment and family-role adjustment) and four first-order factors (work-role task adjustment, work-role relationship adjustment, family-role task adjustment, and family-role relationship adjustment)) did not fit the data well. A good model fit can be indicated by a RMSEA that’s equal to or less than .06, a SRMR that’s equal to or lower than .08.
and a CFI of .95 and above (Hu and Bentler, 1998, 1999). The CFA did not support the suggested factor structure of the Work and Family-Role Adjustment scale.

*Knowledge transfer* was measured using a 5-item Motivation to Transfer Knowledge scale adapted from Chang et al. (2012). The five items in the scale are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree). In prior research (e.g. Chang et al., 2012) the scale has demonstrated good internal reliability scores (Cronbach’s alpha score: .86). In the present study the Cronbach’s alpha was .86.

To examine construct validity of the Expatriate Motivation to Transfer Knowledge scale a confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) was performed. Previous research has shown that the Expatriate Motivation to Transfer Knowledge scale consists of a single factor (Chang et al., 2012). All of the items related to the factor exceeded the minimum factor loading of .40 as recommended by Nunnally (1978). With the exception of the first item related to the factor, which had a factor loading of .46, all of other factor loadings were between .74 and .94. The examination of a number of model fit statistics ($\chi^2 = 51.654, df = 5, N = 356, p < .000, CFI = .96, RMSEA = .162, CI: .124 - .204, SRMR = .047$) showed that overall the model fit the data well. A good model fit can be indicated by a RMSEA that’s equal to or less than .06, a SRMR that’s equal to or lower than .08 and a CFI of .95 and above (Hu and Bentler, 1998, 1999). Although the RMSEA was not equal to or less than .06, the CFI and SRMR met the recommended criteria. The CFA supported the suggested factor structure of the Expatriate Motivation to Transfer Knowledge scale.
Job Performance was measured using the 9-item Job Performance scale developed by Kraimer and Wayne (2004). The nine items in the scale are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1 = very poor and 5 = very good). The measure consists of two subscales which measure task performance and contextual performance respectively. In prior research (e.g. Kraimer and Wayne, 2004) the scale has demonstrated good internal reliability scores (Cronbach’s alpha score: task performance = .86, contextual performance = .84). In the present study the Cronbach’s alpha was .86 for task performance and .84 for contextual performance.

To examine construct validity of the job performance scale a confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) was performed. Previous research has shown that the Job Performance scale consists of two factors, namely, task performance and contextual performance (Kraimer and Wayne, 2004). All of the items related to each factor exceeded the minimum factor loading of .40 as recommended by Nunnally (1978). The factor loadings for the first factor (task performance) were between .49 and .86. The factor loadings for the second factor (contextual performance) were between .60 and .93. The correlation between the two factors (r = .46) was significant. The examination of a number of model fit statistics ($\chi^2 = 156.613, df = 26, N = 356, p < .000, \text{CFI} = .92, \text{RMSEA} = .119, CI: .101 - .137, \text{SRMR} = .059$) showed that overall there was an adequate fit between the two factor model and the data. A good model fit can be indicated by a RMSEA that’s equal to or less than .06, a SRMR that’s equal to or lower than .08 and a CFI of .95 and above (Hu and Bentler, 1998, 1999). In specifying values of model fit indices that indicate good model fit, Hu and Bentler (1999: 1) suggested ‘a cutoff value close to .95’ for CFI. A CFI value of .92 may be judged to be ‘close’ to .95. Furthermore, based on an initial recommendation by Hu and Bentler (1998) research has regularly used the .90 cut-off value for CFI (e.g. Bayazit and
Bayazit, 2017; Fletcher et al., 2016; García-Chas et al., 2014). This suggests that a CFI value of .92 is acceptable. Although the RMSEA did not meet the cut-off criterion, a CFI value close to the recommended value and an SRMR value that satisfied the criterion value suggests that the model did fit the data well. The CFA supported the suggested two factor structure of the job performance scale.
Table 7.1 Study 2 Summary of Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for Measurement Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RMSEA CI 90</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural Identity Integration (BIIS-2)</td>
<td>Cultural Harmony</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Blendedness</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Form Cultural Intelligence Scale (SFCQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>101.317**</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.057 - .090</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Family Role Adjustment</td>
<td>Work-role Adjustment</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family-role Adjustment</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate Motivation to Transfer Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>51.654***</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.124 - .204</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual Performance</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .001, *** p < .0001
**** The GFI statistic was provided by AMOS after error variances within the skills factor were constrained to be equal.

Note. χ² = Chi-Square, df = Degrees of Freedom, CFI = Comparative Fit Index, GFI = Goodness of Fit Index, RMSEA = Root Mean-Square Error of Approximation, RMSEA CI 90 = Root Mean-Square Error of Approximation 90% Confidence Interval, SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual.
7.3 RESULTS

To examine whether bicultural international assignees are more culturally intelligent than monocultural international assignees (RQ2 hypothesis 1), an independent sample t-test was conducted. The test showed that there was a significant difference in the cultural intelligence of monocultural ($M = 3.74$ $SD = .47$) and bicultural ($M = 3.98$, $SD = .46$; $t (354) = 4.979$, $p = .000$, two-tailed) international assignees. The magnitude of the difference between the two groups (mean difference = .25, 95% CI: .15 to .35) was moderate (Eta Squared = .0654) according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988: 284-7) for interpreting effect size values. Expressed as a percentage, 6.5% of the variance in cultural intelligence is explained by whether an assignee is monocultural or bicultural. The statistically significant difference in the mean scores on cultural intelligence for bicultural ($M = 4.01$) and monocultural ($M = 3.81$) international assignees and the moderate effect size (Eta Squared = .0654) of this difference between the two groups suggests that bicultural international assignees are more culturally intelligent than monocultural international assignees. The results support hypothesis 1.

An independent sample t-test was used to examine whether bicultural international assignees are better adjusted to their work roles than monocultural international assignees (RQ2 hypothesis 2). The test showed that there was not a significant difference in the work-role adjustment of monocultural ($M = 3.94$ $SD = .54$) and bicultural ($M = 3.99$, $SD = .68$; $t (286) = .876$, $p = .382$, two-tailed) international assignees. The magnitude of the difference between the two groups (mean difference = .058, 95% CI: -.069 to .185) was very small (Eta Squared = .0022), according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988: 284-7) for interpreting effect size.
values. The statistically non-significant difference in the mean scores on work-role adjustment for bicultural ($M = 3.99$) and monocultural ($M = 3.94$) international assignees, as well as the very small effect size (Eta Squared = .0022) of the difference between the two groups, suggests that there is no difference in the work-role adjustment of bicultural and monocultural international assignees. The results did not support hypothesis 2.

To examine whether bicultural international assignees differ in their family-role adjustment to monocultural international assignees (RQ2 hypothesis 3), an independent sample t-test was conducted. The test showed that there wasn’t a significant difference in the family-role adjustment of monocultural ($M = 3.54$, $SD = .74$) and bicultural ($M = 3.68$, $SD = .78$; $t (354) = 1.724$, $p = .086$, two-tailed) international assignees. The magnitude of the difference between the two groups (mean difference = .139, 95% CI: -.020 to .298) was very weak (Eta Squared = .0083), according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988: 284-7) for interpreting effect size values. The statistically non-significant difference in the mean scores on family-role adjustment for bicultural ($M = 3.68$) and monocultural ($M = 3.54$) international assignees, as well as the very small effect size (Eta Squared = .0083) of the difference between the two groups, suggests that there is no difference in the family-role adjustment of bicultural and monocultural international assignees. The results support hypothesis 3.

An independent sample t-test was used to examine whether bicultural international assignees are engaged in a greater level of knowledge transfer than monocultural international assignees (RQ2 hypothesis 4). The test showed that there was not a significant difference in the knowledge transfer of monocultural ($M = 4.16$, $SD = .56$) and bicultural ($M = 4.24$, $SD = .54$; $t
The magnitude of the difference between the two groups (mean difference = .074, 95% CI: -.041 to .190) was very small (Eta Squared = .0045), according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988: 284-7) for interpreting effect size values. The statistically non-significant difference in the mean scores on knowledge transfer for bicultural (M = 4.24) and monocultural (M = 4.16) international assignees, as well as the very small effect size (Eta Squared = .0045) of the difference between the two groups, suggests that there is no difference in the knowledge transfer of bicultural and monocultural international assignees. The results did not support hypothesis 4.

To examine whether bicultural international assignees differ in their task performance to monocultural international assignees (RQ2 hypothesis 5), an independent sample t-test was conducted. The test showed that there was not a significant difference in the task performance of monocultural (M = 4.31 SD = .47) and bicultural (M = 4.32, SD = .52; t (354) = .101, p = .920, two-tailed) international assignees. The magnitude of the difference between the two groups (mean difference = .005, 95% CI: -.098 to .108) was extremely small (Eta Squared = .000029), according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988: 284-7) for interpreting effect size values. The statistically non-significant difference in the mean scores on task performance for bicultural (M = 4.32) and monocultural (M = 4.31) international assignees, as well as the extremely small effect size (Eta Squared = .000029) of the difference between the two groups, suggests that there is no difference in the task performance of bicultural and monocultural international assignees. The results support hypothesis 5.
To examine whether bicultural international assignees differ in their contextual performance to monocultural international assignees (RQ2 hypothesis 6), an independent sample t-test was conducted. The test showed that there was a significant difference in the contextual performance of monocultural \( (M = 4.05, SD = .55) \) and bicultural \( (M = 4.21, SD = .63; t(306) = 2.513, p = .000, \text{two-tailed}) \) international assignees. The magnitude of the difference between the two groups (mean difference = .16, 95% CI: .04 to .29) was small (Eta Squared = .0175), according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988: 284-7) for interpreting effect size values. Expressed as a percentage, 1.8% of the variance in contextual performance is explained by whether an assignee is monocultural or bicultural. The statistically significant difference in the mean scores on contextual performance for bicultural \( (M = 4.21) \) and monocultural \( (M = 4.05) \) international assignees and the small effect size (Eta Squared = .0175) of this difference between the two groups suggests that bicultural international assignees exhibit better contextual performance than monocultural international assignees. The results support hypothesis 6. Table 5.6 provides a summary of results for all of the independent sample t-tests that were conducted.
# Table 7.2 Study 2 Summary of Results for Independent Sample T-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cultural Intelligence</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>4.979</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.150  .346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work Role Adjustment</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>4.382</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.073  .189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Family Role Adjustment</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>1.724</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.020  .298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Knowledge Transfer</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.041  .190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>3.787</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Contextual Performance</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>4.639</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>2.513</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The hypotheses associated with the third research question are all related to a single model. Path analysis was used to test these hypotheses and examine the overall model. The hypothesised path model was developed based on theory and previous research findings. The model examines how the two components of bicultural identity integration; cultural harmony and cultural blendedness, impact work-role adjustment and cultural intelligence, both of which are posited to have a direct impact on assignment outcomes. The model proposes that work-role adjustment will positively impact task performance and contextual performance, while cultural intelligence will positively influence contextual performance and knowledge transfer by assignees. The path diagram is outline in figure 7.1.

Figure 7.1 Path Model
To test for multivariate normality, SPSS version 21 was used to calculate the Mahalanobis distance for the variables in question. The Mahalanobis distance refers to the distance of particular cases away from the centroid point of the remaining cases, which is, the point created by the means of all the variables (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The maximum Mahalanobis distance was 26.12331. This is higher than 18.47, which is the critical value for four independent variables based on a chi-square distribution for 2 to 10 degrees of freedom at a critical alpha of .001 (Pearson and Hartley, 1958). In total, there were five Mahalanobis distance scores which were higher than the critical value, suggesting that multivariate outliers were present in the data. All outliers (ID 5,51,52,155,348,356) were removed from the data before conducting the analysis. The model in figure 7.1 was constructed in AMOS version 21. The model consisted of 28 observations and 19 parameters. The model was overidentified \( (df = 9) \) rather than just identified or underidentified, as the degree of freedom was greater than zero and also positive. Figure 7.2 presents the path model with path coefficients.

Both path coefficients from, the bicultural identity integration (BII) component, cultural harmony to cultural intelligence \( (\beta = .00) \) (hypothesis 3) and from the BII component cultural blendedness to work-role adjustment \( (\beta = -.06) \) (hypothesis 2) were insignificant. Therefore the results did not support hypothesis 2 and 3. The path coefficients from cultural harmony to work-role adjustment \( (\beta = .17) \) (hypothesis 1) and cultural blendedness to cultural intelligence \( (\beta = .30) \) (hypothesis 4) were both significant. Similarly, the path coefficients from work-role adjustment to task performance \( (\beta = .39) \) (hypothesis 5) and contextual performance \( (\beta = .51) \) (hypothesis 6), as well as the coefficients from cultural intelligence to contextual performance.
(β = .14) (hypothesis 7) and knowledge transfer (β = .32) (hypothesis 8) were all significant. Therefore the results support hypothesis 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Figure 7.2 Path Model with Coefficients

Note: N = 150. Standardized coefficients were reported. *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05. All tests were two-tailed.

In order to account for the correlation that existed between the outcome variables the error terms (e) for each of the variables were correlated. Error terms account for factors other than the observed variables which affect the result of a measurement (Blunch, 2012). A significant correlation was found between task performance and contextual performance ($r = .29, p <$
and also between task performance and knowledge transfer \((r = .29, p < .001)\). The correlation between contextual performance and knowledge transfer was insignificant.

The examination of a number of model fit statistics \((\chi^2 = 18.879, N = 150, p < .05, \text{CFI} = .93, \text{GFI} = .97, \text{RMSEA} = .08, CI: .057 - .090, \text{SRMR} = .08)\) showed that overall there was an adequate fit between the model and the data. A good model fit can be indicated by a RMSEA that’s equal to or less than .06, a SRMR that’s equal to or lower than .08, a CFI of .95 and above (Hu and Bentler, 1998, 1999), and in sample sizes greater than 100, a GFI of .95 and above (Shevlin and Miles, 1998). While the RMSEA was not lower than .06, it was less than .10, a maximum cut-off point for accepting a model (Blunch, 2012; MacCallum et al, 1996). It has been argued that models with RMSEA values which are larger than .10 should not be accepted (Blunch, 2012). Furthermore, although the CFI was slightly below .95, in specifying values of model fit indices that indicate good model fit, Hu and Bentler (1999: 1) suggested “a cutoff value close to .95” for CFI. A CFI value of 0.93 may be judged to be “close” to .95. Furthermore, based on an initial recommendation by Hu and Bentler (1998) research has regularly used the .90 cut-off value for CFI (e.g. Bayazit and Bayazit, 2017; Fletcher et al., 2016; García-Chas et al., 2014). This suggests that a CFI value of .93 is acceptable.

The direct, indirect, and total causal effects of the model are presented in table 7.3. The outcomes of primary interest were task performance, contextual performance, and knowledge transfer. The determinants with the largest total effect on task performance were work-role adjustment (.388), followed by cultural harmony (.068). The determinants with the largest total effect on contextual performance were work-role adjustment (.511), followed by cultural
intelligence (.137). The determinants with the largest total effect on knowledge transfer were cultural intelligence (.321), followed by cultural Blendedness (.097). This model explains approximately 15% of the variance in task performance, 28% of the variance in contextual performance, and 10% of the variance in knowledge transfer.

Overall, the model fit statistics suggest that there is an adequate fit between the model and the data. The model fit statistics support the possibility of the model.

Table 7.4 lists the supported and unsupported hypothesis in this study.
### Table 7.3 Summary of Causal Effects for Path Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Role Adjustment</td>
<td>BII Cultural Harmony</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BII Cultural Blendedness</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence</td>
<td>BII Cultural Harmony</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BII Cultural Blendedness</td>
<td>.302***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>BII Cultural Harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BII Cultural Blendedness</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Performance</td>
<td>BII Cultural Harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BII Cultural Blendedness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Transfer</td>
<td>BII Cultural Harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BII Cultural Blendedness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Direct effect is significant at the .05 level.  
**Direct effect is significant at the .01 level.  
***Direct effect is significant at the .001 level.
Table 7.4 Study 2 Supported and Unsupported Hypothesis

**Research Question 2:** Does biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, impact the effectiveness of international assignees while they are on an assignment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Unsupported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bicultural international assignees will have higher levels of cultural intelligence than monocultural international assignees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bicultural international assignees will be better adjusted to their work roles than monocultural international assignees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bicultural international assignees will not differ from monocultural international assignees in their family role adjustment.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bicultural international assignees will engage in a greater level of knowledge transfer than monocultural international assignees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bicultural international assignees will not differ from monocultural international assignees in their task performance.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bicultural international assignees will exhibit better contextual performance than monocultural international assignees.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 3:** Does bicultural identity integration (BII) impact the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Unsupported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cultural harmony is positively related to work-role adjustment.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cultural blendedness is positively related to work role adjustment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cultural harmony is positively related to cultural intelligence.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cultural blendedness is positively related to cultural intelligence.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work-role adjustment is positively related to task performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Work-role adjustment is positively related to contextual performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cultural intelligence is positively related to contextual performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cultural intelligence is positively related to knowledge transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4 DISCUSSION

This study examined the impact of biculturalism and monoculturalism on the effectiveness of international assignees while they are on assignments. The study proposed that biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism, would impact a number of variables which can influence the overall success of an international assignment. These variables included work-role adjustment, cultural intelligence, knowledge transfer, and contextual performance. The study also proposed that the two components of bicultural identity integration, cultural harmony and cultural blendedness, would impact the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees.

This study is the first in the academic literature, that researcher is aware of, to consider the impact of biculturalism on the effectiveness of international assignees. This study follows on from the first study in this thesis, which found that bicultural individuals are more willing, and possibly more suitable, to undertake international assignments than monocultural individuals. As multinational companies become increasingly global in their scope, there is rising need for employees who possess the competencies to operate globally (Caligiuri et al., 2009).

An emerging field of research, global talent management, considers how multinational companies should manage such employees. One suggested approach within the literature is for companies to develop talent pools of high potential and high performing employees that will fill key positions that differentially contribute the company’s sustainable competitive advantage (Mellahi and Collings, 2010). A review and synthesis of both the international assignment, and biculturalism literature provides a theoretical basis for proposing that bicultural individuals may be effective international assignees. In this sense, high performing bicultural individuals may
represent talent, that when strategically deployed in international roles, provide their organisations with a competitive advantage. While there are grounds for proposing that, intuitively, bicultural individuals may be effective international assignees, the present study considers this proposition empirically.

The study proposed that bicultural international assignees are more culturally intelligent than monocultural international assignees. It has previously been argued without empirical support that bicultural individuals are likely to possess a high level of cultural intelligence (Moore, 2005). The present study indicated that bicultural individuals do indeed possess high levels of cultural intelligence (with a mean score of 3.98 on a 5-point scale) and are more culturally intelligent than monocultural individuals.

As with the first study, this study also indicates that bicultural individuals are more culturally intelligent than monocultural individuals. The first study proposed that integrative complexity and cultural exposure explain the difference in cultural intelligence between monocultural and bicultural individuals. Integrative complexity was said to increase cultural intelligence through its effect on the underlying components of cultural intelligence, namely, cultural knowledge and cultural metacognition. Cultural exposure was also said to increase cultural intelligence through its effect on underlying components of cultural intelligence, namely, cultural knowledge and cultural skills. Integrative complexity and cultural exposure may also explain the high levels of cultural intelligence among bicultural assignees in this study.

The difference in cultural intelligence between bicultural and monocultural assignees was smaller (Mean difference in cultural intelligence = .24) than the difference between bicultural
and monocultural students (Mean difference in cultural intelligence = .6288) in the first study. This was expected given that the monocultural individuals in the second study were likely to have a greater level of cultural exposure than those in the first study. Cultural exposure refers to “experiences related to a region that aid in developing a familiarity or understanding of the norms, values and beliefs of that region” (Crowne, 2013:7). Indeed, monocultural assignees had in fact experienced high levels of cultural exposure. In the present study, 55% of monocultural assignees had spent 3 or more years in another country, and 34% had lived in three or more countries for more than a year. However, bicultural assignees had experienced higher levels of cultural exposure. 72% of bicultural assignees had spent 3 or more years in another country. 39% of these assignees had spent 5 or more years in another country, while 57% of bicultural assignees had lived in 3 or more countries for more than one year.

As well as integrative complexity and cultural exposure, a further factor which may contribute to the greater level of cultural intelligence amongst bicultural international assignees is the consistent presence and influence of multiple cultures in their lives. While on assignment bicultural assignees have at least three cultural influences in their lives. On a day-to-day basis the actions and behaviour of bicultural assignees may be influenced by either of the cultures that they have internalised and identify with or the culture of the host country. Furthermore, exposure to multiple cultures allows one to consciously assess their own cultural norms and assumptions and consider how they differ to those of their current environment, before, during and after intercultural interactions. While monocultural assignees compare two cultures (their culture and the culture of the host country), bicultural assignees compare three (the two cultures that they have internalised and identify with and the culture of the host country). The
consistent presence and influence of multiple cultures may increase the cultural metacognition of bicultural assignees and in turn increase their level of cultural intelligence.

From a global mobility perspective, this finding is quite significant. Organisations are utilizing the cultural intelligence of their employees to achieve their goals and strategies (Tan, 2004). This finding identifies a category of culturally intelligent employees that organisations may utilize for the fulfilment of specific goals.

The study proposed that bicultural and monocultural assignees would differ in their work-role adjustment. Based on the findings of previous research, which indicate that there is a stronger association between biculturalism and sociocultural adjustment than between monoculturalism and sociocultural adjustment, it was predicted that bicultural assignees would be more adjusted to their work-roles than monocultural assignees. Contrary to expectations the findings indicated that there was no significant difference between bicultural and monocultural assignees in relation to work-role adjustment. This could be explained by previous international experience. Research tells us that previous experience of working and living abroad can positively influence adjustment during future international relocations (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). Previous international work and non-work experience allows an assignee to develop realistic expectations, anticipate problems related to cultural transitions, and react to them accordingly, facilitating the assignees adjustment in the assignment location (Black et al., 1991).

The monocultural assignees in this study had comparable international assignment experience to the bicultural assignees and more than half of the monocultural assignees had spent 3 or more years in another country. In this instance the previous international experience of
monocultural assignees may have had a greater impact on their work-role adjustment, than the impact of the relationship between biculturalism and sociocultural adjustment on the work-role adjustment of bicultural assignees.

The study also proposed that bicultural and monocultural assignees would not differ in their family-role adjustment. While there was a theoretical basis (i.e. the relationship between sociocultural adjustment and biculturalism) upon which to propose that bicultural assignees would be better adjusted to their work-roles than monocultural assignees, there was no such basis in relation to family-role adjustment. Consequently, there was no empirical or theoretical reason why bicultural and monocultural assignees would differ in their family-role adjustment.

As expected the findings indicated that there was no significant difference in the family-role adjustment of bicultural and monocultural assignees. It may be that the ability to meet family related responsibilities and maintain relationships with family members while on assignment is influenced more by specific aspects of an assignee’s personality (e.g. conscientiousness) than by how they perceive themselves culturally.

For many multinational companies, knowledge transfer is a common reason for sending their employees on international assignments (Park and Mense-Petermann, 2014; Zaidman and Brock, 2009). These companies often use their assignees to transfer knowledge from headquarters to subsidiaries (Hocking et al., 2004; Harzing, 2001). Such knowledge transfer is believed to be vital to subsidiary performance (Tan and Mahoney, 2006; Gong, 2003; Delios and Beamish, 2001). Bicultural individuals are considered to possess skills, such as effective cross-cultural communication and boundary spanning (Friedman and Liu, 2009; Fontaine and
Richardson, 2003), both of which are particularly relevant for knowledge transfer. Based on the possession of such skills it was proposed that bicultural assignees would engage in a greater level of knowledge transfer than monocultural assignees. Contrary to expectations, the results indicated that there was no significant difference in the knowledge transfer of bicultural and monocultural assignees.

As mentioned earlier in this section, this study found that bicultural assignees were more culturally intelligent than monocultural assignees. Given that cultural skills are an underlying component of cultural intelligence (Thomas et al., 2015), the finding indicates that bicultural assignees may have indeed possessed skills such as effective cross-cultural communication and boundary spanning. It’s possible that, like work-role adjustment, the insignificant difference in knowledge transfer between bicultural and monocultural assignees may be explained by the previous international experience of monocultural assignees. It may be that from their previous international experiences, monocultural assignees have attained experience in transferring knowledge, or have developed cross-cultural skills which facilitate the transfer of knowledge. The previous international experience of monocultural assignees may therefore make them just as capable of transferring knowledge as bicultural assignees were proposed to be.

Just as knowledge transfer is a common reason for sending employees on international assignments (Park and Mense-Petermann, 2014; Zaidman and Brock, 2009), job performance is a common outcome variables used to determine the success of an assignment (Takeuchi et al., 2009). This study assessed the task and contextual performance of monocultural and bicultural
assignees. The study proposed that bicultural and monocultural assignees would not differ in their task performance but would differ in their contextual performance.

As predicted, there was no significant difference in the task performance of bicultural and monocultural assignees. One possible explanation may be the nature of task performance. Unlike contextual performance, which focuses on relationships with host country nationals and adapting to host country norms, task performance does not directly focus on factors which can benefit from being culturally diverse. Rather, task performance focuses on achieving objectives and fulfilling technical facets of the job. Therefore, cultural identification (identifying as monocultural or bicultural) may be inconsequential when considering the task performance of assignees. Also, in developing the hypothesis, it was suggested that compared to contextual performance, there would be no difference in task performance between the two groups of assignees because of the relationship between task performance and experience (Motowidlo, and Van Scotter, 1994). Variations in task performance can be explained by differences in the proficiency of employees to carry out activities related to specific tasks (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993). Greater experience is likely to result in greater proficiency in carrying out task related activities. The experience of employees can therefore influence their task performance regardless of how they perceive themselves culturally.

In contrast to task performance, it was proposed that bicultural and monocultural assignees would differ in their contextual performance. Specifically it was proposed that bicultural assignees would exhibit greater levels of contextual performance than monocultural assignees.
The results indicated that bicultural assignees did indeed exhibit greater levels of contextual performance than monocultural assignees.

It has been argued that bicultural individuals are more attributionally complex than monocultural individuals. This attributional complexity may explain their greater level of contextual performance. Attributional complexity enables individuals to perform effectively in social situations. As contextual performance is very much focused on the development and management of relationships, at its core it considers the effectiveness of assignees in social situations. Individuals that are attributionally complex exhibit higher levels of performance in tasks that involve making judgements and decisions in social situations and are able to assign causes to explain the behaviour of others (Lakshman, 2013). The higher levels of contextual performance amongst bicultural assignees may therefore be explained by an ability to understand the behaviour of host country employees and to continually make effective judgements and decisions within the context of these relationships.

Another factor which may contribute to the higher levels of contextual performance exhibited by bicultural assignees is their extensive multicultural experience. As well as the development and management of relationships with host country nationals, adapting to existing customs in the foreign facility is another facet of contextual performance. The multicultural experience of bicultural assignees is ongoing, because of their internalisation of two different cultures, and their exposure to other cultures while on assignments. The extensiveness of a person’s multicultural experiences has been found to influence their openness to foreign cultural ideas and to result in better performance in insight learning (Leung and Chiu, 2010). The extensive
multicultural experience of bicultural assignees may enable them to gain insights, which help them to understand foreign cultural ideas that influence business customs and norms. The extensive multicultural experience of bicultural assignees consequently impacts their contextual performance.

As well as exploring whether biculturalism and monoculturalism impact the effectiveness of international assignees, the study also examined whether bicultural identity integration impacts the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees. The study proposed and tested a model which considered the impact of the two components of bicultural identity integration, cultural harmony and cultural blendedness, on work-role adjustment and cultural intelligence, both of which were posited to have a direct impact on assignment outcomes.

The model proposed that cultural harmony and cultural blendedness would both be positively related to work-role adjustment. It was argued that as cultural harmony increased, work-role adjustment would also increase, and as cultural harmony decreased and bicultural assignees experienced cultural conflict, work-role adjustment would also decrease. Similarly, it was argued that as cultural blendedness increased, work-role adjustment would also increase, and as cultural blendedness decreased and bicultural assignees experienced cultural compartmentalisation, work-role adjustment would also decrease.

The study found that cultural harmony was indeed positively related to work-role adjustment. The finding indicates that bicultural assignees who perceive that their two cultures are compatible are better adjusted to their work-roles than those that perceive that their two cultures are incompatible. A central facet of work-role adjustment is navigating relationships
with individuals within the context of the role. The finding suggests that cultural harmony or cultural conflict (i.e. low levels of cultural harmony) can effect interactions and relationships with host country employees.

Unlike cultural harmony, cultural blendedness was not found to be positively related to work-role adjustment. The finding appears to indicate that this component of bicultural identity integration does not affect the work-role adjustment of bicultural assignees. It is believed that cultural blendedness captures the arrangement of a bicultural individual’s cultural profiles while cultural harmony provides an indication of their emotional perception of these cultural profiles (Haritatos and Benet-Martinez, 2002). This might, to a certain extent, help us to understand the relationship, and lack thereof, between the bicultural identity integration components and work-role adjustment.

It may be that how an assignee perceives their cultures emotionally (i.e. positive or negative), is more relevant than how they organise them when trying to adjust to a new role, around new and possibly culturally different people, in a foreign location.

Positive or negative emotions towards one’s own cultural identity may influence activities (e.g. work-role adjustment) which are culturally related or within a cultural domain (e.g. international assignment). For instance, negative emotions towards their own cultural identities, may challenge the ability of bicultural assignees to develop and navigate relationships within their role, a central aspect of work-role adjustment. On the other hand, how a bicultural assignee arranges their cultural identities may be of little significance to how they adjust to their work-role.
The model also proposed that cultural harmony and cultural blendedness would both be positively related to cultural intelligence. It was argued that as cultural harmony increased, cultural intelligence would also increase, and as cultural harmony decreased and bicultural assignees experienced cultural conflict, cultural intelligence would also decrease. Similarly it was argued that as cultural blendedness increased, cultural intelligence would also increase, and as cultural blendedness decreased and bicultural assignees experienced cultural compartmentalisation, cultural intelligence would also decrease.

The study found that cultural harmony was not related to cultural intelligence, while cultural blendedness was. This outcome was unexpected, as it was predicted that both components of bicultural identity integration would be positively related to cultural intelligence. Previous research does however provide an insight as to why this may have been the case. Research tells us that the cultural blendedness component of bicultural identity integration is closely related to acculturation factors such as amount of cultural exposure, language proficiency, and identification with the mainstream/dominant culture. On the other hand, the cultural harmony component of bicultural identity integration has been found to be largely independent from such acculturation factors (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). Acculturation encompasses the psychological change and outcomes that occur as a result of adapting to a new culture (Berry, 1997). It may be that acculturation factors encourage the development of cultural intelligence.

Cultural intelligence has three underlying components, namely, cultural knowledge, cultural skills and cultural metacognition, which together, provide an indication of an individual’s level
of cultural intelligence (Thomas et al., 2015). Factors related to acculturation may have unique consequences for each of the underlying factors of cultural intelligence. Cultural knowledge consists of content specific knowledge and process knowledge. Content specific knowledge refers to ‘recognizing the existence of other cultures and defining the nature of these differences’, while process knowledge refers to ‘intercultural encounters, the demands of problem solving and how these demands can be met under varying conditions (Thomas et al., 2015: 1101). Acculturation encourages the development of both content specific and process knowledge. During the process of acculturation an individual is exposed to a new culture and decides whether or not to maintain their ethnic culture, and whether or not to participate in the dominant culture (Berry, 1997). In making these decisions acculturating individuals recognize the dominant culture and develop an understanding of how it differs from their own culture, thereby developing content specific knowledge. Process specific knowledge is developed when acculturating individuals that decide to participate in the dominant culture, engage in intercultural encounters and solve context specific problems.

The cultural skills component of cultural intelligence relates to specific skills which are important for cultural intelligence. These skills include relational skills, tolerance of uncertainty, adaptability, empathy, and perceptual acuity (Thomas et al., 2015). Factors relating to acculturation may influence the development, and or enhancement, of the aforementioned cultural skills. For instance, Identifying with the dominant culture may enhance relational skills and empathy. In identifying with a culture other than ones culture of origin, an individual accepts the norms, attitudes and behaviours associated with that culture (Friedman and Liu, 2009). Identifying with another culture also means feeling a sense of belonging to another
cultural group (Berry, 1980). In order to feel a sense of belonging an individual must first accept
the people in the cultural group. In doing so an individual may enhance their ability to relate
and empathize with culturally different people. Research also attests to relationships between
factors relating to acculturation and cultural skills. For instance, cultural exposure has been
found to be positively related to tolerance for uncertainty (Caligiuri and Tarique, 2011), while
identifying with another culture has been found to be positively related to adaptability (Nguyen
and Benet-Martinez, 2013), and argued to be related to perceptual acuity (Lakshman, 2013).

The final component of cultural intelligence is cultural metacognition. Cultural metacognition
relates to knowledge of and control over one’s culturally related thinking and learning activities
(Thomas et al., 2015). Acculturating individuals that integrate both cultures by choosing to
maintain their ethnic culture and participate in the dominant culture, switch back and forth
between cultural frames. Such individuals exhibit great control over their cultural thinking in
that they are able to apply appropriate behavioural repertoires and cultural knowledge based
on their cultural environment and audience (Hong at al., 2000). Acculturation therefore
improves cultural metacognition.

For bicultural assignees that have extensive assignment experience or have undertaken long-
term assignments, the effect of cultural blendedness on cultural intelligence may be more
pronounced because they may have gone through the acculturation process, on multiple
occasions. These illustrations (see also Thomas et al., 2015; Lakshman, 2013; Nguyen and
Benet-Martinez, 2013; Caligiuri and Tarique, 2011; Hong at al., 2000; Berry, 1997), provide
support for the argument that acculturation factors, which are more closely related to cultural
blededness than cultural harmony, explain the relationship, and indeed the lack thereof between the bicultural identity integration components and cultural intelligence.

The model proposed that the work-role adjustment of bicultural assignees would be positively related to assignment outcomes such as task performance and contextual performance. As predicted the study found that work-role adjustment was positively related to both task performance and contextual performance. The findings indicate that as an assignee’s level of comfort with tasks, responsibilities, and relationships related to their role increases (i.e. work-role adjustment), so too does their ability to achieve job objectives and fulfil technical facets of their job (i.e. task performance), and their ability to develop good relationships with host country nationals and adapt to existing customs in the foreign facility (i.e. contextual performance).

Like previous research, this study indicates that assignee adjustment does indeed impact task performance and contextual performance (e.g. Malek and Budhwar, 2013; Kraimer et al., 2001). Although some scholars have argued that the relationship between the cross-cultural adjustment of assignees and their performance is inconclusive (e.g. Lazarova and Thomas, 2012; Thomas and Lazarova, 2006; Tucker, Bonial and Lahti, 2004), this study provides further evidence that assignee adjustment, in this case work-role adjustment, does in fact impact the performance of assignees.

The model also proposed that the cultural intelligence of bicultural assignees would be related to assignment outcomes such as contextual performance and knowledge transfer. It was predicted that as cultural intelligence increased, contextual performance would also increase
and as cultural intelligence decreased, contextual performance would also decrease. Similarly it was predicted that as cultural intelligence increased, knowledge transfer would also increase and as cultural intelligence decreased, knowledge transfer would also decrease.

While individual differences such as openness to experience and extraversion may influence the performance of assignees it is argued that cultural intelligence is a better predictor of assignee performance in different cultural settings than individual differences (Kim et al., 2008). As predicted, the study found a positive relationship between cultural intelligence and contextual performance. The finding supports other research which has also found a positive relationship between cultural intelligence and contextual performance (e.g. Malek and Budhwar, 2013).

The finding indicates that the more effectively bicultural assignees are able function in culturally diverse settings, the better their ability to perform within their environment. The finding comes as no surprise. One aspect of contextual performance is the development of relationships with host country employees. Cultural intelligence enables this. Cultural intelligence encompasses an “individual’s ability to grasp and reason correctly in situations characterised by cultural diversity” (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008: 4). The ability to understand and reason effectively in culturally diverse situations will help assignees to understand host country employees and also guide their communication with these employees, ultimately facilitating the development of positive relationships.

Cultural intelligence also impacts contextual performance by enabling assignees to adapt to existing customs in the foreign facility. Adapting to existing customs in the foreign facility is another facet of contextual performance. High levels of cultural intelligence are associated with
greater levels of cooperation and a stronger desire to understand one’s surroundings (Imai and Gelfand, 2010), both of which may help an assignee to adapt to the existing customs in the foreign facility. Individuals that possess high levels of cultural intelligence are therefore able to effectively develop and manage relationships with host country employees, and adapt to the customs and norms of their surroundings.

Knowledge management theory suggests that characteristics of the source of knowledge can determine the success of knowledge transfer (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). While some research has proposed a conceptual link between cultural intelligence and knowledge transfer (e.g. Ismail, 2015), the present study has confirmed that there is indeed an empirical relationship between cultural intelligence and knowledge transfer. The study found that cultural intelligence was positively related to knowledge transfer, indicating that the level of cultural intelligence possessed by the source of knowledge can influence the success of knowledge transfer.

People with high levels of cultural intelligence are keen to understand their cultural environments, show more interest in other cultures, and are more motivated to develop relationships with individuals from other cultures (Imai and Gelfand, 2010; Emerson et al., 2002). Knowledge transfer research tells us that social knowledge and social ties are important in order to successfully articulate transferred knowledge (Buckley et al., 2005; Hansen et al., 2005). Cultural intelligence may encourage the attainment of social knowledge, and the development of social ties, as individuals high in cultural intelligence seek to know and understand their environment and the people in it. Furthermore, cultural intelligence increases
communication effectiveness (Bucker et al., 2014), which facilitates successful knowledge transfer, by enabling the source of information to deliver the information effectively.

Overall, the proposed model found that the components of bicultural identity integration, cultural harmony and cultural blendedness, can impact the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees. A number of model fit statistics indicated that there was an adequate fit between the model and the data. The study therefore supports the possibility of the model. Each component of bicultural identity integration was related to either work-role adjustment or cultural intelligence, both of which were subsequently related to job performance and knowledge transfer, the outcome variables included in the model. Although the effects were relatively small, cultural harmony and cultural blendedness were indirectly related to the outcome variables (see table 7.3). This study is the first to propose and test a model of the impact of bicultural identity integration on the effectiveness of international assignees. The study revealed that for bicultural assignees, bicultural identity integration plays a role in how they function while on international assignments.

Previous research has identified the potential of bicultural employees within multinational companies (e.g. Fitzsimmons 2013; Fitzsimmons et al., 2011; Brannen and Thomas, 2010; Friedman and Liu, 2009) and a review of both the international assignment and biculturalism literature suggest that bicultural individuals may be effective international assignees. Results from this study indicate that bicultural assignees are not necessarily more or less effective than monocultural assignees across the board. Rather, bicultural assignees may prove to be more effective than monocultural assignees in specific areas (e.g. cultural intelligence and contextual
based on skills and competence associated with their bicultural identity. Results from the study also indicate that bicultural identity integration can impact the effectiveness of bicultural assignees, suggesting that bicultural employees with highly integrated cultural identities will perform effectively while on assignments.

Based on the findings presented, multinational companies should leverage the ability of bicultural assignees to be effective in specific areas. From a talent management perspective, this involves understanding and utilizing the skill sets of bicultural employees, by placing them in key positions that differentially contribute to the company’s sustainable competitive advantage (Mellahi and Collings, 2010). The next chapter discusses the main findings from both studies in this thesis. It outlines how both studies contribute to research as well as their practical implications. The chapter also provides recommendations for future research and practice, identifies strengths and limitations of the research conducted, and finally draws a conclusion to the thesis.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

8.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The term ‘cultural identity’, which is subjective in nature, refers to the sense of belonging that people feel towards a particular cultural group (Berry, 1980). While a person may have experiences with multiple cultures, cultural experiences and cultural identity are not one in the same. Though cultural experiences may consolidate one’s cultural identity, they do not connect an individual to a culture, in that while an individual may have experience of operating in another culture they may not necessarily feel that they belong to that culture, nor feel that they have internalised the culture (Sussman, 2000; Ting-Toomey et al., 2000; Adler and Bartholomew, 1992).

Cultural identification therefore refers to a person’s sense of identification with, and internalisation of, a national culture. Although the term “cultural identification” may relate to a broad spectrum of identity types, for the purpose of this research, cultural identification referred to whether an individual identified as monocultural or bicultural. This thesis set out to explore the impact of cultural identification on global mobility by examining the impact of self-identification as monocultural or bicultural on international assignments. Specifically, the thesis examined how self-identification as monocultural or bicultural impacts willingness to undertake an international assignment and effectiveness while on assignments. Monocultural individuals are those who identify with and have internalised only one culture. Bicultural individuals are
those who identify with, have been exposed to, and have internalised two cultures (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002).

Research on biculturalism and bicultural individuals, which has its origins in the psychology literature, has begun to appear in business and management literature as scholars recognize the relevance of bicultural experiences and the related skills within organisations (e.g. Dau, 2016; Fitzsimmons, 2013; Brannen and Thomas, 2010; Hong, 2010). Much of this emerging body of literature identifies the benefits of bicultural individuals for multinational companies (e.g. Fitzsimmons 2013; Fitzsimmons et al., 2011; Brannen and Thomas, 2010; Friedman and Liu, 2009). Indeed multicultural individuals, such as bicultural employees, are increasingly seen to represent a significant source of value for multinational organisations (Fitzsimmons, 2013). The study of culturally diverse individuals within organisations is becoming increasingly relevant as nations become more culturally intertwined.

As the world continues to experience rapid rates of globalisation, countries, and their inhabitants, are increasingly exposed to multiple cultural influences. With the number of international migrants standing at 244 million in 2015, it is evident that an increasing number of people worldwide have experience of living in another culture or have been exposed to another culture (United Nations, 2015). In comparing monocultural and bicultural individuals, many of the hypotheses of the current research sought to identify if there were distinctive differences between individuals having experiences of operating in, and/or being exposed to other cultures (e.g. monocultural individuals in culturally diverse environments) and feeling a sense of
belonging to multiple cultures (e.g. bicultural individuals). Specifically, both studies considered how these differences can impact global mobility.

The first study, which was based on a sample of 285 third-level students, examined whether biculturalism and monoculturalism impact willingness to undertake an international assignment. For many multinational organisations, the willingness of employees to accept international assignments is important in recruiting for global roles within the organisations.

The willingness of prospective employees to undertake an international assignment is one of the most important selection criteria for international roles in multinational organisations (Caliguri and Bonache, 2016). In recent times, up to 77% of organisations have stated that they consider a prospective employee’s willingness to undertake an international assignment during the selection process (Brookfield GRS, 2015). This is important as empirical research indicates that employees who perceive that they don't have a free choice in accepting an international role experience difficulties in adjusting to their role, and are less willing to advice peers to accept international roles (Pinto et al., 2012; Feldman and Thomas, 1992). As multinational companies expand globally and the number of international subsidiaries increases, so too does their requirement for international assignees (Caligiuri and Bonache, 2016). Industry research indicates that the demand for international assignees continues to rise (Brookfield GRS, 2014, 2015). Despite the rise in demand for international assignees, many multinational companies have faced difficulties in finding employees who are both suitable and willing to undertake international assignments (Kim and Froese, 2012; Hippler, 2009; Tharenou, 2008; Collings et al., 2007; Konopaske and Werner, 2005). In light of the demand versus supply challenge faced by
many multinational companies, research that aims to identify potential talent pools for international assignments is of particular relevance to international human resource management research and practice.

The first study in the thesis found that bicultural students were more willing to undertake an international assignment than monocultural students. The study also found that for bicultural students, the components of bicultural identity integration, cultural harmony and cultural blendedness, did not impact their willingness to work internationally. The findings suggest that bicultural individuals may be more willing to undertake international assignments than monocultural individuals. Further, the results indicate that the manner in which bicultural individuals integrate their two cultural identities does not affect their willingness to work internationally. However, cultural intelligence does play a role in a person’s willingness to work internationally.

While technical competence is an important criterion for international assignment selection, of equal importance is an assignee’s ability to comfortably operate in foreign cultural environments and work with people from different cultural backgrounds (Caligiuri, Tarique, and Jacobs, 2009). Indeed, the ability of an individual to function effectively in different contexts is an important consideration when selecting international assignees. This is why selection systems for international assignments, compared to those for local positions, often place greater emphasis on predicting a candidates success in the job context (i.e. foreign location) rather than their success in a given role (Caligiuri and Bucker, 2015). On the basis of the findings of the current study it appears that the ability to comfortably operate in foreign cultural
environments and work with people from different cultural backgrounds affects the willingness of individuals to accept assignments. Specifically, cultural intelligence, which relates to a person’s ability to function effectively in culturally diverse settings (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008), was found to impact the willingness of monocultural and bicultural students to undertake an international assignment.

The study found that cultural intelligence was positively related to a person’s willingness to go on an international assignment, and also mediated the relationship between cultural identification and willingness to undertake an international assignment. This suggests that regardless of how a person perceives themselves culturally, their level of cultural intelligence can play a role in their willingness to work internationally. Further, bicultural students were more culturally intelligent than monocultural students and were also more willing to work internationally.

Understanding willingness to accept international assignments is important for global mobility research, and practice. Considering the willingness of prospective employees to undertake international assignments is important because willingness can predict actual decisions to accept or reject job transfers (Brett and Reilly, 1988). Considering the willingness of employees to accept international assignments prior to assignments is equally important because willingness or the lack thereof can have implications for assignment success.

The pressures of the ongoing requirement for individuals to work internationally in multinational organisations, combined with the significant constraints on the supply of such assignees (Collings et al, 2007) create significant challenges for these firms. Firms may
ultimately make assignments mandatory, by forcing employees to accept them and making it difficult for employees to decline them. This however, can prove to have negative effects on the employee and on the assignment objectives.

Employees who feel that they were pressured or forced to accept an international assignment experience difficulties in adjusting to their assignment, and are less likely to advice peers to accept an international assignment (Pinto et al., 2012; Feldman and Thomas, 1992). For employees who refuse to accept an international assignment, their refusal can constitute a breach of the psychological contract between them and their employer. This breach can lead to lower levels of investment in the employee, and subsequently lower levels of objective and subjective career success (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, 2016). Conversely, assignees who feel that they had a free choice in deciding whether to accept an assignment have been found to adjust well to their international assignment and display a greater level of commitment while on the assignment (Kraimer and Wayne, 2004). Therefore understanding and considering the willingness of employees and prospective employees to accept international assignments can have positive implications for assignment success.

Intuitively biculturals seem like suitable candidates for international roles. Indeed, the first study points to their potential suitability in that they are more culturally intelligent, and more willing to undertake international assignments than monocultural individuals. Nevertheless, the willingness of biculturals to accept international assignments and their high levels of cultural intelligence does not necessarily mean that they will be more effective than monocultural assignees while on assignments. An empirical understanding of the variations that may exist in
the potential contributions of bicultural employees, in international roles, is therefore necessary prior to prioritizing such individuals for global roles (Fitzsimmons, 2013).

The second study, which was based on a sample of 356 international assignees working within a multinational food corporation, therefore examined whether biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism impacted the effectiveness of international assignees while they were on assignments. The study found that biculturalism had a greater impact on the effectiveness of assignees, than monoculturalism, in specific areas. Namely, cultural intelligence and contextual performance. There were also several areas in which there was no significant difference between bicultural and monocultural assignees. These included work and family-role adjustment, knowledge transfer, and task performance (it was however predicted that there would be no difference between the two groups in relation to family-role adjustment and task-performance).

Bicultural assignees were more culturally intelligent than monocultural assignees in this sample. This finding supports the results from the first study which identified that bicultural students were more culturally intelligent than monocultural students. Cultural intelligence was also found to impact the effectiveness of bicultural assignees while they were on assignments. Specifically, cultural intelligence was found to be positively related to assignment outcomes such as contextual performance and knowledge transfer. Bicultural assignees also exhibited greater levels of contextual performance than monocultural assignees.

The study also proposed and tested a model of the impact of the components of bicultural identity integration, cultural harmony and cultural blendedness, on the effectiveness of
bicultural assignees. Cultural harmony was found to be related to work-role adjustment, while cultural blendedness was found to be related to cultural intelligence. Work-role adjustment and cultural intelligence were subsequently related to task performance, contextual performance, and knowledge transfer. A number of model fit statistics showed that the data supported the possibility of the model. The model therefore indicates that bicultural identity integration can impact the effectiveness of bicultural assignees. Bicultural employees with highly integrated cultural identities (i.e. those that experience cultural harmony and cultural blendedness) therefore perform more effectively while on assignments.

The results from the second study indicate that while biculturals with highly integrated cultural identities perform effectively while on assignments, bicultural assignees in general may not necessarily be more effective than monocultural assignees when on assignments. While the literature on bicultural individuals points to their potential to function effectively cross-culturally (e.g. Friedman and Liu, 2009), the results from the second study indicate that it shouldn’t be assumed that by virtue of identifying with, being exposed to, and internalising two different cultures that bicultural individuals will function more effectively across the board, than monocultural individuals in cross-cultural settings. For instance, while research suggests that the relationship between biculturalism and adjustment is stronger than the relationship between monoculturalism and adjustment (e.g. Nguyen and Benet-Martinez, 2013) the current research found no significant difference in the work-role adjustment of bicultural and monocultural assignees. Similarly, although theoretically it has been proposed that having bicultural competence can positively impact the knowledge transfer process, (Fontaine and Richardson, 2003) there was no significant difference in knowledge transfer between bicultural
and monocultural assignees. These non-significant findings do not discredit the adjustment or knowledge transfer capabilities of bicultural individuals that have been identified by previous research, but they do indicate that biculturals may not necessarily be more effective than monocultural individuals in these regards in all circumstances.

The results from the second study demonstrate that bicultural assignees may prove to be more effective than monocultural assignees in specific areas (e.g. cultural intelligence and contextual performance), based on skills and competence associated with their bicultural identity. Indeed, recent international business research shows that the number of cultural identities possessed by an individual can predict social and task outcomes such as social capital and intercultural intelligence (e.g. Fitzsimmons et al., 2017). This might further explain why the first and second studies found that bicultural individuals are more culturally intelligent than monocultural individuals. It may also explain why bicultural assignees were found to exhibit higher levels of contextual performance than monocultural assignees.

The integrated study of biculturalism and international assignments has provided novel insights on the potential international impact of culturally diverse individuals within multinational companies. By studying the willingness of monocultural and bicultural college students to work internationally in the future, this thesis considers the long range impact of cultural identification on international assignments. In contrast, by studying the impact of biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism on the effectiveness of international assignees, the thesis also considers the immediate impact of cultural identification on international assignments. By considering both the long range and immediate effects of cultural identification on
international assignments, this thesis provides a more complete picture of the impact of
cultural identification on global mobility. The next section discusses the contributions of the research.

8.2 CONTRIBUTIONS OF RESEARCH

The studies presented in this thesis make significant contributions to our understanding of the potential impact of culturally diverse individuals in multinational organisations. These contributions are diverse in nature (see table 8.1). Only one previous study has considered the impact of biculturalism on international assignments. This study focused specifically on the impact of bicultural competence on assignee adjustment (see Bell and Harrison, 1996). The studies presented in this thesis are the first to compare bicultural and monocultural individuals along several outcome variables. By empirically investigating how biculturalism and bicultural identity integration influence an individual’s willingness to work internationally, and an assignee’s level of effectiveness while on an assignment, the studies further our understanding of the impact of biculturalism on global mobility.
Table 8.1 Research Contributions Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Empirical Evidence</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed and tested a model of the impact of bicultural Identity Integration on the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees. Bicultural identity integration was found to influence assignee effectiveness.</td>
<td>Bicultural individuals are more receptive to working internationally than monocultural individuals.</td>
<td>The factor structure of the BIIS-2 scale requires further assessment using diverse samples of bicultural individuals.</td>
<td>The first study is the first in the biculturalism and international human resource management literature to examine biculturalism in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural individuals have high levels of cultural intelligence and are more culturally intelligent than monocultural individuals.</td>
<td>Cultural intelligence is positively related to knowledge transfer.</td>
<td>The first and second studies are the first to use and validate the newly developed short form measure of cultural intelligence (SFCQ) scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second study in this thesis makes a significant theoretical contribution to biculturalism and international human resource management research. It is the first study in the field to propose, and test a model of the impact of bicultural identity integration on the effectiveness of international assignees. This is significant because as research continues to identify the benefits of bicultural individuals for multinational companies, there is a need to understand if, and how, such individuals vary in their ability to contribute to their organisations success. The study
showed that the components of bicultural identity integration, cultural harmony, and cultural
blendedness, influence how bicultural assignees function while on international assignments. 
While biculturalism may be seen as an advantage when operating cross-culturally, the model
indicates that the degree to which bicultural individuals integrate their two cultures can
influence their cross-cultural effectiveness. By demonstrating that bicultural identity
integration is relevant within the context of international assignments, the study has provided
an empirical basis for greater theoretical exploration of the impact of bicultural identity
integration on global mobility.

The studies presented in this thesis have also made several empirical contributions to research.
One such contribution relates to willingness to work internationally. Many previous studies
have identified several different factors which may influence the willingness of a person to
relocate internationally to undertake an international assignment. The first study in this thesis
however is the first to identify a relationship between biculturalism and willingness to
undertake an international assignment. Specifically, individuals that identify with and have
internalised two different cultures were found to be more willing to undertake an international
assignment than those that identify with and have internalised only one culture. Thus, how an
individual perceives themselves culturally can impact their willingness to work internationally.

In the past it has been suggested without empirical support that bicultural individuals are likely
to possess a high level of cultural intelligence (Moore, 2005). The first study also contributed to
research by providing empirical evidence to support this claim. Bicultural third-level students
were found to possess high levels of cultural intelligence. The second study reinforced this
finding in a different sample, as bicultural international assignees also possessed high levels of cultural intelligence. In both studies, bicultural individuals had higher levels of cultural intelligence than monocultural individuals. Further, cultural identification was also found to be related to cultural intelligence, providing further evidence that biculturalism is related to cultural intelligence.

Additionally, findings from the second study contribute to the knowledge transfer literature. Although some research has proposed a conceptual link between cultural intelligence and knowledge transfer (e.g. Ismail, 2015), no previous research has provided evidence of this relationship. The closest support for this relationship comes from research which considered the impact of cultural intelligence on knowledge sharing in teams (e.g. Chen and Lin, 2013). The present study confirmed that there is indeed an empirical relationship between cultural intelligence and knowledge transfer. The study indicated that the relationship is positive, suggesting that as cultural intelligence increases so too does knowledge transfer. This study therefore contributes to knowledge transfer research by identifying a factor at the individual level which can facilitate successful knowledge transfer. As the first study to empirically examine both of the components of bicultural identity integration within an organisational setting, the second study also broadened the empirical evidence base of the impact of bicultural identity integration on work related outcomes.

Both studies also make contributions to the bicultural identity integration, and the cultural intelligence literature, methodologically. In both studies a confirmatory factor analysis was performed to confirm the factor structure of the BIIS-2 scale, which is the most recent bicultural
identity integration measure. In both instances confirmatory factor analysis did not confirm the factor structure of the BIIS-2 scale suggesting that the scale requires further development. The scale was initially developed and tested using Asian-Americans (Huynh, 2009) whereas in this thesis, the scale was made adaptable for all biculturals, by allowing bicultural individuals to insert their two cultures when completing the questionnaire. The scale was therefore administered to individuals from a very wide range of cultural backgrounds. The Cronbach’s Alpha scores for the subscales in measure were acceptable (i.e. all above .70; DeVellis, 2003), suggesting good internal consistency, in that the items in the subscales all measured the same underlying attribute. However, the factor structure of the BIIS-2 scale should be further assessed using samples that consist of diverse groups of bicultural individuals. Both the first and second studies in the thesis used a new short form measure of cultural intelligence (SFCQ) which was recently developed by Thomas et al (2015). In both studies the Cronbach’s Alpha scores for the scale were high (.87 and .85 respectively) and confirmatory factor analysis confirmed the factor structure of the scale. These results support the suitability of the measure to assess cultural intelligence amongst diverse groups of individuals. To the knowledge of the researcher, other than the initial group of studies in which the measure was developed and validated, the studies presented in this thesis are the first to use the measure and validate its factor structure.

Finally, the research presented in this thesis has also made a context related contribution to biculturalism research. Much of the extant biculturalism literature has been based on research conducted on bicultural individuals with North American and Asian cultural background. There has also been a focus on Latin Americans. Very little research however has focused on bicultural
individuals in Europe (See Schindler et al., 2016 for an exception). The first study in this thesis is the only study in the biculturalism literature to examine biculturalism in Ireland. Research by Eurostat (2015), the statistical office of the European Union, found that Ireland has the sixth highest proportion of foreign nationals in Europe. Specifically, the agency reported that 11.8% of the Irish population hail from abroad. This indicates that almost one in eight people living in Ireland come from other countries (McGarry, 2015). As Ireland becomes more culturally diverse, the study of bicultural individuals becomes increasingly relevant. Further, with over one thousand multinational companies based in Ireland, seven hundred of which originate from the U.S. alone (McDonald, 2015), the study of the impact of bicultural individuals within multinational companies, is becoming more relevant in Ireland.

It is evident that, based on the integration of two separate yet complimentary fields of research, this thesis has provided novel insights which significantly contribute to research. In addition to contributing to knowledge in the research streams of international human resource management and biculturalism, the research presented in this thesis also has implications for practice. These implications are discussed in the next section.

8.3 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

This research also has implications for the practice of global mobility and global talent management. As well as identifying a potential pool of globally mobile talent, the thesis uncovers unique characteristics of culturally diverse individuals which can be leveraged by organisations operating across multiple cultural boundaries.
In discussing the future of global mobility practices, global mobility scholars have encouraged organisations to assess the early-career potential of employees for global roles in order to develop a deeper and more effective pool of talent for future international assignments. They advise that organisations should ‘begin far earlier in the pipeline, to select employees who have the predisposition and motivation for global work’ (Caliguri and Bonache, 2016: 137). Results from the first study suggest that bicultural students, who will soon enter the workforce, have both the predisposition, and the motivation for global work. More broadly the results may provide an empirical basis for using biculturalism as a selection criterion for roles that are likely to involve international relocation.

Compared to the generational groups before them, millennials, who are individuals that entered, or will enter the workforce from the year 2000 onwards, are more disposed to working internationally (Brookfield GRS, 2016). Not only are they willing to work internationally, but they also appear to be quite engaged in their jobs while on international assignments. Recent industry research indicates that younger assignees experience higher levels of engagement while on international assignments (Dickman, 2015). Bicultural millennials represent a potential source of talent for future international assignments. Many millennials expect international opportunities (Brookfield GRS, 2016). Millennials often view international assignments as a career development opportunity, embracing the opportunity to travel across borders and gain international experience. In fact, among these young professionals’ international assignments have come to be seen as a rite of passage (PWC, 2010). With millennials soon to be the largest segment of the population in the workforce, companies need
to pay greater attention to seeking out ways to leverage this population’s willingness to work internationally (Brookfield GRS, 2016).

It appears that companies who have greater alignment between their global mobility and talent management agenda are sending more millennials on international assignments than those that do not. Such companies have twice the amount of assignees between the ages of 20 and 29 and 10% less the amount of assignees between the ages of 40 and 49 (Brookfield GRS, 2016).

The first study showed that bicultural students were more willing to undertake international assignments than monocultural students and were also more culturally intelligent than monocultural students. The results suggest that bicultural individuals’ may be suitable candidates for international assignments. These findings are particularly relevant for organisations who select initial job candidates based on their suitability and willingness to work internationally (e.g. McKinsey & Company and Royal Dutch Shell). The findings not only provide a basis upon which organisations can identify globally mobile staff, they also provide a basis for identify potential international managers and global leaders at an early stage in their career, and developing these individuals to function in global positions.

In addition to providing an insight into the characteristics of prospective bicultural talent, the thesis also shines a light on the unique abilities of bicultural employees. The second study in the thesis revealed that bicultural assignees were more culturally intelligent than monocultural assignees and also exhibited greater levels of contextual performance than monocultural assignees. The study also revealed that bicultural individuals with more integrated cultural
identities will perform more effectively while on assignments. It is argued that in order for an organisation to achieve specified goals in different positions, human resource managers should consider the types of human capital resources needed for those positions (Polyhart and Weekley, 2015). Findings from the second study suggest that multinational companies should strategically deploy bicultural employees so that their strengths, such as their cultural intelligence and their ability to perform effectively within their context, are utilized for the fulfilment of organisational goals and objectives.

The studies presented in this thesis may help multinational companies to enhance their selection procedures for international assignments. The findings indicate that multinational companies, particularly those that seek to recruit globally mobile individuals, should consider and possibly assess the cultural intelligence of prospective employees. It is evident that cultural intelligence not only influences the willingness of a person to work internationally, but can also impact their effectiveness while working abroad.

Multinational companies should also consider identifying bicultural and multicultural employees at the beginning of their employment. Knowing which employees identify with, and have internalised more than one culture will allow organisations to more effectively utilize the abilities of such employees. Beyond just identifying culturally diverse employees, companies should consider, and where possible access the extent to which such individuals have integrated their cultural identities. Indeed, the integration of cultural identities can impact outcomes which are relevant within an organisational setting (e.g. creativity, see e.g. Cheng, Sanchez-Burks, and Lee, 2008).
The research presented in this thesis may inform the global mobility and talent management strategies of multinational companies. It appears that bicultural individuals may not only provide a solution to the demand versus willingness challenge faced by many multinational companies, but when deployed strategically, may also provide a means through which companies can achieve specific goals and objectives.

8.4 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Despite the contributions of this thesis to both research and practice there are some limitations in the research which need to be taken into consideration. These limitations include the use of cross-sectional self-report data and a small sample size in the second study.

While cross-sectional self-report data can be quite useful in assessing perceptions (Spectre, 1994), there is a potential for common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Common method bias, also referred to as common method variance, can be a source of measurement error in self-report research. Common method variance is variance that results from the measurement method rather than the constructs that the measure represents (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Although the use of cross-sectional self-report data is often criticized because it can contribute to common method bias, a number of different methods can be used to assess the actual extent of common method bias within a self-report data set. The most widely used method is Harman’s single factor test (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The results of Harman’s single factor test
for the first and second study of this thesis confirmed that common method bias was not an issue in either study.

Being aware of some of the criticisms leveled against cross-sectional self-report data, the researcher did try and prevent the sole use of such data. The second study in the thesis was designed to incorporate multiple source data. Indeed the data collection process involved the attainment of supervisor ratings on assignee’s performance and knowledge transfer. The researcher designed a survey to collect data from the supervisors of assignees that participated in the study. However, the total number of responses received from supervisors was not enough to include in the study. The researcher had intended to analyses the model in the second study using supervisor ratings on the outcome variables. However, the model was based on 150 bicultural assignees and only 60 of their supervisors participated in the study. Although the outcome variables in the model were self-reported, and therefore subjective in nature, an empirical analysis comparing both objective and subjective measures of performance found that self-reported performance data may not necessarily be as biased as might be expected (Wall et al., 2004).

The researcher initially intended to use structural equation modelling to test the model that was proposed in the second study. However, structural equation modelling could not be used because the sample of bicultural international assignees was too small for this analysis. Although 356 international assignees participated in the study, only 155 were bicultural. Path analysis was subsequently used. The path analysis was based on responses from 150 (5 outliers were removed before the analysis) bicultural international assignees. Many researchers have
suggested that a minimum sample size of 200 is required for structural equation modelling (e.g. Kline, 2011; Weston and Gore, 2006). Some researchers have suggested that when considering the minimum sample size for structural equation modelling a researcher should think in terms of the ratio of cases to the number of model parameters that require statistical estimates. It’s suggested that an ideal sample size-to-parameters ratio is 20:1 (Jackson, 2003). The path analysis model consisted of 19 parameters. Based on Jackson’s (2013) recommendation of a 20:1 ratio, a minimum sample size of 380 was required for structural equation modelling. The sample size of 150 fell short of both of the above recommendations.

Future research should test the hypotheses in the first and second study in this thesis using longitudinal data. Furthermore, the model proposed in the second study should be tested using supervisor ratings on the outcome variables (i.e. task performance, contextual performance, and knowledge transfer). The use of longitudinal and multiple source data to examine the research topic may provide a greater understanding of the relationship between biculturalism and global mobility.

Aside from methodological improvements, there are other ways in which future research can improve on the research presented in this thesis. One suggestion for future research is to consider the concept of cultural identity integration in relation to the number of cultures that an individual identifies with and has internalised. Suffice is to say that the psychological processes involved in managing three or more cultural identities may be more complex and dynamic than those related to managing just two cultural identities. Future research should therefore examine the process involved in integrating several cultural identities and compare it
to the process of bicultural identity integration to determine if cultural identity integration differs as the number of cultural identities increases or decreases.

A growing stream of research which is refining our understanding of global mobility and international assignments is self-initiated expatriation (Dorsch, Suutari, and Brewster, 2013; Richardson and Mallon, 2005; Suutari and Brewster, 2000). This stream of research studies individuals who initiate their own international work experience by migrating abroad to take up position that they find for themselves (Howe-Walsh and Schyns, 2010). Given that there are individual and organisational related differences between self-initiated expatriates and company assigned assignees, future research should consider how biculturalism and bicultural identity integration impacts self-initiated expatriation. Future research should ask questions like “are some bicultural individuals more likely to self-initiate international work experiences than others?” As more scholars consider the relevance of biculturalism within organisational settings, the researcher hopes that the recommendations provided above will be acted on.

8.5 CONCLUSION

This thesis had two main aims. Firstly, it aimed to examine how biculturalism might impact a person’s receptiveness to working internationally. Secondly, it sought to examine the impact of biculturalism on an individual’s level of effectiveness while working abroad. More broadly, the thesis set out to explore the impact of cultural identification on global mobility by examining the impact of self-identification as monocultural or bicultural on willingness to undertake international assignments and effectiveness while on assignments.
The thesis presented two studies. The first study focused on the impact of biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism on the willingness of students to work internationally. The second study focused on the impact of biculturalism, compared to monoculturalism on the effectiveness of international assignees while they were on assignments. These studies contribute to an emerging body of literature that considers the benefits of bicultural individuals for multinational companies (e.g. Fitzsimmons 2013; Fitzsimmons et al., 2011; Brannen and Thomas, 2010; Friedman and Liu, 2009). Unlike any previous studies this thesis is the first to compare bicultural and monocultural individuals along several outcome variables, and empirically investigate how biculturalism and bicultural identity integration influence an individual’s willingness to work internationally, and an assignee’s level of effectiveness while on an assignment.

Intuitively, biculturals may seem like suitable candidates for international roles because of their cultural experience and knowledge. The first study provided empirical support for this notion. Bicultural individuals were found to be more willing to undertake international assignments than monocultural individuals and also had higher levels of cultural intelligence. Further, the study indicated that cultural intelligence is positively related to willingness to undertake an international assignment, and mediates the relationship between cultural identification and willingness to undertake an international assignment. Although willingness to work abroad and cultural intelligence alone, may not fully determine a person’s suitability to work internationally, they do, at the very least, point to potential suitability.
The first study made a number of empirical, methodological and contextual contributions to the international assignment and biculturalism literatures. The study provided empirical evidence that bicultural individuals are more receptive to working internationally than monocultural individuals, and are also more culturally intelligent than monocultural individuals. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the BIIS-2 measure of bicultural identity integration requires further assessment using diverse samples of bicultural individuals. Confirmatory factor analysis also validated the factor structure of the newly developed short form measure of cultural intelligence (SFCQ). Finally, the study is one of very few studies which examine biculturalism in a European context, and is the first to examine biculturalism in Ireland.

While the first study pointed to the potential suitability of bicultural individuals for international assignments, the second study considered their level of effectiveness while on assignments. The study revealed that while working internationally, bicultural individuals exhibit higher levels of cultural intelligence, and greater levels of contextual performance than monocultural individuals. However, bicultural and monocultural individuals did not differ in their work-role adjustment or knowledge transfer while on assignments. These findings suggest that bicultural individuals are not necessarily more effective than monocultural individuals across the board when working internationally, but rather are more effective in specific areas. Further, the study revealed that the components of bicultural identity integration can influence a bicultural individual’s level of effectiveness while working abroad.

The second study made theoretical, empirical, and methodological contributions to the international assignment and biculturalism literatures. The study indicated the relevance of the
theory of bicultural identity integration for international assignments by proposing and testing a model of the impact of bicultural identity integration on the effectiveness of bicultural international assignees. Supporting the first study, in a separate sample, the second study also provided empirical evidence that bicultural individuals are more culturally intelligent than monocultural individuals. Further, the study also provided empirical evidence to support previous conceptual claims that cultural intelligence is related to knowledge transfer (e.g. Ismail, 2015). Finally, like the first study, confirmatory factor analysis conducted in the second study also indicated that the BIIS-2 measure requires further assessment, and validated the factor structure of the short form measure of cultural intelligence (SFCQ).

The study of bicultural individuals within multinational organisations has not only become more relevant, but as migration between national boarders has continued to increase, it has become necessary. Many countries are more diverse than they have ever been. As countries have become more multicultural (Van Oudenhoven and Ward, 2013), the landscape of their workforces have become increasingly more diverse. This may represent an opportunity for multinational companies. As is evident in this thesis, culturally diverse individuals, such as biculturals, can contribute to the attainment of an organisation’s global strategy.
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APPENDIX A: INVITATION LETTERS

A1: Invitation Email Sent to College Cultural Society Representatives

Dear (society name),

My name is Michael Isichei. I am a PhD student and part-time communications skills lecturer in the Dublin City University (DCU) Business School. I am contacting your society because it is a cultural society that is likely to have a number of culturally diverse members. I am currently collecting data for a research project that I am involved in. The project closely relates to many of your societies members.

The project is investigating how cultural identity, cultural experiences and cultural knowledge impact work attitudes.

Specifically, the research project focuses on Biculturalism and willingness to work internationally. Biculturalism is the study of individuals who have been exposed to and have internalised two different cultural identities (e.g. an Indian/Nigerian/Japanese etc. cultural identity and an Irish (or any other second) cultural identity).

Managers in multinational companies are often sent from one location to another for the purpose of achieving certain organisational goals and objectives. My research investigates how having more than one cultural identity and the level of integration between those cultural identities influences an individual’s willingness to work internationally. Individuals that identify with only one national culture may also participate in the study.

I would really appreciate it if you could send an email about the survey to your society’s members. I have already typed the email so all you would need to do is copy and paste it. I have sent an email to the following address (society’s official email address). Attached to this email is the message that can be sent to your society’s members.

Please reply to confirm whether your society would like to participate in this research project, which is the first of its kind.

Each person that completes the survey will be entered into a prize draw to win €100.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely,

Michael Isichei.
Dear Members,

Michael Isichei, who is a PhD student and part-time Communication Skills lecturer in the Dublin City University (DCU) Business School, is currently collecting data for a research project. The project is investigating how cultural identity, cultural experiences and cultural knowledge impact work attitudes.

Michael’s research specifically focuses on the impact of biculturalism on a number of different work and career attitudes. Biculturalism is the study of individuals who have been exposed to and have internalised two different cultural identities (e.g. an Indian/Nigerian/Chinese etc. cultural identity and an Irish (or any other second) cultural identity).

The survey will take only 20-25 minutes to complete. Each person that completes the survey will be entered into a prize draw to win €100. See the final page of the survey for more information.

Please find a link to the survey below:

https://qtrial2015az1.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_4Uuu0gaVZyZLhxH

The survey will close on Friday the 20th of March at 6pm.

Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Kind Regards
A3: Invitation Sent to the Participating Multinational Organisation

Examining the impact of Biculturalism and Monoculturalism on International Assignments

What is it?

Professor David Collings and Mr. Michael Isichei, from Dublin City University (DCU), are launching a unique survey measuring the impact of cultural identity on international assignment outcomes and work attitudes. The survey will examine how monoculturalism (the possession of a single cultural identity), biculturalism (the possession of two cultural identities), and the degree of integration between two cultural identities influences an international assignee’s performance while on assignment. The survey will also examine the impact of cultural identity on several work and career attitudes. The survey will attempt to help partner organisations to understand the factors that might positively or negatively impact assignee adjustment and knowledge transfer and to better understand the performance of individuals when they relocate internationally. There is also an option to provide supervisors with the opportunity to input in terms of expatriate performance and other KPIs as part of the survey process. This will facilitate the development of some KPIs which could feed into return on investment analyses.

What you will receive by participating

As a participant in the study your company will receive a confidential report which will include key findings based on responses from the company’s assignees. Themes and trends in the responses of the company’s assignees will be analysed statistically and reported in a clear and concise manner. All data will be aggregated to ensure confidentiality of company information. Under no circumstances will individual assignee information be identified in the report. Data may also be used in aggregated form and made anonymous for academic publication.

Value Added

The report will provide significant insights which may inform your organisation’s future global mobility policies and practices. By examining culturally related characteristics the report should also help the organisation in thinking about the benefits of a culturally diverse workforce and in building a business case for the development of such a workforce. Findings from the survey will add substantial value to your company’s global mobility and talent management function by identifying ways in which the company can utilize the unique abilities of diverse members of its workforce. The intent of the survey is to help your organisation align mobility to talent management, and achieve mobility improvements that can add significant value to the company’s mobility program.

Responsibilities of the Commissioning Company

In order to effectively run the survey, the principal investigators request your collaboration to ensure assignee participation. We will work with you to introduce the survey and its process to your assignee population and to encourage participation. In addition, once we’ve launched the survey we may garner your assistance in following-up with assignees to remind them to complete the survey in a timely manner.

Timeline

There is some flexibility on the roll out of the survey, however the survey will be launched in February and we would hope to roll it out in the partner organisations relatively soon thereafter.

For more information, please contact:

| Professor David Collings, Dublin City University | Michael Isichei, Dublin City University |
| david.collings@dcu.ie | michael.isichei@dcu.ie |
Dear Colleague,

We have partnered with a research team at Dublin City University (DCU) to undertake a study of the work attitudes and engagement of international assignees. We are interested in exploring how your intercultural experience and the support provided by the company help you in your international role. The survey will also provide you with the opportunity to provide feedback on your experience as an assignee. This will help us to identify ways in which we can improve our global mobility programme.

You will receive an invitation to complete the survey next week.

Thank you in advance for your participation, which is greatly appreciated.

Should you have any queries please contact me or the researchers at Dublin City University, whose contact details can be found below.

Email Addresses: david.collings@dcu.ie/michael.isichei@dcu.ie

Phone Numbers: +35317006937/+35317005970

Yours Sincerely,

{Signed by the companies Head of Global Mobility}
Dear Colleague,

Further to the email that you last received, we have partnered with a research team at Dublin City University (DCU) to undertake a study of the work attitudes and engagement of international assignees. We are interested in exploring how your intercultural experience and the support provided by the company help you in your international role. The survey will also provide you with the opportunity to provide feedback on your experience as an assignee. This will help us to identify ways in which we can improve our global mobility programme.

As part of this survey we will also seek feedback from your supervisor on aspects of your international role. Neither the company nor your supervisor will ever see your responses, and you will not see the responses of your supervisor. The research team will collate this data and maintain strict confidentiality and anonymity protocols.

Please find a link to the survey below.

Survey Link: https://dcubusinessschool.eu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_8JizBOCzYUAVVeB

Thank you for your participation.

Yours sincerely,

{Signed by the companies Head of Global Mobility}
Dear Colleague,

You have received this email because the employee, [employee’s name], who reports to you has recently completed the Cultural Identity and Work Attitudes Survey. We are interested in exploring how the intercultural experience of international assignees and the support provided by the company helps them in their international role.

As part of this survey we are seeking feedback from supervisors on aspects of the assignee’s international role. Hence we would like your input on the above employee. Neither your company nor the employees that report to you will ever see your responses, and you will not see theirs. The research team will collate this data and maintain strict confidentiality and anonymity protocols. The form will take no more than five minutes to complete.

The survey will add substantial value to the company’s global mobility and talent management programme by identifying ways in which the company can utilize the unique abilities of diverse members of its workforce. The intent of the survey is to help the company to better understand its international assignee population and identify ways to improve its global mobility program.

Your assistance is required to ensure that the survey meets its objective. Please complete the survey process by filling out the very brief supervisor feedback form at the link below. The form will take no more than five minutes to complete.

Feedback form link: https://dcubusinessschool.eu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_bgtR0I17iNtDbA9

Thank you for your participation.

Yours sincerely,

{Signed by the companies Head of Global Mobility}
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRES FOR STUDY 1 & 2

B1: Questionnaire for Study 1
Dear Participant,

Welcome to this survey which is about your cultural experiences, knowledge, identity, and work attitudes. This survey is being conducted by Professor David Collings and Mr Michael Isichei, at Dublin City University (DCU).

Confidentiality:

This is a strictly confidential survey. Your participation is entirely voluntary but much appreciated. A report of the overall findings will be available upon request once the study is completed. Under no circumstances will your individual responses be made available to anyone other than the individuals conducting this research nor will you be identified in any way.

Instructions:

This survey should take about 20-25 minutes to complete. Please tick the box that most closely corresponds to your opinion on an issue or write in your answer where indicated.

Thank you in advance for your participation. If you have any queries regarding the study please do not hesitate to contact the principal investigators using the email addresses or phone numbers provided below.

Email Addresses: david.collings@dcu.ie/ michael.isichei@dcu.ie

Phone Numbers: +35317006937/+35317005970

If you have concerns about this study and wish to contact an independent person, please contact:

The Secretary, Dublin City University Research Ethics Committee, c/o Research and Innovation Support, Dublin City University, Dublin 9. Tel 01-7008000

Each person that completes this survey will be entered into a prize draw to win €100. Please see the last page for more information.

Yours faithfully,

Professor David Collings & Mr Michael Isichei
1. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

2. How old are you? ___________

3. What is the name of the college that you currently attend? ______________________________

4. What degree programme are you currently enrolled in?
   - Bachelor’s degree
   - Master’s degree (If you selected this option skip question 5 and continue from question 6)
   - PhD (If you selected this option skip question 5 and continue from question 6)
   - Other (Please specify) __________________

5. If you are currently enrolled in Bachelor’s degree programme please specify what year you are currently in.
   - 1st
   - 2nd
   - 3rd
   - 4th
   - 5th (Applicable to engineering and medical students)
   - 6th (Applicable to medical students)

6. What is the name of your current academic course? ______________________________

7. Are you currently employed on a part-time basis (less than 36 hours per week)?
   - Yes
   - No

8. How much work experience do you have?
   - None
   - Less than 1 month
   - 1-12 months
   - 1-2 years
   - 3+ years

9. Please indicate your marital status
   - Single
   - Married
   - Separated
   - Divorced
   - Engaged
   - Civil Partnership

10. Do you have any children?
    - Yes
    - No (If you selected ‘No’ skip question 11 and 12 and continue from question 13)

11. How many children do you have?
    - 1
    - 2
    - 3
    - 4+

12. How old is your youngest child?
    - 0-4
    - 5-11
    - 12-19
    - 20-24
    - 24+

13. Do you have any dependents? (I.e. individuals for whom you are responsible, excluding biological or adopted children. For example, young or elderly relatives).
    - Yes
    - No

14. What is the longest period of time you have spent in another country?
    - Less than a month
    - 1-6 months
    - 7-12 months
    - 1+ year
    - I haven’t spent any time in another country

15. How many countries have you lived in for more than one year?
a. 1 □  b. 2 □  c. 3 □  d. 4+ □ 

16. What is your nationality? (Insert name of nationality) __________________

17. Have you ever lived outside of the country that you were born in?
   □ Yes  □ No

18. How long have you lived in Ireland for?
   a. Since Birth □ (If you selected this option skip question 19 and continue from question 20)
   b. 1-3 years □  c. 4-7 years □  d. 8-10 years □  e. 10+ □

19. What age were you when you moved to Ireland?
   a. 0-4 years old □  b. 5-11 □  c. 12-19 □  d. 20-24 □  e. 25+ □

Please Read:
A person that identifies with a country and its national culture may feel that they are in some way connected to that country and its people. They may have a sense of attachment or belonging to the country and possess a strong understanding of the cultural norms, values and beliefs that exist in the country. A person that identifies with more than one country and national culture may feel this way about two or more different countries and national cultures. For example, people that have migrated from one country to another (e.g. immigrants, ethnic minorities, international students etc.) and people from a family with a mixed cultural background may identify with their culture of origin or heritage and the culture of the country in which they currently reside.

20. Do you identify with Ireland and Irish culture?
   □ Yes (If you selected ‘Yes’ skip question 21 and 22 and continue from question 23) □ No

21. Do you identify with more than one national culture?
   □ Yes  □ No (If you selected ‘No’ skip question 22 to 24 and section 2 and continue from section 3)

22. If you answered yes to the above question please list your culture of origin or heritage and the second national culture that you identify with (e.g. Nigerian and British, British and Canadian etc.)

   NOTE:
   • Your culture of origin or heritage refers to the culture of the country that you were born in or the culture of the country that your family are originally from.
   • If you identify with several national cultures please list your culture of origin or heritage and a second national culture that you identify most strongly with.

   a. National culture of origin or heritage (please insert the relevant national culture e.g. ‘Nigerian’):___________________________

   b. Second national culture that you identify with (Please insert relevant national culture e.g. ‘British’):_________________________

23. Do you identify with a second country and the culture of that country?
   □ Yes  □ No (If you selected ‘No’ skip question 25 and section 2 and continue from section 3)
24. Please specify the name of the second country that you identify with (If you are not originally from Ireland this may be your country of origin or heritage – see note below): _______________________ (e.g. Nigeria, India, China etc.)

**NOTE:** Your country of origin or heritage refers to the country that you were born in or the country that your family are originally from.

**IMPORTANT:** The next section (section 2) should be completed by individuals that are not originally from Ireland and individuals that identify with more than one national culture.

---

## Section 2  Your Bicultural Identity Integration

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (Please tick *one box only* for each of the following items)

**Instructions:** As an immigrant/ethnic minority/international student/individual that identifies with more than one national culture living in Ireland, you have been exposed to at least **TWO** cultures: your own culture of origin or heritage (for example, *Nigerian, American, Chinese, Indian, Polish, British etc.*.) and the mainstream, dominant *Irish* culture. Thus, you could be described as a **bicultural individual**.

The experience of having and managing two cultures (or more) is different for everybody, and we are interested in **YOUR OWN PARTICULAR EXPERIENCE**.

Please use the scale below to rate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements by ticking the appropriate box. Please rate all statements, even if they seem redundant to you. Try to avoid using “Not sure” if possible.

**Important:** Before you begin responding to the items below, please take a moment to fill in all of the blank spaces with the culture of the country that you specified in question 24 (or 22a) of the previous section. You must complete all of these blank spaces before responding to the items.

If you identify with two different cultures but do not identify with Irish culture please cross out the word ‘Irish’ and replace it with the second national culture that you specified in question 22b of the previous section.

On a scale of 1 to 5 please state how much each of the following statements describe YOUR experience as a bicultural individual in general?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to harmonise ______ and Irish cultures.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rarely feel conflicted about being bicultural.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to balance both ______ and Irish cultures.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel trapped between the ________ and Irish cultures.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that _______ and Irish cultures are complementary</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel torn between ________ and Irish cultures.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- I feel that _______ and Irish cultural orientations are incompatible.
- Being bicultural means having two cultural forces pulling on me at the same time.
- I feel conflicted between the _______ and Irish ways of doing things.
- I feel like someone moving between two cultures.
- I feel caught between the _______ and Irish cultures.
- I cannot ignore the _______ or Irish side of me.
- I feel _______ and Irish at the same time.
- I relate better to a combined _______ - Irish culture than to _______ or Irish culture alone.
- I feel _______ - Irish.
- I feel part of a combined culture that is a mixture of _______ and Irish.
- I find it difficult to combine _______ and Irish cultures.
- I do not blend my _______ and Irish cultures.
- I feel just like a(n) _______ who lives in Ireland (that is, I do not feel "X-Irish").
- I keep _______ and Irish cultures separate in my life (that is, I don’t mix them).

---

### Section 3: Your Willingness to Work Internationally

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (Please tick *one box only* for each of the following items)

**Instructions:** An international assignment involves the temporary relocation of an employee by their organisation to another country. International assignees (also known as expatriates) are often sent abroad for the purpose of completing specific tasks and accomplishing organisational goals

On a scale of 1 to 5 please state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to have a job that requires a lot of travelling to foreign countries.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to live and work in a foreign country.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would use an international assignment as a means to further my career.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would only accept an international assignment if it was forced upon me.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I consider myself to be capable for an international career. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

**SECTION 4  Your Cultural Knowledge**

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (Please tick *one box only* for each of the following items)

**Instructions:** Below are 10 statements about one's experience when interacting with people from other cultures. On a scale of 1 to 5 please indicate to what extent each of the following statements describes you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A Lot</th>
<th>Extremely Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know the ways in which cultures around the world are different.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can give examples of cultural differences from my personal experience, reading, and so on.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy talking with people from different cultures.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the ability to accurately understand the feelings of people from other cultures.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes try to understand people from another culture by imagining how something looks from their perspective.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can change my behavior to suit different cultural situations and people.</td>
<td>☇</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept delays without becoming upset when in different cultural situations and with culturally different people.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with someone from another culture.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a lot about the influence that culture has on my behavior and that of others who are culturally different.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware that I need to plan my course of action when in different cultural situations and with culturally different people.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 5  Your Career Views**

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (Please tick *one box only* for each of the following items)

**Instructions:** With a future career in mind please indicate the extent, to which the following statements are true for you, on a scale of 1 to 5.
- If development opportunities are not offered by my employer, I will seek them out on my own.
- I am responsible for my success or failure in my career.
- Overall, I have a very independent, self-directed career.
- Freedom to choose my own career path is one of my most important values.
- I am in charge of my own career.
- Ultimately, I depend upon myself to move my career forward.
- Where my career is concerned, I am very much “my own person.”
- In the past I have relied more on myself than others to find a new job when necessary.
- I will navigate my own career, based on my personal priorities, as opposed to my employer’s priorities.
- It doesn’t matter much to me how other people evaluate the choices I make in my career.
- What’s most important to me is how I feel about my career success, not how other people feel about it.
- I’ll follow my own conscience if my employer asks me to do something that goes against my values.
- What I think about what is right in my career is more important to me than what my employer thinks.
- In the past I have sided with my own values when others have asked me to do something I don’t agree with.

Instructions: The following nine statements are about how you feel regarding your studies. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your studies. If you have never had this feeling, select “0” (zero). If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it on a scale of 1 to 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If development opportunities are not offered by my employer, I will seek them out on my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for my success or failure in my career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I have a very independent, self-directed career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to choose my own career path is one of my most important values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in charge of my own career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimately, I depend upon myself to move my career forward.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where my career is concerned, I am very much “my own person.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past I have relied more on myself than others to find a new job when necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will navigate my own career, based on my personal priorities, as opposed to my employer’s priorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It doesn’t matter much to me how other people evaluate the choices I make in my career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s most important to me is how I feel about my career success, not how other people feel about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ll follow my own conscience if my employer asks me to do something that goes against my values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I think about what is right in my career is more important to me than what my employer thinks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past I have sided with my own values when others have asked me to do something I don’t agree with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 7  Your Career Development

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (Please tick *one box only* for each of the following items)

**Instructions:** Different people use different strength to build their careers. No one is good at everything; each of us emphasizes some strengths more than others. On a scale of 1 to 5 please rate how strongly you have developed each of the following abilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Not Strong (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Strong (2)</th>
<th>Strong (3)</th>
<th>Very Strong (4)</th>
<th>Strongest (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about what my future will be like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realizing that today’s choices shape my future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming aware of the educational and vocational choices that I must make.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning how to achieve my goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about my career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping upbeat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making decisions by myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking responsibility for my actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sticking up for my beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Counting on myself.
- Doing what’s right for me.
- Exploring my surroundings.
- Looking for opportunities to grow as a person.
- Investigating options before making a choice.
- Observing different ways of doing things.
- Probing deeply into questions I have.
- Becoming curious about new opportunities.
- Performing tasks efficiently.
- Taking care to do things well.
- Learning new skills.
- Working up to my ability.
- Overcoming obstacles.
- Solving problems.

SECTION 8  Your Language Proficiency

Instructions: Please state the extent to which you are fluent in English and a second language (e.g. your ethnic language, if you are originally from a country where a language other than English is spoken) in both speaking and listening on a scale of 1 to 5.

Note: If you do not speak or understand a language other than English please select 1 (no understanding) for the ‘second language’ option.

- English.
- Second language (Please specify the name of a second language that you speak): ________________________.

SECTION 9  Your Self-Efficacy

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (Please tick *one box only* for each of the following items)
**Instructions:** On a scale of 1 to 5 please state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When facing difficult tasks, I am certain that I will accomplish them.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I can succeed at almost any endeavour to which I set my mind.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident that I can perform effectively on many different tasks.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You have reached the end of the survey. Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire!

If you have any further comments, please use the space below:

---

*B2: International Assignee Questionnaire for Study 2*
Introduction

Cultural Identity and Work Attitudes Survey 2015

Dear Participant,

Welcome to this survey which is about your cultural experiences, knowledge, identity, and work attitudes. This survey is being conducted by Professor David Collings and Mr Michael Isichei, at Dublin City University (DCU).

Confidentiality:

This is a strictly confidential survey. Your participation is entirely voluntary but much appreciated. A report of the overall anonymised findings will be provided to Danone. However, under no circumstances will your individual responses be made available to anyone other than Professor Collings or Mr Isichei nor will you be identified in any way.

Instructions:

This survey should take about 15-20 minutes to complete. Please tick the box that most closely corresponds to your opinion on an issue or fill in your answer when indicated.
Thank you in advance for your participation. If you have any queries regarding the study please do not hesitate to contact the principal investigators using the email addresses or phone numbers provided below.

**Email Addresses**: david.collings@dcu.ie/michael.isichei2@mail.dcu.ie

**Phone Numbers**: +35317006937/+35317005970

If you have concerns about this study and wish to contact an independent person, please contact:
The Secretary, Dublin City University Research Ethics Committee, c/o Research and Innovation Support, Dublin City University, Dublin 9. Tel 01-7008000

Yours faithfully,
Professor David Collings & Mr Michael Isichei.

**Section 1**

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

How old are you?

**Note**: Please insert numerical value

What position are you working in?
Full time employee
Head of Department
Specialist
Managing Director

Project Manager
Manager
Other (Please specify below)

How much work experience do you have (including your present and previous jobs)?

Less than 1 year
1-3 years
4-6 years
7-9 years
10+ Years

How many previous international assignments have you been on?

Note: An international assignment, involves the temporary relocation of an employee by Danone to another country to complete specific tasks and accomplish organisational goals.

1
2
3
4
5+

What country is your current international assignment in (Please specify in the space below)?

Note: This refers to the country that you have been posted to.

How long have you been on your present international assignment for?

Less than a year
3-4 years
What is the highest academic qualification you have attained to date?

- Primary level education
- Secondary level education
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctorate degree
- Other (Please specify below)

Please indicate your marital status

- Single
- Divorced
- Married
- Engaged
- Separated
- Civil Partnership

How many children do you have?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4+

How old is your youngest child?

- 0-4
- 5-11
- 12-19
- 20-24
- 24+

Do you have any dependents? (I.e. individuals for whom you are responsible, excluding biological or adopted children. For example, young or elderly relatives.)

- Yes
- No

What is the longest period of time you have spent in another country?
Less than a month 1-2 years
1-6 months 3-4 years
7-12 months 5+ years

How many countries have you lived in for more than one year?
0
1 3
2 4+

What is your nationality? (Insert name of nationality below)

Please Read:

A person that identifies with a country and its national culture may feel that they are in some way connected to that country and its people. They may have a sense of attachment or belonging to the country and possess a strong understanding of the cultural norms, values and beliefs that exist in the country. A person that identifies with more than one country and national culture may feel this way about two or more different countries and national cultures. For example, people that have migrated from one country to another (e.g. immigrants, ethnic minorities, international students etc.) and people from a family with a mixed cultural background may identify with their culture of origin or heritage and the culture of another country in which they have resided for a significant period of time.

Do you identify with more than one national culture?

Yes
No

Please list your culture of origin or heritage and the second national culture that you identify with (e.g. Nigerian and British, British and Canadian etc.).
NOTE:

Your culture of origin or heritage refers to the culture of the country that you were born in or the culture of the country that your family are originally from.

If you identify with several national cultures please list your culture of origin or heritage and a second national culture that you identify most strongly with.

National culture of origin or heritage (please insert the relevant national culture)
Second national culture that you identify with
(Please insert relevant national culture)

How long have you been exposed to ${q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1} culture for?

Note: Here, the term 'exposed' relates to either living within the culture or regularly engaging with the culture (for example, speaking the language, regularly interacting with others from the culture such as friends and family, and watching, reading and listening to media related to the culture).

| Since birth | 5-6 years |
| Less than a year | 7-8 years |
| 1-2 years | 9-10 years |
| 3-4 years | 11+ years |

How long have you been exposed to ${q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2} culture for?

Note: Here, the term 'exposed' relates to either living within the culture or regularly engaging with the culture (for example, speaking the language, regularly interacting with others from the culture such as friends and family, and watching, reading and listening to media related to the culture).
Since birth.  5-6 years
Less than a year  7-8 years
1-2 years.  9-10 years
3-4 years  11+ years

Section 2: Your Bi-cultural Identity Integration

Instructions: As an immigrant/ethnic minority/individual that identifies with more than one national culture, you have been exposed to at least TWO cultures: your own culture of origin or heritage (for example, Nigerian, American, Chinese, Indian, Polish, British etc.) and a second national culture. Thus, you could be described as a bi-cultural individual.

The experience of having and managing two cultures (or more) is different for everybody, and we are interested in YOUR OWN PARTICULAR EXPERIENCE.

Please use the scale below to rate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements by ticking the appropriate box. Please rate all statements, even if they seem redundant to you. Try to avoid using “Not sure” if possible.

On a scale of 1 to 5 please state how much each of the following statements describe YOUR experience as a bi-cultural individual in general?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree 2</th>
<th>Not sure 3</th>
<th>Agree 4</th>
<th>Strongly agree 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to harmonise $\textit{culture}$ and $\textit{culture}$</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rarely feel conflicted about being bi-cultural.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to balance both $\textit{culture}$ and $\textit{culture}$.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I do not feel trapped between the
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1\}$
and
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2\}$
cultures.

I feel that
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1\}$
and
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2\}$
cultures are complementary

I feel torn between
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1\}$
and
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2\}$
cultures.

I feel that
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1\}$
and
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2\}$
cultural orientations are incompatible.

Being bi-cultural means having two
cultural forces pulling on me at the
same time.

I feel conflicted between the
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1\}$
and
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2\}$
ways of doing things.

I feel like someone moving between
two cultures.

I feel caught between the
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1\}$
and
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2\}$
cultures.

I cannot ignore the
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1\}$
or
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2\}$
side of me.

I feel
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1\}$
and
$\{q://QID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2\}$
at the same time.

I relate better to a combined

I feel

$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1$

$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2$

culture than to
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1$
or
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2$
culture alone.

I feel

$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1$

$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2$

difficult to combine
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1$
and
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2$
cultures.

I do not blend my
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1$
and
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2$
cultures.

I feel just like a(n)
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1$
who lives in
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2$
country name e.g. America (that is, I
do not feel
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1$
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2$
).”

I keep
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/1$
and
$cq/qID25/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2$
cultures separate in my life (that is, I
don’t mix them).

Section 3: Your Cultural Knowledge
**Instructions:** Below are 10 statements about one's experience when interacting with people from other cultures. On a scale of 1 to 5 please indicate to what extent each of the following statements describes you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Extremely well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know the ways in which cultures around the world are different.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can give examples of cultural differences from my personal experience, reading, and so on.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy talking with people from different cultures.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the ability to accurately understand the feelings of people from other cultures.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes try to understand people from another culture by imagining how something looks from their perspective.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can change my behavior to suit different cultural situations and people.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept delays without becoming upset when in different cultural situations and with culturally different people.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am aware of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with someone from another culture.

I think a lot about the influence that culture has on my behavior and that of others who are culturally different.

I am aware that I need to plan my course of action when in different cultural situations and with culturally different people.

**Section 4: Your Career Views**

**Instructions:** On a scale of 1 to 5 please indicate the extent to which the following statements are true for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To little or no extent (1)</th>
<th>To a limited extent (2)</th>
<th>To some extent (3)</th>
<th>To a considerable extent (4)</th>
<th>To a great extent (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I seek job assignments that allow me to learn something new.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would enjoy working on projects with people across many organisations.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy job assignments that require me to work outside of the organisation.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I like tasks at work that require me to work beyond my own department.

I enjoy working with people outside of my organisation.

I enjoy jobs that require me to interact with people in many different organisations.

I have sought opportunities in the past that allow me to work outside the organisation.

I am energized in new experiences and situations.

I like the predictability that comes with working continuously for the same organisation.

I would feel very lost if I couldn't work for my current organisation.

I prefer to stay in a company I am familiar with rather than look for employment elsewhere.

If my organisation provided lifetime employment, I would never desire to seek work in other organisations.

If my ideal career, I would work for only one organisation.
Section 5: Your Engagement

**Instructions:** The following nine statements are about how you feel regarding your work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your work. If you have never had this feeling, select "0" (zero). If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it on a scale of 1 to 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sometimes/ A few times a month</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely/ Once a month</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Almost Never/ A few times a year or less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often/ A few times a week</td>
<td>Very Often/ A few times a week</td>
<td>Always/ Everyday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work, I am bursting with energy.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am enthusiastic about my job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job inspires me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of the work I do.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am immersed in my work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel happy when I am working intensely.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get carried away when I'm working.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Creative Role Identity

**Instructions:** On a scale of 1 to 5 please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statement:
I often think about being creative.

I do not have any clear concept of myself as a creative employee.

To be a creative employee is an important part of my identity.

Section 6: Global Business Orientation

Instructions: On a scale of 1 to 5 please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statement:

It is important for our company to internationalize rapidly.

Internationalization is the only way to achieve our growth objectives.

We will have to internationalize in order to succeed in the future.

The growth we are aiming at can be achieved mainly through internationalization.

Section 7: Your Language Proficiency

Instructions: Please state the extent to which you are fluent in English, a second language (e.g. your ethnic language, if you are originally from a country where a
language other than English is spoken), and the national language of your current assignment location, in both speaking and listening on a scale of 1 to 5.

**Note:** if you do not speak or understand a language other than English please select 1 (no understanding) for the ‘second language’ option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No understanding 1</th>
<th>Low fluency 2</th>
<th>Intermediate fluency 3</th>
<th>High fluency 4</th>
<th>Perfect fluency (Like a native) 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second language (Please specify the name of a second language that you speak in the space below)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National language of current assignment location (Please specify the name of the national language of your current assignment location below)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 8: Your Adjustment While on an International Assignment**

**Instructions:** On a scale of 1 to 5 please indicate the extent to which you feel comfortable with each aspect of your global employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very uncomfortable 1</th>
<th>Uncomfortable 2</th>
<th>Neutral 3</th>
<th>Comfortable 4</th>
<th>Very comfortable 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My specific job responsibilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My activities or tasks at work</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: On a scale of 1 to 5 please indicate the extent to which you feel comfortable with each aspect of your family life since you became a global employee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The amount of time I spend with family members</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of time I spend with family members</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My participation in family activities and tasks</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationship with my partner/family</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How we make decisions as a family</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How family members resolve conflict</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 9: Desire to Terminate Assignment
**Instructions:** On a scale of 1 to 5 please state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to terminate this expatriate assignment early.

I hope that I will be asked to return home early.

If this assignment had no impact on my career, I would terminate the assignment now.

I would not have accepted this expatriate assignment if I knew what I was getting myself into.

**Section 10: Knowledge Transfer Between You and Subsidiary Employees**

**Instructions:** On a scale of 1 to 5 please state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

**Note:** *Subsidiary employees* are individuals employed by your organisation in the location you have been sent to on an international assignment.

Here, the term ‘parent company’ relates to the office/facility location of your organisation in which you are employed (e.g. the ‘London’ office).
I am not afraid of losing power and control in order to solve difficulties relating to the transfer of knowledge to subsidiary employees.

I am willing to solve difficulties relating to the transfer of parent company knowledge to subsidiary employees.

I am willing to cope with cultural differences in order to transfer knowledge to subsidiary employees.

I am willing to devote time to solve difficulties relating to the transfer of parent company knowledge to subsidiary employees.

I am willing to make persistent efforts to solve difficulties to transfer parent company knowledge to subsidiary employees.

Section 11: Job Performance

**Instructions:** On a scale of 1 to 5 please rate your job performance in relation to the following items:

Very poor  Poor  Moderate  Good  Very good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting job objectives.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job performance.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting performance standards and expectations.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical competence.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting specific job responsibilities.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with coworkers.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing relationships with key host-country business contacts.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting to the foreign facility's business customs and norms.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with coworkers.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 12: Your Feelings About Your Job**

**Instructions:** On a scale of 1 to 5 please state the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think I will be working for my organisation five years from now.

I am actively looking for a job outside this...
organisation.
As soon as I can find
a better job I will
leave the
organisation.
I am seriously
thinking about
leaving my job.
I often think about
leaving my job with
the organisation.

Note: In addition to your responses to this survey, we will also ask your supervisor
for some input. Their answers will help us understand how your experience and
skills, combined with the support that you receive from Danone, help you to
perform in your international role.

Please be assured of the absolute confidentiality of this process and that any data
that you provide will be maintained under a strict security protocol. Your supervisor
or manager will never see your response nor will you see theirs. The data will not be
made available to Danone either. The only people who will have access to the data
are the research team. They are solely interested in aggregate trends in the data
and never interested in individual responses. The survey is solely interested in
aggregate trends. You will now be asked to enter your supervisor’s email address.
This is so that we can identify your supervisor and ask them to complete their
questionnaire. You will also be asked to enter your own name. This is so we can tell
your supervisor who they are answering the questions about. Again we reinforce
that neither they nor Danone will ever see your responses.

Please insert below, the work email address of the individual that you report
directly to. (i.e. your supervisor).

What is your name?
You have reached the end of the survey. Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

If you have any further comments, please use the space below:

B3: Supervisor Questionnaire for Study 2
Survey and Feedback Form Description

DCU

Cultural Identity and Work Attitudes Survey 2015 - Supervisor Feedback Form

Dear Supervisor,

Welcome to this brief feedback form. The form is part of a wider survey which relates to the cultural experiences, knowledge, identity, and work attitudes of some of the employees that report to you. This survey is being conducted by Professor David Collings and Mr Michael Isichei, at Dublin City University (DCU).

Confidentiality:

This is a strictly confidential survey. Your participation is entirely voluntary but much appreciated. A report of the overall anonymised findings will be provided to your organisation. However, under no circumstances will your individual responses be made available to anyone other than Professor Collings or Mr Isichei nor will you be identified in any way.

Instructions:

This feedback form should take about 5 minutes to complete. Please tick the box
that most closely corresponds to your opinion on an issue or fill in your answer when indicated.

Thank you in advance for your participation. If you have any queries regarding the study please do not hesitate to contact the principal investigators using the email addresses or phone numbers provided below.

**Email Addresses:** david.collings@dcu.ie/michael.isichei2@mail.dcu.ie

**Phone Numbers:** +35317006937/+35317005970

If you have concerns about this study and wish to contact an independent person, please contact:
The Secretary, Dublin City University Research Ethics Committee, c/o Research and Innovation Support, Dublin City University, Dublin 9. Tel 01-7008000

Yours faithfully,
Professor David Collings & Mr Michael Isichei.

---

**Demographic Questions**

What is your staff ID number?

[ ]

Please insert below, the staff ID number of the employee that you are providing feedback on.

[ ]

What is your gender?

Male
How old are you?

What position are you working in?

Head of Department  
Specialist  
Managing Director  
Project Manager  
Manager  
Other (Please specify below)

How long have you been working in this position for?

Less than 1 year  
1-3 years  
4-6 years  
7-9 years  
10+ Years

What country are you currently working in (Please specify in the space below)?

What is the highest academic qualification you have attained to date?

Primary level education  
Secondary level education  
Bachelor's degree  
Master's degree  
Doctorate degree  
Other (Please specify below)

What is your nationality? (Insert name of nationality below)
Employee Creativity

Instructions: On a scale of 1 to 5 please state the extent to which you agree with the following statements relating to the creativity of the employee that you are providing feedback on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tries new ideas or methods first.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks new ideas and ways to solve problems.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generates groundbreaking ideas related to the field.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good role model for creativity.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge Transfer

Instructions: On a scale of 1 to 5 please state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to the knowledge sharing behaviour of the employee that you are providing feedback on.

Note: Subsidiary employees are individuals employed by your organisation in the location that the employee in question has been sent to on an international assignment.

Here, the term ‘parent company’ relates to the office/facility location of your organisation in which you are employed (e.g. the ‘London’ office).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The employee is not afraid of losing power and control in order to solve difficulties relating to the transfer of knowledge to subsidiary employees.

The employee is willing to solve difficulties relating to the transfer of parent company knowledge to subsidiary employees.

The employee is willing to cope with cultural differences in order to transfer knowledge to subsidiary employees.

The employee is willing to devote time to solve difficulties relating to the transfer of parent company knowledge to subsidiary employees.

The employee is willing to make persistent efforts to solve difficulties to transfer parent company knowledge to subsidiary employees.

**Job Performance**
**Instructions:** On a scale of 1 to 5 please rate the job performance of the employee that you are providing feedback on in relation to the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor 1</th>
<th>Poor 2</th>
<th>Moderate 3</th>
<th>Good 4</th>
<th>Very good 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting job objectives.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job performance.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting performance standards and expectations.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical competence.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting specific job responsibilities.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with coworkers.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing relationships with key host-country business contacts.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting to the foreign facility's business customs and norms.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with coworkers.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Matching Previous Supervisor Feedback**

Have you previously completed this feedback form on behalf of another employee?

- Yes
- No
You have reached the end of the feedback form. Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

If you have any further comments, please use the space below:
### APPENDIX C: CORRELATION MATRICES OF THE MAIN VARIABLES IN STUDY 1 & 2

**C1: Correlation Matrix of the Main Variables in Study 1**

#### Table C1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultural Identification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultural Intelligence</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Willingness to Undertake an International Assignment</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05.*
C2: Correlation Matrix of the Main Variables in Study 2

Table C2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultural Identification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BII Harmony</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BII Blendedness</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Intelligence</td>
<td>Work Role Adjustment</td>
<td>Family Role Adjustment</td>
<td>Knowledge Transfer</td>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.256**</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.217**</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.276**</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.133*</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.124*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.178*</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Contextual Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-135*</td>
<td>.206*</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.459**</td>
<td>.190**</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>.418**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05.

a = Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.

C3: Correlation Matrix of the Supervisor Rated Outcome Variables Intended for the Path Model in Study 2

Table C3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisor Rated Knowledge Transfer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Supervisor Rated Task</td>
<td>Supervisor Rated Contextual Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>.561**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.507**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

a = Supervisor data could not be used in the path model due to an insufficient number of responses from the supervisors of bicultural assignees. 150 Bicultural assignees were included in the model but only 60 supervisor provided feedback on their assignees.
APPENDIX D: OUTPUT FROM MEDIATION ANALYSIS

D1: Output from Mediation Analysis Using PROCESS Macro Code for SPSS - Sobel Analysis, 95% Bias-Corrected Confidence Interval, and Preacher and Kelley (2011) Kappa-Squared (k2)

*************** PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.13.2 ***************

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D.       www.afhayes.com

******************************************

Model
Y = Willingness to Undertake an International Assignment
X = Cultural Identification
M = Cultural Intelligence

*************** DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS **************

Direct effect of X on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.1818</td>
<td>.0918</td>
<td>1.9801</td>
<td>.0487</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.3625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect effect of X on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_CQ</td>
<td>.3005</td>
<td>.1995</td>
<td>.4508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normal theory tests for indirect effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.3005</td>
<td>.0554</td>
<td>5.4239</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partially standardized indirect effect of X on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_CQ</td>
<td>.3963</td>
<td>.2677</td>
<td>.5633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completely standardized indirect effect of X on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_CQ</td>
<td>.1979</td>
<td>.1353</td>
<td>.2804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio of indirect to total effect of X on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_CQ</td>
<td>.6230</td>
<td>.3720</td>
<td>.9867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio of indirect to direct effect of X on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_CQ</td>
<td>1.6528</td>
<td>.3151</td>
<td>16.8178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared mediation effect size (R-sq_med)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_CQ</td>
<td>.0901</td>
<td>.0430</td>
<td>.1430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preacher and Kelley (2011) Kappa-squared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_CQ</td>
<td>.1840</td>
<td>.1266</td>
<td>.2615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Normal theory tests for indirect effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.3005</td>
<td>.0554</td>
<td>5.4239</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

************************** ANALYSIS NOTES AND WARNINGS **************************

Number of bootstrap samples for bias corrected bootstrap confidence intervals:

1000

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output:

95.00