

CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING AND SUPPORT PRACTICES OF INTERNATIONAL ASSIGNEES

B. Sebastian Reiche, Yih-teen Lee and Javier Quintanilla

Version August 2013

To be published in The Routledge Companion to International Human Resource Management

Copyright © 2013-2014 Sebastian Reiche, Yih-teen Lee and Javier Quintanilla. All rights reserved.

B. Sebastian Reiche, PhD
IESE Business School
Department of Managing People in Organizations
Ave. Pearson, 21
Barcelona 08034, Spain
Tel: +34 93 602 4491
Fax: +34 93 253 4343
E-mail: sreiche@iese.edu

Cross-Cultural Training and Support Practices of International Assignees

INTRODUCTION

With continued globalization and the removal of barriers between countries, multinational corporations (MNCs) are operating in a growing number of different markets. To staff their various international operations, these companies not only make use of local talent in each respective local market but also deploy talent on a global basis. Over recent years, the group of employees performing their work outside of their home countries has become increasingly fragmented in terms of *assignment direction* (parent country nationals, host country nationals, third country nationals), *assignment length* (traditional long-term assignees, short-term assignees, international business travellers, commuter assignees), *assignment scope* (technical, developmental, strategic, functional) or *locus of assignment initiative* (company-initiated vs. self-initiated assignees) (Caligiuri, 2006; Collings, Scullion, & Morley, 2007; Mayrhofer, Sparrow, & Zimmermann, 2008). However, overall the number of these international assignments has continued to grow, a trend that even the recent financial crisis does not seem to have changed (Brookfield Global Relocation Services, 2012).

What these international relocations have in common is that they are personally demanding because they require the assignee not only to perform new job requirements but also adjust to a new cultural and linguistic environment, learn to effectively interact with cultural others, deal with conflict and competing interests between different units of the MNC, or cope with changes to family life (Harvey & Novicevic, 2004; Johnson, Lenartowicz, & Apud, 2006; Lazarova, Westman, Shaffer, 2010; Takeuchi, 2010). As a result, researchers and global mobility professionals alike have long examined how organizations can alleviate these challenges. In

general, the international assignment process can be considered to entail three distinct phases: pre-assignment, actual assignment and post-assignment (Reiche & Harzing, 2010). While the majority of literature has focused on the design and impact of cross-cultural training that is commonly provided either before or during the relocation (Mendenhall & Stahl, 2000; Morris & Robie, 2001; Tung, 1981), there is a host of other organizational support practices provided alongside the entire assignment process that have been shown to positively affect different dimensions of assignment success (Kraimer, Wayne, & Jaworski, 2001; Reiche, 2012; Takeuchi, Wang, Marinova, & Yao, 2009).

In the remainder of this chapter, we will first examine in greater depth the importance of cross-cultural training and other support practices for international assignees and discuss the main theoretical lenses through which such organizational support has been studied. Second, we will focus on cross-cultural training as a key facet of organizational support and review the different forms of cross-cultural training in terms of (1) training content, i.e. the cognitions, motivations, behaviours and skills to be developed, (2) the recipient of training activities, (3) the training methods, and (4) temporal aspects of the training. In a third step, we will discuss additional organizational support practices that have been shown to facilitate the assignment experience and increase assignees' cross-national effectiveness. Finally, we will identify limitations in the existing literature on cross-cultural training and organizational support, and provide recommendations for future research.

THE RELEVANCE OF INTERNATIONAL ASSIGNMENT SUPPORT

While claims of high rates of expatriate premature return appear to be largely misplaced (Harzing, 1995; Reiche, Kraimer, & Harzing, 2011) it has been common to view assignment success as a multi-faceted construct that comprises aspects of both the actual assignment and the post-

assignment phase (Yan, Zhu, & Hall, 2002). Specifically, scholars have examined assignment success not only in terms of job performance (e.g., Takeuchi et al., 2009) but also adjustment (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005), learning and knowledge transfer (Hocking, Brown, & Harzing, 2007) or career progress and retention (Kraimer, Shaffer, & Bolino, 2009). From that perspective, organizational support can be viewed as any instrument that is within the control of the organization and is aimed at increasing the probability that the assignee achieves each respective success dimension. Concerning cross-cultural training more specifically, scholars have identified three main objectives (Caligiuri, Phillips, Lazarova, Tarique, & Bürgi, 2001) that comprise (1) enabling assignees to determine appropriate cultural behaviours and suitable ways of performing specific tasks in the host country, (2) helping assignees to deal with unforeseen events in the new culture and reduce conflict due to unexpected situations and actions, and (3) creating realistic expectations for assignees with regard to living and working in the host location.

The role of organizational support for international assignees has been studied through various theoretical lenses. A prominent strand in the literature has adopted organizational support theory (e.g., Guzzo, Noonan, & Elron, 1994; Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Takeuchi et al., 2009) which is grounded in a social exchange perspective. Specifically, social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) holds that human relationships, which are not governed by explicit contractual obligations, are developed based on a subjective cost-benefit analysis and a comparison with alternative relationships. If an individual perceives the benefits of a relationship to outweigh its perceived costs, the individual will initiate and maintain it. In the context of employee-organization exchanges such as the relationship between an international assignee and the MNC, perceived organizational support, which concerns employees' general beliefs about the extent to which their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986), serves as an important benefit for the assignee. Organizational

support theory suggests that employees will reciprocate this support with increased loyalty and performance (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Yan et al., 2002). The international assignment literature has indeed found evidence that assignees' perceived organizational support positively relates to their adjustment and performance (Kraimer et al., 2001; Takeuchi et al., 2009), commitment (Guzzo et al., 1994), intentions to stay (Van der Heijden, van Engen, & Paauwe, 2009) and knowledge sharing (Reiche, 2012).

In addition, while thorough theoretical development is largely missing in the literature (Littrell, Salas, Hess, Paley, & Riedel, 2006) various theoretical perspectives have been adopted to examine the usefulness and impact of cross-cultural training. In an early attempt to theorize about why cross-cultural training is effective in achieving the earlier mentioned aims, Black and Mendenhall (1990) draw on social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) to conceptualize how cross-cultural training can increase both assignees' confidence in themselves and their ability to act effectively in a cross-cultural environment, as well as their level of accuracy of perceptions towards the target culture, with beneficial consequences for both adjustment and performance. A few other studies build on anxiety and uncertainty management theory to conceptualize how cross-cultural training can help assignees reduce the uncertainty and anxiety implicit to interactions with cultural others (Gudykunst, 1998). For example, Brandl and Neyer (2009) argue that uncertainty is a cognitive phenomenon and therefore call for training activities that facilitate cognitive adjustment by providing assignees' with attitudinal flexibility and the necessary resources for structuring unknown situations.

A third strand of research uses different theories to examine how cross-cultural training helps to achieve more specific training-related objectives. For example, Caligiuri et al. (2001) draw on the theory of met expectations to investigate conditions under which training activities help create realistic expectations for assignees (see also Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991).

Further, building on the cultural perspective various scholars have highlighted the role that differences in cultural values play for the relative importance as well as design and content of cross-cultural training (Harvey & Miceli, 1999; Yamazaki, 2005). Finally, research has examined the conditions under which assignees are more likely to benefit from cross-cultural training. For example, a study of 166 European managers compared the role of personality factors with other predictors of cross-cultural training performance and found that adaptability, teamwork and communication as measured by an assessment centre exercise provided incremental validity over and above personality and cognitive ability (Lievens, Harris, Van Keer, & Bisqueret, 2003).

Research has generally also supported the theoretical expectation that cross-cultural training facilitates the assignment experience. Several meta-analyses have shown that cross-cultural training is positively related to cross-cultural skill development, adjustment and performance (e.g., Deshpande & Viswesvaran, 1992; Morris & Robie, 2001). There is also evidence that this positive effect holds across assignees from different countries of origin (Waxin & Panaccio, 2005). However, not all findings have been equally supportive of the effectiveness of cross-cultural training. For example, a study drawing on a sample of 300 German expatriates failed to demonstrate a significant positive relationship between pre-departure cross-cultural training and cross-cultural adjustment (Puck, Kittler & Wright, 2008). Similarly, Tarique and Caligiuri (2009) showed that while post-arrival training improved cultural knowledge it was less effective in enhancing adjustment of expatriates.

Further, there is evidence that MNCs increasingly acknowledge the general usefulness of training programs. For example, recent industry survey data suggest that 81 per cent of the responding companies offer some kind of formal cross-cultural preparation for international assignees, with 85 per cent of respondents rating the training provided as having good or great value for facilitating assignment success (Brookfield Global Relocation Services, 2012). At the

same time, it is also true that in many organizations cross-cultural training programs are optional only and are more likely to be offered to parent country expatriates than other types of assignees (Harvey & Miceli, 1999). Research even suggests that a gap remains between individual training needs and the actual training offered by MNCs (Harris & Brewster, 1999), with the provision of language courses and general information on the host-country context often serving as the only instruments. All too often assignees are expected to take responsibility for their own training and preparation. Taken together, this suggests that a substantial group of assignees continue to relocate without formal training. While the importance of organizational support in general is undeniable, the mixed results regarding the scope and impact of cross-cultural training in particular point to the need to disentangle what we have thus far referred to as cross-cultural training and examine existing programs in greater depth.

FORMS OF CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING

Cross-cultural training has generally been defined as an intervention designed to enhance the knowledge, skills and competences of international assignees to help them operate effectively in an unfamiliar host environment (Harris & Brewster, 1999; Kealey & Protheroe, 1996). However, to achieve these aims a myriad of different training programs have been devised. In this section, we will differentiate cross-cultural training in terms of *what* these programs intend to develop, *who* are the typical recipients of the measures, *how* the training is conducted, and *when* it is delivered. It is important to note that there is no one-size-fits-all program. Instead, the design, structure, content and focus of cross-cultural training programs depend on factors such as the individual's cultural background, culture-specific features of the host-country environment, the individual's degree of contact with the host environment, the assignment length, the individual's

family situation, and the individual's language skills (e.g., Harris & Brewster, 1999; Harvey & Miceli, 1999; Tung, 1981).

Training Content and Skill Sets

The content of cross-cultural training can be culture-specific or culture-general. While culture-specific training covers issues useful for individuals to perform well in specific countries, culture-general training aims for offering a range of skills that are applicable to a wider variety of cultural contexts. In fact, the intended objectives of cross-cultural training involve enhancing individuals' cross-cultural effectiveness in the following aspects: good personal adjustment, good interpersonal relationships with people of different cultural backgrounds, and effective completion of task-related goals (Thomas & Fitzsimmons, 2008). To obtain such results, the content of training programs generally needs to go beyond the provision of information on a specific country or culture. Since it is beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss all the skills and competencies in detail, we will focus on the following issues and offer a brief review on each of them: factual knowledge and models of national culture, language skills, cross-cultural competencies, global leadership competencies, cultural intelligence, and self-concept and identity-based training.

Factual knowledge and models of national cultures. To start with, training programs may provide trainees with specific knowledge and facts about a specific country or culture (Brislin, MacNab, & Nayani, 2008). Although sometimes superficial, it is critical that trainees have access to these facts in preparing for their actual sojourn. Popularized by Hofstede's seminal work (2001), the frameworks of cultural dimensions are also commonly mentioned in cross-cultural training (e.g., Hall, Trompenaars, Schwartz, GLOBE). They offer trainees a powerful culture-general tool to conceptualize and make sense of possible cultural differences.

Language. Language skills are often an important prerequisite for expatriates to communicate with local people, hence effectively connecting headquarters and subsidiaries (Harzing, Köster, & Magner, 2011). This conversational currency, as described by Brein and David (1971), will facilitate interactions and working with people from different cultural backgrounds (Shaffer, Harrison, & Gilley, 1999). However, the issue of language in cross-cultural training may be more complex than assumed. For example, is it about English or local language proficiency? As the lingua franca in business communications nowadays, English is certainly a must for most expatriates. Research evidence does indicate that English fluency is related to adjustment (e.g., Nicholson & Imaizumi, 1993; Takeuchi, Yun, & Russell, 2002). However, is it sufficient to focus only on English in designing language training? Should the local language be included in the training beyond English? To which extent should we expect people to be fluent in the relevant local languages? How realistic is this? Will such investment pay off for individuals as well as for the company offering such training? As Thomas (1998) suggested, the return for knowing a few words of a foreign language may be very high, but the effort required to achieve substantial additional benefits can be huge. What is the optimal level of local language proficiency taking into account all the related costs and benefits? These questions are to be further clarified to design better language training for expatriates.

Cross-cultural competencies. Another category of training content involves skills and competencies beyond cognitive knowledge, aiming to enhance expatriates' capability in dealing with various challenges in cross-cultural interactions. The list of cross-cultural competencies can be extremely long. Thomas and Fitzsimmons (2008) adopted the framework of Yamazaki and Kayes (2004), which is in turn based on experiential learning theory (Kolb, 1984), and suggested a typology of cross-cultural skills and competencies. These competencies include (1) information skills (e.g., open-mindedness, tolerance of ambiguity, and empathy), (2) interpersonal skills (e.g.,

sociability, and communication skills), (3) action skills (e.g., behavioural flexibility, self-monitoring, and self-regulation), and (4) analytical skills (e.g., mindfulness, attribution ability, and cultural metacognition). Mol, Born, Willemsen, and Van der Molen's (2005) meta-analysis indicates most of the above-mentioned skills are significantly related to expatriates' adjustment or job performance. Moreover, empathy (or intercultural sensitivity) seems to be one of the most robust predictors of effective intercultural interactions, suggesting the importance of being alert and sensitive to the needs and values of cultural others, hence justifying its critical value in cross-cultural training.

Global leadership competencies. As expatriates are often assigned to tasks in which they are expected not only to “interact” and “collaborate” with people in other cultures, but also to exercise the role of leadership, cross-cultural or global leadership becomes increasingly relevant in cross-cultural training. Again, there are long lists of global leadership competencies (see Bird et al., 2010), and many of these competencies overlap with the cross-cultural competencies mentioned above (e.g., self-awareness, inquisitiveness, self-regulation, empathy, and social skills, see Jokinen, 2005). Unique global leadership competencies include engagement in personal transformation, motivation to work in an international environment, and other non-cultural aspects such as accountability, courage, improvisation, pattern recognition, and cognitive complexity (see Bird et al., 2010). While it may not be necessary (nor realistic) to cover all of these competencies in cross-cultural training, these lists offer a good basis to consider which content is most relevant for specific trainees. A related construct to global leadership is the concept of global mindset (Beechler & Javidan, 2007; Gupta & Govindarajan, 2002). Despite the existence of various possible conceptualizations of global mindset (Javidan & Teagarden, 2011; Levy, Beechler, Taylor, & Boyacigiller, 2007), it has also started to draw attention from cross-cultural trainers.

Cultural intelligence. Defined as an individual's capability to function effectively in culturally diverse contexts, cultural intelligence (CQ) is gaining momentum as a useful construct to understand cross-cultural effectiveness in work settings (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Earley & Ang, 2003). Based on Sternberg and Detterman's (1986) framework of multiple intelligence, cultural intelligence integrates four complementary perspectives in conceptualizing an individual's intelligence in cross-cultural settings, including: being consciously aware of and thinking strategically about culture (metacognitive CQ), possessing cultural knowledge about values and norms (cognitive CQ), directing attention and energy toward cross-cultural learning and interaction (motivational CQ), and generating appropriate behaviour when interacting with people who are culturally different (behavioural CQ; see Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Earley & Ang, 2003 for more detailed discussion). As a holistic model toward cross-cultural effectiveness, cultural intelligence offers a theoretical and parsimonious framework to the much fragmented literature in cross-cultural training.

Individuals who have developed cultural intelligence seem to be more culturally effective in terms of performance (e.g., communication effectiveness, task performance, adaptive performance, multicultural team functioning) and cultural adaptation (e.g., subjective well-being, cross-cultural adjustment, see Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Ang, Van Dyne, Koh, Ng, Templer, Tay & Chandrasekar, 2007). Moreover, Ng, Van Dyne, and Ang (2009) suggest that cultural intelligence enables individuals not only to *grasp*, but also to *transform* the international experience, hence facilitates them to go through the four stages of experiential learning described by Kolb (1984: i.e., concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation). Although a culture-general training approach based on cultural intelligence is potentially useful, more empirical research is needed in this area to inform properly the practices of cross-cultural training based on cultural intelligence (Brislin et al., 2008).

Self-concept and cultural identity. One critical yet much less explored aspect in cross-cultural training is helping trainees develop appropriate self-concepts and cultural identities. Identity is important because it regulates people's understanding and motivation regarding who they are and their major goals and objectives (Brown, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1985). As cross-cultural interaction usually involves two or more cultural groups, the experience of in-group vs. out-group categorizations and the resulting sense of identification and belonging can be particularly pertinent in influencing individuals' assessment and attitudes toward cultural others. Berry's model of acculturation (which differentiated individuals' acculturation strategy into assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization; see Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1987) together with the study of biculturalism (Benet-Martínez, Lee, & Leu, 2006; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993) have laid a solid foundation for an identity-based understanding of cross-cultural adjustment and transition in suggesting that embracing both home and host cultures tends to be the most beneficial approach (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999).

Furthermore, as a result of heightened levels of global mobility and inter-race marriage, nowadays more and more individuals are multicultural, rather than bound to one single culture (e.g., global nomads, third culture kids; see also Brannen & Thomas, 2010). Recent research even suggests that "not identifying to any culture" may bring unique benefits for expatriates in terms of intercultural effectiveness and global leadership (Fitzsimmons, Lee, & Brannen, forthcoming; Lee, 2010). Cross-cultural training can be oriented toward helping people manage their multicultural identities (e.g., making sense of "who they are", seeing alternative ways in which identity can be experienced, understanding the impact of context and upbringing on their own identity development) so as to reap the full benefits from their multicultural experiences.

In sum, the trend is to move away from the assumption that trainees are mostly ignorant of cultural differences, and toward the view that trainees may possess considerable amount of

international experiences, or multicultural backgrounds. As a result, the content of training has to address the emerging needs of such individuals.

Training Recipients

While the need to train the international assignee is obvious, scholars and practitioners alike have stressed the importance to include the assignees' accompanying family in the training. Indeed, evidence suggests that family concerns, partner dissatisfaction and partner inability to adapt are the main reasons for negative assignment experiences and outcomes (Andreason, 2008).

Similarly, according to a recent industry survey 75 per cent of respondents supported the view that both assignees and families should receive cross-cultural training (Cartus, 2012) while Brookfield data suggest that 60 per cent of companies offering cross-cultural training on all assignments provided this training for the entire family (Brookfield Global Relocation Services, 2012). The importance of training support for the family stems from the substantial changes in the family context that an international relocation induces. In many cases, the assignee becomes the sole earner and provider for the family and their partner becomes a household caretaker and a stay-at-home parent, having not only lost a job but also foregone a career, financial independence, and extended family support (Lazarova et al., 2010). While the assignee may benefit from the immediate social relationships developed in the new work environment, the partner often lacks a similar support network in the host country. Beyond reflecting the requirements for cultural adjustment, training also needs to address partners' specific concerns related to their potential career displacement and uncertainty by providing location-specific information about available career options and guidance during the process of seeking re-employment (Bennett, Aston, & Colquhoun, 2000).

Substantially less attention has been paid to involving host country nationals in cross-cultural training activities, despite the accepted view that these individuals can act as important socializing agents and providers of support for international assignees (Toh & DeNisi, 2007). However, to be able to effectively provide support to assignees host country nationals face similar challenges of adjusting to cross-cultural interactions. Involving locals in cross-cultural training activities can therefore be a worthwhile addition, especially for individuals that frequently interact with assignees in the host country (Vance & Ring, 1994). Moreover, host country nationals can also be an important source of information for designing location-specific, culturally appropriate training content (Vance & Ensher, 2002).

Training Methods and Delivery

It has been common to differentiate cross-cultural training activities into didactic (provision of factual information) and experiential (learning how to learn) modes of delivery (Kealey & Protheroe, 1996; Littrell et al., 2006). Didactic training involves information briefings, videos, formal classroom-based trainings, culture assimilator exercises and other intercultural awareness programs aimed to develop trainees' cognitive skills necessary to understand the host culture(s). In particular, cultural assimilators – in which trainees are provided with a collection of real-life scenarios that describe puzzling cross-cultural interactions and subsequently receive feedback from cultural experts on how to interpret each situation – have found wide-spread attention as didactic tools (Bhawuk, 2001). While didactic training activities are often delivered by specially trained experts, other individuals including current assignees, recent repatriates or host country nationals may provide valuable information too. More recently, a range of computer-assisted self-learning tools have found their way into the domain of cross-cultural training, including not only generic multimedia software but also culture-specific sensitizer exercises and assimilator tools

(Mendenhall & Stahl, 2000). In addition, a growing number of internet resources are available for international assignees to inform themselves about the host environment (see e.g., Reiche & Harzing, 2010). Computer-aided autodidactic training is also increasingly used by MNCs, both as additional tools to complement face-to-face training and as stand-alone approaches (Brookfield Global Relocation Services, 2012).

Experiential training entails learning through actual practice and the resulting feedback from significant others. The immediate transfer of learning to practice reinforces the behavioural skills and allows cross-cultural competencies to be quickly incorporated in the personal repertoire of conduct (Selmer, Torbiörn, & de Leon, 1998). Experience-based training modes include look-and-see trips, cross-cultural role plays, intercultural workshops, and simulations, or a combination thereof in the form of assessment and development centres (Kealey & Protheroe, 1996; Littrell et al., 2006; Mendenhall & Stahl, 2000). More generally, international job rotations and cross-border meetings also serve as a means of experiential learning as they regularly expose individuals to cross-cultural interactions (Debrah & Rees, 2010).

Fowler & Blohm (2004) detailed the usefulness, adaptability, and strengths and weaknesses of eighteen common methods of cross-cultural training, covering both didactic and experiential modes. They also suggest that trainers should master a variety of methods because no single method will work all the time with every type of trainee and for all desired outcomes. Further, it is crucial to take into account personal and cultural preferences of training styles and methods –ironically, cross-cultural trainers sometimes ignore possible cultural differences in learning styles (Barmeyer, 2004; Joy & Kolb, 2009) and use the same methods to teach trainees from various cultural backgrounds. It should be noted that the two modes of delivery are complementary in nature and that effective cross-cultural training will involve a combination of both. For example, scholars have highlighted the importance of cultural awareness training,

especially in the context of global virtual teams where individuals from multiple cultural backgrounds are regularly interacting (Brandl & Neyer, 2009). Cultural awareness trainings provide individuals with resources for structuring unknown situations without focusing on a particular culture of interest and facilitate both the individuals' theoretical understanding of intercultural interaction and communication as well as the transfer of these insights into actual behaviour (Gudykunst, 1998).

Timing of Training Activities

In general, training interventions can be organized either at the pre-assignment stage as preparatory means, or as an accompanying tool during the actual assignment (Littrell et al., 2006). Organizations may also offer interventions *before* the candidate and his or her family make a decision to accept the relocation, for example in the form of look-and-see trips to the host location (see Harris & Brewster, 1999). Pre-departure preparation and training is useful as it allows the assignee to develop realistic expectations towards the assignment and the host environment (Caligiuri et al., 2001). Preparatory training can also help reduce the uncertainty and anxiety that individuals perceive towards the relocation (Gudykunst, 1998). At the same time, pre-departure training is necessarily less specific and detailed as the assignee lacks particular experiences that can be related to the training, potentially leading to what Osland and Bird (2000) call sophisticated stereotyping. Existing studies have indeed shown that pre-departure training is ineffective (Puck et al., 2008) or even detrimental (Black, 1988) for the assignment experience. Despite the inherent limitations, there is a relative focus on studying pre-departure training (Puck et al., 2008; Waxin & Panaccio, 2005), a bias that reflects current practice in MNCs (e.g., Brookfield Global Relocation Services, 2012).

By contrast, in-country developmental interventions have the advantage of more easily catering to the specific culture the assignee has entered and incorporating issues and concerns that have been prompted by the assignee's actual experiences (Bennet et al., 2000). Especially individual, real-time training that is tailored to assignees' specific needs, although certainly more expensive, promises to be an effective approach to develop assignees' cross-cultural knowledge and competences and should hence be considered as complementary to preparatory interventions (Mendenhall & Stahl, 2000). Other scholars have pointed to the need to devise sequential training activities that reflect the adjustment cycle (e.g., Oberg, 1960) through which an assignee is moving over time (Selmer et al., 1998). While the pre-assignment stage would primarily comprise informative material about the host country context and the assignment conditions, post-arrival training would initially focus on developing cultural awareness and then move to coping strategies for dealing with culture shock and unfamiliar experiences. The more confident the assignee becomes in the host country, the more the training interventions can shift towards experiential learning. In sum, this suggests that cross-cultural training is not a single intervention but should include repeated and temporally distributed activities (Tarique & Caligiuri, 2009) that are in line with assignees' changing needs.

ADDITIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT PRACTICES

Beyond cross-cultural training, there are other support practices that are relevant at the preparation, assignment and post-assignment stages. In general, these support practices comprise financial incentives and support for the assignment and the relocation process, access to relevant infrastructure such as health care, personal services or club membership, career-related support, counselling services, and broader family-related support such as access to child care or assistance with locating adequate schools (Guzzo et al., 1994). Drawing on organizational support theory,

subsequent research has classified the different support practices into perceived financial, career and adjustment support (Kraimer & Wayne, 2004), with adjustment support usually conceptualized to be broader than cross-cultural training, or distinguished between perceived organizational support in the current assignment and in off-the-job life (Takeuchi et al., 2009).

One important form of organizational support is career and repatriation support because assignees are concerned about the availability of suitable future positions in the company (Kraimer et al., 2009). Some scholars have explicitly differentiated between specific *repatriation* assistance during assignees' return, and career development plans that focus on their long-term *career* in the organization (Bolino, 2007). Others have argued that while both capture slightly different content dimensions, they can be expected to form part of an overarching theoretical construct (Reiche, 2012). Overall, research has shown that perceived career and repatriation support positively relates to performance, knowledge sharing and retention (Reiche, 2012; Reiche et al., 2011; Van der Heijden et al., 2009). However, despite their relevance these support practices are still underused in the corporate arena, especially in the case of repatriation assistance. For example, one study examined a range of repatriation support practices which were considered important by repatriates, including pre-departure briefings on what to expect during repatriation, career planning sessions, an agreement outlining the type of position assignees will be offered upon repatriation, mentoring programs while on assignment, reorientation programs about the changes in the company, repatriation training seminars on emotional responses following repatriation, financial counselling and financial/tax assistance, and on-going communication with the home office (Lazarova & Caligiuri, 2001). At the same time, the study revealed that these practices were available in only 10-50 per cent of the MNCs under study.

Another growing research stream has examined the role of host country nationals as a source of general support for assignees and their families, beyond the provision of specific cross-

cultural training (Farh, Bartol, Shapiro, & Shin, 2010; Malek, Budhwar, & Reiche, 2011; Toh & DeNisi, 2007). While some of this support may be informal in nature and not necessarily initiated by the organization, scholars have particularly highlighted the role of host country mentors. Research has shown that expatriates provided with host country mentors are better able to adjust to their work context and are more likely to interact with host country nationals (Feldman & Bolino, 1999). Evidence also suggests that assignees' mentoring needs are likely to change across pre-assignment, assignment and post-assignment stages, emphasizing the use of multiple mentoring relationships that consist of a mix of hierarchical and peer, and formal and informal mentoring relationships (Mezias & Scandura, 2005). Further, mentoring support should not only be limited to the actual assignee but also include the partner, especially in the case of dual-career couples (Harvey, Buckley, Novicevic, & Wiese, 1999).

In general, research has identified and studied a myriad of support practices that are relevant for assignees throughout their relocation processes. However, what existing evidence indicates is that more is not necessarily better – instead, it is important to adapt support practices to the specific and potentially changing needs that individuals have. It also suggests that to adequately design support practices it is important to view the assignment not in isolation but rather from a multiple stakeholder (Takeuchi, 2010) and career-integrative perspective. Accordingly, we recommend that companies will need to assess the provision of each particular support practice with regard to the assignment stage (pre-assignment, actual assignment and post-assignment) and the particular recipient or stakeholder group (assignee, spouse, accompanying children, host country nationals). Table 1 illustrates this based on three example support practices: cross-cultural training, career support, and mentoring support. Similarly, when conducting research on international assignment-related support, scholars would be well advised to provide a justification for why they study a given support practice at a specific assignment

stage and for a specific group of recipients. This, we believe, will focus and refine future research efforts, and bring more comparability across research samples.

--- INSERT TABLE 1 NEAR HERE ---

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Although a growing strand of research has examined the design, structure and effectiveness of international assignment-related support practices in general and cross-cultural training in particular, there are several limitations concerning the scope of implications that can be drawn from the previous literature. In this final section, we review these limitations and offer recommendations for how future research can provide meaningful contributions.

A first limitation concerns the ambiguous findings as to whether cross-cultural training actually produces significant positive change in trainees with respect to their adjustment and performance. As Caligiuri and Tarique (2012) argue in a recent review, this may be related to the *transfer of training problem*, defined as trainees' failure to apply the acquired knowledge and skills in their jobs in an effective and enduring fashion, and which has thus far been largely ignored in the cross-cultural training literature. In addition, many studies, especially in early research, have been conducted with other groups of international sojourners such as students or peace corps volunteers, making it more difficult to draw generalizations to the international assignee population (Caligiuri et al., 2001). Further, it is important to establish a clear causal relationship between cross-cultural training interventions and relevant outcomes, and rule out alternative explanations for changes in performance levels. To achieve this, research needs to design rigorous experimental studies that include (i) control groups, (ii) randomly assigned participants in the experimental groups, (iii) both pre-training and post-training measures of

change, (iv) longitudinal outcome measures, and (v) multiple outcome measures (Kealey & Protheroe, 1996) – a set of criteria that very few studies have accomplished so far. In particular, while scholars regularly call for longitudinal studies that would be able to demonstrate the usefulness and impact of training interventions and support practices more generally, existing empirical evidence is scarce (for exceptions see e.g., Lievens et al., 2003; Reiche, 2012; Takeuchi et al., 2009).

Second, our review indicated that while research on organizational support practices has developed a solid theoretical foundation in organizational support and social exchange theory, the cross-cultural training literature lacks more elaborate theoretical grounding (Littrell et al., 2006). We believe that there are several theoretical lenses that can inform research on cross-cultural training. For example, experiential learning theory (Kolb, 1984) might lend itself to examine process-related aspects of cross-cultural training delivery, design and transfer into practice. Similarly, identity-based theories (Tajfel & Turner, 1985) can help conceptualize how cultural and multicultural identities are constructed, adapted or integrated, and how this may relate to the design and effectiveness of specific training interventions. Further, while research has primarily focused on the micro level of analysis, macro-level theories such as institutional approaches (see Wood, Psychogios, Szamosi, & Collings, 2012) may be useful in examining the degree to which training and support practices fit with – or need to be adapted to – the institutional environment of the host country the assignee is relocated to. For example, Reiche (2008) conceptualizes how the institutional uniqueness of a specific subsidiary context may affect the design of employee retention practices.

Third, the objectives and methods of cross-cultural training may continue to evolve as the world becomes more globalized. So far, little research is done to guide the design of cross-cultural training that differentiates levels of cultural savvy, and consequently the needs of trainees

(e.g., beginner, intermediate, advanced). How can cross-cultural training add value to individuals who already possess extensive cultural exposure and experiences? What will be the most appropriate content and forms of delivery? Currently this line of research tends to treat all trainees as being in their initial stages of cross-cultural encounters and fails to account for more advanced needs of multicultural individuals. Future research may investigate ways of designing programs of cross-cultural training to account for such heightened levels of complexity and sophistication in terms of training content and methods. Similarly, we would argue that beyond cultural intelligence international assignees also require *political intelligence*. This political dimension is important not only because international assignees increasingly hold boundary spanning positions which involve managing potential conflicts and competing interests between different MNC units, but also because the relationship with their home organization may change once the individual is abroad. While scholars have pointed to the importance of political capital for international assignees (Harvey & Novicevic, 2004), empirical research that examines how such competencies can be best developed is missing.

Finally, we also believe that research on international assignment-related support needs to account more explicitly for the growing fragmentation and diversity of its main unit of analysis. As Collings et al. (2007) have noted, while cross-cultural challenges are at least as important for non-traditional forms of international assignments such as international business travellers or short-term assignees, the requirements for cross-cultural training and organizational support more broadly to accompany these alternative forms have been examined to a much lesser extent. For example, we would assume that there are distinct training and support needs for self-initiated assignees, especially those that relocate between organizations. As these individuals move abroad on their own accounts and often work on local contracts (Mayrhofer et al., 2008), it is usually

more difficult to offer support during the pre-assignment stage. The implications for the design and scope of post-arrival training and support are however still unclear.

In this chapter, we have reviewed research theory and practice regarding cross-cultural training and organizational support for assignees to succeed in their international relocations. While a lot of progress has been made since the beginning of the field, our review also indicates that many questions remain to be answered and the journey to exploring the field of cross-cultural training is far from accomplished. Interestingly, this is similar to learning about a new culture – the more we know, the more we know that we don't know. We hope our chapter offers readers a solid ground for embarking on a deeper discovery of the growing field of international assignment-related support practices.

REFERENCES

- Andreason, A. (2008). Expatriate adjustment of spouses and expatriate managers: An integrative research review. *International Journal of Management*, 25, 382-395.
- Ang, S. & Van Dyne, L. (2008). Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness and nomological network. In S. Ang, & L. Van Dyne (Eds.) *Handbook on cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement and applications* (pp. 3-15). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3, 335-371.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barmeyer, C. I. (2004). Learning styles and their impact on cross-cultural training: An international comparison in France, Germany and Quebec. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28(6), 577-594.
- Beechler, S. & Javidan, M. (2007). Leading with a global mindset. In M. Javidan, M.A. Hitt & R.M. Steers (Eds.), *Advances in International Management, Vol. 19: The Global Mindset*. Oxford: Elsevier, 131-169.
- Bennett, R., Aston, A., & Colquhoun, T. (2000). Cross-cultural training: A critical step in ensuring the success of international assignments. *Human Resource Management*, 39, 239-250.
- Benet-Martinez, V., Lee, F., & Leu, J. (2006). Biculturalism and cognitive complexity: Expertise in cultural representations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37, 386-407.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. *International Migration Review*, 21, 491-511.
- Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P., Harrison, D.A., Shaffer, M.A., & Luk, D.M. (2005). Input-based and time-based models of international adjustment: Meta-analytical evidence and theoretical extensions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 257-281.

- Bhawuk, D. P. S. (2001). Evolution of culture assimilators: Toward theory-based assimilators. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25, 141-163.
- Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., Stevens, M. J., & Oddou, G. (2010). Defining the content domain of intercultural competence for global leaders. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25, 810-828.
- Black, J.S. (1988). Work role transitions: A study of American expatriate managers in Japan. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19, 277-294.
- Black, J. S., & Mendenhall, M. (1990). Cross-cultural training effectiveness: A review and a theoretical framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 113-136.
- Black, J. S., Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (1991). Toward a comprehensive model of international adjustment: An integration of multiple theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 291-317.
- Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Bolino, M.C. (2007). Expatriate assignments and intra-organizational career success: Implications for individuals and organizations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38, 819-835.
- Brandl, J., & Neyer, A.-K. (2009). Applying cognitive adjustment theory to cross-cultural training for global virtual teams. *Human Resource Management*, 48, 341-353.
- Brannen, M.Y. & Thomas, D.C., (2010). Bicultural Individuals in Organizations: Implications and Opportunity. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 10, 5-16.
- Brein, M., & David, K. H. (1971). Intercultural communication and the adjustment of the Sojourner. *Psychological Bulletin*, 76(3), 215.
- Brislin, R., MacNab, B., & Nayani, F. (2008). Cross-cultural training: Applications and research. In P.B. Smith, M.F. Peterson, & D.C. Thomas (Eds.). *The Handbook of Cross-Cultural Management Research*. Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Brookfield Global Relocation Services (2012). Global relocation trends survey report. Woodridge, IL.

- Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 745-778.
- Caligiuri, P.M. (2006). Performance measurement in a cross-national context. In W. Bennet, C.E. Lance & D.J. Woehr (Eds.), *Performance measurement: Current perspectives and future challenges*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 227-243.
- Caligiuri, P., Phillips, J., Lazarova, M., Tarique, I., & Bürgi, P. (2001). The theory of met expectations applied to expatriate adjustment: The role of cross-cultural training. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12, 357-372.
- Caligiuri, P., & Tarique, I. (2012). International assignee selection and cross-cultural training and development. In G.K. Stahl, I. Björkman & S. Morris (eds.), *Handbook of research in international human resource management* (2nd ed.). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 321-342.
- Cartus (2012). 2012 Trends in Global Relocation. Wilmington, NC.
- Collings, D.G., Scullion, H., & Morley, M.J. (2007). Changing patterns of global staffing in the multinational enterprise: Challenges to the conventional expatriate assignment and emerging alternatives. *Journal of World Business*, 42, 198-213.
- Debrah, Y.A., & Rees, C. J. (2010). The development of global leaders and expatriates. In A.-W. Harzing and A.H. Pinnington (eds.), *International human resource management*. 3rd ed. London: Sage, 377-141.
- Deshpande, S. P., & Viswesvaran, C. (1992). Is cross-cultural training of expatriate managers effective? A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 295-310.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). 'Perceived organizational support'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.
- Farh, C.I.C., Bartol, K.M., Shapiro, D.L., & Shin, J. (2010). Networking abroad: A process model of how expatriates form support ties to facilitate adjustment. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 434-454.

- Feldman, D.C., & Bolino, M.C. (1999). The impact of on-site mentoring on expatriate socialization: A structural equation modelling approach. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 10, 54-71.
- Fitzsimmons, S. R., Lee, Y.-t., & Brannen, M.-Y. (forthcoming). Demystifying the myth about marginals: Implications for global leadership. *European Journal of International Management*.
- Fowler, S. M., & Blohm, J. M. (2004). An analysis of methods for intercultural training. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett & M. J. Bennett (eds.), *Handbook of Intercultural Training* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1998). Applying anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory to intercultural adjustment training. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22, 227-250.
- Gupta, A.K., & Govindarajan, V. (2002). Cultivating a global mindset. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16, 116-126.
- Guzzo, R.A., Noonan, K.A., & Elron, E. (1994). Expatriate managers and the psychological contract. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 617-626.
- Harris, H., & Brewster, C. (1999). An integrative framework for pre-departure preparation. In C. Brewster & H. Harris (Eds.), *International HRM: Contemporary issues in Europe*. London: Routledge, 223-240.
- Harvey, M., & Miceli, N. (1999). Exploring inpatriate manager issues: An exploratory empirical study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23, 339-371.
- Harvey, M., & Novicevic, M.M. (2004). The development of political skill and political capital by global leaders through global assignments. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15, 1173-1188.
- Harvey, M., Buckley, M.R., Novicevic, M.M., & Wiese, D. (1999). Mentoring dual-career expatriates: A sense-making and sense-giving social support process. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 10, 808-827.

- Harzing, A.-W. (1995). The persistent myth of high expatriate failure rates. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6, 457-474.
- Harzing, A.-W., Köster, K., & Magner, U. (2011). Babel in business: The language barrier and its solutions in the HQ-subsidary relationship. *Journal of World Business*, 46, 279-287.
- Hocking, J.B., Brown, M.E., & Harzing, A.-W. (2007). Balancing global and local strategic contexts: Expatriate knowledge transfer, applications and learning within a transnational organization. *Human Resource Management*, 46, 513-533.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations* (2 ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Javidan, M., & Teagarden, M.B. (2011). Conceptualizing and measuring global mindset, in William H. Mobley, Ming Li, Ying Wang (ed.). *Advances in Global Leadership* (Advances in Global Leadership, Volume 6), Emerald Group Publishing.
- Johnson, P.J., Lenartowicz, T., & Apud, S. (2006). Cross-cultural competence in international business: Toward a definition and a model. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, 525-543.
- Jokinen, T. (2005). Global leadership competencies: A review and discussion. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 29, 199-216.
- Joy, S., & Kolb, D. A. (2009). Are there cultural differences in learning style? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33, 69-85.
- Kealey, D. J., & Protheroe, D. R. (1996). The effectiveness of cross-cultural training for expatriates: An assessment of the literature on the issue. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13, 141-165.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kraimer, M.L., Shaffer, M.A., & Bolino, M.C. (2009). The influence of expatriate and repatriate experiences on career advancement and repatriate retention. *Human Resource Management*, 48, 27-47.

- Kraimer, M.L., & Wayne, S.J. (2004). An examination of perceived organizational support as a multidimensional construct in the context of an expatriate assignment. *Journal of Management*, 30, 209-237.
- Kraimer, M.L., Wayne, S.J., & Jaworski, R.A. (2001). Sources of support and expatriate performance: The mediating role of expatriate adjustment. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 71-99.
- Lazarova, M., & Caligiuri, P. (2001). Retaining repatriates: The role of organizational support practices. *Journal of World Business*, 36, 389-401.
- Lazarova, M., Westman, M., & Shaffer, M.A. (2010). Elucidating the positive side of the work-family interface on international assignments: A model of expatriate work and family performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 93-117.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 395-412.
- Lee, Y.-T. (2010). Home versus host—Identifying with either, both, or neither? The relationship between dual cultural identities and intercultural effectiveness. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 10(1), 55-76.
- Levy, O., Beechler, S., Taylor, S., & Boyacigiller, N. A. (2007). What we talk about when we talk about ‘global mindset’: Managerial cognition in multinational corporations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38, 231-258.
- Lievens, F., Harris, M. M., Van Keer, E., & Bisqueret, C. (2003). Predicting cross-cultural training performance: The validity of personality, cognitive ability, and dimensions measured by an assessment center and a behavior description interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 476-489.
- Littrell, L. N., Salas, E., Hess, K. P., Paley, M., & Riedel, S. (2006). Expatriate preparation: A critical analysis of 25 years of cross-cultural training research. *Human Resource Development Review*, 5, 355-388.
- Malek, M.A., Budhwar, P., & Reiche, B.S. (2011). Sources of support and expatriation: A multiple stakeholder perspective of expatriate adjustment and performance in Malaysia.

Paper presented at the 9th EIASM Workshop on International Strategy and Cross-Cultural Management, Moscow, October 21-22.

- Mayrhofer, W., Sparrow, P. R., & Zimmermann, A. (2008). Modern forms of international working. In M. Dickmann, C. Brewster & P. R. Sparrow (Eds.), *International Human Resource Management: Contemporary Issues in Europe*: 219-239. London: Routledge.
- Mendenhall, M. E., & Stahl, G. K. (2000). Expatriate training and development: Where do we go from here? *Human Resource Management*, 39, 251-265.
- Mezias, J.M., & Scandura, T.A. (2005). A needs-driven approach to expatriate adjustment and career development: A multiple mentoring perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36, 519-538.
- Mol, S. T., Born, M. P., Willemsen, M. E., & Van Der Molen, H. T. (2005). Predicting expatriate job performance for selection purposes: A quantitative review. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36, 590-620.
- Morris, M.A., & Robie, C. (2001). A meta-analysis of the effects of cross-cultural training on expatriate performance and adjustment. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 5, 112-125.
- Ng, K.Y., Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (2009). From experience to experiential learning: Cultural intelligence as a learning capability for global leadership development. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8, 511-526.
- Nicholson, N., & Imaizumi, A. (1993). The adjustment of Japanese expatriates to living and working in Britain. *British Journal of Management*, 4(2), 119-134.
- Oberg, K. (1960). Cultural shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology*, 7, 177-182.
- Osland, J.S., & Bird, A. (2000). Beyond sophisticated stereotyping: Cultural sensemaking in context. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14, 65-79.
- Puck, J. F., Kittler, M. G., & Wright, C. (2008). Does it really work? Re-assessing the impact of pre-departure cross-cultural training on expatriate adjustment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19, 2182-2197.

- Reiche, B.S. (2008). The configuration of employee retention practices in multinational corporations' foreign subsidiaries. *International Business Review*, 17, 676-687.
- Reiche, B.S. (2012). Knowledge benefits of social capital upon repatriation: A longitudinal study of international assignees. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49, 1052-1077.
- Reiche, B.S., & Harzing, A.-W. (2010). International assignments. In A.-W. Harzing and A.H. Pinnington (eds.), *International human resource management*. 3rd ed. London: Sage, 185-226.
- Reiche, B.S., Kraimer, M.L., & Harzing, A.-W. (2011). Why do international assignees stay? An organizational embeddedness perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42, 521-544.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.
- Selmer, J., Torbiörn, I., & de Leon, C. T. (1998). Sequential cross-cultural training for expatriate business managers: Pre-departure and post-arrival. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9, 831-840.
- Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., & Gilley, K. M. (1999). Dimensions, determinants, and differences in the expatriate adjustment process. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30, 557-581.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Detterman, D. K. (1986). *What is intelligence? Contemporary viewpoints on its nature and definition*. Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior, In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (eds.) *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (2nd ed.), Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Takeuchi, R. (2010). A critical review of expatriate adjustment research through a multiple stakeholder view: Progress, emerging trends, and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 36, 1040-1064.

- Takeuchi, R., Wang, M., Marinova, S.V., & Yao, X. (2009). Role of domain-specific facets of perceived organizational support during expatriation and implications for performance. *Organization Science*, 20, 621-634.
- Takeuchi, R., Yun, S., & Russell, J. E. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of the perceived adjustment of Japanese expatriates in the USA. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13, 1224-1244.
- Tarique, I., & Caligiuri, P. (2009). The role of cross-cultural training absorptive capacity in the effectiveness of in-country cross-cultural training. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 13, 148-164.
- Thomas, D.C. (1998). The expatriate experience: A critical review and synthesis. In J.L. Cheng & R.B. Peterson (eds.), *Advances in international comparative management*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 237-273.
- Thomas, D. C., & Fitzsimmons, S. R. (2008). Cross-cultural skills and abilities: From communication competence to cultural intelligence. In P.B. Smith, M.F. Peterson, & D.C. Thomas (Eds.). *The Handbook of Cross-Cultural Management Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Toh, S.M., & DeNisi, A.S. (2007). Host country nationals as socializing agents: A social identity approach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 281-301.
- Tung, R. L. (1981). Selection and training of personnel for overseas assignments. *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 16, 68-78.
- Van der Heijden, J.A.V., van Engen, M.L., & Paauwe, J. (2009). Expatriate career support: Predicting expatriate turnover and performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20, 831-845.
- Vance, C. M., & Ensher, E. A. (2002). The voice of the host country workforce: A key source for improving the effectiveness of expatriate training and performance. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26, 447-461.
- Vance, C. M., & Ring, P. S. (1994). Preparing the host country workforce for expatriate managers: The neglected other side of the coin. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 5, 337-352.

- Ward, C., & Rana-Deuba, A. (1999). Acculturation and adaptation revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30, 422-442.
- Waxin, M., & Panaccio, A. (2005). Cross-cultural training to facilitate expatriate adjustment: It works! *Personnel Review*, 34, 51-67.
- Wood, G. T., Psychogios, A., Szamosi, L. T., & Collings, D. G. (2012). Institutional approaches to comparative HRM. In C. Brewster & W. Mayrhofer (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Comparative Human Resource Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 27-50.
- Yamazaki, Y. (2005). Learning styles and typologies of cultural differences: A theoretical and empirical comparison. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 521-548.
- Yamazaki, Y., & Kayes, D. C. (2004). An experiential approach to cross-cultural learning: A review and integration of competencies for successful expatriate adaptation. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3, 362-379.
- Yan, A., Zhu, G., & Hall, D.T. (2002). International assignments for career building: A model of agency relationships and psychological contracts. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 373-391.

Table 1. A Contingency Framework for International Assignee Support Practices

<i>Recipient</i>	<i>Assignment stage</i>		
	Pre-assignment	During assignment	Post-assignment
Assignee	Cross-cultural training	Cross-cultural training	
	Career support	Career support	Career support
	Mentoring support	Mentoring support	Mentoring support
Partner	Cross-cultural training	Cross-cultural training	
	Career support	Career support	Career support
		Mentoring support	
Accompanying children		Cross-cultural training	
Host country national		Cross-cultural training	