



Specification of the Content Domain of the Global Competencies Inventory (GCI)

MARK E. MENDENHALL

J. Burton Frierson Chair of Excellence in Business Leadership
University of Tennessee-Chattanooga

MICHAEL J. STEVENS

Weber State University

ALLAN BIRD

Eiichi Shibusawa-Seigo Arai Professor of Japanese Studies
University of Missouri-St. Louis

GARY R. ODDOU

California State University, San Marcos

The Kozai Working Paper Series

Volume 1, Number 1. 2010

First published February 2008
by The Kozai Group, Inc.
16414 Sundance Creek Court
Chesterfield, MO 63005
USA

© 2010 The Kozai Group, Inc.

Typeset in Baskerville and Calibri

All rights reserved. No part of this monograph may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

1. Global competencies -- measurement. 2. Intercultural interaction. 3. Global leadership. 4. Expatriate adjustment and performance.

SPECIFICATION OF THE CONTENT DOMAIN OF THE GLOBAL COMPETENCIES INVENTORY (GCI)

The 21st century is one of unremitting globalization. The bumper sticker wisdom that implores, “think globally, act locally,” has become a reality and a necessity for educators, businesspeople, politicians, scientists, journalists, entertainers, athletes, and inventors alike.

Globalization is an ever-increasing social complexity that arises from the ongoing integration of cultural, technological, political, social, and business processes that results in a teeming, unpredictable, ambiguous, ever-changing context that must be squarely faced by everyone—but especially educators and businesspeople (Lane, Maznevski, & Mendenhall, 2004).

For example, globalization has caused educators to consider how to develop in students of all ages a better understanding of the world and its various cultures, and the need to develop competencies within their students that will allow them to live and thrive in a complex, ever-changing, globalized environment. Similarly, globalization has caused many CEOs to aggressively reposition their companies to deal with the unparalleled cross-border trade and investment, continual and rapid change in technological advances, ongoing shifts in global products and consumers, higher global standards in production and quality, and the inherent unpredictability in markets that are part and parcel of the complexity we call “globalization.”

“How do we develop people who can thrive in the context of globalization?” First, it is necessary to understand and delineate what competencies are associated with thriving in global contexts. What competencies do people possess who exhibit success in living and working in cross-culturally complex situations? And, what clues can these “global leaders” give us in terms of educating and developing people who can be successful in the age of globalization?

Since the early 1990s, an increasing number of scholars have been studying effective global leaders and attempting to delineate the competencies that are critical to their success. Reviews of this literature (Bird & Osland, 2004; Jokinen, 2005; Mendenhall, 2001; Mendenhall & Osland, 2002; Osland, 2008; Osland, Taylor, & Mendenhall, in press) find that social scientists have delineated over fifty competencies that influence global leadership effectiveness; however, many of these competencies overlap conceptually and are often separated only by semantic differences in the labels given them by researchers (Jokinen, 2005; Osland, 2008). The reviews also indicate clearly that global leadership is a multi-dimensional construct.

Mendenhall and Osland (2002) categorized the global leadership literature as exhibiting essentially six core dimensions of competencies, with numerous competencies extant within each dimension. They labeled these six dimensions, respectively: *cross-*

cultural relationship skills, traits and values, cognitive orientation, global business expertise, global organizing expertise, and visioning.

Cross-Cultural Relationship Skills	Traits and Values	Cognitive Orientation	Global Business Expertise	Global Organizing Expertise	Visioning
Building Relationships	Inquisitiveness and Curiosity	Environmental Scanning	Global Business Savvy	Team Building	Articulating a tangible vision and strategy
Cross-Cultural Communication Skills	Continual Learner	Global Mindset	Global Organizational Savvy	Continuity Building	Envisioning
Ability to emotionally connect	Accountability	Thinking Agility	Business Acumen	Organizational Networking	Entrepreneurial Spirit
Inspire, Motivate Others	Integrity	Improvisation	Stakeholder Orientation	Creating Learning Systems	Catalyst for Cultural Change
Conflict Management	Courage	Pattern Recognition	External Orientation	Architecting and Designing	Catalyst for Strategic Change
Negotiation Expertise	Commitment	Cognitive Complexity	Results-Orientation	Global Networking	
Empowering Others	Hardiness	Cosmopolitanism		Strong Customer Orientation	
Managing Cross-Cultural Ethical Issues	Maturity	Managing Uncertainty		Business Literacy	
Social Literacy	Results-Orientation	Local vs. Global Paradoxes		Change Agency	
Cultural Literacy	Personal Literacy	Behavioral Flexibility			
	Tenacity				
	Emotional Intelligence				

Source: Mendenhall, M., & Osland, J. "Mapping the Terrain of the Global Leadership Construct." Paper presented at the *Academy of International Business*, San Juan, Puerto Rico, June 29th, 2002.

When the dimensions of global leadership and their attendant competencies were compared to the literature of expatriate effectiveness, it was found that there was a significant overlap between three of the competency domains of global leadership and the competencies that are important to living and working in a foreign country as an expatriate (Jokinen, 2005; Mendenhall, 2001; Mendenhall & Osland, 2002; Osland, Bird, Mendenhall, & Osland, 2006; Osland, 2008). The six dimensions can be conceptually

divided between those that involve competencies directly related to intercultural interaction at the person and small group level (which are critical to expatriate effectiveness), and those that involve the mastery of more macro, global business knowledge and skills.

<i>INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCIES</i>	<i>GLOBAL BUSINESS COMPETENCIES</i>
Cross-Cultural Relationships Cognitive Orientation Traits and Values	Global Business Expertise Global Organizing Expertise Visioning

AN OVERVIEW OF THE INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCIES IN THE GLOBAL LEADERSHIP AND EXPATRIATION LITERATURES

To explore the evolution of knowledge in the field of expatriation, we analyzed the reviews of the empirical expatriate literature since 1984 (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005; Dinges & Baldwin, 1996; Gersten, 1990; Harrison, Shaffer, & Bhaskar-Shrinivas, 2004; Hechanova, Beehr, & Christiansen, 2003; Jordan & Cartwright, 1998; Kealey, 1996; Mendenhall, Kühlmann, Stahl, & Osland, 2002; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Mol, Born, Willemsen, & Van der Molen, 2005; Oddou & Mendenhall, 1984; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997; Ronen, 1989; Stahl, 2001; Thomas, 1998; Thomas & Lazarova, 2006) to evaluate their assessment of the state of the field.

Additionally, due to the fact that the expatriate research literature is spread across various disciplines, thus making it difficult for reviewers to comprehensively cover all extant empirical studies, we have included empirical studies that were not included in the aforementioned reviews or that were published after the appearance of these reviews. To assess the empirical literature of the global leadership field, we reviewed the most prominent reviews of that literature to date (Jokinen, 2005; Mendenhall, 2001; Mendenhall & Osland, 2002; Osland, 2008; Osland, et. al., in press).

EXPATRIATE ADJUSTMENT COMPETENCIES

The ability to adjust to the work, social, and general cultural dimensions of a new culture has been shown to influence subsequent productivity of the expatriate during his/her overseas assignment (Kraimer, Wayne, & Jaworski, 2001; Harrison & Shaffer, 2005). Successful expatriate adjustment predicts task completion and relationship building effectiveness during the overseas assignment (Harrison & Shaffer, 2005), thus an understanding of what competencies influence expatriate adjustment is critical to an understanding of enhancing individual performance in the global workplace.

We began our review of the expatriate literature with the review and categorization of competencies associated with expatriate adjustment conducted by

Mendenhall & Oddou in 1985. Based upon their oft-cited review of the literature, Mendenhall & Oddou (1985) classified the numerous competencies that they found influenced expatriate adjustment into one of three categories: the *self-oriented dimension*, the *others-oriented dimension*, and the *perceptual dimension*.

The *self-oriented* dimension includes “activities and attributes that serve to strengthen the expatriate’s self-esteem, self-confidence, and mental hygiene” (1985: 40). The *others-oriented* dimension includes “activities and attributes that enhance the expatriate’s ability to interact effectively with host-nationals” (1985: 41), while the *perceptual* dimension contains cognitive processes that facilitate an expatriate’s “ability to understand why foreigners behave the way they do,” thus enhancing their “ability to make correct attributions about the reasons or causes of host-nationals’ behavior” (1985: 42).

This categorization has been a fruitful one over time in the literature (Thomas, 1998) and is, in part, the basis for the most rigorously tested, influential and robust model of expatriate adjustment in the field, *The International Adjustment Model (IA)*, which was developed by J. Stewart Black, Mark E. Mendenhall, and Gary R. Oddou in 1991 (for reviews and empirical validation of this model see: Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005; Hechanova, Beehr, & Christiansen, 2003; Mendenhall, Kühlmann, Stahl, & Osland, 2002; Shaffer, Harrison, & Gilley, 1999).

In their IA model, Black et al. (1991) renamed Mendenhall and Oddou’s (1985) earlier categories. *Self-orientation* was relabeled, *self-efficacy*, reflecting the degree to which an individual believes he or she has the ability to succeed in new tasks and settings (Bandura, 1977). The other two dimensions, *others-oriented* and *perceptual*, were respectively re-labeled as *relational* and *perceptual* in the IA model.

These three dimensions constituted the *Individual* dimension of Black, et. al’s 1991 model, which focused on traits and competencies that had been shown in the literature to positively influence heightened levels of success in interacting with people from other cultures in overseas or cross-culturally significant settings. This *Individual* dimension constituted one of four dimensions of direct determinants of expatriate adjustment (the others were labeled: *job*, *organizational*, and *nonwork*) in the IA model.

A comprehensive meta-analysis of the IA model by Bhaskar-Shrinivas and colleagues (2005) of over 50 determinants of expatriate adjustment using data from 8,474 expatriates in 66 studies emphasized the “centrality, criticality, and complexity of adjustment, strongly supporting Black, Mendenhall, and Oddou’s (1991) model (p. 257).” They also concluded that the “meta-analytic findings attest to the importance of some individual factors--overall self-efficacy and relational skills -- in predicting expatriate adjustment. The variance explained by the latter exceeded that explained by other predictors by 30 percent (p. 272).” Thus, competencies associated with Mendenhall and Oddou’s 1985’s categorization were found to have a powerful influence on a person’s ability to be successful in cross-cultural and global milieus.

To summarize, the research suggests that the content domain of global competencies can be usefully summarized using three broad facets or dimensions for individuals: the *cognitive/perceptual*, *other/relationship*, and *self/self-efficacy* domains (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, et. al., 2005; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Black et. al., 1991; Thomas, 1998: 247). For clarity and pedagogical purposes, these three dimensions have been re-titled the *Perception Management*, *Relationship Management*, and *Self Management* domains in the *Global Competencies Inventory (GCI)*.

These three major competency dimensions will be reviewed below, along with their sub-facts; a discussion of the empirical support for each sub-facet from the extant literature is included as well.

The first dimension that will be reviewed is the *Perception Management* dimension.

PERCEPTION MANAGEMENT

Based on their review of the pre-1985 research on expatriate adjustment Mendenhall & Oddou (1985) concluded that a dimension was warranted that encompassed the abilities to:

- 1) make correct attributions regarding host nationals' behavior;
- 2) be nonjudgmental when evaluating host nationals' behavior;
- 3) make loose vs. rigid evaluations of host nationals' behavior;
- 4) update and modify cognitive schema regarding the host culture;
- 5) seek out information to better process host national cultural stimuli.

Subsequent reviews of the empirical literature support the perceptual dimension as a forceful influencer of cross-cultural adjustment. Various cognitive and perceptual variables have been linked to intercultural effectiveness; variables receiving general support in the reviews of the literature include: *tolerance of ambiguity* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Kealey, 1996; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997; Ronen, 1989; Stahl, 2001), *nonjudgmentalness* (Dinges & Baldwin, 1996; Ronen, 1989; Oddou & Mendenhall, 1984; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997; Stahl, 2001), *flexibility* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Kealey, 1996; Oddou & Mendenhall, 1984; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997; Ronen, 1989); *openness* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Kealey, 1996; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997; Ronen, 1989; Thomas, 1998), *categorization* (Gersten, 1990), *attributional complexity* (Kealey, 1996; Oddou & Mendenhall, 1984) and *cognitive complexity* (Boyacigiller, Beechler, Taylor, & Levy, 2004; Levy, Beechler, Taylor, & Boyacigiller, 2007; Osland, et. al, 2006).

The *GCI* dimension of *Perception Management* thus examines how people cognitively approach cultural differences. It assesses people's mental flexibility when confronted with cultural differences, their tendency to make rapid judgments about those differences, their ability to manage their perceptions when confronted with situations that differ from what they expect, and finally, it also assesses people's innate interest in, and curiosity about, other cultures. In sum, our perceptions of people who are different from us will

ultimately affect what and how we think about them, and very importantly, our behavior toward them.

SPECIFIC COMPETENCIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE PERCEPTION MANAGEMENT DOMAIN

Nonjudgmentalness (NJ) refers to the extent to which one is inclined to withhold or suspend judgment about persons or situations or behavior that is new or unfamiliar. If people are rigid or use only their own culture as the standard for evaluating cultural differences, then they will be less effective working with people from other cultures. A precursor to *inquisitiveness*, the next competency below, *nonjudgmentalness* in part refers to what Kealey (1996) refers to as “the ability to question oneself and to become genuinely open to the behavior and ideas of others (p. 87).”

Waiting to understand the situation or person before making a judgment or strong attributions enhances intercultural effectiveness; the opposite tendency, making snap judgments about situations or people—and being reluctant to change those judgments—is not efficacious in cross-cultural interactions.

Black (1990) and Shaffer et. al. (2006) referred to the obverse of this competency as *ethnocentrism*, “the propensity to view one’s own cultural traditions and behaviors as right and those of others as wrong (p. 114)” and argued that this mindset interferes with making accurate perceptions in cross-cultural encounters. Shaffer et. al. (2006) found that *ethnocentrism* negatively predicted interaction adjustment and contextual performance, and strongly influenced withdrawal from assignment cognitions in their sample of expatriates.

This competency appears both in the global leadership and in the expatriate literature as being related to intercultural effectiveness (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Cui & Awa, 1992; Gersten, 1990; Ronen, 1989; Sinangil & Ones, 1997; Hudson & Inkson, 2006; Kühlmann & Stahl, 1996, 1998; McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002; Moro Bueno & Tubbs, 2004; Oddou & Mendenhall, 1984).

Inquisitiveness (IN) reflects an openness towards, and an active pursuit of understanding ideas, values, norms, situations, and behaviors that are new and different. It involves the willingness to seek to understand the underlying reasons for cultural differences and to avoid stereotyping people from other cultures. It also includes one’s capacity to actively take advantage of opportunities for growth and learning.

Tucker, Bonial, and Lahti (2004: 230) conceptualize it as “the capability to accept new ideas and see more than one’s own way of approaching and solving problems.” It is akin to the Big Five dimension of *Intellectance* or *Openness to Experience*, which reflects the “breadth, depth, originality, and complexity of an individual’s mental and experiential life (John & Srivastava, 1999, p. 121).” Shaffer, et. al. (2006) state that individuals high in *Intellectance*, as well as exhibiting other tendencies, are “more curious and eager to learn”

new information about others and themselves (p. 113.); in their research it predicted expatriate work adjustment, contextual performance, and task performance.

This competency also emerged in reviews of the global leadership literature (Bird & Osland, 2004; Jokinen, 2005; Mendenhall & Osland, 2002; Osland, 2008) and has also found support in work by Kealey and his associates (Hudson & Inkson, 2006; Kealey, 1989, 1994, 1996; Kealey & Ruben, 1983) and others in the expatriate literature (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Black & Gregersen, 1991; Mol, et. al., 2005; Moro Bueno & Tubbs, 2004; Ronen, 1989; Sinangil & Ones, 1997; Kühlmann & Stahl, 1996, 1998; Oddou & Mendenhall, 1984).

Based upon interviews with 90 senior executives and 40 nominated global leaders in 50 companies located in Europe, North America, and Asia, Black, Morrison & Gregersen (1999) found that inquisitiveness was the most important global competency within the constellation of competencies identified in their study. Also, Black & Gregersen (1991) found that individuals who took the initiative to learn about the new culture to which they were assigned to live and work in had higher levels of intercultural adjustment than did expatriates who did not do take such initiative or who relied only on company-provided training. Kealey (1996; 87) cited this as a primary competency in his review, stating that:

Being intrigued about different cultures and wanting to learn about them is associated with effective collaboration across cultures...this interest usually leads to a sincere desire to get to know the country, its people, and its traditions.

The extended effect of inquisitiveness is often that it leads to a preparation and a motivation to exhibit or improve competencies associated with the *Relationship Management* dimension.

Tolerance of Ambiguity (TA) refers to the ability to manage uncertainty in new and complex situations where there is not necessarily a “right” way to interpret things. People may be open to new ideas and experiences, but not necessarily manage the ambiguity and uncertainty associated with them. Those high in tolerance of ambiguity enjoy complexity, are not threatened by it, and see it as a natural part of life; they are not hindered making decisions in conditions of ambiguity.

Tolerance of ambiguity has commonly been found to be an important competency related to intercultural effectiveness in both the global leadership (Jokinen, 2005; Mendenhall & Osland, 2002) and expatriate literatures (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Cui & Awa; 1992; Cort & King, 1979; Hermann, Stevens, & Bird, 2008; Kealey, 1996; Goldsmith, et. al., 2003; Kühlmann & Stahl, 1996, 1998; McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002; Mol, et. al., 2005; Nishida, 1985; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997; Ronen, 1989; Stahl, 2001).

For example, Black et. al., (1999) found that the ability to not only manage uncertainty—but to embrace it and find it challenging and motivating, is an important competency of global leaders. Ruben & Kealey (1979) found that tolerance for ambiguity acts as an important contributor to the ability to communicate well with people from other cultures, indicating that this competency combines with relationship management competencies to enhance overall intercultural effectiveness.

In his 1996 review of the empirical literature, Kealey again emphasized that tolerance of ambiguity appeared to be an important competency necessary to succeed in cross-cultural settings, stating that living and working in cross-cultural settings “demands a capacity to live with the unknown and to work in situations of ambiguity [and] this is difficult for people who need control (p. 86).”

Cosmopolitanism (CO) refers to a natural interest in and curiosity about different countries and cultures, as well as the degree of interest in world and international events. High cosmopolitans demonstrate an intense interest in traveling abroad and learning about foreign places, and strive to stay current on world and international events.

To be effective in a global or cross-cultural milieu, it is necessary to have a perspective of time and space that extends beyond one’s local milieu (Adler & Bartholomew, 1992; Boyacigiller, et. al., 2004; Kedia & Mukherji, 1999; Flango & Brumbaugh, 1974; Goldberg, 1976). This is an important orientation for global leaders to possess (Boyacigiller, et. al., 2004; Levy, et. al., 2007), and emerged in reviews of the literature on effective global leadership competencies (Bird & Osland, 2004; Mendenhall & Osland, 2002; Osland, et. al., 2006; Osland, 2008).

Our conceptualization of cosmopolitanism reflects that of Levy, et. al. (2007) who argue, after reviewing the literature in this area, that cosmopolitanism “represents a state of mind that is manifested as an orientation toward the outside, the Other...a willingness to explore and learn from alternative systems of meaning held by others (p. 240).”

Similarly, in the expatriate and immigrant adjustment literature, an interest in foreign cultures appears as a contributing variable to adaptation (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Hudson & Inkson, 2006; Hull, 1978; Klineberg & Hull, 1979; Pruitt, 1978; Ronen, 1989; Ward & Searle, 1991; also see Ward, 1996).

Interest Flexibility (IF) refers to substituting important personal interests from one’s own background and culture with similar, yet different interests in the host culture. For example, if people enjoy American football, high interest flexibility would involve developing an interest in rugby if they were assigned to live and work in New Zealand. The ability to find new interests and activities to replace existing ones that do not fit within the new culture is important in being successful in global or intercultural settings (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Brein & David, 1973; David, 1976; Hudson & Inkson, 2006; Kühlmann & Stahl, 1996, 1998; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; and Mumford, 1975; Shaffer, et. al., 2006).

Recent research on this variable has supported the concept of *interest flexibility* as a positive influence on expatriate adjustment. Zimmerman, Holman, & Sparrow (2003) found that German expatriates in the People's Republic of China had higher levels of adjustment if they were able to adjust their habits to fit what was available in the host culture. Regarding leisure activities, they concluded that “the principal mode of adjusting to the perceived lack of leisure possibilities was to change their habits ... [such as changing] their sports, such as giving up mountain-biking for playing squash (p. 58).”

Similarly, Shaffer, Ferzandi, Harrison, Gregersen, & Black (2003) found that *interest flexibility* had a significant positive influence on both cultural and work adjustment for Japanese expatriates in twenty countries, Korean expatriates in twenty-two countries, and American, British, Australian and New Zealand expatriates in Hong Kong. Finally, Shaffer, et. al. (2006) found that “the capacity to substitute activities enjoyed in one's home country with existing, and usually distinct, activities in the host country” predicted cultural and work adjustment and task performance in their multi-sample study of expatriates.

The body of theoretical and empirical research in global leadership competencies and development, and in expatriate adjustment and performance, provide strong support for the conceptual formulation of a three dimensional framework as represented in the *Global Competencies Inventory (GCI)*. Specifically, *Perception Management*, *Relationship Management* and *Self Management* constitute three distinctive though related domains. Moreover, each of these competencies can be broken down into separate competencies, each of which captures an important aspect of overall intercultural competency.

The next section will review the *Relationship Management* dimension along with its associated competencies.

RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT

In their review of the research, Mendenhall & Oddou (1985: 41) concluded that a dimension was warranted that encompassed “the ability to develop long-lasting friendships with host-nationals,” due to the fact that this ability “emerged as an important factor in successful overseas adjustment (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Brein & David, 1971, 1973; Hammer, et. al., 1978; Harris, 1973; Hawes & Kealey, 1981; Ratiu, 1983), accounting for large portions of the variance in the factor analytic studies studying adjustment (Hammer, et. al., 1978; Harris, 1973).”

This trend in the literature has remained constant since the publication of Mendenhall & Oddou's 1985 review and categorization of the intercultural competencies that positively influence cross-cultural adjustment. In all of the reviews in both the global leadership and expatriate adjustment literature that we reviewed, the ability to create and maintain relationships with individuals in cross-cultural/global settings was found to be a key competency domain (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Bhaskar-Shrinivas, et. al, 2005; Dinges

& Baldwin, 1996; Jordan & Cartwright, 1998; Harrison, et. al., 2004; Kealey, 1996; Mendenhall, et. al, 2002; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Mol, et. al, 2005; Oddou & Mendenhall, 1984; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997; Osland, 2008; Ronen, 1989; Stahl, 2001; Thomas, 1998; Thomas & Lazarova, 2006).

The *GCI* dimension of *Relationship Management* assesses people's orientation toward the importance of relationships in general; how aware they are of others and their interaction styles, values, etc., and the level of awareness they have of themselves and their impact on others. This dimension complements the *Perception Management* dimension in that it looks at how mental structures shape behaviors, especially with respect to the development and management of intercultural, interpersonal relationships.

Relationships also become a source of information to help people understand other cultures and may also be a source of social support. The development of positive relationships is a critical aspect of effective intercultural job performance (Harrison & Shaffer, 2005; Mol et. al., 2005). This dimension is assessed in the *GCI* using five sub-facet scales.

SPECIFIC COMPETENCIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT DOMAIN

Relationship Interest (RI) refers to the extent to which people exhibit interest in, and awareness of, their social environment. People high in relationship interest are curious about others with whom they interact, and thus strive to understand the kind of people they are, what their cultural norms are, and so on. However, although people may be high in relationship interest, they may still lack the actual ability to develop effective relationships with those in whom they are interested.

Often in the literature this competency is bundled together conceptually with other skills into broader measures of interpersonal skills; for example, Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black, & Ferzandi (2006) conceptualize their *people orientation* variable as encompassing “a desire to understand and relate to HCNs [what we term, *Relationship Interest*] and to develop close relationships with them [what we term *Interpersonal Engagement*] (p. 113).” In their meta-analytic review of the expatriate performance literature, Mol et. al. (2005) found that the factor, *interpersonal interest* emerged as a solid predictor of expatriate job performance.

This foundational competency in the *Relationship Management* domain has been noted in both the expatriate literature (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Kühlmann & Stahl, 1996, 1998; Ronen, 1989; Shaffer, et. al., 2006; Sinangil & Ones, 1997) and in the global leadership literature (Mendenhall & Osland, 2002).

Interpersonal Engagement (IE) refers to the degree to which people have a desire and willingness to initiate and maintain relationships with people from other

cultures. People high on this dimension will work hard to develop relationships with others even though they may not necessarily be high in the competencies needed to effectively develop or maintain those relationships. Mendenhall & Oddou (1985) defined this competency as “the ability to develop long-lasting friendships with host nationals” (p. 41). Black et. al., (1999) describe it as the ability to “emotionally connect with others.”

This competency has been substantiated as being critical to cross-cultural effectiveness and adjustment by reviews of the literature, though it is been classified using different terminology, such as: *people orientation* (Shaffer, et. al., 2006) *interaction management* (Ruben & Kealey, 1979), *relationship building* (Kealey, 1996), *outgoingness* or *extraversion* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Ronen, 1989), *relational abilities* (Jordan & Cartwright, 1998; Thomas, 1998), *sociability* and *interest in other people* (Kealey & Ruben, 1983; Stahl, 2001), *interpersonal skills* (Hechanova, et. al., 2003) and *intercultural competence* (Dinges & Baldwin, 1996). Global leadership literature reviews similarly note that this is an important competency for effective intercultural interaction (Jokinen, 2005; Mendenhall & Osland, 2002).

Empirical studies continue to sustain the role of relationship development, and its attendant skills such as communication competence, as being critical to expatriate adjustment and intercultural competence (Arthur & Bennett, 1997; Bikson, Treverton, Moini, & Lindstrom, 2003; Black & Gregersen, 1991; Cui & Awa, 1992; Cui & Van Den Berg, 1991; Hammer, 1987; Hechanova, et. al., 2003; Kühlmann & Stahl, 1996, 1998; Martin, 1987; Martin & Hammer, 1989; Shaffer, et. al., 2006; Sinangil & Ones, 1997; Sudweeks, Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Nishida, 1990; Thomas, 1998; Torbiorn, 1982).

For example, Waxin (2004) found that “social orientation” had a significant overall effect on French, German, Korean, and Scandinavian expatriates’ ability to adjust productively to interacting with Indians. Similarly, Tucker, Bonial, & Lathi (2004) found that the dimension in their model, *social interpersonal style*, which was made up of the variables of “interpersonal interest” and “social adaptability” was significantly related to intercultural adjustment in their sample of corporate expatriates.

Tsang (2001) argued that *extroversion*, which is positively related to *sociability* and *interpersonal involvement* would be positively related to general and interaction adjustment in his sample of expatriates. This hypothesis was supported in his findings, reinforcing similar findings from past studies (Parker & McEvoy, 1993; Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy, 1993). Social support, a variable in Tsang’s 2001 that he defined as “help received from other people when encountering difficulties in coping with a new environment (p. 356),” is similar to the aspect of relationship development, and was also found to significantly influence general and interaction adjustment in his study (Tsang, 2001).

Mendenhall & Oddou (1985) noted that exercise of relationship development had the effect of establishing friendships with host nationals who then took on mentoring roles to the expatriate, guiding “the neophyte through the intricacies and complexity of the new organization or culture, protecting him/her against faux pas and helping him/her enact appropriate behaviors.” (p. 41-42). Bhaskar-Shrinivas, et. al., (2005) found strong

support for this competency in their meta-analytic review of the expatriate adjustment literature, where they found that the variance explained by [relational skills] exceeded that explained by other predictors by 30 percent.” (p. 272).

Emotional Sensitivity (ES) refers to the extent to which people have an awareness of, and sensitivity to, the emotions and feelings of others. People high in emotional sensitivity can assess and respond appropriately to the emotional and psychological needs of people around them. Emotional sensitivity is akin to the Big Five personality factor of *Agreeableness*, which refers to a prosocial and communal orientation towards others without antagonism (John & Srivastava, 1999; Shaffer, et. al, 2006) and displaying courtesy and tact, empathy, kindness, and respect (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997; Shaffer, et. al., 2006). Mol and his colleagues (2005) found in their meta-analysis of the expatriate literature that *Agreeableness* is a predictor of expatriate job performance. Similarly, Shaffer et. al., (2006) found it to be a key predictor of interaction adjustment.

Research in both the global leadership and expatriate literatures have found that emotional sensitivity is critical to intercultural effectiveness as it contributes to an individual’s ability to:

- *show appropriate respect to others* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Cui & Awa, 1992; Gersten, 1990; Hudson & Inkson, 2006; Jordan & Cartwright, 1998; Kealey, 1994; Kealey & Ruben, 1983; Koester & Olebe, 1988; Moro Bueno & Tubbs, 2004; Olebe & Koester, 1989; Ronen, 1989; Ruben & Kealey, 1979)
- *display both interpersonal and cultural empathy* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Cui & Awa, 1992; Cui & Van Den Berg, 1991; Gersten, 1990; Hechanova, et. al., 2003; Hudson & Inkson, 2006; Jokinen, 2005; Jordan & Cartwright, 1998; Kealey, 1994; Koester & Olebe, 1988; Kühlmann & Stahl, 1996, 1998; Martin & Hammer, 1987; McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002; Mendenhall & Osland, 2002; Moro Bueno & Tubbs, 2004; Oguri & Gudykunst, 2002; Ruben & Kealey, 1979; Ronen, 1989; Sudweeks, Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Nishida, 1990)
- *show tolerance for differences in others* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Cui & Awa, 1992; Gersten, 1990; Hudson & Inkson, 2006; Jordan & Cartwright, 1998; Kealey, 1994; Kealey & Ruben, 1983; Ronen, 1989; Selmer, 1999, 2001).

Self Awareness (SA) refers to the degree to which people are aware of: 1) their strengths and weaknesses in interpersonal skills, 2) their own philosophies and values, 3) how past experiences have helped shape them into who they are as a person, and 4) the impact their values and behavior have on relationships with others.

High scorers are extremely aware of their own values, strengths and limitations, and behavioral tendencies and how they impact and affect others; they are constantly evaluating themselves and this process in their lives. Low scorers report little concern or interest in knowing themselves or how their behavioral tendencies affect other people, and are not very interested in trying to understand their experiences. High self-awareness

provides a foundation for strategically acquiring new competencies and skills, whereas low self-awareness promotes self-deception and arrogance.

Jokinen (2005) categorizes this competency as being one of the primary competencies that is fundamental to effective global leadership. Similarly, Varner and Palmer (2005) argue, from a theoretical standpoint that “conscious cultural self-knowledge is a crucial variable in adapting to other cultures (p. 1).”

Goldsmith, Greenberg, Robertson, & Hu-Chan (2003) include self-awareness as an important competency in the *personal mastery* component of their global leadership model. One of the important benefits, according to Goldsmith, et. al, (2003) regarding this competency is that it allows one to strategically involve others in one’s work to complement one’s personal weaknesses.

Wills and Barnham (1994) found that emotional self-awareness was an important predictor of intercultural effectiveness, and Chen (1987) found that it related to intercultural communication competence. Similarly, Bird and Osland (2004) concluded that one of the byproducts of the competency of self-awareness, a sense of humility, is an important competency for successful intercultural interaction.

Social Flexibility (SF) refers to the extent to which individuals present themselves to others in order to create favorable impressions and to facilitate relationship building. High social flexibility helps people adjust their behaviors to fit the situation and to favorably impress and connect with people they do not know well. Social flexibility also helps people better influence others to adapt their behaviors to fit the social situation.

Kealey (1996: 86) refers to this as “the ability to modify ideas and behavior, to compromise, and to be receptive to new ways of doing things” and this is commonly manifested in both the global leadership research literature (Mendenhall & Osland, 2002) and the expatriate research literature as being important to intercultural effectiveness (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Cui & Awa, 1992; Hechanova, et. al., 2003; Kealey, 1994; Kealey & Ruben, 1983; Kühlmann & Stahl, 1996, 1998; Martin & Hammer, 1987; Moro Bueno & Tubbs, 2004; Ronen, 1989; Ruben & Kealey, 1979; Sinangil & Ones, 1997; also see: Ward, 1996).

Scholars have operationalized social flexibility in a variety of ways. One approach is via the constructs of *self-monitoring* or *impression management*. Mendenhall and Wiley (1994) hypothesized a relationship between *impression management* and expatriate adjustment, and Montagliani (1996) found that it significantly correlated with cultural adjustment scores, suggesting that individuals who use behavioral cues in the social environments of new cultures will increase their potential to enhance their ability to adjust and be effective in those new cultures. Similarly, in their metaanalysis of the expatriate literature, Hechanova, et. al., (2003) reported that Caligiuri (1995) found that self-monitoring correlated with general expatriate adjustment and Harrison, Chadwick, & Scales (1996) found it was associated with interactional adjustment on the part of expatriates.

Social flexibility requires that one be attuned to perceiving, learning, and complying with new behavioral norm structures. In their meta-analysis of the expatriate job performance literature, Mol and his colleagues (2005) found that the Big Five personality factor of *Conscientiousness* was a predictor of expatriate job performance. This factor has to do with being oriented toward socially prescribed impulse control processes, such as following norms and rules and thinking before acting (John & Srivastava, 1999).

In the next section, we will review the last major competency area, *Self-Management*, followed by a detailed look at its competencies.

SELF MANAGEMENT

Mendenhall & Oddou (1985) concluded that a domain of variables existed in the cross-cultural adjustment literature that could be categorized as including “activities and attributes that serve to strengthen the expatriate’s self-esteem, self-confidence, and mental hygiene (p. 40).” They labeled this domain, the *Self-Oriented* dimension of intercultural effectiveness.

Subsequent reviews of both the global leadership and the expatriate literature support the validity of this dimension as an important contributor to intercultural effectiveness. Various variables have been linked to intercultural effectiveness in this domain; common variables receiving general support in the reviews of the literature include: *coping with stress* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Jordan & Cartwright, 1998; Kealey, 1996; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997; Ronen, 1989; Thomas, 1998), *psychological hardiness* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Caligiuri, 2000; Kealey, 1996; Mendenhall, 2001; Osland & Mendenhall, 2002; Osland, 2008; Ronen, 1989), *interest flexibility* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985); *self-confidence* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Bhaskar-Shrinivas, et. al., 2005; Goldsmith, et. al., 2003; Hechanova, et. al., 2003; Jordan & Cartwright, 1998; Kealey, 1996), and *optimism* (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Caligiuri, 2004; Jokinen, 2005; Kealey, 1996; Kühlmann & Stahl, 1996, 1998; McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002; Ronen, 1989).

The *Self Management* dimension takes into account people’s strength of identity and their ability to effectively manage their emotions and stress. To be successful in intercultural situations, it is critical that people have a clear sense of themselves and a clear understanding of their fundamental values. To be effective in a global context, people must be able to understand, change and adapt appropriately to the foreign work and intercultural environment, yet at the same time, they must also have a stable sense of self in order to remain mentally and emotionally healthy. Seven competency scales comprise this dimension.

SPECIFIC COMPETENCIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE SELF MANAGEMENT DOMAIN

Optimism (OP) refers to the extent to which people maintain a positive, buoyant outlook toward other people, events, situations and outcomes. People high in optimism view problems as solvable challenges and as exciting learning opportunities. Thus, individuals who are high in optimism exhibit such tendencies as being persistent, viewing setbacks as opportunities for learning, and believing that putting forth effort will ultimately payoff in positive outcomes. Optimism and its derivative benefits are found both in the global leadership and expatriate literatures (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Caligiuri, 2004; Gersten, 1990; Jokinen, 2005; Kealey, 1996; Kühlmann & Stahl, 1996, 1998; McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002; Ronen, 1989).

Caligiuri, in a study of 256 global leaders, found that they were significantly higher in the realm of “conscientiousness” and significantly lower on the dimension of “neuroticism” in terms of their Big Five personality scores than less effective global leaders (2004). Some of the lexical markers of *Conscientiousness* are being purposeful, strong-willed, and determined (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997), all manifestations of optimism. In his 1996 review of the literature, one of the skills that Kealey derived from the literature was that of *Positive Attitudes*, what we term in the GCI as *Optimism*. Kealey (1996: 86) observed:

One of the best predictors of professional effectiveness overseas is positive attitudes on the part of the expatriate. Feelings of being positive, excited, strong, and determined about undertaking the collaborative venture are indicators of potential to succeed.

Self Confidence (SC) refers to the degree to which people have confidence in themselves and have a tendency to take action to overcome obstacles and master challenges. People high on this dimension believe that if they work hard enough and have the will power, they can learn what they need to learn in order to accomplish whatever they set out to do. Although people may be optimistic regarding cross-cultural situations, they may nevertheless lack the self-confidence to act positively on their optimism.

Self confidence was noted by Kealey in his 1996 review as being an important competency “that is needed to be successful in another culture (p. 84).” Similarly, other scholars have found *self-confidence* or *self-efficacy* to be important variables in intercultural effectiveness and adjustment (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Bhaskar-Shrinivas, et. al., 2005; Gersten, 1990; Goldsmith, et. al., 2003; Harrison, et. al., 2004; Hechanova, et. al., 2003; Jordan & Cartwright, 1998; Shaffer, et. al., 1999; Smith, 1966). In their meta-analyses of the expatriate adjustment literature, Bhaskar-Shrinivas, et. al., (2005) and Hechanova, et. al. (2003) found that self-efficacy was a significant predictor of expatriate adjustment.

Self confidence relates to the Big Five personality dimension of *extraversion*, which, among other things, reflects an energetic approach toward the social and material world, sociability, and positive emotionality (John & Srivastava, 1999). *Extraversion* has been shown to empirically predict expatriate performance (Mol, et. al., 2005)

Additionally, *self confidence* is related to the construct of *locus of control*, which refers to people's beliefs regarding the degree to which they control events and outcomes that impact their lives, or whether external actors or processes primarily control such events and outcomes. The empirical literature indicates that individual's with an external locus of control exhibit significantly lower levels of expatriate adjustment and effectiveness than individuals who have an internal locus of control (Dyal, 1984; Dyal, Rybensky, & Somers, 1988; Kuo, Gray, & Lin, 1976; Kuo & Tsai, 1986; Ward, 1996; Ward & Kennedy, 1992; 1993a; 1993b)

Self-Identity (SI) refers to the extent to which people maintain personal values independent of situational factors and have a strong sense of personal identity. People with high self-identity can adapt culturally, but will do it in a way that maintains a strong framework of personal values, thus allowing them to maintain a sense of their personal integrity. This allows them to integrate their new cultural knowledge into existing mental models, whereas those low in self-identity are either unable to integrate new knowledge, or when they do, they experience life crises that overwhelm them.

Self-Identity is akin to the construct of *independent self-construal* (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), which involves "construing oneself as an individual whose behavior is organized and made meaningful primarily by reference to one's own internal repertoire of thoughts, feelings, and actions rather than by reference to thoughts, feelings, and actions of others (p. 226)."

Oguri & Gudykunst (2002) noted that interdependent self construals (the opposite of independent construals,) results in individual identity and behaviors that "are largely dependent on external factors such as ...ingroups and social contexts (p. 580)." Research findings suggest that expatriates with independent self-construals have higher levels of psychological adjustment overseas than expatriates with interdependent self construals (Cross, 1995; Oguri & Gudykunst, 2002; Pi-Ju Yang, Noels, & Saumure, 2006; Yamaguchi & Wiseman, 2001)

Mendenhall & Osland (2002) found in their review of the global leadership literature that *self-identity* emerged in a variety of studies (Black, et. al., 1999; Goldsmith, et. al., 2003; McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002). Black and his colleagues found that global leaders had to have a strong sense of their own values and ethical frameworks in order to maintain integrity in a global context. Being able to find and maintain the balance between what is ethically unacceptable on a global basis and what is locally permissible is an important part of global leadership (Black, et. al., 1999). Bird and Osland (2004) in their review of this literature, argue that strongly that this competency is crucial to success in working in global and cross-cultural settings.

Similarly, McCall and Hollenbeck (2002) reported that one of the primary characteristics that emerged from their study of 101 global leaders was “operating from a state of honesty and integrity” and Wills and Barnham (1994) also concluded that integrity, holding true to one’s beliefs and values, was an important influence to managerial success in a foreign environment. Bird and Osland (2004) place integrity as one of their threshold competencies in the ION global competency framework. Spreitzer, McCall, & Mahoney (1997) also found that integrity was an important competency in identifying international executives.

In the expatriate literature, Kealey and Ruben (1983) refer to this competency as *positive self-image* in their research (see also: Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Ronen, 1989). Kealey (1996: 86) classifies this as an important adaptation skill in his review, noting that it reflects the ability to be comfortable with and accepting of oneself. . . . the need to be acknowledged or rewarded is minimal [and the] ability to deal with the new environment without excessive worry about one’s personal and professional security is evident.”

Emotional Resilience (ER) refers to the extent to which a person has emotional strength and resilience to cope with challenging cross-cultural situations. Emotional resilience reflects the psychological hardiness that allows a global manager to carry on through difficult challenges. Individuals who can manage and control their emotions are also better equipped to deploy other global competencies than those who are low in emotional resilience.

This competency emerged in Mendenhall & Osland’s 2002 review of the global leadership literature, where they labeled it “hardiness.” It similarly emerged from the ION review of global competencies (Bird & Osland, 2004). Emotional resilience is a common indicator of intercultural effectiveness in the expatriate literature as well (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Caligiuri, 2000; Kealey, 1996; Ronen, 1989). Kelley and Meyers (1992) assert from their research that:

The emotionally resilient person has the ability to deal with stress feelings in a constructive way and to “bounce back” from them. Emotionally resilient people . . . have confidence in their ability to cope with ambiguity . . . and have a positive sense of humor and self-regard.

The ability to carry on, *perseverance*, is described by Kealy (1996) in his review of the literature as being an important attribute of working in foreign cultures. He classifies it as being a key predictor of success in a cross-cultural/global work setting.

Non-Stress Tendency (NT) refers to the scope of the dysfunctional stressors that may influence people in their daily work and social life in intercultural situations. The greater the tendency people have to experience stress, the more likely it is that they will find it difficult to deploy their global competencies in an effective way. Shaffer, et. al., (2006) label this *emotional stability* and define it as “the tendency to experience positive emotional states and to respond calmly to stressful events (p. 112).”

Kealey (1996: 86) refers to this competency as “the ability to be calm and steadfast despite opposition, difficulties, or adversity. . . Learning to be patient is critical for success.” Sometimes referred to as *patience* in the literature, it has been shown to be a critical element of intercultural effectiveness (Gersten, 1990; Kealey, 1994; 1996).

Responding to events naturally, with a calm, consistent bearing (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Gersten, 1990; Gordon, 1967; Mischel, 1965; Smith, 1966) or not being “easily worried [or] nervous” (Mol, et. al., 2005: 612) is an important competency in living and working in cross-cultural settings. In their meta-analysis of 30 primary empirical studies in the expatriate literature on predictors of expatriate job performance, Mol and associates found that an orientation toward *neuroticism* was antithetical to performance in cross-cultural settings. Shaffer, et. al., (2006) found that this competency to significantly 1) influence expatriate work adjustment, and 2) decrease withdrawal cognitions regarding overseas assignments. Also, Selmer (1999; 2001) found that showing tolerance and patience influenced all dimensions of expatriate adjustment.

Stress Management (SM) refers to the degree to which individuals actively utilize stress reduction techniques in their personal lives and are willing to use new techniques in the future. People who consistently use stress reduction techniques are better able to manage or enhance their *emotional resilience* and innate tendency to be unaffected by typical stressors and gain energy to deploy other global competencies effectively.

Mendenhall & Oddou (1985) found that the management of psychological stress in response to stressors inherent in living and working in the host country was an important part of expatriate acculturation. Since then, numerous scholars have theorized about the role of stress and its management in expatriate acculturation processes (for a review of the theoretical literature, see Mendenhall, et. al., 2002: 159-162).

Empirical testing of adjustment models and of the relationship of stress to expatriate adjustment in general has provided the field with a better understanding of the importance of this competency (Arthur & Bennett, 1995, 1997; Coyle, 1988; Feldman & Thomas, 1992; Feldman & Tompson, 1993; Hammer, 1987; Jordan & Cartwright, 1998; Kealey, 1996; Redmond & Bunyi, 1991; Searle & Ward, 1990; Selmer, 2001; Stahl, 1998; Stahl, 1999; Thomas, 1998; Tung, 1998; Ward & Kennedy, 1992; Ward & Kennedy, 1993a; Ward & Kennedy, 1993b). Stress reduction was also noted as being a primary competency in Kealey’s 1996 framework based upon his review of the literature.

For example, Coyle (1988) found that relocating to a new country generates such a high level of change that there is a highly elevated potential for health breakdown if effective coping strategies are not deployed. Stahl (1998, 1999) found that among the most frequent challenges expatriates face is role conflicts in the workplace, and that these types of challenges are among the most difficult with which to cope. Work role issues have been found by a variety of scholars to negatively influence adjustment if not managed well (Black, 1988; Black & Gregersen, 1990; Black & Gregersen, 1991; Gregersen & Black, 1992; Naumann, 1993). Managing the stress associated with the

challenges of working in an intercultural or global setting, and working through it in a productive fashion, seems to be a key global competency.

Studies have consistently found that highly adjusted expatriates tend to draw on a large repertoire of coping strategies in order to meet the challenge of managing the stress inherent in living and working overseas (Feldman & Thomas, 1992; Feldman & Tompson, 1993; Stahl, 1998; Tung, 1998). Thus, focus on a single approach to stress reduction (such as daily physical exercise) on the part of the expatriate, though useful, is necessary but not sufficient to sustain an ongoing stress management process. For example, Zimmerman, et. al., (2003) found that in addition to other skills, maintaining a Western atmosphere at home, and taking holidays to Hong Kong were critical coping mechanisms of expatriates assigned to Hong Kong. Redmond & Bunyi (1991) found that reported communication effectiveness, adaptation, and social integration best predicted effective stress management among their sample of expatriates, again reinforcing the notion that multiple skills are needed in order to manage stress effectively when living overseas. Parenthetically, there is some evidence that training programs focusing on stress-inoculation processes are relatively effective in enhancing subsequent levels of expatriate adjustment (Befus, 1988; Walton, 1992).

Interestingly, there is some evidence that the stress associated with living and working overseas is, in actuality, necessary for the breaking down of rigid behavior and knowledge frameworks, and the subsequent acquisition of global competencies and a global mindset (Kealey, 1989; Kim & Ruben, 1988; Mendenhall & Osland, 2002; Osland, 1995; Thomas, 1995). Thus, learning how to appropriately manage stress is not only necessary for psychological survival and mental health overseas, but is a prerequisite for intercultural skill development and personality growth as well.

Development of the GCI Inventory Items and Scales

In developing the Global Competencies Inventory (GCI), the conceptual domain presented in the previous chapter was used to guide the writing of a large and content valid pool of self-report survey items. The goal at this early stage of item development was to generate a thorough set of items that would ensure a more than adequate coverage of the content domain across all of the 17 facets of the global competencies. In addition, given the intended application of the GCI for predicting important job-related criteria (such as effectiveness of expatriate selection and placement decisions), the potential for self-report response bias was addressed by including a set of “unlikely virtues” survey items (Ones, Viswesvaran & Reiss, 1996; Viswesvaran, Ones & Hough, 2001) in order to control for socially desirable response patterns. In all, 311 self-report statements were written for the initial pool of items, all of which were written to allow for subject responses using a 5-point Likert format, ranging from 1=“Strongly Disagree” 2=“Disagree,” 3=“Neither Agree Nor Disagree,” 4=“Agree,” to 5=“Strongly Agree.”

Once the initial pool of items was developed, an extensive pilot study was undertaken for the express purpose of collecting a data set sufficiently large to allow for stable psychometric analysis of the items and the attendant facet subscales. The subjects

for the pilot study were recruited from as many professional backgrounds, ethnic groups, and nationalities as possible. In the end, both randomly selected and convenience samples were used to recruit the pilot study subjects, with the express purpose of targeting a generalizable sample that would be as similar as possible in work, educational and demographic background as the eventual cross-cultural populations on whom the final validated version of the GCI would be used.

In the end, 2,308 subjects completed the pilot version of the GCI, with the following self-report characteristics: 1) 8% of the subjects were under the age of 20 years, 64% were between 20 and 29 years, and 28% were 30 years and older. In response to questions about “present work position,” 2% of the subjects self-identified as “top level executives,” 12% as “middle management,” 16% as “entry level or supervisory management,” 38% as “hourly/non-supervisory,” and 32% as “other” (including students). Fifty-seven percent of the subjects self-identified as “male” and 43% self-identified as “female.” Although subjects indicated 69 different nationalities of origin, only 16 countries provided more than 10 unique subjects; when grouped by world regions, North America (i.e., Canada and the U.S.) provided 56% of subjects, Asian countries provided 26%, and Europe provided 11%, with the remaining 7% coming from countries across Latin America, Africa and the Middle East.

With a final usable sample size of 2,308 subjects, the pilot study provided more than the recommended minimum subject-to-item ratio of 5-to-1 in order to conduct stable psychometric analyses of Likert-scaled self-report surveys and questionnaires (Hair & Black, 1998; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Standard survey construction procedures and techniques were used in evaluating the initial pool of 311 items. The overarching goal was to refine individual items and eliminate redundant or unnecessary items from the final version of the GCI so as to obtain the most reliable yet parsimonious subscales across the 17 GCI facets (plus the “unlikely virtues” social desirability scale). The results of these scale refinement efforts along with the coefficient alpha reliabilities for each given scale are reported in Tables 1-3 in the Appendix which follows the reference section below.

REFERENCES

- Abe, H., & Wiseman, R.L. (1983). A cross-cultural confirmation of the dimensions of intercultural effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 7: 53-68.
- Adler, N., & Bartholomew, S. (1992). Managing globally competent people. *Academy of Management Executive*, 6(3): 52-64.
- Arthur Jr., W., & Bennett Jr., W. (1995). The international assignee: The relative importance of factors perceived to contribute to success. *Personnel Psychology*, 48: 99-113.
- Arthur Jr., W., & Bennett Jr., W. (1997). A comparative test of alternative models of international assignee job performance. In Z. Aycan (ed.) *New approaches to employee*

management. *Expatriate management: Theory and research vol. 4*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press: 141-172.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84: 191 - 215.

Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44: 1-26.

Bartunek, J.M., Gordon, J.R. & Weathersby, R.P. (1983). Developing 'Complicated' Understanding in Administrators. *Academy of Management Review*, 8(2): 273-84.

Befus, C.P. (1988). A multilevel treatment approach for culture shock experienced by sojourners. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 12(4): 381-400.

Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P., Harrison, D.A., Shaffer, M.A., & Luk, D.M. (2005). Input-based and time-based models of international adjustment: Meta-analytic evidence and theoretical extensions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 259-281.

Bikson, T.K., Treverton, G.F., Moini, J., & Lindstrom, G. (2003). *New challenges for international leadership: Lessons from organizations with global missions*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Bird, A. & Osland, J. (2004). Global competencies: An introduction. In Henry Lane, Martha Maznevski, Mark Mendenhall and Jeanne McNett (eds), *Handbook of global management*. Oxford: Blackwell: 57-80.

Black, J.S. (1988). Work-role transition: a study of American expatriate managers in Japan. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19(2): 274-291.

Black, J.S. (1990). The relationship of personal characteristics with the adjustment of Japanese expatriate managers. *Management International Review*, 30: 119-134.

Black J.S. & Gregersen, H.B. (1990). Expectations, satisfaction and intention to leave of American expatriate managers in Japan. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14: 485-506.

Black, J.S., & Gregersen, H.B. (1991). The other half of the picture. Antecedents of spouse cross-cultural adjustment. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 22: 461-477.

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(2): 291-317.

Black, J.S., Morrison, A. & Gregersen, H.B. (1999). *Global explorers: The next generation of leaders*. New York: Routledge.

Black, J.S., & Stephens, G. (1989). Expatriate adjustment and intent to stay in Pacific Rim overseas assignments. *Journal of Management*, 15: 529-544.

Boyacigiller, N., Beechler, S., Taylor, S., & Levy, O. (2004). The crucial yet illusive global mindset. In Lane, H.W., Maznevski, M., Mendenhall, M.E., & McNett, J. (eds). *The handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 81-93.

Brein, M., & David, K.H. (1971). Intercultural communication and the adjustment of the sojourner. *Psychological Bulletin*, 76: 215-230.

Brein, M., & David, K.H. (1973). *Improving cross-cultural training and measurement of cross-cultural learning (Volume 1)*. Denver: Center for Research and Education.

Caligiuri, P.M. (1995). *Individual characteristics related to effective performance in cross-cultural work settings (expatriate)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, University Park.

Caligiuri, P.M. (2000). The big five personality characteristics as predictors of expatriate's desire to terminate the assignment and supervisor-rated performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 53: 67-88.

Caligiuri, P.M. (2004). *Global leadership development through expatriate assignments and other international experiences*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management, New Orleans, August 2004.

Caligiuri, P.M., & Day, D.V. (2000). Effects of self-monitoring on technical, contextual, and assignment-specific performance. *Group & Organization Management*, 25(2): 154.

Caligiuri, P.M., Jacobs, R.R., & Farr, J.L. (2000). The Attitudinal and Behavioral Openness Scale: Scale development and construct validation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(1): 27-46.

Chen, G. (1987). *Dimensions of intercultural communication competence*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio: Kent State University; 1987. Publication Number: AAT 8719577.

Clarke, C., & Hammer, M.R. (1995). Predictors of Japanese and American managers job success, personal adjustment, and intercultural interaction effectiveness. *Management International Management Review*, 35: 153-170.

Cort, D.A., & King, M. (1979). Some correlates of culture shock among American tourists in Africa. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 3: 211-225.

Coyle, W. (1988). *On the move: Minimizing the stress and maximizing the benefit of relocation*. Sydney: Hampden.

- Cross, S. (1995). Self construals, coping, and stress in cross-cultural adaptation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26: 673-697.
- Cui, G., & Awa, N.E. (1992). Measuring intercultural effectiveness: An integrative approach. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16(3): 311-326.
- Cui, G., & Van den Berg, S. (1991). Testing the construct validity of intercultural effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15: 227-241.
- David, K.H. (1976). The use of social learning theory in preventing intercultural adjustment problems. In P. Pedersen, W.J. Lonner, & J. Draguns (Eds.) *Counseling across cultures*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press: 123-137.
- Deller, J. (1997). Expatriate selection: Possibilities and limitations of using personality scales. In Z. Aycan (ed.) *New approaches to employee management*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press: 93-116.
- Detweiler, R.A. (1975). On inferring the intentions of a person from another culture. *Journal of Personality*, 43: 591-611.
- Detweiler, R.A. (1978). Culture, category width, and attributions: A model-building approach to the reasons for cultural effect. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 9: 259-284.
- Detweiler, R.A. (1980). Intercultural interaction and the categorization process: A conceptual analysis and behavioral outcome. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 4: 275-293.
- Dinges, N.G., & Baldwin, K.D. (1996). Intercultural competence: A research perspective. In D. Landis & R.S. Bhagat (eds.) *Handbook of intercultural training (2nd edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications: 106-123.
- Dyal, J.A. (1984). Cross-cultural research with the locus of control construct. In H.M. Lefcourt (Ed.) *Research with the locus of control construct*. San Diego: Academic Press: 209-306.
- Dyal, J.A., Rybensky, L., & Sommers, M. (1988). Marital and acculturative strain among Indo-Canadian and Euro-Canadian women. In J.W. Berry & R. Annis (Eds.) *Ethnic psychology: Research and practice with immigrants, refugees, native peoples, ethnic groups, and sojourners*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Evans, P., Pucik, V., & Barsoux, J.L. (2002). *The global challenge: Frameworks for international human resource management*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Feldman, D.C., & Thomas, D.C. (1992). Career management issues facing expatriates. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23(2): 271-293.

Feldman, D.C., & Tompson, H.B. (1993). Expatriation, repatriation, and domestic geographical relocation: An empirical investigation of adjustment to new job assignments. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24(3): 507-529.

Flango, V.E., & Brumbaugh, R.B. (1974). The dimensionality of the cosmopolitan-local construct. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19: 198-210.

Gertsen, M.C. (1990). Intercultural competence and expatriates. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3: 341-362.

Goldberg, A.I. (1976). The relevance of cosmopolitan/local orientations to professional values and behavior. *Sociology of Work and Occupation*, 3(3): 331-356.

Goldsmith, M., Greenberg, C., Robertson, A., & Hu-Chan, M. (2003). *Global leadership: The next generation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gong, Y. & Gan, J. (2004). *A longitudinal examination of the role of goal orientation in cross-cultural adjustment*. Unpublished manuscript.

Gordon, L.V. (1967). Clinical, psychometric, and work sample approaches in the prediction of success in Peace Corps training. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51(2): 111-119.

Gregersen, H.B., & Black, J.S. (1992). Antecedents to commitment to a parent company and a foreign operation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(1): 65-90.

Hair, A., & Black, T. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hammer, M.R. (1987). Behavioral dimensions of intercultural effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 11: 65-88.

Hammer, M.R., Gudykunst, W.B., & Wiseman, R.L. (1978). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 2: 382-393.

Harris, J.G. (1973). A science of the South Pacific: Analysis of the character structure of the Peace Corps volunteer. *American Psychologist*, 28: 232-247.

Harris, J.G. (1975). Identification of cross-cultural talent: The empirical approach of the Peace Corps. *Topics in Culture Learning*, 3: 66-78.

Harrison, J.K., Chadwick, M., & Scales, M. (1996). The relationship between cross-cultural adjustment and the personality variables of self-efficacy and self-monitoring. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20: 167-188.

Harrison, D.A., & Shaffer, M.A. (2005). Mapping the criterion space for expatriate success: Task- and relationship-based performance, effort and adaptation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(8): 1454-1474.

- Harrison, D.A., Shaffer, M.A., & Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P. (2004). Going places: Roads more and less traveled in research on expatriate experiences. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 23: 199-247.
- Hawes, F., & Kealey, D.J. (1981). An empirical study of Canadian technical assistance. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 5: 239-258.
- Hechanova, R., Beehr, T.A. & Christiansen, N.D. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of employees adjustment to overseas assignment: A meta-analytic review. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52(2): 213-236.
- Herman, J., Stevens, M., & Bird, A. (2008). *Tolerance for Ambiguity: A refined measure for international management research*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Hudson, S., & Inkson, K. (2006). Overseas development workers: "Big Five" personality scores. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 1(1): 5-9.
- Hull, W.F. (1978). *Foreign students in the United States of America: Coping behavior within the educational environment*. New York: Praeger.
- Hullet, C.R., & Witte, K. (2001). Predicting intercultural adaptation and isolation: Using the extended parallel process model to test anxiety/uncertainty management theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25: 125-139.
- Janssens, M. (1995). Intercultural interaction: A burden on international managers? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16: 155-167.
- John, O.P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspective. In L. Pervin and O.P. Johns (Eds.) *Handbook of personality: Theory and research (2nd Edition)*. New York: Guilford.
- Jokinen, T. (2005). Global leadership competencies: a review and discussion. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 29(2/3): 199-216.
- Jordan, J., & Cartwright, S. (1998). Selecting expatriate managers: Key traits and competencies. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 19(2): 89-96.
- Kealey, D.J. (1989). A study of cross-cultural effectiveness: Theoretical issues, practical applications. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13: 387-428.
- Kealey, D.J. (1994). *Overseas screening and selection: A survey of current practice and future trends*. Hull, Canada: CIDA.
- Kealey, D.J. (1996). The challenge of international personnel selection. In D. Landis & R.S. Bhagat (eds). *Handbook of intercultural training (2nd edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; pp. 81-105.

Kealey, D.J., & Ruben, B.D. (1983). Cross-cultural personnel selection: Criteria, issues and methods. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training*, (Vol. 1, pp. 155–175). New York: Pergamon Press.

Kedia, B., & Mukherji, A. (1999). Global managers: Developing a mindset for global competitiveness. *Journal of World Business*, 34(3): 230-247.

Klineberg, O., & Hull, W.F. (1979). *At a foreign university: An international study of adaptation and coping*. New York: Praeger.

Koester, J., & Olebe, M. (1988). The Behavioral Assessment Scale for Intercultural Communication Effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 12: 233-246.

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(1): 71-99.

Kühlmann, T.M., & Stahl, G.K. (1996). Fachkompetenz alien genügt nicht—Interkulturelle Assessment Center unterstützen die gezielte Personalauswahl. *Personalführung Plus*, 96: 22-24.

Kühlmann, T.M., & Stahl, G.K. (1998). Diagnose interkultureller Kompetenz: Entwicklung und Evaluierung eines Assessment Centers. In C. Barmeyer & J. Bolten (Eds.) *Interkulturelle personalorganisation*. Berlin: Verlag Wissenschaft & Praxis: 213-223.

Kuo, W.H., Gray, R., & Lin, N. (1976). Locus of control and symptoms of distress among Chinese-Americans. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 22: 176-187.

Kuo, W.H., & Tsai, V.-M. (1986). Social networking, hardiness, and immigrants' mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 27: 133-149.

Lane, H.W., Maznevski, M.L., & Mendenhall, M.E. (2004). Hercules meets Buddha. In Lane, H.W., Maznevski, M., Mendenhall, M.E., & McNett, J. (eds). *The handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 3-25.

Lane, H.W., Maznevski, M., Mendenhall, M.E., & McNett, J. (2004). *The handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Levy, O., Beechler, S., Taylor, S. & Boyacigiller, N. (2007). What do we talk about when we talk about global mindset: Managerial cognition in multinational corporations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38: 231-258.

Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98: 224-253.

Martin, J.N. (1987). The relationship between perceptions of intercultural competencies and previous sojourn experience. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 11: 337-355.

Martin, J. N., & Hammer, M.R. (1989). Behavioral categories of intercultural communication competence: Everyday communicators' perceptions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13: 303-332.

Matsumoto, D., LeRoux, J.A., Bernhard, R., & Gray, H. (2004). Unraveling the psychological correlates of intercultural adjustment potential. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28(3-4): 281-309.

Mendenhall, M. (2001). New perspectives on expatriate adjustment and its relationship to global leadership development. In Mendenhall, M., Kühlmann, T., & Stahl, G. (eds.) *Developing global business leaders: Policies, processes, and innovations*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books: 1-16.

Mendenhall, M., Kühlmann, T., & Stahl, G. (2001). *Developing global business leaders: Policies, processes, and innovations*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Mendenhall, M., Kühlmann, T., Stahl, G., & Osland, J. (2002). Employee development and expatriate assignments: A review of the expatriate adjustment theory literature. In Gannon, M. & Newman, K. (eds.) *Handbook of cross-cultural management*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell Publishers: 155-183.

Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (1985). The dimensions of expatriate acculturation: A review. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1): 39-47.

Mendenhall, M., & Osland, J.S. (2002). *An overview of the extant global leadership research*. Symposium presentation at the Academy of International Business, Puerto Rico, June 2002.

Mendenhall, M.E., Osland, J., Bird, A., Oddou, G., & Maznevski, M. (2008). *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development*. London: Routledge.

Mendenhall, M., & Wiley, C. (1994). Strangers in a strange land: The relationship between expatriate adjustment and impression management. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 37(5): 605-620.

McCall, M.W. Jr. & Hollenbeck, G.P. (2002). *Developing global executives: The lessons of international experience*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Mischel, W. (1965). Predicting the success of Peace Corp volunteers in Nigeria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1(5): 517-520.

Mol, S.T., Born, M.P., Willemson, M.E., & Van der Molen, H. (2005). Predicting expatriate job performance for selection purposes: A quantitative review. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36(5): 590-620.

- Montagliani, A.J. (1996). *Impression management and cross-cultural adaptation measures*. Dissertation. Virginia: University of Richmond. Publication Number: AAT 0665820.
- Moro Bueno, C., & Tubbs, S. (2004). Identifying global leadership competencies: An exploratory study. *Journal of American Academy of Business* 5(1/2): 80-87.
- Mumford, S.J. (1975). *Overseas adjustment as measured by a mixed standard scale*. Paper presented at the meetings of the Western Psychological Association, Sacramento, CA.
- Naumann, E. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment among expatriate managers. *Group & Organization Management*, 18(2): 153-187.
- Navara, G.S., & James, S. (2002). Sojourner adjustment: Does missionary status affect acculturation? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26(6): 695-709.99.
- Nicholls, C.E., Rothstein, M.G., & Bourne, A. (2002). Predicting work attitudes: The impact of cognitive closure and adjustment competencies. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 2(3): 297-320.
- Nishida, H. (1985). Japanese intercultural communication competence and cross-cultural adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 9: 247-269.
- Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Oddou, G., & Mendenhall, M. (1984). Cross-cultural person perception: A review of cross-cultural and related literature. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10(2): 77-96.
- Oguri, M., & Gudykunst, W.B. (2002). The influence of self construals and communication styles on sojourners' psychological and sociocultural adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26(5): 577-593.
- Olebe, M., & Koester, J. (1989). Exploring the cross-cultural equivalence of The Behavioral Assessment Scale for Intercultural Communication Effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13: 333-347.
- Ones, D.S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1997). Personality determinants in the prediction of aspects of expatriate job success. In Z. Aycan (ed.) *New approaches to employee management*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press: 63-92.
- Ones, D.S., Viswesvaran, C., & Reiss, A.D. (1996). The role of social desirability in personality testing for personnel selection: The red herring. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 660-679.
- Osland, J.S. (2008). Overview of the global leadership literature. In Mendenhall, M., Osland, J.S., Bird, A., Oddou, G., & Maznevski, M. *Global leadership: Research, practice and development*. London: Routledge: 34-63.

Osland, J.S., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M.E., & Osland, A. (2006). Developing global leadership capabilities and global mindset: A review. In G.K. Stahl and I. Björkman (eds.) *Handbook of research in international human resource management*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing: 197-222.

Osland, J.S., Taylor, S., & Mendenhall, M.E. (in press). Global leadership: Progress and challenges. In Bhagat, R.S., & Steers, R.M. (eds.) *Handbook of culture, organizations, and work*. Oxford: Cambridge University Press.

Palthe, J. (2004). The relative importance of antecedents to cross-cultural adjustment: Implications for managing a global workforce. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28(1): 37-59.

Parker, B., & McEvoy, G. (1993). Initial examination of a model of intercultural adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 17: 355-79.

Pi-Ju Yang, R., Noels, K.A., Saumure, K.D. (2006). Multiple routes to cross-cultural adaptation for international students: Mapping the paths between self-construals, English language confidence, and adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30(4): 487-506.

Pruitt, F.J. (1978). The adaptation of African students to American society. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21: 90-118.

Ratiu, I. (1983). Thinking internationally: A comparison of how international executives learn. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 13: 139-150.

Redmond, M.V., & Bunyi, J.M. (1991). The relationship of intercultural communication competence with stress and the handling of stress as reported by international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 17: 235-254.

Ronen, S. (1989). Training the international assignee. In I.L. Goldsten (ed), *Training and development in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: 417-453.

Rosen, R., Digh, P., Singer, M. & Philips, C. (2000). *Global literacies: Lessons on business leadership and national cultures*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ruben, B.D. (1989). The study of cross-cultural competence: Traditions and contemporary issues. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13: 229-239.

Ruben, B.D., & Kealey, D.J. (1979). Behavioral assessment of communication competency and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 3: 15-47.

Searle, W., & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and socio-cultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14: 449-464.

Selmer, J. (1999). Career issues and international adjustment of business expatriates. *Career Development International*, 4(2): 77-87.

Selmer, J. (2001). Psychological barriers to adjustment and how they affect coping strategies: Western business expatriates in China. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(2): 151-165.

Shaffer, M.A., Ferzandi, L.A., Harrison, D.A., Gregersen, H., & Black, J.S. (2003). You can take it with you: Individual differences and expatriate effectiveness. *BRC papers on cross-cultural management*. #200308. Business Research Center. Hong Kong Baptist University.

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.

Shaffer, M.A., Harrison, D.A., Gregersen, H., Black, J.S., & Ferzandi, L.A. (2006). You can take it with you: Individual differences and expatriate effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 9(1): 109-125.

Sinangil, H.K., & Ones, D.S. (1997). Empirical investigations of the host country perspective in expatriate management. In D.M. Saunders (Series Ed.) and Z. Aycan (Vol. Ed), *New approaches to employee management: Vol. 4. Expatriate management theory and research*. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Smith, M.B. (1966). Explorations in competence: A study of Peace Corps teachers in Ghana. *American Psychologist*, 21: 555-566.

Spreitzer, G.M., McCall, M.W., Jr., & Mahoney, J.D. (1997). Early identification of international executive potential. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(1): 6-29.

Stahl, G.K. (1998). *Internationaler einsatz von führungskräften*. München: Oldenbourg.

Stahl, G.K. (1999). Deutsche führungskräfte im Auslandsensatz: Probleme und problemlöserfolg in Japan und den USA. *Die Betriebswirtschaft*, 59: 687-703.

Stahl, G.K. (2001). Using assessment centers as tools for global leadership development: An exploratory study. In M.E. Mendenhall, T.M. Kühlmann, & G.K. Stahl (eds). *Developing global business leaders*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books: 197-210.

Stroh, L.K, Dennis, L.E., & Cramer, T.C. (1994). Predictors of expatriate adjustment. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. 2(2): 176-192.

- Sudweeks, S., Gudykunst, W.B., Ting-Toomey, S., & Nishida, T. (1990). Developmental themes in Japanese-North American interpersonal relationships. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14: 207-233.
- Taveggia, T.C., & Gibboney, L.S.N. (2001). Cross-cultural adjustment: A test of the Uncertainty Reduction Principle. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 1(2): 153-171.
- Tetlock, P.E. (1983). Accountability and complexity of thought. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45: 74-83.
- Thomas, D.C. (1998). The expatriate experience: A critical review and synthesis. *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 12: 237-273.
- Thomas, D.C., & Lazarova, M.B. (2006). Expatriate adjustment and performance: A critical review. In G.K. Stahl and I. Björkman (eds) *Handbook of research in international human resource management*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing: 247-264.
- Torbiörn, I. (1982). *Living abroad: Personal adjustment and personnel policy in the overseas setting*. New York: Wiley.
- Tsang, E.W.K. (2001). Adjustment of Mainland Chinese academics and students to Singapore. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25(4): 347-372.
- Tucker, M.F., Bonial, R., & Lahti, K. (2004). The definition, measurement and prediction of intercultural adjustment and job performance among corporate expatriates. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28(3/4): 221-251.
- Tung, R.L. (1998). American expatriates abroad: From neophytes to cosmopolitans. *Journal of World Business*, 33: 125-144.
- Varner, I.I., & Palmer, T.M. (2005). Role of cultural self-knowledge in successful expatriation. *Singapore Management Review*, 27(1): 1-25.
- Viswesvaran, C., Ones, D.S., & Hough, L.M. (2001). Do impression management scales in personality inventories predict managerial job performance ratings? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9: 277-289.
- Walton, S.J. (1992). Stress management training for overseas effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16: 507-526.
- Wang, X. (2002). Expatriate adjustment from a social network perspective: Theoretical examination and a conceptual model. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 2(3): 321-337.

- Ward, C. (1996). Acculturation. In D. Landis & R.S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed.): 124-147. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1992). Locus of control, mood disturbance, and social difficulty during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16: 175-194.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1993a). Acculturation and cross-cultural adaptation of British residents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133: 395-397.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1993b). Psychological and socio-cultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions: A comparison of secondary students at home and abroad. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 24: 221-249.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1999). The measurement of sociocultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(4): 659-677.
- Ward, C., & Searle, W. (1991). The impact of value discrepancies and cultural identity on psychological and socio-cultural adjustment of sojourners. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15: 209-225.
- Waxin, M.F. (2004). Expatriates' interaction adjustment: The direct and moderator effects of culture of origin. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28(1): 61-79.
- Wills, S., & Barham, K. (1994). Being an international manager. *European Management Journal*, 12(1): 49-58.
- Yamaguchi, Y., & Wiseman, R.L. (2001). *Locus of control, self construals, intercultural effectiveness, and cross-cultural adjustment*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Washington, D.C.
- Yavas, U., & Bodur, M. (1999). Correlates of adjustment: A study of expatriate managers in an emerging country. *Management Decision*, 37(3): 267-278.
- Zimmerman, A., Holman, D., & Sparrow, P. (2003). Unraveling adjustment mechanisms: Adjustment of German expatriates to intercultural interactions, work, and living conditions in the People's Republic of China. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 3(1): 45-66.

Appendix

Table 1. Factor Analysis Item Loadings for the Five Perception Management Subscales
(overall scale reliability = 0.86)

Nonjudgmentalness (reliability = 0.72)

NJ01	0.656
NJ02	0.670
NJ03	0.625
NJ04	0.604
NJ05	0.496
NJ06	0.521
NJ07	0.455
NJ08	0.489
NJ09	0.488

Inquisitiveness (reliability = 0.84)

IQ01	0.726
IQ02	0.725
IQ03	0.652
IQ04	0.648
IQ05	0.665
IQ06	0.608
IQ07	0.645
IQ08	0.583
IQ09	0.583
IQ10	0.593

Tolerance of Ambiguity (reliability = 0.73)

TA01	0.606
TA02	0.563
TA03	0.538
TA04	0.569
TA05	0.498
TA06	0.490
TA07	0.497
TA08	0.405
TA09	0.450
TA10	0.457
TA11	0.467
TA12	0.499

Table 1. cont.

Cosmopolitanism (reliability = 0.84)

CM01	0.823
CM02	0.735
CM03	0.775
CM04	0.611
CM05	0.704
CM06	0.709
CM07	0.584

Interest Flexibility (reliability = 0.83)

IF01	0.652
IF02	0.675
IF03	0.607
IF04	0.614
IF05	0.633
IF06	0.610
IF07	0.598
IF08	0.614
IF09	0.596
IF10	0.535
IF11	0.538

Note: See pages 35-36 for Table 2, and pages 37-38 for Table 3.

Table 2. Factor Analysis Item Loadings for the Five Relationship Management Subscales (overall scale reliability = 0.91)

Relationship Interest (reliability = 0.80)

RI01	0.710
RI02	0.582
RI03	0.589
RI04	0.582
RI05	0.534
RI06	0.737
RI07	0.665
RI08	0.794

Interpersonal Engagement (reliability = 0.82)

IE01	0.804
IE02	0.696
IE03	0.674
IE04	0.628
IE05	0.499
IE06	0.808
IE07	0.625
IE08	0.620

Emotional Sensitivity (reliability = 0.74)

ES01	0.669
ES02	0.647
ES03	0.620
ES04	0.595
ES05	0.587
ES06	0.560
ES07	0.517
ES08	0.497
ES09	0.433

Self Awareness (reliability = 0.73)

SA01	0.633
SA02	0.627
SA03	0.605
SA04	0.552
SA05	0.583
SA06	0.549
SA07	0.525
SA08	0.510
SA09	0.505

Table 2. cont.

Social Flexibility (reliability = 0.72)

SF01	0.615
SF02	0.567
SF03	0.532
SF04	0.526
SF05	0.496
SF06	0.482
SF07	0.445
SF08	0.432
SF09	0.420
SF10	0.431
SF11	0.402
SF12	0.400
SF13	0.399
SF14	0.332

Table 3. Factor Analysis Item Loadings for the Seven Self Management Subscales (overall scale reliability = 0.93)

Optimism (reliability = 0.74)

OP01	0.648
OP02	0.577
OP03	0.601
OP04	0.541
OP05	0.555
OP06	0.500
OP07	0.543
OP08	0.490
OP09	0.479
OP10	0.436
OP11	0.447

Self Confidence (reliability = 0.83)

SC01	0.700
SC02	0.691
SC03	0.680
SC04	0.688
SC05	0.663
SC06	0.663
SC07	0.581
SC08	0.556
SC09	0.587
SC10	0.577

Self Identity (reliability = 0.73)

SI01	0.601
SI02	0.609
SI03	0.632
SI04	0.498
SI05	0.657
SI06	0.664
SI07	0.584
SI08	0.457

Table 3. cont.

Emotional Resilience (reliability = 0.81)

ES01		0.703
ES02		0.698
ES03		0.697
ES04		0.708
ES05		0.596
ES06		0.608
ES07		0.583
ES08		0.525
ES09		0.538

Non-Stress Tendency (reliability = 0.81)

NS01		0.765
NS02		0.723
NS03		0.740
NS04		0.717
NS05		0.656
NS06		0.706

Stress Management (reliability = 0.74)

SM01		0.737
SM02		0.566
SM03		0.654
SM04		0.718
SM05		0.508
SM06		0.509
SM07		0.675

About the Authors

Mark E. Mendenhall is a Senior Vice-President of the Kozai Group, Inc. He also holds the J. Burton Frierson Chair of Excellence in Business Leadership at the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga. He is past president of the International Management Division of the Academy of Management, and has authored numerous books and scholarly articles in the areas of global leadership and international human resource management. His most recent books are: *Global Leadership: Research, Practice and Development* (2008, Routledge), *Readings and Cases in International Human Resource Management* (2007, Routledge), and *Managing Human Resources in Mergers and Acquisitions* (2005, Stanford University Press), and his research has been published in journals such as *Sloan Management Review*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of International Business Studies*, and *Organizational Dynamics*. He has consulted with, and conducted numerous training programs for many firms, some of which include: IBM-Asia Pacific, IBM-Japan, National Aeronautic and Space Administration (NASA), Boeing, General Motors, United States Army, J.C. Bamford Excavators (JCB), Molex, BlueCross BlueShield, and The Dixie Group.

Michael J. Stevens is a Senior Vice President of the Kozai Group, Inc. He also holds an appointment as a professor of management at Weber State University. His primary areas of expertise include: improving organizational performance through teamwork, empowerment and cross-cultural effectiveness; individual assessment and selection (especially for teams, emotional intelligence, and cross-cultural work assignments); leadership training and development, and its impact on organizational culture and employee performance; and interpersonal effectiveness in the global workplace. Dr. Stevens received his Ph.D. from the Krannert School of Management at Purdue University, where he received the Ralph G. Alexander Best Dissertation Award from the International Academy of Management. He is a widely cited author who has conducted pioneering research in the areas of predicting a person's aptitude for working successfully in teams and in culturally diverse global work environments. He is the lead author of the commercially distributed "Teamwork-KSA" employment test, and also consults with a wide variety of organizations. He has held leadership and board positions in industry, government, and not-for-profit enterprises, and is active in several professional societies. His research has been published in such places as the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of International Business*, *Journal of Management*, and *International Journal of Human Resource Management*.

Allan Bird is President of the Kozai Group, Inc. He is also the Eiichi Shibusawa-Seigo Arai Professor of Japanese Studies and Director of the International Business Institute at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. He has authored/edited numerous books, including *Global Leadership: Research, Practice and Development*, *The Encyclopedia of Japanese Business and Management*, *Japanese Multinationals Abroad: Individual and Organizational Learning and Ekuzekuchibu no Kenkyuu (Research on Executives)*. With more than 90 articles and book

chapters, his work has appeared in the *Academy of Management Journal*, the *Strategic Management Journal*, the *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, the *Journal of International Business Studies* and other academic and practitioner journals. His research interests focus on effective management in intercultural contexts, with a particular focus on intercultural sensemaking and global leadership development. Some of the companies he has worked with include AT&T, Fujitsu, GE, Molex, Monsanto, Nippon Express and Watchmark.

Gary R. Oddou is a Senior Vice President of the Kozai Group, Inc. He received his Ph.D. in organizational psychology from Brigham Young University and currently serves as a professor of international management at California State University, San Marcos, where he directs the Global Business Management program. He has taught and given business seminars in a number of countries, including the U.S, U.K, France, Switzerland, Yugoslavia (at that time), Vietnam and Taiwan, and Japan. His research is principally in two areas: international human resource management and global leadership, specializing in the factors related to effective cross-cultural competence and global leader effectiveness. He has authored or co-authored several books, including *Cases in International Organizational Behavior*, *Managing Internationally: A Personal Journey*, *Managing an Organization: A Workbook Simulation*, and most recently *International Human Resource Management: Readings and Cases, 4th edition* (2007), and *Global Leadership* (Routledge, 2008). His management consulting and training activities have been in the areas of expatriate and repatriate program effectiveness and global management competency evaluation. He has worked with such organizations as IBM, Applied Materials, Molex, and Doctors Without Borders. He speaks French and English fluently and has basic conversational Vietnamese and Spanish language skills. He has lived in the U.S, France, England and Yugoslavia.