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by
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The globalization of business has resulted in both large numbers of workers living and working abroad, as well as an increasingly multicultural domestic work environment. Organizational research has shown that cross-cultural training mitigates or proactively guards against the frustrations, misunderstandings, and culture shock often resulting from cross-cultural interactions that lead to poor adjustment and job performance (Harris & Kumra, 2000). Despite the recent surge of studies in this area, previous cross-cultural effectiveness studies have failed to take into account a number of moderating variables. Particularly, the role of the expatriate’s supervisor and the personality and motivational differences of the expatriate have not yet been explored. Thus, the present study draws upon cross-cultural training theory, in addition to the leader-member exchange framework, in proposing that cross-cultural training for the supervisor of an expatriate subordinate will moderate the impact of cross-cultural training on the expatriate subordinate’s adjustment and job performance. Furthermore, self-efficacy, openness to experience, and extraversion were tested as moderators of the relationship between cross-cultural training and job performance. Participants were individuals from a variety of countries who were coming to the United States for practical training. They took part in a web-based cross-cultural training study before leaving for the U.S. or shortly after they arrived. Results indicate that supervisor cross-cultural training does impact the
effectiveness of cross-cultural training on job performance and work-related adjustment. Additionally, results support the predictions that self-efficacy and extraversion moderate the relationship between cross-cultural training and job performance.
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INTRODUCTION

The globalization of business has changed the fabric of today's organizations. Competition has cropped up in new and unforeseen places and countries. To keep up, organizations are expanding their operations in a number of ways, from outsourcing to building offices overseas. Leaders of global organizations have seen the need, and technology has given them the ability, to capitalize on the strengths that a culturally diverse workforce affords an organization. They have realized that by hiring a culturally diverse workforce, they are more likely to create an innovative, creative culture in their organization. In order to gain access to this diversity, and to increase the selection pool for qualified individuals in certain disciplinary backgrounds, such as engineering, many organizations have expanded their recruitment and training opportunities to include individuals from countries all over the world. New organizational practices and arrangements have been implemented to manage these drastic changes that are occurring within organizational structures (Harris & Kumra, 2000). For example, the use of virtual global teams, comprised of employees located around the world, has become common practice for many organizations. Conferences, seminars, and even small meetings are often conducted virtually and are comprised of people from a variety of countries and cultures. Due to the increased cultural diversity of the workforce and the nature of global organizations, working with and leveraging cultural differences has been identified as a critical success factor to business effectiveness (Javidan & House, 2001).

The 2003/2004 Global Relocation Trends Survey Report, conducted by Global Relocations Services in collaboration with SHRM Global Services, surveyed 134
multinational companies both large and small with over 7,000 offices located around the world. This survey provides interesting insight into the current state of expatriation. Expatriates are individuals who are temporarily or permanently living in a country and culture different from that of their upbringing and/or legal residence (Kraimer, Wayne, & Jaworski, 2001). A total of 31% of respondents from these organizations reported an increase in the number of expatriates over the past year, and cited the U.K., the U.S, China, Singapore, and Germany as the most “active” destinations. Yet the increase in global competition has forced the traditional expatriating organizations to look more carefully at the cost-effectiveness of expatriation (Harris & Kumra, 2000). The average reported annual turnover for expatriates was 8%, an all-time low, but most respondents to the Global Relocation Survey (69%) indicated that they do not keep track of when expatriates leave the company. Regardless, even a low turnover rate is still highly costly to an organization when the average yearly outlay for a long-term transfer is three times the annual salary of the transferee. If the expatriate’s family comes, a three-year assignment can easily cost $1 million (Shellenbarger, 2005). Salaries, benefits, and travel expenses may not be the only financial costs that organizations incur from expatriate failure; serious misunderstandings of cultures creates the possibility for long-term riffs with host-country officials, the organizations’ clients, and the community at large.

The most commonly cited factors leading to assignment failure are family concerns, inability to adapt, and poor job performance. Those who do not end their job early because of poor performance and/or inability to adjust are often operating at a low level of effectiveness. The marked increase in business ties to developing countries, such as India, means that many expatriates are going from a developed country to an
undeveloped country, which is a transition that brings intense challenges. Additionally, short-term assignments in which the expatriate is only living in the host country for a few months have become more popular (Global Relocations Survey Report, 2004). Particularly in these situations, expatriates have limited time to adjust to their new environment. As a result, adaptation and adjustment must be rapid, and performance must be kick-started at the beginning of the assignment and maintained throughout it.

In order to help alleviate problems associated with employee relocation to different countries, multinational organizations have increasingly turned to cross-cultural training. Cross-cultural training is best defined as, "educative processes that are designed to promote intercultural learning; the acquisition of behavioral, cognitive and affective competencies associated with effective interaction across cultures" (Landis & Brislin, 1983, pg. 213). The Global Relocations Survey found that 60% of the organizations surveyed provided cross-cultural training of at least one day’s duration. The increase in the usage of cross-cultural training in encouraging, however, well-constructed empirical studies on the subject are still lacking. With the rate of expatriates climbing every year, there has perhaps never been a stronger need for organizations to focus on improving the performance of these employees through cross-cultural training (Eschbach, Parker, & Stoeberl, 2001).

Cross-cultural training provides expatriates and others working in a multicultural environment with the opportunity to improve upon their ability to communicate with a culturally diverse set of people and to monitor and adjust their behavior to interact effectively with those from different cultures (Triandis, 1996). Despite its growing popularity and use within multinational organizations, research on cross-cultural training
has been plagued with a variety of problems. Huge gaps exist in the cross-cultural training literature that have either not been addressed entirely, or have been tackled by poorly designed studies. To make matters worse, cross-cultural trainers and the organizations that hire them often ignore the findings that have emerged when developing their training approach.

Many researchers in the field of cross-cultural training have called for more pre- and post-training measures of effectiveness, as well as an increased focus on examining cognitive processes resulting from the training, such as cultural awareness, behavioral competencies, and specific intercultural skills. Also, a need clearly exists for comparisons between experimental and control groups, and assignment of participants to these groups on a random basis (Van de Vijver & Leung, 2000). Because field studies are much better than lab studies for measurement of cross-cultural training outcomes (Black & Mendenhall, 1990), many studies have correlational designs, thus limiting the ability to make causal conclusions. A reliance on self-report data has been yet another criticism of cross-cultural training research.

One of the most distinctive limitations in cross-cultural training research at this point in time has been its narrow focus on the expatriates in a management position possessing full control and power over those they are managing in the host country. Very few studies have taken an interest in examining the effectiveness of cross-cultural training for those who are not in a leadership position, but hold a position lower in the hierarchical chain of command found in many large, multinational organizations. Various realities have not been addressed in previous studies, such as situations in which expatriates are the subordinates or trainees of host-country supervisors. Indeed, the term
"expatriate" is thrown around loosely, and can indicate organizational positions ranging from supervisors of an oilrig to CEOs of a multinational company's subsidiaries. Expatriates are not always sent on overseas assignments to manage groups of people; sometimes they are sent to other countries to be trained. Such is the case when employees work for a company that is based overseas and must go to the organization's home base in order to receive job-related training.

Training host country employees on skills that will prepare them for the arrival of an international manager or trainee has recently caught the attention of a few researchers and practitioners in the field (e.g., Kraimer, Wayne, & Jaworski, 2001), but has largely been overlooked. Diversity training researchers have pointed to the need for managerial support for training initiatives (Rynes, 1995); it is reasonable to postulate that the same need exists in the domain of cross-cultural training. Cross-cultural training has been shown to improve the requisite knowledge and skills that are necessary for successful intercultural interactions. It is intuitively appealing that this type of training would be valuable for both expatriates as well for the global leaders who supervise expatriates.

The proposed study was designed with a number of purposes in mind: one, to investigate the effect of a theoretically-based cross-cultural training program on expatriate adjustment and performance; two, to test whether providing cross-cultural training to expatriates' supervisors moderates the effect of expatriate cross-cultural training on the expatriates' adjustment and performance, and three, to explore the role that individual differences play in cross-cultural training effectiveness.

To accomplish these goals, I will first review previous literature relating to culture and its dimensions before introducing culture shock as the primary driver of the need for
cross-cultural training. Next, I will describe the different types of cross-cultural training and the growing significance of web-based training. I will then outline the skills that cross-cultural training is designed to target. Next, I will discuss what is currently known about the effectiveness of cross-cultural training, along with the criteria used for this evaluation. I will then proceed by introducing several possible moderators of cross-cultural training effectiveness and provide the theoretical rationale for their inclusion in the study. Lastly, I will derive specific hypotheses and describe the method used in the current study.

CULTURE

Definitional Issues

The appropriate definition of culture has been the subject of much debate since it began to be studied empirically. Still today there is little agreement on how it is best defined. In fact, there are over 160 definitions of culture. Kluckhohn and Kroeber (1952) describe culture as, “patterns of behavior that are acquired and transmitted by symbols over time, which become generally shared within a group and are communicated to new members of the group to serve as a cognitive guide or blueprint for future actions” (pg. 22). These symbols are manifested in observable ways, such as social interaction and styles of working (Adler, Doktor, & Redding, 1986). The idea that culture is based on symbolic frameworks, cognitions, and conceptual distinctions in people's minds is a running theme in all definitions of culture. Hofstede (1980) offers a more complete definition of culture in his early work:
“Culture is the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another...the interactive aggregate of common characteristics that influence a human group's response to its environment (p. 25) ...

Culture is not a characteristic of the individual; it encompasses a number of people who were conditioned by the same education and life experience. When we speak of culture as a group, a tribe, a geographical region, a national minority, or a nation, culture refers to the collective mental programming that these people have in common; the programming that is different from that of other groups, tribes, regions, minorities, or nations (p. 48).”

Narrowing down the definition of culture to any particular level (e.g. individual, regional, national) is difficult, since culture is a complex phenomenon that can be manifested at many different levels. Researchers often label different cultures with the name of the nation in which they are found. This is an overly simplified method of classification given the multitude of people from different cultures who reside in the same country. However, culture must be defined and given parameters. In the present study, all mention of culture will refer to the macro-level of culture, that of national culture.

Dimensions of Culture

Hofstede's (1980) seminal study of 50 countries from a variety of regions around the world laid the foundation for both his and others' subsequent research on culture. In this study, Hofstede provided evidence for four dimensions of culture: power distance,
individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity, and uncertainty avoidance. Other researchers have argued that these dimensions cannot be assumed to capture the entire domain of cultural differences; however, they have been repeatedly empirically validated (Kolman, Noorderhaven, Hofstede, & Dienes, 2002), and for the proposed study, will be used to discuss the concept of culture.

The dimension that most clearly relates to organizational practices is power distance, which refers to the degree of expectation and acceptance of authority and power of the more powerful members of a society. In societies high in power distance, power is distributed unequally, and hierarchies are more strongly adhered to and enforced (Hofstede & McCrae, 2004). Indonesians, for example, consistently rank high on the power distance dimension. Cultures with low power distance values are typically more egalitarian in nature, with a feeling of equality between societal members of different ranks and backgrounds. The U.S. and Australia are examples of countries that rank low to medium on this dimension. Interestingly, power distance impacts followers’ expectations and preferences regarding leadership. People from high power distance societies both expect and prefer more guidance from authority figures (Dickson, Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003).

Uncertainty avoidance refers to the degree to which a society is tolerant of ambiguity. Some societies seem to be more comfortable with unstructured environments than others. Members of low uncertainty avoidance societies are more at ease with unfamiliar situations, and more tolerant of differing ideas, opinions, approaches to problems, and conceptions of solutions than those in high uncertainty avoidance societies (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000). Another notable finding is that people in
uncertainty-avoiding cultures are less tolerant of those who disobey codes of conduct or violate social norms, and tend to prefer greater structure together with clear rules and standardized operating procedures (Hofstede, 1980). A fifth dimension of culture, termed "long-term versus short-term orientation" is sometimes included in Hofstede’s dimensions as an Asian variant of uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede & Pederson, 1999).

The dimension called individualism/collectivism refers to how members of a society form their self-identity. Collectivism reflects the extent to which people’s values and beliefs about themselves are constructed through, and as a result of, existing social relationships with others (Hofstede, 1991). Triandis (1996) describes the degree of interdependence a person feels with a group as collectivism, and the extent of his or her feeling of differentiation within a group as individualism. Collectivists are more likely to explain behavior by attributing it to the external environment or situation rather than to one’s innate disposition, while those in individualistic cultures demonstrate the opposite pattern of cognitions (Ensari & Murphy, 2003). Individualism-collectivism has been found to be correlated with constructs such as negotiation behavior as well as with training performance, depending on whether the training is group or individual-focused (Hofstede, 2001).

The masculinity-femininity dimension, which is sometimes referred to as performance-orientation versus cooperation-orientation, describes the extent to which people in a society hold traditionally “masculine” or “feminine” values. It is also described as the degree to which cultures look favorably upon aggressiveness and striving for personal success rather than nurturance, service, and other supportive types of behavior (Hofstede, 1980). Empirically, performance-orientation has been linked to
masculinity, and cooperation-orientation has been linked to femininity; it is generally accepted that masculinity-femininity merely act as labels for an underlying phenomenon.

Different constellations of differences, as charted on the various dimensions of culture, can result in very divergent expectations and behaviors. These differences in values are manifested in common life events, such as interpersonal conflict and business problems. For example, in individualistic societies like the U.S. where self-expression is encouraged, conflict is viewed as an inevitable part of life and is often confronted in a direct, face-to-face manner. Collectivist societies, such as those in Asia, tend to handle conflict in a differently. In these societies, interpersonal conflict and problems in various aspects of one’s life, such as work and family, is often seen as a sign of failure, and thus is avoided or denied. The leaders of Japanese companies in particular are less willing to admit failure in business-related problems, and are unlikely to give negative feedback (Hammer & Martin, 1992).

The wide variety of differences found between cultures can have significant implications for someone moving to a new country. Moving one’s life from one continent to another brings a wide array of practical challenges, but these challenges are compounded by vast differences in the structure of society and the behavioral norms of the new location.

Culture Shock

Studies of expatriate employees have found that there is almost always an initial period of lesser productivity due to the disorientation brought on by culture shock (Kealey, Protheroe, MacDonald, & Vulpe, 2005). Culture shock is a term commonly used
to describe the emotional stress of living abroad (Bhawuk & Brislin, 2000). Oberg (1954) first coined the term, which he defined as “an occupational disease of people who have suddenly been transported abroad” (p. 11). Though culture shock is no longer considered a disease, it remains a useful way to describe the problems that people face when they go abroad and confront large cultural differences. Culture shock can have both physical and psychological symptoms, and can be manifested in behaviors ranging from obsessive hand washing to fear and avoidance of interaction with those in the host culture. The most severe reactions to culture shock usually occur when there is a history of conflict between the two cultures, when large differences exist between the customs and religious beliefs of the two cultures, and when there is a large language gap (Triandis, 1994). Research on culture shock has catalyzed a wide range of studies on cultural differences and cross-cultural communication. The majority of research on culture shock focuses on understanding more about the antecedents of culture shock and how to prevent it from happening (Church, 1982).

Culture shock is often a function of both objective and subjective culture-based differences. The real differences between the cultures are sometimes small but seem large to those not prepared for the difference. Objective differences often spin out into subjective or perceived differences, which are reflected in differing belief systems, attitude structures, stereotype formations, norms, roles, values and task definitions. Recognition of and frustration with these real or perceived differences cause significant problems for the international assignee (Bhagat & Prien, 1996) and is likely to result in the experience of stress, loss of control, and feelings of helplessness and depression.
Culture shock has been likened to a roller coaster ride. While adapting to a new culture, people go through six stages: denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration (Bennett, 1986). Initially, sojourners to a foreign country experience great excitement, but this is followed by a low after they encounter small and large cultural differences. Once they feel more comfortable with handling these differences, they are likely to feel quite happy with their new feeling of accomplishment until there comes a point when their emotions and feelings about being in the new culture begin to stabilize. These stages are present at different times and each person has his or her own way of reacting in the stages of culture shock. As a consequence, some stages will last longer than others. The honeymoon stage, for instance, may last from a few days or weeks to six months depending on the circumstances (Triandis, 1994). A wide variety of factors may contribute to the duration and effects of culture shock. Examples of these factors are the individual's state of mental health, personality, previous experiences, socioeconomic conditions, familiarity with the language, family and/or social support systems, and level of education (Furnham & Bochner, 1986). Many versions of the stages experienced in culture shock have been proposed, thus any individual model does not describe each instance of culture shock accurately (Kealey, 1989). Ideally, cross-cultural training is used to eliminate or at least quicken the phases of this cycle.

Cultural fatigue is another term that is sometimes used in place of culture shock in studies of expatriates. Guthrie (1975) described cultural fatigue as being less severe than culture shock, but still a significant stress that is instigated by encountering a different culture. It has been argued that, unlike culture shock, cultural fatigue is a more natural stress, and can even be beneficial in allowing intercultural learning to occur (Eschbach,
Parker, & Stoebel, 2001). Without at least a partial breakdown of the mental frame of reference used in the sojourner’s home culture, new learning is not likely to occur.

CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING

Definition and Types

Recent theory in the intercultural field suggests that interpersonal difficulties across cultural boundaries arise when people do not possess the requisite social skills to meet the challenges brought forth by cultural differences (Furnham & Bochner, 1986). Cross-cultural training is designed to teach trainees both the content and skills that they need in order to effectively interact with culturally different others and cope with change. A cross-culturally trained individual is less likely to be a victim of cross-cultural misunderstanding or engage in inappropriate behaviors (Black & Mendenhall, 1991). Cross-cultural training is distinguished from other types of training in that it focuses on changing the trainees’ attitudes and behaviors, instead of simply providing them with information (Bhagat & Prien, 1996). One of the overarching purposes of cross-cultural training is to instill in the trainee the acceptance of differences between cultures.

All types of cross-cultural training aim to strengthen the same set of skills, however, methods can vary widely. Most recently, Bennett (1986) proposed a three-dimensional model to map the different cross-cultural training approaches. In this model, the three methods that underlie the approach to cross-cultural training are content (culture-general vs. culture-specific), goals (cognitive, affective, behavioral), and process (intellectual or experiential). Because of its strong theoretical and empirical backing, Bennett’s (1986) classification of cross-cultural training approaches was adopted for this
study. First, I will discuss the content dimension, which classifies the content of the training as either culture-general or culture-specific.

Training Content

Culture-General

A fundamental goal of culture-general training is to develop cultural awareness and sensitivity to the values and beliefs of the host country (Pruegger & Rogers, 1994). It seeks to further the trainees’ understanding of the assumptions and values that impact their interactions with people from different cultural backgrounds. The intellectual basis of cultural-general training is achieved by promoting cultural awareness; this cognitive knowledge is valuable for reducing anxiety about interpersonal contact with members of another culture (Brislin, 1986). Additionally, this type of training aims to teach trainees why these differences in values and beliefs exist, and how they are manifested. When the training is applied within the business context, trainees learn how to use specific cognitive tools to bridge the gap between the cultural differences that exist in their work environment to maximize intercultural effectiveness when working with their team (Bhawuk & Brislin, 2000). Thus, culture-general training develops specific competencies that allow the individual to move beyond a simple awareness and sensitivity of different cultures to a level of embracing cultural differences through an understanding of the self and others.

A large part of the focus of culture-general training is on the development of effective communication skills. Hall (1959) argues that most cross-cultural misunderstandings result from distortions in communications among people. Indeed,
Holtgraves' (1997) study on conversational directness showed that miscommunication is often exacerbated when people differ in their level of conversational indirectness. In Holtgraves’ (1997) study, differences in styles of communication are measured at the micro level in terms of comprehension speed and at the macro level in terms of cultural differences. He found that people from different cultures often differ in how they express and interpret meaning. For example, those from some cultures may view a direct communication style to be rude and pushy, while others may view an indirect style as evasive and manipulative.

Often stereotypes are discussed in culture-general training programs. Stereotypes are cognitive structures that help people simplify the complexity and uncertainty of the environment that surrounds them (Schneider, 2004). Communication problems are particularly likely to result when people are from countries that do not share a common language (Spencer-Rodgers & McGovern, 2002). In these instances, it is likely that expatriates and their host country members will have less access to distinctive information about one another. Stereotypes are more likely to arise when people have little information about the target (Goto & Chan, 2005). With little information, it is cognitively easier for a person to label another as a member of a certain social category and use this categorization to form an opinion about him or her. Consequently, stereotyping can lead to over-generalizations about people from a culture different to one’s own, which creates inappropriate and/or inaccurate assessments of another individual’s traits (Hamilton & Sherman, 1996). Even if people’s stereotype of the host country’s culture is that it is very similar to their own, this false assumption still has the potential to cause many problems and miscommunications. In addition to offenses that
could easily be caused by acting or reacting to someone from a different culture based on a stereotype, the disconnect between what is expected by expatriates going to a new culture and what they discover in reality may cause much anxiety.

Culture-general assimilators combined with self-assessment opportunities is the primary method used for this type of training (Harris & Kumra, 2000). These exercises cover broad themes relating to trainees’ intense feelings, knowledge areas, and bases of cultural differences. The goal of the cultural assimilator is to provide the trainee with experience making decisions in realistic social situations, much like a role-play, while imparting knowledge about the behavioral norms specific to that culture (Morris & Robie, 2001). Knowledge areas that have been identified as crucial to understanding cultural differences are work, time and space, language, roles, importance of the group/individual, rituals and superstition, hierarchies, and values (Bhawuk & Brislin, 2000).

Through the use of such methods, expatriates are able to explore the ways in which their own cultural background affects their perceptions, attitudes, stereotypes and behaviors. Culture-general training allows trainees to think about their reactions and, in some cases, to practice certain behaviors in a safe environment where mistakes can be made and learned from without any repercussions. If trained with this approach, expatriates can use the skills they have developed through training for any type of cross-cultural experience they have in their lives, even those that occur in their home country.

Though specific cultural examples are often incorporated into this type of training, the training remains broad in its focus, without discussion of any particular culture. Since the purpose of culture-general training is to provide trainees with
information they can use when living in any new culture, this type of training is especially useful in today's workplace. Many companies have multiple offices overseas, and people who have been assigned to an overseas job once might be sent to a variety of different countries during their tenure at the organization. The cost of training expatriate workers repeatedly before and/or after each of their relocations is costly and impractical.

Additionally, culture-general training has been found to be more effective in terms of adjustment and relating to culturally different others than culture-specific training (Kealey & Protheroe, 1996). Culture-specific training will be discussed in the next section. While some have argued that the culture-general method may overemphasize knowledge of cultural differences and fail to develop behavioral coping abilities sufficiently (Landis & Brislin, 1985), there is general agreement among researchers that culture-general training is more beneficial than culture-specific training, primarily because the former helps to prepare trainees for interacting with a greater variety of people (Milhouse, 1996). Given the support for culture-general content, the current study used this type of training for the manipulation, which will be discussed later in the methods section.

Culture-Specific

Culture-specific training focuses on the history, culture, social structure, economy and political behavior of the host country (Selmer, 2001). This type of training provides expatriates with information that will help them to better understand the political and social context of the particular country in which they are working. Ideally, such information will allow them to be more effective in the overseas workplace. Indeed,
culture-specific training has been found to enhance expatriates’ adjustment to local work realities and facilitates good relations with host country colleagues who might otherwise interpret ignorance of their country as arrogance (Brislin, 1986). Also, knowledge of basic cultural traditions can give an expatriate a framework for both understanding the many forms of behavior that he or she will encounter, such as resistance to change, and for coping with new and unforeseen situations.

A study conducted by Bird, Heinbuch, Dunbar, and McNulty (1993) gave a one-week series of culture-specific seminars, readings, and films on Japan and its history and culture to a group of American managers. The trained group was found to be more knowledgeable about the culture in Japan than the group that did not receive training, and, in addition, the trained group was found to have greater conceptual and attributional knowledge or awareness of appropriate behavior in Japan. The big limitations of this study are that Bird and colleagues neither measured the performance of expatriates nor did they measure intercultural effectiveness in any other way.

Other researchers have come to different conclusions about the effectiveness of culture-specific training. One of the common criticisms of culture-specific training is that the information provided is not sufficient to produce substantial changes in attitudes or to enhance qualities such as empathy that affect one’s ability to be interpersonally and professionally effective overseas (Tung, 1981). Culture-general training, on the other hand, prepares for “learning how to learn” (Bhawuk, 1990, p. 338) and can even ease movement to cultural-specific training, once the right mental structures are in place (Gannon & Poon, 1997). In sum, though culture-specific training is useful for helping
people to better understand the host culture, it probably does not equip expatriate workers
with the personal and professional skills to work effectively within that culture.

Training Objectives

Another dimension of Bennett’s (1986) classification of cross-cultural training is
based on its specific objectives or goals. Cross-cultural training is developed to change
trainees’ cognitions, behaviors, affect, or a combination of these; the method of the
training changes depending on the goal. The cognitive approach will be discussed first.

Cognitive-Based Training Objectives

Triandis (1994) notes that one of most significant problems that people face when
interacting with others from different cultures is that they make incorrect attributions for
the behavior of the host nationals. Cognitively-oriented types of cross-cultural training
focus on changing the trainees’ process of communication and attributions. This approach
can be employed within both a culture-general or culture-specific training structure.
Specifically, cognitive-based training focuses on the trainees’ assumptions and
attributions toward culturally different others in order to encourage trainees to think about
how behavior can be explained differently by taking into account the perspective of the
host country members (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). It seeks to develop within the
trainees the internal cognitive structures that allow them to interpret situations and make
attributions as though they were members of the culture in question.

Cognitive-based training may initially increase intercultural anxiety as prior
attributions are shown to be inappropriate and new ones have yet to be formed (Harrison,
1992). However, the ability to analyze social situations from the perspective of a native is thought to be invaluable when confronting and coping with cultural differences (Morris & Robie, 2001). The uniqueness of cognitive training comes from its usage of “cultural assimilators.” Cultural assimilators are the most researched of all cross-cultural training methods (Landis & Bhagat, 1996) and their effectiveness has been established by many studies (Bhawuk, 1998; Harrison, 1992).

The assimilators consist of real-life scenarios describing puzzling intercultural interactions and either ask for or provide explanations for avoiding misunderstandings (Fiedler, Mitchell & Triandis, 1971). After reading a vignette, a question is presented to the trainee followed by four or five alternatives that might be used as a response to the situation described in the vignette. After the trainee has selected a response, he or she is given the correct answer along with an explanation of why it is correct. Trainees come to learn that because of cultural differences, behaviors will have different effects in different settings. In sum, assimilators are an effective tool at the cognitive level, but should also have a positive impact on behavioral and affective criteria (Bhawuk & Brislin, 2000).

Hammer and Martin (1992) studied the effects of different types of cross-cultural training on American and Japanese managers, and found that cognitively-oriented objectives were more easily attainable than affective or behavioral goals. Simply reading relevant critical incidents and receiving correct responses may be sufficient for a fairly large amount of learning to occur (Harrison, 1992). It should be noted, however, that extensive knowledge gained through the cognitive approach does not necessarily lead to the display of more effective behaviors without the benefits of an opportunity to practice such behavior (Harrison, 1992). Given the overall support for the ability of cross-cultural
training to achieve cognitive-based training goals, this is the approach that will be used for the training manipulation in the current study.

Affective-Based Training Objectives

Affective-based training is aimed at shifting the attitudes and feelings of the trainee, and is based on the idea that people should first confront and come to know themselves in order to know and accept another culture (Waxin & Panaccio, 2005). It often involves self-disclosure in a group setting or working with a professional therapist on an individual or group basis, with the intention of personal change and growth. After participating in affective training programs, trainees are urged to think about their motivations when speaking to people from other countries, and to increase their sensitivity toward different cultures. Videotapes are sometimes chosen as an instructional technique; videotapes alone may be sufficient for some affective learning to take place (Harrison, 1992). Carefully selected films are often aimed at appealing to the trainees’ emotions (Gannon & Poon, 1997) and can provide trainees with emotional reasons to increase their sensitivity toward others.

Perhaps because this approach involves personal self-revelations and emotional outpourings, it is not favored by the majority of employees or managers, who are often wary or uncomfortable with these types of disclosures. Increasingly, the affective approach to cross-cultural training is regarded as personally intrusive and even offensive since it is thought to imply that failure abroad is due to expatriates’ ethnocentrism. As a result, this approach currently receives limited use (Harrison, 1992).
Behavioral-Based Training Method

Behavior modeling is currently the most common training method for delivery of interpersonal skills training in business today (Russ-Eft, Preskill, & Sleeser, 1997). Behavioral-oriented cross-cultural training aims to improve trainees’ capacity to demonstrate the behaviors that will allow them to function effectively in a new culture (Harrison, 1992; Waxin & Panaccio, 2005). As Kealey and Protheroe (1996) acknowledge, “It is one thing to be aware of cultural differences and possess knowledge of how to behave in another culture, it is another thing to be able to demonstrate those understandings in one’s behavior overseas” (pg. 145). Behavioral approaches to cross-cultural training require trainees to model key behaviors, thus enabling them to learn by means of a trial and error process. The role-playing technique brings the trainee into a situation that can have high similarity to what he or she will experience in the host culture (Blake, Heslin, & Curtis, 1996). Behavioral rehearsal provides the trainees with opportunities to practice the behavior they have learned about through reading or listening to a trainer. Practice and feedback are important in this approach, as they help shape the behaviors being trained.

Training Process

The last dimension of the cross-cultural training method that will be discussed in this review is that of process. Two types of processes are used to achieve the goals of the training: experiential and didactic. Each of these types will be discussed, beginning with the experiential approach.
Experiential Training

The experiential method provides opportunities for trainees to engage in specific behaviors, review the behaviors critically, gain useful insight from the analysis, and apply the results in a real situation (Harrison, 1992). This approach has often been used within the field of counseling to understand other cultures (Merta, Stringham, & Ponterotto, 1988). The trainee learns by actually engaging in behaviors that will be required of them when interacting with others in a cross-cultural business context. First, the trainees develop "action theories" from their actual experience. They then modify these theories based on their experience to improve their cross-cultural effectiveness (Harris & Kumra, 2000). Key to the success of this approach is the belief on the part of the learner that behaving in the new way will result in positive outcomes for themselves and others.

One experiential method that has been used widely for instructional purposes is simulation games. These are games that are played over the computer or with some other type of technology to simulate the situation that the trainee will face. For example, some simulations are 3-D games in which trainees feel that they are an actual participant in a high stakes cross-cultural business situation and must make decisions that will influence a key business outcome. As exciting as these games sound, Dekkers and Donatti’s (1981) study found that although simulations were more effective than lectures in the development of attitudes, they provided no advantage in cognitive development and learning retention. Similarly, Randel, Morris, Wetzel, and Whitehill’s (1992) study found no significant differences between simulation games and traditional instruction when they reviewed 46 studies on the subject. More support for this conclusion comes from Gannon and Poon (1997), who found that participants trained with an experiential method did not
perform any better on a test of cross-cultural awareness than did those trained by other methods.

In contrast, other research has shown that experiential training is more effective than didactic approaches in cultivating affective-related variables, like sensitivity. Pruegger and Rogers (1994) found that experiential approaches are associated with increased intrinsic motivation on the part of the trainee and the development of more effective interpersonal skills. There remains controversy as to the effectiveness of the experiential method, but the most agreed upon conclusion in this area is that though trainees may prefer more of the experiential method, the cost to effectiveness ratio of this method is too imbalanced to justify its usage; the costs far outweigh the effectiveness (Earley, 1987).

Didactic (Intellectual) Training

The didactic approach is characterized by lectures and readings, and is similar to the approach found in university classes. This training technique is economical and provides trainees with an intellectual understanding of different aspects of cross-cultural interactions (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992). This approach is often criticized as not being useful for bringing about meaningful changes in attitudes or behaviors of trainees, and inadequate in imparting to trainees the importance of the interpersonal aspects of a cross-cultural environment (Blake et al., 1996). Others claim that when using the didactic approach to cross-cultural training, learning tends to take place only at the idea level, neglecting the importance of the trainee’s emotional reaction to the cross-cultural
situation (Bird et al., 1993). Because lectures are aimed at changes in cognition and not affect, these arguments are not very valid.

More recent research suggests that both didactic and experiential approaches are equally effective in presenting culture-specific or culture-general concepts (Gannon & Poon, 1997). Changes at the cognitive level are expected to be manifested eventually in changes in behavior and affect (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). Lectures and other didactic approaches teach cultural awareness by asking the trainees to identify components unique to their own culture, thereby heightening awareness of analogous components in other cultures. Furthermore, combinations of didactic and experiential techniques may optimize the learning from each approach and give trainees the opportunity to rehearse skills by applying information received from books, lectures, films, and programmed instruction (Harrison, 1992). In Harrison’s (1992) study, he divided up his participants into three groups. One group received experiential training, another received didactic training, and a third received a combination of both didactic and experiential training. He found that participants in the condition that exposed them to a combination of the two techniques showed a significantly higher level of learning than those in a condition with a single technique. Because of its ease of use and shorter development time, didactic rather than experiential training will be used as the training manipulation for the present study.

The Training Medium

Over the past decade, instructor-led classroom instruction has decreased while technological approaches to training, such as those using the Internet, have been on the rise (Goldstein & Ford, 2002). Organizations are more often turning to the Internet for their training needs in order to take advantage of its accessibility and low cost. Putting
numbers behind this trend, the 2003/2004 Global Relocations Survey Report found that of the 16% of companies that offered web-based or CD-based cross-cultural training programs, 65% of these used web-based cross-cultural programs to reinforce traditional in-person cross-cultural programs, 30% of companies used cross-cultural web-based training as an alternative to in-person programs, and 5% offered web-based training only to their employees. Of all the 134 multinational organizations polled, 29% rated web-based cross-cultural training as being high in value, 57% rated it as being of medium value, and 14% rated it as low in value.

Training research generally supports the effectiveness of the web as a mode of training. Morris and Robie (2001) argue that interpersonal communication skills training can be done effectively on the web, so long as the training is structured appropriately. Campbell, Lison, Brosook, Hoover, and Arnold (1995) conducted a study in which they compared training programs using computer/video technology with instructor-led programs. They found no significant differences in the trainees’ learning between the two programs. Notably, in this study, the computer/video program reduced costs and instructors’ working hours to half of what was spent on instructor-led programs. Goldstein and Ford (2002) concur that web-based training can be highly effective, but emphasize that its effectiveness is dependent upon proper design and providing guidance to the learner on what to focus on in the online training program.

Web-based training holds a number of advantages over more traditional training approaches. Tracking the performance of the trainees is easier with web training (Filipczak, 1996), as is updating and maintaining the training. Research shows that most trainees enjoy the self-pacing and flexibility of the web-based approach. They can pace
themselves by spending more time on the information that they are less knowledgeable about or take more time to develop those skills in which they perceive they are weak. Goldstein and Ford (2002) provide an example in their book chapter of an online sales skills course with video clips of behaviors that trainees can practice modeling in private and repeat as often as they wish.

Additionally, web training increases organizations’ ability to reach out to a large number of employees who may be spread across the globe, thereby giving these employees access to the training at any time of the day or week. In contrast, traditional instructional approaches often require organizations to fly employees to a centralized location for training or hire a large number of trainers to deliver the training at multiple locations. One of the biggest disadvantages of traditional training as compared to web-based training is that it must be scheduled and delivered at particular times, which can be difficult for organizations with busy employees. In sum, the support for web-based training is strong; for this reason the training manipulation developed for the current study was administered through this medium.

**INTERCULTURAL SKILLS**

In developing a model to guide training and research practices, Landis and Bhagat (1996) propose what they consider to be the primary antecedents of intercultural behavior. They argue that the most proximate set of predictors of intercultural competence are characteristics of the individual, meaning their knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs). Intercultural competence often results from past experiences in foreign countries in which intercultural interactions took place, yet previous overseas experience
does not always accurately predict successful intercultural behavior (Bhagat & Prien, 1996). Not all people learn equally well from the same kinds of experiences, perhaps due to differences in ability. Likewise, knowledge of other cultures in and of itself is not an accurate determinant of success in intercultural interactions (Bhagat & Prien, 1996). Intercultural competence requires more than a simple knowledge of cultural differences; it requires acceptance of these differences, and the skill to work effectively within the constraints they produce.

Indeed, living or working overseas in a country different from one’s own requires a unique set of skills that go above and beyond those needed for social effectiveness and adjustment within one’s own country or culture. Expatriate workers in particular need to develop skills that are adaptable and transferable to the demands of changing jobs in a dynamic environment. The arguments surrounding which type of cross-cultural training is best for learning do not extend into the area of the appropriate intercultural skills needed to be successful in a cross-cultural environment; all types of cross-cultural training focus on developing the same agreed upon set of skills. These skills have received decades of empirical support (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). For this reason, cross-cultural training focuses on improving the skills that have been shown to be most effective in successful cross-cultural exchanges.

The most widely agreed upon dimensions of skills necessary for success in a cross-cultural environment are those of “self”, “relational”, and “perceptual” (Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Blake, Heslin, & Curtis, 1996; Goldstein & Smith, 1999; Goto & Chan, 2005). The “self” dimension of cross-cultural skills refers to people’s understanding of their own cultural background and how culture influences their values
and behaviors (Goldstein & Smith, 1999). Essentially, this dimension is most closely associated with recognizing the impact of one's culturally-biased behavior on others, called cross-cultural awareness. Conceptually, cross-cultural awareness forms the basis for improved communication, interactions, and working relationships with people from different cultural backgrounds (Gannon & Poon, 1997). It involves the ability to identify the components unique to one's own culture, thereby increasing awareness of similar components in other cultures (Bhawuk, 1998).

Expatriates with cultural awareness skills are better able to attend and respond to cultural stimuli since they are likely to notice cultural differences in the behavior of others. With the ability to recognize and accept such differences, expatriates are prepared to grasp the dynamics and influence of culture in a general sense. Specific skills associated with this dimension include demonstrating confidence in choosing the appropriate behaviors in new culture, knowing how to mentally cope with cultural differences and misunderstandings, and using empathy as a means to reduce the frustration that often results in cross-cultural interactions (D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991).

The relational dimension of intercultural competence is associated with the fostering of relationships with host nationals (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). The ability to communicate effectively, both verbally and nonverbally, is the foundation of this skill dimension. Individuals who exhibit this dimension of intercultural skills are able to identify how cultural differences in verbal communication are manifested in daily life, utilize verbal and nonverbal techniques to avoid misunderstandings when
communicating with others, and recognize the various meanings that nonverbal forms of communication might take on in a different culture.

The perceptual dimension of intercultural skills is demonstrated by showing a sensitivity toward cultural differences, and forming an overall accurate and unbiased perception of the new environment (Landis & Bhagat, 1996). Interculturally-competent individuals demonstrate the perceptual skill by using their understanding of cultural definitions, stereotypes, and comparative value systems to appropriately shift their attributions and assumptions (Gannon & Poon, 1997). The aggregate of these skills is often termed “cross-cultural sensitivity”, which has been described as an enhanced ability to perceive and understand behavioral cues in other cultures (Morris & Robie, 2001). Research suggests that sensitivity toward different cultures may be more amenable to training than are other types of skills (Harris & Kumra, 2000). Developing sensitivity to the values and beliefs of the host country has been called “a fundamental goal of cross-cultural training” (Pruegger & Rogers, 1994, pg. 370). Box B in Figure 1 shows how intercultural skills fit into this study’s paradigm.

EFFECTIVENESS OF CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING

Evaluation Criteria

The criteria for expatriate employees’ success overseas are most commonly defined as adjusting to various aspects of the new environment and performing well on the job (Aycan & Kanungo, 1997). Objective measures, such as whether the expatriate stayed in the new culture the expected length of time, are occasionally used in cross-cultural training effectiveness studies, but these measures are difficult to obtain and
plagued with measurement problems. For example, though most companies keep records of how much time overseas projects take, they rarely keep information about the cause of projects ending early (Global Relocation Trends Survey Report, 2004). Companies do not tend to keep track of whether expatriates leave assignments because of adjustment issues or because they were called back to work on a more important project back in their home-country. For this reason, objective measures will not be discussed further in the review of evaluation criteria.

Adjustment

Adjustment is one of most commonly studied criterion for expatriate success. This is not surprising considering that an expatriate’s inability to adjust to living in a foreign country is one of the most often cited reasons for assignment failure (Black, 1988; Caligiuri, 1997; Kraimer & Wayne, 2004). Adjustment also is highly related with intentions to stay in the new culture, meaning that those who are highly adjusted are less likely to come home early or quit their jobs. Adjustment has been defined as the feeling of familiarity, comfort and proficiency one maintains for living in a new culture, and the ability to get along with and effectively interact with host nationals (Black & Mendenhall, 1990).

Adjustment has been conceptualized as both a unidimensional and multidimensional construct (e.g. Caligiuri, Phillips, Lazarova, Tarique, & Burgi, 2001).

Black (1988) has argued for adjustment’s multidimensionality, identifying three components of adjustment, that of general environmental conditions, adjustment to the
Figure 1. Conceptual model predicting the relationships among the study's variables.
work role, and adjustment to interacting with host nationals. General adjustment refers to the overall adaptation to living in the foreign culture, and includes daily life issues pertaining to food, housing, cost of living and health care. Work adjustment involves becoming accustomed to new job tasks, work roles, work-related responsibilities, and the general work environment (Black, 1988). Interaction / relational adjustment refers to the comfort and proficiency one feels for socializing with host country nationals (Taveggia & Gibboney, 2001). The interaction facet of adjustment is often the most difficult for expatriates to achieve, as cultural differences seem to be the most salient when interacting directly with others from the host country (Black, 1988).

Eschbach and colleagues (2001) describe adjustment as a process, taking a stage approach to explaining the gradual building of expatriate adjustment. In their recent study of expatriate managers, adjustment reflected a U-shaped curve. Self-reported adjustment was high for the first few days or weeks, called the “honeymoon” stage. The honeymoon period was followed by a culture shock phase, with the bottom of the curve reflecting the worst area of culture shock. Gradually, adjustment rose until it leveled off. Eschbach and colleagues argue that reaching the adjustment stage requires that cultural fatigue occurs first, though cross-cultural training can minimize the length of time between cultural fatigue and adjustment. Like culture shock, the adjustment cycle varies for each person. The cycle hits its peaks and valleys at different time points for different people.

Mendenhall and Oddou (1985) discuss several factors that facilitate adjustment. One theme that emerges from their work, however, is the overall importance of cross-cultural training, which has been found to have a strong, positive effect on expatriate adjustment (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). Caliguiri and colleagues’ (2001) study of 65
expatriates on a global assignment working for 31 different multinational companies revealed that employees who had received cross-cultural training reported adjustment to the new culture significantly sooner than did those who did not receive cross-cultural training. Indeed, almost without exception, research supports the positive impact that cross-cultural training has on adjustment to the host country’s culture (Earley, 1987; Morris & Robie, 2001). Ronan (1989) found that expatriates who had been cross-culturally trained experienced greater enjoyment of the host culture and reduced anxiety about interacting with those from the host country. Palthe’s (2004) study of expatriates who had participated in cross-cultural training found that these individuals were better adjusted to the everyday stresses of life in another culture than were those who did not participate in such training.

Given the importance of adjustment to measuring cross-cultural training effectiveness, each facet of adjustment will be included as an outcome measure in the current study. To see how adjustment fits into the set of relationships being examined in the study, please see Box F in Figure 1. The next criterion that will be discussed is job performance.

Performance

Expatriate job performance is often considered the ultimate criterion in the prediction and training of expatriate effectiveness, yet few organizations systematically evaluate or validate the effectiveness of their training programs (Mol, Born, & Van der Molen, 2005). Black and Mendenhall (1990) argue that asking a supervisor to rate the
expatriate’s performance is the best way to operationalize cross-cultural performance, yet they do not explicitly discuss the criteria on which performance should be evaluated.

Much controversy exists over the most appropriate way of conceptualizing and measuring expatriate performance. Caligiuri and Day (2000) propose that expatriate performance may include both task and contextual aspects specific to their assignments. Task performance refers to the expatriate’s performance on meeting job objectives and technical aspects of the job, whereas contextual performance refers to performance aspects that go beyond assigned job duties but are essential to performing well on an expatriate assignment. Contextual performance may include things like adaptation to the foreign facility’s business customs. Caligiuri and Day (2000) clearly support measuring both the task and contextual aspects of expatriate performance, but have failed to identify which dimensions are associated with respective types of performance.

Sinangil and Ones (2001) propose that the existing literature in the realm of domestic job performance should be used to define and measure expatriate job performance. They argue that the criteria developed in these previous studies can be applied across jobs, settings and industries. Alternatively, Ones and Viswesvaran (1997) offer a model of performance that employs a generalist approach to defining criteria for expatriate job performance. The nine dimensions they provide are 1) productivity, 2) communication competence, 3) effort and initiative, 4) compliance with/acceptance of authority, 5) interpersonal relations, 6) leadership, 7) administrative competence, 8) quality of work, and 9) job knowledge.

In 1990, Black and Mendenhall reviewed 29 empirical studies of the effectiveness of various cross-cultural training programs. Their literature review showed that cross-
cultural training had a strong positive impact on expatriate adjustment and performance. Morris and Robie’s (2001) meta-analysis of the effects of cross-cultural training on expatriate adjustment and performance included 78 empirical studies in their sample, 19 of which were published after Black and Mendenhall’s (1990) first meta-analysis. Their study replicated Black and Mendenhall’s (1990) meta-analytic results showing the effectiveness of cross-cultural training. The meta-analysis found mean validity coefficients to be .26 for performance and .12 for adjustment.

In sum, cross-cultural training appears to have a pronounced effect on job performance. Given the support for this relationship and the importance of job performance as a bottom-line criterion, expatriate performance will be included as a measured variable in the current study (see Box G in Figure 1).

Interrelationships between Expatriate Success Criteria

An underlying assumption driving much of the expatriate literature is that adjustment will “spill over” to job performance (Shaffer & Harrison, 1998). Adjustment is the feeling of comfort with interacting and living in a new culture, and provides the basis for adaptation to a new work and living environment. The relationship between adjustment and performance may be similar to the “spillover effect” found in the work-life literature (Schmitt & Bedeian, 1982). Intuitively, high levels of adjustment are a necessary precondition to high levels of job performance.

Support for the relationship between expatriate adjustment and performance has been equivocal. Kraimer and Wayne’s (2004) study of expatriates and their supervisors from three U.S.-based Fortune 500 companies found no relationship between adjustment
and their measures of task and contextual performance. However, Parker and McEvoy (1993) found a positive relationship between work adjustment and job performance and a negative relationship between general adjustment and job performance. In another study, Caliguiri (1997) asked expatriates to rate themselves on the three facets of adjustment in addition to technical, contextual, and expatriate-specific job performance. The expatriates' colleagues and supervisors were also asked to complete an evaluation of their performance on these dimensions. Caliguiri (1997) found a positive relationship between general adjustment and the contextual and expatriate-specific dimensions of self-reported job performance but no relationship between general adjustment and self-reported technical job performance. No relationships between adjustment and performance were found for the peer-rated and supervisor-rated job performance. Perhaps the amorphous definition of performance is driving this unclear pattern of results.

Though previous studies on the relationship between adjustment and performance have been equivocal, I expect adjustment to be related to performance based on theories of psychological stress. Individuals who are poorly adjusted are more likely to experience psychological stress, which is likely to be detrimental to their job performance (Cohen, 1980; Kraiger 2001). Indeed, Motowidlo and colleagues (1986) found occupational stress to be negatively related to job performance. In Kraimer et al.'s (2001) study of expatriates and their supervisors at major Fortune 500 companies, they found a distinct relationship between work adjustment and task performance. Specifically, they found that expatriates who reported being well adjusted to work were rated as higher performers on task dimensions by their supervisor than those who reported lower adjustment to work. They also found a positive correlation between interaction adjustment and expatriate
contextual performance. My model (see Path F-G in Figure 1) suggests that expatriate adjustment will be correlated with job performance.

POTENTIAL MODERATORS

Limitations of Previous Research

Extant research suggests a distinct need to examine situational variables more closely as possible moderators of the effectiveness of cross-cultural training. Meta-analyses of cross-cultural training studies have been of little help in identifying moderators and examining how they work. In their meta-analysis, Morris and Robie (2001) noted that it is difficult to confidently estimate or draw conclusions about moderating effects because of the relatively small number of published studies examining moderators (Morris & Robie, 2001). Black and Mendenhall (1990) postulate that, “it is possible that moderating effects exist” (pg. 131) but were unable to include them in their meta-analysis due to difficulty in converting data from some studies to effect sizes.

Though trainee characteristics have demonstrated the potential to moderate a variety of training outcomes, they have failed to receive adequate empirical attention in studies of cross-cultural training effectiveness. Indeed, Black and Mendenhall (1991), in their meta-analysis, encouraged researchers to “bring the individual back” to the study of cross-cultural training effectiveness. Individual differences play an important role in outcomes for various types of training, yet their role has not been sufficiently explored within the realm of cross-cultural training research. For example, it is generally recognized that personality is a significant determinant of training performance (Noe, 1986). Yet, despite the abundance of strong empirical evidence for the effects of
personality traits on general training-related outcomes, investigators have only recently begun to develop theories about the complex nature of these relationships in the domain of cross-cultural training. For this reason, the moderating effects of these variables will be examined in the current study.

Additionally, the characteristics and skills of expatriates’ host-country supervisors may impact the degree of cross-cultural training effectiveness for the expatriate employee. Very few studies up to this point have considered the work environment that an expatriate will be entering once he or she arrives in the host-country. The people with whom the expatriate will be working are bound to have a marked influence on the expatriate’s adjustment to work and job performance, yet few researchers have considered this factor when studying expatriate effectiveness. Just as it is important for expatriates to develop intercultural competence, it also seems important for those they interact with frequently in the workplace to develop intercultural skills. Thus, in the present study I have examined host-country supervisory characteristics as a moderator of expatriate performance and adjustment, and will give a theoretical framework for this examination in a later section of the paper. I will begin with a discussion of individual differences as moderators of cross-cultural training effectiveness, starting with self-efficacy.

Expatriate Characteristics

Self-Efficacy

Expatriates arrive in the host-country with a set of implicit beliefs and attitudes that will, in part, influence their reaction to problems they are likely to encounter related
to the move. Self-efficacy refers to one’s confidence and determination to succeed in performing a task. Specifically, Bandura (1986) defines self-efficacy as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (p.391). Key to this definition is the specificity of self-efficacy toward a particular task. Measures of self-efficacy should be specifically tailored to the task being assessed (Pajares & Miller, 1995). Because of its dependence on a particular task, self-efficacy is not an inert; rather, it has the capacity to change over time with new information and experience (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). These changes are molded by the determinants of self-efficacy, which include enactive mastery (personal attainment), vicarious experience (modeling), verbal persuasion, and physiological arousal (Bandura, 1997). An individual’s cognitive and affective appraisal and integration of these events determine self-efficacy (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). In organizations, the information used to form efficacy beliefs comes from the individual, the task, and others in the organization.

Though self-efficacy is often cited for its promise as a moderator of cross-cultural training effectiveness, it has received little empirical attention. Black and Mendenhall (1990) used Bandura’s (1979) social learning theory to provide theoretical support for the effectiveness of cross-cultural training, and in doing so, they argue for the importance of self-efficacy in expatriate success overseas. Repeated studies have shown self-efficacy to be an accurate predictor of training learning and performance for a wide variety of tasks (Tracey, Hinkin, Tannenbaum, & Mathieu, 2001). Trainee self-efficacy has also been found to predict job attendance up to nine months after the training and to be related to post-training attitudes and reactions (Saks, 1995). A belief in the ability to perform the
tasks necessary to accomplish the objectives of the training should help the trainee see the goals of the training as more manageable.

Research has shown that people who are high in self-efficacy are more likely to persist in the face of difficulty (Earley & Lituchy, 1991; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Motivation to succeed in challenging environments is especially important when grappling with adaptation to a new country with different cultural norms. While conceptual links between self-efficacy and cross-cultural adjustment have been proposed, little empirical research has linked the two constructs. Palthe’s (2004) study of U.S. business executives in Japan, South Korea, and the Netherlands is one of the few studies that have examined this link. Results from this study indicate that self-efficacy was positively related to work adjustment and interaction (relational) adjustment.

Bandura (1986) contends that highly efficacious individuals are more willing to persist in their attempts to execute new behaviors. Therefore, to the degree that these individuals perceive themselves to be more efficacious, they may be less likely to avoid cross-cultural situations and more willing to take on cross-cultural assignments. Individuals high in self-efficacy also tend to welcome new learning experiences (Earley & Lituchy, 1991) and possess a greater ability to cope with the challenges and demands of the task or work environment (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). These findings indicate that those with high positive pre-training self-efficacy beliefs will likely draw more benefits from a training experience than individuals low in self-efficacy. Lastly, highly efficacious individuals are more likely to view themselves as being capable of obtaining the extrinsic rewards that often result from successful training performance and more willing to seek
out opportunities to apply (transfer) the knowledge and skills acquired from the training (Latham, 1988).

Repeated studies have shown self-efficacy to be an accurate predictor of performance in a variety of domains (Bandura, 1997; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). In the face of difficulty, those with a strong sense of efficacy focus their attention on resolving the problems related to the task and persist until they improve their performance. Thus, self-efficacy was expected to influence performance primarily through perseverance. Self-efficacy has also been linked to the establishment of more rigorous performance goals and greater likelihood to engage the referent task-related behavior (Earley & Lituchy, 1991). In terms of the present study, the sum of these findings suggests that high levels of pre-training self-efficacy to adjust to a new culture and to communicate with host-country members effectively motivates expatriates to more intensely engage in the cross-cultural training, and thus be more confident in demonstrating the skills that are developed through the training. With this confidence, they are likely to interact with others from the host-country more frequently, and to be more successful in these interactions.

Some evidence exists suggesting that self-efficacy functions as a moderator for the effect of training method on general training outcomes. In Gist, Stevens, and Bavetta’s (1991) study of self-efficacy and training performance, they found that initial self-efficacy preceding training in negotiation skills interacted with training method to influence performance six weeks after training. Specifically, trainees who began the training with high self-efficacy beliefs had more success in negotiating higher salaries than trainees with moderate or low self-efficacy beliefs. These studies suggest that the
effectiveness of training may depend on the strength of trainees' self-efficacy, and this finding is likely to extend to cross-cultural training.

Some difficulties exist in measuring self-efficacy in the cross-cultural training context. For example, cultural differences exist in how people view positive self-regard, which may have an effect on their response to measures of self-efficacy (Heine, 1999). Indeed, mean differences in reported self-efficacy have been found between people from individualistic and collectivist countries. Collectivists are less likely to rate themselves high in self-efficacy given that humility and conformity with the group is more highly valued than doing something alone, even if done well (Heine, Kitayama, Lehman, 2001). Thus, the tendency not to distinguish themselves from their group depresses their ratings. Because of these cultural differences, it is probably best to control for collectivism when examining the effects of self-efficacy as a moderating variable in the relationship between cross-cultural training and adjustment and performance.

A more general problem with drawing inferences from the relationship that self-efficacy has with performance relates to the bidirectionality between self-efficacy and performance. Performance influences self-efficacy and self-efficacy, in turn, influences subsequent performance (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). The concept of bidirectionality of influence raises a difficult problem for how best to identify the unique contributions of past performance and self-efficacy on current performance. Despite these inferential and measurement difficulties, self-efficacy should still be included in more studies of cross-cultural training, and will be included in the present study (see Box H in Figure 1).
Extraversion

I adopted the Five-Factor Model (FFM) as the basis for the classification of personality. This framework has become the most widely used and the best empirically-supported conceptualization of personality (McCrae & Costa, 1996). The cross-cultural appropriateness of the five-factor structure has been supported by a number of studies. The structure was found to be invariant across a U.S.-Spanish-Chinese cultural comparison (Schmit, Kihm, & Robie, 2000), and Robie, Brown and Bly (2005) found that the five factors operated similarly from a psychometric perspective in the U.S. and Japan. In fact, the factor structures in both samples were congruent with the normative structure. Lastly, Robie, et. Al. (2005) found that the five factors demonstrated convergent validity and factor structure held for all factors across cultures.

One of the five dimensions assessed in the FFM is extraversion, with the others being conscientiousness, neuroticism, agreeableness, and openness to experience (McCrae & Costa, 1996). Extraversion appears to be important to the formation of relationships with others (Johnson, Kristof-Brown, Van Vianen, De Pater, & Rigsby, 2003). Extraverts highly value human interaction and tend to have good social skills, which makes them more likely to be liked by their co-workers and supervisors. Their propensity for social interaction leads to greater participation in and commitment to social groups and activities (Judge, Martocchio, & Thoresen, 1997). Because extraverted individuals are generally outgoing and enjoy the company of others, they are more likely to be proactive in establishing relationships with those from the host-country. Huang, Chi, and Lawler (2005) found an interesting pattern of results in their study of the five
personality factors and expatriate adjustment. Their results indicated that extraversion is related to interaction and general adjustment, but not work adjustment.

Some studies have found a different pattern of results within the expatriate context. Johnson and colleagues (2003) found that extraversion did not predict social tie formation with host-country nationals or with other expatriates. They explain this finding by noting that although extraversion is often associated with gregariousness and sociability, assertiveness or dominance is also a component of extraversion. It is possible that the facets of extraversion have unique relationships with the formation of friendships with others in a new culture. Overall, the research in this area indicates that though extraverts will probably find it easier to develop and maintain interpersonal ties with host-country individuals, this expectation will depend on the appeal for those who are talkative or outgoing, since such behavior is not appreciated equally across all cultures.

Extraversion has been found to predict training performance for occupations involving social interactions, such as management and sales (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Indeed, those who are extraverted would seemingly be more likely to use the intercultural skills gained through cross-cultural training to their advantage. Though research on extraversion’s effect on job performance in the domain of expatriates is sparse, extraversion has been found to be negatively related to expatriates’ desire to prematurely end an assignment (Caliguiri, 2000). Because many of the jobs that expatriates take on require the ability to coordinate and work with others in informal work groups or teams, extraverts are more likely to be successful in these endeavors (Watson & Hubbard, 1996). Given the support for extraversion as a predictor of broad-based training and adaptation
to unfamiliar social situations, its effect on adjustment and job performance will be investigated in the present study (see Box H in Figure 1).

Openness to Experience

Openness to experience is the dimension from the FFM that has most consistently demonstrated linkages with individual-level employee outcomes after relocation to a new country (Hofstede & McCrae, 2004; Lievens, Harris, Van Keer, & Bisquер, 2003). Openness to experience has demonstrated a significantly positive relationship to cross-cultural training performance (Lievens et al., 2003) and job performance (Schmit, Kihm, & Robie, 2000). Openness has been found to be a solid predictor of most types of training (Barrick & Mount, 1991) mainly because it is the personality trait most related to intellectual pursuits like learning. Lievens et al. (2003) study of expatriate managers provides support for the positive relationship between openness to experience and cross-cultural training performance.

Because open individuals are intellectually curious and seek out new and unconventional experiences, they are more willing to engage in new learning experiences, adapt better to unforeseen changes, and adjust more rapidly to a radically different work environments (Lievens et al., 2003). To the extent that an individual is high in openness, they are more likely to cope with and even thrive on the new challenges presented by relocating to a new country and interacting with people from different cultures. Intuitively, an open-minded person would enter a host country with fewer stereotypes and false expectations. In the realm of cross-cultural training research, there is a clear need to more thoroughly examine the role that openness to experience plays in
post-training outcomes like expatriate adjustment and job performance. Ones and Viswesvaran (1997) argue that openness to experience should have a direct positive effect on expatriate job performance and Huang and colleagues (2005) found that openness was related to work and general adjustment, but not interaction adjustment. Clearly, more research into the role of openness to experience as a moderator of cross-cultural training effectiveness needs to be conducted, which is why it has been included in the current study’s model (see Box H in Figure 1).

POTENTIAL MEDIATORS

When expatriates arrive at their jobs in foreign countries, they are plugged into existing organizational structures, which will likely contain some kind of hierarchy. An expatriate may work for a company in which there is a steep hierarchy and there are many people above him or her, such as when the expatriate has been sent overseas to receive technical training. Or, they may come in as a manager and have wide-ranging power to hire and fire as needed. Despite this range of possibilities, extant research on cross-cultural training and expatriate adjustment and performance has focused strictly on the expatriate in a management role rather than as a member of the staff. As a result, a variety of key factors that may influence the effectiveness of the expatriate, such as organizational support, have been largely ignored. The importance of organizational support, and more proximally, supervisory support has been found to correlate with a number of positive employee outcomes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). In the expatriate context, support demonstrated by the supervisor of the expatriate is likely to play an important role in
easing the expatriate’s adjustment, and jump-starting his or her productivity on the job. Indeed, Kraimer and Wayne’s (2004) study of organizational support for expatriate employees showed it to be a significant predictor of expatriate performance.

Supervisor’s Intercultural Skills

In order to succeed in global organizations, managers need the flexibility to respond positively and effectively to practices and values that may be drastically different from their own. Managers are often mired in their own culture; it is not easy for many of them to understand and accept practices and values that vary from their personal experiences. Additionally, because managers of expatriates are in a position of power, they may feel more entitled to their beliefs and less likely to alter their “cognitive map” than their subordinates, making it all the more difficult to achieve a happy working relationship. Indeed, 65% of executives at Fortune 500 companies who participated in a recent survey indicated that their leaders need additional skills and knowledge before they can meet or exceed the key requirements for being a globally literate or competent manager (Glick, 2002). The resistance or inability to develop empathy for expatriate employees coupled with ignorance of how cultural differences play out in the workplace have the potential to cause serious problems.

A recent RAND study (2005) of various for-profit and non-profit institutions ranked interpersonal skills right after cognitive ability as the most important for effective international leadership. Many of the same skills required of expatriate in developing intercultural competence, such as awareness and sensitivity toward cultural differences, overlap with those necessary for supervisors of expatriate employees in their leadership
roles. Clark and Matze (1999) present a model of relational competence, defined as the ability to effectively and appropriately manage relationships across diverse settings. The relational competence model is centered on fostering development in the self and others through the quality of the interaction. Similar to findings in studies of expatriates, Barham and Devine’s (1991) study of global managers found that the following skills were most important to successful interactions in a cross-cultural environment:

- adaptability to new situations (such as the arrival of an expatriate subordinate), sensitivity to different cultures, and the ability to work in international teams. When working in an international environment, global leaders must be cognizant of differences in communication that may seem insignificant, such as body language and various gestures.

The leadership theory that I believe best captures the reason why supervisors’ development of cross-cultural interaction skills will affect expatriate subordinate performance and adjustment is that of leader-member exchange. The leader-member exchange theory explains why the intercultural competence of an expatriate’s supervisor was predicted to mediate the relationship between supervisor cross-cultural training and expatriate adjustment and performance. See Box D in Figure 1 for a pictorial demonstration of how supervisors’ intercultural skills fit into the broader context of the study.

Leader-Member Exchange

Leadership models that incorporate situational parameters have greater relevance to cross-cultural studies than those that do not take into account situational or cultural variables. Situational approaches to leadership, like leader-member exchange (LMX), are
based on the assumption that effective leaders will adopt a leadership style based on the characteristics of the particular subordinate being supervised or managed (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993). Specifically, LMX (Dansereau, Cashman, & Graen, 1973), which is grounded in role and exchange theories, refers to the dyadic relationship development between superior and subordinate. The LMX model can be distinguished from other models of leadership, such as the Average Leadership Style (ALS), which argue that leaders should seek to find a single “best” leadership style (Dansereau et al., 1973). According to LMX theory, a role is negotiated between each subordinate and the leader in such a way that an active exchange of inputs and outcomes occurs, resulting in a relationship that is either satisfying or frustrating (Gerstner & Day, 1997). A relatively recent meta-analysis by Gerstner and Day (1997) has confirmed the linkage between high-quality LMX relationships and a variety of positive organizational outcomes, such as greater satisfaction with supervisor (Duchon, Green, & Taber, 1986) and high organizational commitment (Nystrom, 1990).

LMX is characterized by respect, trust, and mutual obligation if the quality of LMX is high, and if the quality is low, by a lack of communication and a marked sense of distrust (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). When a leader and follower have a high quality relationship, communication is at its optimal level, with each member of the dyad often knowing the wants and needs of the other without any need for verbal explanation (Duchon et al., 1986). Fewer misunderstandings occur as a result of this fluidity of communication. Though an organization-based power difference exists between the supervisor and the subordinate, there is a high degree of mutual trust and understanding (Boyd & Taylor, 1998). Supportive relationships at work are likely to alleviate the stress
associated with adjusting to a foreign country. Supervisory support at work is particularly important for expatriates, for whom work is the reason why they left their country for a new one. Given that work is such a salient aspect of the expatriates' life, greater adjustment at work is likely to spill over into all aspects of their life.

According to the theory of LMX, effective leaders will take into account cultural differences between themselves and their followers when determining the appropriate approach they should take to leading these individuals. Leaders who have the ability to tailor their leadership style are more effective at motivating their subordinates. Indeed, quality of LMX has demonstrated a direct, positive, relationship with job performance (Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997), including expatriate performance (Kraimer et al., 2001). I propose that when supervisors of expatriates receive cross-cultural training, they will boost the effectiveness of the expatriates' cross-cultural training through the quality of LMX. See Link C-F and C-G in Figure 1 for LMX's expected role in supervisor training on expatriate training performance.

HYPOTHESES

Cross-cultural training is a formalized approach to developing trainees' intercultural skills. Possessing the skills necessary to cope with and appreciated cultural differences among others has been found to lead to a variety of positive outcomes, with the most important for expatriate employees being adjustment to the new culture and job performance. After participating in a focused, theoretically-based cross-cultural training course, trainees are expected to develop the skills necessary for adjusting to a new culture
and performing their job overseas more effectively (see Link A-F and A-G in Figure 1). Specifically, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H1: Cross-cultural training learning will be positively related to general adjustment (H1a), work-related adjustment (H1b), and relational adjustment (H1c).

H2: Cross-cultural training learning will be positively related to job performance.

The existing literature clearly supports the need to develop and provide training for host-country managers before or shortly after the expatriate subordinate arrives (Adler et al., 1986). Landis and Bhagat (1996) note that the primary reinforcer of intercultural behavior is the host-country counterpart. Yet, the effect of providing cross-cultural training to those in the host-country office who work with expatriates has been largely ignored in the literature. No research to this date has examined the effect of providing cross-cultural training for the supervisor of an expatriate on cross-cultural training effectiveness for the expatriate. I predicted that when the supervisors of expatriate subordinates receive cross-cultural training developed in a theoretically correct manner, it will have a positive effect on the expatriate subordinate’s adjustment to a new culture, and their performance at their overseas job (see Link C-F and C-G in Figure 1).

It follows that,

H3: Supervisor cross-cultural training will moderate the relationship between expatriate cross-cultural training learning and the expatriates’ general adjustment (H3a), work-related adjustment (H3b), and relational adjustment (H3c) such that
the relationship will be more positive when the supervisor participates in cross-cultural training.

H4: Supervisor cross-cultural training will moderate the relationship between expatriate cross-cultural training learning and job performance such that the relationship will be more positive when the supervisor participates in cross-cultural training.

As stated earlier, I expected the effect of supervisor cross-cultural training to be explained by leader-member exchange theory. Given the empirically-documented importance of the relationship between leader and follower, I expect that the effect of supervisor participation in cross-cultural training will be mediated by subordinate perceptions of the quality of leader-member exchange. In sum, it is likely that cross-cultural training will assist and promote supervisors’ development of intercultural interaction skills and competence, thereby strengthening the quality of their relationship with the expatriate subordinate. In line with previous empirical support of the relationship between quality of LMX and subordinate performance, increasing the quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationship will positively impact the performance and adjustment of the expatriate to the host country. Specifically, I propose the following:

H5: Quality of LMX will act as a mediator between supervisor cross-cultural training and its moderating effect on expatriate adjustment.

H6: Quality of LMX will act as a mediator between supervisor cross-cultural training and its moderating effect on expatriate job performance.
As previously discussed, trainee characteristics have the potential to act as moderators of cross-cultural training effectiveness. The degree to which cross-culturally trained people perceive themselves to be efficacious will predict the likelihood that they will benefit from cross-cultural training. They are less likely to avoid cross-cultural situations and more willing to expend effort and persist in the face of cross-cultural difficulties after participating in the training. I expect self-efficacy to moderate the relationship between the learning received from expatriate cross-cultural training and expatriate adjustment and performance such that those who report higher levels of self-efficacy for adjusting to their new environment (an aspect of post-cross-cultural training performance) are more likely to be successful in transferring the skills they have acquired during the training to their new environment. Similarly, expatriates high in self-efficacy are more likely than those low in self-efficacy to apply the skills they have developed through training to perform their job more effectively (see Link H-F and H-G in Figure 1). Thus, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H7: Self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between expatriate cross-cultural training learning and the expatriates’ general adjustment (H5a), work-related adjustment (H5b), and relational adjustment (H5c) such that the relationship will be more positive for expatriate subordinates high in self-efficacy.

H8: Self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between cross-cultural training learning and job performance such that the relationship will be more positive for expatriate subordinates high in self-efficacy.
Openness to experience is related to an interest in learning new things and engaging in new and challenging experiences. People who are high in openness to experience are more likely to learn from cross-cultural training, and more willing to seek out experiences in which they will be able to practice the skills they develop through the training. Strong stereotypes and biases are also less likely to be found in people high in openness to experience. Weaker stereotypes will facilitate the objectives of cross-cultural training, and will also improve the ability to cope with new and unexpected differences that are likely to be encountered after moving to a different country and culture. Given the relationships openness to experience has with both learning and adjustment (see Link H-F and H-G in Figure 1), the following hypotheses have been proposed:

H9: Openness to experience will moderate the relationship between expatriate subordinate cross-cultural training learning and general adjustment (H9a), work-related adjustment (H9b), and relational adjustment (H9c) such that the relationship will be more positive for expatriate subordinates high in openness to experience.

H10: Openness to experience will moderate the relationship between expatriate cross-cultural training learning and job performance such that the relationship will be more positive for expatriate subordinates high in openness to experience.

Finally, extraversion is another personality variable that is expected to impact the effectiveness of cross-cultural training. Extraverts are more likely to interact with others from the host-country, which will give them more
opportunities to practice the cross-cultural communication skills they will have
gained through participating in cross-cultural training. Through interacting with
people for the host-country, extraverts are more likely to build upon the
knowledge and skills gained in the training. They will be able to test out
hypotheses and assumptions, and receive essential feedback from others. All of
these factors will allow extraverts to gain more from the training, and to achieve
better outcomes than those who are low in extraversion. The following formal
predictions have been made (see Link H-F and H-G in Figure 1):

H11: Extraversion will moderate the relationship between expatriate subordinate
cross-cultural training learning and general adjustment (H11a), work-related
adjustment (H11b), and relational adjustment (H11c) such that the relationship
will be more positive for expatriate subordinates high in extraversion.
H12: Extraversion will moderate the relationship between expatriate cross-
cultural training learning and job performance such that the relationship will be
stronger and more positive for expatriate subordinates high in extraversion.

Additional Exploratory Questions

Several cultural variables are expected to impact the previously described
hypotheses. For this reason, collectivism, masculinity, power distance, and uncertainty
avoidance will be explored as control variables or as moderators themselves.
Additionally, background variables such as nationality and expatriate experience will be
controlled for in some of the tests of the hypotheses in order to clarify the relationships between the variables.

THE CURRENT RESEARCH

While past research on cross-cultural training clearly supports its positive impact on expatriate adjustment and performance, the present study represents the first attempt at examining the potential moderating effects of supervisory participation in a theoretically-based cross-cultural training program on cross-cultural training effectiveness for an expatriate. This study seeks to answer the following questions: Is cross-cultural training effective for expatriates? Is cross-cultural training for expatriate subordinates more effective when their host-country supervisor receives such training? What role do the expatriates' individual differences (self-efficacy, openness to experience, and extraversion) play in the effectiveness of cross-cultural training?

To test my hypotheses, I recruited supervisor-expatriate subordinate dyads as participants and developed a web-based cross-cultural training program as my training manipulation. The participating dyads were divided up into two groups. Both supervisor and expatriate subordinate received cross-cultural training in one condition, and only the expatriate subordinate received cross-cultural training in the other condition. This grouping allowed me to test my focal hypothesis predicting that expatriates who work with a supervisor who has participated in cross-cultural training will increase the effectiveness of the training for the expatriate, as measured by adjustment and job performance.
Method

Participants

Participants were recruited through the Association for International Practical Training (AIPT), an organization that provides a variety of services for professionals who have been hired by various U.S. companies to complete an on-the-job training assignment for up to 18 months. These individuals are called "expatriate trainees" by AIPT. The expatriate trainees come from a variety of countries and are professionally diverse, with the majority working in the engineering, science, hospitality, and tourism industries. Only expatriate trainees that had assignments in the U.S. for over three months were eligible to participate in the study. The recruitment strategy focused on recruiting supervisor-expatriate trainee dyads by contacting the trainee. A recruitment flyer was sent to the trainees prior to departure for the U.S., or shortly after they had arrived. Expatriate trainees who had been working in the U.S. for less than two months were contacted by either mail or email to request their participation. Participation in the study was voluntary, but the participants were given the opportunity to win a $100 pre-paid debit card.

Recruitment emails with the link to an initial online survey were emailed to approximately 1400 expatriate trainees from 52 different companies. Across all companies, a total of 532 participants returned their surveys (38% response rate). Of the 532 trainees, 165 completed the cross-cultural training and post-training test (31% response rate). Finally, 117 of the 165 completed the final survey mailed out a month after the training (71% response rate). The supervisors of the 532 trainees who completed the first survey were also asked to participate in the study. Of the 532 recruited, 310 were
asked to participate in the cross-cultural training along with their trainee. Of this number, 164 completed the training (response rate of 53%). A total of 69 supervisors completed the survey that was emailed to them one month after the training (response rate of 42%). In the other group of 222 supervisors, I received 131 surveys back (response rate of 59%). A total of 99 dyads resulted from matching together the surveys completed by the supervisor and the expatriate subordinate.

The present study's sample represents individuals from six different continents. The average age of the expatriate trainees was 27 years, and the average age of the supervisors was 41 years. A total of 78.4% of the supervisor respondents and 62.5% of the trainee respondents were men. Of the entire sample, 58.9% were Caucasian, 9.8% were Hispanic or were from Latin America, 28.2% were Asian, and 0.6% were Black. In terms of highest education level of the trainees, 9.2% had a high school diploma, 21.8% were currently enrolled in a university, 34.5% had a Bachelor's degree, 23% had a Master's degree, and 11% had a Ph.D. The average length of time the expatriates expected to work in the U.S. was 14 months. Of the supervisors who responded to the survey, 2.7% had only a high school diploma, 6.8% were currently enrolled in a university, 41.9% had a Bachelor's degree, 20.3% had a Master's degree, and 28.4% had a Ph.D. The majority of supervisors had between 1-2 years of expatriate experience, whereas the majority of trainees had less than a year of expatriate experience.

Design

The design of this study was a two group one-way ANOVA, with the between-factor being supervisor participation in cross-cultural training (training/no training). The
other main predictor was expatriate cross-cultural training, which was conceptualized and measured as the amount of learning exhibited by the expatriates after completing cross-cultural training. The major dependent variables were expatriate adjustment and job performance.

Materials

Training Website

A web-based cross-cultural training course (http://culture101.rice.edu/) (see Figure 2 for screenshots) was designed for the purpose of the present study. The course focused on the key components of culture and cross-cultural communication and began with a short explication of the objectives of the training. The objectives were as follows: 1) increase cultural awareness by understanding key cultural dimensions and how cultural differences might be manifested in every day life; 2) demonstrate how assumptions and values can impact interactions with people from different cultural backgrounds; 3) provide tools for effective communication in a cross-cultural context.

A culture-general, cognitive-based, didactic framework was used to develop the training modules. I chose not to use a behavioral/experiential design for practical reasons and because the use of overlearning may improve reproduction but inhibit generalization (D. Russ-Eft, April 3, 1998). A culture assimilator, which consists of a real-life scenario describing a perplexing cross-cultural interaction (critical incident) between an individual and a group of people, was used as part of the training (developed by Brislin, 1986). The effectiveness of culture assimilators has been repeatedly established in previous studies
Figure 2. Screenshots of the cross-cultural training website.

The Dimensions of Culture

Culture is a complex concept with numerous dimensions and facets. We have chosen to focus on the five most important of these dimensions.

The Building Blocks of Culture

The most significant ways in which cultures differ are in how they deal with the five concepts that will be presented in this module. Not everything people do can be explained through these, but because they are so fundamental, they are often the source of or ultimate reason behind a wide range of thought and behavior. They give you a structure for thinking about and analyzing culture that can help you understand why people from different countries think and behave the way they do, and why you think and behave the way you do.

As you learn more about these dimensions, think about how your place in the dimensions might be different from someone with whom you work or socialize.

Comfort With Uncertainty

High Comfort With Uncertainty:
- Fewer laws and less emphasis is placed on conformity.
- It's okay to break certain laws or rules for practical reasons.
- It's okay to bypass the chain of command if necessary.
- Conflict can always be avoided.
- Taking risks is acceptable.

Example: The United States and Japan have a high level of comfort with uncertainty.

Low Comfort With Uncertainty:
- More laws and greater emphasis is placed on obedience and conformity.
- It's never good to bypass the laws or the chain of command, whatever the reason.
- Conflict must be avoided; risks are not attractive.
- Interactions are more formal.
- Different is dangerous.

Example: Russia and Germany have a low level of comfort with uncertainty.
(Landis & Bhagat, 1996). In the training developed for the present study, the short vignette was followed by a series of questions asking the trainee to reflect on the scenario and think about the source of the misunderstanding (see Figure 3 for screenshot). After given time to reflect, trainees were presented with four or five alternatives to choose from in deciding what the best way was to approach the situation. After they made a decision, they received feedback about their answer and suggestions for avoiding future misunderstandings. In effect, trainees were asked to make attributions and then compare these attributions with the ones provided at the end of the incident. After completing the assimilator, trainees should be able to gain an understanding for how assumptions can be misleading in cross-cultural situations.

The training also covered cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication in order to address the third training objective (see Figure 4 for screenshot). This module presented information regarding the various meanings that nonverbal forms of communication, such as silence, turn-taking, eye contact, space and touching, take on in different cultures. The training presented ways in which to alter methods of communication to be better aligned with a different culture. By the conclusion of the training, trainees should be able to identify cultural differences in communication, recognize when cultural differences may be causing communication problems, and be able to make proper adjustments based on cultural differences in communication styles. In line with Doo's (2005) suggestions for the design of online interpersonal skills training, multiple self-assessment opportunities were embedded in the training program. These self-assessment opportunities gave trainees the opportunity to
Exercise

Please read the following story and think about which of the alternatives listed below would be the best approach for addressing the issue presented.

Ted, a British engineer, works for an international aid agency. He was assigned to a 3-month program in rural Peru to help develop disaster preparedness schemes following a particularly severe earthquake. Although he had some success in convincing local government leaders of the necessity for the measures, he was continually frustrated in trying to initiate preventive building and health programs among the larger Indian population. Ted was impressed with their rebuilding efforts after a disaster, but he couldn’t understand why these people were devout Catholics and believed that natural disasters were acts of God. In his culture, disaster was determined by God’s will. Precautions intended to minimize the effects of calamities thus seemed futile. As a result, nothing could prevent God’s will, and nothing could quell God’s will. Ted himself was a practicing Christian and respected the strong faith of the people, but he could not accept or understand the Peruvians’ lack of support for his work.

How could you help Ted to interpret the difference in religious beliefs?

1. The Peruvians did not have sufficient education or information to appreciate his viewpoints.
2. The Peruvians had been repressed so long by political and economic forces that they had just the will to act on their own belief.
3. The Peruvians probably had an inherent distrust of outsiders and were using their religious beliefs as an excuse not to cooperate.
4. The Peruvians had an intense devotion to religion that prevented their lives from reflecting that degree of Ted’s experience in his culture.

Which of the above alternatives is the best interpretation of the situation? After deciding, please proceed to the next page for the suggested answer.
Figure 4. Screenshot of page from the communications module on the cross-cultural training website.

Verbal Communication

Communication falls into two basic categories: verbal and nonverbal. The verbal category is split further into direct and indirect forms of communication. We will first discuss the differences between direct and indirect communication.

Direct:

- Relay more on words and on those words being interpreted literally.
- Setting and giving information is the goal of direct communication exchanges.
- People say what they mean and mean what they say, you don’t need to read between the lines.
- It’s important to tell it like it is; honesty is the best policy.
- The truth is more important than sparing someone’s feelings.

Indirect:

- Rely less on words to convey the literal meaning of the spoken word and more on nonverbal communication.
- Implying what they mean.
- Understanding is valued; you need to read between the lines.
- The truth, while hurtful, should be tempered.
test themselves on their comprehension of the information presented (see Figure 5 for screenshot).

A short pilot study was run to gauge the clarity and effectiveness of the measures used and to confirm the usability of the online training. Seven international students completed the measures and gave verbal feedback on them. A number of other international adults living in Houston participated in the training and made suggestions for its improvement. Additionally, a usability analysis was run by the actual designers of the website, Rice Web Services. Improvements were made on the website and some measures were changed in order to create more variability in the scores.

**Procedure**

After the appropriate changes were made to the website and the measures, a recruitment email containing links to the first online survey was sent to the trainees. The survey contained measures of demographics and background, personality and cultural variables, and pre-training cultural competence (see Table 1 for a list of all pre/post manipulation measures). The wording used in the survey was simplified for participants whose first language was not English. In accordance with AIPT's guidelines, all trainees must take and pass the TOEFL exam, thus, ability to read the survey was not predicted to cause any psychometric problems. Participants were asked to provide their email address in order to match their responses to subsequent surveys and to their supervisor's surveys.

After completing the first survey, all of the trainee participants were sent a second email with a link to the cross-cultural training website. The supervisor-expatriate trainee dyads were randomly assigned to one of two conditions. If they were in Condition 1, both
Figure 5. Screenshot of Self-Assessment Exercise Used in Cross-Cultural Training Website.
the supervisor and the expatriate trainee were sent a request via email to participate in the cross-cultural training. If they were in Condition 2, only the expatriate trainee received an email with a link to the cross-cultural training website. The web-based training consisted of three modules, and was expected to take each participant approximately 45 minutes to complete. As mentioned previously, pre-training cross-cultural competence tests were given to all participants to identify any pre-existing differences among them. After finishing the training, the participants completed the same cultural competence measure.

The spacing between the pre- and post-test ensured that the pre-test would not act as a primer for the content of the post-test. Participants were asked to complete the web-based training within two weeks of having received the link to it, and were sent reminders to complete the training as needed. Some trainees completed the pre-survey and the training before they arrived in the U.S., whereas others completed it shortly after they had arrived. The timing of the training should not impact any of the relationships being tested (Selmer, 2001).

The second major survey was emailed to the trainees and their supervisors one month after the training. This survey assessed adjustment, job performance, and quality of leader-member exchange. The timing of the post-training measurement was primarily driven by the constraint of the project timetable; however, four weeks is considered to be a sufficient amount of time between the training and evaluation measures when the goal is to determine the longitudinal effects of training (May & Kahnweiler, 2000; Wexley & Baldwin, 1986).

In line with Conway and Huffcutt’s (1997) suggestion that multiple sources provide unique perspectives and that composite measures across different sources are
more reliable, second source data was obtained for some of the measures. To obtain this data, both the supervisors and the expatriate trainees were asked to complete several of the same measures. In the post-survey, supervisors completed an evaluation of their trainee’s performance and a cultural orientation and demographics questionnaire. Supervisors were not asked to complete an assessment of their trainee’s adjustment to the culture since adjustment can only be measured by self-report. The expatriate trainee was emailed a survey in which they were asked to give their perception of leader-member exchange and to evaluate their own job performance and adjustment. After the completion of the study, a drawing was made to award a single participant with a $100 Visa debit card. Debriefing emails were sent out to all participants after the completion of the data collection.

**Measures**

Unless otherwise noted, scale scores were created for each of the measures by averaging the composite items for each scale. Most variables were measured on either a 5-point or 7-point Likert scale. See Appendices A-K for the scales and item anchors. See Table 1 for a summary of measures used, broken down by position (expatriate subordinate / supervisor).

**Demographics.** Six types of demographics were measured: gender, age, race, nationality, country of residence, and level of education (see Appendix A for expatriate measure and B for supervisor measure).
Overseas experience. A single item was used to assess the length of time spent working in countries different from their home country (see Appendix A for expatriates and B for supervisors).

Previous participation in cross-cultural training. These items assessed the quantity and quality of prior participation in cross-cultural training programs. The three items were as follows: “Have you ever participated in a cross-cultural training program before?”, “How focused was the cross-cultural training program in helping you understand a specific culture?”, and “How long was the cross-cultural training program in which you participated?” Items for this measure were not aggregated (see Appendix A for expatriate measure and B for supervisor measure).

English language proficiency. Proficiency with the English language was assessed with three items. The expatriate subordinates rated their ability to read, write and speak English (α = .87) (see Appendix A).

Openness to experience. A 20-item subscale of the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) was used to assess openness to experience. This measure demonstrated an internal consistency reliability of .85. Example items were, “I enjoy hearing new ideas”, and, “I enjoy thinking about things” (see Appendix C).

Extraversion. Extraversion was measured by eight items taken from the 44-item Big Five Inventory (BFI) (John & Srivastava, 1999). Each item was presented as an adjective, and the participant rated the degree to which the adjective described him or her. Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was adequate (α = .85) (see Appendix D).
Table 1. Summary of study measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATEE</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Expatriate Subordinate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Demographics, Educational Level, Expatriate Experience, Cultural Orientation, Previous Participation in CCT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate Subordinate</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>Demographics, Educational Level, Expatriate Experience, English Language Proficiency, Previous Participation in CCT, Length of Time in U.S., Self-Efficacy, Cultural Orientation, Openness to Experience, Extraversion, Adjustment, Job Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cultural Orientation. Cultural measures were adapted to the individual level to measure cultural orientation in the present study (e.g., Aycun & Kanungo, 2001; Stening & Hammer, 1992; Triandis, Brislin, & Hui, 1988). The four dimensions of culture measured were power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism/individualism, and masculine/feminine. These scales had an internal consistency reliability of .68 (power distance), .67 (uncertainty avoidance), .72 (collectivism/individualism), and .87 (masculine/feminine). A confirmatory factor analysis was run to ensure that these measures reflected the cultural constructs as expected. Examples of items from the scales were as follows: “Group welfare is more important than individual rewards” (individualism/collectivism), “Managers should make most decisions without consulting subordinates” (power distance), “It is important to have job requirements and instructions spelled out in detail so that employees always know what they are expected to do” (uncertainty avoidance), and “Meetings are usually run more effectively when they are chaired by a man” (masculinity/femininity) (see Appendix E).

Pre- & Post-Training Learning. A 21-item test was given to participants before and after the cross-cultural training. Each 7-item scale tapped one of the three intercultural skill dimensions (self, relational, and perceptual). As an example, to measure the self-dimension, participants were given a list of behaviors or characteristics and asked if the behaviors / characteristics applied to people living in an individualist culture or a collectivist culture (see Appendix F). Because the scales were correlated with one another, the three facet scales were combined to create an overall score. The Cronbach alpha of the 21-item scale was .62.
Self-efficacy. The self-efficacy measure was adapted from Quinones (1995) and consisted of ten items relating to the perceived ability to effectively adjust to and perform one’s job in a cross-cultural environment. A sample item from this measure: “I can quickly learn how to effectively adjust to a new country, in comparison to other people.” The scale demonstrated adequate internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .86$) (see Appendix G).

Leader-member exchange. Expatriate subordinates were given the LMX-7 scale used in Scandura and Graen’s (1984) to measure the LMX quality of their relationship with their supervisor. The scale included items such as, “How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor?” and was anchored by (1) = “Ineffective” and (5) = “Effective”. The scale demonstrated an internal consistency reliability of .82 (see Appendix H).

Adjustment. Given that adjustment is an individual’s internal and emotional state, it was measured from the perspective of the expatriate subordinate, by using Black’s (1988) 14-item scale. The scale usually breaks down into three factors: general environment (six items), interacting with others (four items), and adjustment to work (four items). Responses were made on a scale from (1) = “Not Adjusted At All” to (7) = “Very Well Adjusted” (see Appendix F & I). The general, relational/interaction, and work dimensions had internal consistency reliabilities of .75, .72, and .86 respectively. After aggregating the subscales into a single global scale of adjustment (e.g. Kraimer & Wayne, 2004), the internal consistency reliability increased to .86 (see Appendix I).

Job performance. Participants responded to a six-item scale that was adapted from the measure developed by Janssen and Van Yperen (2004). The items were reframed to
be appropriate for the supervisor rating. A sample item from this scale was, “This employee fulfills all responsibilities required by his/her job.” The supervisor-rated scale demonstrated an internal consistency reliability of .88, and the expatriate subordinate-rated scaled demonstrated an internal consistency reliability of .73 (see Appendix J for the measure given to the expatriate subordinate and Appendix K for the measure given to the supervisor).

Results

Demographic frequencies for both supervisors and expatriate subordinates can be found in Table 2. Because of the substantial attrition rate of expatriate subordinates from the first to the third data collection period, background variables and demographic frequencies between responders and non-responders for each of these collection periods were reported in Table 3. As the table shows, there are no significant differences between responders and non-responders which eliminates the generalizability issues often associated with low response rates. The preliminary data analysis involved the computation of descriptive statistics for each of the measured variables, broken down by supervisor and expatriate subordinate. The means and standard deviations of all measured variables are reported in Table 4. Correlational analysis was used to determine the zero-order relationships between all of the study variables, and these correlations among the predictor, dependent and control variables are reported in Tables 5-7. Notably, the correlational analysis indicates that self-rated job performance and supervisor-rated job performance are both significantly correlated with work-related adjustment \((r = .41\),
Table 2. Background and demographic frequencies in percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expatriate Subordinates ((n = 99))</th>
<th>U.S.-based Supervisor ((n = 99))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 yrs.</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30 yrs.</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 47 yrs.</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 - 64 yrs.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/Black</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No University</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central/South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 yrs</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 yrs</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous CCT Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Background and demographic comparisons between responders at the three different time points within the expatriate subordinate sample (Total responses = 537)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1 Only ((n = 367))</th>
<th>Time 1 &amp; 2 Only ((n = 48))</th>
<th>Time 1-3 Only ((n = 117))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 yrs.</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30 yrs.</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 47 yrs.</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 - 64 yrs.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/Black</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No University</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in University</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central/South America</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expatriate Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 yr</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 yrs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 yrs</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous CCT Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Means, standard deviations, and sample sizes for study variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expatriate Subordinates</th>
<th>U.S.-based Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of LMX</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment (work)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment (relational)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment (general)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment (aggregated)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Training Test</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Training Test</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>16.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most scales used a 7-point Likert-type response scale anchored with 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 7 (Strongly Agree).
Table 5. Intercorrelations between predictor and control variables (n = 99).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pre-Training Test (Expat)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pre-Training Test (Sup)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Post-Training Test (Expat)</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Post-Training Test (Sup)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Residual CCT Learning</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sup. Training Condition</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quality of LMX</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Openness</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extraversion</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Collectivism</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Power Distance</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Masculinity</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. English Lang. Skills</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Variables 11 – 17 are non-parametric (Spearman-Brown).

*p < .05
Table 6. Intercorrelations between dependent and control variables (n = 99).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Work-Related Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relational Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adjustment (Aggregated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisor-Rated Job Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-Rated Job Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collectivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Power Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Masculinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. English Language Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Variables 7 – 13 are non-parametric (Spearman-Brown).

*p < .05
Table 7. Intercorrelations between predictor and dependent variables (n = 99).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Work-Related Adjustment</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relational Adjustment</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General Adjustment</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adjustment (Aggregated)</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.89*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisor-Rated Job Performance</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-Rated Job Performance</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pre-Training Test (Expatriate)</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pre-Training Test (Supervisor)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Post-Training Test (Expatriate)</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Post-Training Test (Supervisor)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Residual CCT Learning</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Supervisor Training Condition</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Quality of LMX</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Openness To Experience</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Extraversion</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
p < .01 and r = .22, p < .05 respectively) and that self-rated job performance is correlated with the overall adjustment scale (r = .22, p < .05).

As outlined previously, Hypothesis 1 predicted that the amount expatriates learned in cross-cultural training would be positively related to general adjustment (H1a), work-related adjustment (H1b), and relational adjustment (H1c). A paired-samples t-test revealed that pre-training test scores (M = 13.36) were significantly different from post-training test scores (M = 16.21), t(99) = -13.33, p < .01. This finding indicates that, overall, learning did occur between the pre- and post-training tests (d = .35). The cross-cultural training construct was conceptualized on a continuum as the amount that was learned from the training. A multiple regression analysis was used to test these hypotheses in which the pre-training test score was entered into the equation first, followed by post-training test score. The ordering of the predictor variables ensured that pre-training test scores were controlled for in testing the learning that resulted from the cross-cultural training. The results of the regression analysis are reported in Table 8. Contrary to Hypothesis 1a and 1b, cross-cultural training did not predict general adjustment or work-related adjustment. However, consistent with Hypothesis 1c, cross-cultural training did predict relational adjustment (β = .33, r(95) = 2.26, p < .05) (see Link A-F in Figure 1).

A series of additional analyses were conducted to better understand why part of Hypothesis 1 had not been supported by the data. First, I conducted a power analysis to assess the ability I had to detect an effect on adjustment. The analysis revealed a power of .69 to detect the effect of training learning on work-related adjustment and a power of .29 to detect the effect of training learning on general adjustment. I ran several t-tests and
analyses of variance (ANOVA) with demographic variables as the independent variable and adjustment and its facets as the dependent variables to see if there were any significant mean differences based on gender, nationality, race, and amount of previous expatriate experience. The analyses revealed mean differences in adjustment for both gender ($t(95) = -1.99, p < .05, M = 3.72$ for men, $M = 3.97$ for women) and expatriate experience ($F(3, 94) = 3.39, p < .05$), with those with more expatriate experience reporting higher adjustment.

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted with the same independent variables (pre-training test and post-training test) predicting adjustment but controlling for gender and expatriate experience in turn. When controlling for gender, there was marginal support for cross-cultural training as a predictor of overall adjustment ($\beta = .26, t(93) = 1.80, p < .10$). A marginally significant relationship between cross-cultural training and overall adjustment was also detected when controlling for expatriate experience ($\beta = .26, t(93) = 1.85, p = .07$). Exploratory correlational analyses revealed that post-training test scores were positively correlated with work-related adjustment ($r = .27, p < .01$), relational adjustment ($r = .23, p < .05$), and overall adjustment ($r = .26, p < .05$).

Hypothesis 2 predicted that cross-cultural training would be positively related to job performance. Job performance was measured with both self and supervisor ratings. The two sets of ratings were not correlated, which may in part be due to a large difference in the reliability of the scales ($\alpha = .88$ for supervisor-rated performance and $\alpha = .73$ for self-rated performance). The job performance scale contained reverse-coded items, and may have been confusing to expatriate subordinates who were not exceptionally skilled
Table 8. Cross-cultural training learning as a predictor of adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work-Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Training Test</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Training Test</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2.26*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
at reading English. To test Hypothesis 2, I conducted two multiple regression analyses with pre-training test entered first and post-training test entered second, predicting 1) supervisor-rated performance and 2) self-rated performance. Results of these analyses are reported in Table 9. A post-hoc power analysis revealed that I only had a power of .15 to detect the effect of cross-cultural learning on job performance. The same process undertaken for Hypothesis 1 of looking for differences within the demographic variables and controlling for these variables did not produce different results for the present analyses. Post-training test scores did not predict either of the performance ratings. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that supervisor cross-cultural training would moderate the relationship between expatriate cross-cultural training learning and the expatriates’ general adjustment (H3a), work-related adjustment (H3b), and relational adjustment (H3c) such that the relationship would be more positive when the supervisor participated in cross-cultural training. I computed a variable to represent the effect of expatriate cross-cultural training learning by running a multiple regression analysis with the post-training test predicting adjustment, controlling for pre-test, and using the standardized residual values to create a new variable. The categorical supervisor condition variable was standardized and multiplied by the residual variable to compute the interaction term. Multiple regression analyses revealed that, controlling for expatriate experience, the interaction between cross-cultural training learning and the supervisor condition on work-related adjustment was significant ($\beta = .16$, $t(93) = 2.22$, $p < .05$) (see Table 10). The regression lines were plotted and can be found in Figure 6. The graph suggests that the relationship between cross-cultural training learning and work-related adjustment was
stronger for those in the supervisor training condition. No interaction was detected on
relational adjustment, general adjustment, or overall adjustment. Thus, Hypothesis 3b
was supported, but 3a and 3c were not. An additional t-test revealed that supervisor
training had a direct effect on overall adjustment \( t(96) = -2.31, p < .05 \) (see Table 11).
Hypothesis 4 anticipated that supervisor cross-cultural training would moderate the
relationship between expatriate cross-cultural training and job performance such that the
relationship would be more positive when the supervisor participated in cross-cultural
training. A multiple regression analysis was conducted to test this hypothesis with the
residual cross-cultural training variable entered first, the standardized supervisor
condition entered second, and the interaction term entered last, predicting self-rated job
performance. See Table 12 for detailed results of the analysis. The regression analysis did
not support the hypothesized interaction effect between supervisor training and expatriate
cross-cultural learning in predicting self-rated job performance. However, the same
analysis was run on supervisor-rated performance, and a significant interaction did
emerge \( (\beta = .23, t(88) = .229, p < .05) \). See Figure 7 for a graph of the interaction.
Consistent with Hypothesis 4, the graph of the interaction suggests that the relationship
between expatriate cross-cultural training learning and job performance is stronger for
participants in the supervisor training condition. See Link C-G in Figure 1.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) would
act as a mediator between supervisor cross-cultural training and its effect on expatriate
adjustment. As shown in Table 11, supervisor training had a number of direct effects on
the measured dependent variables. The overall measure of adjustment was used as the
Table 9. Cross-cultural training learning as a predictor of job performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Supervisor-Rated Performance</th>
<th>Self-Rated Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Training Test</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Training Test</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Test of supervisor cross-cultural training learning as a moderator of the adjustment - cross-cultural training relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1:</th>
<th>Work-Related Adjustment</th>
<th></th>
<th>Relational Adjustment</th>
<th></th>
<th>General Adjustment</th>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Adjustment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>10.09**</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>9.58**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>16.43**</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-2.24*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Training/No Training)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.22*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning*Supervisor Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01, * p < .05, † p < .10
Figure 6. The interaction of supervisor cross-cultural training and expatriate cross-cultural training learning on work-related adjustment.
dependent variable in this analysis. Following procedures outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986), I conducted a series of regressions to determine whether the effects of the independent variable were reduced (partial mediation) or eliminated (full mediation) when both the independent variable and the mediator were included in the same regression equation. The first step required a test confirming that the independent variable affects the mediator. Results of this test indicated that the supervisor training condition significantly predicted LMX ($\beta = .23, t(95) = 2.31, p < .05$). Second, the independent variable must significantly affect the dependent variable in the absence of the mediator. Results of this test demonstrated that supervisor training condition significantly predicted adjustment ($\beta = .23, t(96) = 2.31, p < .05$). Third, the mediator must have a significant, unique effect on the dependent variable. Results indicated that this condition was also met; LMX significantly predicted adjustment ($\beta = .48, t(95) = 5.36, p < .01$). Lastly, the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable must shrink upon the addition of the mediator to the model. After first entering supervisor training condition into the regression equation, then adding LMX to the model, the effect of LMX was still significant ($\beta = .45, t(94) = 4.89, p < .01$), but the effect of the supervisor training condition did not reach conventional levels of significance ($\beta = .15, t(94) = 1.59, p > .05$). Thus, all four conditions outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986) were satisfied for full mediation. See Table 13 for a full report of all regression equations. LMX fully mediated the positive relationship between the supervisor training condition and its effect on adjustment, which supports Hypothesis 5 (see Link C-F in Figure 1).
Table 11. Independent samples t-tests with the supervisor condition on measured variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor Not Trained</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor Trained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Related Adjustment</td>
<td>4.01 (.73)</td>
<td>4.08 (.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Adjustment</td>
<td>3.66 (.68)</td>
<td>3.85 (.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Adjustment</td>
<td>3.46 (.67)</td>
<td>3.87 (.59)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Adjustment</td>
<td>3.68 (.57)</td>
<td>3.92 (.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-Rated Performance</td>
<td>4.04 (.80)</td>
<td>4.51 (.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Rated Performance</td>
<td>4.48 (.47)</td>
<td>4.50 (.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of LMX</td>
<td>3.92 (.64)</td>
<td>4.20 (.52)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Test of supervisor cross-cultural training as a moderator of the job performance - cross-cultural training relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor-Rated Performance</td>
<td>Self-Rated Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Condition (Training/No Training)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.28*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Figure 7. The interaction of supervisor cross-cultural training and expatriate cross-cultural training learning on job performance.
Hypothesis 6 predicted that quality of LMX would act as a mediator between supervisor cross-cultural training and its effect on expatriate job performance. The same procedure used to test Hypothesis 5 was used to test LMX as a mediator of the relationship between the supervisor training condition and job performance. The supervisor training condition significantly predicted LMX ($\beta = .23, t(95) = 2.31, p < .05$) and supervisor-rated job performance ($\beta = .31, t(89) = 3.08, p < .01$). LMX significantly predicted supervisor-rated job performance ($\beta = .36, t(95) = 3.59, p < .01$). However, in the last test for mediation, it was found that both supervisor training condition ($\beta = .24, t(87) = 2.40, p < .05$) and LMX ($\beta = .30, t(87) = 3.00, p < .01$) were still significant when entered in the multiple regression equation predicting supervisor-rated performance. Thus, it appears that LMX and supervisor training have independent positive effects on supervisor-rated job performance. A full test for mediation of LMX was not conducted for the relationship between the supervisor condition and self-rated performance because the correlation between the two variables was not significant ($r = .02, p > .05$). In sum, the results of these analyses do not support Hypothesis 6.

Hypothesis 7 anticipated that expatriate’s self-efficacy would moderate the relationship between expatriate cross-cultural training learning and general adjustment (H7a), work-related adjustment (H7b), and relational adjustment (H7c) such that the relationship would be more positive for expatriates high in self-efficacy. A multiple regression analysis testing the interaction between self-efficacy and cross-cultural training learning as a predictor of the three facets of adjustment was not significant (see Table 14 for detailed results of the analyses). Upon further exploration, self-efficacy was found to be positively correlated with overall adjustment ($r = .24, p < .05$) but
Table 13. Test of LMX as a mediator of the relationship between supervisor cross-cultural training with adjustment and supervisor-rated job performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Training</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Training</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
uncorrelated with cross-cultural learning. Furthermore, significant mean differences were found to exist by gender \(F(1,94) = 13.13; M = 5.82\) for men, \(M = 5.35\) for women), and by national origin \(F(4,92) = 5.68\), with participants from Central / South American and Africa rating themselves significantly higher in self-efficacy than those from Europe and Asia. The same multiple regression analysis used to test the hypothesis was run again with the addition of nationality and gender as control variables, but this analysis did not change the significance of the interaction term.

Collectivism was also expected to impact the degree to which participants rated themselves as self-efficacious, and thus its use as a control variable was also explored. A multiple regression analysis confirmed that collectivism demonstrated homogeneity of regression slope with cross-cultural learning, which justified its usage as a covariate. I then performed a hierarchical regression analysis in which collectivism was entered in the first step, followed by self-efficacy and cross-cultural learning in the second step, and finally the interaction of self-efficacy and cross-cultural learning in the third step of the regression equation predicting adjustment. The interaction term still did not obtain significance. Hypothesis 7 cannot be supported by the data.

Similarly, Hypothesis 8 predicted that self-efficacy would moderate the relationship between cross-cultural training learning and job performance such that the relationship would be more positive for expatriates high in self-efficacy. Hierarchical regression was again used to test the hypothesis. Self-efficacy and cross-cultural training learning were entered first, and the interaction between self-efficacy and cross-cultural learning was entered second. The interaction was not significant for self-rated job
Table 14. Test of self-efficacy as a moderator of the adjustment - cross-cultural training learning relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work-Related Adjustment</th>
<th>Relational Adjustment</th>
<th>General Adjustment</th>
<th>Overall Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>9.35**</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>10.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.72**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-2.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning*Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, + $p < .10$
performance but was significant when predicting supervisor-rated job performance (β = .28, ΔR² = .13, p < .01) (see Table 15). The graph of the interaction (see Figure 8) suggests that the relationship between cross-cultural training learning and job performance is strongest for those who are high in self-efficacy. Thus, the results from this analysis provide support for Hypothesis 8 (see Link H-G in Figure 1).

Hypothesis 9 predicted that openness to experience would moderate the relationship between expatriate cross-cultural training learning and the expatriates’ general adjustment (H9a), work-related adjustment (H9b), and relational adjustment (H9c) such that the relationship would be more positive for expatriates high in openness to experience. The openness to experience variable was standardized and multiplied with the residual cross-cultural training learning variable to create an interaction term. Openness to experience and cross-cultural learning were the first predictors to be entered into a multiple regression equation, followed by the interaction between openness and cross-cultural training learning. The interaction did not predict any of the three facets of adjustment, nor did it predict overall adjustment (see Table 16). However, zero-order correlations between openness to experience and work-related adjustment (r = .29, p < .01), general adjustment (r = .25, p < .05), and overall adjustment (r = .30, p < .01) demonstrate that a positive relationship between openness to experience and adjustment does exist. Despite these findings, no interaction effect was found. Thus, Hypothesis 9 was not supported.

Hypothesis 10 predicted that openness to experience would moderate the relationship between cross-cultural training learning and job performance such that the relationship would be more positive for expatriates high in openness. To test this
Table 15. Test of self-efficacy as a moderator of the job performance – cross-cultural training learning relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Supervisor-Rated Performance</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Self-Rated Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning*Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>2.67**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01, * p < .05, + p < .10
Figure 8. The interaction of self-efficacy and cross-cultural training learning on job performance.
hypothesis, I conducted a multiple regression with the interaction between openness to experience and the cross-cultural training learning variable as the predictor. The interaction was not significant when predicting self-rated job performance or supervisor-rated job performance (see Table 17). Again, zero-order correlations between openness to experience and self-rated job performance ($r = .23, p < .05$) demonstrate that a relationship exists between openness and expatriate job performance, although the correlational nature of the analysis does not allow us to draw definitive conclusions. Generally, little support was found for Hypothesis 10.

Hypothesis 11 predicted that extraversion would moderate the relationship between expatriate cross-cultural training learning and the expatriates’ general adjustment (H11a), work-related adjustment (H11b), and relational adjustment (H11c) such that the relationship would be more positive for expatriates high in extraversion. The extraversion variable was standardized and multiplied with the residual cross-cultural training learning variable to create an interaction term. The interaction term was entered in a multiple regression equation to predict each of the three facets of adjustment. An interaction was detected when predicting relational adjustment ($\beta = -.15, t(95) = -2.04, p < .05$) and when controlling for uncertainty avoidance, the interaction predicted general adjustment ($\beta = .12, t(91) = 2.43, p < .05$). See Table 18 for detailed results of the analyses. Both of the significant interactions were graphed (see Figures 9 & 10). Consistent with the hypotheses, the relationship between cross-cultural training learning and relational adjustment (H11c) and general adjustment (H11a) was stronger for those high in extraversion (see Link H-F in Figure 1). No interaction was detected for work-related adjustment. Thus, Hypothesis 11 was partially supported.
Table 16. Test of openness to experience as a moderator of the adjustment – cross-cultural training learning relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Work-Related Adjustment</th>
<th>Relational Adjustment</th>
<th>General Adjustment</th>
<th>Overall Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>8.98**</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>9.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.97*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning*Openness to Experience</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, $^+$ $p < .10$
Similarly, Hypothesis 12 predicted that extraversion would moderate the relationship between cross-cultural training learning and job performance such that the relationship would be more positive for expatriate subordinates high in extraversion. A multiple regression analysis was performed to test this hypothesis. Extraversion and cross-cultural training learning were entered first, with the interaction between extraversion and the cross-cultural training learning variable entered second. The interaction was not significant when predicting self-rated job performance but was significant when predicting supervisor-rated job performance ($\beta = .30$, $\Delta R^2 = .14$, $p < .01$) (see Table 19 for regression analyses). The interaction was graphed in order to aid interpretation of its meaning (see Figure 11). It appears from the graph that the relationship between cross-cultural training learning and job performance is stronger for those high in extraversion (see Link H-G in Figure 1). In sum, the results from the analysis provide support for Hypothesis 12.

To synthesize the findings reported for Hypotheses 1 – 12, I evaluated my conceptual model by conducting a path analysis between all relevant variables (see Figure 12) in predicting overall adjustment and job performance. After eliminating the paths from the original model that diminished its fit, I created a new model that effectively captured the structure of the data ($\chi^2(6) = 10.50$ ($p = .10$), RMSEA = .09, CFI = .96, and Standardized RMR = .05).

Additional Analyses

Additional analyses were run to more completely understand the relationships between some of the measured variables. Given the high correlations between LMX quality,
Table 17. Test of openness to experience as a moderator of the job performance – cross-cultural training learning relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Supervisor-Rated Performance</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Self-Rated Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.89*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning*Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01, * p < .05, + p < .10**
Table 18. Test of extraversion as a moderator of the adjustment – cross-cultural training learning relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1:</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning*Extraversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work-Related Adjustment</th>
<th>Relational Adjustment</th>
<th>General Adjustment</th>
<th>Overall Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>9.31**</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-2.21*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning*Extraversion</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-2.68*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01, * p < .05, + p < .10
Figure 9. The interaction of extraversion and expatriate cross-cultural training on general adjustment.
Figure 10. The interaction of extraversion and expatriate cross-cultural training on relational adjustment.
extraversion, and supervisor-rated performance, I tested the direct effect of extraversion on supervisor-rated job performance, with LMX as the mediator. Again, the Baron and Kenny (1986) procedure was employed to test for mediation. LMX was found to significantly predict supervisor-rated performance ($\beta = .36, t(87) = 3.58, p < .01$).

Additionally, extraversion predicted both LMX ($\beta = .23, t(95) = 2.31, p < .05$) and supervisor-rated job performance ($\beta = .23, t(95) = 2.31, p < .05$). When extraversion was tested as a predictor in a multiple regression analysis along with LMX, extraversion was no longer a significant predictor of performance ($\beta = .13, t(86) = 1.21, p > .05$), however LMX retained significance as a predictor ($\beta = .32, t(86) = 3.11, p < .01$). From these results it appears that LMX fully mediates the relationship between extraversion and job performance.

Additionally, a series of analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) were performed to assess the potential impact of demographic and background variables such as age, race, gender, and expatriate experience on cross-cultural training learning. The dependent variable was scores on the post-training test, and the pre-training test was added as a covariate. Before each analysis, the assumption of homogeneity of regression slope of the covariate in respect to the independent variable (the background measure) was met in order to justify its usage. The amount of previous expatriate experience was the only background variable that was found to affect cross-cultural training learning [$F(3, 94) = 3.25, p < .05$].

Lastly, a number of multiple regression analyses were conducted to control for continuous variables such as English language skills. For this analysis, English language skills was entered in the first step, pre-training test was entered in the second step, and
Table 19. Test of extraversion as a moderator of the job performance – cross-cultural training learning relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Supervisor-Rated Performance</th>
<th>Self-Rated Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training Learning*Extraversion</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2.88**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** \( p < .01 \), * \( p < .05 \), + \( p < .10 \)
Figure 11. The interaction of extraversion and expatriate cross-cultural training learning on job performance.
Figure 12: Path analyses for measured variables.
post-training test was entered last to predict supervisor-rated performance. The amount learned from cross-cultural training still did not significantly predict supervisor-rated performance. Another series of other regressions were run with all of the relevant control variables, but controlling for these variables did not allow the relationship between expatriate cross-cultural training learning and job performance to attain significance.

Discussion

The primary goal of this study was to extend research on cross-cultural training by examining key moderators of cross-cultural training effectiveness. In particular, this study sought to clarify the role that supervisor training and individual differences play in facilitating or impeding the effectiveness of cross-cultural training. Each of the major findings of the study will be discussed in turn. For a summary of the hypotheses and findings, see Tables 20 and 21.

Cross-Cultural Training and the Expatriate Employee

Confirming Black and Mendenhall’s meta-analytic conclusions (1990), this study shows that the learning resulting from cross-cultural training positively affects adjustment to interacting with others in a new culture (relational adjustment). Those individuals who learned the most from the training, controlling for their initial level of cross-cultural competence, were more comfortable in socializing with others in the host-country (the U.S.) than were those who did not increase their cultural competence after participating in the training. This finding is particularly important given that the interaction/relational facet of adjustment is often the most difficult for expatriates to achieve since cultural
differences are the most salient when interacting directly with others from the host country (Black, 1988).

Contrary to others’ findings (Morris & Robie, 2001), I did not find that the expatriates’ cross-cultural training learning had a direct effect on general adjustment and work-related adjustment. One explanation for this finding is the low power associated with detecting the effect. A second explanation may lie in the focus and objectives of the training manipulation. The web-based training used in this study was aimed at developing the trainees’ skills to cope with problems arising from misinterpretations of other’s actions and to communicate in a way that mitigates these problems. Thus, the objectives of the training most closely align with relational adjustment. Conceivably, adjustment to work will depend more on the characteristics of the job itself. For example, if expatriates find that their new job has little skill variety or task significance, adjustment to work is likely to be difficult regardless of their intercultural skills.

Similarly, general adjustment is somewhat outside the bounds of what can be expected from culture-general cross-cultural training, as it refers to satisfaction and comfort with aspects of the new environment such as transportation, weather, and food (Black, 1988). General adjustment was included as a dependent variable in the present study because it is one of the three facets of adjustment and was thought to benefit from spillover of the relational facet. Culture-specific training, which focuses on practical and coping skills that are directly relevant to the culture the expatriate is entering, is likely to have more impact on the general facet of adjustment. As Landis and Brislin (1983) have argued, to achieve optimal adjustment to a new culture, it is likely that the expatriate
would need to participate in culture-general and culture-specific training. Although some spillover is likely to occur between the two, it cannot be unilaterally expected. The results also support intercultural skills research (e.g. Blake, Heslin, & Curtis, 1996; Goldstein & Smith, 1999) by showing that strong intercultural skills, as demonstrated by scoring high on the post-training test, were positively correlated with overall adjustment. The high correlation between the post-training test and adjustment also gives support for the validity of the test since those who scored highest reported the highest levels of adjustment.

Contrary to previous studies (e.g. Black & Mendenhall, 1991), learning that resulted from cross-cultural training did not directly impact job performance. As discussed previously, because culture-general training does not specifically address work-related adjustment issues, it may not have enough impact on its own to affect job performance. Notably, there was a low correlation between self-rated and supervisor-rated job performance. This finding is consistent with previous studies. Self-raters have the tendency to inflate their ratings, and as a result, these ratings tend to have rather low agreement with ratings from other sources (Landy & Farr, 1980). Low interrater agreement between supervisor and subordinate on performance ratings is particularly common when the performance instrument does not assess specific job tasks or duties, which unfortunately was true of the performance measure used in this study. Due to the wide variety of jobs held by the expatriates surveyed, it was impossible to administer a highly job-specific performance measure. In line with other studies that have measured both self- and supervisor-ratings of performance (e.g. Caligiuri, 1997), supervisor-ratings
Table 20. Summary of findings for Hypotheses 1 – 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>Cross-cultural training learning will be positively related to general adjustment (H1a), work-related adjustment (H1b), and relational adjustment (H1c).</td>
<td>Cross-cultural training, as measured by learning, predicted relational adjustment but not general or work-related adjustment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>Cross-cultural training learning will be positively related to job performance.</td>
<td>Results did not support the hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>Supervisor cross-cultural training will interact with expatriate cross-cultural training to predict general adjustment (H3a), work-related adjustment (H3b), and relational adjustment (H3c).</td>
<td>A significant interaction between expatriate cross-cultural training and supervisor training in predicting work-related adjustment was found when controlling for expatriate experience. No interaction was detected in the prediction of relational or general adjustment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>Supervisor cross-cultural training will interact with expatriate cross-cultural training to predict the expatriates’ job performance.</td>
<td>Results supported the interaction on supervisor-rated job performance but not self-rated job performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
<td>Quality of LMX will act as a mediator between supervisor cross-cultural training and its moderating effect on expatriate adjustment.</td>
<td>Quality of LMX was a mediator of the direct relationship between supervisor training and adjustment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6</td>
<td>Quality of LMX will act as a mediator between supervisor cross-cultural training and its moderating effect on expatriate job performance.</td>
<td>LMX and supervisor training have independent, positive effects on supervisor-rated job performance. No effect was found for self-rated job performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21. Summary of findings for Hypotheses 7 – 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
<td>Self-efficacy will interact with expatriate cross-cultural learning to predict the expatriates' general adjustment (H3a), work-related adjustment (H3b), and relational adjustment (H3c).</td>
<td>Results did not support the hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8</td>
<td>Self-efficacy will interact with expatriate cross-cultural learning to predict the expatriates' job performance.</td>
<td>Results supported the interaction on supervisor-rated job performance but not self-rated job performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 9</td>
<td>Openness to Experience will interact with expatriate cross-cultural learning to predict the expatriates' general adjustment (H9a), work-related adjustment (H9b), and relational adjustment (H9c).</td>
<td>Openness to experience and adjustment are positively correlated, however no interaction between openness and cross-cultural training was detected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 10</td>
<td>Openness to Experience will interact with expatriate cross-cultural learning to predict the expatriates' job performance.</td>
<td>The hypothesis was not supported, although openness and self-rated performance were positively correlated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 11</td>
<td>Extraversion will interact with expatriate cross-cultural learning to predict the expatriates' general adjustment (H11a), work-related adjustment (H11b), and relational adjustment (H11c).</td>
<td>Extraversion and cross-cultural training interacted to predict relational adjustment and general adjustment but not work-related adjustment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 12</td>
<td>Extraversion will interact with expatriate cross-cultural learning to predict the expatriates' job performance.</td>
<td>The hypothesis was supported for supervisor-rated performance only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were selected over self-ratings as the primary indicator of expatriate job performance, given the likelihood of bias in self-ratings.

Supervisor Cross-Cultural Training and the Expatriate Employee

The results give some support for the impact of working with a supervisor who has undergone cross-cultural training on the relationship between expatriate cross-cultural training and adjustment. Consistent with my prediction, an interaction between expatriate cross-cultural training learning and supervisor training on work-related adjustment was detected from the data. The interaction suggests that cross-cultural training learning had a greater impact on work-related adjustment for expatriates who were working with a cross-culturally trained supervisor than those who were working with an untrained supervisor. In fact, cross-cultural training learning was actually less effective for expatriates working with untrained supervisors. Contrary to predictions, no interaction was detected between supervisor and expatriate cross-cultural training learning on general or relational adjustment. Because expatriates only interacted with their supervisors at work, work-related adjustment was the most likely facet of adjustment to be effected by supervisor cross-cultural training.

A differing pattern of results emerged with respect to job performance. Expatriates who scored high in post-training learning received much supervisor-rated higher job performance ratings when their supervisor had participated in training; however, this effect was not found for those low in post-training learning. For those who learned very little from the training, no detectable difference in job performance ratings between the supervisor training conditions was observed. This finding is perhaps the
most interesting of all the results, and demonstrates the importance of paired supervisor-expatriate cross-cultural training to achieve optimal expatriate job performance. This study is the first to examine such a relationship between paired supervisor-subordinate training and expatriate performance.

Contrary to my hypothesis, the data did not support leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between supervisor training and job performance. Instead, supervisor training and LMX had independent, positive effects on expatriate job performance. The main effect of supervisor training on job performance suggests that regardless of the amount learned from participating in cross-cultural training, expatriates received significantly higher job performance ratings when they were working with a supervisor who had participated in cross-cultural training. Consistent with leader-member exchange theory (Dansereau et al., 1973), developing supervisors’ cross-cultural skills through training did improve the quality of their relationship with their expatriate subordinates. In fact, as predicted, the quality of leader-member exchange emerged as a full mediator of the relationship between supervisor cross-cultural training and expatriate adjustment. Supervisor cross-cultural training appears to strengthen and build the rapport between supervisor and subordinate, resulting in a high quality LMX relationship characterized by mutual respect, trust and obligation (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). This finding synthesizes and adds to both LMX and training theory by showing the impact that co-development of intercultural skills between leader and member can have on training effectiveness criteria.
Individual Differences and Cross-Cultural Training

The results of this study provide evidence for the influence of individual differences across the cross-cultural training effectiveness criteria. Except for the surprising insignificance of openness to experience as a moderator, each individual difference examined in the study was a significant moderator of at least one form of training effectiveness. Self-efficacy was not found to facilitate cross-cultural training’s effect on adjustment but zero-order correlations revealed that it was positively related to adjustment. The most significant finding in regards to self-efficacy was its interaction with expatriate cross-cultural training learning in the prediction of supervisor-rated job performance. Those who were high in self-efficacy and high in cross-cultural learning received the highest supervisor-rated job performance ratings.

For those scoring low on self-efficacy, there was no beneficial effect of cross-cultural training learning on their supervisory performance rating. As suggested in past research on self-efficacy’s impact on training effectiveness (Tracey et al., 2001), it appears that for cross-cultural training to be most effective in improving job performance, the individual must have a strong sense of efficacy to use his or her knowledge in such a way that it improves their work relationships and task-related abilities. Although no moderating effects of self-efficacy were observed on the relationship between cross-cultural learning and self-rated performance, zero-order correlations revealed that self-efficacy is strongly positively correlated with self-rated performance. This finding suggests that individuals who have an inflated sense of self-efficacy also have positively-biased perceptions of their job performance, with neither being substantiated on their supervisor’s perceptions of reality.
The hypotheses predicting a moderating effect of openness to experience on the relationship between cross-cultural training learning and adjustment and between cross-cultural training and job performance were not supported by the data. One explanation for the lack of significant results comes from Church (2000), who suggested that although traits are common across cultures, they may not account for behavior less in some cultures than in others. Consistent with Barrick and Mount's (1991) conclusion that openness to experience predicts training performance across a wide range of occupations, openness to experience and self-reported job performance were correlated. However, this finding was not replicated for the relationship between openness to experience and supervisor-rated performance.

Extraversion demonstrated a pattern of results quite different from that of openness to experience. In fact, extraversion emerged as the strongest and broadest enhancer of cross-cultural training effectiveness of all the individual difference variables investigated. The prediction that extraversion would moderate the relationship between cross-cultural training learning and adjustment was supported for the relational and general facets of adjustment. Individuals high in extraversion were more likely to benefit from what they learned through cross-cultural training than those low in extraversion in respect to relational and general adjustment. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that extraversion is positively related to adjustment (Huang et al., 2005; Shaffer et al., 2006), but extends this research by examining the role of extraversion as a moderator of the cross-cultural training – adjustment relationship. From these findings, it can be inferred that extraverted people are more likely to practice and use the intercultural skills gained through training by interacting with those around them. As a
result, the more extraverts learn in cross-cultural training, the more likely they are to adjust to cross-cultural interactions than are those low in extraversion.

The other finding relating to extraversion was that, as expected, extraversion moderated the relationship between cross-cultural training and supervisor-rated job performance. In a pattern similar to that found in the prediction of adjustment, the relationship between cross-cultural training learning and performance was stronger and more positive for those who were high in extraversion than for those who were low in extraversion. Additionally, this study contributes to both leader-member exchange theory (Dansereau et al., 1973) and the five-factor literature (Goldman, 1981; John & Srivastava, 1999) by exploring the relationships between leader-member exchange, extraversion and job performance. Quality of LMX was found to mediate the effect of extraversion on job performance. These findings suggest that extraverts are more likely to develop high quality relationships with their supervisor, which will positively affect the ratings that their supervisors give for their job performance.

Finally, though a small number of mean differences were detected in adjustment and performance based on demographic and cultural background, controlling for these variables did not change the results of the analyses. In line with previous expatriate adjustment research (Caligiuri, 1997), the relationship between prior international experience and adjustment was not found to be significant. As suggested by Caligiuri (1997), the relationship most likely depends on the similarity or distance of prior experience countries to the current host country. Prior international experience in dissimilar countries to the current host country might have more of an impact on adjustment to the current location than if the previous experience was in a country with a
culture similar to the expatriate’s home country (Taveggia & Gibboney, 2001).

Unfortunately, these data were not collected in the present study.

Cultural differences were also not found to impact many of the relationships in the study, besides that between extraversion and adjustment. Although differences were observed on some of the measured variables, these differences were not significant enough to impact the results of most of the analyses. However, the finding that gender differences exist in adjustment and that both gender and nationality differences exist in self-efficacy could be relevant to other bodies of research.

Theoretical Implications

This study contributes to the theoretical dialogue on cross-cultural skills training by exploring the moderating effects of individual differences and supervisor support on such training. The core contribution of this study is the finding that providing cross-cultural training to the supervisor of the expatriate employee has a positive impact on supervisor-rated job performance, and that this effect is mediated by the quality of the leader-member exchange. No studies to this date have taken a leader-member exchange approach to the study of training and little, if any, research has been conducted on joint supervisor-subordinate training in general. The results of the current study support Kraimer and Wayne’s (2004) conclusion that social support in the workplace has an impact on the expatriate success criteria of expatriate adjustment and job performance. The current study builds upon their findings by specifically studying the supervisor’s role in expatriate adjustment and supervisor-rated performance, and by introducing leader-member exchange as the theoretical underpinning of this influence.
Future research on expatriates should examine what other members of global organizations would benefit from cross-cultural training. These findings will hopefully encourage the examination of cross-cultural training for the subordinates of expatriates, and for work teams that include expatriates. People who work either under an expatriate or as their colleague are likely to benefit from learning how cultural differences may be manifested in the workplace and in their manager’s leadership style, and furthermore how to cope with these differences. Given the finding that leader-member exchange was a mediator of the relationship between extraversion and job performance and between supervisor training and job performance, it is possible that the same pattern of results would occur for situations in which the expatriate is the leader and someone from the host-country is the subordinate. Cultural differences like power distance have the potential to create massive misunderstandings and hurt feelings if they are thought to be an affront to the other individual or personality flaw rather than an innocuous cultural difference in leadership styles. Future research along these lines would require a controlled and methodologically sound examination of the effect of cross-cultural training on a variety of organizational members who come into frequent contact with the expatriate.

Another contribution of this study is its exploration of the moderator effects of individual differences on cross-cultural training effectiveness. Very few studies have been conducted on the relationship between personality variables and cross-cultural training. This study provides a sound base for further explorations of these relationships. In respect to extraversion, future research should examine whether the facets of extraversion have differential effects on the social relationships formed by expatriates.
For example, it is possible that individuals high in sociability will have a large number of friendships, while individuals exhibiting high levels of assertiveness may have a much smaller circle of social relationships. This level of detail was not explored in the current study, but would be an interesting direction for future researchers to take.

The research confirms previous research by Harrison et al. (1996) demonstrating the relationship of self-efficacy with cross-cultural adjustment. Further, it confirms previously suggested (Black & Mendenhall, 1990), but yet untested propositions of the role of self-efficacy as a moderator of the relationship between cross-cultural training and job performance. Morris and Robie (2001) have called for more research addressing the role of pre-training and post-training self-efficacy in cross-cultural training effectiveness, and this study has heeded their call.

Lastly, and not entirely intentionally, this study has contributed to the burgeoning web-based training literature addressing the training of interpersonal skills. What research has been done in this area has shown little if any difference between web-based programs and instructor-led programs (Vrasidas & Zembylas, 2003). The validity of the web-based training used in the present study was empirically supported, and could be used as a platform for further research of online interpersonal skills training, and bolster the acceptance of web-based training for "soft" skills.

Practical Implications

First, given that expatriate assignments result in the disruption of existing social networks, it is important that organizations help to provide employees with the tools to build social networks in the host country. The significant relationships between cross-
cultural training and adjustment support the increasing emphasis on formal training as part of the acculturation process. Second, because the success of employees abroad has financial and emotional implications for expatriates and for the organizations that employ them, it is essential that conditions be optimized for cross-cultural training to have maximal impact. The results of this study suggest that not only should expatriates receive cross-cultural training, but that the supervisor of expatriates should also participate in such training. Third, the training that the expatriate and his supervisor or colleagues receive should be based on current cross-cultural theory. A well-designed and supported cross-cultural training program is critical to the success of global assignments.

Lastly, given the results of the present study, I predict it would be valuable for the supervisor an international employee to be trained in a way that will allow them to leverage cultural diversity within their team. Many companies bring in people from different cultures to bring a diversity of background and experiences to their work teams in the hopes that the output will be creative synergies. These types of outcomes are more likely to occur when expatriates are working with others who have the same intercultural skills that they do.

**Strengths and Limitations**

There are a number of strengths and limitations of the study that should be acknowledged. In terms of limitations, only one post-training outcome survey was administered. Ideally the post-training survey would have been followed up with additional surveys to test the long-term impact of expatriate and supervisor cross-cultural training. Longitudinal studies that explore the predictors of cross-cultural training success
over time are badly needed. A second limitation relates to the sample size. Although the sample size was quite large compared to those of other cross-cultural training studies, it could certainly be increased. Small sample size is a problem in many cross-cultural training studies, especially for those that employ an experimental design. The sample in this study included expatriates from a wide variety of organizations, industries, and national citizenship, which served to increase the generalizability of the results.

Another limitation relates to how the cross-cultural training construct was conceptualized. Cross-cultural training was measured by the degree of learning that occurred during the training. Because the learning measure was mostly knowledge and content-based rather than skill-based, it may not have tapped the complete domain of the cross-cultural training construct. Unfortunately it would have been logistically impossible to evaluate the learning from the web-based cross-cultural training course by observing and rating the trainees’ demonstration of intercultural skills.

A substantial strength of this study is its experimental design within a field setting, which is a rare combination in existing cross-cultural training research. Unfortunately, most studies of cross-cultural training are correlational in nature, which severely limits the causal inferences that can be drawn from their findings. Also, many cross-cultural training studies are conducted in a lab with undergraduate students, therefore severely limiting the generalizability of the findings. The fact that the participants in this study came from a wide range of companies and industries adds a great deal of meaningfulness to the results. Also, method bias was reduced by obtaining multi-source data. Self-report measures, such as the quality of leader-member exchange, were used to predict supervisor-rated variables, such as that of job performance.
An additional strength of this study was the design of the web-based training program. The training was developed based on cross-cultural training theory, with clear objectives, self-assessment opportunities, and tests tapping each of the objectives in a very identifiable way. The majority of training manipulations found in cross-cultural training studies were not designed by the researchers themselves. Instead, most cross-cultural training studies structure their paradigm and research questions around a training program that already exists. In these situations, they have no control over the training method or content, and sometimes know little about how the training was developed. The training course designed for this study was developed through an extensive consultation of cross-cultural training literature, which resulted in a clear set of instructional objectives (Morris & Robie, 2001).

Lastly, the magnitude of this study's findings are perhaps more remarkable given the length and the medium of the training. Most cross-cultural training studies use training manipulations that are longer than 45 minutes and that are facilitated by a real-life trainer (e.g. Bhagat & Prien, 1996). This study found a number of longitudinal effects after trainees participated in a short, web-based training, making it quite a conservative test in comparison to other cross-cultural training studies.

Conclusion

While there is much to be learned about cross-cultural training, this research makes several contributions. This study provides preliminary evidence that cross-cultural training of expatriates is indeed effective, and that to heighten the effectiveness of the training, the supervisor of the expatriate should receive cross-cultural training to
maximize adjustment and job performance of the expatriate employee. Overall, the results also indicate the value of examining individual differences when evaluating the effectiveness of cross-cultural training studies.

Organizations now more than ever are in need of training programs that will prepare their employees for moves to offices overseas, or prepare them to work with the influx of overseas workers coming into their workplace. I expect that the demand for rigorous studies of cross-cultural training effectiveness will continue to increase. The world is changing, and organizations are changing with it. The borders between countries have been stripped down by technology and the globalization of business. This study has contributed to developing better cross-cultural training programs and systems.
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Appendix A

Expatriate Subordinate Questionnaire: Demographics and Background Measures

1. Gender: [ ] Male [ ] Female

2. Age: __

3. Ethnicity: [ ] Asian [ ] Black/African/Caribbean [ ] Hispanic/Latino [ ] White/Caucasian [ ] Other (please specify)

4. Country you have lived in for the longest period of time: ________

5. Nationality: ________

6. Level of education: [ ] No university experience [ ] Currently enrolled in institution for post-secondary education [ ] Completed Bachelor’s Degree or equivalent [ ] Completed Master’s degree [ ] Completed Ph.D or equivalent

7. Expected length of your U.S. training: [ ] Less than 3 months [ ] 3-5 months [ ] 6-11 months [ ] 12-18 months

8. Industry of your U.S. employer: ________

9. Name of your company: _______________

10. Name of your primary U.S. supervisor/trainer: _______________

11. Total amount of time you have spent working in countries different from your home country: [ ] None [ ] Less than 1 year [ ] 1-2 years [ ] 3 years or more

12. How would you rate yourself on your ability to SPEAK English?

[ ] Poor [ ] Fair [ ] Good [ ] Excellent

13. How would you rate yourself on your ability to READ English?

[ ] Poor [ ] Fair [ ] Good [ ] Excellent
Appendix A (continued)

14. How would you rate yourself on your ability to WRITE English?
   [ ] Poor [ ] Fair [ ] Good [ ] Excellent

15. Have you ever participated in a cross-cultural training program before? [ ] yes [ ] no

16. If so, how focused was the cross-cultural training program on helping you understand a specific culture? [ ] Not at all specific [ ] Somewhat specific [ ] Very specific

17. How long was the cross-cultural training program in which you participated? [ ] 1 hour or less [ ] Half a day [ ] Full day [ ] More than 1 day
Appendix B
Supervisor Questionnaire: Demographics and Background Measures

1. Gender: [ ] Male [ ] Female

2. Age: __

3. Ethnicity: [ ] African American [ ] Asian [ ] Hispanic/Latino [ ] White/Caucasian [ ] Other (please specify)

4. Nationality: __________

5. Level of education: [ ] No university experience [ ] Currently enrolled in institution for post-secondary education [ ] Completed Bachelor’s Degree or equivalent [ ] Completed Master’s degree [ ] Completed Ph. D or equivalent

6. Total amount of time you have spent working in countries different from your home country: [ ] None [ ] Less than 1 year [ ] 1-2 years [ ] 3 years or more

7. Have you ever participated in a cross-cultural training program before? [ ] yes [ ] no

8. If so, how focused was the cross-cultural training program on helping you understand a specific culture? [ ] Not at all specific [ ] Somewhat specific [ ] Very specific

9. How long was the cross-cultural training program in which you participated? [ ] 1 hour or less [ ] Half a day [ ] Full day [ ] More than 1 day
Appendix C

Expatriate Subordinate Questionnaire: Openness to Experience

All items anchored by (1) = “Strongly Disagree” and (7) = “Strongly Agree”.

1. I avoid philosophical discussions. (RC)*

2. I believe in the importance of art.

3. I am not interested in abstract ideas. (RC)

4. I have a vivid imagination.

5. I do not like art. (RC)

6. I tend to vote for liberal political candidates.

7. I carry the conversation to a higher level.

8. I enjoy hearing new ideas.

9. I do not enjoy going to art museums. (RC)

10. I tend to vote for conservative political candidates. (RC)

11. I enjoy thinking about things.

12. I can say things beautifully.

13. I enjoy wild flights of fantasy.


15. I have a rich vocabulary.

16. I do not like poetry. (RC)

17. I rarely look for a deeper meaning in things. (RC)

18. I believe that too much tax money goes to support artists. (RC)

19. I am not interested in theoretical discussions. (RC)
Appendix C (continued)

20. I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas. (RC)

*RC = reverse-coded
Appendix D

Expatriate Subordinate Questionnaire: Extraversion

All items anchored by (1) = “Strongly Disagree” and (7) = “Strongly Agree”.

I see myself as someone who:

1. Is talkative
2. Has an assertive personality
3. Is somewhat shy, inhibited (RC)
4. Is outgoing, sociable
5. Is reserved (RC)
6. Is full of energy
7. Generates a lot of enthusiasm
8. Tends to be quiet (RC)
Appendix E

Expatriate Subordinate & Supervisor Questionnaire: Cultural Orientation

All items anchored by (1) = "Strongly Disagree" and (7) = "Strongly Agree".

1. Group welfare is more important than individual rewards.
2. Group success is more important than individual success.
3. Being accepted by members of your work group is very important.
4. Employees should only pursue their goals after considering the welfare of the group.
5. Managers should encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer.
6. Individuals should be expected to give up their goals in order to benefit group success.
7. Managers should make most decisions without consulting subordinates.
8. It is frequently necessary for a manager to use authority and power when dealing with subordinates.
9. Managers should seldom ask for the opinions of employees.
10. Managers should avoid off-the-job social contacts with employees.
11. Employees should not disagree with management decisions.
12. Managers should not delegate important tasks to employees.
13. It is important to have job requirements and instructions spelled out in detail so that employees always know what they are expected to do.
14. Managers expect employees to closely follow instructions and procedures.
15. Rules and regulations are important because they inform employees what the organization expects of them.
16. Standard operating procedures are helpful to employees on the job.
Appendix E (continued)

17. Instructions for operations are important for employees on the job.

18. Meetings are usually run more effectively when they are chaired by a man.

19. It is more important for men to have a professional career than it is for women to have a professional career.

20. Men usually solve problems with logical analysis; women usually solve problems with intuition.

21. Solving organizational problems usually requires an active forcible approach, which is typical of men.

22. It is preferable to have a man in a high level position rather than a woman.
Appendix F

Expatriate Subordinate and Supervisor Questionnaire: Pre- / Post-Training Assessment

Do you think each statement is more likely to apply to a COLLECTIVIST CULTURE or to an INDIVIDUALIST CULTURE?

1. People adhere to tradition.
2. There is a need for autonomy.
3. People change jobs frequently.

Do you think each statement or behavior below is more likely to apply to a culture where time is MONOCHRONIC or POLYCHRONIC?

4. The focus is on the task, getting the job done.
5. Being made to wait is normal.
6. Plans are fixed, once agreed upon.

Do you think the statements below reflect a culture with HIGH POWER DISTANCE or LOW POWER DISTANCE?

7. Interaction between boss and subordinate is more informal.
8. Management style is authoritarian and paternalistic.
9. Management style is consultative and democratic.

10-16. Match Values with Behaviors

Match each value or belief in the columns with exactly one behavior in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of family</th>
<th>Asking people to call you by your first name.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taking off from work to attend the funeral of an aunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not helping the person next to you on an exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving face</td>
<td>At a meeting, agreeing with a suggestion you think is wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informality</td>
<td>Disagreeing openly with someone at a meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bending to authority</td>
<td>Inviting your secretary to eat lunch with you in your office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness</td>
<td>Asking your supervisor’s opinion of something you’re the expert on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F (continued)

Do you think each statement or behavior below is indicative of a culture with INDIRECT COMMUNICATION or DIRECT COMMUNICATION?

17. People are reluctant to say no.
18. Use of understatement is frequent.
19. You have to read between the lines.
20. “Yes” means I hear you.
21. People tell you what they think you want to hear.
Appendix G

Expatriate Subordinate Questionnaire: Self-Efficacy

All items anchored by (1) = “Strongly Disagree” and (7) = “Strongly Agree”.

1. I feel confident in my ability to interact with others in a cross-cultural situation.

2. I think I can eventually reach a high level of performance at my job.

3. I am sure I can learn how to perform my job effectively.

4. I don’t feel that I am as capable as others when working with people in a cross-cultural environment. (RC)

5. On average, other people are probably much more capable of performing this job than I am. (RC)

6. I can quickly learn how to effectively adjust to a new country, in comparison to other people.

7. I am not sure I can ever reach a high level of performance at this job, no matter how much practice and training I get. (RC)

8. It would take me a long time to adjust to working with others in a country different from my own. (RC)

9. I am not confident that I can successfully adjust to interacting with others in a cross-cultural situation. (RC)

10. I feel confident in my ability to adjust to life in the United States.
Appendix H

Expatriate Subordinate Questionnaire: LMX

1. Do you usually know how satisfied your supervisor is with what you do?
[Anchored by (1) = “Never” and (5) = “Very Often”]

2. How well does your supervisor understand your job problems and needs?
[Anchored by (1) = “Poorly” and (5) = “Fully”]

3. How well does your supervisor recognize your potential?
[Anchored by (1) = “Poorly” and (5) = “Fully”]

4. Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that your supervisor would use his/her power to help you solve problems in your work?
[Anchored by (1) = “None” and (5) = “High”]

5. Again, regardless of how much formal authority your supervisor has, what are the chances that he/she would “bail you out” at his/her expense?
[Anchored by (1) = “None” and (5) = “High”]

6. I have enough confidence in my supervisor that I would defend and justify his/her decision if he/she were not present to do so.
[Anchored by (1) = “Disagree” and (5) = “Agree”]

7. How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor?
[Anchored by (1) = “Ineffective” and (5) = “Effective”]
Appendix I

Expatriate Subordinate Questionnaire: Adjustment

All items anchored by (1) = "Not At All" and (5) = "Fully".

How adjusted are you to:

1. Your specific job responsibilities?
2. The performance standards expected at work?
3. Interacting with your colleagues at work?
4. Working with your supervisor?
5. American society and customs?
6. Interacting with Americans outside of work?
7. Conversing with Americans on a daily basis?
8. Living conditions in general?
9. The food?
10. Shopping?
11. The transportation system?
12. Entertainment/recreation facilities and opportunities?
13. Health care facilities?
14. The cost of living?
Appendix J

Expatriate Subordinate Questionnaire: Job Performance

All items anchored by (1) = “Disagree” and (5) = “Agree”.

1. I always complete the job tasks assigned to me.

2. I meet all the formal performance requirements of this job.

3. I fulfill all responsibilities required by the job.

4. I often neglect aspects of the job that I am obligated to perform. (RC)

5. I often fail to perform essential duties of this job. (RC)

6. I am an excellent worker overall.
Appendix K

Supervisor Questionnaire: Job Performance

Anchored by (1) = "Disagree" and (5) = "Agree"

1. This trainee always completes the job tasks assigned to him or her.

2. This trainee meets all the formal performance requirements of the job.

3. This trainee fulfills all responsibilities required by the job.

4. This trainee often neglects aspects of the job that he or she is obligated to perform. (RC)

5. This trainee often fails to perform the essential duties of this job. (RC)

6. This trainee is an excellent worker overall.