

MONASH

UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

INTERNATIONAL WORK IN DOMESTIC JOBS: AN INDIVIDUAL EXPLANATION

Phyllis Tharenou

*Working Paper 14/03
April 2003*

WORKING PAPER SERIES

ISSN 1327-5216

Abstract

This study sought to understand the factors related to the amount of international work individuals perform in domestic jobs, a type of work that is increasing in Australia and elsewhere. Alumni from a single university were surveyed, providing 1046 fulltime domestic employees working in a range of industries. Regression analysis showed that, beyond individual and organizational controls, the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs was related to working in organizations at higher than lower levels of internationalization (e.g., MNCs) and human resource support, to working at high managerial levels, and to having international skills (e.g., prior international assignments), but little to attitudes related to international work and none to family factors. As predicted, the managerial level of the job made a difference in response to the work environment. Working in MNCs and domestic organizations with operations abroad was more related to the amount of international work senior managers and executives perform in domestic jobs than lower and middle managers or subordinates and supervisors. Analysis of open-ended responses showed the major reasons Australians would take DJIRs were money, professional development, and challenging content, and the major reasons they would not were family commitments/disruption, in contrast to the quantitative results for family factors. The difference between the quantitative and qualitative results and the importance of family factors, international skills (versus attitudes), and HR support was discussed.

This paper is a work in progress. Material in the paper cannot be used without permission of the author.

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT

INTERNATIONAL WORK IN DOMESTIC JOBS: AN INDIVIDUAL EXPLANATION

The way in which international work is performed is changing. Partly because of problems with expatriation (e.g., costs, shortage of candidates), organizations have been staffing international work in other ways, including host country managers, short-term assignments, extended business trips, commuter assignments, virtual expatriate assignments, and domestic jobs with international responsibilities, as shown by recent evidence (Fenwick, 2002; Petrovic, Harris, Brewster, 2000; PricewaterhouseCoopers [PWC], 1999, 2000; Tharenou, 2002a). In particular, organizations have been increasing the amount of international work carried out in domestic jobs. At times this has been to replace long-term assignments because of their problems, as in virtual expatriate assignments (Fenwick, 2002; Petrovic et al., 2000; PWC, 1999, 2000). At other times it has been because the globalization of firms has resulted in the emergence of job types specializing in international business performed from headquarters/home, including global manager roles and support roles (Tharenou, 2002a). At other times it has been because international work has encroached into what once were purely domestic jobs so that managers and professionals in organizations (often an unrealized number) now have some international dimensions to their jobs (Auteri & Tesio, 1990; Barham & Devine, 1991; Tung, 1998). Tung (1998) observed: "Domestic managers, who were once quite removed from the dynamics of interacting with nationals of other countries and companies in other industries, find that they increasingly have to contend with these forces in their day-to-day work" (p. 27). Solomon (1994, p. 99) illustrated the point: "Technology takes away the need for people to physically move and live abroad... we take people from all around the world when we're developing products. They'll be part of that team. But we don't relocate them together. We communicate through phone, fax, and computers. It's much more cost-efficient and less disruptive".

Indeed, in Australia, the country of this study, domestic jobs with international responsibilities (DJIRs), ranging from those with almost a completely international focus (e.g., global managers, virtual expatriates, support specialists) to those with only some international dimensions (managers and professionals in their day-to-day jobs), have increased in frequency (Fenwick, 2002; Tharenou, 2002a). Research hitherto has focused on the organizational reasons international work is conducted from/at home through frequent flying, virtual expatriation, and DJIRs (Petrovic et al., 2000; PWC, 1999; Tharenou, 2002a). Yet interviews of Australian managers found personal factors (e.g., an international orientation, family discouragement) were as, if not more, important to their taking up DJIRs as business reasons, and illustrated that individuals partly choose to take up DJIRs rather than DJIRs simply being a job requirement (Tharenou & Mellem, 1999). This study extends research from the organizational perspective by seeking to understand the organizational and individual factors related to the amount of international work Australians perform in their domestic jobs and why they would or would not take DJIRs if there were a choice. Although more individuals are likely to undertake international work in their domestic jobs than expatriate, studies have hitherto focused on understanding expatriation (Feldman, 2001).

This study uses an Australian sample. Australia's use and reasons for DJIRs likely differ from other countries. Less isolated countries than Australia may use DJIRs more; for example, European countries use commuting and frequent flying because of their proximity within the European Union (Brewster & Scullion, 1997; Petrovic et al., 2000; Scullion & Brewster, 2001). Australian MNCs also differ from MNCs in larger countries (De Cieri & Dowling, 1997), for example, by being smaller, and so may use expatriates less and DJIRs more. Yet a comparison of Australian and UK companies showed similar frequencies of use of long- and short-term assignments, frequent business travel, and virtual assignments, except the British commuted more than Australians (Fenwick, 2002). Australian HR practices of selection and training have been shown, overall, to be similar to those of other "Anglo" countries (Huo, Huang, & Napier, 2002; McGraw, 2002). Nevertheless, the results of this study most apply to Australia and not to other countries, including other isolated countries or Anglo countries.

Insert Figure 1 about here

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSITIONS TESTED

The theories used to explain individual's participation in expatriation, such as uncertainty reduction and family systems theories (Feldman, 2001), may not apply in explaining the amount of international work an individual carries out in a domestic job, because DJIRs do not involve as much life disruption as expatriation. Due to the lack of theory and empirical evidence, this study takes an exploratory approach, examining organizational, family, job, and individual factors in relation to the amount of international work individuals perform in domestic jobs. This study presumes that the nature of the organization (e.g., a multinational company [MNC] rather than a domestic firm with limited international activities) and the job (e.g., an executive more than a junior manager) are important to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs, that family factors can be influential (e.g., because of frequent travel away from home), and that individual factors can be relevant because organizations will prefer certain person characteristics for domestic international work (e.g., international skills, an international orientation).

The Environment: The Organization, Job, and Family

The amount of international work individuals perform in domestic jobs should be explained by organizational requirements. If the organization is at a higher international level (e.g., an MNC) than at a lower level (e.g., a domestic organization that exports only), employees should carry out more international work from the home base/headquarters. Tasks would include liaising with subsidiaries, coordinating and controlling operations abroad, and planning international strategy (e.g., Adler & Bartholomew, 1992; Barham & Devine, 1991; Dowling, Welch, & Schuler, 1999). Although organizations at low international levels, which include domestic firms with international divisions or that export only, also perform some international work in domestic jobs (e.g., export, business development; Adler & Bartholomew, 1992; Black, Gregersen, & Mendenhall, 1992; Dowling et al., 1999), the amount individuals perform should be less than if they worked in firms at higher international levels. An organization may also be increasing its international focus, to survive, to grow, to meet its business objectives or government pressure, or in other ways to deal with its environment (e.g., competition; Barham & Devine, 1991). The international work includes developing business abroad, liaising with others abroad such as customers, acquiring businesses abroad, or forming joint ventures. Hence, employees should carry out more international work in their domestic jobs if the organization is increasing its international focus than if it is not. Thus, Hypothesis 1 proposes:

H1: Organizational international level (H1a) and focus (H1b) will be positively related to the amount of international work employees perform in domestic jobs.

Organizational needs will not be the only aspect of the work environment that affect how much international work employees perform in domestic jobs. DJIRs require considerable support because they involve frequent travel (Barham & Devine, 1991; Brewster & Scullion, 1997; Kiser, 1999; PWC, 1999, 2000; Solomon, 1998), working across time zones (Kiser, 1999), developing cross-cultural skills for more than one culture (Adler & Bartholomew, 1992; Tung, 1998), communicating with different cultures from a distance (Kiser, 1999), time away from family and friends and coping with stress and family disruption (DeFrank, Koponasko, & Ivancevich, 2000; PWC, 2000; Striker et al., 1999; Westman & Etzion, 2002), and living abroad on short stints (Solomon, 1998). Hence, the extent to which the organization provides human resource (HR) support through assistance with travel, accommodation, incentives and remuneration, cross-cultural training, family issues, and flexible policies (e.g., for exceptions) the more international work employees may be prepared to carry out in their jobs. Individuals may shy away from DJIRs if HR support is not provided. Hence, Hypothesis 2 proposes that:

H2: HR support for domestic international work will be positively related to the amount of international work employees perform in their domestic jobs.

Family factors may also affect the amount of international work an employee performs in the job because it involves substantial travel and out-of-hours work (Tharenou, 2002a). Those with family responsibilities (partner, children) may be able to carry out international work less than others because of the time spent away due to travel, and working out of hours due to time zone differences. Families reduce managers' business travel (De Frank et al., 2000; Striker et al., 1999), and managers reported family influence

discouraged their taking up DJIRs because of the time spent away from, and loss of, family and social life (Tharenou & Mellem, 1999). DJIRs also disrupt routines (e.g., travel, residential stints abroad, time zone differences) (DeFrank et al., 2000; Fisher & Cooper, 1990), and the disruption anticipated may lead employees to not accept international work in their jobs. Overall, the greater: (a) an employee's family responsibilities (marriage/partner, children), (b) the influence the family has on individuals taking on international work, and (c) the anticipated disruption to routines from DJIRs, the less international work employees may perform in their jobs. Hence, Hypothesis 3 proposes that:

H3: Family responsibilities (H3a), family influence (H3b), and disruption to routines (H3c) will be negatively related to the amount of international work an employee performs in domestic jobs.

The level of the job should also influence the amount of international work performed in it. Senior managers and executives should have more international work in their jobs than lower and middle managers or subordinates and first-level supervisors because of the tasks they perform. Senior managers and executives, unlike more junior staff, plan and coordinate the firm's international strategy, manage product lines across countries, and oversee operations abroad, often from headquarters (Adler & Bartholomew, 1992; Barham & Antal, 1994; Barham & Devine, 1991). These tasks are also more likely in firms at higher than lower international levels and with a higher than lower international focus, suggesting an interaction between managerial level and the organizations' international level and focus in relation to the amount of international work in domestic jobs. Senior managers and executives should also need more HR support to carry out international work in their jobs than lower level employees because of the greater amount of travel and dealing with other cultures required (Adler & Bartholomew, 1992; Barham & Devine, 1991; Kiely, 2001; Tharenou, 2002a). Managerial level should therefore not only be directly related, but also moderate the relationships of organizational level and focus and HR support, to the amount of international work in domestic jobs. Hence, Hypothesis 4 proposes a direct link of managerial level and Hypothesis 5 a moderator effect for managerial level:

H4: Managerial level will be positively related to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs.

H5: The organization's international level, focus, and HR support will be more related to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs by executives and senior managers than by middle and lower managers or subordinates and supervisors.

The Person: Skills and Attitudes

Although the organization and job are clearly related to the amount of international work in domestic jobs, organizations should also select individuals for greater amounts of international work in their jobs based on their international skills, preferences (e.g., international orientation), and self-confidence, consistent with a person-job fit (Edwards, 1991). Employees with skills in international work (e.g., education major, prior expatriate assignments), an international orientation (an openness to other cultures and countries, Caligiuri, 1994), and self-confidence for international work (perceived self-efficacy for working with employees in other countries) are more likely to be selected for greater amounts of international work than others. This is because of the fit between international skills, an international orientation, and perceived self-efficacy for international work with the work. Hence, Hypotheses 6 and 7 propose that:

An employee's international skills will be positively related to the amount of international work in their domestic jobs.

An employee's international orientation (H7a) and perceived self-efficacy (H7b) will be positively related to the amount of international work in their domestic jobs

Why Individuals Take or Do Not Take DJIRs: Qualitative Data

The quantitative analyses of this study assess how much particular factors are related to the amount of international work in individual's jobs (H1 to H7) but not whether employees would initially take up DJIRs.

Although DJIRs do not appear to be voluntary, available evidence suggests that employees choose the work, as well as business reasons resulting in their having international work in their jobs. Managers in DJIRs reported that they took up DJIRs most frequently because of their attitudes (e.g., an international orientation/sense of adventure), followed by business needs caused by the organization's focus and the job (Tharenou & Mellem, 1999). The survey thus also asked respondents two open-ended questions for the main reasons they would take or not take a DJIR. The questions enabled factors that may cause individuals to take up DJIRs, such as their organization's international focus, or that may stop individuals taking DJIRs, such as the family's influence, to emerge.

METHOD

Respondents and Data Collection

The sample comprised university alumni from a single university. Alumni were used for three major reasons. First, university graduates form most employees who perform domestic international work (Egan & Bendick, 1994; Egan, Bendick, & Miller, 2002). Second, because DJIRs arise in a wide range of industries and the profit and not-for-profit sectors (Egan & Bendick, 1994; Egan et al., 2002; PWC, 1999, 2000), a stratified sample of alumni provided graduates in a broad range of industries. Third, because the study was interested in factors related to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs and why individuals would take or not take DJIRs, a sample was needed that could have (but may not have had) international work in their domestic jobs. The university mailed 6,000 surveys to a stratified sample of alumni: (a) with Australian business addresses, to obtain Australians in domestic jobs (to control for other factors that would have arise if the DJIRs were abroad); and (b) who graduated six or more years ago, because international work may not be performed in very early career. The study was part of a larger project whose aim alumni were told was to examine employee interest in international careers at home and abroad. The sampling resulted in these faculty proportions: arts (27%), business and economics (19%), science (17%), law (12%), medicine (11%), engineering (9%), education (3%), and pharmacy and information technology (1% each). The proportions are suitable. Egan and Bendick's (1994) sample of employees working in international business careers in the U.S. were most frequently graduates in business, law, and liberal arts/other fields.

The response rate was 26.33% ($n = 1580$). The low rate resulted from: (a) incorrect addresses --15% of the surveys were returned to the sender, which was likely an underestimate; and (b) inappropriate employees -- some alumni contacted the researcher to say they could not perform international work in their jobs (e.g., school teachers) or were unemployed or employed part-time. Alumni could provide their names and addresses for follow up; 71% did ($n = 1123$). Respondents could thus be compared to nonrespondents (1123 vs 4877) but imperfectly as the latter included some unidentified respondents. Chi-square tests showed that nonrespondents compared to respondents were younger, more likely to be men (64% versus 60%), and more from the law faculty (12% vs 8%) and fewer from the science faculty (16% vs 20%). The representation from the other faculties was similar, as was the highest level of degree obtained. Overall, the small differences found between respondents and nonrespondents should not have affected the results, but in case age or gender were related to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs, they were employed in the regression analysis as controls.

To obtain fulltime employees in domestic jobs, respondents were excluded if they worked fewer than 30 hours per week ($n = 10$), were not Australian citizens or were living abroad ($n = 131$; their mail had been forwarded), or had substantial missing data ($n = 127$), leaving 1312. Pairwise deletion resulted in 266 respondents being omitted in the analyses because they answered the questions asking about their organization's international focus and HR policies for international work as being not applicable. Because the 266 comprised 20% of the sample, they were compared to the rest (i.e., 1046). Chi-square tests showed the 266 were significantly more likely than the 1,046 to not to carry out international work in their jobs, to work in domestic organizations with no international activity, not to work where international work could occur (i.e., not in an MNC, or a domestic organization with operations abroad), and to work in industries where international work was unlikely (e.g., school teachers, doctors). Hence, the effect on the results of the loss of 20% of the respondents was to remove those for whom international work was not relevant. This

enabled the final sample to be relevant to testing the hypotheses of the study as they did have, or could have had, international work in their jobs and organizations, and increased the validity of the sample for testing the hypotheses.

Insert Table 1 about here

The final sample of 1046 respondents averaged 43 years of age and 5 to 35 years fulltime work; 65% were men, 77% had partners, and 65% were parents. Table 1 further describes the sample. Consistent with Egan and Bendick's (1994) sample in DJIRs, 64% worked in the profit sector. The inclusion of the not-for-profit sector (government, education, health and community services, Table 1) agrees with studies that show DJIRs also arise in those industries (Egan & Bendick, 1994; Egan et al., 1992; Feldman & Tompson, 1992). In order to test the hypotheses, the sample needed certain characteristics. Respondents needed to work in organizations at different stages/levels of internationalization to test whether different levels could be related to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs. Table 1 shows the sample did work in organizations varying in levels/stage of internationalization. Respondents also needed to vary from having none to a lot of international work in their domestic jobs for variation in environmental and personal factors to be able to be related to variation in the amount of international work in the job. As shown in Table 1, 44% of the sample currently spent more than 10% of their time performing international work in their jobs, 42% traveled abroad on business for their jobs, and 62% had performed international work in their domestic jobs for a year or more. Moreover, 72% reported they could be personally asked by their organizations to take up a domestic job that includes international work. Hence, a sufficient number of respondents had DJIRs and a sufficient number could have DJIRs for variations in person and environmental factors to be related to the amount of international work in their jobs and to answer the open-ended questions on why they would or would not take up a domestic international job.

Measures

Amount of International Work Performed in Domestic Jobs

The measure was a composite of three items based on Egan and Bendick's (1994) items: the percentage of time the employee spends on international work in the current job (10-point item scored from 1 [0-10%] to 10 [91-100%]), the number of years the employee has performed a domestic job with international work, and the current amount of international travel the employee does per year on business (7-point item scored from 1 [none] to 7 [50 or more days]). Travel was included as scholars regard it as a necessary part of performing international work in a domestic job (Barham & Devine, 1991; Brewster & Scullion, 1997; Egan & Bendick, 1994; Egan et al. 2002; Kiser, 1999; PWC, 1999, 2000; Solomon, 1998). The respondents were instructed to answer the three items in regard to international work they perform in their domestic job and not to prior international assignments in which they had relocated abroad. Examples of the types of work in DJIRs and the ways in which it can be conducted were given. The three items were transformed (by taking the inverse of each item) and the composite formed by averaging the items. The composite of the three items facilitates capturing the distinction that someone may spend 10% of their time on international work but travel abroad for more than 50 working days and another person may spend 30% of their time on international work but rarely travel abroad. The composite also allows taking into account that someone may currently perform a large percentage of international work in their job and another person may perform a smaller current proportion but have done so for several years. A multi-item score, not the single items, was used because the three items emerged as a distinct factor ($\alpha = .77$) in principal components analysis, which was confirmed in confirmatory factor analysis (to be reported in the results).

Education Major

Respondents reported if they had done a minor or major sequence in international business/management in their degrees scored as 1, no; 2, a minor; 3, a major.

Prior International Assignments

The measure was Daily, Certo, and Dalton's (2000), combining the two items of the number of international assignments respondents had in which they relocated abroad for a fulltime job, and the total number of years

in such assignments. The respondents were instructed that prior international assignments were not international work performed in domestic jobs when domiciled in Australia (i.e., DJIRs). As in Daily et al. (2000), the items were transformed (by taking the log of the items) and a composite derived by averaging the transformed scores ($\alpha = .80$). Daily et al. (2000) explained that the two items facilitate capturing the distinction between an employee with one international assignment of 15 years compared to another employee with 15 years experience but in three separate venues.

International Orientation

The measure was Caligiuri's (1994) four, four-item subscales rated by 5-point Likert type scales. In factor analysis to be reported in the results, three of the four subscales had their four items loading and foreign experience had 3 of 4 items. The scores averaged those items. The factors were: (a) international attitudes: positive attitudes to other countries, travel, assignments abroad, and languages ($\alpha = .67$ for this sample); (b) comfort with differences: cultural dissimilarity amongst friends ($\alpha = .68$); (c) cultural events: participation in cultural events ($\alpha = .66$); and (d) foreign experience: learning foreign languages and traveling overseas ($\alpha = .57$). Because of its low alpha, foreign experience was dropped from the analyses (prior international assignments more reliably measured prior foreign experience). The three other subscales were retained because their alphas were close to .70.

Perceived Self-Efficacy

The score assessed the certainty employees had they could work in their jobs with employees in other countries with different cultures to their own, adapting Cianni and Tharenou's (2000) measure of self-efficacy for international work. The score averaged 9, 11-point items ($\alpha = .93$ for this sample) ranging from 0% (no certainty) to 100% (total certainty). The stem was: "I am certain when dealing in my job with people in another country with a different culture to my own that I can...". Examples were: work with foreign colleagues, handle problems, learn the skills in my job, adapt my behavior, and be comfortable dealing with people of different ethnicity to my own.

Organizational International Focus

The measure was based on Barham and Devine's (1991) and was 13, 7-point items scored from 1, strongly disagree to 7, strongly agree. Respondents were asked if their organization was increasing its international focus to grow (a growth strategy, to grow the business/expand, to take advantage of business potential abroad), to meet its business objectives and the industry's international focus, from encouragement (home or host government encouragement, CEO views), to compete (survival needs, foreign competition), and because of changed structures (single markets abroad, speed of market changes, mergers and acquisitions). Based on factor analyses, 11 of the 13 items ($\alpha = .95$) were averaged.

Organization International Level

Employees were asked, based on classifications of company international level/stage (e.g., Adler & Bartholomew, 1992), if they were employed by a domestic organization that (a) exports abroad, (b) has an international division, or (c) has operations abroad, or (d) by an MNC. Respondents answered either yes or no, scored as 1 or 2, to each of the four items, with complete data on all four items. The items were not combined into a single score as the score had a low alpha coefficient (.33) and so could not form a "continuous" variable. The items were not highly intercorrelated (as shown in Table 2) and so each could be included in the same regression analysis.

Human Resource Policies

The score averaged 12, 7-point items ($\alpha = .94$) assessing the extent the respondent's organization had policies to support international work in domestic jobs, scored from 1, never to 5, always. The 12 policies were: travel, exceptions to policy, assistance with accommodation; cross-cultural training, induction, country briefings; incentives and remuneration, assistance with financial issues; information about strategic information; planned career paths, fit of international careers to the organization plan, and consultation about jobs.

Family Responsibilities

Three single items measured having a partner (scored as 1 married/cohabiting; 2, no partner), number of children, and teenage children living with the respondents (1, yes; 2, no).

Family Influence

The measure was 7, 7-point items scored from 1, strongly disagree to 7, strongly agree. The items were developed from the answers given in semi-structured interviews of 42 managers in DJIRs on the influence family factors had on their taking DJIRs (Tharenou & Mellem, 1999). The survey items thus asked the extent respondents were unwilling to take on international work in their jobs because of: (1) time away from family/home life/friends, (2) family/home responsibilities, (3) loss of family life and social contacts, and (4) time away from important events. And how much respondents agreed or disagreed, with regard to taking up international work in their jobs, that (5) their friends/community ties have a strong influence, (6) family has a strong influence, and (7) family's approval and support would be important (e.g., "my family has a strong influence on whether I take on international work in my job"). The first five items emerged as a distinct factor and were averaged for the score ($\alpha = .90$).

Disruption to Routines

The score averaged 3, 7-point items rated from 1, not at all to 7, always ($\alpha = .84$) that asked respondents the extent they anticipated a DJIR would disrupt established work or nonwork (e.g., social, home, family) routines or give substantial uncertainty.

Managerial Level

The 8-point item (Tharenou, 2001) ranged from 1, nonmanager to 8, CEO (Table 1).

Control Variables

Individual and organizational variables were entered as the first block of variables in regression analyses to control for variations within the sample, to enhance generalizability, and to ensure the links found between the hypothesized variables and the amount of international work performed in jobs were not confounded by third variable explanations. The individual variables controlled were age (in years), gender (scored as 1, male; 2, female), and place of birth (scored as 1, Australia; 2, English-speaking country abroad; 3, non-English-speaking country abroad). They were controlled because men, those older, and those born abroad may have been given more international work in their domestic jobs than others. Organizational characteristics were controlled. Because the distribution was skewed, size was collapsed from a 12-point item to three categories of similar frequencies, scored as 1, fewer than 100 employees; 2, 100 to 2000; and 3, greater than 2000. The industries were dummy coded (five categories, Table 1) with the comparison category being government and health and community services combined. Headquarters (HQs) was coded as 1, Australian and 2, other country. Large organizations, some industries, and working at HQs may have been related to more international work in domestic jobs than other circumstances.

Open-Ended Questions

Two questions asked respondents the main reasons they would or would not take up DJIRs. The derivation of the frequencies of the themes/reasons was a two-stage process, first determining a set of agreed themes and then scoring them for frequency. First, two graduate students independently derived themes from the answers to the two questions for all respondents. They then compared them for similarity and identified disagreements, which were discussed to ascertain the reasons for disagreeing. In the main, disagreements arose due to differing definitions being used for themes/reasons, themes being too general rather than specific, different labels being used for the same construct, or errors in interpretation. A common set of themes was derived after discussion based on agreeing on common definitions for each theme and making themes more specific than previously. Second, once the themes were commonly defined and identified, the two raters independently scored the frequency of their occurrence. The raters had high interreliabilities (.97, .98), showing little error. The scores averaged the two raters' scores.

Method of Analysis

In order to assess the construct and discriminant validity of the multi-item scales developed for the study, exploratory analysis was initially conducted followed by a confirmatory analysis (CFA) as suggested by Hinkin (1995). Hierarchical multiple regression was used to test H1 to H4 and H6 and H7 by entering the control variables in Step 1 to account for their effects and then, in Step 2, the hypothesized variables. No order was stipulated as there was insufficient theoretical or empirical support to justify the prioritization of variables. Although the study is exploratory, stepwise regression was not used as it is not recommended for

hypothesis testing because it capitalises on chance (Thompson, 1995). The hypotheses proposed relationships, which were tested by regression analysis, not correlations, to allow for the simultaneous control of several variables in Step 1 and for the interrelationships amongst the predictor variables to be taken into account, to arrive at the variable's unique relationship with the dependent variable. Hierarchical moderated regression analysis was used to test H5 for the moderator effect of managerial level on the work environment variables.

Insert Table 2 about here

RESULTS

Factor analyses showed that, overall, the items mapped onto the constructs they were intended to measure. Principal components analysis of the 66 items of the multi-item measures ($n=1046$) explained 67% of the variance by 14 distinct factors, of which 11 (61 items) were the proposed constructs. The factors were: organizational international focus (19% variance; 11 of 13 items); perceived self-efficacy (10%; 9 items); HR policies (6%; 12 items); family influence (6%; 5 of 7 items); disruption to routines (3%; 3 items); amount of international work performed in domestic jobs (3%; 3 items); prior international assignments (3%; 2 items); and the four international orientation subscales (foreign experience 4%, 3 items; comfort with friends 3%, 4 items; cultural activities 2%, 4 items; international attitudes 2%, 4 items). The remaining three factors were government encouragement (2%; the two remaining items of the international focus scale), another family influence factor (2%; two remaining items) and a HR training factor (1%) whose two items double loaded with the HR factor on which they had much higher loadings.

Although the items mapped onto the expected 11 constructs, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to assess the structure and if a more parsimonious structure fitted as well; for example, the four subscales of international orientation may have loaded on one factor although they are considered as separate (Caligiuri, Jacobs, & Farr, 2000). CFA using the LISREL 8 program (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1998) confirmed that the 11-factor model (GFI=.972, AGFI=.967, NFI=.964, NNFI=.972; RMR=.0491) fitted better than a 7-factor model in which the four subscales of international orientation loaded onto one factor, and the two organizational variables of international focus and HR support loaded on a single factor (GFI=.918, AGFI=.911, NFI=.903, NNFI=.908; RMR=.0810). The increments in fit were GFI=.054, AGFI=.056, NFI=.061, and NNFI=.064, beyond Widaman's (1985, p. 4) criterion of .01. There were also theoretical reasons for using the 11-factor model rather than a 7-factor model; for example, an organization's international focus differs from HR support for international work. A more parsimonious 5-factor model did not fit at the .90 level. Hence, the CFA supported the construct and discriminant validity and unidimensionality of the 11 multi-item scales used.

The variables' means, standard deviations, correlation coefficients, and alpha coefficients are provided in Table 2. Multicollinearity between the predictor variables to be used in the regression analyses appeared not to be a problem. The low intercorrelations amongst the person variables (prior international assignments, international orientation, perceived self-efficacy) indicated they were not interdependent and, overall, the predictor variables had low intercorrelations, apart from headquarters (HQ) with MNC (Table 2). Formal tests of multivariate multicollinearity were conducted between the predictor variables of the regression analysis, by calculating tolerances and variance inflation factors (VIF), because the magnitude of beta coefficients of some variables may have been reduced by their relationships with others. Two variables, HQ and number of children, were dropped from the analyses because their VIFs were greater than two and tolerances less than .70. Pairwise deletion was used for missing data.

Table 3 provides the results of the moderated regression analysis. The amount of international work performed in domestic jobs was regressed on the control variables (Step 1), the environment, job, and person variables testing H1 to H4 and H6 and H7 (Step 2), and interactions between managerial level and the hypothesized variables to test H5 (Step 3). The dependent variable is the inverse so that reverse signs arise for the proposed relationships.

Insert Table 3 about here

Hypothesis 1, that organization international level (H1a) and focus (H1b) will be related positively to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs, was partially supported as shown in Table 3 for the total sample. Taking into account all other variables, working in MNCs and domestic organizations with operations abroad was positively related to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs but, rendering partial support for H1a, so were working in domestic organizations with international divisions or that exported only. An organizational international focus was related to the amount of international work in domestic jobs, supporting H1b. Hypothesis 2 was supported. HR support for international work was positively related to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs.

Hypothesis 3, that family responsibilities (H3a), family influence (H3b), and disruption to routines (H3c) would be negatively related to the amount of international work in domestic jobs, overall gained little support. As shown in Table 3, family responsibilities of a partner and teenage children were not significant nor was family influence, not supporting H3a or H3b. Disruption to routines was related to the amount of international work in domestic jobs, supporting H3c. Hypothesis 4, that managerial level would be related to the amount of international work in domestic jobs, was supported (Table 3).

Hypothesis 5, that managerial level would moderate the links of the work environment to the amount of international work in domestic jobs, was partially supported. The three levels of the moderator were: (a) subordinates and first line supervisors (combining categories 1 and 2); (b) lower and middle managers (3 and 4), and (c) senior managers and executives (5 to 8). Supporting H5, as shown in Table 3, significant interactions arose between managerial level and working in an MNC and a domestic organization with operations abroad. Table 3 provides the regression results for the sample split into the three levels to interpret the significant moderator effects. As expected, for senior managers and executives more than lower and middle managers or subordinates and supervisors, working in MNCs and domestic organizations with operations abroad was related to the amount of international work in domestic jobs.

Hypotheses 6 and 7 proposed that international skills (H6), orientation (H7a), and self-efficacy (H7b) would be positively related to the amount of international work individuals have in their jobs. As shown for the total sample (Table 3), taking into account all other variables, prior international assignments and a university major in international business/management were significant, supporting H6. Of the measures of international orientation, participation in cultural events and comfort with differences, but not international attitudes, were significant, though the beta coefficients were low, providing little support for H7a. H7b was not supported. Perceived self-efficacy was not related to the amount of international work domestic jobs. Omitting the international orientation subscales did not make self-efficacy significant.

Because the sample was heterogeneous, the links found may have held for some subgroups more than others. In order to ensure the results were not confounded by such variations, moderated regressions were performed adding interactions between the hypothesized variables and (a) employment sector (scored as 1, public sector/government and 2, private enterprise), and (b) age to the main equation. The interactions were not significant. The regressions were also run for each of the five industry groups resulting in little difference by industry. However, when the moderator variable was HQs, the interactions added to the explanation of the amount of international work ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $p = .00$) by significant interactions between HQs and managerial level ($B = .10$, $p = .00$), domestic organizations with operations abroad ($B = .08$, $p = <.01$), family influence ($B = -.07$, $p = <.01$), and disruption ($B = .08$, $p = <.01$). When the regressions were run for the two separate groups of Australian and foreign organizations, the beta weights for the four predictors were generally not significant at $p = <.05$, suggesting little effect on support for the hypotheses.

Insert Table 4 about here

Table 4 gives the frequencies for the 23 reasons given by more than five percent of the sample for taking up a DJIR (another 26 reasons were given by fewer than five percent). As shown in Table 4, the 14 major reasons given for taking DJIRs concerned financial rewards (more money, given by 27%), development opportunities (professional development, given by 24%), cultural experiences, career advancement, challenge (especially job content, given by 23%), organizational focus, and lifestyle. The nine major reasons for not taking DJIRs were disruption (especially family commitments/disruption, given by 25%), no reason, job conditions, and organizational focus. Supporting the regression results for self-efficacy, only 1% mentioned uncertainty. As well, only 3% said they would take DJIRs because of fit with their skills.

DISCUSSION

This study contributes to understanding of individuals' participation in international work by being the first to examine, from an individual perspective, the factors related to the amount of international work employees perform in their domestic jobs, a type of work increasing in frequency in Australia (Fenwick, 2002; Tharenou, 2002a). The paper makes two major contributions. First, the explanation of the individual and organizational reasons individuals carry out international work in their domestic jobs is changed by having qualitative, and not only quantitative, results, especially the emergence of the importance of family commitments, which may be more related to taking up the work than to the amount of international work in the job. Second, the results for person factors suggest that task expertise (gained from prior international assignments, university major) is related to carrying out international work in a domestic job whereas attitudes relevant to international work (international orientation, self-efficacy) are not, or little, related, suggesting that selection of individuals on international skills may play a role.

The results of this study are limited to Australia and the cross-sectional self-report data gained. Yet, the positive links of higher organizational international levels, international focus, and HR support to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs, especially for senior managers and executives, are not surprising. MNCs and domestic organizations with operations abroad and organizations increasing their international focus need global manager and specialist corporate support roles operating from headquarters, need to oversee operations abroad, and need to deal with colleagues abroad as well as customers, suppliers, distributors and other groups. To do so, organizations need to provide HR support (e.g., travel, accommodation, rewards, training, etc.) to carry out these tasks. They also need individuals who carry out international work from a domestic base to have international skills, which are gained through prior international assignments and university study in the area. Hence, although the results are limited to an Australian sample and arise from cross-sectional data, they are consistent with the factors thought related to managers and professionals carrying out international work from a domestic base (e.g., Adler & Bartholomew, 1992; Barham & Antal, 1994).

Why Do the Quantitative and Qualitative Results Differ?

The quantitative and qualitative results differ on the importance of family and organization needs to carrying out international work in a domestic job. Overall, the quantitative results indicate that business needs (i.e., the organization's international level and focus, the job's managerial level) and the individual's international skills are more related to the amount of international work in domestic jobs than personal factors of family responsibilities and influence and individuals' attitudes (international orientation, self-efficacy). The expected moderation by managerial level further supports the importance of business needs. It is when working in organizations at high international levels (MNCs, domestic organizations with operations abroad) that senior managers and executives carry out more international work than lower and middle managers or subordinates and supervisors, consistent with the tasks needed in organizations at high international levels (e.g., global manager roles, specialist international roles). The implication that could be drawn from the quantitative results, overall, is that the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs is more of an organizational imperative than an individual choice. A limitation is that the voluntariness of participation in DJIRs was not assessed. If individuals could not exercise a choice in having international work in their jobs, that may directly explain the lack of importance of their preferences and self-efficacy (e.g., Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 2000), the low importance of the family, and the stronger links with the work environment. Future research needs to examine the effect of individual choice or the voluntariness of

participation in DJIRs to assist in explaining why individuals have international work in domestic jobs.

In contrast to the quantitative results, the qualitative results support the importance of employees' expectations and the family to taking DJIRs. The open-ended results suggest the employees of this sample are most likely to take up DJIRs because of the benefits they expect, especially money, development, cultural experiences, challenge, and advancement, rather than because of the organization's focus (e.g., opportunity, strategy/necessity). They are likely not to take up DJIRs because they anticipate costs with the greatest deterrent being family commitments and disruption, in contrast to the lack of links for family responsibilities and influence in the quantitative analyses. The link of anticipated disruption to the amount of international work performed in DJIRs suggests that anticipated disruption may both deter taking up DJIRs and the amount of international work in the job. The qualitative results, overall, are consistent with expectancy theory, in which individual's expectations of benefits and costs explain their job intentions and choices (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994; Wanous, Keon, & Latack, 1983; Van Eerde, & Thierry, 1996). The qualitative results for the deterring effect of family factors are consistent with interviews of Australian managers in DJIRs who reported the family was a strong discouragement to their taking up DJIRs because of the time spent away from children/family and the loss of family life and social contacts (Tharenou & Mellem, 1999). Overall, the qualitative results (outcome expectancies, family commitments/disruption) are consistent with their being some choice in, and personal reasons for, participating in DJIRs. Once, in the job, however, business reasons are more related to how much international work is performed than personal factors including family responsibilities and influence.

Overall, the quantitative and qualitative results differ because they are answering different questions (Lee, Mitchell, & Sablinski, 1999). The qualitative results help explain attitudes to taking or not taking up DJIRs, and therefore are relevant to understanding choice, when family commitments and disruption seem to have most influence. The quantitative results help calibrate the extent that specific factors are related to the amount of international work individuals perform in their jobs, suggesting that business reasons and individuals' skills most explain "how much".

International Attitudes and Skills: Why Are the Results Different?

For this sample, an individual's international orientation (international attitudes, comfort with differences) and perceived self-efficacy are either little related, or not related, to the amount of international work performed in the jobs. The lack of significant findings would have been exacerbated by the restricted variances on the scores for these measures, but that may not be the only explanation. HR support had restricted variance and was significant. Another explanation for the results for international attitudes is consistent with the pattern of results for skills and attitudes. Organizations may select individuals for domestic international work more on their task expertise (i.e., the significant links for prior assignments, education major) than on attitudes relevant to international work, as has been found for expatriation (Barham & Devine, 1991; Haslberger & Stroh, 1992; PWC, 1999). Organizations select individuals to carry out international work from a domestic base and during fly-in/fly-out trips when they have first-hand knowledge of other countries and cultures from prior international assignments. Individuals who have worked abroad will have greater knowledge of global markets and more of a global perspective and skills than those who have not, and so be more suitable for DJIRs (Adler & Bartholomew, 1992). Hence, international skills may be more significant to the amount of international work individuals perform in their jobs than their international attitudes.

HR Support

For this sample, the positive relationship of HR support to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs may mean employees are more likely to carry out more international work in their domestic jobs if they have support for doing so. The problems inherent in DJIRs, especially travel, time zone differences, need for several cross-cultural skills at once, and remote working (Adler & Bartholomew, 1992; Kiely, 2001) can be assisted by HR support for travel, accommodation, financial issues, exceptions to policy, and cross-cultural training. The factors this sample gives as deterring their taking up DJIRs of family issues, undesirable job conditions and financial loss/poor money can also be assisted by HR support. Hence, HR support may be especially important to carrying out greater amounts of international work in domestic jobs.

Future Research and Practical Implications

This study has several limitations, some of which have already been noted. In addition, the predictor variables may affect each other, although they have low interrelationships (Table 2). Tharenou (2002b) proposed that international skills and preferences lead to perceived self-efficacy for international work, and that the work environment shapes skills, preferences, and self-efficacy. Hence, models of sequenced paths with interdependent links amongst the person and environment variables need to be examined. The significant links found may also be reciprocal. The amount of international work performed in the job should improve one's skills, preferences, and perceived self-efficacy, and increase the HR support provided. Hence, longitudinal tests are needed for both prediction and to assess bidirectional links.

Future research also needs to sample organizations where DJIRs are most prevalent and with employees that most perform them. Although the sample was highly diverse, it was from one university. The sample was not from organizations targeted as having large numbers of DJIRs, because it was not known where they would most occur. Future research also needs to differentiate the types of DJIRs for which explanations of individual's participation may vary, consistent with differences in the reasons organizations use them (e.g., Petrovic et al., 2000; PWC, 1999). Moreover, self-report data increase common method variance and inflate relationships, requiring objective measures, especially of the environment.

Practical implications arise from the results. The respondents give more positive reasons for taking DJIRs than negative reasons for rejecting them, suggesting DJIRs are more attractive than unattractive and may be promising alternatives to staffing international work. Because DJIRs are increasing in frequency, organizations need to provide environments to attract individuals to them and to assist performing greater amounts of international work in their domestic jobs. HR support is needed to provide benefits (e.g., financial benefits, professional development opportunities, career development and advancement, job conditions) and reduce costs this sample anticipate, especially those to do with family commitments and disruption (e.g., home offices for out-of-hours work, family accompaniment on trips abroad). The results suggest HR support is needed for travel, accommodation, cross-cultural training, induction, and career planning. Organizations also need to develop managers for future domestic international work through career planning, in terms of providing international assignments, and selection in terms of their prior international assignments and educational majors.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N.J., & Bartholomew, S. (1992). Managing globally competent people. Academy of Management Executive, 6, 52-65.
- Auteri, E., & Tesio, V. (1990). The internationalisation of management in Fiat. Journal of Management Development, 9, 6-16.
- Barham K., & Antal, A. (1994). Competencies for the pan-European manager. In P. Kirkbride (Ed.), Human resource management in Europe (pp. 222-241). London: Routledge.
- Barham, K., & Devine, M. (1991). The quest for the international manager. London: Ashbridge Management Research Group/Economist Intelligence Unit.
- Black, J.S., Gregersen, H.B., & Mendenhall, M.E. (1992). Global assignments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Brewster, C., & Scullion, H. (1997). A review and agenda for expatriate HRM. Human Resource Management Journal, 7 (3), 32-39.
- Caligiuri, P.M. (1994). The International Orientation Scale. In D. Marcic and S. Puffer (Eds.), International Management (pp. 159-177). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.
- Caligiuri, P.M., Jacobs, R.R., & Farr, J.L. (2000). The attitudinal and behavioral openness scale. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24, 27-46.
- Cianni, M., & Tharenou, P. (2000). A cross-cultural study of the willingness of graduating students to accept expat assignments. In R. Edwards, C. Nyland, & M. Coulthard (Eds.), Readings in international business (pp. 337-360). Maryborough, Victoria: Prentice Hall.
- Daily, C.M., Certo, S.T., & Dalton, D.R. (2000). International experience in the executive suite: The path to prosperity. Strategic Management Journal, 21, 515-523.
- De Cieri, H., & Dowling, P.J. (1997). Strategic international human resource management. Management International Review, 37, 21-42.
- DeFrank, R.S., Konopaske, R., & Ivanevich, J.M. (2000). Executive travel stress: Perils of the road warrior. Academy of Management Executive, 14, 58-71.
- Dowling, P.J., Welch, D.E., & Schuler, R.S. (1999). International human resource management. Cincinnati: South-Western College Publishing.
- Edwards, J.R. (1991). Person-job fit. In C.L. Cooper and I.T. Robertson (Eds.), International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 283-357). New York: Wiley.
- Egan, M., & Bendick, M. (1994). International business careers in the United States. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 5(1), 35-50.
- Egan, M., Bendick, M., & Miller, J. (2002). US firms' evaluation of employee credentials in international business. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 13, 76-88.
- Feldman, D.C. (2001). Domestic and international relocation for work. In C.L. Cooper and I.T. Robertson (Eds.), International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 215-244). New York: Wiley.
- Feldman, D., & Tompson, H. (1992). Entry shock, culture shock. Human Resource Management, 31, 345-62.
- Fenwick, M. (2002). Alternative forms of international assignments. Paper given to the Australian Human Resources Institute's International HRM Division, Melbourne.
- Fisher, S., & Cooper, C. (1990). On the move. New York: Wiley.
- Haslberger, A., & Stroh, L.K. (1992). Development and selection of multinational expatriates. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 3, 287-293.
- Hinkin, T.R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. Journal of Management, 21, 967-988.

- Huo, Y.P., Huang, H.J., & Napier, N.K. (2002). Divergence or convergence: A cross-national comparison of personnel selection practices. Human Resource Management, 41, 31-44.
- Jöreskog, K.G., & Sörbom, D. (1998). LISREL 8. Chicago: SPSS.
- Kiely, L.S. (2001). Overcoming time and distance: International virtual executive teams. In W.H. Mobley & M.W. McCall (Eds.), Advances in global leadership Volume 2 (pp. 185-216). Amsterdam: JAI.
- Kiser, K. 1999. Working on world time. Training, (3), 28-34.
- Lent, R.W., Brown, S.D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic self-interest, career choice, and performance. Journal of Vocational Behavior Monograph, 45, 79-122.
- Lent, R.W., Brown, S.D., & Hackett, G. (2000). Contextual supports and barriers to career choice: A social cognitive analysis. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47, 36-49.
- Lee, T.W., Mitchell, T.R., & Sablinski, C.J. (1999). Qualitative research in organizational and vocational psychology, 1979-1999. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 55: 161-187.
- McGraw, P. (2002). The HR function in local and overseas firms: Evidence from the PWC-Cranfield HR project (1999). Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 40, 205-227.
- Petrovic, J., Harris, H., & Brewster, C. (2000). New forms of international working. Research report 1/00. Cranfield School of Management, Cranfield University, UK: CreME.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers. (1999). International assignments: European policy and practice 1999/2000. London, UK: PricewaterhouseCoopers.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers. (2000). Managing a virtual world: Key trends 2000/2001. London, UK: PricewaterhouseCoopers.
- Roberts, K., Kossek, E.E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Managing the global workforce: Challenges and strategies. Academy of Management Executive, 12 (4), 93-106.
- Scullion, H., & Brewster, C. (2001). The management of expatriates: Messages from Europe. Journal of World Business, 36, 346-366.
- Solomon, C. (1994). Staff selection impacts global success. Personnel Journal, 73 (1), 88-101.
- Solomon, C. (1998). Today's global mobility. Global Workforce, 3 (4), 12-17.
- Striker, J., Luippold, R.S., Nagy, L., Liese, B., Bigelow, C., & Mundt, K.A. (1999). Risk factors for psychological stress among international business travelers. Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 56, 245-252.
- Tharenou, P. (2001). Going up: Do traits and informal processes predict advancing in management? Academy of Management Journal, 44, 1005-1017.
- Tharenou, P. (2002a). The global executive: How Australian multinational and international organizations staff leadership roles in international work. Melbourne: Department of Management, Monash University.
- Tharenou, P. (2002b). Receptivity to careers in international work-Abroad and at home. Australian Journal of Management, 27,
- Tharenou, P., & Mellem, S. (1999). Why are we willing to undertake international jobs domestically? Melbourne: Department of Management, Monash University.
- Thompson, B. (1995). Stepwise regression and stepwise discriminant analysis need not apply here. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55, 525-534.
- Tung, R.L. (1998). A contingency framework of selection and training of expatriates revisited. Human Resource Management Review, 8, 23-37.
- Van Eerde, W., & Thierry, H. (1996). Vroom's expectancy models and work-related criteria: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 575-586.

- Wanous, J.P., Keon, T., & Latack, J. (1983). Expectancy theory and occupational/ organizational choices. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, *32*, 66-86.
- Westman, M., & Etzion, D. (2002). The impact of short overseas business trips on job stress and burnout. Applied Psychology: An International Review, *51*, 582-592.
- Widaman, K.F. (1985). Hierarchically nested models for multi-trait multimethod data. Applied Psychological Measurement, *9*, 1-26.

Table 1: Description of the Sample

Characteristic	%	Characteristic	%
Managerial level		Industry	
Non supervisor/non manager	25	Business and property services	25
First-line supervisor	7	Manufacturing/construction/mining/ energy	22
Lower manager	6	Recreational and personal services	9
Middle manager	22	Government	11
Senior manager	17	Education	19
Executive	8	Health and community services	14
Senior executive	8		
CEO	7		
Organization ownership		International level	
Australian-owned	82	Domestic organization with:	
Foreign-owned	18	No international activity	8
		Export only	12
Sector		International division	23
Profit sector	64	Operations abroad	36
Not for profit	36	Multinational company	21
Time spent on international work		International business travel days per year	
0-10%	56	None	58
11-20%	12	Up to 10 days	19
21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70, 81-90, 91-100 (similar frequencies in each category)	42	10 up to 20 days	11
		20 up to 30, 30 up to 40, 40 up to 50, 50 or more days (similar frequencies in each category)	12
Number years in DJIRs		Could be asked to take up a DJIR	
None	38	Yes	72
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 years (similar frequencies in each category)	34	No	28
7 up to 30 years	28		

Note. DJIRs = domestic jobs with international responsibilities.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations, and Alpha Coefficients for All Variables

Variable	X	SD	Correlations																																			
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29							
1. Amount int. work	0.73	0.29	.77																																			
2. Age	44.00	9.16	.04	-																																		
3. Gender	1.39	0.49	.16	-.11	-																																	
4. Partner	1.23	0.42	.01	-.12	.16	-																																
5. Teenagers	1.75	0.43	.02	-.29	.12	.22	-																															
6. Birthplace	1.20	0.52	-.03	.00	-.00	.03	.04	-																														
7. Managerial level	3.74	2.28	-.31	.17	-.27	-.13	-.12	-.05	-																													
8. Manufacturing	0.18	0.38	-.19	-.14	-.22	-.04	.03	-.02	.07	-																												
9. Business	0.22	0.41	-.16	-.16	-.14	.02	.04	-.01	.20	-.24	-																											
10. Services	0.11	0.31	.03	-.00	.02	.02	.04	.02	.05	-.16	-.18	-																										
11. Education sector	0.24	0.43	.05	.23	.21	.02	-.09	.00	-.15	-.26	-.30	-.20	-																									
12. Size	1.99	0.82	-.03	-.04	.04	-.02	.00	-.03	.12	-.02	-.11	-.13	.34	-																								
13. Major	1.12	0.37	-.20	-.04	-.07	.00	.00	-.01	.10	.05	.07	-.01	-.03	.07	-																							
14. Int. assignments	0.18	0.23	-.33	.21	-.09	.02	-.03	.09	.13	.01	-.02	-.08	.04	.01	.11	.80																						
15. Attitudes	4.14	0.75	-.01	-.06	.19	.08	.06	.05	-.06	-.10	-.01	.04	.06	.02	.07	.07	.67																					
16. Comfort	2.36	0.70	-.13	.01	.00	.04	.03	.13	.05	.03	.00	-.02	.01	.04	.06	.07	.01	.68																				
17. Cultural events	3.25	0.64	-.12	-.01	.12	.10	.06	.07	.04	-.17	-.03	.11	.04	-.02	.06	.10	.37	.15	.66																			
18. Self-efficacy	71.42	15.65	-.16	.20	-.04	.02	-.01	.04	.10	.06	-.00	-.03	.03	-.01	.11	.22	.22	.12	.19	.93																		
19. Domestic: Export	1.90	0.30	.24	.05	.02	.02	.02	-.02	-.11	-.18	-.04	.01	.03	.04	-.09	-.05	.02	-.01	.01	-.03	-																	
20. Domestic: International div.	1.82	0.39	.33	.05	-.01	-.03	.02	-.03	.00	.00	.01	.04	-.19	-.17	-.04	-.07	-.02	-.04	.01	-.04	.32	-																
21. Domestic: Opers. abroad	1.70	0.46	.30	.04	.04	.01	-.02	-.03	.01	.04	-.01	.01	-.15	-.26	-.07	-.13	-.01	-.05	-.06	-.06	.18	.30	-															
22. MNC	1.84	0.37	.28	.19	.10	-.04	-.10	-.01	-.04	-.34	-.21	.09	.21	-.14	-.08	-.05	.03	-.02	.02	-.03	-.08	-.15	-.23	-														
23. Organizational int. focus	3.90	1.75	-.43	-.04	-.03	.01	.05	.02	.05	.17	.12	-.06	.09	.21	.13	.16	.02	.08	.07	.11	-.19	-.22	-.29	-.31	.95													
24. HR support	2.31	0.98	-.50	-.12	-.08	-.04	.07	-.01	.10	.22	.18	-.04	-.10	.24	.08	.19	-.02	.09	.05	.14	-.13	-.19	-.28	-.41	.52	.94												
25. Family influence	3.92	1.64	.15	-.04	-.02	-.15	-.04	-.02	-.09	-.08	.00	.01	.04	-.04	-.09	-.15	-.33	-.09	-.13	-.21	.04	.03	.02	.06	-.04	-.09	.90											
26. Disruption routines	4.16	1.37	.19	-.04	.08	-.08	-.03	-.02	-.08	-.03	-.04	.01	-.02	-.06	-.05	-.04	-.07	-.02	-.08	-.11	.03	.09	.09	.04	-.07	-.13	.39	.84										
27. Children	1.63	1.43	.02	.49	-.22	-.39	-.47	-.01	.16	.00	-.07	-.04	-.01	-.10	-.01	.05	-.14	-.01	-.12	.02	.01	.07	.05	.12	-.05	-.04	-.08	.05	-									
28. Foreign experience	2.70	0.97	-.04	-.12	.20	.03	.03	.38	-.08	-.11	.02	.02	.05	-.00	-.03	.10	.19	.05	.12	.13	-.01	-.04	-.07	.07	.01	.02	-.02	.02	-.11	.57								
29. Headquarters	1.13	0.34	-.25	-.17	-.09	.03	.09	.02	.03	.31	.18	-.08	-.20	.07	-.00	-.05	-.07	.02	-.05	.01	.07	.10	.16	-.80	.28	.36	-.01	-.02	-.10	-.06	-							

Note. Correlations of .09 are significant at $p < .01$, and at .11 are significant at $p < .001$. int = international; div = division; opers = operations; MNC = multinational company; HR = human resources. Alpha coefficients are given in the diagonal. $n = 1046$.

Table 3

Regressing the Inverse of the Amount of International Work Performed in Domestic Jobs on Person, Job, and Environment Factors and the Interactions

Variable	Beta Coefficients			
	Total sample	Subordinates/supervisors	Lower/middle managers	Senior managers/executives
Step 1: Controls				
Age	.06 *	.03	.13 *	.05
Gender	.02	.06	.00	.03
Birthplace	.01	.01	.02	.01
Manufacturing	-.06	-.05	-.07	-.05
Business services	-.03	-.02	.05	-.06
Personal services	-.02	-.04	-.04	.01
Education sector	-.07	-.08	-.06	-.06
Size	.13 ***	.14 *	.22 ***	.10 *
	ΔR^2	.11 ***	.08 ***	.06 *
Step 2: Hypothesized variables				
Education major	-.08 ***	-.11 *	-.06	-.07 *
Prior int. assignments	-.18 ***	-.21 ***	-.20 *	-.13 ***
International attitudes	.03	.02	.04	.05
Comfort with differences	-.05 *	-.04	-.13 *	.01
Cultural events	-.06 *	-.08	.07	-.07
Self-efficacy	-.00	.01	.06	-.05
Domestic: Export (DE)	.06 *	.07	-.07	.15 ***
Domestic: International div. (DIV)	.10 ***	.06	.18 **	.10 **
Domestic: Opers. abroad (DOA)	.20 ***	.15 *	.20 **	.25 ***
MNC	.19 ***	.13 *	.17 *	.27 ***
Org. international focus (OIF)	-.12 ***	-.11	-.12	-.16 ***
HR support (HRS)	-.19 ***	-.22 ***	-.15 *	-.25 ***
Partner	-.01	.05	-.02	-.06
Teenagers	.05	.02	.00	.11 **
Family influence	.04	.02	.06	.05
Disruption	.08 ***	.14 **	.13 *	.01
Managerial level (ML)	-.22 ***	-.04	-.03	-.09 *
	ΔR^2	.38 ***	.30 ***	.30 ***
Step 3: Interactions				
DE x ML	.05			
DIV x ML	.03			
DOA x ML	.06 *			
MNC x ML	.08 ***			
OIF x ML	-.03			
HRS x ML	.05			
	ΔR^2	.02 ***		
	R^2	.51 ***	.39 ***	.36 ***
	df	31,952	25,295	25,248
				25,363

Note. Int = international; div = division; opers = operations; MNC = multinational company; org = organizational; HR = human resources.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4

Reasons Coded from Open-Ended Data of Why Respondents Would or Would Not Take a Domestic Job With International Responsibilities Given by More Than Five Percent of the Sample

Reasons for Taking (n=972)	%	Reasons for Not Taking (n=976)	%
Financial rewards		Disruption	
More money	27	Family commitments/disruption	25
Development opportunities		Lifestyle disruption	8
Professional development	24	Too much travel	8
Personal development	12	Less time for friends/social networks	6
Cultural experiences		No reason	
Travel opportunities	15	None	16
Cross-cultural experiences	14	Job conditions	
Career advancement		Undesirable job conditions	16
Career prospects/development	17	Financial loss/poor money	14
Career advancement	13	Not beneficial to career path	8
Challenge		Organizational focus	
Job content/conditions	23	Lack of opportunity	6
Job challenge	14		
Challenge/exciting	7		
Organizational focus			
Actual job opportunity	13		
Organisation strategy/necessity	9		
Lifestyle			
Meeting new people	7		
Change of lifestyle	6		

Figure 1. Person, job, and environment variables investigated in relation to the amount of international work performed in domestic jobs.

