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ABSTRACT

This empirical study reports on the level of importance of culture as part of expatriate manager selection criteria used by 30 New Zealand based organisations. The findings ranged from having the ability to adapt to the host country’s business culture as being the most important culture competency selection criterion, to having previous international assignment experience as the least important.

This study is of value for New Zealand based organisations. Since the deregulation of the New Zealand economy in the 1980s’ and the growth of globalisation, many New Zealand based organisations are continuing to move their operations overseas to assist their growth and lower their costs. These strategies have required expatriates to run these operations.
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International work experience is a major requirement for promotion to higher level managerial positions (Carpenter, Sanders, & Gregersen; 2001; Daily, Certo, & Dalton; 2000). According to Daily et al., (2000) chief executives with abundant international work experience are often in higher demand than those who lack extensive international work experience. However, international assignment failures are very costly to organisations. For example, international businesses spend up to US $1-2 million per expatriate manager (EM) during a four year period, and 20-50 per cent of the EMs resign within a year of their return home (Jassawalla, Connolly, & Slojkowski; 2004). Assignment failure rates may be high in some countries. For example, Seak and Enderwick (2008) reported that EM assignment failures in China are up to 80 per cent. The complexity of the local culture and language, as well as training the local staff and dealing with operational duties; are given as key reasons.

This is of major significance since many organisations worldwide send their EMs to China. Assignment failure rates are similar for Japan where adjustment problems have been related to language skills, social integration, communication and gender (Peltokorpi, 2008).

Possible consequences for failing to fully develop managers with international work experience are many. These include the potential inability to carry out global strategic
initiatives, lost opportunities for creating or penetrating markets, and difficulties building and maintaining relationships with host country stakeholders (Dowling, Welch, & Schuler; 1999). One of the most common reasons for EM assignment failure is their inability to adjust to the foreign host environment (Caligiuri, 2000; Shaffer & Harrison, 1998; Stone, 2005; Tung, 1982). This issue and other expatriate international assignment issues can be addressed if organisations use appropriate expatriate selection criteria to help foster the success of their overseas assignment (Stroh & Caligiuri, 1998).

This paper will focus on culture issues and their level of importance for a successful EM international assignment. The key question the author wants to answer is: What are the key cultural selection criteria used by New Zealand selection managers when selecting their EMs for foreign assignments?

The first question that is important to this research is in relation to EM cross cultural training:

Is the selected EM offered cross cultural training by the home or host organization (or both)?

The key cultural questions that this exploratory study wants to answer in regards to EM selection criteria include:

- How important is it to have previous international assignment experience?
- How important is it to have knowledge of the differences between the home and host countries cultures?
- How important is it to understand host country social culture knowledge?
- How important is it to understand host country business culture knowledge?
- How important is it to have the ability to adapt to the host country’s social culture?
- How important is it to have the ability to adapt to the host country’s business culture?
- How important is it to have the ability to understand the host country’s language?
- How important is it to have the ability to speak the host country’s language?

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Argument as to whether pre-assignment cross-cultural training should be provided**

The importance of EM cross-cultural training (CCT) and adjustment has been well researched but there is continuing arguments as to whether CCT benefits the EM in cultural integration in
the host country. However, very few organisations offer EMs any CCT before they leave on their overseas assignment (Tung, 1981; Vassel, 1983; Dunbar & Katcher, 1990). Adjusting to a new culture and working efficiently requires an EM to accommodate their attitudes and behaviours to the new cultural context (Huang, Chi & Lawler, 2005). Cross-cultural training is expected to provide country specific knowledge for an EM but it is often criticised as being inadequate (Earley & Peterson, 2004).

Other authors argue that CCT provides the expatriate with information about the host country’s culture and assists the expatriate to form realistic foreign assignment expectations, reduces uncertainty, and facilitates adjustment (Caliguiri, Phillips, Lazarova, Tarique & Burgi, 2001; Simeon & Fujiu, 2000). Magnini and Honeycutt (2003) believe that CCT develops a learning orientation to assist an EM to adjust to a foreign culture by learning how to deal with ambiguous situations. Negative experiences with the host culture may cause the expatriate to perceive the host culture as inferior to their own (Peltokorpi, 2008). This issue could lead to poor adaptation of the EM to the host culture and this might result in an early return home.

Further support for CCT in the literature is plentiful. Evidence of this support includes: The need for organisations to invest in training and orientation of EMs before they are sent overseas (Tung, 1988; Black et al. 1991; Tanure, Evans & Pucik, 2006); CCT is required for faster adjustment of EMs in countries such as China (Selmer, 2006) and this is probably because of the high assignment failure rate in China; CCT is needed to ensure EMs have realistic expectations before leaving for overseas (Caligiuri et al., 2001); CCT reduces the severity of cultural shock and reduces the time to adjust to a new culture and job (Eschbach, Parker & Stoeberl, 2001).

According to the 2006 Global Relocation Trends Survey, only 21 per cent of the 180 organisations surveyed insisted that the newly appointed expatriate should receive CCT. This trend has been the same since the Global Relocation Trends Survey began in 1993 (Global Research Trends Survey, 2007).
Part of the argument that home organisations use for not providing pre-assignment CCT include: EMs must find their own way to help them adapt to a new culture (Tung, 1981; Vassel, 1983; Dunbar & Katcher, 1990); CCT programmes are often ineffective resulting in EM dissatisfaction; the temporary nature of the assignment (Mendenhall & Oddou; 1985; Earley & Peterson, 2003); and the short-time span that exists between EMs selection and relocation. The short-time span between being selected and leaving for an international assignment is often because organisations find it difficult to find volunteers to fill their overseas assignment appointments, and has been well reported in the literature (e.g., Stone, 2005; Stahl, Miller & Tung; 2002).

**Where does cultural intelligence fit in with expatriate cultural adaptation?**

Earley (2003) defined cultural intelligence (CI) as: “A person’s capacity to adapt to new cultural settings based on facets including cognitive, motivational and behavioural features” (p. 271). A conceptual framework for intercultural training has been recently reviewed. This framework uniquely identifies the specific capabilities of an expatriate based on a multi-faceted model of cultural adaptation and is known as the Cultural Intelligence Approach (See Earley, 2003; Earley & Ang, 2003).

Earley and Eng (2003) claim that CI is having the capability for adapting across cultures and it reflects an EMs capability to gather, interpret, and act upon radically different cues to function effectively across cultural settings or in a multicultural situation. Further, CI reflects an EMs capability of developing completely different novel behaviours such as speech sounds, and facial and body gestures.

According to Earley and Peterson (2004), their conceptual model addresses the limitations of the cultural values awareness approach since cultural values are not a strong predictive feature of human behaviour. They argue that their conceptual model approach provides a significant improvement on many other intercultural training approaches. Firstly, it is uniquely tailored to the strengths and deficits of an individual. Secondly, it provides an integrated approach to training dealing with knowledge and learning, motivational, and behavioural features.
Thirdly, it is built upon a unifying psychological model of cultural adaptation as opposed to a piecemeal and country-specific approach to training that has often been used by organisations.

**Understanding culture differences between home and host country cultures essential regardless of held perceptions of expatriate manager**

Several researchers found that the greater the culture distance between the home and host countries cultures, the more difficult it is for the expatriate to adjust to the host culture (e.g., Suutari & Brewster, 1998; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Shaffer et al., 1999). This culture distance has been referred to as ‘psychic distance’ and is defined as: “Cultural differences as well as structural elements such as those arising from different administrative, economic, and legal systems, as well as language differences” (Tanure, Barcellos & Fleury; 2009, page 1041).

Stone (1991) believes that understanding the differences between home and host country cultures is important for the success of the expatriate assignment. Dean and Popp’s (1990) research referred to these cultural differences as dealing with changes in lifestyle. However, a perceived similarity between cultures can cause the expatriate to underestimate the actual differences. Research concerning United Kingdom and Australian expatriates suggested that perceived cultural closeness between these two countries does not prevent culture risk, and this emphasises the need for CCT (Stone, 2005); and is also supported by Brewster (1995), O’Grady and Lane (1996), and Selmer (2006).

Some researchers argue that the greater the difference between the home and host countries cultures, the more difficult it would be for the expatriate to adjust and perform well in their workplace (e.g., Black et al., 1991). Others have found there is no association between the difficulty in adapting to the foreign culture and the expatriate’s assignment effectiveness (Black, Gregersen & Mendenhall, 1992; Tung, 1987).

**Issues concerning having previous international assignment experience**

The literature has different viewpoints as to whether having previous international assignment experience is advantageous for an expatriate’s foreign assignment, or whether it is of benefit at all. For example, some empirical studies have found a positive relationship between
previous international assignment experience and adjustment (Black, 1988; Shaffer, Harrison, & Gilley, 1999; Caligiuri, 2000). Black, Mendenhall and Oddou (1991) suggest that expatriates having previous international assignment experience should have developed relocation skills and this would reduce uncertainty associated with living and working in a new environment. Tye and Chen (2005) suggest that this teaches the EM to develop strategies to assist them to adapt to new situations. However, other research results have not always supported this finding (Tung, 1981; Torbior 1982; Black & Gregersen, 1991; Selmer, 2002). Some results have been mixed. For example, Black (1988) found a significant positive relationship between the length of international work experience and work adjustment. Parker and McEvoy (1993) found a positive relationship between previous international living experience and general adjustment, and not work adjustment; Shaffer et al., (1999) found neither of these relationships to be positively related.

Some research has suggested that previous international assignment experience would have a positive effect in the early stages of the adjustment process but it disappears later during the international assignment (Selmer, 2002; Takeuchi & Yun, 2000). This is probably because as time moves on the EM has been exposed to the host culture and has processed ways of dealing with the aspects of the host culture that differ from their home culture values.

Earley and Peterson (2004) argue against the point that EMs having previous international assignment experience provides them with culture knowledge. This is because overseas assignments are becoming shorter. It would also depend on whether the same EM returns to the same country to work and what they have learnt from that experience.

**Understanding host country’s social culture influences required behaviours for success**

Some researchers (e.g., Stone, 1991; Black, 1990) believe that an expatriate’s understanding of the host country’s social culture is very important for the success of the assignment.

Black et al., (1991) believe that understanding the host country’s social culture should reduce culture shock due to an increase in expectations held by the expatriate.

Another viewpoint is that EMs who understands the host country’s social culture will have the confidence to influence appropriate behaviours of the local employees to produce the
desired organisational outcomes, by communicating effectively (Paik & Sohn, 2004). This makes good logical sense if it can be put into practice but it would also depend on the social cultural challenges of the host country that the EM is confronted with being overcome.

**Ability to adapt to host country’s social culture essential for success**

Several researchers (e.g., Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Black, 1988 & 1990; Shaffer et al., 1999) agree that to be successful on an overseas assignment the expatriate needs to achieve adjustment. Different researchers (e.g., Aycan & Kanungo, 1997; Black, 1990; Caligiuri, 2000) claim that an expatriate’s interaction with host country nationals facilitates expatriate adjustment, and that social contacts and exchanges are responsible for successful overseas assignments.

Various researchers (e.g., Handler, 1995; Harvey, 1985; Tung, 1981) have shown that one of the most frequently cited reasons an expatriate’s assignment fails is because they have not been able to adapt to living in the foreign country. Also, the level of the expatriate’s adjustment will reflect how successful their performance will be while on the assignment (Black & Gregersen, 1991; Black & Stephens, 1989; Tye & Chen, 2005). This may influence their satisfaction level, performance level, and assignment job expectations (Harvey, 1997).

**Understanding host country’s business culture vital for assignment success**

For an overseas assignment to be successful the expatriate needs to understand the business culture of the host country (Harris & Moran, 1999). Firoz and Ramin (2004) believe that an expatriate needs to realise that each country is unique with its own business manners. For example, Asian business culture is of high context; whereas American business culture is low context being mainly in spoken words, and is not overridden by non-verbal communication, the cues of gesture, eye contact, and silence (Harris & Moran, 1999). Also, an important aspect of China’s business culture is their intense reliance on relationships. Where business relationships come first and the actual business is dealt with later. This is in complete contrast to how Westerners conduct their business dealings (Seak & Enderwick, 2008). Japanese, Romanians and Germans are very punctual when attending a meeting, whereas, Latin American business people are more relaxed about being on time (Harris & Moran,
Therefore, understanding the host nation’s business culture is essential for successful business dealings but this may require patience in the early stages of the foreign assignment, less use of home organisational ethnocentric business practices and perceptions, and more emphasis on polycentric and geocentric business practices.

**Ability to adapt to host country’s business culture essential for successful business relationships**

It is generally known that to be accepted into the host country’s business culture, the expatriate needs to practice it in their everyday dealings with host country’s business people. This will enable the expatriate to carry out business in the foreign country more smoothly because they learn what the acceptable business behaviours are, that contribute to the success of the EM’s overseas assignment (Harris & Moran, 1999).

**Understanding host country language to help communication**

Black et al., (1992) believe that having host country language skills should be a key EM selection criterion. Understanding the host country’s language becomes a selection issue when the EM is sent to a host country whose language is completely different to their home country (Dowling & Welch, 2005). For example, if an EM is selected from New Zealand to work in Japan, the EM would need an understanding of the Japanese language. This is because expatriates are rarely able to speak Japanese and most Japanese do not have sufficient English skills (Peltokorpi, 2008). Therefore, if the EM has a strong level of understanding of the host country’s language it will assist them with community social interactions, and it will also help them improve communication with the host country’s employees.

**Speaking host country language important for expatriate adjustment**

If the EM is able to speak the foreign language it should assist them with intercultural interaction adjustment (Caligiuri, 2000; Shaffer et al., 1999), and this is important for cross-cultural learning (Shaffer et al., 1999; Stening & Hammer, 1992; Cui & Van Den Berg, 1991). Nicholson and Imaizumi (1993) claim that host country language fluency assists EM adjustment by providing them with effective communication and perceptual skills.

**A standardized common language to fit a multicultural workforce**
Marschan-Piekkari, Welch and Welch (1999) noted that as an organisation builds its operations in multiple foreign locations, this often leads to a more diverse multinational workforce. This further entails important management challenges when working with a diverse workforce. In response to the demands of operating in multiple foreign-language environments, MNCs such as Siemens, Electrolux and Olivetti use one official language as the basis of communication within the company, whether it is the parent company language or another language.

Marschan, Welch and Welch (1997) believe that the human resource implications of language issues within MNCs, including language standardisation through imposition of a common language, is an area that little is known about and needs further research.

**METHODOLOGY**

This research was performed as an exploratory investigation of the important EM culture-based selection criteria used by New Zealand based organisations that send their EMs on overseas assignments.

According to Page and Meyer (2000) “An exploratory study looks for ideas, patterns, or themes, and is an exploration of a phenomenon, event, issue, or problem” (p. 22).

The data for this study was collected over a period of 3 months during 2007, using a mailed-out, paper copy questionnaire. The questionnaire asked the person who selected their organisation's EMs to complete the questionnaire. Hence, the research sample population included line or other selection managers such as human resource selection managers.

Figure 1.0 in the appendices section shows that the sample population is very diverse in regards to the industries it represents. Manufacturing (10 organisations) and financial/services (8 organisations) sectors provided the largest groups of participants. Other industries represented in the sample include: Information, Construction, Energy, Government, Distribution, Education, and Tourism.

The questionnaire included a closed-ended Likert scale having a 6-point measurement; where: 1 = Of no importance, 2 = Of very little importance, 3 = Of some importance, 4 = Of very importance, 5 = Of extreme importance, and 0 = Don’t know. This Likert scale has been used
previously by Arthur and Bennett, (1995), and Bass, Cascio and O’Connor (1974), to measure various EM attributes such as those in this study.

Eighty-two NZ selection managers were sent a hard copy questionnaire. Thirty organisations completed the questionnaire. Another sixteen organisations who were sent a questionnaire reported that they no longer sent expatriate staff overseas, so they were not part of this research study. The response rate was 36 per cent. This is a reasonable response rate considering most research of this nature is much less than this figure (Black & Gregersen, 1991; Sekaran, 2003).

RESULTS

At least 70 per cent of the participating organisations were large organisations that included at least 100 employees, and 50 per cent of the sample was multinational organisations.

The participating organisations were all based in New Zealand but they were not all NZ owned since some were MNCs. Details of the industries representing the population sample are shown in Figure 1, in the appendices section.

Details of the countries that the sample population send their expatriates to are shown in Table 1.0, in the appendices section.

The results for organisations offering CCT programmes included: 53 per cent do not offer CCT in either their home organisation or host organisation; 33 per cent offered CCT in the host country organisation, 17 per cent offered CCT in the home organisation, and 7 per cent offered CCT in both the home and host organisation.

Some participants provided reasons why they thought that CCT was not well supported by their organisations. Four organisations said they leave it up to the selected EM to ask for it if they thought they needed it. Two organisations said that their EMs sometimes take language lessons only in the host country. Two organisations said that they offer CCT but the selected EM often did not have enough time to have any CCT before leaving overseas. Another organisation said that the EM would rather wait and see if they needed CCT once they commenced living and working in the foreign country.
Selection criteria that were very important included: Able to adapt to host country business culture (Mean of 4.13), able to adapt to host country social culture (Mean of 3.87), understands the differences between home country and host country cultures (Mean of 3.73). Selection criteria that were only of some importance included: Understands the host country’s social culture (Mean of 3.57), understands the host country’s language (Mean of 3.43), able to speak the host country’s language (Mean of 3.27), and understands the host country business culture (Mean of 3.20). The selection criterion of very little importance was having previous international assignment experience (Mean of 2.27). Having the ability to adapt to the host country’s business culture was the highest ranked culture selection criterion, and having previous international assignment experience was the lowest. See Table 2.0 in the Appendices section for rankings of these selection criteria.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to identify the level of importance that selection managers place on the following EM selection criteria: Understanding the host country’s social culture; able to adapt to the host country’s social culture; understanding the host country’s business culture; able to adapt to the host country’s business culture; understanding the host country’s language; able to speak the host country’s language; and understanding the differences between the home country and host country cultures. Whether the organisation provided CCT either in the home or host organisations were also measured in this study.

Table 1.0 in the Appendices section shows the host countries represented by EMs. Three countries dominated this sample and included Australia (87 per cent), United Kingdom (70 per cent) and the United States of America (70 per cent). Other countries well represented included Canada (43 per cent), India (43 per cent), Germany (40 per cent), Singapore (40 per cent) and Thailand (40 per cent). Collectively, the organisations in this sample population send their expatriates to most regions of the world. This could create host culture learning and adaptation challenges for New Zealand EMs and their family members who might accompany them. This might especially be the case if the differences in home and host culture values, beliefs, assumptions, and expected behaviours are large. For example, if the EM is sent to
India, Thailand or the Philippines, there is a possibility of EM cultural adjustment problems due to the vast differences between New Zealand and these countries social cultures, business cultures, and languages.

The expatriate’s likelihood to adapt to the host country’s business culture is a very important selection criterion in this study. Adapting to the host country’s business culture means that the EM leaves their normal New Zealand business practices behind in their home country.

This research also found that an expatriate’s likelihood to adapt to the host country’s social culture is a very important. Many academics support the fact that poor adaptation to a foreign culture can cause an overseas assignment to fail, often leading to an early return home for the EM, with business matters left uncompleted or in tatters.

Understanding the differences between the home country and host country cultures is a very important EM selection criterion. This is essential since many of the sample population send their expatriates to countries that have vast differences in culture to New Zealand’s (For example, Viet Nam and Fiji). However, this result is also confusing since very few of these organisations offer CCT in either the home or host organisations, Therefore, the EM might not be prepared for the potential challenging cultural encounters.

Understanding the host country’s social culture is of some importance for this sample population. However, you would expect this selection criterion to be more important. It is important to understand the social culture, especially if it is vastly different to the host country’s social culture. It is an important way of learning new ways and new behaviours.

Understanding the host country business culture is of some importance to expatriate selection managers. This selection criterion should be more important than the results showed. Having a sound understanding of the host country’s business culture is essential for forming trust, commitment and long-term business relationships. This should be the case regardless of the level of differences between the expected business behaviours and attitudes of the home and host organisations. For example, when dealing with business people in Japan, the more important the Japanese business person is, the lower the EM should bow to them as a sign of respect. Expatriate managers also need to have a sound knowledge of the host country’s
cultural superstitions such as numbers and colours so that they do not offend host country business partners and clients, and especially when implementing product marketing strategies. The research finding for expatriates having previous international assignment experience was of very little importance as a selection criterion. This is contrary to strong support for this EM attribute in the literature. Organisations might not believe this selection criterion is important because they want their EMs to be challenged since they are the potential future executives who need to further develop their leadership skills and experiences. However, having previous assignment experience may be irrelevant if organisations are sending their expatriates overseas for the first time to gain international work experience, or if they are required to work in the host country for only a few months.

Understanding and speaking the host country’s language are only of some importance. This might be because English is spoken by many host nationals in their workplace. However, when the expatriate is out and about in the community, communication problems might exist, unless they have an interpreter. Being able to speak the host language enables the EM to adapt and integrate into the host culture, also known as intercultural interaction. This is particularly important if the EMs overseas assignment is long-term such as one year or more. It also assists the EM to be accepted into the new culture.

Finally, the poor support for CCT was not surprising considering a large body of research has found that not many organisations provide CCT (Stone, 2005; Paik & Sohn, 2004). In this research some selection managers noted that staff selected for overseas assignment work like the challenge of learning the foreign culture themselves. Often time is limited for CCT programmes to be delivered because the EM is selected and is then sent immediately on their foreign assignment. Another reason for the poor support for CCT is that top level managers in the host organisation may not understand the advantages of such training (Black & Mendenhall, 1989).

CONCLUSION

The key reason why the research topic was investigated was because there have been very few published articles concerning New Zealand based organisations in relation to the topic.
The methodology involved use of a mailed out questionnaire that received a respectable 36 per cent response rate. Following the processes of data collection, analysis, and interpretation, the key findings can be noted. Firstly, having the ability to adapt to the host country’s business culture, having the ability to adapt to the host country’s social culture, and understanding the differences between the home and host country cultures were all considered to be ‘of very importance’. These were the three top ranked EM selection criteria and are well supported in the literature. Whereas, having the ability to speak the host country’s language, and understanding the host country’s business culture, were considered to be only ‘of some importance’; and having previous international assignment experience, was only ‘of little importance’. These were the three lowest ranked EM selection criteria. But these results contradict many academics viewpoints. 

In contrast to the strong recommendation in the literature for CCT, only a small number of organisations offer CCT programmes, in either the home or host organisations. This could cause potential problems of adaptation to both the business cultures and social cultures of the host country for the newly selected EM. This is important if expatriation is new to the EM, and if the home and host countries have vast differences in both culture values and language.

**FURTHER RESEARCH**

Having previous international assignment experience has been shown in the literature to assist the expatriate to adapt to new cultural environments. This selection criterion was not well supported in this study. Therefore, this issue should be further investigated. Perhaps it is because the expatriate is being sent to gain international assignment experience for the first time, or for personal development, or the home organisation does not have a sufficient number of volunteers to send overseas.

Further research concerning language competencies should investigate at what level is English understood or spoken (or both) by the host nationals working in the foreign facility (including the foreign managers, if applicable). Or does the EM speak the host country language?
Another issue that has been under researched (Marschan et al., 1997) is the use of a standard language, apart from English, in overseas facilities that considers the differences in language speaking for a multinational workforce (e.g. Siemens). Does this strategy lead to more effective communication among the expatriate staff, other foreign staff, and host nationals? Another issue involves the poor support for CCT. What needs to be further investigated is: Do the selection managers leave the decision with the EM as to whether they should have CCT? If this is the case; how effective is the decision in regards to assignment success?

It would also be useful to know whether the culture distance between the home and host countries is considered by selection managers. This is important when deciding whether the expatriate needs CCT. For example, if the culture distance is high then the expatriate should have CCT. Also, does the home organisation provide its own living facilities or do the EM and family (if appropriate) need to live in the host country’s suburbs? If the latter is the case then CCT would be necessary if the culture distance is great.

What needs to be further researched in regards to the Cultural Intelligence Approach Model includes: Are organisations that send EMs overseas on assignments using the Cultural Intelligence Model for EM cultural training? What components of the model are organisations using? Has the model been effective in enabling adaptation capability of the organisation’s EMs to the foreign cultural environment?

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The small sample size limited the amount of data available to analyse and this would reduce the accuracy of the final results. Hence, a larger sample size would have been useful to add validity to the results.

In the research questionnaire, the questions asking whether the expatriate manager received any CCT should have been further addressed by asking the respondents specific questions instead of using an open-ended answer format. This might have improved the response rate.
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APPENDICES

Figure 1.0: Industries representing participants in sample population

Table 1.0: The host countries New Zealand expatriate managers are sent to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries expatriate managers are sent to</th>
<th>Frequencies of organisations</th>
<th>Percentage of organisations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua and New Guinea</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture selection criteria</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having previous international assignment experience</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand differences between home and host country cultures</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand host country social culture</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to adapt to host country social culture</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand host country business culture</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to adapt to host country business culture</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand host country language</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to speak host country language</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.0: Means and rankings of expatriate culture selection criteria