

**International Itinerants and Traditional Expatriates:
Different Breed or Different Circumstance?**

Angelique Shaydulova

Moshe Banai

Zicklin School of Business
Baruch College – CUNY
One Bernard Baruch Way, New York, NY 10010
angelique_shaydulova@baruch.cuny.edu

Wes Harry
Lancashire Business School
Greenbank Building, University of Central Lancashire,
Preston PR1 2HE.
wesharry@gmail.com

A paper submitted to the Academy of International Business
Northeast Chapter Conference
Southern New Hampshire University's School of Business
October 18-20, 2007.

International Itinerants and Traditional Expatriates: Different Breed or Different Circumstance?

Abstract

This exploratory study extends the concept of boundaryless careers toward international career management. It focuses on a new breed of expatriate managers who are becoming more prevalent in multinational corporations—the international itinerant. A group of 52 traditional expatriate managers is compared with a group of 86 international itinerants and, contrary to previous propositions no differences have been found in the levels of organizational commitment, locus of control, and instrumentality of the two groups. Explanations of the findings and propositions for future research are provided.

Key Words: Expatriate Managers, International Boundaryless Careers, International Itinerants, Locus of Control, Organizational Commitment.

INTRODUCTION

This study investigates the extent to which international itinerants are different from traditional expatriate managers. More specifically it tests the propositions, provided in a recent study by Banai and Harry (2004), that international itinerants, namely expatriate managers independently employed by at least two (unrelated) MNCs or local firms in at least two different foreign countries, would possess lower levels of organizational commitment and higher levels of external locus of control, AND instrumentality than traditional expatriate managers.

The study uses theories of traditional and boundaryless career management to explain and predict the similarities and differences between the characteristics of international itinerants and traditional expatriate managers.

From 1940s through the 1980s, the American economy was based on, what researchers call, a traditional career model. People worked in internal labor markets, characterized by long-term employment in one company, internal advancement up a company ladder, well-defined jobs linked to a progression that defined a career, and individual compensation based on merit, seniority, or some combination of thereof (Ancona et al. 1996).

Typically, an employee worked in one or two companies over his/her lifetime. S/he moved up the organization as senior workers retired as positions became available. Promotions were based on seniority rather than performance. Success was measured by pay, promotion, and status. The relationship between an employee and an employer was based on mutual trust and loyalty. Organizational commitment and loyalty were key values. People expected that as long as they would remain loyal and at least perform their work at a satisfactory standard, they would be guaranteed job security, and if they stayed with a company long enough, they would be promoted within the hierarchy. Even in the US system of 'employment at will' where no formal contract existed it was still expected (by both parties) that long service and loyalty would be reciprocated with continued service and reward.

In the 1980s and early 1990s, increasing competitive pressures, globalization, declining power of unions, and increased importance employees attached to work-life balance and moves to 're-engineer' work and de-layer hierarchies, have led to dramatic changes in the nature of the employment relationship and, as a consequence, the career landscape. Few people, most of them working for government agencies, now have a traditional career model and still exhibit

traditional expectations about employers (a psychological contract). For example, by 1993 the median employment tenure for all U.S. workers was four and a half years, and six years for managers (Maguire 1993). Companies also realized that subcontractors and temporary workers were cheaper than regular employees, while still legal and socially legitimate. As a result, for the majority of American employees, companies no longer offer job security in return for organizational loyalty and commitment. Consequently, responsibility for one's career development has shifted from organizations to individual workers. Today, in order to succeed, employees have to think for themselves and look beyond one organization for their career progression. The term *boundaryless career* signifies that an employee's career path is no longer limited (bound) to one company or even one industry.

Boundaryless career in the global context: international itinerants

Banai and Harry (2004) have extended the concept of boundaryless career to global assignments. The new model relaxes assumption underlying the traditional career model: that managers who were sent for overseas assignment were assumed to later move to another location (within the organization) or to return to the home office and continue working for the same company.

Through in-depth interviews, the authors identified a new breed of expatriate managers, namely, international itinerants, who upon completion of their expatriate assignment leave their employer and assume a job in another organization, either in the same or another foreign country. There are no official statistics regarding the percentage of expatriates that become international itinerants. However, anecdotal evidence provided by Banai and Harry (2004), as well as evidence of ineffective repatriation of managers, suggests that the number of international itinerants is growing, making them a group worth investigating.

Indeed, just as companies no longer claim responsibility for ensuring career growth within the domestic realm, they no longer claim to be responsible for successful career transition of expatriate managers upon completion of the assignment abroad. According to Adler (1981), most employees report that reentry into their home country and company was more difficult than the initial move overseas. More than two decades later the situation has not changed much. Numerous scholars (for example Suutari and Brewster 2003) report that most companies that assign expatriate managers have not ensured efficient repatriation even when the traditional career model was accurate for domestic employees. As a result, many expatriates become

disillusioned upon return to their home country. Contrary to expectations and, often, promises given to expatriates, their overseas assignments regularly have negative effects on their careers.

Black and Gregersen (1991) conceptualized repatriation adjustment along three dimensions: work, interaction with others, and general environment back home. In terms of adjusting to work, expatriates may be disillusioned by the difference between their expectations and reality, in which companies are unable to utilize the expatriate's knowledge, reintegrate them into the work place, and ensure career advancement (Adler 1981, Feldman and Thomas 1992). Interaction at work has changed too because while expatriates have moved to the host countries new faces appeared at the corporation's HQs (due to the movements in the domestic 'boundaryless' careers), new patterns of interaction emerged, and organizational politics have changed. Finally, the general environment has changed as society back home and the person living abroad may have changed but not necessarily in the same directions.

Difficulties of repatriation increase the turnover rate, which stands at 20 percent during the first year following the return to the home country and is higher than turnover for non-expatriate managers (Paik, Segaud and Malinowski 2002) which as we saw was 17%- the average manager staying for 6 years (Maguire 1993) by the early 1980s.

As an alternative to returning home and possibly leaving the organization within the first year, expatriates who have already adjusted to a new culture and have a track record of performance in the host country could find another job for a different employer in the same country. Banai and Harry (2004) have named those international managers international itinerants and defined them as "professional managers who over their careers are employed for their ability, by at least two business organizations that are not related to each other, in at least two different foreign countries."

While both, an itinerant and the new employer may benefit from this new employment relationship, the initial employer who had assigned the (now itinerant) person into the foreign country loses a valuable resource. The initial employer financed relocation, and the early period of adjustment – expenses that include housing, cost-of-living allowances, and sometimes, family relocation, private schooling costs for children – the bill can easily run up to \$300,000 in the first year (Krell 2005). The initial employer also shouldered the risk that a newly arrived expatriate manager may not adjust successfully to the new environment and fail the assignment. According to one study, direct cost of a poor international staffing decision ranges from \$200,000 to \$1,2

million (Swaak 1995), while indirect costs can include damage to relationships with customers, suppliers, and employees (Schaffer and Rhee 2005).

When an expatriate, now trained and accustomed to the new culture, chooses to become an itinerant, a company cannot fully capitalize on its investment. True that, as discussed earlier, when expatriates stay with their company and return to the home country, a company may still fails to utilize this overseas experience and get the maximum return on its investment. However, if a manager leaves the company, than there is no chance at all of gaining a return on the investment. In this case, the employer may benefit from the ability to recognize a potential in the itinerant before the person leaves the organization. In addition, as stated earlier, the number of itinerants is growing. Consequently, organizations that employ international itinerants would benefit from information regarding their characteristics, such as personality and levels of organizational commitment, that are likely to affect their performance and tenure in organizations.

Comparing international itinerants and expatriate managers

The qualitative study (Banai and Harry 2004) mentioned earlier has suggested that international itinerants constitute a new breed, people who are in charge of their career, in charge of their lives, and are adventurous.

The current study empirically tests whether, indeed, international itinerants are “a different breed.” In the next section we draw on various theories to build hypotheses regarding potential differences between traditional expatriates and international itinerants in terms of organizational commitment, self-efficacy, locus of control, and beliefs in the instrumentality of their efforts.

Organizational Commitment

The main premise of Banai and Harry’s study is that itinerants exhibit lower attitudinal commitment to an organization, defined as the degree to which an individual identifies and is involved in an organization (Mowday, Porter, and Steers 1979). Organizational commitment is considered one of the focal constructs in organizational behavior science. Recent meta-analysis research shows that people who are committed to their organization perform better, treat clients better, engage in organizational citizenship behavior more often, engage in counterproductive

behavior less often, and are more likely to stay with an organization for a longer period of time (Meyer et al. 2002, Dallal 2005, Hoffman 2007, Riketta 2002). Studies of organizational commitment in the international context support the link between organizational commitment and executive retention (Huselid and Day 1991, Mowday et al. 1982, Stroh et al. 2000)

By definition, international itinerants, unlike traditional expatriates, stay with the company for only a specific period of time and have a history of leaving their organizations in pursuit of another job. Consequently, and as “past behavior is the best predictor of future behavior” principle would imply, international itinerants would be expected to have a lower level of organizational commitment than traditional expatriate managers. Banai and Harry (2004) hypothesized that the lower level of organizational commitment itinerants feel toward their organization is a key disadvantage of hiring them rather than expatriates or a home country nationals.

Hypothesis 1: International itinerants will exhibit lower levels of organizational commitment than traditional expatriate managers.

Generalized Self-Efficacy

Perceived self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands (Wood and Bandura 1989). It can be either task-specific or generalized.

Self-efficacy has been linked to behavior, decision-making, and performance both on theoretical and empirical levels. Thus, according to Albert Bandura's social cognitive theory (1986), self-efficacy, along with affective self-evaluation and personal goal setting, governs self-regulation of motivation and performance attainment (Wood and Bandura 1989). Specifically, self-efficacy serves as a behavioral predictor because individuals undertake and perform successfully tasks they believe they are capable of handling while avoiding tasks they perceive as exceeding their capabilities (Bandura 1978). Furthermore, Mitchell and his colleagues noted that self- efficacy “reflects a forward-looking prediction of how hard one will work” (1994, 506). Empirical studies demonstrated a link between high self-efficacy and success in training (Gist, Stevens, and Bavetta 1991) and performance in computer-related tasks in a work setting (Harrison et al. 1997)

The path of international itinerants requires employees to venture on their own, to leave familiar and secured environment, and to seek a new, better job. Consistent with the social

cognitive theory (Bandura 1986) and accumulated research we conclude that self-efficacy is needed for people to become motivated to undertake the challenge of becoming an itinerant. Consequently,

Hypothesis 2: International itinerants will have higher level of self-efficacy than traditional expatriates.

Instrumentality

According to Scholl (1981) workers are motivated to exert extra effort on behalf of and stay longer with an organization not only because of attachment to the organization, which is attitudinal commitment as defined by Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1979), but also because it is rewarding for them to do so. The latter's rationale for this behavior, also termed calculative commitment (Becker 1960), is grounded in expectancy theory (Porter and Lawler 1968, Vroom 1964) and equity theory (Adams 1963). So long as people believe that their efforts will be rewarded fairly by higher salary, respect, promotion, and satisfaction, they will continue with their efforts. Theoretically, effort-to-reward belief, which in expectancy theory is known as instrumentality, is distinct from organizational commitment, even though both attitudes serve similar purposes and lead to higher performance and longer tenure. Consequently, even if, as Banai and Harry (2004) propose, international itinerants are less committed to an organization, they may still be high performers as long as they believe that their efforts will pay off.

International itinerants usually chose to leave their original employer. It is logical to assume that itinerants chose a new employer because they believed that they would have better chances to get what they want in the new company. In the language of expectancy theory, itinerants would join new firms because they would believe in the instrumentality of their efforts (effort-to-performance) and in the premise that so long as they perform the company would provide adequate rewards.

At the same time some expatriates may stay with the company because of a momentum and fear to venture out on their own. Other expatriates may remain with their organization not out of fear, but because they believe that they can get desired rewards (pay, respect, promotion) in their current organization. In other words, some expatriates may have no need to become itinerants. Therefore, we propose that there will be a small difference between international itinerants and traditional expatriate managers in terms of instrumentality. Additionally, we

propose that the levels of instrumentality will vary to a greater extent among expatriates than among international itinerants.

Hypothesis 3a: International itinerants will exhibit higher level of instrumentality than traditional expatriate managers.

Hypothesis 3b: Expatriate managers instrumentality's variance level will be higher than the international itinerants' instrumentality variance level.

Locus of Control

Locus of control is a person's belief regarding how much control s/he has over events in her / his life. Individuals with an internal locus of control believe that they are in charge of their lives while individuals with an external locus of control believe that external factors and fate control their lives (Rotter 1966). Locus of control is theoretically related to generalized self-efficacy, however there is an important difference. Self-efficacy is one's confidence with respect to succeeding in performing tasks, whereas locus of control is one's confidence in control of the actual outcome, the result of successfully performing tasks. In expectancy theory terms (Vroom 1964), efficacy influences expectancy belief (effort-to-performance), while locus of control influences instrumentality belief (performance-to-reward) Spector (1982) suggested that individuals with an internal locus of control are less likely to stay in a dissatisfying job. Consistent with Spector's conclusion, we propose that taking one's career in her/his own hands in a foreign country requires a strong belief that the expatriate, not an employer or circumstance, controls his/her life and career. Therefore, our hypothesis regarding locus of control follows the same direction as our hypothesis regarding generalized self-efficacy:

Hypothesis 4: International itinerants will possess a higher level of internal locus of control than traditional expatriates.

METHODS

Sample

The authors used personal contacts to identify managers who have been working for at least two organizations that were independent of each other. They were asked to identify their colleagues and acquaintance that might also belong to this group of managers. One hundred questionnaires were administered to international itinerants. Fifty three questionnaires were completed by

itinerants that worked in the Asian region and 29 by itinerants working in Kuwait, establishing a rate of return of 82%. Respondents in the Arab and Asian regions were mostly from Great Britain, United States, or Canada (75%). Twenty three percent of itinerants working in Shanghai were originally from the Asian region. One hundred questionnaires were administered to a group of traditional expatriates working for the Israeli government in New York City. Fifty-six Israeli expatriates completed and returned their questionnaires establishing a rate of return of 56%. All together 138 usable questionnaires were collected: 56 from expatriates and 82 from international itinerants.

The average age of the managers was 41 years of age, and on average 5 years of post-secondary education and 17 years of work experience. Sixty six percent of the expatriate sample were males and 88% if the international itinerant sample were males. The majority of the expatriate respondents have had a previous expatriate assignment while all the international itinerants had worked in at least two foreign countries. The average age and average years of work experience varied significantly for expatriates and international itinerants. Israeli expatriates working in New York were on average 35 years old, while international itinerants working in Asia and Kuwait were on average 45 years old. The corresponding average work experience was 13 years for Israeli expatriates and 21 years for international itinerants.

Measures

Affective Organizational Commitment Scale

A 9-item scale created by Cook and Wall (1980) has been adopted for this study. The authors of the scale proposed and empirically supported 3 dimensions of organizational commitment: identification (sample item is “I am proud to be able to tell people whom I work for”), involvement (sample, reversed scored, item is “I am not willing to put myself out just to help this organization”), and loyalty (sample item is “The offer of more money with another employer would not make me think seriously about changing my job). Reliability for the sub-scales of organizational commitment in the original study by Cook and Wall was 0.79, 0.87, and 0.74 respectively. In the current study, the items did not load on the same factors as in the original study. The first factor included all items originally grouped in organizational identification plus one item from loyalty sub-scale (#2). The second factor included two original involvement items plus another item from the loyalty scale (#7). The remaining two questions (negatively worded)

failed to load on any one factor. Reliability of the two “new factors” (Chronbach Alpha) was 0.68 and 0.75 respectively. Such factor loading is somewhat consistent with results of study by Brian and Shepherd (2002). In that study, items from identification and loyalty scale loaded on one factor as well. Furthermore, these authors also reported problems with the negatively worded items and recommended to use a 6-items version of the survey (with positively-worded items only)

Instrumentality Scale

A 7-item scale was constructed and used to measure instrumentality, a belief that performance will bring (desired) rewards that include higher pay, job security, respect by subordinates, recognition by senior management, promotion, and a sense of achievement. This questionnaire is a variation on the University of Minnesota’s Job Satisfaction questionnaire (Hirschfeld 2000), that differentiates between intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and that has been adapted from Hofstede (1980) in his well known study of international culture at work. The items were introduced with the following instruction statement “Being an effective manager may or may not bring you the outcomes you might desire in your career. For each of the outcomes listed below, please indicate how likely it is that outcomes will occur as a result of your performing effectively as a manager.”

As expected a factor analysis procedure revealed two factors: objective or extrinsic rewards (pay, promotion, and recognition by senior management) and subjective or intrinsic (job security, sense of achievement, and respect of subordinates). The Chronbach Alpha reliability coefficients of the factors were 0.60 and 0.38 respectively. We have called the first factor ‘Instrumentality’ and used it and omitted the intrinsic factor due to its low reliability.

Self-efficacy

In order to measure self-efficacy of the expatriate managers we have constructed a scale based on the commitment model of “Basic Framework of Organizational Commitment During Repatriation” presented by Black, Gregersen and Mendenhall in the book “Global Assignments” (1992). The questionnaire included 15 items describing possible determinants of career success such as ability and performance, playing organizational politics, and person’s background including ethnicity, social status, and prestige of one’s alma-mate.

A principal components method and Varimax factor rotation analysis revealed four factors with an Eigen value above 1.0 (Nunnally 1978). However, only one dominant factor was used because it was the only factor with acceptable reliability with a Chronbach Alpha coefficient of 0.60. This factor explained 30% of the variance. An item was included in the factor calculation if it loaded with a value of above 0.40 and a difference between factor loadings of at least 0.1.

Locus of Control Scale

A Likert type scale of the Rotter's scale was used to measure locus of control. The original Rotter scale includes eight items, each consisting of two alternative phrases (one corresponding to internal locus of control and the other to external locus of control) that a respondent is forced to choose between. For example, "A great deal of what happens to me is probably a matter of chance" vs. "I am the master of my fate." In the current survey, all 16 alternatives have been listed as separate questions with 5 point Likert-scale answers ranging from 1 "to a small extent" to 5 "to a great extent." In this study, the reliability of the Locus of Control scale was low (0.5), indicating validity issues. After eliminating four internal Locus of Control items, we reached reliability level of 0.63.

RESULTS

Table 2 reports demographics, as well as mean scores for variables of interest for expatriates and for international itinerants. All questions (excluding demographics questions) used Likert scale type answers ranging 1 through 5. This table reveals that, except for self-efficacy, mean scores were positively skewed, especially for the instrumentality (extrinsic or subjective component) scale. In terms of demographics, international itinerants were on average ten years older and possessed ten more years of work experience. International itinerants had about the same level of education, but had spent two more years in the countries where survey took places. This table also displays results of the independent samples' one-tailed t-test . Specifically, as predicted, at $p=0.05$, international itinerants exhibited significantly higher levels of self-efficacy and internal locus of control. Contrary to our predictions, the t-test did not reveal differences in commitment or instrumentality. Furthermore, the levels of commitment (on both factors) were actually slightly higher for the international itinerants, which is a different direction from that predicted.

Insert Table 2 Here

Next we investigated whether age and years of work experience co-varied with other variables we measured. As table 3 indicates, and consistent with prior research (Meyer et al. 2002), we detected medium-size correlation of 0.28 between age and commitment (loyalty and identification component), which benefited from a 0.05 level of significance. Correlation of 0.2 between locus of control and age was also significant.

Insert Table 3 Here

In order to control for effect of age when comparing expatriates and international itinerants on these two variables, we performed ANCOVA. This test showed that, contrary to our predictions, difference in levels of locus of control was no longer significant (significance of 0.93). Thus, hypothesis number four was not supported.

Furthermore, age proved to be a much better predictor of commitment levels than role (expatriate versus itinerant). Analysis of covariance revealed that age explained 4.01 of the variance, while role accounted for only 0.09 of the variance. At 0.675, the difference in levels of commitment among expatriates and among international itinerants was not significant. Since international itinerants were ten years older than traditional expatriates, this finding explains why mean scores on commitment were actually higher for international itinerants, which is contrary to our first hypothesis.

Also evident from Table 3 is that most of the variables used in the study (except for age) are significantly correlated. These correlations are not surprising since all these variables have been linked to each other empirically as well as theoretically. Consistent with Judge and his colleagues (2002), who performed meta-analysis of 13 studies and obtained a coefficient of $Rho=0.56$ between locus of control and generalized self-efficacy, we obtained a correlation of $r=0.5$ between these variables. Indeed, Judge and his colleagues theorized that self-efficacy, locus of control, emotional stability and self-esteem are related and reflect the same higher order construct that they named core self-evaluations.

Not surprisingly, instrumentality scores were positively related to self-efficacy and locus of control. Instrumentality scale asked respondents “to indicate, how likely it is that outcomes (such as getting more pay and getting promoted) will occur as a result of [them] performing effectively as a manager.” By definition, people with higher internal locus of control are more

likely to believe that their good performance will influence their life and no other factors will prevent them from getting “fair” rewards for effective performance.

Scores on instrumentality, also known as calculative commitment, positively correlated with attitudinal commitment. This finding may shed some light on the relationship between these two mechanisms that stimulate a person’s motivation to perform and to stay with an organization. Scholl (1981) proposed that these two mechanisms function independently of each other, however the correlation between these two variables in this study does not support Scholl’s position.

DISCUSSION

Banai and Harry’s (2004) proposition that international itinerants are “a new breed of expatriates” has not been supported by the current study except for the fact that international itinerants demonstrated a higher level of self-efficacy. The lack of differences could indicate one of two things. First, indeed, international itinerants are the same breed as other expatriates – just older. Consequently, decision to stay in a foreign region and work for a new company is a matter of opportunity and circumstances rather than of personality.

A second possible reason for the lack of observed differences between itinerants and traditional expatriates is that, while international itinerants are indeed “a different breed,” we are looking for the differences in the wrong places. It is unlikely that slight differences in the levels of self-efficacy could adequately explain why some employees choose to leave an employer when expatriate assignment is complete while others stay with the company at least until they return home and try to re-integrate into the home office.

The results of this study may indicate to a need to refine the model of boundaryless career (Inkson 2004) and to suggest that this new model indicates to the fact that all managers, including the international ones, are exposed to similar environmental forces that channel them into certain career patterns. More specifically, based on this study we may conclude that labor markets competition, globalization, changes in corporations’ attitudes toward the employment contract (Robinson 1996), decline in labor unionization and protection and changes in life styles may lead all managers, whether they are domestic or international and regardless of their personality, to seek new career opportunities. These opportunities may be out of the conventional framework of employment, or what we tend to call traditional careers, and they may create new categories of employees, such as the international itinerants. This new classification of

international managers therefore does not consist of a new breed but rather the same managers at a later stage of their chronological career life cycle, who seize new opportunities to expand their economic and professional assets.

An important finding of this study is that itinerants are just as committed to organizations as traditional expatriates, even when controlling for age. Consequently, one may expect that itinerants will be just as eager to exert extra effort on behalf of the organization as traditional expatriates. Hence, this study carries great value for potential employers of international managers in that it indicates for new patterns of international career management that would require adjustment in these employers' human resource strategies and practices.

If indeed, a choice between staying with the same employer or venturing on their own is a matter of circumstance, current employers have the power to create situation in which staying with the company and returning home is more attractive than searching for and accepting a new job in the foreign region. Specifically, organizations can ensure more efficient repatriation, an effort that should begin much earlier than actual return home. Developing corporate values that emphasize using repatriates' new knowledge upon their return, providing repatriating managers with repatriation training, a mentor, and developing a career plan approved for them – are some of the measures that proved effective in reducing turnover among returning managers (Stroh 1995). It is plausible that these measures will also reduce number of expatriate managers who decide to leave their employer and become international itinerants.

The current exploratory study relied on a convenience sample thus some systematic bias may present validity threat. First, the itinerants sampled were on average 10 years older than the traditional expatriates in the sample. Second, the sample of traditional expatriates was recruited from a single government-service organization, while the sample of itinerants consisted of employees of various private companies. Several scales had alarmingly low reliability (of 0.6) indicating that either participants, many of whom are not native English language speakers, did not interpret the questions as intended by researchers, or did not pay enough attention to the questions.

Future research should compare itinerants and expatriates in terms of variables that may explain why itinerants choose to leave an organization while expatriates choose to stay. Risk taking and openness to new experience (novelty) are two of the personality differences that may play a role in the decision to venture out. Factors other than career and employment may

influence one's decision to return home or to stay in the foreign country. Answers to questions such as "does the expatriate have a family back home or did s/he start a family while on assignment in the foreign country?" "Did the expatriate fall in love with the new country and new life style?" "Did the expatriate's spouse adjust well to the new country and find a satisfying job?" could indicate to factors influencing person's decision to find a new employer in the foreign country rather than go back home.

The next step in this research would be to test empirically whether, indeed, commitment of international itinerants translates into performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and counterproductive behavior. Will relationship be similar to that documented under traditional career model? An even more interesting question is why, even though equally committed, do itinerants leave organizations that employ them?

Despite its limitations this is the first study trying to classify expatriate managers based on their actual career management and based on current career theories. As home countries develop more and more of their own high-class managerial cadres, it is likely that more expatriates, both of home and of third countries, will face tougher competition and be pushed into the "itinerant path." The number of itinerants then will grow and it is important for employers to know what expectations, attitudes, and other characteristics related to performance people on itinerant career path possess. In a rapidly changing world, when more and more people become international managers, expatriates and itinerants, it would be worthwhile to continue to explore this field. A study of Boundaryless career in the European Union, where managers do not suffer from visa restrictions, could be particularly interesting and valuable undertaking.

References

Adams, J. S. 1963. "Toward an Understanding of Inequity." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67: 422-436.

Adler, N.J. 1981. "Re-entry: Managing Cross-cultural Transitions." *Group and Organization Studies* 6 (1): 341- 356.

Ancona et al.1996. "Workforce Management: Employment Relationships in Changing

Organizations, Module 7.” In Ancona, D., Kochan, T., Scully, M., Van Maanen, J., and Westney, D.E. (Eds.), *Managing for the Future: Organizational Behavior & Processes*. Cincinnati: South-Western College Pub.

Banai, M. and Harry, W. 2004. “Boundaryless Global Careers.” *International Studies of Management & Organizations*, 34 (3): 96-120.

Bandura, A. 1978. “Reflections on Self-Efficacy.” *Advances in Behavior Research and Therapy* 1: 237-269.

Bandura, A. 1982. “Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency.” *American Psychologist* 37: 122-147.

Bandura, A. 1986. *Social Foundation of Thought and Action: A Social-Cognitive View*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Becker, H. 1960. “Notes on the Concept of Commitment.” *American Journal of Sociology* 66: 32-40.

Black, J. S., Gregersen, H. B., and Mendenhall, M. E. 1992. “Toward a Theoretical Framework of Repatriation Adjustment.” *Journal of International Business Studies* 23 (4): 737-760.

Black, J. S., Gregersen, H. B., and Mendenhall, M. E. 1992. “Global Assignments: Successfully Expatriating and Repatriating International Managers.” San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Cook, J., and Wall, T. 1980. “New Work Attitude Measures of Trust, Organizational Commitment and Personal Need Non-Fulfillment.” *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 53: 39-52.

Dalal, R. S. 2005. “A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior.” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 90 (6): 1241-1255.

Feldman, D.C. and Thomas, D.C. 1992. “Career Management Issues Facing Expatriates.” *Journal of International Business Studies* 23 (2): 271-94.

Gist, M. E., Stevens, and C. K., and Bavetta, A. B. 1991. “The Influence of Self-Efficacy and Training Condition on Retention of Learning.” *Personnel Psychology* 44: 837-861.

Harrison, A. W., Rainer, R. K., and Hochwarter, W. A. 1997. Testing the Self-Efficacy Performance Linkage of Social Cognitive Theory.” *Journal of Social Psychology* 137 (1): 79-87.

Hirschfeld R. R. 2000. “Does Revising the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Subscales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form Make a Difference? *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 60 (2): 255-270.

Hoffman, B. J., Blair, C. A., Meriac, J. P., and Woehr D. J. 2007. "Expanding the Criterion Domain? A Quantitative Review of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Literature." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92 (2): 555–566.

Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values*. San Francisco: Sage.

Huselid, M.A. and Day, N.E. 1991. "Organizational Commitment, Job Involvement and Turnover: A Substantive and Methodological Analysis." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76 (33): 380-391.

Judge, T.A., Erez, M., Bono, J.E., and Thoresen, C.J. 2002. "Are Measures of Self-Esteem, Neuroticism, Locus of control, and Generalize Self-Efficacy Indicators of a Common Core Construct?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 83: 693-710.

Krell, E. 2005. "The Changing Face of Retirement." *Baylor Business Review* 23 (1): 26-31

Maguire, S.R. 1993. "Employer and Occupational Tenure: An Update." *Monthly Labor Review* June: 45-56.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., and Topolnytsky, L. 2002. "Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 61:20–52.

Michael B. A. 1994. "The Boundaryless Career: A New Perspective for Organizational Inquiry." *Journal of Organizational Behavior, Special Issue: The Boundaryless Career*, 15 (4): 295-306.

Mitchell, T. R., Hopper, H., Danielas, D., George-Falvy, J. and James, L. R. 1994. "Predicting self-efficacy and performance during skill acquisition." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79 (4): 506-517.

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., and Porter, L.W. 1979. "The Measurement of Organizational Commitment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 14: 224–247.

Nunally, J.C. 1978. *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Paik, Y., Segaud, B., and Malinowski C. 2002. "How to Improve Repatriation Management: Are Motivations and Expectations Congruent between the Company and Expatriates?" *International Journal of Manpower* 23 (7): 635 - 648

Poole, M.E., Langan-Fox, J. and Omodei, M. 1993. "Contrasting Subjective and Objective Criteria as Determinants of perceived Career Success: A Longitudinal Study." *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology* 66 (11): 39-54.

Porter, L.W. and Lawler, E.E. 1968. *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin-Dorsey.

- Ricketta, M. 2002. Attitudinal Organizational Commitment and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (23): 257–266.
- Robinson, S.L. 1996. “Trust and Breach of the Psychological Contract.” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41: 574-599.
- Rotter, J. B. 1966. “Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement.” *Psychological Monographs* 80 (1): 609.
- Schaffer, R. A., and Jay H. R. 2005. Consider Cost and Strategy when Choosing between Expatriates and Host Country Managers.” *Journal of Business & Management* 11 (1): 59-71.
- Scholl, R. W. 1981. “Differentiating Organizational Commitment from Expectancy as a Motivating Force.” *Academy of Management Review* 6 (4): 589-599.
- Spector, P. E. 1982. “Behavior in Organizations as a Function of Employee's Locus of Control.” *Psychological Bulletin* 91, 482–497.
- Stroh, L. K. 1995. “Predicting Turnover among Repatriates: Can Organizations Affect Retention Rates?” *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 6 (2): 443-456
- Stroh, L. K., Gregersen, H. B. and Black, J. S. 2000. “Triumphs and Tragedies: Expectations and Commitments upon Repatriation.” *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 11 (4): 681-697.
- Suutari, V., and Brewster, C. 2003. “Repatriation: Empirical Evidence from a Longitudinal Study of Careers and Expectations among Finnish Expatriates.” *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 14(7): 1132-1151.
- Swaak, R.A. 1995. “Expatriate Failures: Too Many, Too Much Cost, Too Little Planning.” *Compensation & Benefits Review* 27 (6): 47-55.
- Vroom, V.H. 1964. *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wood, R. E., and Bandura, A. 1989. “Impact of Conceptions of Ability on Self-Regulatory Mechanisms and Complex Decision Making” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 56: 407-415.
- Williams, L. and Anderson, S. E. 1991. “Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and in Role Behavior.” *Journal of Management* 17(3): 601-617.

Table 2
Comparing Itinerant and Expatriate Samples

Variable	Itinerants (82)	Expatriates (56)
Self-Efficacy	3.15*	2.81
Locus of Control	3.46*	3.27
Instrumentality	3.81	3.67
Commitment: loyalty & identification	3.84	3.62
Commitment: affective	3.57	3.41
Age	44.5	35.4
Years of education	5.0	5.3
Years of work experience	21.0	12.5
Years in host country	6.0	3.8

* Difference is significant at .05 level, 1-tailed
 All scales are Likert type with a range of 1 through 5

Table 3
Correlations between variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. Age	--				
2. Self-efficacy	-.08				
3. Locus of Control	0.20*	0.50**			
4. Instrumentality	-.04	0.32**	0.285**		
5. Commitment, loyalty and Identification	0.28**	0.18*	0.31**	0.27**	
6. Commitment, affective	0.13	0.19*	0.19*	0.24**	0.45**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
 ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).