The Perspective of Host Country Nationals in Socializing Expatriates:

The Importance of Foreign-Local Relations

Soo Min Toh

Rotman School of Management

University of Toronto

Angelo S. DeNisi

A. B. Freeman School of Business

Tulane University

Geoffrey J. Leonardelli

Rotman School of Management

University of Toronto

Abstract

Failure to adapt is one of the most often cited reasons for the premature return of expatriate assignees. This chapter reviews and builds on research that suggests that the expatriate socialization process involves multiple stakeholders. We review the state of the expatriate socialization literature and introduce recent theoretical developments on the process of expatriate socialization by adopting the host country national's (HCN) perspective, and propose that HCNs have a potentially important role as socializing agents for expatriates. Drawing on social identity and justice theories, we identify relevant social cognitions and organizational practice that influence HCN coworkers' decision to play this role – providing social support and sharing information with expatriates. A broader definition of expatriate success that includes the outcomes of HCNs is also proposed. We conclude by highlighting new theoretical perspectives and research directions for developing our understanding of the expatriate socialization processes.

Keywords: expatriate socialization, information sharing, host country nationals, social identity theory, failure to adapt, procedural justice, multinational corporations, expatriates

As organizations venture into overseas markets, expatriate employees, and the local people of the foreign subsidiary, also known as host country nationals (HCN), are added into the multinational organization's workforce. With the rapid globalization of economies in the past several decades, research on expatriation and the effectiveness of their human resource strategies regarding their success has seen tremendous interest among organizational scientists. Expatriates are individuals who have been assigned to work in a country that is not the country of their birth. They are often utilized by multinational organizations to exert direct control, and coordinate subsidiary units for the parent company, and to further the strategic goals of the parent (Harzing, 2001; Martinko & Douglas, 1999). Expatriates may be parent country nationals (i.e., expatriates who originate from the headquarters or parent company country of the multinational corporation), third country nationals (i.e., expatriates neither of the parent nor the host country), or inpatriates (i.e., foreign nationals who live and work in the parent country; Reiche & Harzing, 2011). Expatriates may be assigned by their employer to be relocated to the foreign location, or may initiate the relocation themselves (self-initiated expatriates; Gupta & Govindarajan, 1994; Inkson, Arthur, Pringle, & Barry, 1997; Lee, 2005). In many cases, expatriate assignments are time-limited where expatriates expect or are expected to return back to their home countries after the assignment is completed. The experience from these assignments is often seen by multinational organizations as desirable and increasingly necessary for executive development and promotion (Daily, Certo, & Dalton, 2000).

Expatriation is a specific and unique example of employee socialization. Expatriate assignments constitute a form of work transition, where the expatriate now

operates in a different context from before and may be required to perform novel tasks, and/or adopt a new role. While expatriates are often not new hires into the organization, they are new to the host country in which they have been assigned to work. Because of the transition that expatriates, like any newcomer to an organization, must face, many parallels can be drawn between the domestic concept of socialization and expatriate socialization.

Organizational newcomers, regardless of whether or not relocation to another country is required, need to learn aspects of the job as well as aspects of the cultural and social situation in order to "fit in". Hence, socialization is a learning and "fitting in" process that requires some kind of change or transition within the newcomer over a period of time. Both the domestic and expatriate definitions imply that some learning about the individual's new role and adaptation are involved in order to become an effective organizational member. In this sense, socialization and expatriate adjustment have been treated as synonymous (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). Like much work on socialization and acculturation, many expatriate adjustment studies have adopted the view that adjustment is multifaceted (Black, 1988; Black & Stephens, 1989; Gregersen & Black, 1990; Kraimer, Wayne, & Jaworski, 2001). Although the specific dimensions differ, both literatures agree that becoming adjusted to the job, to the interaction with other organizational insiders, and to the culture of the work and larger cultural context are key components of expatriate adjustment. In addition, both literatures have been concerned with similar work-related outcomes related to newcomer socialization, including work performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intentions

to quit (e.g., Gregersen, 1992; Gregersen & Black, 1992; Naumann, 1993; Shaffer & Harrison, 1998).

Perhaps most importantly, the process of adjustment that expatriates go through is largely similar to the socialization processes described in domestic studies (Lueke & Svyantek, 2000). In particular, domestic socialization research has established the key role of organizational "insiders" as socializing agents for organizational newcomers (Louis, 1980; Louis, Posner, & Powell, 1983; Major, Kozlowski, Chao, & Gardner, 1995; Slaughter & Zickar, 2006) through the information they provide, as well as the social support offered to newcomers (Nelson & Quick, 1999). Recognizing this, expatriate researchers have been paying more attention to the importance of organizational insiders, particularly HCNs, creating a research perspective that is now commonly referred to as the host country national perspective of expatriate socialization (e.g., Aycan, 1997). It is this perspective that the present chapter reviews and builds upon further to advance our understanding of the expatriate socialization process. The main goal of the present chapter is to present a different perspective on the problem of expatriate failure, particularly seeing expatriate socialization through the eyes of HCNs, and to suggest important and interesting avenues of research to further advance our understanding and resolution of the problem.

What Constitutes Failure?

Expatriates sometimes fail in their assignments. Although failure is not as common as was once believed (Harzing, 1995 for a critical review of the misconception) and, although the actual costs of failure are not precisely known (Harrison, Shaffer, & Bhaskar-Shrinivas, 2004), expatriate failure does occur and it IS costly. The costs of

relocation, including pre-departure training, relocation incentives, and compensation adjustments, are often high, particularly when a spouse/partner, or family accompanies the expatriate in the relocation (see Harvey, Mayerhofer, Hartman, & Moeller, 2010). Failed assignments means substantial losses in the investments made to prepare and relocate the expatriate and his/her family. Failed assignments also potentially adversely impact the success of the parent organization and her subsidiaries, various work- and career-related, and psychological outcomes of the expatriate (and family), and the morale, commitment, and productivity of HCNs in the subsidiaries. As such, understanding and identifying ways in which multinational organizations can minimize the likelihood of expatriates failing on their assignments, while maximizing the potential for success among expatriate managers, have been a significant concern for both researchers and organizations for the past few decades (Sinangil & Ones, 2001; Takeuchi, 2010 for reviews of the body of research).

The first issue to address is the actual definition of failure – and by default – success. The most common measure of the failure of an expatriate assignment has been the failure to complete the assignment (Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991 for a more complete discussion of this criterion measure). That is, an expatriate manager who returns to a home country before the scheduled completion of the assignment is considered to be a failure. This probably makes sense, but typically, this is operationalized as the expatriate returning early without any consideration of whether the assigned tasks were actually completed or not. In any event, the mere fact that an expatriate remained in the host country for the assigned time, does not ascertain success.

Success, and thus failure, must be viewed within the context of a firm's international strategy and what it intends to accomplish with expatriate assignments (c.f. Connelly, Hitt, DeNisi, & Ireland, 2007). Bartlett and Ghoshal (1998) have proposed four such strategies, which they call global, international, transnational, and multi-domestic. In each case, the exact goal of an expatriate assignment is somewhat different, but the differences really lie in the extent to which knowledge is transferred from the foreign operation to the headquarters. In all cases, though, a critical function of the expatriate assignment is to transfer knowledge and communication to the foreign subsidiary. In fact, several authors have argued that this type of knowledge transfer is the most important goal of any multinational organization (Ghoshal, 1987; Grant, 1996; Gupta & Govindarajan, 1994; Harzing, 2001; Harzing & Noorderhaven, 2006; Jackson, Hitt, & DeNisi, 2003; Teece, 1977).

Therefore, it seems critical that we include this knowledge transfer in any definition of expatriate failure. Regardless of how long an expatriate remains on assignment, the assignment cannot be viewed as successful unless there is some transfer of knowledge from the expatriate to the local operation. However, what we hope to impress in this chapter is that expatriate success is more likely to occur if there, too, is some transfer of knowledge from HCNs to expatriates. We make the point that expatriate success is a two-sided coin that also encompasses the outcomes of HCNs. We will return to the broader definition of expatriate failure later in the chapter, and we will relate it specifically to the HCNs, who will be a major focus of our discussion. First, though, we turn to the role that adaptation plays in determining the success or failure of any expatriate assignment.

Expatriates' Failure to Adapt

Failure of expatriates to adapt to living and working in the host country is one of the most commonly cited reasons for the premature return and/or ineffectiveness of expatriates (Sinangil & Ones, 2001; Tung, 1987). The dominant perspective on the reasons for expatriates' failure to adapt is the inability of the expatriate to overcome the strain of working and living in an unfamiliar environment (Harrison et al., 2004). Culture shock (Oberg, 1960) and its associated strain experienced by expatriates can lead expatriates to be ineffective on their assignment, and desire to return to their home country. Expatriates unable to learn the ropes or become fluent in the cultural mores of the organization and the host country have difficulty in adjusting to the demands of the assignment (Black et al., 1991). Unaccustomed changes and new forms of inter-cultural contact with HCNs create stress and anxiety (Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001). Such interactional difficulties, in turn adversely affect expatriates' ability to carry out their role (Shaffer, Harrison, & Gilley, 1999; Toh & DeNisi, 2005).

The difficulties of expatriates noted above suggest that the very expatriates sent to host units to transfer information, knowledge and values from the parent company to foreign operations and HCNs (Paik & Sohn, 2004) need, themselves, to be socialized in order to perform effectively (Kraimer et al., 2001; Lee & Larwood, 1983). New to the host unit, expatriates are newcomers to the host organization. The purpose of the expatriate assignment not withstanding, one of the immediate priorities of new expatriate assignees in the host country organization is to quickly adjust to the unique demands of the new job, diminished social ties, and unfamiliar cultural and organizational circumstances (Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Furnham, 1988; Furnham & Bochner, 1983).

Expatriates need to become proficient in managing and interacting with HCNs, and thus fulfill the objectives of their assignment (Caligiuri, 2000; Harzing, 2001). Oftentimes, expatriates need to learn and adopt local practices to be effective (Maurer & Li, 2006). Adding to the challenge, the informational resources the expatriates used to rely upon in their home country are no longer readily available and new networks of support have to be developed (Farh, Bartol, Shapiro, & Shin, 2010). Hence, the socialization of expatriates to the host unit is essential for expatriates to become adjusted to their assignment, particularly for expatriates on assignments that require a great deal of interaction with and cooperation from HCNs (Toh & DeNisi, 2005).

Next, we will elaborate on the focus of expatriate socialization research - expatriate adjustment – and how it has been defined and operationalized. Having reviewed the construct of expatriate adjustment, we briefly discuss the major limitations of extant models of expatriate adjustment, particularly the expatriate-centeredness of much of existing international HR management research (Lazarova, 2006), and the narrow focus of expatriate adjustment. We then turn to our focus to the perspective of a key stakeholder in the expatriate adjustment process that has been often neglected – the HCN. We review the state of the literature that adopts the HCN perspective, introduce new developments, and offer innovative directions in this line of research.

Defining Expatriate Adjustment

The goal of socialization in the context of expatriation (Feldman & Bolino, 1999) has most commonly been referred to and studied as expatriate adjustment. Expatriate adjustment, as a state, may be conceptually distinguished from other constructs such as acculturation and adaptation (see Harrison et al., 2004 for a review). Black and his

colleagues offer the most frequently adopted definition of expatriate adjustment (Black et al., 1991; Black & Stephens, 1989; Gregersen & Black, 1990). Based on a stressor-stress-strain framework, they view expatriate adjustment as the "degree of psychological comfort" the expatriate feels regarding the different aspects of the new situation (1990: 463). They also propose expatriate adjustment as tri-partite - comprising of work, interaction, and general adjustment to the host culture. Work adjustment refers to the level of comfort an expatriate feels about the job and responsibilities; interaction adjustment refers to the level of comfort the expatriate feels about interacting with local supervisors, peers, and subordinates; and general adjustment refers to the level of comfort an individual feels with various aspects of the host country culture, including transportation, food, and climate (Black et al., 1991; Lueke & Svyantek, 2000). General adjustment is synonymous to cross-cultural adjustment of the expatriate, which "involves the gradual development of familiarity, comfort, and proficiency regarding expected behavior and the values and assumptions inherent in the new culture" (Black & Mendenhall, 1990:118).

The facets of expatriate adjustment are highly inter-correlated (Aycan, 1997b; Black, 1988), but have been found to be sub-dimensions within the construct of expatriate adjustment, and to have different antecedents and consequences (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005; Parker & McEvoy, 1993; Shaffer et al., 1999). The facets of adjustment may precede others (for instance, general adjustment and interaction adjustment mediate work adjustment: Aycan, 1997b; Newman, Bhatt, & Gutteridge, 1978), with interaction adjustment suggested as the most fundamental aspect of expatriate adjustment (Bell & Harrison, 1996). Accordingly, the facets also have different value in

predicting various outcomes of expatriate adjustment such as job satisfaction, performance, and withdrawal (Harrison et al., 2004; Shaffer et al., 1999).

Expatriate adjustment may also be viewed as process (Harrison et al., 2004). Specifically, research has considered expatriate adjustment as a learning process, competence-gaining (Aycan, 1997b; Furnham & Bochner, 1983; Mendenhall, Kuhlmann, Stahl, & Osland, 2002), or a process of 'personal transformation' (Osland, 1995). The process occurs through behavioral modeling, feedback, and reinforcement (Black & Mendenhall, 1990) gained from various sources, such as the expatriate's supervisor, co-workers, and subordinates (Peterson, Rodriguez, & Smith, 2000). In this process, expatriates develop social skills and networks, gain local cultural and work-related knowledge, and master the appropriate behaviors necessary for the performance of the expatriate's new role. The acquisition of key global competences (Caligiuri & Di Santo, 2001) help expatriates negotiate everyday encounters with members of the host country (Furnham, 1988), facilitate knowledge exchange, gain competence in their new role, and ultimately develop a sense of comfort in the new environment (Gregersen & Black, 1990).

Finally, expatriate adjustment can also be distinguished by stage of adjustment or when adjustment occurs – *before* the expatriate arrives at the host country (anticipatory adjustment) or *after* the expatriate arrives in the host country (in-country adjustment). Depending on the stage of adjustment, different socialization practices may be required and may be more or less effective in facilitating the expatriate adjustment (Black et al., 1991). For example, the content of pre-departure training to facilitate anticipatory adjustment should differ from post-departure training to facilitate in-country adjustment

(Black et al., 1991; Harris & Brewster, 1999).

The major models identifying the antecedents of expatriate adjustment have been discussed elsewhere (see Harrison et al., 2004; Mendenhall et al., 2002; Takeuchi, 2010). Hence, we have chosen to focus on the major limitations of the existing literature before introducing the HCNs' perspective on expatriate adjustment. In the following section, we briefly discuss the limitations in the theoretical perspectives adopted, the neglect of knowledge acquisition, the onus placed mainly on the expatriate to adjust, and the overlooking of the need for HCNs to be socialized and their roles as sources of valuable local and work information.

Limitations of Existing Models of Expatriate Adjustment

Existing models of expatriate adjustment have been criticized for adopting a narrow range of theoretical perspectives (Harrison et al., 2004). A stressor-strain perspective, based on the work of Lazarus and Folkman (1984), is most often adopted, where models identify various stressors that lead to stress or maladjustment, which in turn is associated with various forms of strain (Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Kraimer et al., 2001). This tradition originated 20 years ago with the introduction of Black et al.'s model in 1991. Since then, most studies have adopted this perspective and developed a substantial body of work aimed at refining our understanding of the various stressors that influence an expatriate's adjustment. Nevertheless, adopting additional theoretical perspectives to think about the expatriate management process, and breaking away from the tradition of focusing on the expatriate's adjustment is much needed to expand and advance the literature, and to explore other issues related to expatriate management that have not yet been fully investigated (Harrison et al., 2004; Takeuchi, 2010).

The literature has also been expatriate-centric in discussing the adjustment process. Typically, the responsibility to adjust successfully to the expatriate assignment belonged primarily to the expatriate, and factors associated with him or her such as the expatriate's individual characteristics and family situation (Vance & Ring, 1994). Other important stakeholders of the multinational organizations have largely been neglected (Harrison et al., 2004; Takeuchi, 2010; Toh & DeNisi, 2003, 2005). Understandably, the resources invested in the expatriate, and the cost of expatriate assignment failures, are likely significantly greater than that associated with HCNs. Hence, much research in expatriate management has been concerned with identifying the organizational practices, such as socialization and training, selection, and compensation, that would maximize expatriate success and minimize failure (Tung, 1987). This research tended to place the onus of adjustment on the expatriate, while the parent organization's primary role was of selecting, training, and motivating expatriates to the best of its ability (Mendenhall et al., 2002). Consequently, the literature has been somewhat underdeveloped in adopting the perspectives of other members and stakeholders of the multinational organizations, particularly the HCNs, and their potential role in the socialization of expatriates (Takeuchi, 2010).

As evinced by the great proportion of expatriate management research focused on expatriate adjustment (Lazarova, 2006), far less attention has been paid to understanding the learning process and the expatriates' ability to transfer and acquire knowledge and know-how from the experience (Vance, Vaiman, & Andersen, 2009). But, before the expatriate can transfer knowledge from the home country, he or she must first acquire information about the local environment. According to socialization research, the process

of socialization comprises of two key dimensions: (1) knowledge acquisition or learning, and (2) adjustment (Ashforth, Sluss, & Saks, 2007). Knowledge acquisition is a more proximal step in socialization and tends to precede the more distal outcome of adjustment. Yet, expatriate adjustment is often seen as the outcome of interest in expatriate management research with more proximal processes, such as knowledge acquisition, not studied (Takeuchi, 2010). This is especially unfortunate, given our earlier discussion about the importance of knowledge transfer between the parent organization and its host subsidiaries.

Currently, few studies focus on the knowledge acquisition process of expatriates and the factors that facilitate or impede this process (Bhagat, Kedia, Harveston, & Triandis, 2002; Reiche, Harzing, & Kraimer, 2009a). The focus has traditionally been on the expatriate's ability to transmit knowledge to the HCNs. This focus on the transfer of knowledge from expatriates to HCNs, and not from HCNs to expatriates reflects again an ethnocentric bias of much expatriate management research. Yet, the fact is, expatriates are often also expected to acquire new knowledge that can be applied back in the parent organization or other foreign subsidiaries (Bonache & Brewster, 2001; Downes & Thomas, 2002; Hocking, Brown, & Harzing, 2004; Reiche et al., 2009a; Reiche, Kraimer, & Harzing, 2009b). The knowledge assignees may acquire during their assignment includes: an understanding of the company's global organization, factual knowledge about the assignment culture, knowledge of their specific role in the host organization, and appropriate social behavior (Antal, 2000; Toh & DeNisi, 2007). This knowledge has both practical and strategic value for the expatriate and the multinational organizations, and can often best be obtained from HCNs. Hence, knowledge transfer between members

within or across units of a multinational organizations is a critical organizational process (Noorderhaven & Harzing, 2009; Zaidman & Brock, 2009), and understanding how expatriates may best acquire the needed knowledge is imperative.

In fact, few studies have actually examined HCNs in the context of expatriate assignments. There has been some work regarding how international HR policies impact HCNs, or how HCNs perceive and react to expatriates and the HR practices that differentiate them from the expatriates (Toh & DeNisi, 2003). But, in general, there has been little attention paid to understanding the role of HCNs in the expatriate adjustment process and how HCNs can more effectively facilitate knowledge flows. As Vance et al. (2009) noted articulately, *"A significant amount of theoretical and empirical research in MNC (multinational corporation) knowledge management renders the impression that the expatriate, in his or her traditional leadership role in a foreign operation on behalf of an MNC, is the exclusive major global player, as if the contributions of the host country workforce were only of minor consequence and not worthy of study in the total picture of MNC knowledge management." (p. 650).* There are, of course, notable exceptions. These include Leung and his colleagues' studies in international joint venture hotels of HCNs' perceptions of pay justice on HCNs' job satisfaction (Leung, Smith, Wang, & Sun, 1996; Leung, Wang, & Smith, 2001), as well as Chen, Choi, and Chi's (2002) study, also on the process of making justice evaluations among HCNs in international joint ventures. Others have examined the attitudinal and behavioral reactions of HCNs to expatriates in the context of aiding of hindering the adjustment of expatriates (e.g., Jackson et al., 2003; Thomas & Ravlin, 1995; Toh & DeNisi, 2003; Varma, Toh, & Budhwar, 2006). Furthermore, the socialization literature has made it abundantly clear that the

socialization of newcomers into new roles is highly impacted by other individuals in the work environment (see Jokisaari and Nurmi, this volume). The role of organizational mentors, for example, illustrates the potential socialization benefits of insider peers and supervisors. For example, Allen, McManus, and Russell (1999) found that formal group peer mentoring relationships can contribute to the successful socialization of newcomers. They found that newcomers who received psychosocial mentoring (e.g., friendship, confirmation, acceptance) from their peers were better at learning the norms and rules of the organization, as well as in performing their jobs. The extent to which newcomers received career-related mentoring (e.g., sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, and protection) from more experienced peers, the more likely the newcomer had established successful and satisfying work relationships. More recently, Slaughter and Zickar (2006) re-examined the role of organizational insiders in the newcomer socialization process and show that the socialization-related attitudes and behaviors exhibited by insiders have important effects on the development of organizational newcomers. Yet, even within the general area of socialization, a great deal of progress needs to be made with respect to viewing the socialization process from the perspective of coworkers and other stakeholders.

As a result of the relative neglect in these areas, a number of researchers have called for research to adopt a different perspective in understanding the expatriate adjustment process, specifically, by encouraging research to adopt the HCNs' perspective. The HCNs' perspective is also suggested as a means to better understand how expatriates may facilitate knowledge flows in multinational corporations more effectively (Aycan, 1997a; Toh & DeNisi, 2003; Vance & Ring, 1994). It is this

perspective to which we now turn our attention.

Host Country National Perspective on Expatriate Socialization

Vance and Ring (1994) were among the first to recognize the neglect of the perspective of HCNs in expatriate socialization practices. They note that much of existing expatriate management research is characterized by an ethnocentric belief that HCNs are not particularly significant in the success of the expatriate or the multinational corporation. With greater awareness of this gap in the literature, more and more researchers are turning their attention to the HCN (Takeuchi, 2010; Vance et al., 2009). The HCN perspective views expatriate management issues from the "other side of the coin," taking into consideration the role of HCNs in the expatriate socialization process (Vance & Ring, 1994). It also examines the impact of expatriation and its associated HR practices on HCNs. It stems from recognizing that expatriate adjustment studies are significantly lacking when they overlook the potential socializing role of HCNs (Toh & DeNisi, 2003, 2005). In fact, very few studies examine the role of HCNs and their outcomes in the context of the expatriate adjustment process, and even fewer theoretical developments in this realm (Takeuchi, 2010). We take stock of the research on HCNs as potential socializing agents in the socialization process of expatriates next.

The Role of HCNs as Socializing Agents

As early as the 1980s, Black and his colleagues speculated that the support that HCNs may provide to expatriates might significantly influence the likelihood of success for the expatriate (Black, 1988; Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Black et al., 1991). Without the cooperation of the HCNs, they theorized that the expatriate is not likely to perform his or her job well (Gregersen & Black, 1992). Toh and DeNisi (2007) drew on domestic

socialization research to propose that supportive HCN relationships, including friendships that provide emotional reassurance, information, encouragement, or aid in dealing with stressful situations can help the newcomer deal with unexpected or unpleasant experiences (Fisher, 1985; Louis et al., 1983; Nelson & Quick, 1999). Organizational newcomers have been shown to feel better adjusted to their environments after being socialized through social support from insiders (Cable & Parsons, 2001; Cooper-Thomas, Van Vianen, & Anderson, 2004). Toh and DeNisi (2005, 2007) argue that HCNs play the role of "insiders", and that the unique information and resources that insiders possess can be a source of support, insight and assistance to newcomers that secondary sources of information cannot (Morrison, 2002). Access to support from insiders can facilitate learning and decrease the amount of time needed to achieve proficiency in one's task (Pinder & Schroeder, 1987). The researchers further argue, based on research on social support, that even if help is not needed, the mere knowledge that support is available to the expatriate can be (and is often) sufficient to help alleviate the newcomers' stress (Wills, 1991).

A review of the literature reveals that HCNs can assist in the socialization process, and thus knowledge flows, in at least two ways: by offering social support or friendship, and providing unique knowledge (Jackson et al., 2003; Toh & DeNisi, 2005, 2007; Vance et al., 2009). Because expatriates are no longer in a familiar social environment where their networks of friendship are readily available, developing and having available alternative sources of social support can be beneficial to their adjustment. In their meta-analysis of the findings on expatriate adjustment, Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al. (2005) and Hechanova, Behr, and Christiansen (2003) found that HCN

co-worker support was related to all facets of expatriate adjustment. The friendship that HCNs extend to the expatriates can help expatriates overcome the most stressful periods they face during the adjustment process (Bell & Harrison, 1996; Bjorkman & Schaap, 1994; Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Suutari & Brewster, 1998). In fact, strong social ties (in terms of quantity and quality) with HCNs are found to relate to the different facets of expatriate adjustment (Johnson, Kristof-Brown, Van Vianen, De Pater, & Rigsby, 2002; Liu & Shaffer, 2005). On-site mentoring from HCNs, whereby expatriates receive task and career assistance, as well as psycho-social support, increases the likelihood of expatriates becoming socialized to the new situation more quickly (Feldman & Bolino, 1999). On the other hand, poor relations with HCNs have a negative effect on the work adjustment and commitment of expatriates to the host unit (Florkowski & Fogel, 1999). Hence, consistent with socialization research that suggest that insiders may serve as valuable sources of social support (Louis et al., 1983), HCNs in the host unit can also potentially be a source of social support (Toh & DeNisi, 2007).

Next, recent theorizing posits that information sharing from HCN employees to expatriates in the multinational organization can facilitate the prompt and successful adjustment of newcomer expatriates (Farh et al., 2010; Johnson et al., 2002; Liu & Shaffer, 2005; Vance & Paik, 2002). Host country supervisors, co-workers, and subordinates are possible sources of valuable role information (Peterson et al., 2000), knowledge, and feedback (Javidan, Stahl, Brodbeck, & Wilderom, 2005; Osland, 1995). As organizational insiders, HCNs can help expatriates understand the norms of the organization, as well as learn their work roles. Vance et al. (2009) term the role that HCNs can play as a liaison, potentially playing an effective conduit of knowledge to

various parties within and across units of the multinational corporation. HCNs have more experience than the newcomer in the organization, and if difficulties arise, insiders usually have sufficient knowledge and history to make sense of the situation and resolve it (Louis, 1980). Insiders also have a more established network of other insiders to rely upon, whereas the expatriate newcomer is unlikely to have these.

As cultural insiders, HCNs possess intimate knowledge of the cultural mores and accepted norms that expatriates may not be aware of. Sharing this information with expatriate newcomers can help expatriates become aware of what is socially accepted and avoid committing potentially serious cultural faux pas (Toh & DeNisi, 2005), as well as increase organizational knowledge, organizational knowledge-sharing, job performance, and the career development of expatriates (Carraher, Sullivan, & Crocitto, 2008). As such, researchers conclude that resource network that HCNs can bring to expatriates is valuable to the expatriate as he/she learns his/her role (Feldman & Bolino, 1999; Toh & DeNisi, 2005, 2007). Some even go as far as to suggest that the knowledge gained from HCNs cannot be substituted by formal training the organization may provide beforehand (Caligiuri & Di Santo, 2001; Oddou, 2002). Relatedly, Vance and his colleagues argue that the design of pre- and post-departure training programs for expatriates can benefit from the local knowledge experts, and that the input of HCNs should be included even in the planning of the objectives for the expatriate assignment to ensure greater expatriate assignment success (Paik, Vance, Gale, & McGrath, 2008; Vance & Ring, 1994; Vance et al., 2009).

Having established the important socializing role that HCNs can and should play, the next question is: how can we ensure that HCNs are willing and able to play this role?

Acting as socializing agents for expatriates are often not in the HCNs' job descriptions, and even if it was, HCNs have at least some (if not considerable) degree of latitude in how conscientiously they may engage in this role (Toh & DeNisi, 2007). For example, the work of a secretary does not formally include training his/her incoming expatriate manager. Yet, in addition to assisting the manager with the administrative aspects of his/her work, the secretary's knowledge is very likely vital to the expatriate manager's ability to perform his/her job and to successfully integrate into the host environment (Osland, 1995). HCNs may choose not to share information with expatriates and may even act as saboteurs of expatriates when they intentionally withhold critical information from expatriates and jeopardize the expatriate's ability to perform his or her job effectively (Florkowski & Fogel, 1999; Toh & DeNisi, 2005).

So why might HCNs choose to withhold information from expatriates – individuals who could most benefit from the unique information that HCNs posses? How can organizations facilitate knowledge sharing? To answer these questions, we review recent theoretical and empirical developments aimed at addressing these issues, and propose some ideas for researchers and organizations to consider.

Facilitating HCN-Expatriate Information Sharing – A Social Identity Approach

Recent research has drawn on social identity theory to explain the circumstances under which HCNs might share information with expatriates (Jackson et al., 2003; Toh & DeNisi, 2007). Information sharing from HCNs to their expatriate counterparts does not always occur, it is believed, in part because of the salient intergroup boundaries between HCNs and expatriates in the host unit (Toh & DeNisi, 2007). Salient categories are ones that are psychologically and cognitively accessible to the individual's field of perception

(Atkinson, 1986; Kahneman, 2003; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). According to social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978), salience refers to a readiness to use a given dimension to categorize oneself as well as others. Categorizations are driven by the perception of clearly identifiable or distinct social dimensions (Cota & Dion, 1986; Lansberg, 1988; McGuire, McGuire, Child, & Fujioka, 1978) that may be based on real or perceived differences, the presence of similar others in close proximity, or the sharing of a common fate with others (Campbell, 1958). Even the mere knowledge of others being in the same social group can be sufficient to elicit a common identity and result in category-consistent perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Locksley, Ortiz, & Hepburn, 1980).

It is clear that, as organizations recruit more employees from overseas or move them to international assignments, local and expatriate categories are becoming increasingly common and increasingly salient within the organization. Toh and DeNisi (2007) identified a number of surface- and deep-level factors that could increase the salience of HCN-expatriate categories. Organizational factors such as rank and compensation packages that differentiate expatriates from locals also increase the salience of HCN-expatriate categorizations (Chen et al., 2002; Toh & DeNisi, 2003). Expatriates often look and talk differently from the locals, and bring with them their national identities, status, and lifestyles, which often ostensibly differentiate them from the locals (Hailey, 1996; Johnson et al., 2002; Van Vianen, De Pater, Kristof-Brown, & Johnson, 2004). These HCN-expatriate categorizations are thus not easily concealed and are often actively maintained for a complex number of macro- and micro-level reasons (Bettencourt, Dorr, Charlton, & Hume, 2001; Leonardelli, Pickett, & Brewer, 2010;

Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988). Hence, clear national boundaries

within the organization are perpetuated, creating the potential for conflict between

expatriate employees and their local counterparts, and potentially reducing the likelihood

of information sharing.

Because the intergroup relations literature tends to conclude that social

categorization leads to intergroup conflict (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2010; see also Tajfel,

Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971; Yzerbyt & Demoulin, 2010), current expatriate

management research has recommended that intergroup boundaries between locals and

expatriates should be minimized to facilitate local-expatriate cooperation (Olsen &

Martins, 2009; Toh & DeNisi, 2007). For example, Toh and DeNisi (2007) suggested

several situational characteristics that influence HCNs' motivation to help expatriates,

such as the availability of rewards to HCNs for helping, the perceived supportiveness of

the organization, the fairness of HCN-expatriate pay differentials, and the HCNs' desire

to be affiliated with the expatriate group. They argue that these characteristics can

moderate the negative relationship between HCN-expatriate categorization and HCNs'

display of helping towards expatriates. In their model, HCN-expatriate categorization

discourages helping to cross national lines.

However, the most recent evidence suggests the contrary. Universal evidence for

outgroup discrimination is lacking (e.g., Brewer, 1999; Saucier, Miller, & Doucet, 2005)

and a growing body of research challenges the conclusion that intergroup boundaries

necessarily lead to conflict (e.g., Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Nadler, 2010; Wright &

Richard, 2010). We discuss the implications this has for HCN-expatriate information

sharing next. We review recent findings that suggest certain forms of aid, specifically aid

that requires some transfer of resources (such as knowledge), is facilitated by clear social categorization under specific conditions.

Social Categorization and Fair Treatment Encourage Information Sharing

Research examining intergroup prosocial behavior finds that salient social group categories need not lead to intergroup conflict (see Stürmer & Snyder, 2010), and work has revealed that social categorization is necessary to generalize positive contact to other moments of contact (see Brown & Hewstone, 2005). Going in this direction, but taking it one step further, Leonardelli and Toh (2011) recently argued that social categorization can lead to *greater* intergroup cooperation, particularly cooperation involving a transfer of resources, because salient social categories can differentiate the group(s) of people in need of aid and the group(s) of people who can give it. Social categories are useful ways of making sense of the social environment, people and situations, as well as providing direction as to how one might act in various social situations (Tajfel, 1978; Ting-Toomey et al., 2000). Likewise, social categorization could also assist in diagnosing opportunities for helping and prosocial behavior. As applied to expatriate adjustment, categorizing expatriates as an outgroup could also serve an important function of making clear to the local employees that expatriate co-workers might benefit from their help.

Leonardelli and Toh (2011) recognized that past research finds that social categorization can also yield intergroup conflict, and proposed that fair treatment or procedural justice could be one moderator of the potential positive and negative consequences social categorization could bring to facilitating locals' assistance of their expatriate co-workers. According to the group engagement model, procedural justice – particularly when exhibited by organizational authorities – creates identity security and

respect (Tyler & Blader, 2003), leading members to become "voluntarily motivated to act in ways that make use of distinctive qualities and abilities" (p. 360). Distinguished from distributive justice (i.e., the fair distribution of outcomes), procedural justice refers to the fair treatment of individuals. Although it can be exhibited by a wide variety of sources (e.g., peers, subordinates), procedural justice exhibited by authorities has been revealed by research (e.g., Blader & Tyler, 2009; Tyler & Lind, 1992) to be particularly useful, as it increases members' identification with and cooperation within the group. It does so because it is expected to create identity security and respect (Blader & Tyler, 2003), leading members to be "voluntarily motivated to act in ways that make use of distinctive qualities and abilities" (p. 360).

In the context of intergroup relations, procedural justice can improve cooperation when the groups are nested within a more inclusive superordinate group that includes authority figures. In such a case, procedural justice will lead members of the subgroups to feel secure and respected (Haslam, Eggins, & Reynolds, 2003; Huo & Molina, 2006; Leonardelli & Tormala, 2003), and these feelings will motivate cooperation across group boundaries. Theory and evidence support this notion; for example, White Americans and Black Americans were more likely to support authorities' efforts to maintain intra-national justice, including the redistribution of resources between these two groups, when they perceived fair treatment from American authorities (Smith & Tyler, 1996).

Consistent with past research (Smith & Tyler, 1996), Leonardelli and Toh (2011) argued that procedural justice can improve intergroup relations, when the groups are nested within a more inclusive "superordinate" group and authorities represent this superordinate group. Next, even though procedural justice may motivate intergroup

cooperation, it does not help to identify which group of individuals is in need of assistance and which can give aid. Social categorization can do so (Leonardelli & Toh, 2011). Furthermore, it may also motivate group members to perceive social categorization as a "distinctive quality," one where they seek to make use of its cooperative benefits. As a result, Leonardelli and Toh predicted that it is the combination of fair treatment from the multinational organization's authorities and social categorization that together would most successfully increase the degree to which locals gave useful knowledge. Fair treatment motivates locals to cooperate and social categorization helps them gain insight into the expatriate coworker's needs. Only when fair treatment and social categorization are both high would locals be most likely to report giving expatriates information that would facilitate the expatriate's adjustment to the local culture.

In two studies, Leonardelli and Toh (2011) found just that. Only when locals perceived their organization's authorities as fair and only when they perceived high social categorization (e.g., by agreeing to statements such as "I consider expatriates as 'one of them' and host country national employees to be 'one of us'") did HCNs report the highest levels of information sharing with their expatriate coworkers. This novel finding that certain forms of intergroup cooperation require social categorization, where social categories are used to identify a group of people in need of assistance from those who can give aid, suggest new prescriptions for managing expatriate assignments, HCN-expatriate relations in multinational organizations, as well as in other contexts such as in mergers and acquisitions, and international joint ventures (Bjorkman & Schaap, 1994). To achieve the positive effects of social categorization, however, one needs to identify the best

treatment for encouraging group members to see categorization as an asset. Leonardelli and Toh (2011) argue that procedural justice is better than other intergroup contact treatments (e.g., de-categorization) because it also allows for a "dual identity." A dual identity is one where group members simultaneously identify with a more inclusive superordinate group membership that contains their group and other group(s) (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2009; Leonardelli, Pickett, Joseph, & Hess, in press). Procedural justice was found to reduce the antagonism that often occurs between a superordinate identity and a subgroup identity. This dual identity is beneficial in multinational organizations because HCNs may reject the organizational identity to protect their local subgroup identity to the detriment of the organization's interests. Further, were identification with the subgroup and shared superordinate categories both encouraged to employees, conflict between expatriate and HCN subgroups may potentially be reduced (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a, 2000b).

Hence, procedurally just organizational authorities can allow HCNs and expatriates to have separate and shared identities. Equally important, procedural justice allows group members to see their category membership as a distinctive asset, one that can be used to assist others. Thus, when HCNs perceive expatriates as a different group and feel that they are fairly treated by the organization's authorities, conditions are conducive for information sharing to occur (Leonardelli & Toh, 2011). This position has not been previously asserted or empirically established and provides a fruitful avenue for further study.

What should Organizations do to Facilitate Information Sharing?

It should be clear that the expatriate socialization process cannot do without the input and involvement of HCNs (Paik et al., 2008; Vance et al., 2009). Multinational organizations should be aware that HCNs are vital socializing agents, and that HCNs need to be motivated to play this role as it is often not in their job descriptions nor are they formally rewarded (Toh & DeNisi, 2005). So what steps can they take to facilitate the socialization of expatriates and ensure that expatriates gain access to valuable information from HCNs and adjust to the host situation?

First, recognizing that HCNs are valuable sources of knowledge then requires multinational organizations to prepare HCNs for effective interactions with expatriates to increase HCNs ability to play this role more effectively (Toh & DeNisi, 2005). Like expatriates, HCNs should also be trained in cross-cultural sensitivity, communication, and management (Vance & Ring, 1994; Toh & DeNisi, 2005). The onus is not merely on the expatriate to develop working relationships with HCNS. HCNs too should be equipped with cross-cultural communication and problem-solving skills to aid them in their interactions with expatriates. Key HCNs in the multinational organization can be trained in roles of roles of cultural interpreter, communication facilitator, information resource broker, talent developer, and change partner (c.f. Vance et al., 2009). Having the right attitude towards expatriate newcomers is also imperative in building effective working relationships (Florkowski & Fogel, 1999). HCNs should also be involved in the planning of expatriate assignments and in the selection process (Paik et al., 2008). Their input can lead to better-informed decisions on expatriate assignments and objectives. Involvement can also enable key HCNs to be more aware of the knowledge and support

that the expatriate assignee needs, and thus be better able to identify the ways in which HCNs and the host unit can support the expatriate in his/her mission.

Second, reward HCNs for socializing expatriates. HCNs may not be fully willing because the apparent social distance between HCNs and expatriates that increases the perceived and real costs of doing so (Javidan et al., 2005; Toh & DeNisi, 2005). Redefining receiving HCNs' roles to include mentoring or buddying incoming expatriates, and rewarding the fulfillment of this role, will make the socializing behavior more likely to occur. HCNs should see that socializing expatriates could lead to positive outcomes. Rewards may also be informal or personal. HCNs may value the experience of interacting with managers and professionals from other countries, and thus be more willing to interact with expatriates (Toh & DeNisi, 2007).

Socialization research suggests that the socialization process can be a proactive one where newcomers actively seek feedback and information to fill in the gaps in their knowledge (Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000). Expatriates can and should do the same – proactively seeking out sources of support and information (Farh et al., 2010; Wong, 2001). Learning from HCNs should be encouraged among expatriates. Even if the expatriate's mission is to transfer the parent organization's values and practices to the host unit, expatriates need to understand the values and expectations of the HCN workforce and the unit, and adapt their own ways of managing and interacting with HCNs (Maurer & Li, 2006). Even though simply allowing managers across the units of the multinational corporation to interact can facilitate knowledge flows (Noorderhaven & Harzing, 2009), rather than leave it to chance, learning from HCNs should be an explicit objective of the expatriate assignment. Expatriates should recognize that HCNs, as local

insiders, are reservoirs of unique and valuable information, and be prepared to learn from them. Even expatriates sent as top executives have much to gain if he/she adopts an attitude of learning and openness towards the different perspectives and insights that HCNs have to offer. Openness to experience is an important characteristic that expatriates should have for adjustment (Caligiuri, 2000). We propose here that it is also a particularly important trait for expatriates for knowledge acquisition and management in multinational organizations. Expatriates who isolate themselves from HCNs, however, will be less likely to tap into the HCN knowledge resource. Ethnocentric expatriates may be less willing to learn from HCNs and thus have greater difficulty in becoming comfortable with their social interactions at work (Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black, & Ferzandi, 2006; Takeuchi, Yun, & Russell, 2002). Making expatriates aware of the value of learning from HCNs, and putting in place procedures that value learning by expatriates on assignment could encourage the seeking out of information from HCNs.

Multinational organizations should also provide the right conditions for cooperation between expatriates and HCNs. Pay discrepancies that favor the expatriate may lead to perceptions of injustice and dissatisfaction which get in the way of cooperative relations between expatriates and HCNs (Leung et al., 1996; Leung et al., 2001; Toh & DeNisi, 2003). Furthermore, as demonstrated in Leonardelli and Toh (2011), perceiving the organization's authorities as fair could facilitate information sharing when HCNs saw expatriates as different from them. Hence, the fairness perceptions of HCNs are an important area of study (Chen et al., 2002) and can be an important basis to encourage spontaneous cooperation (Tyler & Blader, 2003; for supporting evidence in the expatriate adjustment context, see Leonardelli & Toh, 2011).

In addition to the socialization of expatriates and building cooperative relations between HCNs and expatriates, HCNs serve other important strategic roles as well (Harvey, Novicevic, & Speier, 2000). As insiders to other HCNs, HCN liaisons can be particularly credible and thus effective in facilitating the transmission of the parent organization's values and practices to the host unit (Maurer & Li, 2006; Vance et al., 2009). Multinational organizations have much to benefit from ensuring that HCNs are satisfied with their jobs, and are committed and identified with the organization (Harvey et al., 2000; Leung et al., 1996; Toh & DeNisi, 2007).

But, Returning to the HCNs Themselves …

As noted earlier, the socialization of expatriates is not typically part of the job description of the HCN. We discussed some things an organization can do to facilitate that socialization but, if we consider the broader goal of expatriate assignments to be the transfer of knowledge from the headquarters to the subsidiary, we would argue that the assignment is not really successful unless the HCNs also get something out of the expatriate assignment. That is, the HCNs should be gaining useful knowledge and expertise by working with the expatriate manager for the assignment to be truly successful. Thus, another implication of widening the scope of consideration to include HCNs is that we include their perspective in determining the success of expatriate assignments. In fact, the process of socializing expatriates can provide HCNs with many opportunities to gain valuable outcomes. Simply stated, the stronger the ties between the expatriate and HCN, the easier should be the flow of information, and the better should be the socialization of the expatriate. But, in addition, the stronger the ties, the more opportunities will be generated for the HCN to gain knowledge critical to his or her future

career, since information transfer is likely to be facilitated (Reagans & McEvily, 2003; Schaefer & Kornienko, 2009). Furthermore, efforts by the HCN to help socialize the expatriate are likely to be reciprocated by the expatriate in terms of transferring valuable information (cf., Farh et al., 2010).

What exactly can the HCN gain through these interactions? One example is critical information about the norms and values of the parent company which may not be as apparent to the HCN (cf., Black & Gregersen, 1991). But, perhaps the best example of the information that can be gained by the HCN is what DeFillipi and Arthur (1994) refer to as three ways of "knowing" that can constitute real career capital for the HCN (or anyone; e.g., Eby, Butts, & Lockwood, 2003). Specifically, DeFillipi and Arthur (1994) refer to different types of organizational knowledge as "knowing how" (broad competencies such as task-related skills, judgment skills, and the ways to link resources and activities); "knowing whom" (social ties to important and influential individuals inside the organization and outside as well); and "knowing why" (understanding strengths and weaknesses and how they relate to career progression, which leads to increased confidence and motivation). There is evidence that expatriates acquire these types of career capital during their international assignments (e.g., Jokinen, Brewster, & Suutari, 2008), and it seem reasonable that the HCNs should be acquiring this career capital during their interactions with expatriates as well.

If this were the case, it is clear that our definitions of success and failure of an expatriate assignment would have to be substantially broadened. These definitions would have to include consideration of whether or not HCNs acquired knowledge and career capital during the time spent working with expatriates. It would also require tracking the

career progression and development of HCNs. If HCNs are gaining valuable information and career capital, this should translate into better career progression, greater career success and greater job satisfaction for at least the HCNs who had the opportunity to work directly with the expatriate(s). In other words, if an expatriate assignment is truly successful the expatriate should gain knowledge and experience, the HCN should gain knowledge and career capital, and the organization should benefit both because of the successful transfer of information that motivated the assignment in the first place, but also from the career capital gained by *all* of its employees.

Future Directions

The preceding discussion suggests some new ways to conceptualize success and failure of expatriate assignments, but adopting an HCN perspective also leads to a number of other directions and suggestions for future research.

Expanding models of expatriate socialization. Both organizational socialization and expatriate socialization research have tended to neglect the more proximal outcome of knowledge acquisition relative to adjustment (Ashforth et al., 2007). The bulk of expatriate management research has focused on adjustment as an outcome of interest and as instrumental to expatriate success (e.g., performance, assignment completion, job satisfaction). Both the domestic and expatriate definitions imply that some learning about the individual's new role and adaptation are involved in order to become an effective organizational member (Louis, 1980). Hence, expatriate socialization should be viewed as the degree to which the expatriate learns *and* feels comfortable with various aspects of his or her new organizational role, and operationalized as such (Ward et al., 2001). The time is ripe for embarking on "roads less travelled" in the expatriate management

literature (Harrison et al., 2004). We suggest re-directing or at least expanding the focus of research to include the critical step of knowledge acquisition, as has been the key focus of this chapter. In doing so, key concepts such as role clarity, feedback seeking, information seeking and other proactive behaviors can be drawn from the socialization literature and applied to both HCNs and expatriates.

Much remains to be understood, and the potential is great to draw from various disciplines and paradigms to inform our models. Drawing from the strategic management perspective, expatriate management research could be advanced by drawing on resource-based and knowledge-based views of the firm, and social networks to understand how knowledge flows may occur (Barney, 2001; Liu & Shaffer, 2005; Reiche et al., 2009a). Viewing knowledge management as a means to a sustained competitive advantage is imperative (Argote, McEvily, & Reagans, 2003; Jackson et al., 2003). Drawing from social psychological research, various perspectives such as the social identity theory can yield interesting advancements in our understanding of how knowledge might be acquired and exchanged between social groups (Kane, Argote, & Levine, 2005; Leonardelli & Toh, 2011). Laboratory research in the field of expatriate management is relatively rare (Thomas & Ravlin, 1995; Varma, Pichler, Budhwar, & Biswas, 2009), yet much needed to elucidate the underlying social-psychological mechanisms that are in play in knowledge flows. The expatriate management field could benefit from examining knowledge transfer processes in the laboratory. Research on the psychology of intergroup relations has also seen new developments in understanding the motivations behind the transfer/exchange of resources between social groups (see Stürmer & Snyder, 2010). Integrated with research on cross-cultural psychology, these may be fruitfully applied to

understanding the process of information sharing between HCN and expatriate employee groups.

In addition to understanding the individual, social, and organizational factors that encourage knowledge sharing, research is also needed to understand the antecedents of expatriate's willingness to learn and acquire knowledge from HCNs (coworkers, subordinates, leaders). Even if HCNs are willing to sharing information, expatriates must also be receptive to acquiring and utilizing the new knowledge. Research could determine if the same factors that encourage HCNs to provide aid, namely social categorization and procedural justice, also create suitable conditions for encouraging expatriates' openness to knowledge seeking, utilization, and exchange. Furthermore, the potential benefits and downsides for the recipients and providers of knowledge should be explored. Some research in groups suggests that providing knowledge can be a means to exert and maintain one's superior position over another group (Nadler, 2002; Nadler & Halabi, 2006), thus, receiving and utilizing the knowledge may not necessarily be to the best interest of the recipient. Under what circumstances might expatriates (or HCNs) be (un)willing to share/receive knowledge from the other?

Impact of expatriate socialization on HCNs. In his review of the expatriate adjustment literature, Takeuchi (2010) noted that there are few studies that investigate the impact of expatriates on organizational stakeholders, such as the HCN. Ward and her colleagues note, "When culturally disparate groups come into contact with each other, they tend to have an impact on each other's social structures, institutional arrangements, political processes, and value systems. The nature and extent of these changes will depend on the conditions under which the contact occurs (e.g. whether peaceful or in

conquest), the relative power of the interacting groups, and a wide range of other variables. Likewise, the actual accommodation between the groups can take a great variety of forms. In addition, the individuals caught up in the contact also have an impact on each other." (Ward et al., 2001: 27). Much of expatriate socialization research has been concerned with how expatriates adapt but not how the presence of expatriates and the socialization process that they go through affect HCNs. Questions remain on the impact expatriates may have on HCNs, and on the adaptation HCNs might go through as a result in terms of their own behavior, values, and attitudes. Perhaps more research is needed to understand how HCNs can be better prepared for working with expatriates and be primed to exchange knowledge with expatriates, such that the individual, social, and organizational consequences of that interaction will be beneficial.

Socialization of other types of expatriates. Thus far, we have discussed the experience and involvement of two groups of stakeholders in the expatriate socialization process – expatriates and HCNs. There are, however, other important groups of stakeholders that need consideration. Inpatriates and repatriates, for example, are groups that are gaining in momentum in research as strategic cross-unit knowledge agents (Reiche, 2011; Reiche et al., 2009a). Inpatriates are foreign nationals who have been transferred from subsidiaries into the multinational corporation's parent unit; repatriates are expatriates who are now relocated back to the parent unit (Reiche & Harzing, 2011). Other groups of expatriates also needing study include self-initiated expatriates (Lee, 2005; Reiche & Harzing, 2011), expatriates from small firms, and female expatriates (Caligiuri & Cascio, 1998; Napier & Taylor, 2002; Varma et al., 2006). We expect that the socialization experiences of these groups in the parent organization would be

somewhat different from that of expatriate assignees given that the motivations, perceptions, and social dynamics that are in play are likely to be different (Harvey, Novicevic, Buckley, & Fung, 2005).

Expatriate socialization in different corporate and national contexts.

Furthermore, research that takes into account various corporate structures and integrating research examining those structures with expatriate socialization research is also needed. The literatures on international mergers and acquisitions or international joint ventures, have been concerned with ensuring the survival of these structures, and integration and cooperation of members of the newly created entity (Bjorkman & Schaap, 1994; Hébert, Very, & Beamish, 2005). Interesting research questions arise in these corporate contexts that relate socialization of both expatriates and HCNs. For instance, what socialization practices might be useful for expatriates and HCNs in these contexts? Would they vary and would different tactics be needed for the expatriate and HCN subgroups? How should subgroup identities be best managed, and how might positive relations between members of formerly separate organizations be facilitated to enable the successful socialization of both groups to the new culture? Our recent work found that social categorization and procedural justice together are associated with greater information sharing and a dual identity among HCNs (Leonardelli & Toh, 2011). Some laboratory evidence suggest that a dual identity – an "us and them" mindset – rather than an "us versus them" reduces merger resistance (van Leeuwen & van Knippenberg, 2003), and that identity continuity could be key to post merger identification (van Knippenberg & van Leeuwen, 2001). Much remains to be understood about social categorization processes and identities in the socially complex contexts of mergers and acquisitions and international joint ventures.

Future research should explore ways in which the literatures related to these contexts and the expatriate socialization literature may be integrated and fruitfully inform each other.

Next, the socialization of expatriates to date has also focused on expatriates from the triad countries (US, Japan, Europe; Reiche et al., 2009b), reflecting a somewhat ethnocentric bias (Paik et al., 2008; Takeuchi, 2010). Research needs to expand its scope to consider expatriates from other regions and countries, and also examine how HCNs of triad countries may react differently to expatriates from other countries. In Napier and Taylor's (2002) study of female expatriates in Japan, China, and Turkey, for example, the expatriates were faced with similar challenges of gaining credibility, and similar frustrations, but varied to some degree in their experiences with harassment in the host country. Selmer's (2002) study of Asian and Western third country national expatriates in China also found rather unexpected findings that suggest that Asian expatriates in China were disadvantaged in becoming adjusted relative to Western expatriates. Clearly, much remains to be understood about the culture-specific influences on the socialization processes of expatriates (Varma, Budhwar, & Pichler, 2009).

Socialization as an information exchange process. Finally, the expatriate socialization research would benefit from more fully understanding the psychological processes that govern knowledge transfer between expatriates and HCNs. There are a substantial number of biases (Kane et al., 2005; Stasser, Stewart, & Wittenbaum, 1995) that can inhibit knowledge transfer and our theory and research has offered some interesting directions for how to reduce such biases and allow information to be shared. However, for knowledge to be successfully transferred, the recipient of such information must process it and perceive it as valuable. We think that some of our more recent

research (Leonardelli & Toh, 2011) helps to facilitate this side of the information exchange process too. We had previously argued that, when coupled with fair treatment from organizational authorities, social categorization would increase the likelihood that locals will give information to expatriate co-workers. However, these same conditions, we think will also make the expatriate more receptive to the information they receive from their local colleagues, as social categorization helps to lend confidence to the HCN's advice; the more expatriates perceive their HCN co-workers as locals (and thus, different from themselves), they may be more confident in the HCN's advice as they perceive it to be coming from an expert. Future research will benefit from testing this prediction.

Expatriate socialization research has tended to be steps behind the developments in organizational socialization research (Black et al., 1991). Expatriate socialization has endeavored to draw upon the advancements in the latter to inform research and practice, and should continue to do so for guidance. Research on proactive socialization (Ashford & Black, 1996), social integration (Morrison, 2002), mentoring (Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000; Wanberg, Welsh, & Hezlett, 2003), and fit (Kristof-Brown, Jansen, & Colbert, 2002; Van Vianen et al., 2004), should continue to be drawn upon by expatriate socialization research. As well, models adopting the interactionist approach (Griffin, Colella, & Goparaju, 2000; Reichers, 1987) – examining in tandem the role of the attempts of newcomers, insiders, and the organization at socialization should be adopted by expatriate researchers. Expatriate researchers should also play a lead role in informing research and practice on maximizing the success of career transitions that involve crossing national boundaries and interacting with people of other cultures – global careers

(Thomas, Lazarova, & Inkson, 2005). Another ambitious direction could be the development and testing of more dynamic models of the expatriate socialization process (Farh et al., 2010; Jokisaari & Nurmi, 2009). Little is known about how insiders react to newcomers or how developmental relationships evolve and affect the newcomer different in the course of the socialization process (Slaughter & Zickar, 2006). Like most research, longitudinal expatriate research is acknowledged as imperative, yet sorely lacking.

In contrast, socialization research might also gain new insights from that gained in the expatriate literature. For example, socialization research has not paid much attention to whether or not coworkers hoard or hide knowledge (Connelly, Zweig, Webster, & Trougakos, In press) from the newcomer, and the circumstances in which this is more or less likely to take place. Information sharing in the socialization literature has tended to be examined in mentoring relationships (peer or senior mentors; e.g., Allen et al., 1999). Our ideas on how seeing difference can facilitate information sharing in conditions of fair treatment could also be tested in a newcomer-"old-timer" context, and potentially lead researchers to rethink the usefulness of removing the "newcomer" label and assimilating newcomers too quickly. Recent evidence would suggest that if organizational insiders see newcomers as a group of fellow organizational members in need of help, and themselves as part of a group who are able to help, they are more likely to share information with the newcomers when they feel that the organization's authorities also treat them fairly.

Conclusion

Expatriates face various challenges as they approach their jobs in an unfamiliar cultural environment. They require a great a deal of support from different sources as they navigate different stages of the adjustment process (Farh et al., 2010). To feel

accepted by HCNs and interact effectively with them is clearly an integral part of an expatriate's socialization to the host unit (Caligiuri, 2000; Florkowski & Fogel, 1999; Varma et al., 2009). This chapter aimed to take stock of the extant research on expatriate socialization, review recent developments, and to provide new theoretical perspectives on the problem. We feel that the HCN perspective on expatriate socialization has much room for development, and that various theoretical perspectives, such as knowledge management, social identity theory, and fairness may be useful lenses to view the problem of knowledge flows and intergroup relations between HCNs and expatriates. We have also identified several new questions and directions in which expatriate management may take. It is hoped that the thoughts reflected in this chapter will spur greater interest and more innovative research in this realm.

References

Allen, T. D., McManus, S. E., & Russell, J. E. A. (1999). Newcomer socialization and stress: Formal peer relationships as a source of support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*(3), 453-470.

Antal, A. B. (2000). Types of knowledge gained by expatriate managers. *Journal of General Management, 26*(2), 32-51.

Argote, L., McEvily, B., & Reagans, R. (2003). Managing knowledge in organizations: An integrative framework and review of emerging themes. *Management Science, 49*(4), 571-582.

Ashford, S. J., & Black, J. S. (1996). Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(2), 199-214.

Ashforth, B. E., Sluss, D. M., & Saks, A. M. (2007). Socialization tactics, proactive behavior, and newcomer learning: Integrating socialization models. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 70*(3), 447-462.

Atkinson, M. L. (1986). The perception of social categories: Implications for the social comparison process. In J. M. Olson, C. P. Herman & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Relative deprivation and social comparison: An Ontario symposium* (pp. 181-200). Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Aycan, Z. (1997a). Acculturation of expatriate managers: A process model of adjustment and performance. In Z. Aycan (Ed.), *New approaches to employee management* (Vol. 4, pp. 1-40). Greenwich: JAI Press Inc.

Aycan, Z. (1997b). Expatriate adjustment as a multifaceted phenomenon: Individual and
organizational level predictors. *The International Journal of Human Resource
Management, 8*(4), 434-456.

Barney, J. B. (2001). Resource-based theories of competitive advantage: A ten-year
retrospective on the resource-based view. *Journal of Management, 27*(6), 643-
650.

Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). *Managing across borders: The transnational
solution* (2nd ed.). Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.

Bell, M. P., & Harrison, D. A. (1996). Using intra-national diversity for international
assignments: A model of bicultural competence and expatriate adjustment.
Human Resource Management Review, 6(1), 41-74.

Bettencourt, B. A., Dorr, N., Charlton, K., & Hume, D. L. (2001). Status differences and
in-group bias: A meta-analytic examination of the effects of status stability, status
legitimacy, and group permeability. *Psychological Bulletin, 4*, 520-542.

Bhagat, R. S., Kedia, B. L., Harveston, P. D., & Triandis, H. C. (2002). Cultural
variations in the cross-border transfer of organizational knowledge: An integrative
framework. *Academy of Management Review, 27*(2), 204-221.

Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P., Harrison, D. A., Shaffer, M. A., & Luk, D. M. (2005). Input-based
and time-based models of international adjustment: Meta-analytic evidence and
theoretical extensions. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(2), 257.

Bjorkman, I., & Schaap, A. (1994). Outside in the Middle Kingdom: Expatriate managers
in Chinese-Western joint ventures. *European Management Journal, 12*(2), 147-
153.

Black, J. S. (1988). Work role transitions: A study of American expatriate managers. *Journal of International Business Studies, 19*(2), 277-284.

Black, J. S., & Mendenhall, M. (1990). Cross-cultural training effectiveness: A review and a theoretical framework for future research. *Academy of Management Review, 15*(1), 113-136.

Black, J. S., Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (1991). Toward a comprehensive model of international adjustment: An integration of multiple theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Review, 16*(2), 291-317.

Black, J. S., & Stephens, G. K. (1989). The influence of the spouse on American expatriate adjustment and intent to stay in Pacific Rim overseas assignments. *Journal of Management, 15*(4), 529-544.

Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). What constitutes fairness in work settings? A four-component model of procedural justice. *Human Resource Management Review, 13*(1), 107-126.

Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2009). Testing and extending the group engagement model: Linkages between social identity, procedural justice, economic outcomes, and extrarole behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(2), 445-464.

Bonache, J., & Brewster, C. (2001). Knowledge transfer and the management of expatriation. *Thunderbird International Business Review, 43*(1), 145-168.

Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(3), 429-444.

Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "We"? Levels of collective identity and self representations. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 71*(1), 83-93.

Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 37, pp. 255-343). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Cable, D. M., & Parsons, C. K. (2001). Socialization tactics and person-organization fit. *Personnel Psychology, 54*(1), 1-23.

Caligiuri, P. (2000). Selecting expatriates for personality characteristics: A moderating effect of personality on the relationship between host national contact and cross-cultural adjustment. *Management International Review, 40*(1), 61-80.

Caligiuri, P., & Cascio, W. F. (1998). Can we send her there? Maximizing the success of western women on global assignments. *Journal of World Business, 33*(4), 394-416.

Caligiuri, P., & Di Santo, V. (2001). Global competence: What is it, and can it be developed through global assignments? *Human Resource Planning, 24*(3), 27-35.

Campbell, D. T. (1958). Common fate, similarity, and other indices of the statues of aggregates of persons as social entities. *Behavioral Science, 3*, 1958.

Carraher, S. M., Sullivan, S. E., & Crocitto, M. M. (2008). Mentoring across global boundaries: an empirical examination of home- and host-country mentors on expatriate career outcomes. *Journal of International Business Studies, 39*(8), 1310-1326.

Chen, C. C., Choi, J., & Chi, S.-C. (2002). Making justice sense of local-expatriate

    compensation disparity: Mitigation by local referents, ideological explanations,

    and interpersonal sensitivity in China-foreign joint ventures. *Academy of*

    Management Journal, 45(4), 807.

Connelly, B., Hitt, M. A., DeNisi, A. S., & Ireland, R. D. (2007). Expatriates and

    corporate-level international strategy: governing with the knowledge contract.

    Management Decision, 45(3), 564-581.

Connelly, C. E., Zweig, D., Webster, J., & Trougakos, J. P. (In press). Knowledge hiding

    in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.

Cooper-Thomas, H. D., Van Vianen, A., & Anderson, N. (2004). Changes in person-

    organization fit: The impact of socialization tactics on perceived and actual P-O

    fit. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology, 13*(1), 52-78.

Cota, A. A., & Dion, K. L. (1986). Salience of gender and sex composition of ad hoc

    groups: An experimental test of distinctiveness theory. *Journal of Personality &*

    Social Psychology, 50(4), 770-776.

Daily, C. M., Certo, S. T., & Dalton, D. R. (2000). International experience in the

    executive suite: The path to prosperity? *Strategic Management Journal, 21*(4),

    515.

Defillippi, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1994). The boundaryless career: a competency-based

    perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(4), 307-324.

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2010). Intergroup bias. In S. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert & G.

    Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 1084–1121).

    Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2009). Commonality and the complexity of "We": Social attitudes and social change. *Personality & Social Psychology Review 13*(1), 3-20.

Downes, M., & Thomas, A. S. (2002). Knowledge transfer through expatriation: The U-curve approach to overseas staffing. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 12*(2), 131-149.

Eby, L. T., Butts, M., & Lockwood, A. (2003). Predictors of success in the era of the boundaryless career. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(6), 689-708.

Farh, C. I. C., Bartol, K. M., Shapiro, D. L., & Shin, J. (2010). Networking abroad: A process model of how expatriates form support ties to facilitate adjustment. *Academy of Management Review, 35*(3), 434-454.

Feldman, D. C., & Bolino, M. C. (1999). The impact of on-site mentoring on expatriate socialization: a structural equation modelling approach. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 10*(1), 54-71.

Fisher, C. D. (1985). Social support and adjustment to work: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Management, 11*(3), 39-53.

Florkowski, G. W., & Fogel, D. S. (1999). Expatriate adjustment and commitment: the role of host-unit treatment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 10*(5), 782-807.

Furnham, A. (1988). The adjustment of sojourners. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Adaptation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Furnham, A., & Bochner, S. (1983). Social difficulty in a foreign culture: An empirical analysis of culture shock. In S. Bochner (Ed.), *Cultures in Contact: Studies in Cross-Cultural Interaction*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Ghoshal, S. (1987). Global strategy: An organizing framework. *Strategic Management Journal, 8*(5), 425-440.

Grant, R. M. (1996). Prospering in dynamically-competitive environments: Organizational capability as knowledge integration. *Organization Science, 7*(4), 375-387.

Gregersen, H. B. (1992). Commitments to a Parent Company and a Local Work Unit During Repatriation. *Personnel Psychology, 45*(1), 29-54.

Gregersen, H. B., & Black, J. S. (1992). Antecedents to Commitment to a Parent Company and a Foreign Operation. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*(1), 65-90.

Gregersen, H. B., & Black, S. J. (1990). A multifaceted approach to expatriate retention. *Group & Organization Studies, 15*(4), 461-485.

Griffin, A. E. C., Colella, A., & Goparaju, S. (2000). Newcomer and organizational socialization tactics: An interactionist perspective. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*(4), 453-474.

Gupta, A. K., & Govindarajan, V. (1994). Alternative value chain configurations for foreign subsidiaries: Implications for coordination and control within MNCs. In H. Thomas, D. O'Neal & R. White (Eds.), *Building the strategically responsive organization* (pp. 375-392). Chichester, UK: John Wiley.

Hailey, J. (1996). The expatriate myth: Cross-cultural perceptions of expatriate managers. *The International Executive, 38*(2), 255-271.

Harris, H., & Brewster, C. (1999). The coffee-machine system: how international selection really works. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 10*(3), 488-500.

Harrison, D. A., Shaffer, M. A., & Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P. (2004). Going places: Roads more and less traveled in research on expatriate experiences. In J. J. Martocchio (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management* (Vol. 23, pp. 199-247). Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.

Harvey, M., Mayerhofer, H., Hartman, L., & Moeller, M. (2010). Corralling the "horses" to staff the global organization of 21st century. *Organizational Dynamics, 39*(3), 258-268.

Harvey, M., Novicevic, M. M., Buckley, M. R., & Fung, H. (2005). Reducing inpatriate managers' 'Liability of Foreignness' by addressing stigmatization and stereotype threats. *Journal of World Business, 40*(3), 267-280.

Harvey, M. G., Novicevic, M. M., & Speier, C. (2000). An innovative global management staffing system: A competency-based perspective. *Human Resource Management, 39*(4), 381.

Harzing, A.-W. (1995). The persistent myth of high expatriate failure rates. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 6*(2), 457-474.

Harzing, A.-W. (2001). Of bears, bumble-bees, and spiders: The role of expatriates in controlling foreign subsidiaries. *Journal of World Business, 36*(4), 366.

Harzing, A.-W., & Noorderhaven, N. (2006). Geographical distance and the role and management of subsidiaries: The case of subsidiaries down-under. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 23*(2), 167-185.

Haslam, S. A., Eggins, R. A., & Reynolds, K. J. (2003). The ASPIRe model: Actualizing social and personal identity resources to enhance organizational outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76*(1), 83-113.

Hébert, L., Very, P., & Beamish, P. W. (2005). Expatriation as a bridge over troubled water: A knowledge-based perspective applied to cross-border acquisitions. *Organization Studies, 26*(10), 1455-1476.

Hechanova, R., Beehr, T. A., & Christiansen, N. D. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of employees' adjustment to overseas assignment: A meta–analytic review. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 52*(2), 213-236.

Hocking, J. B., Brown, M., & Harzing, A. W. (2004). The strategic purposes and path-dependent outcomes of expatriate assignments: A knowledge transfer perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 15*(3), 565-586.

Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000a). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality & Social Psychology Review, 4*(2), 143-156.

Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000b). Intergroup similarity and subgroup relations: Some implications for assimilation. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(8), 948-958.

Huo, Y. J., & Molina, L. E. (2006). Is pluralism a viable model of diversity? The benefits and limits of subgroup respect. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 9*(3), 359-376.

Inkson, K., Arthur, M. B., Pringle, J., & Barry, S. (1997). Expatriate assignment versus overseas experience: Contrasting models of international human resource development. *Journal of World Business, 32*(4), 351-368.

Jackson, S. E., Hitt, M. A., & DeNisi, A. S. (2003). *Managing knowledge for sustained competitive advantage: Designing strategies for effective human resource management.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Javidan, M., Stahl, G. K., Brodbeck, F., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2005). Cross-border transfer of knowledge: Cultural lessons from Project GLOBE. *The Academy of Management Executive, 19*(2), 59.

Johnson, E. C., Kristof-Brown, A. L., Van Vianen, A. E. M., De Pater, I., & Rigsby, M. M. (2002). *Expatriate social ties: The impact of relationships with comparable others and host country nationals.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Denver, Colorado.

Jokinen, T., Brewster, C., & Suutari, V. (2008). Career capital during international work experiences: contrasting self-initiated expatriate experiences and assigned expatriation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19*(6), 979-998.

Jokisaari, M., & Nurmi, J.-E. (2009). Change in newcomers' supervisor support and socialization outcomes after organizational entry. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(3), 527-544.

Kahneman, D. (2003). A perspective on judgment and choice. *American Psychologist, 58*(9), 697-720.

Kane, A. A., Argote, L., & Levine, J. M. (2005). Knowledge transfer between groups via

personnel rotation: Effects of social identity and knowledge quality.

Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 96(1), 56-71.

Kraimer, M. L., & Wayne, S. J. (2004). An examination of perceived organizational

support as a multidimensional construct in the context of an expatriate

assignment. *Journal of Management, 30*(2), 209.

Kraimer, M. L., Wayne, S. J., & Jaworski, R. A. (2001). Sources of support and

expatriate performance: The mediating role of expatriate adjustment. *Personnel

Psychology, 54*(1), 71-99.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Jansen, K. L., & Colbert, A. E. (2002). A policy-capturing study of

the simultaneous effects of fit with jobs, groups, and organizations. *Journal of

Applied Psychology, 87*(5), 985-993.

Lansberg, I. (1988). Social categorization, entitlement, and justice in organizations:

Contextual determinants and cognitive underpinnings. *Human Relations, 41*(12),

871-899.

Lazarova, M. (2006). International human resource management in a global perspective.

In M. J. Morley, N. Heraty & D. Collings (Eds.), *International human resource

management and international assignments* (pp. 24-51): Palgrave Macmillan.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer

Publication Co.

Lee, C. H. (2005). A study of underemployment among self-initiated expatriates. *Journal

of World Business, 40*(2), 172-187.

Lee, Y., & Larwood, L. (1983). The socialization of expatriate managers in multinational firms. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 657-665.

Leonardelli, G. J., Pickett, C. L., & Brewer, M. B. (2010). Optimal distinctiveness theory: A framework for social identity, social cognition and intergroup relations. In M. Zanna & J. Olson (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 43, pp. 65-115). New York: Elsevier.

Leonardelli, G. J., Pickett, C. L., Joseph, J. E., & Hess, Y. D. (in press). Optimal distinctiveness theory in nested categorization contexts: Moving from dueling identities to a dual identity. In R. M. Kramer, G. J. Leonardelli & R. W. Livingston (Eds.), *Social cognition, social identity, and intergroup relations: A festschrift in honor of Marilynn Brewer. Psychology Press Festschrift Series*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Leonardelli, G. J., & Toh, S. M. (2011). Perceiving expatriate coworkers as foreigners encourages aid: Social categorization and procedural justice together improve intergroup cooperation and dual identity. *Psychological Science, 22*(1), 110-117.

Leonardelli, G. J., & Tormala, Z. L. (2003). The negative impact of perceiving discrimination on collective well-being: the mediating role of perceived ingroup status. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(4), 507-514.

Leung, K., Smith, P. B., Wang, Z., & Sun, H. (1996). Job satisfaction in joint ventures hotels in China: An organizational justice analysis. *Journal of International Business Studies, 27*(5), 947-962.

Leung, K., Wang, Z., & Smith, P. B. (2001). Job attitudes and organizational justice in joint venture hotels in China: The role of expatriate managers. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 12*(6), 926-945.

Liu, X., & Shaffer, M. A. (2005). An investigation of expatriate adjustment and performance: A social capital perspective. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 5*(3), 235-254.

Locksley, A., Ortiz, V., & Hepburn, C. (1980). Social categorization and discriminatory behavior: Extinguishing the minimal intergroup discrimination effect. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 39*(5), 773-783.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 25*(2), 226-251.

Louis, M. R., Posner, B. Z., & Powell, G. N. (1983). The availability and helpfulness of socialization practices. *Personnel Psychology, 36*(4), 857-866.

Lueke, S. B., & Svyantek, D. J. (2000). Organizational socialization in the host country: The missing link in reducing expatriate turnover. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 8*(4), 380-400.

Major, D. A., Kozlowski, S. W. J., Chao, G. T., & Gardner, P. D. (1995). A longitudinal investigation of newcomer expectations, early socialization outcomes, and the moderating effects of role development factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(3), 418-431.

Martinko, M. J., & Douglas, S. (1999). Culture and Expatriate Failure: An Attributional Explication. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 7*(3), 265-263.

Maurer, S. D., & Li, S. (2006). Understanding expatriate manager performance: Effects of governance environments on work relationships in relation-based economies. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*(1), 29-46.

McGuire, W. J., McGuire, C. V., Child, P., & Fujioka, T. (1978). Salience of ethnicity in the spontaneous self-concept as a function of one's ethnic distinctiveness in the social environment. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 36*(5), 511-520.

Mendenhall, M., Kuhlmann, T. M., Stahl, G. K., & Osland, J. S. (2002). Employee development and expatriate assignments. In M. J. Gannon & K. L. Newman (Eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Cross-Cultural Managment*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Business.

Morrison, E. W. (2002). Newcomers' relationships: The role of social network ties during socialization. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(6), 1149-1160.

Nadler, A. (2002). Inter-group helping relations as power relations: Helping relations as affirming or challenging inter-group hierarchy. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*, 487-502.

Nadler, A. (2010). Interpersonal and intergroup helping relations as power relations: Implications for real-world helping. In S. Stürmer & M. Snyder (Eds.), *The psychology of prosocial behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping* (pp. 269-288). Walden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Nadler, A., & Halabi, S. (2006). Inter-group helping as status relations: Effects of status stability, identification and type of help on receptivity to high status group's help. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*, 97-110.

Napier, N. K., & Taylor, S. (2002). Experiences of women professionals abroad: comparisons across Japan, China and Turkey. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 13*(5), 837-851.

Naumann, E. (1993). Organizational predictors of expatriate job satisfaction. *Journal of International Business Studies, 24*(1), 61-80.

Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. C. (1999). Social support and newcomer adjustment in organizations: Attachment theory at work? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*(6), 543-564.

Newman, J., Bhatt, B., & Gutteridge, T. (1978). Determinants of Expatriate Effectiveness: A Theoretical and Empirical Vacuum. *Academy of Management Review, 3*(3), 655-661.

Noorderhaven, N., & Harzing, A.-W. (2009). Knowledge-sharing and social interaction within MNEs. *Journal of International Business Studies, 40*(5), 719-741.

Oberg, K. (1960). Cultural shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology, 7*, 177-182.

Oddou, G. (2002). *Repatriate assets and firm performance: Toward a model.* Paper presented at the Annual Academy of Management Meeting, Denver, CO.

Olsen, J. E., & Martins, L. L. (2009). The effects of expatriate demographic characteristics on adjustment: A social identity approach. *Human Resource Management, 48*(2), 311-328.

Osland, J. (1995). *The Adventure of Working Abroad: Hero Tales from the Global Frontier* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Paik, Y., & Sohn, J. D. (2004). Expatriate managers and MNC's ability to control international subsidiaries: the case of Japanese MNCs. *Journal of World Business, 39*(1), 61-71.

Paik, Y., Vance, C. M., Gale, J., & McGrath, C. A. (2008). Improving global knowledge management through inclusion of host country workforce input. In K. O'Sullivan (Ed.), *Strategic knowledge management in multinational organizations* (pp. 167-182). NY: IGI Global.

Parker, B., & McEvoy, G. M. (1993). Initial examination of a model of intercultural adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 17*(3), 355-379.

Peterson, M. F., Rodriguez, C. L., & Smith, P. B. (2000). Agency theory and event management. In P. C. Earley & H. Singh (Eds.), *Innovations in international and cross-cultural management* (pp. 131-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press.

Pinder, C. C., & Schroeder, K. G. (1987). Time to proficiency following job transfers. *Academy of Management Journal, 30*(2), 336-353.

Reagans, R., & McEvily, B. (2003). Network structure and knowledge transfer: The effects of cohesion and range. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 48*(2), 240-267.

Reiche, B. S. (2011). Knowledge transfer in multinationals: The role of inpatriates' boundary spanning. *Human Resource Management, 50*(3).

Reiche, B. S., & Harzing, A.-W. (2011). International assignments. In A.-W. Harzing & A. H. Pinnington (Eds.), *International human resource management* (3rd ed. ed., pp. 185-226). London: Sage.

Reiche, B. S., Harzing, A.-W., & Kraimer, M. L. (2009a). The role of international assignees' social capital in creating inter-unit intellectual capital: A cross-level model. *Journal of International Business Studies, 40*(3), 509-526.

Reiche, B. S., Kraimer, M. L., & Harzing, A.-W. (2009b). Inpatriates as agents of cross unit knowledge flows in multinational corporations. In P. R. Sparrow (Ed.), *Handbook of international HR research: Integrating people, process and context*. Oxford Blackwell.

Reichers, A. E. (1987). An interactionist perspective on newcomer socialization rates. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(2), 278-287.

Saucier, D. A., Miller, C. T., & Doucet, N. (2005). Differences in helping Whites and Blacks: A meta-analysis. *Personality & Social Psychology Review, 9*(1), 2-16.

Schaefer, D. A., & Kornienko, O. (2009). Building cohesion in positively connected exchange networks. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 72*(4), 384-402.

Selmer, J. (2002). Adjustment of third country national expatriates in China. *Asia Pacific Business Review, 9*(2), 101 - 117.

Shaffer, M. A., & Harrison, D. A. (1998). Expatriates' psychological withdrawal from international assignments: Work, nonwork, and family influences. *Personnel Psychology, 51*(1), 87-118.

Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., & Gilley, K. M. (1999). Dimensions, determinants, and differences in the expatriate adjustment process. *Journal of International Business Studies, 30*(3), 557-581.

Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gregersen, H., Black, J. S., & Ferzandi, L. A. (2006). You can take it with you: Individual differences and expatriate effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(1), 109-125.

Sinangil, H. K., & Ones, D. S. (2001). Expatriate management. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 424-443). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Slaughter, J. E., & Zickar, M. J. (2006). A new look at the role of insiders in the newcomer socialization process. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(2), 264-290.

Smith, H. J., & Tyler, T. R. (1996). Justice and power: when will justice concerns encourage the advantaged to support policies which redistribute economic resources and the disadvantaged to willingly obey the law? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26*(2), 171-200.

Stasser, G., Stewart, D. D., & Wittenbaum, G. M. (1995). Expert roles and information exchange during discussion: The importance of knowing who knows what. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31*(3).

Stürmer, S., & Snyder, M. (2010). *The psychology of prosocial behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping*. Walden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Suutari, V., & Brewster, C. (1998). The adaptation of expatriates in Europe Evidence from Finnish companies. *Personnel Review, 27*(2), 89.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. London: Published in cooperation with European Association of Experimental Social Psychology by Academic Press.

Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 1*, 149-178.

Takeuchi, R. (2010). A critical review of expatriate adjustment research through a multiple stakeholder view: Progress, emerging trends, and prospects. *Journal of Management, 36*(4), 1040-1064.

Takeuchi, R., Yun, S., & Russell, J. E. A. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of the perceived adjustment of Japanese expatriates in the USA. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 13*(8), 1224-1244.

Teece, D. J. (1977). Technology transfer by multinational firms: The resource cost of transferring technological know-how. *Economic Journal, 87*(346), 242-261.

Thomas, D. C., Lazarova, M. B., & Inkson, K. (2005). Global Careers: New Phenomenon or New Perspectives? *Journal of World Business, 40*(4), 340-347.

Thomas, D. C., & Ravlin, E. C. (1995). Responses of employees to cultural adaptation by a foreign manager. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(1), 133-146.

Ting-Toomey, S., Yee-Jung, K. K., Shapiro, R. B., Garcia, W., Wright, T. J., & Oetzel, J. G. (2000). Ethnic/cultural identity salience and conflict styles in four US ethnic groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24*(1), 47-81.

Toh, S. M., & DeNisi, A. S. (2003). Host country national (HCN) reactions to expatriate pay policies: A proposed model and implications. *Academy of Management Review, 28*(4), 606-621.

Toh, S. M., & DeNisi, A. S. (2005). A local perspective to expatriate success. *Academy of Management Executive, 19*(1), 132.

Toh, S. M., & DeNisi, A. S. (2007). Host country nationals as socializing agents: a social

identity approach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*(3), 281-301.

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988).

Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup

relationships. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 54*(2), 323-338.

Tung, R. L. (1987). Expatriate assignments: Enhancing success and minimizing failure.

Academy of Management Executive, 1(2), 117-125.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987).

Rediscovering the Social Group: Self-Categorization Theory. Oxford, UK ; New

York, NY, USA: B. Blackwell.

Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice,

social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality & Social Psychology*

Review, 7(4), 349-361.

Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In P. Z.

Mark (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. Volume 25, pp.

115-191): Academic Press.

van Knippenberg, D., & van Leeuwen, E. (2001). Organizational identity after a merger:

Sense of continuity as the key to post-merger identification. In M. A. Hogg & D.

J. Terry (Eds.), *Social Identity Processes in Organizational Contexts* (pp. 249-

264). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

van Leeuwen, E., & van Knippenberg, D. (2003). Organizational identification following

a merger: The importance of agreeing to differ. In S. A. Haslam, D. van

Knippenberg, M. J. Platow & N. Ellemers (Eds.), *Social identity at work:*

Developing theory for organizational practice. (pp. 205-221): New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.

Van Vianen, A. E. M., De Pater, I. E., Kristof-Brown, A. L., & Johnson, E. C. (2004). Fitting in: Surface-and deep-level cultural differences and expatriates' adjustment. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*(5), 697-709.

Vance, C. M., & Paik, Y. (2002). One size fits all in expatriate pre-departure training? *Journal of Management Development, 21*(7/8), 557.

Vance, C. M., & Ring, P. S. (1994). Preparing the host country workforce for expatriate managers: The neglected other side of the coin. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 5*(4), 337-352.

Vance, C. M., Vaiman, V., & Andersen, T. (2009). The vital liaison role of host country nationals in MNC knowledge management. *Human Resource Management, 48*(4), 649-659.

Varma, A., Budhwar, P., & Pichler, S. (2009). Chinese host country nationals' willingness to help expatriates: The role of social categorization. *Thunderbird International Business Review*.

Varma, A., Pichler, S., Budhwar, P., & Biswas, S. (2009). Chinese host country nationals' willingness to support expatriates: The role of collectivism, interpersonal affect, and guanxi. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management, 9*(2), 99-216.

Varma, A., Toh, S. M., & Budhwar, P. S. (2006). A new perspective on the female expatriate experience: The role of host country national categorization. *Journal of World Business, 41*(2), 112-120.

Wanberg, C. R., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of

    proactivity in the socialization process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3),

    373-385.

Wanberg, C. R., Welsh, E. T., & Hezlett, S. A. (2003). Mentoring research: A review and

    dynamic process model. In J. J. Martocchio & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in*

    personnel and human resources management (Vol. 22, pp. 39-124). Oxford,

    England: Elsevier Science.

Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock*. London:

    Routledge.

Wills, T. A. (1991). Social support and interpersonal relationships. In M. S. Clark (Ed.),

    Review of Personality and Social Psychology (Vol. 12, pp. 265-289). Newbury

    Park, CA: Sage.

Wong, M. M. L. (2001). Internationalizing Japanese expatriate managers: Organizational

    learning through international assignment. *Management Learning, 32*(2), 237-

    251.

Wright, S. C., & Richard, N. T. (2010). Cross-group helping: Perspectives on why and

    why not. In S. Stürmer & M. Snyder (Eds.), *The Psychology of Prosocial*

    Behavior: Group Processes, Intergroup Relations, and Helping (pp. 311-336).

    Walden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Yzerbyt, V., & Demoulin, S. (2010). Intergroup relations. In S. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert & G.

    Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 1024–1083).

    Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Zaidman, N., & Brock, D. M. (2009). Knowledge transfer within multinationals and their

foreign subsidiaries: A culture-context approach. *Group & Organization*

Management, 34(3), 297-329.