A taxonomy of global careers: Identifying different types of international managers
Abstract

Research on expatriates indicates that substantial differences exist within internationally active employees. Several typologies of expatriates have been suggested to account for this diverseness. However, empirical evidence on the accuracy of these classification schemes is scarce. Based on these research efforts, we introduce a data-based taxonomy of internationally mobile managers. By means of sequence analysis we derive four career patterns from the curriculi vitae of 202 German managers. These patterns are built on the dimensions mobility and duration of the stays abroad. We further show that these patterns differ with regard to various individual and organizational variables. Based on these findings, we argue that expatriation career management practices and responsibilities need to be differentiated.
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Introduction

Due to a growing demand for competent global managers (Suutari, 2003), a considerable amount of empirical research aimed at identifying challenges and characteristics that distinguish expatriate managers from domestic employees. At an individual level, it has been shown that, for example, adjustment processes, job satisfaction, or career concepts are different for domestic and international employees (Osland, 2000; Bonache, 2006). Further, from an organizational point of view, selection, training, and career management issues have been shown to substantially differ between expatriates and domestic employees (Suutari & Brewster, 2001; Evans, Pucik, & Barsoux, 2002; Suutari, 2003).

Going beyond this dichotomous distinction between national and international managers, several researchers started to consider differences within the group of internationally mobile employees in terms of, for example, the initiation of the work abroad, corporate and personal goals pursued, the psychological response to the host culture, allegiance, time of exposure, the building of social capital, and intensity of international contact through work and non-work life (e.g., Inkson, Arthur, Pringle, & Barry, 1997; Peiperl & Jonsen, 2007; Scullion, Collings, & Gunnigle, 2007; Bozkurt & Mohr, 2011). Within this research domain, several authors proposed different types of expatriates by identifying characteristic career trajectories of internationally mobile employees (e.g., Borg, 1988; Mayrhofer, 2001; Suutari, 2003; Banai & Harry, 2004). Mayrhofer (2001), for example, develops a typology that comprises four types of organizational international career logics based on whether expatriation is a part of an organization’s personnel development or management and control efforts in foreign subsidiaries. We applaud these fruitful attempts to shed light on inter-individual differences within the group of internationally mobile employees. However, these approaches start from theoretically defined ideal types that might not match empirical prevalence (Doty & Glick, 1994).
In this article, we aim at contributing to the literature in two ways. First, we summarize and integrate existing typologies of employees’ international career trajectories. Second, and more importantly, we extend previous research by presenting a taxonomy of internationally mobile managers that is based on empirical data rather than theoretical considerations. More specifically, we apply Optimal Matching Analysis (e.g., Abbott & Tsay, 2000) to cluster similar job sequences into patterns of international careers. Such an empirically-driven classification is of great importance to contemporary international human resource management (IHRM), as we argue that employees in different career patterns have varying motives and competencies, which, in turn, call for a differentiation of career management practices and responsibilities to optimally develop and mobilize distinct groups of internationally mobile employees. For that purpose, we relate the career taxonomies to variables that describe differences at an organizational and individual level in order to better understand the specific requirements of these groups.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. We first review the expatriate career literature with respect to a differentiation of personnel practices for different groups of internationally mobile managers pursuing varying career paths and summarize main results of existing typologies of international careers. We then describe the methodological approach chosen in this study and present a taxonomy of internationally mobile managers. Lastly, we discuss our results, point out theoretical and practical implications for international career management, and show the limitations to our research.

Career paths of internationally mobile managers

The need for differentiation of international career management

The differentiation of personnel practices, i.e. the recognition of and commitment to plan for employee differences, is an essential component of modern human resource management (Huselid, 1995; Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt, 2003). Increasing internationalization raises the
linked key question of how organizations that operate internationally need to differentiate their international HR practices. In this respect, Suutari (2003) underlines the necessity to do more research in this field, as companies have globalized their strategies and functions, but the global HRM function is still underdeveloped.

One of the major functions in IHRM concerns expatriate management, including recruiting, preparing, relocating, placement, integration, rewarding, appraising, promoting of expatriates, and repeating the process for repatriation (Baruch & Altman, 2002). Several studies have examined how expatriate management practices should differ content-wise with respect to the stage of a firm’s internationalization (Adler & Ghadar, 1990; Milliman, Von Glinow, & Nathan, 1991) as well as to different international management strategies (Caligiuri & Colakoglu, 2007). Furthermore, Caligiuri and Colakoglu (2007) relate these practices to different categories of expatriate assignments (technical, functional, developmental, and strategic). The primary focus lies on the question of integration, differentiation, or duality of international practices (Farndale, Brewster, & Poutsma, 2008) in order to fit each organization’s unique environmental setting.

Discrepancies in study results such as the willingness of expatriates to accept further international assignments, which varies from 13 percent to 91 percent (Forster, 2000; Riusala & Suutari, 2000), or the share of repatriates facing a positive career impact from an international assignment ranging from around a quarter (Suutari & Brewster, 2003) to 46 percent (Forster, 1994), indicate that there is a large degree of variability within the group of expatriates. In view of this variability and the importance of the psychological contract that has been stressed recently by various researchers (e.g., Riusala & Suutari, 2000; Haslberger & Brewster, 2009), not only the content of the practices at an organizational level, but also the responsibilities regarding expatriate liaison and support and in the sense of contact persons at an individual level, need to be aligned to different types of expatriates in order to closely tailor initiatives to expatriates needs (van Roessel, 1988; Bonache, Brewster, & Suutari, 2007;
Andresen & Göbel, 2010). However, expatriation management continues to be the area of HR that is most centrally determined (Brewster, Harris, & Sparrow, 2002), suggesting a comparably low differentiation of responsibilities between the HR function at headquarters or the international subsidiary, line management, and expatriates themselves.

Frameworks for potential differences within the group of internationally mobile employees have been offered in form of typologies that are based, for example, on the following criteria: Inkson and colleagues were one of the first to argue that one must distinguish between employees being sent on international assignments by their employers and those individuals that seek employment abroad on their own initiative (self-initiated expatriates; Inkson et al., 1997; see also Tharenou & Caulfield, 2010). First empirical results support the significance of this notion and show that organizational mobility, for example, is lower among assigned expatriates compared to self-initiated expatriates (Biemann & Andresen, 2010) and that differences in the development of career capital between the two groups exist (Jokinen, Brewster, & Suutari, 2008). Hays (1974) and Derr and Oddou (1991) identify different types of expatriates based on the goals pursued with their assignment such as reproducing a structure, analyzing and solving a technical problem, carrying out a well-defined position or individual development (see also Beaverstock, 2004; Caligiuri, 2006). Bochner (1982) classified expatriates according to their psychological response to the host culture, ranging from rejection either of the culture of origin or the second culture over a vacillation between two cultures to a synthesis of both cultures. Black and colleagues (1992) developed a typology of expatriates in terms of their allegiance to either the parent firm and/or to the local operation. Harris and colleagues (2003) as well as Peiperl and Jonsen (2007) distinguished different types of assignments according to the respective length, intensity and breadth of exposure. Examples are traditional, short-term, frequent flyer and commuter assignments (see also Collings, Scullion, & Morley, 2007; Meyskens, Von Glinow, Werther, & Clarke, 2009). Finally, and central for our study, are a few approaches aimed at
defining different types of expatriates by identifying characteristic career trajectories (e.g., Borg, 1988; Mayrhofer, 1996).

With expatriation becoming an increasingly common part of a manager’s and executive’s career (Daily, Trevis Certo, & Dalton, 2000; Richardson & McKenna, 2002), career management issues become one of the main challenges for international HR professionals. Suutari (2003) criticizes that research on the specifics of international careers is limited to the effect of one separate international assignment on the career after repatriation to the home country leading to homogeneous recommendations for HR practice and responsibilities. But in addition to these single international movements, more permanent global careers are becoming increasingly important in international business (Suutari, 2003; Suutari & Taka, 2004; Suutari & Mäkelä, 2007; Mäkelä & Suutari, 2009, 2011). Yet, these global managers with frequent international relocations (in contrast to global managers with a worldwide coordination task; Cappellen & Janssens, 2010) have not been subject to the same exhaustive enquiry as has been applied to traditional expatriates and potential subgroups remain almost unvetted. In order to better understand the relevance of differences within the group of internationally mobile managers and to successfully manage their careers, first, potential subgroups and their specific characteristics and challenges concerning their career aspirations and typical career patterns need to be identified. Second, a set of differentiated expatriate career management practices including necessary career planning and related career guidance and support practices need to be considered.

**Typologies of internationally mobile employees’ careers**

In order to determine potential subgroups, existing conceptual typologies of career patterns that lead to ideal types based on a limited number of theoretically meaningful dimensions are briefly summarized in this section. However, the major disadvantage of typologies is that empirical evidence running counter to theoretical specifications may not be strong enough to
discover inherent weaknesses of the typology (Bailey, 1994). Hence, we aim at developing a taxonomy of career paths in the following. Taxonomies, by contrast, are based on empirical data and categorize phenomena into mutually exclusive and exhaustive sets with a series of discrete decision rules (Doty & Glick, 1994), leading to a comprehensive classification system. The major strength is that the patterns and sequences discovered may cross boundaries of existing theories. Hence, the development of a taxonomy can make a valuable contribution towards a better understanding of the different career patterns of internationally mobile managers. However, the selection of variables is problematic since it is usually not based on theory or a conceptual model (Marradi, 1990). In order to avoid this weakness, we will rely on reasonable variables as suggested by existing career typologies (see Table 4) and, in addition, scrutinize variables that were used to further elaborate typologies in order to make use of them for our own taxonomy. Implications can be deduced that are relevant to the differentiation of career management practices by organizations as well as the career planning by individuals.

Career is defined as “the evolving sequence of a person’s work experiences over time” (Arthur, Hall, & Lawrence, 1989: 8). Accordingly, the global manager’s career usually includes a sequence of moves in different locations and positions (Cappellen & Janssens, 2005) and does not necessarily follow fixed career paths predetermined by organizations. Several researchers (Borg, 1988; Gunz, 1988; Fukuda & Chu, 1994; Mayrhofer, 1996, 2001; Suutari, 2003; Banai & Harry, 2004) proposed career typologies that are based on the following four dimensions: organizational purpose, mobility in terms of spatial and organizational mobility, duration of the stay abroad, and position level in the organization.

Organizational purpose

Mayrhofer’s (1996; 2001) differentiates four organizational international career logics (OICLs), i.e. types of international assignments (see Table 1). OICLs are based on two
dimensions, personnel development versus management and control purposes, that are assumed to be independent. These two dimensions form a 2x2 matrix that comprises four different OICLs.

The type 1 logic (watchdog, trouble-shooting logic) describes international careers that primarily serve coordination and control purposes, with personnel development issues playing only a minor role. A typical example is the assignment of a home country national to a key position in the foreign subsidiary, for example, the chief financial officer. In the type 2 logic (senior management, high potential logic) the high importance of coordination and integration tasks, as in type 1 logic, is complemented by personnel development goals such as building up leadership competency, social networks, and acquiring intercultural skills for the future of the career. International moves within the type 3 logic (developmental-junior logic) primarily serve personnel development motives and much less to steer foreign subsidiaries. An example of this is the assignment of junior managers to a foreign business unit as part of a management development program. Type 4 logic (isolation, dead end logic) is neither motivated by coordination and control issues nor by personnel development aims. Rather this form of assignment is to be understood as a punishment or due to a lack of potential. For each of the four logics a specific profile is developed based on different characteristics of the country of destination, i.e. the strategic importance of the countries or foreign subsidiaries, hierarchical level of the position abroad, transfer direction, easiness of repatriation, and the expatriate, i.e. their seniority and career success.

Summarizing, we consider that Mayrhofer succeeded in developing an intuitively plausible typology that is rich in substance, linking the types with different features of the foreign country and the expatriate. It is to be criticized, however, that instead of distinguishing four types, the use of the two dimensions would be a better basis for argumentation as personnel development always has an impact on careers and management and control efforts are only relevant in strategically important foreign subsidiaries etc. So, the dimensions could
be analyzed separately, as the argumentation is not necessarily based on a fit or misfit between both. A typology only implies an increase of knowledge, if a type is based on a combination of specific features. Moreover, Mayrhofer assumes that each company pursues one dominant, organizational international career logic, whereas it is to be expected that all logics will be represented in larger companies operating on a global scale. Finally, the typology focuses on single assignments under exclusion of a career logic of multiple expatriate assignments.

*Mobility*

The mobility pattern in terms of spatial and organizational mobility is central for the determination of typologies suggested by Borg (1988) and Suutari (2003). Both base their types of internationally mobile managers on spatial mobility: *circular mobility* on the one hand, i.e. whether the manager by the end of the observation period works and lives in the home country or abroad (denoted as ‘destination’ in Borg’s typology), and *residential mobility* on the other hand, i.e. the number of assignments a manager takes up during the time his career is followed (denoted as ‘mobility’ in Borg’s typology) comprising relocations between home and host country, within an area as well as migration between nations. Borg (1988) developed four archetypes of internationally mobile managers (cf. Table 2) and Suutari (2003) three groups of expatriates based on these two dimensions of spatial mobility, albeit using different terms.

Managers of Borg’s archetypes, *naturalized* and *locals*, both display a low mobility and were only assigned once. But whereas “naturalized” stay abroad and probably go native to some extent after having spent a long time in the foreign country in the same place, *locals* return back home after the termination of the first assignment. The so-called *unsettled* managers have several assignments abroad but finally return to their home country. *Cosmopolitans* show no strong attachment to any country and take up additional assignments.
Global managers in Suutari’s (2003) typology pursue an international career for a longer term by varying between domestic and international assignments without focusing on some specific country or even some specific cultural area. Hence, this group differs from those expatriates who repatriate permanently back to their home country after the assignment and from those who move directly from one international assignment to another.

Borg compared these four archetypes referring to different features of the assignment, such as organizational motives and the hierarchical level at first assignment, and of the assignee, including the age when assigned abroad and career success. Suutari focuses on individual variables such as differences regarding balance between personal and working life, family adjustment, and the perceived importance of the international career.

The strength of Borg’s, as well as Suutari’s, archetypes lies in their long-term deduction. However, Borg’s typology is to be criticized, as a statistical test is missing so that the analysis remains descriptive. Furthermore, the classification based on two criteria is rather simplistic all-the-more-so since the length of the phase of observation of 13 years was chosen arbitrarily. It is questionable how stable the patterns are over time. Finally, Borg only analyzed expatriates that stayed in one country and excluded those who changed their employer. Suutari (2003) based his typology on a qualitative study. As comparisons between the groups are missing, it remains unclear as to how far the three groups differ with respect to the criteria chosen and how important these differences are. Valuable for the development of our own taxonomy are the two variables that form the basis of the patterns (circular and residential mobility) as well as the features of the assignment (e.g. duration) and of the individual (e.g. age, work-life balance).

Mobility in terms of organizational mobility, i.e. the movement between different jobs and employers, is the basis of Banai and Harry’s (2004) typology. The types of expatriates are based on two dimensions: the number of business organizations they work for and the number of foreign countries they work in. Traditional expatriate managers are assigned abroad by
their employer and pursue a career within the same organization. *International itinerants*, by contrast, are managers who are employed by a number of different employers in several countries, take unilateral charge over their careers, and strive less after status and hierarchical ranks. Hence, careers can be viewed as having no boundaries. In addition, the proactive search for international work might predominate, manifesting itself in a larger share of self-initiated foreign work experience.

The theoretical concept has not been completely elaborated yet and empirical studies for its foundation are missing. But as the career type described is the only career pattern for international managers with reference to the newer career literature, a comparison of international itinerants with other international and national managers could give first insights into the importance and impact of new career concepts in an international context.

*Duration of stay abroad and position level*

Finally, the length of the expatriate assignment along with the position level in the organization build the two underlying dimensions of the typology of the four groups of expatriates by Fukuda and Chu (1994; see Table 3).

The *starters* encompass typically young expatriates who have spent less than six years abroad holding relatively low positions in a given functional area of management. They tend to view the international assignment as an opportunity for career development and advancement. *Climbers* work internationally for less than six years in all and usually are in midcareer. They view the international assignment as a way to further their career by demonstrating their abilities to manage the company’s operations abroad. Managers in the *survivor* group spend more than six years abroad holding relatively low positions in the company. Although they gain international experience during many years, they do not advanced much career-wise. *Achievers* are typically older, already having spent more than six years abroad. They possess successful track records in their services abroad and hold senior
positions (e.g., general manager, managing director). These four groups are characterized further by individual variables such as the family status, including the age of their children.

The valuable contribution of Fukuda and Chu’s typology is the description of types in relation to different career stages and duration of the expatriate’s stay abroad. However, a weakness inextricably linked with this approach is that the types cannot be seen as being exclusive since an employee may develop and be grouped into another type during his or her career. It remains unclear why six years are seen as a dividing rule and why career success should increase with the length of the assignment. Although the typology is based on empirical data, it remains descriptive as a statistical verification is missing. Hence, the simplicity of the typology with two dimensions is at the same time its weakness.

In the following Table 4 the basic dimensions of the typologies as well as characteristic variables of the different types are summarized.

**Implications for the development of a taxonomy of internationally mobile employees**

It can be summarized from the previous section that the literature dealing with career typologies is scarce and that different theoretical points of criticism exist. Both aspects corroborate the need for further research. The typologies have in common that career types remain descriptive or are defined theoretically. Moreover, most of the typologies model international work experience as a single career step and omit a long-term career perspective including multiple career moves in different foreign countries as are typical for global careers (Mäkelä & Suutari, 2009). The aim of our explorative study is to scrutinize the identified, determining dimensions of career patterns and to investigate their relevance for theory and practice as well as to extend and to concretize them. Since scientific research in career types is at an early state and a solid theory does not exist yet, an explorative approach is deemed to be reasonable.
All of the five typologies presented above are based on reasonable dimensions as well as a comprehensible selection of descriptive variables which can be used as a starting point for a data-based taxonomy. Out of the four core dimensions, organizational purpose, position level, mobility, and duration of stay abroad, only the last two are relatively independent of the expatriates’ organizations. We thus use these two dimensions for our taxonomy. The organizational aims pursued with expatriation are excluded as they are not independent and, moreover, are not able to capture careers that cross organizations such as self-initiated expatriation. Career paths imply a longitudinal view of different steps in a career. Hence, the use of the position level as a dimension would suggest that career paths are different over a life-time for those who have low, medium and high position levels and that these paths do not pass into one another as is the case in hierarchical career paths. Furthermore, career paths depend also on the level of experience. A person may change jobs at the same hierarchical level but work in different areas asking this person to begin again (e.g. portfolio career, Handy, 1994). Hence, the position level is not used as a dimension.

The typologies described above mainly focus on organizational careers, i.e. external careers coming from intra-company, hierarchical advancement (Schein, 1996). In the international setting, the internal career, i.e. inter-company self-development (Parker & Inkson, 1999) plays a role in international careers (Stahl, Miller, & Tung, 2002) and can be viewed as boundaryless (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996). Hence, the inter-organizational mobility is included. With respect to career success, material manifestations as indicators of objective career success (Heslin, 2005; Sturges, 1999), and subjective, holistic career success referring to an individual’s personal judgments of their career achievements can be distinguished (Ng, Eby, Sorenson & Feldman, 2005). Moreover, organizational aspects are broadly missing in the typologies discussed, such as the degree of internationalization, that influences the extent, kind, and duration of expatriation (Stahl, 2002). Summing up, we will in the following explore different patterns of international careers that differ with regard to mobility (i.e.
number of foreign employments and organizations) and length of work episodes (e.g., length of international work experience). We will show that this very basic set of career-related characteristics offers enough information to derive meaningful career patterns. This will be validated by relating these patterns to a number of criteria focused at individual (e.g., career success, work-life balance) and organizational characteristics (e.g., size, planned internationalization) that are also referred to, albeit in a rather inconsistent manner, in the existing typologies presented (cf. Table 4) with the exception of gender that has been added because specificities are to be expected especially in case of international careers (Tharenou, 2010; Kattenbach, Lücke, Schlese & Schramm, 2011).

**Method**

**Sample**

To reach our target population, we asked various expatriate organizations to give us access to expatriate and repatriate managers (e.g., chambers of commerce, online expatriate communities). Several domestic organizations were also contacted to recruit the group of domestic managers with only a small amount of international experience. With this sampling approach, we were able to approach a great variety of groups and were not limited to assigned expatriates from a small number of organizations. We designed an online questionnaire in German and asked cooperating organizations to provide the link to the online questionnaire to their target population. We chose an online format over a paper-and-pencil version, because the former are better suited to be sent out to expatriates in various countries (Dillman, 2000). Due to this procedure, we were not able to exactly specify the number of individuals that had the opportunity to click on the link that was shown on the websites of cooperating organizations. Hence, we were not able to calculate an exact response rate. The final sample consists of 202 German-speaking managers (162 male, 30 female, 10 unreported). 150 of them had extended international experience (at least 6 months in a single position), 33 had
some international experience (work period abroad of several weeks but no longer than 6 months) and 29 were introduced as a domestic control group with no or very limited international experience. We included a group of domestic managers to contrast internationally mobile managers to those employees that have little or no international career experience.

**Measures**

The online questionnaire contained detailed questions regarding the participants’ career history, organizational variables, and individual characteristics. It took the participants about 25 minutes to finish the questionnaire.

*Career history.* The individuals’ career histories were assessed with detailed self-reported curriculum vitae, which included information for each career step (i.e. time span, function, organization, industry, and country). This information was used to (a) calculate professional experience, international experience, organizational tenure, number of organizations, number of industries, and number of international assignments and (b) form career sequences on a yearly base for each individual. For the latter, each year of a person’s career was coded based on country and organization. A year was thus coded as international experience, if the self-reported country of residence differed from a manager’s country of origin in the given year.

*Number of employees.* The number of employees was assessed in the survey as a proxy of company size with a question in which participants indicated the absolute number of employees in their own organization. The number was logarithmized before entering the analyzes due to the skewness of the distribution (see Dalton & Kesner, 1983).

*Internationalization.* Current internationalization was calculated as an index of (1) the percentage of foreign sales to total sales and (2) the logarithmized number of countries an organization operates in. Both values were z-standardized prior to aggregation. Planned internationalization was assessed with three items on a 5-point Likert-scale (1 = do not agree;
Two items were based on Nummela, Saarenketo, and Puumlainen (2004) and a third item was added (“For my organization, the importance of foreign markets will rise in the future.”).

*Industry globalization.* This construct captures the degree of international linkages within an industry, based on the distinction between global and multi-domestic industries (Porter, 1986). It was surveyed with three items on a 5-Point Likert scale (e.g., “In our industry, competitive positions in different countries are highly interdependent.”).

*Self-initiated foreign experience.* Participants indicated in the questionnaire whether they were seeking employment internationally on their own or if they were sent abroad by their company of employment (dummy variable; sent abroad = 0 and self-initiated = 1).

*Perceived importance of international careers.* We assessed the perceived importance of international experience with a 7-point Likert scale with four items based on Adler (2002). These items captured various advantages of international careers (i.e. usefulness of international careers for promotion prospects, income, challenging tasks, and a rich private life) were assessed (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.65).

*Career centrality.* We used a single-item measure to capture individuals’ career centrality (“My own career progress is very important to me.”).

*Career success.* Subjective career success was assessed using a 5-Point Likert-scale with 5 items that was developed by Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Wormley (1990) to measure career satisfaction (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.84). Objective career success was measured by an index of self-reported annual salary on a 10-point scale, the number of subordinates, and the hierarchical level, as these are the most common instruments to capture objective career success (Heslin, 2005). The three variables that form the index were z-standardized before adding them up to a single index.
Age, gender, and workload. These variables were assessed in single questions that asked the participants for their age in years, whether they are male or female, and their hours of work per week, respectively.

Data analysis

The main purpose of the present paper is the identification of career patterns of internationally mobile managers. However, finding similarities between individuals’ careers remains methodically challenging (Abbott & Hrycak, 1990). In this study, we apply Optimal Matching Analyses (OMA) to derive a taxonomy of career patterns. OMA is a recently developed type of sequence analysis that determines the similarity between sequences by defining the costs of transforming one sequence into another with a set of transformation operations (Stovel & Bolan, 2004). In essence, OMA proceeds in three steps (for a more detailed description, see Abbott & Tsay, 2000; MacIndoe & Abbott, 2004; Aisenbrey & Fasang, 2010). First, one must define a finite set of different states. In this study, patterns are based on organizational membership (organizational mobility) and international experience (spatial mobility, duration of stay abroad). Each year of professional experience was coded as being (a) either in the home country or abroad and (b) in the current organization or in another organization (for a comparable procedure, see Biemann & Wolf, 2009). Thus, four different states can be differentiated: In the home country in the current organization (state A), in the home country in another organization (B), in a foreign country in the current organization (C), and in a foreign country in another organization (D). For example, a manager who first worked 3 years for an organization in his or her home country, subsequently 2 years for the current organization in another country, and afterwards 1 year for the same organization in the home country, is assigned the sequence AAACCA. For each individual in the sample, a sequence reflecting the previous career is defined.
Second, one must define a weighting scheme for costs of transforming one sequence into another. In general, the more changes that must be applied to transform one sequence into another, the less similar are these sequences. Elements in one sequence can be substituted, inserted or deleted until one sequence resembles the other (insertion and deletion costs are labeled ‘indel costs’). These costs must be defined by the researcher. For our research purpose, we set indel costs to 1 and employ substitution costs that are shown in Table 5. For example, if the sequence AAACCB is compared to the sequence AAACCC, the last C in the latter sequence must be replaced by a B. Then, both sequences are identical. The total costs for the transformation between these two sequences are 2, as the costs of substituting B by C are 2 (see Table 5). Note that OMA is capable of dealing with sequences of different length. For example, if the sequence AAACCB is compared to AACCB, costs would be calculated for deleting one A to reach sequence alignment. In most cases, it needs more than a single operation before any two sequences are equal. Then, the cost minimum for all operations that are necessary are added up. Low costs indicate a high similarity between sequences whereas high costs imply that two sequences are very dissimilar. In OMA, all pairs of sequences are compared and the resulting costs entered in the transition cost matrix.

In a third step, sequences with low transition costs are clustered. This procedure is based on the transition cost matrix, which shows the distance between each pair of sequences. Cluster analyses are the most prominent tool to allocate the sequences to different clusters. Note that the resulting clusters can be interpreted as career patterns, since they comprise individuals with similar career sequences.

Results

Mean values, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations among study variables are depicted in Table 6. Note that age is correlated with objective and subjective career success ($r = 0.67$ and $r = 0.27$, respectively).
Table 7 shows results from OMA. As described above, indel costs were set to 1 and substitution costs were based on Table 5. Cluster analyses based on Ward’s algorithm (1963) suggest a four-cluster solution. In the following, we will first describe the four clusters based on the criteria that were used to derive the clusters and, subsequently, these clusters will be related to variables on the organizational and individual level that may have impacted or are impacted by these patterns. As mentioned above, career sequences were built based on organizational experience and international experience, and the length of the sequence can be interpreted as professional experience, since each year of professional experience was transformed into a single sequence element (i.e., A, B, C or D). These variables are underlined in Table 7, as they build the basis for the derivation of career patterns. Clearly, differences between the patterns in the variables that are chosen as a sequence-generating variable are not surprising, but they show that there are distinct careers in the sample and may be used to characterize these patterns.

The first pattern is labeled “early career.” It contains 101 individuals who have an average professional experience of 6.04 years, about 2 years international experience, and have worked about 5 years for the current organization. In the second pattern, named “international organizational career,” there are 32 managers who have a relatively high professional experience (22.88 years) with much international experience (9.50 years). They spend most of their time working for the current organization (22.25 years) on two to three international assignments. The third pattern, “international boundaryless career,” comprises 56 individuals who have comparable characteristics to the second pattern with regard to professional experience (18.48 years) and international experience (6.70 years). It differs, however, in organizational tenure, which is only 6.88 years (experienced during about 2 international assignments) in the latter pattern. The fourth pattern “transnational career” subsumes 13 managers who have very much professional experience (36.62 years); most of
this experience was spent in their current organization (33.31 years) during various international assignments (34.62 years of foreign experience).

In the following, we will analyze differences between these patterns that go beyond those variables that were chosen to generate the career sequences (i.e. professional experience, international experience, and organizational tenure), structured along organizational and individual variables. Differences are tested via ANOVAs or Chi²-tests in case of dichotomous variables. Superscripted numbers indicate significant differences among clusters’ mean values (alpha = 5 percent; with Bonferroni Correction). With regard to the organizations that employ managers in our sample, we first find that managers following the international boundaryless career (pattern 3) work in significantly smaller organizations that have a significantly lower degree of internationalization compared to organizations of managers from the other three patterns (hence the superscripted “124” attached to the number of employees and current internationalization for pattern 3). Planned internationalization and industry globalization are slightly lower in organizations from early career-managers (pattern 1), compared to the international organizational career (pattern 2).

We find, however, less pronounced differences among individual characteristics between managers in different career patterns. The proportion of female managers does not differ significantly between the four patterns (possibly due to the relatively low base rate of 16 percent in the sample). The number of self-initiated international experiences varies significantly across the career patterns (Chi² = 14.35, p < .001), as in the international boundaryless career pattern, there are 41 percent of managers who started to work internationally on their own initiative, whereas there are 9 percent and 0 percent self-initiated international managers in the international organizational career and the transnational career patterns, respectively. When analyzing the workload of the managers in the different clusters, results show that the early career pattern shows a lower workload compared to the other patterns (the difference is only significant when comparing the early career pattern to the
international organizational career). Moreover, Table 7 shows that managers in the transnational career pattern rank the importance of international careers higher than managers in the early career pattern.

For career centrality, subjective career success, and objective career success, we controlled for age (i.e. using residual values when career success is regressed on age) before comparing mean values between the patterns, as they are highly correlated with age (see Table 6). Managers in the four described patterns do not differ significantly with regard to career centrality. Furthermore, we find no significant differences in subjective career success in the different patterns. However, the objective career success is significantly higher for managers that show the career pattern of an international organizational career compared to the early career pattern. Note that the objective career success in transnational careers and international boundaryless careers is between the early career and the international organizational career, as the latter pattern exhibits the highest average objective career success.

Discussion

Based on a sample of 202 German managers we derived a taxonomy of four international career patterns of managers, namely the early career, the international organizational career, the international boundaryless career, and the transnational career. For the development of the taxonomy, existing descriptive career typologies were scrutinized and a list of relevant dimensions for the determination and characterization of career types was completed and substantiated (cf. Table 4). The four patterns are based on the length of their professional experience, international experience and organizational tenure.

Comparing Career Patterns of International Managers
Managers following the *international organizational career* pattern worked most of the time for the same employer and almost half of it abroad during two to three assignments on average, indicating a comparably medium spatial mobility, low social mobility, and high duration. This group, as well as the managers within the *transnational career* pattern, correspond largely to the group of global managers as described by Suutari (2003; see also Mäkelä & Suutari, 2009, 2011) who have had three or more international assignments in two or more countries and worked for either one or several employers. The differentiation into two subgroups in our sample is based on significant differences in international experience in terms of years and number of international employments. Whereas the respondents in Suutari’s (2003) study were mixed regarding their career orientation, managers following an international organizational career were highly career oriented. Comparing the four patterns it becomes obvious that these managers exhibit the highest objective career success in terms of the salary that they earned, the number of subordinated employees, and the hierarchical level they reached with one employer. This career success, however, is achieved at the expense of comparably the longest working hours as is also described by Mäkelä and Suutari (2011).

Interestingly, despite the comparably high objective career success reached in this bounded career, usually in larger organizations, the subjective career success is not higher in this group. Moreover, and in contrast to Suutari’s (2003) study, the international experience gained is not seen as being of special importance for their career success. Rather, repatriating to the headquarters in their home country is seen as an important step in order not to miss the connection. The risk of not being embedded in the home organization is also emphasized as a potential pitfall and problem in repatriation by Mäkelä and Suutari (2009).

The managers belonging to the *international boundaryless career* pattern largely fit to the “international itinerant” as described by Banai and Harry (2004). In contrast to our international organizational careerists, these persons changed employers several times during their international career. This mobility is frequently addressed in research as it is known that
significant rates of employees of up to half of the expatriate population are leaving their company after repatriation (Black & Gregersen, 1999; GMAC, 2005). In this regard Suutari and Brewster (2003) argue that repatriates thought their international experience was valuable, but not necessarily in the company that had sent them out. However, looking at the international boundaryless career pattern, objective career success is rather low in this group. Similarly, Jokinen et al. (2008) report that SIEs corresponding to *international boundaryless careerists* often operate at a lower organizational level than AEs corresponding to our *international organizational careerists*. Banai and Harry (2004) explain the limited career progress and hierarchical advancement of their group by the fact that these managers purposely accumulate less company-specific knowledge and focus instead on knowledge that is transferable between organizations. In addition, as presumed by Banai and Harry (2004) and in accord with the concept of the international itinerant, the managers strive less after status and hierarchical ranks.

Overall, it becomes obvious that both the *international organizational* and the *international boundaryless* career patterns comprise expatriates in their mid-careers, but differ with regard to their career concepts (e.g., Arthur & Rousseau, 1996). While the former reflects a traditional career concept with careers in only one organization, individuals in the latter pattern worked in multiple organizations and industries (see Table 7). Furthermore, while career centrality and subjective career success are relatively similar in both groups, individuals in the international organizational career have a somewhat higher objective career success. This indicates differences in individuals’ criteria for career success. Expatriates in a boundaryless career pattern might measure success through the meaningfulness of their work, whereas traditionally, career success is based on pay, promotion, and status (Sullivan, 1999). Thus, although objective career success can be lower for expatriates in boundaryless careers, subjective career success is not. From a human capital point of view, this also raises the question whether international experience is a form firm-specific human capital (Becker,
1964), because, objectively, individuals in the organizational career pattern receive the highest tangible rewards in terms of pay, promotion, and number of subordinates. The transnational careerists spent almost their whole work life abroad with one employer staying at many different places, resulting in the highest spatial mobility, and see an international career as being most important for achieving promotion, income, challenging tasks, and a rich private life. Although it is a limited group in our sample, it confutes the argument in literature (Forster, 2000) that these a-spatial careers with frequent international relocations are a myth. Looking at the motives behind this mobility, it becomes obvious that although they value the international experience, their career orientation is not notably high. Similarly, Borg (1988) argued that the prospects of career advancement are of very little importance in the decision for additional foreign assignments. Further, there are major commonalities with the managers of the type-4-logic by Mayrhofer (1996) who also have a long organizational tenure, are not repatriated, and whose career is seen as interrupted or even stopped. This is reflected in our sample in the perceived objective career success that is the lowest among the four career patterns. The assumption by Mayrhofer that this expatriation is to be seen as a punishment or lack of potential is to be questioned in view of the high perceived importance of international careers and the fact that managers value personal aims and the subjective career success being as high as in the other career patterns. It is likely that the transnational careerists sacrificed external success in favor of a more inspiring and interesting job or a job environment that is more in line with their goals and capabilities (see also Suutari & Mäkelä, 2007) and against these objective career drawbacks re-evaluate their subjective career that is comparably higher than in the other three groups. It is also noteworthy that, although small in number (n = 13), there is no self-initiated expatriate in this group. Expatriation was therefore always on the organization’s initiative. The transnational careerists might be exemplary for Hall’s argument that in the protean career the person’s definition of success is internal, subjective success (Hall & Chandler, 2005).
The group of managers in the *early career* pattern corresponds to the traditional image of the expatriate, who works for several years in a foreign subsidiary and repatriates permanently back to the home country after the assignment. This group is partly reflected in the typology by Fukuda and Chu (1994) who described groups called the starters and the climbers being in the beginning of their career or midcareer who, similarly to the early careerists, spend a shorter period abroad and who value the international assignment from a career point of view. Additionally, congruence is given with the type-3-logic of the developmental, junior logic by Mayrhofer (1996).

**OMA to Identify Career Patterns**

We presented a taxonomy of internationally mobile managers that was based on empirical career data rather than theoretical considerations. This extends previous efforts to understand international managers’ careers in several ways. First, much research was qualitative in nature. For example, Suutari (2003) interviewed 24 global managers and found a typical career track that involved alternating assignments in the home country and various foreign countries. However, he did not offer a more detailed look at distinct career patterns, probably because of the small sample size and a lack of adequate methods. Similarly, Suutari and Mäkelä (2007) and Mäkelä and Suutari (2009). In this study, OMA allowed an assessment and a comparison of complex career pathways, which supplements qualitative approaches that cannot handle larger sample sizes very well. Second, OMA results gave interesting insights into differences between career patterns. For example, managers with an international organizational career showed a higher objective career success, while the subjective career success was similar to the other groups with more and less years of international experience. Also, we found differences in the prevalence of self-initiated career experiences between the groups. Overall, the results indicate that methods that, for example, primarily look at linear relationships (e.g., regression analyses) might overlook important aspects, but which can be
captured in an analysis of complex career patterns. Third, OMA offered a finer-grained analysis of different types of global managers. In order to simplify matters, contemporary research often only (if at all) distinguishes between self-initiated and assigned expatriates, without looking at further career characteristics in longer career sequences. OMA, on the contrary captures career trajectories that go beyond current employment settings. This allows a sophisticated approach to understanding differences, determinants, and outcomes of international careers.

**Managerial Relevance**

Regarding the importance of objective and subjective career success, the transnational career and the international organizational career represent two extremes. The differences could be either inherent in the mobility patterns or due to an insufficient expatriation management in the case of transnational careers. In the following, implications for organizations with regard to expatriates’ career management of the different career patterns are analyzed. The four career patterns advise to develop differentiated practices that imply a higher specialization of activities and programs, for example, by assigning different jobs to internationally mobile managers of different career patterns or by giving more support to certain expatriates. Most importantly, the taxonomy suggests that separate expatriation policies for different career patterns make sense and that the responsibilities for the expatriate career management should be differentiated according to different career patterns and taken over by either the corporate or local HR department, line management, or the expatriates themselves (cf. Table 8). Note that the responsibility for several career management tasks (e.g., training and development) is not identical with its actual execution. In practice, by contrast, 82 per cent of the 70 medium sized German companies surveyed by Deloitte in 2008 operate expatriation centrally at the headquarters and a differentiation of expatriation policies according to various mobility patterns is only given in 22 per cent of the companies (Deloitte, 2008). Similarly, Sparrow,
Brewster and Harris (2004) showed that in close to 60 per cent of the international companies surveyed the worldwide corporate HR managers are responsible for expatriation management.

Companies which aim at the development of a pool of highly qualified managers with international competencies, who will be able to manage global integration and coordination activities, are well-advised to offer the international organizational career pattern to potential candidates. The international career management should be steered from the headquarters. One of the selection criteria of candidates needs to be a strong motivation to reach objective career success in terms of a hierarchical advancement, large span of control and high salary. For this group, companies need to define international career paths combining national and international work periods and to involve these persons in the long-term personnel planning. This includes concrete repatriation plans with definite and suitable job assignments for returnees where they can use the new skills and knowledge they have acquired. Additionally, companies need to communicate to the expatriate how the overseas assignment relates to his overall career plan. The continuous management of the psychological contract between employer and expatriate is of major importance for this group in order to be able to retain them in the long-term. The expatriate management department at the headquarters acts like a spring, letting people go and also taking them back.

In case of a need for highly mobile managers who will fulfil tasks in several different subsidiaries abroad, such as the setup of new offices or plants world-wide, the transnational career pattern corresponds best. In the selection process it is most promising to identify those managers who perceive international careers as being highly important, but for whom the career is at the same time less central. However, these transnational careerists still need to be managed in a way in which they perceive a high subjective career success. Hence, although these managers are rarely working at the headquarters, corporate HRM should take over the responsibility for keeping personal contact and take care of their international professional development on a strategic level. Decisions about operational issues including HR planning,
recruitment and placement, training and development needs, and performance appraisal, in contrast, should be decided on a local level in the different countries. Hence, the HR departments in the local subsidiaries pass on the baton.

For projects that require international savvy, but are managed at the regional level, the international boundaryless career pattern is best suited. People are selected locally and the local HR department takes over the management of these international workers together with the expatriates themselves. Due to their high mobility and comparably low embeddedness, these internationally mobile managers should be assigned to projects of a limited duration. In order to profit from this pool of boundaryless careerists, networks with other, also typically smaller companies could be built up in order to develop a network labour market (Biemann & Andresen, 2010). The local HR departments are comparable to maritime pilots who help internationally mobile managers to find their way, but the expatriates need to steer their career themselves.

Since the preference of the managers for one of these three international career patterns cannot be anticipated precisely at the start of the international career, as also managers need to first gain international experience and start their career planning, the group of the early careerists is of major importance. For the anticipation of potential mobility of labour, the employee’s background is of interest since a causal effect of prior mobility on later international labour migration is documented (e.g. Parey & Waldinger, 2011). The early careerists build the pool for the other three groups of managers and are allowed to identify and develop talent on a global basis; the remaining share of them will stay in the home country after their first assignment. The consequence is that corporate headquarters should take over the sole responsibility for them during the first assignment, but later on could pass on the responsibility or involve the local HR department depending on the career pattern. All the more important is the close management of expectations and of the psychological contract in order to define the further career path with these managers. A metaphor for the expatriate
management department at headquarters is a sun with the other planets (foreign subsidiaries) orbiting around and headquarters pulling expatriates back.

**Limitations and implications for further research**

This study is subject to several limitations. A first methodical limitation is the moderate sample size. It allowed an identification of four career patterns, but a somewhat larger sample size might uncover further sub-career patterns that might be relevant for theoretical and practical reasons. For example, a relatively large group was classified in the early career pattern with relatively few career experiences. A larger sample size would be necessary to identify subgroups within this cluster. Furthermore, we formed career sequences for German managers on two relatively simple dimensions, i.e. organizational membership and country. Therefore, we encourage researchers to investigate differences in career patterns in other countries and with regard to other sequence-building dimensions, for example, hierarchical level or functional experience. The cross-sectional nature of the sample also did not allow us to identify changes in career patterns over time, which might shed light on contemporary career theories that predict an ongoing shift towards boundaryless (e.g., Arthur & Rousseau, 1996) or protean careers (e.g., Hall & Moss, 1998). Although we identified an “international boundaryless career” pattern in our study, we cannot confirm if this pattern’s prevalence changed over time. Lastly, to present an easy and comprehensible analysis, we theoretically defined very simply the cost settings in the OMA that we applied to identify career patterns. These cost settings are seen as a critical step in OMA and other theoretically or empirically derived cost schemes are possible (Abbott & Tsay, 2000; Hollister, 2009). However, further analyzes in which we varied the cost schemes revealed that the solution presented in this article is relatively stable across various settings (details are available on request). It will be of interest to empirically investigate the differentiation of responsibilities for international career management and specific HR practices for different groups of expatriates, as so far only few
studies deal with this aspect (e.g., van Roessel, 1992; Deloitte, 2008) as well as their impact on the career success of different types of managers.
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Table 1: Typology of Organizational International Career Logics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International careers as part of personnel development efforts</th>
<th>International careers as part of management and control efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3 Developmental-Junior Logic</td>
<td>Type 4 Isolation, Dead End Logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2 Senior Management, High Potential Logic Type 1</td>
<td>Watchdog, Trouble-Shooting-Logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(following Mayrhofer, 1996: 343; 2001: 135)
Table 2: Transfer archetypes of international managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Low Mobility</th>
<th>High Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abroad</td>
<td>Naturalized (25%)</td>
<td>Cosmopolitans (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Locals (38%)</td>
<td>Unsettled (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Types of expatriates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of the expatriate’s stay abroad</th>
<th>Expatriate’s position in the company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6 years</td>
<td>low Starter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ years</td>
<td>middle Climber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high Survivor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: following Fukuda and Chu, 1994: 44 f.
Table 4: Basic dimensions of typologies and characteristic variables of types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional experience</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International experience</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational tenure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of organizations</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of industries</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of international assignments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer direction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current internationalization</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned internationalization</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry globalization</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motive of assignment by employer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family status</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-initiated foreign experience</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life-balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical level</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived importance of international careers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective career success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective career success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: X = basic dimensions of the typologies; X = characteristic variables of different types; (X) = characteristic variables of different types used implicitly
Table 5: Transition Cost Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (home country, current organization)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (home country, other organization)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (foreign country, current organization)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (foreign country, other organization)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations among study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
<th>13.</th>
<th>14.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional Experience</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. International Experience</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Tenure</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>.81***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of Employees</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>56427</td>
<td>110637</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Current Internationalization</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Planned Internationalization</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Industry Globalization</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Age</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>.92***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gender (1 = male)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Self-initiated foreign XP (1 = yes)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Workload (in h/week)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Importance Int. Careers</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18* (0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Subjective Career Success</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.40*** (0.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Objective Career Success</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Career Centrality</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>-.39***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.39***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N = number of valid cases; M = mean; s.d. = standard deviation. Cronbach’s alpha on diagonal in parentheses (when applicable).
* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 (two-tailed)
Table 7: Career patterns of internationally mobile managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career pattern:</th>
<th>Early Career</th>
<th>International Organizational Career</th>
<th>International Boundaryless Career</th>
<th>Transnational Career</th>
<th>F-value/ Chi²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Career history

- **Professional experience (in years):**
  - Career pattern 1: 6.04
  - Career pattern 2: 22.88
  - Career pattern 3: 18.48
  - Career pattern 4: 36.62
  - F-value: 159.51***

- **International experience (in years):**
  - Career pattern 1: 1.87
  - Career pattern 2: 9.50
  - Career pattern 3: 6.70
  - Career pattern 4: 34.62
  - F-value: 159.36***

- **Organizational tenure (in years):**
  - Career pattern 1: 5.27
  - Career pattern 2: 22.25
  - Career pattern 3: 6.88
  - Career pattern 4: 33.31
  - F-value: 192.47***

- **Number of organizations:**
  - Career pattern 1: 1.36
  - Career pattern 2: 1.22
  - Career pattern 3: 3.48
  - Career pattern 4: 1.54
  - F-value: 62.15***

- **Number of industries:**
  - Career pattern 1: 1.27
  - Career pattern 2: 1.23
  - Career pattern 3: 1.98
  - Career pattern 4: 1.23
  - F-value: 14.02***

- **Number of international employments:**
  - Career pattern 1: 1.00
  - Career pattern 2: 2.69
  - Career pattern 3: 2.04
  - Career pattern 4: 5.92
  - F-value: 36.51***

### Organization b

- **Number of employees:**
  - Career pattern 1: 59012<sup>23</sup>
  - Career pattern 2: 121490<sup>13</sup>
  - Career pattern 3: 15856<sup>124</sup>
  - Career pattern 4: 55966<sup>3</sup>
  - F-value: 10.46***

- **Current internationalization:**
  - Career pattern 1: 0.07<sup>23</sup>
  - Career pattern 2: 1.16<sup>13</sup>
  - Career pattern 3: -0.70<sup>124</sup>
  - Career pattern 4: 1.03<sup>3</sup>
  - F-value: 10.67***

- **Planned internationalization:**
  - Career pattern 1: 11.22<sup>24</sup>
  - Career pattern 2: 12.74<sup>1</sup>
  - Career pattern 3: 11.65
  - Career pattern 4: 13.58<sup>1</sup>
  - F-value: 4.58***

- **Industry globalization:**
  - Career pattern 1: 10.06<sup>2</sup>
  - Career pattern 2: 11.68<sup>1</sup>
  - Career pattern 3: 10.41
  - Career pattern 4: 11.67
  - F-value: 3.12*

### Individual b

- **Gender:**
  - Career pattern 1: 0.18
  - Career pattern 2: 0.10
  - Career pattern 3: 0.18
  - Career pattern 4: 0.00
  - Chi²: 3.76

- **Self-initiated foreign experience:**
  - Career pattern 1: 0.21
  - Career pattern 2: 0.09
  - Career pattern 3: 0.41
  - Career pattern 4: 0.00
  - Chi²: 14.35***

- **Workload (h/week):**
  - Career pattern 1: 51.6<sup>23</sup>
  - Career pattern 2: 58.8<sup>13</sup>
  - Career pattern 3: 55.0
  - Career pattern 4: 58.5<sup>1</sup>
  - Chi²: 8.39***

- **Perceived importance of international careers:**
  - Career pattern 1: 15.01<sup>4</sup>
  - Career pattern 2: 15.52
  - Career pattern 3: 14.95
  - Career pattern 4: 17.23<sup>1</sup>
  - Chi²: 3.49*

- **Career centrality a:**
  - Career pattern 1: 0.00
  - Career pattern 2: -0.12
  - Career pattern 3: 0.14
  - Career pattern 4: -0.40
  - Chi²: 1.14

- **Subjective career success a:**
  - Career pattern 1: 0.05
  - Career pattern 2: -0.05
  - Career pattern 3: 0.01
  - Career pattern 4: 0.08
  - Chi²: 0.08

- **Objective career success a:**
  - Career pattern 1: -0.16<sup>2</sup>
  - Career pattern 2: 0.43<sup>1</sup>
  - Career pattern 3: 0.08
  - Career pattern 4: -0.18
  - Chi²: 2.67*

**Notes.** Chi²= Chi²-value; post-hoc-tests with Bonferroni Correction.

- b controlling for age
- For ANOVAs, superscripts indicate significant differences between patterns. For example, “23” in column “Early Career” (pattern 1) indicates that pattern 1 differs significantly from the patterns 2 and 3 (see text for details).
- c Due to the skewness of the distribution, ANOVA was based on logarithmized values.

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001
Table 8: Responsibilities regarding international career management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Pattern</th>
<th>Early Career</th>
<th>International organizational career</th>
<th>International boundaryless career</th>
<th>Transnational career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR planning</td>
<td>Home HR</td>
<td>Home HR</td>
<td>Expatriate</td>
<td>Host HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(outgoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing &amp;</td>
<td>Home HR / line</td>
<td>Home HR / line</td>
<td>Expatriate</td>
<td>Host HR / line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp;</td>
<td>Home HR</td>
<td>Home/host HR</td>
<td>Host HR</td>
<td>Host HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Home HR / line</td>
<td>Home/host HR / line</td>
<td>Host HR / line</td>
<td>Host HR / line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR planning</td>
<td>Home HR / line</td>
<td>Home HR / line</td>
<td>Expatriate / home HR</td>
<td>Host HR / line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(return/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsequent stay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-entry process</td>
<td>Home HR</td>
<td>Home HR</td>
<td>Expatriate</td>
<td>./.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Home country</td>
<td>Home country &amp; host countries</td>
<td>Expatriate</td>
<td>Host countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career management</td>
<td>“sun”</td>
<td>“spring”</td>
<td>“pilot”</td>
<td>“baton”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metaphor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>