Global Leader or Foreign Traitor? The “Paradoxical” Effects of International Experiences on Leadership Effectiveness vs. Leadership Selection

As globalization accelerates, international experiences are increasingly valued by individuals and organizations, partly because they assume that international experiences foster leadership. However, limited empirical research has tested this assumption. This omission is critical, particularly because several research findings appear to stand in stark contrast to the concept of “global leader”: (1) the majority of top-company CEOs had never worked abroad (Hamori & Koyuncu, 2011); (2) the more international experiences these CEOs had accumulated, the longer it had taken them to reach the top (Hamori & Koyuncu, 2011); (3) the majority of repatriates reported that international experiences had a neutral, if not negative, impact on their leadership careers (Stahl, Miller, & Tung, 2002).

To resolve this apparent puzzle and to understand the effects of international experiences on leadership, I distinguish between leadership effectiveness and leadership selection. My core theoretical proposition is that international experiences may increase an individual’s leadership effectiveness, but may decrease his/her likelihood of being selected as a leader by his/her cultural in-group members. That is, the same international experiences that make an individual a “global leader” may also render him/her a “foreign traitor”.

To examine how and when international experiences foster leadership effectiveness (ASQ, under review), I have developed a social-cognitive model of international experiences and conducted three studies: a “360” survey in the U.S. (Study 1), a dyadic field survey in an Australian company (Study 2), and a 25-year panel data of soccer managers of the English Premier League (Study 3). Three key findings emerged: (1) international experiences positively predicted leadership effectiveness; (2) this effect was mediated by communication competence; (3) this effect was moderated by team national diversity, such that managers with more international experiences are particularly effective when leading teams that are more multinational.

Methodologically, since it is difficult to randomly assign individuals to live abroad versus domestically, past studies on international experiences have mostly been correlational and thus prone to endogeneity problems. In contrast, my soccer study is novel in using an instrumental variable (GDP per capita of a manager’s birth country) to provide quasi-experimental causal evidence for the positive effect of international experiences on leadership effectiveness.

To examine the effects of international experiences on leadership selection (targeting AMJ), I have administered a social network survey to MBA students (Study 4) and conducted a 2 (short vs. long international experiences) × 2 (cultural in-group vs. out-group) between-subjects experiment (Study 5). Results suggest that if a person has lived abroad for a long period of time, cultural out-group members are more likely to select him/her as their leader because they perceive him/her as more global and thus more similar to themselves. In contrast, cultural in-group members are less likely to select him/her as their leader because they perceive him/her as less similar to themselves.

By simultaneously demonstrating an upside of international experiences for leadership effectiveness but a downside for leadership selection, my dissertation offers important theoretical contributions and practical implications for leadership, culture, diversity, teams, communication, human resources, and international management in an increasingly globalized world.
Leadership effectiveness, commonly defined as a leader’s performance in influencing and guiding others toward achievement of goals (Hogan, 1994; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002), is vital to the success of individuals, groups, and organizations (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Effective leaders “communicate a clear mission or sense of purpose” (Hogan et al., 1994: 499), motivate their followers, and ultimately improve the performance of their teams and organizations (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Harris, Wheeler, & Kacmar, 2009). In contrast, inept leaders increase turnover rate and counterproductive work behavior (for a meta-analysis, see Schyns & Schilling, 2013). As Hogan and colleagues (1990) noted in their review, the majority of organizational employees regard their leader (e.g., immediate supervisor) as the most stressful aspect of their job. Given the critical importance of leadership effectiveness, the present research explores a novel antecedent: individuals’ international experiences.

Due to the rise of globalization, individuals and organizations increasingly value and invest in international experiences. Each year, thousands of managers and employees are sent abroad by firms like Samsung, sometimes “fully paid, to do nothing but travel, relax, and learn the language and soak up the culture,” partly in the hope that they will become more effective leaders (Kim, 1996: 21). As expressions like “global leader” and books like “Get Ahead by Going Abroad” (Yeatman & Berdan, 2007) become popular, it is widely assumed that international experiences have a positive impact on individuals’ leadership effectiveness. Despite
this widely-held assumption, it remains unclear whether this is indeed the case, and if so, why international experiences may have a positive impact on individuals’ leadership effectiveness.

This omission is critical for at least two reasons. First, several research findings in the management literature appear to stand in stark contrast to the concept of “global leader”: (1) 60% of the CEOs of the 500 largest European corporations and 76% of the CEOs of the 500 largest American corporations had never worked abroad (Hamori & Koyuncu, 2011); (2) among those CEOs who had worked abroad, the more international experiences they had amassed, the longer it had taken them to reach the top (Hamori & Koyuncu, 2011); (3) the majority of repatriates report that their international experiences had a neutral or even negative impact on their leadership progression (Adler, 2001; Black, Gregersen, Mendenhall, & Stroh, 1999; Stahl, Miller, & Tung, 2002). Second, international experiences are expensive. Research has estimated that a fully loaded expatriate package costs between $300,000 to $1 million every year, “probably the single largest expenditure most companies make on any one individual except for the CEO” (Black & Gregersen, 1999: 53). Together, these findings raise the question of whether international experiences are in fact conducive to individuals’ leadership effectiveness. The current research directly addresses this question.

Most past studies related to the connection between international experiences and leadership have taken a macro-level, strategy perspective focusing on firm-level outcomes (Carpenter, Sanders, & Gregersen, 2001; Daily, Certo, & Dalton, 2000; Nielsen & Nielsen, 2013; Reuber & Fischer, 1997; Roth, 1995). For example, Reuber and Fischer (1997) found that firms with CEOs who had more international experiences were more likely to develop foreign strategic partners and undertake internationalization. In another study, Roth (1995) found that among medium-sized firms in global industries, CEO international experience was positively related to
income growth in companies with high levels of international interdependence. Importantly, past research has mostly relied on the resource-based view, which regards CEOs with international experiences as “a valuable, rare, and inimitable resource” that allows their firms to better realize “global inter- and intrafirm exchange and cooperation… and thereby improve firm performance” (Carpenter et al., 2001: 496-497). In other words, these studies have centered on how firms may benefit from CEOs’ international experiences as a strategic resource, but have not examined whether and how international experiences shape an individual’s leadership effectiveness (cf. Dragoni, Oh, VanKatwyk, & Tesluk, 2011). This is an important void in the literature particularly because, as globalization accelerates, international experiences are increasingly commonplace: The percentage of executives with international experiences has doubled between 1997 and 2005 (Hamori & Koyuncu, 2011), the number of international expatriates rose by 25% from 1998 to 2009 (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2010), and the number of international students worldwide has soared from 2 million to 4.5 million since 2000 (The Economist, 2016). These trends suggest that international experiences are increasingly less of a rare and inimitable resource. Against this backdrop, it is important to move beyond the macro-level, strategy perspective to examine whether international experiences themselves—rather than their structural byproducts (e.g., foreign strategic partners)—are conducive to the leadership effectiveness of individuals in general (e.g., non-executive employees).

To understand how and when international experiences affect individuals’ leadership effectiveness at a more micro, individual level, the present research develops a social-cognitive view of international experiences (Figure 1). To examine the “how” question, we explore whether international experiences can foster individuals’ leadership effectiveness by enhancing their communication competence. To examine the “when” question, we explore whether
individuals with international experiences are particularly effective when leading teams that are more multinational.

The current studies offer several important theoretical contributions. First, we provide one of the first empirical tests examining whether international experiences nurture individuals’ leadership effectiveness. By identifying a novel, experiential antecedent of leadership effectiveness (i.e., international experiences), we augment the literature on leadership development (Avolio, 1999; Day, 2000). Second, whereas past work has adopted a macro-level, resource-based view of international experiences as a strategic resource for the firm (Carpenter et al., 2001; Daily et al., 2000; Roth, 1995), we examine the micro-level, social-cognitive processes that underlie the link from international experiences to leadership effectiveness. In particular, by exploring the mediating role of communication competence, we integrate a communication perspective with the literature on leadership effectiveness (Flauto, 1999). Third, we distinguish between the effects of the breadth (the number of foreign countries) vs. the depth (the duration of time spent abroad) of international experiences (Cao et al., 2014; Godart et al., 2015; Lu, Quoidbach et al., 2017) on leadership effectiveness. Fourth, we examine team national diversity as an additional test of the link between international experiences and leadership effectiveness, thereby contributing to the literatures on teams and diversity (e.g., Bell et al., 2011; Stahl et al., 2010; van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004). Finally, by investigating whether individuals with broader international experiences are particularly effective when leading more (vs. less) multinational teams, we augment the literatures on international management and leader-team congruence (Cole, Carter, & Zhang, 2013; DeRue & Hollenbeck, 2007; Greer, Homan, De Hoogh, & Den Hartog, 2012; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005).
THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

Below we unpack our theoretical model step by step, beginning with the link between communication competence and leadership effectiveness.

Communication Competence  ➔  Leadership Effectiveness

The author and former presidential speechwriter James Humes once remarked: “The art of communication is the language of leadership.” Building upon this insight, we theorize that communication competence is a critical driver of leadership effectiveness. Communication competence is defined as the ability to interact appropriately and effectively with others in a specific environment (Chen & Starosta, 1996: 358; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984). Anecdotal evidence suggests that communication competence is a critical antecedent of leadership effectiveness (e.g., Flauto, 1999; Henderson, 2008), as “leadership is enacted through communication” (Barge, 1994: 21). Leaders spend a great deal of time listening and talking to their subordinates, colleagues, supervisors, clients, and other important stakeholders, articulating their visions and ideas (Monge, Bachman, Dillard, & Eisenberg, 1982), clarifying roles and expectations (Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004), motivating their teams, resolving conflicts, and providing feedback (Hogan et al., 1994). Indeed, many of the acclaimed leadership styles (e.g., charismatic leadership, transformational leadership) are based on the premise of effective communication (e.g., De Vries, Bakker-Pieper, & Oostenveld, 2010; Podsakoff et al., 1990;
Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1998), with several studies demonstrating that leaders’ communication competence positively predicts employee satisfaction, productivity, motivation, and organizational commitment (Flauto, 1999; Henderson, 2004; Mikkelsen, York, Arritola, 2015). For example, Madlock (2008) found that leader communication competence explained about 70% of the variance in employee satisfaction.

**International Experiences → Communication Competence**

Having theoretically linked communication competence to leadership effectiveness, we next propose that international experiences can enhance individuals’ communication competence. According to social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), individuals learn and develop by interacting with their social environment: “The people with whom one regularly associates, either through preference or imposition, determine the types of competencies, attitudes, and motivational orientations…” (Bandura, 1997: 92-93). Similarly, experiential learning theory (Kolb, 1984; Kolb & Kolb, 2005) posits that individuals learn from reflected experiences. When individuals are immersed in their home culture, they tend to interact and communicate with people from similar cultural backgrounds who share similar attitudes and behaviors (Leung et al., 2008; Morris, Savani, Mor, & Cho, 2014). In contrast, international experiences provide diversifying experiences, which are defined as highly unusual, actively experienced events or situations that push individuals “outside the realm of ‘normality’” (Ritter et al., 2012: 961). While abroad, individuals need to communicate with people from different cultural backgrounds and learn new sets of assumptions, beliefs, conventions, and values (Bird, Mendenhall, Stevens, Oddou, 2010; Chua, Roth, & Lemoine, 2015; Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martínez, 2000). As Ricks and colleagues (1990: 220) remarked, international experiences “instill new ways of learning and responding to stimuli because of socio-cultural differences.” A person who learns
how to communicate with culturally different others is analogous to a musician who expands their repertoire by learning new music styles (Chua & Ng, 2017; Morris et al., 2014).

We theorize that international experiences can develop individuals’ communication competence in four inter-related ways—cognitively, meta-cognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally—through the lens of cultural intelligence (Ng, Van Dyne, & Ang, 2009). Cognitively, international experiences provide cultural learning, or “the acquisition of new information and understanding about the assumptions, beliefs, customs, norms, values, or language of another culture” (Lu, Hafenbrack et al., 2017: 1093). For example, all else being equal, Spaniards who work in France have more opportunities to obtain proficiency in French than their friends who work in Spain. As a result, they can better communicate with French speakers in future situations. Importantly, recent research has discovered that much of cultural learning is implicit (Savani, Morris, Fincher, Lu, & Kaufman, 2017). Although some cultural knowledge about communication can be learned explicitly from books and social media (e.g., bowing in Japan), many communication patterns (e.g., how far to stand from another person in a conversation) are difficult to learn through explicit reasoning, because much cultural learning depends on a complex function of multiple cues (e.g., familiarity, relative age, status) that can resist explicit verbalization (Cantor, Mischel, & Schwartz, 1982). Because cultural learning is a holistic process of adaptation that involves “thinking, feeling, perceiving, and behaving” (Kolb & Kolb, 2005: 194), being physically immersed in a foreign culture and actively engaging with culturally different others are critical for developing communication competence.

Meta-cognitively, international experiences may lead individuals to “reflect on cultural assumptions in order to prepare for, adapt to, and learn from intercultural interactions” (Chua, Morris, Mor, 2012: 116; Earley & Ang, 2003; Earley, Ang, & Tan, 2006; Van Dyne, Ang, Ng, &
Koh, 2008). When a person is immersed in their home culture, much of their behavior is based on habits and routines (Triandis, 1980). In comparison, a foreign cultural environment is more likely to trigger meta-cognitive awareness and reflection (Maddux et al., 2010; Marquis & Battilana, 2009). For example, upon arriving in a foreign country where conversational space is significantly wider than in one’s home country, a manager may realize for the first time that different people prefer different levels of “personal space”. As a result, this manager may be more attentive to others’ differential needs (in general) in future interpersonal interactions (Leung et al., 2008; Leung, Lee, & Chiu, 2013; Mortensen & Neeley, 2012). Therefore, international experiences not only enable individuals to learn about cultural differences (i.e., cognitive), but also prompt them to examine the different assumptions and values that underlie these cultural differences (i.e., meta-cognitive).

Such cognitive and meta-cognitive changes may be accompanied by motivational changes in interpersonal communication (Chen, Liu, & Portnoy, 2012). Individuals with extensive international experiences may be more motivated to keep updating their cultural knowledge (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008). They may also feel more confident in interpersonal communication (Bandura, 1997), and thus actively experiment with their communication schemas (Ng et al., 2009) and derive satisfaction from doing so (Deci & Ryan, 1985). In short, international experiences can motivate individuals to “direct attention and energy towards” developing communication competence (Ng et al., 2009: 514).

Finally, international experiences may lead to behavioral changes in interpersonal communication. For example, research has found that individuals take more turns to talk in second-language meetings than in first-language meetings (Du-Babcock, 1999). When communicating with others, individuals with more international experiences may display more
respect, patience, and sensitivity to others’ feelings and needs (Ting-Toomey, 1999), engage in more perspective-taking, and react to others with greater behavioral flexibility (Hall, 1959; Leung, Lee, & Chiu, 2013; Lu, Quoidbach et al., 2017). As a result, they may be more likely to “exhibit situationally appropriate behaviors from a broad repertoire of verbal and nonverbal behaviors”, including using situationally appropriate “words, tones, gestures, and facial expressions” (Ng et al., 2009: 515; see also Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Chua, 1988).

The Breadth vs. The Depth of International Experiences

Importantly, not all dimensions of international experiences are equally conducive to communication competence and thus leadership effectiveness. Here, we distinguish between the breadth and the depth of international experiences: whereas breadth refers to the number of foreign countries, depth refers to the duration of time abroad (Cao et al., 2014; Godart et al., 2015; Lu, Quoidbach et al., 2017). Compared to someone who lived in only one foreign country for ten years, a person who lived in three different foreign countries over those same ten years is likely to have exposure to more diversifying experiences and a more diverse set of people (Cao et al., 2014; Ritter et al., 2012). As detailed earlier, these diversifying experiences can develop individuals to become more competent communicators in cognitive, meta-cognitive, motivational, and behavioral ways (Ng et al., 2009). As Suutari and Mäkelä (2007: 629) pointed out, “the most extensive learning of global competencies takes place during wider-ranging global careers, during which individuals go through a number of adjustment processes in different international positions and contexts.” Overall, then, we predict that compared to the depth of international experiences, the breadth of those experiences will be a stronger predictor of communication competence and leadership effectiveness.
Hypothesis 1. Broad (more than deep) international experiences positively predict communication competence.

Hypothesis 2. Broad (more than deep) international experiences positively predict leadership effectiveness.

Hypothesis 3. Communication competence mediates the positive effect of broad international experiences on leadership effectiveness.

Team National Diversity as a Moderator of the Effect of Broad International Experiences on Leadership Effectiveness

If broad international experiences indeed foster leadership effectiveness by increasing communication competence, it stands to reason that broad international experiences may be particularly helpful in contexts where communication competence is of central importance. One such context is multinational teams. To further test our theoretical model, we examined whether individuals with broader international experiences would be particularly effective when leading more vs. less multinational teams. Investigating the moderating role of team national diversity not only serves as an additional test of our theoretical model, but is important also because multinational teams are increasingly common due to the rise of globalization (Cheng, Chua, Morris, & Lee, 2012; Dahlin, Weingart, & Hinds, 2005; Earley & Mosakowski, 2000; Elron, 1997; Gibson & Gibbs, 2006; Gong, 2006; Kilduff, Angelmar, & Mehra, 2000; Tröster, Mehra, & van Knippenberg, 2014).

Team national diversity can impair team performance by breeding miscommunication, mistrust, and conflict (Chua, 2013; Milliken & Martins, 1996; Elron, 1997; Montalvo & Reynal-Querol, 2005; Polzer, Milton, & Swann, 2002; Von Glinow, Shapiro, & Brett, 2004). National
origin often reflects the cultural values that guide an individual’s attitudes and behaviors (Hofstede, 1980). Team members from different nations tend to have different beliefs, values, and communication styles (e.g., Adair et al., 2016; Dahlin et al., 2005; Erez & Earley, 1993; Sanchez-Burks et al., 2003; Sanchez-Burks, Bartel, & Blount, 2009; Homan et al., 2015), thus posing particular demands on a leader’s communication competence. Compared to other types of team diversity (e.g., racial diversity), team national diversity is particularly vulnerable to miscommunication due to language barriers and cultural differences. Relatedly, team national diversity produces salient ingroup-outgroup distinctions. According to social categorization theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), individuals tend to use cultural similarities and differences to categorize themselves and others into ingroup versus outgroup (van Knippenberg et al., 2004). Moreover, they strive to protect and promote the positive distinctiveness of their cultural ingroup—even at the cost of cultural outgroups (Dahlin et al., 2005; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The “similarity-attraction” paradigm suggests that individuals are apt to like and trust ingroup members more than outgroup members (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). Consequently, cultural cliques are prone to emerge, creating communication problems and jeopardizing team cohesion and performance. All of these theories and findings suggest that multinational teams will face particularly severe communication challenges.

Given the communication challenges faced by multinational teams, we hypothesize that the positive effect of broad international experiences on leadership effectiveness will be stronger for more vs. less multinational teams. That is, while individuals with broader international experiences may be more effective leaders on average (Hypothesis 2), they may be particularly effective when leading teams that are more multinational.
Earlier we have theorized how broad international experiences can foster general leadership effectiveness through cognitive, meta-cognitive, motivational, and behavioral channels (Ng et al., 2009). We now apply these same four channels to understand how broad international experiences may be particularly conducive to leading multinational teams.

Cognitively, leaders with broader international experiences tend to be more knowledgeable about the different assumptions, beliefs, customs, norms, and values of team members from different cultures (Leung et al., 2008; Lu, Quoidbach et al., 2017). As the leader of the English Premier League (EPL) team Arsenal—a team currently of 18 nationalities—the legendary manager Arsène Wenger noted: “Being on time isn’t the same for a Japanese man as it is for a Frenchman—when a Frenchman arrives five minutes late, he still thinks he is on time. In Japan, when it’s five minutes before the set time he thinks he is too late…” (Cross, 2013).

Moreover, leaders with broader international experiences can better communicate with team members from different cultures. Walter Mazzarri, a well-respected Italian manager who had led domestic soccer teams (e.g., Inter Milan) for 12 years, was hired to manage a non-Italian team (i.e., the EPL team Watford) for the first time in July 2016. However, due to his allegedly poor English and communication skills (BBC Sport, 2017), Watford was almost relegated in Season 2016-2017 and Mazzarri was discharged at the end of the season. By contrast, Arsène Wenger is able to communicate with his players in six different languages, including Japanese which he learned while working in Japan (Palmer, 2011).

Meta-cognitively, broad international experiences may shape leaders to be more mindful of the cultural differences among different team members and the aforementioned communication challenges faced by multinational teams. This point was echoed by the esteemed German soccer manager Jupp Heynckes, who managed teams abroad for eight years:
“Particularly as a manager abroad, I have learned that communication, respect and sensitivity are crucial for the success of the team. With hard training and simply good preparation you cannot establish a top team. Intercultural dialogue is just as important as soccer talent... When I talk to a player, I need to know how his childhood was, what religion he has, if he misses his home, his culture, his family. It must be communicated over and over again to sensitively and respectfully deal with it as a team and integrate him into the team.” (Mondialogo, 2005; as cited in Maderer et al., 2014)

Motivationally, leaders with broader international experiences may feel less anxious and more self-efficacious when interacting with team members from different countries (Ng et al., 2009). Intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998) suggests that the more contact a person has with cultural outgroups, the more favorable his/her attitudes will be toward them, particularly when the leader and the followers are working together toward a common goal in an environment that supports meaningful interactions (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Thus, leaders with broader international experiences may have more positive attitudes towards different cultural outgroups, which is central to leading multinational teams. Indeed, recent research has revealed that individuals with more multicultural exposure tend to exhibit less intergroup bias (Tadmor, Hong, Chao, Wiruchnipawan, & Wang, 2012) and more generalized trust (Cao et al., 2014).

Behaviorally, leaders with broader international experiences may be more adept at resolving challenges and facilitating teamwork in multinational teams. Their meta-cognitive awareness may prompt them to more mindfully communicate with individuals from different cultures (Krauss & Chiu, 1998; Leung, Lee, & Chiu, 2013). For example, they may repeat a strategy several times for the sake of non-native speakers on the team, insist that team members
take turns to talk in meetings, or adjust their communication style to different team members. Moreover, leaders with broader international experiences may be more likely to engage in cultural brokerage, both by facilitating interactions among team members and by resolving cultural issues on behalf of other members (Jang, 2017).

Overall, we propose that leaders with broader international experiences will be particularly effective when leading teams that are more multinational:

*Hypothesis 4: Team national diversity positively moderates the relationship between the breadth of international experiences and leadership effectiveness, such that the positive effect of breadth on leadership effectiveness is stronger for more vs. less multinational teams.*

**STUDY OVERVIEW AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

To test our theoretical model (Figure 1), we conducted a “360” survey among students at a U.S. MBA program (Study 1), administered a field survey in an Australian company (Study 2), and analyzed a 25-year archival panel of soccer managers of the English Premier League (EPL; Study 3). Study 1 examined the first step of our model: the link between broad international experiences and communication competence. Extending Study 1, Study 2 then tested the “how” question of our model: whether communication competence mediates the link between broad international experiences and leadership effectiveness. Finally, Study 3 tested the “when” question of our model: whether team national diversity moderates the link between broad international experiences and leadership effectiveness.
In testing our theoretical model, these studies also aimed to resolve several methodological limitations that have plagued past studies on international experiences, leadership effectiveness, and team diversity. First and foremost, since it is difficult or impossible to randomly assign individuals to live abroad versus domestically, the majority of past studies have been correlational and thus prone to reverse causality issues and omitted variable biases (cf. Godart et al., 2015). In contrast, our EPL study uses instrumental variable analysis (Greene, 2011) to offer quasi-experimental causal evidence for the effect of international experiences on leadership effectiveness. Second, whereas most past studies on leadership effectiveness and team diversity have used U.S. contexts, our studies featured Australian and explicitly multinational contexts. Third, prior studies on leadership and teams have overly relied on student samples recruited just for the purpose of research (see a review by Joshi & Lazarova, 2005: 288), raising concerns of generalizability (Simons, Shoda, & Lindsay, 2017) and demand characteristics (Orne, 1962). Fourth and relatedly, such temporary leaders and teams typically have neither a history nor a future of collaboration, which can motivate substantively different behaviors than do real-world leadership and team contexts (Maderer et al., 2014). To address these shortcomings, our studies not only investigated three real-world settings, but also examined subjects who had interacted with one another for a meaningful amount of time: In our “360” study, MBA subjects were rated by well-acquainted colleagues from former jobs. Similarly, in our Australian study, participants were colleagues who had worked together on average for over three years. In our EPL study, soccer managers and team players were typically contracted for at least one year, and often for many years.

**STUDY 1: BROAD INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCES PREDICT COLLEAGUE-RATED COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE**
Study 1 explored the first part of our theoretical model: whether broad international experiences positively predict communication competence (Hypothesis 1). As part of a mandatory course, a cohort of MBA students participated in a “360” survey, where they both rated themselves on items of communication competence and asked well-acquainted colleagues from former jobs to rate them on the same items. Importantly, this “360” design precludes self-report biases (e.g., Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), where employees with more international work experiences are simply more likely to view themselves more favorably (e.g., as more competent communicators).

**Participants**

Participants were 203 MBA students (34.5% female; \(M_{\text{age}} = 27.74\) years, \(SD_{\text{age}} = 2.40\)) from a U.S. business school. Among this culturally diverse sample, 37.9% considered the U.S. their home country.

**Independent Variables: Breadth and Depth of International Experiences**

As part of a class assignment, within the first week of their MBA program all students self-reported the number of countries they had lived in abroad (i.e., breadth; \(M = 2.28, SD = 1.54\)) and the number of months they had lived abroad (i.e., depth; \(M = 44.52, SD = 60.03\)). Not surprisingly, breadth and depth were significantly and positively correlated, \(r = .23, p < .001\).

**Dependent Variables: Self- and Colleague-Rated Communication Competence**

As part of a different class assignment at a later date (within the first month of their MBA program), all students completed a “360” survey to better understand themselves (rather than just for the purpose of research). First, each student rated himself/herself on communication competence on a ten-item scale (Ames, Maissen, Brockner, 2012; 1 = “never”, 7 = “always”; \(\alpha = .70\)). Example items included: “When making a point, I am concise, brief, and clear”, “When
someone else is speaking, I interrupt and/or show impatience” (reverse-coded), “As a listener, I get others to open up, elaborate, and share information”, “I am unable to communicate effectively in person with larger groups and audiences” (reverse-coded), “After listening, I build on what I have heard, incorporating it into the conversation”, “I do not produce well-written work and communications, including letters and email” (reverse-coded).

After self-evaluation, each student was asked to invite well-acquainted colleagues (superiors, subordinates, peers) from previous jobs to rate him/her on the same ten items of communication competence (e.g., “When making a point, X is concise, brief, and clear”; $\alpha = .85$). Importantly, the colleagues were informed that their ratings would remain confidential and only aggregated feedback would be presented to the recipient. On average, each student received ratings from 4.44 colleagues ($SD = 1.29$).

Control Variables

Since personality traits might be related to both international experiences and communication competence (Marginson & Sawir, 2011; Niehoff, Petersdotter, Freund, 2017; Richmond, McCroskey, & McCroskey, 1989), we controlled for self-rated Big Five personality traits as important control variables (Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003). Moreover, we also controlled for age, gender, and whether or not a participant considered the U.S. their home country.

Results

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations are displayed in Table 1. In support of Hypothesis 1, colleague-rated communication competence was significantly and positively correlated with the breadth of international experiences ($r = .16$, $p = .027$). In comparison, colleague-rated communication competence was not significantly correlated with the depth of
international experiences ($r = .06, p = .40$). Although positively correlated with colleague-rated communication competence ($r = .17, p = .015$), self-rated communication competence was not significantly correlated with either breadth ($r = .00, p = .99$) or depth ($r = .01, p = .91$).

---

**Regression analyses on colleague-rated communication competence.** To provide a rigorous test of the effect of the breadth of international experiences on communication competence, Table 2 presents a progression of OLS regression models with additional control variables included at each step. In support of Hypothesis 1, breadth itself positively and significantly predicted colleague-rated communication competence (Model 1: $B = .05, SE = .02, p = .027$). This effect remained significant when accounting for depth (Model 2: $B = .05, SE = .02, p = .038$), the demographic control variables (Model 3: $B = .05, SE = .02, p = .025$), Big Five personality traits (Model 4: $B = .05, SE = .02, p = .021$), and self-rated communication competence (Model 5: $B = .05, SE = .02, p = .027$). Finally, in a trimmed model that retained only the variables significantly correlated with colleague-rated communication competence, breadth remained a significant predictor (Model 6: $B = .05, SE = .02, p = .022$).

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---
Discussion

In support of Hypothesis 1, Study 1 provided evidence for the link between broad (but not deep) international experiences and communication competence in our theoretical model: individuals with broader international experiences were rated as more competent communicators by their well-acquainted colleagues. This effect remained robust after controlling for demographic characteristics, personality traits, and self-rated communication competence.

STUDY 2: COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE MEDIATES THE EFFECT OF BROAD INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCES ON LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Study 2 had three main objectives. First, we sought to replicate the link between broad international experiences and communication competence (Hypothesis 1) within an ongoing work setting and with another validated communication competence scale (Monge et al., 1982). Second, we examined the key link between broad international experiences and leadership effectiveness (Hypothesis 2). Third, we tested the mediating role of communication competence in explaining the link between broad international experiences and leadership effectiveness (Hypothesis 3).

Participants

The field survey was conducted at an Australian company that specialized in construction and engineering. Its executive team helped us distribute the survey via email to all 133 full-time employees of two divisions (Information and Communication Technology, People and Culture) located in its Melbourne headquarters. Participants were informed that all responses would remain confidential and no one from their company would be able to access individual responses. One hundred and twenty employees (49.2% female; $M_{\text{age}} = 40.07$ years, $SD_{\text{age}} = 9.12$) voluntarily
participated in the survey (response rate = 90.2%); five participants started but did not finish the survey. Among the 115 participants, 113 identified Australia as their home country.

**Survey Design**

To preclude self-report biases, the survey had a dyadic design: Each employee was randomly assigned to provide feedback for a well-acquainted colleague and to receive feedback from a different colleague (e.g., Employee A provided feedback for Employee B, Employee B provided feedback for Employee E, etc.). No participant was cognizant of their colleague rater’s identity. On average, a participant had worked with their target colleague for 37.63 months. The survey itself consisted of two parts: Each participant provided feedback for their target colleague (e.g., leadership effectiveness, communication competence) in the first part, and then provided information about themselves (e.g., international work experiences) in the second part.

**Independent Variables: Breadth and Depth of International Experiences**

Participants self-reported the number of countries they had worked in abroad (i.e., breadth; \( M = 1.16, \ SD = 1.42 \)) and the number of months they had worked abroad (i.e., depth; \( M = 54.83, \ SD = 88.28 \)). Not surprisingly, breadth and depth were significantly and positively correlated, \( r = .55, p < .001 \).

**Dependent Variable: Leadership Effectiveness**

Each participant rated the leadership effectiveness of their target colleague by completing a six-item scale adapted from Giessner and van Knippenberg (2008). This measure had been used and validated in past studies (e.g., Brands, Menges, & Kilduff, 2015; Johnson, Venus, Lanaj, Mao, & Chang, 2012; Lanaj & Hollenbeck, 2015). Example items asked whether the target colleague “is a very good leader”, “makes good decisions”, and “helps our team, project, and/or
organization to achieve success” (1 = “strongly disagree”, 7 = “strongly agree”; α = .97). The presentation order of the six items was randomized.

**Mediator: Communication Competence**

Each participant also rated the communication competence of their target colleague by completing the eight-item Communicator Competence Scale (Monge et al., 1982; also see Henderson, 2008; Madlock, 2008). Example items asked whether the target colleague “is a good listener”, “expresses his/her ideas clearly”, “is easy to talk to”, and “writes in a way that is easy to understand.” (1 = “strongly disagree”, 7 = “strongly agree”; α = .88). The presentation order of the eight items was randomized.

Importantly, the measures of leadership effectiveness and communication competence were counterbalanced across participants.

**Control Variables**

The company provided detailed employee data, which served as important control variables: age, gender, division (1 = People and Culture, 0 = Information and Communication Technology), and income brackets (in Australian dollars: 1 = “$50k ~$100k”, 2 = “$100k ~$150k”, 3 = “$150k ~$200k”, 4 = “$200k ~$250k”, 5 = “$250k+”). Moreover, participants rated themselves on Big Five personality traits (Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003). Furthermore, since a rater’s characteristics might affect his/her ratings of the target, we also explored rater Big Five personality traits as potential control variables.

**Results**

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations are displayed in Table 3. As predicted, the breadth of international work experiences was significantly and positively correlated with both leadership effectiveness ($r = .28, p = .004$) and communication competence ($r = .24, p = .017$). In
comparison, the depth of international work experiences was not significantly correlated with leadership effectiveness \( (r = .08, p = .44) \) and communication competence \( (r = .09, p = .37) \).

Consistent with prior research (Judge et al., 2002), an employee’s extraversion was positively correlated with leadership effectiveness \( (r = .28, p = .005) \). Moreover, the rater’s agreeableness was also positively correlated with leadership effectiveness \( (r = .36, p < .001) \) and communication competence \( (r = .32, p = .001) \), suggesting that more agreeable raters tended to rate their target colleagues more favorably.

---

**Regression analyses on leadership effectiveness.** To provide a rigorous test of the effect of the breadth of international work experiences on leadership effectiveness, Table 4 presents a progression of OLS regression models with additional control variables included at each step. In support of Hypothesis 2, the breadth of international work experiences itself positively and significantly predicted leadership effectiveness (Model 1: \( B = .28, SE = .09, p = .004 \)). This effect remained significant when accounting for depth (Model 2: \( B = .34, SE = .11, p = .003 \)), Big Five personality traits (Model 3: \( B = .34, SE = .11, p = .002 \)), the demographic and occupational control variables (Model 4: \( B = .35, SE = .11, p = .002 \)), and the rater’s agreeableness (Model 5: \( B = .31, SE = .11, p = .005 \)). Finally, in a trimmed model that retained only the variables significantly correlated with leadership effectiveness, breadth remained a significant predictor (Model 6: \( B = .27, SE = .09, p = .003 \)).
Regression analyses on communication competence. To provide a rigorous test of the effect of the breadth of international work experiences on communication competence, Table 5 presents a progression of OLS regression models with additional control variables included at each step. In support of Hypothesis 1, breadth itself positively and significantly predicted communication competence (Model 1: $B = .23$, $SE = .10$, $p = .017$). This effect remained significant when accounting for depth (Model 2: $B = .26$, $SE = .12$, $p = .024$), Big Five personality traits (Model 3: $B = .26$, $SE = .12$, $p = .025$), the demographic and occupational control variables (Model 4: $B = .25$, $SE = .12$, $p = .036$), and the rater’s agreeableness (Model 5: $B = .23$, $SE = .12$, $p = .052$). Finally, in a trimmed model that retained only the variables significantly correlated with communication competence, breadth remained a significant predictor (Model 6: $B = .22$, $SE = .09$, $p = .020$).

Mediation analyses. To test whether the effect of broad international experiences on leadership effectiveness was driven by communication competence, we conducted mediation
analyses. In support of Hypothesis 3, a bootstrapping analysis with 5,000 iterations (Preacher & Hayes, 2008) revealed that communication competence significantly mediated the effect of breadth on leadership effectiveness, as the 95% bias-corrected confidence interval for the indirect effect did not include zero, CI$_{95}$ = [.0254, .2890].

We also tested the alternative mediation model with breadth as a mediator of the link between communication competence and leadership effectiveness (i.e., “communication competence $\rightarrow$ breadth $\rightarrow$ leadership effectiveness”), but breadth did not emerge as a significant mediator, CI$_{95}$ = [-.0004, .1035]. This result lends further support to our theoretical model.

**Discussion**

Replicating Study 1’s finding with a different measure of communication competence within an ongoing work setting, Study 2 found that employees with broader (but not deeper) international experiences were rated as more competent communicators by their colleagues (Hypothesis 1). More importantly, Study 2 revealed that individuals with broader international experiences were rated as more effective leaders (Hypothesis 2). Finally, communication competence mediated the positive effect of broad international experiences on leadership effectiveness: Employees with broader international experiences had better communication skills, which in turn rendered them more effective leaders in the eyes of their colleagues (Hypothesis 3).

**STUDY 3: TEAM NATIONAL DIVERSITY MODERATES THE EFFECT OF BROAD INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCES ON LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS**

The goal of Study 3 was five-fold. First, although the “other-rating” designs of Studies 1 and 2 precluded self-report biases, they might have suffered from biases due to raters’ subjectivity. As Judge and colleagues (2002: 767) critiqued: “Such ratings, although they represent the predominant method of assessing leadership effectiveness, can be criticized as
potentially contaminated. Because such ratings represent individuals’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness rather than objectively measured performance outcomes (e.g., team performance), they may be influenced by raters’ implicit leadership theories.” Indeed, Study 2’s results indicated that more agreeable colleagues tended to rate their targets’ leadership effectiveness more favorably. To overcome this shortcoming, Study 3 used team performance as an objective measure of leadership effectiveness. Second and relatedly, Study 3 aimed to replicate the effect of international experiences on leadership effectiveness within a high-stake team context.

Third, Study 3 aimed to provide better evidence for the causal effect of international experiences on leadership effectiveness via instrumental variable analysis (Greene, 2011). Past research on international experiences has mostly been of a correlational nature because, understandably, it is difficult or impossible to randomly assign individuals to live abroad versus domestically. The correct use of instrumental variable analysis transforms a correlational study into a “quasi-experimental research design” (Angrist, Imbens, & Rubin, 1996; Angrist & Krueger, 2001), which allows us to make stronger causal inferences than in Study 2.

Finally, Study 3 explored the question of when international experiences will be particularly beneficial for leadership effectiveness. To answer this “when” question, we examined whether leaders with more international experiences would be particularly effective in leading more vs. less multinational teams.

The English Premier League as a Study Context

Established in 1992, the English Premier League (EPL) consists of about 20 world-class male soccer teams. In every season, which lasts from August to May, the teams compete for the EPL championship and avoid being one of the three bottom teams relegated to a lower league.
We chose a soccer league as the context to study the effect of international work experiences on leadership effectiveness for several reasons. First, in assessing the effectiveness of leading multinational teams, past research has mostly relied on subjective measures such as self-report and other-report, which are prone to psychological biases (Judge et al., 2002). Here, the EPL provides an objective measure of leadership effectiveness: team performance. Second, many of the multicultural teams in past studies were artificially formed just for the purpose of research, which might have predisposed them to demand characteristics (Orne, 1962). Moreover, such temporary teams may lack external validity because they tend to have inconsequential goals, and have neither a history nor a future of collaboration (Maderer et al., 2014). By contrast, EPL teams are “real” teams: EPL players are contracted typically for at least a year and often for five or more years, and many managers are committed to leading their teams for many years.

Like the leaders of many other businesses, EPL managers play an indispensable role in their teams’ success or failure. Importantly, EPL managers are called “managers” rather than “coaches” because in addition to coaching responsibilities, they have a multitude of managerial responsibilities, including buying and selling players, dealing with the media, and maintaining financial profits (Kelly, 2017). Indeed, many managers are often the “face” of their team and franchise.

We specifically chose the EPL rather than another sports league for a number of reasons. First, the EPL is one of the most multinational sports leagues in the world (Poli, Ravenel, & Besson, 2016); in Season 2015-2016, foreign players accounted for over 65% of all players. Second, the variance in national diversity among its teams is high; in Season 2015-2016, 92% of the players at Watford were foreigners, versus only 43% at Bournemouth. Third, there is a high level of variance in the international work experiences of the managers, ranging from 0 month to
243 months in Season 2015-2016. Fourth, because the EPL is one of the most popular leagues across the globe, detailed and reliable data are readily available for the variables of interest.

**Data Collection**

We collected panel data of all 25 seasons since the EPL’s establishment in 1992. This dataset contained 142 unique soccer managers for a total of 47 unique teams. Manager demographics, team composition, and team performance data were sourced from and cross-validated on authoritative websites such as www.worldfootball.net, www.leaguemanagers.com, and www.statbunker.com (See Appendices A and B for data scraping scripts). Additionally, we obtained team wage data as an important control variable from the British accounting firm Deloitte.

**Independent Variables**

*Breadth and depth of international experiences.* Consistent with the literature (Cao et al., 2014; Godart et al., 2015; Lu, Quoidbach et al., 2017) and Studies 1 and 2, we operationalized foreign breadth as the number of foreign countries in which a manager had worked before the start of a given season ($M = .58$, $SD = 1.14$), and foreign depth as the number of months a manager had worked abroad before the start of a given season (converted into “years”, $M = 1.83$ years, $SD = 4.40$).\(^1\) As a comparison, we also measured domestic depth, or the number of months a manager had worked in their birth country before the start of a given season (converted into “years”, $M = 9.51$ years, $SD = 7.15$). We used July as the “start” of a given season because most manager contracts start in July.

---

\(^1\) By “foreign country”, we mean a country that is different from a given manager’s birth country. We chose birth country (instead of nationality) because our instrumental variable of choice involves the GDP per capita of the birth country. Importantly, using nationality (instead of birth country) yielded substantively similar results.
**Team national diversity.** To capture the *national diversity* of a team, we computed Blau’s (1977) heterogeneity index: \((1 - \sum P_i^2)\), where \(P_i\) is the proportion of players from the \(i\)th country. A higher score on Blau’s index indicates greater national diversity \((M = .73, SD = .15)\).

**Dependent Variable**

*Leadership effectiveness (as measured by team performance).* In the EPL, a win = 3 points, a draw = 1 point, and a loss = 0 point. To assess objective leadership effectiveness, we tallied each team’s total points in each season. However, because the number of matches each team played changed from 42 to 38 after Season 1994-1995, the maximum points possible changed from 126 to 114 accordingly (i.e., if the team won every single match). To account for this difference, we divided a team’s total points by the maximum points possible in a given season.\(^2\) For example, in Season 2016-2017 during which each team played 38 matches, the champion Chelsea won 30 times, drew 3 times, and lost 5 times, so their performance score was \((30 \times 3 + 3 \times 1 + 5 \times 0)/38 \times 3 \approx 0.82\).

**Control Variables**

All managers in the EPL are male. Since elder managers might be more skilled and also have more coaching experiences abroad, we controlled for their age in a given season \((M = 49.89, SD = 7.77)\). Similarly, we controlled for a manager’s tenure at his team before the start of a given season (Takeuchi et al., 2005). In addition, we controlled for whether a manager was born in the U.K.\(^3\) Since wealthier teams have more financial resources to recruit better managers and players,

---

\(^2\) All results remained substantively unchanged when we operationalized team performance as (1) the percentage of games won or (2) rank. However, these measures are less precise. All results also remained substantively unchanged when we only limited our sample to the 22 seasons after 1994-1995.

\(^3\) In our analysis, we treated the four regions of the U.K. — England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales — as the same country for two reasons. First, the four regions have similar soccer cultures and feature teams from each other (e.g., Swansea City is Welsh but plays in the EPL). Second, our instrumental variable involves the GDP per capita of the birth country, but reliable data are available only for the U.K. rather than for *each* of its four regions.
we also controlled for team-level inflation-adjusted annualized wage costs of managers and players (in £10 million).

Importantly, in all regression models we also included both (a) team fixed effects to control for any unobserved heterogeneity due to team-specific characteristics and (b) year fixed effects to control for any unobserved time-varying effects (e.g., trend, macroeconomic conditions).

**Data Analysis**

The data analysis section consists of two parts. First, we present a progression of fixed-effects OLS panel regression models. Thereafter, we present instrumental variable analysis that provides quasi-experimental causal evidence for the effect of international work experiences on leadership effectiveness.

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations are displayed in Table 6.

---

Fixed-effects OLS panel regression analyses. The unit of analysis is the team-year in our fixed-effects OLS panel regressions. To reduce multicollinearity, we mean-centered the key variables (i.e., foreign breadth, foreign depth, domestic depth, team national diversity). None of our models suffered from problems of multicollinearity, as all maximum variance inflation factor (VIF) values were below 10 (Belsley, Kuh, & Welsch, 2004; Kennedy, 2008).
Model 1 is the baseline model with team fixed effects, year fixed effects, and annualized wages. Not surprisingly, annualized wages positively predicted team performance (Table 7 Model 1: $B = .01, SE = .002, p < .001$).

In Model 2, we entered team national diversity, which did not significantly predict team performance in fixed-effects panel regressions (Table 7 Model 2: $B = .02, SE = .06, p = .76$). Moreover, there was no quadratic relationship between team national diversity and team performance ($B = .15, SE = .20, p = .44$). In Model 3, we entered the manager-level control variables.

In Models 4a-4c, we entered our key predictor variables: foreign breadth (Model 4a), foreign depth (Model 4b), and domestic depth (Model 4c). Supporting Hypothesis 2 and replicating Study 2’s finding, foreign breadth positively predicted team performance (Model 4a: $B = .01, SE = .005, p = .009$). In contrast, neither foreign depth (Model 4b: $B = .001, SE = .001, p = .57$) nor domestic depth (Model 4c: $B = .002, SE = .001, p = .13$) was significantly predictive of team performance. Importantly, the positive effect of foreign breadth on team performance remained significant when accounting for all the control variables as well as foreign depth and domestic depth (Model 5: $B = .03, SE = .01, p < .001$). Foreign breadth, foreign depth, and domestic depth had no significant quadratic effect on team performance (all $ps > .20$).

Finally, Model 5 tested team national diversity as a moderator of the effect of broad international work experiences on leadership effectiveness (as measured by team performance).
In support of Hypothesis 4, team national diversity positively moderated the effect of foreign breadth on team performance, such that managers with broader international work experiences were particularly effective when leading teams that were more multinational (Model 6: $B = .17$, $SE = .06$, $p = .007$). To help interpret this significant interaction effect, we performed simple slope analysis (Aiken & West, 1991) and examined the effect of foreign breadth on team performance at three values of team national diversity (1 SD above mean value, mean value, and 1 SD below mean value) when controlling for the other variables: For teams high on national diversity (1 SD above mean value), foreign breadth positively and significantly predicted team performance ($\beta = 4.32$, $p < .001$); for teams moderate on national diversity (at mean value), foreign breadth positively and significantly predicted team performance ($\beta = 1.93$, $p = .05$); for teams low on national diversity (1 SD below mean value), foreign breadth did not significantly predict team performance ($\beta = .22$, $p = .82$). For a graphical illustration, see Figure 2.

Robustness checks. As a robustness check, we repeated each of the above analyses with heteroscedasticity-robust standard errors (Wooldridge, 2013), which yielded similar results (Table 8).

Moreover, to examine whether the observed effects were driven by outliers, we calculated Cook’s distance statistics for each regression model (Godart et al., 2015). All results remained substantively unchanged when we excluded outliers (e.g., the Dutch manager Guus...
Hiddink) that had a Cook’s distance statistics higher than the threshold (computed by $4/N$, where $N$ = the number of observations).

Instrumental variable analysis. Although the results of Study 2 and the above fixed-effects OLS panel regression analyses provided consistent evidence for the link between broad international work experiences and leadership effectiveness, these results are of a correlational nature and thus prone to endogeneity problems of reverse causality and omitted variables (Hamilton & Nickerson, 2003). In terms of reverse causality, one alternative explanation is that individuals who were more effective leaders to start with were more inclined to work abroad (rather than the other way around). In terms of omitted variables, there might be unobserved variables (e.g., extraversion) that affect both an individual’s proclivity to work abroad (Zimmermann & Neyer, 2013) and leadership effectiveness (Judge et al., 2002). Such issues can be interpreted as bias associated with the error term $u$ of the regression equation examining the effect of international work experiences on leadership effectiveness (Bascle, 2008; Godart et al., 2015).

A standard econometric strategy to resolve both reverse causality and omitted variables (and incidentally, measurement errors) is to conduct instrumental variable analysis (Shaver, 1998). A suitable instrumental variable $Z$ is a variable that can have an effect on the dependent variable $Y$ (i.e., team performance) only through $Z$’s effect on the endogenous variable $X$ (i.e.,
international work experiences). In other words, \( Z \) must strongly predict the endogenous variable (international work experiences), but cannot correlate with the error term \( u \) (Bascle, 2008; Godart et al., 2015). In Stage 1 of a two-stage instrumental variable regression, a *predicted probability* of the endogenous event (i.e., working abroad as a soccer manager) is first computed as a function of the instrumental variable plus other theoretically-relevant control variables. In Stage 2, this predicted probability is added as a control variable with the ultimate dependent variable of interest (i.e., team performance) without the instrumental variable. Greene (2011: 259–296) shows that “the inclusion of this predicted probability in Stage 2 absorbs the biases associated with reverse causality and omitted variables, effectively yielding conditions that are as good as ‘random assignment’ for examining the relationships between all independent variables and the dependent variable in Stage 2 of the regression” (Godart et al., 2015: 205; also see Wooldridge, 2002). As a result, instrumental variable regressions are commonly described as “quasi-experimental research designs” (Angrist & Krueger, 2001) that enable causal inferences from archival data (Bollen, 2012; Godart et al., 2015).

**GDP24 as an instrument.** In line with prior management studies (e.g., Godart et al., 2015), our instrument of choice was the gross domestic product (GDP) per capita of the birth country of a soccer manager at the age of 24 (henceforth “GDP24”). Its unit was constant Year 2010 U.S. dollars in quantities of $2 million (World Bank, 2016). We chose GDP24 for three key reasons. First, we did not use GDP per capita at birth because of the shortage of reliable GDP data before Year 1950 (e.g., the Norwegian manager Egil Olsen who managed Wimbledon for Season 1999–2000 was born in 1942). Second, GDP data before Year 1950 tend to be abnormal because of the proximity to the Second World War. Third, because the youngest soccer managers start their career only in their twenties, the economic condition of that age range is likely to have
a greater influence on their choice of working abroad versus domestically than the economic condition of their birth age (e.g., Roy Hodgson, the former national coach of England, started working as a soccer manager at the age of 24).⁴

GDP24 was a suitable instrument for both theoretical and empirical reasons. Theoretically, since individuals cannot choose their birth country, they are “randomly assigned” to different levels of GDP24. Therefore, the random variations in GDP24 can be considered to have an *exogenous* influence on the extent to which individuals will pursue broad international work experiences. Moreover, it is unlikely for GDP24 of a manager’s birth country to *directly* affect a soccer team’s performance. Similarly, it is implausible for a soccer team’s performance to affect its manager’s birth country GDP24. Hence, if GDP24 had an effect on team performance, it is plausible that the effect was through the manager’s broad international work experience; in other words, an individual might become a more effective manager *partly* because the (random) economic condition of his birth country led him to seek broad international work experiences. Importantly, we by no means suggest that GDP24 is the *only* determinant of international work experiences; instead, our instrumental variable analysis shows that the *part* of international work experiences that had been exogenously caused by the random factor GDP24 had a positive effect on leadership effectiveness.

Empirically, GDP24 satisfied the statistical criteria of a suitable instrumental variable. First, it was significantly predictive of the breadth of a soccer manager’s international work experiences ($\beta = -2.49, p = .01$).⁵ That is, managers from a country that was less wealthy when they were 24 tended to have broader international work experiences. This result was consistent

---

⁴ Importantly, all results remain substantively unchanged when instrumenting the GDP per capita of the birth country at the age of 18.

⁵ This effect of GDP24 on breadth remained significant even when excluding the UK ($\beta = -2.43, p = .01$), suggesting that this effect was not merely driven by UK-born managers.
with past studies documenting that individuals from poorer countries are more likely to seek educational and work opportunities abroad (Agrawal, Kapur, McHale, & Oettl, 2011; The Economist, 2016). For example, upon completing a financially attractive two-year contract abroad, a soccer manager from a poorer country might be more likely to seek a similarly lucrative managing position in another foreign country than to return to his home country (because of its less desirable economic conditions). Second, GDP24 was verified as a strong instrument by the weak instrument test (Staiger & Stock, 1997) of our instrumental variable regressions, as the \( F \) statistics were above the suggested threshold value of 10 (Murray, 2006). Third, the Wu-Hausman test for endogeneity showed that the coefficients of the OLS models significantly differed from those of the instrumental variable models (all \( ps < .05 \)), suggesting that OLS estimates could be biased due to endogeneity issues and thus the instrumental variable models would indeed be preferred (Antonakis, Bendahan, Jacquart, & Lalive, 2014; Tarakci, Greer, & Groenen, 2016).

**Results of instrumental variable analysis.** We conducted fixed-effects instrumental variable analysis using the `ivregress` command in Stata. Consistent with the results of the fixed-effects OLS panel regressions, instrumental variable regressions revealed that foreign breadth had a positive effect on team performance—whether when just controlling for team and year fixed effects \( (B = .05, SE = .01, p < .001; \) weak instrument test \( F[1, 425] = 53.99, p < .001; \) Wu-Hausman test \( F[1, 424] = 6.54, p = .011 \) ) or when further controlling for the other variables \( (B = .09, SE = .03, p = .008; \) weak instrument test \( F[1, 380] = 12.13, p < .001; \) Wu-Hausman test \( F[1, 379] = 7.43, p = .007 \) ). In other words, the part of foreign breadth that was caused by experiencing a “random” level of GDP24 had a positive effect on a manager’s leadership effectiveness (as measured by team performance).
Discussion

Using team performance as an objective measure of leadership effectiveness, Study 3 replicated the positive effect of broad international experiences on leadership effectiveness (Hypothesis 2). Moreover, instrumental variable analysis provided quasi-experimental causal evidence for this effect. Furthermore, Study 3 revealed that individuals with broader international work experiences were particularly effective when leading teams that were more multinational (Hypothesis 4). This finding also provides indirect support for the role of communication competence, which is particularly critical in multinational teams.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Across three studies using both subjective and objective measures of leadership effectiveness, the present research examined how and when international experiences increase leadership effectiveness. Using “360” survey data, Study 1 found that individuals with broader international experiences were rated as more competent communicators by their colleagues. Using a field survey, Study 2 revealed that individuals with broader international experiences were rated as more effective leaders because of their greater communication competence. Using archival data and instrumental variable analysis, Study 3 provided quasi-experimental causal evidence that soccer managers with broader international experiences were more effective leaders (as measured by objective team performance). Moreover, Study 3 found that leaders with broader international experiences were particularly effective when leading teams that were more multinational. Overall, this research uncovered a reliable main effect of broad international experiences on leadership effectiveness, a mediating mechanism (communication competence), and a moderating factor (team national diversity).

---

6 We are careful to draw causal inference only for the main effect of breadth. That is, we do not draw causal inference for the moderating effect of team national diversity, because doing so would require the identification of another valid instrumental variable (in addition to GDP24).
Theoretical Contributions

The current work makes a number of important theoretical contributions. First and foremost, we tested the widely-held yet under-examined assumption that international experiences foster individuals’ leadership effectiveness. Whereas past research has mostly adopted a resource-based view of international experiences as a strategic resource for the firm (Carpenter et al., 2001; Daily et al., 2000; Nielsen & Nielsen, 2013; Roth, 1995), the present research advances a social-cognitive view for how and when international experiences can shape the psychological processes of the individuals in ways that enhance their leadership effectiveness. Whereas past studies on leaders’ international experiences were at the macro level and thus agnostic about individual-level mechanisms, we identified communication competence as a key social-cognitive mechanism for the link between international experiences and leadership effectiveness. Importantly, although broad international experiences likely foster culture-specific communication competence (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Leung, Lee, & Chiu, 2013; Ng et al., 2009), we demonstrate that they can promote domain-general communication competence. As a result, we more closely integrate a communication perspective with the literature on leadership effectiveness (Flauto, 1999; Henderson, 2008).

Second, by identifying a novel, experiential antecedent of communication competence and ultimately leadership effectiveness (Dragoni et al., 2014), we add insights to the literature on leadership development. Given the vital importance of leadership for organizations (Yukl, 1989), researchers have long sought ways to develop effective leaders (Avolio, 1999; Day, 2000; Dragoni et al., 2014). The present research points to international experiences as an alternative to artificially designed leadership training programs, which often yield limited or dissatisfactory outcomes (Eden et al., 2000; Seibert, Sargent, Kraimer, & Kiazad, 2017). By theorizing how
international experiences can produce cognitive, meta-cognitive, motivational, and behavioral changes in individuals (Ng et al., 2009), we lend support to the idea that leadership effectiveness can be cultivated through challenging and developmental experiences (Avolio, 2007; Bandura, 1977; DeRue & Wellman, 2009; Hackman & Wageman, 2007).

Third, we extend the literature on the consequences of international experiences (Cao et al., 2014; Godart et al., 2015; Leung et al., 2008; Lu, Quoidbach et al., 2017; Tadmor et al., 2012). Whereas past studies have mostly focused on personal outcomes such as individuals’ creative performance (Maddux et al., 2010), moral behavior (Lu, Quoidbach et al., 2017), and self-concept clarity (Adam et al., 2017), the current research illuminated the effect of international experiences on an interpersonal outcome (i.e., leadership effectiveness). Moreover, we advance the knowledge on the differential effects of the breadth versus the depth of international experiences (Cao et al., 2014; Godart et al., 2015; Lu, Quoidbach et al., 2017) by demonstrating that breadth but not depth positively predicted communication competence and leadership effectiveness. This finding provides evidence for our theoretical perspective that broad international experiences shape individuals by exposing them to diversifying experiences and diverse people (Ritter et al., 2012), thereby supporting social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) and experiential learning theory (Kolb, 1984).

Fourth, we contribute to the literatures on teams and diversity by advancing knowledge on team national diversity—a type of team diversity that is increasingly prevalent worldwide. In the context of our EPL study, team national diversity did not have a significant main effect on team performance. One possible explanation for this result is that, similar to team racial diversity, team national diversity functioned like a double-edged sword such that its benefits and costs offset each other (Galinsky et al., 2015; Stahl et al., 2010). Because multinational teams are
prone to communication challenges, we predicted that the more multinational a team was, the more a leader would need to be an effective communicator. Thus, we also tested the moderating effect of team national diversity, and revealed that international leaders are particularly effective when leading multinational teams. This finding not only augments the literatures on diversity, teams, and international management, but also underscores the importance of considering leader-team cultural congruence as a form of person-environment fit (Cole, Carter, & Zhang, 2013; DeRue & Hollenbeck, 2007; Greer, Homan, De Hoogh, & Den Hartog, 2012; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005).

Overall, the present research integrates and advances the literatures on culture, diversity, leadership, communication, teams, and globalization.

**Methodological Contributions**

The current work also offers several methodological contributions. First, prior studies on leadership and teams tend to overly rely on convenient samples (e.g., college students), who have neither a history nor a future of collaboration (Maderer et al., 2014), raising concerns of generalizability (Simons et al., 2017). In contrast, the subjects in our studies had worked with one another for a considerable amount of time. Second, whereas past studies often used subjective ratings as measures of leadership effectiveness which were susceptible to biases (Judge et al., 2002), our EPL study used team performance as an *objective* measure of leadership effectiveness.

Third, since it is difficult or impossible to randomly assign subjects to live abroad versus domestically, most past studies have been correlational and thus vulnerable to reverse causality and omitted variable biases (cf. Godart et al., 2015). To overcome this issue, the EPL study leveraged the “random assignment” of soccer managers to different birth countries and used birth
country GDP per capita as an instrumental variable to offer quasi-experimental causal evidence for the effect of international experiences on leadership effectiveness. This analytical approach offers methodological insight for future studies on culture and expatriation.

**Practical Implications**

Due to the unprecedented rise of globalization, individuals and organizations increasingly value and invest in international experiences. However, international experiences are not cheap (Black & Gregersen, 1999). Against this backdrop, the present research lends support to organizations’ investment in employees’ international experiences—provided that employees are truly exposed to diversifying experiences abroad, and that organizations are mindful of the difficulties associated with repatriation, a topic we turn to below.

The current studies consistently found that the breadth (but not the depth) of international experiences predicted communication competence and leadership effectiveness. This finding offers important insights for both organizations and individuals. When structuring international assignments, organizations should consider exposing their employees to a broad set of foreign postings (e.g., global rotation programs) compared to one lengthy foreign posting (Suutari & Mäkelä, 2007). Similarly, individuals might consider pursuing international educational programs (e.g., global MBA/EMBA) that allow them to engage with different cultures. Moreover, our research also indicates that working abroad in itself may be insufficient to nurture communication competence and leadership effectiveness. Rather, expatriates must actively experience different social environments and interact with culturally different others (Leung et al., 2008; Lu, Hafenbrack et al., 2017; Maertz, Takeuchi, & Chen, 2016; Tadmor et al., 2012). Because of shared cultural backgrounds, expatriates are apt to “stick together” with their cultural ingroups and communicate in their mother tongues (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001)—
whether at work or at leisure. Ironically, the unprecedented rise in expatriation makes it increasingly easy for expatriates to psychologically stay within their home-culture “comfort zone” despite being physically located in a foreign culture. Here, we highlight the importance of going out of this comfort zone to actively communicate with and learn from individuals from different cultures (Lu, Hafenbrack et al., 2017; Maddux et al., 2010).

Just as international experiences are increasingly prevalent across the globe, so are nationally diverse teams and organizations. We provide evidence that more multinational teams may perform better when led by leaders with broad international experiences, thus highlighting the importance of leader-team cultural congruence. As illustrated by the downfall of the Italian soccer manager Walter Mazzarri, assigning an individual who lacks international experiences to lead a multinational team may have negative ramifications—even though this individual may well be effective in leading a domestic team.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

While the current work offers significant theoretical contributions, methodological insights, and practical implications, there are a number of limitations that provide opportunities for future research. Below we explore other potential mediators and moderators of the relationship between international experiences and leadership effectiveness, and a potential downside of international experiences for leadership.

**Other potential mediators.** The present research revealed the mediating role of communication competence for the link between international experiences and leadership effectiveness. Nevertheless, other mediators may also be at play, particularly since leadership effectiveness can be considered a “meta-construct” that encompasses various personal and
Regarding interpersonal constructs, international experiences can lower individuals’ need for cognitive closure and thus reduce intergroup bias (e.g., stereotype endorsement, symbolic racism, discriminatory decision making; Tadmor et al., 2012). Likewise, by exposing a person to cultural outgroup members, international experiences have been found to elevate one’s generalized trust of other people (Cao et al., 2014), another interpersonal quality key to effective leadership (Chua, Ingram, & Morris, 2008; Jarvenpaa & Leidner, 1999). Therefore, lower
intergroup bias and higher generalized trust may also mediate the link from international experiences to leadership effectiveness. Taken together, future research is needed to test these potential mediators simultaneously.

**Other potential moderators.** While the current research identified team national diversity as a moderator of the effect of international experiences on leadership effectiveness, future research should examine other potential moderators. One such moderator may be cultural intelligence (CQ), defined as “an individual’s capability to function effectively in culturally diverse contexts” (Ng et al., 2009: 512; also see Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Earley & Ang, 2003). For example, whereas low-CQ expatriates may “stick together” with their cultural ingroup members in their mother tongues, high-CQ expatriates may go out of their “comfort zone” to actively engage in cultural learning. Consequently, high-CQ individuals (compared to low-CQ individuals) may accrue more benefits of communication competence and leadership effectiveness from their international experiences (Ng et al., 2009; Spreitzer, McCall, & Mahoney, 1997).

**Global leader or foreign traitor?** Although the current studies provide consistent evidence for the effectiveness of “global leader”, they have yet resolved the puzzling finding that international experiences appear to have a detrimental effect on leadership progression (Adler, 2001; Black, Gregersen, Mendenhall, & Stroh, 1999; Stahl, Miller, & Tung, 2002). To understand this puzzle, we make the critical distinction between leadership effectiveness and leadership selection (Judge et al., 2002). Whereas leadership effectiveness refers to a leader’s performance in influencing and guiding others toward the achievement of common goals (Hogan, 1994), leadership selection (or emergence) refers to whether a person is viewed and selected as a leader by others, who typically “have only limited information about his/her performance”
(Judge et al., 2002: 767). We speculate that although international experiences can increase an individual’s leadership effectiveness (as shown in the present research), they may also decrease his/her likelihood of being selected as a leader by his/her cultural ingroup members because they may perceive him/her as less similar to themselves (Hogg, 2001). In other words, although international experiences help an individual to become a “global leader”, they may also render him/her a “foreign traitor” in the eyes of his/her cultural ingroup (Wang, 2015). This possibility awaits future investigations.

**CONCLUSION**

As the world becomes increasingly globalized and workforces become increasingly culturally diverse, it is important for scholars and practitioners to understand how international experiences shape individuals’ leadership effectiveness. Integrating insights from the literatures on cultural psychology, leadership, diversity, teams, and communication studies, the present research revealed that as individuals gain broader international experiences, they communicate more competently and thus lead more effectively. Moreover, this advantage is particularly pronounced in more nationally diverse work teams.

In the story of the Tower of Babel, humans failed to build the tower because of language barriers and cultural differences (Genesis 11: 4-7; Gerosa, 2008). Had the Tower project been led by a global leader who could overcome the communication challenges among the team members, the tower might have been completed and named differently.
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**Table 1**
*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 1)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Foreign breadth</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.54</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. Foreign depth (years)</td>
<td>44.52</td>
<td>60.03</td>
<td>.23**</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. Colleague-rated communication competence</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-rated communication competence</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Openness to experience</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Extraversion</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Agreeableness</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Emotional stability</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Age</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gender (1 = male, 0 = female)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-24**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. U.S. home (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p < .05. **p < .01.*
Table 2  
Linear Regression Analyses Predicting Colleague-Rated Communication Competence (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign breadth</td>
<td>.05* (.02)</td>
<td>.05* (.02)</td>
<td>.05* (.02)</td>
<td>.05* (.02)</td>
<td>.05* (.02)</td>
<td>.05* (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign depth</td>
<td>.0002 (.0006)</td>
<td>.0002 (.0006)</td>
<td>.0005 (.0006)</td>
<td>.0005 (.0006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>- .02 (.01)</td>
<td>- .02 (.01)</td>
<td>- .02 (.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1 = male, 0 = female)</td>
<td>.03 (.07)</td>
<td>.05 (.07)</td>
<td>.06 (.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. home (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
<td>- .03 (.07)</td>
<td>- .07 (.07)</td>
<td>- .06 (.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06† (.03)</td>
<td>.04 (.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06† (.03)</td>
<td>.04 (.03)</td>
<td>.03 (.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>- .04† (.02)</td>
<td>- .04† (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.06* (.03)</td>
<td>.06* (.03)</td>
<td>.05 (.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>.01 (.02)</td>
<td>- .00 (.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-rated communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08 (.07)</td>
<td>.08 (.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td>4.98*</td>
<td>2.55†</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.23*</td>
<td>2.15*</td>
<td>3.77**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Unstandardized regression coefficients are displayed, with standard errors in parentheses.  
† p < .10. * p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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. Foreign breadth</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.42</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. Foreign depth (years)</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>.55**</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. Leadership effectiveness</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.08</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. Communication competence</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.62**</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. Openness to experience</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</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. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Extraversion</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Agreeableness</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Emotional stability</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Age</td>
<td>40.07</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gender (1 = male, 0 = female)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Income bracket</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Months worked together with rater</td>
<td>37.63</td>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Division (1 = PC, 0 = ICT)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Rater’s agreeableness</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01. PC = People and Culture, ICT = Information and Communication Technology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign breadth</td>
<td>.28** (.09)</td>
<td>.34** (.11)</td>
<td>.34** (.11)</td>
<td>.35** (.11)</td>
<td>.31** (.11)</td>
<td>.27** (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign depth</td>
<td>-.02 (.02)</td>
<td>-.02 (.02)</td>
<td>-.02 (.02)</td>
<td>-.02 (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.16 (.16)</td>
<td>.12 (.16)</td>
<td>.08 (.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.23** (.09)</td>
<td>.19* (.09)</td>
<td>.13 (.09)</td>
<td>.20** (.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.001 (.12)</td>
<td>-.03 (.14)</td>
<td>.11 (.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>-.07 (.15)</td>
<td>-.05 (.16)</td>
<td>-.06 (.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1 = male, 0 = female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income bracket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months worked together with the rater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division (1 = PC, 0 = ICT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater’s agreeableness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 \]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
R^2 & 0.08 & 0.09 & 0.18 & 0.22 & 0.30 & 0.24 \\
Adjust R^2 & 0.07 & 0.07 & 0.12 & 0.11 & 0.19 & 0.22 \\
Overall F & 8.86** & 4.92** & 3.02** & 2.08* & 2.81** & 10.59*** \\
\end{array}
\]

**Note.** Unstandardized regression coefficients are displayed, with standard errors in parentheses.

† \( p < .10 \). * \( p < .05 \). ** \( p < .01 \). *** \( p < .001 \). PC = People and Culture, ICT = Information and Communication Technology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign breadth</td>
<td>.23* (.10)</td>
<td>.26* (.12)</td>
<td>.26* (.12)</td>
<td>.25* (.12)</td>
<td>.23† (.12)</td>
<td>.22* (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign depth</td>
<td>-.01 (.02)</td>
<td>-.01 (.02)</td>
<td>-.01 (.02)</td>
<td>-.003 (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>-.01 (.16)</td>
<td>.04 (.17)</td>
<td>.09 (.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.26 (.17)</td>
<td>.26 (.18)</td>
<td>.25 (.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.05 (.09)</td>
<td>.003 (.10)</td>
<td>-.06 (.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.03 (.13)</td>
<td>-.05 (.15)</td>
<td>-.09 (.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>-.09 (.16)</td>
<td>-.14 (.17)</td>
<td>-.15 (.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01 (.02)</td>
<td>-.003 (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1 = male, 0 = female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32 (.33)</td>
<td>-.22 (.32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income bracket</td>
<td>-.02 (.14)</td>
<td>.03 (.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months worked together with the rater</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>-.001 (.005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division (1 = PC, 0 = ICT)</td>
<td>.25 (.31)</td>
<td>.22 (.31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater’s agreeableness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38** (.13)</td>
<td>.34** (.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 \)  
Adjusted \( R^2 \)  
Overall \( F \)  

\( R^2 \): .06 .06 .09 .11 .20 .14  
Adjusted \( R^2 \): .05 .04 .02 .01 .09 .13  
Overall \( F \): 5.92* 3.06† 1.30 .93 1.72† 8.22***

**Note.** Unstandardized regression coefficients are displayed, with standard errors in parentheses.

† \( p < .10 \). * \( p < .05 \). ** \( p < .01 \). *** \( p < .001 \). PC = People and Culture, ICT = Information and Communication Technology
Table 6  
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Team performance</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Wage (10 million £)</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team national diversity</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Manager age</td>
<td>49.89</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Born in U.K.</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
<td>-0.49**</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tenure at team (years)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Foreign breadth</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>-0.47**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Foreign depth (years)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>-0.44**</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.86**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Domestic depth (years)</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01.
Table 7
Study 3: Fixed-Effects OLS Regressions Predicting Team Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4a</th>
<th>Model 4b</th>
<th>Model 4c</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team-level variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage (10 million £)</td>
<td>.013***</td>
<td>.013***</td>
<td>.011***</td>
<td>.010***</td>
<td>.011***</td>
<td>.011***</td>
<td>.011***</td>
<td>.011***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team national diversity</td>
<td>.019 (.062)</td>
<td>- .015 (.063)</td>
<td>- .019 (.062)</td>
<td>- .017 (.063)</td>
<td>- .021 (.062)</td>
<td>- .022 (.062)</td>
<td>.033 (.065)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager age</td>
<td>- .001 (.001)</td>
<td>- .002† (.001)</td>
<td>- .001 (.001)</td>
<td>- .002 (.001)</td>
<td>- .003* (.001)</td>
<td>- .004** (.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in U.K. (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
<td>- .047***</td>
<td>- .035* (.016)</td>
<td>- .045** (.016)</td>
<td>- .051** (.016)</td>
<td>- .037* (.016)</td>
<td>- .041* (.016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure at team</td>
<td>.005** (.002)</td>
<td>.006*** (.002)</td>
<td>.005** (.002)</td>
<td>.005** (.002)</td>
<td>.006*** (.002)</td>
<td>.006*** (.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign breadth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.013** (.005)</td>
<td>.032*** (.009)</td>
<td>.018† (.011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.011 (.001)</td>
<td>-.005 (.003)</td>
<td>-.006* (.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002 (.001)</td>
<td>.002 (.001)</td>
<td>.003* (.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign breadth x Team national diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.171** (.062)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unstandardized OLS regression coefficients are displayed, with standard errors in parentheses.

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Team national diversity, foreign breadth, foreign depth, and domestic depth were mean-centered in all regression models.
Table 8
Study 3: Fixed-Effects OLS Regressions Predicting Team Performance (with Heteroscedasticity-Robust Standard Errors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4a</th>
<th>Model 4b</th>
<th>Model 4c</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wage (10 million £)</td>
<td>.013*** (.003)</td>
<td>.013*** (.003)</td>
<td>.011*** (.003)</td>
<td>.010*** (.003)</td>
<td>.011*** (.003)</td>
<td>.011*** (.003)</td>
<td>.011*** (.003)</td>
<td>.011*** (.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team national diversity</td>
<td>.019 (.067)</td>
<td>-.015 (.065)</td>
<td>-.019 (.065)</td>
<td>-.017 (.065)</td>
<td>-.021 (.067)</td>
<td>-.022 (.066)</td>
<td>-.033 (.070)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager age</td>
<td>-.001 (.001)</td>
<td>-.002† (.001)</td>
<td>-.001 (.001)</td>
<td>-.002 (.001)</td>
<td>-.003† (.002)</td>
<td>-.004* (.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in U.K. (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
<td>-.047** (.018)</td>
<td>-.035† (.019)</td>
<td>-.045* (.018)</td>
<td>-.051** (.018)</td>
<td>-.037* (.018)</td>
<td>-.041* (.017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure at team</td>
<td>.005* (.002)</td>
<td>.006** (.002)</td>
<td>.005* (.002)</td>
<td>.005* (.002)</td>
<td>.006** (.002)</td>
<td>.006** (.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign breadth</td>
<td></td>
<td>.013* (.006)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.032** (.011)</td>
<td>.018 (.011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001 (.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.005 (.003)</td>
<td>-.006† (.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002 (.001)</td>
<td>.002 (.002)</td>
<td>.003† (.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign breadth × Team national diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.171* (.076)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teams Fixed Effects: Yes
Year Fixed Effects: Yes

\( R^2 \) | .63 | .63 | .64 | .65 | .64 | .65 | .66 | .67

Adjusted \( R^2 \) | .57 | .57 | .58 | .59 | .58 | .58 | .59 | .60

Unstandardized OLS regression coefficients are displayed, with heteroscedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses.

* \( p < .10 \), ** \( p < .05 \), *** \( p < .01 \), **** \( p < .001 \).

Team national diversity, foreign breadth, foreign depth, and domestic depth were mean-centered in all regression models.
Figure 1. Theoretical Model.

- Breadth of International Experiences
- Depth of International Experiences
- Team National Diversity
- Communication Competence
- Leadership Effectiveness
Figure 2. Team national diversity positively moderated the effects of broad international work experiences on leadership effectiveness (as measured by team performance).
APPENDIX A. DATA SCRAPING SCRIPT (LINUX BASH) FOR MANAGER WORK EXPERIENCES

#!/bin/bash -x

for i in `cat CoachURLclean`; do
curl -s "http://www.worldfootball.net/player_summary/${i}/" | tr -d 'r' | tr -d 'n' | sed -e 's/<h2/>Teams managed' | sed -e 's/</</g' | grep '^<h2>Teams managed' | sed -e 's/<tr/><tr/g' | strings | sed -e 's/  / /g' | xargs echo -n | sed -e 's/<tr/><tr/g' | grep '^<tr' | grep -v 'tr class=dunkel' | sed -e 's/[^<]*<\d+[^>]*>/\1\2/g' | tee ./COACHCSV/$i.csv
done

APPENDIX B. DATA SCRAPING SCRIPT (LINUX BASH) FOR TEAM NATIONAL DIVERSITY

#!/bin/bash

for i in `cat teaminfo`; do
echo working on $i ... TEAMNAME=$(echo $i | cut -f 1 -d,)
    URL=$(echo $i | cut -f 2 -d,)
curl "https://www.statbunker.com/competitions/ClubNationalities?${URL}" | grep '^<tr' | sed -e 's/<tr/><tr/g' | sed -e 's/[^<]*<\d+[^>]*>/\1\2/g' | tee ./${TEAMNAME}.out
done