Cross-Cultural Career Paths: Analyzing Traditional and Boundaryless Orientations Among Expatriates in Saudi Arabia's Banking Sector

Saeed Turki Alshahrani[1] ⓘD

Abstract: This study aimed to investigate differences in dominant career orientations between self-initiated expatriates (SIEs) and company-assigned expatriates (AEs). Schein's career model provides a theoretical framework to investigate differences in career preferences and orientations between SIEs and AEs. This paper builds career constructs by dividing the eight career anchors into two groups (boundaryless and traditional-oriented anchors). The career anchor model is used to investigate if a comparable sample of SIEs and AEs drawn from the banking sector in Saudi Arabia exhibits traditional and/or boundaryless career orientations. A between-subjects design was used, and MANOVA was used to analyze data from 418 expatriates working within the Saudi banking sector to understand how the career orientations of SIEs and AEs differ. Compared to AEs, SIEs were found to be more oriented to traditional career anchors characterized by technical/functional competence and security/stability. This study makes an important contribution to existing knowledge on SIE orientations by identifying differences that exist between traditional and boundaryless careers. The findings reveal differences between SIEs and AEs regarding their technical/functional competence, security/stability, lifestyle, and pure challenge career anchors. Managers need to use bespoke HRM policies and procedures to cater to the career orientation of each expatriate cohort accordingly. This quantitative study reveals factors that impact organizationally and individually managed careers in different directions. Therefore, this study presents a clear distinction between the two career orientations and argues that they can be viewed through the lenses of boundaryless and/or traditional career perspectives.

Keywords: Career anchors, self-initiated expatriates, assigned expatriates, career orientations, Cross-Cultural Career Paths

Cite this article as:

Alshahrani, S. T. (2024.) Cross-Cultural Career Paths: Analyzing Traditional and Boundaryless Orientations Among Expatriates in Saudi Arabia's Banking Sector. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, *24*(3), 104-118. doi.org/10.36923/jicc.v24i3.887

Corresponding Author(s):

Saeed Turki Alshahrani
Business College, Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU), Saudi Arabia. Email: stshahrani@imamu.edu.sa

1. Introduction

Company-assigned expatriates (AEs) have historically been the focus of attention as the staffing strategy of choice for filling overseas vacancies (Richardson & Mallon, 2005; Suutari & Brewster, 2000). However, more recent research calls attention to the viability of utilizing self-initiated expatriates (SIEs) to complement AEs in filling vacant positions (Phyllis, 2013). This "potent global labour-market segment" (Froese & Peltokorpi, 2013), which can serve as a "source of global talent increasingly available in host country labour markets" (Vaiman et al., 2015), has only recently begun to be studied in the field of management.

The SIE literature has evolved over different phases, each of which reveals some of the variations and complexities surrounding SIEs, particularly in terms of their career experiences within the expatriate domain (Al Ariss & Özbilgin, 2010; Andresen et al., 2014; Doherty et al., 2011; Jokinen et al., 2008; McNulty & Brewster, 2017; Nolan & Morley, 2013; Selmer & Lauring, 2011). Moreover, existing research in the field has found the career capital of AEs and SIEs is different (Dickmann et al., 2016; Jokinen et al., 2008). There is a belief that AEs have a higher knowing-why career capital dimension due to their stronger career, but there is inadequate evidence to support this. Further, there is a need to investigate similarities in the social capital of AEs and SIEs (Brewster et al., 2019). Some authors have argued that AEs and SIEs acquire positive career capital, but there is a lack of clarity if this benefit trickles to all assignees. Some AEs have been observed to experience negative effects due to the withdrawal of home country networks, while some SIEs have been observed to experience negative effects of high uncertainty and risk when working abroad. Similarly, the career success of AEs and SIEs was unclear. Mixed evidence on objective career success was observed among AEs, but there was no evidence among SIEs, while there was mixed evidence on subjective career success among AEs and SIEs. Thus, there is a need for a systematic comparison of AEs and SIEs to understand their career capital and success (Mello et al., 2023). Differences in career anchors and orientations have been observed between AEs and SIEs. While SIEs tend to have a boundaryless and personal investment career orientation, which characterizes them as having a security career anchor, AEs have a traditional orientation that declines as they age and characterizes them as having an "internationalism" career anchor. AEs and SIEs have similarities in lifestyle anchors (Farcas & Gonçalves, 2016).

[1]Business College, Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU), Saudi Arabia. Email: stshahrani@imamu.edu.sa

Despite the advances made in this field, research on differences and similarities among AEs and SIEs suffers from some issues, particularly in terms of sample comparability concerns and nascent evidence on career perspectives and orientations (Dickmann et al., 2016). Given this situation, scholars such as McKenna & Richardson (2016) provide an "ontological and methodological alternative" to remedy SIE literature which is dominated by the functionalist paradigm. They argue that SIEs' global mobility is highly complex and multi-faceted rather than being a singular and unique construct. So far, little is known about how SIEs perceive their career orientation, which makes it difficult for multi-national enterprises (MNEs) to "understand, leverage, and manage changes in expatriates' career orientation" (McNulty & Vance, 2017, p. 217). The acknowledged complexity surrounding the dichotomization of careers into traditional versus contemporary categorizations (Kuron et al., 2016) underpins the intention behind the present study. In an effort to uncover whether career anchors can be used in order to make this distinction clearer, AEs and SIEs are used as comparative cohorts, knowing that these two groups are truly distinct (Haslberger & Vaiman, 2013).

Schein's (1990) career anchors model is especially useful in this regard as it encompasses both organizational (traditional) and contemporary career aspects. It shows stable career identity is formed from interactions among interests, capabilities, and values of an individual (Feldman & Bolino, 1996). To examine whether these cohorts follow traditional and/or boundaryless careers, Schein's career model is employed in this research to assess the career preferences and orientations of SIEs as compared to their AE counterparts.

Arthur & Rousseau (2001) note a traditional career can be distinguished from a boundaryless career as employees have the flexibility of not being tied to a single organization, profession, or job. There are four characteristics that can be used to distinguish traditional and boundaryless careers. First, in a traditional career, progression is limited to one or two organizations, while in a boundaryless career, progression is between multiple companies and there is limited loyalty to a single organization. Second, in a traditional career, there is a long-term relationship between an employer and an employee, and an organization invests in staff training, while in a boundaryless career, there is no long-term relationship and staff have responsibility for personal development. Third, in a traditional career, progression is limited to a single profession, while in a boundaryless career, fields of expertise change often. Fourth, in a traditional career, there is some sense of tenure security, while in a boundaryless career, there is no tenure security.

This study aims to make two contributions to career literature. First, it elucidates factors that impact the different directions organizationally and individually managed careers take. This study is therefore able to present a clear distinction between the two research fields and demonstrate the two career orientations can be viewed through the lenses of boundaryless and/or traditional career perspectives. Second, it adds to existing knowledge in the expatriate career literature by exploring differences and similarities among comparable samples of AEs and SIEs (professional bankers), which allow us to exclude students, tourists, business travelers, and temporary foreign workers who were being used as samples in the literature as SIEs (McKenna & Richardson, 2016) and by using the career anchors model in the less researched and culturally distant context of Saudi Arabia. It is irrefutable "little is known about SIEs who move between culturally distant regions" (Cao et al., 2012). This knowledge gap requires attention considering it has been empirically and theoretically shown there is a preference for specific locations rather than organizations among SIEs (Rodriguez & Scurry, 2014). Furthermore, "contextual factors may also heighten or depress empirical results" (Andresen et al., 2020), so consideration and examination of specific expatriate contexts would seem increasingly valuable. The Saudi Arabian context is unique within the Gulf Cooperation Countries (GCC) as its large economy and skill shortage is an attraction to expatriates from around the world (Alshahrani, 2023). Data from The Saudi General Authority indicates expatriates represented more than 38% of the total population in 2020 (GAS, 2020). However, the context of these workers is not adequately investigated (Girgis et al., 2002; Ariss, 2014).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Career Anchors Theory

In over a decade, using data obtained from a panel of 44 alumni, Schein developed eight career anchors which are: "autonomy/independence, pure challenge, service/dedication to a cause, security/stability, lifestyle, technical/functional competence, general managerial competence, and entrepreneurial creativity" (Schein, 1977, as cited in Abessolo et al., 2017).

There are four career anchors models that have been proposed in the literature. Schein's original model has been successfully used in many populations. There have been three attempts to revise Schein's original model, but no strong theoretical arguments or empirical data have been provided to lead to the conclusion that revised models are better than Schein's model (Schein 1990a; Feldman & Bolino, 1996).

The "career anchors model" is specifically suited to an evolving career concept which goes beyond organizational borders (Schein, 1996). The evolution of employment relationships, which has shifted careers from a traditional organizational boundary to a less constrained boundary, has created opportunities for alternative entrepreneurship and self-employment (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Bonache, 2007). Careers that go beyond organizational borders stimulate "imaginative development by presenting the concepts of boundaryless" (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996) and protean (Hall, 1996) careers. Arthur (1994) introduced a boundaryless career and argued individual

career progression is no longer bound to a specific organization or employer because individuals have mobility across departments, organizations, industries, and professions.

Hall (1996) introduced a protean career, which is described as "a career orientation in which the person, not the organization, is in charge, where the person's core values are driving career decisions, and where the main success criteria are subjective (psychological success)". Individuals on an organizational career path are characterized by a passive role and direction by an organization. However, individuals on a protean career path are characterized by more responsibility and control over career choices and opportunities (De Vos & Soens, 2008). Boundaryless and protean careers are primarily distinguished by individual attitudes towards employers.

2.2. Distinction of Company-Assigned and Self-Initiated Expatriates

Four conditions have been identified to describe a typical business expatriate. The first condition is employment in an organization. AEs need to be employed in multi-national organizations while SIEs need to be employed in a local or multi-national organization. This condition is essential to differentiate business expatriates from travellers, tourists, and migrants. The second condition is the intended period of stay. The usual period of stay for western AEs is between 1 and 5 years while employed SIEs can remain abroad indefinitely. The third condition is business expatriates cannot acquire host country citizenship. The fourth condition is business expatriates must meet legal requirements to stay and work in the host country (McNulty & Brewster, 2017).

Unlike AEs who are company-supported, SIEs move abroad on their initiative, attracted by opportunities, and they are unlike refugees who run away from economic or political instability or immigrants who intend to relocate permanently (Andresen et al., 2020). The reasons for this travel include a variety of individual drives beyond employment requirements, such as adventure and novelty (Cerdin & Selmer, 2014; Dickmann et al., 2008). Andresen et al. (2014) demarcation model and Cerdin & Selmer (2014) criteria provide a basis for the SIE definition used in this study. Therefore, Alshahrani (2022) defines SIEs as "A skilled and professional individual who has a job offer/work visa in hand prior to his/her expatriation and who takes the decision to go abroad through self-funding and self-control to embark on a temporary work-related assignment." Previously, corporate preference has been on the use of AEs as they are better placed to implement organizational strategy and transfer headquarter culture than SIEs. However, corporate and scholarly interest in SIEs has been growing as they are considered accessible and relatively cheaper, and there is a decreasing pool of headquarters employees willing to expatriate (Lauring & Selmer, 2018).

2.3. Career Anchors from the Perspective of Traditional and Boundaryless Careers

Rapid shifts in the way global trade is carried out, employee diversity and organization structure have altered employer-employee relationships and led to the decline of a career in a single organization. This has led to the emergence of boundaryless and protean careers. Organizations can no longer provide a career growth path that retains and motivates employees; therefore, it is important to understand the career choices of employees. Schein's career anchors model provides a theoretical framework for understanding career choices (Bravo et al., 2017).

Using Schein's theoretical framework, assigned expatriates working in a non-profit organization were found to have the most dominant factors as internationalism, dedication to a cause, and lifestyle respectively. These results have been similarly observed in for-profit organizations suggesting there are marginal differences between for-profit and not-for-profit organizations. An important difference is in not-for-profit organizations managerial competence was not a dominant factor as a dedication to a cause was the dominant factor (Wechtler et al., 2017). A comparison of career anchors of AEs and SIEs showed there are differences and similarities. While the top anchors for AEs are "lifestyle, internationalism, and pure challenge" respectively, the top anchors for SIEs are "lifestyle, pure challenge, and internationalism" respectively. Internationalism and pure challenge are anchors that are likely to be shared by AEs and SIEs, but it is unlikely the security anchor will be shared by the two groups (Cerdin & Pargneux, 2010). Protean career orientation exists among young people who lack the experience to pursue a boundaryless career. The top three career anchors in protean careers are freedom/autonomy, self-reliance, and flexibility. Traditional anchors such as security and promotion were observed among those with a protean orientation suggesting such individuals exhibit traditional and protean values (Kim et al., 2023).

The theoretical point of departure for developing the hypotheses involved, in the first instance, dividing all career anchors into two groups, namely, those that are more oriented by a traditional career, and those that are more oriented by a boundaryless career as illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1: Career anchors of traditional and boundaryless careers

Anchor	Elements related to traditional career	Elements related to boundaryless career
Technical-functional	Values work, position responsibilities, job roles, job advancement	None
Managerial competence	Manages people, manage organizations, and accomplish common goals	None

Security and stability	Seeks job security, long-term employment, organization's identity and values, told what to do	None
The Entrepreneurial Creativity	None	Creates own business and projects, invents new projects, makes new starts and initiates new organizations
The Autonomy and Independence	None	Seeks work situations that are free of organizational restrictions, works according to own timeframe, accepts contracts and part-time jobs
The Service and Dedication to a cause	None	Seeks jobs that meet his/her values rather than his/her skills, aligns work with personal values
Pure Challenge	None	Defines his/her career, personal winning is everything that matters
Lifestyle	None	Seeks work-life balance and flexibility

Source: Calculated by the author

Overall, the traditional career group possesses career anchors that are related to "technical/functional competence, managerial competence, and security and stability." In contrast, "entrepreneurial creativity, autonomy and independence, service and dedication to a cause, pure challenge, and lifestyle" are career anchors seen in the boundaryless career group.

Traditional career theories emerged from an environment where human resource managers invested in career paths to achieve employee loyalty and workforce stability. Non-traditional theories emerged in the 2000s when there was higher independence in work and movement across organizations was natural and essential (Veloso et al., 2018). Individuals following a traditional career tend to have a single or limited number of employers in their career path (Dries et al., 2008), and most studies on AEs have revealed that such cohorts have fewer previous employers than their SIE counterparts (Alshahrani & Morley, 2015; Inkson et al., 1997). AEs are better suited than SIEs when organization-specific requirements such as "control, transfer, running foreign operations and management development" are required. SIEs are better suited to technical and lower-level management positions (Tharenou, 2010). These needs require a specific technical and managerial competence level and advanced personal skills. In contrast, SIEs are a more heterogeneous cohort in terms of their career, personal, and motivational factors for traveling abroad. Doherty et al. (2011) found host location and reputation as well as relations between the home and host are the key motivations for expatriates moving abroad. SIEs see traveling abroad as an opportunity to evade negative work environments and seek change (McKenna & Richardson, 2016). Building on this, our first hypothesis is stated as:

H1: *Career anchors that are related to a traditional career will be higher among AEs than among their SIE counterparts*.

Scholars have indicated that there is an ongoing switch from a traditional career, which is characteristically linear, to a boundaryless career, which is characteristically non-linear. This has led to the pursuit of entrepreneurship and self-employment (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Baruch, 2006; Bonache et al., 2007; Dries et al., 2008; Lyons et al., 2015; Pate & Scullion, 2009). Arthur (2008) notes managers who possess entrepreneurial skills are highly sought after because of their knowledge and experience, which is valuable when venturing into a new market. Gonlepa et al. (2023) note employee creativity encompasses the ability to generate novel ideas that contribute to achieving "effectiveness, innovation, and significant breakthroughs." For such employees, entrepreneurial aspirations positively influence turnover intention (Li et al., 2022). Alshahrani & Morley (2015) found that the rates of movement across companies and industries within the host country are higher among SIEs than AEs. Moreover, "career scholars have also begun to incorporate entrepreneurship as a critical dimension of the 21st-century context of more boundaryless and protean or self-directed (rather than traditional, organizationally-managed) careers" (Chan et al., 2015).

McNulty (2013) notes orientation to a pure challenge career can explain an individual's motivation to accept an international assignment. Marshall and Bonner (2003) report lifestyle is the most important career anchor while pure challenge is second. Lifestyle is a prevalent factor in research on expatriation, as evidenced by multiple studies on work-life balance, gender, adjustment, expatriate families, "dual-career couples, and life satisfaction" (Farcas & Gonçalves, 2016; Copeland & Norell, 2002; Harvey, 1985; Lazarova et al., 2010; Shaffer & Harrison, 1998; Tung, 1987). Schein (1990) notes individuals whose career is anchored on lifestyle have a low desire for geographic mobility, but some empirical evidence implies this anchor is among the top considerations for expatriates and has a significant influence on choice of career (Cerdin & Pargneux, 2008; 2010; Marshall & Bonner, 2003; Suutari & Taka, 2004). Cerdin & Pargneux (2010) note the dominance of this anchor amongst AEs and SIEs. In light of this, the second hypothesis is stated as:

H2: *Career anchors that are related to a boundaryless career will be higher among SIEs compared to AE counterparts.*

3. Methodology

3.1. Expatriates in the Saudi Arabian Financial Sector

Current labour market estimates place the number of foreign labourers in Saudi Arabia at ten million (MOL, 2018). Significant enablers of bringing professional workers to the Saudi labour market are local and international recruiting agencies as well as business networks (Rahman, 2011). In Saudi Arabia, the financial sector has four market segments which are "banking, money exchange, insurance/reinsurance, and financial leasing companies." The largest market segment is banking, which makes up 97% of financial sector assets and contributes 85% of GDP (IMF, 2017). The International Monetary Fund (IMF) notes that in Saudi Arabia, relative to other sectors, the financial sector has fair regulation but cross-sector coordination is lacking. The Saudi Central Bank SAMA is the regulatory body for 12 Saudi and 18 foreign commercial banks, and it has the responsibility for issuing licenses and regulating the hiring of key managers of all banks.

Random sampling was used to select participants. A paper-based survey was administered to 650 participants in 2013 through the HR departments of Saudi Arabian banks that gave their consent to participate. There were no financial incentives provided to these participants. The questionnaire was written in English, as this is the standard language in the Saudi banking sector and is a prerequisite for employment, especially for expatriates (Yavas et al., 1990). There were 460 questionnaires returned, translating to a response rate of 70%. There were 42 questionnaires that were excluded as they were incomplete or because the respondent did not meet the definition of being either an SIE or an AE as outlined earlier. The final sample comprises both AEs (74) and SIEs (344) representing 27 different nationalities employed in the Saudi banking sector. A summary of the demographic characteristics of participants is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Demographic Data Summary (n=418)

	AEs (n=74)		SIEs (n=344)		Total	
	n	%	n	%	N	%
Female	4	9.8	37	90.2	41	10
Male	70	18.6	307	81.4	377	90
Marital status						
Married	47	63	277	80	324	77
Single	27	37	67	20	94	23
Accompanying family						
Yes	35	47	192	56	227	54
Spouses working						
Yes	7	9	36	10	43	10
(18-22)	0	0	1	100	1	0.2
(23-29)	13	20.6	50	79.4	63	15.1
(30-36)	27	22.3	94	77.7	121	28.9
(37-42)	17	17.9	78	82.1	95	22.7
(43-49)	11	19.3	46	80.7	57	13.6
(50-59)	6	8.5	65	91.5	71	17
(60+)	0	0	10	100	10	2.4
Less than Undergrad	6	8	22	23	28	7
Undergraduate	35	47	215	62	250	60
Masters	31	42	98	28	129	31
Doctoral	2	3	9	3	11	2
Cultural Background						
Arab	18	24	86	25	104	25
Asian	25	34	207	60	232	55
Western	31	42	51	15	82	20
Executive	30	41	43	13	73	17
Middle management	28	38	104	30	132	32
Lower management	5	7	80	23	85	20
Non-supervisory/trainee	0	0	11	3	11	3
Technical/Specialist	11	15	106	31	117	28
Position						
Management	25	34	109	32	134	32
Consultancy	7	9	12	3	19	4
Financial	14	19	110	32	124	30
Technical	14	19	77	22	91	22
Engineering	14	19	36	10	50	12

Source: Calculated by the author

As evident from Table 2 above, there is considerable variation across sample participants in terms of cultural background, level of position (main hierarchical levels represented), and occupation (covering groups like technical and engineering, which typically come out with distinct career anchors). As such, the sample reflects the large variety one generally sees within the expatriate population in Saudi Arabia.

To properly classify the respondents as either AEs or SIEs and avoid some of the confusion in the literature alluded to above, the participants were screened using this question: "How did you get your first job in Saudi Arabia?" To ensure that the participants were from meaningfully comparable cohorts, available options were:

- "I was sent by my employer overseas to work here"

- "My employer sent me, but I quit and am on my own"

- "I was seeking employment internationally of my own volition"

- Other

Career orientations were examined using Schein's (1990) scale which consists of 40 items. This scale has been used by several authors (e.g., Danziger et al., 2008; Lazarova et al., 2014; Leong et al., 2014). A five-point Likert scale, from (1) "strongly disagree" to (5) "strongly agree," was used. The individuals were asked to indicate the importance of the specified statements on their career.

Several analytical techniques were employed to test the research hypotheses. First, scores were created for the eight career anchors using the scoring methods described by Schein (1990). All eight career anchors were tested among the AEs and SIEs.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to test the significant main effects between the two groups on the eight anchors. The main objective in using MANOVA is to determine if the response variables (two career constructs; traditional versus boundaryless) are altered by the independent variables (SIEs versus AEs).

Multivariate normality was assessed using Mahalanobis distances with a critical value of 15.51 denoting outliers. The linearity of the outcome variables was assessed using scatterplots of the variables for each group. Multicollinearity was tested for using Pearson's r correlation coefficients. Equality of covariance was analyzed using Box's M test. Normality was assessed using skewness and kurtosis statistics. Equality of variance was tested using Levene's test. Significant main effects were not tested in a post hoc fashion due to only two independent groups being assessed. Marginal means and 95% confidence intervals were reported. Another separate MANOVA was conducted on the two career constructs made from the eight career anchors: traditional and boundaryless.

4. Results

Observations with Mahalanobis distances above the critical value were removed from the analysis in a listwise fashion (n = 39) to satisfy the requirement of multivariate normality. Listwise deletion was used as the number of outliers was less than 10% of the overall sample. All Pearson correlations were below 0.80 between the outcome variables. Box's M test yielded a p-value above 0.001, meaning the assumption was met. All outcomes were normally distributed, and homogeneity of variance was assumed.

There was a significant main effect for expatriation status across the eight outcome anchors, $F(8, 359) = 6.56$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.13$, power = 1.0. Individual one-way ANOVA analyses found significant differences between the groups for Technical Functional ($p = 0.001$), Security Stability ($p = 0.001$), Pure Challenge ($p < 0.001$), and Lifestyle ($p = 0.006$). The other anchors did not reach statistical significance ($p > 0.05$). Marginal means and 95% confidence intervals are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: MANOVA results for the Eight Career Anchors

Outcome	AEs	SIEs	p-value
Technical Functional	3.68 (3.55 – 3.80)	3.92 (3.86 – 3.97)	0.001
General Management	3.62 (3.50 – 3.75)	3.60 (3.55 – 3.66)	0.768
Autonomy Independence	3.39 (3.24 – 3.54)	3.46 (3.39 – 3.53)	0.404
Security Stability	3.51 (3.36 – 3.66)	3.78 (3.71 – 3.84)	0.001
Entrepreneurial Creativity	3.34 (3.18 – 3.50)	3.48 (3.41 – 3.56)	0.108
Service Dedication	3.73 (3.59 – 3.87)	3.78 (3.72 – 3.84)	0.497
Pure Challenge	3.49 (3.35 – 3.63)	3.98 (3.92 – 4.04)	< 0.001
Lifestyle	3.69 (3.55 – 3.83)	3.90 (3.84 – 3.97)	0.006

Source: Calculated by the author

The MANOVA results for the two career constructs showed a significant main effect, $F(2,415) = 8.20$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .04$, and power = 0.96. Individual ANOVAs indicated that there was a statistically significant differnce between AEs and their SIE counterparts for a traditional career, ($p = 0.001$), and a statistically significant difference between the two cohorts for a boundaryless career, ($p < 0.001$). The marginal means showed that the SIE cohort was significantly higher for both outcomes (see Table 4 below). Overall, the MANOVA results indicate support for H2; however, H1 is not supported.

Table 4: MANOVA results for the Two-Career Constructs

Outcome	AEs	SIEs	p-value
Traditional	3.51 (3.41 – 3.61)	3.71 (3.66 – 3.75)	0.001
Boundaryless	3.49 (3.39 – 3.58)	3.68 (3.64 – 3.73)	< 0.001

Source: Calculated by the author

5. Discussion

This study identified the career orientations of AEs and SIEs drawn from the Saudi banking sector in order to determine whether these two distinct cohorts of expatriates followed boundaryless and/or traditional careers. The literature served as the generative mechanism for the initial classification of the career anchors as boundaryless or traditional and the development of two hypotheses for testing.

Independent sample tests showed a non-statistically significant difference between the AE and SIE cohorts with respect to "managerial competence, autonomy/independence, entrepreneurial creativity, and service/dedication to a cause." These findings are in agreement with the outcomes of previous empirical studies, including those by Suutari & Taka (2004), Cerdin & Pargneux (2010), and Danziger & Valency (2006). However, the results revealed statistically significant differences among the two cohorts in "technical/functional competence, security/stability, lifestyle, and pure challenge career anchors." Surprisingly, the SIEs in this study have a higher likelihood of being anchored by technical/functional competence, security/stability, lifestyle, and pure challenge compared to their AE counterparts. Previous studies show that the technical anchor is not as represented among expatriates and global managers (Suutari & Taka, 2004). However, findings by Schein (1990), Igbaria et al. (1991), Yarnall (1998), Marshall & Bonner (2003), and Danziger & Valency (2006) show technical anchorage is the first or second most common career orientation across studies targeting specific professions, which prompts the question of whether international banking as the context for this study investigation represents a profession infused with different motivations and drivers.

Turning to the second hypothesis, the findings reveal unexpected results in relation to H1. H1 suggested that AEs are influenced more by traditional career anchors, which are "managerial competence, technical/functional competence, and security/stability." However, the results reveal that SIEs are more likely to be driven by traditional anchors related to "technical/functional competence and security/stability." Findings from H1 diverge from previous studies that argue for SIEs to be less focused on technical and security/stability career anchors (Cerdin & Pargneux, 2010; Inkson et al., 1997; Inkson & Myers, 2003; Jokinen et al., 2008). A possible explanation is the more complex and diverse nature of SIE careers compared to those of AEs, and perhaps the fact that the study focuses on the banking sector (which could be considered a more traditional industry than some others). For instance, studies assessing expatriates' career success reported that functional background (Suutari et al., 2018) and industry (Ramaswami et al., 2016) impact career outcomes.

Another explanation may be the development of AE careers that tend to shift from traditional, as assumed, to more of a mixture of boundaryless and/or protean careers, which allow individuals to take more responsibility for managing their career beyond an organizational perspective (Cerdin & Pargneux, 2010; Hall, 1996). Indeed, there has been something of a shift in the conceptualization of the dynamic global career recently, viewing it as something that develops and changes over time (McNulty & Vance, 2017, p. 205) with different positive and negative experiences, much like career anchors (Schein, 1996). McNulty & Vance's (2017) work moves beyond the traditional view of AEs and SIEs' linear career progression to a more dynamic view that allows them to choose their career position on the AE-SIE continuum at any given time. Nevertheless, context is another element to consider in this career continuum, particularly in the Saudi Arabian case, which is new and culturally distant, where expatriate career transitions are limited by strict workplace and employment conditions. Recent studies have called for additional research around the influence of the context within which individuals work on the psychological capital of the individual employee (Miao et al., 2021). Finally, as expected with H2, however, SIEs are more influenced by boundaryless career anchors.

The practical contribution is a call to attention to variations in the underlying career orientations of AEs and SIEs, which have implications for the engagement of these groups as part of a global talent pool. A case in point, the findings reveal that SIEs have a higher likelihood of being anchored by both boundaryless and traditional career orientations than their AE counterparts. As a result, organizations that seek to attract and retain these expatriates need to consider investing in modifiable HR tools and practices which can be used to attract this cohort by taking a sub-group perspective rather than a single cohort perspective.

6. Limitations

This study has inherent limitations. First, the use of self-reported measures may have introduced some bias in the responses. However, this limitation is expected to be mitigated by the use of Schein's scale, which has been well validated. Second, this study used a sample from the banking sector in Saudi Arabia, and these results may not be generalizable to other sectors or countries. Third, although the results suggest there are important differences between AEs and SIEs with respect to career anchors, the cause of these differences was beyond the scope of this study. Fourth, the study did not use a within-subject design that would have enabled the examination of changes in career anchors over time within the same sample.

7. Implications For Research And Practice

Future research should prioritize using diverse samples that can provide a comprehensive comparison of career anchors for AEs and SIEs across different sectors and countries. Additionally, there is a need to investigate the underlying factors that contribute to the differences in career anchors between these two groups. Employing within-subject designs could offer insights into whether career anchors of SIEs and AEs change over time, thus providing a dynamic understanding of expatriate career development. This approach can uncover the evolving nature of career orientations and inform strategies for managing expatriate careers effectively. Understanding these factors will be crucial for developing targeted HR policies and practices that cater to the distinct needs of AEs and SIEs, thereby enhancing their career satisfaction and organizational commitment.

8. Conclusion

The present study makes a contribution to the emerging SIE career orientation literature by focusing on traditional and boundaryless careers. The findings show important differences between SIEs and AEs with respect to technical/functional competence, security/stability, lifestyle, and pure challenge career anchors. Results also suggest that SIE cohorts are driven more by both traditional and boundaryless careers, relative to their AE counterparts. Findings from this study reveal the high complexity of SIEs' careers compared to AEs, and this complexity is also acknowledged in the literature on career anchors among the two cohorts (Cerdin, 2012). This is because the SIE cohort is not a clear player in the international labor market and is heterogeneous relative to AEs with respect to their work and personal motivational factors and their personal initiatives (Andresen et al., 2020). This is not to say that SIEs are not self-reliant and self-managing, as claimed in the literature, but there is a broader distribution of career anchors in this cohort – and people in international banking are not biased towards one (or a few) given anchors. The intricacies of the SIE phenomenon and their distinction from AEs are major hurdles that face organizations and HR professionals in putting in place bespoke programs, policies, and procedures that respond to the needs of various expatriates instead of using a collective management strategy.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Authors' contribution statements: Author 1 contributed to the Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, and Writing - Original Draft, Software, Validation, Data Curation, Investigation, and Project Administration.

Ethical consideration statement: This study involved human participants, ethical considerations related to participant welfare, informed consent, and privacy were not applicable. However, ethical permission was received from the Deanship of Scientific Research at Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU).

Data availability statement: Data is available at request. Please contact the corresponding author for any additional information on data access or usage.

Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author(s) and contributor(s) and do not necessarily reflect JICC's or editors' official policy or position. All liability for harm done to individuals or property as a result of any ideas, methods, instructions, or products mentioned in the content is expressly disclaimed.

References

Abessolo, M., Rossier, J., & Hirschi, A. (2017). Basic values, career orientations, and career anchors: Empirical investigation of relationships. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1556. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01556

Al Ariss, A., & Özbilgin, M. (2010). Understanding self-initiated expatriates: Career experiences of Lebanese self-initiated expatriates in France. *Thunderbird International Business Review, 52*(4), 275-285. https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.20355

Alshahrani, S. T., & Morley, M. (2015). Accounting for variations in the patterns of mobility among conventional and self-initiated expatriates. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 26*(15), 1936-1954. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1041757

Alshahrani, S. (2023). Determinants of self-initiated expatriates resilience: Conceptual framework and research propositions. In *Handbook of Research on Entrepreneurship and Organizational Resilience During Unprecedented Times* (pp. 459-478). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-4605-8.ch021

Alshahrani, S. T. (2022). The motivation for mobility: A comparison of the company-assigned and self-initiated expatriates in Saudi Arabia. *Cogent Social Sciences, 8*(1), 2027626. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2027626

Andresen, M., Bergdolt, F., Margenfeld, J., & Dickmann, M. (2014). Addressing international mobility confusion: Developing definitions and differentiations for self-initiated and assigned expatriates as well as migrants.

The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25(16), 2295-2318. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.877058

Andresen, M., Pattie, M. W., & Hippler, T. (2020). What does it mean to be a 'self-initiated' expatriate in different contexts? A conceptual analysis and suggestions for future research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 31*(1), 174-201. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1674359

Arthur, M. B. (1994). The boundaryless career: A new perspective for organizational inquiry. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(4), 295-306. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150402

Arthur, M. B. (2008). Examining contemporary careers: A call for interdisciplinary inquiry. *Human Relations, 61*(2), 163-186. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726707087783

Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (2001). *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era*. Oxford University Press.

Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (1996). *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195100143.001.0001

Baruch, Y. (2006). Career development in organizations and beyond: Balancing traditional and contemporary viewpoints. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*(2), 125-138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2006.03.002

Bonache, J., Brewster, C., & Suutari, V. (2007). Preface: Knowledge, international mobility, and careers. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 37*(3), 3-15. https://doi.org/10.2753/IMO0020-8825370300

Bravo, J., Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., Wayne, S. J., & Liden, R. C. (2017). Measuring career orientations in the era of the boundaryless career. *Journal of Career Assessment, 25*(3), 502-525. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072715616107

Brewster, C., Mäkelä, L., & Suutari, V. (2019). Careers of highly educated self-initiated expatriates: Observations from studies among Finnish business professionals. *In V. Vaiman & A. Haslberger (Eds.), Talent Management of Self-Initiated Expatriates: A Neglected Source of Global Talent* (pp. 41-60). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95056-3_2

Cai, M. (2012). Measurement approach to the comparisons of career anchor models. *Semantic Scholar*. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Measurement-Approach-to-the-Comparisons-of-Career-Cai/1fe1d157a06ab44a716efcbd8a1a3382ad9b5d0e

Cao, L., Hirschi, A., & Deller, J. (2012). Self-initiated expatriates and their career success. *Journal of Management Development, 31*(2), 159-172. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621711211199494

Cerdin, J.-L. (2012). Motivation of self-initiated expatriates. *In M. Andresen, A. Al Ariss, & M. Walther (Eds.), Self-initiated expatriation: Individual, organizational, and national perspectives* (pp. 59-74). Routledge.

Cerdin, J.-L., & Pargneux, M. L. (2008). Career anchors and motivation: A comparison between self-initiated expatriates and organization assigned expatriates. Paper presented at the *EIASM Workshop on Expatriation*, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain.

Cerdin, J.-L., & Pargneux, M. L. (2010). Career anchors: A comparison between organization-assigned and self-initiated expatriates. *Thunderbird International Business Review, 52*(4), 287-299. https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.20350

Cerdin, J.-L., & Selmer, J. (2014). Who is a self-initiated expatriate? Towards conceptual clarity of a common notion. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25*(9), 1281-1301. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.863793

Chan, K. Y., Uy, M. A., Moon-ho, R. H., Sam, Y. L., Chernyshenko, O. S., & Yu, K. Y. T. (2015). Comparing two career adaptability measures for career construction theory: Relations with boundaryless mindset and protean career attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 87*, 22-31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.11.006

Copeland, A. P., & Norell, S. K. (2002). Spousal adjustment on international assignments: The role of social support. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 26*(3), 255-272. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(02)00003-2

Danziger, N., Rachman-Moore, D., & Valency, R. (2008). The construct validity of Schein's career anchors orientation inventory. *Career Development International, 13*(1), 7-19. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810849506

Danziger, N., & Valency, R. (2006). Career anchors: Distribution and impact on job satisfaction, the Israeli case. *Career Development International, 11*(4), 293-303. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430610672513

De Vos, A., & Soens, N. (2008). Protean attitude and career success: The mediating role of self-management. *Journal of Vocational behavior*, 73(3), 449-456.

Dickmann, M., Doherty, N., Mills, T., & Brewster, C. (2008). Why do they go? Individual and corporate perspectives on the factors influencing the decision to accept an international assignment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19*(4), 731-751. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190801953749

Dickmann, M., Suutari, V., Brewster, C., Mäkelä, L., Tanskanen, J., & Tornikoski, C. (2016). The career competencies of self-initiated and assigned expatriates: Assessing the development of career capital over time. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 1-25*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1172657

Dries, N., Pepermans, R., & De Kerpel, E. (2008). Exploring four generations' beliefs about career: Is "satisfied" the new "successful"? *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*(8), 907-928. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810904394

Farcas, D., & Gonçalves, M. (2016). Do three years make a difference? An updated review and analysis of self-initiated expatriation. *SpringerPlus, 5*(1), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-2991-x

Froese, F. J., & Peltokorpi, V. (2013). Organizational expatriates and self-initiated expatriates: Differences in cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(10), 1953-1967.

GAS. (2020). Manpower population 4th Q 2020. Retrieved from https://www.stats.gov.sa/sites/default/files/LM_Q4%202020%20%28Press%20release_AR%29_1.pdf (accessed April 1, 2020).

Girgis, M., Handoussa, H., & Tzannatos, Z. (2002). National versus migrant workers in the GCC: Coping with change. In H. Handoussa & T. Zafiris (Eds.), *Employment creation and social protection in the Middle East and North Africa* (pp. 192-216). American University in Cairo Press.

Gonlepa, M. K., Dilawar, S., & Amosun, T. S. (2023). Understanding employee creativity from the perspectives of grit, work engagement, person-organization fit, and feedback. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 1012315. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1012315

Hall, D. T. (1996). Protean careers of the 21st century. *The Academy of Management Executive, 10*(4), 8-16. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1996.3145315

Harvey, M. G. (1985). The executive family: An overlooked variable in international assignments. *The International Executive, 27*(3), 15-16. https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.5060270307

Haslberger, A., & Vaiman, V. (2013). Self-initiated expatriates: A neglected source of the global talent flow. In V. Vaiman & A. Haslberger (Eds.), *Talent Management of Self-Initiated Expatriates* (pp. 1-15). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230392809_1

Hussain, T., & Deery, S. (2018). Why do self-initiated expatriates quit their jobs? The role of job embeddedness and shocks in explaining turnover intentions. *International Business Review, 27*(1), 281-288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2017.08.002

Igbaria, M., Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1991). Career orientations of MIS employees: An empirical analysis. *MIS Quarterly, 15*(2), 151-169. https://doi.org/10.2307/249376

IMF. (2017). Financial system stability assessment paper on Saudi Arabia. Retrieved from http://www.imf.org/external/ns/search.aspx?NewQuery=saudi+arabia&submit= (accessed April 1, 2018). https://doi.org/10.5089/9781484323458.002

Inkson, K., Arthur, M. B., Pringle, J., & Barry, S. (1997). Expatriate assignment versus overseas experience: Contrasting models of international human resource development. *Journal of World Business, 32*(4), 351-368. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516(97)90017-1

Inkson, K., & Myers, B. A. (2003). The big OE self-directed travel and career development. *Career Development International, 8*(4), 170-181. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430310482553

Jokinen, T., Brewster, C., & Suutari, V. (2008). Career capital during international work experiences: Contrasting self-initiated expatriate experiences and assigned expatriation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19*(6), 979-998. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190802051279

Kim, S., Hood, M., Creed, P. A., & Bath, D. (2023). The underlying career values of young adults' protean and traditional career orientations. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance, 1-23.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-023-09593-z

Kuron, L. K. J., Schweitzer, L., Lyons, S., & Ng, E. S. W. (2016). Career profiles in the "new career": Evidence of their prevalence and correlates. *Career Development International, 21*(4), 355-377. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-05-2015-0066

Lauring, J., & Selmer, J. (2018). Person-environment fit and emotional control: Assigned expatriates vs. self-initiated expatriates. *International Business Review, 27*(5), 982-992. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2018.02.010

Lazarova, M., Cerdin, J.-L., & Liao, Y. (2014). The internationalism career anchor. *International Studies of Management & Organization, 44*(2), 9-33. https://doi.org/10.2753/IMO0020-8825440201

Lazarova, M., Westman, M., & Shaffer, M. A. (2010). Elucidating the positive side of the work-family interface on international assignments: A model of expatriate work and family performance. *Academy of Management Review, 35*(1), 93-117. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2010.45577883

Leong, F. T. L., Rosenberg, S. D., & Chong, S. (2014). A psychometric evaluation of Schein's (1985) career orientations inventory. *Journal of Career Assessment, 22*(3), 524-538. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072713498685

Li, M., Li, J., & Chen, X. (2022). Employees' entrepreneurial dreams and turnover intention to start-up: The moderating role of job embeddedness. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(15), 9360. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19159360

Lyons, S. T., Schweitzer, L., & Ng, E. S. (2015). How have careers changed? An investigation of changing career patterns across four generations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30*(1), 8-21. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-07-2014-0210

Marshall, V., & Bonner, D. (2003). Career anchors and the effects of downsizing: Implications for generations and cultures at work. A preliminary investigation. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 27*(6), 281-291. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590310479910

McKenna, S., & Richardson, J. (2016). Self-initiated expatriation: Changing the ontological and methodological box. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 11*(3), 150-168. https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-09-2015-1326

McNulty, Y. (2013). Are self-initiated expatriates born or made? Exploring the relationship between SIE orientation and individual ROI. In V. Vaiman & A. Haslberger (Eds.), *Talent Management of Self-Initiated Expatriates: A Neglected Source of Global Talent* (pp. 30-58). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230392809_3

McNulty, Y., & Brewster, C. (2017). Theorizing the meaning(s) of 'expatriate': Establishing boundary conditions for business expatriates. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28*(1), 27-61. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1243567

McNulty, Y., & Brewster, C. (2018). Management of (business) expatriates. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Resource Management, Springer*, 109-137. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66864-2_5

McNulty, Y., & Vance, C. (2017). Dynamic global careers: A new conceptualization of expatriate career paths. *Personnel Review, 46*(2), 205-221. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-06-2015-0175

Mello, R., Suutari, V., & Dickmann, M. (2023). Career success of expatriates: The impacts of career capital, expatriate type, career type and career stage. *Career Development International, 28*(4), 406-425. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-07-2022-0196

MOL. (2018). Statistics and figures. Retrieved from https://mlsd.gov.sa/sites/default/files/uploads/v.26%20202016%التقرير20%السنوي.pdf (accessed March 19, 2018).

Nolan, E. M., & Morley, M. J. (2013). A test of the relationship between person-environment fit and cross-cultural adjustment among self-initiated expatriates. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25*(11), 1631-1649. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.845240

Pate, J., & Scullion, H. (2009). The changing nature of the traditional expatriate psychological contract. *Employee Relations, 32*(1), 56-73. https://doi.org/10.1108/01425451011002761

Phyllis, T. (2013). Self-initiated expatriates: An alternative to company-assigned expatriates? *Journal of Global Mobility: The Home of Expatriate Management Research, 1*(3), 336-356. https://doi.org/10.1108/JGM-02-2013-0008

Rahman, M. (2011). Does labour migration bring about economic advantage? A case of Bangladeshi migrants in Saudi Arabia. *SSRN eLibrary*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1938168

Ramaswami, A., Carter, N. M., & Dreher, G. F. (2016). Expatriation and career success: A human capital perspective. *Human Relations, 69*(10), 1959-1987. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726716630390

Richardson, J., & Mallon, M. (2005). Career interrupted? The case of the self-directed expatriate. *Journal of World Business, 40*(4), 409-420. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.08.008

Rodriguez, J. K., & Scurry, T. (2014). The global talent challenge of self-initiated expatriates. In A. Al Ariss (Ed.), *Global Talent Management* (pp. 93-105). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05125-3_7

Schein, E. H. (1996). Career anchors revisited: Implications for career development in the 21st Century. *Academy of Management Executive, 10*(4), 80-88. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1996.3145321

Shaffer, M. A., & Harrison, D. A. (1998). Expatriates' psychological withdrawal from international assignments: Work, nonwork, and family influences. *Personnel Psychology, 51*(1), 87-118. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1998.tb00717.x

Suutari, V., Brewster, C., & Dickmann, M. (2018). Contrasting assigned expatriates and self-initiated expatriates: A review of extant research and a future research agenda. *The Management of Global Careers* (pp. 63-89). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76529-7_3

Suutari, V., Brewster, C., Mäkelä, L., Dickmann, M., & Tornikoski, C. (2018). The effect of international work experience on the career success of expatriates: A comparison of assigned and self-initiated expatriates. *Human Resource Management, 57*(1), 37-54. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21827

Suutari, V., & Taka, M. (2004). Career anchors of managers with global careers. *Journal of Management Development, 23*(9), 833-847. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710410558440

Tharenou, P. (2010). Women's self-initiated expatriation as a career option and its ethical issues. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(1), 73-88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0348-x

Tung, R. L. (1987). Expatriate assignments: Enhancing success and minimizing failure. *The Academy of Management Executive, 1*(2), 117-125. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1987.4275826

Vaiman, V., Haslberger, A., & Vance, C. M. (2015). Recognizing the important role of self-initiated expatriates in effective global talent management. Human Resource Management Review, 25(3), 280-286.

Veloso, R., Trevisan, N., da Silva, R. C., & Dutra, S. (2018). The use of traditional and non-traditional career theories to understand the young's relationship with new technologies. *Revista de Gestão, 25*(4), 340-357. https://doi.org/10.1108/REGE-12-2017-0008

Wechtler, H., Koveshnikov, A., & Dejoux, C. (2017). Career anchors and cross-cultural adjustment among expatriates in a non-profit organization. *Management International Review, 57*(2), 277-305. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-016-0307-6

Yarnall, J. (1998). Career anchors: Results of an organisational study in the UK. *Career Development International, 3*(2), 56-61. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620439810207536

Yavas, U., Luqmani, M., & Quraeshi, Z. (1990). Organisational commitment, job satisfaction, work values: Saudi and expatriate managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 11*(7), 3-10. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437739010137752

About the Author (s)

Dr. Saeed Turki Alshahrani is an accomplished academic in International Human Resource Management. He has been an Associate Professor of International HRM at Imam Mohammed Ibn Saud Islamic University since 2011. He has also served as a visiting scholar and Fulbright at Florida International University, broadening his international perspective and contributing to cross-cultural academic exchange. Currently, Dr. Alshahrani is a member of the career advisory council at Princess Nourah University and works as a training and development consultant for government and private organizations.

Appendix A: Questionnaire

Section One

- **Gender:**   M   F
- **Age:**   Younger than 23   23-29   30-36   37-42   43-49   50-59   60+
- **Nationality:** --
- **Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated, or never married?**
  Married
  Widowed
  Divorced
  Separated
  Never married
- **If married, is your spouse with you in Saudi?**   Yes   No
- **If yes, is your spouse working in Saudi?**   Yes   No
- **Do you have children?**   Yes   No
- **What is your highest educational attainment?**
  - Less than high school degree
  - High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)
  - Some college but no degree
  - Associate degree
  - Bachelor degree
  - Master degree
  - Doctor Degree
- **Which of the following best describes your current occupation?**
  - Management Occupations
  - Consultancy Occupations
  - Business and Financial Operations Occupations
  - Funds and Assets Management Occupations
  - Computer and Mathematical Occupations
  - Engineering Occupations
  - Investment Occupations
  - Technical Occupations
  - Sales, Marketing and Related Occupations
  - Other, please specify--
- **Position level**
  - Board member
  - Executive/Senior management
  - Middle management
  - Lower management
  - Non-supervisory/Management trainee
  - Professional/Technical/Specialist
  - Other, please specify ---
- **How did you get your first job in Saudi?**
  - Being sent by my employer overseas to work in Saudi Arabia
  - Being sent by my employer but I quit and I am on my own
  - I was seeking employment internationally on my own
  - Other (please specify) ---
- **How long have you been working in Saudi?** (   ) Year/s   (   ) Month/s
- **Are you working for the same company since you arrived in Saudi?**
  Yes   No
- **If No, please answer the following:**

  I worked for   (   ) (Number/s of company/ies (Organisation/s))

  I worked in   The same industry   Different industries

- **Before coming to Saudi, do you have previous work related international experience/s?**
  Yes   No
- **If yes, please complete the following questions:**

  How many years?   (   )

  How many companies?   (   )

  How many countries?   (   )

  Other than your home country, please list the location/s of your previous international assignment experience/s:

- **Before you had your first international assignment, do you have previous general international travel experience/s that is not related to work?**
                  Yes   No
- **If yes, please complete the following:**

  How many travel times/trips?   (   ) How many countries?   (   )

  The total length of these international experience/s (   ) years   (   ) Months

- **The purpose of this/these non-work international travel experience/s was/were for:**
     Vacationing/Recreation abroad
     Study/education abroad
     Both
     Other (please specify) ---

- **Upon completing your work assignment in Saudi Arabia, do you have a guarantee job somewhere else?**

  Yes   No

- **If yes, do you know the future role/responsibility of this job?**

Section Two

How much influence did the following factors have on your decision to work abroad?Motivational Factor	No Influence	Little influence	Mild influence	Moderate Influence	Considerable Influence	Great Influence	Very great Influence
Motives related to your career							
Impact on career	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
Potential for skills development	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
The job you were offered (This is the only option I had)	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
Having the relevant job skills	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
Maintaining work networks with the home country	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
Expected length of stay	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
Personal financial impact	o	o	o	o	o	o	o

- **I am satisfied with the progress I have made towards meeting my goals for income**

  - Very dissatisfied

  - Somewhat dissatisfied

  - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

  - Somewhat satisfied

  - Very satisfied

- **I am satisfied with the progress I have made in my career advancement**

  - Very dissatisfied

  - Somewhat dissatisfied

  - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

  - Somewhat satisfied

  - Very satisfied

Section Three

- **How important are the following statements to your career**

Career	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I dream of being so good at what I do that my expert advice will be sought continually.	o	o	o	o	o
I am most fulfilled in my work when I have been able to integrate and manage the efforts of others.	o	o	o	o	o
I dream of having a career that will allow me the freedom to do a job my own way and according to my own schedule.	o	o	o	o	o
Security and stability are more important to me than freedom and autonomy.	o	o	o	o	o
I am always looking for ideas that would permit me to start my own enterprise.	o	o	o	o	o
I will feel successful in my career only if I have a feeling of having made a real contribution to the welfare of society.	o	o	o	o	o
I dream of a career in which I can solve problems or win in situations that are extremely challenging.	o	o	o	o	o
I would rather leave my organization than be put into a job that would compromise my ability to pursue personal and family concerns.	o	o	o	o	o
I will feel successful in my career only if I can develop my technical or functional skills to a very high level of competence.	o	o	o	o	o
I dream of being in charge of a complex organization and of making decisions that affect many people.	o	o	o	o	o
I am most fulfilled in my work when I am completely free to define my own tasks, schedules, and procedures.	o	o	o	o	o
I would rather leave my organization altogether than accept an assignment that would jeopardize my security in that organization.	o	o	o	o	o
Building my own business is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position in someone else's organization.	o	o	o	o	o
I am most fulfilled in my career when I have been able to use my talents in the service of others.	o	o	o	o	o

Career	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I will feel successful in my career only if I face and overcome very difficult challenges.	o	o	o	o	o
I dream of a career that will permit me to integrate my personal, family, and work needs.	o	o	o	o	o
Becoming a senior functional manager in my area of expertise is more attractive to me than becoming a general manager.	o	o	o	o	o
I will feel successful in my career only if I become a general manager in some organization.	o	o	o	o	o
I will feel successful in my career only if I achieve complete autonomy and freedom.	o	o	o	o	o
I seek jobs in organizations that will give me a sense of security and stability.	o	o	o	o	o
I am most fulfilled in my career when I have been able to build something that is entirely the result of my own ideas and efforts.	o	o	o	o	o
Using my skills to make the world a better place in which to live and work is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position.	o	o	o	o	o
I have been most fulfilled in my career when I have solved seemingly unsolvable problems or won out over seemingly impossible odds.	o	o	o	o	o
I feel successful in life only if I have been able to balance my personal, family, and career requirements.	o	o	o	o	o
I would rather leave my organization than accept a rotational assignment that would take me out of my area of expertise.	o	o	o	o	o
Becoming a general manager is more attractive to me than becoming a senior functional manager in my current area of expertise.	o	o	o	o	o
The chance to do a job my own way, free of rules and constraints, is more important to me than security.	o	o	o	o	o
I am most fulfilled in my work when I feel that I have complete financial and employment security.	o	o	o	o	o
I will feel successful in my career only if I have succeeded in creating or building something that is entirely my own product or idea.	o	o	o	o	o
I dream of having a career that makes a real contribution to humanity and society.	o	o	o	o	o
I seek out work opportunities that strongly challenge my problem-solving and/or competitive skills.	o	o	o	o	o

Career	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Balancing the demands of my personal and professional lives is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position.	o	o	o	o	o
I am most fulfilled in my work when I have been able to use my special skills and talents.	o	o	o	o	o
I would rather leave my organization than accept a job that would take me away from the general managerial path.	o	o	o	o	o
I would rather leave my organization than accept a job that would reduce my autonomy and freedom.	o	o	o	o	o
I dream of having a career that will allow me to feel a sense of security and stability.	o	o	o	o	o
I dream of starting up and building my own business.	o	o	o	o	o
I would rather leave my organization than accept an assignment that would undermine my ability to be of service to others.	o	o	o	o	o
Working on problems that are almost unsolvable is more important to me than achieving a high- level managerial position.	o	o	o	o	o
I have always sought our work opportunities that minimise interference with my personal or family concerns.	o	o	o	o	o
I can easily keep up with the developments in my job.	o	o	o	o	o
I can easily adjust myself to using new technologies.	o	o	o	o	o
I can easily pick up new working styles and procedures.	o	o	o	o	o
I have sufficient knowledge/skills to practice another job.	o	o	o	o	o
I contact that I can use to get (equivalent or better) job.	o	o	o	o	o
I know of other organisations/companies where I could get work	o	o	o	o	o