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**Abstract**
The literature on international staffing in MNEs often focuses on staffing choices based on nationality categories (e.g. PCNs, HCNs, TCNs) for key positions in subsidiaries when examining their impacts on subsidiary outcomes. Considering both nationality and international experience, we suggest an integrative typology to identify and classify various types of traditional and alternative subsidiary staffing options and evaluate them in relation to social capital and knowledge flows across MNE organizations.
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Research Highlights

• Based on a social capital view of MNEs, we propose a typology of subsidiary staffing options founded on the dimensions of nationality and the location of prior international experience of incumbents of key positions. Then traditional as well as alternative staffing options from the literature are identified and evaluated corresponding to each type of staffing option in the framework.

• Our typology identifies nine types of subsidiary staffing options. It includes and classifies the traditional and alternative staffing options, while highlighting types which need further research. The study also suggests impacts of the traditional and alternative staffing type on social capital and knowledge flows in MNEs.

• The new typology identifies various types of subsidiary staffing options comprehensively and evaluates them systematically. HRM specialists can classify subsidiary managers based on the typology and examine which staffing option would be desirable given a specific subsidiary context. Our research also provides novel insights on what needs to be considered to select and develop subsidiary managers who can build internal and external social capital in MNEs.

Introduction

The competitiveness of a multinational enterprise (MNE) depends on its capacity to source, transfer, combine, and utilize knowledge from internal and external sources across a range of geographical locations (Bartlett and Ghoshal, 1989). To be effective, each subsidiary of an MNE should be able to access knowledge from corporate headquarters (HQ) as well as local external parties (Birkinshaw et al., 2005). Given the dual embeddedness of the subsidiary within the MNE and in the local context (Meyer et al., 2011), subsidiary managers should translate and utilize the sourced knowledge in ways relevant to the local context (Roth and O’Donnell, 1996).

In this regard, social capital, the sum of actual or potential resources embedded in the network of relationships possessed by an individual (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998) is particularly important. Social capital built by subsidiary managers with local parties as well as key individuals in HQ allows them to access knowledge sources across local environments and the MNE organization (Kostova and Roth, 2003). Social capital builds trust which
nurture the willingness to share knowledge with geographically and culturally distant employees (Adler and Kwon, 2002).

The decision of whom to appoint in key positions in a subsidiary – the subsidiary staffing decision – has considerable implications for the social capital needed for knowledge flows in the MNE. Each individual brings different social relationships or networks of relationships and also has different capacity in building them in the subsidiary. Some may have limited relationships with either local actors or HQ actors, while others bring wider and stronger relationships with both local actors and HQ actors, implying significant variations in the capacity of accessing knowledge dispersed across different locations. Thus, what matters is the type of individuals who can bring or build the social capital that enables knowledge flows in an MNE.

The issue of subsidiary staffing in MNEs has attracted significant attention in the fields of international business and international human resource management research (Belderbos and Heijltjes, 2005; Collings et al., 2007). Subsidiary staffing in the extant literature refers to the appointment of employees in subsidiary key positions (Colakoglua et al., 2009) to meet certain objectives such as responding to host market needs and transferring knowledge across national borders (Harzing, 2001a; Scullion and Collings, 2006). Much of this literature, however, confines the staffing decision to a choice among parent-country nationals (PCNs), host-country nationals (HCNs) and third-country nationals (TCNs) (Gong, 2003b; Lazarova, 2006). In terms of the ability to access knowledge sources across countries, the nationality-based staffing options may imply trade-offs between connections to HQ and those to local parties. For example, while PCNs are better connected to HQ than HCNs (Harzing et al., 2015), HCNs have stronger local networks than PCNs (Vance et al., 2009). Considered as a ‘compromise’ between PCNs and HCNs (Michailova et al., 2016; Reiche and Harzing, 2015), TCNs might have modest levels of connections with HQ and local parties facilitated by, for example, language affinity.

The current understanding of subsidiary staffing options based on the nationality categories may be too simplistic to consider alternative staffing options that enable a subsidiary to be connected to both HQ and local parties. In subsidiary staffing decisions, MNEs might consider not just individuals’ nationalities, but also their prior international experiences, which help to complement their capacity to build connections across different locations. For example, MNEs can use international assignments intentionally to develop a pool of PCN expatriates who have prior experience in particular host countries (Caligiuri and Colakoglu, 2007). They can hire foreign nationals who have experience in the MNE’s home country
Piaskowska and Trojanowski, 2014), and use short-term international assignments to provide relevant international experience to their employees (Wang and Tran, 2012).

Although the current literature has acknowledged various alternative forms of international working including self-initiated expatriates (SIEs) (Richardson and McKenna, 2014), inpatriates (Reiche et al., 2009), global careerists (Georgakakis et al., 2016), regional specialists (Sparrow et al., 2017) and many others, “much of the work in this area has been atheoretical and often anecdotal in nature” (Collings et al., 2009: 1264). Each alternative form tends to be treated in a rather idiosyncratic way in the literature without an integrative framework or an underlying theoretical construct that may allow systematic comparison and analysis among the traditional and alternative staffing options. In particular, when it comes to examining the influences on, and the impacts of, various subsidiary staffing options, the nationality-based categories such as PCN and HCN are still widely used (Gong, 2003a; Tarique et al., 2006; Tarique and Schuler, 2008) and the alternative staffing options are not included in such analyses.

Our purpose here is to suggest an integrative typology of subsidiary staffing options by considering both nationality and prior international experience to identify and classify various types of traditional and alternative subsidiary staffing options. We evaluate traditional and alternative types of staffing options in relation to social capital and knowledge flows across MNE organizations. We make two contributions to the subsidiary staffing literature. First, we provide a basis for comparative analysis of various staffing options by considering two key variables – nationality and the location of prior international experience – as underlying dimensions of the subsidiary staffing typology. The review of staffing options based on the new typology shows that the two underlying factors identified are keys to capture traditional and alternative subsidiary staffing options comprehensively. Second, we suggest implications for future study by evaluating the potential impacts of the staffing options on social capital and related knowledge flows within MNEs (Downes and Thomas, 2000; Taylor, 2007).

The paper takes the following form. First, we review previous literature on subsidiary staffing in MNEs. Then, we introduce a typology of subsidiary staffing options and evaluate potential implications of each staffing option for the development of various forms of social capital which enable knowledge to flow between HQ, local parties and subsidiaries. Finally, based on the discussion of the typology and the implications of the staffing options, we provide suggestions for practitioners and future research on subsidiary staffing in MNEs.
Studies of Subsidiary Staffing in MNEs

The first analysis of subsidiary staffing was Perlmutter's (1969) widely cited typology of MNEs as ethnocentric, polycentric, and geocentric. The ethnocentric staffing policy assigns PCNs to key positions in the subsidiaries, while the polycentric staffing policy prefers the utilization of HCNs in subsidiary key positions. The geocentric staffing policy seeks the best people for key positions throughout the organization, regardless of their nationality. Later, regio-centric supplemented the typology (Heenan and Perlmutter, 1979). A regio-centric policy is more likely to staff with a composition weighted toward TCNs – who have been socialized at the regional HQs (Tarique et al., 2006), and have the skills to run subsidiary operations, and often carry regional management responsibilities (Schuler et al., 1993).

Subsidiary staffing issues began to be explored extensively during the 1980s (Collings et al., 2009). Much of the early literature concerns issues related to assigned PCN expatriates such as their selection, training and development, adjustment, and failure (Perera et al., 2017), while comparably less attention has been devoted to HCNs or TCNs (Collings et al., 2008; Tungli and Peiperl, 2009). Subsidiary staffing studies in the late 1980s and early 1990s focused on the latter stages of the expatriate cycle such as evaluation and repatriation (Stahl et al., 2002), but also expanded geographically from US MNEs to European MNEs (Suutari and Brewster, 2001), demographically to female expatriates (Altman and Shortland, 2008), and latterly to alternatives to expatriation, such as short-term assignments, and international business travel (Collings et al., 2007; Mäkelä et al., 2015).

One of the issues that have attracted substantial research interest is which type of subsidiary staffing option or composition leads to better subsidiary outcomes (e.g. Gaur et al., 2007; Gong, 2003a; Harzing, 2001b; Hyun et al., 2014). These studies usually assumed that PCNs and HCNs are the major subsidiary staffing choices for MNEs (Harzing, 2001b). Despite their high cost, assigned PCNs remain a valuable staffing option for MNEs as they are believed to understand and internalize the values and beliefs of the parent company and thus better function as HQ agents in controlling and developing subsidiaries (Collings et al., 2007; Gong, 2003a). On the other hand, HCNs – employees of the MNEs who work in the foreign subsidiary and are citizens of the country where the foreign subsidiary is located – can respond to the local conditions and requirements of the host country more effectively than PCNs, as they are familiar with the cultural, economic, political, and legal environment of the host country (Tarique et al., 2006). HCNs might, for example, be better able to negotiate with local suppliers, buyers, and governments (Harzing, 2001b). Empirical studies of the
relationship between subsidiary staffing options based on nationality categories and subsidiary performance have shown, not surprisingly, mixed results. Some studies found a positive impact of assigning PCNs on subsidiary performance (Gong, 2003a; Hyun et al., 2014), while others showed a negative impact of using PCNs instead of HCNs on subsidiary performance (e.g. Fang et al., 2010; Gaur et al. 2007) or no significant impact (e.g. Colakoglu and Caligiuri, 2008). These mixed results of the empirical studies might indicate the potential limitation of using the dichotomous categories of staffing options.

A strand of research has emerged exploring alternative staffing options. A number of staffing or international working options have been suggested, such as short-term assignments, and international business travel (Collings et al., 2007; Mäkelä et al., 2015) mainly as cost-effective alternatives to expensive PCN expatriates. But, if we consider the needs of multidirectional knowledge flows in MNEs, staffing options with experiences in different nations may be more relevant, as they may bring social networks that enable such knowledge flows across borders. Indeed, staffing options with various international experiences have been acknowledged in more recent literature, such as inpatriation (Collings et al., 2010), SIEs (Andresen et al., 2013; Richardson and McKenna, 2014; Vaiman and Haslberger, 2013; Zhang and Rientos, 2017), global careerists (Georgakakis et al., 2016), regional specialists (Sparrow et al., 2017). As these alternative staffing options have been studied separately without being integrated into subsidiary staffing research, it seems useful to develop a conceptual framework based on certain common dimensions in order to analyze and evaluate both traditional and alternative staffing options comprehensively. Our next section introduces a typology based on nationality and international experience as key dimensions of subsidiary staffing options.

Dimensions of Subsidiary Staffing Options

A social capital view suggests that the relational aspect of organizational life is important as key resources are “embedded within, available through, and derived from the network of relationships possessed by an individual or social unit” (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998: 243). The experiences of direct interactions with people in a place are particularly important in building social capital in that location (Burt, 1982; Granovetter, 1973), as they provide opportunities to build relationships and develop the capacity to build relationships through learning how to interact with people there (Kostova and Roth, 2003). With regard to subsidiary staffing in MNEs, it is crucial to consider the location of one’s experiences and social interactions, as they determine the locational boundary of social capital and
knowledge flows that the individual can build and access. Arguably, nationality and the location of international experiences could be considered as key factors that capture a variety of nationally-bounded experiences meaningfully for the purpose of subsidiary staffing decision.

**Nationality of Subsidiary Managers**

As discussed earlier, subsidiary staffing choices have been established to vary along the dimension of nationality (Harzing, 2001b; Sekiguchi et al., 2011). Nationality can be defined as “the country in which an individual spent the majority of her or his formative years” (Hyun et al., 2014: 809). It is an important dimension of subsidiary staffing options, as it determines one’s locational boundary of social capital built throughout and after the formative years. A person has opportunities to interact with people in the country of their nationality and build relationships there. PCNs, HCNs, and TCNs are the traditional categories of nationality in relation to subsidiary staffing in MNEs. PCNs refer to the nationals of an MNE’s home country, while HCNs are the host country nationals of the MNE (Reiche and Harzing, 2015). TCNs are people, who are nationals of neither the home nor the host country. Each of the three categories indicates different national boundary of social capital.

From the social capital and knowledge-based perspectives, PCNs are better connected to HQ than HCNs, able to play a critical role in the knowledge transfer process from HQ to subsidiaries (Harzing et al., 2015), while having limited contacts and thus limited access to local knowledge in the host country. By contrast, HCN subsidiary managers are disadvantaged in the exchange of knowledge between HQ and the foreign affiliates due to their limited connections to key HQ personnel (Sekiguchi et al., 2011), but can access local knowledge and respond to local requirements more effectively using their local networks (Vance et al., 2009). TCN subsidiary managers tend to be considered as a compromise between PCNs and HCNs (Michailova et al., 2016; Reiche and Harzing, 2015), having modest levels of connections with both HQ and local parties. Depending on their closeness to a host country, or their language ability, they may have greater host country knowledge than PCNs, though having weaker local connections than HCNs (Dowling et al., 2008). In addition, TCN managers may have better connections with HQ and thus access sources of knowledge in HQ more easily than HCNs, though not better than PCNs (Perkins and White, 2008; Potočnik et al., 2014).
The Location of International Experience of Subsidiary Managers

Although an individual’s nationality may constrain one’s locational boundary of social capital, the boundary can be extended through international experiences. By working in a foreign country, one has opportunities to interact with people in the country and learn the ways of building relationships there, thus extending the locational boundary of his or her social capital.

International experience has gained increasing significance in the international HRM literature, being acknowledged as a vital vehicle to develop cognitive and relational abilities that international managers need for their successful career in MNEs (Takeuchi et al., 2005). International experience is a multi-dimensional concept (Le and Kroll, 2017; Takeuchi et al., 2005) in terms of type (work and non-work) (Kim et al., 2015; Wang and Tran, 2012), time (prior, current, future) (Ancona et al., 2001; Hippler et al., 2015), and location (Schmid and Wurster, 2017). However, with respect to the type and time dimensions, we incorporate only the “work” and “prior” aspects of these dimensions, while the location dimension varies. Although non-work and current and future international experiences might be important aspects of international experience, we focus on the locational aspect of prior work international experiences of subsidiary managers, considering that our major concern is to understand staffing decisions in the particular context of subsidiaries in MNEs.

In terms of the locational dimension, international experiences can be distinguished into two types such as culture-general and culture-specific experiences (Rickley, 2019). It has been acknowledged that culture-general experience (i.e., a variety of international experiences across different cultures) are associated with superior cognitive abilities that allow one to find common and differentiating patterns across cultures (Caligiuri and Bonache, 2016; Lücke et al., 2014), and make sense of, and help adaptation to, other culturally distant environments (Hammer, 1987; Rickley, 2019). On the other hand, culture-specific experiences may enable one to learn how to interpret the actions of people in the particular culture, and interact and communicate with them appropriately (Maitland and Sammartino, 2015; Rasmussen and Sieck, 2015; Takeuchi et al., 2005). With culture-specific expertise, the individual would be more effective at information access and exchange in that culture (Rickley, 2019). Thus, the location of prior international experience matters in the context of subsidiary staffing decisions, as unique cultural attributes of a host country make a particular cultural-specific international experience more relevant than others (Chen et al., 2012).
A Typology of Subsidiary Staffing Options and Social Capital/Knowledge Flows in MNEs

By combining the dimension of the national location of international experiences with the traditional nationality-based staffing categories (PCNs, HCNs, and TCNs), more specific staffing choices can be suggested (Figure 1): (1) PCNs with no prior international experience; (2) PCNs with prior international experience in the host country; (3) PCNs with prior international experience in a third country; (4) HCNs with no prior international experience; (5) HCNs with prior international experience in the MNE home country; (6) HCNs with prior international experience in a third country; (7) TCNs with no prior international experience; (8) TCNs with prior international experience in the MNE home country; and (9) TCNs with prior international experience in the host country. We discuss each type of staffing choice in relation to its implications for social capital and knowledge flows in MNE subsidiaries.

1) PCNs with no prior international work experience usually imply traditional expatriates who were relocated by their organization from HQ to another country, usually for several years, to complete a specific task or accomplish an organizational goal (McNulty and Brewster, 2017). They may facilitate the communication process between the parent company and its affiliates by using their existing strong internal networks with managers in HQ (Downes and Thomas, 2000; Riusala and Suutari, 2004). Their home-country-based social capital may be valuable in influencing HQs in favor of decisions that benefit the subsidiary operations (Colakoglu et al., 2009).

Early works with a knowledge-based view of MNEs gave attention to knowledge flows from HQ to subsidiaries (Schulz, 2001). PCN-expatriates were seen as key agents in transferring knowledge from parent firms to their subsidiaries (Delios and Björkman, 2000; Downes and Thomas, 2000; Gaur et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2009). However, as discussed earlier, this type of staffing option has limitations in accessing local networks and thus local knowledge sources.

2) PCNs with prior international experience in the host country include PCN-expatriates who participated in development programs that provide them with
opportunities to experience local cultures as well as job responsibilities in the host country before their later international assignments in the country (Sparrow et al., 2017). Their understanding of local environment and local networks built from their prior experiences help their adjustment in the host country (Farh et al., 2010). When they perform as subsidiary managers, they may benefit from their local networks and abilities to build such networks in addition to their home networks. Comparing with PCNs with no prior international experiences, they are in a better position to contact experts who can provide novel information and different perspectives on relevant issues, being aware of a wider range of possible strategic solutions that can be applied to the challenges facing their firms (Blomstermo et al., 2004; McDonald et al., 2008). However, there has been limited attention on this type of staffing option.

3) PCNs with prior international experience in the third country include PCN subsidiary managers who worked previously as expatriates in third countries. For example, global careerists are people who have a long-term commitment to working in an international context and face frequent international relocations during their career (Cappellen and Janssens, 2005; Suutari et al., 2012). From their culture-general international experiences, they may develop superior cognitive abilities to make sense of new environments and devise innovative strategies, which might be particularly useful in the context of new subsidiary development. They also develop skills in finding right contacts and strengthening social ties in new countries (Lamb and Sutherland, 2010). MNEs with high degrees of internationalization require managers with international networks to perform their roles effectively (Carpenter et al., 2001; Ruigrok et al., 2013). Although they don’t have any working experiences in the host country, PCNs with prior work experience in a third country may build local networks by leveraging prior learning in other countries and also utilizing knowledge from those countries to solve similar problems in the newly assigned country, in addition to their home networks (Georgakakis et al., 2016). However, they might be less competent in understanding local contexts and accessing local networks than PCNs with prior experiences in the host country due to their lack of country-specific knowledge. In addition, their ability to utilize their cultural learning from the third country would be limited depending on the similarity of cultures between the third and the host countries.

4) HCNs with no prior international experience are local managers who work in the foreign subsidiary and are citizens of the country where the foreign subsidiary is
located (Tarique et al., 2006). They are likely to have networks within host countries, which may help the MNE to obtain valuable local knowledge if they share their local-based social capital with PCNs in the subsidiaries and with HQ (Varma et al., 2009). Their rich knowledge of local markets and institutions may also help MNEs to learn practices of business in the host country (Vo, 2009). However, due to their lack of working experience and social ties at HQ, they may face difficulties in accessing knowledge from HQ and the wider MNE (O’Donnell, 2000; Roth and O’Donnell, 1996; Sekiguchi et al., 2011), leading to potential conflicts with HQ’s intentions.

5) HCNs with prior international experience in the MNE home country are local managers who spent time as inpatriates at HQ before repatriating back to their home countries (Reiche et al., 2009). As they have social networks not only in their own countries but also in their parent companies (Harvey et al., 1999; Harvey et al., 2011; Reiche et al., 2009; Reiche, 2012), they can act as boundary spanners across borders (Björkman et al., 2004; Blomstermo et al., 2004; Carpenter et al., 2001; Harvey et al., 2011). Strong internal and external social interfaces provide access to information and influences that have been associated with effective knowledge transfer (Hansen, 2002; Moeller et al., 2016).

6) HCNs with prior international experience in a third country include local subsidiary managers who have working experiences in countries other than the MNE home countries. Similar to PCNs with third-country experiences, their culture-general experiences may help HCNs to develop novel insights into their subsidiaries’ business strategies. They may be able to build and utilize contacts there and perform boundary spanning roles between the subsidiary in his or her country and that in the third country. However, they have a limitation in accessing HQ networks and knowledge due to their lack of experiences in the MNE home country. We could not find any example of this staffing choice in the international staffing literature.

7) TCNs with no prior international experience are nationals neither of the assignment country nor of the country in which the HQ is located (Bahn and Cameron, 2013). TCNs are often regionalists: subsidiary managers or specialists within the region where the subsidiary is located (Reynolds, 1997). Such TCNs may be relatively close to the host country with regard to culture and language, which can play a critical role for individuals’ boundary spanning ability in MNEs (Barner-Rasmussen et al., 2014). If they share a common, or similar, language with the host country, this will enhance communication with locals (Dowling et al., 2008) and enable them to be better
informed of the host country contexts than PCNs without international experiences due to their communication skills with locals (Barner-Rasmussen and Björkman, 2007). While some studies have acknowledged the significance of TCNs as a staffing choice (Gong, 2003b; Michailova et al., 2016; Tarique et al., 2006), there has been limited empirical work on the use of TCNs in MNE subsidiaries (Collings et al., 2008; Tungli and Peiperl, 2009).

8) TCNs with prior international experience in the MNE home country include subsidiary managers working in a host country who are neither PCNs nor HCNs but have prior experience in the MNE home country. TCN managers can access sources of knowledge in corporate HQ than HCNs (Perkins and White, 2008), if they have close connections to HQ and understand the company’s goals, practices and procedures (Potočnik et al., 2014) through their prior experience. If a subsidiary in a country faces similar problems with another subsidiary in a third country, a TCN from that third country may function a boundary spanning role effectively among HQ and the two subsidiaries, utilizing networks in HQ as well as in the third country subsidiary. However, we found no research on this subsidiary staffing option.

9) TCNs with prior international experience in the host country are able to adjust and build relationships with locals rather easily at the subsidiary (Tarique et al., 2006). Cultural and language skills can be critical resources for individuals who play a boundary spanning role in MNEs, as they can perform more functions with those skills (Barner-Rasmussen et al., 2014). Although there is little extant literature on TCNs in subsidiary staffing, we expect that they may develop useful relationships through their prior international experience in the host country and subsidiary also gains knowledge from third countries (Gong, 2003b).

In summary, we show that each staffing option has different implications for social capital and knowledge flows. Thus, by considering nationality as well as the location of prior international experiences of potential candidates for subsidiary staffing, MNEs can better assess candidates’ potential for building the social networks and knowledge flows required for a particular subsidiary context. There have been studies of the role of international assignees for knowledge transfer (Chang et al., 2012). The management of knowledge flows is essential for a competitiveness (Argote and Ingram, 2000) and the international relocation of people can be an important mechanism particularly for transferring context-specific and tacit knowledge across borders (Riusala and Suutari, 2004). Research has also
emphasized the role of international assignees for multi-directional knowledge flows in MNEs. Subsidiaries of an MNE may need to access knowledge from HQ, from local external parties (Birkinshaw et al., 2005) and from peer subsidiaries (Miao et al., 2011). These multi-directional knowledge flows may be one of the most important drivers of firm performance (Sanchez-Vidal et al., 2016).

Discussion and Conclusion

The way that MNEs choose to staff subsidiaries is one of the most strategic decisions when expanding global operations (Belderbos and Heijltjes, 2005; Delios and Björkman, 2000). However, previous research has focused on nationality-based staffing choices which may limit our understanding of the various subsidiary staffing options. By considering the location of international experience as an additional dimension for subsidiary staffing options, more specific subsidiary staffing options could be derived for further analysis. We also explore the implications of utilizing each type of staffing options.

Implications for Future Research

Using the staffing typology based on both nationality and the location of prior international experiences, we identified various types of staffing options which have different implications to social networks and knowledge flows in MNEs. Future studies may explore, first, how each type of staffing options affects subsidiary managers’ social networks and knowledge flows in MNEs. For example, we may examine whether the staffing types such as PCNs with prior international experience in the host country and HCNs with prior international experience in the MNE home country are more conducive to the development of their social networks with both HQ actors and local actors, and thus knowledge flows from both HQ and local parties.

Second, we can extend the research on the relationship between subsidiary staffing and performance by considering the more nuanced types of staffing options than the nationality-based categories of subsidiary staffing options. Based on the two dimensions underlying the typology we suggest, we may identify different types of staffing options in various empirical settings and examine which one would be most beneficial for subsidiary performance. Furthermore, based on the social capital and knowledge-based view, we may theorize and test a model that includes subsidiary managers’ social networks with HQ and local actors and knowledge flows from HQ and local parties as mediating factors in the relationship between the types of subsidiary staffing options and subsidiary performance.
Practical Implications

The progress of globalization has critical implications for global talent management. It has been argued that there is a shortage of talented managers to deal effectively with the challenges arising from firms’ international operations (Dragoni et al., 2014): increasing the pressure to develop managers with networks and knowledge. This study suggests two practical implications.

First, HRM specialists can classify the subsidiary managers based on the typology and examine which staffing option would be desirable given a specific subsidiary context. In particular, depending on a subsidiary’s strategic context (e.g. multidomestic, global, and transnational strategic context), the sources of critical knowledge the subsidiary needs might be different (e.g. knowledge from HQ, knowledge from local parties). For example, in the context of transnational strategy which demands both global integration and local responsiveness for a subsidiary, subsidiary managers without international experience are less capable of having the internal and external social networks that allows them to access relevant sources of information and knowledge across the MNE and local environment (Mäkelä and Suutari, 2009). By utilizing staffing options such as PCNs with prior international experience, HCNs with prior international experience in the MNE home country or relevant TCNs, therefore, MNEs can exploit managers’ social relations across MNEs (Reiche, 2012) in order to facilitate the sharing of knowledge (Andrews and Delahaye, 2000).

Second, MNEs can devote attention to effective selection systems for international managers by considering both nationality and prior international experiences in order to reduce their failure rates and to improve organizational performance in the subsidiary (Caligiuri et al., 2009). MNEs should be aware of the limitations of traditional forms of international assignments and should work toward more sophisticated recruitment and selection methods (Collings et al., 2007). Most MNEs continue to focus on domestic career record as the most important selection criteria, not fully appreciating international experience (Morley and Flynn, 2003). For example, inpatriates are one alternative. During their assignments in HQ, they build social ties with HQ colleagues (Reiche, 2012). A strong internal and external social interface that provides access to information and influence is associated with effective knowledge transfer (Hansen, 2002; Moeller et al., 2016).
Limitations

This study has limitations. Although we mentioned above the strategic context of a subsidiary and relevant staffing options, we do not comprehensively discuss how the specific subsidiary contexts can be linked to the different types of staffing options in the typology. One such contextual factor we do not examine is the cultural distance (Chen and Hu, 2002) between focal countries in relation to subsidiary staffing. For example, when there is a high level of cultural difference between the MNE home and subsidiary host countries, PCNs with prior international work-related assignments in the host country would be preferable, as their previous international work experiences in the host country may help them access accurate information or knowledge about the foreign country (Lee and Sukoco, 2010; Shannon and Begley, 2008).

In addition, we do not consider another important contextual factor - the role of supply and demand of workforces in subsidiary staffing decisions. For the demand side, subsidiary strategic contexts could be considered, as the significance of international experience would be different depending on specific demands from the subsidiary strategic context. For example, as mentioned earlier, in the transnational strategic context of a subsidiary, where knowledge access to both HQ and local parties would be important, relevant international experience would be more important than global or multi-domestic strategic context. For the supply side, the consideration of a particular position would be important where the available human resources would be limited in key managerial positions because the context may be much more demanding. For these positions, choosing a manager with international experience may be more important than others to increase the pool of available human resources and access knowledge across boundary.
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### Figure 1: A Typology of Subsidiary Staffing Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of International Experience</th>
<th>PCNs</th>
<th>HCNs</th>
<th>TCNs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Country</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PCNs with prior international experience in a third country  
  e.g., global careerists |      |      |      |
| Host Country                        |      |      |      |
| PCNs with prior international experience in the host country  
  e.g., expatriates who participated in development programs |      |      |      |
| Parent Country                      |      |      |      |
| PCNs with no prior international experience  
  e.g., traditional expatriates |      |      |      |
| PCNs with prior international experience in the MNE home country  
  e.g., expatriates |      |      |      |
| PCNs with no prior international experience  
  e.g., local managers who work in the foreign country and are citizens of the country where the foreign subsidiary is located |      |      |      |
| PCNs with no prior international experience  
  e.g., subsidiary managers working in a host country who are neither PCNs nor HCNs but have prior experience in the host country |      |      |      |
| PCNs with prior international experience in the MNE home country  
  e.g., subsidiary managers working in a host country who are neither PCNs nor HCNs |      |      |      |

**Nationality**