

Factors Influencing Managerial Perceptions of Psychic Distance

ABSTRACT

This paper bridges the gap between two previously distinct streams of psychic distance literature by exploring the relationship between a broad range of 'national level' psychic distance stimuli and managerial perceptions of psychic distance. The results confirm a direct linkage between six of the psychic distance stimuli dimensions put forward by Dow & Karunaratna (2006) and perceived psychic distance. A variety of individual respondent level characteristics are also included in the model and found to have significant direct and/or moderating effects on the perceptions of psychic distance.

Douglas Dow
Associate Professor in Business Strategy
Centre for the Practice of International Trade
Melbourne Business School, The University of Melbourne
200 Leicester Street, Carlton, Victoria, AUSTRALIA

Keywords: psychic distance, cultural distance, best worst scaling, international experience

INTRODUCTION

Psychic distance is arguable one of the most fundamental constructs within the field of international business. Across the past four decades, it has been cited as an important predictor variable for:

- the decision to export (Fletcher & Bohn, 1998; Holzmüller & Kasper, 1990; Wiedersheim-Paul, Olson, & Welch, 1978),
- market selection decisions - for both exporting (Dow, 2000; Johanson & Vahlne, 1977) and foreign direct investment (Davidson, 1980; Green & Cunningham, 1975; Grosse & Goldberg, 1991; Grosse & Trevino, 1996; Habib & Zurawicki, 2002),
- entry mode choices – concerning both the degree of control (Brouthers & Brouthers, 2001; Chang & Rosenzweig, 2001; Kogut & Singh, 1988; Tihanyi, Griffith, & Russell, 2005), and the use of acquisitions versus greenfield entries (Brouthers & Brouthers, 2000; Harzing, 2002; Padmanabhan & Cho, 1999; Shaver, 1998)
- international performance (Brouthers, 2002; Evans & Mavondo, 2002; Evans, Mavondo, & Bridson, 2008; O'Grady & Lane, 1996; Tihanyi et al., 2005),
- the degree of adaptation in foreign markets (Dow, 2001; Mueller, 1991; Sousa & Bradley, 2005), and
- a variety of other international phenomena (Boyacigiller, 1990; Gong, Shenkar, Luo, & Nyaw, 2005; Manev & Stevenson, 2001).

Within the last five years alone, 37 articles referring to psychic distance, or the closely associated concept - cultural distance¹, were published in the Journal of International Business Studies. Indeed, Cho and Padmanabhan (1995, p.309) have gone so far as to claim that “no international business study can be considered complete unless there is an explicit variable controlling for cultural distance”.

Yet, despite this notoriety, the various empirical studies incorporating psychic distance show it to be an empirically weak and sporadic predictor variable. In a meta-analysis of international entry mode studies, Zhao et al (2004, p.530) find the impact of cultural distance to be statistically significant, but it is “the least influential factor among the six determinants [of entry mode choice]”. In another meta-analysis focusing specifically on cultural distance, Tihanyi, et al (2005, p.277-278) find that “the relationship between cultural distance and the three key variables [entry mode choice, performance and international diversification] was near zero across the 66 independent samples” and that “cultural distance ... failed to contribute to prediction”. In a third meta-analysis, Magnusson et al (2006) find slightly stronger effects, with cultural distance proving to be a statistically significant predictor of entry mode, performance and FDI market selection; but in each case the effect size remains small in absolute terms – between 0.03 and 0.07.

These weak and mixed empirical results have provoked a wide range of reactions, including Stottinger and Schlegelmilch (2000) suggesting psychic distance is ‘a concept past it due date’. However, other commentators, most notably Shenkar (2001), have laid much of the blame on the tendency of researchers to employ a single surrogate measure to represent

¹ Some researchers, such as Gomes and Ramaswamy (1999) and Lee (1998) treat psychic distance and cultural distance as isomorphic; however, we favour the interpretation which views them as related but distinct constructs, with cultural distance being only one dimension of psychic distance. Nevertheless, we do need to be cognisant that the former interpretation is quite common.

psychic distance – Kogut and Singh’s (1988) composite index of Hofstede’s (1980) dimensions of national culture. Indeed, in the three meta-analyses mentioned earlier, the proportion of studies which use the Kogut & Singh index as their sole indicator of psychic distance range from 71% to 94% of the respective samples. In his seminal article, Shenkar (2001) notes that the Kogut and Singh index, as a surrogate for psychic distance, only represents a narrow portion of a much broader construct. In their meta-analysis, Zhao, et al (2004, p.534) concur with Shenkar, and state that “the use of Hofstede’s cultural index as a measure of uncertainty seems ineffective to capture the diversity and subtlety of cultural influences”.

In more recent times, a wider range of scales which are intended to represent the various underlying drivers of psychic distance have been put forward and tested (Brewer, 2007; Dow & Karunaratna, 2006). However, while these are important contributions and have begun to address the breadth of the psychic distance construct, it is also important to remember that managerial decisions are made on the basis of the decision-maker’s perceptions (Evans & Mavondo, 2002; Harzing, 2003; Stottinger & Schlegelmilch, 1998). Scales, such as those put forward by Dow & Karunaratna are not direct measures of those perceptions, but rather measures of the exogenous factors which may shape the decision-maker’s perceptions. That is precisely why Dow & Karunaratna refer to their scales as psychic distance stimuli (as opposed to claiming that they are direct measures of psychic distance). That distinction forms the crux of this paper.

The primary aim of this article is to take the next step and directly investigate the linkages between the **psychic distance stimuli**, as measured by Dow & Karunaratna (2006), and the **actual perceptions of psychic distance** of managers; and to introduce a range of **decision-maker characteristics** which may directly influence managerial perceptions, or moderate the aforementioned relationships. Thus, our overall research question can best be summarized as:

What are the factors influencing a manager's perception of psychic distance?

An important additional aspect to this research agenda is an investigation into how to most effectively and parsimoniously measure perceived psychic distance. To this end, the technique known as 'best-worst' scaling is introduced as both a highly reliable and parsimonious approach for measuring perceived psychic distance. This new approach to measuring perceived psychic distance is tested and validated against more traditional instruments.

LITERATURE REVIEW & HYPOTHESES

One of the earliest cited definitions of psychic distance was put forward by Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul (1975, p 308):

“factors preventing or disturbing the flow of information between firm and market. Examples of such factors are differences in language, culture, political systems, level of education, level of industrial development, etc.”

This 'Uppsala' definition of psychic distance, or minor variations of it, has wide spread recognition and has been cited by numerous scholars (Child, Ng, & Wong, 2002; Dow & Karunaratna, 2006; Evans & Mavondo, 2002; Kogut & Singh, 1988; Shenkar, 2001; Stottinger & Schlegelmilch, 1998). However, there have also been a variety of 'revised definitions' put forward by scholars such as Evans & Mavondo's (2002). Most of these 'revisions' have focused on the perceptual aspects of psychic distance, arguing “it is the manager's *perception* of the level of [psychic distance] between specific countries that influences [their decisions]” (Harzing, 2003, p.23). These two diverging definitions of psychic distance reflect an important bifurcation in the manner in which psychic distance has been operationalized over the past decade.

The Measurement of Psychic Distance and Our Hypotheses

Roughly three quarters of the empirical research concerning psychic distance has, at least implicitly, adopted the ‘Uppsala’ definition of psychic distance by employing **secondary data** in order to measure ‘psychic distance stimuli’. As mentioned earlier, far and away the most popular of these ‘secondary data’ scales is the Kogut & Singh index². This scale, an unweighted index of the four original dimensions of Hofstede’s (1980) national culture dimensions, has virtually become the default instrument with which to measure psychic and cultural distance, despite a remarkable number of studies showing that it has little or no predictive power with respect to entry mode choice (Magnusson et al., 2006; Tihanyi et al., 2005; Zhao et al., 2004), market selection (Dow, 2000; Dow, 2006; Dow & Karunaratna, 2006; Habib & Zurawicki, 2002) and performance (Tihanyi et al., 2005). In contrast, the few studies which have adopted a wider range of secondary indicators have produced fairly consistent, statistically significant results (Brewer, 2007; Dow & Karunaratna, 2006; Dow & Larimo, 2007; Dow & Larimo, 2008; Drogendijk & Martin, 2008). Thus, at both the theoretical level and the empirical level, there are strong arguments for researchers to use a wider range of psychic distance stimuli than just the Kogut & Singh index.

Now, we turn to the less commonly employed approaches to measuring psychic distance. A modest number of researchers have attempted to directly measure **perceptions** of psychic distance (e.g. Stottinger & Schlegelmilch, 1998). This stream of research can be further divided into two branches. Some researchers have used multiple item scales to capture the relevant manager’s perceptions of the various dimensions of psychic distance (Evans & Mavondo, 2002; Kim & Hwang, 1992; Klein & Roth, 1990; Sousa & Bradley, 2006). A

² Given the plethora of such articles, we have not attempted to cite them here, but rather refer you to several excellent reviews (Harzing, 2003; Tihanyi et al., 2005; Zhao et al., 2004).

larger, though still modest number of researchers have attempted to directly measure the ‘summary construct’ using single item scales (Boyacigiller, 1990; Dow, 2000; Gripsrud, 1990; Pedersen & Petersen, 2004) or the principals of cognitive mapping (Dichtl, Koeglmayr, & Mueller, 1990; Dichtl, Leibold, Koeglmayr, & Mueller, 1984; Stottinger & Schlegelmilch, 1998).

These ‘perceptual’ approaches to measuring psychic distance have tended to yield more statistically significant results (Zhao et al., 2004); however, they are not without their limitations. Virtually all of the published studies linking a decision-maker’s perceptions of psychic distance to actual decisions, measured the perceptions *post-hoc*; and thus, there are legitimate concerns about the direction of causality of the observed correlations.

In summary, each of these streams of psychic distance research has its strengths and weaknesses. The secondary data approach has the benefit of exogenous and unbiased estimates, but completely ignores the perceptual aspects of psychic distance. Conversely, the cognitive approach addresses the perceptual aspects, and provides greater predictive power, but is chronically hindered by the fact that *a priori* estimates of psychic distance are notoriously difficult to collect. Furthermore, the cognitive approach begs to obvious question: ‘what is driving those perceptions’?

Not surprisingly, these comments lead us back to the main research agenda of this paper. We are proposing to take the next step in the measurement of psychic distance, and investigate the factors which drive a manager’s actual perceptions of psychic distance. In particular, we want to confirm the linkage between perceptions of psychic distance and the exogenous ‘psychic distance stimuli’; as well as identify specific characteristics of the decision-makers which may cause their perceptions to occasionally diverge from the ‘exogenous’ and ‘objective’ measures of differences. We are, in effect, trying to bridge the gap between the legions of researchers who prefer to employ ‘secondary source’ indicators of

psychic distance stimuli and researchers who advocate ‘perceptual’ measures of psychic distance. To date, only two previous papers have attempted to bridge this gap (Hakanson & Ambos, 2007; Sousa & Bradley, 2006); however in both of these analyses, the Kogut and Singh index was the only psychic distance stimuli considered. It is our intention to go much further by including a broad range of psychic distance stimuli, and by including a wide range of respondent characteristics which may have direct and/or moderating effects on perceived psychic distance.

Psychic Distance Stimuli

The starting point for developing our hypotheses is the manager’s perception of psychic distance. As argued by researchers such as Boyacigiller (1990) and Harzing (2003), managers make decisions based on their perceptions of the environment; and thus, it is the manager’s perception of psychic distance that is critical when investigating issues such as market selection and choice of entry mode. However, when we turn our attention to what drives those perceptions, the exogenous national-level psychic distance stimuli, such as large differences in culture, language, religion, education, industrial development and political systems amongst countries, are almost certainly going to play a major role. While there are undeniably variations within countries (Shenkar, 2001), large variations amongst countries are similarly undeniable. Thus, our first set of hypotheses are essentially taken directly from the early work of the Uppsala School (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977; Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1975), and reflect the secondary data approach to measuring psychic distance (e.g. Dow & Karunaratna, 2006; Kogut & Singh, 1988). Foremost amongst these factors are differences in dominant languages and religions amongst countries. These two factors have been frequently cited within the psychic distance literature for over thirty years (Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1975); and for individuals who have not traveled abroad, they are arguably the most visible of the psychic distance stimuli. In addition to these, national level

differences in industrial development, education, and political systems have all been frequently cited as possible factors contributing to high levels of psychic distance (Boyacigiller, 1990; Carlson, 1974; Evans & Mavondo, 2002; Johanson & Vahlne, 1977; Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1975).

H1. Perceptions of psychic distance amongst countries will be positively associated with national level differences in a) languages, b) religion, c) education levels, d) industrial development, and e) political systems.

Country-Specific Respondent Characteristics

As acknowledged by Shenkar (2001) and others, there are substantial intra-country differences in many of the aforementioned psychic distance stimuli. In particular, there are substantial variations in linguistic abilities and religious affiliations within many countries. Similarly, high levels of international migration and international travel have created subsets of people in each country for whom national-level averages do not accurately reflect their international experiences. As a result, while national level averages will almost certainly influence perceptions of psychic distance, they do not necessarily capture all of the potential variance. For this reason, we have introduced a set of three hypotheses which reflect instances where an individual's experiences and background may deviate from national average.

Fluency in a foreign language, defined here as fluency in a language other than one of the dominant languages of the person's home country, is the first of these factors. While the linguistic distance between Canada and Japan may be quite large, for a Canadian who is fluent in Japanese, the perceived distance between the two countries is likely to be substantially lower. Similarly, for a Chinese citizen who speaks fluent English, the perceived distance of the USA, UK, Canada and New Zealand will tend to be lower than for a Chinese

citizen who does not have such linguistic capabilities. In many respects, this hypothesis is simply a repetition of **H1a** taking into account instances where an individual's experiences deviate from the national average.

H2a. An individual's fluency in 'another' language (*i.e. a language other than the dominant language of their home country*) will reduce their 'perception of the psychic distance' of countries in which that language is commonly spoken.

A similar argument can be made with respect to a person's knowledge and/or affiliation with a religion other than the dominant religion of their home country. If an individual has an affiliation with, or a high degree of knowledge of a religion other than the dominant religion of their home country, then 'national level differences in religion' (*i.e.* hypothesis **H1b**) will not fully capture their situation. This 'extra knowledge' of a particular religion is very likely to affect that individual's perception of countries where that religion is dominant. For example, a German citizen who is Muslim will perceive predominantly Muslim countries, such as Egypt or Qatar, to be psychically closer than a German citizen who has minimal knowledge or affiliation with Islam.

H2b. An individual's knowledge of, or affiliation with 'another' religion (*i.e. a religion other than the dominant religion of their home country*) will reduce their 'perception of the psychic distance' of countries in which that religion is dominant.

For the third hypothesis in this set, we move away from specific dimensions of psychic distance stimuli, and focus on the issue of a person's international experiences. A cornerstone of the Uppsala internationalisation model (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977; Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1975) is that tacit knowledge plays a critical role as a firm internationalizes, and this knowledge can only effectively be acquired by direct experience. As a result, a firm will initially enter a psychically distant market in a low commitment mode.

However, as the firm gains experience, its store of knowledge which is relevant to that market will increase; thus decreasing its perception of the psychic distance of that market. In turn, the firm gradually moves to higher commitment modes within that country. For our purposes, we simply want to move this chain of logic down from the level of the firm to the level of the individual. As an individual gains experience with a specific foreign country, their perception of the psychic distance of that market will decrease. For example, a Danish citizen who travels frequently to Brazil and Chile for business purposes, and possibly even lives there for a short while, will perceive Brazil and Chile to be psychically closer than a Danish citizen who has had no direct contact with those countries. Similarly, a Turkish citizen who travels to the USA, whether it be on a holiday or to study, will tend to view the USA as psychically closer than a Turkish citizen who has never travelled to the USA. Thus, we predict that international travel to a specific country will reduce a person's perception of the psychic distance of that country.

H2c. The degree to which an individual has travelled to, or lived in a foreign country will reduce their 'perception of the psychic distance' of that country.

Moderating Hypotheses

In addition to the national level psychic distance stimuli, and the country-specific respondent characteristics, there is a third set of factors which may influence a person's perceptions of psychic distance. These are factors which potentially moderate an individual's response to the various psychic distance stimuli. In contrast to the second set of hypotheses, we are talking here about factors which are NOT country specific, and which have a moderating impact rather than a direct effect on perceived psychic distance. In particular, we believe factors such as the decision-maker's age, education and overall international experience may moderate their perceptions of psychic distance. This set of hypotheses can

claim its origins in the early work of the Uppsala School. One of the fundamental elements of the Uppsala internationalization process model is the contention that an organization learns as it gains experience, and thus its perceptions of foreign markets change over time. This was an explicit acknowledgement that characteristics of the decision-makers play an important role in moderating their perceptions of psychic distance. Thus, this set of hypotheses concerns the moderating impact of decision-maker characteristics on their perceptions of psychic distance.

Age

Borrowing from the top-management-team (TMT) literature (Hambrick & Mason, 1984), the age of an individual is one characteristic which has been frequently linked to potential biases in a person's perceptions, attitudes and beliefs. Wiersema & Bantel (1992, p.93) argue that relative youth amongst senior managers is related to their "receptivity to change" and their "willingness to take risks". They found a significant relationship between the age of senior managers and the degree of diversification of their organisation. Buchholtz & Ribbens (1994), and Herrmann & Datta (2006) investigated similar hypotheses with respect to the resistance to takeovers and the choice of foreign entry modes respectively. Within the context of perceptions of psychic distance, this proposed 'resistance to change' and 'stronger aversion to risk taking' would be manifested in an older manager having a stronger negative reaction to any 'objective differences' between countries (e.g. a different language), than a younger manager. In effect, we are predicting that the age of the manager will magnify the relationship between the exogenous psychic distance stimuli and the overall perception of psychic distance.

H3a. The relationship between the various types of ‘psychic distance stimuli’ and a person’s ‘perceptions of psychic distance’ will be positively moderated by the age of the individual.

Level of Education

A second characteristic which has been frequently cited in the TMT literature and has been linked to ‘openmindedness’ (Herrmann & Datta, 2002), ‘receptivity to change’ (Wiersema & Bantel, 1992) and ‘receptivity to innovation’ (Hambrick & Mason, 1984) is the level of formal education. Extending these propositions to perceptions of psychic distance, one might expect a manager with a higher level of formal education to have a more muted response to any differences between countries, than a manager with a lower level of formal education. I.e. the degree of formal education will reduce the strength of the relationship between the exogenous psychic distance stimuli and the overall perception of psychic distance.

H3b. The relationship between the various types of ‘psychic distance stimuli’ and a person’s ‘perceptions of psychic distance’ will be negatively moderated by the level of education of the individual.

Linguistic Abilities

In addition to the arguments we presented in developing hypothesis **H2a**, we believe there may be an even more subtle language effect. In many instances, an individual may be fluent in multiple languages, even though none of those languages happen to be dominant in the country in question. Nevertheless, this linguistic knowledge may still have an impact on the person’s perceptions of the psychic distance of the country. First of all, as an individual learns a language, or languages, beyond their mother tongue, they may come to realise that learning a new language is not as difficult as they had feared. This knowledge in turn may

reduce their fear of all foreign languages. Similarly, their knowledge of other languages may be an indicator of a superior proficiency in learning other languages. This higher proficiency may be innate, or it may be the result of a ‘learning curve effect’. Thirdly, a person’s fluency in a second or third language may be an indicator of a general ‘openness’ and ‘interest’ in different languages, culture, etc. The net effect is that we believe that individuals with a greater general knowledge of multiple languages may have a more muted response to the various distance stimuli, than people with a more limited knowledge of foreign languages. I.e. a greater general knowledge of foreign languages will be associated with a reduction in the strength of the relationship between the actual differences between countries and the person’s overall perceptions of psychic distance.

H3c. The relationship between the various types of ‘psychic distance stimuli’ and a person’s ‘perception of psychic distance’ will be negatively moderated by the individual’s general fluency in multiple languages.

General International Experience

Our final moderating hypothesis parallels hypothesis **H2c**, and focuses on a key mechanism for acquiring new knowledge – international experience; however there is a subtle difference in the underlying logic. When developing the Uppsala internationalisation model, Johanson and Vahlne (1977) made the distinction between ‘general knowledge’ and ‘market-specific knowledge’ (p28). Whereas, our first ‘experience’ hypothesis (**H2c**) built on the concept of market-specific knowledge, hypothesis **H3d** builds on the concept of ‘general international knowledge’. Within the Uppsala model, it is the general international knowledge which a firm acquires while operating in a psychically close market which allows the firm to then move into psychically more distant markets.

At the empirical level, general international experience has a long history in the international business research. In their meta-analysis, Zhao et al (2004) reported that 30 of the 38 empirical studies included in their review included international experience. Furthermore, international experience had the largest and most significant effect size of the six variables examined. However, at the level of the individual, general international experience has received more limited attention (Herrmann & Datta, 2002; Herrmann & Datta, 2006; Sousa & Bradley, 2006). Nevertheless, we think there are sound reasons to believe that as a person gains international experience, either through living or travelling abroad, these experiences will tend to moderate the individual's perception of distant countries.

H3d. The relationship between the various types of 'psychic distance stimuli' and a person's 'perceptions of psychic distance' will be positively moderated by their overall exposure to foreign countries through living and/or travelling abroad.

METHODOLOGY

The preceding hypotheses are tested using a web-based survey of Australian managers conducted in late 2007. These managers were surveyed concerning their perceptions of psychic distance for a selection of countries, and on aspects of their international experiences. This data was matched with secondary source data concerning the specific countries (i.e. the psychic distance stimuli) and subjected to a series of moderated regression analyses. Each moderating variable was created by re-centring the component variables in order to reduce multicollinearity.

Sample Population

Our sample population of Australian managers is selected from a list people who have received some form of management education from the local university in the last 20 years,

ranging from graduates of a Master of Business Administration degree, to individuals who have attended one-day management training sessions. From a total population of approximately 13,000 alumni, a random sample of 1,500 people were contacted via email and asked to participate via a web-based survey. A total of 179 useable responses were collected, yielding a response rate of 12%.

Measuring Perceived Psychic Distance

Perceptions of psychic distance are measured using two different instruments. Our first, and primary instrument for measuring perceptions of psychic distance uses a technique known as Best-Worst Scaling (BWS), also referred to as Max-Diff (Marley & Louviere, 2005). We have chosen this newly emerging technique as it is particularly effective and parsimonious when it is necessary for respondents to assess a relatively large number of alternatives. The second instrument, included to cross-check the BWS estimates, is a classic multi-item semantic scale for measuring perceptions of psychic distance.

For the BWS instrument, we have chosen to investigate the perceived psychic distance of 104 countries; although our main analyses are restricted to 86 countries for which we currently have a full set of predictor variables. In order to cover the full range of 104 countries, our sample survey population was randomly divided into twelve groups. Each group of respondents was asked to rank 16 countries – 8 benchmark countries which are standard across all groups and 8 countries which are unique to each of the 12 groups (i.e. $8 + 12 \times 8 = 104$). The benchmark countries are the same for all respondents to allow us to test for differences across groups and standardize the responses if necessary. The BWS instrument uses a 20 panel, four items per panel ‘balanced’ design. I.e. each respondent is presented with a panel of four countries and asked to select the nearest and the furthest country, in terms of psychic distance. This task is repeated 20 times such that each country and country pair is presented an equal number of times. The definition of psychic distance

supplied to each respondent immediately before completing the task is based on Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul (1975) and is included in Appendix I. Each time a country is selected in a panel of four as the furthest, it has one point added to its score, and each time a respondent ranks a country as the nearest, it has one deducted from its score. This would normally produce a scale centred around zero; however, the scores have been adjusted to produce a scale that varies from 1 to 15 (**Psy Dist_{BWS}**), with a high score indicating a psychically distant country.

The second instrument used to measure perceived psychic distance is based on a combination of scales from Klein & Roth (1990), Kim & Hwang (1992) and Boyacigiller (1990). This instrument is included in order to cross-check the validity of the BWS estimates of psychic distance and is only utilised for 48 countries. As discussed in the literature review, the Klein & Roth scale is one of the few publicly available, multi-item rating scales with which to measure perceived psychic distance³. We subsequently augmented Klein & Roth's five item 5 point scales with two items from Kim & Hwang (1992): 'culture', and 'political systems', and Boyacigillier's (1999) summary construct. These eight items are then subjected to confirmatory factor analysis in order to produce a single summary construct (**Psy Dist₈**).

Measuring Psychic Distance Stimuli

In order to measure the main predictor variables: the various types of psychic distance stimuli, we have adopted six scales put forward by Dow & Karunaratna (2006).

- Differences in language and religion between countries are each measured using three items. The first item is a 5 point scale indicating the 'distance' between the

³ One of the other highly cited potential scales (Evans & Mavondo, 2002) contains a substantially larger number of items (> 24 in the reduced form) and thus was not adopted.

major languages and religions of each country using a hierarchy of languages and religions (Dow & Karunaratna, 2006). The second and third items are 5 point scales indicting the proportion of the population who speak (or are adherents of) one of the other country's major languages (or religions). E.g. the proportion of Americans who speak Japanese and the proportion of Japanese who speak English.

- Differences in levels of education and degree of industrialization are measured using three and nine item scales respectively. For these two instruments, Dow & Karunaratna (2006) utilised data from the United Nations (UN, 1995a; UN, 1995b).
- In order to measure differences in the degree of democracy, a four item instrument is employed, combining scales from Henisz (2000), Gleditsch (2003) and Freedom House (2000). For the remaining aspect of differences in political systems, Beck et al's (2001) scale of political ideology is employed (**Social**) to measure the extent to which the government in power has a bias towards socialist policies.

For the first five of the aforementioned sets of scales, confirmatory factor analysis is used to reduce each of them into a single factor (**Lang^F**, **Relig^F**, **Edu^F**, **Ind Dev^F**, and **Dem^F**). Based on Dow & Karunaratna's expanded data set of 120 countries, the Cronbach Alpha's for these factors are 0.909, 0.844, 0.872, 0.953 and 0.967 respectively⁴. Thus they are all highly reliable indicators. For the measures of differences in education, industrial development, degree of democracy and political ideology, the absolute value of these factors

⁴ Factor loadings for specific items are available from the corresponding author on request.

is employed in keeping with comments and analyses by Shenkar (2001) and Dow & Karunaratna (2006).

Descriptive statistics for all of the psychic distance stimuli factors are included in Table 1. Table 2 provides a correlation matrix for these same factors, the country-specific respondent characteristics, plus the two measures of perceived psychic distance. Details on the specific items in the psychic distance stimuli factors are not presented here as they are extensively discussed in Dow & Karunaratna (2006).

Measuring Respondent Characteristics

Age & Level of education

The first two moderating variables, the age and highest level of formal education of the respondent, are relatively simple to measure. Each respondent's age has been recorded on an 11 point scale with each point representing a 5 year age band (**Age**). The highest level of education achieved (**Education**) has been recorded on a 7 point scale ranging from completion of primary school to completion of a postgraduate degree.

Languages spoken

In order to assess the language capabilities of each respondent, they are asked to indicate the languages they speak, and to provide a rating of their level of fluency in those languages. Fluency in any given language is assessed on a self-reported 5 point scale, ranging from 'unfamiliar with this language' to 'fluent'. This information has then been used to create two 'languages spoken' variables. The first of these (**Lang Count**) is a simple count of the number of languages the respondent claims to be at least partially fluent in (i.e. a score of 2 or higher on the fluency scale).

The second language familiarity variable (**Lang Fluency** _{Local}) is a weighted average of the respondent's fluency in the main languages spoken for the country in question⁵. The weighting scheme is based on the proportion of the country's population which speaks each of 33 commonly spoken languages (Grimes & Grimes, 1996). As a result, this later scale will range from 1 to 5.

Familiarity and affiliation with major religions

One issue which is relatively unique to religion is the distinction between knowledge and/or familiarity with a religion, and affiliation with a religion. The two concepts are almost certainly correlated, but they are distinct. If a person is affiliated with a particular religion, then it is very likely that their familiarity and knowledge of the religion will be generally high. Conversely, a person can be knowledgeable about a religion, yet not be formally affiliated with the religion; however, formal affiliation with a religion (i.e. claiming to be a member or a follower of that religion) will very likely provoke more favourable attitudes towards a foreign country which shares the same religion, than simple knowledge of the religion. For this reason we have included measures of both familiarity and affiliation, but have kept them separate in order to assess their relative impact.

With respect to the issue of familiarity, each respondent is asked to indicate their familiarity with each of seven major religions (Buddhism, Chinese-folk religion, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism and Sikhism) on a 5 point Likert-type scale. This religion familiarity information is then matched with each country nominated in the survey to calculate a weighted average of each respondent's familiarity with that nation's major religions (**Relig Familiar** _{Local}). As with the **Lang Fluency** _{Local} variable, the weighting

⁵ - For this variable we exclude the languages which are dominant in the respondent's home country. This aspect of language differences is already captured in the national-level language variable.

scheme is based on the proportion of the country's population claiming affiliation with each of the seven religions. The national affiliation data is sourced from Barrett (1982).

For the second religion scale, each respondent is given the opportunity to indicate the religion they are '*most strongly affiliated with*'. This information is matched with each country nominated in the survey to calculate a weighted average of each respondent's affiliation with that nation's major religions (**Relig Affiliation_{Local}**).

International experience

For the final category of respondent characteristics, 'international experience', there are three distinct dimensions – living abroad (Carpenter, Sanders, & Gregersen, 2001; Herrmann & Datta, 2006; Reuber & Fischer, 1997), travelling abroad for business purposes, and travelling abroad for personal reasons (Athanassiou & Nigh, 2000; Carpenter & Frederickson, 2001). Within each of these dimensions, we have two measures of general experience and a single measure of country-specific experience.

General 'living overseas' experience is measured by the number of countries the respondent has lived in (**Live OS_{Ctries}**), and the number of years the respondent has lived overseas (**Live OS_{Yrs}**). In terms of country specific experience, living overseas is measured in terms of the number of years the respondent has lived in that country (**Live_{Local}**).

For work-related overseas travel, such general experience is measured in terms of the number of countries visited (**Travel Bus_{Ctries}**) and the number of trips taken (**Travel Bus_{Trips}**). Business related travel to specific countries is measured in terms of the number of trips to that country (**Travel Bus_{Local}**). Travel for personal reasons is measured in the same manner (**Travel Per_{Ctries}**, **Travel Per_{Trips}** and **Travel Per_{Local}**).

For each dimension of general international experience, the two indicators (e.g. years and number of countries) have been subjected to confirmatory factor analysis and collapsed into a single construct (Table 3). However, with respect to combining the three dimensions of

international experience (living overseas, business trips and personal trips), it is important to note that, while they are moderately correlated, they represent distinct methods of acquiring international experience. For that reason, we have treated them as formative indices rather than reflective indices (Diamantopoulos & Winklhofer, 2001), and have combined them arithmetically after standardizing the variables.

The descriptive statistics for the all variables are provided in Table 1. Correlation matrices are provided in Tables 2a and 2b. Table 3 provides the factor loadings and Cronbach alphas for each confirmatory factor analysis.

RESULTS

As shown in Table 3, each of the confirmatory factor analyses produced reliable summary constructs, with all of the factor loadings exceeding 0.700 and Cronbach alpha's ranging from 0.679 to 0.951. Of particular note is the confirmatory factor analysis combining our 8 item secondary measure of perceived psychic distance (**Psy Dist_s**) and our BWS measure of perceive psychic distance (**Psy Dist_{BWS}**). While we eventually use the BWS scale alone, due to its ease of use, and thus substantially greater coverage of countries, a confirmatory factor analysis demonstrates the very high level of correspondence between the two scales. The factor loadings are 0.937 and the Cronbach alpha is 0.859.

Model 1 presented in Table 4 is effectively a test of the first hypothesis. This model is highly significant ($F = 375.85$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.001$) and explains over a third of all the variance in perceived psychic distance (adjusted $R^2 = 0.350$). All of the psychic distance stimuli variables in this model are significant predictors of perceived psychic distance confirming hypotheses **H1a** through to **H1e**. As noted earlier, in order to deal with multicollinearity inherent in the psychic distance stimuli variables, four of the dimensions have been reduced to a single factor; however, in supplementary analyses not presented here, each of those four

correlated variables have been tested independently, and all have statistically significant coefficients.

Model 2 in Table 4 tests the second set of hypotheses. International experience with the local market (**H2c**), and both measures of familiarity/affiliation with local religions (**H2b**) have statistically significant coefficients, confirming their respective hypotheses. The only one of the second set of hypotheses not to be confirmed is the role of fluency in a local language (**H2a**). It should be noted that this result does not necessarily mean that speaking a country's local language is unimportant to perceptions of psychic distance. The non-significant result may simple be the result of the low incidence (3%) in our sample of a respondent being able to speak a foreign language that is relevant for the country in question.

Model 3 through to 14 in Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 represent tests of the four moderating hypotheses. Based on these models, there is no evidence that respondent age (**H3a**) moderates a person's perceived psychic distance, and only weak evidence that respondent degree of education (**H3b**) is a significant moderator. For the respondent's education, the moderating variable is only significant for one of the three psychic distance stimuli and even then it is a relatively weak relationship ($p < .10$, two tailed) given the substantial sample size involved. In contrast, Table 7 indicates that there is substantial evidence that fluency in other languages (**H3c**) is a moderating factor. The effect is strongest with the religion-industrial development-education-democracy factor, and weakest with the differences in socialism factor; however this pattern merely parallels the strength of the direct effects of those three factors. Table 8 indicates some support for overall international experience as a moderating variable (**H3d**), but only with respect to differences in language.

One significant relationship in our regressions which was not part of a formal hypothesis is the direct effect that international experience has on perceived psychic distance. Contrary to what one might expect, the regression coefficient indicates that general international

experience may increase overall perceived psychic distance. In a curious twist, when this result is combined with the moderating effect, it may be an endorsement of O’Grady and Lane’s ‘psychic paradox’ (1996) proposition. Inexperienced firms (or people) may underestimate the ‘distance’ of similar countries. As they gain international experience, their misperceptions about similar countries are corrected, raising the overall average of their perceived psychic distance.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

The most significant finding of this research is the confirmation that all of the six psychic distance stimuli dimensions put forward by Dow and Karunaratna (2006) are significant and important predictors of an individual manager’s perception of psychic distance. These six factors taken together explain 35% of the total variance. In contrast, the respondent specific characteristics investigated here only collectively explain a further 7.4% of the variance. This is particularly relevant given the ongoing debate about whether such national level indicators are appropriate surrogates for perceived psychic distance. Obviously, the ideal situation is one where researchers measure all the constructs, including *a priori* perceptions at the level of each individual; however, this is often not possible given the infrequent and hard to predict timing of many international business decisions. Fortunately, our results show that in such instances, our selection of psychic distance stimuli are reliable predictors of perceived psychic distance, and may be confidently utilised in such situations. These results are consistent with earlier results finding the aforementioned psychic distance stimuli to be strong predictors of trade flows (Dow & Karunaratna, 2006), export market selection (Drogendijk & Martin, 2008), entry mode choices (Dow & Larimo, 2007) and establishment mode choices (Dow & Larimo, 2008).

Notwithstanding the preceding comments, our results also show that there are significant instances where an individual’s personal experiences cause them to deviate from the ‘national

average' in terms of perceived psychic distance. In particular, international travel to specific countries, and a strong knowledge of, or affiliation with a specific religion will influence their perceptions of specific countries. The non-significance of our language variable in this respect is surprising; however, this may only reflect the low incidence of fluency in a second language in our sample population. Similarly, there appear to be important respondent characteristics which moderate the psychic distance stimuli – perceived psychic distance relationship. Specifically, the overall amount of international travel experience of the respondent, the education level of the respondent, and his or her overall linguistic abilities all appear to moderate the respondent's perceptions of psychic distance.

These 'respondent characteristic' findings have important implications for future international business research. In instances where it is not possible to directly measure *a priori* perceptions of psychic distance, it may be possible to measure specific characteristics of the top management team. Combined with the national level indicators, this may allow researchers to more accurately model the *a priori* perceived psychic distance.

The research presented here has a number of limitations which readers should be aware of. The most significant of these limitations concerns the sample population. The sample population employed in this paper is heavily biased in terms of the nationality (exclusively Australian) and the level of education of the respondents (substantially above the national average). The latter of these two biases is intentional in that our primary concern is the perceptions of people who have made, or are likely to make major international business decisions. Thus, our results are not necessarily representative of the population in general, but we believe they may be representative of the potential international business managers. The other potential sample bias - nationality – is of more concern when one considers the generalizability of the results. Australian managers are not necessarily representative of all

managers worldwide, and we most certainly suspect that on issues such as ‘second languages spoken’, they deviate substantially from managers in Europe.

This bias, of course leads us to the next steps in our research agenda. While we have confirmed the linkage between psychic distance stimuli and perceptions in Australia, it is important to confirm whether these same results hold in other countries and cultures. Thus, we believe it is critical to replicate these results across a wide range of countries.

In closing, we want to reiterate that this research is significant in that it builds a bridge between two often ‘opposing views’, or approaches, to measuring psychic distance. Specifically, we are bringing together in one model:

1. measures of exogenous psychic distance stimuli,
2. decision-maker characteristics which may cause them to ‘deviate’ from the ‘national average’,
3. decision-maker characteristics which may have a moderating impact on a manager’s perceptions of psychic distance, and of course
4. decision-maker’s perceptions of psychic distance.

In doing so, we are attempting to both theoretically and empirically reconcile two main approaches to measuring psychic distance, and hopefully provide a greater understanding of an important, but often misrepresented construct.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
<u>Measured at the country level (n = 86)</u>				
Lang ^F	-0.58	1.33	-3.87	0.53
Relig ^F	-0.52	0.93	-1.29	1.53
Edu ^F (abs)	1.10	0.67	0.01	2.17
Ind Dev ^F (abs)	0.87	0.65	0.00	2.22
Dem ^F (abs)	0.67	0.63	0.00	2.13
Social	0.36	0.22	0.00	0.67
<u>Measured at the respondent level (n = 179)</u>				
Age	5.15	2.05	2	11
Education	6.78	0.60	4	7
Lang Count	1.16	0.41	1	3
Live OS _{Ctries}	1.47	1.22	0	5
Live OS _{Yrs}	3.97	3.14	0	8
Travel Bus _{Ctries}	5.88	4.89	0	15
Travel Bus _{Trips}	8.20	6.13	0	15
Travel Per _{Ctries}	9.06	4.99	0	15
Travel Per _{Trips}	9.42	5.05	0	15
<u>Measured at the respondent-country level (n = 2,091)</u>				
Lang Fluency _{Local}	0.03	0.28	0	4.72
Relig Familiar _{Local}	0.39	0.74	0	4.71
Relig Affiliation _{Local}	0.002	0.039	0	0.91
Live _{Local}	0.03	0.21	0	2
Travel Bus _{Local}	0.12	0.42	0	2
Travel Per _{Local}	0.18	0.49	0	2
Psy Dist _{BWS}	7.50	2.83	1	14
Psy Dist ₈	-0.13	1.01	-1.73	+1.63

Table 2a Correlation Matrix for Psychic Distance Stimuli and Respondent Familiarity with Target Market

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Lang ^F	1.00												
2 Relig ^F	0.14	1.00											
3 Edu ^F (abs)	-0.16	0.27	1.00										
4 Ind Dev ^F (abs)	0.20	0.48	0.74	1.00									
5 Dem ^F (abs)	0.32	0.55	0.45	0.75	1.00								
6 Social	0.18	-0.11	0.12	0.24	0.24	1.00							
7 Lang Fluency _{Local}	0.00	-0.05	-0.01	-0.03	-0.04	0.01	1.00						
8 Relig Familiar _{Local}	0.05	0.80	0.36	0.45	0.43	-0.01	-0.02	1.00					
9 Relig Affiliation _{Local}	-0.03	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.02	-0.01	0.05	0.24	1.00				
10 Live _{Local}	-0.18	-0.02	-0.06	-0.12	-0.09	-0.03	0.18	0.02	0.17	1.00			
11 Travel Bus _{Local}	-0.16	0.01	-0.14	-0.18	-0.13	-0.01	0.08	0.00	0.03	0.36	1.00		
12 Travel Per _{Local}	-0.18	0.01	-0.16	-0.20	-0.15	0.00	0.10	0.01	0.09	0.33	0.32		
13 Psy Dist _{BWS}	0.31	0.19	0.48	0.56	0.49	0.19	-0.06	0.21	-0.05	-0.19	-0.28	-0.34	
14 Psy Dist ₈	0.33	0.20	0.61	0.70	0.66	-0.02	-0.09	0.27	0.03	-0.21	-0.35	-0.38	0.75

Table 2b Correlation Matrix for Respondent Familiarity with Target Market and General Respondent Characteristics *

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1 Lang Fluency _{Local}	1.00														
2 Relig Familiar _{Local}	-0.02	1.00													
3 Relig Affiliation _{Local}	0.05	0.24	1.00												
4 Live _{Local}	0.18	0.02	0.17	1.00											
5 Travel Bus _{Local}	0.08	0.00	0.03	0.36	1.00										
6 Travel Per _{Local}	0.10	0.01	0.09	0.33	0.32	1.00									
7 Age	-0.05	0.01	-0.03	0.00	0.11	-0.01	1.00								
8 Education	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	-0.40	1.00							
9 Lang Count	0.20	0.01	0.08	0.05	-0.02	0.02	-0.21	0.05	1.00						
10 Live OS _{Ctries}	0.07	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.10	0.07	-0.08	0.12	0.17	1.00					
11 Live OS _{Yrs}	0.11	0.04	0.06	0.10	0.08	0.02	-0.09	0.22	0.31	0.55	1.00				
12 Travel Bus _{Ctries}	0.01	0.01	-0.05	0.04	0.21	0.01	0.24	0.11	-0.05	0.26	0.20	1.00			
13 Travel Bus _{Trips}	0.00	0.01	-0.05	0.05	0.26	0.05	0.21	0.10	-0.05	0.28	0.18	0.76	1.00		
14 Travel Per _{Ctries}	0.09	0.03	-0.04	0.02	0.10	0.13	0.08	0.20	0.07	0.31	0.31	0.42	0.32	1.00	
15 Travel Per _{Trips}	0.06	0.00	-0.04	-0.04	0.03	0.15	-0.06	0.09	-0.01	0.15	-0.01	0.12	0.19	0.51	1.00
16 Psy Dist _{BWS}	-0.06	0.21	-0.05	-0.19	-0.28	-0.34	0.01	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01
17 Psy Dist _g	-0.09	0.27	0.03	-0.21	-0.35	-0.38	0.02	-0.05	0.08	-0.05	0.01	0.00	-0.04	-0.02	-0.08

* The correlations amongst the psychic distance stimuli variables and the general respondent characteristics are not shown, but are available on request from the lead author. None of the omitted correlations are statistically significant and are all less than 0.05.

Table 3 Factor Loadings and Construct Reliabilities

	Factor Loadings	Cronbach Alpha
Relig, Ind, Edu & Dem Factor		
Relig ^F	0.832	0.786
Edu ^F (abs)	0.795	
Ind Dev ^F (abs)	0.867	
Dem ^F (abs)	0.680	
Experience^{General}		
Live OS _{Ctries}	0.880	0.707
Live OS _{Yrs}	0.880	
Travel Bus _{Ctries}	0.938	0.864
Travel Bus _{Trips}	0.938	
Travel Per _{Ctries}	0.870	0.679
Travel Per _{Trips}	0.870	
Psychic Distance – PsyDist₈		
“Differences in Language	0.716	0.951
... Culture”	0.882	
... Business Practices”	0.928	
... Economic environment”	0.881	
... Legal system”	0.910	
... Communications infrastructure”	0.838	
... Political system”	0.873	
“Difficult to do business ...”	0.894	
PsyDist₈	0.937	0.859
PsyDist_{BWS}	0.937	

Table 4 Regressions Predicting Perceived Psychic Distance (direct effects only)

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t
Lang ^F	0.446 ***		12.21	0.334 ***		9.47	0.326 ***		9.23
Relig, Ind, Edu & Dem Factor	1.443 ***		27.59	1.562 ***		24.19	1.565 ***		24.24
Social	0.727 **		3.37	0.694 **		3.36	0.698 **		3.39
Experience _{Local}				-2.356 ***		-13.35	-2.450 ***		-13.66
Lang Fluency _{Local}				-0.039		-0.23	-0.071		-0.42
Relig Familiar _{Local}				-0.453 ***		-5.39	-0.464 ***		-5.52
Relig Affiliation _{Local}				-2.899 *		-2.33	-2.715 *		-2.18
Age							0.027		1.04
Education							0.054		0.61
Lang Count							0.047		0.39
Experience _{General}							0.173 *		2.47
Adj R ²	.350			.422			.424		
F (df)	375.85 (3)			219.02 (7)			140.59 (11)		
P	< .001			< .001			< .001		
Δ F (df)				66.18 (4)			2.34 (4)		
P of the change				< .001			.053		

Table 5 Regressions Predicting Perceived Psychic Distance with Respondent's Age as a Moderator

	Model 3			Model 4			Model 5			Model 6		
	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t
Lang ^F	0.326 ***		9.23	0.326 ***		9.22	0.326 ***		9.23	0.324 ***		9.17
Relig, Ind, Edu & Dem Factor	1.565 ***		24.24	1.565 ***		24.25	1.565 ***		24.23	1.564 ***		24.24
Social	0.698 **		3.39	0.705 **		3.42	0.698 **		3.39	0.695 **		3.37
Experience _{Local}	-2.450 ***		-13.66	-2.447 ***		-13.64	-2.450 ***		-13.65	-2.458 ***		-13.70
Lang Fluency _{Local}	-0.071		-0.42	-0.077		-0.45	-0.071		-0.42	-0.061		-0.36
Relig Familiar _{Local}	-0.464 ***		-5.52	-0.465 ***		-5.54	-0.464 ***		-5.52	-0.462 ***		-5.50
Relig Affiliation _{Local}	-2.715 *		-2.18	-2.691 *		-2.16	-2.712 *		-2.17	-2.719 *		-2.18
Age	0.027		1.04	0.030		1.15	0.028		1.03	0.028		1.08
Education	0.054		0.61	0.056		0.63	0.054		0.61	0.056		0.64
Lang Count	0.047		0.39	0.048		0.40	0.047		0.39	0.046		0.38
Experience _{General}	0.173 *		2.47	0.173 *		2.47	0.173 *		2.47	0.169 *		2.42
Lang ^F x Age				-0.039		-0.82						
'RIED' Factor x Age							0.003		0.06			
Social x Age										0.055		1.17
Adj R ²	.424			.423			.423			.424		
F (df)	140.59	(11)		128.91	(12)		128.81	(12)		129.01	(12)	

Table 6 Regressions Predicting Perceived Psychic Distance with Respondent's Education as a Moderator

	Model 3			Model 7			Model 8			Model 9		
	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t
Lang ^F	0.326	***	9.23	0.326	***	9.24	0.326	***	9.23	0.326	***	9.23
Relig, Ind, Edu & Dem Factor	1.565	***	24.24	1.565	***	24.24	1.560	***	24.15	1.566	***	24.26
Social	0.698	**	3.39	0.697	**	3.38	0.700	**	3.40	0.697	**	3.38
Experience _{Local}	-2.450	***	-13.66	-2.448	***	-13.64	-2.454	***	-13.69	-2.448	***	-13.65
Lang Fluency _{Local}	-0.071		-0.42	-0.072		-0.42	-0.069		-0.40	-0.077		-0.45
Relig Familiar _{Local}	-0.464	***	-5.52	-0.464	***	-5.52	-0.456	***	-5.42	-0.466	***	-5.54
Relig Affiliation _{Local}	-2.715	*	-2.18	-2.715	*	-2.18	-2.677	*	-2.15	-2.712	*	-2.18
Age	0.027		1.04	0.027		1.05	0.028		1.05	0.027		1.04
Education	0.054		0.61	0.053		0.60	0.019		0.21	0.055		0.62
Lang Count	0.047		0.39	0.048		0.39	0.047		0.39	0.050		0.41
Experience _{General}	0.173	*	2.47	0.173	*	2.47	0.174	*	2.48	0.174	*	2.48
Lang ^F x Education				0.012		0.27						
'RIED' Factor x Education							-0.087	t	-1.85			
Social x Education										0.038		0.80
Adj R ²	.424			.423			.424			.423		
F (df)	140.59	(11)		128.82	(12)		129.30	(12)		128.90	(12)	

Table 7 Regressions Predicting Perceived Psychic Distance with Respondent's Language Abilities as a Moderator

	Model 3			Model 10			Model 11			Model 12		
	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t
Lang ^F	0.326	***	9.23	0.325	***	9.22	0.329	***	9.33	0.326	***	9.23
Relig, Ind, Edu & Dem Factor	1.565	***	24.24	1.564	***	24.27	1.553	***	24.08	1.566	***	24.27
Social	0.698	**	3.39	0.697	**	3.39	0.705	**	3.43	0.686	**	3.33
Experience _{Local}	-2.450	***	-13.66	-2.451	***	-13.69	-2.453	***	-13.71	-2.456	***	-13.70
Lang Fluency _{Local}	-0.071		-0.42	-0.034		-0.20	-0.084		-0.49	-0.051		-0.30
Relig Familiar _{Local}	-0.464	***	-5.52	-0.453	***	-5.40	-0.453	***	-5.40	-0.464	***	-5.53
Relig Affiliation _{Local}	-2.715	*	-2.18	-3.082	*	-2.46	-2.270	t	-1.82	-2.754	*	-2.21
Age	0.027		1.04	0.027		1.04	0.029		1.09	0.028		1.06
Education	0.054		0.61	0.054		0.61	0.060		0.67	0.053		0.60
Lang Count	0.047		0.39	0.091		0.75	-0.101		0.79	0.047		0.39
Experience _{General}	0.173	*	2.47	0.170	*	2.43	0.165	*	2.37	0.170	*	2.43
Lang ^F x Lang Count				-0.136	**	-2.84						
'RIED' Factor x Lang Count							-0.173	**	-3.42			
Social x Lang Count										-0.094	t	-1.90
Adj R ²	.424			.425			.426			.424		
F (df)	140.59	(11)		129.98	(12)		130.51	(12)		129.33	(12)	

Table 8 Regressions Predicting Perceived Psychic Distance with Respondent's International Travel Experience as a Moderator

	Model 3			Model 13			Model 14			Model 15		
	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t	b	Sig.	t
Lang ^F	0.326	***	9.23	0.320	***	9.09	0.324	***	9.17	0.327	***	9.25
Relig, Ind, Edu & Dem Factor	1.565	***	24.24	1.555	***	24.14	1.559	***	24.12	1.564	***	24.23
Social	0.698	**	3.39	0.739	***	3.60	0.705	**	3.42	0.697	**	3.38
Experience _{Local}	-2.450	***	-13.66	-2.496	***	-13.93	-2.478	***	-13.76	-2.447	***	-13.64
Lang Fluency _{Local}	-0.071		-0.42	-0.053		-0.31	-0.080		-0.47	-0.073		-0.43
Relig Familiar _{Local}	-0.464	***	-5.52	-0.455	***	-5.43	-0.452	***	-5.36	-0.462	***	-5.50
Relig Affiliation _{Local}	-2.715	*	-2.18	-2.537	*	-2.04	-2.799	*	-2.24	-2.715	*	-2.18
Age	0.027		1.04	0.028		1.08	0.027		1.02	0.028		1.07
Education	0.054		0.61	0.054		0.61	0.055		0.62	0.054		0.61
Lang Count	0.047		0.39	0.041		0.34	0.041		0.33	0.046		0.38
Experience _{General}	0.173	*	2.47	0.206	**	2.93	0.144	*	1.99	0.173	*	2.48
Lang ^F x Experience _{General}				-0.181	***	-3.87						
'RIED' Factor x Experience _{General}							-0.080		-1.64			
Social x Experience _{General} t										-0.035		-0.73
Adj R ²	.424			.431			.424			.423		
F	140.59	(11)		130.99	(12)		129.20	(12)		128.88	(12)	

Appendix I – Survey Questions

Best Worst Scaling instructions	<p>In this portion of the survey, we are asking you to make judgements about the relative 'psychic distance' of a variety of countries (see below for the definition of psychic distance). For each of the 20 panels of four countries, select:</p> <p>The country which you feel is the nearest to you in terms of psychic distance (by electing a button in the first column), and</p> <p>The country which you feel is the furthest from you in terms of psychic distance (by selecting a button in the third column)</p> <p>Please note that while this is a survey of Australian managers, we are asking for your perceptions of that country, based on your experiences. We do not expect you to be knowledgeable about each and every country, but we do request that you select a 'nearest' and 'furthest' country for each panel of four, based on your current perceptions.</p> <p>Definition of Psychic Distance: Psychic distance is typically described as ...</p> <p><i>"the sum of factors preventing or disturbing the flow of information between firm and market. Examples of such factors are differences in language, culture, political systems, level of education, level of industrial development, etc."</i> Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1975</p> <p>In essence, psychic distance reflects the degree of difficulty people have in communicating with, and understanding, another person (or market as a whole) when conducting business in a foreign market. As such, psychic distance has the potential to influence which foreign countries Australian firms choose to compete in, the mode by which they might enter such markets, and the likelihood of their success.</p> <p>For the purpose of this research, we define the aforementioned term 'conduct business in' to include the full range of possible foreign market entry modes, ranging from indirect exporting to managing direct foreign investments.</p>															
<p>The panel on the right is one of 20 that each respondent was asked to complete</p>	<table><tr><td>The 'NEAREST' country to you is:</td><td></td><td>The 'FURTHEST' country to you is:</td></tr><tr><td><input type="radio"/></td><td>Lithuania</td><td><input type="radio"/></td></tr><tr><td><input type="radio"/></td><td>Sweden</td><td><input type="radio"/></td></tr><tr><td><input type="radio"/></td><td>Pakistan</td><td><input type="radio"/></td></tr><tr><td><input type="radio"/></td><td>Croatia</td><td><input type="radio"/></td></tr></table>	The 'NEAREST' country to you is:		The 'FURTHEST' country to you is:	<input type="radio"/>	Lithuania	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Sweden	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Pakistan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Croatia	<input type="radio"/>
The 'NEAREST' country to you is:		The 'FURTHEST' country to you is:														
<input type="radio"/>	Lithuania	<input type="radio"/>														
<input type="radio"/>	Sweden	<input type="radio"/>														
<input type="radio"/>	Pakistan	<input type="radio"/>														
<input type="radio"/>	Croatia	<input type="radio"/>														

REFERENCES

- Athanassiou, N., & Nigh, D. (2000). Internationalization, Tacit Knowledge and the Top Management Teams of MNCs. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31(3), 471-487.
- Barrett, D. B. (Ed.). (1982). *World Christian Encyclopedia*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, T., Clarke, G., Groff, A., Keefer, P., & Walsh, P. (2001). New Tools in Comparative Political Economy: The Database of Political Institutions. *World Bank Economic Review*, 15(1), 165-176.
- Boyacigiller, N. (1990). The Role of Expatriates in the Management of Interdependence, Complexity and Risk in Multinational Corporations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21(3), 357-381.
- Brewer, P. (2007). Operationalizing Psychic Distance: A Revised Approach. *Journal of International Marketing*, 15(1), 44-66.
- Brouthers, K. D. (2002). Institutional, Cultural and Transaction Cost Influences on Entry Mode Choice and Performance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33(2), 203-221.
- Brouthers, K. D., & Brouthers, L. E. (2000). Acquisition or Greenfield Startup? Institutional, Cultural and Transaction Cost Influences. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(1), 89-97.
- Brouthers, K. D., & Brouthers, L. E. (2001). Explaining the National Cultural Distance Paradox. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(1), 177-192.
- Buchholtz, A. K., & Ribbens, B. A. (1994). Role of Chief Executive Officers in Takeover Resistance: Effects of CEO Incentives and Individual Characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 554-579.
- Carlson, S. (1974). International Transmission of Information and the Business Firm. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 412(March), 55-63.
- Carpenter, M. A., & Frederickson, J. W. (2001). Top Management Teams, Global Strategic Posture, and the Moderating Role of Uncertainty. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(3), 533-545.
- Carpenter, M. A., Sanders, W. G., & Gregersen, H. B. (2001). Bundling Human Capital with Organizational Context: The Impact of International Assignment Experience on Multinational Firm Performance and CEO Pay. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(3), 493-511.
- Chang, S.-J., & Rosenzweig, P. M. (2001). The Choice of Entry Mode in Sequential Foreign Direct Investment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(8), 747-776.
- Child, J., Ng, S. H., & Wong, C. (2002). Psychic Distance and Internationalization. *International Studies of Management & Organizations*, 32(1), 36-56.
- Cho, K. R., & Padmanabhan, P. (1995). Acquisition Versus New Venture: The Choice of Foreign Establishment Mode by Japanese Firms. *Journal of International Management*, 1(3), 255-285.
- Davidson, W. (1980). The Location of Foreign Direct Investment Activity: Country Characteristics and Experience Effects. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 11(2), 9-22.
- Diamantopoulos, A., & Winklhofer, H. M. (2001). Index Construction with Formative Indicators: An Alternative to Scale Development. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2), 269-277.
- Dichtl, E., Koeglmayr, H.-G., & Mueller, S. (1990). International Orientation as a Precondition for Export Success. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21(1), 23-40.
- Dichtl, E., Leibold, M., Koeglmayr, H.-G., & Mueller, S. (1984). The Export Decision of Small and Medium-Sized Firms: A Review. *Management International Review*, 24(2), 49-60.

- Dow, D. (2000). A Note on Psychological Distance and Export Market Selection. *Journal of International Marketing*, 8(1), 51-64.
- Dow, D. (2001). The Adaptation of Host Market Positioning Strategies: Empirical Evidence from Australia. *Journal of International Marketing*, 9(3), 41-62.
- Dow, D. (2006). Factors Moderating the Impact of Psychic Distance Stimuli: Empirical Tests on Bi-Lateral Trade Flows, Academy of International Business. Beijing, China.
- Dow, D., & Karunaratna, A. (2006). Developing a Multidimensional Instrument to Measure Psychic Distance Stimuli. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(5), 575-577.
- Dow, D., & Larimo, J. (2007). Entry Mode Choice: Testing New Approaches to Measuring Psychic Distance and International Experience, European International Business Academy. Catania, Italy.
- Dow, D., & Larimo, J. (2008). Psychic Distance, International Experience and Establishment Mode, Academy of International Business. Milan.
- Drogendijk, R., & Martin, O. (2008). Country Distance: A Objective Measure and Its Impact on International Market Selection, Academy of International Business. Milan.
- Evans, J., & Mavondo, F. T. (2002). Psychic Distance and Organizational Performance: An Empirical Examination of International Retailing Operations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33(3), 515-532.
- Evans, J., Mavondo, F. T., & Bridson, K. (2008). Psychic Distance: Antecedents, Retail Strategy Implications and Performance Outcomes. *Journal of International Marketing*, 16(2), 32-63.
- Fletcher, R., & Bohn, J. (1998). The Impact of Psychic Distance on the Internationalisation of the Australian Firm. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 12(2), 47-68.
- Freedom_House. (2000). Freedom in the World. Retrieved 17 December, 2003, from <http://www.freedomhouse.org/upload/FIWrank7502.xls>
- Gleditsch, K. S. (2003). Modified Polity P4 and P4D Data. Retrieved 17 December, 2003, from <http://weber.ucsd.edu/~kgledits/Polity.html>
- Gomes, L., & Ramaswamy, K. (1999). An Empirical Examination of the Form of the Relationship Between Multinationality and Performance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30(1), 173-188.
- Gong, Y., Shenkar, O., Luo, Y., & Nyaw, M.-K. (2005). Human Resources and International Joint Venture Performance: A System Perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(5), 505-518.
- Green, R. T., & Cunningham, W. H. (1975). The Determinants of US Foreign Direct Investment: An Empirical Investigation. *Management International Review*, 15(2-3), 113-120.
- Grimes, J. E., & Grimes, B. F. (Eds.). (1996). *Ethnologue Language Family Index*. Dallas, Tx: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Gripsrud, G. (1990). The Determinants of Export Decisions and Attitudes to a Distant Market: Norwegian Fishery Exports to Japan. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21(3), 469-486.
- Grosse, R., & Goldberg, L. G. (1991). Foreign Bank Activities in the United States: An Analysis by Country of Origin. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 15(6), 1093-1112.
- Grosse, R., & Trevino, L. J. (1996). Foreign Direct Investment in the United States: An Analysis by Country of Origin. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(1), 139-155.
- Habib, M., & Zurawicki, L. (2002). Corruption and Foreign Direct Investment. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33(2), 291-307.

- Hakanson, L., & Ambos, B. (2007). The Antecedents of Psychic Distance, European International Business Academy. Catania, Sicily.
- Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). Upper Echelons: The Organization as a Reflection of Its Top Management. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 193-206.
- Harzing, A. W. (2002). Acquisitions Versus Greenfield Investments: International Strategy and Management of Entry Modes. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23(3), 211-227.
- Harzing, A. W. (2003). The Role of Culture in Entry Mode Studies: From Neglect to Myopia. In J. C. a. M. Hitt (Ed.), *Advances in International Management* (Vol. 15, pp. 75-127). Amsterdam/New York: Elsevier / JAI.
- Henisz, W. J. (2000). The Institutional Environment for Economic Growth. *Economics and Politics*, 12(1), 1-31.
- Herrmann, P., & Datta, D. K. (2002). CEO Successor Characteristics and the Choice of Foreign Market Entry Mode: An Empirical Study. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33(3), 551-569.
- Herrmann, P., & Datta, D. K. (2006). CEO Experiences: Effects on the Choice of FDI Entry Mode. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(4), 755-778.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultural Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Holzmuller, H. H., & Kasper, H. (1990). The Decision-Maker and Export Activity: A Cross-National Comparison of the Foreign Orientation of Austrian Managers. *Management International Review*, 30(3), 217-230.
- Johanson, J., & Vahlne, J.-E. (1977). The Internationalization Process of the Firm-A Model of Knowledge Development and Increasing Foreign Commitments. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 8(1), 23-32.
- Johanson, J., & Wiedersheim-Paul, F. (1975). The Internationalization of the Firm: Four Swedish Cases. *Journal of Management Studies*, 12(October), 305-322.
- Kim, W. C., & Hwang, P. (1992). Global Strategy and Multinationals' Entry Mode Choice. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23(1), 29-53.
- Klein, S., & Roth, V. J. (1990). Determinants of Export Channel Structure: The Effects of Experience and Psychic Distance. *International Marketing Review*, 7(5), 27-38.
- Kogut, B., & Singh, H. (1988). The Effect of National Culture on the Choice of Entry Mode. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19(3), 411-432.
- Lee, D.-J. (1998). The Effect of Cultural Distance on the Relational Exchange Between Exporters and Importers: The Case of Australian Exporters. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 11(4), 7-22.
- Magnusson, P., Baack, D. W., Zdravkovic, S., & Staub, K. (2006). Cultural Distance in International Business: A Meta-Analytic Review, Academy of International Business. Beijing.
- Manev, I. M., & Stevenson, W. B. (2001). Nationality, Cultural Distance, and Expatriate Status: Effects on the Managerial Network in a Multinational Enterprise. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(2), 285-303.
- Marley, A. A. J., & Louviere, J. J. (2005). Some Probabilistic Models of Best, Worst, and Best-Worst Choices. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 49(6), 464-480.
- Mueller, B. (1991). Multinational Advertising: Factors Influencing the Standardised Versus Specialised Approach. *International Marketing Review*, 8(1), 7-18.
- O'Grady, S., & Lane, H. W. (1996). The Psychic Distance Paradox. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(2), 309-333.

- Padmanabhan, P., & Cho, K. R. (1999). Decision Specific Experience in Foreign Ownership and Establishment Strategies: Evidence from Japanese Firms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30(1), 25-43.
- Pedersen, T., & Petersen, B. (2004). Learning About Foreign Markets: Are Entrant Firms Exposed to a "Shock Effect"? *Journal of International Marketing*, 12(1), 103-123.
- Reuber, A. R., & Fischer, E. (1997). The Influence of the Management Team's International Experience on the Internationalization Behaviors of SMEs. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28(4), 807-825.
- Shaver, J. M. (1998). Accounting for Endogeneity when Assessing Strategy Performance: Does Entry Mode Choice Affect FDI Survival. *Management Science*, 44(4), 571-585.
- Shenkar, O. (2001). Cultural Distance Revisited: Towards a More Rigorous Conceptualization and Measurement of Cultural Differences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(3), 519-536.
- Sousa, C. M. P., & Bradley, F. (2005). Global Markets: Does Psychic Distance Matter? *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 13(1), 43-59.
- Sousa, C. M. P., & Bradley, F. (2006). Cultural Distance and Psychic Distance: Two Peas in a Pod? *Journal of International Marketing*, 14(1), 49-70.
- Stottinger, B., & Schlegelmilch, B. B. (1998). Explaining Export Development Through Psychic Distance: Enlightening or Elusive? *International Marketing Review*, 15(5), 357-372.
- Stottinger, B., & Schlegelmilch, B. B. (2000). A Response to Evans et al: Psychic Distance: A Concept Past its Due Date. *International Marketing Review*, 17(2), 169-173.
- Tihanyi, L., Griffith, D. A., & Russell, C. J. (2005). The Effect of Cultural Distance on Entry Mode Choice, International Diversification, and MNE Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(3), 270-283.
- UN. (1995a). Social Indicator Data. Retrieved 16 June, 1998, from <http://www.un.org/depts/unsd/social/>
- UN. (1995b). Statistical Yearbook (42nd ed.). New York: United Nations Statistical Division.
- Wiedersheim-Paul, F., Olson, H. C., & Welch, L. S. (1978). Pre-Export Activity: The First Step in Internationalization. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 9(1), 47-58.
- Wiersema, M. F., & Bantel, K. A. (1992). Top Management Team Demography and Corporate Strategic Change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(1), 91-121.
- Zhao, H., Luo, Y., & Suh, T. (2004). Transaction Cost Determinants and Ownership-Based Entry Mode Choice: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(6), 524-544.