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ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine the relationships between job resources at various levels, including (a) an individual level—positive psychological capital (PsyCap); (b) an interpersonal level—perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, and perceived family support; (c) an organizational level—perceived organizational support; and (d) a societal level—perceived community support, and work performance in the context of an expatriate assignment. The mediating effects of cross-cultural adjustment (CCA) and work engagement on the relationships were also examined. Three theories, conservation of resource theory, job demands-resources model, and spillover theory guided this study. The variables and the Korean cultural context are systematically reviewed to develop research hypotheses.

An online questionnaire survey was implemented to collect data, including 12 translated instruments into Korean. The sample size was 438 Korean expatriates in 32 countries. Descriptive statistics, reliability, correlation, common method variance, confirmatory factor analysis, structural equation modeling, and bootstrapping were used in this study.

The results of the analyses indicated that the hypothesized conceptual model was adequately supported by the results of this study. In the path analysis, PsyCap was associated with all dimensions of CCA. While perceived supervisor support was related to organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and general CCA, perceived subordinate support was associated with work performance, work engagement, and interaction CCA.
Perceived family support was related to task performance, counterproductive work behavior (CWB), and work engagement. Perceived organizational support was related to OCB and all dimensions of CCA. Perceived community support was associated with interaction and work CCA. General CCA was associated with work engagement, CWB, and withdrawal behavior. Interaction CCA was associated with task performance and OCB. Work CCA was related to work engagement. Work engagement was associated with task performance and OCB.

The findings of this study overall supported the selected theories and related research. The significance of this study includes new insights and a deeper understanding of the relationships between multiple job resources and outcomes in the context of an expatriate assignment, which is an under-explored research area in HRD. The findings also provide several significant theoretical contributions to HRD and important practical insights for multiple stakeholders.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Globalization has flattened borders; as a result, the manner and environment in which businesses operate have drastically changed. Organizations around the world have attempted to leverage unprecedented opportunities and avoid threats from the dynamic business environment (Friedman, 2007). While organizations expand their boundaries, an increasing number of global talents including expatriates are needed to manage diverse workforces and international operations (Brookfield Global Relocation Services, 2015). The effectiveness of expatriates becomes a crucial concern as it can determine the success or failure of international operations of multinational corporations (MNCs).

Given the significance of expatriation, organizations are now more careful in selecting their expatriates and providing extra compensation, benefits, and training. However, according to the Global Mobility Trend Survey (Brookfield Global Relocation Services, 2015), the rate of expatriate failure, including early return and job failure, is currently more than 12% in general, especially 22% in China. Lievens, Harris, Van Keer, and Bisqueret (2003) calculated that the cost of a failed expatriation contract is approximately three times the cost of the expatriate’s annual contract. Specifically, it is estimated that the failure costs range from $250,000 up to $1,000,000, excluding the intangible costs such as damaged relations, lost productivity, lost opportunities, and reputational damage (Littrell, Salas, Hess, Paley, & Riedel, 2006; Moon, Choi, & Jung, 2012; Puck, Kittler, & Wright, 2008).
Considering the high rate of expatriate failure and the significant impact of the failure, scholars have investigated factors influencing expatriation over the past few decades (Harvey & Moeller, 2009; Littrell et al., 2006). While a number of studies have identified the expatriate outcomes and their antecedents, there are many under-explored constructs in the context of an expatriate assignment, including positive psychological capital, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support, and perceived community support. In addition, there lacks studies examining the impact of multiple job resources holistically at various levels (e.g., individual, interpersonal, organizational, and societal levels) in both work-related and non-work-related domains. More importantly, multiple components of work performance have not been examined; as a result, we have limited our understanding of the relationships between job resources and expatriate outcomes. Therefore, a holistic approach (Kang, 2011; Lee, 2007) is needed to explore the relationships between multiple job resources at various levels in both work-related and non-work-related domains and multiple components of work performance in the context of an international assignment.

**Problem Statement**

In industry, one of the primary reasons for expatriate failure is related to the selection of expatriates. Due to a critical shortage of well-prepared global talent, MNCs generally select and develop expatriate candidates internally (Conger & O'Neill, 2012; Oliver, Church, Lewis, & Desrosiers, 2009). However, during the selection process, MNCs tend to place more emphasis on managerial or job competency than competency related to cultural adjustment, which is argued to be equally important (Anderson, 2005;
Johnson, Lenartowicz, & Apud, 2006; Moon et al., 2012). For example, 81% of MNCs select expatriates based on their managerial or technical competencies without considering their cultural competencies (Brookfield Global Relocation Services, 2011).

Due to the unbalanced and inadequate criteria for expatriate selection and development, alternative criteria (e.g., positive psychological capital (PsyCap)) are necessary, which are positively related to expatriate outcomes, including cross-cultural adjustment, work engagement, and/or work performance. In particular, alternative criteria are needed because the partially competent expatriate candidates need to be fully developed into competent expatriates for the sustainability and prosperity of global organizations (Gubbins & Garavan, 2009; Marquardt, 2005; McLean, 2001).

With the increasing need for competent expatriates (Brookfield Global Relocation Services, 2015; Razi, 2009), the role of Human Resource Development (HRD) has become crucial in developing expatriates internally and warranting desired outcomes (Marquardt, Berger, & Loan, 2004; Wang & McLean, 2007). However, expatriation is one of the under-explored areas in HRD research. According to Ghosh, Kim, Kim, and Callahan (2014) in their trend analysis, only one percent of HRD studies focused expatriates.

More importantly, there should be a focus on various job resources to enhance expatriate outcomes. In the context of an expatriate assignment, there are several under-explored psychological constructs in a work-related domain (e.g., PsyCap and perceived subordinate support) and a non-work-related domain (e.g., perceived family support and perceived community support). Although hiring seems to be simpler, cheaper, and
quicker, recruitment is not a strategy, but a tactic (Charan, Drotter, & Noel, 2001). In fact, it is costly and competitive to hire global talent, and it also requires additional time and cost for the talent to learn and adapt to the organizational culture and context in both home and host countries (Oliver et al., 2009). Therefore, more investigation is needed on multiple job resources at various levels in both work-related and non-work-related domains and their relationships with expatriate outcomes from a holistic perspective.

Expatriate studies have been designed originally from the stress perspective of employee adjustment because expatriates are usually located in an unfamiliar or often unfavorable context with full of uncertainty (Kraimer & Wayne, 2004). Although the job demands-resources model is one of the widely used models from the stress perspective, the applicability of the job demands-resources model in the expatriate context has not been empirically examined (Rattrie & Kittler, 2014). In this vein, the mediating role of work engagement on the relationships between job resources at various levels and multiple components of work performance should be examined.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study aimed to examine the relationships between job resources at various levels in both work-related and non-work-related domains and expatriate outcomes. As independent variables, job resources for this study included (a) PsyCap at an individual level; (b) perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, and perceived family support at an interpersonal level; (c) perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary organization at an organizational level; and (d) perceived community support at a societal level. The dependent variables of expatriate outcomes included
cross-cultural adjustment (CCA), work engagement, and work performance. Therefore, the direct relationships among the job resources and the components of expatriate outcomes were the primary focus of this study. The mediating effects of CCA and work engagement on the relationships between the job resources and work performance were also examined, as shown in Figure I-1.

*Figure I-1. Simplified hypothesized model of this study*

**Theoretical Framework**

Three theories guided the current study. They are conservation of resource theory (Hobfoll, 1989), job demands-resources model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001), and spillover theory (Caligiuri, Hyland, Joshi, & Bross, 1998). Among these three theories, conservation of resource theory and job demands-resources model have been used in only a limited number of expatriate studies. Therefore, the findings of this study could significantly contribute to the expatriate literature.
**Conservation of resource theory**

According to conservation of resource (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989), individuals pursue acquiring, maintaining, and protecting the quantity and quality of their resources, including psychological resource (e.g., self-esteem), social/organizational resource (e.g., family and co-workers), and energies (e.g., money and knowledge) while resource gain and loss are significantly related to various outcomes. In this study, the COR theory provided a rationale for the selection of specific independent variables at various levels and the relationships between the job resources and outcomes. The job resources that were considered independent variables in this study were categorized into four levels: (a) the individual level (i.e., PsyCap); (b) the interpersonal level (i.e., perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support), (c) the organizational level (i.e., perceived organizational support), and (d) the societal level (i.e., perceived community support). According to the COR theory, these resources are positively related to CCA (Chen, Westman, & Eden, 2009) and work engagement (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007). Further, the job resources are positively related to work performance (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2011; Halbesleben, Wheeler, & Paustian-Underdahl, 2013; Janssen, Lam, & Huang, 2010).

**Job demands-resources model**

The primary assumption of the job demands-resources (JD-R) model is that every job has its own specific risk factors related to job stress and there are two categories of factors: job demands and job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti et al., 2001). Job demands, such as a high level of workload, time pressure, and an unfavorable
environment, could cause employees to be exhausted mentally and physically (Demerouti et al., 2001). On the contrary, self-efficacy (at the individual level), feedback, autonomy (at the task level), supervisor support, team climate (at the interpersonal/social level), rewards, and training (at the organization level) are job resources that could affect human motivation (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Job demands and job resources are significantly associated with job strain and motivation, which influence positive outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Singh & Singh, 2011; Wang, 2014), work engagement (Nahrgang, Morgeson, & Hofmann, 2011) and work performance (Bakker, van Emmerik, & van Riet, 2008), and negative outcomes, such as withdrawal intention (Qiao & Wilmar, 2011) and counterproductive work behavior (CWB) (Balducci, Schaufeli, & Fraccaroli, 2011). Expatriates are employees who (a) are placed in an unfamiliar culture and customs in a foreign country, (b) do not possess any social network (i.e., relatives, friends, or business partners), and (c) need to play new roles (Bennet, Aston, & Colquhoun, 2000; Mendenhall, Osland, Oddou, Maznevski, Stevens, & Stahl, 2013). At this high level of job demands, expatriates need more resources, as suggested by the COR theory. In this vein, according to the JD-R model, the individual, interpersonal, organizational, and societal job resources in work-related and non-work-related domains (a) play a role of buffering the influence of job demands on strain, which reduce the tendency of withdrawal and CWB and (b) motivate expatriates to be engaged and ultimately perform better and employ OCB. In this study, the JD-R model was useful in illuminating the association of the variables in work-related domains on CCA and work engagement, which influenced work performance.
**Spillover theory**

According to the spillover theory, there are reciprocal relationships between experiences in work-related and non-work-related domains (Aldous, 1969; Caligiuri et al., 1998; Piotrkowski, 1979; Staines, 1980). When positive or negative emotions and attitudes are conveyed from work to home or vice versa, spillover occurs (Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair, & Shafiro, 2005). In this study, the spillover theory described the relationships between resources in non-work-related domains, including perceived family support and perceived community support, and expatriate outcomes, including their CCA and work engagement. Furthermore, the resources in non-work-related domains were positively related to the work performance of expatriates.

**Operational Definition of Terms**

**Expatriates**

Since this study focused on expatriates in private organizations, expatriates in this study refers to individuals who are transferred outside their home countries for an international assignment, and live and work in a foreign subsidiary organization on behalf of their parent company for a pre-determined period of time. During this period, expatriates are responsible for managing and coordinating operations, tasks, or local employees or transferring knowledge, skills, and the organization’s cultural values to local employees (Bennet et al., 2000; Lee & Croker, 2006).

**Human resource development**

Since Harbison and Myers (1964) first proposed a definition of HRD, many scholars and practitioners have attempted to define HRD. Some maintain that it is
impossible or unnecessary to define HRD (Blake, 1995; Lee, 2001) while others have strongly advocated on one specific definition, focusing on either performance (Swanson, 1995) or learning (Watkins, 1991). One of the main critiques about these definitions is that they have been mostly derived from the U.S. or the U.K. Based on the needs of an inclusive definition, which is applicable to many countries around the world, McLean and McLean (2001) provided a holistic and global definition of HRD, which was derived from many countries.

Human resource development is any process or activity that, either initially or over the long term, has the potential to develop adults’ work-based knowledge, expertise, productivity, and satisfaction, whether for personal or group/team gain, or for the benefit of an organization, community, nation or, ultimately, the whole of humanity (p. 322).

**Positive psychological capital**

PsyCap simply refers to “an individual’s positive psychological state of development” (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007, p. 3). As a second order factor, PsyCap consists of four subconstructs: self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resiliency (Luthans et al., 2007; Stajkovic, 2006). Self-efficacy is “one’s conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context” (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a, p. 66). Optimism refers to “a mood and attitude associated with an expectation about the social or material future—one which the evaluator regards as socially desirable, to his/her advantage, or to his/her pleasure” (Tiger, 1979, p. 18).
Hope is “a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (a) agency (goal-directed energy) and (b) pathways (planning to meet goals)” (Snyder, Irving, & Anderson, 1991, p. 287). Resilience in the workplace is the “capacity to rebound, to ‘bounce back’ from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure or even positive change, progress and increased responsibility” (Luthans, 2002, p. 702).

**Perceived supervisor support and perceived subordinate support**

Perceived supervisor or subordinate support in this study refers to expatriates’ general views concerning the extent to which supervisors or subordinates value their contributions and care about their well-being (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988).

**Perceived family support**

Perceived family support in this study refers to expatriates’ perceptions of the extent to which family members provide emotional sustenance and instrumental assistance (King, Mattimore, King, & Adams, 1995). Emotional sustenance includes positive behaviors and attitudes, reflecting the family members’ “interest in the employee's work, willingness to listen to, talk to, and advise the employee about his/her work, and general indications of care and concern for the employee” (King et al., 1995, p. 237). Instrumental assistance is sharing behaviors and attitudes of family and household routines, including relieving expatriates of household chores and sharing household tasks.

**Perceived organizational support**

Perceived organizational support simply refers to the perception of being valued and cared for by the organization (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986).
Perceived community support

Perceived community support refers to expatriates’ perceptions of belongingness and feeling that they are included and interdependent with others while they are mutually supported (McMillan & Chavis, 1986; Sarason, 1974). In this study, perceived community support consists of community integration, community participation, and use of community organization (Herrero & Gracia, 2007).

Cross-cultural adjustment

Cross-cultural adjustment refers to the extent to which expatriates adjust to and are comfortable with a new society or a new environment regarding three dimensions: work, interaction, and general adjustments (Black, 1988; Puck et al., 2008).

Work engagement

Work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that includes an energetic (i.e., vigor), an affective (i.e., dedication), and a cognitive dimension (i.e., absorption) (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Work performance

Work performance refers to “behaviors and actions that are relevant to the goals of the organization” (Campbell, 1990, p. 704). In this study, task performance, OCB, CWB, and withdrawal work behaviors are used as multi-dimensional elements for the construct of work performance.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Two overarching research questions guided this study. First, what are the relationships between job resources at various levels in work-related and non-work-
related domains and the components of work performance among expatriates? Second, what is the impact of cross-cultural adjustment and work engagement on the relationships between job resources at various levels and the components of work performance among expatriates? To explore the two research questions, 23 research hypotheses were tested (see Figure I-2 for visual display of the hypothesized paths):

1. **H1:** PsyCap will be positively related to work performance ((a) task performance (TP), (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) withdrawal behavior (WB)).
2. **H2:** PsyCap will be positively related to CCA.
3. **H3:** PsyCap will be positively related to work engagement.
4. **H4:** Perceived supervisor support in work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).
5. **H5:** Perceived supervisor support in work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.
6. **H6:** Perceived supervisor support in work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.
7. **H7:** Perceived subordinate support in work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).
8. **H8:** Perceived subordinate support in work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.
9. **H9:** Perceived subordinate support in work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.
10. **H10:** Perceived family support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).
11. **H11:** Perceived family support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.
12. **H12:** Perceived family support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.
Figure 1-2. Hypothesized conceptual model of this study
H13: Perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).

H14: Perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary will be positively related to CCA.

H15: Perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary will be positively related to work engagement.

H16: Perceived community support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).

H17: Perceived community support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.

H18: Perceived community support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.

H19: CCA will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).

H20: CCA will be positively related to work engagement.

H21: Work engagement will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).

H22: CCA will mediate the relationships between the resources at various levels and work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).

H23: Work engagement will mediate the relationships between the job resources at various levels and work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).

Significance of the Study

Research significance

This study contributes to the literature of HRD in several ways. First, expatriation is one of the under-explored areas in HRD research. For example, Ghosh et al. (2014) conducted an HRD research trend analysis of articles published in the four major HRD journals, Advances in Developing Human Resources, Human Resource

More importantly, little is known about several constructs implemented in this study in the context of an expatriate assignment, including PsyCap, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support, and perceived community support. Possible empirical examination of their relationships with multiple components of expatriate outcomes could expand our current knowledge base.

Unlike previous research, this study takes a holistic approach by examining the impact of multiple job resources at various levels in work-related and non-work-related domains. Not only job resources, but also multiple components of work performance and several expatriate outcomes were included in this study. By doing so, I hope to provide a clearer and broader picture of the relationships between job resources and expatriate outcomes.

In addition, the applicability of the JD-R model in the expatriate context has not been empirically examined (Rattrie & Kittler, 2014). Although the model has been widely used in a single country study or cross-cultural comparative studies among several countries, there is a scarcity of evidence regarding the applicability of the JD-R model in the expatriate context. The findings from this study provided empirical evidence that shed light on the applicability of the JD-R model to international assignments and HRD.
Practical significance

The expected findings from this study have potential to offer important practical insights to multiple stakeholders. First, this study can generate empirical evidence that enhances MNCs’ understanding of multi-level job resources and their association with expatriate outcomes. Such knowledge enables MNCs to make informed decision about how to prioritize job resources at work-related and non-work-related domains and use them more strategically to improve expatriate outcomes. Second, evidence of the effects of job resources in the non-work-related domains can be used to justify more investment in programs in the non-work-related domains. Third, based on the results for this study, PsyCap could be an alternative criterion for global HR managers to use when selecting the appropriate candidates for an international assignment. In addition, HR practitioners could design more targeted interventions to enhance the expatriate outcomes. Finally, for expatriates, this study provides them with an opportunity to critically reflect on their own performance and identify the job resources critical for their job success.

Summary

Chapter I provided an overview of the study. Specifically, this chapter briefly discussed problem statement, research purpose, theoretical framework, definition of terms, research questions, hypotheses, significance of the study, and methodology and methods.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The current study aimed to examine the relationships among (a) PsyCap at the individual level; (b) perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support at the interpersonal level; (c) perceived organizational support from a local host organization at the organizational level; (d) perceived community support at the societal level; and (e) work performance, as an outcome factor in the context of an expatriate assignment. The mediating effects of CCA and work engagement were also examined among the relationships. To achieve the purpose, it is necessary to decide a clearer scope of a population (expatriate) and context (expatriate assignment) for this study.

The word expatriate originally means “from the homeland,” which is derived from the Latin term ex patria. Expatriates can generally be defined as individuals who live and work outside their home countries for a pre-determined assignment period (Osland, 2013). However, it is necessary to add home and host organizations as the context in the definition to distinguish temporary international workers or self-initiated expatriates (SIEs). According to Doherty, Dickmann, and Mills (2011), SIEs refer to people who independently relocate to live and work abroad “without the sponsorship of an organization” (p. 595). Although these SIEs who work for an organization in a foreign country without an organization in a home country might experience similar adjustment issues, the context and working environment could be different. As this
study focused exclusively on expatriates in private organizations, expatriates in this study refer to individuals who are transferred outside their home countries for an international assignment, and live and work in a foreign subsidiary organization on behalf of their parent company for a pre-determined assignment period (Mendenhall et al., 2013). During this period, expatriates are responsible for managing and coordinating operations, tasks, or local employees or transferring knowledge, skills, or cultural values of their organizations to local employees (Bennet et al., 2000; Lee & Croker, 2006).

In this chapter, the theoretical framework, the constructs used in this study, and the research context are discussed. After describing how literature was identified and analyzed, the first part of this chapter describes the theoretical framework related to this study. Then, independent and dependent variables as well as the Korean cultural context are reviewed to develop research hypotheses. Lastly, the hypothesized conceptual model for this study is presented.

**Literature Review Procedure**

For this study, two consecutive phases of a literature review were conducted. In Phase 1, I reviewed dissertations related to expatriates or expatriation in order to investigate expatriate outcomes, the antecedents of expatriate outcomes, and trends in expatriate studies. The goal was to identify gaps in current knowledge base. At the end of Phase 1, a hypothesis model was developed based on the identified gaps and a theoretical framework. Then, relevant literature on the variables included in this study was thoroughly reviewed in Phase 2 to determine what has been studied that relates to the variables. The review procedure involved (a) searching articles, book chapters,
books, and dissertations, (b) selecting appropriate literature, and (c) analyzing the literature and organizing the contents.

**Phase 1**

Based on both quantitative and qualitative dissertations completed since 2004, an integrative literature review was conducted to identify expatriate outcomes, the antecedents of expatriate outcomes, and trends in expatriate studies, and ultimately to discover knowledge gaps. Dissertations were particularly helpful because they provide much more detailed explanations of constructs, measures, academic gaps, and theoretical frameworks, compared to peer-reviewed articles that are subject to word limits.

According to Torraco (2005), an integrative literature review is defined as “a form of research that reviews, critiques, and synthesizes representative literature on a topic in an integrated way such that new frameworks and perspectives on the topic are generated” (p. 356). Researchers must review literature systematically to support their frameworks or perspectives while synthesizing results from literature on a particular topic or issue ((Callahan, 2010; Ridley, 2012). For this study, Garrard’s (2011) matrix method was used to guide the literature review. The matrix method is “both a structure and a process for systematically reviewing the literature” (Garrard, 2011, p. 17).

According to Garrard (2011), the matrix method is composed of four parts. The first part is to track a record of the search process for a literature review. While tracking could be done informally, researchers could also define specific search criteria and terms. The second part is to manage the documents from the literature review. The documents could be in different formats, such as pdf, Word, links to a journal article, or paper
documents. The third part is to organize the information from the documents stored from the second part. As a result of this part, researchers create a spreadsheet or a word document table with columns and rows, which include selected information for analysis. The last part is to produce a final outcome for the research by synthesizing all the parts and critically analyzing them.

Following the guidelines by Garrard (2011), the matrix table describes the core and related information for those selected dissertations in the ascending chronological order using a structured abstracting form with nine columns: an order, name of an author, title of a dissertation, published year, targeted types of expatriates, significant antecedents, consequences/measures, research method, and the number of participants.

**Selection criteria and search process for Phase 1.** Three criteria were used to select dissertations for Phase 1 of the literature review: (a) published between January 2004 and November 2013, (b) empirical studies, and (c) targeting the expatriates as defined above. Dissertations published in online universities and Master’s theses were excluded for quality assurance after several of them were reviewed (e.g., problematic sampling approaches). The initial year 2004 was chosen to gauge the trends of the expatriate literature; ten years are enough to see the trends. Also, this search was conducted in November, 2013. One primary database for dissertations was searched: *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text*. To acquire a maximum number of results, expatriat* was used for both the Document Title and Subject Term.

Searching with expatriat* for the title and keyword through *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text*, 196 dissertations and theses were initially found by
matching the first criteria. Next, 126 publications remained by matching the second criteria and excluding the dissertations about English literature, music, religion, public relations, anthropology, urban planning, child development, and history. Excluded were nine dissertations exploring specific family issues of expatriates (e.g., learning difficulties of expatriates’ children in their host countries) or the cultural specific factors (e.g., the identity of a specific national), which fit into anthropology rather than international management studies. Then, after 31 dissertations published in online universities and six master’s theses were excluded, 80 studies remained in the pool. The third criterion was used last because I wanted to see the trends of dissertations about expatriation regarding their populations, such as self-initiated expatriates. Finally, 56 dissertations were included for final analysis after dissertations about self-initiated expatriates, including international/exchange students, international teachers/professors, or temporary international workers were excluded because their characteristics did not match the definition of expatriates described above. The exemplary matrix table, as outcomes from Phase 1, is shown below.
Table II-1

Exemplary Chronological Review Matrix Table from Phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Yr</th>
<th>Main Target</th>
<th>Significant Antecedents</th>
<th>Consequences Measures</th>
<th>Research Method</th>
<th>Participants (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>De Paul Chimm, Nicola</td>
<td>Modeling Effectiveness Outcomes Among Expatriate Professionals Working for Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Expat in NGO</td>
<td>(a) perceived organizational support from the host and parent organization, (b) affective commitment to the host organization, and (c) socio-cultural adaptation to the host culture</td>
<td>effectiveness of expatriate (self-report)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hefock, Victoria J.</td>
<td>Evaluation of an expatriate program at a US-based multinational corporation</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Expat</td>
<td>(a) pick qualified individuals for assignment, (b) help them take care of the details, (c) provide them with adequate training and information, (d) involve knowledgeable others in the process, (e) plan for the expatriates' return in advance, and (f) allow for returning expatriates to detrain</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lima de Melo, Fernanda</td>
<td>Effectiveness of expatriate programs: The influences of individual, job, and social characteristics in the success of expatriation and repatriation phases</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Expats</td>
<td>individual characteristics (personality, language proficiency), social support system (spousal adjustment), and organizational and job factors (role factors, satisfaction)</td>
<td>turnover, turnover intentions, satisfaction, performance, cross cultural adjustment</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>53 expats, 44 repats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monson, Sabine</td>
<td>Professional women in multinational corporations and the expatriate opportunity: Factors that determine whether they accept or turn down a foreign assignment</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Expats</td>
<td>Previous experiences, influence from society, influence from organization, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, family support, trust toward boss, and organizational</td>
<td>Acceptance or turning down the expatriation offer</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cruz, Cristine S.</td>
<td>Use of technologies for American expatriate training</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Expats</td>
<td>online learning is not effective, traditional instructor-led classroom training,</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coble, Kyle</td>
<td>Perceived history: Effects on willingness to expatriate and purchase</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Expats</td>
<td>optimism, personal salience, perceived history, knowledge</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 2

Several unexplored constructs and missing links, which were identified at Phase 1, were selected for Phase 2 of the literature review procedure in this study. The constructs identified included: PsyCap (self-efficacy, hope, optimism, resilience), perceived supervisor and subordinate support, perceived family support, perceived organizational support, perceived community support, CCA, work engagement, and work performance (task performance, OCB, CWB, withdrawal behavior). Nine online databases were searched: ABI/Inform Global, Academic Search Complete, Business Source Complete, Emerald, ERIC(EBSCO), Management & Organization Studies a SAGE Full-Text Collection, Psychology a SAGE Full-Text Collection, PsycINFO, and ScienceDirect. In addition, the following journals in which multiple articles on the
variables of this study were published were searched: *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Advances in International Management*, *Human Resource Management*, *Human Resource Management Review*, *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, and *Journal of International Business Studies*. Publications commonly cited in the obtained literature were also searched. Books about expatriation were searched through www.amazon.com. A few books were chosen only because they were cited by some referred journal articles. The search process was conducted at the beginning of 2015.

**Selection criteria and search process for Phase 2.** There were three general criteria used to select the literature to be reviewed at Phase 2: (a) publications between January 2000 and February 2015, (b) peer-reviewed, and (c) relevance to the research purpose. The search period was set to include the most recent fifteen years to see the current trends of the variables in this study though there were several exceptions of the classic and foundational articles for the variables. The abstracts, findings, and discussion/conclusions were carefully reviewed to determine the appropriateness of the literature for this study. A total of 148 scholarly works were retained for the final analysis.

**Theoretical Framework**

Three theories were used to guide this study. They are the COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), the JD-R model (Demerouti et al., 2001), and the spillover theory (Caligiuri et al., 1998). The first theory provides a rationale for the selection of specific independent variables at various levels for this study, while the other two support the relationships
among the variables in either work-related or non-work-related domains. In this section, the three theories are described and brief rationales are provided to explain how each theory was used to inform this study.

**Conservation of resource theory**

**Origin of the theory.** Over the past 25 years, the COR theory has become one of the leading theoretical frameworks employed to understand stress. According to Hobfoll (2011), although the COR theory was originally suggested to describe stress in a human life (e.g., Benight et al., 1999; Hobfoll, Canetti-Nisim, & Johnson, 2006; Norris, Perilla, Riad, Kaniasty, & Lavizzo, 1999), the theory has become fundamental in the literature of burnout, work engagement (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Freedy & Hobfoll, 1994; Hobfoll, 2002; Hobfoll & Freedy, 1993; Ito & Brotheridge, 2003; Neveu, 2007), and positive psychology (Bakker et al., 2007; Halbesleben & Bowler, 2007; Sun & Pan, 2008; Zellars, Perrewe, Hochwarter, & Anderson, 2006). The COR theory was originally developed by Hobfoll (1989) to clarify the concept of stress when the ambiguous and phenomenological concept of stress made an empirical study difficult. Therefore, Hobfoll (1989) defined stress as “a reaction to the environment in which there is (a) the threat of a net loss of resources, (b) the net loss of resources, or (c) a lack of resource gain following the investment of resources” (p. 516). In addition, Hobfoll (1989) referred to resources as “those objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies that are valued by the individual or that serve as a means for attainment of these objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies” (p. 516). Based on these clear definitions of stress and resources, Hobfoll developed the COR theory with the
assumption that individuals want to acquire, maintain, and protect resources and avoid resource loss (Hobfoll, 1988, 1989). Compared to previous stress or resource theories (e.g., Stress-response theory (Selye, 1976)), the COR theory conceptualizes stress by combining two different approaches: individuals’ subjective perception of an event as resource gain (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Sarason, 1972) and the objective/actual circumstances or situations as resource loss (Selye, 1950).

**Summary of the theory.** According to the COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), individuals pursue acquiring, maintaining, and protecting the quantity and quality of their resources, including psychological (e.g., self-esteem), social/organizational (e.g., family and co-workers), and energies (e.g., time, money, and knowledge). The COR theory has two key principles and several corollaries (Hobfoll, 1998, 2011).

First, resource loss primarily occurs rather than resource gain in both degree and speed, which may prompt individuals to behave reactively and focus on maintenance from resource loss rather than to discover alternatives and new strategies for resource gain actively. Since the degree of negative impact from the resources loss is psychologically higher than the degree of positive impact from the resource gain, losses at work have more impact than similarly valued resource gains (Halbesleben, Neveu, Paustian-Underdahl, & Westman, 2014).

Second, individuals should “invest resources in order to protect against resource loss, recover from losses, and gain resources” (Hobfoll, 2011, p. 117). In a work setting, when a manager needs to produce more, s/he can request more resources from his/her organization, acquire more (tentative or permanent) employees, or put more job demands
on current employees (Hobfoll & Shirom, 1993). The manager invests various types of resources to protect his/her resource loss.

Hobfoll (1998, 2001) provided four corollaries to the resource investment process. First, individuals with resources are able to invest those resources. Second, a resource loss makes it more difficult to invest their resources. Third, a resource gain makes it easier to invest, and ultimately to gain additional resources. According to these three corollaries, individuals who possess a greater amount of resources are less vulnerable to resource loss and accessible to resource gain (Hobfoll, 2011), whereas individuals who possess fewer resources have less opportunity for resource investment and ultimately resource gain. Therefore, individuals who already possess various types of resources in terms of quantity and quality may be more capable of maintaining their resources and producing positive outcomes. The fourth corollary states that a resource loss leads individuals to be more defensive and reactive to protect their remaining resources (e.g., Benight et al., 1999; Halbesleben & Bowler, 2007). This lack of opportunity for resource investment ultimately leads them to lose more resources in the future (Halbesleben et al., 2014).

**Research based on the theory.** Many studies used the COR theory as their guiding theoretical framework for examining the relationships between various resources and outcomes. In the literature of organizational behavior, resources loss has been positively related to various negative organizational behaviors, such as CWB (Penney, Hunter, & Perry, 2011), burnout (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), abusive actions taken toward coworkers (e.g., Hochwarter, Laird, & Brouer, 2008; Wheeler, Halbesleben, &
Whitman, 2013), and reactive behaviors (Whitman, Halbesleben, & Holmes, 2014). In addition, several scholars identified positive relationships between resource investment and positive outcomes, such as engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), better adjustment (Chen et al., 2009), and optimal performance (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2011; Halbesleben et al., 2013; Janssen et al., 2010).

In the context of an expatriate assignment, there are several studies using the COR theory. For example, Silbiger and Pines (2014) identified the positive relationships between the level of expatriates’ stress and burnout based on the COR theory. Cao, Hirschi, and Deller (2012) found that three components of career capital (career network size, protean career attitude, and cultural intelligence) are significant for successful CCA for self-initiated expatriates. Considering conflict as a source for resource loss, van Erp, Giebels, van der Zee, and van Duijn (2011) identified the negative relationships between conflict and psychological adjustment of expatriate couples and the moderating effect of avoidance behavior, which could be regarded as defensive behavior. Although no study was identified that implemented the COR theory for CCA of expatriates in the context of an expatriate assignment, the COR theory could describe the possible relationships among resources at various levels, work engagement, and CCA. Further, these resource gains could lead to better and optimal work performance.

Implication for this study. In this study, several resources at various levels were considered independent variables, including PsyCap, perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support, perceived organizational support, and perceived community support. In particular, the resources were categorized
into four levels: (a) an individual level-PsyCap; (b) an interpersonal level-perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support, (c) an organizational level-perceived organizational support from a local host organization, and (d) a societal level-perceived community support. According to the COR theory, these resources at multiple levels, which expatriates possess or acquire in various ways, are positively related to CCA and work engagement. Further, as shown in several studies (e.g., Bakker & Bal, 2010; Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2011; Halbesleben et al., 2013; Janssen et al., 2010), these resource gains are positively associated with work performance. The detailed descriptions of the hypothesized structural relationships among the variables in this study are provided in the last part of this chapter.

Job demands–resources model

**Origin of the theory.** The JD-R model was first framed by Demerouti et al. (2001) when they expanded demands-control model (DCM) by Karasek (1979). Karasek (1979, 1998) argued that the primary reasons for job strain are high job demands (e.g., over workload or pressure) and/or low job control (e.g., low autonomy), which may indicate that job control is the only solution to enhance employee well-being from consequences of job demands. While critiquing the DCM, an exclusive focus of job control on autonomy (and later social support), and primary focus of job demands on work overload and time pressure, Demerouti et al. (2001) proposed the JD-R model as a balanced and comprehensive approach to employee well-being. Unlike earlier models of work-related stress and burnout focusing on job demands, such as the job demands-control model (Karasek, 1979) and the demand-control-support model (Johnson & Hall,
the JD-R model categorizes job characteristics into job demands and job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti et al., 2001).

**Summary of the theory.** The primary assumption of the JD-R model is that every job has its own specific risk factors related to job stress and there are two categories of the factors, job demands and job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti et al., 2001). Since the two factors for the JD-R model provide more specific lists (e.g., time pressure for job demands and social support for job resources), the lists of job demands and job resources allow the JD-R model to be implemented in various work domains regardless of the particular element of demands and resources involved (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

According to Demerouti et al. (2001), job demands is defined as “those physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical or mental effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and psychological costs” (p. 501). A high level of physical workload and an unfavorable physical environment are several examples of the specific lists of job demands, which may cause employees to be exhausted mentally and physically.

On the other hand, job resources refer to “those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that may do any of the following: (a) be functional in achieving work goals; (b) reduce job demands at the associated physiological and psychological costs; or (c) stimulate personal growth and development” (Demerouti et al., 2001, p. 501). Therefore, job resources contribute to the decrease of the negative impact from job demands, as well as increase in employee motivation. In this way, the
JD-R model is aligned with the COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 2001). Both theories argue that resource gain and maintenance are primary reasons for human motivation (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) and both theories can be applied to various resources on multiple levels (e.g., individual, social/interpersonal, and organizational). There are various types of job resources, including self-efficacy (at the individual level), feedback, autonomy (at the task level), supervisor support, team climate (at the interpersonal/social level), rewards, and training (at the organization level). Furthermore, job demands and job resources are significantly related to job strain and motivation, as shown in Figure II-1.

![Figure II-1. Components and processes of the job demands-resources model](image)

First, job demands may lead employees to feel exhausted both mentally and physically, which ultimately depletes their energy and causes physical or mental illness (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti et al., 2001). Several studies identified the positive relationships between job demands (i.e., work overload or time pressure) and
exhaustion (i.e., severe fatigue) in various contexts (e.g., Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005; Hakanen, Schaufeli, & Ahola, 2008; Jourdain & Chenevert, 2010; Lee, Brotheridge, & Lovell, 2010). According to Hockey (1993), there is another mediator between the relationships, the physiological costs. Job demands require physiological costs for the individual, such as putting in extra individual effort, restricting attention, making more risky decisions, and lowering the standard of task requirement. Ultimately, the physiological costs exhaust individuals physically and mentally.

Second, job resources may lead employees to be intrinsically and extrinsically motivated. Job resources as an intrinsic motivator could cultivate employee growth and development (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). For example, when employees receive proper and constructive feedback, they learn and grow. They become more autonomous when they are socially supported by colleagues or supervisors. Job resources could be also used to achieve team or task goals as an extrinsic motivational factor. A favorable work environment could boost a work engagement of employees, which possibly makes them more productive and optimize their performance (Meijman & Mulder, 1998).

Furthermore, Bakker and Demerouti (2007) proposed the interaction between job demands and job resources in the JD-R model. As stated briefly while describing the DCM, job resources (i.e., job control or autonomy) play a buffering role in enhancing employees’ well-being from the consequences of job demands. For example, when employees have a high level of autonomy or supervisor support, these resources could reduce their emotional and physical job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). As another interaction, job resources are highly associated with human motivation or work
engagement when job demands are intense. The COR theory offers the reason behind this. According to Hobfoll (2001), individuals acquire, maintain, and protect the quantity and quality of their resources. Consequently, a high level of resource loss or job demands strengthens the relationships between job resources and motivation.

Finally, the strain and motivation influence outcomes. Highly motivated employees are more likely to meet their goals (Demerouti et al., 2001), to be more committed to their job, and to feel more engaged to their work (Crawford, LePine, & Rich, 2010; Nahrgang et al., 2011; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008). On the other hand, those who are exhausted by a high level of job demands may experience burnout and physical and mental illness (Alarcon, 2011; Demerouti, Bakker, & Fried, 2012; van Vegchel, de Jonge, & Landsbergis, 2005).

**Research based on the theory.** The relationships among job demands, job resources, burnout, and engagement have been established by empirical studies in the various work contexts across the world (see meta-analysis studies by Crawford et al. (2010) and Nahrgang et al. (2011)). According to the systematic review of the JD-R model studies in international and cross-cultural contexts (Rattrie & Kittler, 2014), the JD-R model has been most widely adopted for studies in Europe (64.5%). However, there were only three studies of cross-cultural comparison among European countries (e.g., Llorens, Bakker, Schaufeli, & Salanova, 2006; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008; Van Den Broeck, De Cuypers, De Witte, & Vansteenkiste, 2010). The salient relationship between job resources and enhancing engagement and reducing stress was also demonstrated by studies such as Billings, Folkman, Acree, and Moskowitz (2000),
Demerouti et al. (2012), Hakanen, Bakker, and Demerouti (2005), and Halbesleben and Bowler (2007). Furthermore, organizational outcomes are found to be associated with motivation or exhaustion respectively. For example, motivation is found to be positively associated with the development of well-being, performance related outcomes (Hu, Schaufeli, & Taris, 2011; Hur, Rhee, & Ahn, 2015), commitment (Parzefall & Hakanen, 2010), OCB (Peng & Chiu, 2010), and performance (Bakker et al., 2008). Job strain resulted by job demands is also positively related to turnover intention (Qiao & Wilmar, 2011), CWB (Balducci et al., 2011), and depression (Hakanen et al., 2008).

In the context of an expatriate assignment, only limited studies are available, similar to the findings of the systematic review by Rattrie and Kittler (2014). Cole and Nesbeth (2014) utilized the JD-R model to understand expatriate performance within the work-family interface. Collecting qualitative data from 64 former expatriate family members, Cole and Nesbeth (2014) identified the possible negative relationships between family support and withdrawal or early return.

Using the JD-R model, Mahajan and De Silva (2014) proposed the framework of the relationships between unmet role expectations (job demands) and expatriate adjustment (outcome) with a moderating effect of host-country national support (job resource) on the relationships between their support and expatriate adjustment. However, this study is conceptual in nature. Similarly, Lazarova, Westman, and Shaffer (2010) proposed a conceptual framework of work-family interface, emphasizing the family role in expatriate adjustment based on the JD-R model, but this framework was not derived from empirical evidence either.
It is quite surprising that previous research in the field of expatriation has not paid much attention to the JD-R model when examining the relationships between resource gain/loss and job motivation and strain. Similarly, studies in the international management literature seem to examine the relationships without any reference to the JD-R model. For example, Van Der Zee, Ali, and Salome (2005) examined role interference and perceived well-being among expatriate families, using the DCM model (Karasek, 1979) rather than the JD-R model.

**Implication for this study.** Expatriates are those who are located in an unfamiliar culture and customs of a foreign country. According to the JD-R model, the unfavorable physical environment is considered job demands. In addition, expatriates are located in a foreign country where they do not possess any social network (i.e., relatives, friends, and business partners). They also need to play new roles, such as leading local employees with different cultural backgrounds and coordinating operations and relationships between their headquarters and local employees. With such high job demands, expatriates try to gain more resources to maintain the level of their resources (Hobfoll, 1989). According to the JD-R model, those individual, interpersonal, and organizational resources in work-related and non-work-related domains (a) play a role in buffering the influence of job demands on strain, which lessens the tendency of withdrawal and counterproductive behavior, and (b) motivate expatriates to be more engaged and ultimately perform better and possibly demonstrate OCBs. Due to a lack of empirical evidence to show the impact of the JD-R model in the context of an expatriate assignment, the findings of this study significantly contribute to the literature.
Spillover theory

Origin of the theory. Although the spillover theory has been widely used to examine the reciprocal influence between work and non-work domains, no researches have clearly described the origin of this theory. This theory was originally documented in the literature of work-family interface or family research. In the 60s and 70s, several researchers began developing the conceptual framework and empirically examining the reciprocal relationships between home experiences and a person’s work life (e.g., Aldous, 1969; Piotrkowski, 1979; Pleck, 1977; Staines, 1980). These researchers used a broad term spillover and examined spillover hypothesis or model in their studies. In the 80s and 90s, several studies further investigated the relationships between work-related and non-work-related domains in the domestic context (e.g., Barling & MacEwen, 1992; Burke & Greenglass, 1987; Repetti, 1987; Williams & Alliger, 1994).

Caligiuri et al. (1998) were the first to apply the spillover theory to the context of expatriate assignments by examining whether family support, family communication, and family adaptability were significantly related to expatriate adjustment. Although there had been studies (e.g., Fukuda & Chu, 1994; Black & Stephens, 1989) examining the relationship between spousal adjustment and expatriate adjustment before the study by Caligiuri et al. (1998), the previous studies did not use the spillover theory as the guiding theoretical framework. Takeuchi, Yun, and Tesluk (2002) adapted the spillover theory to investigate whether general adjustment and general satisfaction of expatriates were significantly related to expatriate work adjustment and job satisfaction while
exploring the relationships between the general adjustment of a spouse and expatriates’
general and work adjustments as crossover effects.

**Summary of the theory.** According to the spillover theory, there are reciprocal
relationships between experiences in work-related and non-work-related domains
(Aldous, 1969; Caligiuri et al., 1998; Piotrkowski, 1979; Staines, 1980). When positive
or negative emotions and attitudes are conveyed from work to home or vice versa,
spillover occurs (Hammer et al., 2005). In the expatriate assignment context, domains of
work and life are blurred because all the family members need to live in a new country
and face various types of issues (Harvey, 1985), such as the spouses’ careers (Black &
Stephens, 1989), their children’s education (Fukuda & Chu, 1994), and the family
members’ losses of social networks (i.e. friends and communities; Pellico & Stroh,
1997). For these reasons, family members’ adjustment and their support are crucial to
expatriate adjustment and expatriate outcomes.

**Research based on the theory.** Several meta-analyses presented the spillover
effect and the strong relationships between experiences in work-related and non-work-
related domains (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005; Mishel, Clark, &
Jaramillo, 2011). In the expatriate context, Takeuchi et al. (2002) conducted an empirical
study and identified the validity of the spillover theory while examining the impact of
the general and work adjustment of expatriates on general satisfaction and job
satisfaction, and ultimately on the intent to withdraw. The reciprocal relationships
between experiences in work-related and non-work-related domains have been
empirically studied (e.g., Lazarova et al., 2010; Rosenbusch & Cseh, 2012; Selmer &
Fenner, 2009). After Kim and Slocum (2008) examined the relationships among individual differences, CCA, job satisfaction, and individual performance, they proposed to use CWB as withdrawal intention rather than actual failure rates because the actual failure rates are generally exaggerated and confounded with other factors (Molinsky, 2007; Zhang, George, & Chan, 2006).

**Implication for this study.** The spillover theory could be used as the theoretical framework for this study to describe the impact of resources in non-work-related domains, including perceived family support and perceived community support, on expatriates’ adjustment. Furthermore, as discussed earlier, the resources in the non-work-related domain are positively related to the work performance of expatriates.

**Hypothesized Conceptual Model**

The three theories, the COR theory, the JD-R model, and the spillover theory, framed the hypothesized conceptual model (See Figure II-2 and II-3). The COR theory offered a rationale for the selection of specific independent variables at various levels for this study: (a) PsyCap at the individual level, (b) perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support at the interpersonal level, (c) perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary organization at the organizational level, and (d) perceived community support at the societal level. The resource gain would lead to enhanced CCA (Cao et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2009), engagement (Bakker et al., 2007), and work performance: task performance (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Halbesleben et al., 2013; Janssen et al., 2010) and CWB (Penney et al., 2011; Wheeler et al., 2013; Whitman et al., 2014). The JD-R model illustrated the positive effect of job resources at various levels.
on engagement (Crawford et al., 2010; Nahrgang et al., 2011; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008), adjustment (Lazarova et al., 2010; Mahajan & Silva, 2014), and work performance: performance (Bakker et al., 2008; Hu et al., 2011; Hur et al., 2015), commitment (Parzefall & Hakanen, 2010) and OCB (Peng & Chiu, 2010). The JD-R model also explained a negative influence of resource loss on withdrawal intentions (Qiao & Wilmar, 2011), CWB (Balducci et al., 2011) and depression (Hakanen et al., 2008). The spillover theory described the relationships among the job resources in non-work-related domains, CCA, and work performance. Based on the theoretical framework in Figure II-2, I developed the hypothesized conceptual model (see Figure II-3), which include structural relationships among the variables and outcomes.

![Diagram of theoretical framework](image)

*Figure II-2. Theoretical framework of this study*
Figure II-3. Hypothesized conceptual model.
Constructs and Contexts

In this section, the variables for this study are discussed based on the literature review. The variables are (a) PsyCap at an individual level; (b) perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support at an interpersonal level, (c) perceived organizational support at an organizational level, (d) perceived community support at a societal level, (e) CCA, (f) work engagement, and (g) work performance in the context of an expatriate assignment. After definitions, antecedents, correlates, consequences, and important studies are introduced for each variable, research hypotheses are proposed.

Individual level job resources

Positive psychological capital. As a personal and psychological job resource, PsyCap simply refers to “an individual’s positive psychological state of development” (Luthans et al., 2007, p. 3). Based on the needs in theoretical advances due to dramatic change in the work environment (Stajkovic, 2006) and lack of focus on talent development due to over-emphasis on recruitment, selection, and assessment (Luthans et al., 2007), several scholars proposed and developed PsyCap as a higher order construct. Based on these social, theoretical, and practical needs, PsyCap has been demonstrated as a developable state-like construct conceptually (Luthans et al., 2007) and empirically (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007). Furthermore, many empirical studies have identified the positive relationships among PsyCap, performance and organizational behaviors (e.g., Avey, Luthans, & Youseff, 2010; Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011; Luthans, Avey, Avolio, & Peterson, 2010).
As a second order factor, PsyCap is characterized and manifested by four first-order psychological constructs, specifically self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resiliency (see Figure II-4; Luthans, Youssef, et al., 2007; Stajkovic, 2006). Drawing from Bandura’s (1997) social cognitive theory, Stajkovic and Luthans (1998a) defined self-efficacy as “one’s conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context” (p. 66). Through a meta-analysis, Stajkovic and Luthans (1998b) identified the relationship between self-efficacy and human motivation, which affects work-related performance.
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*Figure II-4. Structure of positive psychological capital and its first-order constructs*

As the second component of PsyCap, hope is defined as “a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (a) agency (goal-directed energy) and (b) pathways (planning to meet goals)” (Snyder et al., 1991, p. 287). After refining and conceptualizing the hope theory with three sub-constructs, developing measures, and implementing them in several practical contexts (e.g., for teaching (Snyder, 2005)), Snyder (2005) provided a more constructive definition of
hope: “the perceived capability to: (1) develop workable goals; (2) find routes to those goals (pathways thinking); and (3) become motivated to use the pathways (agency thinking)” (p. 73). As clearly indicated in the definitions, hope has been identified as a state-like construct through several empirical studies (e.g., Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006; Snyder, 2000). Furthermore, the positive relationship between hope and performance has been empirically established (e.g., Combs, Clapp-Smith, & Nadkarni, 2010; Luthans, Youssef, et al., 2007).

Next, optimism, a state-like construct (e.g., Beck, 1967; Peterson, 2000; Seligman, 1998), refers to “a mood and attitude associated with an expectation about the social or material future—one which the evaluator regards as socially desirable, to his/her advantage, or to his/her pleasure” (Tiger, 1979, p. 18). According to Seligman (1998), individuals with optimism attribute positive events to internal, stable, and global reasons whereas negative events to external, unstable, and specific reasons.

Finally, resilience makes individuals capable of coping in the face of change, adversity, and risk (Stewart, Reid, & Mangham, 1997). In the workplace, Luthans (2002) defined resilience as the “capacity to rebound, to ‘bounce back’ from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure or even positive change, progress and increased responsibility” (p. 702). As a state-like construct (Richardson, 2002; Tugade, Fredrickson, & Barrett, 2004), the relationships between resilience and positive outcomes have been empirically identified, including performance (Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, 2005; Maddi, 1987); job satisfaction (Larson & Luthans, 2006); as well as satisfaction, commitment, and happiness (Youssef & Luthans, 2007).
Outcomes of positive psychological capital. In their empirical study, Avey et al. (2010) examined the relationship between PsyCap and positive and negative attitudes and behaviors. They identified the positive relationships of PsyCap with OCB and the negative relationships with CWB and withdrawal intention (Avey et al., 2010). Later, Avey et al. (2011) conducted a meta-analysis to examine the relationships of PsyCap with performance, attitudes, and behaviors. Based on the analysis of 15 published articles, two unpublished dissertations, and 28 unpublished data sets, Avey et al. (2011) identified the positive relationships of PsyCap with OCB and employee task performance and the negative relationships between PsyCap and CWB and withdrawal intention. In the context of an expatriate assignment, PsyCap was found to be positively related to task performance (Vogelgesang, Clapp-Smith, & Osland, 2014). On the other hand, there is a paucity of literature that sheds light on the relationship between PsyCap and CCA. One study examining the relationship was conducted by Dollwet and Reichard (2014). Based on 361 participants in Study 1 and 2,134 participants in Study 2 from various cultural and ethnic backgrounds, Dollwet and Reichard (2014) identified PsyCap as related to CCA, cultural intelligence, openness to experience, and ethnocentrism though the participants were not expatriates. Similarly, although the participants were not expatriates, several scholars identified the relationships of PsyCap with global mindset (Vogelgesang et al., 2014) and cultural intelligence (Gulistan Yunlu & Clapp-Smith, 2014; Reichard, Dollwet, & Louw-Potgieter, 2014), which are positively related to CCA (Moon et al., 2012). Furthermore, Avey et al. (2011) concluded through a meta-analysis of the impact of PsyCap, that PsyCap is likely related
to engagement due to its positive relationship with organizational commitment, which is ultimately associated with engagement (Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007; Luthans et al., 2008). Based on these empirical findings, a simpler hypothesis model related to PsyCap was developed for this study (Figure II-5).

Since some of the relationships between the subcomponents of PsyCap and expatriate outcomes were barely examined, I also reviewed the literature about the relationships between the first order factors of PsyCap and positive and negative attitudes and behaviors. Several empirical studies presented the significant relationships between the subcomponents of PsyCap and the components of work performance, CCA, and work engagement.

![Figure II-5. Hypothesis model related to positive psychological capital](image)

*Self-efficacy and task performance.* Self-efficacy, a motivational factor (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998b), is found to be positively related to work performance.
(e.g., Baundura, 1997; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998b). Through a meta-analysis of 28 published and 10 unpublished studies with 5,414 people, Sitzmann and Yeo (2013) identified a positive association between self-efficacy and performance. Tierney and Farmer (2011) conducted experimental research on the relationships of self-efficacy and creativity with creative performance while collecting 145 data sets with Time 1 to Time 2 matched responses. They found out a positive relationship between self-efficacy and performance.

*Self-efficacy and organizational citizenship behavior.* Chen and Kao (2011) investigated the relationships among work characteristics, self-efficacy, collective efficacy, and OCB, using a total of 602 police officers from 54 police stations in Taiwan. The findings indicated a positive relationship between self-efficacy and OCB, same as those from Dussault’s (2006) study with 487 French high school teachers.

*Self-efficacy and counterproductive work behavior.* Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Barbaranelli, and Farnese (2014) examined the negative effects of self-efficacy on CWB. Data were collected from 1,147 Italian workers. They found that individuals who possessed a higher level of self-efficacy tended not to engage in CWB because self-efficacy moderated between stressors and negative emotions. Cretu and Burcas (2014) explored self-efficacy as a moderator of the relationship between emotional dissonance and CWB, based on a sample of 147 employees from an oil and gas company in Romania. Their study confirmed that self-efficacy is one of the significant predictors for CWBs.
Self-efficacy and withdrawal behavior. Caillier (2014) examined the relationship among transformational leadership, goal clarity, self-efficacy, extra-role behaviors, and withdrawal intentions. Data were collected from 913 public sector employees in the U.S. Findings from this study revealed that self-efficacy was negatively associated with withdrawal intentions.

Self-efficacy and cross-cultural adjustment. Osman-Gani and Rockstuhl (2009) investigated the relationships between cross-cultural training (CCT) effectiveness, self-efficacy, and CCA. The study sample included 169 current expatriate managers from four different national backgrounds. Their findings suggested that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between CCT and adjustment. Yusoff (2012) examined whether self-efficacy and perceived social support were positively related to the psychological adjustment of international students in a Malaysian public university. Data were collected from 185 international students from various nations. Results indicated that self-efficacy is positively related to the adjustment of international students.

Self-efficacy and work engagement. Ouweneel, Schaufeli, and Le Blanc (2013) investigated the relationships among self-efficacy, engagement, and performance, using 335 university students in Study 1 and 91 university students in Study 2. They measured levels of self-efficacy, engagement, and performance at two time points in the middle and end of a semester for Study 1. For Study 2, they designed three conditions, including a positive feedback group, a negative feedback group, and a no feedback group. As a result, they identified a positive relationship between self-efficacy and engagement for both studies. The findings of Ouweneel et al. (2013) are similar to those from other
previous experimental studies (e.g., Salanova, Llorens, Cifre, Martínez, & Schaufeli, 2003; Salanova, Llorens, & Schaufeli, 2011) and previous survey-based studies (e.g., Diseth, 2011; Ouweneel, Le Blanc, & Schaufeli, 2011).

_Hope and task performance._ Combs et al. (2010) investigated the effect of Indian service workers’ hope on their performance outcomes. Data were collected from 160 service workers of a privately held business process outsourcing firm in India. Conducting regression and structural equation model analyses, Combs et al. (2010) identified a significant positive relationship between hope and performance. Karatepe (2014) examined the mediating effect of work engagement on the relationship among hope, job performance, service recovery performance, and extra-role customer service based on a data set from 110 full-time frontline hotel employees and their managers in Romania. Their findings revealed that hope is positively associated with performance, which is mediated by work engagement (Karatepe, 2014).

_Hope and organizational citizenship behavior/counterproductive work behavior._ In their meta-analysis, Alarcon, Bowling, and Khazon (2013) pointed out that research on hope and optimism has primarily focused psychological and physiological well-being, and barely explored the role and consequences of hope and optimism in the workplace. Although the relationships of hope with OCB and CWB have not been examined in literature, hope is found to be positively related to employee satisfaction and commitment (Adams, Snyder, Rand, King, Sigmon, & Pulvers, 2014; Youssef, 2004), which are significantly associated with OCBs (Williams & Anderson, 1991) and CWBs (Carpenter, Newman, & Arthur, 2014; Mount, Llief, & Johnson, 2006).
Hope and withdrawal behavior. Seirup and Rose (2011) examined the effects of hope on academic achievement and retention based on a data set of 235 students on academic probation at a private university in the U.S. Findings showed that hope is positively associated with retention. Hope in stressful jobs is negatively related to emotional exhaustion and work withdrawal (Kirk & Koeske, 1995; Spencer & Spencer, 1993).

Hope, optimism, and cross-cultural adjustment. As introduced above, Alarcon et al. (2013) indicated a lack of the literature of hope and optimism exploring the role and consequences of optimism in the workplace. Rather, Dollwet and Reichard (2014) identified the positive relationship between PsyCap and CCA.

Hope and work engagement. As introduced earlier, Karatepe (2014) identified the positive relationship between hope and work engagement, using 110 full-time frontline hotel employees and their managers in Romania. Ouweneel, Le Blanc, Schaufeli, and Wijhe (2012) examined the relationship between hope and work engagement, using a diary study in which participants were asked to complete a survey for five consecutive working days, twice a day. After collecting data from 59 employees of a Dutch university, they conducted a hierarchical linear modeling. Results showed a positive relationship between hope and work engagement. As several scholars proposed, individuals who possess meaningful goals and develop plans to pursue those goals (i.e., hope) are more likely to be highly engaged in their tasks (Howell, 2009; MacLeod, Coates, & Hetherton, 2008; Sansone & Thoman, 2006).
Optimism and task performance. Chen, Liao, Redd, and Wu (2014) studied the relationships between entrepreneurs’ optimism and their firms’ performance. Data were collected from 146 Laotian entrepreneurs. Chen et al. (2014) reported that entrepreneurial optimism was positively related to their new venture performance. When looking at the relationship between optimism and performance in manufacturing settings, Green, Medlin, and Whitten (2004) found a positive relationship between employee optimism and a level of performance. Later, Medlin and Green (2009) investigated the relationships among goal setting, engagement, optimism, and performance, using 426 full-time and part-time employees. The findings indicated that optimism is positively associated with individual performance.

Kluemper, Little, and DeGroot (2009) investigated the relationship between optimism and outcome variables. After conducting a pilot test with 900 students from a large university in the southern U.S., Kluemper et al. (2009) collected data from 118 newly hired treatment workers at a large residential treatment center in the Midwest. The 118 workers voluntarily participated in the 3-month survey: pre and post. Results showed that optimism is positively related to task performance. Optimism is also positively related to commitment, job satisfaction, and conceptual performance, which is significantly associated with OCB (Williams & Anderson, 1991) and CWB (Mount et al., 2006).

Optimism and organizational citizenship behavior. Naeem, Malik, and Bano (2014) investigated the impact of 197 pharmaceutical sales people’s perceptions of
optimism on their OCBs in Pakistan. Findings of the study suggested a strong positive link between optimism and OCB.

In a school setting, Schwabsky (2014) examined the links among optimism, trust, and citizenship behavior. Based on a sample of 370 teachers from public elementary schools in northern Israel, Schwabsky (2014) found a positive relationship among the constructs, especially between optimism and citizenship behaviors.

Optimism and counterproductive work behavior. In the literature, there is a lack of studies examining the relationship between optimism and CWB. However, several studies indirectly indicated a negative relationship between these two constructs. For example, Grote, Bledsoe, Larkin, Lemay, and Brown (2007) found that people with a high level of optimism are less likely to experience negative consequences when faced with stressors. According to Luthans, Youssef et al. (2007), optimistic employees tend to take charge, avoid complaints, and embrace change, which are opposite to CWBs.

Optimism and withdrawal behavior. Bressler, Bressler, and Bressler (2010) investigated the role of and relationships among hope, optimism and goal setting in achieving academic success by sampling 219 students enrolled in online accounting courses. The findings of this study suggested that optimism increases student performance as well as their retention, which are opposite to withdrawal behavior.

Optimism and work engagement. Medlin et al. (2009) investigated the relationships among goal setting, engagement, optimism, and performance in the workplace. They identified positive correlations among work engagement, optimism, and performance. Based on their measurement model with coefficients and correlation
matrix, optimism is positively correlated to work engagement (Medlin et al., 2009). Nes, Segerstrom, and Sephton (2005) examined whether optimism can make individuals more engaged, which result in better outcomes in spite of difficult stressors. Data were collected from 54 university students at the University of Kentucky. Results revealed a positive relationship between optimism and work engagement.

**Resilience and task performance.** Kotze and Kleynhans (2013) examined whether psychological well-being and resilience are significantly related to the academic performance of 789 first-year students at a South African university. Results indicated that the relationship between resilience and performance was statistically significant. Kwek, Bui, Rynne, and So (2013) also explored the relationships among self-esteem, resilience, and the academic performance of 247 international students compared to 173 domestic students on two campuses of a large Australian university. Their study showed a positive link between resilience and the academic performance of the university students. The findings of Kotze and Kleynhans (2013) and Kwek et al. (2013) are consistent with those of Hartley (2011, 2012), Luthar (2006), Taylor (2010), and Wang and Gordon (2012) in the educational context.

**Resilience and organizational citizenship behavior/counterproductive work behavior.** There is a lack of research on the relationship among resilience, OCB, and CWB. As Luthans (2002) noted, resilient individuals “rebound, ‘bounce back’ from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure or even positive change, progress and increased responsibility” (p. 702). They believe in their own abilities and capabilities for achieving goals and handling challenges. They are also able to work in a highly stressful
context due to their high level of tolerance. These capabilities allow them to see the positive side and to adapt to change and challenge. Several studies confirmed the positive relationships between resilience and positive outcomes such as job satisfaction and commitment (Ilies, Scott, & Judge, 2006; Larson & Luthans, 2006; Youssef & Luthans, 2007), all of which are related to OCB and CWB (Carpenter et al., 2014; Mount et al., 2006; Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Resilience and withdrawal behavior. Hudgins (2015) investigated the relationships among resilience, job satisfaction, and work withdrawal. Based on the data collected from 89 nurse leaders in a multi-hospital healthcare system in southwestern Virginia, Hudgins found out significant negative relationships between resilience and work withdrawal. According to Coomber and Barriball (2007), stress is one of the most influential factors for work withdrawal. Since resilience allows individuals to better deal with the stressors, resilience is assumed to be negatively related to work withdrawal.

Resilience and cross-cultural adjustment. Breiden, Mohr, and Mirza (2006) examined how (a) the fit between work-related abilities and requirements of expatriates and (b) the fit between the needs and reinforcing factors for expatriates are associated with task satisfaction and emotional satisfaction, which are ultimately related to CCA. Interestingly, part of the work-related abilities and requirements was resilience, and the results illuminated the positive relationship between the fit and task satisfaction, and ultimately CCA. Therefore, this study indirectly showed a possible relationship between resilience and CCA. In addition, after identifying a positive link among self-esteem, resilience, and the academic performance of international students, Kwek et al. (2013)
concluded that CCA depends on the protective and risk factors that operate in the students’ circumstances. That is, individuals with a higher level of resilience likely experience fewer adjustment issues, and cope better with difficulties.

**Resilience and work engagement.** Mache, Vitzthum, Wanke, Groneberg, Klapp, and Danzer (2014) explored the relationships among resilience, self-efficacy, optimism, organizational resources, and work engagement, using 223 physicians. They found that resilience is positively related to engagement. Similarly, Bakker, Gieveld, and Van Rijswijk (2006) discovered a positive link among resilience, self-efficacy, optimism, and work engagement based on the data set from female school principals. Kotze and Kleynhans (2013) also identified the positive correlation between resilience and work engagement, as well as between resilience and performance.

**Interactions of positive psychological capital within the hypothesized model.** For this study, several positive outcomes of PsyCap and its subcomponents were identified in the context of an expatriate assignment. First, work performance is almost always considered as the primary potential outcome of PsyCap (Avery et al., 2010; Avery et al., 2011). In particular, PsyCap has positive relationships with all four components of work performance, including task performance (Vogelgesang et al., 2014), OCB, CWB (Avery et al., 2010), and withdrawal intention (Avery et al., 2011). Next, PsyCap has a direct association with CCA (Dollwet & Reichard, 2014) and an indirect association with CCA (Moon et al., 2012) through global mindset (Vogelgesang et al., 2014) and cultural intelligence (Gulistan Yunlu & Clapp-Smith, 2014; Reichard et al., 2014). Lastly, PsyCap has a positive relationship with organizational commitment.
and job satisfaction, both of which ultimately influence engagement (Avey et al., 2011; Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007; Luthans et al., 2008). Therefore, work engagement could be another primary outcome of PsyCap. More importantly, as discussed earlier, each of the subcomponents of PsyCap also has a significant relationship with the following primary outcomes: CCA, work engagement, and work performance. Therefore, informed by the empirical evidence and conceptual framework outlined above, the following hypotheses are proposed for this study (see Figure II-6):

**H1:** PsyCap will be positively related to work performance ((a) task performance (TP), (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) withdrawal behavior (WB)).

**H2:** PsyCap will be positively related to CCA.

**H3:** PsyCap will be positively related to work engagement.

*Figure II-6. Hypothesized interactions of positive psychological capital*
Interpersonal level resources

Perceived social support. As a social and interpersonal resource, social support decrease psychological distress and enhance emotional well-being (Kim, Kirkman, & Chen, 2008). Social support has been identified as essential to expatriate adjustment and performance (Lee, Veasna, & Wu, 2013). In fact, perceived support often has more impact on positive outcomes than the actual support (Leung, Huang, Su, & Lu, 2011; Scott & Bruce, 1994). According to the psychological climate theory (James & Sells, 1981), individuals react primarily to a perceived environment rather than the actual environment. As a result, social support leads an individual to believe that he or she is cared for, esteemed, valued, and belongs to a network of communication and mutual obligation (Cobb, 1976; Kirmeyer & Lin, 1987). Scholars in stress management indicated that social support comes from multiple sources, including supervisors, subordinates, family, friends, and organizations (Adkins & Premeaux, 2012; Kraimer & Wayne, 2004). As expatriates’ home and host national friends within a community (e.g., diasporic, religious, or expatriate) could provide strong support for expatriate adjustment (Bennett et al., 2000; Lin, Lu, & Lin, 2012), I include perceived community support in this study. Compared to a large number of studies examining perceived organizational support, research on other types of social support or the combination of various types of social support is scarce to non-exist (Bader, 2014). Therefore, it would be meaningful to examine the effects of the combination of various types of social support. In this section, I focus on discussing supports from supervisors, subordinates, and family at the
interpersonal level. Support at the organizational level and societal levels will be discussed later.

In the literature of expatriation, social support at the interpersonal level could be divided into the work-related and non-work-related domains. In the work-related domain, support from supervisors and subordinates in a host organization are included and family support is included in the non-work-related domain. Perceived supervisor or subordinate support refers to employees’ general views concerning the extent to which supervisors or subordinates value their contributions and care about their well-being (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). Therefore, the support from supervisors or subordinates includes physical, cognitive, and emotional dimensions regarding tasks and personal interactions at work. Expatriates generally encounter a new and unfamiliar work and living environment. In order to develop a new social network in a host country, they need to interact with supervisors, subordinates, partners, and customers with different cultural backgrounds. Therefore, support from both supervisors and subordinates are critical to expatriates. Further, social support can help expatriates develop PsyCap through encouragement by supervisors and subordinates (Shaffer & Harrison, 2001). In addition, several studies identified positive relationships between support from supervisors and subordinates and expatriate adjustment (e.g., Waxin, 2004) and work attitude (e.g., Bader, 2014).

In the non-work-related domain, perceived family support could be one of the most critical interpersonal resources (Konopaske, Robie, & Ivancevich, 2005). Spouses, in particular, could be a critical source of (a) information and assistance for general
adjustment, (b) a feeling of affection, and (c) encouragement for the completion of expatriate assignments and optimized performance (Caligiuri et al., 1998; Takeuchi, 2010). Although several studies examined the positive relationships between family adjustment and expatriate adjustment (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Palthe, 2004; Takeuchi et al., 2002), the expatriate literature has not paid much attention to perceived family support as the antecedents of expatriate family adjustment (Takeuchi, 2010). Only a limited number of scholars examined the relationships between support from expatriates’ family members and expatriate adjustment (Caligiuri, Joshi, & Lazarova, 1999; Kraimer, Wayne, & Jaworski, 2001; Waxin, 2004). Consequently, it is imperative to study the impact of family support.

**Outcomes of perceived supervisor and subordinate support.** The relationships between perceived supervisor and subordinate support and the components of work performance, CCA, and work engagement have been empirically identified by several studies.

**Perceived supervisor and subordinate support and task performance.** Liaw, Chi, and Chuang (2010) examined the relationships among transformational leadership, customer orientation, and service performance and the mediating effects of perceived supervisor support and perceived coworker support. Data were collected from 212 frontline service employee-customer dyads from 55 service organizations in Taiwan. Results showed that perceived supervisor support is positively associated with performance (Liaw et al., 2010). Dysvik and Kuvaas (2012) investigated a link among perceived supervisor support, perceived investment in employee development, and
business-unit performance. Through a survey with 543 employees of 75 gas stations located in Norway, these researchers found that perceived supervisor support was positively related to the performance of each gas station.

*Perceived supervisor and subordinate support and organizational citizenship behavior.* Wang (2014) examined the relationship between perceived supervisor support and OCB, and the mediating effect of commitment. After conducting hierarchical regression analyses of data collected from 238 Chinese employees, Wang (2014) identified a positive relationship between perceived supervisor support and OCB. Wang, Hinrichs, Prieto, and Howell (2013) also examined the relationship between perceived supervisor support and five dimensions of OCB, using 126 U.S. and 128 Chinese employees in the U.S. and China, respectively. They identified a clear and positive relationship between perceived supervisor support and OCB. Bourne, McComb, and Woodard (2012) examined the moderating effect of coworker support on the relationship between family-oriented benefits and OCB through a survey with 375 employees of four service organizations in the northeastern U.S. Their results suggested that general support from supervisors and subordinates are positively associated with OCB. Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, and Taylor (2000) also noted that employees with supervisor social support tended to exhibit OCB directed toward their supervisors.

*Perceived supervisor and subordinate support and counterproductive work behavior.* Sakurai and Jex (2012) examined the relationships of coworker incivility with both work effort and CWB, and the mediating effect of supervisor social support. Data were collected from 209 undergraduate students from a midsized university in the U.S.
They identified a negative relationship between perceived supervisor support and CWB. Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) also identified that expatriates’ work attitude could be better when supervisors and subordinates are kind and supportive. In his empirical study, Bader (2014) argued that supervisors and subordinates of expatriates could support and help expatriates in various ways, such as CCA. These supports could reduce the strain and stress of expatriates (Beehr, Jex, Stacy, & Murray, 2000) and further improve their work behaviors (Bader, 2014). On the contrary, without social support, expatriates might present a bad work attitude, which is similar to CWB. Bader (2014) found that social support is significantly correlated to work attitude.

*Perceived supervisor and subordinate support and withdrawal behavior.* Maertz, Griffeth, Campbell, and Allen (2007) examined the mediating effects of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support on the relationships between withdrawal intention and actual turnover. As revealed by responses from 225 social service workers from a state department of family and children’s services in the southeastern U.S. Perceived supervisor support was negatively related to withdrawal intention. This finding was confirmed by Bhatnagar (2014) identifying the relationship with 312 Indian knowledge workers. Newman, Thanacoody, and Hui (2012) also discovered a negative association between perceived supervisor support and withdrawal intentions, using 437 Chinese employees of five MNCs in the Chinese service sector.

*Perceived supervisor and subordinate support and cross-cultural adjustment.* Lee et al. (2013) investigated the relationships among social support, transformational leadership, expatriate adjustment, and performance, using 156 expatriate managers of
Taiwanese MNCs operating in China. They found the positive relationship between perceived supervisor support and CCA, which is significantly related to expatriate outcomes (Lee et al., 2013). Yusoff (2012) investigated whether self-efficacy and perceived social support were positively related to psychological adjustment of 185 international students in a Malaysian public university. Results suggested that self-efficacy was positively related to the adjustment of international students. Waxin (2004) also found positive relationships between support from supervisors and subordinates and expatriate adjustment.

*Perceived supervisor and subordinate support and work engagement.* Mache et al. (2014) explored the relationships among resilience, self-efficacy, optimism, organizational resources, and work engagement. They identified the positive relationship between social support and work engagement. In particular, the correlation coefficients between social support and work engagement presented their significant relationship (Mache et al., 2014). Taipale, Selander, Anttila, and Natti (2011) examined the relationships among job demands, autonomy, social support, and work engagement, using 7,867 employees in various business fields from Bulgaria, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden and the U.K. A strong relationship between social support and work engagement was revealed by this study.

*Interactions of perceived supervisor and subordinate support within the hypothesized model.* Perceived supervisor and subordinate support influences several outcomes. First, task performance was one of the primary positive outcomes (Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2012; Liaw et al., 2010). Next, perceived supervisor and subordinate support
has a positive relationship with OCB (Masterson et al., 2000; Wang, 2014; Wang et al., 2013), which could be conceptually supported by the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). CWB is another primary outcome of perceive supervisor and subordinate support (Bader, 2014; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Sakurai & Jex, 2012). In addition, perceived supervisor and subordinate support plays a significant role in decreasing withdrawal behavior and intentions (Bhatnagar, 2014; Maertz et al., 2007; Newman et al., 2012). Perceived supervisor and subordinate support is also associated with CCA in the context of expatriation (Lee et al., 2013) and international study abroad (Yusoff, 2012). Lastly, work engagement is one of the primary outcomes (Mache et al., 2014; Taipale et al., 2011). Therefore, informed by the empirical research and conceptual framework outlined above, the following hypotheses are proposed for this study (see Figure II-7):

**H4:** Perceived supervisor support in work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).

**H5:** Perceived supervisor support in work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.

**H6:** Perceived supervisor support in work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.

**H7:** Perceived subordinate support in work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).

**H8:** Perceived subordinate support in work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.

**H9:** Perceived subordinate support in work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.
Outcomes of perceived family support. Perceived family support at the interpersonal level is significantly associated with the components of work performance, CCA, and work engagement. Overall, there are not many studies supporting the direct relationship between perceived family support and those outcomes, but the indirect relationship with the outcomes.

Perceived family support and task performance. Family support plays a significant role in enhancing task performance. Pearson (2009) examined whether self-efficacy, family support, family affection, and family conflict are associated with academic performance of 685 middle school adolescents from rural and semirural public schools. Pearson identified the crucial influence of family support and family affection
on academic performance. In the context of an expatriate assignment, few studies examined the relationship between perceived family support and task performance, and most studies focused on supporting family members from organizations (e.g., Ahmad & Omar, 2012) and its relationship with expatriate adjustment. For example, several scholars stressed that family well-being and adjustment of the family members are critical to expatriate adjustment (Black & Gregersen, 1991; Caligiuri et al., 1998; Takeuchi, 2010). Lee and Kartika (2014) examined the relationships among individual, family, social capital factors, expatriate adjustment, and performance using 287 expatriates from the foreign MNCs in Taiwan and China. In their study, Lee and Kartika (2014) argued that family support from the spouse is critical to expatriate adjustment because adjustment of the family and spouse is the major stress to expatriates during their international assignments (Kraimer et al., 2001). Furthermore, these authors stated that the family and spouse may support expatriates to concentrate on their job, which can lead an improvement in their task performance (Takeuchi, Lepak, Marinova, & Yun, 2007). Forster (1997) also indicated the critical role of family relationships in the outcomes of expatriate assignments. Consequently, it is assumed that perceived family support could play a significant role in task performance of expatriates.

Perceived family support and organizational citizenship behavior. Singh and Singh (2011) examined the relationships among perceived organizational support, family involvement, and OCB using 188 Indian managers. Although they did not directly examine perceived family support, Singh and Singh (2011) identified that the family relationship with employees are significantly associated with OCB.
Perceived family support and counterproductive work behavior. Boyar, Maertz, and Pearson (2005) examined how work-family conflict and family-work conflict are related to non-attendance behaviors of 432 assembly or inspection workers of a furniture manufacturer in the southern U.S. They identified the statistically significant relationship between the work-family conflict and non-attendance behaviors, which are included in CWB. In addition, Ferguson, Carlson, Hunter, and Whitten (2012) also identified similar findings using 344 job incumbents and 190 dyads of job incumbents and their partners. Ferguson et al. (2012) showed that those who have work-family conflict exhibited deviant behaviors.

Perceived family support and withdrawal behavior. Nohe and Sonntag (2014) examined the relationships among work–family conflict, social support, and turnover intentions. Data were collected from 665 employees for a 5-month time lag. This findings consistent with other research such as Nohe and Sonntag (2014) and Hammer, Bauer, and Grandey (2003). In the expatriates’ context, researchers also showed empirically how family relationships are significant for their completion of international assignment (e.g., Caligiuri et al., 1998; Takeuchi, 2010).

Perceived family support and cross-cultural adjustment. Caligiuri et al. (1998) examined the sequential influences of family characteristics, including family support, family adjustment, and CCA, using 110 families of expatriates in a host country. They identified the significant relationship between family support and expatriates’ CCA. Similarly, Takeuchi et al. (2002) reported a positive influence of family adjustment and support on expatriates’ CCA.
Perceived family support and work engagement. Arabzadegan, Nouri, and Oreyzi (2012) explored the moderating effect of perceived family support on the relationship between work engagement and work-family conflict using 183 employees of an industrial company. Findings indicated the positive association between perceived family support and work engagement. In addition, family adjustment may enable expatriates to better focus on and engage in their job (Takeuchi et al., 2007).

Interactions of perceived family support within the hypothesized model. There are not many studies examining the relationship between perceived family support and its outcomes. In fact, most studies focused on either support for family members by organizations or the relationship between family support and expatriate adjustment. Nevertheless, several individual and organizational outcomes are found to be associated with perceived family support. First, perceived family support has a positive relationship with task performance (Pearson, 2009; Takeuchi et al., 2007; Forster, 1997) and OCB (Singh & Singh, 2011), and a negative relationship with CWB (Boyar et al., 2005; Ferguson et al., 2012) and withdrawal behavior and intentions (Nohe & Sonntag, 2014; Hammer et al., 2003). Second, perceived family support is associated with CCA in the context of expatriation (Caligiuri et al., 1998; Takeuchi et al., 2002). Last, work engagement is also one of the primary outcomes of perceived family support (Arabzadegan et al., 2012; Lee & Kartika, 2014). Therefore, informed by the empirical evidence/studies and conceptual framework outlined above, the following hypotheses are proposed for this study (see Figure II-8):

H10: Perceived family support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).
H11: Perceived family support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.

H12: Perceived family support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.

Figure II-8. Hypothesized interactions of perceived family support

Organizational level resources

As resources in the work-related domain, both perceived organizational support and cross-cultural training are reviewed below.

Perceived organizational support. As an organizational level resource, perceived organizational support refers to the perception of being valued and cared for by the organization (Eisenberger et al., 1986). The strong and positive effects of perceived organizational support on employee outcomes have been identified through
many empirical studies (see a meta-analysis study by Riggle, Edmondson, & Hansen, 2009). In particular, perceived organizational support has been highlighted as a critical factor in the context of an expatriate assignment (Lee et al., 2013; Stroppa & Spieß, 2011). Unlike employees in the context of general employment arrangement, expatriates are selected from a parent organization, transferred outside their home countries for an international assignment, and live and work in a local subsidiary organization. Consequently, expatriates have dual relationships with their parent company and the local subsidiary in which they are located. Thus, there are two different types of perceived organizational support, the perceived organizational support from the parent company and the perceived organizational support from the local subsidiary. Since the primary responsibilities for expatriates include managing and coordinating operations, tasks, or local employees or transferring knowledge, skills, and the organization’s cultural values to local employees (Bennet et al., 2000; Lee & Croker, 2006), the perceived organizational support from the local subsidiary may be more crucial because day-to-day work and even the personal life of expatriates are significantly influenced by the local subsidiary (Liu & Ipe, 2010; Paik, Parboteeah, & Shim, 2007). In the expatriate literature, a large number of studies examined the positive influence of the perceived organizational support from the parent company (e.g., Kawai & Strange, 2014; Cao, Hirschi, & Deller, 2014; Takeuchi, Wang, Marinova, & Yao, 2009). However, a relatively small number of studies focused on the influence of the perceived organizational support from the local and host organizations (e.g., Chen, Kirkman, Kim,
Consequently, the perceived organizational support for expatriates from a local host organization is included in this study.

**Outcomes of perceived organizational support.** Perceived organizational support at the organizational level is significantly associated with the components of work performance, CCA, and work engagement.

**Perceived organizational support and task performance.** Chen et al. (2010) examined the influence of expatriate cross-cultural motivation on work adjustment and job performance while investigating the mediating effects of subsidiary support and cultural distance on the relationship between cross-cultural motivation and work adjustment. Based on the data collected from 556 expatriates in 31 foreign subsidiaries, these authors concluded that subsidiary support was significantly related to task performance. Other previous studies also support this positive relationship between perceived organizational support and task performance (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990).

**Perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior.** Cheung (2013) investigated the mediating effect of perceived organizational support on the relationship between informational and interpersonal justice and OCB through a study with 159 matched supervisor-subordinate dyads of three engineering firms in Hong Kong. She identified the significant relationship between perceived organizational support and OCB. In the expatriate context, Liu (2009) investigated the relationships between perceived organizational support from a parent company and a local subsidiary, organizational commitment, and OCB for expatriates. Data were collected from 162
expatriates in 37 subsidiaries of multinational corporations located in China. Her findings suggested that the perceived organizational support from both parent companies and local subsidiaries are significantly associated with OCB. In their meta-analysis study, Riggle et al. (2009) also reported that contextual performance, which shares most components of OCB, was significantly related to perceived organizational support.

Perceived organizational support and counterproductive work behavior. Nielsen (2014) examined the relationship between perceived organizational support and CWB, using 154 matched supervisor-employee dyads of various types of three organizations. A significant relationship between perceived organizational support and CWB was established by this study. The author also found the positive relationships between perceived organizational support, performance rated by supervisors, and OCB. Liu and Ding (2012) examined the relationships between individual differences in ethical judgments and workplace deviance based on a sample of 460 employees from various organizations and industries in Taiwan. They identified that perceived organizational support is related to interpersonal deviance, which is included in CWB.

Perceived organizational support and withdrawal behavior. Maertz et al. (2007) examined the mediating effects of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support on the relationships between withdrawal intention and the actual turnover, using 225 social service workers from a state department of family and children’s services in the southeastern U.S. They found the negative relationship between perceived organizational support and withdrawal behavior. Cao et al. (2014) also examined the effect of perceived organizational support on withdrawal intention,
using 112 self-initiated expatriates in Germany. Their findings were consistent with others’ (e.g., Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002; Maertz et al., 2007). In addition, Shusha (2013) identified a positive relationship between perceived organizational support and withdrawal behavior and intention of 467 employees and their supervisors from 20 small factories in Egypt.

Perceived organizational support and cross-cultural adjustment. Many expatriate studies examined the relationship between perceived organizational support and CCA. Kawai and Strange (2014) recently examined the mediating effects of work adjustment and affective commitment on the relationships between perceived organizational support and task and contextual performance. By analyzing data from 118 expatriates working at the German subsidiaries of Japanese MNCs, these authors disclosed a significant positive relationship between perceived organizational support and expatriate work adjustment, as well as between perceived organizational support and OCB. Takeuchi et al. (2009) studied the relationships among perceived organizational support, CCA, affective commitment, and job performance. After analyzing data from 165 expatriates working in various cities in China, they concluded that perceived organizational support is positively associated with CCA.

Perceived organizational support and work engagement. Ugwu and Ogwuche (2013) investigated the relationships between perceived psychological contract breach, perceived organizational support, and work engagement using 218 employees from 11 commercial banks in Nigeria. Implementing a hierarchical regression, they identified a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and work engagement.
Zacher and Winter (2011) investigated the relationships among eldercare demands, strain, and work engagement using perceived organizational support as a moderator. Data were collected from 147 employees in Germany. A positive relationship between perceived organizational support and work engagement ($r = .42$, $p<.01$) was found (Zacher & Winter, 2011).

**Interactions of perceived organizational support within the hypothesized model.**

Many empirical studies illuminate the relationships between perceived organizational support and individual and organizational outcomes. First, perceived organizational support is positively related to task performance (Chen et al., 2010; Eisenberger et al., 1986, 1990; Riggle et al., 2009) and OCB (Cheung, 2013; Liu, 2009) and negatively associated with CWB (Liu & Ding, 2012; Nielsen, 2014) and withdrawal behavior and intentions (Cao et al., 2014; Eisenberger et al., 2002; Maertz et al., 2007; Shusha, 2013). Second, perceived organizational support is significantly related to CCA in the context of expatriation (Kawai & Strange, 2014; Takeuchi et al., 2009). Third, work engagement is also positively related to perceived organizational support (Ugwu & Ogwuche, 2013; Zacher & Winter, 2011). Therefore, informed by the empirical evidence and conceptual framework outlined above, the following hypotheses are proposed for this study (see Figure II-9):

**H13:** Perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).

**H14:** Perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary will be positively related to CCA.

**H15:** Perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary will be positively related to work engagement.
Figure II-9. Hypothesized interactions of perceived organizational support

**Societal level resources**

**Perceived community support.** As a resource at the societal level and in the non-work-related domain, expatriates’ communities could provide strong support (Lin et al., 2012). Community is a “group of people who have the same interests, religion, race, etc” (Merriam Webster, 2015). Community includes not only a geographically bounded neighborhood where a particular ethnic group live and a business is situated, but also refers to social institutions and interpersonal networks (Zhou & Kim, 2006.). For example, an ethnic minority community (e.g., Korean American community), religious community (e.g., church), and expatriate community could be included. When involved in community activities and relationship building, individuals could build a sense of
belonging, integration and fulfillment, share emotional connections, and gain educational and economic resources, all of which could be psychologically perceived as support from a community (McMillian & Chavis, 1986; Snowden, Martinez, & Morris, 2000; Zhou & Kim, 2006). More importantly, given that perceived support often has a stronger impact than the actual support (Leung et al., 2011; Scott & Bruce, 1994), perceived community support was included in the hypothesized model of this study. In the expatriate literature, there are not many studies examining the effect of perceived community support. However, this resource informed by the spillover theory might be positively related to CCA and work-related outcomes (Caligiuri, 1997; Takeuchi et al., 2002).

**Outcomes of perceived community support.** There is a lack of empirical studies examining perceived community support. However, according to Au and Fukuda (2002), expatriates tend to be involved with different communities, such as their ethnic group, other expatriates, and/or local individuals. These culturally diverse social networks could provide various types of information and advice to expatriates (Smith, 1999). Therefore, boundary-spanning occurs through the communities in which expatriates are involved (Baron, Field, & Schuller, 2000; Osman-Gani & Rockstuhl, 2009). This expatriate boundary-spanning is closely related to the work of the expatriates as it helps expatriates build relationships with local individuals, adapt to local ways of doing business, coordinate tasks smoothly with local individuals, and collect critical information (Johnson & Duxbury, 2010). Therefore, it is assumed that perceived community support could be positively associated with task performance. For
example, Caligiuri (1997) examined expatriate success based on three criteria: (a) completion of the foreign assignment, (b) CCA, and (c) performance on the foreign assignment. Data were collected from 260 expatriates at a large U.S. based multinational organization. Results suggested that the contextual performance, including the interpersonal relationships with members of a local community, was correlated with self-rated performance (Caligiuri, 1997). Through boundary-spanning, expatriates likely gain more job resources, such as information and social networks, which could be perceived as supports from their communities. According to the JD-R model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), the perceived support from their communities positively impact human motivation. The outcomes of the human motivation include organizational commitment, work engagement, and job satisfaction (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Crawford et al., 2010; Nahrgan et al., 2011), which are significantly related to OCBs (Williams & Anderson, 1991) and CWBs (Carpenter et al., 2014; Mount et al., 2006). In addition, Snowden et al., (2000), focusing on black and Latin communities, identified that a community of family, religion, and indigenous healers could decrease stress in minorities. Although there is no study examining the direct effects of perceived community support on the components of work performance and work engagement, these linkages from the perceived support from expatriates’ community by their boundary-spanning to motivation and from the motivation to performance outcomes indicate that there are possible relationships between perceived community support and performance outcomes.
Perceived community support and cross-cultural adjustment. A few studies examined perceived community support and CCA. Kang (2011) investigated the relationship between the community and family factors and the international adjustment of expatriates using 120 Korean expatriates in the U.S. She identified that community support are significantly related to general and interaction adjustments, but it was not associated with work adjustment. Min and Kim (2002) also pointed out the significance of church community for the Korean expatriates and immigrants in host countries because the religious community serves multiple functions, including spiritual practices, psychological support, and educational and economic resources (Zhou & Kim, 2006). Through the perceived support from community, such as a sense of belonging, integration, and fulfillment, and sharing emotional connections, the communities could play a buffering role against stress and culture shock (Snowden et al., 2000). Consequently, expatriates better adjust to the new environment of the host country.

Interactions of perceived community support within the hypothesized model.

Since communities could assist expatriates to span their boundary in a new environment (Osman-Gani & Rockstuhl, 2009), expatriates could acquire job resources from communities, possibly resulting in organizational commitment, work engagement, and job satisfaction (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Crawford et al., 2010; Nahrgan et al., 2011). These outcomes are significantly related to OCBs (Williams & Anderson, 1991) and CWBs (Carpenter et al., 2014; Mount et al., 2006). Perceived community support may also be related to task performance (Caligiuri, 1997). Furthermore, the relationships between perceived community support in the non-work-related domain and work
performance components and work engagement could be hypothesized based on the spillover theory (Caligiuri, 1997; Takeuchi et al., 2002). Last, a few researchers in the expatriate literature reported the positive relationship between community support and CCA (e.g., Kang, 2011). Therefore, informed by the empirical evidence and theoretical framework outlined above, the following hypotheses are proposed for this study (see Figure II-10):

**H16:** Perceived community support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).

**H17:** Perceived community support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.

**H18:** Perceived community support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.

*Figure II-10. Hypothesized interactions of perceived community support*
Dependent variables

Cross-cultural adjustment. As one of the primary and crucial antecedents of successful expatriation, CCA has been frequently used for many expatriate studies (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Puck et al., 2008; Takeuchi, 2010). Expatriate adjustment refers to “the degree of psychological adjustment experienced by the individual within a new society or the degree of psychological comfort and familiarity perceived within a new environment” (Puck et al., 2008, p. 2183). The adjustment can be explained with several dimensions: process, degree, mode, and facets (Black, 1988; Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991).

Process. Black and Mendenhall (1990, 1991) proposed the U curve of adjustment including four processes: honeymoon, cultural shock, adjustment, and mastery. While excited about living in a new country with lots of hope and energy in the honeymoon stage, expatriates tend to feel confused, frustrated, and lonely in a different environment in the cultural shock stage. In the adjustment stage, they start adjusting their behaviors and attitudes while communicating with locals and understanding the differences between the two cultures. In the final stage, they become masters of the host culture and flexible in a new environment.

Degree. Expatriates can measure their own degree of adjustment from two lenses: subjective and objective. The subjective lens deals with the level of comfort expatriates feel in their new role or the level of adjustment required for them to assume a new role. The objective lens deals with the level of comprehensiveness and performance in their new roles (Black, 1988).
Mode. The mode of adjustment has two components: socio-cultural and psychological (Black & Gregersen, 1991). Socio-cultural adjustment indicates the ability of expatriates to fit into the new culture; and psychological adjustment is about the attitudes of expatriates and the level of satisfaction with the new environment (Black & Gregersen, 1991). For example, those contact with host nations, length of stay in the new environment, and cultural distance are factors in socio-cultural adjustment. On the other hand, personality traits, life changes, and social support are factors of psychological adjustment (Ward & Chang, 1997). The factors of socio-cultural adjustment are easier to achieve than those of psychological adjustment (Selmer, 1999).

Facet. There are three facets of adjustment: general, work, and interactive (Black, 1988). General adjustment is the adjustment to the non-work environment and “involves a process through which an expatriate becomes comfortable and establishes familiarity with the local surroundings in the host country” (Wang & Takeuchi, 2007, p. 1439). Work adjustment refers to the adjustment to a new work environment, such as jobs, tasks, roles, and environment. Interactive adjustment is the adjustment to the ways of building social networks or communicating with local people. The three aspects of adjustment have been empirically examined and employed to measure expatriate outcomes.

Outcomes of cross-cultural adjustment.

Cross-cultural adjustment and task performance. Malek, Budhwar, and Reiche (2015) investigated the mediating effects of adjustment of expatriates and their spouses on the relationships between support from their organizations and host-country nationals and performance. While collecting and analyzing data from 134 expatriates and their
spouses in foreign MNCs in Malaysia, they identified a positive relationship between CCA and task performance ($r = .19, p < .05$). Lee and Kartika (2014) examined the influences of individual, family, and social capital factors on expatriate adjustment and performance and the moderating effect of psychological contract and perceived organizational support, using a sample of 287 expatriates of foreign MNCs in Taiwan and China. Their findings showed that expatriate adjustment is positively associated with performance. Wu and Ang (2011) tested the relationships among corporate expatriate supporting practices, CCA, and performance using 169 expatriates in Singapore. They found that performance was influenced by general, interaction, and work adjustment ($r = .31, .49, .32, p < .01$). The relationship between CCA and task performance was also supported by empirical evidence in the expatriate literature. For example, Shaffer and Harrison (2001) pointed out that well-adjusted expatriates should have greater resources (time, effort, and emotional investment) available to support good performance. In particular, work adjustment exhibited a significant positive relationship with job performance (Kraimer et al., 2001; Takeuchi, Wang, & Marinova, 2005).

_Cross-cultural adjustment and organizational citizenship behavior/counterproductive work behavior._ Although no study was identified examining the direct association of CCA with OCB and CWB, several studies examined the relationship of CCA with organizational commitment and job satisfaction, which are significantly related to OCBs and CWBs. Lii and Wong (2008) examined the relationships among entrepreneurship, work role characteristics, emotional intelligence, locus of control, the adjustment, and organizational commitment using 152 expatriates in Taiwanese
companies in China. They identified a positive relationship between expatriate adjustment and organizational commitment. Chen and Chiu (2009) also identified the positive relationship between CCA and organizational commitment when they investigated the relationships among psychological contracts, the adjustment, and organizational commitment of 219 Taiwanese expatriates. Pinto, Cabral-Cardoso, and Werther (2012) discovered a positive relationship between CCA and job satisfaction with 166 expatriates in 39 different countries. Froese and Peltokorpi (2013) compared the differences of expatriates and self-initiated expatriates in the relationship between CCA and job satisfaction using 57 expatriates and 124 self-initiated expatriates. Results from their study showed the positive relationship between CCA and job satisfaction. Although components of contextual performance are embedded in the components of OCBs, Kraimer and Wayne (2004) were able to identify a positive relationship between CCA and contextual performance and Wu and Ang (2011) identified that interaction and work adjustment were significantly related to OCBs. Accordingly, it is assumed that CCA is positively related to OCB and negatively related to CWB.

**Cross-cultural adjustment and withdrawal behavior.** While examining the relationship between CCA and general satisfaction with the assignment and withdrawal intentions, Pinto et al. (2012) noticed that all three types of CCA have the negative association with intentions of assignment withdrawal. Siers (2007) examined the relationships among organizational justice perceptions, adjustment, and withdrawal intentions, using 99 expatriates located in the U.S. He found a positive relationship between general adjustment and withdrawal intentions \( (r=-.30, p<.01) \). Several previous
studies indicated that when expatriates are well adjusted, they tend to complete their assignment (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Black & Stephens, 1989; Takeuchi, Tesluk, Yun, & Lepak, 2005). For example, Takeuchi, Tesluk, et al. (2005) identified a negative relationship between CCA and withdrawal intentions from Japanese expatriates. Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al.’s (2005) meta-analysis also revealed the negative relationship between CCA and withdrawal intentions.

**Interactions of cross-cultural adjustment within the hypothesized model.** In the expatriate literature, CCA has been widely examined as an indicator of expatriate outcomes as well as a mediator of work performance. From empirical studies, several outcomes of CCA emerged. First, CCA has a positive relationship with task performance (Lee & Kartika, 2014; Malek et al., 2015; Wu & Ang, 2011). In addition, CCA is positively associated with organizational commitment (Chen & Chiu, 2009; Lii & Wong, 2008) and job satisfaction (Froese & Peltokorpi, 2013; Pinto et al., 2012), which are significantly related to OCB and CWB. CCA is also associated with contextual performance (Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Wu & Ang, 2011), which is embedded in OCB. Consequently, it is hypothesized that CCA is positively related to OCB and negatively related to CWB. Lastly, CCA is significantly related to withdrawal behaviors (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al. (2005) for a meta-analysis; Pinto et al., 2012; Siers, 2007; Takeuchi et al., 2005). Based on the evidence above, the following hypotheses are proposed for this study (also see Figure II-11):

**H19:** CCA will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).

**H20:** CCA will be positively related to work engagement.
**Figure II-11.** Hypothesized interactions of cross-cultural adjustment

**Work engagement.** In the literature of engagement, four perspectives have been documented (Shuck, 2011). They include “(a) Kahn’s (1990) need-satisfying approach, (b) Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter’s (2001) burnout-antithesis approach, (c) Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes’s (2002) satisfaction-engagement approach, and (d) Saks’s (2006) multidimensional approach. Kahn’s concept of engagement (1990), which is widely recognized as a foundational study of engagement, consists of three psychological domains: meaningfulness, safety, and availability. Maslach et al.’s (2001) approach was conceptualized as the positive antithesis and the opposite to burnout. Based on this burnout-antithesis approach, three dimensions of work engagement have been further developed by Schaufeli and other scholars: vigor, dedication, and absorption (e.g.,
Schaufeli, Martinez, Marques, Salanova, & Bakker, 2002, Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002). Unlike those two previous approaches, Harter et al. (2002) focused on the antecedents of engagement in terms of perceived job resources and regarded job satisfaction as an outcome of engagement. Their measures have been used to examine a massive deposit of data through the Gallup database (e.g., more than 7 million employees in 112 countries; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). Lastly, Saks (2006) developed the multidimensional concept of engagement while distinguishing between job engagement and organizational engagement. In particular, Saks’s (2006) three dimensions include cognitive, emotional, and behavioral elements, which were developed based on the three previous approaches. Although no single approach has been accepted in academia (Christian, Garza, & Salughter, 2011; Shuck, 2011), I adopted Schaufeli and his colleagues’ approach to work engagement (Schaufeli, Martinez, et al., 2002, Schaufeli, Salanova, et al., 2002) for two reasons. First, the validity and reliability of their measure scores (Schaufeli, Salanova, et al., 2002) has been empirically demonstrated by many studies in various fields across the world. Although Harter et al.’s (2002) approach has a higher reliability estimate based on a massive deposit of data through the Gallup, the correlation between engagement and job satisfaction is extremely high (.91), possibly meaning that their concept of engagement is similar to job satisfaction (Harter et al., 2002). Second, I prefer a three-dimensional measure of work engagement rather than a unidimensional measure because multidimensional measure can better incorporate a range of indicators to capture the complexity of work engagement. Although Saks’ (2006) multidimensional approach is
also applicable due to its inclusion of the three domains of being human (i.e., thinking, feeling, and behaving), the job and organizational engagement of Saks’s (2006) approach are highly related with each other ($r = .62$) and presented different patterns of relationships with antecedents and consequences (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). Although May, Gilson, and Harter (2004) also developed three dimensions of engagement based on Kahn’s conceptualization of engagement, one factor instead of the three factors emerged from their factor analysis (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). Therefore, this study chose the concept of work engagement by Schaufeli, Salanova, et al. (2002).

According to Schaufeli, Salanova, et al. (2002), work engagement is a “positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption,” (p. 74) which is clearly separated from organizational engagement. With vigor, employees work with high levels of energy and psychological resilience, are devoted to their work, and endure when they are confronted with difficulties (Schaufeli, Salanova, et al., 2002). Dedication is a “strong psychological identification with one’s job” while absorption refers to “being fully concentrated and engrossed in one’s work” (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006, p. 498).

**Outcomes of work engagement.** In the literature on organizational behavior, many studies examined the relationship between work engagement and various outcomes, including work performance. For example, work engagement has positive relationships with extrinsic and intrinsic motivation (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008) and organizational outcomes (e.g., performance (Salanova, Agut, & Peiro, 2005; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009)).
Work engagement and task performance. Wang, Lu, and Siu (2015) examined the moderating effect of organizational justice and the mediating effect of work engagement on the relationship between job insecurity and job performance. For their two consecutive surveys, data were collected from 140 Chinese employees for Study 1 (two-wave data) and 125 Chinese employees for Study 2 (three-wave data). Wang et al. (2015) identified the positive relationship between work engagement and task performance while they were significantly correlated ($r = .29$ (Study1), .27 (Study2), $p < .01$). Vogelgesang, Leroy, and Avolio (2013) conducted a 3-month longitudinal study examining the mediating effects of leader integrity and engagement on the relationships between communication transparency and performance, using 451 military cadets from a United States military academy. Results showed the positive relationship between work engagement and task performance. The significant relationship between work engagement and task performance was also confirmed by Christian et al. (2011) in their meta-analysis and Demerouti and Cropanzano (2010) in their literature review.

Work engagement and organizational citizenship behavior. Shantz, Alfes, Truss, and Soane (2013) examined the mediating role of work engagement between antecedents (task variety, autonomy, task significance, task identity, and feedback from job) and consequences (task performance, OCB, and deviance), using 283 employees in a consultancy and construction firm based in the U.K. They found a firm relationship between work engagement and OCB ($r = .44$, $p < .01$). Wickramasinghe and Perera (2014) examined the mediating effect of OCB on the relationships between perceived organizational support and engagement and performance, using 255 employees in 12
manufacturing firms in Sri Lanka. Their findings revealed the positive relationship between engagement and OCB. While there are two types of OCB, such as OCB at the individual level and organizational level, Saks (2006) also identified that engagement was significantly related to OCB at the organizational level ($r = .39, p < .001$).

**Work engagement and counterproductive work behavior.** Ariani (2013) investigated the relationship between employee engagement, OCB, and CWB using 507 employees from service industries in Indonesia. The findings presented the negative relationship between engagement and CWB ($r = -.18, p < .01$). Shantz et al. (2013) also identified the negative relationship between engagement and deviance, which is similar to CWB ($r = -.30, p < .01$). When employees are engaged, they may possess less negative emotions (Avey, Wernsing, & Luthans 2008) and more job resources (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009), resulting in less counterproductive or deviant work behaviors.

**Work engagement and withdrawal behavior.** Shuck, Twyford, Reio, and Shuck (2014) investigated the negative relationship among HRD practices, employee engagement, and withdrawal intentions by sampling 207 employees in health care industries. These authors identified a significant negative relationship between engagement and withdrawal intentions ($r = -.34, p < .001$). Similar findings were reported by Saks (2006) to show the negative relationship between engagement and withdrawal intention ($r = -.22, p < .10$).

**Interactions of work engagement within the hypothesized model.** As one of the most popular topics in the literature of organizational behavior, outcomes of work engagement have been empirically examined and identified by many scholars. However,
among them only a few studies were situated in the expatriate context. In the literature of management and organizational behavior, the components of work performance have been identified as outcomes of work engagement. Work engagement is found to be positively associated with task performance (Christian et al., 2011; Vogelgesang et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2015; and Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010 for the overview of outcomes) and OCB (Saks, 2006; Shantz et al., 2013; Wickramasinghe & Perera, 2014) and negatively related to CWB (Ariani, 2013; Shantz et al., 2013) and withdrawal behavior (Saks, 2006; Shuck et al., 2014). These findings led to the development of the following hypotheses for this study (see Figure II-12) related to work engagement:

\[ H21: \text{Work engagement will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).} \]

*Figure II-12. Hypothesized interactions of work engagement*
Work performance as expatriate outcomes.

Expatriate outcomes. In the expatriate literature, while various criteria of expatriate outcomes have been conceptually developed and empirically examined (e.g., Black et al., 1991; Caligiuri, 1997; Chen et al., 2010; Hechanova, Beehr, & Christiansen, 2003; Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Lazarova et al., 2010; Mol, Born, & van der Molen, 2005), three indicators were popularly used to measure expatriate outcomes: (a) completion of the expatriate assignment, (b) CCA, and (c) performance. Based on my review of 56 dissertations published between January 2004 and November 2013, expatriate outcomes were primarily measured by these indicators. However, scholars recently began using other organizational behaviors, including organizational commitment (Natalie Vladi, 2008), job satisfaction (de Melo, 2013), knowledge transfer/sharing (Hsu, 2012), or psychological wellbeing (Li, 2009).

Previous expatriate studies were designed from the stress perspective of employee adjustment because expatriates are usually located in an unfamiliar or often unfavorable context (Kraimer & Wayne, 2004). As a result, the job demands (e.g., unfavorable physical environment) as suggested in the JD-R model and the resource loss (e.g., lack of social network and social support) as suggested in the COR theory may occur. Therefore, the previously listed three criteria of expatriate outcomes have been primarily used in the expatriate literature because the negative impact of the job demands or the positive impact of the job resources on outcomes were empirically examined by many studies.
The first typical indicator of expatriate outcomes is completion of the expatriate assignment. Since it is difficult to collect data from repatriates who either already left their companies or have worked in different contexts, many expatriate studies adopted measures of withdrawal intentions or intent to complete the assignment (e.g., Caligiuri, 2000; Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Shaffer et al., 2001; Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black, & Ferzandi, 2006; Takeuchi, Wang, et al., 2005). However, as Caligiuri (1997) warned, the intent to withdraw or complete the expatriate assignment may not be reliable.

The second indicator of expatriate outcomes is expatriate adjustment. In his classic study of CCA, Black (1988) examined the relationships between CCAs and several predictors, such as previous international assignment, cultural knowledge, family adjustment, and interaction with local people. Based on his study, Black (1988) suggested three components of CCA built on a synthesis of literature: general, interaction, work. Although expatriate studies measured CCA before Black (1988) proposed the multiple components of adjustment, the construct had been measured from a single dimension. Many subsequent expatriate studies incorporated Black’s (1988) three dimensions of CCA as a valid and reliable indicator of expatriate outcomes based on the assumption of the firm positive relationships between CCA and outcomes (e.g., Black & Stephens, 1989; Downes, Varner & Hemmasi, 2010; Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Moon et al., 2012; Takeuchi et al., 2002; Takeuchi et al., 2009; Toh & DeNisi, 2007). Further, several meta-analysis reported positive relationships between adjustment and withdrawal intention and task performance (e.g., Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Hechanova et al., 2003). However, scholars (e.g., Mol et al., 2005) challenged the
assumption of a positive relationship between CCA and expatriate outcomes.

Consequently, CCA was used as a mediator rather than an outcome in this study.

Last, work performance is one of the typical criteria not only for expatriate outcomes, but also for general outcomes. Many studies in the fields of management, psychology, and education have used performance as an outcome variable to identify its predictors and effects (Koopmans, Bernaards, Hildebrandt, van Buuren, van der Beek, & de Vet, 2013). Work performance refers to “behaviors and actions that are relevant to the goals of the organization” (Campbell, 1990, p. 704). By this definition, behaviors and actions, rather than the results, are the primary focus. However, task performance has been a main focus in the literature, which only measures the results (Campbell, 1990).

In spite of several calls for the need for a multidimensionality of work performance (e.g., Austin & Villanova, 1992; Cambell, 1990; Murphy, 1989), researchers consistently focused solely on task or job performance and did not pay attention to individual and organizational behaviors until recently (e.g., Koopmans, Bernaards, Hildebrandt, Schaufeli, de Vet, & van der Beek, 2011; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Dalal, 2005). Likewise, most of the extant expatriate studies also implemented task or job performance as an indicator of expatriate outcomes. Rather than focusing exclusively on task or job performance, several studies in the expatriate literature measured work performance from two dimensions, task and contextual or in-role and extra-role (e.g., Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Shaffer et al., 2006). Contextual performance refers to “behaviors that support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function”
The exemplary behaviors for contextual performance include demonstrating effort, facilitating peer and team performance, cooperating, and communicating (Campbell, 1990; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Although contextual performance captures the extended contexts impacting work performance, it still does not measure some of the positive and negative work behaviors, which does not allow researchers to capture the dynamics and a holistic picture of work performance.

Koopman et al. (2013) proposed three dimensions of work performance measure based on their conceptual framework derived from a systematic review of work performance (Koopman et al., 2011). Through a conceptual analysis, Koopman et al. (2011) proposed four dimensions of work performance applicable to any type of jobs, including task performance, contextual performance, CWB, and adaptive performance. In their empirical study later, Koopman et al. (2013) found that the adaptive performance was not supported by the data they collected (N = 1,181). However, the questionnaires Koopman et al. (2011, 2013) used in both studies did not include withdrawal behaviors, which they included in the construct of CWBs. This could be problematic because the set of items for one criterion construct (i.e., CWB) could represent two criterion constructs (i.e., CWB and withdrawal behavior).

Carpenter et al. (2014) proposed a comprehensive model of work performance. According to the authors, four core categories of work behaviors could be extracted from several meaningful and popularly used models of work performance (e.g., Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Campbell, 1990; Murphy, 1989, 1990; Sackett, 2002; Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006; and Viswesvaran, Schmidt, & Ones, 2005). The categories
include (a) the completion of tasks, (b) positive work behaviors, (c) negative and harmful behaviors, and (d) negative behaviors to avoid the tasks (Carpenter et al., 2014).

**Work performance.** For my study, work performance was chosen as an indicator of expatriate outcomes. In particular, task performance, OCB, CWB, and withdrawal behaviors were used as multi-dimensional components of work performance.

**Task performance.** The first component of work performance is task performance, which refers to “the proficiency with which individuals perform the core substantive or technical tasks central to his or her job” (Campbell, 1990, pp. 708-709). In their systematic review, Koopman et al. (2011) listed constructs similar to task performance, including job-specific task proficiency (Campbell, Ford, Rumsey, et al., 1990; Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007; Wisecarver, Carpenter, & Kilcullen, 2007), technical proficiency (Campbell, Hanson, & Oppler, 2001; Campbell, McHenry, & Wise, 1990; Lance, Teachout, & Donnelly, 1992), or in-role performance (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004; Maxham, Netemeyer, & Lichtenstein, 2008). These behaviors and activities are officially written in job descriptions and are recognized by organizational reward systems (William & Anderson, 1991). In addition, behaviors and activities related to task performance are directly related to tasks or jobs (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). As described previously, the tasks of expatriates include managing and coordinating operations, tasks, and local employees as well as transferring knowledge, skills, and the organization’s cultural values to local employees (Bennett et al., 2000; Lee & Croker, 2006). Therefore, task performance of expatriates reflects the extent to which expatriates satisfy their required tasks or jobs.
Organizational citizenship behavior. Although task performance is critical, researchers believe that task performance is only one of the critical parts of work performance. In other words, there are other critical parts of work performance, which may not be directly related to tasks or jobs but prevent or enhance productivity (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). One of the popular work performance constructs is OCB. Coined by Organ (1988), OCB is derived from Katz’s (1964) category of extra role behavior and is defined as performance of individual behavior that “is discretionary or volitional behavior that is not explicitly recognized by an organization’s reward system (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006, p. 3). In the 80s and 90s, several scholars tried to conceptualize OCB with different terms, such as prosocial organizational behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), or organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992). According to Williams and Anderson (1991), there are two types of OCBs. First, OCB at the organizational level (OCBO) directly benefits the organization (e.g., informing in advance of an absence) and is considered generalized compliance, whereas OCB at the individual level (OCBI) benefits the members of the organization (e.g., assists those who work overnight) and is considered altruism (e.g., Lee & Allen, 2002; Organ & Konovsky, 1989). While OCBO is directly related to the organizational effectiveness, OCBI indirectly contributes to the organizational effectiveness.

Counterproductive work behavior. CWB is another critical component of work performance. Defined as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and, in so doing, threatens the well-being of the organization or its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, p. 556), the intentional deviant behaviors may be
harmful for the organization or its members (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Spector & Fox, 2005). CWB could be divided into three categories. The first category is behaviors related to substance abuse or poor self-discipline (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002), such as personal deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995) and downtime behavior (Murphy, 1989). The second category of CWB includes behaviors actually destroying property or equipment of organizations (e.g., destructive/hazardous behavior (Murphy, 1989) and property deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995)). The third category includes behaviors and activities harmful to coworkers. Political deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), personal aggression (Robinson & Bennett, 1995) and unruliness (Hunt, 1996) could be examples in this category. Based on the above definitions and conceptualizations, CWB and OCB could be seen as the ends of one dimension. However, Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, and Laczo (2006) presented a better fit of multi-factor models rather than a single-factor model. In addition, several meta-analyses (e.g., Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Dalal, 2005) supported the distinctiveness of the two constructs.

Withdrawal work behaviors. Withdrawal behaviors are “behaviors that individuals engage in to avoid their work role or minimize the time spent on their specific work tasks, while retaining their current organizational membership (Hanisch, 1995, p. 158). As Carpenter et al. (2014) indicated, conceptual models of CWB and withdrawal are not clearly developed because some models of CWB include withdrawal behaviors as a lower-order factor (e.g., Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh, & Kessler, 2006) and others include CWB as a lower-order factor (e.g., Hanisch & Hulin, 1990, 1991). Withdrawal behaviors are different from CWB because the behaviors do
not intend to harm the organization or its members (Spector et al., 2006). In the expatriate literature, withdrawal behaviors or withdrawal intention is one of the most commonly used indicators for expatriate outcomes because incompletion of the expatriate assignment is considered a failure (e.g., Caligiuri, 2000; Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Shaffer et al., 2001; Shaffer et al., 2006; Takeuchi et al., 2005).

Based on the discussion above, the mediating effects of work engagement and CCA between job resources at various levels and work performance could be assumed. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed for this study (also see Figure II-13):

*H22: CCA will mediate the relationships between the resources at various levels and work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).*

*H23: Work engagement will mediate the relationships between the job resources at various levels and work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, & (d) WB).*

*Figure II-13. Hypothesized mediating effects of cross-cultural adjustment and work engagement*
Korean culture

The Korean culture has been influenced by the Chinese culture for geopolitical reasons and is strongly rooted in Confucianism and Taoism (Pratt, 2006). In Korea, Confucianism emphasizes a humanistic perspective and proper relationships as the foundation for society. It stresses group harmony (Lee, 2012), the virtue of humility (Knutson, 1996), a respect for hierarchies (Merkin, 2009), in-group loyalty and affection and out-group distrust (Horak, 2014), and a long-term perspective (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Taoism also influences the Korean culture (Byun, 1986) in reconciliation and harmony, which does not eliminate the distinctiveness of each part, but enhances the characteristics of each to create mutually interacting relationships. Shaped by Taoism, the Korean culture has embraced the yin yang paradigm and moderation (Byun, 1986). The national culture of modern Korea can be characterized by being collectivistic (Cho & Yoon, 2001), hierarchical (Lee, 2012), paternalistic (Kim, 1994), high contextual, and concerned with saving face (Merkin, 2009).

Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions (Hofstede et al., 2010) can provide a unique perspective on Korean national culture. Since Hofstede published Culture’s Consequences in 1980, his work has been expanded and replicated (Kirkman, Lowe, & Gibson, 2006). The most influential contribution of Hofstede’s research is that it helps people in both international and domestic businesses become aware of the cultural differences. For example, Hofstede (1980, 1991) offered a metaphor of cultural levels and the levels of human mental programming for readers to understand the concept of national culture based on a positivistic paradigm. These components are described very
distinctively and intriguingly in his book, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. The hallmark of Hofstede’s research is the four cultural dimensions he proposed based on rich data (116,000 cases) from employees at IBM subsidiaries in 53 countries. Those four cultural dimensions, initially suggested by Inkeles and Levinson (1969), had been developed by Hofstede’s extensive empirical investigation from the data: power distance, collectivism versus individualism, femininity versus masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede et al., 2010).

Power distance can be defined as the extent to which the members holding less power could be taken for granted and accept social inequality (Hofstede et al., 2010). For example, South Korea at a score of 60 is a slightly hierarchical society, where individuals accept unevenly distributed powers and prefer a superior who is “a benevolent autocrat or good father” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 76).

As the second dimension, individualism can be described as members are expected to look after themselves and their immediate families rather than a community, society, or nation (Hofstede et al., 2010). At a score of 18, South Korea is dominantly collectivistic. In such a highly collectivistic society, Koreans avoid eccentric or individual behaviors to maintain group harmony and avoid direct confrontations.

The third cultural dimension is masculinity, referred to as the degree to which social gender roles are clearly distinct. In a masculine society, men are expected to be more assertive, tough, and goal-oriented whereas women ought to be modest, tender, and relationship-oriented. South Korea scored 39, which means it is primarily a feminine society where individuals value equality, solidarity and quality in their working lives. A
supportive and participative manager is considered effective in this type of society.

The last dimension is uncertainty avoidance, which can be demonstrated by the extent to which the members avoid and are threatened by ambiguous or unfamiliar situations (Hofstede et al., 2010). Since the score of South Korea is 85, which is very high, Korean employees tend to pursue clear goals or directions for their tasks as they feel threatened by unclear or unknown circumstances and thus try to avoid such situations (Hofstede et al., 2010).

Figure II-3 (see p. 39) provides the hypothesized directionality of each interaction within the hypothesized conceptual model.

Summary

Chapter II started with a description of the procedure used for the literature review. Following that, the theoretical framework guiding this study was introduced, including the COR theory, the JD-R model, and the spillover theory. For each theory, its origins, definition, summary, research based on it and implications for this study were presented. Then, the variables for this study and their interactions were discussed based on the literature review. The variables include (a) PsyCap at an individual level; (b) perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support at an interpersonal level, (c) perceived organizational support from a local organization at an organizational level, (d) perceived community support at a societal level, (e) CCA, (f) work engagement, and (g) work performance, as an outcome factor in the context of an expatriate assignment. For each relationship, research hypotheses were also proposed.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

This chapter provides an overview of the research design, the population and sample of this study, the instruments used for data collection, the procedures implemented for data collection, and the methods employed for data screening and analysis. The chapter starts with a restatement of the purpose of the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the relationships among (a) PsyCap at an individual level; (b) perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support at an interpersonal level, (c) perceived organizational support from a local host organization at an organizational level, (d) perceived community support at a societal level, and (e) work performance, as an outcome factor in the context of an expatriate assignment. In addition, the mediating effects of (f) CCA and (g) work engagement were examined among these relationships.

Research Design

An online questionnaire survey was used to collect data for this study. Twelve extant and validated instruments were utilized: PsyCap (Luthans et al., 2005, 2007; Norman, 2006), perceived supervisor support (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001), perceived subordinate support (Hammer, Saksvik, Nytro, Torvatn, & Bayazit, 2004), perceived family support (King et al., 1995; Nasurdin & O’Driscoll, 2012), perceived organizational support (Kramer & Wayne, 2004; Kawai &
Strange, 2014), *perceived community support* (Herrero & Gracia, 2007; Ng, Chan, & Lai, 2014), *CCA* (Black, 1988; Black & Stephens, 1989), *work engagement* (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006), and *work performance* (Carpenter et al., 2014). Each instrument was translated from English to Korean by a native English speaker, and two bilingual and cultural experts, using the forward-backward translation (Degroot, Dannenburg, & Vanhell, 1994). A pilot test was conducted with ten Korean international doctoral students at Texas A&M University to check the clarity of the items in Korean and the functionality of the online survey instrument. After receiving the approval from Texas A&M University Institutional Review Board (IRB, see Appendix A), I contacted more than 100 global HR practitioners (executives, directors, and/or managers) of large Korean conglomerates by phone or email (see Appendix B) and requested their assistance for the voluntary participation of their expatriates in this study. I was able to meet 61 global HR practitioners in person. To increase the response rate, participants in a raffle were entered to win one of 12 gifts I provided (specifically two iPad Air, two iPad mini, eight $100 Amazon gift cards) when they completed the questionnaire. I contacted the HR practitioners more than three times in various ways (i.e., email, phone call, and face-to-face meeting) to encourage their expatriates to be candid in their responses and complete the questionnaires on time. After data collection for six months, data were screened based on literature of missing data, outliers, normality, and multicollinearity. Also, reliability was estimated for scores of all 12 instruments using Cronbach’s alpha. After conducting CMV and CFA, I examined the theoretical model and hypothesized structural correlations, using a SEM analysis.
Population and Sample

Study population

According to Utts and Heckard (2006), a population refers to “a collection of all individuals about which information is desired” (p. 4). Studies with populations are generally not feasible because they are costly and take a huge amount of time and effort (Coolidge, 2006). Therefore, scholars choose an alternative option, such as inferential statistics, when collecting sample data from a large population data (Coolidge, 2006). The population of this study consisted of Korean expatriates who were transferred outside their home country for an international assignment and lived and worked in a foreign or local subsidiary on behalf of their parent company for a pre-determined assignment period (Bennett et al., 2000; Lee & Croker, 2006).

Sampling procedure

Three criteria were used for this purposive sampling: (a) current Korean expatriates (b) who have worked in private organizations (c) for more than six months in host countries. First, data were collected only from current expatriates rather than repatriated employees because this study asked about their perceptions of the relationships among the constructs. It was assumed that the perceptions of repatriated employees might already be transformed while they went through a repatriation process to their home country and parent organization.

Second, the expatriates should work in private organizations. Compared to public organizations, private organizations generally have a larger pool of expatriates in their subsidiary headquarters, offices, and manufacturing factories across the world.
Therefore, expatriates’ jobs (e.g., HR, marketing, or sales) and tasks could be more diverse, which may lessen the influence of unexpected factors. More importantly, gaining access to global HR practitioners in private organizations is much easier than in public organizations. My review of the 56 dissertation revealed that the average number of expatriate participants in these dissertations was less than 150. Since the number of expected participants for this study was 300, recruitment was a top priority.

Lastly, the condition of working for a minimum of six months in their local subsidiaries was required because this amount of time would allow the expatriates to obtain a good understanding and experience of the new environment in the host country, thus providing rich data needed for this study. While a pure random sampling of all Korean expatriates was impossible, non-probability sampling (Field, 2013) was employed. Although this technique might limit the generalizability, it is commonly used for expatriate research considering the difficulty in gaining access to expatriates.

From a total of 31 MNCs in Korea, 507 responses were collected (also see the Data Collection Procedure section of this chapter). After examining the responses, 69 responses were removed because the participants either did not answer the demographic questions, or did not fully answer the survey questions for the main constructs. Since I used the function of Force Response in the Qualtric online survey program, which required a participant to respond all questions in order to move to a next page and ultimately to the end, no missing data was identified in general. However, the participants who worked abroad without their family members (N = 220) did not respond
to the questionnaire of perceived family support. Therefore, I coded them with “99”. As a result of the data screening, a total of 438 cases were remained for further analysis.

Regarding the sample size for SEM, Kline (2011) recommended that more than 200 is large enough, between 100 and 200 is medium, and less than 100 is small. In this study, 438 expatriates participated in this survey, which satisfied the requirement by Kline (2011). Since 1,200 links were distributed, the response rate was 36.5% (Deutskens, Ruyter, Wetzels, & Oosterveld, 2004; Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004).

**Demographic characteristics**

Using SPSS 22.0, demographic characteristics of the participants were examined and presented in Table III-1. Male participants (n = 428, 97.7%) outnumbered female participants (n = 10, 2.3%). Regarding the age, the participants represented a variety of age groups ranging from less than 25 years old to over 56 years old. The largest number of the participants fell into 41-45 year-old (n = 182, 41.6%), followed by 36-40 years old (n = 88, 20.1%) and 46-50 years old (n = 87, 19.9%). The smallest groups consisted of participants who were less than 25 years old (n = 1, 0.2%) and then over 56 years old (n = 4, 0.9%). The majority of the participants held a bachelor’s degree (n = 323, 73.7%) or a master’s degree (n = 94, 21.5%). Regarding the family type of the participants, 55.9% of the expatriates was married without a child (n = 245), followed by the married group with children (n = 156, 35.6%). While half of the participants was expatriated with their family members (n = 220, 50.2%), the other half was expatriated either without their family members (n = 182, 41.6%) or with a single status (n = 36, 8.2%). The majority of the participants were able to use English for business communication (n = 272, 62.1%)
or daily life conversation (n = 101, 23.1%), while 9.1% of the participants (n = 40) needed help from translators. Regarding local languages of the expatriated countries, the majority needed translators (n = 203, 46.3%) or were able to communicate only for their daily life conversation (n = 134, 30.6%).

Table III-1

Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 years old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years old</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35 years old</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 years old</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 years old</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 years old</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55 years old</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56 years old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school/GED</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married with children</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Divorced) with children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriation with family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need help from translators</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily life conversation</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business conversation</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native speaking skill</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III-1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local language capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need help from translators</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily life conversation</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business conversation</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native speaking skill</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional characteristics**

Professional characteristics of the participants were presented in Table III-2. More than half of the expatriates were senior managers (n = 259, 59.1%), followed by managers (n = 95, 21.7%) with the smallest group being employee assistants or staff members (n = 18, 4.1%). Regarding the length of expatriation for their current assignments, the largest two groups were 6-12 months (n = 149, 34.02%) and 13-24 months (n = 111, 25.34%) whereas the smallest two groups were over 5 years (n = 26, 5.94%) and 49-60 months (n = 33, 7.53%). Regarding the expatriation location, the participants represented a variety of locations including 32 countries, which are listed according to their gross domestic product (GDP) per capita. The industries of the participants’ organizations were diverse. Regarding the types of the local organizations where the participants currently worked for, the largest two groups were foreign corporations as branches (n = 177, 40.4%) and as subsidiaries (n = 146, 33.3%); joint ventures (n = 5, 1.1%) and liaison offices (n = 17, 3.9%) were the smallest groups. More than half of the participants had previous expatriation experiences (n = 241, 55%). While 25.34% (n = 111) of the participants did not take cross-cultural training provided
from their organizations, 60.04% (n = 263) of the participants had cross-cultural training before they left Korea and 14.62% (n = 64) of the participants had cross-cultural training after they arrived in their local organizations.

Table III-2

*Professional Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Assistant or staff</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Deputy or Assistant Manager</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Expatriation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>34.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-24 months</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>25.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-36 months</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-48 months</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60 months</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years (Range ~ 20 years)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriation Location (order by GDP per Capita)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong SAR, China</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and food services</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financials</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructions</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>48.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio/Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/Media</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Shopping</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Feed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local or Domestic Corporation</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Corporation (Subsidiary)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Corporation (Branch)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison Office</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous expatriation experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Before leaving Korea)</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>60.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (After arriving in a local country)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>25.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrumentation

To examine the proposed theoretical model and the hypothesized structural relationships, the survey for this study included 12 instruments: PsyCap, perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support, perceived organizational support, perceived community support, work engagement, CCA, and work performance. The quality (validity and reliability) and practicality (easy to use and short) were considered for the selection of specific measures. The total number of items was 134 including 14 demographic information items and each item was given as a 7-point Likert-type scale with 1 being “strongly disagree” and 7 being “strongly agree.” Although the validity and reliability of the scores of the 12 instruments have been examined in previous studies, the construct validity and reliability were estimated by a principal component analysis (PCA) and Cronbach’s alpha for this study, respectively.

The details on each measure are presented in Table III-3.

Table III-3

The Number and Reference(s) of Each Measure and Reliability of Measure Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>Reliability (α) from the reference study</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>Norman, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Supervisor Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>Rhoades et al., 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Subordinate Support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>Hammer et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td># of Items</td>
<td>Reliability (α) from the reference study</td>
<td>Reference(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived family Support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.90 instrumental .92 emotional</td>
<td>Nasurdin &amp; O’Driscoll, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived organizational Support</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.91 career .85 finance .87 adjustment</td>
<td>Kraimer &amp; Wayne, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Community Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.79 integration .69 participation .70 organization</td>
<td>Ng et al., 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.80 vigor .88 dedication .73 absorption</td>
<td>Schaufeli et al., 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.87 general .84 interaction .80 work</td>
<td>Black, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>Williams &amp; Anderson, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.88 OCBI .75 OCBO</td>
<td>Williams &amp; Anderson, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive Work Behavior</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.91 Org deviance .87 Ind deviance</td>
<td>Bennett &amp; Robinson, 2000; Guay, Choi, Oh, Mitchell, Mount, &amp; Shin, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>age, gender, ethnicity, length of service, family status, job type, education, position, previous exp., &amp; language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure of positive psychological capital

The 12-item PsyCap scale (e.g., Choi, 2014; Norman, 2006) was utilized to measure the PsyCap of expatriates. This scale is a reduced version of Norman (2006), adapted from the original 24-item PsyCap questionnaire (PCQ 24) developed and validated by Luthans et al. (2005, 2007). While PCQ 24 includes six items for each of the four sub-constructs, the 12-item PsyCap scale includes three items for self-efficacy and resilience, four items for hope, and two items for optimism.

According to Avey et al. (2011) in their meta-analysis on PsyCap, the reliability of the PCQ score was generally acceptable (.88 on average). Several recent empirical studies also reported high and acceptable reliability estimates (e.g., $\alpha = .86$ (Li, Guo, Xu, Yu, & Zhou, 2014); $\alpha = .85$ (Story, Youssef, Luthans, Barbuto, & Bovaird, 2013)). For the shortened version of PCQ, Norman (2006) initially reported that the reliability of score of the shortened version PCQ was .93. Recently, Choi (2014) translated this shortened version into Korean and Cronbach’s alpha of the shortened version was .82, .81, .83, and .83 for self-efficacy, hope, resilience, and optimism, respectively. Consequently, both 24-item and 12-item measures have demonstrated adequate psychometrics. Sample items included: “I feel confident in representing my work area in meetings with management” (self-efficacy); “If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it” (hope); “I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job” (optimism); “I can be on my own, so to speak, at work if I have to” (resiliency). The shortened 12-item scale asked participants to respond based on a 7-point Likert scale. The 12 items included in this scale are presented in Appendix D.
Measure of perceived supervisor support

Perceived supervisor support was measured using Rhoades et al.’s (2001) four-item scale. These items were adapted from the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS; Eisenberger et al., 1986, 1990) by replacing the term organization with the term supervisor. In their study, Rhoades et al. (2001) chose the four items based on the high factor loadings on the SPOS (coefficient alphas ranged from .74 to .84 in Eisenberger et al. (1990); .81 to .84 in Rhoades et al. (2001)) and defined SPOS as “a supervisor’s positive valuation of the employees’ contributions and care about the employees’ well-being” (p. 828).

Rhoades et al. (2001) reported that the reliability of the perceived supervisor support instrument score was acceptable (Cronbach’s alpha was .90). Several recent empirical studies also reported the high and acceptable reliability estimates (e.g., $\alpha = .86$ (Dysvic et al., 2012); $\alpha = .88$ (Skerlavaj, Cerne, & Dysvik, 2014)). Expatriates were asked to evaluate their perceptions of their supervisors on a 7-point scale, as was used by Rhoades et al. (2001). A sample item was “My supervisor cares about my opinions.” The four items included in this scale are presented in Appendix D.

Measure of perceived subordinate support

While perceived subordinate support has not been commonly used as a construct in the literature, perceived coworker support or social support was used to measure the extent to which employees feel supported. In this study, perceived subordinate support was measured on the 5-item scale developed by Hammer et al. (2004). In their study, Hammer et al. (2004) developed the five items measuring perceived coworker support.
while the authors investigated the influence of organizational level norms regarding work requirements and social relations, and work–family conflict on job stress and subjective health symptoms, using 1,346 employees in the Norwegian food and beverage industry. The term *coworkers* were replaced with the term *subordinates* for this current study. Although several other measures of perceived coworker support were identified (e.g., Seers, McGee, Serey, & Graen, 1983; Susskind, Kacmar, & Borchgrevink, 2003), the instrument by Hammer et al. (2004) was chosen because of its practicality and better fit to the expatriate context.

Hammer et al. (2004) reported that Cronbach’s alpha of the perceived subordinate support instrument was acceptable (.83). Several recent empirical studies also reported the high and acceptable reliability estimates (e.g., $\alpha = .93$ (Karatepe, Keshavarz, & Nejati, 2010). Expatriates were asked to share their perceptions of the subordinates on a 7-point scale. A sample item was “I receive help and support from my subordinates.” The five items included in this scale are presented in Appendix D.

**Measure of perceived family support**

Family Support Inventory (FSI) for workers was developed and validated by King et al. (1995). In this instrument, two dimensions of family support were measured, including emotional sustenance (29 items) and instrumental assistance (15 items). When investigating relationships between work overload and parental demands due to work–family conflict, using 202 academic staff from New Zealand and 183 from Malaysia, Nasurdin and O’Driscoll (2012) utilized a reduced version of FSI with 8 items: 4 for
emotional sustenance and 4 for instrumental assistance. They chose items with the highest item-total correlations from each dimension.

King et al. (1995) reported that the Chronbach’s alpha of the FSI was excellent (.97 for emotional sustenance and .93 for instrumental assistance). One of the most widely used measures was the items developed by Pinneau (1975) and Caplan et al. (1975), measuring social support from managers, coworkers, family, and friends. Although the Chronbach’s alpha of their measure was above .70, Cronbach’s alpha for the FSI was much higher. For example, Nasurdin and O’Driscoll (2012) reported that the Chronbach’s alpha of the shortened 8-item version of the FSI were .92 (New Zealand) and .95 (Malaysia) for emotional family support, and .90 (New Zealand) and .91 (Malaysia) for instrumental family support. In this current study, expatriates were asked to share their perceptions on support from their family on a 7-point scale. A sample item for instrumental support was “My family members do their fair share of household chores.” A sample item for emotional support was “Members of my family are interested in my job.” The eight items are presented in Appendix D.

**Measure of perceived organizational support**

While two uni-dimensional instruments of perceived organizational support, developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986, 1990) and Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, and Pinneau (1975), have been widely used, Kraimer and Wayne (2004) proposed a multi-dimensional measure of perceived organizational support with three dimensions (career, financial, and adjustment), particularly in the expatriate context. They collected data from 339 expatriates and validated the first-order 12 items and the second-order three
factors (.88 for career related perceived organizational support, .92 for financial related perceived organizational support, and .87 for adjustment related perceived organizational support). Four items were converged to each of the three factors while all loadings from items to their factor ranged from .67 to .92. Recently, Kawai and Strange (2014) implemented the 9-item shortened version of Kraimer and Wayne’s (2004) instrument and found that the Chronbach’s alpha of this instrument was excellent (.91 for career related perceived organizational support, .85 for finance related perceived organizational support, and .87 for adjustment related perceived organizational support). Cao et al. (2014) also employed this instrument and found it highly reliable (.90 for career related perceived organizational support and .83 for adjustment related perceived organizational support) while the dimension of financial perceived organizational support was not implemented in their study.

In this current study, expatriates were asked to share their perceptions on support from their local organizations on a 7-point scale. Representative items for measuring career, finance, and adjustment perceived organizational support were “The local subsidiary company takes an interest in my career,” “The financial incentives and allowances provided to me by the parent/local subsidiary company are good,” and “The parent/local subsidiary company has provided my family with enough assistance to help them adjust to the foreign country.” The nine items are presented in Appendix D.

**Measure of perceived community support**

Based on the definition of community support by Lin, Dumin, and Woelfel (1986), Herrero and Gracia (2007) developed and validated the instrument of Perceived
Community Support Questionnaire (PCSQ) with 14 items from three dimensions: community integration, participation, and organizations. Herrero and Gracia (2007) conducted their study with three different numbers and types of participants (N = 1,009, 780, & 440) and found that the reliability estimates of the three dimensions for the three different studies ranged from .75 to .88. Recently, Ng et al. (2014) implemented a 10-item shortened version of PCSQ and the reliability estimates of the three dimensions were .79, .69, and .70 for community integration, participation, and organization respectively. The 10 items were chosen for this current study based on the high factor loadings (> .60) on each of the three dimensions.

In this current study, expatriates were asked to share their perceptions on support from their communities to which they belong on a 7-point scale. While two, three, and five items were included for each dimension of community integration, participation, and organizations, respectively, representative items for measuring community integration, participation, and organizations were “I identify with my community,” “I collaborate in organizations and associations in my community,” and “I could find people that would help me feel better.” The ten items included in this instrument are listed in Appendix D.

**Measure of cross-cultural adjustment**

While examining the relationships between several variables and CCA from 67 U.S. expatriates in Japan, Black (1988) suggested three components of CCA based on a synthesis of literature: general, interaction, and work. Before Black proposed the multiple components of adjustment, scholars had measured the construct with a single
dimension. This instrument (Black, 1988; Black & Stephens, 1989) assessed three dimensions of adjustment: general (7 items), interaction (4 items), and work adjustment (3 items). Malek et al. (2015) utilized this instrument and reported that Chronbach’s alpha for the composite scale was .89. Pinto et al. (2012) also used Black’s (1988) CCA measure and showed that the reliability estimates for each dimension were 0.87 for general adjustment, 0.84 for interaction adjustment, and 0.80 for work adjustment.

In the current study, a 7-point scale was used from 1 (‘not adjusted at all’) to 7 (‘completely adjusted’). The following were sample items from each scale of general, interaction, and work adjustment: “Entertainment/recreation facilities and opportunities,” “Interacting with host nationals outside of work,” and “Performance standards and expectations.” The 14 items included in this instrument are listed in Appendix D.

Measure of work engagement

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) has been developed, validated, and widely used across the world (Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010). As described earlier, Schaufeli et al. (2006) conceptualized work engagement with three key dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Likewise, the UWES includes three key dimensions. The instrument was originally developed with 17 items (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003; Schaufeli, Salanova, et al., 2002) while a 9-item shortened version of the UWES is also available. The reliability estimate of this instrument has been excellent in many empirical studies across the world (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). Recently, Bakker and Xanthopoulou (2013) showed that the reliability estimates were .80, .88, and .73 for vigor, dedication, and absorption. Shantz et al. (2013) also used the shortened version of
the UWES and Chronbach’s alpha for the composite scale was .89. Several empirical studies using this shortened version have confirmed a high level of reliability estimate (e.g., Christian et al., 2011).

In this current study, the short version was implemented to identify the level of expatriates’ work engagement. A 7-point scale was used from 1 (‘strongly disagree’) to 7 (‘strongly agree’) for all subscales. The following were sample items from each scale of vigor, dedication, and absorption: “At my work, I feel bursting with energy,” “I am enthusiastic about my job,” and “I feel happy when I am working intensely.” The nine items included in this instrument are listed in Appendix D.

**Measure of work performance**

Carpenter et al. (2014) evaluated a substantive validity of commonly-cited and commonly-implemented instruments of work performance, including task performance, OCB, CWB, and withdrawal behavior, and provided enhanced construct validity of reassembled instruments. As a form of content validity, substantive validity refers to whether individuals perceive that the items of an instrument reflect the definition of a particular construct (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991). Carpenter et al. (2014) chose four specific instruments, which were widely cited in literature and aimed to represent the definition of a particular construct (Carpenter et al., 2014). Carpenter et al. (2014) recruited 115 employees in various positions and fields through Amazon.com’s Mechanical Turk and 122 faculty and staff employees at a large university in the Midwestern U. S. for a validity study. The instruments are the 7-item version of task performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991), the 14-item version of OCB (Williams &
Anderson, 1991), the 19-item version of CWB (Bennett & Robinson, 2000), and the 9-item version of withdrawal behavior (Hanisch, 1995; Hanisch & Hulin, 1990). After their first study, Carpenter et al. (2014) conducted a validity study of the reassembled instruments based on data from 165 supervisors and 185 employees. Ultimately, the four sets of instruments were revised to (a) the 5-item version of task performance, 11-item version of OCB, 17-item version of CWB, and 16-item version of withdrawal behavior. All of the factor loadings from items to constructs ranged from .55 to .95.

**Task performance and organizational citizenship behavior.** William and Anderson (1991) originally reported Cronbach’s alpha of the instruments for task performance and OCB were high (α = .91 for task performance, .88 for OCBI, and .75 for OCBO). Recently, Ferris, Lian, Brown, and Morrison (2014), using these instruments, reported that the estimates of Cronbach’s alpha were .82 for task performance, .85 for OCBI, and .82 for OCBO). In this current study, the reassembled 5-item version of task performance and 11-item version of OCB were used on a 7-point scale. The following were sample items from each scale of task performance and OCB: “Adequately completes assigned duties” and “Helps others who have been absent.” The items of the instruments are listed in Appendix D.

**Counterproductive work behavior.** The instrument of CWB by Bennett and Robinson (2000) has been empirically validated by many scholars. Ferris et al. (2014), using this instrument, showed its high Chronbach’s alpha (α = .93 for organizational deviance, and .90 for interpersonal deviance). Guay et al. (2015) also used this instrument and reported its high reliability estimate (α = .91 for organizational deviance,
and .87 for interpersonal deviance). In this current study, a 17-item version of CWB was used on a 7-point scale. A sample item was: “Makes fun of someone at work.” The items are presented in Appendix D.

**Withdrawal behavior.** The instrument of withdrawal behavior, developed by Hanisch and Hulin (1990), has been empirically validated by many studies. Aryee, Chu, Kim, and Ryu (2013) used a 12-item scale and reported that the alpha was acceptable ($\alpha = .72$). In addition, Loi et al., (2015) reported the acceptable reliability estimate of the instrument in their study ($\alpha = .71$). In this study, a 16-item version of withdrawal behavior scale was used on a 7-point scale. A sample item was: “The employee was late for work or scheduled work assignments.” The items are listed in Appendix D.

**Demographic variables.** Two types of questions were asked to obtain further information about the participants. Items for the demographic characteristics of the participants included gender, age, education, family type, expatriation with family, English capability, and local language capability. On the other hand, items for the professional characteristics of the participants included position, length of expatriation, expatriation location, industry type, subsidiary type, previous expatriation experience, and cross-cultural training. All of demographic items are included in Appendix D.

**Instrument translation**

The adapted instruments in this study were originally developed in English and were used in the Korean context. Therefore, these instruments were translated from English to Korean for this study. To ensure the content validity of the translated version of the instruments, the forward-backward translation was conducted. First, I translated
the instruments in English to Korean. Next, another bilingual and cultural expert, who spoke both languages, knew both cultures, and had lived in the U.S. more than four years, back-translated the Korean version to English (Degroot et al., 1994). Then, one native English speaker and two bilingual speakers including me compared the original English version and the forward-backward translated version. For example, the first question of perceived community support is “(Company) takes an interest in my career.” After translating this sentence to Korean and back translating the Korean version to English, it became “(Company) is interested in my career.” Although wording of these two sentences were different, meaning of them were same. Therefore, we concluded the translation appropriate. When there was any difference in meaning between the two English versions, the differences were reexamined by the same procedure of forward-backward translation to enhance the accuracy.

**Validity of instrument**

After the instruments were translated to Korean, a pilot test was conducted with ten international doctoral students at Texas A&M University to check whether (a) face validity was satisfied, (b) the items were clear and easy to understand, (c) the online survey was accessible and functioning well, and (d) it took too long to complete the online survey. Based on the comments from the ten participants, minor changes (e.g., font size and page breaks) were made to improve the online survey.

**Reliability of instrument**

Estimation of reliability was conducted for the 12 instruments in this study and summarized in Table III-4. Cronbach’s alpha, associated with the variation accounted for
by a true score of a hypothetical variable that is being measured (Santos, 1999), was used to check the internal consistency of the items in factors or constructs. The generally accepted cutoff value of Cronbach’s alpha for the internal consistency of an instrument is .70 (> .70) (Kline, 2011). As shown in Table III-4, the 12 instruments and their possible sub-dimensions were reliable.

Table III-4

Estimates of Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Reliability (α)</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Reliability (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>P Supervisor S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P family S</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.94 emotional</td>
<td>P Subordinate S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81 instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P org. S</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.94 career</td>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.92 general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.93 finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.94 interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.93 adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89 work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Community S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.93 integration</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.94 OCBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.91 participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.93 OCBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.96 organization</td>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.97 Ind deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.91 vigor</td>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.94 dedication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89 absorption</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethical Considerations

The Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Standing Committee on Ethics and Integrity provided the ethical guidelines for research and publication (AHRD, 1999). In addition, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Texas A&M
University required its approval for data collection (see Appendix A). I followed the ethical guidelines by AHRD and IRB. Data were protected in a private and secure place and only I, as a primary investigator, had access to the data collected.

**Data Collection Procedure**

Upon receiving the approval from the IRB of Texas A&M University (see Appendix A), I contacted more than 100 global HR practitioners (executives, directors, or managers) of large Korean conglomerates by phone or email and requested their assistance for the expatriates for this study (see Appendix B). Sixty one global HR practitioners agreed to assist my study and I was able to meet them in person at their offices or café near their offices. During the meeting, I introduced myself in detail and described the study and the procedure of data collection.

To collect data, an online survey tool, *Qualtrics*, was utilized and about 1,200 emails with the survey link were sent to those voluntary participants by global HR practitioners (see Appendix C) because the contact information of the expatriates were confidential for the participating organizations. As the time frame is shown below in Figure III-1, online surveys were conducted between July and December 2015. Since the online survey was employed, more individuals than needed were distributed to participate in this study and several strategies were employed to enhance the response rate, such as sending multiple reminders to the agreed HR professionals and including incentive statements in the emails to the participants (Dillman, Smyth, & Christina, 2009). For example, I asked the HR practitioners more than three times in various ways (e.g., email, phone call, and face-to-face meeting) requesting them to encourage their
expatriates to complete the questionnaires on time. To increase the response rate, participants in a raffle were entered to win one of 12 gifts I provided (two iPad Air, two iPad mini, eight $100 Amazon gift cards) when they completed the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) IRB approval</td>
<td>a) Meeting HR practitioners in Korean large conglomerates</td>
<td>a) Online survey administration</td>
<td>Thank you email to participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Online Survey Preparation</td>
<td>b) Online survey administration</td>
<td>b) Encouraging candidates</td>
<td>c) Encouraging candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Pilot study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure III-1. Timeline for data collection*

**Data Screening**

Before data analysis, it is critical to screen data to identify and prevent any possible issues regarding the data collected (Kline, 2011). Consequently, after data collection, data were screened based on the literature of missing data, outliers, multicollinearity, and normality, using IBM SPSS 22.0 and Mplus 7.2.

**Missing data**

It is critical to handle missing data before the primary data analysis because missing data is generated beyond the researchers’ control, but highly impacts data analysis (Tabachnick & Fedell, 1996). For example, participants intentionally or unintentionally do not answer certain or many questions, or the online survey tool freezes while participants answer questions, resulting in many missing parts. When the pattern of the missing data is not random (i.e., not-missing-at-random (NMAR) data
(Little & Rubin, 1987)), it affects the generalizability of the findings. Data, which are missing completely at random, cause less serious problems.

To deal with missing data, it is necessary to check the original data before creating a raw data file (Kline, 2011) while checking the descriptive statistics and the graphic representations of the variables. List-wise deletion could be implemented to exclude cases with missing scores from all analyses whereas pair-wise deletion can be employed to exclude cases when there are missing data on the variables involved in a particular analysis.

In the current study, 507 responses from a total of 31 private organizations were collected. After examining the responses, 69 cases were removed because the participants either barely answered demographic questions, or did not respond to the rest of the survey questions for the main constructs. Since I used the function of Force Response in the Qualtrics online survey program, which required a participant to answer the questions before moving to the next page, no missing data was identified. However, those who worked abroad without their family members (n = 218) did not respond to the questions regarding perceived family support. Therefore, I coded them with “99”. As a result, a total of 438 cases were included for the further analysis.

**Outliers**

**Univariate outliers.** When scores from participants are extremely different from the average, the normality assumption might be violated, which could result in inaccurate data analysis. Since a univariate outlier occurs when a set of data possesses an extreme (i.e., more than three standard deviations beyond the mean) score on a single
variable, a box plot and a standard score were used to identify univariate outliers. In the box plot, the center line of the box is the median (the 50th percentile) and the borders of the box are set at the 25th and the 75th percentile. Two lines connected with whiskers are called inner fences and scores placed outside those fences are generally considered outliers. I also checked cases for each item with standard scores of ± 3.29 or greater or lesser (Field, 2013) and identified that 35 cases were associated with univariate outliers. Out of 35 cases, 24 cases were associated with univariate outliers for the dependent variables, including mediating variables. In particular, there were 26 outliers in CCA, 13 outliers in work engagement, 9 outliers in task performance, 9 outliers in OCB, and 8 outliers in withdrawal behavior (outliers were overlapped in the 24 cases). After examining each case of univariate outliers, I identified that the univariate outliers captured responses of 1 or 7 as univariate outliers while a 7-point Likert scale was used for all survey questionnaires. In addition, the maximum percentage of the outlier cases among the total in a variable was 5.48% (24/438), which indicated a small amount of outliers existing in the data collected for this study. Therefore, rather than removing the univariate outliers, I kept the cases and carefully observed the results of data analysis.

**Multivariate outliers.** Outliers in a combination of multiple variables, multivariate outliers, were also checked by conducting Mahalanobis Distance or $D^2$ of each case. Mahalanobis Distance checks whether a case is far from or close to the centroid (the sample mean) of all cases (Field, 2013) and follows a chi-square statistic with degrees of freedom equal to the number of cases ($p < .001$; Kline, 2011). A total of 35 multivariate outliers (7.99%) were detected for independent variables. To check
whether these outliers affect the data analysis, the hypothesized model was tested both with and without the outliers. No significant difference was found between the two analyses. Therefore, outliers were included in the data for this study.

**Multicollinearity**

Multicollinearity occurs when variables are highly correlated (Kline, 2011; Meyers, Gamst, and Guarino, 2013). It can be detected by observing a variance inflation factors (VIF), which is the ratio of the total standardized variance over unique variance (tolerance), and Durbin-Watson value (Field, 2013). VIF should be below 10 (Myers, 1990) and Durbin-Watson value must be between 1.0 and 3.0 (Field, 2013). If VIF is above 10.0, the variable in question may be redundant. In this study, no estimates for VIF were above 10.0 (3.138 to 7.968) and Durbin-Watson value was 1.986, both of which were within the acceptable range.

**Normality**

The basic assumption of SEM is normal distribution in the multivariate condition. Therefore, it is important to secure normality in this study. Skewness and kurtosis of each of the individual variables were checked to test the univariate normality of the variables. If the skew index is greater than ± 3.0 (z score) and the kurtosis index is greater than ±10.0 (z score), the data distribution is symmetrical and highly peaked (Kline, 2011). In this study, there was no significant skewness or kurtosis. Using Mplus 7.2, I also examined multivariate normality, which suggested that all of the univariate distributions are normal, the joint bivariate distributions of any pair of the variables were
normal, and the linear combinations of the variables were normally distributed (Field, 2013; Kline, 2011). Given that, no multivariate normality was identified in this study.

**Data Analysis**

Several techniques were employed for data analysis: CMV, reliability analysis, descriptive analysis, CFA, correlation analysis, and SEM, using IBM SPSS 22.0 and Mplus 7.2.

**Common method variance**

CMV was examined to identify possible common method effects. Bagozzi and Yi (1991) defined method variance as “variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the construct of interest” (p. 426). The measurement method indicates the form of measurement, such as the content of specific items, scale type, response format, and the general context (Fiske, 1982). Due to its significance, CMV is popularly tested in the literature before any further analyses (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Following Podsakoff et al.’s (2003) recommendations, I implemented several procedural remedies to minimize CMV. First, I specified in the consent form (see Appendix B & C) and the description of the online survey that the participants’ responses were confidential, there were no right or wrong answers, and the participants should respond as honestly as possible. Second, a pilot study was conducted to improve scale items: (a) avoiding ambiguous concepts, (b) providing examples, and (c) keeping questions simple and concise. More importantly, Podsakoff et al. (2003) suggested several statistical remedies to control for CMV. Among them, the single-common-method-factor approach was recommended when (a) the predictor and criterion
variables could not be obtained from different sources, (b) the predictor and criterion variables could not be measured in different contexts, and (c) the sources of the method bias could not be identified.

Nevertheless, since the data were collected from a self-reported survey questionnaire in the same context during the same period of time, CMV might influence the relationships among the constructs and cause bias. Thus, the most popularly used Harman’s single-factor test was conducted. A result of this technique indicates that no common method effects are found in a data set when the majority of the variance is not accounted for by one general factor. Based on the result of the current study from an exploratory factor analysis using rotated/un-rotated principal component factor analysis, more than one factor was detected, which accounted for the majority variance of the data. This led to a conclusion that there might be little CMV in the data.

Several scholars have warned that Harman’s test is insensitive for assessing the extent to which CMV may be a problem. Therefore, a single unmeasured latent method factor approach was implemented (Johnson, Rosen, & Djurdjevic, 2011; Podsakoff et al., 2003). As shown in Appendix E, a first-order unmeasured latent factor to all of the items was added in my hypothesized model. CMV could be estimated by squaring the average unstandardized factor loading estimates for the common factor (Williams, Cote, & Buckley, 1989). In this study, the average factor loading estimates for the common factor was .60, which represented 36% of variance explained by the common method factor in the hypothesized model. This result did not satisfy the guideline that the average variance should be less than 25% (Williams et al., 1989). Thus, it was concluded
that there was an influence of CMV on items in this study. According to Podsakoff et al. (2003), the factor of CMV may reflect not only different types of CMV, but also variance due to relationships between the constructs other than the one hypothesized. Since CMV could influence the hypothesized model of this study, I conducted further analyses for both models with and without the unmeasured latent factor.

**Descriptive statistics**

The descriptive information of the participants regarding the demographic variables was identified focusing on the number of each response, means, and standard deviations. The results of the descriptive analysis are presented in Chapter IV.

**Confirmatory factor analysis**

CFA was conducted because the factor analysis was driven by the theoretical relationships among the items and the latent factors (Kline, 2011). The first step of CFA was to test a one-factor model or a model with a certain number of factors and see whether the number of factors is theoretically formulated or not (Kline, 2011). While Maximum Likelihood (ML) was used, Chi-square/df for ML estimation (2.0-5.0), comparative fit index (CFI, >.90), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA, <.10), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR, <.10) were examined as essential fit indices in evaluating the adequacy of the two models (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2011; Lei & Wu, 2007).

**Correlation analysis**

To examine the relationships between the factors or latent variables, the correlation coefficient \(r\) was conducted. An absolute correlation coefficient could
indicate a weak, moderate, and strong relationship when the coefficient is between .10 and .30, between .40 and .60, and .70 and above, respectively (McMillan, 2000). The threshold level for a p value is .05, meaning the degree of relationship is statistically significant.

**Structural equation modeling**

SEM was employed to examine the relationships among and mediating effects of variables for this study. In particular, SEM was used to take advantage of its greater flexibility in model specification and estimation options (Preacher & Hayes, 2008) as the hypothesized model of this study included mediation effects with latent variables. Furthermore, simultaneous examination of complex mediating effects with multiple latent variables is possible in SEM (Kline, 2011). In this study, CCA could be considered as a higher-order construct, which consists of three sub-dimensions. SEM allows treating the higher-order constructs as latent variables. SEM also allows testing a path analysis of a complex framework with many relationships among several constructs (Kline, 2011). As the hypothesized model of this study was complex, including six exogenous (independent) variables and six endogenous (four dependent and two mediating) variables, it was critical to conduct path analyses and validate the proposed mediation model from a holistic perspective in order to draw meaningful conclusions and implications.

To do so, I followed the six basic steps and two additional steps, which Kline (2011) suggested. The basic steps include (a) model specification, (b) model identification, (c) measure selection and data collection, (d) model estimation, (e) model
re-specification, and (f) reporting the results. The two additional steps include replication and application of the results.

As the most crucial step among the steps of SEM (Kline, 2011), model specification means specifying prepared hypotheses in the form of a structural equation model by drawing a model diagram or with a series of equations. The model could be specified with two types of variables: exogenous and endogenous. Exogenous variables are independent variables while endogenous variables are generally mediation or dependent variables (Kline, 2011). In this study, all of the job resources at various levels in work-related and non-work-related domains were exogenous variables, and work engagement, CCA, and the components of work performance were endogenous variables.

Second, Kline (2011) indicated that model identification is required for the SEM software (Mplus) to generate a unique estimate of a specific model. For the measurement model, the degrees of freedom for the model (i.e., the numbers of observations minus some values that limit the observations’ freedom to vary) must be equal or more than zero: t-rule or counting rule (Kaplan, 2009). In addition, every latent factor must be assigned a scale (metric) for the structural model (Kline, 2011). The SEM in this study was identified in the measurement and the structural models. Two-step modeling (Kline, 2011) was conducted to validate the measurement model and to fit the structural model.

Third, researchers utilize the SEM software to identify a set of parameter estimates that can minimize the Maximum Likelihood (ML) function, which is the commonly used method for estimations of structural path coefficients and model-fitting
(Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Kline, 2011). In this study, Mplus (7.2) was used for this analysis with the variance-covariance matrix with the maximum likelihood (ML) estimation.

Fourth, the model fit was tested to determine whether the hypothesized model should be accepted or rejected based on the chi-square test and goodness of fit indices. While chi-square ($\chi^2$) intends to examine the model fit by comparing with the actual or observed data set (Meyers et al., 2013), relative chi-square is the most fundamental and sensitive to the sample size (Kline, 2011). When a p value of relative chi-square is equal or above .05 or a p value of a non-significant chi-square score is above .05, the proposed model is accepted (Byrne, 2001; Holbert & Stephenson, 2002). Regarding goodness-of-fit indices, Bentler’s (1990) Comparative Fit Index (CFI; >.90), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR, <.10), and Steiger-Lind (Steiger, 1990) root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA, <.10) were presented to evaluate the structural model fit.

**Mediating effect.** This study examined the mediating effects of CCA and work engagement on the relationships between job resources and several components of work performance. Mediation tests the likelihood that the effect of an independent variable on a dependent variable is transmitted through a second, mediating variable. Figure III-2 shows the simple illustration of a mediation design. In Figure III-2, X is an independent variable (i.e., job resources) while Y is a dependent variable (i.e., work performance). M is a mediating factor, such as CCA and work engagement in this study. The lower case characters (e.g., a, b, c’) are unstandardized coefficients. Therefore, a total effect (c) could be the combination of a direct effect (c’) and an indirect effect (a*b): $c = c’ + (a*b)$. 
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A bias-corrected bootstrap mediation model was implemented using Mplus 7.2. The bias-corrected (BC) bootstrap method was chosen because it provides the best balance between Type I and Type II error rates of all available approaches for detecting indirect effects (MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, & Sheets, 2002). A bootstrap analysis also provides greater statistical power without assuming multivariate normality in the sampling distribution (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

Since a random sample from the original data is taken in a bias-corrected bootstrap mediation model, there is an equal probability of selecting any given case on any draw. The effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable, of the mediating variable on the dependent variable, and of the independent variable on the dependent variable controlling for the mediating variable, were identified for the bootstrap sample. This process was then repeated at least 1,000 times (Preacher & Hayes, 2008) with 95% bias-corrected bootstrap confidence intervals. If the 95% bias-corrected
bootstrap confidence interval does not include zero, the indirect effect is considered statistically significant at the .05 level (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

**Summary**

Chapter III detailed the procedures for conducting this study. After restating the purpose and hypotheses of this study, this chapter provided a brief overview of the research design. Then, the population and participants of this study, their demographic and professional characteristics, the instruments used for the data collection, the instrument translation, its validity and reliability and ethical considerations were described. Finally, this chapter elaborated the procedures implemented for the data collection, and the detailed methods and techniques employed for the data screening (e.g., missing data, outliers, multicollinearity, and normality) and the data analysis (e.g., CMV, reliability analysis, construct validity analyses, descriptive analysis, CFA, correlation analysis, and SEM).

To test hypotheses, an online questionnaire survey, consisting of 12 instruments, was used for data collection. Data were screened based on the literature of missing data, outliers, normality, and multicollinearity. A total of 438 cases were included for the final analysis. The result from Harman’s single-factor test and a single-method-factor approach using CFA revealed small influence of CMV in the data of this study.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Data collected from the survey were analyzed using multiple statistical techniques. Reported in this chapter are the results of the descriptive statistics, CFA, correlation analysis, structural model analysis, and bootstrap analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

The composite means and the standard deviations for all of the variables used in this study are summarized in Table IV-1. The participants included 438 Korean expatriates currently working in 31 Korean MNCs across 32 countries. All items were completed by the 438 participants except for the items of perceived family support, which were completed by 220 expatriates working abroad with their family members.

Table IV-1

Descriptive Statistics of Composite Scores for Each Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Composite Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean, standard deviation, minimum score, maximum score, and number for all 134 items were calculated and are reported in Table IV-2. Three items (i.e., PsupS_4, PFS_6, PFS_8) were reverse scored.

Table IV-2

Descriptive Statistics of All Items for Each Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_1</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CCA_13</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_2</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CCA_14</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_3</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WE_1</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_4</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WE_2</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_5</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WE_3</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_6</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WE_4</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_7</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WE_5</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_8</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WE_6</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_9</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WE_7</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_10</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WE_8</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_11</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>JP_9</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_12</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>JP_1</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS_1</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>JP_2</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS_2</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>JP_3</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS_3</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>JP_4</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS_4*</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>JP_5</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS_1</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB_1</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS_2</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB_2</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS_3</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB_3</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS_4</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB_4</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS_5</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB_5</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S_1</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB_6</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S_2</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB_7</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S_3</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB_8</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S_4</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB_9</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S_5</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB_10</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S_6</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCB_11</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S_7</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CWB_1</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IV-2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS_S_8</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CWA_2</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S_9</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CWA_3</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.352</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_1</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>CWA_4</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_2</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>CWA_5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_3</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>CWA_6</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_4</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>CWA_7</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_5</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>CWA_8</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_6</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>CWA_9</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_7</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>CWA_10</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.397</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_8</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>CWA_11</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.386</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS_1</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.274</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CWA_12</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS_2</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CWA_13</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS_3</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CWA_14</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.424</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS_4</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CWA_15</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS_5</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CWA_16</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS_6</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>CWA_17</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS_7</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_1</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS_8</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_2</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS_9</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.447</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS_10</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_4</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_1</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_5</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.343</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_2</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_6</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_3</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_7</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_4</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_8</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_9</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_6</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_10</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_7</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.229</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_11</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_8</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_12</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_9</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_13</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.413</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_10</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_14</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.386</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_11</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_15</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_12</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>WB_16</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Items with an asterisk (*) were reverse scored. PsyCap: positive psychological capital, PsupS: perceived supervisor support, PsubS: perceived subordinate support, PFS: perceived family support, POS_S: perceived organizational support, PCS: perceived community support, CCA: cross-cultural adjustment, WE: work engagement, TP: task performance, OCB: organizational citizenship behavior, CWB: counterproductive work behavior, WB: withdrawal behavior.
**Correlation Analysis I**

Bivariate correlations \((r)\) among the 14 variables, including 11 instruments and three sub-dimensions of one instrument (CCA), are summarized in Table IV-3. As shown in Table IV-3, all of the correlations in the hypothesized model were statistically significant \((p < .01)\) and strong \((>.70, \text{McMillan, 2000})\), except for the correlations between (a) PFS and PCS, (b) PFS and three sub-dimensions of CCA, and (c) interaction CCA and withdrawal behavior, which were moderate \((<.70)\).

Table IV-3

*Bivariate Correlations in the Hypothesized Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PsyCap</th>
<th>PsupS</th>
<th>PsubS</th>
<th>POS_S</th>
<th>PFS</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>CCA_G</th>
<th>CCA_I</th>
<th>CCA_W</th>
<th>WE</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_I</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_W</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>-.86**</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>-.84**</td>
<td>-.81**</td>
<td>-.77**</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>-.82**</td>
<td>-.74**</td>
<td>-.78**</td>
<td>-.84**</td>
<td>-.86**</td>
<td>-.88**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>-.82**</td>
<td>-.77**</td>
<td>-.81**</td>
<td>-.76**</td>
<td>-.75**</td>
<td>-.76**</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>-.69**</td>
<td>-.75**</td>
<td>-.81**</td>
<td>-.83**</td>
<td>-.85**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PsyCap was significantly correlated with perceived supervisor support ($r=.85, p<.01$), perceived subordinate support ($r=.86, p<.01$), perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary ($r=.82, p<.01$), perceived family support ($r=.77, p<.01$), perceived community support ($r=.79, p<.01$), CCA ($r=.85, .79, .82, p<.01$), work engagement ($r=.86, p<.01$), task performance ($r=.85, p<.01$), OCB ($r=.86, p<.01$), CWB ($r=-.86, p<.01$), and withdrawal behavior ($r=-.82, p<.01$). Perceived supervisor support was significantly correlated with perceived subordinate support ($r=.79, p<.01$), perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary ($r=.78, p<.01$), perceived family support ($r=.71, p<.01$), perceived community support ($r=.76, p<.01$), CCA ($r=.79, 73, 73, p<.01$), work engagement ($r=.79, p<.01$), task performance ($r=.79, p<.01$), OCB ($r=.81, p<.01$), CWB ($r=-.80, p<.01$), and withdrawal behavior ($r=-.77, p<.01$). Perceived subordinate support was significantly correlated with perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary ($r=.81, p<.01$), perceived family support ($r=.82, p<.01$), perceived community support ($r=.79, p<.01$), CCA ($r=.81, 71, 76, p<.01$), work engagement ($r=.86, p<.01$), task performance ($r=.85, p<.01$), OCB ($r=.87, p<.01$), CWB ($r=-.80, p<.01$), and withdrawal behavior ($r=-.77, p<.01$).

Perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary was significantly correlated with perceived family support ($r=.73, p<.01$), perceived community support ($r=.82, p<.01$), CCA ($r=.79, .76, .76, p<.01$), work engagement ($r=.82, p<.01$), task performance ($r=.82, p<.01$), OCB ($r=.81, p<.01$), CWB ($r=-.81, p<.01$), and withdrawal behavior ($r=-.76, p<.01$). Perceived family support was significantly correlated with perceived community support ($r=.68, p<.01$), CCA ($r=.66, .63, .65,$
work engagement \( (r = .77, p < .01) \), task performance \( (r = .81, p < .01) \), OCB \( (r = .79, p < .01) \), CWB \( (r = -.77, p < .01) \), and withdrawal behavior \( (r = -.75, p < .01) \).

Perceived community support was significantly correlated with CCA \( (r = .77, .75, .75, p < .01) \), work engagement \( (r = .80, p < .01) \), task performance \( (r = .77, p < .01) \), OCB \( (r = .78, p < .01) \), CWB \( (r = -.80, p < .01) \), and withdrawal behavior \( (r = -.76, p < .01) \).

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

CFA was conducted to examine the validity of the measurement model for the participants. The model fit with the collected data was evaluated using four fit indices, including Chi-square/df for ML estimation (2.0-5.0), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA, <.10), comparative fit index (CFI, >.90), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR, <.10) (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2011; Lei & Wu, 2007). The model fit estimates of the CFA are presented in Table IV-4, but the estimates of CFI and TLI were not acceptable.

**Table IV-4**

*Model Fit Indices for CFA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimates</td>
<td>( \chi^2 (6929) = 17234.915, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model respecification**

Kline (2011) strongly recommended that intercorrelations among indicators for the same latent factor should be positive and at least moderately high in magnitude
(>.50). Therefore, I examined the correlation matrix among the indicators for each of the 14 latent factors. Interestingly, several correlation coefficients of items were below .50, including a) the 5th, 7th, and 8th items of perceived family support, b) the 5th, 6th, and 7th items of CCA (general), and c) the 6th, 9th, 10th, and 11th items of OCB. In addition, the factor loadings of the items were below .70 or the item significantly impacted or the reliability estimate of the latent factor which the item belongs to.

Regarding the content of these items, the items showed possible contextual and cultural issues. For example, the items in the instrumental part of the perceived family support asked whether the expatriates shared household chores fairly or if their family members helped them with routine household tasks. Since Korean expatriates work overtime mostly during the weekdays and work often during weekends (Chai, Nam, & McLean, 2014), it was possible that the instrumental items were possibly misunderstood by the participants. Therefore, the four items for the instrumental part of perceived family support were removed in the alternative model. Second, the high workload level of expatriates could have influenced the responses for items on OCB at an organizational level (OCBO). For example, since working overtime is the norm in Korea, the item related to attendance at work could not be considered the norm. In addition, the term “personal interest” in the 6th item of OCB seemed to be misunderstood by the participants since the responses from the participants were inconsistent. Therefore, the four items of the OCBO and the 6th item were removed in the alternative model. Finally, since the GDP per capita of 22 countries among the 32 countries where the participants worked abroad was lower than the GDP per capital of South Korea, the items of general
CCA could be biased by the social economic status of the host countries. Therefore, the three items of general CCA were removed in the alternative model.

While exploring the modification indices values produced by Mplus 7.2 and the content of related items, there were several cases that two items in a same latent variable ask similar phenomenon. They included the following items: 3rd and 4th items (career development), and the 8th and 9th items (assistance for adjustment) of perceived organizational support, the 1st and 2nd items (belongingness) of perceived community support, the 1st and 2nd items (energy) of work engagement, and the 15th to 16th items (performance) of CWB. Thus, the similar items were correlated in the alternative model.

CFA was conducted to examine the validity of the alternative measurement model. The model fit with the collected data was evaluated by the same four fit indices. The model fit estimates of the CFA are presented in Table IV-5. The chi-square of the model was significant ($\chi^2 (5574) = 12474.086, p < .001$), indicating that the model was not consistent with the covariance data. However, the chi-square estimate might be significant due to its sensitivity to a large sample (n = 438; Kline, 2011). Since all other fit indices were satisfactory, the alternative model was acceptable. Informed by the parsimony principle (Kline, 2011), the simpler model was selected for further discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table IV-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Fit Indices for CFA of the Alternative Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The standardized factor loading coefficients for each factor are presented in Appendix F. All of the standardized factor loading estimates were statistically significant and ranged between .75 and .98, which were greater than the benchmark of .30 (Meyers et al., 2013).

**Confirmatory factor analysis with common method variance**

As stated in Chapter III, two opposite results related to the influence from CMV were identified. There may be little CMV in the data based on Harman’s single factor test, whereas there may be influence from CMV on items in this study based on a single unmeasured latent method factor approach. Therefore, I decided to check the CFA of the alternative hypothesized model with CMV. As cautioned in Chapter III, one of the potential problems of a single unmeasured latent method factor approach is that it does not allow the researcher to identify the specific reasons for the method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003). That is, the factor of CMV may reflect not only different types of CMV, but also variance due to relationships between the constructs or items in the hypothesized model. Therefore, the correlated items in the alternative model were not correlated in this CFA.

The model fit estimates of the CFA are presented in Table IV-6. The chi-square of the model was statistically significant ($\chi^2 (5472) = 11929.783, p < .001$). Although all other fit indices estimates were satisfactory, the simpler alternative hypothesized model without CMV was selected based on the parsimony principle (Kline, 2011).
Table IV-6

*Model Fit Indices for CFA of the Alternative Model with Common Method Variance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimates</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (5472) = 11929.783, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability of Instrument II**

An estimation of reliability was conducted for the 12 instruments with the reduced number of items. All of the reliability estimates were the same as the estimates in Table III-4 except for three cases. Perceived family support was only measured by its emotional dimension ($\alpha = .94$). In addition, general CCA was measured by the first four items out of seven items ($\alpha = .93$), and OCB was measured only at an individual level (OCBI) rather than both at individual and organizational levels. Furthermore, the 6th item was removed ($\alpha = .95$).

**Correlation Analysis II**

Bivariate correlations ($r$) among the 14 variables including 11 instruments and three sub-dimensions of one instrument (CCA) were examined and are summarized in Table IV-7. Similar to the correlations in Table IV-3, all of the correlations in the alternative model were statistically significant ($p < .01$) and strong ($> .70$, McMillan, 2000), except for the correlations between (a) PFS and PCS, (b) PFS and three sub-dimensions of CCA, and (c) interaction CCA and withdrawal behavior, which were moderate ($< .70$).
Bivariate Correlations in the Alternative Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PsyCap</th>
<th>PsupS</th>
<th>PsubS</th>
<th>POS_SPFS_E</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>CCA_G</th>
<th>CCA_I</th>
<th>CCA_W</th>
<th>WE</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>OCBI</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_E</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_I</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_W</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBI</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>-.86**</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>-.84**</td>
<td>-.81**</td>
<td>-.74**</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>-.74**</td>
<td>-.78**</td>
<td>-.84**</td>
<td>-.86**</td>
<td>-.81**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>-.82**</td>
<td>-.77**</td>
<td>-.81**</td>
<td>-.76**</td>
<td>-.72**</td>
<td>-.76**</td>
<td>-.78**</td>
<td>-.69**</td>
<td>-.75**</td>
<td>-.81**</td>
<td>-.83**</td>
<td>-.75**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), PsyCap: positive psychological capital, PsupS: perceived supervisor support, PsubS: perceived subordinate support, PFS_E: perceived family support (emotional dimension), POS_S: perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary, PCS: perceived community support, CCA_G: general cross-cultural adjustment, CCA_I: interaction cross-cultural adjustment, CCA_W: work cross-cultural adjustment, WE: work engagement, TP: task performance, OCBI: organizational citizenship behavior (individual dimension), CWB: counterproductive work behavior, and WB: withdrawal behavior.

Path Model Analysis

The hypothesized path or structural model was tested and the fit indices of the hypothesized path model are reported in Table IV-8. Regarding the overall fit of the proposed model in Table IV-8, the chi-square of the model was statistically significant ($\chi^2 (5577) = 12498.853, p < .001$). Again, although this significant chi-square indicated that the path model was not consistent with the covariance data, the chi-square estimate
could be significant due to its sensitivity to a large sample (n = 438; Kline, 2011). The estimates of CFI and TLI were above .90 and the estimates of RMSEA and SRMR were less than .10, which confirmed the acceptance of the hypothesized path model.

Table IV-8

*Model Fit Indices for the Path Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chi-Square (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimates</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (5577) = 12498.853, p&lt;.001$</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the significant paths of the hypothesized model are presented in Figure IV-1, and the decomposition of effects in the structural model is presented in Table IV-9.

*Figure IV-1. Significant paths of the hypothesized model*

Note. Blue line (→): positive relationship, Red line (→): negative relationship, PsyCap: positive psychological capital, PsupS: perceived supervisor support, PsubS: perceived

Table IV-9

*Decomposition of Effects in the Structural Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsubS → TP</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.178**</td>
<td>.522**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS → TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.156*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS → TP</td>
<td>.162*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.189**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G → TP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.070**</td>
<td>.170*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_I → TP</td>
<td>-.097*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_W → TP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.077**</td>
<td>.142*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE → TP</td>
<td>.283**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.283**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS → OCBI</td>
<td>.247*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.233*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS → OCBI</td>
<td>.241*</td>
<td>.109*</td>
<td>.350**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS → OCBI</td>
<td>.230**</td>
<td>.068*</td>
<td>.298**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G → OCBI</td>
<td></td>
<td>.082**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_I → OCBI</td>
<td>.102*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.113*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_W → OCBI</td>
<td></td>
<td>.090**</td>
<td>.150*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE → OCBI</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.332**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap → CWB</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.133*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS → CWB</td>
<td>-.483**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.470**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS → CWB</td>
<td>-.182**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.158*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G → CWB</td>
<td>-.151*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.138*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS → WB</td>
<td>-.457**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.493**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS → WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.119*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G → WB</td>
<td>-.193*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.194**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** Statistically significant at the .01 level. * Statistically significant at the .05 level. Insignificant paths and estimates are not shown.
The model was complicated with 14 latent factors included in the model. Therefore, the standardized path coefficients are presented separately by each of the independent variables in the figures below.

**Job resource at an individual level**

**Positive psychological capital.** The statistically significant path coefficients ($p < .05$) in the structural model that are related to PsyCap are presented in Figure IV-2.

![Diagram](image)

*Figure IV-2. Standardized path coefficients of the hypothesized model related to positive psychological capital.*


There was no positive significant relationship ($p > .05$) between PsyCap and work performance (task performance, OCB, CWB, and withdrawal behavior), which did not
support Hypothesis 1. PsyCap was significantly associated with all three subdimensions of CCA: general (β=.38, p<.05), interaction (β=.62, p<.05), work (β=.60, p<.05). These positive relationships fully supported Hypothesis 2. Since there was no relationship between PsyCap and work engagement (p>.05), Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

**Job resources at an interpersonal level**

**Perceived supervisor support.** The statistically significant path coefficients (p<.05) in the structural model that are related to perceived supervisor support are presented in Figure IV-3.

*Figure IV-3.* Standardized path coefficients of the hypothesized model related to perceived supervisor support

Perceived supervisor support in work-related domains was positively related to OCB ($\beta=.30, p<.05$), but it was not associated with the other three sub-dimensions of work performance ($p>.05$), indicating that Hypothesis 4 was partially supported. Perceived supervisor support was positively related to general CCA ($\beta=.25, p<.05$), but it was not associated with the other two sub-dimensions of CCA ($p>.05$), which indicated that Hypothesis 5 was partially supported. Since there was no relationship between perceived supervisor support and work engagement ($p>.05$), Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

**Perceived subordinate support.** The statistically significant path coefficients ($p<.05$) that are related to perceived subordinate support are presented in Figure IV-4.

![Figure IV-4](Attachment:figureIV4.png)

*Figure IV-4. Standardized path coefficients of the hypothesized model related to perceived subordinate support.
Perceived subordinate support was positively associated with task performance ($\beta=.34$, $p<.05$) and OCB ($\beta=.24$, $p<.05$), and was negatively associated with CWB ($\beta=-.48$, $p<.05$) and withdrawal behavior ($\beta=-.46$, $p<.05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 7 was fully supported. Interestingly, perceived subordinate support was negatively related to interaction CCA ($\beta=-.32$, $p<.05$), but was not associated with the other two subdimensions of CCA ($p>.05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 8 was not supported. In addition, there was a positive relationship between perceived subordinate support and work engagement ($\beta=.43$, $p<.05$), indicating that Hypothesis 9 was fully supported.

**Perceived family support.** The statistically significant path coefficients ($p<.05$) that are related to perceived family support are presented in Figure IV-5.

![Figure IV-5](image-url)

*Figure IV-5.* Standardized path coefficients of the hypothesized model related to perceived family support

As one of the job resources at an interpersonal level in non-work-related domains, perceived family support was positively related to task performance ($\beta=.16$, $p<.05$) and negatively associated with CWB ($\beta=-.18$, $p<.05$). However, perceived family support had no relationship with OCB and withdrawal behavior ($p>.05$); thus, Hypothesis 10 was partially supported. As there was no relationship between perceived family support and the three sub-dimensions of CCA ($p>.05$), Hypothesis 11 was not supported. Finally, perceived family support was positively associated with work engagement ($\beta=.15$, $p<.05$), which fully supported Hypothesis 12.

**Job resources at an organizational level**

**Perceived organizational support**. The statistically significant path coefficients ($p<.05$) in the structural model that are related to perceived subordinate support are presented in Figure IV-6. As one of the job resources at an organizational level in work-related domains, perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary organization was positively associated with OCB ($\beta=.23$, $p<.05$), but statistically not associated with the other three sub-dimensions of work performance ($p>.05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 13 was partially supported. In contrast, perceived organizational support was positively related to all of the three sub-dimensions of CCA: general ($\beta=.15$, $p<.05$), interaction ($\beta=.31$, $p<.05$), and work ($\beta=.18$, $p<.05$), indicating that Hypothesis 14 was fully supported. In addition, there was no relationship between perceived organizational support and work engagement ($p>.05$), so Hypothesis 15 was not supported.
Figure IV-6. Standardized path coefficients of the hypothesized model related to perceived organizational support


Job resources at a societal level

Perceived community support. The statistically significant path coefficients (p<.05) that are related to perceived community support are presented in Figure IV-7.

As one of the job resources at the societal level in non-work-related domains, perceived community support was not related to the four components of work performance (p>.05), indicating that Hypothesis 16 was not supported. However, perceived community support was positively related to interaction CCA (β=.21, p<.05) and work CCA (β=.16, p<.05), but it was not associated with general CCA (p>.05). Therefore, Hypothesis 17
was partially supported. Since there was no relationship between perceived community support and work engagement ($p > .05$), Hypothesis 18 was not supported.

**Figure IV-7.** Standardized path coefficients of the hypothesized model related to perceived community support


**Cross-cultural adjustment and work engagement**

The statistically significant path coefficients ($p < .05$) in the structural model that are related to CCA and work engagement are presented in Figure IV-8. General CCA was negatively associated with CWB ($\beta = -.15, p < .05$) and withdrawal behavior ($\beta = -.19, p < .05$). Interaction CCA was negatively associated with task performance ($\beta = -.10, p < .05$) and positively associated with OCB ($\beta = .10, p < .05$). Work CCA was not
statistically related to any of the four sub-dimensions of work performance ($p > .05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 19 was partially supported. Among the three sub-dimensions of CCA, general ($\beta = .25$, $p < .05$) and work ($\beta = .27$, $p < .05$) dimensions were positively related to work engagement, which partially supported Hypothesis 20. Finally, work engagement was positively associated with task performance ($\beta = .28$, $p < .05$) and OCB ($\beta = .33$, $p < .05$). However, as there was no relationship between work engagement and CWB and withdrawal behavior ($p > .05$), Hypothesis 21 was partially supported.

![Figure IV-8](image.png)

*Figure IV-8. Standardized path coefficients of the hypothesized model related to cross cultural adjustment and work engagement.*


According to Cohen's $R^2$ (Kotrlik & Williams, 2003), the squared multiple correlations ($R^2$) in the structural model indicated that all of the dependent variables had
large effect sizes (> .26): general CCA ($R^2 = .83$), interaction CCA ($R^2 = .73$), work CCA ($R^2 = .80$), work engagement ($R^2 = .84$), task performance ($R^2 = .89$), OCB at the individual level ($R^2 = .84$), CWB ($R^2 = .81$), and withdrawal behavior ($R^2 = .76$).

**Mediation effects**

Table IV-10 shows the statistical significance of the mediation effects of the three sub-dimensions of CCA (i.e., general, interaction, and work) and work engagement between job resources at various levels and sub-dimensions of work performance. The relative strength of the specific indirect effects, standard error estimate, and standard score ($Z$) with their 95% bias-corrected (BC) bootstrap confidence intervals (CI) are presented in Table IV-10.

The three sub-dimensions of CCA and work engagement mediated a total of 15 relationships between job resources at various levels and the four sub-dimensions of work performance. Therefore, Hypotheses 22 and 23 were partially supported. In particular, there were seven relationships mediated by two latent factors. For example, general CCA and work engagement mediated the relationship between task performance and PsyCap ($\beta = .027$, 95% CI [.003, .051]) and perceived supervisor support ($\beta = .021$, 95% CI [.000, .043]) at the .05 level since the 95% BC bootstrap CI for the indirect effects did not include zero. The two mediating variables also had an indirect influence on the relationship between PsyCap and OCB ($\beta = .031$, 95% CI [.004, .058]) and between perceived supervisor support and OCB ($\beta = .025$, 95% CI [.000, .050]). The indirect effect of PsyCap on task performance through work CCA and work engagement was significant at the .05 level ($\beta = .046$, 95% CI [.011, .081]). Work CCA and work
engagement also mediated the relationship between OCB and PsyCap ($\beta=0.054$, 95% CI [.013, .095]) and perceived community support ($\beta=0.015$, 95% CI [.001, .029]).

Table IV-10

*Standardized Bootstrap Estimates of the Mediation Effect in the Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path: IV $\rightarrow$ MV $\rightarrow$ (MV) $\rightarrow$ DV</th>
<th>Product of Coefficients</th>
<th>BC 95% CI*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>SE$_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap $\rightarrow$ CCA_G $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ TP</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS $\rightarrow$ CCA_G $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ TP</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap $\rightarrow$ CCA_G $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ OCBI</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS $\rightarrow$ CCA_G $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ OCBI</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap $\rightarrow$ CCA_W $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ TP</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap $\rightarrow$ CCA_W $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ OCBI</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS $\rightarrow$ CCA_W $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ OCBI</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap $\rightarrow$ CCA_G $\rightarrow$ WB</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ TP</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ TP</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ TP</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_W $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ TP</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ OCBI</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ OCBI</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_W $\rightarrow$ WE $\rightarrow$ OCBI</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. IV = independent variable; MV = mediating variable; DV = dependent variable; PsyCap: positive psychological capital; PsupS: perceived supervisor support; PsubS: perceived subordinate support; PCS: perceived community support; CCA_G: general cross-cultural adjustment; CCA_W: work cross-cultural adjustment; WE: work engagement; TP: task performance; OCBI: organizational citizenship behavior (individual dimension); WB: withdrawal behavior; $a$ = standardized estimate of the mediating effect; SE$_a$ = standard error; BC = bias corrected bootstrapping; CI = confidence interval.
As a single mediator, general CCA and work engagement had an indirect influence on eight relationships between job resources and work performance. For example, the indirect effect of PsyCap on withdrawal behavior through general CCA was significant at the .05 level since the 95% BC bootstrap CI for the indirect effects did not include zero (β = -0.074, 95% CI [-.147, -.001]). Work engagement also mediated the relationship between task performance and perceived subordinate support (β = 0.123, 95% CI [.047, .199]), perceived family support (β = 0.044, 95% CI [.001, .087]), general CCA (β = 0.070, 95% CI [.023, .117]), and interaction CCA (β = 0.077, 95% CI [.026, .0128]). Work engagement further mediated the relationship between perceived subordinate support and OCB (β = 0.144, 95% CI [.058, .230]), between general CCA and OCB (β = 0.082, 95% CI [.023, .141]), and between work CCA and OCB (β = 0.090, 95% CI [.033, .147]).

**Summary**

In this chapter, the results of the descriptive statistics, CFA, correlation analysis, structural model analysis, and bootstrap analysis were reported. The acceptability of the hypothesized model and the empirical support of 23 research hypotheses were also reported. As a result, the model fits of the alternative measurement model and the hypothesized structural model were acceptable. In the path analyses, the standardized path coefficients between the exogenous and endogenous variables were examined and hypothesized mediation effects were tested. A more detailed discussion of the results, the implications for HRD and expatriation research and practice, and recommendations for future research are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter starts with a summary of the study. Next, the results of this study are discussed in relation to the research hypotheses and the existing literature. Based on the findings, the implications for HRD theory and practice are derived. The chapter concludes with the limitations of this study and recommendations for future research.

Summary

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the direct and indirect relationships between multiple expatriate outcomes and job resources at various levels in both work-related and non-work-related domains. In particular, job resources included (a) PsyCap at an individual level; (b) perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support at an interpersonal level; (c) perceived organizational support from a local host organization at an organizational level; and (d) perceived community support at a societal level. The outcome variables included (e) CCA, (f) work engagement, and (g) work performance. The mediating effects of CCA and work engagement were also examined among the relationships.

Research questions and hypotheses

Two consecutive phases of a systematic literature review were conducted. In Phase 1, dissertations related to expatriate or expatriation were reviewed to investigate expatriate outcomes, antecedents of expatriate outcomes, and relative trends in expatriate
studies, and ultimately to discover the academic gaps. Then, the relevant literature on the theoretical framework, the variables included in this study, and their interactions was thoroughly reviewed in Phase 2. The theoretical framework included the COR theory, the JD-R model, and the spillover theory. The following two overarching research questions guided this study:

1) What are the relationships between job resources at various levels in work-related and non-work-related domains and components of work performance among expatriates?

2) What is the impact of CCA and work engagement on the relationships between job resources at various levels and components of work performance among expatriates?

To explore the two research questions, 23 research hypotheses were tested in Chapter IV and the results are summarized in Table V-1.

Table V-1

*Summary of Results of the Hypotheses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: PsyCap will be positively related to work performance ((a) task performance (TP), (b) OCB, (c) CWB, &amp; (d) withdrawal behavior (WB)).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: PsyCap will be positively related to CCA.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: PsyCap will be positively related to work engagement.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Perceived supervisor support in work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, &amp; (d) WB).</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Perceived supervisor support in work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Perceived supervisor support in work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V-1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H7: Perceived subordinate support in work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, &amp; (d) WB).</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: Perceived subordinate support in work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9: Perceived subordinate support in work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10: Perceived family support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, &amp; (d) WB).</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11: Perceived family support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12: Perceived family support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13: Perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, &amp; (d) WB).</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14: Perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary will be positively related to CCA.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15: Perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary will be positively related to work engagement.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16: Perceived community support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, &amp; (d) WB).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17: Perceived community support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to CCA.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18: Perceived community support in non-work-related domains will be positively related to work engagement.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H19: CCA will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, &amp; (d) WB).</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H20: CCA will be positively related to work engagement.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H21: Work engagement will be positively related to work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, &amp; (d) WB).</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H22: CCA will mediate the relationships between the resources at various levels and work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, &amp; (d) WB).</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H23: Work engagement will mediate the relationships between the job resources at various levels and work performance ((a) TP, (b) OCB, (c) CWB, &amp; (d) WB).</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. F (black font): Hypothesis is fully supported, P (blue font): Hypothesis is partially supported, N (red font): Hypothesis is not supported.
Data collection

**Instruments.** An online questionnaire survey was implemented to address the research questions and hypotheses and to collect data. To examine the proposed theoretical model and the hypothesized structural relationships, the survey for this study included 12 extant and validated instruments: *PsyCap* (Luthans et al., 2005, 2007; Norman, 2006), *perceived supervisor support* (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades et al., 2001), *perceived subordinate support* (Hammer et al., 2004), *perceived family support* (King et al., 1995; Nasurdin & O’Driscoll, 2012), *perceived organizational support* (Kramer & Wayne, 2004; Kawai & Strange, 2014), *perceived community support* (Herrero & Gracia, 2007; Ng et al., 2014), *CCA* (Black, 1988; Black & Stephens, 1989), *work engagement* (Schaufeli et al., 2006), and *work performance* (Carpenter et al., 2014), including *task performance* (Williams & Anderson, 1991), *OCB* (Williams & Anderson, 1991), *CWB* (Bennett & Robinson, 2000), and *withdrawal behavior* (Hanisch 1995; Hanisch & Hulin, 1990). The total number of items was 134 including 14 demographic information items and each item was measured with a 7-point Likert-type scale from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (7). Since the adapted instruments in this study were originally developed in English and were used in the Korean context, these instruments were translated from English to Korean, using forward-backward translation.

**Data collection procedure.** Before the data collection, a pilot test was conducted with 10 international doctoral students at Texas A&M University to check the face validity and practicality of the survey items and functioning of the online survey program. Based on the comments, minor changes were made to improve the survey.
After more than 100 global HR practitioners of large Korean conglomerates were contacted to request their assistance with voluntary participation of their expatriates in this study, I met in person with 61 HR practitioners and they agreed to distribute the online survey link of this study to their expatriates across the world. After distributing the survey link to around 1,200 participants, a total of 507 responses from 31 private organizations in 32 countries were collected (42.2% participation rate) and 438 cases remained after data screening based on literature of missing data, outliers, multicollinearity, and normality. The data satisfied all the statistical assumptions. The response rate was 36.5%, which satisfied the requirement by Kline (2011).

Data analysis

The data analyses for this study included CMV, reliability analysis, construct validity analyses, descriptive analysis, CFA, correlation analysis, SEM, and BC bootstrap method. Although the result of Harman’s single-factor test indicated that there may be little CMV in the data, based on a single unmeasured latent method factor approach, there was slight influence of CMV in the data of this study. Since it was possible that CMV influenced the hypothesized model of this study, I conducted further analysis for both models with and without the unmeasured latent factor.

Measurement model. CFA was conducted because the factor analysis was driven by the theoretical relationships among the items and the latent factors (Kline, 2011). CFA examined the validity of the measurement model for the participants. The model fit with the collected data was evaluated using four fit indices, including chi-square/df for ML estimation (2.0-5.0), root mean square error of approximation
(RMSEA, <.10), comparative fit index (CFI, >.90), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR, <.10) (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2011; Lei & Wu, 2007). Among the four fit indices, the estimates of CFI and TLI were not acceptable. Therefore, I examined the correlation matrix among the indicators for each of the 14 latent factors (i.e., 11 constructs and 3 sub-dimensions of CCA) because Kline (2011) strongly recommended that intercorrelations among indicators for the same latent factor should be positive and at least moderately high in magnitude (> .50). While I identified several problematic items, these items showed possible contextual and cultural issues in terms of the content of these items or there were several cases that two items in a same latent variable seemed to be similar. As a result, CFA was conducted again to examine the validity of the alternative measurement model after the problematic items were removed. All of the fit indices estimates were satisfactory, which indicated that the alternative model was acceptable. All of the standardized factor loading estimates were statistically significant and ranged between .75 and .98, which were substantially greater than the benchmark of .30 (Meyers et al., 2013). According to the parsimony principle (Kline, 2011), the simpler alternative measurement model was selected for further discussion.

Since there might be influence from CMV on items in this study based on a single unmeasured latent method factor approach, CFA of the alternative hypothesized model with CMV was also conducted. Although all of the fit indices estimates were satisfactory, the alternative model without CMV had better fit indices and was a simpler model. Based on the parsimony principle (Kline, 2011), the simpler alternative hypothesized model without CMV was selected.
An estimation of reliability was conducted for the 12 instruments with the reduced number of items, using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. All of the reliability estimates were acceptable (> .70). Bivariate correlations (r) among the 14 variables including 11 instruments and three sub-dimensions of one instrument (CCA) were examined. All of the correlations in the alternative model were statistically significant (p < .01) and strong (> .70, McMillan, 2000) except for the correlations between (a) PFS and PCS, (b) PFS and three sub-dimensions of CCA, and (c) interaction CCA and withdrawal behavior, which were moderate (<.70).

**Structural model.** The overall fit indices of the proposed model were satisfactory and confirmed the acceptance of the hypothesized path model. In the path analyses, the standardized path coefficients between the exogenous and endogenous variables were also examined and hypothesized mediation effects were tested. While Table V-1 provided the overview of the results, the following section describes the results of the relationships among constructs used in this study.

**Positive psychological capital.** As an exogenous variable, PsyCap was not significantly related to work performance and work engagement (p > .05) whereas PsyCap was significantly associated with all three sub-dimensions of CCA: general (β = .38, p < .05), interaction (β = .62, p < .05), and work (β = .60, p < .05).

**Perceived supervisor support.** Perceived supervisor support was positively related to OCB (β = .30, p < .05) but statistically was not associated with the other three dimensions of work performance (p > .05). Perceived supervisor support was also positively related to general CCA (β = .25, p < .05), but it was not associated with the other
two sub-dimensions of CCA ($p > .05$). In addition, perceived supervisor support was not found to be a significant direct predictor of work engagement ($p > .05$).

**Perceived subordinate support.** Perceived subordinate support was significantly related to all of the four sub-dimensions of work performance: task performance ($\beta = .34$, $p < .05$), OCB ($\beta = .24$, $p < .05$), CWB ($\beta = -.48$, $p < .05$), and withdrawal behavior ($\beta = -.46$, $p < .05$). Perceived subordinate support was negatively associated with interaction CCA ($\beta = -.32$, $p < .05$), but it was not associated with the other two sub-dimensions of CCA ($p > .05$). In addition, there was a positive relationship between perceived subordinate support and work engagement ($\beta = .43$, $p < .05$).

**Perceived family support.** As one of the job resources at an interpersonal level in non-work-related domains, perceived family support was significantly associated with task performance ($\beta = .16$, $p < .05$) and CWB ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .05$) whereas it was not significantly related to OCB, withdrawal behavior, and the three sub-dimensions of CCA ($p > .05$). Finally, perceived family support was positively associated with work engagement ($\beta = .15$, $p < .05$).

**Perceived organizational support.** As one of the job resources at an organizational level in work-related domains, perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary organization was positively related to OCB ($\beta = .23$, $p < .05$), but it was not associated with the other three sub-dimensions of work performance ($p > .05$). Perceived organizational support was positively related to all of the three sub-dimensions of CCA: general ($\beta = .15$, $p < .05$), interaction ($\beta = .31$, $p < .05$), and work
(β=.18, p<.05), whereas perceived organizational support was not associated with work engagement (p>.05).

**Perceived community support.** As one of the job resources at a societal level in non-work-related domains, perceived community support was not associated with work performance, general CCA, and work engagement (p>.05). In contrast, perceived community support was positively associated with interaction CCA (β=.21, p<.05) and work CCA (β=.16, p<.05).

**Cross-cultural adjustment and work engagement.** General CCA was significantly associated with work engagement (β=.25, p<.05), CWB (β=.15, p<.05), and withdrawal behavior (β=.19, p<.05). Interaction CCA was negatively associated with task performance (β=.10, p<.05) and positively associated with OCB (β=.10, p<.05). Work CCA was not significantly associated with any of the four sub-dimensions of work performance (p>.05), but was related to work engagement (β=.27, p<.05). Finally, work engagement was significantly associated with task performance (β=.28, p<.05) and OCB (β=.33, p<.05), whereas it was not related to CWB and withdrawal behavior (p>.05).

**Mediation effects.** A BC bootstrap method was conducted to examine the mediating effects of CCA and work engagement on the relationships between job resources and several components of work performance. As dual mediators, general CCA and work engagement mediated the relationship between task performance and PsyCap and perceived supervisor support. The two mediating variables also had an indirect impact on the relationship between OCB and PsyCap and perceived supervisor
support. The indirect effect of PsyCap on task performance through work CCA and work engagement was statistically significant. Work CCA and work engagement also mediated the relationship between OCB and PsyCap and perceived community support.

As a single mediator, the indirect effect of PsyCap on withdrawal behavior through general CCA was statistically significant. Work engagement also mediated the relationship between task performance and perceived subordinate support, perceived family support, general CCA, and interaction CCA. Work engagement further mediated the relationship between OCB and perceived subordinate support, general CCA, and work CCA.

In conclusion, the model fits of the alternative measurement model and the hypothesized structural model were acceptable. There were several direct and indirect relationships between job resources at various levels in both work-related and non-work-related domains and work performance. In addition, several cases of the mediating effects of CCA and work engagement were identified among the relationships.

Discussion

This section discusses the results of the current study in relation to the relevant literature. In particular, the results are discussed following the sequence of the 23 hypotheses.

Interestingly, the results of the correlations (Table IV-7) among the 14 variables including 11 instruments and three sub-dimensions of one instrument (CCA) supported the 23 hypotheses of this study, but the results from the structural model analysis showed several unexpected and/or insignificant relationships. One of the primary reasons for
this discrepancy is the different characteristics of the two analyses. A correlation coefficient solely tests whether the relationship between two variables is linear or not (Field, 2013) without controlling for other variables. On the contrary, the associations among the variables are examined while other variables are included and controlled in the same model through the analysis of SEM (Kline, 2011).

**Hypothesis 1: Positive psychological capital and work performance**

As personal and psychological job resources, PsyCap did not significantly predict any of the four sub-dimensions of work performance. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was not supported by the empirical data of this study. However, PsyCap was significantly correlated with task performance ($r=.85$, $p<.01$), OCB ($r=.86$, $p<.01$), CWB ($r=-.86$, $p<.01$), and withdrawal behavior ($r=-.82$, $p<.01$). The reason for this discrepancy could be the influence of other variables on the relationships between PsyCap and the four sub-dimensions of work performance in the model.

This result did not support findings from previous research. As a second-order factor derived from self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resiliency (Luthans, Youssef, et al., 2007; Stajkovic, 2006), PsyCap is found to be significantly associated with the four components of work performance based on several extant empirical studies (e.g., Avery et al., 2010, 2011; Vogelgesang et al., 2014). In addition, empirical evidence also revealed significant relationship between multiple components of work performance and components of PsyCap (e.g., Alarcon et al., 2013; Bressler et al., 2010; Caillier, 2014; Chen & Kao, 2011; Chen et al., 2014; Combs et al., 2010; Cretu & Burcas, 2014; Grote et al., 2007; Hudgins, 2015; Kotze & Kleynhans, 2013; Schwabsky, 2014; Seirup &
Thus, this result was unexpected. However, PsyCap was significantly correlated with all of the components of work performance. One of the possible explanations is that the four components of work performance are indirect outcomes of PsyCap. In this study, task performance, OCB, and withdrawal behavior were indirect outcomes of PsyCap, mediated by CCA and/or work engagement (see Table IV-10).

Another possible reason for this unexpected result is that work performance was rated by the expatriates themselves rather than by their supervisors, peers, and/or subordinates. Several researchers have noticed some discrepancies between self-rated performance and other-rated performance because individuals tend to evaluate their own performance leniently (Adler et al., 2016; Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988; Heidemeier & Moser, 2009). Adler et al. (2016) recently argued that performance rating systems should not be used due to the controversy about their validity. The research on performance management has focused mainly on leniency of self-rating performance appraisals and these studies have been primarily conducted in Western cultures (Cho & Payne, 2016). In contrast, Farh, Dobbins, and Cheng (1991) showed that self-raters in China rated their own performance lower than did their supervisors, colleagues, and subordinates. Barron and Sackett (2008) also identified empirically that Japanese and Korean managers rated their own performance lower than managers from other countries did. These few but significant studies indicated that cultural characteristics might lead to discrepancies in employees’ self-perception across cultures. Heidemeier and Moser (2009) supported this argument in their meta-analysis that people in individualistic
societies tend to rate themselves higher. The participants in this study were Korean, but they were expatriates who had been influenced by various host cultures. Therefore, further investigation are needed to examine a direct and indirect association of PsyCap on work performance rated by others in various cultural contexts.

**Hypothesis 2: Positive psychological capital and cross-cultural adjustment**

Based on the path analysis, PsyCap had a significant and positive relationship with all three sub-dimensions of CCA, which fully supported Hypothesis 2 in this study. In addition, PsyCap was strongly correlated with general, interaction, and work CCA ($r=.84, .79, .82, p<.01$). One of the interpretations is that the expatriates who possess a higher level of PsyCap adjust better to the new work-related and non-work-related environment, and the new ways of building networks or communicating.

This result is aligned with the hypothesis based on the reviewed literature. Although there is a paucity of studies that shed light on the relationship between PsyCap and CCA, Dollwet and Reichard (2014) examined the relationship based on a large sample from various cultural and ethnic backgrounds, and they identified the significant relationships between the two variables. As the first study examining the relationship in the context of an expatriate assignment, the current study confirmed the relationships between PsyCap and the three sub-dimensions of CCA: general, interaction, and work.

The significant and positive relationship of PsyCap with all three sub-dimensions of CCA also supported the JD-R model. According to the JD-R model, job resources may lead employees to be intrinsically and extrinsically motivated, whereas job demands may cause employees to be mentally and physically exhausted. Finally, strain and
motivation factors influence outcomes. Expatriates are generally located in an unfamiliar culture and customs of a foreign country, which adds to their job demands. In addition, expatriates are often located in a foreign country where they do not have any social network (i.e., relatives, friends, and business partners). They also need to play new roles since they need to lead and/or transfer their competencies to local employees with different cultural backgrounds and coordinate operations and relationships between their headquarters and local employees. With this high level of job demands, PsyCap can (a) play a role in buffering the impact of job demands on strain and (b) motivate expatriates to cross-culturally adjust better, both of which could ultimately enhance work performance.

**Hypothesis 3: Positive psychological capital and work engagement**

Findings of this study revealed no relationship between PsyCap and work engagement; therefore, Hypothesis 3 was not supported. However, PsyCap was significantly and strongly correlated with work engagement ($r = .86, p < .01$). In the literature on work engagement, only few studies have examined the relationship between PsyCap and work engagement. Interestingly, PsyCap has a positive relationship with organizational commitment and job satisfaction, which is ultimately associated with engagement (Avery et al., 2011; Luthans et al., 2008).

One of the possible reasons for this discrepancy could be that the 12-item shortened version of the original 24-item PsyCap questionnaire (PCQ 24) (Luthans et al., 2005, 2007) did not fully capture the four sub-dimensions of PsyCap. As reviewed in Chapter II, the relationship between each component of PsyCap and work engagement
has been empirically examined: self-efficacy (Ouweneel et al., 2013; Salanova et al., 2011), hope (Karatepe, 2014; Ouweneel et al., 2012), optimism (Medlin et al., 2009; Nes et al., 2005), resilience (Kotze & Kleynhans, 2013; Mache et al., 2014). Therefore, the validity of the 12-item shortened version needs to be examined further.

**Hypothesis 4: Perceived supervisor support and work performance**

As one of the job resources at the interpersonal level, perceived supervisor support in work-related domains was positively related to the individual level OCB, but it was not significantly associated with the other three sub-dimensions of work performance. When expatriates perceive that they are highly supported by their supervisors, they tend to engage more in OCB at an individual level. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was partially supported by the results of this study. Perceived supervisor support was significantly correlated with task performance ($r=.79, p<.01$), OCB ($r=.79, p<.01$), CWB ($r=-.80, p<.01$), and withdrawal behavior ($r=-.77, p<.01$). In addition, task performance was an indirect outcome of perceived supervisor support, mediated by general CCA and work engagement (see Table IV-10).

This result partially supported the reviewed literature, which was unexpected. In previous studies, researchers argued that perceived supervisor support is significantly associated with task performance (e.g., Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2012; Liaw et al., 2010), OCB (Masterson et al., 2000; Wang, 2014; Wang et al., 2013), CWB (Bader, 2014; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Sakurai & Jex, 2012), and withdrawal behavior/intentions (Bhatnagar, 2014; Maertz et al., 2007; Newman et al., 2012). In the current study, perceived supervisor support was significantly correlated with all of the sub-dimensions
of work performance. However, the results of the current study showed that task
performance, CWB, and withdrawal behavior were not significantly associated with
perceived supervisor support in the hypothesized model.

One of the possible reasons for the significance of the specific relationship
between perceived supervisor support and OCB is that individuals in a collectivistic
and/or hierarchical cultural context tend to engage in OCB (Wang et al., 2013). In the
Korean cultural context influenced by Confucianism (Horak, 2014; Lee, 2012; Merkin,
2009), individuals value authoritarianism, harmony, and stability, all of which are mostly
aligned with OCBs (Wang et al., 2013).

Regarding the discrepancy between the extant literature and the result of the
current study, the influence of other variables in the hypothesized model might make the
relationship between perceived supervisor support and the other three components of
work performance insignificant. Another possible reason for this unexpected result is
that work performance was rated by expatriates themselves rather than by their
supervisors, peers, and/or subordinates.

**Hypothesis 5: Perceived supervisor support and cross-cultural adjustment**

Perceived supervisor support was positively related to general CCA, but it was
not associated with the other two sub-dimensions of CCA. When expatriates perceive
that they are highly supported by their supervisors, they tend to adjust better to the non-
work environment in a host country. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was partially supported by
the empirical data of this study. Perceived supervisor support was significantly and
positively correlated with general, interaction, and work CCA ($r = .79, 73, 73, p < .01$).
Researchers argued that perceived supervisor support is significantly related to CCA (Lee et al., 2013; Yusoff, 2012). In this study, perceived supervisor support was positively related to general CCA, but it was not associated with interaction and work CCA. One of the possible explanations is that the participants of this study were mostly managers and senior managers (80%) and their supervisors tended to be expatriates rather than local employees. While the length of expatriation and prior expatriation experience were compared between managers/senior managers and executives in the current study, there was not much difference. Therefore, perceived support from supervisors was not considered by the expatriates to be related to their adjustment to the new work-related environment and the new ways of building networks and communicating with local employees. As stated above, another possible reason for the discrepancy is that while the relationship between perceived supervisor support and CCA were examined, other variables were also included and controlled in the same model through the analysis of SEM (Kline, 2011).

**Hypothesis 6: Perceived supervisor support and work engagement**

Perceived supervisor support was not significantly associated with work engagement. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was not supported. However, perceived supervisor support was significantly correlated with work engagement ($r=.79$, $p<.01$). This implies that the relationship between perceived supervisor support in work-related domains and work engagement became insignificant when other variables in the hypothesized model were controlled.
This result is interesting because most extant studies on work engagement examined the relationship between work engagement and social support, which includes support from both supervisors and coworkers (e.g., Mache et al., 2014; Taipale et al., 2011). Hypothesis 6 was anticipated based on these extant studies. However, the result from the current study showed that perceived supervisor support did not have a significant positive relationship with work engagement. Similarly, although still limited, Olivier and Rothmann (2007) reported that the relationship between supervisor relations and work engagement became insignificant when their hypothesized model included coworker relations, coworker norms, job insecurity, and/or psychological safety. However, supervisor relations were positively associated with work engagement when the researchers examined the relationship between supervisor relations and work engagement, excluding coworker relations. Likewise, since the hypothesized model of the current study included several other constructs of perceived support as independent variables, this result could be explained.

**Hypothesis 7: Perceived subordinate support and work performance**

Perceived subordinate support in work-related domains was positively associated with task performance and OCB, and negatively associated with CWB and withdrawal behavior. When expatriates perceive that they are highly supported by their subordinates, the expatriates perform their tasks better and are more likely to engage in individual-level OCBs, but are less likely to engage in CWBs and withdrawal behaviors. Therefore, Hypothesis 7 was fully supported by the results of this study. In addition, perceived
subordinate support was significantly correlated with task performance ($r = .85, p < .01$), OCB ($r = .81, p < .01$), CWB ($r = -.84, p < .01$), and withdrawal behavior ($r = -.81, p < .01$).

This result was expected and interesting because few studies have solely examined the relationship between perceived subordinate support and outcomes in general, especially in the context of an expatriation assignment. As stated earlier, most studies focused on the impact of social support including support from both supervisors and coworkers. In addition, items to measure social support generally have only one or two items, explicitly asking about support from their subordinates. The result of the current study fully supported the relationship between perceived subordinate support and the four components of work performance.

More importantly, this result corresponds to the COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989). According to the COR theory, stress occurs when the loss of resources is greater than the gain of resources. In this vein, Hobfoll (1989) defined stress as “a reaction to the environment in which there is (a) the threat of a net loss of resources, (b) the net loss of resources, or (c) a lack of resource gain following the investment of resources” (p. 516). As stated above, expatriates are located in unfamiliar cultures with unfamiliar customs of the foreign country where they do not have any social networks. In this context that expatriates have already lost their resources, they would want to acquire, maintain, and protect resources (Hobfoll, 1988, 1989). In addition, the Korean expatriates tend to put great value on social relations with coworkers based on their collectivistic cultural context (Shim, Kim, & Martin, 2008). Therefore, a level of perceived support from their
subordinates could be significantly associated with the four sub-dimensions of work performance, which was supported by the results of the current study.

**Hypothesis 8: Perceived subordinate support and cross-cultural adjustment**

In Hypothesis 8, the positive relationship between perceived subordinate support and the sub-dimensions of CCA was anticipated. Interestingly, perceived subordinate support had an opposite, negative relationship with interaction CCA, but it was not associated with the other two sub-dimensions of CCA. Based on this result, when expatriates perceive that they are highly supported by their subordinates, the expatriates are apt to adjust less to the ways of building social networks or communicating with local people in the host country. Therefore, Hypothesis 8 was not supported by this study. However, perceived subordinate support was positively correlated with general, interaction, and work CCA ($r=.80, 71, 76, p<.01$). This implies that the relationship between perceived subordinate support in work-related domains and work engagement became insignificant when other variables in the hypothesized model were controlled.

This result was unexpected. As stated in Chapter II, there is a paucity of literature that sheds light on the relationship between perceived subordinate support and CCA. Previous studies reported a significant relationship between CCA and perceived coworker support, including organizations, supervisors, subordinates, and colleagues (e.g., Farh et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2013; Wu & Ang, 2011). Thus, Hypothesis 8 was anticipated. However, the result from the current study showed that perceived subordinate support was negatively rather than positively associated with interaction CCA, but it was not associated with general and work CCA in the hypothesized model.
One of the possible interpretations of this result is that the subordinates might not be mostly local employees, but expatriates. Bartlett and Ghoshal (1989) categorized globalization of organizations into four quadrants by high/low need for global integration and local responsiveness: 1) international, 2) multinational, 3) global, and 4) transnational. Based on the description of the categorization, most of the participating organizations were multinational organizations that send Korean expatriates to control local subsidiary organizations in foreign countries. While expatriate managers perceived strong support from those Korean expatriate subordinates, tasks such as communicating and interacting with local employees or partners were handled primarily by the subordinates. In addition, expatriates might interact mainly with the expatriate subordinates instead of local employees due to their language constraints. In this context, the participants might have had less opportunity to communicate with local employees or partners and to build local networks, which consequently would reduce the level of expatriates’ interaction CCA. It is also possible that the expatriates’ closer relationship with their expatriate subordinates made the relationship between perceived subordinate support and general and work CCA insignificant.

**Hypothesis 9: Perceived subordinate support and work engagement**

Perceived subordinate support was significantly associated with work engagement. When expatriates perceive that they are highly supported by their subordinates, they are likely to be more engaged in their work. Therefore, Hypothesis 9 was fully supported by the empirical data of this study. Perceived subordinate support was also correlated with work engagement ($r=.86, p<.01$).
This result was expected and interesting because few studies have focused exclusively on the relationship between perceived subordinate support and work engagement. As stated earlier, most studies examined the impact of perceived social support or coworker support, including support from both supervisors and coworkers. Items to measure social support generally have only one or two items explicitly asking about support from their subordinates. Hypothesis 6 was anticipated based on these extant studies (Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; Taipale et al., 2011) and is also supported by the result of the current study. As the first study examining this relationship in the context of an expatriate assignment, the current study confirmed the relationship between perceived subordinate support and work engagement in the expatriate context.

This result also supported the JD-R model. According to the JD-R model, job resources may encourage employees to be intrinsically and extrinsically motivated (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Then, strain and motivation factors influence outcomes. According to the result of the current study, expatriates with a high level of perceived subordinate support as a job resource tend to be more engaged in their work. In addition, work engagement mediated the relationship between perceived subordinate support and task performance and OCB at the individual level (see Table IV-10). As a result, perceived subordinate support may have motivated the expatriates to engage in their work, which ultimately would enhance work performance (Demerouti et al., 2001).

**Hypothesis 10: Perceived family support and work performance**

As one of the job resources at an interpersonal level in non-work-related domains, perceived family support was positively related to task performance and negatively
related to CWB. When expatriates perceive that they are highly supported by their family members, they perform their tasks better, and are less likely to engage in CWBs. However, perceived family support had no relationship with OCB and withdrawal behavior. Therefore, Hypothesis 10 was partially supported. Perceived family support was significantly correlated with task performance ($r = .78, p < .01$), OCB ($r = .71, p < .01$), CWB ($r = -.74, p < .01$), and withdrawal behavior ($r = -.72, p < .01$). This implies that the relationship between perceived family support and OCB and withdrawal behaviors became insignificant when other variables in the hypothesized model were controlled.

Few studies have examined the relationship between perceived family support and its outcomes whereas most studies have focused on either organizational support for family members or the relationship between family support and expatriate adjustment. Most previous studies have examined work-family conflict, parental demands, and/or family demands as important stress factors that would disturb expatriates’ work performance. Within the limited literature, several studies have reported that perceived family support had a positive relationship with task performance (Pearson, 2009; Takeuchi et al., 2007) and OCB (Singh & Singh, 2011), and a negative relationship with CWB (Boyar et al., 2005; Ferguson et al., 2012) and withdrawal behavior and intentions (Nohe & Sonntag, 2014; Hammer et al., 2003). Hypothesis 10 was established based on the extant studies. However, the result from the current study showed that perceived family support was positively related to task performance and negatively related to CWB, but it was not associated with OCB and withdrawal behavior.
One of the possible explanations for the insignificance of the relationship between perceived family support and the two sub-dimensions of work performance is that the instruments of perceived family support and work-family conflict captured different phenomena. The items of perceived family support in this study (see Appendix D) asked whether family members provided emotionsupport to the expatriates (job resource based approach), whereas the items of work-family conflict captured how much the expatriates’ work interfered with the expatriates’ relationships with their family members (job demand based approach). In this vein, this study could be considered an initial study examining the relationship between perceived family support and work performance.

The significant relationships of perceived family support with task performance and CWB support in this study represented the reciprocal influence between work domains and non-work domains, which supported the spillover theory (Caligiuri et al., 1998). In the context of an expatriate assignment, domains of work and life are blurred because all the family members need to live in a new country and confront various cultural issues. Therefore, family members’ adjustment and their support for expatriation are crucial to the expatriate outcomes, according to the spillover theory (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Mishel et al., 2011). This argument was supported by the results of the current study.

**Hypothesis 11: Perceived family support and cross-cultural adjustment**

Perceived family support was not significantly associated with any sub-dimension of CCA. Therefore, Hypothesis 11 was not supported. However, perceived
family support was significantly correlated with general, interaction, and work CCA ($r = .64, .63, .61, p < .01$). This implies that the relationship between perceived supervisor support in work-related domains and work engagement became insignificant when other variables in the hypothesized model were controlled.

Caligiuri et al. (1998) identified the significant relationship between family support and expatriates’ CCA, using 110 families of expatriates in a host country. Except for Caligiuri et al.’s study, most other studies examined the relationships among family adjustment, work-family conflict, family demands and expatriates’ cross cultural adjustment. Hypothesis 11 was established based on these extant studies. However, the results from the current study showed that perceived family support was not associated with the three sub-dimensions of CCA. As stated in Hypothesis 10, this insignificance of the relationship can be explained by the instruments of perceived family support and work-family conflict that capture different parts of the interactions between expatriates and their family members. Therefore, findings from this study can be interpreted that reducing job demands in non-work-related domains can be directly related to CCA, whereas job resources in non-work-related domains may be indirectly or insignificantly related to CCA when other variables are controlled.

**Hypothesis 12: Perceived family support and work engagement**

Perceived family support was positively related to work engagement. As expatriates perceive that they are highly supported by their family members, the expatriates tend to engage more in their work. Therefore, Hypothesis 12 was fully
supported by the empirical data of this study. In addition, perceived family support was significantly correlated with work engagement ($r=.74, p<.01$).

This result was expected based on a few studies and the spillover theory. Arabzadegan et al.’s (2012) is the only one study examining the relationships between perceived family support and work engagement and the researchers identified the relationship as significant. Takeuchi et al. (2007) also argued that family adjustment might enable expatriates to concentrate on and engage in their jobs. Therefore, the current study is one of the first studies examining the relationship between perceived social support from family members and work engagement, and the the first study examining the relationship in the context of an expatriate assignment.

The significant relationship between perceived family support and work engagement also supports the spillover theory (Caligiuri et al., 1998). In the context of an expatriate assignment, domains of work and life are blurred because all of the family members need to live in a new country and confront various types of issues. Therefore, if family members quickly adjust to the new environment and support the expatriates emotionally, the expatriates are likely to be able to concentrate and engage in their work (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Mishel et al., 2011). Thus, the result of the current study supported the argument of the spillover theory.

**Hypothesis 13: Perceived organizational support and work performance**

As one of the job resources at an organizational level in work-related domains, perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary organization was positively associated with OCB, but it was not significantly related to the other three components
of work performance. As expatriates perceive that they are highly supported by their local organizations, they tend to engage in more OCBs. Therefore, Hypothesis 13 was partially supported by this study. However, perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary was significantly correlated with task performance ($r = .82, p < .01$), OCB ($r = .81, p < .01$), CWB ($r = -.81, p < .01$), and withdrawal behavior ($r = -.76, p < .01$).

The above result partially supported the reviewed literature. This was an unexpected result. Existing studies reported that perceived organizational support was significantly associated with task performance (Chen et al., 2010; Eisenberger et al., 1986, 1990; Riggle et al., 2009) and OCB (Cheung, 2013; Liu, 2009), and had a negative relationship with CWB (Liu & Ding, 2012; Nielsen, 2014) and withdrawal behavior and intentions (Cao et al., 2014; Eisenberger et al., 2002; Maertz et al., 2007; Shusha, 2013). In the current study, perceived organizational support was significantly correlated with all of the components of work performance. However, the result of this study showed that task performance, CWB, and withdrawal behavior were not significantly associated with perceived organizational support in the hypothesized model.

As discussed above, a possible reason for the sole significance of the relationship between perceived organizational support and OCB is that individuals in a collectivistic and/or hierarchical cultural context, including the Korean culture, tend to engage in more OCBs (Wang et al., 2013) under the influence of Confucianism (Lee, 2012; Merkin, 2009; Horak, 2014). OCBs are aligned with several characteristics of Confucianism (Wang et al., 2013). Regarding the discrepancy between the extant literature and the result of the current study, the influence of other variables in the hypothesized model
might make the relationship between perceived organizational support and the three other components of work performance insignificant.

**Hypothesis 14: Perceived organizational support and cross-cultural adjustment**

Perceived organizational support was positively associated with all of the three sub-dimensions of CCA, which fully supported hypothesis 14 in this study. Perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary organization was also strongly correlated with general, interaction, and work CCA ($r = .78, .76, .76, p < .01$). This can be interpreted that expatriates who perceive that they are highly supported by their local organizations could adjust better to the new work environment, non-work environment, and the new ways of building networks or communicating with local people in the host country.

This result is aligned with the hypothesized result based on the reviewed literature (e.g., Kawai & Strange, 2014; Takeuchi et al., 2009). This result also supported the JD-R model. Bakker and Demerouti (2007) asserted that job resources may lead employees to be intrinsically and extrinsically motivated, which ultimately influence outcomes. According to the result of the current study, expatriates with a high level of perceived organizational support tend to adjust better to the new work-related and non-work-related environments and have better interactions with local people, which ultimately enhance their work performance. Therefore, the current study confirmed the relationships between perceived organizational support and the three sub-dimensions of CCA, which supported the JD-R model.
Hypothesis 15: Perceived organizational support and work engagement

Perceived organizational support was not significantly associated with work engagement. Therefore, Hypothesis 15 was not supported by the result of this study. However, perceived organizational support from a local subsidiary was significantly correlated with work engagement ($r=.82$, $p<.01$). This implies that the relationship between perceived supervisor support in work-related domains and work engagement became insignificant when other variables in the hypothesized model were controlled.

This result was unexpected and interesting because most extant studies in the literature of work engagement identified the relationship between perceived organizational support and work engagement in a domestic work environment (e.g., Ugwu & Ogwuche, 2013; Zacher & Winter, 2011). Hypothesis 15 was anticipated based on these extant studies in a domestic work environment. However, the result from this current study showed that perceived organizational support did not have a significant positive relationship with work engagement in the context of an expatriate assignment. Similarly, Gantasala and Padmakumar (2011) reported that perceived organizational support was not significantly correlated with work engagement.

One of the possible reasons for the insignificance of this specific relationship is the different context between the current study and the extant studies. Whereas most studies have examined the relationship in a domestic working environment, the current study focused on the context of an expatriate assignment. In addition, the relationship might be influenced by several other constructs of perceived support and CCA in this
hypothesized model, which possibly made the direct relationship between perceived organizational support and work engagement insignificant.

**Hypothesis 16: Perceived community support and work performance**

As one of the job resources at the societal level in non-work-related domains, perceived community support was not associated with work performance; therefore, hypothesis 16 was not supported. However, perceived community support was significantly correlated with task performance \( (r=0.77, p<0.01) \), OCB \( (r=0.76, p<0.01) \), CWB \( (r=-0.80, p<0.01) \), and withdrawal behavior \( (r=-0.76, p<0.01) \).

Existing studies have reported that perceived community support was associated with organizational commitment, work engagement, and job satisfaction (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Crawford et al., 2010; Nahrgan et al., 2011), which ultimately influence task performance (Caligiuri, 1997) and OCB (Williams & Anderson, 1991), CWB (Carpenter et al., 2014; Mount et al., 2006), and withdrawal behavior. In the current study, perceived community support was significantly correlated with all of the sub-dimensions of work performance. However, the results indicated that the four dimensions of work performance were not significantly associated with perceived community support in the hypothesized model.

One of the possible explanations is that the four dimensions of work performance are indirect outcomes of perceived community support. In the current study, OCB was an indirect outcome of perceived community support, mediated by work CCA and work engagement (see Table IV-10). Regarding the discrepancy between the extant literature and the result of the current study, the influence of other variables in the hypothesized...
model might make the relationship between perceived community support and the four sub-dimensions of work performance insignificant. Self-rating performance could be another possible reason for this unexpected result.

**Hypothesis 17: Perceived community support and cross-cultural adjustment**

Perceived community support was positively related to interaction CCA ($\beta=.21, p<.05$) and work CCA ($\beta=.16, p<.05$), but it was not associated with general CCA ($p>.05$). This can be interpreted that expatriates who perceived that they were highly supported by their community (e.g., religion, expatriation, and/or ethnicity) could adjust better to the new work environment and the new ways of building networks or communicating with local people in the host country. Therefore, Hypothesis 17 was partially supported by this study. However, perceived community support was significantly correlated with CCA ($r=.76, .75, .75, p<.01$).

The result partially supported the extant literature, and this result was unexpected. As stated in Chapter II, few studies shed light on the relationship between perceived community support and CCA, especially in the context of an expatriate assignment. Few but existing related studies have reported a significant relationship between perceived community support and CCA (e.g., Kang, 2011; Min & Kim, 2002; Zhou & Kim, 2006). Hypothesis 17 was anticipated based on these extant studies. However, the result of the current study showed that perceived community support was positively related to interaction and work CCA, but it was not associated with general CCA.

The significant relationship between perceived community support and interaction and work CCA supported the spillover theory (Caligiuri et al., 1998). In the
context of an expatriate assignment, domains of work and life are blurred. Therefore, if expatriates and their family members quickly adjust to the new environment through community support (e.g., ethnic, religious, expatriate group), expatriates may be able to adjust better to the new work environment and interactions with local people, which ultimately enhance work performance. In the current study, the relationship between perceived community support and OCB was mediated by work CCA and work engagement. Therefore, the result of the current study supported the argument of the spillover theory. Regarding the discrepancy between the extant literature and the result of the current study, the influence of other variables in the hypothesized model might make the relationship between perceived community support and general CCA insignificant.

**Hypothesis 18: Perceived community support and work engagement**

Perceived community support was not significantly associated with work engagement. Therefore, hypothesis 18 was not supported by the empirical data of this study. However, perceived community support was significantly correlated with work engagement ($r=.80$, $p<.01$).

This result was interesting because few studies have examined the relationship between perceived community support and work engagement in the context of an expatriate assignment. Hypothesis 15 was established based on the spillover theory and the JD-R model. However, the result from the current study indicated that perceived community support did not have a significant direct relationship with work engagement in the context of an expatriate assignment.
One of the possible interpretations for the result in the current study is that work engagement plays a mediator role in the relationship between perceived community support and work performance because the relationship between perceived community support and OCB was mediated by work CCA and work engagement (see Table IV-10).

**Hypothesis 19: Cross-cultural adjustment and work performance**

General CCA was negatively associated with CWB and withdrawal behavior, but it was not related to task performance and OCB. Interaction CCA was negatively associated with task performance and positively associated with OCB, but it was not related to CWB and withdrawal behavior. Work CCA was not statistically related to any of the four sub-dimensions of work performance. Therefore, hypothesis 19 was partially supported by the empirical data of this study. However, general CCA was significantly correlated with task performance, OCB, CWB, and withdrawal behavior ($r=.80, .76, -.80, -.78, p<.01$). Interaction CCA was also significantly correlated with task performance, OCB, CWB, and withdrawal behavior ($r=.70, .74, -.74, -.69, p<.01$). Work CCA was significantly correlated with task performance, OCB, CWB, and withdrawal behavior ($r=.78, .76, -.78, -.75, p<.01$).

This result partially supported the reviewed literature, and it was unexpected. Existing studies reported that CCA was directly or indirectly associated with work performance. However, the result of the current study partially supported the relationships. One of the possible reasons is that this study examined the three sub-dimensions of CCA whereas other extant studies examined the second order of CCA.
More importantly, since little research has examined the relationship between CCA and OCB and CWB, I examined the significant outcomes of CCA such as organizational commitment (Chen & Chiu, 2009; Lii & Wong, 2008), and job satisfaction (Froese & Peltokorpi, 2013; Pinto et al., 2012), which is related to OCB and CWB. In addition, CCA was positively associated with contextual performance (Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Wu & Ang, 2011), which is embedded in OCB. Therefore, rather than a direct relationship between CCA and OCB and CWB, an indirect relationship between CCA and work performance would be significant, mediated by the other outcomes, including organizational commitment and job satisfaction. In the current study, general and work CCAs were indirectly associated with task performance and OCB by work engagement (see Table IV-10).

The negative relationship between interaction CCA and task performance could be interpreted that expatriates’ adjustment to the local communication and interaction might be negatively associated with their short-term performance. For example, they might spend more time in building their local networks in both work-related and non-work-related domains, as a result, they might not be able to complete their planned tasks. For their long-term success, these interactions and local networks are necessary, but could be harmful for their short-term task performance. It is like when people invest they lose some resources in the short term, but earn more in the long term. The significant relationship between interaction CCA and OCB proved that interaction CCA was still necessary for expatriates to be successful.
Hypothesis 20: Cross-cultural adjustment and work engagement

Among the three sub-dimensions of CCA, general CCA and work CCA were positively associated with work engagement, which partially supported Hypothesis 20. However, all three dimensions of CCA were significantly correlated with work engagement ($r=.83, .74, .81, p<.01$).

This result was interesting because Hypothesis 20 was established based on the JD-R model. The result from the current study indicated that general and work CCA was positively associated with work engagement whereas the relationship between interaction CCA and work engagement was insignificant. Related to the result of the negative relationship between interaction CCA and task performance, the relationship between interaction CCA and work engagement becomes insignificant because adjustment to local communication and interaction might provide both positive and negative impacts on their work engagement. For example, when expatriates spend more time building their local networks in both work-related and non-work-related domains, they might not be able to concentrate on their work and be distracted from their work even though these networks might be helpful for their long-term goals. This could be a reason why interaction CCA was still positively related to OCB whereas the relationship between interaction CCA and task performance was negative.

Hypothesis 21: Work engagement and work performance

Work engagement was positively associated with task performance and OCB. However, since work engagement was not associated with CWB and withdrawal behavior, hypothesis 21 was partially supported. Work engagement was significantly
correlated with task performance, OCB, CWB, and withdrawal behavior \( (r=0.87, 0.84, -0.84, -0.81, p<0.01) \).

The result partially supported the reviewed literature, and it was unexpected. Existing studies revealed that work engagement is positively associated with task performance (Christian et al., 2011; Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010; Vogelgesang et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2015) and OCB (Saks, 2006; Shantz et al., 2013; Wickramasinghe & Perera, 2014), and negatively associated with CWB (Ariani, 2013; Shantz et al., 2013) and withdrawal behavior (Saks, 2006; Shuck et al., 2014). However, the result of the current study partially supported the relationships.

The significant relationship between work engagement and task performance and OCB can be explained by the JD-R model because internally or externally motivated employees produce positive outcomes (Demerouti et al., 2001). Furthermore, the insignificant relationships between work engagement and the negative sub-dimensions of work performance, including CWB and withdrawal behavior, were caused by the different environmental contexts between domestic and expatriate employees. For example, most extant studies on the relationship between work engagement and CWB and withdrawal behavior were in the domestic work environmental context. In addition, several studies have examined the relationship between work engagement and turnover/withdrawal intention, but not withdrawal behavior. Since the intention to quit and withdrawal behavior are two different constructs, the results from the extant literature and the current study could be different. More importantly, even though expatriates are motivated and engaged in their work, due to the typical high work load
and difficulties for them and their family members to adjust in various ways (i.e., job demands), they might or might not become engaged in CWB and withdrawal behavior, which made the relationship complicated and insignificant.

**Hypothesis 22 & 23: Mediating effects of cross-cultural adjustment and work engagement**

CCA and work engagement mediated several relationships between job resources and work performance (see Table IV-10). There were several relationships mediated by the two latent factors. General CCA and work engagement mediated the relationship between task performance and PsyCap and perceived supervisor support. The two mediating variables also had an indirect impact on the relationship between OCB and PsyCap and perceived supervisor support. The indirect effect of PsyCap on task performance through work CCA and work engagement was significant. Work CCA and work engagement also mediated the relationship between OCB and PsyCap and perceived community support.

As a single mediator, general CCA mediated the relationship between PsyCap and withdrawal behavior. Work engagement also mediated several relationships of task performance with (a) perceived subordinate support, (b) perceived family support, (c) general CCA, and (d) interaction CCA. Work engagement further mediated the relationships between OCB and (a) perceived subordinate support, (b) general CCA, and (c) work CCA. Therefore, hypotheses 22 and 23 were partially supported by the empirical data of this study.
One of the possible reasons for this partially validated relationship is the influence of other variables in the hypothesized model, which might mean there are several reasons for the mediating effects. For example, there was no relationship mediated by interaction CCA. As mentioned above, interaction CCA played various and interesting roles in this hypothesized model (e.g., negative impact on task performance, positive impact on OCB, and negative relationship with perceived subordinate support), which could make several relationships in this hypothesized model insignificant.

**Theoretical Implications**

The current study adapted the definition of HRD by McLean and McLean (2001), which expanded the scope of HRD to a more holistic and global level. Aligned with this broader definition of HRD, the results of this study provide several significant theoretical contributions to HRD.

First, Ghosh et al. (2014) called for studies on culture, cross-cultural, and globalization issues because they found through a trend analysis that only 10 percent of published studies in the four major HRD journals have focused on these areas. As one of the under-explored research areas in HRD, expatriation and its outcomes should be explored in greater depth. Furthermore, as globalization has flattened borders and boundaries, and the manner and environment in which businesses operate have drastically changed, organizations across the globe have attempted to transform themselves into translational or global organizations to leverage the unprecedented opportunities and avoid threats from the dynamic business environment. However, much of the HRD literature has remained in the domestic or local context, so the
literature does not meet the needs of multinational organizations. Based on this call and need, the current study aimed to examine the relationships between job resources and expatriate outcomes in the context of an expatriate assignment where cross-cultural interactions occur.

Second, this study has generated new insights and a deeper understanding of the relationships between job resources and expatriate outcomes in the context of an expatriate assignment. Little is known about several job resources at various levels in the context of an expatriate assignment, including PsyCap, perceived subordinate support, perceived family support, and perceived community support. The significant and insignificant relationships between these job resources and several components of expatriate outcomes found in the results of this current study could expand our current knowledge base. In particular, the direct and indirect effects of emotional support from expatriates’ family members and support from their community (e.g., religious, ethnic, and/or expatriate groups) in a non-work-related domain on CCA, work engagement, and/or work performance provided a more holistic picture of the relationships between job resources and expatriate outcomes, and has empirically supported the spillover theory (Caligiuri et al., 1998). Since this current study examined the impact of perceived support from the community as a whole, future research is encouraged to examine the relationship between different types of communities and expatriate outcomes.

More importantly, this study implemented a multi-dimensional instrument of work performance. Rather than measuring one or two specific measures of work performance, such as task and contextual or in-role and extra-role (e.g., Bhaskar-
Shrinivas et al., 2005; Kraimer & Wayne, 2004), this study employed a comprehensive and multi-dimensional model of work performance, including task performance, OCB, CWB, and withdrawal behavior (Carpenter et al., 2014). Although using self-rated performance could be problematic to accurately measure expatriates’ performance (Adler et al., 2016; Barron & Sackett, 2008; Heidemeier & Moser, 2009), measuring the four sub-constructs rather than one or two sub-constructs helps reduce the problematic effects. Furthermore, since the four components of work performance were included in this study, this study provided a clearer and broader picture of the relationships between job resources and work performance.

Fourth, the current study tested the applicability of the JD-R model in the expatriate context. The JD-R model has been widely used in single-country studies or cross-cultural comparative studies among several countries; however, it has been barely applied in the expatriate context. The results from this study have provided empirical support for the JD-R model in the expatriate context, indicating that job resources at various levels in both work-related and non-work-related domains play a role in buffering the influence of job demands on strain and motivate expatriates to adjust better to the new work-related and non-work-related environment and interactions with local people. This adjustment could ultimately enhance work performance of expatriates. In addition, the level of expatriates’ engagement in their work was not associated with negative organizational outcomes and one of the possible reasons could be that this study included only job resources rather than both job demands and resources. Thus, it would be interesting for future research to examine the relationship between expatriates’
specific job demands and negative organizational outcomes, including CWB and withdrawal behavior (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

Fifth, according to the COR theory, stress occurs when the loss of resources is greater than the gain of resources. In the case where expatriates have already lost their resources, they might want to acquire, maintain, and protect resources (Hobfoll, 1988, 1989). Expatriates experience a high level of stress when they are relocated to an unfamiliar culture and customs of a foreign country where they do not possess any social network. Therefore, a higher level of the perceived support at individual, interpersonal, organizational, and/or societal levels could have a noticeable impact on components of expatriate outcomes. In this vein, the current study examined holistically the impact of job resources at various levels in both work-related and non-work-related domains on expatriate outcomes, including the three sub-dimensions of CCA, work engagement, and the four sub-dimensions of work performance. This study identified the significant direct and indirect relationships among the relationships, which clearly supported the COR theory.

Next, the results of this study demonstrated the validity of Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory or the two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1959, 1966). According to the two-factor theory, the motivational factors involved in producing job satisfaction are distinct from the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction. That is, the opposite of the positive work behaviors or attitudes is not the negative work behaviors or attitudes; they are two different criteria. According to Herzberg (1987), there are two different needs of human beings: needs from humankind’s animal nature and needs from unique human
characteristic. The former is built in drive to avoid pain and all other biological needs that drive humans: hygiene factors. The latter is the ability to achieve and to experience growth: motivating factors. In this study, general CCA, which could be considered hygiene factors for expatriates, was solely associated with CWB and withdrawal behavior; it was not related to task performance and OCB. On the other hand, work engagement, which could be considered motivating factor, was positively associated with task performance and OCB. Therefore, the findings of this study could support Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory or the two-factor theory.

Finally, the results of this study indicated that individuals in a collectivistic or hierarchical cultural context are likely to engage in more OCB, which has been reported by Wang et al. (2013). In this study, OCB was one of the four work performance components that was directly or indirectly associated with a majority of job resources in the hypothesized model: direct relationship with perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, and perceived organizational support; and indirect relationship with PsyCap, perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, and perceived community support. Individuals in the Korean culture, influenced by Confucianism (Lee, 2012; Merkin, 2009; Horak, 2014), value authoritarianism, harmony, and stability, which are mostly aligned with OCBs (Wang et al., 2013). Hence, a comparison study of the relationships among samples from various cultural contexts would be meaningful.

**Practical Implications**

The results from the current study offer several important practical insights for multiple stakeholders. First, the results indicated that MNCs need to consider
holistically job resources at various levels and their influence on expatriate outcomes. Such knowledge enables MNCs to make informed decisions about how to prioritize job resources in work-related and non-work-related domains and use these resources more strategically to improve expatriate outcomes. Specifically, the results of this study have generated new insights and a better understanding of the relationships between job resources in the non-work-related domains and expatriate outcomes in the context of an expatriate assignment. With such enhanced knowledge of the relationships, Korean MNCs will be in a better position to leverage opportunities and challenges in the global environment by using the results to reduce job demands and enhance job resources for their expatriates across the world. HR professionals can play a critical role in developing customized compensation and benefit packages and deciding specific job resources at various levels for expatriates, which helps expatriates adjust better, to be more engaged in their work, and to ultimately have a higher level of work performance.

Second, the results from this study indicated that PsyCap could be used as an alternative criterion for selecting the appropriate candidates and preparing them for expatriate assignments. MNCs may consider adding PsyCap as one of the primary job resources for expatriate candidates since the results of the current study indicated that PsyCap was significantly associated with the three sub-dimensions of CCA, which were ultimately related to work engagement and work performance in this study. In addition, PsyCap, including self-efficacy, hope, resilience, and optimism, can be included in an assessment tool for evaluating expatriates and anticipating their possible future adjustment and work performance. Furthermore, HRD practitioners can use the study
findings to design targeted interventions to enhance expatriates’ PsyCap, which would ultimately enhance their expatriate outcomes.

Third, MNCs should adjust their criteria for expatriates’ outcomes. As indicated by the result of this study, interaction CCA may be negatively associated with task performance, which primarily focuses on short term gains. However, interaction CCA is required for expatriates to achieve long term success and outcomes in local subsidiary organizations. Therefore, HR professionals should diversify criteria for expatriates’ performance appraisal and provide resources for expatriates’ boundary spanning, which ultimately leads to a positive outcome.

Next, global HR practitioners and MNCs must consider several ways to reduce the job demands that expatriates generally have for their expatriate assignments. As the COR theory indicates, stress occurs when the loss of resources is greater than the gain of resources. Expatriates generally experience a high level of stress when they are sent to an unfamiliar culture with new customs in a foreign country where they do not have any social network. Based on the JD-R model, when feeling supported expatriates are likely to adjust better, be more engaged in their work, and ultimately produce more positive organizational outcomes. More importantly, both CCA and work engagement must be focused as mediators and/or outcomes of the job resources and job demands. Since CCA tends to be more related to negative work behaviors or attitudes and work engagement is more likely to be related to positive work behaviors or attitudes in this study, HR practitioners and MNCs need to consider both factors to enhance the subcomponents of work performance. Therefore, from a holistic perspective, global HR practitioners
should identify possible job demands and provide job resources at various levels in both work-related and non-work-related domains, which could influence both hygiene and motivational factors.

The results of the current study also indicate that relationships between certain types of perceived support and expatriate outcomes could be influenced by the Korean culture. Thus, gaining insights into Confucianism, the foundation of the Korean culture (Kim & Park, 2003; Lee, 2012; Merkin, 2009), might help global HRD practitioners customize their criteria for recruitment and assessment, as well as their strategies for developing expatriates. For MNCs, this could lead to greater success in retaining and motivating their expatriates. For example, while collectivism and strong relationship are critical in the Korean culture, perceived community support play a significant role for expatriates to adjust to their host countries. HRD professionals could assist expatriates to build new social networks in host countries using advanced technology or their own social network system (e.g., Facebook, LinkedIn, or Tweeter).

Finally, this study provides expatriates with an opportunity to critically reflect on their own performance and identify job resources key to their success. By understanding the results of this study and the interactions between specific job resources and expatriate outcomes, Korean expatriates in Korean MNCs may request and obtain these job resources at various levels to become more successful in their expatriate assignments.

Limitations, Recommendations, and Future Studies

There are several limitations in this study and suggestions for future research. First, the collected data for this study are based on the results of a self-reported
perception-based survey. Thus, the possibility of response bias and CMV should be considered when the results are interpreted. Although several procedural remedies were incorporated to prevent or reduce bias, two opposite results regarding the influence of CMV on the data were identified by Harman’s single factor test and a single unmeasured latent method factor approach. Therefore, the collected data may not be completely free from CMV. Therefore, alternative approaches to overcome this possible problem (e.g., performance rated by supervisors, peers, and/or subordinates) may be employed for future research, particularly in measuring the outcome variable. In addition, a cross-rating survey (e.g., supervisors, peers, subordinates) or repeated measuring in a longitudinal study could also be considered to enhance the level of reliability.

The literature of work performance has presented various arguments about the leniency of self-rated performance appraisals. Most of the previous studies were conducted mostly in Western context and supported the leniency of performance appraisals by self-rating (Cho & Payne, 2016; Heidemeier & Moser, 2009). Others highlighted the importance of the cultural context. For example, self-raters in Confucian cultural contexts tended to rate their own performance lower than did their supervisors, colleagues, and subordinates (e.g., Barron & Sackett, 2008; Farh et al., 1991). Therefore, future studies need to investigate the cultural influence on the discrepancies in employees’ self-perception.

Third, this study showed a negative relationship between interaction CCA and task performance. The result could be interpreted that when expatriates’ adjustment to the local communication and interaction might be negatively associated with their short-
term performance and positively related to their long-term performance. Therefore, it is necessary to collect objective outcome data and further examine such relationship. More importantly, qualitative data would be valuable in illuminating the reasons for the unexpected and inconsistent relationship between interaction CCA and task performance.

Fourth, several under-explored job resources and job demands for expatriates in both work-related and non-work-related domains must be further examined based on the COR theory and the JD-R model. As noted earlier, expatriates experience a high level of stress when dealing with unfamiliar cultures and customs in foreign countries where they do not have any social network. From a holistic perspective, it is necessary to further investigate and identify possible job demands and job resources, which may help expatriates cross-culturally adjust better, be more engaged in their work, and ultimately produce more positive organizational outcomes and less negative organizational outcomes. In particular, researchers are encouraged to explore the influence of different types of communities for expatriates (e.g., religious, ethnic, and/or expatriate groups) on their outcomes since this study looked at the community as a whole.

Fifth, this study aimed to holistically examine the relationship between job resources at various levels for expatriates and their outcomes. Although the hypothesized model was supported by the collected data and most of the hypotheses were either fully or partially supported, it is necessary to test the applicability of this model in various contexts since the data for this study was collected only from Korean expatriates. Future studies may need to examine expatriates from other countries. The measurement invariance of the hypothesized model between Korean expatriates and
other national expatriates must be compared cross-culturally. Furthermore, it would be very interesting to collect data from Korean expatriates in public and/or non-profit organizations and to compare the difference between the groups, using multi-group SEM.

Sixth, this study adopted a cross-sectional design to allow the researcher to observe a natural phenomenon without direct interventions (Field, 2013). The limitation of this research design is a lack of observing continuative phenomena. Since the data were collected from expatriates at a specific time point, the data cannot be fully generalized. Therefore, longitudinal studies would verify the conclusions of this study.

Next, the collected data were analyzed without controlling for demographic variables since the current study aimed to examine the overall relationships between job resources and expatriate outcomes in the hypothesized model. The relationships may be different when certain demographic variables are controlled for, such as the host country, length of expatriation, and completion of cross-cultural training. Future studies may include control of possibly influential demographic variables at the design stage.

Regarding gender, the number of male participants outnumbered female participants (97.7% vs. 2.3%). From the literature review of this study, I identified that most expatriation studies also had outnumbered male participants. Therefore, future studies in this area may need to balance the ratio of demographic characteristics.

Finally, the hierarchical linear model approach could be employed to capture the differences in the relationships among the variables depending on the national and/or cultural context after several data sets are accumulated. This effort would shed light on future cross-cultural studies, which, in turn, could benefit to MNCs in various countries.
Summary

This chapter reviewed and summarized the current study. In addition, the results of this study were discussed in relation to the research hypotheses and the existing literature. The implications for HRD theory and practice were then discussed, followed by the limitations and recommendations for future research.
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6. Consent Forms: When using a consent form or information sheet, the IRB stamped approved version must be used. Please log into IRIS to download the stamped approved version of the consenting instruments. If you are unable to locate the stamped version in IRIS, please contact the IRIS Support Team at 979.845.4969 or the IRB liaison assigned to your area.
7. Post Approval Monitoring: Expedited and full board studies may be subject to post approval monitoring. During the life of the study, please review and document study progress using the PI self-assessment found on the RCB website as a method of preparation for the potential review. Investigators are responsible for maintaining complete and accurate study records and making them available for post approval monitoring. Investigators are encouraged to request a pre-initiation site visit with the Post Approval Monitor. These visits are designed to help ensure that all necessary documents are approved and in order prior to initiating the study and to help investigators maintain compliance.
8. Recruitment: All approved recruitment materials will be stamped electronically by the HSPP staff and available for download from IRIS. These IRB-stamped approved documents from IRIS must be used for recruitment. For materials that are distributed to potential participants electronically and for which you can only feasibly use the approved text rather than the stamped document, the study’s IRB Study Number, approval date, and expiration dates must be included in the following format: TAMU IR#20XX-XXXX. Approved: 20XX/X/XX XX. Expiration Date: XX/XX/XX00.
9. FERPA and PPRA: Investigators conducting research with students must have appropriate approvals from the FERPA administrator at the institution where the research will be conducted in accordance with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment (PPRA) protects the rights of parents in students ensuring that written parental consent is required for participation in surveys, analysis, or evaluation that ask questions falling into categories of protected information.

This electronic document provides notification of the review results by the Institutional Review Board.
APPENDIX B

ORGANIZATION CONSENT FORM

Re: Research Participation Request

I am a doctoral student majoring in Human Resource Development at Texas A&M University. With Professor Jia Wang, my dissertation director, I am working on my dissertation focusing on the relationships between various job resources in work-related and non-work-related domains and work performance. The outcomes of the study will help your organization better understand how to assist expatriates in successfully working in their new environments. Study results will not only contribute to the literature, but also provide feedback and recommendations to your organizations and expatriates.

To conduct this study, I would like to survey expatriates in your organization. Could you please allow me to contact expatriates in your organization to ask for their participation in this study? If you approve this request, I will ask the expatriates to complete a survey questionnaire. Completing the survey should take about 30 minutes. Since their time and effort are very valuable, if they complete the survey and return their survey to us, they in a raffle are entered to win one of 12 gifts I provide (including two iPad Air, two iPad mini, eight $100 Amazon gift cards).

I would truly appreciate your help. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact me by phone 1-979-446-2670 or by email at daeseokchai@gmail.com

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Dae Seok Chai
APPENDIX C

RECRUITMENT LETTER

You are invited to participate in a research project investigating—the relationship between various job resources and expatriate effectiveness. This study will be conducted by Dae Seok Chai for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements for his doctoral program at Texas A&M University. This study is supervised by Dr. Jia Wang at Texas A&M University. Results of this study will contribute to advancing the knowledge and practice of cross-cultural adjustment intervention for expatriates.

This study aims to examine the relationships between job resources at various levels, including (a) an individual level—positive psychological capital; (b) an interpersonal level—perceived supervisor support, perceived subordinate support, and perceived family support; (c) an organizational level—perceived organizational support and cross-cultural training; (d) a societal level—perceived community support, and work performance, as an outcome in the context of an expatriate assignment. The mediating effects of work engagement and cross-cultural adjustment on the relationships are also examined.

The results of the research may be used for a dissertation paper, educational presentation or journal article. All information you provide will be strictly confidential in accordance with the protocol of Texas A&M University Board of Ethics. The records of this study will be kept private. No identifiers linking you to this study will be included in any sort of report that might be published. Research records will be stored securely and only the Principal Investigator, Protocol Director, and IRB Protocol will have access to the records. Furthermore, your responses will only be presented in aggregate, and no single individual’s results will be highlighted.

Your participation is voluntary, and you are free to withdraw at any time. You are free to refuse to answer any questions. There are no risks or discomforts expected as a result of your participation. Participation involves completing survey questions for approximately 30 minutes.

If you agree to participate in the survey, please then precede with the survey. If you complete the survey and return your survey to us, you in a raffle are entered to win one of 12 gifts I provide (including two iPad Air, two iPad mini, eight $100 Amazon gift cards).

I am happy to answer any questions about the survey. Please write or call me at 979-446-2670 or daeseokchai@gmail.com. Feel free to also email my academic advisor Dr. Jia Wang at jiawang@tamu.edu.
If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Texas A&M University Human Subjects Protection Program office at (979) 458-4067 or irb@tamu.edu.

We would truly appreciate your time and consideration in participating in this study.
Sincerely yours,

Dae Seok Chai

PRINTED NAME: ___________________ Your Signature ____________________
APPENDIX D
QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Expatriate:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project exploring the relationship between job resources and expatriate effectiveness. Your knowledge and insight are extremely important to the success of this project.

The survey will focus on questions pertaining to your thoughts about cross-cultural adjustment in the local foreign country. Enclosed is a Consent Form that I request you read thoroughly, sign, and date. This signed consent form is required by Texas A&M University. I will pick it up at the time of our meeting, or you can send it to me by email attachment. I would also be happy to provide you with a copy of this form for your records, if requested.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (979) 446-2670 or at daeseokchai@gmail.com or daeseokchai@tamu.edu. Thank you again for agreeing to participate in this project.

Sincerely,

Dae Seok Chai, Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development
Texas A&M University

Instructions

1. The estimated time for this survey is about 30 minutes.
2. Since your time and effort are valuable for this study, you in a raffle are entered to win one of 12 gifts I provide (including two iPad Air, two iPad mini, eight $100 Amazon gift cards) when you fully complete this survey.
3. Your participation in this study is confidential.
4. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement by marking one number on the scale (1-7) with 1 being “strongly disagree” and 7 being “strongly agree.”
5. Please be as open and candid as possible with your answers, since the information you provide will help us continue to improve future expatriation experiences.

**Demographic information**

Gender

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

Age

- ☐ 25-30
- ☐ 30-35
- ☐ 35-40
- ☐ 40-45
- ☐ 45-50
- ☐ 50-60

Please specify your ethnic and cultural background. (The U.S. only)

- ☐ African American
- ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander
- ☐ White/Caucasian
- ☐ Hispanic
- ☐ Native American
- ☐ Other (___________)

Family Status

- ☐ Single
- ☐ Married
- ☐ Married with Children
- ☐ With Children

If you are married, are your family members with you?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Your level of education

- ☐ High school or qualification for high school graduation
- ☐ Bachelor’s degree
- ☐ Master’s degree
- ☐ Ph.D. degree

Your position in the current organization

- ☐ Employee Assistant
Manager Deputy
Manager
Senior Manager
Executive
Other (describe it)____________

Type of business of your organization

Food and food services
Electronics
Financials
Information technology
Other (describe it) _______________________

Years of service in the current organization (including in Korea)

Less than 1 year
1-5 years
6-10 years
Over 10 years

How long have you been expatriated in the current local organization?

(__________ years ___________ months)

Do you have previous experience in a foreign assignment

Yes
No

If the answer is yes, in which countries did you work and for how long? Please write below (i.e., England, 1 year). You may write as many countries and years as necessary.

(Country) _______________ (Length) ________ years _________ months

(Country) _______________ (Length) ________ years _________ months

(Country) _______________ (Length) ________ years _________ months

(Country) ___________ ______ (Length) ________ years _________ months
Indicate your level of English language proficiency.

- Need help from translators
- Daily life conversation
- Business conversation
- Native speaking skill

Indicate your level of local language proficiency.

- Need help from translators
- Daily life conversation
- Business conversation
- Native speaking skill

Cross-cultural training

1. Have you participated in cross-cultural training (CCT) provided from your organization?
   - Yes
   - No

2. If yes, was the CCT provided before your departure or after your arrival in a host country?
   - Before departure
   - After arrival

3. How effective was the CCT? (If no training was provided, please mark zero.

   N/A Very Ineffective Ineffective Slightly Ineffective Neutral Slightly Effective Effective Strongly Effective

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Cross-cultural adjustment

(Black, 1988; Black & Stephens, 1989)

Please indicate how you perceive your adjustment from 1 (very unadjusted) to 7 (very adjusted).
1. Living conditions in general
2. Housing conditions
3. Food
4. Shopping
5. Cost of living
6. Entertainment/recreation facilities and opportunities
7. Health care facilities
8. Socializing with host nationals
9. Interacting with host nationals on a day-to-day basis
10. Interacting with host nationals outside of work
11. Speaking with host nationals
12. Specific job responsibilities
13. Performance standards and expectations
14. Supervisory responsibilities

Use the scale below to indicate how much you believe that each statement accurately describes your current status.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Neutral Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Positive psychological capital
(Luthans et al., 2005, 2007; Norman, 2006)

1. I feel confident in representing my work area in meetings with management.
2. I feel confident contributing to discussions about the company’s strategy.
3 I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues.
4 If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it.
5 Right now I see myself as being pretty successful at work.
6 I can think of many ways to reach my current work goals.
7 At this time, I am meeting the work goals that I have set for myself.
8 I can be “on my own,” so to speak, at work if I have to.
9 I usually take stressful things at work in stride.
10 I can get through difficult times at work because I’ve experienced difficulty before.
11 I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job.
12 I’m optimistic about what will happen to me in the future as it pertains to work.

**Perceived supervisor support**
(Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades et al., 2001)
1. My supervisor cares about my opinions.
2. My work supervisor really cares about my well-being.
3. My supervisor strongly considers my goals and values.
4. My supervisor shows very little concern for me. (R)

**Perceived subordinate support**
(Hammer, Saksvik, Nytro, Torvatn, & Bayazit, 2004)
1. I receive help and support from my subordinates.
2. I feel I am accepted in my work group.
3. My subordinates understand if I have a bad day.
4. My subordinates back me up when I need it.
5. I feel comfortable with my subordinates.”

**Perceived family support**
(King et al., 1995; Nasurdirn & O’Driscoll, 2012)
1. Members of my family are interested in my job.
2. When I'm frustrated by my work, someone in my family tries to understand.
3. When I have a problem at work, members of my family express concern.
4. My family members are sympathetic when I'm upset about my work.
5. My family members do their fair share of household chores.
6. My family leaves too much of the daily details of running the house to me. (R)
7. Members of my family help me with routine household tasks.
8. Too much of my time at home is spent picking up after my family members. (R)

**Perceived organizational support**
1. (Kramer & Wayne, 2004; Kawai & Strange, 2014)
2. (Company) takes an interest in my career.
3. (Company) considers my goals when making decisions about my career.
4. (Company) keeps me informed about career opportunities available within the company.
5. I feel that (Company) cares about my career development.
6. The financial incentives and allowances provided to me by (Company) are good.
7. I have received generous financial support from (Company).
8. I cannot complain about the financial benefits associated with my expatriate assignment.
9. (Company) has provided my family with enough assistance to help them adjust to the foreign country.
10. (Company) has provided me with many opportunities to ease the transition to the foreign country.

**Perceived community support**
(Herrero & Gracia, 2007; Ng et al., 2014)
1. I would be able to cheer up and get into a better mood.
2. I would find a source of satisfaction for myself.
3. I would find someone to listen to me when I feel down.
4. I could find people that would help me feel better.
5. I would relax and easily forget my problems.
6. I take in activities in my community.
7. I collaborate in organizations and associations in my community.
8. I take part in some social or civic groups in my community.
9. I identify with my community.
10. I feel like my community is my own.

**Work engagement**  
(Schaufeli et al., 2006)
1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
3. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.
4. I am enthusiastic about my job.
5. My job inspires me.
6. I am proud of the work that I do.
7. I feel happy when I am working intensely.
8. I am immersed in my work.
9. I get carried away when I am working.

**Work performance**  
(Carpenter et al., 2014)
“I…”
1. Adequately complete assigned duties.
2. Fulfill responsibilities specified in job description.
3. Perform tasks that are expected of me.
4. Meet formal performance requirements of the job.
5. Engage in activities that will directly affect my performance evaluation.
6. Help others who have been absent.
7. Help others who have heavy workloads.
8. Assist (my) supervisor with his or her work (when not asked).
9. Take time to listen to coworkers’ problems and worries.
10. Go out of (my) way to help new employees.
11. Take a personal interest in other employees.
12. Pass along information to co-workers.
13. Give advance notice if unable to come to work.
14. Conserve and protects organizational property.
15. Adhere to informal rules devised to maintain order.
16. Attendance at work is above the norm.
17. Make fun of someone at work.
18. Say something hurtful to someone at work.
19. Make an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work.
20. Curse at someone at work.
21. Play a mean prank on someone at work.
22. Act rudely toward someone at work.
23. Publicly embarrass someone at work.
24. Take property from work without permission.
25. Falsify a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than I spent on business expenses.
26. Litter my work environment.
27. Neglect to follow my supervisor's instructions.
28. Discuss confidential company information with an unauthorized person.
29. Use an illegal drug or consume alcohol on the job.
30. Complain about insignificant things at work.
31. Fail to perform essential duties.
32. Do poor quality work.
33. Use equipment for personal purposes without permission.
34. Am late for work or scheduled work assignments.
35. Am absent from work when I was supposed to be there.
36. Fail to attend scheduled meetings.
37. Let others do my work.
38. Take frequent or long coffee or lunch breaks.
39. Make excuses to go somewhere to get out of work.
40. Am absent when I am not actually sick.
41. Neglect aspects of the job I am obligated to perform.
42. Spend too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working.
43. Take an additional or longer break than is acceptable at the workplace.
44. Come in late to work without permission.
45. Intentionally work slower than I could have worked.
46. Put little effort into my work.
47. Drag out work in order to get overtime.
48. Take undeserved breaks.
49. Spend great deal of time with personal phone conversations.
설문지 (Korean version)

설문 응답 시 다음사항에 유념해 주십시오.

1. 이 설문은 대략 25 분 정도 소요됩니다.
2. 답변하신 내용은 어느 누구와도 공유되지 않습니다.
3. 설문질문을 읽어보신 후, 이에 어느 정도 동의하는지 표시해 주십시오.
   (1 번 (전혀 동의하지 않음) 부터 7 번 (매우 동의함)사이에 선택하시면 됩니다)
4. 설문에 끝까지 응해 주시는 분들은 아래와 같은 상품에 당첨될 수 있는 기회를 드립니다.
   1등: iPad Air2 (16GB)- WiFi 전용 (600,000 원 상당)
   2등: iPad mini3 (16GB)- WiFi 전용 (480,000 원 상당)
   3등: Amazon 또는 스타벅스 상품권 (100,000 원 상당)
5. 이 연구의 결과는 현재 그리고 후배 주재원 분들이 성공적으로 업무에 임할 수 있도록 어떻게 지원을 할 수 있는지를 더 깊이 이해하는 데 도움이 될 것입니다.

일반적인 문항

성별
○ 남 ○ 여

나이
○ 25이하 ○ 26-30 ○ 31-35 ○ 36-40 ○ 41-45 ○ 46-50 ○ 51-55 ○ 56이상

가족 사항
○ 미혼 ○ 기혼
○ 기혼이며 자녀가 있음 ○ 배우자 없이 자녀가 있음
기혼자이시라면, 가족과 함께 살고 계십니까?
○ 네 ○ 아니오

귀하의 학력
○ 고등학교 졸업 또는 이에 상응하는 학력 ○ 학사 ○ 석사 ○ 박사
현 조직에서 귀하의 직위
- 사원 (staff)
- 대리 (assistant manager)
- 과장 (manager)
- 부장/차장 (senior manager / director)
- 임원 (executive level)
- 기타 ____________

귀사의 업종
- 식품/식품서비스
- 전자
- 금융
- IT
- ‘기타’는 괄호 안에 적어 주십시오. ________________

현재 주재하고 있는 지사의 형태
- 현지법인 (Local or domestic corporation)- 법적으로 본사와 분리
- 해외법인 (Foreign corporation)- 법적으로 본사와 연계되어 있음
- 연락 사무소 (Liaison office)
- 기타 ________________

현조직에서의 근무연수 (한국 포함)
- 1년 미만
- 1-5 년
- 6-10 년
- 10 년 이상

현재 주재 업무를 하고 있는 지역과 회사명, 및 연수와 달을 기재하여 주십시오.
(주재국가: ____________ 회사명: ____________ 기간: _____ 년 _____ 개월)
보기: ( 브라질 일류전자 3년 5개월)

이전에 해외 주재 경험이 있으십니까?
- 있다
- 없다
이전 해외 주재 경험이 있으시다면 주재하신 모든 지역과 기간을 기재해 주십시오.
(예. 영국, 1년; 프랑스, 2년)
(국가명) _______________ (기간) _______년 ________개월
(국가명) _______________ (기간) _______년 ________개월
(국가명) _______________ (기간) _______년 ________개월
(국가명) _______________ (기간) _______년 ________개월

귀하의 영어소통 정도를 표시해 주십시오.
- 통역의 도움이 필요함
- 일상생활 대화 가능
- 비즈니스 대화 가능
- 미국인 정도의 실력

귀하의 주재국가 언어소통 정도를 표시해 주십시오.
- 통역의 도움이 필요함
- 일상생활 대화 가능
- 비즈니스 대화 가능
- 현체인 정도의 실력

이문화 교육

4. 주재원 대상 이문화 교육을 이수하셨습니까? 또는 그에 상응하는 교육을 받으셨습니까?
   ○ 네          ○ 아니오

5. 만약 이수하셨다면, 이문화 교육을 이수하신 것은 주재국가로 출국하기 전이었습니까 아니면 도착 후였습니까?
   ○ 주재국가로 출국 전   ○ 주재국가 도착 후

6. 이수하신 이문화교육은 얼마나 효과적이었나고 생각하십니까?
   (교육을 받지 못하셨다면 "0(영)"에 체크해 주십시오.)
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>해당사항</th>
<th>매우 비효과적</th>
<th>비효과적</th>
<th>중간 비효과적</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>조금 효과적</th>
<th>조금 비효과적</th>
<th>효과적</th>
<th>매우 효과적</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>없음</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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귀하의 적응 정도를 표시해 주십시오 (적응하기 매우 힘들다 = 1, 적응하기 매우 쉽다 = 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>적응하기</th>
<th>적응하기</th>
<th>적응하기</th>
<th>보통</th>
<th>적응하기</th>
<th>적응하기</th>
<th>적응하기</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>매우 힘들</td>
<td>힘들</td>
<td>조금 힘들</td>
<td>조금 쉬움</td>
<td>쉬움</td>
<td>매우 쉬움</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

현재 거주하는 지역의 전반적인 생활 환경
주거 환경
음식
쇼핑
생활비용
여행/레저 시설 및 기회
의료시설
현지인들과의 친목 활동
일상 생활에서 현지인들과 교류 활동
직장 밖의 현지인들과의 어울림
현지인들과의 대화
거주 국가내 직책에서 구체적인 업무 책임
거주 국가내 직책에서 회사의 성과 기준과 기대치
거주 국가내 직책에서 직원 감독 의무

다음 항목에 대하여 귀하가 얼마나 동의하시는지 표시해 주십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>전혀</th>
<th>그렇지 않다</th>
<th>조금</th>
<th>그렇게 하지 않다</th>
<th>그렇게 하지 않다</th>
<th>그렇게 하지 않다</th>
<th>그렇게 하지 않다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

긍정적 심리 자본 (Luthans et al., 2005,2007; Norman, 2006)

1. 나는 경영진과의 회의에서 자신 있게 내 업무 영역에 대해 이야기 할 수 있다.
2. 우리 회사의 전략에 관해 논의할 때 공헌할 수 있다고 자신한다.
3. 나는 동료들에게 내가 가진 정보를 자신 있게 제공할 수 있다.
4. 나는 직장에서 난관에 부딪쳤을 때 그것을 벗어날 수 있는 많은 방법을 생각해 낼 수 있다.
5. 나는 현재 직장에서 편 성공적이라고 스스로 평가한다.
6. 나는 나의 업무목표를 달성하기 위해 많은 방법들을 생각해 낼 수 있다.
7. 나는 나는 나 자신이 스스로 설정한 업무목표를 달성해 가고 있다.
8. 필요할 경우, 나는 타인의 도움이나 자기 없이 업무를 수행할 수 있다.
9. 나는 보통 직장에서 받는 스트레스를 당연하다고 받아들이지만.
10. 나는 과거에도 어려움을 경험했기 때문에 직장에서 부딪히는 힘든 일들을 잘 극복할 수 있다.
11. 나는 업무에 관하여 향상 받은 면을 보려고 한다.
12. 나는 현 직장에서 앞으로 내게 일어날 일에 대하여 낙관적이다.

인지된 상사 지원 (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades et al., 2001)
1. 나의 상사/리더는 나의 의견에 관심을 갖는다.
2. 나의 상사/리더는 나의 웰빙에 관심을 갖는다.
3. 나의 상사/리더는 나의 목표와 가치를 상당히 고려해 준다.
4. 나의 상사/리더는 나에 대해 별로 관심을 보이지 않는다. (R)

인지된 부하 지원 (Hammer, Saksvik, Nytro, Torvatn, & Bayazit, 2004)
1. 나는 나의 부하직원으로부터 도움과 지원을 받는다.
2. 나는 팀 안에서 받아들이고 있다고 생각한다.
3. 나의 부하직원은 내가 일진이 좋지 않을 때 나를 이해해 준다.
4. 나의 부하직원은 내가 필요할 때 나를 지원해 준다.
5. 나는 나의 부하직원을 편하게 느낀다.

인지된 가족 지원 (King et al., 1995; Nasurdin & O’Driscoll, 2012)
9. 나의 가족 구성원은 나의 직업/업무에 관심을 갖고 있다.
10. 업무 때문에 힘들어할 때 가족 구성원 중 누군가는 그것을 이해해주려 한다.
11. 직장에서 문제가 생겼을 때, 가족 구성원들은 함께 걱정해 준다.
12. 직장에서 생긴 일 때문에 졸고있어할 때 가족 구성원들이 공감해 준다.
13. 나의 가족 구성원들은 집안 일을 공평하게 나눠서 한다.
14. 나의 가족 구성원들은 집안 일의 많은 부분을 나에게 넘긴다. (R)
15. 나의 가족 구성원들은 집안 일을 도와준다.
16. 집에 머무는 동안 상당히 많은 시간을 나의 가족 구성원들의 뒤틀리를 하는데 보낸다. (R)

인지된 조직 지원 (Kramer & Wayne, 2004; Kawai & Strange, 2014) – 본사

아래 9 가지 문항은 여러분이 속한 회사의 한국 본사와 관련된 내용입니다.

1. (본사에서) 나의 경력에 관심을 가지고 있다.
2. (본사에서는) 내 경력에 대한 의사결정을 할 때 나의 목표를 고려해준다.
3. (본사에서는) 회사 내에 가능한 경력개발 기회를 나에게 알려준다.
4. 나는 (본사가) 나의 경력개발에 관심을 가지고 있다고 느낀다.
5. (본사로부터) 나에게 제공되는 금전적 인센티브와 지원은 좋은편이다.
6. 나는 (본사로부터) 관대한 금전적 지원을 받고있다.
7. 나는 주재업무와 관련하여 받는 금전적 혜택에 대해 불만이 없다.
8. (본사) 나의 가족들이 타국에서 정착할 수 있도록 충분한 도움을 주었다.
9. (본사에서는) 내가 타국에서 잘 정착할 수 있도록 많은 기회들을 제공해 주었다.

인지된 조직 지원 (Kramer & Wayne, 2004; Kawai & Strange, 2014) – 현지 지사

아래 9 가지 문항은 여러분이 일하고 계신 현지 지사와 관련된 내용입니다.

1. (현지 지사는) 나의 경력에 관심을 가지고 있다.
2. (현지 지사에서는) 내 경력에 대한 의사결정을 할 때 나의 목표를 고려해준다.
3. (현지 지사에서는) 회사 내에 가능한 경력개발 기회를 나에게 알려준다.
4. 나는 (현지 지사가) 내의 경력개발에 관심을 가지고 있다고 느낀다.
5. (현지 지사로부터) 나에게 제공되는 금전적 인센티브와 지원은 좋은편이다.
6. 나는 (현지 지사로부터) 관대한 금전적 지원을 받고있다.
7. 나는 주재업무와 관련하여 받는 금전적 혜택에 대해 불만이 없다.
8. (현지 지사는) 나의 가족들이 타국에서 정착할 수 있도록 충분한 도움을 주었다.
9. (현지 지사에서는) 내가 타국에서 잘 정착할 수 있도록 많은 기회들을 제공해 주었다.

인지된 커뮤니티 지원 (Herrero & Gracia, 2007; Ng et al., 2014)

아래 10 가지 문항은 현지에서 여러분이 속한 커뮤니티/공동체 (예. 종교모임, 주재원모임, 한인모임 등)와 관련된 내용입니다.
11. 나는 나의 커뮤니티와 나를 동일시한다.
12. 나의 커뮤니티가 내 것이라고 느낀다.
13. 나의 커뮤니티 활동에 참여한다.
14. 나의 커뮤니티 내 조직과 소모임에 협력한다.
15. 나의 커뮤니티 내 모임에 참여한다.
16. 커뮤니티에서 나는 힘이나고 기분이 더욱 좋아진다.
17. 커뮤니티에서 나는 나 자신을 위한 만족감을 느낀다.
18. 기분이 좋지 않을 때 커뮤니티에서 나는 내 이야기를 들어 줄 사람을 찾을 수 있다.
19. 커뮤니티에서 나는 내 개인적인 문제를 쉽게 잊고 휴식을 취한다.
20. 커뮤니티에서 나는 내 기분을 좋게 만들어 줄 사람을 찾을 수 있다.

업무 몰입도 (Schaufeli et al., 2006)

10. 나는 일할 때 의욕이 넘친다
11. 나는 내 일에 대해 활력을 느낀다
12. 매일 아침 일하러 가고 싶다
13. 나는 내 업무에 대해 열정적이다
14. 나의 업무는 나를 고무시킨다
15. 나는 내가 하고 있는 일에 대해 자부심을 느낀다
16. 나는 일에 몰두할 때 행복감을 느낀다
17. 나는 내 업무에 집중한다
18. 나는 일할 때 몸시 열정적이 된다

업무 성과 (Carpenter et al., 2014)

과제 성과

나는...
1. 할당된 업무를 적절하게 완수한다.
2. 직무 기술서에 제시되어 있는 책임을 이행한다.
3. 자신에게 요구되는 과제를 수행한다.
4. 직무에 필요한 공식적인 요구사항을 충족한다.
5. 업무평가에 직접적인 영향을 미치는 과제/활동에 참여한다.

조직시민행동

나는...
6. 결근한 사람을 도와준다.
7. 업무가 많은 사람들도 도와준다.
8. (상사가 요구하지 않더라도) 상사의 업무를 보조한다.
9. 직장 동료의 문제나 고민을 듣는 데 시간을 할애한다.
10. 새로 입사한 직원들을 돕기 위해 특별히 노력한다.
11. 동료 직원들에 대해 개인적인 관심을 갖는다.
12. 직장 동료들과 정보를 공유한다.
13. 출근할 수 없을 경우 사전에 통보를 한다.
14. 조직의 재산/물건을 아껴 쓰고 보호한다.
15. 사내 질서(order)를 유지하기 위해 만들어진 비공식적인 규칙을 따른다.
16. 제 시간에 직장에 출근하는 것은 당연한 것이다.

반생산적 과업 행동

 나는...
17. 직장에서 누군가를 놀린다.
18. 직장에서 누군가에게 상처 주는 말을 한다.
19. 직장에서 종교 혹은 인종 관련된 발언을 한다.
20. 직장에서 누군가에게 악담을 퍼붓는다.
21. 직장에서 누군가에서 못된 장난을 친다.
22. 직장에서 누군가에게 무례하게 행동한다.
23. 직장에서 공공연히 누군가를 당황시킨다.
24. 허락 없이 직장의 물건을 슬쩍 훔친다.
25. 자신이 사용한 지출 경비보다 더 많은 돈을 받기 위해 영수증을 위조한다.
26. 업무 환경을 어지럽힌다.
27. 상사의 지시사항을 등정한다.
28. 업무와 관련 없는 사람과 회사의 기밀 사항에 대해 이야기한다.
29. 업무 중에 불법 약물을 복용하거나 음주를 한다.
30. 직장 내의 사소한 것들에 대해 불평한다.
31. 혼란적인 의무 사항들을 수행하지 못한다.
32. 낮은 수준의 업무를 보인다.
33. 개인적 용도를 위해 허락 없이 사내 용품/장비를 이용한다.
철회/탈퇴 행동
나는...
34. 예정되어 있는 직무 과제 혹은 업무를 늦게 처리한다.
35. 참석하기로 예정된 상황에서 결근한다.
36. 예정된 회의/미팅에 참석하지 않는다.
37. 나의 업무를 다른 사람이 하도록 만든다.
38. 임시 시간이나 커피 휴식 시간을 빈번히 혹은 길게 갖는다.
39. 일을 하지 않고 일찍 퇴근하기 위해 평계를 댔다.
40. 실제로 아프지 않더라도 결근한다.
41. 내가 직접 처리해야 하는 직무들을 소홀히 한다.
42. 업무 보다는 몽상이나 잡생각을 하는 데 많은 시간을 보낸다.
43. 직장에서 허용된 것보다 더욱 오랜 시간 휴식을 갖는다.
44. 허락 없이 직장에 늦게 온다.
45. 내가 끝낼 수 있는 시간보다 고의적으로 업무를 천천히 한다.
46. 내 일에 거의 노력을 기울이지 않는다.
47. 조과 근무 수당을 위해 업무를 지연시킨다.
48. 부당한 휴식을 취한다.
49. 직장 내에서 사적인 전화 통화를 하면서 상당한 시간을 보낸다.

상품응모, 추첨 및 수령을 위해 참가자 본인의 이메일 주소를 기재해 주시기 바랍니다.
APPENDIX E

THE PATH MODEL WITH COMMON METHOD VARIANCE
APPENDIX F

STANDARDIZED FACTOR LOADING COEFFICIENTS OF CFA
OF THE ALTERNATIVE MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPC1</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WE1</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>WE2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC3</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WE3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC4</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WE4</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WE5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC6</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>WE6</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC7</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WE7</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC8</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WE8</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC9</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>WE9</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>TP1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC11</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>TP2</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC12</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>TP3</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS1</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>TP4</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS2</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>TP5</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS3</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>OCB11</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsupS4</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>OCB12</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS1</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>OCB13</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS2</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>OCB14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS3</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>OCB15</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>OCB16</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsubS5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>CWB1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S1</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>CWB2</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S2</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>CWB3</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>CWB4</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>CWB5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S5</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>CWB6</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S6</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>CWB7</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S7</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>CWB8</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S8</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>CWB9</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS_S9</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>CWB10</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_E1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>CWB11</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Estimates</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Estimates</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_E2</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>CWB12</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_E3</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>CWB13</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS_E4</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>CWB14</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>CWB15</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>CWB16</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS3</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>CWB17</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS4</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>WB1</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS6</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB3</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS7</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB4</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS8</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB5</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS9</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB6</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS10</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB7</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB8</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G2</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB9</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G3</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB10</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_G4</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>WB11</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_I1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB12</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_I2</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB13</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_I3</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB14</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_I4</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB15</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_W1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>WB16</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_W2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA_W3</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>