5-2009

INTERNATIONAL WORK DEMANDS AND EMPLOYEE WELL BEING AND PERFORMANCE

Hailey Herleman

Clemson University, ahailey@clemson.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_dissertations

Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Herleman, Hailey, "INTERNATIONAL WORK DEMANDS AND EMPLOYEE WELL BEING AND PERFORMANCE" (2009).
All Dissertations. 380.

https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_dissertations/380

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations at TigerPrints. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TigerPrints. For more information, please contact kokeefe@clemson.edu.

INTERNATIONAL WORK DEMANDS AND EMPLOYEE WELL BEING AND
PERFORMANCE

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Graduate School of
Clemson University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy
Industrial and Organizational Psychology

by
Hailey A. Herleman
May, 2009

Dissertation Committee:
Dr. Thomas W. Britt, Committee Chair
Dr. Patrick Raymark
Dr. Patrick Rosopa
Dr. Dewayne Moore

ABSTRACT

Today's global workplace is growing in size and scope, creating a demand to integrate strategies and research in the field of international management (Bjorkman & Stahl, 2006). In the present study I argue for a more comprehensive understanding of the demands that employees face when engaged in international work responsibilities along with an analysis of the relationships between international work demands and important outcomes. The current project includes both a qualitative and quantitative study utilizing separate samples. The qualitative study identifies positive and negative aspects of international work demands for employees. In addition, the qualitative study investigates sources of support for employees engaged in international work along with perceived individual qualifications for dealing with international work demands. The quantitative study is the first to define, describe, and measure international work demands. In addition, an organizational stress framework is tested as a basis for understanding the relationships between international work demands and employee well being, job satisfaction, and performance. Finally, three individual and organizational resources: experience, self-monitoring, and perceived organizational support for international work, are examined as possible moderators of the proposed relationships. A robust test of the model was conducted utilizing multiple applied samples, multiple sources of data, and SEM analyses. Results indicated that international work demands can be appraised by workers as more or less challenging or threatening. In addition, the appraisals of international work demands are related to positive and negative psychological states for workers. Finally, both positive and negative psychological states were related to job

satisfaction but not to performance. The constructs of international work experience and self-monitoring significantly moderated the relationship between international work demands and appraisals although not all interactions were in the predicted direction. Overall, the two studies provide preliminary evidence that international work demands are relevant to workers today, that challenge and threat appraisals of these demands at work are happening and have differential relationships with important outcomes, and finally that some individual resources should be considered as moderators of the relationship between demands and the appraisal of those demands by workers.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my husband Matthew Herleman. His friendship, love, and eternal optimism provided me with much needed strength and support. In this endeavor as in all others we were partners. Also to our son, Blaise Camden Herleman, who provides me each day with a reminder of why we work so hard. In this endeavor, and down the roads where it leads, I work to provide a better world for him.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My dissertation reflects the generosity, guidance, and effort of many individuals, but I would like to thank first and foremost my advisor, Dr. Tom Britt. His insight, guidance, and support made this ambitious project possible. Also, I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee. Dr. Pat Raymark provided key insights into my logic when I failed to see them. Dr. Patrick Rosopa provided a keen eye for detail and unique perspective. Finally, Dr. DeWayne Moore provided invaluable guidance and support through the complex quantitative analysis included in this dissertation. I have learned from each of them and to each I am grateful.

In addition, I would like to acknowledge a number of additional collaborators on the project. Numerous individuals within the College of Business and Behavioral Science at Clemson University were instrumental in helping me identify groups to survey included Meredith McTigue and Gail DePriest. Also, members of the human resources divisions of two large organizations, who are not identified directly in this paper, were also very generous in the time and resources they dedicated to help make this project a success. Words cannot express my gratitude.

Also, a relatively large group of graduate and undergraduate students contributed substantially to the analysis of qualitative data for this dissertation. This group included Christine Haugh, Melissa Waitsman, Kate Williams, Hannah Peach, Anthony Kincaid, Alma Koon, Charlotte Powers, and Savannah Spearman. The content analysis would not have been possible without their time, attention to detail, and enthusiasm. I am often in

awe of their talent and potential, I feel honored they volunteered to engage in this project with me.

Finally, I would like to thank each member of my family that made a sacrifice so that my dissertation was possible. Many individuals gave their time, utilized their contacts, and did without time and effort from me they would have normally received. I recognize and appreciate each of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TITLE PAGE	i
ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
International Work	1
Organizational Stress Framework	16
Moderators of the Proposed Relationships	27
II. METHODS	38
Study 1	38
Study 2	39
Data Analysis	47
III. RESULTS	52
Study 1	52
Study 2	61
IV. DISCUSSION	84
Study 1	85
Study 2	91
APPENDICES	107
A: Structural Model for Direct and Indirect Effects	108
B: Study 1 Survey	109

C:	Survey of International Work Demands	112
D:	The Cognitive Appraisal of International Work Scale	113
E:	Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ).....	114
F:	Organizational Frustration Scale.....	115
G:	State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (State)	116
H:	Job Diagnostic Survey (General Satisfaction)	117
I:	Job Performance Measure.....	118
J:	Experience Scale.....	119
K:	Revised Self-Monitoring Scale	120
L:	Survey of Perceived Organizational Support for International Work	121
M:	Demographic Questionnaire	122
REFERENCES		123

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Purpose of International Travel	55
2	Benefits of International Work	56
3	Challenges and Risks of International Work	57
4	Organizational Support for International Work	58
5	Qualifications for International Work.....	60
6	Standardized Factor Loadings of Latent Variables.....	65
7	Range, Means, SD, and Alpha Levels	67
8	Correlations Among the Variables.....	69

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Structural Model for Direct and Indirect Effects	108
2	Moderating Effect of Experience on Challenge Appraisal	76
3	Moderating Effect of Experience on Threat Appraisal.....	78
4	Moderating Effect of Self-Monitoring on Threat Appraisal.....	80

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

International Work

Business today is globalizing at an ever increasing rate which is leading to a change in the nature of work for many employees. In the past, organizations deployed workers on international assignments that included relocation of the entire family for a number of years in order to address the needs of their globalizing business. In contrast, today, while long term expatriate assignments still exist, the strategies of organizations for managing their multinational business are changing. Job responsibilities for many workers now include various forms of international coordination including short term assignments, commuter assignments, and virtual team assignments (GMAC, 2008). In fact, 49% of organizations surveyed in 2008 reported an increase in their organization's utilization of alternatives to long-term expatriate assignments (GMAC, 2008). Although great progress has been made in fields such as Industrial and Organizational Psychology as well as International Human Resource Management (IHRM) in understanding certain types of international work such as expatriation (e.g., Morley, Heraty, & Collings, 2006; Thomas & Lazarova, 2006), a comprehensive understanding of types of international work that employees are engaged in still does not exist. For the current study, international work is defined as any job-related responsibilities that necessitate interaction with individuals from different cultures.

International work, defined in this way, embodies a large range of work responsibilities but limits this range to that work which includes international

interpersonal interactions. International work focuses on business conducted with individuals who were born and/or raised in a country or culture other than the worker's; however, as it is defined in this paper international work does not begin to encompass the complexities of cross-cultural work that have been established repeatedly in the literature (e.g. Sanchez-Burks, Bartel, & Blout, 2009, Hofstede, 1991). The focus of the current work is on the experience of working with others who are culturally different, but does not begin to address how that experience varies depending on relevant dimensions (e.g. individualism and collectivism) of the two cultures and how they interact (however this would be an excellent direction to take this research in the future.) Although international work could include anything from managing a group of Hispanic chefs in a restaurant to relocation to China for many years it does not include working with materials that were manufactured in a different country or coordinating with other American workers who are physically located abroad.

Past research has established that workers in today's global marketplace are engaged in many different kinds of international work, including traditional expatriate assignments, international weekly or biweekly commutes (commuter or rotational assignments), short term assignments (1 to 12 months), virtual international assignments, and frequent business travel (Collings, Scullion, & Morley, 2007; GMAC 2008; Tharenou, 2005; Welch & Worm, 2006; Lazarova & Cerdin, 2008). In addition, workers who are located domestically also have international work responsibilities in the form of managing local multi-national work teams or simply coordinating by phone with workers in other countries who serve support functions, such as on-boarding or IT support

(Harrison, Shaffer, & Bhaskar-Shrinivas, 2004). Based on this past research I have developed a matrix to describe the various types of international work (see matrix below).

	Domestic Technology	Domestic In Person	Travel	Relocation
Culture				
Language				

The proposed matrix identifies two key ways in which international work can be classified. First, international work can be divided up by the physical requirement of that work in terms of both location and time. Some international work can be conducted while the employee remains in his/her home country (or country of residence) either through technological mediums or through colleagues traveling or relocating to the worker's country of residence. Other international work may require travel to countries outside of the worker's home country. Finally, a more permanent relocation outside of the workers home country may be required for some international work. Second, international work, by definition, requires that employees work with others from a culture different from their native culture. The second distinction, or row, relates to whether this cultural difference is accompanied by a language difference or not. Some international work occurs where employees work with others who were born/raised in a culture different from his/her own and have a different native language than that of the worker. However, other international work occurs where employees speak the same *native* language as their international co-workers and only their culture differs. For example,

workers from the United States could be asked to collaborate with other workers in the United Kingdom where they share a common native language of English but the cultures where each worker was born/raised are different. Separating out the language barrier from the cultural difference allows closer examination of each issue at all levels of international work.

Physical Requirements

Domestic international work. For the first distinction, physical requirements of the work, there are a few important points to discuss. First, international work can be conducted in various forms from within the worker's home country. For example, this could include coordinating with co-workers, customers, or suppliers that were born/raised in a different culture and/or speak another native language that have traveled or relocated to the home country of the employee. This is referred to as "in person" domestic international work within the matrix. Domestic international work could also consist of interactions through technological mediums such as coordinating a task force of representative workers from thirty different international locations through internet and telephone. This is referred to as "technology" domestic international work in the matrix. The distinction between these two types of domestic international work is made in order to separate out the logistical demands of domestic international work from the interpersonal ones. Employees who work with co-workers, customers, or suppliers from within their home country (or country of residence) who are physically located in the same place, face work demands related to culture and language differences. In addition to these demands, if the domestic international work is conducted via technological

mediums such as the phone and internet, many logistical stressors are introduced such as time zone differences, and difficulty communicating in writing.

Tharenou (2005) was the first to call attention to the idea of international work within domestic jobs in Australia. She described how these types of jobs are increasing in Australia, especially for workers within the headquarters offices of multi-national corporations. She surveyed 1046 university alumni and found that those employees who worked in more globally focused organizations and held jobs at higher managerial levels engaged in more international work within their domestic jobs. Also, qualitative results demonstrated that the reasons individuals pursue domestic jobs that include more international work are higher salaries, professional development, and because they are challenging.

Another area of research, global virtual teams research, has also indirectly assessed some issues surrounding international work within domestic jobs. Collings et al. (2007) called attention to this important development in international work and suggested that the implementation of global virtual teams could be a good strategy for workers engaged in relatively routine activities. In addition, Kiser (1999) discussed the advantages of utilizing virtual teams to mitigate the extensive costs associated with international travel and relocation. However, this author also noted the significant stressors that could be presented by this type of work, including layers of difficulties communicating cross culturally across technological mediums. Although a full review of the virtual teams literature is beyond the scope of this project, the literature could easily be expanded to address many issues within the category of domestic international work

through technological mediums. Although the physical requirement of domestic international work is small, it should not be assumed that this type of work is easier than the other two. There can be great variability in the demands of domestic international work on an employee including anything from mediating cultural differences in work strategies to scheduling conference calls across time zones.

International business travel. Second, international work can require travel outside of the employee's native country. If the worker remains outside of his/her home country for one month or less at a time, resides in temporary housing while out of the country, and/or the family of the worker remains in the home country this is considered travel and not relocation. International work containing travel can again vary significantly from a one week trip to Canada by an employee from the United States to biweekly commutes to China for a year. International work requiring travel is distinguished from international work conducted from within the home country due to the added stresses potentially created by traveling in general and leaving the home country for any period of time.

Collings et al. (2007) identified international business travel (or frequent flyer assignments) as a good, low cost, alternative to traditional expatriate assignments. Welch and Worm (2006) argued that international business travel could be particularly appropriate in countries where workers are reluctant to relocate such as developing markets or volatile countries. In addition, these researchers argued that international business travel can also be appropriate when flights between countries are only a couple of hours long, such as Canada from a northern US state or within the countries of the

European Union. International business travel has the advantage of maintaining face to face interactions and developing social capital for the business but the stress of international business travel on workers and their families is thought to be substantial due to stressors such as jet lag and time away from family (Diamond, Hicks, & Otter-Henderson, 2008; Collings et al., 2007; Mayerhofer, Hartmann, Michelitsch-Riedl, & Kollinger, 2004; Mayerhofer, Hartmann, & Herbert, 2004; Welch & Worm, 2006). In 2008, Lazarova and Cerdin's Academy of Management Symposium highlighted the increasing need to understand the experience of "flexpatriates" or frequent business travelers. A qualitative study by Demel and Mayrhofer presented in the symposium highlighted the aspiration of these workers to be "high and free." Each aspired to great future careers and found the experience of international travel fun and exciting. This study also acknowledged significant concerns for the worker's well-being and work-life balance.

Empirical research on international business travelers remains scarce or non-existent despite the timeliness of the topic (Collings et al., 2007). However, past research has addressed some questions that could be related to the effects of international travel on workers. One group of researchers has investigated the effects of international travel on business students, finding that international travel led to high levels of learning about other cultures (Paul & Mukhopadhyay, 2003). Another group of researchers (DeFrank, Konopaske, & Ivancevich, 2000; Ivancevich, Konopaske, & DeFrank, 2003) has investigated the effects of general business travel on managers. Their first article (DeFrank et al., 2000) proposed that travel be investigated as an important stressor facing

workers today and proposed ideas for organizations to decrease the impact of travel stress on the personal stress reactions of workers.

In the second article (Ivancevich et al., 2003), a comprehensive model to understand the effects of general business travel on proximal and distal worker outcomes was presented. The authors highlighted that effects of this model are likely to differ for individuals engaged in light, moderate, or frequent travel. The individual level of their model takes a somewhat similar approach to the one outlined in the present paper, but differs in many important ways. At the beginning of the general travel stress model the authors list the possible stressors that could result from travel. This differs from the currently proposed model in that my model of international work first measures the amount of international work that employees are engaged in as an objective characteristic of their environment followed by the appraisal of that characteristic. Stress is thought to reside in that appraisal and is not specifically measured in my model. After the stressors part of the travel stress model, the individual level of Ivancevich et al.'s (2003) model proposed that travel stressors will be related to proximal outcomes (first-level outcomes) for workers such as anxiety and depression and that these proximal outcomes will influence more distal (second-level) outcomes such as performance. This part is somewhat similar to my model as I also propose that the interpretation of international work responsibilities will be related to proximal outcomes of employee well-being (psychological capital, anxiety, and frustration) as well as more distal outcomes of job satisfaction and performance.

In addition, Ivancevich et al. (2003) proposed that individual and organizational resources (such as self-efficacy and social support of travelers) would moderate the relationship between the stressors and the first-level outcomes. This is somewhat similar to the moderation hypotheses (for self-monitoring and perceived organizational support of international work) that I propose in my model later. Ivancevich et al. (2003) also included an organizational level component to their model that highlights the relationship between organizational policies for business travel and second-level outcomes such as turnover that is not included in my model. Although it is interesting to note the similarities and differences between the Ivancevich et al. (2003) model and the one proposed in the current project, it is also notable that no empirical studies have investigated the impact of travel on employees, let alone international travel specifically to date.

Relocation. Finally, some international work requires the worker to physically relocate or live in a country other than his/her native country for some period of time. Relocations can be distinguished from travel based on the living arrangements made by the organization for the worker. If the worker is asked to remain out of his/her home country for more than one month at a time, resides in permanent housing while in the country, and/or his or her family is relocated to the country with the worker then this is considered relocation within the proposed matrix. Again great variance can exist within this category with relocations ranging from a couple of months to those lasting for five or more years.

Short term relocations abroad have received little to no attention in the empirical literature. Tahvanainen, Welch, and Worm (2005) conducted a brief qualitative study of short term relocations that included interviews of eleven Finnish human resource managers. They found that organizations vary in their definition of a short-term assignment but generally they ranged from 1 to 12 months in duration and the employee's compensation remained based in their home country (as opposed to the employee being compensated by the host office which is typical for a long-term assignment). Also for some short term assignments they found that the family remained in the home country. This qualitative study also revealed that short term assignments are implemented by organizations for three main reasons: 1) Skills transfer and problem solving (such as implementation and troubleshooting) 2) Managerial control (when an assignee is sent to manage a specific operation and 3) Management development. Finally, this research revealed unique benefits and stressors of these short term assignments compared with business travel and long term expatriation. Benefits included the simplicity and cost effectiveness of it and the stressors included the extreme environments where the assignments often take place and the resulting loneliness as the assignees don't have long enough to be integrated with the local culture but are gone so long that family troubles often surface. In fact these authors note a high rate of divorce and treatment for alcoholism among employees who frequently take short term assignments. Collings et al. (2007) reiterate the importance of these assignments in the scope of international work today and make an additional call for increased research in this area.

In contrast to short term international assignments, long term international relocations lasting one year or more including the relocation of family are considered the most intensive kind of international work and have been extensively researched under the term “expatriate assignments.” Thomas, Lazarova, and Inkson (2005) cite expatriate assignment research as one of the cornerstones of the field of international human resource management. In addition, Morley, Heraty, and Collings (2006) cite empirical evidence from this literature related to important trends in such areas as expatriate selection, work/family relationships for expatriates, the role of host country nationals in expatriate adjustment, and gender differences in expatriate experiences. They discussed outcomes such as expatriate adjustment, which has received great attention while the outcome of expatriate performance remains not very well understood. This book also reviewed literature related to the frequency of failure of expatriate assignments. Finally, repatriation from expatriate assignments remains the “weakest link” (p. 42) of this area of research, according to this review, as empirical evidence has revealed many difficult issues for repatriates such as culture shock and career disappointments. Various human resource management techniques have also been investigated related to expatriate assignments with mixed findings, especially related to cross-cultural training (Morley, Heraty, & Collings, 2006).

Another major review of the expatriate literature (Harrison et al., 2004) presented the past research on expatriate assignments within an organizational stress model. These authors posited that the study of expatriates and their adjustment as a psychological state can be considered a body of literature on a particular type of stress. They further

proposed that the literature related to antecedents of adjustment and the buffers between these antecedents and adjustment can be considered stressor research. Lastly, they say that research related to how adjustment impacts other important outcomes such as returning early from assignment can be considered a study of strains. The review discussed the stress of long term relocation outside of one's home country to be much more than a domestic relocation in that the new location brings additional challenges such as language difference, social norm (and law) differences, as well as changes to basic life activities such as shopping, going to school, cooking, etc. For the stressors related to expatriate assignments, or the demands of the foreign environment that are mismatched with the employee's personal resources, the authors reviewed many findings. These include empirical evidence of the relationships between personal factors such as age and self-efficacy, workplace factors such as role clarity and supervisor support, family/friends factors such as spouse adjustment, and environmental factors such as cultural distance and standard of living and adjustment. Finally, the authors reviewed empirical work that has investigated the strains of expatriate assignments, or consequences of adjustment, including withdrawal cognitions, job satisfaction, and performance.

Only a very brief overview of the extensive and important literature on expatriate assignments is given here since this type of assignment is only one part of international work. The focus of the current project is to highlight the range and types of international work that today's employees are experiencing, therefore, a thorough review of the topic is outside of the scope of the current project (see Harrison et al., 2004 for such a review).

Language Difference

The second key distinction in the proposed matrix of international work is whether or not the international work the employee is engaged in includes a language barrier. By definition, international work must contain interactions with people who were born and/or raised in a culture different from that of the worker. However, in some instances, this does not have to include a language barrier but in many others international work will. Research dedicated towards understanding the impact of a language barrier for international business is surprisingly sparse. In 2005, a special issue of the journal *International Studies of Management and Organizations* was dedicated to this topic. The preface of this issue discussed the role of language in international business as “the most neglected field in management,” and “the forgotten factor” (Piekkari & Zander, 2005, p.3). Again, Harzing and Feely (2008) highlight how this field is in its infancy and propose a model to potentially jumpstart research on the issue. Their model comes from a socio-linguistic background and proposes that the communications cycle interrelates with the management cycle in a vicious cycle to explain the impact of language differences on management across nations. Three major views of the role of language in international organizations exist: the instrumental, political, and cultural perspectives (Janssens, Lambert, & Stevaert, 2004).

The instrumental view sees language as a vital tool for knowledge sharing and collaboration within an organization. Studies conducted from this perspective suggest practical solutions to the language barrier such as identifying a common corporate language (Barner-Rasmussen & Bjorkman, 2005). Secondly, from the political

perspective common language is viewed as a desired source of power. Welch, Welch, and Piekkari (2005) discussed the power struggle surrounding the issue of language in international business, including isolating power for certain groups in picking a corporate language, especially in multi-national mergers, as well as the power to isolate entire groups of employees based on differences in native language. Finally, the cultural view sees language differences as an additional tool to understanding key cultural differences that present barriers to communication. Interestingly, Zander (2005) found that similarities in language, such as those found in Latin countries all speaking Spanish, did not necessarily mean similarities in communication preferences across included countries. This study highlights the importance of understanding language barriers and cultural differences as separate phenomena. This view of culture and language is reflected in the matrix presented in the current study.

The influence of language differences on international work that includes either travel or relocation outside of the home country, while it should be understood separately from cultural differences, seems intuitive. Traveling or relocating to countries where individuals natively speak a different language will present language differences. However more recently some work has highlighted the role of language differences in domestic, in-country, work as well. For example, Jacobs, Chen, Karliner, Agger-Gupta, and Mutha (2006) highlighted the importance of the little understood language barrier that often occurs in domestic healthcare jobs. These employees did not take a job where they intentionally engage in international work regularly, but instances of international work are rising with patients arriving for care who were born/raised in a culture different

from the workers and possibly speak another language than the healthcare worker. In addition, Ahmand (2007) identified language barrier issues as a key problem for many American lawyers who frequently encounter clients speaking different native languages from the lawyer. Therefore, it is important that the issues of cultural and cultural plus language differences be examined at each physical requirement of international work: domestic work, work that requires travel, as well as work that requires relocation.

Overall, the matrix proposed in the current study is presented as a way to organize the initial research in the field of international work into eight basic categories, and also to highlight the areas where much more research is needed. The overall quantitative measure of international work utilized in the current study is based on these eight categories placing an emphasis on the measurement of the domestic and travel dimensions across language and culture. This quantitative measure will allow for the investigation of relationships among international work as whole and important employee outcomes. In addition, effects of specific areas within international work could be investigated. For example, the effects of working internationally from the home country versus traveling outside of the home country temporarily could be investigated. Additionally, the effects of language barriers versus cultural barriers could be investigated.

International work is conceptualized as at least a small component of some, if not almost all, jobs within global organizations today. It is first hypothesized that individual employees within the US are often engaged in work responsibilities that could be considered international work. In addition, it is thought that these employees will vary

significantly in the amount and types of international work they engage in depending on the demands of their job and the nature of the organization for which they work. The present study will first take a qualitative approach to understanding various aspects of international work that today's US employees are engaged in. This study will consist of an anonymous survey (see Appendix B) containing many open ended questions. The data collected as part of the qualitative component will be utilized as evidence to support the relevance and importance of international work in US organizations today along with other aspects of benefits and challenges related to international work and personal and organizational resources that are important to performing international work responsibilities well. In addition, data collected through this qualitative study could serve as the basis to form future research questions related to international work responsibilities.

In addition to study one, study two will apply an organizational stress framework in order to quantitatively understand the relationships between international work and proximal and distal outcomes for workers including satisfaction, well-being, and performance.

Organizational Stress Framework

A model of the organizational stress framework for understanding relationships between international work and both proximal and distal outcomes for employees is provided in Figure 1. The following sections will present the hypotheses for the relationships among the variables that are reflected in the model along with theoretical justification for why these hypotheses are proposed. Although aspects of international

work have been studied as stressors in the past (e.g. stressors related to expatriate assignments, see Harrison, Shaffer, & Bhaskar-Shrinivas, 2004 for a review, and stress related to international business travel, see Welch & Worm, 2006 for a qualitative discussion), a thorough understanding of relationships between international work as a whole and important outcomes for employees has never been previously undertaken.

Cognitive Appraisal of International Work

Within this framework, international work is conceptualized as an objective characteristic of the individual's work environment that could be appraised in two different ways by the worker. International work could be viewed as a positive challenge in the life of the worker, a negative stressor in the life of the worker, or some combination of the two. Transactional theories of stress have previously focused on the cognitive appraisal of objective characteristics of an individual's environment as the key to understanding the impact of these characteristics on individuals and their work (Cooper, Dewe, & O'Driscoll, 2001). Lazarus (1966) argued there are two types of cognitive appraisals that take place during this transactional process. First, an individual conducts a primary appraisal or a realization that something of value is at stake, therefore giving the environmental stimuli, in this case international work, meaning. This meaning can either be positive, seeing the environmental stimuli as a challenge, or negative, seeing the environmental stimuli as a threat or a potential threat, or some combination of the two.

Second, a secondary appraisal could be necessary, if the environmental stimulus is evaluated as a threat, where the individual assesses his/her available resources to cope

with the threat. If the environmental stimulus is interpreted as a positive challenge, then no secondary appraisal is necessary. The primary appraisal process makes up the core of the proposed model, while the secondary appraisal process will be investigated by introducing a series of moderators to the model. For this reason, the secondary appraisal will be discussed in further detail in the section that covers potential moderators. The primary and secondary appraisals are the key components of the transactional model of stress (Dewe, Cox, & Ferguson, 1993) and according to this theory there is no construct of “stress” or “stressors” that are modeled (Lazarus, 1990). The proposed theoretical model in this paper reflects this thinking.

Prior research in the field of stress has investigated challenge versus threat appraisals of stressful situations. However, this research differs from the current research in that it has focused on single episodes, following an individual from the experience of a single stressor, how that stressor was interpreted, and the effect of that interpretation on outcomes such as well-being (e.g. Folkman & Lazarus, 1985). In contrast, the present study aims to understand the challenge versus threat appraisals made by workers related to an entire aspect of their job, not a single potentially stressful incident. Also the past stress research on this phenomenon was conducted in educational and other settings; the present study is the first to test this idea within an organizational context.

In addition, researchers have begun to apply the challenge versus threat (or hindrance) distinction in the review and meta-analysis of the effects of stressors on performance. Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, and Boudreau (2000) ran a factor analysis of self-reported work stress among US managers and found a two factor solution that

they labeled “challenge-related stressors” and “hindrance-related stressors.” In addition, these authors found that the two groups of stressors had opposite effects on job satisfaction with challenge-related stressors demonstrating a positive relationship with job satisfaction and hindrance-related stressors demonstrating a negative relationship. Later, LePine, Podsakoff, and LePine (2005) conducted a meta-analysis on the stress and performance relationship. They sorted stressor measures that they found in the literature into challenge and hindrance stressor groups based on the findings of Cavanaugh et al. (2000). These authors also reported opposite findings for the two groups, demonstrating that challenge stressors were positively related to performance while hindrance stressors were negatively related to performance. Podsakoff, LePine, and LePine (2007) extended their previous meta-analysis of challenge and hindrance stressors to retention related outcomes. Again they found a similar opposite pattern of results with challenge stressors demonstrating a positive relationship with the outcomes and hindrance stressors demonstrating a negative relationship. Finally, Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, and Cooper (2008) took a slightly different approach to the challenge/hindrance stressor distinction. These authors argued that the challenge and threat appraisals are made simultaneously and occur on two separate continuums so that the highest stress response would be a high threat (or hindrance) appraisal and a low challenge appraisal. They rationalized that previous research supported the idea that in a simultaneous process, bad is always stronger than good. Their findings seem to support this idea as they found a negative relationship between stressors and performance for all stressors they considered. However, it is interesting to note that none of the stressors that they considered as

predictors in their meta-analysis were sorted as challenge stressors in the previous work, they were all considered hindrance stressors by the previous authors.

Primary Appraisal: Positive Challenge. During the primary appraisal process, the employee evaluates the degree to which his/her international work is a positive challenge in his/her life. This evaluation of the degree of positive challenge resulting from a stimulus has not received as much attention in the literature as the evaluation of a stimulus as a negative threat. However, a call has been made in the field of psychology for a shift in focus from studying only ways to alleviate disease, weakness, and damage to studying ways to foster the positive aspects of human behavior, such as strength and virtue. This is known as the positive psychology movement. Researchers involved in the growing movement of positive psychology are not just interested in fixing what is wrong with people, but also building what is right (Seligman, 2002). The equal emphasis placed on the positive evaluation of international work along with the negative evaluation in the proposed model was inspired by this call for a more positive and balanced focus.

Primary Appraisal: Negative Threat. In addition to a positive challenge appraisal, international work could also be viewed as a negative stressor by employees. The additional personal resources required by the employee to engage in interactions with individuals at work who come from a different cultural background and/or who speak a different native language can be viewed as taxing by the individual. In addition, significant personal resources and sacrifices can be required for extensive international travel, including separation from family and safety concerns (Welch & Worm, 2006). Finally, international relocation, either short or long term, can include separation from

extended family. Also, hassles of having to learn a new way of life both inside and outside of work which can be very taxing to an individual's resources (e.g. Van der Zee, Ali, & Salome, 2005). This type of taxation of resources could result in the interpretation of international work as more of a negative stressor by the worker. Although past researchers have discussed the reasons why some components of international work could be viewed as a stressful by workers, no empirical investigation on the interpretation of international work has previously been undertaken. The first path in the proposed framework highlights the idea that international work could be viewed by the worker as either a positive challenge or a negative threat or a combination of the two.

Psychological Effects of the Positive Challenge Appraisal

The effects of interpreting difficult situations as a positive challenge have been investigated by researchers in the past. When a situation is appraised as a challenge, a person may see an opportunity to prove her or himself, anticipating that this will lead to some personal gain, mastery, or social reward. The person feels confident in being able to meet the demands of the situation and the experience is viewed as pleasant, exciting, and interesting (Schwarzer & Taubert, 2002). Past research has demonstrated that interpreting a situation as a challenge, even a very difficult situation, can lessen the impact of that situation on psychological health and well-being (Moore, 2002) and lead to lower subjective stress and higher perceptions of performance (Blascovich & Mendes, 2000). In addition, making a positive challenge appraisal of a situation has been shown to lead to positive emotional states for the individual (Skinner & Brewer, 2002). Although this past research is relevant to the current project, no studies to date have

investigated the effects of a positive challenge appraisal of an objective stressor in the work environment. The proposed study would be the first to investigate this idea in a work setting.

Within the field of positive psychology, constructs such as hope, resilience, optimism, and self-efficacy have been studied as positive psychological states that workers may experience, resulting from individual characteristics as well as characteristics of the work environment (Luthans & Youssef, 2007; Turner, Barling, & Zacharatos, 2002). Researchers have proposed the new construct of psychological capital as a composite variable taking into account aspects of these four previously studied constructs. Psychological capital is defined as: “an individual’s positive psychological state of development...characterized by: (a) having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (b) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (c) persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and (d) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back even beyond (resilience) to attain success” (Luthans Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007, p. 542).

Psychological capital is theorized to be a state-like variable, meaning that it is relatively malleable and open to development; however, researchers are careful to point out that psychological capital is not so easily changeable to warrant being grouped with emotions and feelings, but is also not so stable as to be thought of as a trait (Luthans et al., 2007). Within the current model, workers who view, or appraise, their international work as a positive challenge in their lives should report higher levels of psychological

capital. Prior researchers have argued that it is possible to develop psychological capital within workers who are faced with challenging situations through generating goals, identifying potential obstacles, and increasing awareness of personal assets (e.g., Luthans & Youssef, 2007; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). One unique contribution of the current proposed study is examining the positive appraisal of international work as a predictor of psychological capital.

Workers who interpret their international work as higher in positive challenge should report higher psychological capital. A few studies have investigated similar relationships between challenge appraisals and positive states in non-employee samples. For example, Smith and Ellsworth (1985) found associations between positive states such as hope and cognitions consistent with the positive challenge appraisal among college students. Participants in this study described challenging experiences as ones where they felt fairly confident that they would achieve the desired goal although they know it would require a large amount of effort. In addition, Folkman and Lazarus (1985) found that challenge emotions such as feeling confident and eager before an exam were associated with feeling in control. Overall, it appears that a positive challenge appraisal likely leads to positive emotional states as a result of applying effort to overcome difficulties and with the anticipation of personal rewards (Skinner & Brewer, 2002). Again, although these studies provide interesting initial insight into the relationship between challenge appraisals and positive emotional states, none of these studies took place within an organizational context.

Hypothesis 1. Individuals who appraise their international work as more of a positive challenge will report higher levels of psychological capital.

Psychological Effects of the Negative Threat Appraisal

Previous research has established, outside of a workplace setting, that threat appraisals reflect low confidence in the ability to cope with the threat and/or potential danger to one's well-being. Research has demonstrated that this anticipated failure and negative evaluation is seen as a significant threat to self-identity and self-esteem (Skinner & Brewer, 2002). Lazarus (1991) theorized that when a negative threat appraisal is made, negative emotional states will result. Threat appraisals have been empirically linked to general distress (McGowan, Gardner, & Fletcher, 2006) as well as emotional outcomes including anger, guilt, anxiety, and sadness (Smith, Haynes, Lazarus, & Pope, 1993). Finally, negative threat appraisals have been linked, through the coping process, to more distal outcomes such as decreased psychological well-being and decreased social functioning and morale (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). In the model guiding the present research, negative threat appraisals of international work are hypothesized to be positively related to work frustration and anxiety on the job. Both of these emotional outcomes have been previously shown to be predicted by work stressors (e.g. Spector & Jex, 1991); however, no previous work has linked threat appraisals in the work environment to these negative emotional states.

Hypothesis 2. Individuals who appraise their international work as more of a negative threat will report higher levels of work frustration and anxiety on the job.

Distal Effects of Cognitive Appraisals

Exploration of the proximal psychological effects of the appraisals of international work are interesting in their own right; however, an additional goal of the proposed study is to tie these effects to more distal outcomes in which organizations will be interested. More specifically, the distal outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction will be considered in the present study. Although the relationship between job satisfaction and performance is not a focus of the current study (see Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001), it is thought that the predictor variables of psychological capital, frustration, and anxiety will affect both outcomes similarly. It is hypothesized that psychological capital will be positively related to both outcomes and that frustration and anxiety will be negatively related to both outcomes. In the following sections each hypothesized relationship will be discussed in more detail including a review of any past relevant research.

Effects of Psychological Capital. The positive relationship between the composite variable, psychological capital, and the organizationally relevant outcomes of supervisor rated overall job performance and general job satisfaction has been supported by previous research conducted by Luthans and colleagues (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007). In their most recent study, two different workplace samples were utilized (one a high tech manufacturer and the other an insurance service firm) and a significant positive relationship was found between Psychological Capital (hereinafter, PsyCap) and supervisor rated performance ($r=.33$ for the first firm, $r=.22$ for the second) as well as PsyCap and general job satisfaction ($r=.32$ for the first firm, $r=.53$ for the

second). The current project attempts to replicate this prior finding within the context of a broader model of international work.

Hypothesis 3. Individuals who report higher levels of psychological capital will report higher levels of general job satisfaction and receive higher ratings of overall job performance by their supervisors.

Effects of frustration and anxiety. The negative bivariate relationship between the more proximal worker outcomes of work frustration and anxiety on the job and the more distal outcomes of job satisfaction and performance has received some support in the literature. For example, Spector and Jex (1991) found a significant negative correlation of $-.36$ between work frustration and general job satisfaction. The authors also found a significant negative correlation of $-.38$ between anxiety on the job and general job satisfaction. General frustration has also been found to lead to decreased performance for complex (Schmeck & Bruning, 1968) and new tasks (Libb & Serum, 1974). Finally, other researchers have found a negative bivariate relationship between general state anxiety and job performance (e.g., Reio & Callahan, 2004). The current study aims to also replicate these findings within the context of the broader model of international work.

Hypothesis 4. Individuals who report higher levels of work frustration and anxiety on the job will report lower levels of general job satisfaction and receive lower ratings of overall job performance by their supervisors.

Moderators of the Proposed Relationships

According to Lazarus' (1990) theory of the cognitive appraisal process related to stress, the secondary appraisal includes the evaluation of resources that are available to the individual in order to cope with the possible stress created by the objective environmental characteristic, in this case, international work. The effects of these resources will be investigated in the present study by introducing a series of moderators to the proposed model. The particular resources chosen for investigation in the proposed study were chosen for two reasons. First, they reflect possible resources that could theoretically be expected to alter the effect of international work on both the challenge and threat appraisal as well as the effects of that appraisal on the proximal worker outcomes of work frustration, and anxiety on the job. Second, these particular resources were repeatedly identified in conversations between the author and managers of international workers as keys to determining the success or failure of employees engaged in international work. Therefore, the proposed tests of moderation serve two purposes: to test the effects of theoretically supported resources that could affect the relationships proposed in the model and to test the importance of constructs often discussed by managers of international workers within the proposed model of international work (see Guion, 1998 for a discussion of the importance of lay conceptions of predictors of performance in organizations)

More specifically, the moderating effects of two individual resources for dealing with international work will be examined: international experience and self-monitoring.

In addition the moderating effect of one perceived organizational resource, perceived organizational support for international work, will also be examined.

International Work Experience

Dierdorff and Surface (2008) defined general work experience as, “the degree of exposure that individuals accumulate in relation to performing the requirements of their work roles.”(p. 31). For the current study, this more general definition is adopted but specifically for the requirements of the employee’s international work roles. Quinones, Ford, and Teachout (1995) propose that work experience should be classified along two dimensions: measurement mode and level of specificity. These researchers, among others (e.g., Richman & Quinones, 1996), emphasize that measuring the workers’ tenure in a specific work role or job is not sufficient for understanding the role of experience. For the current study, international work experience will be assessed at the task level, more specifically the group of tasks that would be considered international work, with two of the proposed measurement modes: amount and type of work experience. These two measurement modes were found, meta-analytically, to relate to work role performance (Quinones et al., 1995).

Within the literature on expatriate assignments previous overseas experience has been investigated as a predictor of outcomes such as adjustment. Some authors suggest that individuals high in international experience may adjust to the situation easier because they are able to anticipate problems more accurately, while other authors report no effect or even a negative effect of previous experience. Some authors believe that these mixed findings are due to the various operationalizations of previous experience in the past

international assignment research including a heavy reliance on the number of previous assignments (Harrison, et al., 2004).

Theoretically, the importance of international work experience as a potential resource that affects the way individuals interpret and deal with their international work can be supported by social perception theory. This theory postulates that direct experience leads individuals to develop schemas which then, in turn, play an influential role in the evaluation of a person's surroundings (e.g. the demands of their work role) (Skrull & Wyer, 1988). Therefore, it is likely that individuals with high levels of international work experience will have well developed schemas through which to process new information they receive related to their international work. It is hypothesized that having clear and developed schemas of international work will help employees to view the demands of their international work as a challenge that they can overcome easily because these demands are not new to the individual and the path for overcoming them is more clear. Although the literature on job experience in general is relatively well developed the proposal that job experience is related to organizational stress for employees is a relatively new contribution of the proposed study (see Jones, Chonko, Rangarajan, & Roberts, 2007 for job experience as a moderator of the relationship between role overload and performance). Also, although the role of experience on important outcomes for long term international assignments has been previously studied to some degree, the role of experience in international work, as it is more broadly defined in the current proposal, has not been previously undertaken.

Hypothesis 5. **For individuals higher in international work experience, as they report higher levels of international work they will report lower levels of threat and higher levels of challenge than those who report lower levels of international work. For individuals engaged in higher current levels of international work, international work experience should be more positively related to challenge appraisals and negatively related to threat appraisals. International work experience should not be as strongly related to challenge and threat appraisals for those currently engaged in lower levels of international work.**

In addition, it is proposed that international work experience will function as a resource that also moderates the relationship between threat appraisals and the negative proximal outcomes of frustration and anxiety. Past empirical evidence has established that experience is closely linked to expertise (e.g., Chi, Glaser, & Rees, 1982). Therefore, those individuals who have more experience not only develop a clearer schema by which to interpret their current surroundings but also have more effective techniques for dealing with those surroundings. It is hypothesized that an individual's international work experience will serve as a resource influencing the relationship between negative threat appraisals and levels of frustration and anxiety due to their acquired expertise in the area of international work.

Hypothesis 6. **For individuals who report higher threat appraisals, international work experience should be more negatively related to reported frustration and anxiety. International work experience should not be as strongly related to frustration and anxiety for those who report lower threat appraisals.**

It should also be noted that a moderation hypothesis is not being made for the relationship between challenge appraisals and international work experience on psychological capital. The main reasoning for this links back to Lazarus's (1966) original theory where he states that the secondary appraisal process related to assessing an individual's resources to cope with demands is only relevant if the objective characteristic of the work environment is initially appraised as threatening. If the characteristic, in this case international work, is appraised as highly challenging then an assessment of resources such as job experience is not as relevant or important. Therefore, while it is possible that higher international work experience could be related to outcomes such as psychological capital, job satisfaction, and job performance it is not thought that experience will moderate the relationship between challenge appraisals and psychological capital.

Self-monitoring

Self-monitoring is an individual difference personality variable that reflects the ability to modify a person's self-presentation given the demands of a situation, in addition to a sensitivity to the behavior of others around him/her (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). Self-monitoring was chosen as a personal resource to investigate as a moderator in the proposed study due to its theoretical relationships with the variables presented in the model along with its similarity to the popular concept of adaptability defined as the ability to both assimilate information from the environment and accommodate behavior to the demands of that environment (Glover, Rainwater, Jones, & Friedman, 2002). Both of these constructs, self-monitoring and adaptability, are defined various ways in the

literature. The conceptualization and assessment of self-monitoring offered by Lennox and Wolfe (1984) is the most relevant to the present study.

Self-monitoring as a personality construct was first proposed by Snyder (1974) to consist of five factors: (a) concern with the social appropriateness of an individual's self-presentation, (b) attention to social comparison information, (c) ability to control and modify an individual's self-presentation, (d) the use of this ability in particular situations, (e) the extent to which the individual's self-presentation is consistent across situations (p. 529). A series of empirical studies utilizing Snyder's (1974) measure of self-monitoring revealed an inconsistent factor structure. Self-monitoring emerged as three separate factors: acting ability, extraversion, and other directedness (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). In response to this inconsistency in findings, Lennox and Wolfe proposed a Revised Self-Monitoring Scale assessing simply the ability to modify self-presentation and sensitivity to the expressive behaviors of others. They proposed, and found empirical support through exploratory factor analysis, that the remaining factors proposed by Snyder should be measured as the separate construct of concern for appropriateness. Snyder and Gangestad (1986) responded to the criticisms of Snyder's scale by proposing their own revision of an 18 item measure (from the original 25 item measure). However, this new scale still includes items reflecting acting ability and extraversion that are not included in the Lennox and Wolfe (1984) revised scale.

In the current study it is hypothesized that high self-monitoring will function as a personal resource that employees could use to cope with the demands of international work. Since individuals higher in self monitoring are sensitive to changes in the behavior

of those around them (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984), these individuals should be better able to sense the meaningful variations in their work environment that are created by working in an international context. Interactions with individuals who are vastly different from the worker, in terms of culture and/or language, demand that the individual be able to perceive the content of those differences in a clear way. In addition, individuals high in self-monitoring are better able to modify their self-presentation based on the information perceived from the environment (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). Therefore, individuals higher in self-monitoring should be better able to modify their behavior so that it is appropriate to the vastly different environments they find themselves in when engaged in international work. It is hypothesized that those individuals higher in self monitoring, within the current study, will interpret their international work as more of a challenge and less of a threat.

Hypothesis 7. For individuals higher in self-monitoring, as they report higher levels of international work they will report lower levels of threat and higher levels of challenge than those who report lower levels of international work. For individuals engaged in higher current levels of international work, self-monitoring should be more positively related to challenge appraisals and negatively related to threat appraisals. Self-monitoring should not be as strongly related to challenge and threat appraisals for those currently engaged in lower levels of international work.

Similarly for those individuals who perceive their international work as more of a threat, those who are higher in self-monitoring should still be able to better navigate the different situations he/she finds himself/herself in when engaged in international work which will be related to better outcomes. Within the literature on long-term international assignments, one study of 99 American expatriates in Europe found that individuals high in self-monitoring reported higher levels of general and interactional adjustment than those individuals lower in self-monitoring (Harrison, Chadwick, & Scales, 1996). These authors theorized that this relationship was found because individuals low in self-monitoring, when faced with difficult or threatening situations on their assignment, continued to behave in the same manner they always did and failed to adapt their behavior to the demands of the situation. Therefore, it is hypothesized in the current study that this pattern of non-adaptation, despite the demands of the situation, for individuals lower in self-monitoring will be related to higher levels of frustration and anxiety for individuals who report higher threat appraisals.

Hypothesis 8. For individuals who report higher threat appraisals, self-monitoring should be more negatively related to reported frustration and anxiety. Self-monitoring should not be as strongly related to frustration and anxiety for those who report lower threat appraisals.

Also for self-monitoring, it should be noted that a hypothesis is not being made for a moderation relationship of self-monitoring and challenge appraisals on psychological capital. Supported by the same idea described in the section on international work experience, self-monitoring, as a personal resource, is not as relevant

for individuals who report higher challenge appraisals as for individuals who report higher threat appraisals. If individuals are already appraising their international work as a positive challenge then they don't need to additionally assess their resources for overcoming the demands.

Perceived Organizational Support for International Work

Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, and Sowa (1986) proposed and found evidence for a construct they named Perceived Organizational Support (POS). They found that employees form global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. In addition, they proposed a measure of these global beliefs. Since this proposal many researchers have found that POS accounts for significant variance in many important organizational outcomes. POS has been found to correlate positively with job attendance, performance, affective attachment to the organization (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & LaMastro, 1990), and organizational citizenship behaviors (Shore & Wayne, 1993). The present study plans to narrow the scope of this construct to specifically address Perceived Organizational Support for International Work. Similar modifications of this construct have been made previously. For example, Kraimer and Wayne (2004) proposed and found support for three separate and more specific areas of POS for expatriate employees: Adjustment POS, or the extent to which the organization cares about the employee and their family adjustment after transfer, Career POS or the extent to which the organization cares about employee's career needs, and Financial POS or the extent to which the organization cares about employee financial needs and rewards employee contributions.

For the present study POS and POS for international work are seen as two separate constructs. Employees could believe that overall the organization values their contributions and cares for their well-being and also believe that the organization is failing to value their unique contributions to the global business and/or failing to take care of him/her when they are engaged in the specific tasks that are considered international work as often these tasks require more care of the employee on the part of the organization. In a sense high POS for international work is going above and beyond what an employee might consider their global assessment of POS.

The current study proposes that employees who are engaged in international work will view their international work as more of a challenge and less of a threat when they perceive higher levels of organizational support for international work. Employees who feel higher levels of this kind of support should, theoretically, feel that while their international work can add challenges, it is likely that if he/she has trouble dealing with those challenges on his/her own then the organization will step in and help because the employee is valued and the organization cares about his/her well-being.

Hypothesis 9. For individuals who report higher perceived organizational support for international work, as they report higher levels of international work they will report lower levels of threat and higher levels of challenge than those who report lower levels of international work. For individuals engaged in higher current levels of international work, perceived organizational support for international work should be more positively related to challenge appraisals and negatively related to threat appraisals. Perceived organizational support for international

work should not be as strongly related to challenge and threat appraisals for those currently engaged in lower levels of international work.

In addition, if international work is perceived as highly threatening but the employee feels that the organization highly supports his/her international work then it is proposed this will be related to less reported frustration and anxiety. Within the long-term international assignment literature, significant positive relationships have been found between expatriate perceptions of company support and cross-cultural adjustment (e.g. Shaffer, Harrison, & Gilley, 1999; Guzzo, Noonan, & Elron, 1994) and this relationship has been replicated in the still minority population of women expatriate employees as well (Caligiuri, Joshi, & Lazarova, 1999). In this literature it is thought that although long-term international assignments are highly stressful and demanding on the employee, when the organization provides support for the unique needs of this population, it leads to higher reported levels of adjustment and other indicators of well-being. For the current proposal, theoretically if the employee interprets his/her international work as a threat but then also feels like the organization will step in and help when needed then it is likely that these individuals will experience lower levels of frustration and anxiety about this international work.

Hypothesis 10. **For individuals who report higher threat appraisals, perceived organizational support for international work should be more negatively related to reported frustration and anxiety. Perceived organizational support for international work should not be as strongly related to frustration and anxiety for those who report lower threat appraisals.**

CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Study 1

Sample

For the qualitative study, approximately 2000 alumni of the Masters of Business Administration program of a mid-sized state university were anonymously surveyed. One hundred and seventeen responses were received for a response rate of approximately six percent. Ninety-four respondents were male and 23 were female. Age of participants ranged from 26 to 65 years with a mean of 41 years. One hundred twelve respondents listed their race as White, 2 Black, 2 Asian, and 1 Hispanic. Six participants had earned their doctorate degree after finishing their MBA.

Participants had been working for their current employer for a mean of 7.1 years (85.67 months). On average, participants had been in their current role for a little over 3 years (38.16 months). Fifty-five percent of respondents worked for a very large firm (500 million USD + in annual revenues), 18% worked for a medium to large organization (51 – 500 million USD in annual revenues), and 28% worked for a small firm (less than 50 million USD in annual revenues).

Procedure

An anonymous on-line survey tool was created for data collection in this study by an independent web designer. The survey contained a combination of multiple choice and open-ended questions. These questions were designed to (a) describe the participant's current international work responsibilities, (b) assess the participant's

perceptions of benefits and risks associated with international work responsibilities, (c) assess the participant's perceptions of their organization's support for international work roles, (d) assess the participant's perceptions of his/her own qualifications for conducting international work responsibilities, and (e) collect basic descriptive data about the person and organization (see Appendix B for the list of questions). The experimenter mailed a letter from the Director of Alumni Relations for the college to each MBA alumnus requesting participation in the study and providing a link to an on-line survey. Then, six weeks later the same Director of Alumni Relations e-mailed each MBA alumnus who was enrolled in the on-line alumni list-serve a reminder to participate.

Study 2

Sample

Two similar organizations participated in the current study; both were manufacturers of industrial goods marketed to other businesses. One hundred sixteen individual employees participated from Organization 1 and 98 of those had matched supervisor ratings of job performance. Sixty-nine employees participated from Organization 2 and 42 of those had matched supervisor ratings of performance. Only those participants with matched supervisor ratings of performance were utilized in the analysis (see Results section for details on data screening). The following description of the sample is based on the 139 participants included in the structural equation modeling analysis.

Ninety-one participants filled out surveys with paper and pencil while 48 participated in an identical on-line survey. Sixty-five percent of the sample was male and

35% were female. The race distribution in the sample was 76% White, 4% Black, 5% Hispanic, 15% Asian. Ages of the participants ranged from 23 to 65 years with a mean age of 42.8. The highest education level of the participants varied greatly: 3 with a high school diploma, 16 with some college, 3 with an associates or technical degree, 62 with a bachelors degree, 50 with a master's degree, and 5 with a doctorate level degree.

Employees reported being in their current role anywhere from 0 to 192 months (~16 years) with a mean role tenure of 33.7 months (~2.5 years). Employees reported working for their current employer for anywhere from 1 to 480 months (~40 years) with a mean tenure with the employer of 89.7 months (~7.5 years). Employees had worked in their current career field for anywhere from 3 to 540 months (~45 years) with a mean career tenure of 175.9 months (~14.5 years). In addition, employees reported working in jobs that had some form of international work responsibilities anywhere from 0 to 540 months (~45 years) with a mean tenure for international work responsibilities of 136.3 months (~11 years). Seventeen participants were currently relocated outside of their native country. Thirty-one participants were born outside of the USA and 38 had lived outside of the USA for one year or more.

Procedure

The quantitative data collection consisted of each participant filling out a questionnaire containing measures of all of the proposed constructs with the exception of job performance. Then, each participant's supervisor completed a measure of his/her job performance. This procedure was carried out on-line or on paper, depending on the needs of each organization with Organization 1 responding primarily through paper and pencil

and Organization 2 responding primarily on-line. The researcher traveled to the headquarters office of Organization 1 to administer the surveys to employees and supervisors, create a random experimental Identification Number (ID) for each participant that matched him/her with his/her supervisor rating of performance, and answer any relevant questions. Individuals within Organization 1 who were not available to fill out the employee or supervisor survey during the researcher's visit were e-mailed links to the appropriate on-line survey as well as an assigned ID number so that they could participate on-line the next week. For Organization 2 the researcher worked with a liaison in the human resources department to identify potential participants and their supervisors and assign them an ID number. The liaison within the organization then sent an e-mail to each identified employee and supervisor containing his/her random ID number (or the ID numbers of the employees he/she was supposed to rate) and the link to the appropriate survey. The survey was programmed so that participants had to enter a valid ID number in order to view the questions, supervisors filling out ratings for multiple employees could fill out the linked survey one time for each valid ID he/she entered.

Measures

Demographic questions. Basic demographic information (e.g., gender, age, race, ethnicity, education) was collected for each participant using a set of items developed specifically for this study (see Appendix M). In addition, demographic information thought to be possibly related to the outcomes of interest was also collected. For example, the organization in which the data was collected and the employee's tenure in their role, organization, and career was obtained.

International Work Demands. The measure of international work demands was developed specifically for the present study. This measure consisted of one item that assesses whether or not individuals are currently relocated outside of his/her home country. This item was analyzed separately from the other international work demands. In addition, six items (one for each remaining cell in the matrix) were developed to quantify the amount of international work demands participants are experiencing in his/her current role (see Appendix C). Participants indicated the extent to which each item is present in their current job. Responses were given on a 5-point scale ranging from “Not at all” to “Very much.” Two example items are, “I work with individuals located in other countries (i.e. over the phone and through e-mail) whose culture is different from my own,” and “I travel outside of my native country to countries where the native language is different than my own for work.”

Challenge and Threat Appraisal. In order to assess challenge and threat appraisals a modified version of the 18-item Cognitive Appraisal Scale (Skinner & Brewer, 2002) was utilized for this study (see Appendix D). Participants responded to questions in reference to all of the international work they engage in on their current job. Responses on this measure are indicated on seven point Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Internal consistency reliability for the original threat scale was .92 and for the original challenge scale it was .85 (Skinner & Brewer, 2002). An example item for the challenge scale used for the current study is, “I tend to focus on the positive aspects of my international work” and an example item for the

threat scale is, “I worry that I will say or do the wrong things when engaged in my international work.”

Psychological Capital. The 24-item Psychological Capital Scale (PCQ) (Luthans, Youssef, & Avoilio, 2007) was utilized to measure psychological capital (see Appendix E). This scale was created based on previously published scales (Parker, 1998, Snyder et al., 1996, Wagmild & Young, 1993, and Scheier & Carver, 1985) and can be divided into four subscales: (a) Self-efficacy: Items 1-6, (b) Hope: Items 7-12, (c) Resilience: Items 13-18, (d) Optimism: Items 19-24. Responses are indicated on a six-point Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” An example item from the Self-efficacy subscale is, “I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area.” An example item from the Hope subscale is, “Right now I see myself as being pretty successful at work.” An example item from the Resilience subscale is, “I usually manage difficulties one way or another at work.” An example item from the Optimism subscale is, “I always look at the bright side of things regarding my job.”

Initial research conducted with the PCQ indicated that the aggregate overall PCQ score accounts for additional variance than each of the subscales combined (i.e., the total score accounted for a significant amount of incremental variance above and beyond a model containing just the four subscale scores) (Luthans et al., 2007). Therefore, the total PCQ score will be used for analysis in the current study. Measurement properties of the PCQ have been established through repeated testing including a stable factor structure and reliability among the items (Luthans et al., 2007). Psychological Capital, measured with the PCQ, has demonstrated consistently strong relationship with outcomes of

interest to the workplace such as performance and job satisfaction. Data have been collected to support these findings from various firms (e.g., hospitals, aerospace firms, and manufacturing companies) as well as across cultures (e.g., India and China) (Luthans et al., 2007).

Work Frustration. The 3-item Organizational Frustration Scale (Peters, O'Connor, & Rudolf, 1980) was used to assess level of frustration with work (see Appendix F). Responses to this scale are indicated on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." An example item is, "Trying to get this job done is a very frustrating experience." The initial study utilizing this measure found a coefficient alpha of .76 (Peters et al., 1980) and later studies (e.g., Chen & Spector, 1992) found similar reliabilities for this scale, .78. Evidence has been found that work frustration is related to workplace stressors, in general ($r=.77$) (Chen & Spector, 1992), as well as more specifically role conflict ($r=.46$), work overload ($r=.61$), and organizational constraints ($r=.47$) (Spector & O'Connell, 1994). In addition, work frustration has been related to many important workplace outcomes such as job satisfaction ($r=-.26$) (Spector & O'Connell, 1994), ($r=-.31$) and intentions to quit ($r=.36$) (Chen & Spector, 1992).

Anxiety on the Job. In order to assess anxiety, a modified version (same modifications as Spector & Jex, 1991) of the 20-item State Anxiety subscale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, 1983) was used (see Appendix G). Responses for this inventory are rated on a 4-point scale ranging from "Not at all" to "Very much so." Two example items are, "I feel calm," and "I am tense." In past research, the STAI State

Anxiety subscale has demonstrated internal consistency reliabilities ranging from .83 to .92 and test-retest reliability ranging from .16 to .62 (Spielberger, 1983). Anxiety on the job has been found to be related to work frustration in two studies: ($r=.53$) (Spector & Jex, 1991) and ($r=.59$) (Spector & O'Connell, 1994). In addition, anxiety on the job has been related to job satisfaction ($r=-.38$) and turnover intentions ($r=.43$) (Spector & Jex, 1991).

Job Satisfaction. Job satisfaction was assessed with Hackman and Oldham's (1975) Job Diagnostic Survey, more specifically the 3-item "general satisfaction" subscale (see Appendix H). An example item for this scale is, "Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with this job." The response scale for these items is a seven point Likert type scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree," to "Strongly Agree." This scale has been utilized in numerous previous studies and has shown relatively strong internal consistency reliability, ranging from .77 to .82 (deJong, van der Velde, & Jansen, 2001; Fillian, Tremblay, & Truchan, 2007). The relationship between job satisfaction and job performance is a highly debated issue in the literature, but the relationship between the two is meta-analytically estimated to be about $r=.30$ (Judge et al., 2001). The relationship between satisfaction and indicators of well-being at work was previously discussed in the above sections.

Job Performance. Supervisor rated overall job performance was assessed in the current study with Hochwarter, Witt, Treadway, and Ferris's (2006) 6-item measure (see Appendix I). Supervisors rate employees on a five point scale: 1 (weak or bottom 10%), 2(fair or next 20%), 3(good or next 40%), 4 (very good or next 20%), 5 (best or top

10%). Items are summed to yield a total performance score for each worker. Two example items are, “This employee finds creative and effective solutions to problems,” and “This employee strives to meet deadlines.” The internal consistency reliability of this scale was tested by the authors with two different samples. Results indicated high levels of reliability (Study 1, $\alpha = .88$, Study 2, $\alpha = .85$).

Experience. International experience was measured utilizing a scale developed specifically for this study. Participants were instructed to rate the amount of experience they have had over the course of their whole career with each facet of international work (the same 6 questions presented on the international work demands measure). Responses were given on a 4 point scale ranging from “None” to “A lot of experience.” (see Appendix J).

Self-monitoring. Self-monitoring were measured using Lennox and Wolfe’s (1984) Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (see Appendix K). This scale was modified from Snyder’s (1974) Self-Monitoring Scale to assess the narrower definition of self-monitoring as the ability to modify self-presentation and sensitivity to expressive behavior of others. Responses were given on a 6 point Likert-type scale ranging from “Certainly, Always False” to “Certainly, always true.” Example items are, “In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else is called for,” and “I am often able to read people’s true emotions correctly through their eyes.” Lennox and Wolfe (1984) found internal consistency reliability for the ability to modify self-presentation items to be .77 while the alpha for sensitivity to expressive behavior of other subscale was .70. In addition, Day, Schleicher, Unckless, and Hiller (2002) found

an average alpha of .81 for this scale across 14 samples. Meta-analytic results for relationships between self-monitoring and important outcomes, utilizing data from many self-monitoring scales, revealed small relationships with outcomes such as performance ($r=.09$) and job satisfaction ($r = -.04$) (Day et al., 2002). Lennox and Wolfe (1984) did find a significant relationship between social anxiety and self-monitoring ($r = -.18$).

Perceived Organizational Support for International Work. A modified version of the 8-item shortened version of Eisenberger et al.'s (1986) Survey of Perceived Organizational Support was utilized for this study (see Appendix L). Participants were instructed to answer each question with respect to his/her own feelings about the particular organization for which he/she is now working – indicating his/her degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement specifically regarding his/her international work. Responses were indicated on a 7-point Likert scale. An example item is, “The organization values the contribution my international work makes to its well-being.” The shortened version of this scale follows the recommendations of Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) due to the unidimensionality and high internal reliability of the original scale the use of shorter versions does not appear to be problematic.

Data Analysis

Study 1

The experimenter downloaded the data for study one from the on-line data collection tool to a Microsoft Excel file. Then the experimenter followed the Weber (1990) protocol for content analysis of open-ended responses. This protocol included the identification of three groups of independent coders, consisting of both undergraduate

students and graduate students, who were unaware of the hypotheses and goals of the research. The first group of coders received an Excel file with one sheet for each question and each respondent's text for that question in a separate row. Group 1 consisted of three coders who independently created meaningful categories by which to code the respondents' answers for each question. Then Group 1 met to discuss and resolve discrepancies in categories until a set of categories was agreed upon for each open-ended question. Then, Group 2, consisting of two coders, received an Excel file similar to the one Group 1 received, but with set categories in each column for each question. Group 2 coders independently categorized each respondent's text into one of the categories provided for each question, by indicating a "1" in the appropriate column. Group 2 then met, discussed, and resolved discrepancies in coding by making revisions to the categories. Next, Group 3, consisting of two coders, received a similar Excel file, but with the revised categories. Group 3 first independently divided the respondents' text in each row into separate responses, or rows, where appropriate, for example, if one respondent talked about two different benefits of international work in their text this would be divided into two rows, one for each benefit or response.

Discrepancies in dividing responses were resolved by the experimenter and then the number of respondents and responses for each question were tallied and recorded. Next, Group 3 independently coded each response into the categories provided (that had been revised by Group 2). The experimenter calculated inter-rater reliability statistics for Group 3 and found that all but one question reached an acceptable level, 67% agreement or higher (this level of agreement is below the 90% estimate given as a guideline in the

Weber, 1990 protocol, but was determined to be acceptable in the current situation given the breadth of the questions and the descriptive goals of the data). Of the 9 questions analyzed, 1 had 67% agreement, 5 had 70-75% agreement, and 3 had 86-89% agreement. Group 3 met for the one question that fell below an acceptable level in their first coding and discrepancies were discussed and the categories were again revised. Group 3 then independently recoded the one question into the new categories. This time inter-rater agreement reached an acceptable level. Finally, one independent coder, who had not participated in Group 1, 2, or 3 and who was also not aware of the hypotheses, resolved discrepancies in the final coding by choosing between the categories indicated by the Group 3 raters. During the process, two questions were eliminated from the content analysis when it was determined that the responses to these questions added no new information to responses that were given in other areas of the survey.

Study 2

Methods of structural equation modeling, utilizing the EQS 6.1 software, were used in order to analyze the data obtained from the quantitative portion of the study. Fit indices recommended by Kline (2005) were used in order to assess model fit. First, the measurement model was assessed for all constructs in the model, including the international work demands measure, to ensure that measures functioned properly in the quantitative sample. More specifically, the baseline model was examined for overall fit with all parameters freely estimated. Indicators of misfit were examined with the LaGrange Multiplier (LM) test, including inadequate item loadings on a factor, absence of needed error covariances among the items, and cross-loadings of items on other

factors, among others. Once the measurement model was established, the proposed theoretical model of the effects of international work demands (see Figure 1) was tested using structural path analysis with latent variables and a series of Sobel (1982) mediation tests. Fit indices were examined in order to determine whether the variances and covariances implied in the theoretical model are consistent with the observed variances and covariance. For example, the model chi-square test examined the difference between the estimated or theoretical model and the observed model. In addition, the comparative fit index (CFI) and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) were examined as a comparative and absolute fit index respectively.

Finally, a series of tests were run in order to assess the effects of the proposed moderators according to the unconstrained approach suggested by Marsh, Wen, and Hau (2004). After a strong measurement model was obtained for each variable, as discussed above, for this analysis, all indicators of the included independent variables were mean centered. Then, from the measurement model, indicators of the two independent variables were matched based on the loading to their respective latent factor with highest loadings first. Only indicators with sufficiently high loadings were used to calculate interaction terms, with three indicators per latent variable. The model was run in EQS with all parameters freely estimated except for constraints applied for the identification of the model. Robust estimations of the same fit indices described above were examined in order to determine if the moderation model fits the observed data. Significance tests were also conducted in order to determine if significant moderation occurred within the

data. If significant moderation was found then additional tests of simple slopes were conducted in order to describe the results.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Study 1

Overall Summary

Overall, the data gathered in Study 1 yielded informative results relevant to how workers think about their international work demands. The specific questions aimed at understanding the different types of international work that employees are engaged in were written in a way that was too broad and responses were not useful to address this question. However, many of the other questions provided useful information about the qualitative content of many of the constructs that were included in the quantitative Study 2. For example, responses to two of the questions provided information regarding the aspects of international work individuals find to be positive challenges and what aspects are negative and threatening. Two additional questions addressed the proposed moderators in Study 2 by addressing first what types of organizational support individuals are receiving for their international work responsibilities and what other personal qualifications they have for engaging in international work. Responses about qualifications for international work included many examples where individuals discussed their experience and/or adaptability. Below, a detailed content analysis of each question that yielded analyzable responses is provided.

International Work Description

Fifty-nine percent of respondents worked for highly global organizations with business in multiple countries and 24% indicated that their organizations are somewhat

global or beginning to grow globally. Seventeen percent indicated their organization had little to no global ties. Most of the participants (112) described the primary industry of their organization in the survey. The majority worked for manufacturing businesses with 24 respondents indicating they worked for a manufacturing business that was not specified in another category. Seventeen respondents work in engineering or construction, 12 work in information technology and communications, 13 work in finance, banking, or accounting, and 7 work in a business that could not be categorized. In addition, the following industries had less than 10 respondents each: law (2), insurance (3), consulting in industry not specified elsewhere (5), other professional services (8), health care and medicine (8), education (6), government/military (3), and retail (4).

Related to their international work, six respondents indicated they were currently located outside of their native country and 70 indicated they travel outside of their home country for their current job. Of those 70 respondents, 40 take 0-3 trips per year, 22 take 4-7 trips per year, 4 take 8-12 trips per year, and 6 take 12 or more trips per year. Each trip lasts 1 to 2 weeks in length on average. Of those 70 respondents, 51 travel internationally in North America, 13 in South America, 18 in Central America, 55 in Western Europe, 14 in Eastern Europe, 27 in Asia, 2 in Africa, 6 in Australia, and 8 in the Middle East. Seventy-three percent of respondents indicated that they interact with individuals in their current job who speak a different native language while 65% indicated they work with individuals in their current job who speak the same native language but whose native culture is different from their own.

Purpose of International Travel

Sixty-six participants described their most common purpose or goal for their international business travel in six main categories (see Table 1), although about half of the participant's 104 responses were not specific enough to be properly categorized. Responses in the "not specified" category included, "business," and "meeting with clients." Sales trips made up about 5% of response and included responses such as "coordinate with regional sales offices," and "increasing sales internationally." Receiving or providing training made up 7% of the responses. One participant, in this category remarked, "Training... to better understand global needs, local customs and the impact of business strategies and tactics on these "local" markets." Another 7% of the responses included international travel with a goal of providing expertise to local business. One respondent in this category said, "Help local business offices in reaching sales and marketing goals." Another respondent stated, "Solving engineering challenges for a tile manufacturer." Four percent of the responses indicated they were attending a conference, convention, or trade show. Planning and organizational development was the most common purpose of an international trip stated with 25% of responses fitting this category, "Face to face meet with colleagues from other sites in the company as part of project implementation," stated one response in this category. Finally, 6% of respondents most commonly traveled to another country to conduct an audit or compliance investigation, "Audits of facilities for compliance," one respondent indicated.

Table 1. *Purpose of International Travel*

Purpose	% Response
1. Not Specified	46%
2. Planning and Organizational Development	25%
3. Receiving or Providing Training	7%
4. Providing expertise to local business	7%
5. Conducting audit or compliance investigation	6%
6. Sales	5%
7. Attending conference, convention, or trade show	4%

Benefits of International Work

Seventy-seven respondents indicated 127 benefits of international work (see Table 2). The majority of responses, 42%, reflected a benefit of increased cultural awareness, respect, or appreciation. Example responses in this category include, “Get to visit another culture and learn from it and they can learn from mine,” and “Much better understanding of other cultures; a realization that people's values are not that different even though cultures can be.” The second largest group of responses, 21%, reflected opportunity for business growth and professional development. An example response from this category is, “Revenue generated from international sales now exceeds 50% of total revenue for the company. This diversification provides opportunities in that we are less affected by the current severe economic downturn in the US.” Ten percent of responses indicated that they viewed the ability to travel and see other parts of the world as a major benefit to international work, “Personally allows the ability to travel and see parts of the world that I otherwise may not.” Other groups of responses, containing less than 10% of responses each, included: personal networking and meeting new people (6%), learning and practicing a new language (4%), and personal/professional challenges

(6%). Eight percent of responses were sorted as “miscellaneous benefits” these include responses such as, “learn to like real Chinese and Indian food!” and “variety of tasks & assignments.”

Table 2. *Benefits of International Work*

Benefit	% Response
1. Increased cultural awareness, respect, and/or appreciation	42%
2. Opportunity for business growth or professional development	21%
3. Ability to travel and see the world	10%
4. Misc. benefits	8%
5. Personal networking	6%
6. Personal and/or professional challenges	6%
7. Learning and practicing a new language	4%

Challenges and Risks of International Work

Seventy-five respondents indicated 112 challenges and risks associated with their international work (see Table 3). Challenges related to language and communication were most often indicated, 26%. Examples include, “Language barriers and mis-understanding of specifications, especially units of measure,” and “Most significant aspect is the communication challenge. I would benefit the most if I could speak Mandarin...” The second largest group of challenges (24%) was dealing with cultural differences. Examples include, “Understanding cultural differences, attitudes and expectations,” and “It is a challenge not to impose cultural ideas from my own country on the actions I observe by those not from my country. Often, their actions do not have those same cultural connotations.” Safety risks made up 8% of responses including, “getting lost in a dangerous area and not knowing it.” Work-family conflicts also made

up 8% of responses, “International travel is often difficult on my family because of the length of the trips and the time difference often makes it difficult to communicate.” Four percent of responses indicated general negative effects on health as a major risk including jet lag, exhaustion, and stress, “wear and tear on the body due to travel and time zones.” Two responses indicated a concern about health care in the countries where they were traveling, “Health concerns and lack of modern medical facilities for employees.” Other categories of responses included challenges related to time-zone differences (5%), exchange rate and currency issues (4%), understanding international laws, regulations, and enforcement (4%), and time wasted in transit during international travel (2%). Miscellaneous challenges and risks made up 8% of responses. One interesting response in this category, “Biggest challenge is ensuring that the meetings are as productive as possible once you get there. Travel is long and expensive - you need to get the most out of your trip. However, in prepping for the trip, it's a challenge to coordinate meetings and topics beforehand.”

Table 3. *Challenges and Risks of International Work*

Challenge or Risk	% Response
1. Language and communication challenges	26%
2. Working across cultural differences	24%
3. Personal safety	8%
4. Misc challenges or risks	8%
5. Time zone changes and/or differences	5%
6. Negative effects of travel on personal health	4%
7. Exchange rate and/or currency issues	4%
8. Understanding international laws, regulations, and/or enforcements	4%
9. Time wasted in international transit and recovery	2%
10. Uncertainty about health care in an emergency	2%

Organizational Support for International Work

Sixty-six respondents provided 89 responses related to organizational support for international work (see Table 4). Twenty-two percent of those responses indicated no support from the organization. Sixteen percent indicated that the organization provided language training or assistance. Thirteen percent indicated organization provided culture or diversity training or assistance. For example, “We have to complete a diversity training course annually,” and “The Head of Global HR counsels me on a weekly basis on how to navigate the politics of the organization, especially when dealing with different cultures.” Translators or other experts were mentioned in 9% of the responses, for example, “Maintains bi-lingual support staff in China.” Smaller numbers of responses indicated health and security protection (2 %) and organizational flexibility (6%). An example of organizational flexibility is, “The company encourages flexible work hours.” Other miscellaneous forms of support (31%) included examples such as, “excellent resources for managing travel, ie travel agency,” “Provide financial, technical, logistics support,” and “The company provides communication tools (cell phones that are international in capability).”

Table 4. *Organizational Support for International Work*

Organizational Support Type	% Response
1. Miscellaneous support	31%
2. No support	22%
3. Language training or assistance	16%
4. Cultural diversity training or assistance	13%
5. Translators or other experts	9%
6. Organizational flexibility	6%
7. Health and security protection	2%

Communication in International Work

Eighty-three respondents described their work with individuals who speak a different native language. Of the 226 responses provided, 7% specified that they communicated with English as a common language while 7% specified that they used a translator. One percent indicated that the respondent used the other person's native language to communicate (191 responses or 86% did not specify how they communicated with individuals who spoke a different native language). The majority of responses indicated that phone and e-mail were the primary mediums of communication with individuals who speak a different native language. Twelve percent specified they work face to face with individuals who speak a different native language while 4% utilized an advanced form of technology to communicate such as video conferencing or teleconferencing (73 responses or 32% did not indicate a medium for communication).

Qualifications for International Work

Fifty-eight respondents provided 120 (113 usable) examples of characteristics that made them qualified to engage in international work (see Table 5). Many discussed their experience or expertise including experience living or traveling abroad (16%), field specific expertise (5%), and experience interacting with individuals from other cultures (5%). Some example responses from this group are, "I was stationed in Italy for 5 years with the US army," "7 yrs of experience with (2) different multinational organizations," and "I've worked for an Australian company (in Australia) for three years, as well as British, Swedish and Israeli companies in the US." Other responses indicated education (6%) or language skills (7%) as qualifications for international work, for example: "I

have a undergraduate degree in International Business and French,” and “I have a level of fluency in two languages other than English.” Many responses described something about their personality or attitudes related to international work. Some indicated they are open-minded and open to new ideas (13%), some stated they are respectful of differences or tolerant (7%). Eleven percent indicated adaptability or flexibility as their qualification including these responses, “adaptable to different types of people and surroundings,” and “I have also learned to adapt to my environment when needed.” Eleven percent indicated they are task-focused and goal-oriented as a qualification and 12% indicated they are adventurous and eager and willing to take on international experiences. One response stated, “Desire to broaden experience and learn about other cultures.” Other qualifications that were not categorized included, “good communication skills,” “Cultural and political skills,” and “ability to maximize available resources.”

Table 5. *Qualifications for International Work*

Qualification	% Response
1. International experience or expertise	16%
2. Open minded and/or open to new ideas	13%
3. Adventurous, eager, and/or willing to take on international experiences	12%
4. Adaptability and/or flexibility	11%
5. Task-focused and/or goal oriented	11%
6. Language skills	7%
7. Respectful of differences and/or tolerant	7%
8. Education	6%
9. Intercultural experience	5%
10. Field specific experience	5%

Other International Work Considerations

When asked about other international work considerations that had not been previously covered on the survey, forty respondents provided text and ten of those responses indicated something relevant and not already covered. Four responses discussed working with international materials and supplies, two discussed pricing and currency issues, four mentioned international laws, taxes, and regulations. For example, “we deal with international tax treaties and international accounting standards,” and “We purchase parts from countries around the world.”

Study 2

Data Preparation

Data were examined for outlier cases that may have a disproportionate influence on the hypothesis tests. More specifically, the Malanobis distance test was used to examine multivariate outliers with a critical value of 130 to indentify significant leverage (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2001) and no significant outlying cases were identified. The skewness and kurtosis of each item were also examined. All items’ skewness were found to be at an acceptable level. Twenty items had kurtosis above 3.00 but no items were severe enough to be eliminated based on kurtosis values alone. Two cases were eventually eliminated from the measurement and structural model in EQS due to their extreme influence on the Normalized Estimate of kurtosis for the model.

Of the 192 individuals who responded to the survey in study two, 7 were eliminated due to large proportions of missing data (each were missing data from two or more entire scales). Data were imputed with the dataset of 185 cases using the

Expectation Maximization (EM) method in EQS. The EM method imputes data based upon two pieces of information: 1) the responses on other items a participant completed, and 2) the inter-relationships found among all items in the full sample. Forty-four data points were imputed out of a possible 16,835 data points (less than .01%). No individual was missing more than two data points on any one scale. A significant MCAR test revealed that the missing data did not meet the MCAR assumption, MAR was assumed. It is thought that this is likely due to the small number of missing data points, over 30 separate missing data patterns were found with only 44 missing cells. With this small amount of data, it was decided that imputation was still appropriate under the MAR assumption.

Of the 185 individuals who responded to the employee survey, 141 of their supervisor's rated their overall performance. The supervisor ratings of performance were examined for possible nested effects due to the fact that some supervisors rated multiple participants. An ANOVA was conducted to compute the ICC1 (Bliese & Halverson, 1998) statistic. Eighty-six supervisors rated anywhere from 1 to 8 employees. Results indicated an ICC1 of .65 indicating that 65% of the variance in individual performance ratings was attributable to the supervisor. With this relatively high proportion of the variance in ratings attributable to the supervisor, it is important to group mean center the performance ratings in order to remove these effects in the model for hypothesis testing. Group mean centering provided a cleaner investigation of relationships among the included variables and performance given that the group mean centered performance variable only represented variation attributable to individual employee behavior.

Measurement Model

The measurement model was initially built with all indicators included in the employee survey except for the international work demands scale (not included because the amount of demands is not a conceptually reflective factor). Three of the scales, the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) State-subscale, and the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale, proved to be problematic for various reasons. The items in the PCQ (analyzed as a 4 factor structure including self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience) were highly related to each other as well as to other items and latent factors within the measurement model. This is likely a function of the very broad domain space of the Psychological Capital meta-construct.

The items in the STAI formed two factors, one with positively worded items and one with negatively worded items, which is consistent with Spielberger and Vagg's (1984) findings of a state-anxiety present and state-anxiety absent factor structure. However, in addition, five items did not load even moderately on either factor (regretful, self-confident, jittery, high strung, and over-excited) and reduced the fit of the model below acceptable levels unless they were eliminated.

The Revised Self-Monitoring Scale was analyzed according to Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) theory with a two factor solution reflecting 1) Sensitivity to expressive behavior of others, and 2) Ability to modify self-presentation. This two factor structure was problematic due to high cross loadings of the items across the two factors and with items contained in the PCQ. Given the considerable measurement issues in the current model with these scales and the relatively low sample size (which does not provide

enough power to suggest a complete re-specification of these established measures), I decided to model these variables as observed scores corrected for measurement unreliability.

The International Work Demands Scale was initially conceptualized as a formative factor given that participants could engage in high levels of one type of international work within his/her current role without engaging in high levels of another type. When modeled as a formative factor, it became apparent that the six items clustered into 3 pairs. Therefore, the formative factor was specified with three indicators created by calculating the mean of the two items with similar wording. Two of the indicators had relatively low loadings on the formative factor of international work demands and the one indicator with a high loading had to be fixed to zero (along with the disturbance term) in order to identify the factor. Due to these issues, along with the relatively high internal consistency reliability estimate among the items, I decided to also model International Work Demands as an observed score corrected for unreliability.

The Cognitive Appraisal of International Work Scale was modeled as two reflective factors: Challenge (items 1, 3, 6, and 8) and Threat (items 2, 4, 5, and 7). The Organizational Frustration Scale, Job Diagnostic Survey (general job satisfaction subscale), International Experience Scale, and Perceived Organizational Support for International Work Scale were all modeled as single reflective latent factors. One item was dropped from the Challenge scale (item 3) due to a low loading and high covariances with other items. All loadings were significant and at least moderately high in the final model (see Table 6). Three within factor error covariances were added to the model (two

within the International Experience measure and one within the Perceived Organizational Support for International Work measure) due to similar wording in the items. All factor covariances were modeled. Job performance was modeled with the single group mean centered indicator, as described earlier. Model fit ($N=139$) was estimated with Robust estimations due to moderate multivariate kurtosis (normalized estimate = 19.82). Model fit was at an acceptable level: model Chi-Square = 431.09 with 411 degrees of freedom ($p>.05$), CFI = .97, RMSEA = .02. The CFI, or comparative fit index, provides a percentage improvement of the specified model compared to the independence or null model taking into consideration the degrees of freedom in the model (Bentler, 1990). The RMSEA, or root means square error of approximation, is an absolute fit index that also gives credit for a more parsimonious model (Steiger, 1990).

Table 6. *Standardized Factor Loadings of Latent Variables*

Factor	Item Loadings (In order of survey appearance)							
11. Challenge Appraisal (excluding item 3)	.49	.76	.60					
12. Threat Appraisal	.43	.67	.79	.61				
13. Frustration at Work	.78	.68	-.71					
14. Job Satisfaction	.82	.88	.87					
15. International Work Experience	.89	.49	.75	.91	.54	.75		
16. POS for International Work	.66	-.78	-.70	.60	-.77	.73	-.68	.72

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Table 7 provides ranges, means, standard deviations, and internal reliabilities for each measure used in the study. It is important to note that descriptive statistics and correlations were calculated using the sample of 139 participants who filled out both the self-report questionnaire and had supervisor ratings of performance. Only items retained

in the final measurement model were included. The range, mean, and standard deviations were calculated with observed (or mean) scores for the included items while the correlations were calculated with latent variables in EQS.

Overall, participants reported at least a few international work demands within their current role, although the amount varied. Participants reported relatively high challenge appraisals of their international work and relatively low threat appraisals. Psychological Capital was overall quite high in the sample, as very few participants reported levels below the mid-point of the scale. The means for anxiety and frustration were near the mid-point of the scale. However, participants varied much more in their reports of frustration than anxiety. For the moderators, participants were overall moderately high in self-monitoring, perceived organizational support for international work, and had relatively high amounts of international work experience, with much greater variability in international work experience. Job Satisfaction was overall quite high, and performance ratings were slightly higher than the midpoint.

The internal consistency reliability of each scale was calculated using the Cronbach's alpha statistic. All scales except for the challenge and threat were at an acceptable alpha level (although the frustration scale was somewhat low with $\alpha = .77$). The low alpha levels of the challenge and threat scales could in part be due to the low number of items in each scale and the relatively broad definitions of the constructs. The unreliability in these measures was corrected for by the latent variable modeling process in EQS so the hypothesis tests continued with the scales intact utilizing the latent variables for analysis.

Table 7. *Range, Means, SD, and Alpha Levels*

Measure	Range	M	SD	Alpha Level
1. International Work Demands	1.33 – 5.00	3.45	.80	.79
2. Challenge	4.00 – 7.00	6.07	.74	.59
3. Threat	1.00 - 4.75	2.50	.91	.70
4. Psychological Capital	4.17 – 7.00	5.82	.47	.86
5. Anxiety	1.00 - 3.35	1.78	.43	.91
6. Frustration	1.00 – 6.33	3.65	1.33	.77
7. Self-Monitoring	2.38 – 5.85	4.37	.56	.88
8. POS – International Work	1.88 – 7.00	5.16	.93	.89
9. International Work Experience	1.67 – 6.00	4.17	1.12	.88
10. Job Satisfaction	3.00 – 7.00	5.97	.86	.89
11. Performance	1.40 – 5.00	3.81	.72	.84

Table 8 describes the correlations among the latent variables for the current study.

Current international work demands and international work experience were highly correlated, which is logical if those employees with more previous international work experience are put into roles with progressively higher international work demands. International work demands were significantly correlated with challenge and threat appraisals, so that employees with higher international work demands reported significantly higher challenge appraisals and significantly lower threat appraisals. Participants who reported higher international work demands also reported higher psychological capital and frustration, as well as higher self-monitoring. In addition, results indicated that challenge and threat appraisals have a significant negative relationship with each other. Also those who reported higher challenge appraisals also reported higher Psychological Capital, Self-Monitoring, and International Work Experience.

Individuals who reported higher threat appraisals reported significantly higher anxiety. However, there was no relationship between challenge and threat appraisals and frustration. Higher threat appraisals were significantly related to lower levels of all three resources, Self-monitoring, POS for International Work, and International Work Experience.

Psychological Capital had a significant negative relationship with Anxiety but demonstrated no relationship with Frustration. Higher Psychological capital was also related to higher Job Satisfaction, Self-Monitoring, and International Work Experience. Anxiety and Frustration had a significant positive relationship, although the two variables exhibited different relationships with other variables. Participants who reported higher Frustration and Anxiety also reported lower Perceived Organizational Support for International Work and lower Job Satisfaction. Higher reported Frustration was also related to higher International Work Experience.

Self-monitoring and International Work Experience demonstrated a significant positive relationship. In addition, a significant positive relationship was found between Perceived Organizational Support for International work and Job Satisfaction. None of the measured variables demonstrated a significant bivariate relationship with Performance.

Table 8. *Correlations Among the Variables*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. International Work Demands	-										
2. Challenge	.60*	-									
3. Threat	-.26*	-.65*	-								
4. Psychological Capital	.42*	.61*	-.49*	-							
5. Anxiety	-.02	-.05	.32*	-.42*	-						
6. Frustration	.26*	.03	.13	-.07	.59*	-					
7. Self-Monitoring	.41*	.53*	-.31*	.42*	-.10	-.03	-				
8. POS – International Work	-.01	.05	-.23*	.16	-.37*	-.30*	.04	-			
9. International Work Experience	.83*	.41*	-.32*	.35*	-.07	.22*	.38*	.01	-		
10. Job Satisfaction	.03	.15	-.16	.39*	-.27*	-.34*	.12	.34*	.01	-	
11. Performance	-.02	.14	-.03	.03	.01	-.07	-.05	-.03	.00	.19	-

* Indicates significance ($p < .05$)

Structural Model Fit

In order to specify the structural model, equations specifying the hypothesized paths among the variables were added in EQS. In order to first address the overall model and hypotheses one through four, the moderators were not modeled. In order to achieve model fit, three covariances among factor disturbance terms were added to the model (between challenge and threat appraisals, anxiety and psychological capital, and between anxiety and frustration). Also, one covariance was added between the error term for performance and the disturbance term for job satisfaction. The variances and covariances specified in the hypothesized model fit the observed data well according to Robust estimations: Model Chi-square = 119.20, 108 DF, ($p > .05$), CFI = .96, RMSEA = .03.

In addition to the initial hypothesized model, a second model was tested that included direct paths for each mediated relationship within the hypothesized model, in order to assess whether the proposed mediation effects reflected complete or partial mediation. With these paths specified, model fit improved slightly: Model Chi-Square = 108.10, 101 DF, ($p > .05$), CFI = .97, RMSEA = .02. The model is illustrated in Figure 1, error terms and covariances have been omitted for clarity of the image.

Hypothesis Tests for Direct and Indirect Effects

After good fit for the model was established, the hypotheses related to the direct and indirect effects in the model were be tested.

Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 1 was supported. Individuals who appraised their international work as more of a positive challenge reported higher levels of psychological capital ($B=1.27$, $z=3.97$, $SE=.32$, $p<.05$). The Sobel (1982) test reveals a significant

indirect effect of international work demands on psychological capital through challenge appraisals ($B=.41$, $SE=.13$, $p<.05$). Given that the direct effect of international work demands on psychological capital was non-significant ($B=.03$, $SE=.12$, ns), the effect of international work demands on psychological capital is completely mediated by challenge appraisals, with the indirect effect accounting for 93% of the total effect of international work demands on psychological capital.

Hypothesis 2. Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. Threat appraisals did not significantly predict frustration ($B=.35$, $z=1.83$, $SE=.19$, ns). The Sobel test indicated that the indirect relationship of international work demands on frustration through threat appraisals was not significant. However, the direct effect of international work demands on frustration was significant ($B=.42$, $z=3.19$, $SE=.13$, $p<.05$). In contrast, threat appraisals demonstrated a significant positive relationship with anxiety ($B=.40$, $z=2.58$, $SE=.15$, $p<.05$). The Sobel Test for anxiety revealed that the indirect relationship between international work demands and anxiety through threat appraisals was also non-significant. In addition, the direct effect of international work demands on anxiety was not significant.

Hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 3 was partially supported. Individuals who reported higher levels of psychological capital also reported higher levels of general job satisfaction ($B=.44$, $z=2.95$, $SE=.15$, $p<.05$). The Sobel test indicated a significant indirect effect of challenge appraisals on job satisfaction through psychological capital ($B=.56$, $SE=.24$, $p<.05$); however, the direct effect of challenge appraisals on job satisfaction was negative ($B=-.26$, $SE=.37$, ns). The reversing of sign between the direct

and indirect effect reveals that challenge is acting as a suppressor variable. In contrast, individuals who reported higher levels of psychological capital did not receive higher ratings of job performance ($B=-.02$, $z=-.24$, $SE=.08$, ns). In addition, the Sobel test revealed no significant direct or indirect relationship between challenge appraisals and performance.

Hypothesis 4. Hypothesis 4 was also partially supported. Individuals who reported higher frustration on the job also reported lower levels of general job satisfaction ($B=-.27$, $z=-2.72$, $SE=.10$, $p<.05$). The Sobel test revealed no significant indirect effect of threat appraisals on job satisfaction through frustration. In addition, no direct effect of threat appraisals on job satisfaction was found. In contrast, individuals who reported higher frustration on the job were not rated significantly lower in job performance ($B=-.05$, $z=-1.24$, $SE=.04$, ns). Again the Sobel test revealed no significant indirect effect of threat appraisals on supervisor rated performance through frustration and no significant direct effect was found. Taking a closer look at the effect of anxiety, no significant results were found. Anxiety demonstrated no significant relationship with job satisfaction ($B=.13$, $z=1.07$, $SE=.12$, ns) or with job performance ($B=.03$, $z=.48$, $SE=.07$, ns). In addition, threat appraisals did not demonstrate a significant direct or indirect relationship with job satisfaction or ratings of job performance.

Three Path Mediation Test. Taylor, MacKinnon, and Tein (2008) propose a product-of-coefficients test for three path mediation. With the information provided in the EQS software, this test is optimal as a significance test for the three path mediation hypothesized in the proposed model. The product-of-coefficients test for three path

mediation using the multivariate delta estimation of the standard error utilizes similar information as the Sobel (1982) test used above to describe two path indirect effects.

Three path mediation significance tests were conducted for each of the three proposed multiple mediation models containing job satisfaction. Given that no included variables demonstrated a significant relationship with performance and none demonstrated a two-path indirect effect on performance, the three path mediation models with performance were not tested. The first multiple-mediation model tested was the indirect effect of international work demands on job satisfaction through challenge appraisals and psychological capital. Results indicated that significant three-path mediation existed among these variables ($B=.18$, $SE=.09$, $p<.05$). Given that the direct effect of international work demands on job satisfaction is not significant ($B=.03$, $z=.18$, $SE=.14$, ns), complete three path mediation was found, with the indirect path accounting for 86% of the total effect of international work demands on job satisfaction. It should be noted, however, that the suppression effect of challenge appraisals that inflated the relationship between challenge appraisals and job satisfaction in the two-path mediation tests described above also affects the three-path analysis presented here. The correlation between international work demands and job satisfaction (see Table 3) is near zero so it is likely that the significant indirect three-path effect found here is largely driven by the inflation of relationships between other variables in the model created by the suppression effect of challenge appraisals.

Next, the three-path indirect effect of international work demands on job satisfaction through threat appraisals was examined for both frustration and anxiety as the

second mediator. Both tests were not significant, revealing that the effect of international work demands on job satisfaction does not seem to function through the threat appraisal's effect on negative psychological states such as anxiety.

Hypothesis Tests for Moderation Effects

The unconstrained approach proposed by Marsh, Wen, and Hau (2004) was utilized to test the proposed moderation effects. This approach involves the calculation of product terms between pairs of items from each of the scales involved in the interaction. Items are matched by their loading of each respective factor. The three items with the highest loadings were first mean centered and then multiplied to produce three product term interaction variables for each interaction to be tested. Each interaction was modeled as a latent reflective factor with the latent interaction factor reflecting each of the product term variables. Each product term variable demonstrated a sufficiently high loading on the latent interaction factor (standardized loading greater than .65) with a couple of exceptions. One item on the interaction factor of perceived organizational support for international work and international work demands, demonstrated a loading of -.53 due to negative wording. In addition, items on the interaction factor between perceived organizational support for international work and threat appraisals were not sufficiently high (see hypothesis 10 for details). Due to the lack of relationships found with the performance variable in previous tests, the moderation effects were tested utilizing the model with direct and indirect effects described above, with the performance outcome variable removed.

Hypothesis 5. To test Hypothesis 5, the latent factor for the mean centered main effect for international work experience and the latent factor for the interaction between international work demands and international work experience were added to the structural model as predictors of challenge appraisals along with the mean centered score for international work demands.

For the outcome of challenge appraisals, three covariances were added among the exogenous variables of international work demands, international work experience, and the interaction term. Sufficient fit was achieved with this model: Chi-square = 264.60, 255 DF, ($p > .05$); CFI = .99, RMSEA = .02. All previous relationships described within the model remained the same. The main effect of international work experience was not significant. However, the interaction between international work demands and international work experience on challenge appraisals was significant ($B = -.12$, $z = -2.41$, $SE = .05$, $p < .02$). The slope of international work demands and challenge appraisals changes by $-.12$ for every unit change in international work experience. At low values of experience (1 SD below the mean) the slope of international work demands and challenge appraisals is -0.81 and at high values of experience (1 SD above the mean) the slope of international work demands and challenge appraisals is 1.88 . The intercept for this model is equal to zero because the present latent variable analysis does not include an analysis of means and the variables were mean centered to form the interaction variable. In order to test the significance of the simple slopes, covariances among the parameter estimates are needed and these values are not reported in EQS 6.1 so this test was not conducted. See Figure 2 for a visual representation of the moderation effect. For

individuals higher in international work experience as they reported higher international work demands they also reported higher challenge appraisals whereas for individuals lower in international experience as they reported higher international work demands they reported lower challenge appraisals.

Figure 2: *Moderating Effect of Experience on Challenge Appraisal*

For the outcome of threat appraisals, the international work experience factor as well as the interaction factor were removed as a predictor of challenge appraisals and added as a predictor of threat appraisals. The same three factor covariances were estimated in the model and sufficient fit was achieved: Chi-square = 266.93, DF = 255, $p > .05$; CFI = .98, RMSEA = .02. For this model all relationships on the positive side of the model remained as previously described; however, on the negative threat side of the model relationships changed. The main effect of international work experience on threat

appraisals was significant ($B = -.34, z = -2.05, SE = .17, p < .05$). In addition, the relationship between international work demands and threat appraisals was no longer significant when controlling for international work experience and the interaction term. Finally, the interaction between international work demands and international work experience on threat appraisals was also significant ($B = -.13, z = -2.08, SE = .06, p < .05$). At low values of experience (1 SD below the mean) the slope of international work demands on threat appraisals is -1.26 and at high values of experience (1 SD above the mean) the slope of international work demands on challenge appraisals is 1.42. See Figure 3 for a visual representation of the moderation effect. For individuals higher in international work experience as higher international work demands were reported higher threat appraisals were reported, whereas for individuals lowering in international work experience as higher international work demands were reported lower threat appraisals were also reported. Hypothesis 5 was partially supported, as the interaction between international work demands and international work experience was significant for both challenge and threat appraisals; however, the pattern of the interaction for threat appraisals was different than expected.

Figure 3: *Moderating Effect of Experience on Threat Appraisal*

Hypothesis 6. To test Hypothesis 6, the same basic model described above was utilized. The latent variable of international work experience was added as a predictor of frustration and anxiety. In addition, the latent factor interaction between threat appraisals and international work experience was also added as a predictor of frustration and anxiety. Covariances among the exogenous factors were estimated. Sufficient fit was achieved: Chi-square = 290.06, DF = 253, $p > .05$; CFI = .94, RMSEA = .03. The main effect of international work experience was not significant for frustration or anxiety. In addition the interaction between threat appraisals and international work experience was non-significant for both frustration and anxiety. It is interesting to note, however, that the effect of international work demands on frustration was no longer significant when controlling for the effects of these variables. Overall Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

Hypothesis 7. To test Hypothesis 7, the main effect of self-monitoring and the latent interaction factor between international work demands and self-monitoring were added as predictors of challenge appraisals and then threat appraisals. Covariances among the exogenous variables of international work demands, self-monitoring, and the latent interaction factor were estimated. For the challenge appraisals analysis sufficient fit was achieved: Chi-square = 129.13, DF = 119, $p > .05$, CFI = .96, RMSEA = .03. Results indicated a significant main effect of self-monitoring on challenge appraisals ($B = .14$, $z = 2.53$, $SE = .05$, $p < .05$). The effect of the interaction term on challenge appraisals was not significant. All other relationships in the model remained the same.

To test the effects of the interaction on threat appraisals, the same model described for the challenge appraisal tests was conducted with the addition of a covariance between the disturbance of the challenge appraisals factor and the self-monitoring factor. Sufficient fit was achieved: Chi-square = 125.39, DF = 118, $p > .05$; CFI = .97, RMSEA = .02. Self-monitoring demonstrated a significant main effect on threat appraisals ($B = -.21$, $z = -2.25$, $SE = .10$, $p < .05$). With the addition of the main effect of self-monitoring and the interaction term between international work demands and self-monitoring to the model, international work demands no longer demonstrated a significant relationship with threat appraisals. Finally, the interaction term between international work demands and self-monitoring demonstrated a significant effect on threat appraisals ($B = -.28$, $z = -2.07$, $SE = .14$, $p < .05$). The slope of international work demands changes by -.281 for every unit change in self-monitoring. At low values (1 SD below the mean) of self-monitoring the slope of international work demands on threat

appraisals is -1.40 and at high values (1 SD above the mean) of self-monitoring the slope of international work demands on threat appraisals is 0.63 . See Figure 4 for a visual representation of the slopes. For individuals higher in self-monitoring as reports of international work demands increase threat appraisals also increase whereas for individuals lower in self-monitoring as reports of international work demands increase threat appraisals decrease. Overall, Hypothesis 7 is partially supported by the findings. The interaction between international work demands and self-monitoring was significant for threat appraisals although the pattern of findings was different than expected.

Figure 4: *Moderation Effect of Self-Monitoring on Threat Appraisals*

Hypothesis 8. To test Hypothesis 8, the main effect of self-monitoring and the latent interaction factor between threat appraisals and self-monitoring were added to the basic model described above as predictors of frustration and anxiety. Covariances among

the exogenous variables were estimated. Sufficient fit was achieved: Chi-Square = 156.84, DF = 151, $p > .05$, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .02. None of the relationships in the previous model changed with the addition of the main effect and interaction with self-monitoring. In addition, the main effect of self-monitoring was not significant for frustration or anxiety. Finally, the interaction between self-monitoring and threat appraisals did not have a significant effect on frustration or anxiety. Overall, Hypothesis 8 was not supported.

Hypothesis 9. To test Hypothesis 9, the main effect of perceived organizational support for international work and the interaction between international work demands and perceived organizational support for international work were added to the structural model. For the challenge appraisals model, covariances were estimated among the exogenous factors. In addition, one covariance was added between the error terms of one item in the perceived organizational support for international work scale and one of the interaction composite items due to the common variance these items shared beyond the factors due to their negative wording. Sufficient fit for the model was achieved: Chi-square = 326.07, DF=303, $p > .05$; CFI = .95, RMSEA = .02. All previous relationships within the model stayed the same. No significant main effect of perceived organizational support for international work was found for challenge appraisals. In addition, the interaction between international work demands and perceived organizational support for international work on challenge appraisals was not significant.

To test the effect of perceived organizational support for international work and the interaction term on threat appraisals the latent factors were removed as predictors of

challenge from the model above and added as predictors of threat appraisals. Sufficient fit was achieved: Chi-square = 319.47, $DF = 303$, $p > .05$, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .02. The main effect of perceived organizational support for international work on threat appraisals was significant ($B = .18$, $z = 2.91$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$). Also it is interesting to note that when controlling for the effects of perceived organizational support for international work and the interaction term on reported threat appraisals, the effect of threat appraisals on frustration is now significant ($B = .41$, $z = 2.08$, $SE = .20$, $p < .05$). Overall Hypothesis 9 was not supported.

Hypothesis 10. To test Hypothesis 10, the basic model described above was utilized. Perceived organizational support for international work was added as a predictor of frustration and anxiety. In addition, the latent interaction factor of threat appraisals and perceived organizational support for international work was added as a predictor of frustration and anxiety. Factor covariances were also estimated. Sufficient fit for the model could not be obtained: Chi-square = 379.63, $DF = 302$, $p < .05$; CFI = .87, RMSEA = .04. The linear term indicators were not sufficiently reliable to create a sound interaction factor, which lead to the misfit in the model. Due to the skewed product terms in the interaction factor, the robust CFI estimate never reached an acceptable level despite the fact that the normal CFI estimate was sufficiently high and all estimates, including standard errors, looked similar between the robust and normal estimations. Due to the level or kurtosis observed in the dataset the robust CFI estimate needed to reach sufficient levels in order to reliably estimate the parameters in the model.

Given that this standard was not met, the results of the tests of Hypothesis 10, described below, should be interpreted with caution.

The interaction between perceived organizational support for international work and threat appraisals did not have a significant effect on frustration or anxiety. Most relationships remained the same within the structural model; however, a few new main effects emerged. Perceived organizational support for international work had a significant main effect on frustration ($B=.48$, $z=3.66$, $SE=.13$, $p<.05$) and anxiety ($B=.23$, $z=2.45$, $SE=.10$, $p<.05$). In addition, similar to what was previously described in hypothesis 9, when controlling for the effect of perceived organizational support for international work on frustration the effect of threat appraisals on frustration was now significant ($B=.38$, $z=2.16$, $SE=.18$, $p<.05$). Overall Hypothesis 10 was not supported.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

The pairing of both a qualitative and quantitative study in the current project yielded a complementary set of informative results related to international work demands. Study 1 provided qualitative information about what a broad range of workers think about their international work responsibilities. This information can be utilized to better understand the content of many of the constructs related to international work demands discussed in Study 2, how they are interpreted by the worker, and the resources necessary to deal with those demands. The results of Study 1 reveal exactly what aspects of international work employees find beneficial (e.g. the opportunity to see the world) or risky (miscommunication across languages), whereas Study 2 reveals how the evaluation of international work demands as more or less challenging and more or less threatening is related to important outcomes. In addition, Study 1 reveals information about specific resources, both personal and organizational, that employees find helpful when engaged in international work (e.g. experience working internationally and language training).

Then, Study 2 quantitatively investigated how personal and organizational resources (e.g. international work experience and perceived organizational support for international work) are related to employee interpretation of international work responsibilities as more or less challenging or threatening. Overall, the combination of the two studies demonstrates that international work demands are relevant to today's workers, that they can be interpreted differently by workers as more or less challenging

or threatening (for various reasons), and that these interpretations are related to important positive and negative psychological states (e.g. psychological capital and anxiety) which are related to overall job satisfaction. The sections below will discuss the results of each study in greater detail, highlight important implications for theory and practice from the results, and identify limitations to the current research as well as directions for future research.

Study 1

Respondents in Study 1 represented a very broad array of industries, organizations, and managerial levels despite the fact that all were alumni of one MBA program. Past research has established that today's workers are engaged in many different forms of international work ranging from international relocations, to frequent business travel, to collaboration across distances through internet and phone based resources (e.g. Collings, Scullion, & Morley, 2007; GMAC 2008; Tharenou, 2005; Welch & Worm, 2006; Lazarova & Cerdin, 2008). Study 1 lent some support to this idea, although many respondents were not detailed about the types of international work responsibilities they are currently experiencing. Six (out of 117) respondents indicated they were currently relocated outside of their home country, 70 indicated they travel outside of their home country for their current job, and 73 indicated they work with individuals who speak a different native language within their current job. Clearly, international work demands are a reality for many of today's US workers.

When participants were asked why they travel internationally, many respondents were not specific with their answers; however, about half of the participants provided

their responses in a way that could be coded. Planning and organizational development were the most common purposes for international travel, which is in line with previous statements in the literature that international business travel is advantageous because it allows for face to face interactions that are ideal for addressing complex or ambiguous topics (e.g. Collings et al., 2007). Other purposes for international travel listed by participants also require face to face contact such as attending conferences, conducting audits, and receiving or providing training. The results from this question reveal that some employees need to meet the goals of a global organization through face to face interactions at times and international travel is required for this.

Increased cultural awareness, respect, and/or appreciation were the most commonly stated benefits of engaging in international work responsibilities. In line with the positive psychology movement (Seligman, 2002), results to this question highlight what is good about international work demands for employees. Lazarus (1966) theorized that a stimulus in the environment could be interpreted as a positive challenge and/or negative threat. Results to this question identify what aspects of international work could lead to a higher challenge appraisal. Opportunity for business growth or professional development was another main benefit identified by workers that could result from meeting the demands of their international work. In addition, ability to travel and see the world (with the company paying for it), personal networking opportunities, and the opportunity to learn and practice a new language were other benefits identified by multiple people. Overall it appears that employees perceive numerous benefits from meeting or exceeding the demands of their international work environment.

In addition to benefits identified by workers, risks or challenges of international work were also reported. Again, in line with Lazarus' (1966) theory, employees also make an appraisal of how threatening they find their international work demands. The most consistently reported threats reported by workers included language barriers and miscommunication, and working across various cultures. Other lesser reported threats included personal safety risks and negative effects of travel on health. Overall, reports of threats by participants varied a lot more than reports of benefits. Participants seemed to be much more specific about the threats or risks that international work presented, which could reflect that they think about these more often or that threats or risks are more specific to the type of international work they are engaged in while benefits of international work are more general.

Two broad groups of resources for dealing with the demands of international work were addressed in the qualitative study. First, participants indicated the types of organizational support they were receiving to deal with the demands of their international work. Again, many respondents were not specific about the support they were receiving and/or indicated they were receiving no support. This result seems to suggest that while some organizations are recognizing the demands of international work on employees and providing sources of support, many organizations are failing to provide this support or employees are unaware of support if it does exist. Some respondents provided specific information about organizational support for international work. The most commonly provided support was language training or assistance, with cultural diversity training or assistance being reported almost as often. A few other organizations provided translators,

organizational flexibility (in terms of working hours etc.), and health and security protection for employees.

Finally, respondents in Study 1 indicated the qualifications that they felt helped them deal with the demands of their international work. Many respondents indicated various forms of international experience as a personal resource that helped them deal with international work demands while others identified personality characteristics such as being open-minded and adaptable. In addition, other respondents indicated attitudes as qualifications for international work, including willingness to take on international experiences and being task-focused and respectful of differences. Overall, participants seemed to indicate that a range of experience, personality characteristics, and attitudes qualified them to engage in international work responsibilities. In Study 2, described below, two of these personal resources (international work experience and adaptability – defined as self-monitoring) were investigated as far as their impact on the stress process related to international work demands.

Implications

The qualitative results of Study 1 should be used to guide researchers on possible avenues for future research related to better understanding international work demands and their effects on workers. The data provides preliminary evidence that international work demands are relevant to today's workers in various forms. Each of these forms, domestic, travel, and relocation, seem to have unique demands that should be further defined and investigated. In addition, employees who are engaged in international work seem, based on this evidence, to have a more balanced experience with international

work demands than much of the previous literature would suggest. Although previous literature has focused on the stress related to international work demands and the toll that takes on the worker, especially international relocation (e.g. Harrison et al., 2004), the evidence from Study 1 suggests that researchers should also investigate the benefits that employees experience as a result of meeting the demands of international work and how those positively impact employees. Overall, while the nature of the data gathered in Study 1 is qualitative and descriptive, it can serve as an excellent starting point for future, more in depth, research ideas.

Limitations

A few limitations to Study 1 should be acknowledged. First, as described previously, the data are qualitative and descriptive in nature. Although this met the goal of the current study, relationships among variables cannot be understood from this data and causal connections can obviously not be established. In addition, there are limitations to the sample. The sample size is overall quite small and the response rate was not high (6% response rate). Also, many respondents were not specific in their responses, which left even fewer responses that were able to be coded in the content analysis (although the number of responses varied by question). It should be noted, however, that this study was preliminary in nature and despite the small number of respondents meaningful patterns among responses were identified and described. Finally, all participants were well educated (all had received at least an MBA) and a large majority were white males. It is unknown if the pattern of responses that were found in Study 1 would generalize to very different populations.

Future research

Numerous research projects could be built off of the basic foundation of qualitative information collected in Study 1. First, future research could address whether or not increasing the presence or salience of the benefits identified of international work for employees in Study 1 impacts their challenge or threat appraisals of international work, as measured in Study 2. Similarly future research could address whether organizational support and/or policies related to the areas of perceived threat from international work demands, identified in this study, positively impacts challenge and threat appraisals of international work demands by employees. In addition, future research could address whether the presence and utilization of the types of organizational support within global organizations, described by respondents in this study, impacts overall perceptions of perceived organizational support for international work (as investigated in Study 2). Finally, researchers could initiate the creation of selection measures based on qualifications for international work identified in this study investigate their relationship with performance in jobs with high international work demands and/or engage in training current employees to enhance the identified qualifications (where possible). Overall, future research should focus on creating, implementing, and investigating the effectiveness of policies, procedures, and programs, based on findings from Study 1, with the goal of enhancing the positive aspects of international work and helping to alleviate the negative.

Study 2

Overall, Study 2 provided a quantitative investigation of the organizational stress perspective on how international work demands impact individual employees. Results support the idea that international work demands are appraised differently by workers as more or less challenging or threatening and that those appraisals are related to important psychological states at work. In addition, results support the idea that appraisals of international work and important psychological states at work are also related to overall job satisfaction.

Measurement Issues

The present study utilized many established measures in the field; however, many of them proved problematic when subjected to rigorous measurement assessment through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) procedures. The Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ) (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007) was written as a composite of four previously established measures of self-efficacy, optimism, resilience, and hope. Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman (2007) discuss PsyCap as a higher order factor made up of distinct components with the four scales. They support this idea by entering each individual scale score in step one of a hierarchical regression and the total composite PCQ score in step 2 and demonstrating that PCQ accounts for a significant unique portion of variance in the dependent variables (job satisfaction and performance) above and beyond the individual scale scores.

However, no studies, to my knowledge, have previously investigated a CFA of the PCQ. In the present study, the items within the PCQ scale proved highly problematic.

The PCQ was first analyzed as four individual latent factors of self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience and then the higher order factor of PsyCap would have been modeled. However, the four individual latent factors could never be established. The items were highly related to each other as well as to other items and latent factors within the measurement model. Although the self-efficacy subscale would model with only one item removed, the other scales of hope, optimism, and resilience could not be separated from each other or other latent factors, most likely due to the very broad domain space of PsyCap and the somewhat positive nature of many of the other constructs involved in the present study. However, it should be acknowledged that the relatively small sample size in the current study ($N=139$) could have been a limiting factor in the CFA analysis. Future research should examine the factor structure of the PCQ with a sufficient sample size (multiple large samples would be preferable) before making a final determination about the measurement structure of the PCQ. In addition, future research should examine the effects of common method on the PCQ scale. Given that all scales are completed by self-report at one point in time, it is possible that some variation within the PCQ scale is attributable to the common method of measurement making it difficult to examine individual factors within the scale separately.

In addition to the PCQ, the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) State-subscale (Spielberger, 1983) and the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984) also proved problematic within the measurement model. For the STAI, Spielberger and Vagg (1984) had established through exploratory factor analysis that the State-subscale of the STAI appeared to have two factors: anxiety-present and anxiety-absent. However, when

the STAI was subjected to the CFA first as one factor (as it is typically analyzed), then as two with the positively worded items making up one factor and the negatively worded items making up the other factor, neither model fit the data well. Numerous items within each factor were highly related to items in other latent factors and/or had very low loadings on their intended latent factors. Again, it should be acknowledged that the sample size of the current study limits confidence in the CFA findings and this study should be replicated with multiple larger samples to address the measurement properties of the STAI – state subscale appropriately.

The Revised Self-Monitoring scale demonstrated similar issues when subjected to the CFA analysis. The two factor structure proposed by Lennox and Wolfe (1984) did not fit the data well, as many items demonstrated significant cross loadings on the other self-monitoring factor as well as other factors within the model. Again, these results should be qualified by the sample size involved in the CFA analysis. In the present study, the solution to the measurement problems discovered in all three of these scales was to calculate a composite score of all of the items within the scales and correct those scales for unreliability for use in the structural model.

Direct and Indirect Relationships

Analysis of direct and indirect relationships among the variables included in Study 2 provides interesting information about the organizational stress process related to international work demands. The bivariate correlation analysis among the latent variables revealed relatively strong relationships among many of the included variables. However, the most interesting finding for the correlation analysis was that none of the

included constructs were significantly related to supervisor rated job performance. Performance was included in the structural model for the remaining analysis of direct and indirect relationships, but no significant findings with performance emerged. Relationships among performance and a few of the included variables were expected based on past research, such as Psychological Capital (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007) and job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2001).

The lack of findings with performance could be due to the rating coming from the employee's supervisor. It is expected that an independent rating of performance would minimize shared variance among the constructs due to the common method of self-report. In addition, the supervisor ratings demonstrated a high level of variance accounted for by the supervisor ($ICC1 = .65$) and this proportion of the variance was removed from the supervisor ratings by group mean centering the scores. However, with 65% of the variance in performance ratings removed there is only 35% of the variance remaining that reflected actual individual differences in performance. Although the correction provides a better picture of true performance differences between employees, the reduction in overall variance could impact the ability of the correlation and structural analysis to find significant effects on performance. Finally, the relatively small sample size negatively affected power to detect effects for some of the more sophisticated tests of indirect effects which could have limited the ability to detect effects on performance as well. It should be noted, however, that none of the effects on performance were approaching significance, so these results should be replicated in the future to further examine relationships with performance. It is possible that the stress process under examination in

the current study is actually more related to well-being and attitudinal outcomes for employees than their supervisor rated performance.

Further tests of the direct and indirect relationships specified in the model (shown in Figure 1) were conducted by testing a structural model in EQS 6.1 that included paths for both direct and indirect effects of the included variables. First, an examination of the relationships between international work demands and challenge and threat appraisal reveals interesting information related to which workers rated their demands as more or less of a challenge or threat. Those workers who reported higher amounts of international work demands within their current role also reported higher challenge appraisals and lower threat appraisals than those workers who reported lower amounts of international work demands in their current role. This result could be explained by a classic attraction, selection, and attrition argument (Schneider, 1987). Workers who see international work demands as more of a challenge and less of a threat could be more likely to seek jobs with higher international work demands, be selected for those jobs, and remain in those jobs over time than workers who see international work demands as more threatening and less of a positive challenge. The idea that individuals are attracted to jobs where the demands of the position are appraised as challenging by the worker and individuals are not attracted to jobs where the demands are viewed as threatening could be an interesting avenue for future research. Potentially this avenue is simply a variation of person-job fit (Edwards, 1991), but to my knowledge, the challenge and threat appraisals viewpoint has not yet been studied in the fit literature.

Second, on the positive side of the model, the 3-path mediation effect of international work demands affecting job satisfaction through its effect on challenge appraisals and then psychological capital was significant. It appears that the presence of high challenge appraisal of international work demands is related to higher positive psychological states which are then related to higher job satisfaction. Although past research has provided some support for positive outcomes resulting from a challenge appraisal (Blascovich & Mendes, 2000; Moore, 2002; Skinner & Brewer, 2000) and some support for distinct features of challenge stressors and hindrance stressors in the workplace (Cavanaugh et al., 2000; LePine et al., 2005), this is the first study to demonstrate a relationship between positive outcomes and challenge appraisals of a particular set of demands at work.

This finding supports the importance of a balanced view in understanding the effects of work demands on both proximal and distal outcomes for workers that is called for by the values of the positive psychology movement (Seligman, 2002). The interpretation of the findings on the positive side of the model should be qualified, however, by the significant two path suppression effect that was found within the three-path mediation model. The analysis for hypothesis 3 revealed that when you hold all participants constant at the mean of challenge appraisals, psychological capital has a larger effect on job satisfaction. It is also worth noting, however, that the suppression effect does not impact the significant complete mediation effect of international work demands on psychological capital that functions through challenge appraisals. Although challenge appraisals do not seem to be related to general job satisfaction ($r=.15$, *ns*), they

demonstrate a strong relationship with psychological capital ($r=.61, p<.05$). The data from Study 1 do support the idea that positive challenge appraisals are important to consider given that they are positively related to both international work demands and psychological capital.

Lastly, on the negative side of the model a different pattern of results was observed for the proximal outcomes of frustration and anxiety. First, international work demands were directly related to frustration, although threat appraisals were not related to frustration. In addition, frustration was negatively related to job satisfaction. It appears from this pattern of findings that higher international work demands is related to higher frustration, which is related to lower job satisfaction independent of the psychological appraisal of international work demands. In contrast, threat appraisals demonstrated a positive significant relationship with anxiety. However, the indirect relationship between international work demands and anxiety through threat appraisals was not significant. Results indicate that appraising international work demands as more of a negative threat is related to higher reported anxiety although anxiety in the overall model was not related to job satisfaction or performance. An interesting parallel finding between Study 1 and Study 2 is that the negative side of the hypothesized model, just like the negative aspects of international work reported in the qualitative study, seems to be more complex and possibly job specific than the positive side of the model (and the positive benefits reported related to international work demands).

Moderation Tests

The first set of moderation tests investigated the effects of international work experience on four different relationships within the model. A significant interaction was found between international work demands and international work experience on challenge appraisals. The form of the interaction revealed that for individuals higher in international work experience, as reports of international work demands increased higher challenge appraisals were reported. In contrast, for those individuals lower in international work experience, as they reported higher levels of international work demands, challenge appraisals were lower. The effect of international experience on the relationship between international work demands and challenge appraisals fits the resource perspective of international experience.

Individuals with more international work experience should have better schemas through which to process new international work demands and will likely be more successful in surmounting the demands (Scruell & Wyer, 1988). Therefore, as international work demands increase challenge appraisals will increase for those higher in international work experience and decrease for those lower in international work experience. In addition to the significant interaction with challenge appraisals, international work experience and international work demands also demonstrated a significant interaction for threat appraisals. However, the form of this interaction was not in line with the resource perspective. For individuals higher in international work experience, reports of higher international work demands were related to higher threat

appraisals, and for individuals lower in international work experience, higher reports of international work demands were related to lower threat appraisals.

Whereas the opposite pattern of the interaction was expected for challenge and threat appraisals, the results indicate that the same pattern of results was observed. It is possible that the similar pattern of the interaction could be explained through international work experience leading to more appraisal processing for individuals so that with more international work experience, as individuals report higher international work demands they report higher appraisals (both challenge and threat) whereas those individuals lower on international work experience as they report higher international work demands they report lower appraisals of both types just because they are not processing the information as much as those who are higher in experience. Of course due to the cross-sectional and single source nature of the data the precise reasons for the pattern of results cannot be determined. These questions will have to be addressed in future research.

In addition to the interactions observed with international work experience, a few interesting main effects were also observed. A significant main effect of international work experience on threat appraisals was found and in addition to this the main effect of international work demands on threat appraisals and frustration were no longer significant when controlling for international work experience. This pattern of relationships could be partially due to the large relationship between international work demands and international experience ($r=.83, p<.05$). Also, it is possible that international work experience drives threat appraisals of international work and general

frustration at work more than the amount of international work demands being experienced in the worker's current job. Again, this causal relationship cannot be tested within the current cross-sectional database (see e.g. Stone-Romero & Rosopa, 2008) but is an interesting avenue for future research.

The second set of moderation tests involved testing the effects of self-monitoring on four different relationships within the structural model. Self-monitoring demonstrated a significant positive relationship with challenge appraisals and a negative relationship with threat appraisals so that individuals higher in self-monitoring reported higher challenge appraisals for their international work and lower threat appraisals. The main effects observed here are in line with the resource perspective that those individuals who have the ability to modify their self-presentation given the demands of a situation, as well as a sensitivity to the behavior of others around him/her (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984), will view their international work demands as more challenging and less threatening than those lower on self-monitoring.

It is also interesting to note, similar to the effect of international work experience on threat appraisals, when self-monitoring is inserted into the model as a predictor of threat appraisals the main effect of international work demands on threat appraisals is no longer significant. Finally, international work demands and self-monitoring demonstrated a significant interaction for threat appraisals. The form of the interaction revealed that for individuals higher in self-monitoring, as international work demands increased so did the threat appraisal of international work, but for individuals lower on self-monitoring, as international work demands increased, threat appraisals decreased.

The interaction finding supports the more classic view of self monitoring as a slightly anxious trait where individuals are highly attuned to their environment and change their behavior to meet the demands of the environment to make sure they fit in (Snyder, 1974), more than the resource view of self-monitoring taking in the current study that self-monitoring would serve as a skill used to better navigate the highly variable environments workers find themselves in when engaged in international work.

Thirdly, a set of moderation tests investigated the effects of perceived organizational support for international work on four different relationships within the model. Perceived organizational support for international work demonstrated a positive significant relationship with threat appraisals so that those individuals who perceived higher organizational support for international work also reported lower threat appraisals of their international work. In addition, when controlling for the effect of perceived organizational support for international work the effect of threat appraisals on frustration was found to be significant. These findings suggest that perceived organizational support for international work is related to threat appraisals and playing a key role in buffering the effects of threat appraisals on frustration. In addition to these findings, a positive significant main effect of perceived organizational support for international work was also observed for frustration and anxiety. It is interesting that the reported organizational support focused specifically on international work responsibilities still has a large main effect on general frustration and anxiety at work although the last two main effects should be interpreted with caution as the fit of the model used to test these relationships never hit sufficient levels to be confident in the stability of the error estimates.

Finally, one overall note should be made about the moderation tests conducted in Study 2. Due to the fact that twelve different moderation hypotheses were tested within one data set there is likely an inflated Type 1 error rate due to multiple tests. If the alpha level is adjusted down from the $p < .05$ level to the $p < .01$ level in order to take a more conservative approach, then none of the observed interactions remain significant (although the interaction between international work demands and international work experience on challenge appraisals is close, $p < .02$). It should also be noted that the power to detect significant interaction effects at the $p < .01$ level with a sample of 139 individuals is low. It is possible that with a larger sample size, some of the interactions may be significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Implications (Theoretical and Practical)

Many theoretical and practical implications emerge out of the results from Study 2. First, the relationship between demands and the challenge and threat appraisals should be carefully considered. Workers who hold jobs higher in international work demands seem to see these demands as more challenging and less threatening than those who hold jobs with fewer international work demands. Second, work demands, including international work demands, should be considered from a balanced viewpoint. The positive effects of a higher challenge appraisal of work demands could be just as important, if not more so, than the negative effects of a higher threat appraisal. Third, results indicate that the underlying organizational stress process under investigation in the Study 2, although it is cross-sectional, is more related to job attitudes such as job satisfaction than overall job performance. Fourth, international work experience, or more

generally experience dealing with the work demand under investigation, seems to be important; however, the effects were hard to tease apart from the effects of the current level of demands being experienced at work. Fifth, self-monitoring demonstrated a complex set of results where the main effects suggest self-monitoring might be a resource to deal with the demands of international work and where the interaction supports a more anxious view of self-monitoring. Sixth, perceived organizational support for international work overall appears to be an important resource to lower threat appraisals for international work specifically but also lowering more general negative psychological states at work such as frustration and anxiety. Finally, the results of Study 2 supports the importance of investigating moderators of the relationship between demands and appraisal in addition to the relationship between threat appraisals (or stress) and outcomes. Although stress researchers in the past have found numerous resources that help buffer the effects of felt stress on outcomes (citation) few if any have focused on resources that might influence whether or not objective demands in the environment are interpreted as stressful in the first place. The significant interactions found in the current study all moderated the relationship between demands and appraisals. No significant moderation effect was found between threat appraisals and the negative psychological states at work.

Limitations

A few important limitations to the current research should be noted. First, the data gathered in the current study were cross-sectional, which limits the ability to make causal inferences within the results because time order of the variables cannot be

established. In addition, the sample utilized for Study 2 represented two very similar organizations. It is unknown how the results would generalize to very different organizations with very different populations of workers. Also, while supervisor ratings of performance were utilized in the current study, the other variables were all measured in a single self-report survey. More objective measures of international work demands could have been advantageous.

Directions for Future Research

Future research on the topic of international work demands and challenge and threat appraisals of demands could take a number of different directions. First, the international work demands measure could be expanded to encompass importance ratings in addition to frequency ratings. The job analysis literature supports the idea that both aspects of work tasks are important to understand criticality to job performance (Harvey, Anderson, Barnowski, & Morath, 2007). It is possible that relationships with job performance within the current model could increase if both frequency and importance ratings of international work demands were considered as predictors.

Second, additional proximal outcomes, other than psychological states, could be considered in the model. For example more proximal behaviors than overall job performance could be considered such as proactive seeking of international work responsibilities. Are workers asking for opportunities to expand their experience in the area of international work?

Third, future research could investigate how the organizational stress framework tested in the current study to better understand international work demands would apply

to other well-defined groups of job demands. For example, would individuals who are required to engage in various levels of interactions with high-technology equipment interpret those responsibilities differently and how would that affect important outcomes?

Fourth, longitudinal studies of the framework tested in the current study should be conducted. Ideally the test would include measuring demands at one time period, measuring the proximal outcomes at a second time period, and then measuring the distal outcomes at a third time period. This additional longitudinal component would help to establish the time order of the variables and stronger causal attributions could be made.

Lastly, future studies should investigate more objective measures of current international work demands. For example, employee records of travel reimbursement could be pulled to code for frequency of international travel. With a more objective measure it is possible that the relationship between international work experience and international work demands could be teased apart.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in Study 1 and Study 2 helped to provide important insights regarding the international work demands that employees are facing today. In addition, information about the positive challenges and negative threats employees experience from their international work was generated in both the descriptive, qualitative study and the quantitative study where relationships with important outcomes could be investigated. Finally, important personal and organizational resources were both discussed in a qualitative manner and tested quantitatively as components of the overall organizational stress framework. Results

reveal that a balanced view of work demands should be taken in the future considering both the positive challenge appraisal of work demands and the positive outcomes this might lead to and the negative threat appraisals of work demands and the negative effects of these appraisals. In addition, results reveal that personal and organizational resources should be investigated as a moderator of the relationship between the objective demands of the environment and the interpretation of those demands as stressful (or challenging), as well as a moderator of the relationship between subjective stress (or threat appraisals) and important outcomes. Overall, a more complex view of the impact of international work demands on outcomes such as job satisfaction and performance is supported by the current set of studies.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Figure 1: Structural Model for Direct and Indirect Effects

Note: White boxes represent latent variables and gray boxes represent variables modeled as observed scores. Solid lines indicate direct paths and dotted lines indicate non-significant paths within the model. Error terms and covariances are not included in order to increase clarity of the image.

Appendix B

Study 1 Survey

The first section of this survey asks about international work that you engage in within your **current job**. Please provide details when appropriate.

1. Are you living outside of your home country for your current job (e.g. on an expatriate assignment)?

YesNo
2. If yes, please describe your international relocation (where to, where from, how long, why, etc).
3. Have you ever traveled outside of your home country for your current job?

YesNo
4. If yes, please answer the questions below
 - a. How frequently do you travel?

0 – 3 trips per year

4-7 trips per year

8-12 trips per year

12 or more trips per year
 - b. How long is your average international trip? weeks
 - c. What is the most common purpose or goal of your international trip?
 - d. What areas of the world have you traveled to (check all that apply)

North America

South America

Central America

Western Europe

Eastern Europe

Asia

Africa

Australia

Middle East

Other (please specify)
5. Do you interact with individuals within your current job whose **native** language is **different** from your own?

YesNo
6. If yes, please describe the nature of the most common interactions you have with these individuals [i.e. your relationship to these individuals, tasks you are involved with, and how you are communicating (e.g. phone, e-mail, translator)]:

7. Do you interact with individuals within your current job who **speak the same native language** as you but were born and/or raised in a culture or country other than your own?
- Yes No
8. If yes, please describe the nature of the most common interactions you have with these individuals [i.e. your relationship to these individuals, tasks you are involved with, and how you are communicating (e.g. phone, e-mail, in person etc.)]:.
9. Are there any other international aspects of your current work role that we have not yet discussed? If so, please describe them now.
10. What are some of the benefits for you (if any exist) that result from engaging in international work (feel free to discuss personal and/or professional)?
11. What are some of the challenges or risks for you (if any exist) that result from engaging in international work (again feel free to discuss both personal and/or professional)?

The second section of this survey asks about the **organization** for which you work.

12. Please describe the organization that you are currently working for without naming it by answering the questions below:
- a. Size of your organization (in terms of annual revenue in US dollars) :
- ☐ less than 50 million (small)
☐ 51-250 million (medium)
☐ 250 million – 500 million (large)
☐ 500 million plus (very large)
- b. Please describe your core business (e.g. textile manufacturer or professional services provider). _____
13. Please describe the degree to which the organization you work for is global. For example: large multi-national organization with a truly global work environment or small organization just starting to export goods out of the US.
14. Please describe any measures that your organization takes to support you and help develop your abilities to manage your international work responsibilities which you find especially helpful.

Finally, we would like to ask a couple of questions about you!

1. Your gender (circle one): Male Female
2. Your race/ethnicity (circle all that apply): White/Caucasian
Black/African American

Asian/Pacific Islander
Hispanic/Latino
Other (please specify) _____

3. Age (in years) _____

4. Education level (please mark highest level achieved):

☐ Some high school Degree	☐ Some college	☐ Masters
☐ GED Degree	☐ Assoc. or Technical Degree	☐ Doctoral
☐ High School Diploma	☐ Bachelors Degree	

5. How long have you been working for this organization (months and years)?

6. How long have you been in your current role with this organization (months and years)?

7. Please describe your current function within the business (e.g. Marketing, IT) _____

8. Please describe your current managerial level within the organization

☐ Entry level – no management responsibility
☐ Entry level management
☐ Middle management
☐ Chief Officer, Partner, or other top level management

9. Please describe any characteristics of yourself or your work experience that you feel qualifies you for international work responsibilities.

Appendix C

Survey of International Work

<p>For the following questions culture refers to customs, norms of behavior, and traditions of a group of people; native language refers to the language that is spoken among family.</p> <p>In reference to the INTERNATIONAL WORK you do for your CURRENT JOB –</p> <p>Please rate how often you engage in EACH ITEM in your current job.</p>	Not at all	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
1. I work with individuals located in other countries (i.e. over the phone and through e-mail) whose culture is different from my own.					
2. I work with individuals who are in the country where I currently live but whose culture is different from my own.					
3. I travel outside of my native country to countries where the culture is different than my own for work.					
4. I work with individuals located in other countries (i.e. over the phone and through e-mail) whose native language is different from my own.					
5. I work with individuals who are in the country where I currently live but whose native language is different from my own.					
6. I travel outside of my native country to countries where the native language is different than my own for work.					

7. Are you currently relocated outside of your native country?

Yes

No

Appendix D

The Cognitive Appraisal of International Work Scale

In reference to the INTERNATIONAL WORK you do for your CURRENT JOB – Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I tend to focus on the positive aspects of my international work.							
2. I worry that I will say or do the wrong things when engaged in my international work.							
3. I often think about how great it would be if I do very well at my international work.							
4. I feel that difficulties with my international work are piling up so that I cannot overcome them.							
5. I lack self confidence when engaged in my international work.							
6. In general I anticipate being successful at my international work, rather than expecting to fail.							
7. I am concerned that others will not approve of me when it comes to my international work.							
8. I look forward to opportunities to fully test the limits of my skills and abilities through my international work.							

Appendix E

Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ)

In reference to how you may have thought about yourself at work over the past 30 days - Use the following scales to indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
9. I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution.							
10. I feel confident in representing my work area in meetings with management.							
11. I feel confident contributing to discussions about the company's strategy.							
12. I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area.							
13. I feel confident contacting people outside the company (e.g., suppliers, customers) to discuss problems.							
14. I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues.							
15. If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it.							
16. At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my work goals.							
17. There are lots of ways around any problem.							
18. Right now I see myself as being pretty successful at work.							
19. I can think of many ways to reach my current work goals.							
20. At this time, I am meeting the work goals that I have set for myself.							
21. When I have a setback at work, I have trouble recovering from it, moving on.							
22. I usually manage difficulties one way or another at work.							
23. I can be "on my own," so to speak, at work if I have to.							
24. I usually take stressful things at work in stride.							
25. I can get through difficult times at work because I've experienced difficulty before.							
26. I feel I can handle many things at a time at this job.							
27. When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best.							
28. If something can go wrong for me work-wise, it will.							
29. I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job.							
30. I'm optimistic about what will happen to me in the future as it pertains to work.							
31. In this job, things never work out the way I want them to.							
32. I approach this job as if "every cloud has a silver lining."							

Appendix F

Organizational Frustration Scale

In reference to your work over the past 30 days - Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
33. Trying to get this job done was a very frustrating experience.							
34. Being frustrated comes with this job.							
35. Overall, I experience very little frustration on this job.							

Appendix G

State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (State)

In reference to the past 30 days -				
Please indicate how much each statement describes how you have felt at work.				
	Not at all	Somewhat	Moderately so	Very much so
36. I feel calm				
37. I feel secure				
38. I am tense				
39. I am regretful				
40. I feel at ease				
41. I feel upset				
42. I am presently worrying over possible misfortunes				
43. I feel rested				
44. I feel anxious				
45. I feel comfortable				
46. I feel self-confident				
47. I feel nervous				
48. I am jittery				
49. I feel "high strung"				
50. I am relaxed				
51. I feel content				
52. I am worried				
53. I feel over-excited and "rattled"				
54. I feel joyful				
55. I feel pleasant				

Appendix H

Job Diagnostic Survey – General Satisfaction

In reference to your CURRENT JOB in general - Please indicate your own, personal feelings about your job by marking how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
56. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.							
57. The work I do on this job is very meaningful to me.							
58. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job.							

Appendix I

Job Performance Measure

Please rate the following employee's performance using the scale provided below: _____ (Employee name)	Weak or bottom 10%	Fair or next 20%	Good or next 40%	Very good or next 20%	Best or top 10%
1. This employee finds creative and effective solutions to problems.					
2. This employee adapts readily to changing rules or requirements.					
3. This employee assumes a sense of ownership in the quality of personal performance.					
4. This employee strives to meet deadlines.					
5. This employee encourages coworkers to do more than what is expected.					
6. This employee creates effective working relationships with others.					

Appendix J

Experience Scale

<p>For the following questions culture refers to customs, norms of behavior, and traditions of a group of people; native language refers to the language that is spoken among family.</p> <p>In reference to your WHOLE CAREER –</p> <p>Please rate the extent to which EACH of the following describes your work related experiences over the course of your career. (please respond to each item)</p>	No experience	Very limited experience	Limited experience	Moderate amount of experience	A lot of experience	Extensive experience
1. I have worked with individuals located in other countries (i.e. over the phone and through e-mail) whose culture is different from my own.						
2. I have worked with individuals who are in the country where I live but whose culture is different from my own.						
3. I traveled outside of my native country to countries where the culture is different than my own for work.						
4. I have worked with individuals located in other countries (i.e. over the phone and through e-mail) whose native language is different from my own.						
5. I have worked with individuals who are in the country where I live but whose native language is different from my own.						
6. I traveled outside of my native country to countries where the native language is different than my own for work.						

Appendix K

Revised Self-Monitoring Scale

For each of the following items please indicate the extent to which each statement is true or false in how it describes you.	Certainly, always false	Generally false	Somewhat false	Somewhat true	Generally true	Certainly, always true
59. In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else is called for.						
60. I am often able to read people's true emotions correctly through their eyes.						
61. I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.						
62. In conversations, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in the facial expression of the person I'm conversing with.						
63. My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding others' emotions and motives.						
64. I can usually tell when others consider a joke to be in bad taste, even though they may laugh convincingly.						
65. When I feel that the image I am portraying isn't working, I can readily change it to something that does.						
66. I can usually tell when I've said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener's eyes.						
67. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.						
68. I have found that I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of any situation I find myself in.						
69. If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from that person's manner of expression.						
70. Even when it might be to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front.						
71. Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.						

Appendix L

Survey of Perceived Organizational Support for International Work

Please answer each of the following questions with respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working – indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement specifically regarding your international work.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
72. The organization values the contribution my international work makes to its well-being.							
73. The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me when it comes to my international work.							
74. The organization would ignore any complaint from me about my international work.							
75. The organization really cares about my well-being while engaged in my international work.							
76. Even if I did the best job possible on my international work, the organization would fail to notice.							
77. The organization cares about how satisfied I am with my international work.							
78. The organization shows very little concern for me when I am involved in my international work.							
79. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at my international work.							

Appendix M

Demographic Questionnaire

1. Gender

☐ Male
☐ Female

2. Race/Ethnicity (check all that apply)

☐ White/Caucasian
☐ Black/African American
☐ Hispanic/Latino(a)
☐ Asian
☐ Other (Please specify _____)

3. A) Country where you were born: _____

B) Country (Countries) where you were raised (spent a year or more living): _____

4. Please list each language that you speak fluently enough to effectively conduct business.

Native language (s): _____

Other languages: _____

5. Age: _____ Years

6. Education Level

☐ Some high school
☐ GED
☐ High School Diploma
☐ Some college
☐ Associates or Technical Degree
☐ Bachelors Degree
☐ Masters Degree
☐ Doctoral Degree

7. In what department or function do you currently work?

8. What is your current role within that function?

9. How long have you been in your current role (months, years)?

10. How long have you been working for your current employer (months, years)?

11. How long have you been working in this career field (months, years)?

12. How long (over your whole career) have you been in a work role that requires some degree of international work (months, years)?

References

- Ahmad, M. (2007). Interpreting communities: Lawyering across language difference. *UCLA Law Review*, 54(5), 999-1086.
- Barner-Rasmussen, W., & Bjorkman, I. (2005). Surmounting interunit barriers. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 35(1), 28-46.
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Bjorkman, I., & Stahl, G. (2006). International human resource management research: An introduction to the field. In G. K. Stahl and I. Bjorkman (Eds.), *Handbook of research in international human resource management* (pp.1-14). Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Blascovich, J., & Mendes, W. B. (2000). Challenge and threat appraisals: The role of affective cues. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Feeling and thinking: The role of affect in social cognition* (pp. 59-82). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bliese, P.D., & Halverson, R. R. (1998). Group size and measures of group-level properties: An examination of eta-squared and ICC values. *Journal of Management*, 24, 157-172.
- Caligiuri, P. M., Joshi, A., & Lazarova, M. (1999). Factors influencing the adjustment of women on global assignments. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 10, 163-179.
- Cavanaugh, M. A., Boswell, W. R., Roehling, M. V., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). An empirical examination of self-reported work stress among U.S. managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 65-74.
- Chen, P. Y., & Spector, P. E. (1992). Relationships of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft and substance use: An exploratory study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65, 177-184.
- Chi, M. T. H., Glaser, R., & Rees, E. (1982). Expertise in problem solving. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Advances in the psychology of human intelligence* (pp. 7-75). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Collings, D. G., Scullion, H., & Morley, M. J. (2007). Changing patterns of global staffing in the multinational enterprise: Challenges to the conventional expatriate assignment and emerging alternatives. *Journal of World Business*, 42, 198-213.

- Cooper, C. L., Dewe, P. J., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2001). *Organizational stress: A review and critique of theory, research, and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Day, D. V., Schleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. (2002). Self-monitoring personality at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 390-401.
- DeFrank, R. S., Konopaske, R., & Ivancevich, J. M. (2000). Executive travel stress: Perils of the road warrior. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14, 58-71.
- De Jong, R. D., van der Velde, M. E. G., & Jansen, P. G. W. (2001). Openness to experience and growth need strength as moderators between job characteristics and satisfaction. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 350-356.
- Dewe, P., Cox, T., & Ferguson, E. (1993). Individual strategies for coping with stress and work: A review. *Work and Stress*, 7, 5-15.
- Diamond, L. M., Hicks, A. M., & Otter-Henderson, K. D. (2008). Every time you go away: Changes in affect, behavior, and physiology associated with travel related separations from romantic partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 385-403.
- Diedorff, E. C., & Surface, E. A. (2008). Assessing training needs: Do work experience and capability matter? *Human Performance*, 21, 28-48.
- Edwards, J. R. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, (Vol. 6, pp 283-357). New York: Wiley.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & LaMastro, V. D. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51-59.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.
- Fillian, L., Tremblay, I., & Truchan, M. (2007). Satisfaction and emotional distress among nurses providing palliative care: Empirical evidence for an integrative occupational stress model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14 (1), 1-25.

- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1985). If it changes it must be a process: Study of emotion and coping during three stages of a college examination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 150-170.
- Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. (2008). A meta-analysis of work demand stressors and job performance: Examining main and moderating effects. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 227-271.
- GMAC Global Forum. (2008). *Global Relocation Trends 2008 Survey Report*. Woodridge IL: GMAC Global Relocation Services.
- Glover, J., Rainwater, K., Jones, G., & Friedman, H. (2002). Adaptive leadership (part two): Four principles for being adaptive. *Organization Development Journal*, 20, 18-38.
- Guion, R. M. (1998). *Assessment, measurement, and prediction for personnel decisions*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Guzzo, R. A., Noonan, K. A., & Elron, E. (1994). Expatriate managers and the psychological contract. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 617-626.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Harrison, D. A., Shaffer, M. A., & Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P. (2004). Going places: Roads more and less traveled in research on expatriate experiences (pp. 199-247). In J. J. Martocchio (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management*, Vol 23. US: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.
- Harrison, J. K., Chadwick, M., & Scales, M. (1996). The relationship between cross-cultural adjustment and the personality variables of self-efficacy and self-monitoring. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20(2), 167-188.
- Harvey, J. L., Anderson, L. E., Barnowski, L. E., & Morath, R. (2007). Job analysis: Gathering job-specific information. In D. L. Whetzel and G. R. Wheaton (Eds.), *Applied measurement: Industrial psychology in human resource management* (pp. 57-86). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Harzing, A. W., & Feely, A. J. (2008). The language barrier and its implications for HQ-subsidiary relationships. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 15(1), 49-61.

- Hochwarter, W. A., Witt, L. A., Treadway, D. C., & Ferris, G. R. (2006). The interaction of social skill and organizational support on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 482-489.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). Empirical models of cultural differences. In Nico Bleichrod and Pieter Drenth (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in cross-cultural psychology* (pp 4-20). Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger Publishers.
- Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, R., & DeFrank, R. S. (2003). Business travel stress: A model, propositions and managerial implications. *Work and Stress, 17*(2), 138-157.
- Jacobs, E., Chen, A. H., Karlinger, L. S., Agger-Gupta, N., & Mutha, S. (2006). The need for more research on language barriers in health care: A proposed research agenda. *The Milbank Quarterly, 84*(1), 111-133.
- Janssens, M. J., Lambert, J., & Steyaert, C. (2004). Developing language strategies for international companies: The contribution of translation studies. *Journal of World Business, 39*(4), 414-430.
- Jones, E., Chonko, L., Rangarajan, D., & Roberts, J. (2007). The role of overload on job attitudes, turnover intentions, and salesperson performance. *Journal of Business Research, 60*, 663-671.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*, 376-407.
- Kiser, K. (1999). Working on world time. *Training, 36*(3), 28-34.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kraimer, M. L., & Wayne, S. J. (2004). An examination of perceived organizational support as a multidimensional construct in the context of expatriate assignment. *Journal of Management, 30*, 209-237.
- Lazarova, M. B., & Cerdin, J. L. (2008). The new global nomads: Examining diverse forms of international mobility. Symposium presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Lazarus, R. S. (1990). Theory-based stress measurement. *Psychological Inquiry*, 1, 3-13.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Progress on a cognitive-motivational-relational theory of emotion. *American Psychologist*, 46, 819-834
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
- Lennox, R. D., & Wolfe, R. N. (1984). Revision of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 1349-1364.
- LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor – hindrance stressor framework: An exploration for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 764-775.
- Libb, J. W., & Serum, C. (1974). Reactions to frustrative nonreward as a function of perceived locus of control of reinforcement. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 102, 494-497.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 541-572.
- Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2007). Emerging positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Management*, 33, 321-349.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marsh, H. W., Wen, Z., & Hau, K. T. (2004). Structural equation models of latent interactions: Evaluation of alternative estimation strategies and indicator construction. *Psychological Methods*, 9, 275-300.
- Mayerhofer, H., Hartman, L. C., & Herbert, A. (2004). Career management issues for flexpatriate international staff. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 46, 647-666.
- Mayerhofer, H., Hartmann, L. C., Michelitsch-Riedl, G., & Kollinger, I. (2004). Flexpatriate assignments: A neglected issue in global staffing. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15, 1371-1389.

- McGowan, J., Gardner, D., & Fletcher, R. (2006). Positive and negative affective outcomes of occupational stress. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 35, 92-98.
- Moore, K. A. (2002). Positive psychology and health: Situational dependence and personal striving. In Erica Frydenberg (Ed.), *Beyond coping: Meeting goals, visions, and challenges* (pp. 107-125). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Morley, M. J., Heraty, N., & Collings, D., G. (2006). *International human resource management and international assignments*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paul, P., & Mukhopadhyay, K. (2003). The impact of international travel component of the executive MBA curriculum on participant learning. *Marketing Education Review*, 13(3), 1-16.
- Peters, L. H., O'Connor, E. J., & Rudolf, C. J. (1980). The behavioral and affective consequences of performance-relevant situational variables. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 25, 79-96.
- Piekkari, R., & Zander, L. (2005). Preface. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 35(1), 3-9.
- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor – hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 438-454.
- Preacher, K. J., & Coffman, D. L. (2006, May). Computing power and minimum sample size for RMSEA [Computer software]. Available from <http://www.quantpsy.org/>.
- Quinones, M. A., Ford, J. K., & Teachout, M. S. (1995). The relationship between work experience and job performance: A conceptual and meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 887-910.
- Reio, T. G., & Callahan, J. L. (2004). Affect, curiosity, and socialization-related learning: A path analysis of antecedents to job performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(1), 3-22.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.
- Richman, W. L., & Quinones, M. A. (1996). Task frequency rating accuracy: The effect of task engagement and experience. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 512-524.

- Sanchez-Burks, J., Bartel, C., & Blout, S. (2009). Performance in intercultural interactions at work: Cross-cultural differences in response to behavior mirroring. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 216-223.
- Schmeck, R. R., & Bruning, J. D. (1968). Task difficulty and the frustration effect. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 75*, 516-520.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 437-454.
- Schwarzer, R., & Taubert, S. (2002). Tenacious goal pursuits and striving toward personal growth: proactive coping. In Erica Frydenberg (Ed.), *Beyond coping: Meeting goals, visions, and challenges* (pp. 107-125). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scruell, T. K., & Wyer, R. S. (1988). *Advances in social cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). Positive psychology, positive prevention, and positive therapy. In C. R. Snyder and Shane J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 3-9). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., & Gilley, K. M. (1999). Dimensions, determinants, and differences in the expatriate adjustment process. *Journal of International Business Studies, 30*, 557-581.
- Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 774-780.
- Skinner, N., & Brewer, N. (2002). The dynamics of threat and challenge appraisals prior to stressful achievement events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 678-692.
- Smith, C. A., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1985). Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*, 813-838.
- Smith, C. A., Haynes, K. N., Lazarus, R. S., & Pope, L. K. (1993). In search of the "hot" cognitions: Attributions, appraisals, and their relation to emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 916-929.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 526-537.

- Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 125-139.
- Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equations models. In S. Leinhard (Ed.), *Sociological methodology 1982* (pp. 290-312). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1991). Relations of job characteristics from multiple data sources with employee affect, absence, turnover intentions, and health. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 46-53.
- Spector, P. E., & O'Connell, B. J. (1994). The contribution of personality traits, negative affectivity, locus of control and Type A to the subsequent reports of job stressors and job strains. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 1-11.
- Spielberger, C. (1983). *Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Spielberger, C. D., & Vagg, P. R. (1984). Psychometric properties of the STAI: A reply to Ramanaiah, Franzen, and Schill. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48(1), 95-97.
- Steiger, J. H. (1990). Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 25, 173-180.
- Stone-Romero, E. F., & Rosopa, P. J. (2008). The relative validity of inferences about mediation as a function of research design characteristics. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11, 326-352.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics (4th edition)*. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tahvanainen, M., Welch, D., & Worm, V. (2005). Implications of short term international assignments. *European Management Journal*, 23, 663-673.
- Tharenou, P. (2005). International work in domestic jobs: An individual explanation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16, 475-496.
- Thomas, D. C., & Lazarova, M. B. (2006). Expatriate adjustment and performance: A critical review. In G. K. Stahl and I. Bjorkman (Eds.), *Handbook of research in international human resource management* (pp.1-14). Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Thomas, D. C., Lazarova, M. B., & Inkson, K. (2005). Global careers: New phenomenon or new perspectives? *Journal of World Business*, 40, 340-347.
- Turner, N., Barling, J., & Zacharatos, A. (2002). Positive psychology at work. In C. R. Snyder and Shane J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 3-9). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Van der Zee, K., Ali, A. J., & Salome, E. (2005). Role interference and subjective well-being among expatriate families. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 14, 239-262.
- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Welch, D., Welch, L., & Piekkari, R. (2005). Speaking in tongues: The importance of language in international management processes. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 35(1), 10-27.
- Welch, D. E., & Worm, V. (2006). International business travelers: A challenge for IHRB. In G. K. Stahl and I. Bjorkman (Eds.), *Handbook of research in international human resource management* (pp.1-14). Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Zander, L. (2005). Communication and country clusters. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 35(1), 83-103.