

**The positive role of self-initiated expatriates' Psychological Capital in
facilitating their performance**

Ms. Nour R. El Amine

PhD Candidate

Universitat Rovira i Virgili

Facultad de Economía y Empresa

nour.elamine@estudiants.urv.cat

0034 977 758932

Dr. Rosalía Cascón-Pereira

Associate Professor of Human Resource Management

Universitat Rovira i Virgili

Facultad de Economía y Empresa

rosalia.cascon@urv.cat

0034 977 758932

Prof. Joaquin Aldas-Manzano

Professor of Marketing in the Department of Marketing

Universitat de Valencia

School of Economics- Department of Marketing

joaquin.aldas@uv.es

Avda. de los Naranjos s/n

46020 Valencia

Spain

Abstract

Through the lens of Conservation of Resources (COR) and Self-Determination (SDT) theories, this paper examines the role of Psychological Capital (PsyCap) and motivation in facilitating the success of self-initiated expatriates (SIEs) in Kuwaiti hospitals. Despite the vast literature on expatriate success, most studies have focused on adjustment and have neglected performance as a key dimension. The study collects data from 149 SIEs nurses through an online questionnaire and employs partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) to test the hypotheses. The findings reveal that PsyCap is positively associated with adjustment, motivation, and performance. Moreover, it shows the positive effect of motivation on performance. This study contributes to the literature on expatriates' success by highlighting the importance of considering psychological and motivational factors in facilitating their performance, particularly in the context of SIEs, which is relatively limited in defining their success comprehensively, including their performance.

Human Resource Management Track

The positive role of self-initiated expatriates' Psychological Capital in facilitating their performance

Introduction

If successful, expatriates capitalize on their increased understanding of specific business and cultural environments (Mezias and Scandura, 2005) and expand their individual-level career capital, e.g., skills and motivations, which contributes positively to their performance individual or organizational (Caligiuri, 1997; Jokinen et al., 2008). Despite the vast literature on expatriate success, the necessity of considering performance as one of its key dimensions was overlooked, except for some papers (Heijden et al., 2009; Gabel et al., 2005). Most studies have focused on adjustment and have equated success to it (Davies et al., 2015; El Amine and Cascón-Pereira, 2021), leaving performance neglected.

Researchers have also proposed that individual differences are significant in predicting expatriates' success in their assignments and have investigated different individual characteristics as predictors of such success. Among many antecedents, Big Five personality characteristics (Ones and Viswesvaran, 1997), cultural intelligence (Huff, 2013) and language proficiency (Caligiuri et al., 2009) have been related to expatriates' performance, rated mainly by their supervisors, as a dimension of success. However, these few studies have often been conducted on organizational expatriates (OE) (Harjo et al., 2016), except for a few that studied self-initiated expatriates' (SIEs) performance (e.g., Luring and Selmer, 2014). SIEs take the initiative, independent of the organization, to move abroad for employment and career paths (Tharenou, 2015). SIEs display remarkable characteristics compared to OEs. They express a strong motivation to live abroad, have confidence in working and living abroad, and possess a greater desire for cross-cultural experiences (Suutari and Brewster, 2000; Doherty et al., 2011). Like with OEs, measuring SIEs' success can be challenging as it depends on multiple factors, including personal and professional

objectives, the host country's various factors, and individual performance, among others (Selmer and Luring, 2011; Suutari and Brewster, 2003). Nevertheless, despite SIEs becoming a growing phenomenon lately, the research on SIEs is still relatively limited, particularly in defining their success comprehensively, including their performance.

As such, it is critical to understand what facilitates and enhances SIE's success at the micro-level of analysis (psychological-individual-level experiences) beyond traditionally limited explanations focusing only on adjustment as a proxy of success. This study does so, particularly by focusing on the influence of expatriates' 'psychological capital' (PsyCap; Luthans et al., 2007) and motivation on success. Although previous studies on SIEs' motivation have focused on factors influencing SIEs to go abroad (Froese, 2012), there is still a paucity of how to benefit from this knowledge to assist an organization in attaining its goals (Kim et al., 2018). According to several studies (Muir et al., 2014; Nolan and Morley, 2014; Richardson and McKenna, 2006; Selmer and Luring, 2011), the literature suggests that the motives of self-initiated expatriates (SIEs) are more complex than initially proposed. While non-career motivations are consistently found to be more significant for SIEs than for OEs, various factors contribute to the complexity of SIEs' motives. Furthermore, some studies have investigated the effect of general work motivation on cross-cultural adjustment (Froese, 2012) and work performance (Varma et al., 2011) but overlooked the effect of PsyCap on motivation. PsyCap is "an individual's positive psychological state of development" (Luthans et al., 2007, p. 3) and comprises four key positive psychological capacities: hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism (Luthans and Youssef-Morgan, 2017), which have often been investigated independently in expatriate studies. Particularly, resilience has been positively linked to expatriate adjustment (Davies et al., 2019). Additionally, self-efficacy's mediating effect between cross-cultural training and adjustment has been highlighted (Osman-Gani and Rockstuhl, 2009). It has also been proven that expatriates with high optimism tend to experience less stress and work-family conflicts and better satisfaction, therefore, adjustment (Jassawalla et al., 2004). PsyCap relates to desirable attitudes and behaviors (Davis et al., 2018). For instance, Alessandri and colleagues (2018) found that PsyCap positively associated with employee engagement and enhanced performance in domestic work settings (Luthans et al., 2005). Similarly, Davis et al. (2018) proposed that the higher PsyCap, the better the adjustment and

performance. Thus, this research examines how hope, resilience, self-efficacy, and optimism combined in the second-order construct of PsyCap play a role in SIEs success among a sample of 149 SIEs nurses working in a Kuwaiti hospital. Additionally, it explores the effect of their motivation on their success.

From the lens of the Conservation of Resources theory (COR; Hobfoll, 1988), we aim to link the impact of expatriates' PsyCap and motivation on their adjustment and performance. COR theory's central premise is that individuals strive "to obtain, retain, and protect resources and that stress occurs when resources are threatened with loss or lost or when individuals fail to gain resources after substantive resource investment" (Hobfoll, 2002, p. 312). Hobfoll (2002) describes resources as "those entities that either are centrally valued in their own right (e.g., self-esteem, close attachments, health, and inner peace) or act as a means to obtain centrally valued ends (e.g., money, social support, and credit)" (p. 307). As such and based on the concept of resource caravans (Hobfoll, 2001), SIE's PsyCap and motivation may interact synergistically to produce positive outcomes and affect their performance and adjustment. Moreover, and from an additional theoretical lens based on the Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci and Ryan, 1985, 2008a, 2008b; Ryan and Deci, 2000), we seek to explore the impact of motivation on expatriates' adjustment and motivation. Deci and Ryan (1985) focus on individuals' intrinsic motivation and need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. They propose that satisfying these psychological needs increases motivation, engagement, and well-being. Hence, expatriates with a strong sense of autonomy, competence, and relatedness are more likely to be intrinsically motivated and perform better in their assignments. In fact, research has shown that autonomy and choice acted as motivators for expatriates in the adjustment of female SIEs who also had more opportunities for reinvention and better performance. (Schreuders-van den Bergh and Du Plessis, 2016)

Hence, we propose to test the following set of hypotheses on SIE nurses:

H1a: PsyCap is positively associated with adjustment.

H1b: PsyCap is positively associated with motivation.

H1c: PsyCap is positively associated with performance.

H2a: The more motivated the expatriate is, the better their performance will be.

H2b: The more motivated the expatriate is, the better their adjustment will be.

H3: The better adjusted the expatriate is, the better their performance will be.

Methodology

To test our hypotheses, we conducted an online survey through human resources personnel from a hospital in Kuwait. Kuwait was chosen because of its heavy reliance on expatriates and the under-researched nature of expatriate research in the global south. A total of 149 respondents completed the survey, with 77.9% female and the majority falling in the 35-44 age range (49.7%). 85.9% had a Bachelor's degree, 7.4% Master's degree, and 6.7% had other education levels. The respondents represented ten different countries, with the majority from India (51%), followed by the Philippines (22.8%), Egypt (8.7%), Lebanon (7.4%), Jordan (6%), Syria (1.3%), Armenia (0.7%), Canada (0.7%), Indonesia (0.7%), and Sudan (0.7%).

To measure our variables, we used established and validated scales. Psychological capital (PsyCap) was measured using a 24-item self-reported PsyCap Questionnaire (PCQ) from Luthans et al. (2007), which includes four subscales: efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience. Motivation was measured with the Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS) from Gagné et al. (2015), which includes six subscales: extrinsic regulation-social, extrinsic regulation-material, introjected regulation, identified regulation, intrinsic motivation, and amotivation. For the dependent variables, cross-cultural adjustment (CCA) was measured with Black's 14-item (1988) scale covering three facets of adjustment: general, interactional, and work. The Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ) measured performance (Koopman et al., 2014), which

includes four subscales: task, performance, adaptive, and counterproductive work behavior. Refer to Appendix A1 for item details.

To examine the relationships among the variables in this study, the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) technique was employed using SmartPLS 4 software (Ringle et al., 2022). SEM allows for estimating complex relationships between latent variables and observed indicators, providing a comprehensive theoretical understanding. Furthermore, PLS-SEM is particularly well-suited for our research due to the inclusion of latent variables with a substantial number of indicators and our limited sample size, characterized by nonnormal data distribution. Furthermore, two of the constructs in our model, motivation and performance, had been modelised as second-order formative constructs, which does not allow using classic covariance-based structural equation modelling to estimate the model (Hair et al., 2019). Second-order constructs were introduced in the model following the disjoint two-stage approach method (Sarstedt et al., 2019). Statistical significance of weights and loadings has been established with 5,000 sub-samples bootstrapping (Hair et al., 2017).

To assess measurement model reliability and convergent validity, for reflective constructs, loadings should be significant and higher than .70 (Hair et al. 2011), composite reliability coefficient (CR) should also be higher than .70 and the average variance extracted (AVE), higher than .50 (Hair et al., 2017). Table A2.1 in Appendix 2 shows those criteria are fulfilled, and as CR and AVE were above the threshold, removing the few indicators loading in the range of .50-.70 was unnecessary (Rasoolimanesh et al., 2017). Discriminant validity was checked using both Fornell and Larcker (1981) and HTMT ratio (Henseler et al., 2015) criterion, as shown in table A2.2 in Appendix 2, and no problems were detected. For formative constructs, the weight-

loading criterion was applied to keep or delete formative indicators (Hair et al., 2017) after discarding collinearity problems (table A2.1 in Appendix 2).

Following Hair et al. (2022; p.92-93): "While researchers have proposed various model fit measures for PLS-SEM (Schuberth et al., 2018; Tenenhaus et al., 2005), their efficacy for identifying misspecified models is highly limited. As a consequence, to judge the model's quality, researchers using PLS-SEM rely on alternative measures that assess the model's predictive capabilities (Shmueli et al., 2016; Shmueli et al., 2019), both in-sample and out-of-sample." Table A2.3 in Appendix 2 shows the results of applying one of these criteria (PLSPredict) to establish the model's predictive relevance.

Findings

Table 1 shows the results of the model estimation and hypotheses contrast. As hypothesized, PsyCap has a positive and significant effect on SIEs adjustment (H1a, $\beta=0.279$, $p<0.01$), motivation (H1b, $\beta=0.507$, $p<0.01$) and performance (H1c, $\beta=0.440$, $p<0.01$). However, while a significant effect of motivation on SIEs performance has been detected (H2b, $\beta=0.303$, $p<0.01$), we have not been able to confirm the impact of motivation on adjustment (H2a, $\beta=0.052$, $p>0.05$) nor of adjustment on performance (H3, $\beta=0.103$, $p>0.05$).

Table 1. Hypotheses testing

Hypothesis		Standardized Beta		t value (bootstrapping)	Confidence Interval 95%	
					2.50%	97.50%
H1a	PsyCap -> Adjustment	0.279	**	2.78	0.077	0.463
H1b	PsyCap -> Motivation	0.507	**	5.67	0.280	0.646
H1c	PsyCap -> Performance	0.440	**	5.41	0.247	0.577
H2a	Motivation -> Adjustment	0.052		0.41	-0.196	0.257
H2b	Motivation -> Performance	0.303	**	3.08	0.123	0.512
H3	Adjustment -> Performance	0.103		1.53	-0.043	0.219

** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0,05$

Discussion and conclusion

Previous research has shown that psychological capital (PsyCap) is positively related to positive work-related outcomes among self-initiated expatriates (SIEs), including job commitment, satisfaction, and performance (Alessandri et al., 2018; Luthans et al., 2007; Sun et al., 2012). The present study further supports these findings by demonstrating that PsyCap positively correlates with performance, motivation, and adjustment among SIE nurses. This highlights the important role that PsyCap plays in facilitating SIEs' adaptability to new cultural contexts and fostering their motivation in the host country (Cao et al., 2012). Moreover, our findings showed the positive impact of motivation on SIE's performance, which asserts that intrinsic motivation is necessary for good performance (Doherty et al., 2011).

Nonetheless, in contrast with previous studies (Osman-Gani and Rockstuhl, 2009); (Froese et al., 2012), our results indicate that SIE's motivation didn't impact their adjustment and that SIEs' adjustment did not impact their performance. This intriguing finding is worth exploring further as our results are preliminary. However, it could be attributed to the possibility that adjustment alone may not be enough to ensure good performance as multiple factors shape the performance of SIEs, who differ from OEs in some key characteristics. It is possible that these SIEs are extrinsically motivated due to their difficult life circumstances back home but have still made a heavy personal investment in their move and take it upon themselves to perform well regardless of their adjustment level.

Moreover, while previous studies have investigated PsyCap's subconstructs independent of one another and their impact on OEs' performance, our study holistically explores SIEs' performance from the umbrella of PsyCap. We comprehensively analyze the findings by integrating the self-determination theory (SDT) and the conservation of resources (COR) theory to further make sense of the findings. These theories provide valuable frameworks for understanding the psychological processes that influence expatriate outcomes. In the context of expatriates, on the one hand, (COR) theory suggests that PsyCap can be regarded as a personal resource (Hobfoll, 2001) that expatriates draw upon to cope

with the challenges and demands of their international assignments. Thus, expatriates with higher levels of psychological capital are more likely to possess the necessary psychological resources to adapt to new environments, overcome obstacles, and perform well.

Similarly, (COR) theory emphasizes that individuals are motivated to acquire and protect their resources (Hobfoll, 2002). Hence, expatriates' motivation to succeed and perform well in the expatriate context can be linked to their desire to protect and build their personal and professional resources (Davis et al., 2018). On the other hand, from the lens of (SDT), strongly motivated employees often exhibit a high need to learn new skills and knowledge to accumulate experience and advance their performance (Ryan and Deci, 2017). Hence, expatriates will be motivated to learn more, exert more effort to perform better, and eventually succeed in new cultural contexts (Howard et al., 2016; Shin and Jung, 2021). Thus, this may explain some of the factors our SIEs perceive as relevant to their mission success and performance.

Despite the significant contribution of this study to understanding all the dimensions of PsyCap united on SIEs' performance, there are some limitations. The participants were non-native English speakers, and the survey was in English, which may have distorted some findings. Additionally, the use of self-reported performance measures may have led to an overestimation of performance.

Finally, according to SDT, motivation can be categorized into two types, intrinsic and extrinsic, which in turn also represent different degrees of autonomy. Future research should study the effect of different types of motivation on performance, which can give more insights into what type of motivation (if neglected) can be detrimental to their performance, especially for IHRM purposes.

References

- Alessandri, G., Consiglio, C., Luthans, F. and Borgogni, L., 2018, "Testing a dynamic model of the impact of psychological capital on work engagement and job performance", *Career Development International*, Vol. 23 No.1, pp.33-47.
- Bagozzi, R.P. and Yi, Y., 1988, "On the Evaluation of Structural Equation Models," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 16 No.1, pp. 74–94.
- Bagozzi, R.P. and Yi, Y., 2012, "Specification, Evaluation, and Interpretation of Structural Equation Models," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 40 No.1, pp. 8-34.
- Barclay, Donald & Higgins, C., and Thompson, Ron. 1995, "The Partial Least Squares (PLS) approach to causal modelling, personal computer adoption and use as an illustration," *Technology Studies*, Vol. 2 No.2, pp. 285-309.
- Black, J. Stewart. ,1988, "Work role transitions: A study of American expatriate managers in Japan", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 19 No.2, pp. 277-94.
- Caligiuri, P. M. 1997," Assessing expatriate success: beyond just "being there.", Z. Aycan (Ed.), *New approaches to employee management, Expatriate management: Theory and research*, Stamford, CT: JAI Press, pp.117-140.
- Caligiuri, P., Tarique, I. and Jacobs, R. 2009, "Selection for International Assignments", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 251–262.
- Cao, L., Hirschi, A. and Deller, J., 2012, "Self-initiated expatriates and their career success", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 31 No.2, pp.159-172.
- Cohen, J., 1988, "Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences," (2nd ed.), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Davies, S., Kraeh, A. and Froese, F. 2015, "Burden Or Support? The Influence of Partner Nationality on Expatriate Cross-Cultural Adjustment", *Journal of Global Mobility-The Home of Expatriate Management Research*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 169–182.
- Davies, S. E., Stoermer, S., and Froese, F. J., 2019, " When the going gets tough: The influence of expatriate resilience and perceived organizational inclusion climate on work adjustment and turnover intentions", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 30 No.8, pp. 1393–1417.
- Davis, S.A., Fretwell, C.E., and Schraeder, M., 2018," Enhancing expatriate success: A psychological capital perspective", *Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 36 No.1, pp. 39–50.
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M., 1985, "Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior", *Plenum*, New York, NY.
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M., 2000, "The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior", *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 227-268.
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M., 2008a, "Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains", *Canadian Psychology*, Vol. 49 No. 1, pp. 14-23.
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M., 2008b, "Self-determination theory: a macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health", *Canadian Psychology*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 182-185.
- Doherty, N., Dickmann, M., and Mills, T., 2011," Exploring the motives of company-backed and self-initiated expatriates", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 22 No.3, pp. 595–611.

El Amine Nour and Cascón-Pereira Rosalía, (2021), "Lights and shadows in the expatriate success literature," in *XXX Congreso de ACEDE, XXX ACEDE Conference 28-30 Junio-June 2021, Cartagena, Spain*.

Fornell, C. G., & Larcker, D. F., 1981, "Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.18 No.1, pp. 39–50.

Froese, F.J., 2012, "Motivation and adjustment of self-initiated expatriates: the case of expatriate academics in South Korea", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 23 No. 6, pp. 1095-1112.

Gabel, R.S., Dolan, S.L., Cerdin, J.L., 2005, "Emotional intelligence as predictor of cultural adjustment for success in global assignments" *Career Development International* 10, pp. 375–395.

Gagné, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, L., Van den Broeck, A., Aspel, A.K., Bellerose, J., Benabou C., Chemolli, E., Güntert, S.T. and Halvari, H., 2015, "The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries," *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp.178-196.

Hair, J.F., Howard, M.C. and Nitzl, C., 2020, "Assessing measurement model quality in PLS-SEM using confirmatory composite analysis," *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 109 No.1, pp.101-110.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., and Sarstedt, M., 2017, "A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)" (2nd ed.). Sage.

Hair, J., Ringle, C., and Sarstedt, M., 2011, "PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet", *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol. 19 No.2, pp.139-152.

Hair, J.F., Risher, J.J., Sarstedt, M. And Ringle, C.M., 2019 "When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM", *European Business Review*, Vol. 31 No.1, pp.2-24.

Harjo, E., 2016, "Antecedents of Expatriate Performance in Short-Term Assignment An Empirical Study on The Relationship Between Individual Factors and Expatriate Performance in Short-Term Assignments" *The 3rd International Seminar and Conference on Learning Organization (ISCLO-15)*, Vol., 45, Atlantis Press, pp. 112-117.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C.M. and Sarstedt, M., 2015, "A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling," *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, Vol. 43 No.1, pp.115-135.

Heijden, J. A. V. v. d., Engen, M. L. v., and Pauwee, J., 2009 "Expatriate career support: predicting expatriate turnover and performance", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.20 No.4, pp. 831-845.

Hobfoll, S. E., 1988, "The conservation of resources: A new stress model", *The Ecology of Stress*, Washington DC: Hemisphere, pp. 25-55.

Hobfoll, S. E., 2001, "The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory". *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, Vol. 50 No.3, pp. 337-421.

Hobfoll, S. E., 2002, "Social and psychological resources and adaptation", *Review of General Psychology*, Vol. 6 No.4, pp. 307-324.

Howard, J., Gagne, M., Morin, A.J.S. and Broeck, A.V., 2016, "Motivation profiles at work: a self-determination theory approach", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vols 95-96, pp. 74-89.

Hu, L., and Bentler, P. M., 1998, "Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to under-parameterized model misspecification", *Psychological Methods*, Vol. 3 No.4, pp. 424-453.

Huff, K.C. 2013, "Language, Cultural Intelligence and Expatriate Success", *Management Research Review*, Vol. 36 No. 6, pp. 596-612.

Jassawalla, A., Truglia, C. and Garvey, J. 2004b, Cross-cultural conflict and expatriate manager adjustment. An exploratory study, *Management Decision*, Vol. 42 No.7, pp. 837-849.

Jokinen, T., Brewster, C. and Suutari, V., 2008, "Career capital during international work experiences: Contrasting self-initiated expatriate experiences and assigned expatriation", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 19 No.6, pp.979-998.

Kim, K., Halliday, C.S., Zhao, Y., Wang, C. and Von Glinow, M.A., 2018, "Rewarding self-initiated expatriates: a skills-based approach", *Thunderbird International Business Review*, Vol. 60 No. 1, pp. 89-104.

Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C.M., Hildebrandt, V.H., De Vet, H.C. and Van der Beek, A.J., 2014, "Construct validity of the individual work performance questionnaire", *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, Vol. 56 No.3, pp.331-337.

Lauring, J. and Selmer, J., 2014, "Global mobility orientation and the success of self-initiated expatriates in greater China", *Asia Pacific Business Review*, Vol. 20 No.4, pp.523-540.

Li, Y., Wang, Z., Yang, L.Q. and Liu, S., 2016, "The crossover of psychological distress from leaders to subordinates in teams: The role of abusive supervision, psychological capital, and team performance", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 21 No.2, p.142-153.

Luthans, F., Avolio, B.J., Avey, J.B. and Norman, S.M., 2007, "Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 60 No.3, pp.541-572.

Luthans, F., Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F.O. and Li, W., 2005, "The psychological capital of Chinese workers: Exploring the relationship with performance", *Management and organization review*, Vol. 1 No.2, pp.249-271.

Luthans, K.W. and Jensen, S.M., 2005, "The linkage between psychological capital and commitment to organizational mission: A study of nurses", *The Journal of Nursing Administration*, Vol. 35 No.6, pp.304-310.

Luthans, F., and Youssef, C. M., 2004, "Human, social, and now positive psychological capital management", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 33 No.2, pp. 143-160.

Luthans, F., and Youssef-Morgan, C. M., 2017, "Psychological capital: An evidence-based positive approach", *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 4 No.1, pp. 339-366.

Mezias, J., Scandura, T., 2005, "A needs-driven approach to expatriate adjustment and career development: a multiple mentoring perspectives," *Journal Of International Business Studies* 36, 519–538.

Muir, M., Wallace, M., & McMurray, D., 2014, "Women on the move: The self-initiated expatriate in China", *Journal of Global Mobility*, Vol. 2 No.2, pp. 234–254.

Nolan, E., & Morley, M. 2014, "A test of the relationship between person-environment fit and cross-cultural adjustment among self-initiated expatriates", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 25 No.11, pp. 1631–1649.

Ones, D. and Viswesvaran, C., 1997, "Personality determinants in the prediction of aspects of expatriate job success", Aycan, Z. (Ed.), *New Approaches To Employee Management, Expatriate Management: Theory and Research*, Stamford, CT: JAI Press, pp. 63–92.

Osman-Gani, A.M. and Rockstuhl, T., 2009, "Cross-cultural training, expatriate self-efficacy, and adjustments to overseas assignments: An empirical investigation of managers in Asia", *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 33 No.4, pp.277-290.

Rasoolimanesh, S.M., Ringle, C.M., Jaafar, M. And Ramayah, T., 2017," Urban vs. rural destinations: resident's perceptions, community participation and support for tourism development:, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 60 June, pp.147-158

Richardson, J.,and McKenna, S., 2006, "Exploring relationships with home and host countries: A study of self-directed expatriates", *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 13 No.1, pp. 6–22.

Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., and Becker, J.M., 2022, "SmartPLS 4. Oststeinbek: SmartPLS". Retrieved from <https://www.smartpls.com>

Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L., 2017, *Self-determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness*, The Guilford Press, New York.

Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., Thiele, K. O., and Gudergan, S. P. 2016, "Estimation issues with PLS and CBSEM: Where the bias lies!", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 69 No. 10, pp. 3998–4010.

Selmer, J. and Luring, J., 2011, "Acquired demographics and reasons to relocate among self-initiated expatriates", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.22 No.10, pp.2055-2070.

Shmueli, G., Ray, S., Velasquez Estrada, J. M., & Chatla, S. B., 2016, "The elephant in the room: Predictive performance of PLS models", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 69 No.10, pp. 4552–4564.

Shmueli, G., Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Cheah, J.-H., Ting, H., Vaithilingam, S., and Ringle, C. M., 2019, "Predictive model assessment in PLS-SEM: Guidelines for using PLSpredict", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 53 No.11, pp. 2322–2347.

Shin, I. and Jung, H., 2021, "Differential roles of self-determined motivations in describing job crafting behavior and organizational change commitment", *Current Psychology*, Vol. 40 No. 7, pp. 3376-3385.

Sartstedt, M., Hair, J.F., Chea, J-H, Becker, J-M, Ringle, C.M., 2019," How to specify, estimate, and validate higher-order constructs in PLS-SEM", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 27 No.3, pp. 197-211.

Schreuders-van den Bergh, R., & Du Plessis, Y., 2016, "Exploring the role of motivational cultural intelligence in SIE women's adjustment", *Journal of Global Mobility*, Vol. 4 No.2, pp. 131–148.

Schuberth, F., Henseler, J. and Dijkstra, T.K., 2018, "Confirmatory composite analysis", *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 9, p. 2541.

Sun, T., Zhao, X.W., Yang, L.B. and Fan, L.H., 2012, "The impact of psychological capital on job embeddedness and job performance among nurses: a structural equation approach", *Journal of advanced nursing*, Vol.68 No.1, pp.69-79.

Suutari, V. and Brewster, C., 2000, "Making their own way: International experience through self-initiated foreign assignments", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 35 No.4, pp.417-436.

Suutari, V. and Brewster, C., 2003, "Repatriation: Empirical evidence from a longitudinal study of careers and expectations among Finnish expatriates", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 14 No.7, pp.1132-1151.

Tenenhaus, M., Esposito Vinzi, V., Chatelin, Y.-M. and Lauro, C., 2005, "PLS Path Modeling", *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, Vol. 48 No. 1, pp. 159-205.

Tharenou, P., 2015, "Researching expatriate types: The quest for rigorous methodological approaches", *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 25 No.2, pp.149-165.

Varma, A., Pichler, S. and Toh, S.M., 2011, "A performance theory perspective on expatriate success: the role of self-efficacy and motivation", *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 38-50.

Appendices

Appendix A1: Measurement scales

Scale	Sub-Scale	Item	Definition
Adjustment	General Adjustment	Gen Adj1	Living conditions in general
		Gen Adj2	Housing conditions
		Gen Adj3	Food
		Gen Adj4	Shopping
		Gen Adj5	Cost of living
		Gen Adj6	Entertainment/recreation facilities and opportunities
		Gen Adj7	Health care facilities
	Interactional Adjustment	Int Adj1	Socializing with Host Country National (HCN)s
		Int Adj2	Interacting with Host Country National (HCN)s on a day-to-day basis
		Int Adj3	Interacting with Host Country National (HCN)s outside of work
		Int Adj4	Speaking with Host Country National (HCN)s
	Work Adjustment	Wrk Adj1	Specific job responsibilities
		Wrk Adj2	Performance standards and expectations
		Wrk Adj3	Supervisory responsibility

The respondents indicated how unadjusted or adjusted they were. All the items were evaluated using the seven-point Likert scale, with choices ranging from 1 (completely unadjusted) to 7 (completely adjusted).

Appendix A1: Measurement scales

Scale	Sub-Scale	Item	Definition
Performance	Task Performance	TP1	How do you rate the quality of your own work in the past year?
		TP2*	How do you rate the quantity of your own work in the past year?
		TP3*	How often was the quantity of my work below what it should have been the last year?
		TP4*	How often was the quality of my work below what it should have been the last year?
		TP5	How often was the quality of your work below what it should have been in the past year?
		TP6	How often was the quantity of your work less than it should have been in the past year?
		TP7	I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time
		TP8*	I worked towards the end result of my work
		TP9	I kept in mind the results that I had to achieve in my work
		TP10	I had trouble setting priorities in my work
		TP11*	I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work
		TP12	I was able to perform my work well with minimal time and effort
		TP13	It took me longer to complete my work tasks than intended
	Contextual Performance	Cont1	I was able to meet my appointments
		Cont2	I was able to fulfil my responsibilities
		Cont3	Collaboration with others went well
		Cont4	Others understood me well when I told them something
		Cont5	I understood others well when they told me something
		Cont6	Communication with others led to the desired result
		Cont7	I came up with creative ideas at work
		Cont8	I took the initiative when there was a problem to be solved
		Cont9	I took the initiative when something had to be organized
		Cont10	I started new tasks myself when my old ones were finished
		Cont11	I asked for help when needed
		Cont12*	I was open to criticism of my work
		Cont13	I tried to learn from the feedback I got from others on my work
		Cont14	I took on challenging work tasks, when available
		Cont15	I think patients were satisfied with my work
		Cont16	I took into account the wishes of the patient in my work
	Adaptive Performance	AP1	I worked at keeping my job knowledge up to date
		AP2	I worked at keeping my job skills up-to-date
		AP3	I have demonstrated flexibility
		AP4	I was able to cope well with difficult situations and setbacks at work
		AP5	I recovered fast, after difficult situations or setbacks at work
		AP6	I came up with creative solutions to new problems
		AP7	I was able to cope well with uncertain and unpredictable situations at work
		AP8	I easily adjusted to changes in my work
	Counter-productive Work Behaviour	CWB1*	I complained about unimportant matters at work
		CWB2	I made problems greater than they were at work
		CWB3	I focused on the negative aspects of a work situation, instead of on the positive aspects
		CWB4	I spoke with colleagues about the negative aspects of my work
		CWB5	I spoke with people from outside the organization about the negative aspects of my work
		CWB6	I purposely worked slowly
		CWB7	I purposely left my work so that someone else had to finish it
		CWB8	I behaved rudely towards someone at work
		CWB9	I quarrelled with my colleagues, manager, or patients
		CWB10	I purposely made mistakes

The statements above describe what the respondents may think about their performance during the past year. All these items are evaluated using the five-point Likert scale, with choices ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always); except for the first two questions of task performance, their choices range from 1 (insufficient) to 5 (very good). () indicate that the item was dropped due to a low loading and AVE.*

Appendix A1: Measurement scales

Scale	Sub-Scale	Item	Definition
Psychological Capital	Hope	Hope1*	If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it
		Hope2	At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my work goals
		Hope3	There are lots of ways around any problem
		Hope4	Right now, I see myself as being pretty successful at work
		Hope5	I can think of many ways to reach my current work goals
		Hope6	At this time, I am meeting the work goals that I have set for myself
	Resilience	Res1*	When I have a setback at work, I have trouble recovering from it, moving on
		Res2*	I usually manage difficulties one way or another at work
		Res3	I can be ""on my own", " so to speak, at work if I have to
		Res4*	I usually take stressful things at work in stride
		Res5	I can get through difficult times at work because I've experienced difficulty before
		Res6	I feel I can handle many things at a time at this job
	Self-Efficacy	SE1	I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution
		SE2	I feel confident in representing my work area in meetings with my superiors
		SE3	I feel confident contributing to discussions about the 'hospital's strategy
		SE4	I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area
		SE5	I feel confident contacting people outside my organization to discuss problems
		SE6	I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues
	Optimism	Opt1*	When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best
		Opt2*	If something can go wrong for me work-wise, it will
		Opt3	I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job
		Opt4	I'm optimistic about what will happen to me in the future as it pertains to work
		Opt5*	In this job, things never work out the way I want them to
		Opt6	I approach this job as if ""every cloud has a silver lining""

The above statements describe how the respondents may think about themselves right now. All the items were evaluated using the seven-point Likert scale, with choices ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). () indicate that the item was dropped due to a loading < 0.6.*

Appendix A1: Measurement scales

Scale	Sub-Scale	Item	Definition
Motivation	Extrinsic Regulation-Social	Ext Reg Social1	To get others' approval (e.g., supervisor, colleagues, family)
		Ext Reg Social2	Because others will respect me more (e.g., supervisor, colleagues, family)
		Ext Reg Social3	To avoid being criticized by others (e.g., supervisor, colleagues, family)
	Extrinsic Regulation-Material	Ext Reg M1	Because others will reward me financially only if I put enough effort in my job (e.g., employer, supervisor...)
		Ext Reg M2	Because others offer me greater job security if I put enough effort in my job (e.g., employer, supervisor...)
		Ext Reg M3	Because I risk losing my job if I don't put enough effort in it
	Introjected Regulation	Intro1	Because I have to prove to myself that I can
		Intro2	Because it makes me feel proud of myself
		Intro3	Because otherwise I will feel ashamed of myself
		Intro4	Because otherwise I will feel bad about myself
	Identified Regulation	Iden1	Because I personally consider it important to put efforts in this job
		Iden2	Because putting efforts in this job aligns with my personal values
		Iden3	Because putting efforts in this job has personal significance to me
	Intrinsic Regulation	Intrinsic1	Because I have fun doing my job
		Intrinsic2	Because what I do in my work is exciting
		Intrinsic3	Because the work I do is interesting
	Amotivation	Amot1	I don't, because I really feel that I'm wasting my time at work
		Amot2	I do little because I don't think this work is worth putting efforts into
		Amot3	I don't know why I'm doing this job, it's pointless work

The above statements describe how the respondents may think about their motivations behind pursuing an international experience. All these items are evaluated using the seven-point Likert scale, with choices ranging from 1 (completely agree) to 7 (completely disagree).

Appendix A2: Measurement model validation and model's predictive relevance

Table A2.1 Reliability and convergent validity

1st order factors	Item	Standardized loading	t statistic (bootstrapping)	Weight	t statistic (bootstrapping)	VIF	rho_A	CR	AVE
Amotivation	AM1	0.82	**	13.79			0.86	0.90	0.75
	AM2	0.88	**	24.16					
	AM3	0.89	**	26.95					
Adaptative	AP1	0.82	**	21.63			0.92	0.93	0.63
	AP2	0.78	**	16.98					
	AP3	0.82	**	19.42					
	AP4	0.83	**	20.75					
	AP5	0.74	**	14.09					
	AP6	0.73	**	13.88					
	AP7	0.79	**	20.60					
	AP8	0.82	**	24.57					
Contextual	CP1	0.66	**	12.27			0.91	0.91	0.42
	CP2	0.76	**	20.39					
	CP3	0.63	**	7.63					
	CP4	0.57	**	7.84					
	CP5	0.67	**	9.44					
	CP6	0.67	**	10.02					
	CP7	0.63	**	12.80					
	CP8	0.73	**	16.91					
	CP9	0.68	**	12.66					
	CP10	0.59	**	9.05					
	CP11	0.54	**	8.30					
	CP13	0.57	**	6.12					
	CP14	0.67	**	11.47					
	CP15	0.64	**	9.17					
	CP16	0.64	**	9.73					

Table A2.1 Continued

CWB	CWB1	0.52	**	7.14	0.95	0.94	0.62
	CWB2	0.76	**	11.76			
	CWB3	0.83	**	20.17			
	CWB4	0.68	**	12.91			
	CWB5	0.76	**	14.44			
	CWB6	0.87	**	20.02			
	CWB7	0.92	**	37.75			
	CWB8	0.83	**	19.65			
	CWB9	0.78	**	13.55			
	CWB10	0.86	**	20.18			
Extrinsic Material	EM1	0.94	**	30.84	0.86	0.92	0.85
	EM2	0.91	**	21.10			
Extrinsic Social	ES1	0.89	**	20.33	0.90	0.91	0.78
	ES2	0.91	**	25.13			
	ES3	0.84	**	13.50			
General	GA1	0.79	**	12.76	0.90	0.91	0.59
	GA2	0.87	**	21.37			
	GA3	0.75	**	8.18			
	GA4	0.79	**	10.91			
	GA5	0.69	**	9.22			
	GA6	0.76	**	11.02			
	GA7	0.72	**	9.33			
Hope	H2	0.79	**	9.57	0.89	0.92	0.69
	H3	0.76	**	13.20			
	H4	0.87	**	42.52			
	H5	0.87	**	40.24			
	H6	0.85	**	38.47			
Interactive	IA1	0.86	**	28.94	0.89	0.92	0.74
	IA2	0.84	**	19.08			
	IA3	0.86	**	27.76			
	IA4	0.87	**	30.17			
Identified Reg	IFR1	0.87	**	15.72	0.89	0.93	0.82
	IFR2	0.92	**	31.71			
	IFR3	0.92	**	42.00			

Table A2.1 Continued

Introjected	IJR1	0.90	**	28.00	0.88	0.85	0.60
	IJR2	0.89	**	21.44			
	IJR3	0.64	**	6.84			
	IJR4	0.61	**	6.77			
Intrinsic	IM1	0.66	**	7.77	0.94	0.86	0.68
	IM2	0.87	**	21.39			
	IM3	0.91	**	52.15			
Optimism	O3	0.83	**	23.24	0.69	0.81	0.59
	O4	0.81	**	15.78			
	O6	0.65	**	7.04			
Resilience	R3	0.58	**	5.46	0.55	0.75	0.50
	R5	0.84	**	20.72			
	R6	0.69	**	6.36			
Self-Efficacy	SE1	0.77	**	16.48	0.86	0.88	0.55
	SE2	0.83	**	23.73			
	SE3	0.76	**	13.20			
	SE4	0.82	**	25.44			
	SE5	0.51	**	4.35			
	SE6	0.70	**	8.77			
Task	TP1	0.69	**	10.14	0.83	0.86	0.41
	TP2	0.70	**	11.52			
	TP5	0.73	**	12.01			
	TP6	0.68	**	9.16			
	TP7	0.64	**	6.30			
	TP9	0.56	**	7.07			
	TP10	0.54	**	5.87			
	TP12	0.57	**	6.56			
	TP13	0.62	**	7.81			
Work	WA1	0.88	**	25.79	0.92	0.92	0.79
	WA2	0.89	**	28.69			
	WA3	0.91	**	34.26			

Table A2.1 Continued

2nd order factors										
Adjustment	General	0.82	**	14.66				0.85	0.89	0.73
	Interactive	0.84	**	21.41						
	Work	0.90	**	28.05						
PsyCap	Hope	0.89	**	44.77				0.86	0.89	0.67
	Optimism	0.82	**	25.80						
	Resilience	0.76	**	17.42						
	Self-Efficacy	0.80	**	27.29						
Motivation	Amotivation	-0.53	**	3.69	-0.32	1.82	1.26	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Extrinsic Material	-0.04		0.33	-0.26	1.80	1.44			
	Extrinsic Social	0.14		0.90	0.27	1.79	1.41			
	Identified Reg	0.82	**	9.81	0.16	0.76	2.84			
	Intrinsic	0.75	**	7.90	0.41	**	2.99	1.53		
	Introjected	0.80	**	8.49	0.43	*	2.48	2.41		
Performance	Adaptative	0.81	**	9.91	0.29	1.70	2.35	N/A	N/A	N/A
	CWB	-0.59	**	4.55	-0.38	*	2.30	1.07		
	Contextual	0.80	**	9.47	0.24	1.56	2.49			
	Task	0.84	**	11.51	0.42	**	3.52	1.82		

Note: rho A=Dijkstra-Henseler rho; CR=Composite reliability; AVE= Average Variance Extracted

N/A = Does not Apply (formative constructs)

**p<0.01; *p<0.05

Table A2.2. Discriminant validity

Construct level	Factor	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	F10	F11	F12	F13	F14	F15	F16	F17	F18	F19
1st order factors	F1. Adaptive	0.79	0.19	0.25	0.81	0.16	0.07	0.13	0.65	0.28	0.33	0.34	0.26	0.52	0.61	0.37	0.71	0.27		
	F2. Amotivation	-0.15	0.87	0.49	0.20	0.22	0.28	0.14	0.25	0.38	0.12	0.16	0.31	0.16	0.11	0.21	0.28	0.08		
	F3. CWB	-0.23	0.46	0.79	0.22	0.13	0.11	0.18	0.38	0.29	0.15	0.13	0.34	0.32	0.33	0.25	0.27	0.16		
	F4. Contextual	0.73	-0.16	-0.20	0.65	0.20	0.10	0.14	0.54	0.39	0.34	0.36	0.39	0.43	0.53	0.46	0.74	0.24		
	F5. ExtMaterial	-0.14	0.19	0.09	-0.06	0.92	0.60	0.12	0.11	0.16	0.08	0.18	0.26	0.20	0.14	0.29	0.10	0.07		
	F6. ExtSocial	0.01	0.23	0.08	-0.03	0.50	0.88	0.16	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.15	0.08	0.16	0.07	0.31	0.10	0.15		
	F7. General	0.11	-0.12	-0.16	0.11	-0.06	0.12	0.77	0.14	0.17	0.59	0.12	0.10	0.26	0.20	0.18	0.17	0.82		
	F8. Hope	0.59	-0.22	-0.34	0.50	-0.03	0.09	0.13	0.83	0.46	0.26	0.47	0.41	0.83	0.89	0.67	0.60	0.25		
	F9. IdentifiedReg	0.25	-0.33	-0.27	0.36	0.13	0.08	0.15	0.41	0.91	0.14	0.66	0.83	0.44	0.37	0.46	0.45	0.13		
	F10. Interactive	0.30	-0.11	-0.13	0.33	-0.06	0.09	0.51	0.24	0.13	0.86	0.12	0.11	0.19	0.17	0.35	0.26	0.65		
	F11. Intrinsic	0.32	-0.11	-0.12	0.33	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.43	0.57	0.09	0.82	0.53	0.46	0.33	0.43	0.41	0.14		
	F12. Introjected	0.25	-0.29	-0.35	0.36	0.18	0.02	0.05	0.40	0.75	0.09	0.47	0.77	0.43	0.40	0.40	0.39	0.05		
	F13. Optimism	0.41	-0.12	-0.25	0.35	0.13	0.13	0.21	0.66	0.34	0.16	0.35	0.32	0.77	0.91	0.66	0.44	0.33		
	F14. Resilience	0.43	-0.06	-0.23	0.37	0.01	0.02	0.13	0.59	0.25	0.12	0.22	0.28	0.52	0.71	0.68	0.68	0.33		
	F15. SelfEfficacy	0.34	-0.19	-0.22	0.43	0.20	0.22	0.16	0.60	0.41	0.31	0.38	0.38	0.53	0.46	0.74	0.50	0.32		
	F16. Task	0.60	-0.25	-0.23	0.64	-0.04	0.02	0.12	0.52	0.40	0.21	0.36	0.37	0.33	0.42	0.43	0.64	0.22		
	F17. Work	0.24	-0.06	-0.14	0.23	-0.05	0.14	0.70	0.23	0.11	0.58	0.13	0.04	0.27	0.23	0.30	0.19	0.89		
2nd order factors	F18.Adjustment																		0.854	0.357
	F19. Psycap																		0.305	0.818

Note: Diagonal, AVE square root; Upper triangle HTMT ratios; Lower triangle: Latent variable correlations

Note: Performance and motivation do not appear in the table as they are formative constructs

Table A2.3 PLSpredict assessment of manifest variables.

Item	PLS-SEM		LM	PLS-SEM - LM
	RMSE	Q2Predict	RMSE	RMSE
General	0.996	0.019	1.017	-0.021
Interactive	0.975	0.057	0.979	-0.004
Work	0.961	0.085	0.982	-0.021
Amotivation	1.001	0.017	0.998	0.003
ExtMaterial	1.012	0.011	0.984	0.028
ExtSocial	1.004	0.004	1.01	-0.006
IdentifiedReg	0.914	0.174	0.92	-0.006
Intrinsic	0.92	0.163	0.923	-0.003
Introjected	0.918	0.168	0.935	-0.017
Adaptive	0.855	0.278	0.832	0.023
CWB	0.961	0.091	0.962	-0.001
Contextual	0.876	0.242	0.889	-0.013
Task	0.872	0.253	0.865	0.007