How does perceived underemployment influence expatriate job-related outcomes? A moderated mediation study
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Abstract. Although research has investigated the consequences of underemployment in domestic settings, research on the effects of underemployment among expatriates remains limited and has yielded inconsistent results. From a theoretical perspective, there is a need for a better understanding of the mechanisms through which underemployment affects various work-related outcomes and to account for potential contingencies. Drawing on the person-job fit literature and research on organizational identification, we theorise and empirically examine how and under what conditions underemployment influences expatriate performance. Using an original primary dataset of 103 Japanese expatriate managers in the UK, we find that underemployment affects expatriate work outcomes by increasing expatriates' maladjustment and that this effect is moderated by the level to which expatriates identify with their organization.
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Introduction

Expatriates often hold positions that do not allow them to utilize their particular knowledge, experience, and abilities (Bolino & Feldman, 2000a; Lazarova & Cerdin 2007). For example, more than 25% of 268 expatriates from six Fortune 500 MNCs studied by Bolino and Feldman (2000b) were classified into a category that indicates particularly low levels of skill utilization. Al Ariss and Özbilgin (2010) and Felker (2011) also report high levels of perceived underemployment among self-initiated expatriates. Expatriates thus often face a significant gap between their overseas position and a previous or ideal position in terms of the required education, skill level and experience, as well as the learning opportunities and challenges associated with the respective position (e.g., Benson & Pattie, 2008; Bolino & Feldman, 2000a). This clear skills-related gap constitutes a particular type of underemployment, which generally refers to individuals’ perception that “they are working in inferior, lesser, or lower quality jobs relative to some defined standard.” (e.g., Bolino & Feldman, 2000: 889).¹

Research drawing on the person-job (P-J) fit literature or relative deprivation theory suggests that underemployment poses a threat to the success of overseas assignments (Bolino & Feldman, 2000b; Kraimer et al., 2009; Ren et al., 2013). Underemployment has been argued to lead to work maladjustment, frustration, career dissatisfaction and higher levels of stress (e.g., Benson et al., 2009; Bolino & Feldman, 2000a; Feldman, Leana, & Bolino, 2002) and thus negatively affects employees’ psychological and physiological health and their

¹ Feldman (1996) distinguishes underemployment resulting from poor fit between an individual and job requirements in terms of education, skills and experience, time (i.e., jobs that provide too few hours) and salary (i.e., jobs that pay too little). In this study, underemployment refers to skills-related underemployment, defined by Pedulla and Newman (2011: 234) as the “mismatch between a worker’s formal education or labor market experience and her current job”. Similar to Erdogan and Bauer (2011: 215), underemployment in our study captures “the degree to which a person possesses more skills, education, and experience than the job demands and requirements”. Additionally, we focus on subjective (i.e., perceived) rather than objective underemployment because (objective) employment characteristics generate the underemployment phenomenon when they do not suit employees’ own desires and expectations (Anderson & Winefield, 2011; Feldman, 1996).
attitude towards work (Anderson & Winefield, 2011; Lee, 2005). However, there is very little research on the consequences of underemployment for expatriates’ performance (Bolino & Feldman, 2000a; Feldman, 2011; Maynard, 2011). Feldman (2011) draws on the P-J fit framework to suggest that underemployment affects both the performance of expatriates and their intention to return home (Feldman, 2011). However, prior research has led to inconsistent results regarding the effect of underemployment on various job outcomes among both domestic employees (Erdogan & Bauer, 2009; Fine & Nevo, 2009; Friedland & Price, 2003; Khan & Morrow, 1991; McKee-Ryan et al., 2009) and expatriate managers (Bolino & Feldman 2000a).

We aim to contribute to the understanding of the effect of underemployment on expatriates’ performance by clarifying the mechanism through which underemployment affects this performance and highlighting the contingent nature of the effect of underemployment. First, we identify an increase in work maladjustment as the key mechanism through which underemployment influences expatriate work outcomes. Work maladjustment reflects the degree of an individual’s psychological comfort in terms of assigned tasks (Chen et al., 2010; Takeuchi, Marinova, Lepak & Liu, 2005) and work responsibilities (Black, 1988; Black & Stephens, 1989) in an unfamiliar foreign workplace. Prior research suggests that frustration, career dissatisfaction and higher levels of stress, which are highlighted as consequences of underemployment (e.g., Benson et al., 2009; Bolino & Feldman, 2000a; Feldman, Leana, & Bolino, 2002), are manifestations of maladjustment in general (Nolan & Morley, 2014) and a lack of work adjustment in particular (Breiden et al. 2006; Lee, 2005). Work maladjustment, in turn, is likely to have negative effects on different facets of expatriates’ work performance. Recent research has stressed the multifaceted nature of employees’ job performance in general (Dalal, Weiss, Welch, & Hulin, 2009; Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994) and of expatriates’ job performance in
particular (Caligiuri & Day, 2000). Specifically, we suggest that by increasing maladjustment, underemployment is likely to affect expatriate managers’ task performance (i.e., the extent to which expatriate managers perform specific tasks), contextual performance (i.e., the extent to which they demonstrate their interpersonal adaptation to a new foreign workplace) (Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Van der Heijden et al., 2009), and their intention to return (Holton, Lee, & Tidd, 2002; Maynard, 2011; Feldman 2011; Bolino & Feldman, 2000a)\(^2\). The first research question that we address is the following: *(1) Does expatriate maladjustment mediate the relationship between underemployment and expatriates’ work performance?*

Second, various authors have suggested that the effects of underemployment are likely to be contingent and have called for research to identify potential contingencies (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2009; Erdogan et al., 2011), particularly those associated with particular characteristics of individuals (Maynard, 2011; Feldman, 2011; Feldman, 2011). We draw on social identity theory and investigate the potential moderating effect of expatriate managers’ organizational identification (i.e., the psychological state of connection or bond between the self and the organization) (Edwards, 2005), which results from individuals’ cognitive process of internalizing organizational visions and values (Hall et al. 1970; Mael & Ashforth, 1992). Prior research indicates that individuals with high levels of organizational identification are

\(^2\) These three dimensions of expatriate performance have been chosen in response to calls in existing research to consider task performance, contextual performance and premature return intention as important elements of a broader conceptualization of expatriate assignment-specific performance (e.g., Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Van der Heijden et al., 2009). We decided to measure these three distinctive indicators of expatriate success for theoretical and practical reasons. First, task performance reflects an in-role dimension of the performance construct. It has been argued that person-job misfit constrains individuals to acquire declarative knowledge and to make efforts to solve problems, ultimately lowering the levels of task proficiency and work efficiency (Bashshur et al., 2011). The second dimension of performance, contextual performance, refers to pro-social values and attitudes towards others in the organization. There is a clear consensus among P-J fit researchers that this performance construct is essential for understanding the adverse impact of person-job misfit since poor social behaviors may adversely affect organizational effectiveness due to a lack of social interactions and cooperation with colleagues (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Connelly et al., 2011; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). We use expatriates’ premature return intention as our third dimension of expatriate performance. The results of Maynard and Parfyonova’s study (2013) revealed that job mismatch activates withdrawal cognitions. In the context of expatriation, individuals’ poor fit with their jobs may trigger the failure to complete assignment objectives, consequently damaging not only own career advancement goals but also the interests of the organization (Kraimer et al., 2009). From a practical point of view, it is thus imperative for organizations to embrace the value of a P-J fit since human capital is a key source of competitive advantage (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). For these reasons, we decided to choose the three dependent variables that lead us to capture the relative costs of perceived expatriate underemployment.
less likely to face the potentially negative consequences of underemployment (Osipow & Davis, 1988). Thus, organizational identification is likely to weaken the negative effects of underemployment. The second research question we address is the following: (2) How does organizational identification moderate the mediated effects of underemployment on expatriate performance?

By addressing our two research questions, we contribute to the expatriate and underemployment literature in the following ways. First, by drawing on person-environment fit theory, specifically person-job (P-J) fit theory, to investigate the effect of expatriate underemployment on the task and contextual performance of expatriates and on expatriates’ premature return intentions, we contribute to the understanding of the role of underemployment among expatriate managers. Our study contributes to the development of the theory not only by testing its applicability in an international rather than a domestic setting but also by clarifying the role of maladjustment as a mechanism through which a poor P-J fit affects job outcomes in the context of expatriates. Understanding the mechanism by which underemployment affects expatriate performance is also important from a practical perspective given the likely negative consequences of expatriate managers’ underemployment in the form of the underutilization or loss of skills and capabilities through low performance or assignment failure and thus on overall corporate performance (Lee, 2005). Underemployment is thus a central concern for human resource managers. Most MNCs tend to focus on recruiting, training, and sending only the most skilled employees (Bolino & Feldman, 2000b) without accounting for the degree to which an individual’s skills can be used during an overseas assignment, thereby exacerbating the problem of underemployment among expatriates. There is thus a clear need to clarify how underemployment affects the success of overseas assignments.
Second, by drawing on social identity theory to identify an individual’s organizational identification as a boundary condition of the effects of underemployment we contribute to the literature and respond to recent calls for such explorations (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2009; McKee-Ryan & Harvey, 2011: 991). Integrating organizational identification into the underemployment-expatriate performance model on the basis of P-J fit theory allows us to connect these two streams of the literature to provide a better explanation of the contingent effect of underemployment in the context of expatriate managers. Specifically, we argue for and empirically investigate the role of individuals’ organizational identification as a boundary condition of the effect of underemployment. In so doing, we contribute to resolving prior inconsistent findings on the effects of underemployment (Erdogan & Bauer, 2009; McKee-Ryan et al., 2009). Drawing on insights from social identity theory allows us to enrich the P-J fit model in the context of international human resource management. Clarifying possible contingencies is also important from a practical perspective, because knowledge of such contingencies may enable firms to minimize the unfavourable performance outcomes of expatriate underemployment.

This article is structured as follows. The next section uses P-J fit theory and social identity theory to develop hypotheses on the contingent effect of underemployment on expatriate managers’ job performance and premature return intention. The subsequent section introduces our analytical strategy, including descriptions of the data and the measurement of our variables. We then present and discuss our results before highlighting the study’s contribution to research and the practice of international HRM.

**Theoretical background and hypotheses**

In the context of expatriate managers, underemployment relates to the perception of a significant gap between the characteristics of an overseas position and the preferences and
expectations of the expatriate manager in terms of, for example, required skills. We thus suggest that person-environment (P-E) interaction/fit theory (Lewin, 1935) is particularly relevant for understanding the effects of underemployment for expatriates’ job performance and premature return intention. The theory posits that there are five types of P-E fit (Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006; Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005): person-vocation fit, person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit, person-supervisor fit, and person-person fit. Individuals perceive underemployment with regard to a particular position rather than a vocation or group, for example. The fit between persons and their jobs (i.e., the P-J fit) is particularly important for our understanding of the effects of underemployment (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Underemployment represents a classic type of mismatch between an individual’s knowledge, skills, and abilities and job demands (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Maynard et al., 2006). We therefore draw on this particular strand of the general P-E fit literature to develop our hypotheses on the effect of perceived underemployment on expatriates’ job performance and premature return intention.

Researchers have conceptualized two types of P-J fit: demands-abilities fit and supplies-values fit (Edwards, 1991). Demands-abilities fit refers to the alignment of individuals’ skills with the job requirements (Edwards 1991; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Kristof-Brown 2000). Applied to the context of expatriate assignments demands-abilities fit refers to the alignment of expatriates’ skills with the requirements of the particular overseas assignment. In contrast, supplies-values fit refers to the extent to which individuals’ expectations are met by opportunities in the work environment (Caplan, 1983; Maynard & Feldman, 2011). The employer usually attempts to provide such “supplies”/opportunities by offering rewards, novel tasks, training investment, and promotion opportunities (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). For instance, prior research suggests that in the case of Japanese firms, overseas assignments are associated with the expectation of career
advancement for the expatriate upon his/her return to Japan (e.g., Wong, 2001). In the context of perceived underemployment of expatriate managers, supplies-values fit refers to the extent to which expatriate managers perceive their expectations to be met by the opportunities of an overseas assignment.

P-J fit theory suggests that low levels of supplies-values fit and/or demands-abilities fit have numerous adverse effects on individuals’ work behaviours and psychological well-being (e.g., Kraimer et al., 2009; Maynard & Parfyonova, 2013). Because the levels of supplies-values fit and/or demands-abilities fit tend to be even lower in the context of overseas assignments, these adverse effects will be particularly pronounced among expatriate managers. Specifically, we expect perceived underemployment to affect expatriates’ task performance, contextual performance and/or premature return intention through an increase in expatriates’ work maladjustment.

**The mediating effect of expatriate work maladjustment**

Prior research drawing on the P-J fit model suggests that underemployment is associated with individuals’ work maladjustment (Bolino & Feldman, 2000a; Breiden, Mohr & Mirza, 2006). Expatriate managers whose assignments provide supplies/demands that do not match managers’ values/abilities will show low levels of adjustment to their work situation. Work maladjustment relates to the degree of an individual’s psychological comfort in terms of assigned tasks (Chen et al., 2010; Takeuchi, Marinova, Lepak & Liu, 2005) and work responsibilities (Black, 1988; Black & Stephens, 1989) in an unfamiliar foreign workplace. Prior research has highlighted various aspects of this maladjustment resulting from perceived underemployment, including lower need fulfilment (Cable & Edwards, 2004), lower mental health (Bolino & Feldman, 2000a), heightened levels of stress (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Luksyte & Spitzmueller, 2011; Shaffer et al., 2013), disappointment and frustration (Erdogan & Bauer 2009), and a damaged self-image (Harvey, 1989).
The increase in work maladjustment associated with perceived underemployment negatively affects all three dimensions of an expatriate’s performance. Maladjustment lowers expatriates’ task performance (i.e., the extent to which expatriate managers perform their specific tasks) (Chen et al., 2010; Kawai & Strange, 2014; Kraimer et al., 2001; Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Van der Heijden et al., 2009, Takeuchi et al., 2009). The manifestations of maladjustment, such as greater levels of stress (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Shaffer et al., 2013) and damaged self-image (Harvey, 1989) directly affect expatriates’ ability to perform their tasks. Additionally, Bolino and Feldman, (2000a) highlight how underemployment negatively affects individuals’ motivation to perform. Although expatriates may have the necessary skills and experience to perform their jobs successfully, their motivation and willingness to do so is likely to decline with the maladjustment resulting from perceived underemployment (e.g., Bahshur, Hernández & Periò, 2011; Borgen, Amundson, & Harder, 1988).

Maladjustment also lowers expatriates’ contextual performance, i.e. the extent to which expatriate managers demonstrate their interpersonal adaptation to a new foreign workplace (Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Van der Heijden et al., 2009). The greater psychological strains associated with low levels of work adjustment make maladjusted expatriates less able or willing to cope with the interpersonal cross-cultural challenges inherent in an international assignment. Prior research also suggests that the maladjustment associated with underemployment can increase an individual’s aggressive behaviour towards his/her colleagues and can discourage prosocial behaviours, such as helping others and engaging in organizational citizenship behaviour (Feldman 2011). Maladjustment therefore negatively affects expatriates’ contextual performance.

The maladjustment resulting from perceived underemployment will negatively affect not only expatriates’ task and contextual performance but also their intention to return
This is because maladjustment associated with the perception of low levels of supplies-values fit and/or demands-abilities increases employees’ withdrawal behaviours (Erdogan & Bauer, 2009; Maynard et al., 2006; McKee-Ryan et al., 2009; Kraimer et al., 2009; Maynard & Parfyonova, 2013). Various studies indicate that underemployed individuals are more likely to leave their positions and to do so earlier than individuals who do not perceive themselves to be underemployed (Feldman et al., 2002; McKee-Ryan, Virick, Prussia, Harvey, & Lilly, 2009). Although this behaviour is reflected in higher levels of absenteeism and turnover, in the context of expatriate managers, the withdrawal behaviour associated with maladjustment is likely to manifest in expatriates’ premature termination of an overseas assignment (Bolino & Feldman, 2000a; Kraimer et al 2009). Similarly, prior research has underlined how the maladjustment associated with underemployment reduces an employee’s satisfaction with his or her job or career (Benson et al., 2009; Bolino & Feldman, 2000a; Erdogan & Bauer, 2009; Lee, 2005; Maynard & Parfyonova, 2013; Khan & Morrow, 1991; Ren et al., 2013). Because expatriates’ satisfaction affects their willingness to complete an overseas assignment (Caligiuri & Day, 2000; Kraimer & Wayne, 2004; Van der Heijden, et al, 2009), maladjustment affects expatriates’ intention to return by reducing their satisfaction. Based on this discussion, we formulate the following hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1a:** Work maladjustment mediates the relationship between perceived underemployment and expatriates’ task performance.

**Hypothesis 1b:** Work maladjustment mediates the relationship between perceived underemployment and expatriates’ contextual performance.

**Hypothesis 1c:** Work maladjustment mediates the relationship between perceived underemployment and expatriates’ premature return intention.

**The moderating effect of organizational identification**
We expect the degree to which an expatriate identifies with her or his employer to weaken the mediated effect of perceived underemployment on performance. This is because individuals who identify with their organizations are better able and more willing to cope with the negative consequences of underemployment.

Research drawing on social identity theory has highlighted the role of organizational identification as an important element of organizational behaviour and human resource management (Van Knippenberg et al., 2002). Social identity theory underscores the role of individuals’ need to establish and maintain a particular social identity (i.e., individuals’ perception of oneness with specific categories or groups) (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Van Knippenberg & Van Schie, 2000). The organization represents one such important category or group with which individuals are able to identify. According to Hall et al. (1970: 176-177), this organizational identification captures “the process by which the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly integrated and congruent”. In other words, organizational identification can be conceptually construed as the psychological state of a connection or bond between the self and the organization that results from individuals’ cognitive process of internalizing organizational visions and values (Edwards, 2005; Mael & Ashforth, 1992).3

Organizational identification in the context of expatriates reflects the degree to which the goals of the expatriate and those of the organization have become integrated and congruent as a result of expatriate managers internalizing the organization’s vision and values. Because a shared social identity or subjective fit with organizational values increases an individual’s capacity to cope with the negative effects associated with a difficult and stressful job (Newton & Jimmieson, 2009), organizational identification mitigates the negative effects

---

3 Although there are overlaps between organizational identification and the person-organization-fit discussed in the P-E-fit theory, the two concepts differ in nature. The former indicates the degree of psychological oneness whereas the latter highlights the level of value congruence. We would like to thank one of the reviewers for highlighting the potential overlaps between these two concepts.
of underemployment on work maladjustment, which we expect to affect expatriates’ performance and their intention to repatriate. We suggest that a high level of organizational identification will increase expatriates’ ability and willingness to cope with the negative effects of underemployment. Prior research also suggests that employees who strongly identify with their organization are more likely to sacrifice their personal interests and extend their efforts for the benefit of their organization (van Knippenberg, 2000; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Organizational identification thus increases individuals’ resistance to the effects of underemployment and will thus attenuate the effects of underemployment on expatriates’ work maladjustment.

Prior research has highlighted the possibility of cognitive reappraisal, which helps employees to better cope with a difficult work situation by framing their position as more positive (e.g., Feldman 2011). Expatriates who identify strongly with their employing organization are more likely to engage in cognitive reappraisal, for example, by shifting their reference point from their previous home-country position to overseas assignments and/or to the individuals on these assignments. (e.g., Feldman 2011), thereby weakening the negative effects of perceived underemployment. Expatriate managers who identify with their organization are more likely to reinterpret the two types of mismatch (i.e., poor demands-abilities fit and poor supplies-values fit) as temporary and part of a particular assignment rather than as a fundamental characteristic of their position in the organization, reducing the effect of perceived underemployment on work maladjustment.

Thus, we expect that individuals with high levels of organizational identification are less likely to face the potentially negative consequences of underemployment and/or are better able to address these consequences than individuals with low levels of organizational identification are. Organizational identification is thus likely to moderate the indirect effect of
underemployment on task performance, contextual performance, and repatriation intention. Accordingly, we formulate the following hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 2a:** Organizational identification moderates the indirect relationship between perceived underemployment and task performance via work maladjustment such that the indirect relationship becomes weaker as organizational identification is greater.

**Hypothesis 2b:** Organizational identification moderates the indirect relationship between perceived underemployment and contextual performance via work maladjustment such that the indirect relationship becomes weaker as organizational identification is greater.

**Hypothesis 2c:** Organizational identification moderates the indirect relationship between perceived underemployment and premature return intention via work maladjustment such that the indirect relationship becomes stronger as organizational identification is weaker.

Figure 1 shows the hypothesized relationships in our study.

[INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]

**Methodology**

**Sample and survey**

This study is based on data collected from Japanese nationals who were sent by Japanese firms from Japan to the UK on assignments at their UK-based subsidiaries. The potential effect of the underemployment phenomenon is pertinent to Japanese MNCs because they continue to rely heavily on expatriates as a means to manage, control, and coordinate their overseas subsidiaries (Delios & Björkman, 2000; Tungli & Peiperl, 2009). The assignment tenure of Japanese expatriate managers is also much longer than that of American or UK
expatriates (Nicholson & Imaizumi, 1993). The problem of expatriate underemployment and the negative consequences of underemployment for expatriates’ job performance and intention to repatriate are thus particularly pronounced in the case of Japanese MNCs. The UK provides an excellent research setting as Japanese MNCs regard it as a strategically important location (Buckley et al., 2013). As of 2013, 1,070 expatriates were assigned to and 74,401 local employees worked for UK-based Japanese subsidiaries (Toyo Keizai, 2013).

Using the Toyo Keizai data source, we identified the names of general managers and the number of expatriates in 150 subsidiaries of Japanese firms in the UK. The majority of these firms were relatively large firms in the service industry. Subsidiary managers received survey packages by mail in early April 2013 with the request to distribute the questionnaires among their Japanese colleagues. We received a total of 103 valid responses, which represents an overall response rate of 16%. Our sample size and the response rate are satisfactory in the context of previous studies on expatriate underemployment (Kraimer et al., 2009; Ren et al., 2013). Table 1 shows that the majority of expatriates in our sample were between 30 and 49 years of age, had been with their company for almost 18 years, were on assignments that were scheduled to last an average of 30 months, and had been on 1.5 prior overseas assignments. More than 80% of expatriates in our sample were accompanied by their spouse.

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

The questionnaire was prepared in English and translated into Japanese by a professional translation agency. Following Brislin’s (1970) recommendation, a Japanese native speaker who was proficient in English was asked to back-translate the Japanese version into English to ensure the accuracy and clarity of the questionnaire items. We found no major differences between the versions.

Because of the use of self-reported data we adopted several procedural remedies to reduce potential common method bias, including randomized item ordering (Chang et al.,
guaranteeing anonymity and confidentiality, using clear and unequivocal language (Podsakoff & Organ 1986; Podsakoff et al. 2003), and reverse-coding some of the items (Podsakoff et al. 2003). Both Harman’s (1967) one-factor test (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986) and the marker variable technique (Conway & Lance, 2010; Lindell & Whitney, 2001; Malhotra et al., 2006) confirmed the absence of a common method bias.

Measures

The operationalization of all constructs used in this research design was based on previous studies. Our three dependent variables, task performance, contextual performance, and expatriates’ early return intentions, were measured as follows. The task performance assessment was adopted from Kraimer and Wayne (2004). The participants were instructed to rate their task performance on a five-point Likert scale (1 = ‘very poor’ to 5 = ‘outstanding’). Sample items were ‘meeting job objectives’ and ‘technical competence’. The Cronbach’s alpha score for the task performance scale was 0.845. The average rating was 3.412 with a standard deviation of 0.649. We used a scale consisting of four items originally developed by Kraimer and Wayne (2004) to measure expatriates’ contextual performance as our second dependent variable (α = 0.719). Sample items were ‘interacting with host-country co-workers’ and ‘establishing relationships with key host-country business contacts’. The three scale items examining expatriates’ early return intentions were adopted from Shaffer and Harrison (1998). Responses were based on a five-point Likert scale (1 = ‘strongly disagree’ to 5 = ‘strongly agree’). A sample item was ‘I am seriously considering ending my expatriate assignment early’. The Cronbach’s alpha exceeded the threshold of 0.70 for a generally acceptable level of reliability (Nunnally, 1978).

Independent variable: Although past research has used both objective and subjective measures of underemployment, we consider a subjective indicator adequate because objective evaluations do not sufficiently reflect the extent to which individuals feel under-challenged
(Erdogan & Bauer, 2009) and because perceptions of underemployment often shape individuals’ emotional and behavioural reactions (Feldman, 2011). In this study, the perceived underemployment measure was adopted from prior studies (Humphrys, 1981; Khan & Morrow 1991). The expatriates were asked to evaluate the extent to which they agreed with five statements using a five-point Likert scale (1 = ‘strongly disagree’ to 5 = ‘strongly agree’). Sample items were ‘this job gives me a chance to do the things I do best’ and ‘this job lets me use skills from my previous experience and training’. The items were reverse-coded to prevent response bias. The reliability of this measure was relatively high, with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.745 (Nunnally, 1978).

**Mediating variable:** We measured expatriates’ work maladjustment variable using three items from previous studies (Black, 1988; Black & Stephens, 1989). We used a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (‘not adjusted at all’) to 5 (‘very well adjusted’). The statements used were ‘How adjusted are you to your specific job responsibilities?’ ‘How adjusted are you to your supervisory responsibilities?’, and ‘How adjusted are you to your performance standards and expectations?’ We reverse-coded and averaged these scores into a composite measure. The Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for this measure ($\alpha = 0.751$) was deemed acceptable since it exceeded the broadly used cut-off value of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978). The average was 2.304 with a standard deviation of 0.647.

**Moderating variable:** We measured expatriates’ organizational identification with six questionnaire items adopted from Mael and Ashforth (1992). We asked the expatriates to report the level of their agreement with each of the six statements using a five–point Likert scale (1 = ‘strongly disagree’ to 5 = ‘strongly agree’). A sample item was ‘I am very interested in what others think about my company’. The Cronbach’s alpha was 0.687, suggesting satisfactory reliability for our scale, although it was slightly below the cut-off value of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978).
We included several control variables that have been highlighted as important in prior research on expatriate performance and intention to repatriate (e.g., Bolino & Feldman, 2000a; Kraimer et al., 2009; Lee, 2005; Ren et al., 2013). We measured expatriate age using the natural logarithm of respondents’ age. We included the number of overseas assignments to control for the potential effect of previous assignments and the associated experiential knowledge of the expatriate. Participants were asked to report how many times they had been assigned to foreign subsidiaries. Expatriates’ education level was assessed as an ordinal variable with four levels: high school diploma (coded as 1), bachelor’s degree (coded as 2), master’s degree (coded as 3), and doctorate degree (coded as 4).

We used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to confirm the measurement model and the dimensionality of the five multi-item constructs (expatriate underemployment, organizational identification, task performance, contextual performance, and premature return intention) using LISREL 9.1 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2012). Two items from the organizational identification scale and one item from the contextual performance scale were eliminated due to low factor loadings (below the cut-off values of 0.5). The CFA confirmed that the six variables were distinct from one another. The chi-square for this model was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 521.60$, df $= 260$, p-value $= 0.000$). The other goodness-of-fit statistics were satisfactory (comparative fit index [CFI] = 0.91, incremental fit index [IFI] = 0.91, root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA] = 0.09, root mean square residual [RMR] = 0.08). Following Fornell and Larcker (1981), we also calculated Average Variance Extracted (AVE) scores to ensure the convergent validity of our measures. The results show that all AVE values were well above the 0.50 cut-off point.

Empirical Results
Table 2 reports the means, standard deviations, and Pearson correlation coefficients for the variables used in this study. As indicated in Table 2, underemployment was correlated with work maladjustment ($r = 0.519$, $p < 0.01$). Furthermore, work maladjustment was negatively correlated with task and contextual performance ($r = -0.604$, $p < 0.01$; $r = -0.584$, $p < 0.01$) whilst it was positively correlated with premature return intention ($r = 0.399$, $p < 0.01$). Table 2 demonstrates that none of the correlation coefficients of the variables exceeded the threshold value of 0.70 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996), indicating that multicollinearity should not be a critical problem in our hypothesized model. To further ensure that there were no multicollinearity problems, variance inflation factors (VIFs) were checked, and no VIF exceeded the general threshold of 10 (Myers 1990). Therefore, this study had few problems related to multicollinearity. We used the PROCESS macro developed by Hayes (2013) to test our hypothesized relationships. The PROCESS macro is a path-analytic tool that enables researchers to simultaneously examine the strength of moderation and mediation effects based on bootstrapping procedures (Hayes, 2013; Preacher et al., 2007).

[INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]

Hypotheses 1a, 1b and 1c predicted that the relationship between expatriates’ perception of underemployment and their task performance, contextual performance, and premature return intention, respectively, would be mediated through work maladjustment. As summarized in Table 3, the findings of PROCESS mediation analyses (Model 4) with 20,000 bootstrap samples revealed that the confidence intervals for the indirect effect of underemployment on task performance (bootstrapping estimate = -0.328; 90% bias-corrected CI [-0.508, -0.208]), contextual performance (bootstrapping estimate = -0.261; 90% bias-corrected CI [-0.397, -0.165]), and premature return intention (bootstrapping estimate = -0.192; 90% bias-corrected CI [0.092, 0.332]) through work maladjustment excluded zero. Therefore, these results fully confirm our predictions.
Hypotheses 2a, 2b and 2c predicted that the indirect relationship between underemployment and each expatriate performance indicator via work maladjustment was contingent on the level of expatriates’ organizational identification. We employed the SPSS PROCESS macro for moderated mediation analysis (Hayes, 2013; Preacher et al., 2007) to test these hypotheses. The results of 20,000 bootstrapping samples demonstrated that the indirect effect from underemployment to task and contextual performance (through expatriate work maladjustment) was significant at high levels (bootstrapping estimate = -0.264, 90% CI = [-0.412, -0.160]; bootstrapping estimate = -0.210, 90% CI = [-0.381, -0.118]) and low levels (bootstrapping estimate = -0.481, 90% CI = [-0.723, -0.305]; bootstrapping estimate = -0.382, 90% CI = [-0.604, -0.220]) of organizational identification. The indices of moderated mediation (20000 bootstrap samples) for task and contextual performance were significant and positive (index = 0.146, 90% CI = [0.019, 0.271]; index = 0.116, 90% CI = [0.015, 0.228]). The results verify that for higher organizational identification the effect of underemployment on expatriates’ task and contextual performance via expatriate work maladjustment was weaker. Our results thus provide support for Hypotheses 1a and 1b. Similarly, the results indicate that for higher organizational identification the mediated effect of underemployment on expatriates’ intention to return was weaker (bootstrapping estimate = 0.154, 90% CI = [0.062, 0.254]). The index of moderated mediation was statistically significant and negative (index = -0.185, 90% CI = [-0.196, -0.006]), thus providing full support for Hypothesis 1c.

Following Aiken and West (1991) and Cohen et al. (2003), we plotted figures to demonstrate the moderating effect of organizational identification on the underemployment-expatriate work maladjustment relationship (see Figure 2). As shown in Figure 2,
organizational identification causes the positive slope of the regression line to become less steep, in line with our expectation.

[INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]

A number of our control variables were statistically significant. The results show that expatriate age was positively related to premature return intention ($p < 0.01$, Table 3). Educational attainment was negatively associated with expatriates’ premature return intention ($p < 0.05$, Table 3).

**Discussion**

Our study was motivated by the dearth of research on the effect of the perceived underemployment on expatriate managers’ performance. Although research has begun to investigate the effects of perceived underemployment of expatriates (Bolino & Feldman, 2000a), the mechanisms that underlie these effects and the potential contingencies that shape these effects have not yet been explored in detail.

Drawing on the P-J fit theory, we argue that perceived underemployment with regard to skills, qualification and work experience negatively affects expatriates’ job performance through an increase in expatriates’ work maladjustment. We find support for the role of maladjustment as the mechanism by which underemployment affects three key facets of expatriates’ performance. Our argument, based on P-J-fit theory, thus contributes to the literature on the effects of underemployment in general and in the context of expatriate managers in particular. Although this research has highlighted the negative effects of underemployment on employees’ performance (Bolino & Feldman, 2000a; Erdogan & Bauer, 2009; Kraimer et al., 2009; McKee-Ryan et al., 2009), little research has explored the actual mechanisms through which these effects occur. Our findings are thus in line with arguments and empirical evidence suggesting that when individuals feel deprived of challenging job
situations, their job performance suffers significantly (Feldman et al., 2002; Maynard & Parfyonova, 2013; Ren et al., 2013). However, we extend this research by providing theoretical arguments and empirical evidence for the role of maladjustment as a mediator in this relationship.

Our focus on maladjustment as a central mechanism through which underemployment affects expatriate performance was based on prior research on P-J fit, underemployment, and expatriate adjustment. Our findings support the role of maladjustment as the mediator in this relationship, but other mechanisms through which underemployment affects expatriate performance should be identified and analysed in future research. Although our findings show a direct effect of underemployment on expatriate performance, these direct effects of underemployment disappear once we account for the mediating role of maladjustment. This full mediation of the relationship through maladjustment thus underlines the central role of maladjustment as a mechanism through which underemployment affects expatriate performance. Additionally, whereas prior research on expatriate managers has predominantly treated work maladjustment as an outcome variable (Black & Stephens, 1989), our study indicates that maladjustment may play a more complex role in shaping expatriates’ experience and performance.

Following calls for the exploration of individual characteristics as potential moderators of the effects of underemployment (Maynard, 2011, Feldman, 2011), we drew on insights from social identity theory to argue that organizational identification moderates the impact of underemployment on work maladjustment and thus on expatriate performance. In support of this argument, we found that the effect of underemployment is weaker for expatriates who identify strongly with their organization than for those who report low levels of organizational identification. We argued that expatriates with strong organizational identification may exert efforts to acquire new skills and knowledge unique to international assignments even in the
case of a person-job mismatch, by drawing on a shared social identity and using cognitive reappraisal to reframe difficult situations in a positive manner (Branscombe et al., 1999; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Newton & Jimmieson, 2009; Newton & Teo, 2014; van Knippenberg, 2000).

The magnitude of the mediated effect of underemployment on expatriate performance and intentions to leave found in this study may vary with other characteristics of expatriates or their assignments. For example, managers on developmental overseas assignments may view underemployment as an opportunity rather than a reason to return home early. Prior research suggests that control and coordination (rather than personal development) are the main drivers of Japanese firms’ use of overseas assignments (e.g., Delios & Björkman, 2000; Tungli & Peiperl, 2009). There is also evidence that improved career prospects upon return are the dominant motivation for Japanese expatriates (e.g., Wong, 2000). We did not collect data on expatriates’ motives for accepting an overseas assignment. However, interviews conducted with a small number of Japanese expatriates in the UK confirm this comparatively high level of homogeneity among Japanese expatriates’ (stated) motivations to take an overseas assignment in the UK. However, this homogeneity may be specific to the particular sample. Future research should investigate this issue using more diverse samples and/or samples consisting of expatriate managers from/in different home/host countries. Additionally, the mediated effect of perceived underemployment on expatriate performance may depend on the particular job task. To test this possibility, we investigated the potential moderating effects of expatriate challenge-related stress and job clarity. The results of this analysis show no statistically significant moderating effect.\footnote{We would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for highlighting this possibility.}

\footnote{We would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for highlighting this possibility. The results of this additional analysis are available from the authors. We used Cavanaugh et al.’s (2000) challenge-related stress, which was measured through the six-item scale. Job clarity was measured by six items that were originally developed by Rizzo, House and Lintzman (1970).}
Although prior research has argued that expatriates exhibit higher levels of organizational identification than other types of employees do (Banai & Reisel, 1993; Vora et al., 2007), our findings highlight the potential differences in organizational identification among expatriate managers and the relevance of such differences in shaping the effects of underemployment on expatriate performance outcomes. We suggest that the conception of organizational identification warrants greater attention in research on expatriate managers. Future studies should draw on the extensive body of research highlighting the role of organizational identification in the domestic context (Edwards, 2005; Hall et al. 1970; Mael & Ashforth, 1992).

Overall, our study contributes to the research on expatriate management by underscoring the mediated and contingent effect of perceived underemployment for expatriates’ job performance and premature return intention (Bolino & Feldman, 2000a, 2000b; Kraimer et al., 2009; Lee, 2005). Drawing on both P-J fit theory (Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006; Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005) and social identity theory, we contribute to a better theoretical understanding of the contingent effects of perceived underemployment and the mechanism underlying this effect in this context.

The results of our study also deserve close attention from practitioners. HR practitioners have thus far been given little guidance on the effects of underemployment on the job performance of employees in general (e.g., Feldman, 1996) and on expatriates in particular (e.g., Bolino & Feldman, 2000a). A key question commonly raised by HR managers is whether to hire individuals who may be overqualified, over-skilled, or over-experienced for (and who thus experience underemployment in) a particular job (Feldman, 2011). Extended to the context of expatriate management, the question is whether to give expatriate assignments to individuals who are likely to experience underemployment while overseas.
We found that perceived underemployment weakens work adjustment which
negatively affects expatriates’ task and context performance and increases their intention to
repatriate. To avoid underemployment, HR managers should make the best use of rigorous
assessment procedures, such as ability tests, technical development, and on-site mentoring at
multiple levels, to more appropriately match the job requirements of an overseas assignment
with the qualifications of expatriates before sending them abroad (Bolino & Feldman, 2000b).
In addition, our findings suggest that the negative effects of underemployment vary with the
level to which expatriate managers identify with their organization. Firms may thus be able to
weaken the negative consequences of underemployment on work maladjustment and thus on
expatriate performance by taking measures to increase expatriates’ organizational
identification. Prior research suggests various strategies for this purpose, including the
development of an attractive organizational image and culture (Dutton et al., 1994; Dutton et
al., 2010; Newton & Teo, 2014; Verbos et al. 2007).

Our study has a number of limitations. This study focuses on a particular type of
underemployment that exists with regard to expatriate managers’ skills, work related
experience and qualifications. We did not account for other types of underemployment, such
as, underemployment related to an individual’s status (e.g., Friedland & Price, 2003) or salary
expectations (Dooley & Prause, 2004). Because these types of underemployment may also
play an important role in affecting expatriates’ job outcomes and/or affect the relevance of the
type of underemployment we investigate in this study, future research should explore the
effects of these other types of underemployment in the context of expatriate management.6
Similarly, the focus of our study was individual-level job outcomes. Recent research has
begun to highlight the potential effects of underemployment on performance at the team-
and/or organizational levels (e.g., Bahshur, Hernández & Perió, 2011). Future research that

6 We would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for highlighting this limitation.
empirically analyses such effects in the domestic context and, particularly, the international context would be a useful extension of our study.

Moreover, we focus on individuals’ perceived underemployment and thus subjective underemployment rather than objective underemployment. This choice followed suggestions in the literature that objective evaluations cannot sufficiently reflect the extent to which individuals feel underemployed (Erdogan & Bauer, 2009; Feldman, 1996). Although we have taken a variety of steps to reduce and check for potential common method bias, future research that uses objective data or combines subjective with objective indicators of underemployment could enhance the validity of our findings.

To enhance the generalizability of our findings, it would be worthy for future scholars to test our model using a larger sample size in a longitudinal design. In addition, our sample consists of only Japanese corporate expatriates in the UK. Future studies should use samples with expatriates from different home and host countries so that they would be able to validate whether the findings are unique to the Japanese expatriates only.

Although the current study examined how the relationship between underemployment and expatriate performance is directly and indirectly moderated by organizational identification, it would be worthwhile to adopt a non-linear moderated approach to the aforementioned relationship (Lin et al., 2017). Future researchers should also seek to theorize and empirically test how the indirect relationship between expatriate underemployment and key job outcomes is contingent upon individuals’ motives for international assignments (Dickmann et al., 2008; Shaffer et al., 2012) and task characteristics as well as upon corporate views of assignment objectives (Caligiuri & Colakoglu, 2007; Harzing et al., 2016; Stahl et al., 2009; Tungli & Peiperl, 2009)\textsuperscript{7}. The inclusion of these variables would be valuable to further understand conditions in which expatriates fall into the danger of underemployment.

\textsuperscript{7} We would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for pointing out these insightful comments.
Finally, because of the cross-sectional nature of our data, it is not possible to test causal relationships. Although we argue and find support for the mediating effect of work maladjustment, future research may investigate alternative effects of this variable. A combination of time-series and cross-sectional research designs may enable future research to conduct a dynamic evaluation of the causal directions of the relationships among the constructs we investigate in this study.

Conclusions

The findings of this study advance the literature on underemployment (Maynard & Feldman 2011; Bolino & Feldman, 2000a; Feldman, 1996) in two meaningful ways. First, we find that the expatriate underemployment phenomenon leads indirectly to decreased job performance and increased withdrawal intentions by intensifying expatriates’ work maladjustment during international assignments. Second, the current study represents the first attempt to shed light on the vital role of organizational identification in attenuating the negative effect of perceived underemployment on expatriates’ job-related outcomes transmitted via work maladjustment. In sum, drawing on P-J fit theory and social identity theory, our study empirically verifies when and how underemployment affects expatriate job-related outcomes. Despite certain limitations inherent in the research design, we believe that this study will enrich continued scholarly consideration of underemployment in the expatriate context.
Figure 1: Proposed model

Figure 2: Moderating effect of organizational identification on the perceived underemployment-work maladjustment relationship
Table 1: Socio-demographic profile of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>% of Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or longer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assignment Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;12 months</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 months-24 months</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 months-36 months</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 months-48 months</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 months or longer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Assignments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or below</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Descriptive statistics, and correlations between study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual performance</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premature return intention</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>-0.435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work maladjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived underemployment</td>
<td>-0.234</td>
<td>-0.306</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td>-0.328</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate age (years)</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of assignments</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.412</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>1.654</td>
<td>2.304</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>3.532</td>
<td>42.078</td>
<td>1.544</td>
<td>2.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>8.898</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>67.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 103. Bold values indicate statistical significance at the 0.01 level.
Table 3: Results of the moderated-mediation analysis (PROCESS macro, Model 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Boot LLCI</th>
<th>Boot ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator variable model: work maladjustment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.502</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>-0.318</td>
<td>3.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate underemployment (EU)</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>5.334</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification (OI)</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>-1.948</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU × OI</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>-2.031</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.380</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>-0.626</td>
<td>1.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational backgrounds</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. of international assignments</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>-1.011</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variable model: task performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.254</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>5.249</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.592</td>
<td>6.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work maladjustment</td>
<td>-0.649</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>-5.316</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.852</td>
<td>-0.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate underemployment</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>-0.371</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>-1.324</td>
<td>0.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational backgrounds</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>-0.594</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. of international assignments</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect effect of X on Y</strong></td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Boot SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work maladjustment</td>
<td>-0.328</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>-0.508</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variable model: contextual performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.557</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>4.986</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.373</td>
<td>8.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work maladjustment</td>
<td>-0.506</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>-4.378</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.698</td>
<td>-0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate underemployment</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-1.121</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>-1.233</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>-2.632</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational backgrounds</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. of international assignments</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect effect of X on Y</strong></td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Boot SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work maladjustment</td>
<td>-0.261</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.397</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variable model: premature return intention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.553</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>-1.877</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-4.812</td>
<td>-0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work maladjustment</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate underemployment</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.470</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>2.845</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>3.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational backgrounds</td>
<td>-0.234</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>-2.078</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.422</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. of international assignments</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>-0.474</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect effect of X on Y</strong></td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Boot SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work maladjustment</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** CI = confidence interval, LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; 20,000 bootstrapping samples were used; SE = standard error. N = 103
Table 4: Conditional indirect effect & index of moderated mediation (PROCESS macro, Model 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task performance</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditional indirect effects (via work maladjustment)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification (-1 SD)</td>
<td>-0.481</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>-0.723</td>
<td>-0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification (M)</td>
<td>-0.372</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>-0.525</td>
<td>-0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification (+1 SD)</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>-0.412</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of moderated mediation</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual performance</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditional indirect effects (via work maladjustment)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification (-1 SD)</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-0.604</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification (M)</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>-0.432</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification (+1 SD)</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>-0.381</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of moderated mediation</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premature return intention</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditional indirect effects (via work maladjustment)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification (-1 SD)</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification (M)</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification (+1 SD)</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of moderated mediation</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** CI = confidence interval, LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; 20,000 bootstrapping samples were used; SE = standard error. N = 103
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