



PennState

CIHRS
Center for International
Human Resource Studies

CIHRS Research Paper Series

Also see additional works at: <http://ler.la.psu.edu/cihrs/series/research-paper-series>.

Series #: 3-2018

Mentoring Expatriates: The Mediating Effect of Affective Commitment on Project Success

Sarah A. Greeley

The Pennsylvania State University

Thank you for downloading this research paper from the Center for International Human Resource Studies (CIHRS: <http://ler.la.psu.edu/cihrs>). All papers here have been reviewed by a faculty member of CIHRS, and are made available to you free-of-charge. For more information, please contact cihrs@psu.edu.

Suggested citation: Greeley, S.A. (2018). Mentoring Expatriates: The Mediating Effect of Affective Commitment on Project Success. Research Paper 3-2018, Center for International Human Resource Studies. Downloaded from <http://ler.la.psu.edu/cihrs/series/research-paper-series>.

CIHRS

Center for International
Human Resource Studies

This paper is available for download at: <http://ler.la.psu.edu/cihrs/series/research-paper-series>.

Mentoring Expatriates: The Mediating Effect of Affective Commitment on Project Success

Sarah A. Greeley
The Pennsylvania State University
2018

Abstract

Organizations are globalizing more rapidly than ever. As a result, more and more organizations are utilizing expatriates. This study aims to explore how mentoring relationships relate to organizational levels of affective commitment and project success in an expatriate population. Through a questionnaire designed by the researcher and given to an American multinational organization, the role that mentors play in expatriate assignments and their relation to affective commitment and project success is examined. Findings indicate that there is a positive association between mentor relationships and project success abroad, but not with affective commitment. A significant relationship was found between affective commitment and project success. Whether or not an expatriate has a mentor influences the magnitude of the relationship between their reported affective commitment and project success. Limitations and future directions of study for this population are discussed.

Keywords: mentoring, expatriates, project success, affective commitment

Introduction

The rapid globalization of many corporations in recent years has had a myriad of unforeseen effects on the way businesses are managed (Khadria, 2001). In consequence, the way employees are being managed is changing as well, and Human Resources departments worldwide need to take innovative steps to address novel issues. One of these novel issues is how to foster a successful expatriate assignment. Expatriates are vital to business success for a variety of reasons including, but not limited to, developing international markets, supplying adequate talent and leading training initiatives in developing markets (Bird & Dunbar, 1991). As a result of these goals being extremely important to an organization's efficacious expansion and overall performance, it is vital that expatriates succeed while on assignment. However, expatriates experience extremely high levels of project failure, from less-than-effective performance, to early return or turnover shortly after returning to the home country (Birdseye & Hill, 1995; Briscoe & Schuler, 2004). These failures are extremely costly for organizations. This is where the area of Human Resource Management (HRM) and its link to employee performance enters the picture.

High performance, or in the case of expatriates, project success, is the main goal of an international assignment. Despite being the central goal of expatriate assignments, project success is often difficult to define and achieve due to the dynamic nature of international work (Kealey, Protheroe, MacDonald & Vulpe, 2005). It can be both objective; meeting time constraints, staying within budget and producing a high-quality product, or it can be subjective; relating to stakeholder and employee satisfaction and development (Baccarini, 1999). In spite of the challenges surrounding effective cross-border performance, there are many Human Resource Management techniques that can aid in the creation of project success for expatriates, one of which is mentoring.

Mentoring relationships are often fostered through HRM practices. They are traditionally defined as intense, interpersonal relationships between an experienced colleague, the mentor, and a more junior colleague, the mentee. Through these relationships, the mentee receives both career and psychosocial support from the mentor with the goal of developing both personally and professionally (Russell & Adams, 1997). Domestically, this practice is shown to create benefits for the organization and employees by socializing the employee, which can decrease both intent to turnover and actual turnover while increasing job satisfaction, organizational commitment and overall job performance. These positive outcomes are theorized to be part of a healthy psychological contract, or set of unspoken agreements between an employee and employer that can be created through mentoring (Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, 2000; Haggard & Turban, 2012; Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Viator & Scandura, 1991).

Despite the empirically studied positive effects of domestic mentoring relationships, and the need to find tools to increase expatriate assignment success, Carraher, Sullivan & Crocitto, (2008) notes that there is an extreme dearth of empirical evidence on mentoring expatriates. In the few studies covered in their review, there seems to be a similar pattern of benefits internationally as there is domestically. Expatriates, who engaged in the HRM practice of mentoring, generally experienced greater social and professional adjustment and success during their assignments than their non-mentored peers. Therefore, despite the limited composite of previous research to draw conclusions from, it appears there is a potential connection between mentoring relationships and project success for cross-border employees (Carraher et al., 2008). Mentoring relationships appear to have an empirical connection to successful performance outcomes. However, it remains to be seen if there are potential unidentified links that connect these two constructs.

Affective organizational commitment, is a possible linking construct that could explain how mentoring relationships lead to positive project outcomes during international assignments. Broadly

defined, organizational commitment revolves around an employee's feelings of attachment to and attitude towards their organization of employment. Affective commitment is more specifically the positive emotional attachment that an employee has toward their workplace that causes them to stay at the organization and identify with its mission (Muthuvelo & Rose, 2005). This concept has been empirically linked to both mentoring relationships and performance outcomes, which could explain its usefulness in the current research model (Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Payne & Huffman, 2005). It has also been tied to the psychological contract because employees with healthy psychological contracts have been shown to feel increased commitment toward their organizations (Turnley et al., 2003). However, like mentoring, it has mostly been studied in the US domestic context without a focus on people working internationally (Day & Allen, 2004; Payne & Huffman, 2005). The lack of empirical evidence linking all of these concepts in an international context leads to the following research question:

How do mentoring relationships affect the level of project success of expatriates on assignment and is this relationship mediated by organizational commitment?

The paper will begin by reviewing previous literature that serves to inform the current study and aids in the creation of the hypotheses tested. Next, the methodology used to conduct the project is explained. The results of the study will be described. Finally, the results are discussed as well as the limitations and future directions for research on this topic.

What is Project Success?

Project success is the most essential goal of any expatriate assignment, but is often the most difficult to obtain. Many reasons for the heightened rates of failure of international projects as compared to domestic projects have been postulated. The four most common are failure to adjust to the international culture, the increasing organizational-employee distance that occurs while on assignment that causes common practices and communications to breakdown, the broader environmental context in which the assignment takes place (i.e. changing political, social and legal conditions in foreign countries) and finally the different ideals that exist between the home country and host country business units (Kealey et al., 2005).

The failure of an international project has extreme consequences for both employees and organizations. One study by Nowak & Linder (2016) calculated that the average cost for a two-year assignment, including pre-departure and repatriation costs average a company about €430,000. When the extremely high costs of an assignment are coupled with the finding that only 30% of companies feel that they receive a good ROI for international assignments, this loss in capital is egregious (McNulty & Tharenou, 2004). These findings generally indicate that although organizations invest heavily in international assignments, they often do not see positive results, and in turn, lose money and time.

In tangent with costly consequences for organizations, employees also experience extremely negative consequences when their international assignments fail. Information collected by Carraher et al. (2008) reported that three-quarters of expatriates feel neglected by their organization while on assignment, and others experience negative results upon return like reverse culture shock, negative expected career growth, turnover, increased family stress and decreased job satisfaction.

Due to the large effects of project failure, it is important for both organizations and employees to define what good project performance is before an assignment starts in order to set strategic goals and troubleshoot the inevitable problems involved with international projects as noted by Kealey et al. (2005). However, defining what makes a project successful is largely ambiguous.

A review conducted by Baccarini (1999) notes that many definitions of project success exist, however, most are largely contended and little agreed upon. There have been many attempts at creating one definition for project success, but due to the subjective and objective nature of what truly makes a project successful, there is little consensus. Generally speaking, objective measures of project success can be considered by completing a high-quality project on time and within budget. These facets of project success are visible and therefore easily quantifiable in determining the achievement of a project. However, there are other subjective aspects to project accomplishment like feelings of positive team cohesion and satisfaction with the project that are more personal and difficult to measure (Baccarini, 1999; de Wit, 1988). These definitions of success are effected by a variety of external conditions during international assignments.

Intuitively, both elements of objective and subjective project success are important to examine during international assignments to increase positive outcomes for both the organization and international employee. By aiming to have high levels of both objective and subjective project success, both organizations and their employees are able to negate the costly negative consequences that come with the failure of an expatriate project. However, due to the personal and varying nature of international assignments between individuals, the current study is focusing on subjective measures of project success (Kealey et al., 2005).

Mentoring and Project Success

Continuing to examine HRM policies and outcomes, one needs to examine the connection between mentoring and its effect on project success. Mentoring is traditionally defined as an intense relationship between a more senior colleague and a less experienced employee, where the more experienced colleague provides support, feedback and plans for both professional and personal development (Russell & Adams, 1997). Upon looking further into the construct of mentoring, researchers have discovered that mentors usually provide two forms of support; psychosocial, which are the interpersonal aspects of the relationship like role modeling and friendship, and career support, which is when the mentor challenges the mentee with assignments and aids in their career development through increased networking and sponsorship (O'Brien, Biga, Kessler, & Allen, 2010).

There are also formal and informal mentoring relationships. Informal mentoring relationships tend to develop organically with a mentor and mentee mutually choosing one another. These relationships are characterized as extremely close knit, with the mentor providing both psychosocial and career support. Formal mentoring is more structured. It is usually an organizational policy where mentors and mentees are assigned to one another for the mentee's career development (Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000).

An interesting dimension of mentoring, that exists only internationally, is the ability to have both home and host-country mentors. Carraher et al. (2008) noted that having a mentor in the home country, as well as in the host country can provide a variety of benefits to an expatriate employee that closely mimic the domestic benefits. Specifically, the home country mentor is theorized to be responsible for pre-departure socialization for the expatriate that will increase their knowledge about the new work country while decreasing unrealistic expectations of their assignment, bolstering a healthy psychological contract. The home country mentor also serves as a link to the home country during assignment, by keeping the employee up to date on changes at headquarters and providing organizational knowledge. Finally, during the repatriation phase, the home country mentor is essential to reduce the stress created by returning home by providing re-socialization support and continued career support (Carraher et al., 2008).

The role of the host country mentor appears to be slightly different. They are integral in socializing the expatriate on the ground in the host country. They are responsible for attending to both the work and cultural socialization needs of the expatriate. They can serve these roles by providing specialized organizational knowledge about the subsidiary that will serve to increase the employee's feelings of identification with the new location. They can also provide psychosocial support in aiding the expatriate to adjust to a new lifestyle in a different culture. Through intercultural training, the host country mentor can reduce uncertainty created by an international move (Carraher et al., 2008). The benefits provided by both home and host country mentors as well as formal and informal mentors fall into the broader categories of both career and psychosocial support, which is why the current study is focusing solely on these larger facets of mentoring (Carraher et al., 2008; Ragins, Cotton & Miller, 2000).

Positive mentoring relationships can stimulate a variety of benefits for the mentee, including increased career satisfaction, more promotions and higher salaries when compared to their non-mentored peers (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004). Each of these outcomes is indicative of increased job performance as a result of successful mentoring relationships.

Even organizations as a whole receive benefits from positive mentoring relationships. Due to the repetitive and intense nature of the mentoring relationship, mentors can serve as effective conduits of organizational values, culture, expectations and implicit behaviors (Wilson & Elman, 1990). These organizational lessons may be related to the career success that mentees experience because the nature of the relationship provides a structure around which to develop a psychological contract, or one's belief about the subjective terms and reciprocal agreement between themselves and their employer (Rousseau, 1989; Haggard & Turban, 2012). Tying the underlying theory of psychological contract development that is created through mentoring relationships to job success, Perera, Chew & Nielsen (2017) found that the psychological contract is a mechanism that affects both the behavior and attitudes of an employee toward an organization. Also, employees whose psychological contracts are met are generally more committed to their jobs and tend to be stronger performers (Turnley, et al., 2003).

The connection between mentoring and project success can also be applied to expatriates. Carraher, et al. (2008) found that expatriates with mentors experience greater job performance and satisfaction than their non-mentored peers while on assignment. This effect on expatriates can be viewed through the framework of the psychological contract as well. International assignments are unpredictable and novel. Expatriates face a variety of uncertainties that they do not normally encounter in their domestic working lives. As a result, Shore & Tetrick (1994) theorized that expatriates employ the psychological contract more than domestic employees to fill in the knowledge gaps that are created when changing working environments. For this reason, mentoring may be even more important for expatriate's project success while on assignment because it can serve to fill the gaps in cultural and organizational knowledge created by an international assignment by fulfilling the psychological contract, continuing the education of organizational culture for the employee and therefore enhancing their project performance.

Hypothesis 1: Mentoring relationships will be positively related to project success for expatriates.

Mentoring and Organizational Commitment

Mentoring relationships appear to have a direct tie to employee's objective and subjective levels of project success (Allen et al., 2004). The development of the psychological contract, spurred by the mentoring relationship, seems to underlie this connection. It is also possible that the theory of the psychological contract, created through mentoring relationships, may explain increased levels of employee commitment to their organization.

Organizational commitment can be divided into affective, normative and continuance components. Affective commitment is characterized as the positive feelings that one feels towards an organization that cause them to feel aligned with the organization's goals and desire to stay with the organization. The subcomponent of normative commitment refers to an employee's obligatory feelings to remain with the organization as a result of having internalized the goals of the business. Finally, continuance commitment revolves around the employee's perceptions of the costs tied to leaving the organization (Muthuelo & Rose, 2005).

Each type of commitment, especially affective commitment, has been shown to be influenced through mentoring relationships. Lapointe and Vandenberghe (2017) hypothesized that affective organizational commitment was a result of mentoring relationships and had a potentially mediating effect on intent to leave an organization. After conducting their study, their hypothesis was supported. In relation to this avenue of research, Banerjee-Batist & Reio (2016) found that both psychosocial mentoring and career related mentoring increased mentee's affective levels of organizational commitment when compared to their non-mentored peers.

The foundational aspects of affective commitment are especially important because it has been theorized that affective commitment leads to an individual identifying more closely with their organization through adopting and organization's values and goals (Payne & Huffman, 2005). This concept relates back to the underlying framework that mentoring relationships help to form the psychological contract, which is so essential in increasing employee's levels of performance and commitment (Turnley et al., 2003; Perera et al., 2017). If an employee internalizes their organization's values and feels positive feelings toward their place of work, their psychological contract is more likely to be fulfilled, increasing both their affective commitment to their organization and their levels of performance.

The connection of mentoring to affective commitment via the creation of a healthy psychological contract can be viewed through an international lens as well. A review conducted by Carraher et al. (2008) noted that previous research has identified that different forms of mentoring are likely to increase expatriate's success while on assignment. Home country mentors are likely to be fortuitous in creating positive feelings toward the organization of employment, increasing job-satisfaction, on-the-job performance and reducing stress levels of their mentees. Each of these results of mentoring has proven to be a function of project success while on assignment and essential to the development of the psychological contract (Allen et al., 2004; Perera et al., 2017). Host country mentors are also helpful in stabilizing the unpredictable expatriate experience through providing on-site socialization through psychosocial mentoring. Carraher et al. (2008) also found that these mentors are responsible for aiding an expatriate's transition to their new work location in ways that are similar to onboarding a domestic employee. Through increased communication, the host country mentor can reinforce organizational values and help the expatriate to troubleshoot some of the cultural confusion that is inevitable during an international assignment. As a result, employees are more likely to maintain their affective commitment to their organization through the internalization of positive emotions and they are less likely to experience a breach of the psychological contract than their non-mentored associates.

It is important to reiterate the unpredictability of the expatriate experience. Expatriates face a variety of challenges that are unique when compared to their domestic colleagues, which often results in assignment failure. However, it appears that mentoring may be able to increase an employee's levels of affective commitment to their organization and therefore combat many of the pitfalls that occur on international assignments. Unfortunately, this concept is understudied at best. Most of the previous

literature is conceptually based on domestic theories without empirical evidence (Carragher et al., 2008). This lack of sound evidence leads to the next hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: Mentoring will have a positive association with affective commitment among expatriates.

Organizational Commitment and Project Success

Mentoring is theoretically related to both project success and organizational commitment for expatriates. This theory was noted by Carragher et al. (2008), who found a positive relationship between mentoring and project performance for expatriates. It was then further supported when Banerjee-Batist & Reio (2016) linked mentoring relationships to heightened levels of affective commitment in employees. However, the relationship between organizational commitment and levels of project success is understudied at best.

Previous research has found links between levels of affective organizational commitment and project performance. A meta-analysis conducted by Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Toponlnytsky (2002) found that affective commitment is a strong predictor of performance outcomes. They found that both supervisory and self-ratings of performance tend to be higher for individuals with greater levels of affective commitment.

Spurring off the meta-analysis results, later researchers attempted to further define the relationship between affective organizational commitment and project performance. In 2013, Ma, Xing, Wang & Chen, further tied affective commitment to performance by creating a mediating model where affective commitment was an intermediary to the direct relationship between job satisfaction and performance. Their study indicates that in addition to being related to performance itself, affective commitment is also related to many other variables that may influence levels of project success, such as mentoring. In addition to the mediating nature of affective commitment, it has also been related to increased levels of contextual performance like personal industry and voluntary involvement in projects (Wang, 2015).

Previous sections have explained the underlying role of the psychological contract in the development of both organizational commitment and successful performance. A healthy psychological contract leads an employee to develop a positive emotional connection with their organization that results in high levels of affective commitment (Payne & Huffman, 2005; Perera et al., 2017). Connecting previous information about how the psychological contract boosts affective commitment, and then in turn how affective commitment increases project performance, one can conclude that the psychological contract is again an essential framework underlying the relationship between commitment and success.

Despite years of domestic research on the relationship between affective commitment and project success, there is still little empirical examination of the relationship in the expatriate context. When examining overall levels of organizational commitment, Hechanova, Beehr & Christiansen (2003) concluded that expatriate commitment to their organization as a whole had a positive effect on their levels of project performance while on assignment. Later research conducted by Liu (2009) found the mediating nature of affective commitment can exist in the international field by increasing positive affect specifically toward the parent country organization and contextual citizenship behaviors while on assignment. These positive levels of affective commitment and project success have been postulated to be a result of mutual expectations and understanding between an expatriate and an organization via the development of the psychological contract (Yan, Zhu & Hall, 2002).

The theorized domestic relationship between levels of affective commitment and project success, and the developing empirical evidence of this relationship in the expatriate context lead to the third hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Expatriates experiencing greater levels of affective commitment to their organization will have increased levels of project success.

Mediating Model of Affective Commitment to Project Success

Based on the theory of the psychological contract, I posit that mentoring relationships will increase expatriate's levels of organizational affective commitment, which will, in turn increase their levels of project success while on assignment. Mentoring relationships can increase expatriate's success while on assignment (Carragher, et al., 2008). These relationships also serve to teach employees the organizational values that are the cornerstone of the development of a healthy psychological contract and affective commitment (Payne & Huffman, 2005; Perera et al., 2017). As a result of heightened affective organizational commitment, employees are posited to feel that their project performance is greater than their non-mentored peers (Allen et al., 2004; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Toponlnytsky, 2002).

The idea that affective commitment can mediate the relationship between mentoring and feelings of project success for expatriates is partially supported by Yan, Zhu & Hall, (2002) and Ma, Xing, Wang & Chen, (2013), who found that affective commitment mediates the relationship between a variety of factors like job satisfaction, citizenship behaviors and project success. It appears that affective commitment is able to mediate certain variables that directly relate to project success. See Figure 1-1 for a visual model of this relationship. As a result of this previous research, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 4: The size of the relationship between affective commitment and project success will be greater for those with mentors than those without.



Figure 1-1: Mediating model of affective commitment

Methodology

In order to test the relationship between mentoring relationships, affective commitment and project success, participants were sourced from an American industrial company. The company employs 35,000 people in 25 different countries. The company granted access after a professional relationship was established by the researcher during a summer internship in 2017 with the company's relocation department. Data were collected quantitatively through a questionnaire designed by the researcher and sent out by the department managers within the company. The department managers sent out the initial recruitment email, written by the researcher, which explained the purpose of the study and contained the link to the questionnaire, to the population on Friday, January 12th, 2018. Each Friday, the same recruitment email was sent out by the company to remind participants about the study until

February 9th, 2018, when the questionnaire was closed. Participants were incentivized to participate with the chance to win one of five \$50 Amazon gift cards. The survey was conducted online using Qualtrics Software. It was designed to tap into organizational levels of affective commitment, perceived project success and mentoring.

Sample

The company has a large expatriate network of mostly U.S. outbound employees. Seventy percent of expatriates in this sample stated that the United States was their home country. The company managers sourced their database and compiled the email addresses of both current and recently returned expatriates (within the last five years), whose assignments were not classified. This population consisted of 229 expatriates, whom were all invited to participate. In total, 91 answered the survey for a response rate of 39.7%. Of these 91 responses, 18 were removed due to insufficient information provided, leaving 73 questionnaires to be analyzed. Of the 73 respondents, eight were female (11%) and 65 were male (89%). The majority of participants were Caucasian (64%) followed by Asian, (14%), Hispanic/Latino (10%), or Other (4%). Six participants chose not to disclose their race. The majority age group of respondents was between 30-39 (30%) while the mean was slightly above 40 years of age (see Table 1-1)

Gender	N	%
Female	8	11
Male	65	89
Age		
20-29	5	6
30-39	22	30
40-49	19	26
50-59	19	26
60-69	7	10
No Response	1	1
Race		
White	47	64
Hispanic	7	10
African-American	0	0
Native American	0	0

Asian	10	14
Other	3	4
No Response	6	8

Table 1-1: Demographics

Measures

The items that assessed mentoring relationships were from Dreher & Ash (1990). This section of the questionnaire was a 16-item scale with a 5-point Likert format, with 1 indicating 'Not at All' and 5 indicating 'A Very Large Extent'. The scale assesses mentoring relationships from the perspective of the mentee. An example question is, "To what extent has your mentor given or recommended you for challenging assignments that present opportunities to learn new skills" (Dreher & Ash, 1990). This survey was designed to capture both career and psychosocial facets of mentoring. This section of the survey loaded onto a single factor with a Cronbach's alpha reliability of $\alpha=.937$.

In order to assess expatriate levels of affective commitment, the 6-item Allen & Meyer (1990) Affective Commitment Scale was used. This scale functioned on a 7-point Likert format ranging from 'Strongly Disagree' (1) to 'Strongly Agree' (7). An example of a survey item is, "This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me" (Allen & Meyer, 1990). This measure has been previously validated with a reliability of $\alpha=.755$.

To determine the levels of perceived project success felt by participants, items were adapted from Hemmasi, Downes & Varner (2010). This survey was initially 40-items tapping into a variety of project success related subscales, however, for the purpose of this study, 7 of the items assessing Overall Assignment Success/Effectiveness, Satisfaction and Assignment Completion were used. The items from these subsections were chosen specifically due to their relation to measureable overall individual project success. Subsection items relating to larger organizational outputs of a subsidiary were excluded. These 7-items used a 7-point Likert format ranging from 'Strongly Disagree' (1) to 'Strongly Agree' (7). An example of questions incorporated includes, "I was able to effectively complete the project tasks". The reliability of this 7-item section was $\alpha= .86$.

Data Analysis

After conducting the literature review for the paper, a mediation model was originally hypothesized, where affective commitment would mediate the relationship between mentoring and project success for expatriates. However, out of the 73 questionnaires analyzed, only 23, (31.5%) reported having mentors. As a result of this small sample size, using multiple regressions to determine a significant relationship between mentoring and project success was not feasible and no statistically significant results emerged. Without being able to adequately test a large enough population with mentors to determine significance, the researcher was unable to incorporate the mediation model as originally intended. The statistical program, SPSS, was used to test the hypotheses.

Consequently, the researcher incorporated one-way ANOVAs to compare the means between those participants with mentors who scored high, medium or low on the mentoring scale. Of the 23 participants reporting mentors, three fell into the 'low' mentoring group (scores ranging from 1-2.74 on the 5-point Likert scale), 11 fell into the 'medium' mentoring group (scores ranging from 2.75-3.5) and

nine fell into the ‘high’ group (scores ranging from 3.51-5). To test the entire group, those with and without mentors, t-tests were utilized with 50 participants making up the ‘no mentor’ group and 23 participants falling into the ‘mentor’ group. The means and standard deviations of each mentor group can be found in Appendix C. The ANOVA and t-test groups were used to analyze the relationship between mentoring and both affective commitment and project success for hypotheses one and two (mentoring will be positively related to project success and mentoring will be positively associated with affective commitment). Mentoring was not included in the third hypothesis, (those with high levels of affective commitment will experience greater project success), so this data could be tested as originally stated in hypothesis three. However, to maintain uniformity throughout the analysis, an ANOVA was also conducted for this hypothesis. To stratify affective commitment, those scoring from 1-3.5 were grouped into the ‘low’ category (7 individuals), those scoring 3.51-5.49 were in the ‘medium’ level (31 participants) and those scoring from 5.50-7 were placed in the ‘high category’ (35 participants). Due to the high mean score for affective commitment (5.17), few individuals could be placed into the low-scoring group. The affective commitment rankings were different from the mentored rankings due to their measure being conducted on a 7-point Likert scale rather than a 5-point Likert scale. This was done to maintain statistical validity via the utilization of previously validated measures.

Hypothesis four, (the size of the relationship between affective commitment and project success will be greater for those with mentors than without) was intended to examine the mediating relationship of affective commitment on mentoring and project success, however, this hypothesis was unable to be analyzed due to the small sample size. Therefore, ANOVAs were again incorporated to examine the size of the difference between affective commitment and project success between the group reporting mentors (N=23) and those without mentors (N=50).

Results

The methodology implemented in this study aided the researcher in answering the question, how do mentoring relationships affect the level of project success of expatriates on assignment and is this relationship mediated by organizational commitment? To begin, the means and standard deviations for each of the three variables, mentoring, affective commitment and project success are reported in Table 1-2. The mean for those who either had or did not have a mentor was 1.68, indicating that the majority of participants (N=50) did not report having a mentor relationship while on assignment. Of the 23 participants who did report having a mentor, the mean score was 3.34 on a scale of 1-5, indicating medium levels of the quality of these relationships. All 73 participants who completed the affective commitment items were analyzed and displayed a mean score of 5.17, indicating high levels of affective commitment to the organization at large during assignment. Finally, for the variable of project success, the mean score was 5.93, which was the highest mean score displayed out of any of the variables and indicates that the expatriates surveyed perceived their assignments to be highly successful.

Variable	Mean	SD	N
Mentor (Yes/No)	1.68	.468	73
Mentor Relationship	3.34	.871	23
Affective Commitment	5.17	1.07	73

Project Success	5.93	.902	73
-----------------	------	------	----

Table 1-2: Means and Standard Deviations

Before testing the hypotheses themselves, the correlations between the chosen variables were examined. The results of these correlations can be viewed in Table 1-3. Utilizing the Spearman’s significance level of $p=.05$, the correlations between variables were largely insignificant. Only two significant correlations were found. Firstly, project success was significantly negatively correlated to having a mentor, $p=.044$ with a correlation coefficient of $-.236$, when having a mentor was coded as ‘1’ and not having a mentor was coded as ‘2’. Indicating that having a mentor was related to increased project success. The other significant correlation existed between affective commitment and project success. The correlation coefficient for this relationship was positive, $.379$ with a p-value of $.001$.

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Mentor (Yes/No)	-	-		
2. Mentor Relationship	-	(.937)		
3. Affective Commitment	-.060	.062	(.755)	
4. Project Success	-.236**	-.106	.379***	(.860)

- Constant variable, cannot compute

** $p<.05$

*** $p<.01$

Factor reliability on the diagonal in parentheses.

Table 1-3: Correlation Matrix

Two analyses were conducted on two groups to test hypothesis one, that mentoring relationships will be positively related to project success. The first analysis tested the group that reported having mentors ($N=23$) in order to assess quality of mentoring relationships. As noted previously, this population size was too small to utilize multiple regressions, so an ANOVA was used to examine the difference between those reporting high, medium and low levels of quality of mentoring relationships. No significant differences were found between any of these groups, indicating that the first group analyzed did not support hypothesis one.

The second analysis for hypothesis one incorporated the entire population ($N=73$) and used a t-test to analyze whether having a mentor or not effected levels of project success. This analysis did find a significant difference between the mentored and non-mentored groups at the p-value of $.10$, when equal variances were not assumed ($p=.057$). This result supports hypothesis one and indicates that having a mentor or not can influence an expatriate’s project success on assignment. Those reporting having mentors reported greater levels of project success. The results for the first hypothesis test can be viewed in Table 1-4, for the first analysis and Table 1-5 for the second analysis.

H1	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.247	2	.123	.230	.796
Within Groups	10.72	20	.536		
Total	10.96	22			

Table 1-4: ANOVA, Hypothesis One, Analysis One

H1	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Equal Variances Assumed	.086	.390	.224
Equal Variances Not Assumed	.057†	.390	.200

† p<.10

Table 1-5: T-test, Hypothesis One, Analysis Two

Similar analyses to test hypothesis one were conducted to test hypothesis two, that mentoring will have a positive association with affective commitment among expatriates. The group reporting mentors was tested first, using an ANOVA to compare the means between those reporting low, medium and high-quality mentoring relationships against levels of affective commitment. No significant differences were found between any of the groups, failing to support hypothesis two and indicating that the quality of one’s mentoring relationship has little effect on one’s affective commitment to their organization.

T-tests were again conducted to analyze the second group studied within this hypothesis, those reporting a mentoring relationship or not. No significant differences were found between those with or without mentors, again failing to support hypothesis two. These findings indicate that mentor relationships do not influence an expatriate’s level of commitment to their organization during an assignment. The findings for this analysis can be found in Table 1-6 and Table 1-7.

H2	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.44	2	2.22	2.22	.135
Within Groups	20.05	20	1.00		
Total	24.49	22			

Table 1-6: ANOVA, Hypothesis Two, Analysis One

H2	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference

Equal Variances Assumed	.640	.128	.271
Equal Variances Not Assumed	.637	.128	.268

Table 1-7: T-test, Hypothesis Two, Analysis One

The third hypothesis stated that expatriates experiencing greater levels of affective commitment to their organization will have increased levels of project success. This analysis was conducted using the entire population (N=73) because mentoring was not involved. As a result, a linear regression could be used to test this relationship. A significant relationship between affective commitment and project success was found with a p-value of .008. This result can be viewed in Table 1-8. An ANOVA was also utilized to assess the differences between the mean scores of those reporting low, medium and high levels of affective commitment to the organization against levels of project success for hypothesis three. A significant difference was reported between groups (p=.026). A Tukey’s Post Hoc test was then conducted to analyze the differences between groups to a greater extent. No significant differences were found between those expressing low and medium or low and high levels of affective commitment. However, a significant difference was found between those displaying medium and high levels of affective commitment (p=.021). This finding supports hypothesis three and indicates that project success can differ as a result of an expatriate’s level of affective commitment to their organization, particularly within the medium and high levels of commitment. The results for this analysis are visualized in Table 1-9 and Table 1-10.

H3	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	5.62	1	5.62	7.54	.008***
Residual	52.91	71	.745		
Total	58.54	72			

***p<.01

Table 1-8: Linear Regression, Hypothesis 3

H3	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.80	2	2.90	3.85	.026**
Within Groups	52.74	70	.753		
Total	58.55	72			

** p<.05

Table 1-9: ANOVA, Hypothesis 3

AC Level	AC Level	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Low	Medium	.144	.363	.917
Medium	High	-.585	.214	.021**
High	Low	.441	.359	.442

**p<.05

Table 1-10: Tukey’s Post Hoc, Hypothesis 3

The final hypothesis stated that the size of the relationship between affective commitment and project success will be greater for those with mentors than those without mentors. ANOVAs were conducted on the levels of affective commitment and their relationship to the project success variable for both the group reporting mentors (N=23) and those without mentors (N=50). A significant difference was found within the mentor group (p=.034), but not for the non-mentored group (p=.287). Within the mentored group, the Tukey Post Hoc analysis showed a significant difference specifically between the medium and highly committed individuals with regards to their levels of project success (p=.038). The difference in significant values between the mentored and non-mentored groups support hypothesis four and indicate that mentoring can positively affect the relationship between one’s affective commitment and project success when compared with non-mentored individuals. The visual table for these analyses can be found in Table 1-11 and Table 1-12 for the mentored group and Table 1-13 for the non-mentored group.

H4	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.14	2	1.57	4.01	.034**
Within Groups	7.83	20	.391		
Total	10.96	22			

** p<.05

Table 1-11: ANOVA, Hypothesis Four, Mentored Group

AC Level	AC Level	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Low	Medium	.018	.495	.999
Medium	High	-.749	.281	.038**
High	Low	.731	.475	.295

** p<.05

Table 1-12: Tukey’s Post Hoc, Hypothesis Four, Mentored Group

H4	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.33	2	1.17	1.28	.287
Within Groups	42.85	47	.912		
Total	45.18	49			

Table 1-13: ANOVA, Hypothesis Four, Non-Mentored Group

Discussion

Expatriation is a rapidly increasing business strategy that is integral to the successful globalization of many firms (Bird & Dunbar, 1991). However, despite their necessity to international organizational performance, expatriate assignments are known for their high rates of failure (Birdseye & Hill, 1995; Briscoe & Schuler, 2004). Although expatriates are essential to organizational success and are often ineffective, little research has been done on this population. Particularly, it remains to be seen how Human Resources Management can bolster the preparation and success of its employees abroad. The connection between Human Resource Management and effectively designed systems that aid in increased positive organizational and employee outcomes is popularly studied domestically, but this link needs to be examined internationally (Paauwe & Farndale, 2017).

One Human Resources practice that could be useful in aiding expatriates, but has seen little empirical attention, is mentoring (Carragher et al., 2008). The few research projects examining the mentoring relationships that expatriates forge in their home and host countries, as well as the wealth of domestic studies, indicate that mentoring relationships play a significant role in developing a healthy psychological contract within employees (Haggard & Turban, 2012; Perera et al., 2017; Turnley et al., 2003). In turn, this mentoring relationship, as well as the psychological contract, increase an employee's affective commitment to their organization and their job success (Allen et al., 2004; Banerjee-Batist & Reio, 2016; Carragher et al., 2008). Despite the apparent connection in these concepts, no study has yet examined the direct relationship that mentoring has on affective commitment and project success for expatriates.

The current study sought to fill this knowledge gap about the effects that mentors have on expatriate project success and affective commitment to the organization. Utilizing a model created by Guest (1997) and expanded by Wright & Gardner (2001), this project aimed to examine an HRM process that could be linked with positive performance. The HRM tool in this study was mentoring and its relationship to project success. It has been found that within a domestic workforce, mentoring provides many benefits that relate to project success, by aiding the mentee in workplace socialization, learning organizational values and assisting in knowledge transfer, which are directly related to increased performance (Allen et al., 2004; O'Brien et al., 2010; Wilson & Elman, 1990). As a result of previous literature, the first hypothesis posited that mentoring relationships would be positively related to project success. The first analysis, conducted on the group reporting mentors was not significant, indicating that the quality of the mentoring relationship did not influence how successful an expatriate felt their assignment was. However, the second analysis, conducted between the mentored and non-mentored group did find a statistically significant result. This supports previous research that links mentoring to increased performance. The finding indicates that expatriates who engage in mentoring relationships may be more successful on their international assignments, which would potentially mitigate the high rate of failure experienced on these projects.

Mentoring has also been found to be related to employee's feelings of affective commitment toward their employing organization (Banerjee-Batist & Reio, 2016; Lapointe & Vandenberg, 2017; Perera et al., 2017). Affective commitment benefits organizations and employees in a variety of ways. For example, high levels of affective commitment can be linked to intent to turnover, which is especially important for organizations employing expatriates, because high rates of turnover are both common and costly (Lapointe & Vandenberg, 2017). Despite the wealth of evidence that mentoring increases employees' affective commitment, little research has examined this relationship in the expatriate context. As a result, I sought to establish this relationship by hypothesizing that mentoring will be positively associated with affective commitment in an expatriate sample. Similar to the first hypothesis, two groups were analyzed due to the small population of expatriates reporting mentors. In both analyses, with the mentor only group and comparing the mentor group against the non-mentored group, no significant results were established. This result could indicate that there is a different mechanism underlying the development of affective commitment within the expatriate community. Mentoring may not be an effective HRM intervention for organizations seeking to increase their international employee's commitment. More research should be conducted to determine the unique pathways within which expatriates develop their commitment to their companies.

The third relationship examined in this study was between affective commitment and project success. Affective commitment has been domestically demonstrated to be an antecedent of project success and work performance (Meyer et al., 2002; Ma et al., 2013; Wang, 2015). Similar to the previous relationships studied, despite years of domestic research, there is little evidence supporting these relationships in the international arena. However, there are a few studies that indicate that the relationship between commitment and project success can be applied to expatriates. Hechanova, Beehr & Christiansen (2003) and Liu (2009) demonstrated that expatriates with high levels of affective commitment performed better on their international assignments than their less committed peers. In order to add greater credence to this supposition, I examined whether those expatriates reporting greater levels of affective commitment also reported increased levels of success on the international projects. Overall, this hypothesis was supported. Specifically, the groups reporting medium and high levels of affective commitment demonstrated significant differences in their project success abroad. It is surprising that no difference was found between the low and high levels of commitment. However very few participants (7) reported low levels of affective commitment. This small sample size for this group could have made it impossible to view a significant relationship between this group and the others. In total, it does appear that an organization seeking to employ successful expatriates could view high levels of affective commitment to be a qualifying trait.

The final relationship examined questioned if having a mentor can affect the size of the relationship between affective commitment and project success for expatriates. Initially, this relationship supposed that affective commitment would mediate the relationship between mentoring and project success. This idea was supposed by previous literature citing the mediating nature of affective commitment to other work-related variables (Ma et al., 2013; Yan, Zhu & Hall, 2002). However, due to the small sample size and being unable to find a direct relationship between mentoring and affective commitment, a mediation model was impossible. However, it was still possible that mentoring could have an effect on the magnitude of the relationship between the two dependent variables. The analysis supported this new hypothesis. It appears that the mentored group experienced a larger and significant relationship between their levels of affective commitment and project success when compared to their non-mentored peers. This indicates that although commitment does not mediate the direct relationship between mentoring and project success, mentoring can influence commitment and project success for expatriates. Referring back to hypothesis two, that posited that mentoring and

affective commitment were related, but was not supported, it still may be beneficial to consider mentoring in relation to commitment and other third variables because this relationship can be significant and important for international success.

Limitations

The largest limitation within this study was the lack of employees reporting having mentors. Without having a large sample of mentored individuals, it was difficult to find significant and generalizable results within the population. Another result of this limitation was that it was impossible to examine how the type of mentoring relationship (i.e. formal or informal, home or host country, etc.) affected the dependent variables. It remains to be seen whether expatriates generally do not engage in mentoring relationships, or if this organization is unique in this respect.

In addition, the expatriates surveyed conducted their international assignments all over the world. The different locations of the assignments, from countries like Canada and Germany to Saudi Arabia and the UAE, could have influenced the variables via their political, social and economic differences. Host country locations were not considered to be a qualifying control variable in this study in order to obtain a large enough sample size to test the chosen variables.

Another limitation occurred with the division of the high, medium and low levels of affective commitment and project success reported within the data. The means for both of these variables were generally high, 5.15 and 5.93 respectively. As a result, few participants fell into the low category for either of these variables, which created a small group that may have skewed the outcome when the ANOVAs were conducted.

In addition to having an unexpectedly small sample of those with mentors, another limitation was the way mentoring relationships were measured. Few mentoring scales that relate directly to the project success of expatriates have been previously validated. Therefore, the researcher needed to choose between utilizing a previously validated measure or creating their own in order to directly tap into the ways in which mentors influence project success. The previously validated Dreher & Ash (1990) measure was chosen to enhance statistical validity and reliability. Despite the statistical validity of this measure, few items were directly related to the way mentors influence expatriate success abroad. Instead, most of the questions were related to general career mentoring that could be used for either domestic or international employees, i.e., "Has your mentor given or recommended you for assignments that increased your contact with higher-level managers?" This measurement is specifically limiting because it diminishes the ability to examine exactly what types of mentoring behaviors influence project success the most.

Another limitation with this measure and the overall model of mentoring was that it did not consider every aspect of an expatriate assignment that could influence both success and affective commitment abroad. As stated previously, this measure focused on general career and psychosocial mentoring. As a result, potentially influential variables like cultural adjustment, personal self-efficacy and other personality traits were not considered. It could be possible that these external variables shape the success and commitment of expatriates, but the current study was unable to examine this.

Finally, this study was a cross-sectional, single response study. This design limits the ability to examine change in a population over time. It also does not allow for a pre and post-assignment assessment to determine if the international assignment created changes within the employees mentoring relationships, affective commitment and project success. The dynamic nature of expatriation denotes that there are many fluctuations during an assignment and that assignments follow specific stages (i.e. pre-departure, assignment and repatriation) (Carragher et al., 2008; Hechanova, Beehr &

Christiansen, 2003). By only being able to measure the respondent's opinions at a single point in time, any fluctuations and changes within the participants during the assignment was unaccounted for.

Future Directions

The increasingly common and essential nature of expatriates denotes that this is an important population to study. Both organizations and the expatriates themselves could benefit from increased research on their unique experiences and organizational tools that can be implemented to increase international project success.

Within the scope of mentoring, future studies should ensure to sample a population that reports enough mentoring relationships in order to maintain generalizable results. The current study used a population too small to ensure significant results for certain analyses, which excluded the possibility of looking into different types of mentoring relationships and their effects on project success. One particularly interesting relationship to study could be the different roles played by mentors in the home and host countries of expatriates. Carraher et al. (2008) remarks on the different roles played by each of these mentor groups. Particularly within the domains of socialization and knowledge transfer. The review by Carraher et al. (2008) is one of the only studies to explore this relationship, and due to its uniqueness and exclusivity to expatriate populations, it would be fruitful to explore this relationship in more depth.

In addition to increase the sample size to ensure generalizable results, a larger population could allow future studies to control for cultural variables that may influence expatriate experiences. By controlling for cultural dimensions, researchers could get a clearer picture of the underlying mechanisms that allow mentoring relationships to influence affective commitment and project success on assignment.

A large sample size could determine whether or not there are more expatriates who report low levels of affective commitment to their organization or project success. In the current study, it is difficult to extrapolate whether this sample is unique in its high levels of both of these traits or if expatriates as a group will score high on these concepts. If studies in the future incorporate these suggestions, the true influence and impact that mentoring relationships may have on expatriate commitment and success can be more clearly identified and better aid organizations in creating programs to ensure international project success.

In addition, a future study could focus on creating and validating a measure to specifically look at the facets of mentoring that are directly related to success abroad to ensure that the most direct relationships between mentoring, commitment and project success are being examined. A new measure would allow future studies to examine the role that mentoring plays on each of these outcomes variables in a deeper manner in order to gain richer insights into this relationship.

In regards to the model and measures utilized in this study, a future study would do well to incorporate a more complex model and more complex measurements to account for potential confounding variables like cultural adjustment, personal efficacy and other personality traits. The literature review denotes that mentoring can be a complex relationship offering a variety of different benefits to organizations and employees, as a result, future models and questionnaires should aim to examine and control for these third variables. If this change is made in future studies, the relationship between the examined variables could become clearer, allowing both researchers and organizations to understand and implement more effective programs for increasing success abroad.

Finally, future studies should incorporate a longitudinal methodology in order to examine the changes within an expatriate during assignment. By measuring an expatriate's experience with

mentoring over a longer period of time, future research could capture richer data in order to better inform organizations about the types of mentoring that are most effective at different times during an international assignment.

Conclusion

Overall, there is some, although limited evidence that mentoring does play a significant role in the success that expatriate employees experience on assignment. Likewise, affective commitment appears to be a significant predictor of an employee's project success. As a result, organizations seeking to enhance their expatriate programs could benefit from implementing Human Resources Management programs that focus on creating mentoring relationships for expatriates or aim to enhance an employee's commitment to their organization before, during and after their assignments. These concepts could increase the low ROI of only 30% that companies currently feel they receive out of international assignments (McNulty & Tharenou, 2004). These programs could also benefit employees by aiding them in developing healthy psychological contracts that bolster their positive feelings, satisfaction and intent to stay with their organizations after assignment (Perera et al., 2017; Turnley et al., 2003). However, more research is needed to continue adding knowledge to the unique work experiences that expatriates undergo by working in a foreign country and in understanding how mentoring directly affects project success as well as any other pathways towards increasing the success of expatriates. Overall, this study has provided evidence to support that mentoring programs may be an effective organizational tool for navigating these novel international situations. Future research into the relationship between mentoring, affective commitment and project success within international populations appears to be fruitful.

References

- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*: 127-136.
- Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*:1-18.
- Baccarini, D. (1999). The logical framework method for defining project success. *Project Management Journal, 30*(4): 25-32.
- Banerjee-Batist, R., & Reio, T. G. (2016). Attachment and mentoring: Relations with junior faculty's organizational commitment and intent to turnover. *The Journal of Management Development, 35*(3): 360-381.
- Bird, A., & Dunbar, R. (1991). Getting the job done over there: Improving expatriate productivity. *National Productivity Review, 10*(2): 145-156.
- Birdseye, M. G., & Hill, J. S. (1995). Individual, organizational/work and environmental influences on expatriate turnover tendencies: An empirical study. *Journal of International Business Studies, 26*(4): 787-813.
- Briscoe, D. R., & Schuler, R. S. (2004). *International human resource management: Policy and practice for the global enterprise* (Vol. 5): Psychology Press.
- Carraher, S.M., Sullivan, S.E., & Crocitto, M.M. (2008). Mentoring across global boundaries: An empirical examination of home-and host-country mentors on expatriate career outcomes. *Journal of International Business Studies, 39*: 1310-1326.
- Day, R., & Allen, T. D. (2004). The relationship between career motivation and self-efficacy with protégé career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*(1): 72-91.
- de Wit, A. (1988). Measurement of project success. *International Journal of Project Management, 6*(3): 164-170.
- Dreher, G.F., & Ash, R.A. (1990). Comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(5): 539-546.
- Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta- analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26*: 463-488.
- Guest, D.E. (1997). Human resource management and performance: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 8*(3): 236-76.
- Haggard, D.L., & Turban, D. B. (2012). The mentoring relationship as a context for psychological contract development. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(8): 1904-1931.
- Hechanova, R., Beehr, T. A., & Christiansen, N. D. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of employees' adjustment to overseas assignment: A meta-analytic review. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 52*(2): 213-236.
- Hemmasi, M., Downes, M., & Varner, I.I. (2010). An empirically-derived multidimensional measure of expatriate success: Reconciling the discord. *Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(7): 982-998.
- Holtbrügge, D. & Ambrosius, J. (2015). Mentoring, skill development, and career success of foreign expatriates. *Human Resource Development International, 18*(3): 278-294.
- Kealey, D.J., Protheroe, D.R., MacDonald, D., & Vulpe, T. (2005). Re-examining the role of training in contributing to international project success: A literature review and an outline of a new model training program. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*: 289-316.

- Khadria, B. (2001). Shifting paradigms of globalization: The twenty-first century transition towards generics in skilled migration from India. *International Migration*, 39(5): 45.
- Lapointe, E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2017). Supervisory mentoring and employee affective commitment and turnover: The critical role of contextual factors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 98: 98-107.
- Lankau, M., & Scandura, T. A. (2002). An investigation of personal learning in mentoring relationships: Content, antecedents, and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 779–790.
- Liu, Y. (2008). Perceived organizational support and expatriate citizenship behavior. *Personnel Review*, 38(3): 307-319.
- Ma, L., Xing, Y., Wang, Y., & Chen, H. (2013). Research on the relationship among enterprise employee's job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job performance. *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, 411-414, 2477-2480.
- McNulty, Y. M., & Tharenou, P. (2004). Expatriate return on investment: A definition and antecedents. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 11(1): 23–44.
- Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, I., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Muthuvelo, R., & Rose, C. R. (2005). Typology of organisational commitment. *American Journal of Applied Science*, 2(6): 1078-1081.
- Nowak, C., & Linder, C. (2016). Do you know how much your expatriate costs? An activity-based analysis of expatriation. *Journal of Global Mobility*, 4(1): 88-107.
- O'Brien, K.E., Biga, A., Kessler, S.R., & Allen, T.D. (2010). A meta-analytic investigation of gender differences in mentoring. *Journal of Management*, 36(2): 537-554.
- Paauwe, J., & Farndale, E. (2017). *Strategy, HRM, and performance* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Payne, S. C., & Huffman, A. H. (2005). A longitudinal examination of the influence of mentoring on organizational commitment and turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(1): 158-168.
- Perera, H. K., Chew, E. Y. T. & Nielsen, I. (2017). A psychological contract perspective of expatriate failure. *Human Resource Management*, 56(3): 479-499.
- Ragins, B. E., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6): 1177-1194.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2: 121–139.
- Russell, J. E. A., & Adams, D. M. (1997). The changing nature of mentoring in organizations: An introduction to the special issue on mentoring in organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51: 1–14.
- Shore, L. M., & Tetrick, L. E. (1994). The psychological contract as an explanatory framework in the employment relationship. In C. Cooper & D. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior* (Vol. 1, pp. 91–109). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Turnley, W. H., Bolino, M. C., Lester, S. W., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2003). The impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 29(2): 187-206.
- Viator, R. E., & Scandura, T. A. (1991). A study of mentor- protégé relationships in large public accounting firms. *Accounting Horizons*, 5: 20–30.
- Wang, Y. (2015). Examining organizational citizenship behavior of Japanese employees: A multidimensional analysis of the relationship to organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(4): 425-444.

- Wilson, J. A., & Elman, N. S. (1990). Organizational benefits of mentoring. *The Executive* 4(4): 88-94.
- Wright, P.M. & Gardner, T.M. (2003). Theoretical and empirical challenges in studying the HR practices: Firm performance relationship. Work paper 00-04, Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies, Cornell University, USA.
- Yan, A., Zhu, G., & Hall, D.T. (2002). International assignments for career building: A model of agency relationships and psychological contracts. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(3): 373-391.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Mentoring, Affective Commitment and Project Success of Expatriates

Q1 A mentor relationship is defined as an interpersonal relationship between a more experienced colleague, the mentor, and a more junior colleague, the mentee. Through these relationships, the mentee receives both career and social support from the mentor with the aim of developing personally and professionally. After reading this definition, did/do you have a mentor during your international project?

Yes

No

Q2 Do/did you have a mentor in your home country (the country where you normally reside) during your international project?

Yes

No

Q3 Thinking of your most influential home country mentor, is your relationship...

Formal- a relationship that developed through organizational policy where the mentor and mentee were paired with one another

Informal- a relationship that developed organically through the mentor and mentee mutually choosing to enter this relationship

Q4 Thinking of your most influential home country mentor during your international project, to what extent has your mentor...

	Not At All	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Large Extent	To A Very Large Extent
Given or recommended you for challenging assignments that present opportunities to learn new skills?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Given or recommended you for assignments that increased your contact with managers in different parts of the company?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Given or recommended you for assignments that increased your contact with higher-level managers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Given or recommended you for assignments that helped you meet new colleagues?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Protected you from working with other managers or work units before you knew about their likes/dislikes, opinions on controversial topics and the nature of the political environment?

Gone out of his/her way to promote your career interests?

Kept you informed about what is going on at higher levels in the company or how external conditions are influencing the company?

Conveyed feelings of respect for you as an individual?

Conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings you have discussed with him/her?

Shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to your problems?

Discussed your questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors or work/family conflicts?

Shared history of his/her career with you?

Encouraged you to prepare for advancement?

Encouraged you to try new ways of behaving on the job?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Served as a role model?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Displayed attitudes and values similar to your own?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q5 Do/did you have a mentor in your host (the location of your international assignment) country during your international project?

- Yes
- No

Q6 Thinking of your most influential host country mentor, is your relationship...

- Formal- a relationship that developed through organizational policy where the mentor and mentee were paired with one another
- Informal- a relationship that developed organically through the mentor and mentee mutually choosing to enter this relationship

Q7 Thinking of your most influential host country mentor during your international project, to what extent has your mentor...

	Not At All	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Large Extent	To A Very Large Extent
Given or recommended you for challenging assignments that present opportunities to learn new skills?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Given or recommended you for assignments that increased your contact with managers in different parts of the company?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Given or recommended you for assignments that increased your contact with higher-level managers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Given or recommended you for assignments that helped you meet new colleagues?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Protected you from working with other managers or work units before you knew about their likes/dislikes, opinions on controversial topics and the nature of the political environment?

Gone out of his/her way to promote your career interests?

Kept you informed about what is going on at higher levels in the company or how external conditions are influencing the company?

Conveyed feelings of respect for you as an individual?

Conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings you have discussed with him/her?

Shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to your problems?

Discussed your questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors or work/family conflicts?

Shared history of his/her career with you?

Encouraged you to prepare for advancement?

Encouraged you to try new ways of behaving on the job?

Served as a role model?

Displayed attitudes and values similar to your own?



Q8 Please indicate your agreement with the following statements as they relate to your feelings about Textron during your international project.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel like part of the family at my organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q9 Are you currently on your international assignment?

Yes

No

Q10 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements as they relate to your experience during your international project.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I was able to effectively complete the project tasks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The project was worth the expenses incurred.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, the project contributed to the financial success of the subsidiary.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, the project contributed to the competitive position of the company.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In terms of meeting the organization's objectives, the project succeeded in meeting the expectations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In terms of meeting my professional objectives, the project succeeded in meeting the expectations.

Taking everything into account on both a personal and professional level, I can say I am satisfied with this experience overall.



Q11 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements as they relate to your experience during your international project.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I am able to effectively complete the project tasks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The project will be worth the expenses incurred.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, the project will contribute to the financial success of the subsidiary.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, the project will contribute to the competitive position of the company.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In terms of meeting the organization's objectives, the project will succeed in meeting the expectations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In terms of meeting my professional objectives, the project will succeed in meeting the expectations.

Taking everything into account on both a personal and professional level, I can say I am satisfied with this experience overall.

Q12 What is your age?

- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60 and above
- I prefer not to answer

Q13 With what gender do you identify?

- Male
 - Female
 - Non-binary
 - I prefer not to answer
-

Q14 What is your race?

- White, Non-Hispanic Latino
 - White, Hispanic-Latino
 - Black/African-American
 - Native American/American Indian
 - Asian/Pacific Islander
 - Other
 - I prefer not to answer
-

Q15 What is your home country (the country where you typically reside)?

- United States of America
 - Other, please specify: _____
-

Q16 What is/was your host country (the location where your international assignment was)?

Q17 On what date did your assignment begin?

Month	
Year	

Q18 On what date did your assignment end/is expected to end?

Month	
Year	

Q19 What was your job title during your international project?

Q20 How many international projects have you worked on for the company?

Please select from the dropdown menu	▼ 1 ... 30
--------------------------------------	------------

Q21 How many international projects have you worked on during your entire career?

Please select from the dropdown menu	▼ 1 ... 30
--------------------------------------	------------

Q22 Thank you for completing the survey regarding your experiences as an expatriate. Survey participants are eligible to enter themselves into a drawing to win 1 of 5 \$50 Amazon gift cards. If you would like to be entered into the raffle, please enter your email address below. Email addresses will only be used to contact you if you have won a gift card. They will not be stored or shared for any other means.

Appendix B

Factor Analyses

Mentor Scale

Has your mentor given or recommended you for challenging assignments that present opportunities to learn new skills?	.853
Has your mentor given or recommended you for assignments that increased your contact with managers in different parts of the company?	.929
Has your mentor given or recommended you for assignments that increased your contact with higher-level managers?	.822
Has your mentor given or recommended you for assignments that helped you meet new colleagues?	.817
Has your mentor protected you from working with other managers or work units before you knew about their likes/dislikes, opinions on controversial topics and the nature of the political environment?	.609
Has your mentor gone out of his/her way to promote your career interests?	.777
Has your mentor kept you informed about what is going on at higher levels in the company or how external conditions are influencing the company?	.709
Has your mentor conveyed feelings of respect for you as an individual?	.823
Has your mentor conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings you have discussed with him/her?	.600
Has your mentor shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to your problems?	.768
Has your mentor discussed your questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence,	.669

commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors or work/family conflicts?	
Has your mentor shared history of his/her career with you?	.789
Has your mentor encouraged you to prepare for advancement?	.657
Has your mentor encouraged you to try new ways of behaving on the job?	.598
Has your mentor served as a role model?	.789
Has your mentor displayed attitudes and values similar to your own?	.806

Affective Commitment Scale

I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.	.393
I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.	.596
I do not feel like part of the family at my organization.	.660
I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization.	.842
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	.796
I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.	.706

Project Success Scale

I am able to effectively complete the project tasks.	.630
The project will be worth the expenses incurred.	.799
Overall, the project will contribute to the success of the subsidiary.	.822
Overall, the project will contribute to the competitive position of the company.	.768

In terms of meeting the organization's objectives, the project will succeed in meeting the expectations.	.706
In terms of meeting my professional objectives, the project will succeed in meeting the expectations.	.776
Taking everything into account, on both a personal and professional level, I can say I am satisfied with this experience overall.	.681

Appendix C

Descriptive Statistics of Mentored Groups

The first table displays the descriptive statistics for the entire sample (N=73) in regards to the mean scores on the affective commitment and project success variables. The second table compares this entire sample to the subset of the sample that reported having mentors (N=23). Finally, a third table displays the mean scores for affective commitment and project success for the group reporting not having mentor relationships (N=50). Each of the different groups maintains similar mean scores for their levels of affective commitment and project success, however, the group reporting mentors shows slightly higher means than the other groups analyzed.

	Mean	SD	N
Affective Commitment	5.17	1.07	73
Project Success	5.93	.902	73

Table 2-1: Entire Sample Descriptives

	Mean	SD	N
Affective Commitment	5.26	1.05	23
Project Success	6.19	.706	23

Table 2-2: Mentored Group Descriptives

	Mean	SD	N
Affective Commitment	5.13	1.09	50
Project Success	5.80	.960	50

Table 2-3: Non-Mentored Group Descriptives

CIHRS

Center for International Human Resource Studies

The Center for International Human Resource Studies is an initiative of the School of Labor and Employment Relations at the Pennsylvania State University (USA), which aims to encourage IHRM scholarly research, and to serve the International HR practitioner community. Through targeted events, our goal is to develop a strong community of academics and practitioners passionate about international HRM, enabling the sharing of ideas to advance knowledge and practice in the field. The activities of the CIHRS are led by a core team of academics in the School of Labor and Employment Relations – Dr Elaine Farndale (Center Director), Dr Sumita Raghuram, Dr Helen Liu, Dr Jean Phillips, and Dr Stan Gully – supported by researchers and a network of CIHRS Fellows who are leading experts in the IHRM field from across the globe. CIHRS Fellows currently include: Ingmar Björkman (Aalto University, Finland), Chris Brewster (Henley Business School, UK), Paula Caligiuri (Northeastern University, USA), Lisbeth Claus (Willamette University, USA), Tony Edwards (Kings College London, UK), and Randall Schuler (Rutgers University, USA).