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The migration of coaches between countries in search for new opportunities and challenges have become a distinguished feature in today’s global sport (Carter, 2011; Maguire et al, 2002). Migrating to work overseas becomes for many coaches not only a needed step to achieve global exposure and increase his/her professional expertise, but also a place to test their abilities and skills. While the mobility of coaches might bring many advantages to the team that hires them (e.g., contributes to raise the standards of team performance), it also brings many challenges as well, particularly a coach’s capacity to effectively communicate, adapt and cope with the new environment (MacIntosh, Bravo & Li, 2012). Typically, clubs or national governing bodies that hire foreign coaches not only invest a significant amount of resources, but also they put high expectations in their success. Therefore, in light of the current trend of coaching migration and the strategic role this type of action plays for the organization that hires a foreign coach, it seems appropriate to investigate factors that influence coaches’ working relationships in multicultural environments.

Organizational behavioural scholars have contributed to explain employees' behaviour at work through multiple theoretical frameworks such as employee engagement (Kahn, 1990), organizational commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1991), and perceived organizational support (Eisenberger and Huntington, 1986) In addition, the influence of the psychological contract (PC) has been examined which focused on the less explicit deals of the working relationships (Robinson, 1996; Rousseau, 1989). The PC is based on the belief that promises and obligations exist between employees and employers. And while the PC is essentially subjective (e.g., it lies in the mind of the beholder), empirical evidence suggests that its breach leads to many unwanted outcomes for the organization like lower employee well-being (Conway & Briner, 2002), decreased level of trust toward the organization (Robinson, 1996), increased withdrawal behavior (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Robinson, 1996), and job dissatisfaction (Tekleab & Taylor, 2003). But, despite these advancements made to explain behaviour at work, most of these theories alone fail to explain an accurate picture of how individuals behave at work because of the employee’s specific cultural orientation (Thomas, Au, & Ravlin, 2003). In the context of increased foreign labour migration, it is deemed to understand any of these frameworks within the context of a employee's specific culture. Collectivism is a dimension of cultural variation that stress an individual's interdependent role with the larger group, also referred to as communal sharing (Fiske, 1991). Individuals high on collectivism orientation are more prone to sacrifice personal interest for the well-being of the group (Triandis,1995). In this study we draw on psychological contract theory and theory of culture variation (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1995) to investigate the effects of psychological contract fulfilment (or breach) and collectivism on coaches' job satisfaction. Considering that the nature of the coaching job demands working as a team (group cohesion) is why we choose to examine the role of collectivism.

Three hypothesis were set in this study: H1: PC fulfilment will be positively related to job satisfaction; H2: Collectivism will be positively related to job satisfaction; and H3: Collectivism will moderate the relationship between PCF and job satisfaction. A convenience sample of coaches (N = 798) from countries typically referred to as collective cultures were selected (Hofstede, 1991) including; Taiwan (n = 200), Russia (n = 208), Japan (n = 190), and Venezuela (n = 200). The questionnaire included scales that measure three dimensions of PC fulfilment/breach, (PCF/B) including transactional (3 items; alpha =.88), relational (3 items; .84), and training-related (3 items; .87), job satisfaction (2 items; .72), and collectivism orientation (8 items; .86). Responses to job satisfaction and
collectivism were on five-point scales (1 = ‘strongly disagree’; 5 = ‘strongly agree’). PC outcome variables were measured on five-point scales, ranging from 1 (‘received much less than promised’; breached) to 5 (‘received much more than promised’; fulfilled). The average age of the respondents was 39 years old (SD = 11.03) with an organizational tenure of 9.89 years (SD = 7.84). The majority of respondents were male (n = 556; 69.7%) and full-time coaches (n = 567; 71.1%). Several demographic questions, including age, gender (0 = male, 1 = female), organizational tenure, and job status (0 = full-time, 1 = part-time) were also asked. Mean-centered scores were used in moderated multiple regressions in order to reduce multicollinearity (Aiken & West, 1991). Following Pedhazur’s (1982) and Aiken and West (1991), in the first step of the regression equation, control variables such as age, gender, organizational tenure, and job status were entered as covariates. In the second step, the three measures of PCF/B and perceived collectivism were entered to test for main effects. In the third step, three two-way multiplicative terms (e.g., transaction x collectivism) were entered to test for two-way interaction effects.

Results revealed that collectivism (beta = .29, p < .001) and two dimensions of PCF, namely transactional (beta = .11, p < .01) and relational outcomes (beta = .30, p < .001) had positive effects on job satisfaction. The second step explained 32% of the variance. Entry of the interaction terms explained a significant amount of additional variance in job satisfaction, R-squared change = .02, F(3, 786) = 6.08, p < .001. Specifically, collectivism moderated the relationship between transactional fulfilment and job satisfaction (beta = -.15, p < .001). A higher level of transactional breach resulted in a lower level of job satisfaction when collectivism was lower than under conditions of higher collectivism. To minimize sampling bias (i.e., country differences), we ran the second moderated regression with additional control variables: three dummy variables for respondents’ nationality. Those three dummy variables were entered in the first step of the regression equation along with four demographic variables such as age. After controlling for demographic and nationality variables, the second step explained 16% of the variance in job satisfaction. Collectivism (beta = .10, p < .001) and transactional (beta = .10, p < .05) and relational fulfilment (beta = .27, p < .001) were statistically significant predictors in the second step. Again, we found a significant two-way interaction between transactional fulfilment and collectivism.

H1 confirms the importance of the PC in working relationships, while H2 suggests that those higher in collectivism orientation are more prone to be satisfied in their job. In other words, collectivism moderates the relationship between PCF and job satisfaction. That is, the positive impact of PCF on job satisfaction is stronger if one perceives to be in a more collectivistic culture. H3 was only partially confirmed as there were no interaction effects of collectivism with relational PCF, but it was on transactional PCF. This means that coaches high on collectivism orientation are less sensitive to transactional fulfilment or breach. Implications of the study will be discussed.