**Supplemental Information:**

1. The G\*Power program (Faul et al., 2007) was used to determine an adequate sample size. With the effect size of .15, power of 0.8, probability level of .05, and 11 predictors (1 focal predictor, 1 mediator, 2 pairwise comparison groups and another moderator, 3 interactions, and 3 covariates), the required sample size would be 123. Our sample sizes - for each country and overall - were therefore adequate.
2. The reason to remove five scale items were based on a close inspection indicating that the two productivity items had the lowest factor loadings in Koopman et al.’s (2002) original study, and that the three resilience items had nearly identical meanings as the other resilience items but were worded differently. Without these problematic items, the productivity and resilience scales still had high face validity and acceptable internal reliability.
3. Before testing the hypotheses, the data were first screened and the results showed that the assumptions concerning homoscedasticity, normality of residuals, linearity, the lack of multicollinearity, and the lack of outliers were met. A relatively small number of cases (.4 to 2.8%) had missing values across the study variables and the results of Little’s MCAR tests indicated that the missing values were completely at random and unproblematic (*X2* = 26.97, *df* = 20, *p =* .14). Listwise deletion was used to handle those missing values.
4. Since the data were collected through an online survey, procedural and statistical measures were taken to minimize and assess common method variance (CMV), a systematic error variance due to the use of a single source data (Podsakoff et al., 2003). First, various question types (e.g., Likert scales, close-ended, and open-ended questions) were used and all scale items on the questionnaires were randomized. Second, Harman single factor test was conducted using an exploratory factor analysis of all study items with an unrotated factor solution. The test yielded an explained variance of 33.53% (US sample), 35.29% (Croatian sample), and 37.71% (Thai sample), which were all below the 50% rule of thumb (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Moreover, zero-constraints tests were performed with a common latent factor connected to all observed variables to determine if there was any specific response bias affecting the measurement model. In all three samples, the unconstrained model and zero-constrained model were all nonsignificant (*p* = 1.0). This indicated that common method bias was not a problem in this study (Gaskin, 2017).
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