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ABSTRACT

Integrating work/family linkages, the present study examined the spillover of the different antecedents on Malaysian expatriates international adjustment. We also examined the effect of expatriates' favourable attitudes towards an assignment location towards expatriates adjustment. Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted using a sample of Malaysian expatriates who are living and working away from Malaysia to account for the unique variance in work and general adjustment explained by work-related and nonwork factors. The findings indicate that role discretion and role conflict have direct within and cross domain relationship with expatriates adjustment. Culture novelty and favourable destination have within domain effect but only favourable destination has cross domain relationship with work adjustment.
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INTRODUCTION

Globalisation of business operations has influenced the internationalisation of human resource management. It has necessitated human resources to possess not only business skills but also abilities to adjust in cross-cultural settings. This is because international assignment involves changes to not only employees’ work environment such as performance expectations and job responsibilities but also to their non-work routines and to the people they interact with everyday (Nicholson & West, 1988). Therefore, expatriates need to possess the necessary technical expertise and importantly, the ability to handle cross-cultural issues to ensure successful international adjustment.

Expatriates who do not adjust are those who fail to cope with the strain of relocating to a new environment. These expatriates will opt to leave the assignment early, change jobs or in extreme cases leave the organisation (Birdseye & Hill, 1995; Naumann, 1992). Windham International has reported that attrition rate of expatriates was nearly identical to that of other employees, which was about 14% (Global Relocation Trends Survey Report, 2001). This reduces a company’s return on investment for an assignment. Alternatively, unadjusted expatriates may stay in the assignment, but most will be underperformers (Harvey, 1985; Tu & Sullivan, 1994) and will have higher withdrawal cognitions or intention to leave (Nicholls, Rothstein, & Bourne, 1999; Shaffer & Harrison, 1998). On the other hand, adjusted expatriates are expected to show higher job performance and satisfaction (Black & Gregersen, 1990; Parker & McEvoy, 1993). Thus, as international assignment is an expensive corporate investment, it is important for companies to double their efforts in making sure that their expatriates adjust successfully.
Recently, some of the work-related and nonwork factors are found to have indirect impact on expatriates international adjustment and spillover theory is used to explain these relationships (Black & Gregersen, 1991b; Black & Stephens, 1989; Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley, & Luk, 2001; Takeuchi, Yun, & Tesluk, in press). However, a thorough investigation of the other antecedents is still limited (Shaffer & Joplin, 2001; Shaffer & Harrison, 1998; Shaffer et al., 2001; Takeuchi et al., in press).

Thus, the present study aims at integrating the work/family linkages and expatriates adjustment to explore all possible cross domain relationships. In the present research, we conceptualise the antecedents and expatriates adjustment as consisting of only two different domains—the work and nonwork domains. This study also adds to the literature by testing the impact of favourable destination on Malaysian expatriates international adjustment.

**LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT**

Expatriates international adjustment refers to the degree of psychological comfort and familiarity experience by a newcomer in the new environment (Black, 1988). Expatriates international adjustment has been conceptualised as a multi-dimensional construct consisting of three distinct facets of adjustment; 1) work adjustment, 2) general adjustment, and 3) interaction adjustment (Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991; Shaffer et al., 1999). The work adjustment is defined as the psychological comfort an individual feels with various aspects of job responsibilities, performance expectations, and interactions at work (Black, 1988). The general adjustment describes an individual familiarity with features of the general environment with regards to weather, food, and general living conditions. Finally, the interaction adjustment refers to an individual’s psychological comfort with socializing with
host country nationals. Black (1988, 1990) conceptualized general and interaction adjustment as similar constructs and used only expatriate general adjustment to describe expatriate adjustment to outside of work environment. Shaffer and Harrison (1998) have argued that interaction adjustment can overlap with work and non-work environments. Thus, this study conceptualized international adjustment consisting of only two distinct facets namely work and general adjustment.

Generally, the most important factor to expatriates will be work adjustment such as the adjustment to job responsibilities, supervision, and performance expectations (Black, 1988). However, international relocation also brings about new challenges associated with living in a new environment and having to deal with people of different cultures (Nicholson & West, 1984). Integrating work/nonwork linkages, Figure 1 illustrates the proposed within and cross domain effects model of expatriates international adjustment as were used to integrate the primary and the secondary determinants of life and job satisfaction (Rice, Near, & Hunt, 1979).

The following sections will first discuss hypotheses related to the within domain relationship, followed by hypotheses related to cross domain relationships.

*Within Domain Relationship*

The within domain relationships between the work-related factors specified by Black et al. (1991) and expatriates work adjustment and nonwork factors and general adjustment has
been well supported by empirical studies (Black, 1988; Black & Gregersen, 1990, Black & Gregersen, 1991a; Shaffer & Harrison, 1998; Shaffer et al., 1999).

Work-related factors. The four work-related factors specified by Black and others (1991) have been found to be significantly related to work adjustment. First, role discretion or role flexibility refers to how much autonomy is given to an individual (Nicholson, 1984; Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). Role discretion has strong positive affect on work adjustment (Black & Gregersen, 1991a; Shaffer et al., 1999). Secondly, role conflict, which is defined as role congruence-incongruence or compatibility-incompatibility, has been shown to result in greater difficulty for role transition (Black et al., 1991; Feldman, 1976; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970) and to inhibit work adjustment (Black, 1988; Black & Gregersen, 1990; 1991a). Thirdly, role novelty refers to the differences in the expected patterns of behaviours of the new role from the previous roles. Pinder and Schroeder (1987) found that the greater the role difference, the longer it will take a person to reach the level of proficiency at work. However, role novelty has shown inconsistent results. Although Black (1988) and Shaffer et al. (1999) do not support the relationship between role novelty and work adjustment, Nicholson and Imai:rumi (1993) found it a significant hindering predictor of Japanese expatriates' work adjustment. Finally, role clarity is the degree of clarity given about the new role which the expatriate is expected to hold. Role clarity has shown to have a strong positive effect towards work adjustment (Black & Gregersen, 1991a; Shaffer et al., 1999; Takeuchi et al., in press). Therefore, to test the within domain relationship between the work-related factors and work adjustment, we hypothesised:

H1a: Role discretion will be positively related to expatriate work adjustment.

H1b: Role conflict will be negatively related to expatriate work adjustment.

H1c: Role novelty will be negatively related to expatriate work adjustment.
H1d: Role clarity will be positively related to expatriate work adjustment.

Nonwork factors. Culture novelty, which is the perceived distance between the host and home cultures, is expected to affect general adjustment. Church (1982) has noted that the more culturally distance or different the host’s culture is from the home culture, the more difficult it will be to adjust. Specifically, high culture novelty has shown to have a significant and negative relationship with general adjustment (Black & Stephens, 1989; Shaffer et al., 1999).

The effect of having favourable perception about the destination prior to expatriation is another nonwork factor that is being investigated. A person has a capacity to exercise will or choice over adjustment outcomes, where motives and appropriate skills can re-enforce a person to make this choice (Nicholson, 1984). In other words, the greater the individual’s motivation to make a cross-cultural transition, the greater will be his or her subsequent efforts to adjust to the new culture. Studies have shown that destination is the highest motive for expatriates to accept overseas assignments (Brewster, 1991; Torbiorn, 1982). Some postings seem to be perceived as being more prestigious than others and location has been associated with managerial self-worth (Birdseye & Hill, 1995). Favourableness towards the assignment destination can be a motivational orientation for expatriates to achieve positive work role transition. The effect of expatriates favourableness towards the destination on their international adjustment has never been tested. However, spouse favourable opinion about the assignment prior to leaving has been found to correlate positively with their international adjustment (Black & Gregersen, 1991b; Black & Stephens, 1989). Armes and Ward (1989) have found a positive association between expatriate’s favourable attitudes towards an assignment location, and psychological, health, and social adjustment. Thus, with regards to both of these nonwork factors, we hypothesised:
**H2a:** *Culture novelty will be negatively associated with expatriate general adjustment.*

**H2b:** *Favourable destination will be positively associated with expatriate general adjustment.*

**Cross Domain Relationship**

Spillover refers to effects of work and non-work on one another that generate similarities between the two domains (Lambert, 1990; Near, Rice, & Hunt, 1980; Staines, 1980). Research on role “spillover” indicates that moods, stress, and thoughts that are generated in one role domain often influence or spill over into the other domains (Williams & Alliger, 1994). Role novelty and role ambiguity have been found to relate to general adjustment, whereas spouse adjustment and family factors have been found to be critical predictors of expatriates work adjustment (Black & Stephens, 1989; Shaffer & Harrison, 1998; Shaffer et al., 1999; Takeuchi et al., in press). Furthermore, Black and Gregersen (1991a) have found that expatriates interaction with home and host nationals as positively related with work adjustment.

In conclusion, sufficient evidence exists to emphasis the interconnection or interrelation of work and non-work domains of expatriates international adjustment. Taking what has been reported within expatriate management literatures and supporting it with work/nonwork literatures, the present framework hypothesised cross domain relationships between the work-related factors and expatriates general adjustment and the nonwork factors and expatriates work adjustment. Thus, we hypothesised that:

**H3a:** *Role discretion will be positively related to expatriate general adjustment.*

**H3b:** *Role conflict will be negatively related to expatriate general adjustment.*
H3c: Role novelty will be negatively related to expatriate general adjustment.
H3d: Role clarity will be positively related to expatriate general adjustment.
H3e: Culture novelty will be negatively associated with expatriate work adjustment.
H3f: Favourable destination will be positively associated with expatriate work adjustment.

METHOD

Sample

Questionnaires were distributed to Malaysian expatriates who were currently working and living away from Malaysia from 21 different multinationals corporations. The firms operated in seven industrial sectors: petrochemical, manufacturing, airline, agricultural, telecommunication, electrical and financial services. The contact addresses of the expatriates were acquired from the human resource managers of the participating companies. Of the 399 surveys mailed, 149 voluntarily completed the survey questionnaire, yielding a response rate of 37%. Expatriates assigned to 26 different countries completed the questionnaires. Respondents consisted of mainly Malays 79% ($n = 117$), 13% Chinese ($n = 20$), and a little over 7% Indians ($n = 11$). The respondents were 95% male and 5% female. Majority of them were 31 years or less with the mean age of 38 years old. Only nine percent of the respondents were 50 years or older. About 39% of the respondents had served their organisations for 6 years or less; 7 to 12 years (30%); 13 to 18 years (12%), 19 to 24 years (16%), and 25 or more years (4%). Over 80% of the respondents had been in their present assignment for two to three years. Most of the respondents had previous international work experience (54%). Respondents came from both technical (40%) and management level (60%). Eighty-five percent of the respondents were married. As for number of children, it ranged from one to six
with 36% of the expatriates having three children or more and 61 % had at least one child living with them.

**Instruments**

*Expatriates international adjustment.* In measuring the multi-facets of adjustment (general, and work), 16-items were adapted from Black (1988) and Black and Stephens (1989). Out of the 16 items, 10 items measure the general adjustment, and six items measure the work adjustment. The general adjustment questions asked respondents on how adjusted they were to the general environment and the interactions outside of work, whereas the work adjustment items asked respondents on how adjusted they were to the performance standards and responsibilities at work. For each item, respondents indicated their degree of adjustment on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Not Adjusted At All to 7 = Very Well Adjusted).

Means, standard deviations, zero-order correlations, and reliability coefficients for all variables are presented in Table 1. Expatriates international adjustment is represented by two dimensions namely work and general adjustment with an acceptable coefficients alpha of .81 and .89. The intercorrelation between the two dimensions was moderately significant (Cohen, 1988).

Insert Table 1 about here

*Work-related factors. Role discretion* measurement was adopted from Janssen (2000). The measure consists of items focusing on the task timing and the method control. There were 11-items to be answered by the 7-point Likert scale (1 = Never to 7 = Always). *Role conflict* scale developed by Rizzo et al. (1970) had 15 items. The instrument measures the conflict
with individual standards and values, conflict with time, resources or capabilities, conflict with other roles, and conflicting organizational expectations, and policies. Respondents were expected to answer using the 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Never to 7 = Always. Role novelty was measured using Nicholson and West's (1988) four items. Each item was answered using the 7-point Likert scale (1 = Very Similar to 7 = Very Different). The instrument refers to the novelty of the role demands, and whether new skills are required in the new job. An example of a statement is: “How different is the methods used to do your present job from your previous job". Role clarity was measured with a 15-items, 7-point Likert scale (1 = Never to 7 = Always) adopted from Rizzo et al. (1970). Originally a measurement for role ambiguity, but for the purpose of this study the scale was reverse-scored. The items reflect certainty about the duties, authorities, clarity, or existence of guides, directives, policies, and abilities to predict the outcomes, or responses to one's behaviour. A principal components analysis followed by a varimax rotation was undertaken. As expected, four factors emerged, accounting for a total of 60.66% of the variance. The factor loadings ranged between .63 and .90. The coefficients alpha for the work-related factors ranged between .66 and .89 (see Table 1). As expected, the work-related factors were intercorrelated- r-values ranged between .01 and .20, which were considered small (Cohen, 1988).

Nonwork factors. Culture novelty measurement was taken from Torbiorn (1982). The instrument has eight items. Respondents were asked to compare their native country to the host country on the aspects of customs and general living based on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Very Similar to 7 = Very Different). Favourable destination was measured by asking expatriates to indicate the extent to which the expatriate was in favour of the current assignment location and related general living factors concerning the new location prior to leaving for the assignment. This was a self-constructed 7-items questionnaire using a 7-point
Likert scale (1 = Highly Favourable; 7 = Highly Unfavourable). A specified principal components analysis followed by a varimax rotation was undertaken. As expected, two factors emerged, accounting for a total of 62.02% of the variance. The factor loadings ranged between .68 and .90. The coefficients alpha for the culture novelty and favourable destination were .88 and .91 (see Table 1).

Control variables. A series of single-statement items to assess the respondents' demographics such as age, overseas experience, relocation programmes, and length of service were used. We expect that relocation training programmes experienced by the expatriates prior to expatriation, age, tenure, and previous overseas experience to have some degree of influence towards expatriates international adjustment as reported in past studies (Black, 1988; Black et al., 1991; Church, 1982; Dawis & Lofquist, 1984; Nicholson & Imaizumi, 1993; Parker & McEvoy, 1993; Yavas & Bodur, 1999). As shown in Table 1, all of these variables were significantly related to at least one facet of expatriate adjustment. Thus, in all analyses we controlled for age, tenure, previous overseas experience, and relocation training experienced.

RESULTS

We tested our hypotheses for the two dimensions of dependent variables with two separates 3-step hierarchical regression analyses (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). As the first step, we simultaneously entered the four control variables. This was to remove any confounding effects these variables may have towards the dependent variables. Then, the independent variables were entered as the second and third step. The second step was to test within domain relationship towards the dependent variable. For example, if the dependent
variable under regression was work adjustment, then work-related factors would be entered as the second step. Following as the third step would be non-work factors, to test for cross domain relationship. Table 2 reports the results of our hierarchical regression analysis.

Some regression weights were marginally significant ($p \leq .10$) for the expatriates international adjustment. Although these results do not achieve traditional levels of significance ($p \leq .05$), we considered it important to identify these marginal results because of the exploratory nature of this study.

The results (see Table 2) revealed that collectively the control variables predicted work adjustment ($R^2 = .06, p < .10$) as well as general adjustment significantly ($R^2 = .10, p < .01$). However, none of the individual regression coefficient was significantly associated with work adjustment, but relocation support programs was significantly related to general adjustment ($\beta = .25, p < .01$).

Within Domain Relationships

Hypotheses 1a through 1b predict that role discretion, role conflict, role novelty, and role clarity to predict work adjustment. Although the work-related factor accounted for a significant amount of the variance in work adjustment ($\Delta R^2 = .11, p < .01$), only role discretion had a significant and positive ($\beta = .29, p < .001$), whereas role conflict had a significant and negative ($\beta = -.18, p < .05$) association with work adjustment. Thus, hypotheses 1a and 1b are supported.
Hypotheses 2a and 2b predict that there are significant association between the non-work factors and general adjustment. In step two where general adjustment was regressed on culture novelty and favourable destination, the non-work factors accounted for a significant amount of the variance in general adjustment above and beyond that was accounted for by the control variables ($\Delta R^2 = .14, p < .01$). As predicted, culture novelty had a significant and negative association with general adjustment ($\beta = -.22, p < .01$), whereas favourable destination had a significant and positive association with general adjustment ($\beta = .30, p < .001$). Thus, both hypotheses 2a and 2b are supported.

Cross Domain Relationships

Hypotheses 3a through 3f hypothesised cross-domain relationships. Step 3 (see Table 2) showed the effects of cross domain relationship between the non-work factors and work adjustment as well as between work-related factors and general adjustment. Non-work factors accounts a significant amount of variance in work adjustment ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .10$). However, only favourable destination had a significant and positive association with general adjustment ($\beta = .16, p < .05$). Likewise, work-related factors explained an additional 8% of the variance in general adjustment. Only role discretion ($\beta = .21, p < .01$) and role conflict ($\beta = -.19, p < .05$) were positively and negatively related to general adjustment. Therefore, hypotheses 3a, 3b, and 3f are supported.

In comparison to variance explained by the within domain effects, the additional variance explained by cross domain relationship is smaller. Work-related factors accounted for a total of 11% of the variance in work adjustment and only a further 3% of the variance was significantly added by the non-work factors. In comparison, the non-work factors
accounted for a higher significant amount of variance in general adjustment (14% of total variance), whereas only 8% of the variance was significantly added by work-related factors.

DISCUSSION

Relatively little empirical study has thoroughly investigated the indirect relationships between the work-related factors and expatriates general adjustment or between the nonwork factors and expatriates work adjustment. This study utilised the work/family linkages to capture the different relationships that can exists between the different antecedents and the two dimensions of expatriates international adjustment and extended Black’s et al. model (1991) by investigating the impact of favourable destination on cross-cultural adjustment.

Within Domain Relationships

The results suggest all set predictors related more strongly to subjective conditions in their respective domain than to an outside domain. This is shown by the smaller variance explained by the outside domain predictors when they were added after the within domain predictors towards both expatriates international adjustment dimensions. Findings in this respect are consistent with those of Rice and others (1979) and Sexena (1992).

Consistent with past studies (Black, 1988; Black & Gregersen, 1991a; Shaffer et al., 1999), the significance of role discretion and role conflict highlights the importance of job design to the success of international adjustment. These findings suggest that organisations should emphasis on designing expatriates positions that are clearly defined and are given greater decision making authority. On the other hand, role clarity and role novelty showed
insignificant relationship with work adjustment. This is because 54% of our respondents are already in their second year of the present assignment. Time may have given expatriates opportunities to learn the appropriate behaviour for the new environment and reduce possible culture shock experienced. However, past studies have consistently showed that role clarity is a strong predictor of work adjustment (Black & Gregersen, 1991a; Shaffer et al., 1999; Takeuchi et al., in press) but not in this study. It is possible that personal characteristics affect the relationship between role expectations and employee behaviour as suggested by Bedeian and Armenakis (1981). Future studies should investigate possible role of individual differences in determining expatriates international adjustment.

As predicted, culture novelty and favourable destination were significantly related to general adjustment (Black & Gregersen, 1991b; Nicholson, 1984; Shaffer et al., 1999). Favourable destination found as a stronger predictor of general adjustment ($\beta = .30, p < .01$) than culture novelty ($\beta = -.22, p < .01$). It is possible that when expatriates were in favour of the assignment destination, they engage themselves in self-initiated predeparture training. It is believed that expatriates’ motivation to make the international transfer may have led them to try harder to adjust to the new culture (Black & Gregersen, 1991b). This may explain why favourableness towards the destination and relocation support programs was positively correlated with general adjustment (see Table 1).

**Cross Domain Relationships**

The spillover effect suggested earlier is confirmed when only those variables that had significant within domain relationships are also affecting the other domain. For instance, the positive and negative effects of role discretion and role conflict towards work adjustment
spillover to the general adjustment in the same direction but not role novelty and role clarity, which were not statistically significant with work adjustment.

Expatriates favourableness towards the destination was found to have positive spillover effect towards work adjustment but not culture novelty. There can be two possible explanations. First, it is possible that country’s culture novelty is diluted by the organization’s own culture through its sets of policies and procedures that usually dominate work environment (Shaffer et al., 1999). Secondly, expatriates may have infrequent interaction with host country nationals at work that the host country culture has little opportunity of emerging and becoming salient at work (Black & Stephens, 1989). Furthermore, some of the respondents did indicate to us that the nature of their job did not require them to interact or supervise any host country nationals co-workers.

The cross domain relationships suggest efforts directed to better manage expatriates at work level will extend to their general environment and vice versa. This has policy implication where the organisation must now consider nonwork factors because these factors do affect expatriates work adjustment. The effects of nonwork factors are consistent with previous research of spouse adjustment that represents nonwork factors relationship with expatriates work adjustment (Black & Gregersen, 1991b; Black & Stephens, 1989; Takeuchi et al., in press; Torbiorn, 1982). This indicates the extent of the complexities involve in managing expatriates international adjustment.

Future research could benefit from identifying the major potential limitations of the present research. First, this study is cross-sectional in nature. Future studies could use longitudinal design to investigate whether the effect of role novelty or role clarity is time
sensitive. Secondly, in an effort to generalise the findings, the study included sample of Malaysian expatriates working in various countries and holding managerial and technical level (Black & Gregersen, 1990; Birdseye & Hill, 1995), but all of the expatriates were Malaysian. Although it contributes to existing expatriates adjustment literatures that are limited on Eastern expatriation behaviour, it does not make comparisons with other expatriates group. A third limitation is common method variance, since all variables were assessed using self-report measures, the possibility of shared response bias cannot be ruled out. Future research could use independent ratings of host country nationals supervisors, managers at home, and family members for expatriates international adjustment. Finally, in measuring the effect of culture novelty towards work adjustment, future studies might improve its measurement by adding items related to the relative frequency of expatriates interaction with host country nationals. This may improve reliability of culture novelty influence at workplace.

Despite of these limitations, the present research does have some obvious implications for theory and practice. From a theoretical perspective, we have identified spillover effects between the different domains of the predictors and expatriates international adjustment dimensions. We have also identified that favourableness towards the destination prior to expatriation is an important motivating factor forming expatriates anticipatory adjustment. The results provide considerable insight to what involves in cross-cultural management. Organisations are advised to pay closer attention to expatriates’ general demands and provide support for expatriates either at work or outside of work.
CONCLUSION

To help firms and international assignees to be highly effective and successful in their international assignment, it is important for a continuous research in investigating the factors that affect expatriates international adjustment. This study has provided several insights into the complexities of international adjustment process such as 1) discovering the cross domain relationships that exist between the different domains of expatriates international adjustment and 2) identifying a motivational orientation such as favourable destination as a stronger antecedent than culture novelty in predicting expatriates international adjustment. Further investigations into our suggestions will help both practitioners and researchers to better understand the challenges and unravel the complexities associated with managing international workforce.
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**Figure 1.** A conceptual model of work-related factors, nonwork factors, and expatriate international adjustment.
Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tenure</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>75**</td>
<td>SIM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overseas Experience*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-24*</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>SIM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relocation Support Programs</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>-34**</td>
<td>-29**</td>
<td>22**</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Role Discretion</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>25**</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>(89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Role Conflict</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-21**</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Novelty</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Role Clarity</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>32**</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Favourable Destination</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-17*</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>24**</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Culture Novelty</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>39**</td>
<td>34**</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>24**</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. General Adjustment</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>28**</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>-29**</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>37**</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>(89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Work Adjustment</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>33**</td>
<td>-18*</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>51**</td>
<td>(81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Cronbach's Alpha appears along the diagonal in parentheses. Decimals are omitted from correlations and reliability coefficients.

*Overseas Experience is coded as follows: 0 = No, 1 = Yes. SIM = Single-item Measure.

*p < .05. **p < .01.*
Table 2

Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Expatriate International Adjustment with Work, Non-work Factor as Predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchical step and independent variable</th>
<th>Work adjustment</th>
<th>Hierarchical step and independent variable</th>
<th>General adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Control Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in present organisation</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06a</td>
<td>Tenure in present organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation support programs</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relocation support programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas experience</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.06a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.06a</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work-related Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Non-work Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Discretion</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture Novelty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Favourable Destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Novelty</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Novelty</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Role Discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable Destination</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td>Role Novelty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.03a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 149. * p < .10. ** p < .05. *** p < .01.