A Path Analysis of the Relationship between Cross-Cultural Adjustment, Person-Environment Fit and Work-Related Outcomes

Eimear-Marie Nolan

April, 2012

Supervisor: Prof. Michael Morley

External Examiner: Prof. Ruth Alas

Internal Examiner: Dr. Siobhan Tiernan
Declaration

This thesis is entirely my own work and has not been submitted to any other University or Higher Education Institution or for any other academic award.

Where the work of others has been reported, it has been fully acknowledged and referenced.

__________________________________________

Eimear-Maire Nolan
Live, Laugh, Love
Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my thesis supervisor Professor Michael Morley for his help, support and patience in guiding me through the last three years. I’m sure it was not easy for you!

Thank you to those at the Kemmy Business School, who saw potential in my work and award me the KBS Scholarship. The three years would not have been possible without it and I am truly grateful.

I would like to thank all at the Kemmy Business School for their on-going support, and in the final months, all those at the University of Surrey who I am sure are as glad as I am that I have finished. I suspect for different reasons though!

Of course, special thanks are required to my colleagues and friends who have supported and encouraged me, especially in the final month. You know who you are! Thank you also to Emma Hardy for the proof reading!

Finally, like any PhD student, the support from my family, partner and friends has been overwhelming. I can honestly say that I would not have been able to do it without you! I think Ross Davis is entitled to a PhD of some sort for constantly listening to me!
Abstract

Understanding how expatriates adjust to the various aspects of the host environment has been a focal point of research within international human resource management literature for several decades. Person-environment (PE) fit investigates the degree of ‘fit’ an employee has with the various dimensions of their working environment. Several researchers have suggested that successful PE fit positively influences work outcomes such as adjustment, job satisfaction and task performance. However, to the author’s knowledge, no empirical research has been conducted on the relationship between PE fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes. The main aims of this study were to 1) investigate the overall relationship between PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment and 2) investigate the overall relationship between PE fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes. Three hundred and sixty-nine non-consultant hospital doctors (NCHDs) working in Ireland filled out the questionnaire. Backward multiple regression and path analyses were the statistical approaches used to determine the relationship between PE fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes. The results revealed both direct and indirect relationships between the three models suggesting that good overall PE fit on an international assignment can positively influence an expatriate’s overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes. The results indicate that Human Resources (HR) should focus on maintaining expatriates’ overall PE fit while on an international assignment as higher levels of overall PE fit can positively influence successful cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This thesis is concerned with the relationship between overall person-environment (PE) fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes. The study has two main aims: 1) to investigate the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment and 2) to investigate the relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance). The original idea for this work came from the cross-cultural adjustment and PE fit literature and the apparent lack of empirical knowledge on the relationship between both constructs.

Decades of research (e.g. Black, 1988; Black, Mendenhall and Oddou, 1991; Grainger and Nankervis, 2001; Hechanovam Beehr and Christiansen, 2003; Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer and Luk, 2005; Peltokorpi, 2008; Okpara, 2010; Festing and Maletzky, 2011) have been conducted on how employees adjust to working and living in a host environment. Successful cross-cultural adjustment is linked to lower levels of turnover and intent to quit the contract prematurely (e.g. Tung, 1987; Black et al., 1991; McEvoy and Parker, 1995; Black and Gregersen, 1999; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Takeuchi, Seakhwa-Yun and Tesluk, 2002; Ramalu, Rose, Kumar and Uli, 2010; Takeuchi, 2010). It is estimated that expatriate failure on an assignment can cost organisations U.S. $300,000 to US$ 1 million annually (Selmer, 2008), although it has been suggested that failure rates are over-estimated. Consequently, organisations and academics strive to identify factors that influence successful cross-cultural adjustment. Several authors have investigated factors that can aid or hinder successful cross-cultural adjustment such as age, marital status and nationality (cf Bhaskar-Shrinicas et al., 2005). Measuring cross-cultural adjustment and predicting individual eventual levels of cross-cultural adjustment beforehand.
goes to the very heart of international human resource management (HRM). Successful cross-cultural adjustment can predict task completion of an international assignment (Harrison and Shaffer, 2005), thus understanding what competencies influence expatriate adjustment is critical in gaining an understanding of how to improve expatriate performance on an international assignment.

Over the last two decades, PE fit has been introduced into the adjustment literature as a method of understanding the adjustment process between organisational members and their work environments (i.e. Judge and Kristof-Brown, 2004; Kristof, 1996; Spokane, Meir and Catalano, 2000; Nawab, Li Nisar, 2011). PE fit is an overarching construct that subsumes several other fit types. These fit concepts include person-supervisor fit, person-group fit, person-organisation fit and person-job fit. PE fit investigates the degree to which individuals ‘fit’ with various aspects of the host organisation such as work and organisational culture. For example, person-supervisor (PS) fit examines the congruence between the individual and their supervisor. This can be done by identifying the similarity between the values of the individual and their supervisor. When congruence exists between the individual and the supervisor, good PS fit is achieved. Within the PE fit literature, high levels of PE fit are suggested to positively influence adjustment (cf Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). To the author’s current knowledge however, no empirical research exists supporting these claims. Thus, the first aim of this research was to empirically investigate the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment. In addition, both job satisfaction and task performance are identified as positive outcomes of overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment (cf Verquer, Beehr, and Wagner, 2003; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). The inclusion of work-related outcomes in the study came from the need to determine how the relationships between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment influence employees’ work outcomes. Therefore the second aim of this research was to investigate the relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes.
As a result of the focus highlighted above, this research represents the author’s attempt to develop an informed understanding of the relationships between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes. The aim of this chapter is to outline the background to the study and provide an overview of the structure and contents of the thesis. The background and rationale for the study is given in the next section. Following this, the research methodology for primary data collection and data analyses techniques employed in the study are summarily presented. The final section of this chapter outlines the structure of the thesis.

1.2 Background and Rational for the Study

1.2.1 Cross-Cultural Adjustment

Cross-cultural adjustment has been a focal point of enquiry in research for many decades and this is likely to continue for the foreseeable future (Van Der Bank and Tothmann, 2006; Peltokorpi and Froese, 2009). With increased levels of globalisation in recent years, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has reported a rise in the number of expatriates travelling abroad for work (OECD, 2011). Organisations want to select employees who will best meet the demands of the job, adapt to the environment and remain loyal and committed to the firm. Because of this, research continues to investigate factors that are associated with expatriate success or failure when adjusting to the new host culture and organisation (e.g. Black et al., 1991; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Selmer, 2005; D'amato and Zijlstra, 2008; Peltokorpi, 2008; Peltokorpi and Froese, 2009; Howe-Walsh and Schyns, 2010; Festing and Maletzky, 2011).

Cross-cultural adjustment refers to the degree of psychological comfort an individual feels concerning a new situation or culture (Gregersen and Black, 1990; Nicholson, 1984). It can be described as a learning process through which expatriates attain the new skills, cultural norms and appropriate behaviours to adjust to the host culture (Black, 1988; Ward, Bochner and Furnham, 2001;
Takeuchi, Marinova, Lepak and Lui, 2005; Peltokorpi and Froese, 2009). It is acknowledged that moving across borders to work can have substantial effects on both the individual and the organisation. While immersed in the host environment the expatriate can become aware of several differences between their host and home culture. They may become susceptible to the variety of challenges that exist out of their comfort zone such as the inability to speak the host national language, the inability to cope with the stress of culture shock, and the inability to interact effectively with host country nationals (Caligiuri and Tarique, 2005). Lack of adjustment to a new culture is viewed by researchers as a key factor in the high failure rates of international assignments (Black, 1988; Grainger and Nankervis, 2001; Selmer and Leung, 2003). Due to the high cost associated with expatriate failure rates, practitioners, academics and researchers alike stress the importance of maximising the cross-cultural adjustment of expatriates.

Black (1988) introduced a triple-faceted model of adjustment that has become one of the most dominant frameworks in literature for analysing cross-cultural adjustment (Festing and Maletzky, 2011). The phenomenon of adjustment is specifically conceived as multi-faceted (Black, 1988; Black and Stephens, 1989; Black et al., 1991) with three distinct facets: general adjustment, interaction adjustment and work adjustment. General adjustment (sometimes called environmental or non-social adjustment) refers to the extent to which expatriates are able to adapt to the main environmental and physical aspects of the new culture. Interaction adjustment refers to the extent to which expatriates socialise or become acquainted with host nationals. Finally, work adjustment is the extent to which expatriates feel comfortable with their new job role and its requirements. These three facets are combined to measure overall cross-cultural adjustment. Examining the interaction of both the individual and the environment has become the central plank of person-environment (PE) fit (D'amato and Zijlstra, 2008). Over the last two decades, PE fit has been introduced into adjustment literature as a method of understanding the adjustment process between the organisational member and their work environment (Judge and Kristof-Brown, 2004; Kristof, 1996; Spokane, Meir and Catalano, 2000).
1.2.2 Person-Environment Fit

PE fit posits that certain characteristics of the organisation (i.e. climate, culture, behaviours, expectations, or needs of the work environment) have the potential to be congruent with the characteristic of the individuals (i.e. values, skills, knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, personality traits, cognitive styles) working there. A multitude of evidence from research literature on PE fit agrees that the model provides a valid and useful way of thinking about the interaction between the individual and their given environment (e.g. Tinsley, 2000; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Betsch and Kunz, 2008; Van Vianen Van, Nijstad and Voskuijl, 2008). Within the overall PE fit construct, various levels of fit exist. This research looks at four predominant domains of PE fit: Person-supervisor fit (PS fit), which examines the degree of congruence between an employee and their supervisor. Person-group fit (PG fit) refers to the degree of congruence between an employee and their work group or team. Person-organisation fit (PO fit) refers to the degree of congruence between an employee and the organisational culture of the company they work for. Person-job fit (PJ fit) is the degree of congruence between an employee and their work-related tasks (job).

The cross-cultural adjustment literature advocates that successful adjustment to the host culture (general adjustment) decreases expatriates’ uncertainties and intent to leave the contract prematurely, therefore aiding overall cross-cultural adjustment (Parker and McEvoy, 1993; Ones and Viswesvaran, 1997; Bhaskar-Shirinivas, Harrison, Shaffer and Luk, 2005; Peltokorpi, 2008; Ramalu et al., 2010; Takeuchi, 2010). However, PE fit has been predominantly used to determine the congruence between the person and the various dimensions of their work-environment within their home culture. Because of this, there is an obvious lack of PE fit dimensions that investigate the congruence between the person and their non-work environment, for example the congruence between the person and their host culture. In order to investigate the overall relationship between PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment adequately the author extends PE fit to measure person-host culture (PHC) fit.
The lack of empirical investigations into the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment means that academics and practitioners are unaware of the degree to which PE fit can influence cross-cultural adjustment. The author believes identifying the relationships between the various PE fit dimensions and the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment will provide valuable information on factors that influence the success of an individual’s adjustment to international assignments. For example, a positive relationship between PS fit and work adjustment would suggest the importance of selecting and recruiting individuals whose values are congruent with their supervisor, so that this can increase the expatriate’s work adjustment.

This research not only investigates the relationship between PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment, it also investigates the impact such relationships may have on work-related outcomes. Past research has found that both PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment have a positive relationship with employee job satisfaction and task performance within organisations (Black, 1988; Edwards, 1991; Judge and Kristof-Brown, 2004; Kristof, 1996; Spokane, Meir and Catalano, 2000; Verquer, Beehr and Wagner, 2003; Werbel and Gilland, 1999).

1.2.3 Work-Related Outcomes

Job satisfaction is believed to be primarily a work-related outcome that is presumed to arise from an expatriate’s successful adjustment to the overseas job and their effective interpersonal relationship with host country nationals (HCNs) while on the assignment (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Shaffer and Harrison, 1998; Selmer, 2009). Task performance consists of behaviours that support task accomplishment and it is a function of both ability and the motivation that expatriates devote to their job in the host culture. Mol, Born and Van Der Molen (2005) argue that expatriate task performance should be ‘the focal operationalisation of expatriate effectiveness’ (2005:341). While investigating the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment will generate deeper knowledge and understanding of factors influencing expatriate
adjustment, the inclusion of these measurements of work-related outcomes will allow this research to identify how the relationship between both constructs can influence work outcomes.

1.2.4 Defining the Term Expatriate

Before defining the methodological approach of this research it is important to define what the term ‘expatriate’ means in this research. The term ‘expatriate’ can have varying meanings depending on the research context. Conceptually, an expatriate is a voluntary, temporary migrant who resides abroad for a particular purpose and ultimately goes back to his or her home country (Cohen, 1977; Huang and Lawler, 2005). As a large proportion of cross-cultural adjustment research has revolved around multinational companies in the private sector, the term expatriate has generally been defined as an individual who takes an international contract in one of their company’s subsidiaries (e.g. Suutari and Brewster, 2000; Richardson and Mallon, 2005; Black 1988, 1998; Hofstede 1991, 2005). However, recent years have shown a growing interest in self-initiated expatriates (Howe-Walsh and Chyns, 2010) described as individuals who seek employment and are employed outside of their home culture (Anderson, 2003; Ward, Bochner and Furnham, 2001; McGinley, 2008). For the purpose of this research, the term expatriate will refer to an individual who finds a position in another country by themselves or with the help of a recruitment agency but is not sent to a subsidiary company by their home organisation. Selmer and Fenner (2009a) note while there is a vast amount of research on the private sector, expatriation research is sparse on public sector expatriates. In an attempt to fill the lacuna, this study will add to public sector expatriate literature by examining doctors working in public hospitals in Ireland. Little substantial research has been conducted to date on the cross-cultural adjustment of foreign doctors (also referred to as non-consultant hospital doctors) working in Ireland. The number of non-consultant hospital doctors (NCHDs) working in Ireland has increased significantly over past years due to the current shortfall in the number of nationally trained doctors available (Scherer, 2008). As our nation is reliant on
these professionals to fill the existent gap, their successful cross-cultural adjustment is vital.

1.4 The Methodological Approach

While Chapter 3 describes in detail the methodological approach employed in this research it seems important to outline from the outset the adopted approach in collecting the primary data. A quantitative approach was adopted to address the two research aims stated in the introduction. The research utilised established and reliable scales to measure cross-cultural adjustment, the various dimensions of PE fit (PS, PG, PO, PJ fit), and both work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance). In an attempt to measure PHC fit, the author adapted scales measuring PO culture fit from Saks and Ashford (1997) and Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001).

The study analysed the overall relationships between PE fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes using correlations. Regression analysis was then used to measure the direct relationship between the dimensions of PE fit (PS, PO, PJ, PHC fit) and the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work adjustment). Regression analysis was also used to measure the direct relationships between the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment and both work-related outcomes and the relationships between the dimensions of PE fit and both work-related outcomes. Following this, the direct and indirect relationships between the dimensions of PE fit, the facets of cross-cultural (general, interaction and work adjustment) and both work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance) were analysed using an extension of multiple regression analysis, called path analysis.
1.5 Outline of the Thesis Structure

Chapter 2 builds upon the introductory chapter and provides a review of the extant literature. The chapter is divided into three sections, section one defines the term ‘expatriate’ and its context within this research in further detail. Following this, the phenomenon of cross-cultural adjustment and its importance to international human resource management (IHRM) research and literature is presented. In addition, past measurements of cross-cultural adjustment are described along with the factors that are found to positively or negatively impact adjustment. Section two describes the concept of person-environment fit and its various dimensions (PS, PG, PO, PJ). Support for the inclusion of a new fit dimension, person-host culture (PHC) fit, is established based on past research and literature. Section three presents a detailed review of the literature on task performance and job satisfaction. Support for their inclusion within the study as work-related outcomes measures is also presented. A number of hypotheses and sub-hypotheses are presented throughout the literature review in accordance with the aims of this study.

Chapter 3 describes and explains the underpinning methodology for this thesis. The two research aims are operationalised and a theoretical justification for the quantitative methodology is described. The data collection, sampling design and fieldwork is explained, followed by a detailed review of the data preparation and the techniques used for analysis.

Chapter 4 presents the findings. Descriptive statistics of the sample are given followed by findings of the regression and path analysis.

Finally, Chapter 5 discusses the findings in light of the enfolding literature presented in Chapter 2. The study’s contributions in the conceptual, theoretical and empirical domains are discussed as well as the study’s limitations and recommendations for future research.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The following chapter is divided into three sections that review the literature as it pertains to the theoretical and empirical research context relevant to the study. Section one commences by defining the term ‘expatriate’ and its context within this research. Following this, the phenomenon of cross-cultural adjustment and its importance to international human resource management research and literature is presented. In addition, past measurements of cross-cultural adjustment are described along with the factors that are found to positively and negatively impact cross-cultural adjustment.

Section two explains the concept of person-environment fit and a detailed review of its dimensions (PO fit, PJ fit, PS fit, and PG fit) is given. In addition, support for the inclusion of a new fit dimension, person-host culture fit, is established based on past research and literature.

Section three provides a detailed review of the theoretical and empirical literature on task performance and job satisfaction. Support for their inclusion within this study as work-related outcomes measures is also presented.

Throughout sections two and three of this chapter, several hypotheses and sub-hypotheses are presented theorising the relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

Section One

2.2 Defining the Term Expatriate

Expatriates can be defined as individuals who live or work outside of their own home country on a non-permanent basis (McGinley, 2008). The term expatriate can be broken down into two main categories, conventional expatriates (EA) and self-initiated expatriates (SIE). EAs are individuals sent on an international assignment by their organisation, while SIEs describe individuals who themselves make the decision to move and work abroad (Myers and Pringle, 2005; Harrison, Shaffer and Bhaskar-Shriaivas, 2004). The majority of cross-cultural research to date has focused on EAs (Collings and Scullion, 2006; Thomas and Lazarova, 2006; Stahl and Bjorkman, 2006) because issues surrounding their assignments keep rising due to high costs and low returns of failed assignments (Morley and Heraty, 2004; Scullion and Brewster, 2001). As international organisations today compete in a more globally connected market place, the global competencies of job candidates are becoming more important than ever (Vance, 2005; Yan and Jum, 2002; Tarique, Schuler and Gong, 2006). The recruitment of SIEs can offer a way for organisations to enlarge the candidate pool for international positions at a reduced cost rather than recruiting EAs (Mo and Jian-Ming, 2010). The author suggests this as the predominant reason for the evident increase in the number of studies that have been conducted on the adjustment of SIEs in recent years. This suggestion is also supported by several academics (e.g., Inkson and Myers, 2003; Myers and Pringle, 2005; Vance, 2005; Peltokorpi and Froese, 2009).

Inkson, Arthur, Pringleand, Barry (1997) were the first to seriously address the issue of self-initiated expatriation. Inkson et al., (1997) specified four major characteristics that differentiate SIEs from EAs: the source of initiative, goals for
the foreign job, the source of funding and career type. The first two issues deal with the motives for an international assignment. According to Inkson et al., (1997) the source of EA initiative comes from the employer and the individual, while for SIEs it comes only from the individual. Early research indicates that self-initiated expatriation was favourable among young people who were keen on the ‘travelling abroad experience’ rather than the career advancement options during their early career phase (Myers and Inkson, 2003; Inkson et al., 1997). However, Myers and Pringle (2005) broadened this and introduced the term ‘free agents’ to reflect individuals (usually older) who became SIEs for a variety of other reasons (i.e. planned career advancement, financial improvements) that are similar to that of EAs (Helver, 2004).

The second issue Inkson et al., (1997) notes is that the goal of the job for EAs is generally to complete a specific organisational project, while SIEs’ goals are often unspecified. Mo and Jian-Ming (2010) suggest that the achievement of specific company goals is of less importance for SIEs than for EAs. EAs ultimately leave their home organisation having the expectation to return to it after a period of working internationally has been completed, which is not generally the case with SIEs. The third issue, source of funding, suggests that EAs’ funding comes from their company and this can make it difficult for them to break organisational links (Howe-Walsh and Schyns, 2010; Suutari and Brewster, 2000). In contrast, SIEs often fund their own transfer as their overseas job is usually not arranged prior to departure. This can make it easier for them to break company links whenever they desire. Finally, career type indicates that EAs have an organisational career where they return home to the company after their assignment, while SIEs have a ‘boundaryless’ more independent career (Inkson et al., 1997; Fitzgerald and Howe-Walsh, 2008; Yan and Jum, 2002; Arthur et al., 1999). The difference here is that SIEs are not repatriated to their home-country organisation after the assignment; they can decide whether or not and when they want to return home (Crowley-Henry and Weir, 2007; Suutari and Brewster, 2000).
It is important when researching the cross-cultural adjustment phenomenon that the sample used is clearly classified as either EAs or SIEs. Such a classification is becoming increasingly important as some motives can influence the adjustment process (Peltokorpi and Froese, 2009). The sample used in this research (NCHDs) fall into the category of SIEs primarily on the basis that they are not sent by their host organisation on an international assignment. They are actively recruited in their host culture (by the Irish government) to complete an international contract in an Irish hospital. It is acknowledged that the motives of EAs and SIEs traditionally differed in research but the disparity between them seems to be narrowing. For example, one of the main reasons NCHDs come to Ireland is for career advancement (Sanjay, 2006), similar to that of EA motives. In addition, as the SIEs in this research are doctors, it seems reasonable to suggest that the goals of their jobs in the host hospital are clear and specific causing them to have more in common with EA’s who are said to often have defined job goals. After the completion of the contract, EAs are traditionally repatriated back to their home organisation. In contrast, the SIEs in this research have the opportunity to move to another location and are therefore considered to have an independent career. It is possible that such a personal impact on the course and direction of their career can lead them to viewing their host organisation as a stepping stone (Biemann and Andresen, 2010).

2.3 Cross-Cultural Adjustment

The phenomenon of cross-cultural adjustment has gained momentum over the last two decades. Takeuchi (2010) suggests that this is partially due to increased globalisation of the world’s business environment and in partially due to the determined efforts by many researchers to highlight the importance of this topic in the late 1980s to the mid-1990s (e.g. Black, 1988; Black et al., 1991). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) statistics released in 2011 indicate that the mobility of labour across national and cultural boundaries has grown significantly over the past decade (OECD International
Migration Outlook, 2011). This increase in globalisation has led to more expatriates embarking on international assignments and several scholars have indicated that this trend will continue in the future (e.g. Van Der Bank and Tothmann, 2006; Peltokorpi and Froese, 2009).

As international organisations compete in a more globally connected market place (Tarique et al., 2006), the global competencies of job candidates become more important (Vance, 2005; Yan and Jum, 2002). Past literature on expatriate adjustment held that failure rates, while on an international assignment, were generally high and ranged from 25% to 70% (Grainger and Nankervis, 2001). However, a review of such failure rates in 2002 by Harzing suggests that this is not fully supported by empirical evidence. Despite this, it is true to say that expatriate failure rates can vary (Tung, 1982; Chew, 2004) and it is important to understand and consider the factors that can attribute or hinder successful expatriate adjustment.

McGinley (2008) posits that significant social and economic costs are associated with failed expatriate adjustment. Maladjustment of an expatriate can result in high cost and low returns for both the expatriate and the host organisation. Because of this, it is not surprising that a mass of academic literature has been produced over decades about the antecedents and consequences of cross-cultural adjustment (e.g. Black, 1988; Ones and Viswesvaran, 1997; Black, Mendenhall and Oddou, 1991; Hechanovam Beehr and Christiansen, 2003; Bhaskar-Shirinivas, Harrison, Shaffer and Luk, 2005).

2.3.1 Conceptualisation of Cross-Cultural Adjustment

Despite receiving over 50 years of research, a limited consensus still exists on what actually constitutes cross-cultural adjustment. Numerous authors have noted that expatriation literature has failed conceptually and operationally to agree, or in some instances even define the term cross-cultural adjustment (e.g. Tucker, Bonial and Lahti, 2004; Bird, Mendenhall, Stevens, and Oddou, 2010). Cross-cultural adjustment has been described, interpreted and measured in
various ways and from numerous perspectives, which could be an attributing factor to the fragmented and inconsistent definitions that exist in current literature. Various theoretical perspectives have been taken when conceptualising models of expatriate adjustment. Stahl (1998) categorises models as being established on learning theory, traditional theory, communication theory and developmental psychology, to name but a few. Anderson (1994) differentiates recuperation models, the learning process and communication theory. It is perhaps these different conceptualisations of cross-cultural adjustment that has led to various definitions in current literature.

Drawing from an extensive review of the numerous definitions of cross-cultural adjustment this research views cross-cultural adjustment as the process of adjusting to living and working in a foreign environment and the perceived degree of psychological comfort and familiarity an expatriate has with the new host culture (Black, 1988; Takeuchi et al., 2005; Peltokorpi and Froese, 2009). Brett (1980) advocates that uncertainty reduction is an important influencing factor of successful expatriate adjustment. In order for expatriates to adjust they must reach both cognitive and emotional levels of satisfaction with the existent values, norms and attitudes of their host culture (Black et al., 1991). This enables them to integrate to cultural assumptions of their new environment by adapting to differences that exist in the physical, psychological and communication environments. Assumptions that expatriates have about every day encounters may differ in the host culture, often leading to increased ambiguity. It is essential that expatriates are able to reduce these uncertainties by learning the main characteristics of the host culture and acquiring the necessary knowledge and social skills to perform their job effectively (Peltokorpi and Froese, 2009). The acquisition of these key global competences aids their ability to negotiate everyday social interactions with HCNs, which in turn facilitates knowledge exchange within and outside the host organisation (Gregersen and Black, 1990).

Expatriate adjustment is of great importance to both the host organisation and the expatriates themselves. Adjustment from an organisation’s perspective partially predicts performance and successful completion of their assignment (Parker and
McEvoy, 1993). Adjustment from an expatriate’s perspective can influence job satisfaction and psychological well-being (e.g. Peltokorpi, 2008). If the expatriates are satisfied with their job, their motivation to perform well and remain in the host culture is higher. In contrast, expatriates who are incapable of adjusting (maladjustment) to work and general life in the host culture are likely to perform poorly on their foreign assignment or return prematurely (Ones and Viswesvaran, 1997).

2.3.2 Measures of Cross-Cultural Adjustment

Historically, cross-cultural adjustment in general, and particularly expatriate adjustment, have been conceptualised as unitary constructs (Okpara, 2010). Past theories of cross-cultural adjustment like Lysgaard’s (1955) U-Curve theory, Oberg’s (1960) Culture Shock, and Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) W-Curve theory offer insight into the cross-cultural adjustment process. However, such approaches merely examine the cross-cultural adjustment process by assessing the expatriate’s self-reported adjustment. They fail to examine and understand what exactly the expatriate has to adjust to, in other words the environment itself. Black and Stephens (1989), the leading researchers in the field of adjustment, argue that many models are simplistic in nature. Black (1988) suggested that cross-cultural adjustment should be treated as a multidimensional concept, rather than a unitary phenomenon, which has previously been the dominating view (Gullahorn and Gullahorn, 1963; Oberg, 1960). In 1988 he introduced a triple-faceted model of adjustment that has become one of the most dominant frameworks in literature for analysing cross-cultural adjustment (Festing and Maletzky, 2011).

The phenomenon of adjustment is specifically conceived as multi-faceted with three distinct yet related facets: general adjustment, interaction adjustment and work adjustment. Together these three facets encompass the work and non-work domains of the expatriation experience while on contract abroad (Peltokovpi, 2008). The reason for the distinction between these three facets is because not all
domains may be equally related (Young-Chul Chang, 1997). For example, Takeuchi et al., (2002) reported that expatriate’s general adjustment was significantly related to work adjustment, which in turn was related to interaction adjustment. Hippler (2005) compared the results of eight studies (Black, 1990; Black and Gregersen, 1991; Black and Stephens, 1989; Gregersen and Black, 1990; Parker and McEvoy, 1993; Selmer, 1996; Selmer, 1998; Shaffer, Harrison and Gilley, 1999) that used Black’s (1988) model of adjustment. He found that the all three domains were intercorrelated as follows; work and interaction adjustment (r = 0.42); work and general adjustment (r = 0.43), and interaction and general adjustment (r = 0.52). From this the author suggests that while the three facets of adjustment are distinct from each other in part (as they aim to measure adjustment along three different domains) they can also be interrelated. A review of the three facets is present below.

1. General Adjustment- can be defined as the degree of comfort and familiarity expatriates have with the general living conditions of the host country. This includes non-work factors like food, housing and culture (Black and Stephens, 1989). Expatriates will not only have to make sense of the organisation’s facilities, but also the foreign country. This may include a different political and monetary system, different language, norms, values and behaviours to that of their home culture.

Research in both the general work role adjustment literature and cross-cultural adjustment literature suggests that non-work factors influence adjustment (Hechanova et al., 2003; Selmer, 2005; Peltokorpi, 2008; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2004; Dawis and Lofquist, 1984; Feldman, 1984; Nicholoson, 1984; Black et al., 1991; Church, 1982). In addition, Hechanova et al., (2003) and Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., (2004) meta-analyses of antecedents and consequences of expatriate adjustment found that interpersonal skills and relational skills were correlated with general adjustment. The meta-analysis by Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., (2004) also notes that the ability to speak the host language positively aids successful general adjustment. This suggests that expatriates who had greater ability to accurately understand another person’s feelings and work effectively
with them reported greater adjustment to their new environment. It can be concluded from this that expatriates who have high levels of general adjustment will have lower withdrawal cognitions.

2. Interaction Adjustment - refers to the degree of interaction an expatriate has with HCNs, and the comfort they feel in interacting with supervisors, peers and subordinates in the host culture (Black and Stephens, 1989). Black et al., (1991) articulate that interaction adjustment is the most difficult dimension of adjustment as differences in mental maps and rules (perceptions, beliefs and values) become evident when expatriates interact with HCNs. Different cultures generally have certain norms that guide the proper functioning of individuals within the society. As a result of these differences, expatriates can experience conflict and misunderstandings in the host culture with HCNs. In order for expatriates to adjust successfully it is important that the uncertainties they may experience are reduced. HCNs are an important source of information regarding appropriate behaviours and consequences that can increase an expatriate’s efficiency in communication with others (Aycan, 1997; Mendenhall and Oddou, 1985). It is not surprising therefore that the meta-analysis by Bhaskar-Shriniwas et al., (2004) found that language ability and relational skills aided interaction adjustment among expatriates. From this, the author suggests that expatriates who learn new social and cultural skills (i.e. new language, interacting with HCNs) decrease uncertainties, hence aiding interaction adjustment and decreasing withdrawal cognitions.

3. Work Adjustment - is conceptualised as the degree of adjustment an individual has about the job, responsibilities and working conditions in the host country (Black, 1988; Black and Stephens, 1989). The theoretical framework of work adjustment emanating from Dawis and Lofquist (1984) and Nicholson (1984) suggests that adjustment to a new role is fundamental to subsequent outcomes in the role. Work adjustment concerns itself with the degree of psychological comfort an expatriate feels with various aspects of work (e.g. managing authority relationships). According to Black, Gregersen and Mendenhall (1992), this is the easiest dimension of the three cross-cultural
domains mainly because it is aided by the similarities of the role in the home culture. From this, the author suggests that work adjustment is assisted if the procedures, policies and requirements of the new job are similar to that of their job in the host culture. However, it is important to highlight that the new environment’s corporate culture may differ and may require the expatriate to make an additional effort adjusting.

Hechanova, Beehr and Christiansen’s (2003) meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of expatriate adjustment found that job characteristics were moderately correlated with work adjustment (e.g. role conflict, role ambiguity). In addition, interaction with host country nationals was positively correlated with work adjustment (Hechanova, Beehr and Christiansen, 2003). HCNs can supply the expatriate with important information about the job and the behaviours and practices that are expected from them within the working environment (supported by Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2004). Drawing from this, the author contends that such insight can reduce uncertainties that expatriates have about the organisation culture and job requirement, hence increasing work adjustment and decreasing intention to leave.

2.3.3 Adopting a Model to Measure Cross-Cultural Adjustment

Black’s model of adjustment is one of the most popular measurements and conceptualisations of adjustment within expatriation literature, although it is not without some criticisms. For example, Huang, Chi and Lawler (2005) suggest that the three-dimensional model of adjustment is not grounded on a solid theoretical basis. It has been criticised for being a statistical construct with elements that are not well-defined or discrete. Despite such claims, Black’s model is supported by a series of empirical studies on expatriate adjustment (e.g. Black and Gregersen, 1990, 1991; McEvoy and Parker, 1993; Shaffer, Harrison and Gilley, 1999; Selmer, 2005, 2009, 2011). Recent meta-analytic large-scale investigations of studies of expatriates also confirmed this three-dimensional theoretical framework (Hechanova et al., 2003; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). In fact, meta-analytic investigation completed by Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., (2005)
covered 66 studies and close to 8,500 business expatriates and confirmed the three-dimensional theoretical framework.

Thus far this section of the literature review has established the term ‘expatriate’ in the context of this research. The sample used in this research falls into the category of self-initiated expatriates for two main reasons; 1. They are not sent by their home organisation to work in a subsidiary organisation in Ireland and, 2. They are unlikely to undergo repatriation if they choose to return to their home organisation. While these expatriates are self-initiated, the author suggests that their cross-cultural adjustment process will be similar to conventional expatriates. Their motives for working abroad (e.g., career advancement) are similar to that of conventional expatriates while self-initiated expatriates are more concerned with life experience and travel. In addition to this, the samples in this research are doctors who have clearly defined job goals in the host organisation. Many self-initiated expatriates are seeking employment upon arrival to the host country therefore their job goals have not been established.

This research will adopt Black’s model of adjustment as a means of assessing cross-cultural adjustment for several reasons: 1) While researchers (Ward et al., 1998; Caliguri, Joshi and Lazarova, 1999; Hechanova, Beehr and Christiansen, 2003; Kraimer, Wayne, and Jaworski, 2001) offer alternative models of expatriate adjustment to Black, it is evident that these models still exhibit the influence of the Black’s model, in that the three facets of adjustment are delineated into general, interaction and work domains. The factors influencing these adjustment aspects have not been replaced in these models but addition factors have been added. 2) It is evident from both theoretical and empirical literature that Black’s model is one of the most influential and commonly cited models of adjustment (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer and Luk, 2005). Supporting this, Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., (2004:1) describes the model as ‘easily the most influential and often-cited theoretical treatment’ of expatriate adjustment. Finally, 3) Black et al., (1991) note that the model is universally applicable to all expatriates.
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Section Two

It is clear from the above cross-cultural literature and research that successful adjustment requires the expatriate to obtain a certain degree of adjustment to various environmental factors (i.e. the job, culture and people). Person-environment fit is defined as a method for understanding the process of adjustment between individuals and the work environment (Caplan, 1987). It can be broadly viewed as the congruence between the individual (the expatriate) and the environment (the host organisation).

PE fit is an umbrella notion consisting of several dimensions; person-supervisor, person-group, person-organisation, person-job, and person-host culture. Each of these dimensions describes an individual’s perceived relationship with their new environment; the higher the perceived relationship the better the fit. When a goodness of fit is attained it is said that a certain degree of adjustment has been achieved (Caplan, 1987). However, to the author’s knowledge the relationship between this degree of adjustment and PE fit to date has not been empirically measured. The following section presents a detailed review of literature on the phenomenon of person-environment fit. Overall PE fit and each of its dimensions (mentioned above) will be addressed and from this, several hypotheses are given on the expected relationship between PE fit and overall adjustment.

2.4 Person-Environment Fit

2.4.1 Conceptualisation of Person-Environment Fit

The concept of PE fit dates back to the work of Plato (Dumont and Carson, 1995), however contemporary PE fit research can often be traced back to Parsons (1909). He developed a model that described PE fit as the match between the characteristics of the person and that of different vocations. Following this,
Murray’s need-press model (Murray, 1938, 1951), and Lewin’s field theory (Lewin, 1935, 1951) proposed a formula $B = F(P,E)$ that states behaviour is a function of both the person and the environment. It is not surprising that PE fit has emerged as central plank of enquiry in both social and behavioural science (Morley, 2007). Person-environment fit is defined as the degree of congruence (fit or match) between the individual and the environment. Muchinsky and Monahan (1987) noted that what actually constitutes a fit or match is unclear and they proposed two distinct conceptualisations of PE fit: complementary and supplementary fit.

**Complementary fit** traditionally reflects the individual’s skill meeting the environment’s needs (demands-abilities fit). Kristof (1996) extends this definition to incorporate a needs-supplies perspective where fit is the match between individual’s preferences or needs and organisation’s systems and structure (e.g. Bretz, Ash and Drecher, 1989; Cable and Judge, 1994). Thus, complementary fit is when the characteristics of individuals fill a gap in the environment or vice versa. This approach is mainly used in the selection process (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

**Supplementary fit** is concerned with measuring the similarities between fundamental characteristics of people and organisations. Supplementary fit suggests that individuals fit into the organisational environment context because they supplement or possess characteristics that are similar to the other employees within the organisational environment (Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987). This congruence between the individual and the organisational values is the most frequently used operationalisation of this perspective (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

One important distinction is made between complementary and supplementary models and that is how the ‘environment’ is viewed. The supplementary model describes the environment according to the people in it. The complementary model defines the environment according to its demands and requirements and
not by the people who inhabit it. Kristof (1996) offers a comprehensive
definition in order to integrate the conceptualisations above:

The compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both.

(Kristof, 1996: 4-5)

This definition recognises the multiple conceptualisations of PE fit and permits both perspectives to be considered concurrently (Kristof, 1996). Complementary fit has predominantly been used in past research assessing person-job fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), whereas supplementary fit has been the focus of all other types of fit. Drawing from the above, this research holds that PE fit occurs when a degree of mutually beneficial arrangements occur between the expatriate and the organisation allowing goals to be met (complimentary fit), or when similar values, characteristics, culture are perceived to exist between the individual and the environment (supplementary fit). In this research, complimentary fit will be used for person-job fit and supplementary fit will be used for all other dimensions of fit (person-organisation, person-supervisor, person-group, and person-host culture).

2.4.2 Measurements of Person-Environment Fit

Another area that causes confusion within PE fit research is the nature of the questions being asked and who answers them (Verquer et al., 2003; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Hoffman and Woehr, 2006). Kristof (1996) classified the differences into three categories that are measured directly or indirectly: subjective fit, perceived fit and objective fit. Perceived fit involves directly asking the individuals how well their characteristics match that of their host organisation. Subjective fit indirectly asks individuals to make a direct assessment of the compatibility between themselves and their host organisation. The degree of fit is then calculated by assessing the discrepancies between both of these assessments. It is important to note that the definition of perceived fit in this research is consistent with French, Rodgers and Cobb (1974) and Kristof-
Brown et al., (2005) and not with Verquer et al., (2003) whose labels are reversed (between perceived and subjective fit). Objective measurements ask the individuals to describe their own characteristics and then other organisational members are asked to describe the characteristic of the organisation. The degree of fit is then found indirectly between the individual’s description and the combined answers of the organisational members (Hoffman and Woehr, 2006). In order to be consistent with past research (Verquer et al., 2003; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005) this research uses the perceived approach to measuring the dimensions of PE fit.

2.4.3 Dimensions of Person-Environment Fit

Person-environment fit can be characterised simply as matching the individuals to the various levels of their work environment (Judge and Ferris, 1992; Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). PE fit in this research comprises of several dimensions that are discussed in detail in this section: person-supervisor fit (PS), the perceived similarities between the individual and their supervisor; person-group fit (PG), the perceived similarities between the individual and their work group/team; person-organisation fit (PO), the ability of the individual to fit in to the host organisational culture; and person-job fit (PJ), the congruence of the individual’s skill and the requirements of the job.

Drawing from these dimensions of PE fit, it is clear that they all focus how individuals fit with the various aspects of the work environment. Cross-cultural adjustment research notes that expatriates must adjust not only to the work environment, but also to the host culture in order to achieve successful overall adjustment (e.g. Black, 1988). Consequently, congruence between the expatriate and the host culture is required to achieve adjustment. Drawing from this, the research suggests that there is a gap in PE fit literature: the inclusion of a dimension that investigates the congruence between the individual and the host culture. The author argues that PE fit needs to establish the degree of fit an expatriate has with their host culture while on an international contract.
Adjustment literature (e.g. Black, 1988; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2004; Selmer, 2005; Festing and Maletzky, 2011) has informed us that general adjustment is a vital part of an expatriate’s overall adjustment. It is noted in the previous section that expatriates reporting high levels of adjustment to their host culture experience a reduction in uncertainties and intent to leave the contract prematurely. Knowing then that expatriate adjustment to their host culture has a positive relationship with overall adjustment, it is pivotal that such a measurement be included as part of PE fit phenomenon. Without such a dimension it seems impossible to use PE fit adequately when investigating expatriate adjustment. Therefore, the final dimension discussed in this section under the PE fit umbrella is person-host culture fit (PHC).

2.4.4 Person-Environment Fit and Overall Cross-Cultural Adjustment

Several researchers agree that the PE fit model provides a valid and useful way of thinking about the interaction between the individual and their given environment (i.e. Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987; Tinsley, 2000; Betsch and Kunz, 2008; Ward and Chang, 1997; Van Vianen et al., 2008). Kristof (1996) notes that PE fit is associated with positive work-related attitudes and behaviours and that various measures of PE fit are related to several job responses. Autry and Daugherty (2003) indicate that satisfied employees are more likely to demonstrate behaviours that will benefit themselves and the organisation. In contrast, dissatisfied individuals are more likely to leave the organisation or display destructive behaviour. Research on fit tends to find that higher levels of PE fit obtained through the socialisation of new employees is generally considered positive for both the organisation (Kristof, 1996) and the individual (Schneider, 1987b). These outcomes are similar to those described previously in the cross-cultural adjustment literature. Such findings suggest that high levels of PE have a positive relationship with an individual’s overall adjustment. Therefore, this research hypotheses that PE fit will have a positive relationship with overall adjustment.
Hypothesis A: There will be a positive, statistically significant relationship between PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment.

One of the aims of this research is to establish the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment. It is expected that expatriate’s perceptions regarding what behaviours are expected, valued and rewarded within and outside the organisation become important influences on their behaviour and attitudes. The following section describes the various PE fit dimensions: PS fit, PG fit, PO fit, PJ fit, and PHC fit. Sub-hypotheses are presented suggesting their relationship with overall adjustment. According to the meta-analysis by Kristof-Brown et al., (2005), the relationship between the employee and their supervisor has received little attention (Adkins et al., 1994; Van Vianen, 2000). The following section presents a review of the sparse literature on PS fit, and its expected relationship with overall cross-cultural adjustment is presented as a sub-hypothesis.

2.5 Person-Supervisor Fit

Weiss (1978) advocates that there exists a higher quality of exchange relationship with supervisors, when both the person (employee) and the supervisor shared similar values. Ahmad (2008) found that as the supervisor’s personality becomes more similar to that of the employee, the employee will become more satisfied with the supervisor, the particular work and with the job as a whole.

Past research concludes that individuals are more likely to work in environments where their values are similar to that of their supervisor, co-workers, subordinates and management (Locke, 1976). Therefore, it is expected that employees with the same values and personalities are attracted to, selected by, and remain in organisations where others have those same characteristics. One reason for this is that people who have common values tend to share common aspects of cognitive processing and common methods of interpreting events.
These common values and belief systems within an organisation reduce uncertainties, stimulus overload, ambiguity, conflict and other negative features of work interactions (Schein, 1992). Drawing from the adjustment literature, the reduction of expatriates’ uncertainties aids successful adjustment. If an expatriate can identify and agree with their supervisor’s values and method of management, a deeper respect and understanding is likely to foster. As people, we all strive to ‘fit in’ and when we are surrounded by people with the same values and thinking as ourselves, we often feel understood. However, it is important to note that expatriates may not initially see the common characteristic they may share with their supervisor and this process can take time to develop. Van Vianen’s (2000) research found a weak PS fit among newcomers to the organisation in their study. Supporting this, Schneider, Goldstein and Smith, (1995) note that homogeneity in personal characteristics such as values and personality will occur over time within an organisation once the individual becomes aware of their surroundings.

2.5.1 Person-Supervisor Fit and Overall Adjustment

Within the PE fit construct, PS fit is one dimension that has received little empirical attention. There is some research that indicates PS fit may have a positive relationship with all three facets of adjustment. Successful adjustment requires an expatriate to learn and navigate the foreign environment correctly. Benson and Pattie (2009) examined the relationship with expatriates and host/home country supervisors. They found that a good relationship between the expatriate and host supervisor increased the expatriate’s work and interaction adjustment. The supervisor can aid adjustment by answering questions, providing guidance and explaining local norms and behaviours, therefore increasing general and interaction adjustment. In addition, the supervisor can also play a vital role in the expatriate’s job performance by supplying them with direction, training and support for their job, hence facilitating work adjustment. This research therefore suggests that PS fit will have a positive relationship with all three facets of cross-cultural adjustment. Drawing from this, the following sub-hypothesis is presented.
Sub-hypothesis A1: A positive, direct relationship will exist between PS fit and the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment: a) general, b) interaction, c) work adjustment.

2.6 Person-Group Fit

Ostroff et al., (2005) suggest that an individual’s value congruence within the workgroup is more important than the fit with their supervisor. Organisations are placing increasing importance on work-teams in the corporate world and it is no surprise that person-group fit (or person-team fit) has become an increasingly important dimension within the PE fit construct (Guzzo and Salas, 1995; Hoerr, 1989). The following section gives a detailed review of PG fit literature and a sub-hypothesis is presented on the relationship between PG fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment.

PG fit is defined as the extent to which an individual perceives his/her characteristics, attitudes, opinions and behaviours to be compatible with that of their team members (Kristof, 1996). PG fit has been operationalised in several different ways; typically employees are compared to their co-workers in terms of goals (Kristof-Brown and Stephens, 2001), values (Adkins et al., 1996) or personality traits (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Kristof-Brown et al., (2005:286) note that ‘of all types of fit, PG fit research is the most nascent’. There is little research that places emphasis on the psychological compatibility between co-workers and the individual in a group setting (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Several studies have examined PG fit on personality traits (e.g. Barsade, Ward, Turner and Sonnerfeld, 2000; Hobman, Bordia and Gallois, 2003) however, only few published studies have investigated PG fit in relation to goals (Kristof-Brown and Stephens, 2001; Witt, 1998) or values (Adkins, Ravlin and MeGLino, 1996; Becker, 1992; Witt, 1998).
Byrne’s (1997) similarity–attraction paradigm states that co-workers who share common values are more likely to work together and develop stronger bonds with one another in comparison to dissimilar co-workers. Klimoski and Jones (1995) affirms that the achievement of high levels of PG fit is the driving principle behind effective team dynamics and that values influence behavioural and attitudinal outcomes for the group as a whole and the individual group members. Therefore, it is vital that the members of any new or on-going team have the appropriate attributes to work effectively with each other (Werbel and Johnson, 2001). Knowing how to ‘fit in’ (Fisher, 1986) and feel part of the ‘gang’ (Chao, O’Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, and Gardner, 1994) are significant social aspects of the work environment salient to the individual. Thus, perceived PG fit results from how well one’s immediate work group meets the individual’s needs for affiliation (Kristof-Brown, Jansen and Colbert, 2002). Employees who maintain social support at work can cope better with the pressure from their work environment than those who do not (Cohen and Wills, 1985). Also, individuals who are more central to certain aspects of their ‘at work’ network often perform better than others that are less central (Sparrowe, Liden, Wayne and Kraimer, 2001). In general, achieving fit with a team member has been linked positively to the quality of work relationships (Werbel and Johnson, 2001). For example, expatriates experiencing high quality work relationships can interact more effectively with co-workers, making more substantial contributions to group decisions.

2.6.1 Person-Group Fit and Overall Adjustment

The extent to which expatriates feel they fit into the work group is likely to result in emotional outcomes such as perceived levels of stress and self-efficacy. Such emotional feelings, whether positive or negative, play an important role in career decision-making, mainly intent to leave the organisation (Young and Hurlic, 2007). Within the adjustment literature, expatriate adjustment in all three facets (general, interaction and work) has been consistently linked to intent to leave the contract. This suggests a relationship between PG fit and all three facets of adjustment. In addition, high levels of PG fit results in positive work-related
outcomes (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), which suggests a relationship with work adjustment. Finally, the compatibility between co-workers is said to enhance workplace interactions and communication (Adkins et al., 1996; Gerguras and Diefendorff, 2009). The adjustment literature highlights that expatriate interaction and communication with HCNs is a cornerstone of successful expatriate adjustment, especially interaction adjustment. Drawing from this, it is suggested that PG fit has the strongest relationship with interaction adjustment and to a lesser degree work and general adjustment.

**Sub-hypothesis A2:** A positive, direct relationship will exist between PG fit and interaction adjustment and to a lesser degree with general and work adjustment.

### 2.7 Person-Organisation Fit

In the meta-analysis by Kristof-Brown et al., (2005), 172 studies of PO fit were cited, most of which had been conducted in the past ten years. It is clear that person-organisation fit has been the most researched dimensions of PE fit and there is an abundance of theoretical and empirical research on the importance of PO fit. The following section describes PO fit and sub-hypotheses are presented suggesting a relationship between PO fit and the various facets of overall cross-cultural adjustment.

Organisations today utilise various numbers of human resource tools to achieve person-organisation fit: sophisticated selection processes (Arnold and McKenzie-Davey, 1999), training and development practices (Cheng and Ho, 2001), organisational socialisation processes (Autry and Wheeler, 2005), and career planning and development processes (Graham and McKenzie, 1995). PO fit emphasises the importance of fit between the individual and their organisational values. It highlights the importance of creating an organisational culture that is consistent with the values of the organisation. Similar to O'Reilly et al., (1991), this research holds that the values of the organisation create the organisational culture and that in turn guides employee's behaviour. The focus of PO fit is normally on the selection process and is based on the assumption that a
prospective employee fits with the job, organisation and team in relation to personality, skills, values and the environment (Lievens, Decaesteker, Coetsier, and Geirnaert, 2001; West and Cyr, 2004). PO fit has also been examined from the employee perspective, where candidates make assessments about their potential fit to an organisation and utilise the results in employment decisions (Cable and Judge, 1996; Carless, 2005). In general, PO fit occurs when the organisation satisfies individuals’ values. Values are described as conscious desires held by the person that encompasses preferences, interests, motives and goals (Edwards, 1996). Thus, individuals tend to work and remain in organisations where they feel they ‘fit’, which allows them to achieve these goals that subsequently facilitate their growth and optimal functioning. Several researchers have utilised individual goal congruence with organisational peers and leaders to operationalise PO fit (e.g. Vancouver, Millsap and Peters, 1994; Witt and Silver, 1995).

2.7.1 Person-Organisation Fit and Overall Adjustment

Employees, who ‘fit’ the organisational values, join a ‘psychological group’ of people who share the same social identification. Organisational socialisation practice is the process through which individuals come to understand the values, abilities, accepted behaviours and social knowledge that are vital for their work role and participating as an organisational member (Louis, 1980; Van Maanen and Schein, 1979). Such socialisation with HCNs facilitates knowledge exchange about the organisational environment, for example the establishment of working relationships, performance proficiency, organisational history, organisational goals, values and so on (Kristof, 1996). Meta-analyses on PO fit reveals that a high level of PO fit is related to effective communication and decreased intent to quit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Verquer et al., 2003). HCNs can help expatriates to understand the culture and the subtleties of the organisation, which in turn will aid the work and general adjustment of the expatriate (Toh and Denisi, 2007). Adjustment literature holds that interacting with HCNs positively affects all three facets of adjustment (e.g. Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2004). In addition, adjustment literature links low intent to quit with high levels of
adjustment on all facets (e.g., Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2004). Drawing from this, it is proposed that PO fit will have a positive and significant relationship with all three facets of cross-cultural adjustment.

Sub-hypothesis A3: A positive, direct relationship will exist between PO fit and the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment: a) general, b) interaction, c) work adjustment.

2.8 Person-Job Fit

It is important to acknowledge that a definite distinction exists between person-organisation fit and person-job fit. The following section differentiates between both dimensions and presents a review of the literature on person-job fit. Drawing from the literature on PJ fit and adjustment, a sub-hypothesis on their expected relationship between both models is presented.

Examining the interaction between individual characteristics and their work environment is central to the PE fit model (D'amato and Zijlstra, 2008). Initially one might make the mistake of viewing PO fit and PJ fit as similar constructs of PE fit. However, PO fit has most often been referred to as the congruence between an employee’s personal values and an organisation’s culture, whereas PJ fit relates to the congruence between an employee’s skills and the demands of the job. Such a conceptualisation is useful as it highlights the issue that an individual must fit both the organisation and their job as a whole in order to achieve successful adjustment (Bowen, Ledford and Nathan, 1991; Kristof-Brown, 2000). Traditionally, research on PJ fit has been directed towards the employee selection process, which is the match between the employee’s knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) (Schneider, 1987a) and the requirements of the job as the focus of selection criteria (Sekiguchi, 2007). However, Edwards (1991) defines PJ fit as the fit between the desire of a person and the attributes of a job (needs-supplies) or the abilities of a person and the demands of a job (demands-abilities).
Needs-supplies fit (PJNS) perceptions are judgements of congruence between the individual’s needs and the rewards they receive in return for their service and contribution (e.g. pay and benefits). Needs-supplies fit may be one of the most important constructs of fit from an employee’s perspective. If a perceived match between an expatriate’s needs and the supplies of their job exists, it is likely that job satisfaction will be high, resulting in work adjustment. Demands-abilities fit (PJDA) investigates whether an individual has the abilities to fit with the needs of the job. Part of the basic motivation for people to enter the labour market and accept jobs is based on the rewards that the particular organisation offers as inducements (Simon, 1951). These two types of fit were initially investigated separately but are now generally combined to conceptualise overall PJ fit (Cable and DeRue, 2002; Scroggins, 2007; Vogel and Feldman, 2009). However, this research will investigate PJDA and PJNS fit separately in order to capture their individual relationship with overall adjustment.

2.8.1 Person-Job Fit and Overall Adjustment

Various researchers have suggested that there is a relationship between the fit of an expatriate to their job and the degree of expatriate adjustment achieved whilst in the host country (Brewster, 1993; Parker and McEvoy, 1993; Mendenhall and Wiley, 1994; Harrision, Chadwick and Scales, 1996; Aycan, 1997). Drawing from Morley, Heraty and Collings (2006), by assessing the fit between the expatriate and their job it is possible to make more accurate predictions relating to the level of work adjustment achieved on their assignments. In Kristof et al.’s (2005) meta-analysis, a strong negative correlation was found between PJ fit and intent to quit. This suggests that expatriates with higher levels of PJ fit experience a decrease in their intent to leave the job prematurely. This is similar to the results in adjustment research that found a relationship between expatriate’s adjustment and low desires to quit the contract (e.g. Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2004). Work adjustment is based on a multiplicity of factors, such as specific job responsibilities, expected performance standards, communicating with local colleagues and dealing with people in authority. PJDA
fit is work/skills orientated, thus this research suggests that a positive relationship exists between PJDA fit and work adjustment. It is clear from the definition of PJDA that it investigates the relationship between the employee and their job; however PJNS does not assess the congruence between an employee and their job. It investigates how the employees’ needs, desires, or preferences are met by the job. PJNS fit has been the emphasis of various theories of well-being and satisfaction (e.g. Caplan, 1983; French, Caplan and Harrison, 1974). Drawing from this, the current research suggests that no relationship exists between PJNS fit and work adjustment.

Expatriate adjustment to their new job role involves a socialisation process (Takeuchi, Wang and Marinova, 2005). Through this process expatriates can acquire the task skills, social knowledge and behaviours required to become an organisational member (Selmer and Fenner, 2008). Consequently, interaction with HCNs inside the organisation while on an international contract could have the ability to influence expatriate PJNS and PJDA fit. General adjustment refers to expatriates’ adjustment to items such as food, accommodation, shopping, climate and entertainment in the host culture. Such items are not directly work-related, therefore this research suggests that there will be no relationship between PJNS and PJDA fit and general adjustment. Drawing from the above, the following sub-hypotheses are suggested.

*Sub-hypothesis A4*: A positive, direct relationship will exist between PJDA fit and work adjustment.

*Sub-hypothesis A5*: No direct relationship will exist between PJNS fit and work adjustment.

*Sub-hypothesis A6*: A positive, direct relationship will exist between PJNS and PJDA fit and interaction adjustment.

*Sub-hypothesis A7*: No direct relationship will exist between PJNS fit and PJDA fit and general adjustment.
2.9 Person-Host Culture Fit

As seen in the above section, PE fit is made up of various work-related dimensions (PS, PG, PO, and PJ) that are said to influence the degree of fit between the individual and the organisation (e.g. Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Organisations strive to create a good work climate that facilitates productivity, interpersonal relations and adjustment. A large part of what makes up organisational culture is in fact the host culture. The host culture (consisting of values and beliefs) is brought into an organisation by the employees. Jabes and Gruere (1986) advocate that an organisation’s employees normally tend to have the values and beliefs synonymous with the host culture. Within the adjustment literature, Black and colleagues (Black et al., 1991; Black and Stephens, 1989) note that expatriates must adjust not only to the organisational culture, but also the host culture when working abroad. When investigating PE fit from an international assignment/contract prospective, the inclusion of a person-host culture dimension seems vital for assessing the overall fit and adjustment of expatriates, however few researchers have attempted to investigate such a domain. Lee, Reiche and Song (2010) proposed assessing the moderator effects of national culture in relation to PE fit and social capital theory, and Kocsis (2005) investigated organisation culture and national culture in an attempt to work out a measurement tool for culture-culture fit. To the authors knowledge no PE fit scale measuring the congruence of expatriate home and host culture exists. For these reasons, this research proposes an additional dimension to PE fit that incorporates the fit between the individual and their host environment based on perceived similarities. This domain is called person-host culture fit (PHC).

Culture is a fuzzy set of attitudes, beliefs, behavioural norms, and basic assumptions and values that are shared by a group of people, and that influence each member's behaviour and his/her interpretations of the "meaning" of other people's behaviour.

( Spencer-Oatey, 2000:4)
As organisations are said to adapt to their surroundings (Schein, 1985; Parker, Bochner and Schneider, 2001; Newman and Nollen, 1996) it is necessary to assess the host culture when looking at PE fit in a cross-cultural context. Darwin’s theory of evolution states that in order to survive, species must learn to adapt to their given environment. Therefore, the environment itself is of vital importance in the adjustment process. Research on host culture has increased in recent years, mainly through the use of cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 2001; Kirkman, Lowe, and Gibson, 2006; Trainidis, 2003) and the Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness project (GLOBE), which consists of in-depth descriptions of culture and leadership in countries (House et al., 2004). Cultural differences are evident at many different levels, professions, classes and religions, but Gooderham and Nordhaug (2003) state that it is particularly potent at a national level due to generations of socialisation into the national community. Hofstede (1994) defined culture as:

…the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the member of one group or category of people from another

(Hofstede, 1994:5)

It embraces factors such as language, economic structure and level of technology, management styles, the size and complexity of the formal society and its political structure, specific ceremonies and rituals, and the style of primary social relationships (Warren, 1977; Kogut and Singh, 1988). Culture is often in the individual’s subconscious and is comparable to an invisible control mechanism operating in our thoughts (Hall, 1984). Therefore, expatriates may only become aware of their own culture when faced with another. For this reason, in order to understand expatriate adjustment it is important to look at the similarities and differences that exist between the expatriate’s home and the host culture.

The measurement of culture is both a challenging and complex task to complete correctly. Many anthropologists reject the notion of measuring different cultures using quantitative methods, while psychologists continue to develop and apply numerous measures of differing aspects of culture. A mass of literature exists on
Hofstede’s (1991) four national culture dimensions: power-distance, collectivism vs. individualism, femininity vs. masculinity and uncertainty avoidance. The power-distance dimension reflects the degree to which a culture believes how institutional and organisational power should be distributed (equally or unequally) and how the decisions of the power holders should be viewed (challenged or accepted). Power distance can be described as the extent to which the less powerful members of the organisation and institution (like the family) accept and expect the power to be distributed unequally.

Collectivism vs. individualism is characterised by the priority of an individual’s interests over the interests of a group versus the priority of in-group interests over those of the individual (Parkes et al., 2001). Collectivism vs. individualism concentrates on the basic differences in individual beliefs and how they should be integrated within their groups. In collectivist cultures individuals tend to view themselves as interdependent parts of their group, while within individualist cultures individuals seek autonomy from groups (Bochner, 1994; Earley and Gibson, 1998). Numerous reviews on cross-cultural organisational behaviour have focused on the empirical consequences of collectivism vs. individual for work practices such as motivation, satisfaction, retention, attitudes and behaviour (Bond and Smith, 1996). However, cross-cultural researchers have shifted from studying these separate dimensions to the investigation of cultural orientation, which is a combination of more than two limited dimensions (Chirkov, Ryan and Willness, 2005; Chirkov, Lynch and Niwa, 2005). The most rigorously investigated dimensions have been horizontal collectivism and individualism and vertical individualism and collectivism.

Femininity vs. masculinity reflects the degree to which a culture values such behaviours as assertiveness, achievement, acquisition of wealth, caring for others, social supports and the quality of life. It refers to what is expected from the two genders within the culture in question.

Uncertainty avoidance refers to the extent to which a culture feels threatened by ambiguous or uncertain situations and tries to avoid them by establishing more
structure. The high positive uncertainty avoidance scores indicate low tolerance for ambiguity. These cultures prefer to avoid uncertainty and dissent as a cultural value and desire consensus. Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) postulate that these four dimensions address two of the most fundamental issues of human social life: 1) attitudes towards authorities and 2) the relationship between the individual and the group. They categorised the first problem as the power distance dimension. It addresses the issue of inequality among individuals in relation to varying attributes, spanning from physical and psychological through to social and political. The latter problem is associated with the co-ordination of the person’s needs and the community or group goals and norms, traditionally known as individualism and collectivism (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005).

Chirkov et al., (2005) has raised some potential issues regarding the methodological validation of these measurements. There is concern regarding the utility of an individual’s ethnicity or background as indicators of a person’s culture. The majority of individuals today live in a multi-cultural society with varying sub-groups of cultures. It is therefore, inaccurate to predict a person’s culture by incorporating such a wide reliance on the nation as a whole, as varying sub-cultures will display different norms and behaviours based on their value system. In addition, there is a lack of interpersonal consideration in this method; the way people internalise attitude, behaviours and cultural values is person-unique and suggesting homogeneity of one particular culture would be ill-founded. There is an obvious dearth in research on host culture fit but out of the research that has been conducted on host culture fit, scales measuring personality (i.e. Ward and Chang’s (1997) and Hofstede’s national culture dimensions (2005) are popular.

**2.9.1 Person-Host Culture Fit and General Adjustment**

A meaningful way to conceptualise how culture influences an expatriate’s behaviour can be found in the congruence perspective. Chirkov et al., (2005) assess what they referred to as ‘perceived cultural context’ (PCC). They view psychology as a subjective phenomenon, which reflects people’s perception of
the practices, values and norms that are shared by other members of a certain
group or culture. Adopting this stance, PHC fit measures the expatriate’s
perceived congruence between the values of their home and host cultures. It is
expected that by asking expatriates to identify their perceived congruence with
the host culture, their level of PHC fit can be established. The scale items were
adapted from pre-existing reliable scales measuring PO fit (Saks and Ashford,
1997; Lauver and Kristof-Brown, 2001) by replacing the term organisation
culture with host culture. For example, to what extent are the values of the
organisational culture similar to your own values? was adapted to: To what
extent are the values of the host culture similar to your own values? Further
support and information on the development of PHC fit scale is provided in the
methodology chapter of this thesis. General adjustment is the degree of comfort
and familiarity expatriates have with the host culture. As PHC fit measures the
degree of fit an expatriate perceives with their host culture it is expected that a
relationship will exist between PHC fit and general adjustment. As PHC fit
relates to the congruence between the employee and the host culture, the author
suggests that there will be no relationship between PHC fit and interaction and
work adjustment.

Sub-hypothesis A8: A positive, direct relationship will exist between PHC fit and
general adjustment.

Sub-hypothesis A9: No relationship will exist between PHC fit and interaction
and work adjustment.

This section of the literature review has presented a detailed review of the
various domains of person-environment fit. An overall expected relationship was
hypothesised between PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment based on
existing literature. Following this, several sub-hypotheses were presented on the
expected relationship between the various domains of PE fit and the three facets
of adjustment. In addition, a new domain of PE fit was proposed, called person-
host culture fit. The rationale for developing it and its expected relationship with
the facets of adjustment was also supplied.
Investigating the relationship between PE fit and overall adjustment is vital as it will empirically establish the extent of the relationship between both constructs. The inclusion of how such relationships impact on work outcomes offers additional value to the research. For example, if we found PS fit had a direct positive relationship with work adjustment we would know that an increase in PS fit increases work adjustment. Hence, implementing policies and procedures that nurture such a relationship within an organisation would be recommended. This brings us to the second aim of the research: to investigate the direct and indirect relationships that PE fit and overall adjustment have with work-related outcomes. This aim is addressed in the final section of the literature review, which is presented in the following section. The section gives a detailed literature review of two popular work-related outcomes: task performance and job satisfaction, which are commonly cited in both adjustment and PE fit research as work-related outcomes (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005).
Chapter Two Literature Review

Section Three

2.10 Work-Related Outcomes

The previous sections of the literature review agree that there is a need to facilitate expatriate adjustment to both the host organisation and the host culture. One of the main underlying assumptions of expatriate maladjustment research has been that turnover decisions or withdrawal cognitions would eventually result in early returns, which are costly (Sanchez, Spector and Cooper, 2000). The results of several expatriate adjustment studies (e.g. Tung, 1987; Black et al., 1991; McEvoy and Parker, 1995; Black and Gregersen, 1999; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Takeuchi et al., 2002; Ramalu et al., 2010; Takeuchi, 2010) generally indicate that if expatriates do not adjust adequately to their international contract, they might depart prematurely. Of those who remain on the contract, their maladjustment has been associated with negative effects towards the job, such as poor job satisfaction and task performance (Kraimer et al., 2001; Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black and Ferzansi, 2006).

It is not surprising that job satisfaction and task performance are two prominent work-related outcomes that are highlighted as being important factors in determining successful expatriate adjustment and intent to quit (Ones and Viswesvaran, 1997; Downes, Thomas and Singley, 2002; Osman-Gani and Rockstuhl, 2008; Takeuchi et al., 2002; Shay and Baack, 2006; Kim and Slocum, 2008). In addition, the various domains of PE fit (PO, PJ, PS, and PG) have been empirically found to have positive relationships with both job satisfaction and task performance (Verquer et al., 2003; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). As they have been repeatedly cited as underlying outcomes of successful adjustment and PE fit, it is vital that more empirical research is conducted into the extent of the relationships. Black and Mendenhall (1991) advocate that culturally adjusted expatriates are likely to perform their work tasks effectively. It is therefore
suggested that successful adjustment and fit to the various aspects of the host environment results in an increase in expatriate job satisfaction and task performance and vice versa. Drawing from this, the following hypothesis is suggested:

*Hypothesis B:* There will be a positive, statistically significant, relationship between PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes.

While it is important to identify the overall relationship between PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes it is also necessary to investigate the relationships in finer detail. Hence, the direct relationship between the three facets of adjustment (general, interaction, and work), and both work-related outcomes is suggested. Along with this suggestion, an investigation into the direct relationship between the various domains of PE fit (PO, PJ, PS, and PG) and both of the work-related outcomes will be undertaken. In addition, section two of the literature review presented several hypotheses on the expected relationship between the domains of PE fit and three facets of adjustment. Assuming that these relationships exist to some degree it is necessary to investigate the indirect relationships between the various dimensions of PE fit, the three facets of adjustment and their relationship with both of the work-related outcomes.

Identifying the extent to which each of these domains has a direct and indirect relationship with the work-related outcomes can provide vital information for academics and practitioners alike. For example, a positive direct relationship between PS fit, work adjustment and task performance suggests that higher levels of PS fit increases work adjustment, which in turn increases task performance. These results would highlight the importance of establishing policies and practices aimed at increasing PS fit, as it has a positive effect on task performance and work adjustment. A positive indirect relationship between PS fit, work adjustment and task performance would suggest that policies and practices need to be implemented that nurture the PS relations, as higher levels of PS fit positively effect work adjustment, which in turn positively effect expatriate task performance. Therefore, the following section will suggest potential direct
and indirect relationships between the domains of PE fit, the three facets of adjustment and the two work-related outcomes.

### 2.11 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as the positive emotional state resulting from the overall evaluation of one’s job (Shaffer and Harrison, 1998). It is believed to be primarily a work-related outcome that is presumed to arise from an expatriate’s successful adjustment to the overseas job and their effective interpersonal relationship with host country nationals (HCNs) on the assignment (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Shaffer and Harrison, 1998; Selmer and Fenner, 2009b). High levels of expatriate job satisfaction is linked with lower turnover tendency (Birdseye and Hill, 1995), withdrawal cognition (Shaffer and Harrison, 1998), and higher motivation to perform and complete expatriate assignments (Downes, Thomas and Singley, 2002). When expatriates feel they are being treated fairly it is logical that they feel satisfied with their job. According to Adams (1963), perception of equity is the extent to which an employee perceives he is treated fairly relative to comparable others inside and outside the organisation. According to equity theory, individuals are motivated by a sense of fairness in their interactions. Moreover, our sense of fairness is a result of the social comparisons we make to our comparable counterparts. In short, we compare our inputs (hard work, training, education, loyalty, skills) and outputs (pay acknowledgement, rewards intrinsic to the job, benefits) with inputs and outputs of other people. We perceive fairness if we believe that the inputs-to-outcome ratio we have is similar to that of our counterparts. Most of the research that investigates the relationship between perception of equity and job satisfaction reported a positive relationship between the two variables (McIntyre, Bartle, Landis and Dansby, 2002; Deconinck and Bachmann, 2007; Lambert, Hogan and Griffin, 2007).

If expatriates are satisfied with their job, their motivation to perform well and remain on the foreign contract increases (Peltokorpi, 2008). Therefore, it is
proposed that job satisfaction is one of the outcomes of successful PE fit and adjustment. The next section will unfold the three facets of adjustment and present the relevant empirical and theoretical findings that suggest what type of relationship exists between them and job satisfaction. After this, the same strategy is employed for the various dimensions of PE fit (PS, PG, PO PJNS and PJDA). PHC fit is not included in this section as it primarily related to non-work factors. In addition, as PHC fit is a new untested scale devised by the author, no theoretical or empirical research exists about its relationship with work-related outcomes. However, its relationship with both outcomes will be investigated and results presented in the findings chapter.

2.11.1 Job Satisfaction and Overall Adjustment

2.11.1.1 Job Satisfaction and General Adjustment

Empirical evidence suggesting a relationship between general adjustment and job satisfaction is hard to find (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). Lee (2005b) found that job satisfaction was a predicted outcome of cross-cultural adjustment but did not break down its relationship with the three facets of adjustment. In addition, Hechanova et al., (2003) found a positive relationship between overall adjustment and job satisfaction. This relationship was not broken down into the three facets of adjustment, so it was unclear what relationship general adjustment in particular had with job satisfaction. Research undertaken by Takeuchi et al., (2002) did find a positive relationship between general adjustment and job satisfaction in the correlation table. However, Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al.,’s (2005) meta-analysis using data from 8,474 expatriates in 66 studies found that general (cultural) adjustment had a positive relationship with job satisfaction. It is evident that past research that suggests a relationship between general adjustment and job satisfaction is indeed unclear. Some research suggests that overall cross-cultural adjustment has a relationship with job satisfaction but whether general adjustment accounts for any of the variances explained in the findings was not acknowledged in their studies. Instead, general, interaction and work adjustment
were combined to measure the relationship between overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction. This research unpacks overall cross-cultural adjustment into its three facets (general, interaction and work adjustment). In order to add to the much needed empirical knowledge on the relationship between general adjustment and job satisfaction, and in line with the findings of Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., (2005), this research suggests that a positive relationship exists between general adjustment and job satisfaction.

*Sub-hypothesis B1:* A positive, direct relationship will exist between general adjustment and job satisfaction.

### 2.11.1.2 Job Satisfaction and Interaction Adjustment

When examining the relationship between interaction adjustment and job satisfaction some researchers have found a significant positive relationship between both. Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., (2004) found that relationships involving interaction adjustment and job satisfaction were positive and significant. Supporting this, Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al.,’s (2005) meta-analysis also found the relationship between interaction adjustment and job satisfaction was positive and significant. However, Shaffer and Harrison (1998) established that interaction adjustment was not a predictor of job satisfaction. It is clear from above that the findings are inconsistent. However, the majority of empirical findings suggest interaction adjustment has a positive relationship with job satisfaction. Therefore, the following sub-hypothesis is presented:

*Sub-hypothesis B2:* A positive, direct relationship will exist between interaction adjustment and job satisfaction.
2.11.1.3 Job Satisfaction and Work Adjustment

Shaffer and Harrison (1998) found in their empirical research of 452 expatriates living in 45 countries that work adjustment had a positive relationship with job satisfaction. Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., (2004) found that relationships involving work adjustment and job satisfaction were positive and significant. Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al.,’s (2005) meta-analysis found the relationship between job satisfaction and work adjustment was positive and significant. This was supported by Selmer and Fenner’s (2009a) correlation table revealing a positive significant correlation between work adjustment and job satisfaction. Drawing from this, it is suggested that work adjustment will have a positive significant relationship with job satisfaction.

Sub-hypothesis B3: A positive, direct relationship will exist between work adjustment and job satisfaction.

2.11.2. Job Satisfaction and Person-Environment Fit

2.11.2.1 Job Satisfaction and Person-Supervisor Fit

Turban and Jones (1988) found that perceived similarities had a high correlation with job satisfaction. Meglino, Ravlin and Adkinsm (1989) established that employees who perceive their supervisor’s values to be similar to their own were more satisfied with their job and this was supported by Amos and Weathington (2008). Hatfield and Huseman (1982) note that perceptual congruence, in relation to communication between the individual and their supervisor has a significant connection to job satisfaction. Kristof-Brown et al., (2005) found in their meta-analysis that PS had a strong, positive, relationship with job satisfaction. Drawing from this, it is expected that PS fit will have a positive, direct relationship with job satisfaction. As all three facets of adjustment (general,
interaction and work) are expected to have a positive, direct relationship with job satisfaction, a positive, indirect relationship is suggested between PS fit, the three facets of adjustment and job satisfaction.

Sub-hypothesis B4: A positive, direct relationship will exist between PS fit and job satisfaction.

Sub-hypothesis B4.1: A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PS fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction.

2.11.2.2 Job Satisfaction and Person-Group Fit

According to Kristof-Brown et al.’s (2005) meta-analysis, little attention in research has been paid to PG fit. Therefore, a very limited number of studies can be drawn from in order to establish the relationship between PG fit and job satisfaction. Of the research that exists on PG fit, Mountgomery (1996) linked it to job satisfaction and Kristof-Brown et al., (2005) found a positive correlation between PG fit and job satisfaction. Drawing from this, it is suggested that PG fit will have a positive direct relationship with job satisfaction. In addition, as all three facets of adjustment (general, interaction and work) are expected to have a positive direct relationship with job satisfaction, a positive indirect relationship is suggested between PG fit, the three facets of adjustment and job satisfaction.

Sub-hypothesis B5: A positive, direct relationship will exist between PG fit and job satisfaction.

Sub-hypothesis B5.1: A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PG fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction.
2.11.2.3 Person-Organisation Fit and Job Satisfaction

Empirical evidence reveals that a high level of PO fit is related to work attitudes, such as job satisfaction (i.e. Boxx et al., 1991; Bretz and Judge, 1994; Chatman, 1991; O’Reilly et al., 1991; Vancouver and Schmitt, 1991; Saks and Ashforth, 1997; Verquer et al., 2003). This is supported by Verquer et al.’s (2003) meta-analysis that indicated a positive relationship between PO fit and job satisfaction. Cadwell and O’Reilly (1990) found that PO fit was positively related to satisfaction when they examined the congruence between individual work and the task necessary to complete the job. Coupled with this, Kristof-Brown et al., (2005) note that PO fit had high correlations with overall job satisfaction. Drawing from this, it is suggested that PO fit will have a positive direct relationship with job satisfaction. In addition, as all three facets of adjustment (general, interaction and work) are expected to have a positive direct relationship with job satisfaction, a positive indirect relationship is suggested between PO fit, the three facets of adjustment and job satisfaction.

Sub-hypothesis B6: A positive, direct relationship will exist between PO fit and job satisfaction.

Sub-hypothesis B6.1: A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PO fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction.

2.11.2.4 Job Satisfaction and Person-Job Fit

Past research indicates that job-related constructs are strongly associated with attitudes about the job (Shore and Martin, 1989). Numerous researchers suggest that overall job satisfaction is strongly influenced by employees’ evaluations of the work and tasks they perform, which are key components of PJ fit (e.g. Smith, Kendall and Hulin, 1969). Kristof (1996) suggested that PJ fit should be more strongly associated with attitudes specific to the job (e.g. job satisfaction). In addition, Hall, Schneider and Nygren (1970), Hollenbeck (1989), and O’Reilly
(1977) found PJ fit correlated with job satisfaction. As job satisfaction is listed in past research as an outcome that is positively related to good PJ fit (Edwards, 1991; Sekiguchi, 2004; Kristof-Brown, 2000; Cable and DeRue, 2002; Vogel and Feldman, 2009), this research proposes that PJNS and PJDA will have a positive direct relationship with job satisfaction. In addition, as all three facets of cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work) are expected to have a positive direct relationship with job satisfaction, a positive indirect relationship is suggested between PJNS fit, interaction adjustment and job satisfaction, and PJDA fit, interaction and work adjustment and job satisfaction.

**Sub-hypothesis B7:** A positive, direct relationship will exist between PJNS and PJDA fit and job satisfaction.

**Sub-hypothesis B7.1:** A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PJNS fit, interaction adjustment and job satisfaction.

**Sub-hypothesis B7.2:** A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PJDA fit, interaction and work adjustment and job satisfaction.

### 2.12 Task Performance

One of the presumptions that is driving much of expatriate literature is that maladjustment to an international assignment can result in low performance (e.g. Caliguri, 1997), which may lead to the expatriate quitting the assignment prematurely (e.g. Gregersen and Black, 1990; Naumann, 1992). A detailed review of literature and empirical findings of task performance, overall adjustment and PE fit is presented below.

Task performance can be defined as the successful execution of overseas duties, including attaining specific goals or accomplishing definable projects (i.e. Harrison and Shaffer, 2005; Parker and McEvoy, 1993; Kraimer et al., 2001). In addition, Ones and Viswesvaran (1997) suggest that the core facets of expatriate
performance are fulfilling specific task requirements in addition to developing and maintaining relationships with HCNs. The following section provides a detailed review of the three adjustment facets (general, interaction and work), and the PE fit dimensions (PO, PJ, PS, and, PG) and their relationship with task performance.

2.12.1 Task Performance and Overall Adjustment

2.12.1.1 Task Performance and General Adjustment

While general adjustment has been predicted mainly by non-work related factors in past literature (Li and Tse, 1998), Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., (2004) found that cultural (general) adjustment was statistically associated with task performance. Supporting this, Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., (2005) using 8,474 expatriates from 64 counties found that general adjustment was significantly related to task performance. However, Nicholson and Imaizumi (1993) found no relationship between general adjustment and task performance. This is supported by a number of sources (Takeuchi, Wang and Marinova, 2005; Parker and McEvoy, 1993; Kraimer, Wayne and Jaworski, 2001; Shaffer et al., 2003; Lee and Sukoco, 2008), who found no relationship between general adjustment and task performance. Such results are confusing, therefore drawing a solid conclusion from them seems impossible. Based on the majority of findings in the investigations above, the author suggests that general adjustment will not have a significant relationship with task performance.

Sub-hypothesis B8: No direct relationship will exist between general adjustment and task performance.
2.12.1.2 Task Performance and Interaction Adjustment

Scholars and practitioners have supported the idea that the level of an expatriates’ adjustment itself can determine the level of performance. Shaffer et al., (2003) found interaction adjustment had a statistically significant relationship with task performance. However, the majority of empirical research in this area found no relationship between interaction adjustment and task performance. This is supported by Black’s claim that successful interaction adjustment may not have a direct relationship with performance. In addition, Lee and Sukoco’s (2008) study on the effects of expatriate adjustment found that interaction adjustment had no relationship with task performance. There seems to be a general consensus in research suggesting that interaction adjustment does not have a relationship with task performance. Therefore, the following sub-hypothesis is proposed.

*Sub-hypothesis B9:* No direct relationship will exist between interaction adjustment and task performance.

2.12.1.3 Task Performance and Work Adjustment

In line with the theory of work adjustment, it is expected that the level of work adjustment achieved by an expatriate abroad can be partially derived from the level of task satisfaction reported by the individual (Breiden, Mohr and Mirza, 2006). The expectation of work adjustment has been that highly adjusted expatriates perform well at work (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). For example, if expatriates perceive high levels of work adjustment, it is likely that they will perceive high levels of task performance. Nicholson and Imaizumi (1993) found a statistically significant positive relationship between work adjustment and task performance. This is supported by Parker and McEvoy (1993), Kraimer, Wayne, and Joworski (2001), Shaffer et al., (2003), and Selmer and Fenner (2009a) who all found positive significant correlations between work adjustment and task
performance. It can be concluded from this that work adjustment is positively and significantly related to task performance.

*Sub-hypothesis B10:* A positive, direct relationship will exist between work adjustment and task performance.

The following section presents past research on the relationship between task performance and the various dimensions of PE fit (PS, PG, PO, and PJ).

### 2.12.2 Task Performance and Person-Environment Fit

#### 2.12.2.1 Task Performance and Person-Supervisor Fit

It is suggested that the quality and frequency of subordinate-supervisor interactions are important influences on an individual’s performance (Liden and Graen, 1980; O’Reilly, 1977). Schein (1985) suggests that congruence between a leader and subordinate would have a positive association with the performance of the subordinate. Turban and Jones (1988) note that perceived similarities correlated highly with performance. Kristof-Brown et al., (2005) advocates that PS fit is under-researched, hence there is little empirical data suggesting its relationship with overall performance. In their meta-analysis they found that PS fit had a small positive relationship with overall performance. Meglino et al., (1989) report a negative association between PS fit and performance although these results contradict findings in other studies. However, while such a finding is noted, this research proposes the PS fit will have a positive direct relationship with task performance. In addition, as work adjustment is expected to have a positive direct relationship with task performance, a positive indirect relationship is suggested between PS fit, work adjustment and task performance.

*Sub-hypothesis B11:* A positive, direct relationship will exist between PS fit and task performance.
Sub-hypothesis B11.1: A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PS fit, work adjustment and task performance.

2.12.2.2 Task Performance and Person-Group Fit

According to Feldman (1984), PG fit can enhance compliance with important group norms and helps promote group performance. In addition, employees possessing strong relationships with colleagues are more likely to give and receive valuable resources from co-workers (Vogel and Feldman, 2009). Past empirical research has found positive relationships between PG fit and overall performance (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Kristof-Brown et al., (2005) note that PG fit is an under-researched dimension of PE fit, hence there is a limited number of empirical findings. From the findings that are presented above, it is suggested that PG fit will have a positive direct relationship with task performance. In addition, as work adjustment is expected to have a positive direct relationship with task performance, a positive indirect relationship is suggested between PG fit, work adjustment and task performance.

Sub-hypothesis B12: A positive, direct relationship will exist between PG fit and task performance.

Sub-hypothesis B12.1: A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PG fit, work adjustment and task performance.

2.12.2.3 Task Performance and Person-Organisation Fit

Cadwell and O’Reilly (1990) found that PO fit was positively associated with performance when they examined the congruence between individual work and the tasks necessary to complete the job. Arthur et al., (2006) found a positive relationship between PO fit and task performance. In addition, Kristof-Brown et al., (2005) noted that PO fit correlated with overall job performance. Coupled with this, Hoffman and Woehr (2006) extended the meta-analyses of Verquer,
Beehr and Wanger, (2003) by providing a meta-analyses review of the relationship between PO fit and behavioural criteria. The results indicated that PO fit had a positive relationship with job performance. Therefore, it is suggested that PO fit will have a positive direct relationship with task performance. In addition, as work adjustment is expected to have a positive direct relationship with task performance, a positive indirect relationship is suggested between PO fit, work adjustment and task performance.

Sub-hypothesis B13: A positive, direct relationship will exist between PO fit and task performance.

Sub-hypothesis B13.1: A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PO fit, work adjustment and task performance.

2.12.2.4 Task Performance and Person-Job Fit

Kristof-Brown et al.’s (2005) meta-analysis found that there is a strong relationship between PJ fit and task performance. In addition, task performance is listed in past research as an outcome that is positively related to PJ fit (Edwards, 1991; Sekiguchi, 2004; Kristof-Brown, 2000; Cable and DeRue, 2002; Vogel and Feldman, 2009). Drawing from this, it is suggested that PJNS and PJDA will have a positive direct relationship with task performance. In addition, as work adjustment is expected to have a positive direct relationship with task performance, a positive indirect relationship is suggested between PJDA fit, work adjustment and task performance.

Sub-hypothesis B14: A positive, direct relationship will exist between PJNS and PJDA fit and task performance.

Sub-hypothesis B14.1: A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PJDA fit, work adjustment and task performance.
2.13 Conclusion

It is widely recognised that effective expatriate adjustment on an international contract is critical for companies to succeed in global ventures (Carpenter, Sanders and Gregersen, 2000). Therefore, it is not surprising that an increasing number of studies have been carried out in the past decades on the adjustment process and the factors that contribute to or hinder successful adjustment (e.g. Kraimer, Wayne and Jaworski, 2001; Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black and Ferzansi, 2006; Van Vianen, De Pater, Selmer, 2011). Successful expatriate adjustment involves adjusting to cross-cultural differences at work and to the international assignment outside of work (Black et al., 1991; Black and Stephens, 1989; Takeuchi et al., 2002). PE fit has been used to assess the degree of congruence between individuals and their work environment on various levels PS, PG, PO, and PJ fit (e.g. Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). When a ‘match or fit’ exists between the individual and the environment it is proposed that a certain level of psychological adjustment will be achieved (Caplan, 1987). It is clear that overall adjustment and PE fit both investigate the degree of adjustment/fit an individual achieves with the various aspects of the international job. Despite this, no research to date has been conducted on the overall relationship between both frameworks.

The first aim of this research (to investigate the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment) was addressed in section one and two of the literature review (hypothesis A). Several sub-hypotheses were presented based on past empirical and theoretical literature on adjustment and PE fit (see Diagram 1: The overall relationship between PE fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes). In addition, the inclusion of a person-host culture dimension to the PE fit construct was deemed appropriate by the author. It has been long established that in order to adequately assess expatriate adjustment it is vital to examine work and non-work factors (Black, 1988). This is supported in adjustment literature where emphasis is placed on investigating expatriate adjustment within and outside the host organisation to determine their level of overall adjustment (Black, 1988). The inclusion of this PHC fit dimension to PE fit broadens its ability to assess expatriate adjustment effectively by looking at
how expatriates fit in with the various aspects of the non-work environment with the view to determine the explanatory power of the relationship between overall PE fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes.

The second aim of this research is to investigate the direct and indirect relationships between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes. This aim was addressed in section three of the literature review. Both job satisfaction and task performance are two of the most cited outcomes of adjustment and PE fit within literature, hence they are the two work-related outcomes included in this research. By drawing from past literature, the overall relationship between adjustment, PE fit and work-related outcomes is suggested in hypothesis B. Then the various dimensions of adjustment (general, interaction and work), PE fit (PS, PG, PO, PJ), and work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance) are unfolded and their direct relationships, based on past literature, with both work-related outcomes are presented. In addition, the expected indirect relationships with PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and the work outcomes are presented as sub-hypotheses (see Diagram 1: The overall relationship between PE fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes).

Chapter 3 of this research describes in detail the research methodology employed in this research including information on the research design and method, the sample frame, data collection, questionnaire design and administration, and the data analysis techniques used.
Diagram 1. The Overall Relationship between PE Fit, Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Work-Related Outcomes
Chapter 3 Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the theoretical and philosophical approach taken that influenced this research. Firstly, the research aims and philosophical underpinnings of the research are discussed. Second, a detailed account is supplied in relation to selecting and defining the sample and the response rate. Third, the questionnaire design and pilot testing, questionnaire administration, and the main fieldwork phase of the research are presented. The final section of this chapter describes the preliminary data analysis and the data analysis techniques used in this research.

3.2 Framework of Research Design

The fundamental principle of research design is that the strategy and techniques employed are appropriate for the questions the researcher wishes to answer. Perhaps then, this chapter should start by restating the main research aims: 1) to determine the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment and 2) to determine the direct and indirect relationships between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance). Once the research aims are clear the next step is to determine the theoretical stance that the research will adopt in its design.

3.3 Research Design

This research adopts the positivistic frame of reference. Positivism supports the application of natural sciences methods to the theory of social science (Bryman
and Bell, 2003). Positivist researchers look for a constant relationship between variables or events and are interested in the collection of facts (Robson, 2002).

Within the literature review the research suggests two hypotheses and several sub-hypotheses on the expected relationship between both frameworks and the two work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance), which have been formulated from studying past empirical and theoretical research. Using hypotheses is supported by the positivist paradigm, as all hypotheses and sub-hypotheses are founded on facts and hypotheses are tested against these facts. Furthermore, within the positivistic approach the social world is deemed concrete, observable and measureable (Easterby-Smith, Thrope and Lowe, 2001; Gill and Johnson, 2002). Consequently, the development of an accurate study sample is a critical task in undertaking quantitative research in order to reach somewhat generalisable conclusions.

3.4 The Context for the Study

The mobility of medical doctors is a major issue in Ireland both in terms of the inflow and outflow of health professionals. Ireland has been experiencing an acute shortage in the number of medical doctors servicing its nation’s hospitals. The primary reason for such shortages is that an increased amount of Irish medical doctors are choosing to work outside of Ireland (Canada, U.S.A & Australia) for career advancement opportunities and increased pay. Special schemes (Work Visa/Work Authorization replaced in 2006 by Green Card Scheme) were introduced in Ireland to facilitate the entry of persons from non-EU countries in occupations where skills shortages exist. These immigrant doctors come to occupy low or middle grade posts in provincial hospitals, which are not attractive to the Irish workforce. Immigration has made a significant contribution to increasing the supply of healthcare professionals in Ireland in the last number of years. Immigration has been successful in alleviating serious skill shortages in a relatively inexpensive manner and there is no doubt that
immigration, to a greater or lesser extent will continue to provide healthcare professionals for the Irish healthcare system.

NCHDs represent between 45-50% of medical doctors currently working in Ireland according to the Health Service Executives. This percentage, like all statistics relating to the number of NCHDs in Ireland, is an approximation brought about by the lack of accurate record keeping by the HSE. There are approximately 3,600 NCHDs employed in Ireland in the public sector (explained further in section section 3.6). NCHDs apply for positions in Irish hospital for the same reasons that Irish doctors apply to Canada, the U.S.A and Australia; career advancement, better working conditions and increased levels of remuneration. The majority of NCHDs coming to Ireland are from Asia and Africa. Again, the exact percentage of NCHDs from each Country is unknown, but the Irish Medical Council indicates that the majority of NCHDs come from Sudan, Nigeria, Pakistan, India and Egypt (decending order) and their contact length is dependent on the job role they attain. Some NCHDs will be in Ireland a year while others can be on rolling contracts for much longer. By working in Ireland these doctors will accumulate European experience which will aid them in attaining medical positions in the U.S.A. NCHDs are particulary interested in working in the U.S.A for increased pay, benefits and perceived quality of life compared to what they receive in Ireland. Ireland is spending a considerable amount of money on attracting, selecting and recruiting NCHDs. It is interesting to note that these NCHDs could be using Ireland as a stepping stone to the U.S.A. If this is the case, then the HSE needs to be aware of factors that can positively influence and effect NCHDs desire to remain in Ireland offered by this research.

We are aware from the literature review in Chapter Two that successful PE fit and CCA are linked to increased levels of job satisfaction and task performance both of which reduce intent to quit. Understanding how NCHDs adjust and fit into working and living in Ireland can supply the HSE with valuable information on factors that influence their WRO. In addition, these NCHDs are in close contact with a different culture to their own on a day-to-day basis in dealing with patients and this in itself is a cause for concern. We need to understand any difficulties
they are experiencing, not only from a medical administration perspective but, also from a personel perspective. Cultural differences can cause various misunderstandings in general life but, when dealing with patients’ lives it can become a fatal consequence of maladjustment. For example, if an NCHD has difficulty understanding the Irish accent then they are at an increased risk of misunderstanding medical directions from their co-workers or important cues from their patients. For these reasons there is an urgent need for policymakers to address the CCA of these NCHDs.

3.5 Defining the Sample

Non-consultant hospital doctors (NCHDs) who are currently working on contract in Ireland are the focus of this study. The sample was selected in order to add to the limited amount of research on public sector expatriates as the majority of expatriate research has been conducted on conventional expatriates in the private sector (cf Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Hechanova et al., 2003). This is supported by Selmer and Fenner (2009b) who suggest that studies on private sector expatriates dominant adjustment literature. One factor that has been a significant contribution to the large body of expatriate research on the private sector has been the rapid increase of multinational companies (MNC), and their need to manage their staff overseas effectively (Selmer and Fenner, 2009a). This intense focus on literature regarding expatriate managers within MNCs has led to a lack of research on public sector expatriates. Due to this, the importance of investigating the cross-cultural adjustment of expatriates in the public sector has been raised (Selmer and Fenner, 2009a; Selmer and Fenner, 2009b). Only a few studies have focused on public sector expatriates and their cross-cultural adjustment (e.g., Anderson, 2001; Harris and Holden, 2001; Selmer and Fenner, 2009a; Selmer and Fenner, 2009b). Taking this into account, this research acknowledges the current gap on public sector expatriate research, hence this study uses only public sector expatriates as the sample in an attempt to add to the limited amount of research in the area. Once it was identified that public sector
expatriates would be used in this study, the next step was to establish what type of public sector expatriates they would be.

Since free mobility was introduced with the European Union (EU) migration, tendencies have increased dramatically among health-care professionals. Consequently, Ireland is experiencing ‘brain drain’ in recent years, as newly qualified Irish doctors are leaving for more prosperous positions that are on offer abroad (Scherer, 2008). Garcia-Perez, Amaya and Otero (2007) study on the EU, found that Ireland has the highest percentage of doctors practising abroad (47%) with the majority registered as working in the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States of America (USA). Because of this, the migration of doctors has become significant in international health policy debates (Bunchan et al., 2001; Williams and Baláž, 2008; Astor et al., 2005; Tjadens, 2002; Stilwell, Diallo, Zurn, Vujicic, Adams and Dal Poz, 2004). In order for Ireland to fill the shortages of ‘home-grown’ doctors servicing the nation’s hospitals, the majority of positions have been filled by overseas doctors, coming predominately from Africa and Asia, referred to as NCHDs.

There are several push and pull factors that influence the influx of foreign doctors to Ireland. The push factors include low pay, inadequate working conditions, limited career advancement and limited educational opportunities in their home country (Bezuidenhout et al., 2009). The pull factors include higher pay, better working conditions, the chance of career advancement, enhanced health care systems and educational opportunities (Buchan et al., 2001). It is important to note that the majority of foreign doctors entering Ireland bring with them concerns about professional expectations and cultural adaptation. They may have the language ability required to do their job and the recognised medical qualifications but it is likely, as with any other expatriate, that they will require a period of adaptation to both the host organisation and culture. For the reasons above, the author deemed it appropriate to use NCHDs working in Ireland as the sample.
3.6 Creating a Sample List

In order to create the sample list for the study the first issue was to establish how many NCHDs are currently in Ireland. This allowed the researcher to determine if it was possible to include the entire population in the study. The Health Service Executive (HSE) supplied contact details for all hospitals in the republic of Ireland. They also gave estimates of how many NCHDs were in Ireland each year, however this was not accurate enough to draw a sample size number from. For example, some of the registered doctors may not have been in Ireland anymore or may not be practising medicine anymore. The South HSE contacted the researcher and suggested a more complete study that is carried out every three years by The Postgraduate Medical and Dental Board in Dublin. Their latest research showed that approximately 2,549 NCHDs were in Ireland in 2008. It was suggested that this was unlikely to change much (a maximum of 100-200 difference) in their new study, forecasted to be available in 2012.

3.7 Sampling

Once the population was identified, the next step in the research was to select the sample. There are two main decisions in relation to any survey according to Anderson (2009). The first being the size of the sample and the second is the way the sample is selected so that it is large enough, random and unbiased. All hospitals supplied by the HSE (46 in total) were contacted and of those, 34 hospitals replied and agreed access to the NCHDs in their hospitals. The 34 participating hospitals each supplied the researcher with a close estimate of the number of NCHDs working for them, which combined was circa to 1,610. This represented an estimated sample size of 63.16% of the entire population of NCHDs currently working in Ireland. While the findings of this research cannot claim to be representative of all NCHDs’ PE fit, adjustment and work-related
outcomes to working in public sector hospitals in Ireland, every effort was made to develop a comprehensive and representative sample, as highlighted above. It could be argued that the sample is convenient. The researcher argues that the sample was as random as it could have been considering the constraints placed on the researcher by non-participating hospitals.

3.8 The Questionnaire

There are various approaches to data collection within social science and each option was fully contemplated when considering the research design of this study. This research adopts a quantitative approach using a questionnaire for data collection (the most common survey data collection tool) for the following reasons: the sample size is too large and the time line too short to allow for an effective qualitative approach. More importantly, the research is looking to identify the relationship between the pre-existing and well-tested frameworks (PE fit, adjustment and work-related outcomes). There are tried, tested and reliable scales already developed that can be used to investigate these potential relationships. A qualitative approach may be useful if insight is required in order to generate a new set of scales that measure expatriate PE fit, adjustment and work-related outcomes. The approach of adopting and adapting existing scales is common practice within social science and one that adds to the reliability and validity of instruments (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2007). In terms of reliability, the use of a survey instrument is regarded as one of the most reliable methods due to their highly structured nature (Gill and Johnson, 2002).

In order to ensure a good response rate it was vital that the questionnaire was well-structured, clear, precise and aesthetically pleasing. Coupled with this, the survey questions have been designed to help achieve the aims of the research (see section 3.2). The questionnaire used closed questions (i.e. rating scales and multiple choice questions), which minimised the risk of bias, which is apparent in open-ended questions. For example, open-end questions tend to have a higher non-response and drop-out rate than closed questions, as participants may feel
there is too much writing involved in open-ended question (Knapp and Heidingsfelder, 2001).

The study required the questionnaires to be administered through e-mail, personally and by post (described in detail in section 3.10). An electronic copy of the questionnaire was designed and formatted as a Microsoft Word Survey document to ensure the electronic and hard copy had identical layouts. Having two very different looking questionnaires can cause bias as one may be more appealing to fill out than the other. The questionnaire (Appendix A) opened with an information sheet that gave the overview and the purpose of the research being conducted. The confidentiality and anonymity of participants was also addressed in the information sheet. An instruction sheet accompanied the questionnaire stating how to fill it out and once completed how to return it to the researcher. Contact information for the researcher was also supplied in case there were any additional queries about the study. A consent form was attached to the questionnaire and respondents were asked to read and sign it if they wished to participate in the study. For the email questionnaires, an opening email stating all of the above was included, followed by instructions on returning the completed questionnaire. In addition, respondents had the option to print off the completed questionnaire and post it back to the researcher if they had any concern about their anonymity being compromised with email addresses.

The questionnaire was five pages long and consisted of four main parts (A, B, C and D), which are presented in Table 3.1 below. Section A asked general questions about the participant’s demographics and questions related to living and working in Ireland, such as understanding the Irish accent. In order to answer the questions asked in these two pages, multiple choice boxes provided a list of answers to choose from. The inclusion in some cases of the ‘other’ option gave participants the opportunity to write in their answer if it was not present in the given list. Section B presented the scales measuring overall adjustment consisting of general, interaction and work adjustment. Section C included PE Fit scales and scales for both work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance). Finally, section D incorporated the researcher’s own scale for person-host culture fit.
Table 3.1 Breakdown of Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>General demographics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B       | Overall adjustment measurement consisting of:  
|         | General Adjustment Scale  
|         | Interaction Adjustment Scale  
|         | Work Adjustment Scale |
| C       | Person-environment measurement consisting of:  
|         | Person-Supervisor Fit Scale  
|         | Person-Group Fit Scale  
|         | Person Organisation Fit Scale  
|         | Person-Job Needs Supplies Fit Scale  
|         | Person-Job Demands Ability Fit Scale |
|         | Work-related outcome measurements consisting of:  
|         | Job Satisfaction Scale  
|         | Task Performance Scale |
| D       | Person-Host Culture Fit Scale |

As mentioned previously, past measurements of overall adjustment, PE fit, job satisfaction and task performance were used in the questionnaire to ensure the validity of the study. The researcher contacted several leading authors in the area of adjustment and fit in order to establish the most appropriate scales to use in this research. This advice was taken on-board and the following section describes each of the scales used in this study. In the questionnaire, Likert scales were used to measure the responses given, ranging from 1-5 and 1-7 depending on the particular scales (Table 3.2). The use of Likert scales within this research as measurement tools is considered the most efficient and effective method of developing highly reliable scales (Anderson, 1981).
Table 3.2 Likert-Scale Arrangement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Likert-scale and range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent/Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General, Interaction and Work Adjustment Scales</td>
<td>1-7 from (1) very unadjusted to (7) very adjusted. Mid-range option (4) represented 'normal'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>Likert-scale and range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit Scale</td>
<td>1-5 from (1) not at all to (5) almost always. Mid-range option (3) represented 'sometimes'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Group Fit Scale</td>
<td>1-7 from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. Mid-range option (4) represented 'neither agree or disagree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organisation Fit Scale</td>
<td>1-5 from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. Mid-range option (4) represented 'neither agree or disagree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job( Needs Supplies- Demands Abilities) Fit Scale</td>
<td>1-5 from (1) to a very little extent to (5) to a very large extent. Mid-range option (3) represented 'to some extent'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture Fit Scale</td>
<td>1-5 from (1) to a very little extent to (5) to a very large extent. Mid-range option 'to some extent'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>Likert-scale and range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>1-7 from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. Mid-range option (4) represented 'neither agree or disagree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance Scale</td>
<td>1-7 from (1) not at all a characteristic to (7) totally characteristic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Investigating the relationship between adjustment and PE fit, adjustment was the dependent variable: investigating the relationship between work-related outcomes and adjustment, adjustment was the independent variable.
The following are the details of the main likert scale items used in the research. Reliabilities of each of the scales are reported using Cronbach’s Alpha, which is the most commonly used indicator of internal consistency.

### 3.8.1 Overall Adjustment Measurement

Adjustment was measured using one of the most tried and tested models of adjustment, Black’s (1988) model of adjustment, as discussed in Chapter 2. It consisted of 14 items on a 7-point likert scale, anchors ranging from 1- very unadjusted to 7 - very adjusted. Participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they felt adjusted to the 14 items. Black (1988) suggests that in order for an individual to successfully adjust they must adjust to both work and non-work factors. From this he divided overall adjustment into general adjustment, interaction adjustment and work adjustment, consisting of work and non-work factors, and when combined together measured overall adjustment. General adjustment items included food, health care facilities, entertainment, living conditions, cost of living, shopping and housing conditions. Interaction adjustment items included interacting with host country nationals outside of work, on a day-to-day basis, and socialising with host country nationals. Work adjustment items included performance standards and expectations, supervisory responsibilities, and specific job responsibilities. Consequently, in this study the 14 items were divided into general adjustment, interaction adjustment and work adjustment for analysis. In this research, the reliability (Cronbach Alpha) for general adjustment was $\alpha = 0.81$, for interaction adjustment was $\alpha = 0.89$ and for work adjustment was $\alpha = 0.81$. The combined reliability of the three items, referred to as overall cross-cultural adjustment, yielded a Cronbach Alpha of $\alpha = 0.91$. 
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3.8.2 Person-Environment Measurements

**Person-Supervisor Fit**

Person-supervisor fit refers to the relationship between an individual and his/her supervisor. This research used Turban and Jones’ (1988) perceived PS fit scale consisting of three items on a five point likert scale. Item one: ‘How much like you in outlook, perspective, values, and work habits is your supervisor’. The items were ranging from 1- not at all to 5- almost always. Items two and three were ‘My supervisor and I see things in much the same way’ and ‘My supervisor and I are alike in a number of areas’. The anchors for these two questions were 1- strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree. In this study, the PS fit scale yielded a reliability (Cronbach Alpha) of $\alpha = 0.86$.

**Person-Group Fit**

Person-group fit refers to the interpersonal compatibility between individuals and their work groups. It assumes that most employment positions require interpersonal interactions with group members. This research used Vogel and Feldman’s (2009) scale measuring PG fit. It consisted of 5 items measured on a 7-point likert scale with anchors from 1- strongly disagree to 7- strongly agree. Items were constructed similarly to those of the other fit scales so they could be comparable with them in future empirical research. Typical items included ‘Working with other people in my group is one of the best parts of my job’ and ‘I get along well with the people I work with on a day-to-day basis’. In this study, the PG fit scale yielded a reliability (Cronbach Alpha) of $\alpha = 0.54$. Vogel and Feldman (2009) suggested that this is certainly not the best scale of PG fit but it is the only tested one to their knowledge. They did, however, have a reliability of $\alpha = 0.76$ unlike the result in this research. Items on the scale were systematically
dropped from the scale and then reintroduced where reliability analysis was performed at each stage to identify if one particular item was causing the low Cronbach Alpha. The results showed that dropping one or several items out of the scale did not increase the reliability. Due to this, the PG fit scale was not used in the analysis, as the results of the Alpha was deemed unreliable by the researcher.

**Person-Organisation Fit**

Person-organisation fit refers to the congruence between an employee’s personal values and an organisation’s culture. It is different from person-job fit, which relates to the congruence between an employee’s skills and the demands of the job. Saks and Ashforth (1997) developed a 4-item scale that is used in this study to measure PO fit perceptions. Participants responded by using a 5-point scale, similar to the Likert scale, with anchors from 1 - to a very little extent to 5 - to a very large extent. The items were designed to capture specific aspects of PO fit consistent with what has been reported in previous research on fit perceptions (Cable and Judge, 1996, 1997; Saks and Ashforth, 1997). Typical PO fit items included ‘To what extent are the values of the organisation similar to your own values?’ and ‘To what extent does your personality match the personality or image of the organisation?’ In this study the PO fit scale yielded a reliability (Cronbach Alpha) of $\alpha = 0.83$.

**Person-Job Fit**

Person-job fit is defined by Cable and DeRue (2002) as the fit between the demands of the job and the abilities of the person (demands-abilities), or the desire of a person and the attributes of a job (needs-supplies). The scale consisted of three items measuring demands-abilities and three items measuring needs-supplies. Respondents answered these 6 items on a 7-point Likert scale ranging
from 1- strongly disagree to 7- strongly agree. An example of the demands-abilities fit items included ‘The match is very good between the demands of my job and my personal skills’. This study yielded a reliability (Cronbach Alpha) for demands-abilities of $\alpha = 0.77$. Typical needs-supplies scale items included ‘There is a good fit between what my job offers me and what I am looking for in a job’. In this study the needs-supplies fit scale yielded a reliability (Cronbach Alpha) of $\alpha = 0.85$.

**Person-Host Culture Fit**

The person-host culture fit scale addresses how an individual perceives how they fit into the host culture of the new environment (non-work related). To the researcher’s knowledge, there are no existing scales measuring person-host culture fit. Based on previous research, the author compiled a fit measurement for host culture. It was adapted from Saks and Ashford (1997) (questions 1, 2, and 7) and Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) (questions 3-6). Instead of investigating the organisational culture as both Saks and Ashford, and Lauver and Kristof-Brown did, this research replaced the term ‘organisational culture’ with ‘host culture’ in the scales. This enabled the scale items to investigate the NCHDs’ perceived fit into the host culture as opposed to the organisational culture. Respondents answered 7 items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1- to a very little extent to 5- to a very large extent. Typical items included ‘To what extent are the values of the host culture similar to your own values?’, ‘To what extent is the host culture a good match for you?’ and ‘To what extent do you feel you are able to maintain your values in the host culture?’ This study yielded a reliability (Cronbach Alpha) for PHC fit of $\alpha = 0.80$. Confirmatory factor analysis was run on the scale which highlighted that item six (‘To what extent do you feel your values prevent you from fitting in to the host culture because they are different from your values’ -reverse scored-) loaded on a second component (see Appendix D). After much consideration, this item was excluded from the scale. The Cronbach Alpha for the final PHC fit scale used in this research increased to $\alpha = 0.85$. 
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3.8.3 Work-Related Outcome Measurements

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was assessed using three items from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Seashore, Lawler, Mirvis and Cammann, 1982). Each answer was rated on a 7-point Likert scale, with anchors ranging from 1-­‐strongly disagree to 7-­‐strongly agree. The scale included items such as, ‘all in all I am satisfied with my job’. One scale item was reversed scored. This study yielded a reliability (Cronbach Alpha) for job satisfaction of α = 0.69. The researcher considered this to be an acceptable scale as it is very close to 0.70 and therefore included in the study.

Task Performance

Task performance addressed the level of perceived performance an individual felt they achieved at work. This study utilises Goodman and Svyantek’s (1999) scale of task-based job performance. The scale consisted of nine items that assessed an individuals’ current performance. Each performance item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1-­‐not at all a characteristic to 7-­‐totally characteristic. The scale included items such as ‘achieves objectives of the job’ and ‘meets criteria for performance’. Participants were asked to consider to what extent they felt the statements contained their personal characteristics. This study yielded a reliability (Cronbach Alpha) for task performance of α = 0.94. The researcher acknowledges the possible consequence of the ‘halo effect’, which can arise from asking participants to self-rate their perceived level of task performance. Every effort was made to remedy such a problem; as much information as possible was provided to the participants on the purpose and use of this research in the information and instruction sheet (Appendix A). Furthermore, great care was taken in the scale ordering of task performance items included in the questionnaire. As this research is concerned with measuring
NCHDs’ perceived levels of cross-cultural adjustment and fit to working and living in Ireland, is was deemed appropriate to also determine their perceived level of task performance though a self-rated scale.

3.8.3.1 The nature of the tasks performed by NCHDs

NCHDs are doctors in training and are all temporary employees in Irish hospitals, except a small number who have been successfully before the Labour Court or the Rights Commissioner Service in attaining a contract of indefinite duration under the fixed Term work legislation. NCHDs working in Ireland have a number of roles and responsibilities that identify their tasks.

1. Managing complex decisions;
2. Exercising judgement;
3. Processing skills and expertise;
4. Facing diversity;
5. Precision;
6. Intense physical and demanding work;
7. Exposure to risk (e.g., needle stick injuries, patient aggression, litigation);
8. Team working;
9. Exercising persuasion and influence;
10. Managing resources;
11. Dealing with stress and uncertainty;
12. Teaching and mentoring medical students and/or more junior colleagues.

It is evident from the list of tasks above that NCHDs are not only responsible for patients’ medical care but they are expected to have a high level of effective interpersonal communication as well. This highlights the importance of investigating their CCA and identifying factors that can either influence/hinder their adjustment and work-related outcomes.

NCHDs careers in Ireland involve a constant rotation on a three, six or twelve month basis through hospitals across the country. There is no automatic
progression to a higher grade (senior house officer, registrar etc.) solely based on the length of time in the post nor automatic retention in that particular post beyond the agreed amount of time in their contract. The progression of NCHDs to a higher grade is entirely dependent on open competition and is not confined to the place of employment but open to both doctors in Ireland and abroad. Once NCHDs have completed their specialist training there is no further career progression available within the HSE until a post becomes available and is advertised and recruited openly.

NCHDs are key to the provision of frontline services and in addition to the above job tasks they are the only workers in the Health Service who are required to work compulsory overtime. The Irish Medical Board released a report in 2011 indicating the breakdown of hours worked on site by NCHDs. 70% of NCHD’s time on site (in the hospital) is spent on clinical and associated administrative work e.g., patient contract and associated administration (patient letters). 30% of their time is spent on other tasks including portering–bloods and x-rays and the administration of routine medications. 30% of NCHDs work between 50-60 hours a week. 24% work between 61-70 hours per week and 16 % work 71+ hours a week on site in the hospital. These long working hours can not only affect patient care, but also can affect the level of adjustment NCHDs achieve in the host culture. NCHDs spend a considerable amount of time away from their friends and family and are unable to achieve a ‘normal’ life in Ireland as they frequently have to move home and job.

3.9 Pilot Testing the Questionnaire

Once all the appropriate scales were selected the next step was to carefully compile them into a questionnaire. Following this, the researcher sought and was granted ethical approval for the research from the University of Limerick (Appendix B). The next stage was to conduct a pilot test to ensure that there was no difficulty understanding or answering the questions.
Pilot testing is essential in aiding the wording and sequence of the questions in the questionnaire. When done correctly pilot testing can reduce the non-response rates.

(Oppenheim, 1996:25)

Conducting a pilot test of the questionnaire before official administration to the relevant participants contains a great benefit. It can highlight issues with language use, physical layout or spelling, which might be wrong or cause possible ambiguity with the questionnaire. It is important when conducting a pilot test that the questionnaire is administered to individuals who are as close as possible to the research sample in the study. In order not to diminish the finite research sample of this study, the pilot test was carried out on mostly non-nationals living in Ireland, as they would be closest subjects to the sample as possible. Twenty-five pilot questionnaires were administered in total. Of them, 19 were to non-nationals living in Ireland and the remaining 6 were Irish natives. The 19 non-nationals were recruited through friends and were deemed appropriate proxies for the actual NCHDs, as the pilot test was only concerned if the questions in the questionnaire were comprehensible and unambiguous. All 19 of the non-nationals were asked to participate in the pilot test and were informed that their feedback in relation to the questionnaire would be required. In addition, the pilot test purposely included 6 Irish natives, as they might highlight different errors in the questionnaire design.

All of the non-nationals and Irish natives that were asked to participate in the pilot test consented to do so. Following this consent, each participant received the information and instruction sheet, the consent form and the questionnaire through the mail or by email. For reasons outside the researcher’s control, this research adopted a mixed-mode approach to administrating the final questionnaire (see section 3.10). It was therefore deemed appropriate to follow the same format in the pilot test. Of the 25 pilot questionnaires, 8 (6 non-nationals and 2 Irish natives) were administered personally, 8 (6 non-nationals and 2 Irish natives) were sent by mail and the remaining 9 (7 non-nationals and 2 Irish natives) were sent by email. The information and instruction sheet informed the native participants to complete the questionnaire as if they were non-
nationals in Ireland. The information and instruction sheet also encouraged all participants to suggest changes where they deemed them necessary or to supply any additional feedback they felt was important or could be useful the researcher.

All 25 respondents completed the questionnaire and on average the completion of the questionnaire took between 10-13 minutes. On a whole, the respondents understood the questions and found the questionnaire layout easy to follow. However, the comments and feedback were discussed and notes were taken on items that caused problems or ideas that the respondents had. There were no obvious differences between respondents’ suggestions from those who received the questionnaire personally, by postal mail or by e-mail. The main issues that arose with the questionnaire and the action taken to resolve them are highlighted in the Table 3.3 below. Once these issues were resolved, the next step was to administer the questionnaire to the sample. The following section describes the main field work phase of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing options</td>
<td>Respondents reported that for some questions a ‘don’t know’ or not applicable’ option was not available to them.</td>
<td>Questionnaire was reviewed and these options were inserted where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire design</td>
<td>Questionnaire had too many pages</td>
<td>Converted the last three pages of the questionnaire to horizontal format which allowed more items to fit on the page and look aesthetically pleasing to the eye.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.10 Main Fieldwork Phase

The main fieldwork took place between July 2010 and December 2010. As this research chose a sample consisting of medical professionals, certain ethical conduct had to be followed to gain access to the sample frame required. The HSE have stringent research ethics to protect both the medical staff and patients. Healthcare research can require participation of staff and patients in the scientific evaluation of new and established treatments and practices. This requires participant knowledge, consent and an understanding of the risks involved. Hence, the HSE ethics committees are in place to ensure the safety of participants and the creation of efficient systems to promote and encourage high quality research.

Initial contact was made with the HSE by telephone. A letter was then sent to them stating the aims of the study, the requested sample and the questionnaire, along with the information and instruction sheet and a consent form. Once the research was approved, a list of hospitals and their managers was sent to the researcher. Advice was given to contact each hospital and ask for ethical permission to administer the questionnaires to the relevant doctors. Some hospitals required the completion of ethical forms, which would then be discussed at their ethical meeting that was on average held once a month, where the decision for approval would be determined. Other hospitals suggested that the research did not need to go through the official board meetings, as it did not involve patients or trial medical treatment. In these cases permission was granted promptly.

3.11 Questionnaire Administration

One common clause in all participating hospitals was that the location of the premises should remain confidential. The researcher was given three main approaches to gain access to the relevant sample depending on the particular hospitals: 1) the questionnaire must be sent along with the information and
instruction sheet and the consent form to the hospital by e-mail and this would be distributed to the entire sample via email; 2) questionnaires sent via post, again including all the above documentation as well as a self-addressed return envelope, had to be sent to either the hospital or the list of addresses the hospital sent to the researcher. Once the hospital had received the package, they would administer the questionnaires to the relevant doctors (in their mail boxes), or the researcher would send out the questionnaire directly to the sample if postal information had been provided by the hospital; 3) finally, some hospitals preferred the researcher to visit the hospital personally and time was given after meetings (where all NCHDs were present) for the researcher to talk about the study and administer the questionnaires to those willing to participate. In this case, self-addressed envelopes were provided so that the questionnaire could be returned directly to the researcher. Also, a time of collection and a location (mainly the doctor’s residence) was arranged for those who wished to hand back the completed questionnaire personally.

This mixed-mode of questionnaire administration is becoming more popular due to advancements in technology and therefore the ability to gain access to a larger sample (Gravem, 2011). In this study the mixed-mode approach was the only option to access as much of the population as possible. Caution should be taken when using mixed-modes such as telephone questionnaires and postal questionnaires, as the sequence of the questions may be different (Bowling, 2005). As telephone questionnaires were not used in this study and the sequence and layout of the entire questionnaire was identical, Bowling’s concerns are unwarranted in this study. Gravem (2011) also indicated that when certain limitations are placed on the research, little can be done but to use different modes of collection. Dillman et al., (2009) suggests that mixed-mode approaches may lower costs, improve timeliness, reduce coverage errors, improve response rates and reduce non-response errors.

Upon administering the questionnaires, a coloured circle was placed on the top right hand corner of each questionnaire that corresponded to the mode in which that particular questionnaire was administered. The colour code was as follows: blue - personal administration, red - postal administration and green - e-mail
administration. When inputting the data from each questionnaire into SPSS the mode of administration was also inputted. On conversing with the Statistical Consultancy Unit in the University of Limerick, it was decided that a simple examination of the mean using independent analysis of variance (ANOVA) of each mode of collection should be carried out. This would identify if the three approaches of administration had any influence on the data obtained when comparing the three categories. This ANOVA test was run in SPSS and the results indicated that there was no significant difference between the mean of each method of administration, suggesting that the mixed-mode in this research did not generate substantially different responses.

One advantage that came from the personally administered questionnaires was that the vast majority of NCHDs offered additional information about their experience of working and living in Ireland after they had completed the questionnaire. Almost all the NCHDs (close to 160 NCHDs) who received the questionnaire personally gave additional information about their experience and their feelings of working in Ireland. The researcher took and retained informal notes on their perception of adjusting to Ireland. The NCHDs also gave additional written information on several of the postal and e-mail questionnaires (62 in total) that were returned to the researcher. These informal conversations and notes gave the researcher valuable insight into the adjustment and fit of NCHDs in Ireland and greater knowledge of their situation, both in work and non-work related environments. Such information assisted the researcher in making sense of some novel findings that have been presented in Chapter 4 of this research. Several NCHDs also contacted the researcher offering interviews or additional information where needed. Coupled with this, the author has received several e-mails asking for the findings of the research once completed.

### 3.12 Response Rate

Two key concerns when carrying out any type of survey research are the response rate and how representative the responses are of the total population.
The response rate in this research refers to the percentage of NCHDs that completed the survey. The higher the response rate the more reliable and useful the data is, whilst the lower the response rate the less accurate any characteristic generalisation of the sample towards the whole population of NCHDs would be. Monetary incentives on completion of the questionnaire were not considered as no funds were available to do so. However, to increase the response rate, a report was offered to all NCHDs who were interested in the research, which documented the main findings of the study once it had been completed. As mentioned in section 3.6, 34 hospitals gave permission for the research to be conducted in their hospital. In accordance with the sample size given, a total of 1,610 questionnaires were administered to the participating hospitals. From this, 369 useable questionnaires were received and yielded a response rate of 23%, which is considered an acceptable rate in the social sciences (Baruch, 1999) and much higher than the typical response rate of 10% in organisational research suggested by DeVellis (1991). Of those who responded and were included in the analysis, 62.6% were male (n = 268) and 27.4% were female (n = 101). Of the 1,610 questionnaires administered, 628 were personally administered and 190 were returned completed (yielding a 30% response rate), 657 were sent by post and 128 were returned completed (yielding a 19% response rate) and 325 were administered by e-mail with 51 returned completed (yielding a 15% response rate). Once the questionnaires were returned the next step was to analyse the data accordingly. The following section provides detailed information on the data handling and analysis techniques used.

3.13 Data Analysis

3.13.1 Preliminary Analyses

As the data was received, it was inputted manually into the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) version 16 by the researcher. The data was then screened for accuracy, which involved the researcher proofreading the original
data against the data inputted into SPSS. Following this, univariate descriptive frequencies and statistics were used to examine the data and identify any unusual data inputs i.e. miscoded data. Each of the variables in the data set was then checked for implausible values or out-of-range numbers. The minimum and maximum sets were analysed to ensure that they fell within the variation of the Likert scales. Both the mean and standard deviation were checked for plausibility. Any incorrectly transcribed data items identified through these analyses were checked against the original data items on the questionnaire and items in the SPSS data file were corrected. All missing data was coded as ‘999’ in the SPSS data file. This made it easier for the researcher to identify if a variable was genuinely missing (999) or was overlooked on input and SPSS coded it as missing. The Missing Value Analysis (MVA) in SPSS was carried out in accordance with Tabachnick and Fidell’s (2007) guidelines. The MVA highlighted that a small proportion of missing data was found in the questionnaire. Pairwise data deletion was employed where possible and appropriate, as recommended by Pallant (2007). Within the questionnaire, two negatively worded items were present among the scales, one in the job satisfaction scale and one in person-host culture scale. These two items were reversed before the total scores were calculated.

Following the data screening, the next step was to check variables for any violation of the assumed underlying correlation, regression and path analysis techniques. Most statistical techniques used to analyse quantitative data hold several basic assumptions. The four most common are: normally distributed data, homogeneity of variance, interval data and independence. According to Field (2005), the latter two can be measured by common sense. The most common assumption above is that the population exhibits a frequency distribution that falls to a normal curve (Sheskin, 2000). The closer the score is to the mean, the more it occurs. All of the statistical techniques used in this research assume that the distribution of scores on the dependent variable is ‘normal’. This can be described as a symmetrical, bell-shaped curve, which presents the greatest frequency scores in the middle with the smaller frequencies towards the extremes
A visual examination of the variables curve indicated the type of distribution concerned. The normal curve line presented in the histograms gives an idea where the distribution should lie, indicating whether the variables are normal or not. Additional tests were performed to investigate normality: mean score versus trimmed mean score, skewness and kurtosis scores and kolmogorov-smirnov tests. These results are presented in Appendix C. It was concluded that the data in this research fit the criterion of normally distributed data.

Following this, factor analysis using varimax rotation was employed in the analysis to validate all the scales used in the research questionnaire and used principal components analysis (PCA). Prior to performing PCA, the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed (Appendix D). Factor analyses were run on all previously developed scales and the results were normal. It is important when developing a new scale to present the factor analysis of it, thus factor analysis was also performed on the person-host culture fit scale. The final results demonstrated that all items exhibited a factor loading of greater than 0.329, which is in the guidelines suggested by Stevens (1992) and the Cronbach Alpha was 0.846, indicating the high reliability of the scale. In addition, parallel analysis was conducted and the results confirmed the one factor solution (see Appendix D). These results demonstrated that the PHC fit scale was a reliable measurement of PHC fit.

### 3.13.2 Correlation, Regression and Path Analysis

Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r) (Pearson, 1938; Pallant, 2007) was used in this research to investigate: 1) the relationships among the independent variables (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC fit), 2) the relationships among the dependent variables (general adjustment, interaction adjustment, work adjustment, job satisfaction and task performance), and 3) the relationships between the independent and dependent variables. This study adopts Cohen’s (1988) suggestion that the relationship size should be reported in terms of what correlation constitutes a small or large relationship. According to Cohen (1988) $r = 0.10$ represents a small relationship, which can explain 1% of the total
variance. A medium relationship represents \( r = 0.30 \), which can explain 9% of the total variance, and \( r = 0.50 \) represents a large relationship which can explain 25% of the total variance. The results are presented in the findings chapter of this research.

In order to determine the direct and indirect relationship between overall adjustment, PE fit and work-related outcomes, this research will use Baron and Kenny’s (1986) four step approach. Before this step approach is described it is important to identify that when assessing the indirect relationship in path analysis, an intervening variable(s) is required. Chapter 2 of this study supplied several sub-hypotheses indicating expected indirect relationships between the dimensions of PE fit and both work-related outcomes when using the facets of overall adjustment as intervening variables. These sub-hypotheses were drawn from the logical assumption (based on past research presented in the literature review) that increased PE fit can result in increased overall adjustment, which in turn can result in increased work-related outcomes. It is important to note that this research does not aim to determine the causality of such relationships but merely to indicate whether the relationships exist. Perhaps, once the initial aims of this study are answered, further research could be conducted into the causal relationship between overall adjustment, PE fit and work-related outcomes.

Within this analysis the term ‘causal model’ must be understood to mean a model that conveys causal assumptions and not automatically a model that produces validated causal conclusions. Hence, the researcher notes that a good fit with the path model in this study does not rule out equally good fit by another model consistent with different hypotheses (Olobatuyi, 2006). Consequently, it is important to understand that correlation in the path analysis does not imply causality. To believe that confirmation of a causal model implies proof or validation is false (Olobatuyi, 2006).

As mentioned above, Baron and Kenny’s (1986) four step approach was adopted as a data analysis technique to address the aims and answer the hypotheses presented in Chapter 2. In order to conduct a path analysis using intervening variables there must be 1) a relationship between the independent and intervening variables, 2) a relationship between the intervening variables and the
dependent variables, and 3) a relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Once these relationships exist, it is deemed appropriate to investigate the direct and indirect relationships using the chosen intervening variables, resulting in step four. Hence, step one in this study investigated the relationship between the independent variables (dimensions of PE fit) and intervening variables (facets of adjustment) using stepwise backward regression analysis. Step two investigated the relationship between the intervening variables (facets of adjustment) and the dependent variables (both work-related outcome variables) using stepwise backward multiple regression. Step three, investigated the relationship between the independent variables (dimensions of PE fit) and the dependent variables (both work-related outcome variables), again using stepwise backward multiple regression. Finally, step four conducted path analysis using linear structural relations LISREL in order to determine the direct and indirect relationships between the facets of adjustment, the dimensions of PE fit and both work-related outcomes. In step four the dimensions of PE fit were the independent variables, the facets of adjustment were the intervening variables and work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance) were the dependent variables. This step approach is considered in statistics to be a concrete approach to a final path model (Preacher and Hayes, 2004). This research used LISREL and considered it the appropriate path analysis package due to its ease of coding and compatibility with SPSS.

It is important to note that path analysis is not a substitute of regression analyses but rather a complementary methodology to regression analysis. A set of additional regressions is added to the original regression analysis to trace out indirect relationships. Path analysis started in the 1930s as a method of studying direct and indirect relationships of variables, while the regression analysis model remains as a method of discovering causal relationships (Pedhazur, 1997). In addition, the variables are considered to be directly observed and therefore the measurements are seen to be free from measurement error. Because of this complexity, a path diagram is typically used to display all of the causal relationships (Jeonghoon, 2002). The path diagram, besides showing the nature and direction of causal relationships, also includes estimates of the strength of those relationships, the path coefficients. A coefficient is the standardised slope
of the regression of the dependent variable on the independent variable when all other independent variables are taken into account. Path analysis is a special case of structural equation modelling (SEM) and is an extension of multiple regression to multivariate multiple regression. Therefore, the assumptions of multiple regression analysis extend to path analysis. The exploratory data analysis, descriptive analysis, correlation analysis and regression analysis were all performed in SPSS. Once completed, data was then transferred to preprocess for LISREL (PRELIS), a precursor/pre-processor to LISREL. LISREL does not use raw data as found in SPSS so PRELIS was used to calculate the correct matrix for use in LISREL. LISREL then conducted all analyses based on a correlation of matrices or covariance matrices. The results are presented in the next chapter.

3.14 Conclusion

This chapter set out the methodological approach employed in the study. This thesis was described as taking a positivistic approach to the research, chosen because it was the most appropriate method to answer the research aims. NCHDs were chosen to be the sample group for this research for the following two reasons 1) the level of international migration has increased significantly over the past decade with the introduction of globalisation. Past research on cross-cultural adjustment has focused its attention on expatriates within the private sector, mainly MNCs. Because of this, there is an evident lack of research on the expatriate adjustment of public sector workers and, 2) Ireland is heavily reliant on foreign doctors to fill the void of medical staff in public sector hospitals. Following the justification of the sample choice, this chapter identified the population of NCHDS in Ireland and selecting the sample.

The quantitative approach of this research was highlighted along with the development of the questionnaire. A detailed review of the questionnaire’s scales measuring overall adjustment, PE fit and both work-related outcome variables was supplied. Once the questionnaire was designed, a pilot test was conducted
consisting of 25 participants, 19 of whom where non-nationals and 6 Irish natives. Appropriate amendments were made to the questionnaire after receiving the suggestions and advice from the 25 participants. Due to constraints made by the hospitals, the researcher was left with no choice but to use mixed-mode administration techniques to ensure access to the sample was as high as possible. The questionnaire was administered personally, by post or by e-mail and the fieldwork took place from July 2010 to December 2010, yielding a response rate of 23%.

The final section of the chapter detailed the techniques used for data handling, the preliminary analysis and the main data analysis. A four step approach proposed by Baron and Kenny’s (1986) was employed in this research. Step one to three, stepwise backward multiple regression was used to indicate the direct relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Step four used path analysis to identify the direct and indirect relationships on the independent and dependent variables.

The following chapter will give a detailed account of the research findings.
Chapter 4 Findings

4.1 Introduction

This research aims 1) to investigate the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment, and 2) to investigate the relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance). Chapter 3 gave a thorough account of the data analysis techniques used in this study to achieve the aims highlighted above. The results of these analyses are given in this chapter.

The chapter is divided into two sections. The first section provides a detailed description of the sample and the second section presents the results of the data analysis conducted. The correlation analysis of all PE fit dimensions (PS, PO, PJDA, PJNS and PHC), facets of cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work) and both work-related outcomes (task performance and job satisfaction) is provided. The findings of the relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes are then presented. The results of Baron and Kenny’s (1986) four step approach using backward multiple regression is then given, demonstrating the direct relationships between the dimensions of PE fit (PS, PO, PJDA, PJNS, and PHC), facets of cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work) and both work-related outcomes (task performance and job satisfaction). The results of step four, path analysis, demonstrating the direct and indirect relationships among PE fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes is also given. All hypotheses and sub-hypotheses in Chapter 2 are then addressed and the results summarised in a concluding table.
4.2 Description of the Sample

As mentioned in the previous chapter, three methods of data collection were utilised in this study, as presented in Table 4.1. Personal administration and collection accounted for 51.5% (n=190) of the returned questionnaires, postal administration and collection accounted for 34.7% (n=128) of the returned questionnaires and e-mail administration and accounted for 13.8% (n=51) of the returned questionnaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal collection</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to the low e-mail percentage, it is important to note that the majority of NCHDs do not have hospital e-mail addresses, therefore the use of e-mail questionnaires was limited. Table 4.2 highlights the gender of respondents categorised by nationality.
The majority of respondents who completed the questionnaire were male 72.6% (n=268) with females accounting for 27.4% (n=101). The average age of respondents fell between 31-40 years of age (38.8%), coming mainly from Africa (46.3%) and Asia (40.9%) to Ireland. Table 4.3 displays the age of respondents categorised by gender.

Table 4.2 Gender (Categorised by Nationality)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Age (Categorised by Gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In relation to age, 38.8% (n=143) of the respondents were between the ages of 31-40 while 37.7% (n=139) were between the ages of 20-30. Respondents over the age of 41 accounted for 23.6% (n=87) of the responses. Table 4.3 shows that significantly more females 68.3% (n=69) were under the age of 30 compared to 26.1% (n=70) of males. In addition, significantly less females 5% (n=5) were over the age of 41 compared to 30.6% (n=82) of males. Table 4.4 presents detailed breakdown of participants’ nationalities categorised by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 above breaks down the respondents’ nationalities using the 7 continent model (Africa, Asia, South America, North America, Australasia, Europe and Antarctica). The majority of respondents were from Africa 46.3% (n=171) mainly Sudan and Nigeria. Egypt and Asia accounted for 40.9% (n=151) and respondents were mainly from Pakistan, Malaysia and India. Europe accounted for 7.6% (n=28), with respondents mainly from Poland and Britain. North America accounted for 3.3% (n=12) and respondents were mainly from Canada and America. A very small proportion of the sample 1.1% (n=4) were from
South America and Australasia 0.8% (n=3). This finding supports the HSE research that found the majority of NCHDs are from Africa and Asia. These results are combined in Hofstede’s (2005) cultural dimensions summary in Table 4.5. Sudan and Egypt fall into the category of the Arabic world and Nigeria falls into West Africa.

Table 4.5 Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Power-Distance</th>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Masculinity</th>
<th>Uncertainty Avoidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic World</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ireland scored the lowest in power-distance in comparison to the other countries. This indicates that NCHDs from the five countries are more comfortable with a larger status differential than Ireland. High power-distance countries are indicative if a high level of inequality of power and wealth within the society. In general, high power-distance cultures tend to be collectivistic than low power-distance cultures. This is true in relation to this research. All five countries with high power-distance are more collectivist where Ireland in more individualistic. These collectivistic cultures tend to be more group-orientated. When in conflict, collectivist cultures are more likely to use avoidance, intermediaries or other face saving techniques. In contrast, individualistic cultures (Ireland) value self-expression, speak out to resolve problems and are likely to use be confrontational strategies when dealing with interpersonal problems. Ireland is also the highest in masculinity, which suggests that as a culture they believe in achievement and ambition. They are said to have distinct expectations of male and female roles in society. All of the countries above are in the mid-range, indicating that they are a mix of masculinity and femininity. Feminine cultures prefer equality between sexes and less prescriptive role behaviours associated with each gender. The more feminine cultures have a greater ambiguity in what is expected of each gender. Finally, Ireland scored the lowest on uncertainty avoidance (35),
followed closely by Malaysia (36) and India (40). Cultures that have a low uncertainty score have a high tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity while cultures with high uncertainty avoidance (Arabic world, West Africa, Pakistan) prefer formal rules and any uncertainty can express itself in increased levels of anxiety. High uncertainty avoidance countries tend to develop many rules to control social behaviour, whereas low uncertainty avoidance countries need few rules to control social behaviour.

The above paragraph highlights the difference that NCHDs experience when working in Ireland. As mentioned in the literature review, in order for expatriates to adjust they must come to terms with the various differences in the host culture. It is clear from Hofstede’s (2005) cultural dimension summary that there is a high cultural distance between the host culture and the home culture of NCHDs.

Results relating to gender were broadly similar for both males and females. Table 4.6 presents the marital status of respondents categorised by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/separated</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked about their marital status, as it has been suggested that this can influence successful cross-cultural adjustment (Black et al., 1991). In total, 66.1% (n=244) of the sample were married and 33.9% (n=125) were single or separated. Breaking this statistic down further shows that only 1.4% (n=5) were separated. It is not common practice to divorce in Africa or Asia so the
majority of respondents under single or separated category were indeed single. A higher percentage of females (55.4%) were single or separated compared to only 25.7% of males. Of the respondents who were married, it was important to ask if their spouse was with them on their assignment as this can influence cross-cultural adjustment. Table 4.7 presents these results and have been categorised by gender.

Table 4.7 Spouse on Assignment (Categorised by Gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse on assignment</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 66.1% (n=244) of respondents that were married, 55% (n=203) stated that their spouse was with them on their assignment in Ireland. A small number, 11.1% (n=41), stated that their spouse was not with them on their assignment. Table 4.8 presents the type of medical registration the respondents held while in Ireland categorised by gender.
Table 4.8 Medical Registration (Categorised by Gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Registration</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee Specialist</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/General</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked what type of medical registration they had while working in Ireland. The majority, 48.8% (n=180) had specialist or general registration. Over 30% (n=111) of the respondents were trainee specialists and 20.1% (n=74) were interns at the hospitals. A further 1.1% (n=4) stated ‘other’ but did not clarify what type of registration ‘other’ was. Interestingly, 36.6% (n=37) of females were on an internship in Ireland compared to only 13.8% of males. The 58.2% of males (n=156) had specialist or general registration compared to only 23.8% (n=24) of the female respondents. Table 4.9 presents the length of time the respondents had been working in Ireland categorised by gender.
Respondents were asked about the length of time they had been working in Ireland. The majority of respondents had been working in Ireland for over three years 56.9% (n=210), 24.4% (n=90) had been working in Ireland between one and three years and 18.4% (n=68) had been working in Ireland for less and one year. The length of time spent so far in Ireland is approximately the same for both genders. Respondents were asked if they experienced any difficulty understanding the Irish accent while on contract in Ireland. Table 4.10 presents the results categorised by gender.
Table 4.10 Difficulty Understanding the Irish Accent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty understanding the Irish accent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes all</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctors and patients</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patients and socially</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>364</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5 individuals did not indicate if they experienced difficulty understanding the Irish accent)

The findings of this question were very interesting, with 62.1% (n=229) of the participants stating they had difficulty understanding the overall Irish accent. This was further broken down into the following: difficulty understanding Irish doctors 1.6% (n=6), difficulty understanding Irish patients 13.6% (n=50), difficulty understanding Irish people socially 14.6% (n=54), difficulty understanding Irish doctors and patients 1.4% (n=5), difficulty understanding Irish patients and Irish people socially 4.3% (n=16) and yes to all of the aforementioned 26.3% (n=97). Over 65% of all females admitted to having difficulty understanding the Irish accent upon arrival, not too dissimilar from the 60.8% of males. More females (25.7%) had difficulty understanding Irish doctors and Irish patients, which is much larger than the difficulty reported by males (13.4%). However, 20.5% of males identified having difficulty understanding Irish patients and Irish people in a social setting in comparison to a much lesser degree of female 14.9%. Over 36% (n=135) stated that they had no difficulty understanding the Irish accent. A further 1.4% (n=5) did not answer this question. Following from this, respondents indicated the length of time they felt
it took to fully understand the Irish accent. Table 4.11 presents the results categorised by gender.

Table 4.11 Length of Time it Took to Fully Understand the Irish Accent (Categorised by Gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time to understand the Irish accent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 6 months</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11 months</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7 individuals did not indicate how long it took to understand the Irish accent)

A total of 84.1% of all respondents indicated that it took a degree of time to understand the Irish accent. Of this, the females (86.2%) took slightly more time and had a little more difficulty than males (83.2%). Over 53% of the respondents (the highest percentage in the categories for both male [52.2%] and female [56.4%]) took less than six months to get used to the Irish accent. Furthermore, in understanding the Irish accent it took 16% (n=59) of all respondents between 6-11 months, 9.8% (n=36) between 1-2 years and 4.9% (n=18) over two year. An additional 3.8% (n=14) specified that they have never got used to the Irish
accent, however 10.3% (n=14) reported never having issues understanding the Irish accent with males (11.2%) demonstrating this more than females (7.9%).

The following section provides the results of the data analysis techniques used in the research. The bivariate correlation matrix is presented showing the relationships among the dependent variables (facets of cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes) and the independent variables (dimensions of PE fit).

4.3 Correlation Analysis

Table 4.12 Bivariate Correlations Matrix - All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  General Adjustment</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Interaction Adjustment</td>
<td>.121*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Work Adjustment</td>
<td>.701**</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Person-Supervisor</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Person-Organisation</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Person-Job NS</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>.522**</td>
<td>.304**</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>.557**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Person-Job DA</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.281**</td>
<td>.388**</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>.495**</td>
<td>.641**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Person-Host Culture</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Task Performance</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td>.419**</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.607**</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>.278**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*.Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-Tailed).

**.Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-Tailed).

4.3.1 Relationship among the Dependent Variables

One small, positive, statistically significant, relationship exists between general adjustment and interaction adjustment (r = 0.121, p < .05), suggesting that high levels of interaction adjustment are positively correlated with general adjustment. Two medium, positive, statistically significant, relationships exist between general adjustment and task performance (r = 0.316, p < .01) and job satisfaction (r = 0.320, p < .01), suggesting that NCHDs with higher levels of general
adjustment will experience increased task performance and job satisfaction. A large, positive, statistically significant, relationship exists between general adjustment and work adjustment \( (r = 0.701, p < .01) \), suggesting that NCHDs with higher levels of work adjustment are more likely to experience increased levels of general adjustment. Work adjustment has a positive, medium, statistically significant relationship with both task performance \( (r = 0.381, p < .01) \) and job satisfaction \( (r = 0.341, p < .01) \), suggesting that NCHDs with higher levels of task performance and higher levels of job satisfaction are more likely to experience increased work adjustment. Job satisfaction has a small, positive, statistically significant, relationship with task performance \( (r = 0.278, p < .01) \), suggesting that high levels of job satisfaction are positively correlated with task performance.

4.3.2 Relationship among the Independent and Dependent variables

All five independent variables that make up PE fit when combined (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA, PHC) are statistically significantly correlated with the three facets of overall cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work), as displayed in Table 4.12 above. A number of small, positive, statistically significant, relationships exist between general adjustment and PS fit \( (r = 0.266, p < .01) \), suggesting that high levels of PS fit are positively correlated with general adjustment; PO fit \( (r = 0.288, p < .01) \), suggesting that high levels of PO fit are positively correlated with general adjustment; PJNS fit \( (r = 0.288, p < .01) \), suggesting that high levels of PJNS fit are positively correlated with general adjustment and PJDA \( (r = 0.290, p < .01) \), suggesting that high levels of PJDA fit are positively correlated with general adjustment. One positive, medium, statistically significant, relationship exists between general adjustment and PHC fit \( (r = 0.455, p < .01) \), suggesting that NCHDs perceiving high levels of PHC fit are more likely to experience general adjustment.
A large, positive, statistically significant, relationship exists between interaction adjustment and PJNS fit ($r = 0.522, p < .01$), suggesting that NCHDs with higher levels of PJNS are more likely to experience interaction adjustment. A medium, positive, statistically significant, relationship exists between interaction adjustment and PO fit ($r = 0.331, p < .01$), suggesting that higher levels of perceived PO are positively correlated with interaction adjustment. Two small, positive, statistically significant, relationships exist between interaction adjustment and PJDA fit ($r = 0.281, p < .01$) and PHC fit ($r = 0.238, p < .01$).

One small, positive, statistically significant, relationship exists between work adjustment and PS fit ($r = 0.244, p < .01$), suggesting that higher levels in PS fit is positively correlated with work adjustment. A number of medium, positive, statistically significant, relationships exist between work adjustment and PO organisation fit ($r = 0.322, p < .01$), PJNS ($r = 0.304, p < .01$), PJDA fit ($r = 0.388, p < .01$) and PHC ($r = 0.388, p < .01$), suggesting that NCHDs who perceive higher levels of PO, PJNS, PJDA and/or PHC are likely to achieve greater work adjustment.

Two small, positive, statistically significant, relationships exist between task performance and PJNS fit ($r = 0.167, p < .01$) and PHC fit ($r = 0.194, p < .01$), suggesting that higher levels of PJNS fit and PHC fit are positively correlated with task performance. Three positive, statistically significant, relationships exist between task performance and PS fit ($r = 0.323, p < .01$), PO fit ($r = 0.325, p < .01$), and PJDA fit ($r = 0.389, p < .01$), suggesting that NCHDs with higher levels of PS, PO and/or PJDA fit are likely to experience higher levels of task performance.

Job satisfaction had a small, positive, statistically significant, relationship with PHC fit ($r = 0.271, p < .01$), suggesting that high levels of job satisfaction are positively correlated with PHC fit. Job satisfaction have two medium, statistically significant, positive, relationships with PS fit ($r = 0.419, p < .01$) and PO fit ($r = 0.486, p < .01$), suggesting that higher levels of job satisfaction increases NCHDs PS and PO fit. Job satisfaction had two large, statistically significant, relationships with PJNS ($r = 0.652, p < .01$) and PJDA ($r = 0.607$,
suggesting that NCHDs with higher levels of PJNS and/or PJDA fit are likely to experience an increase in their job satisfaction.

4.3.3 Relationship among Independent Variables

Four large, positive, statistically significant, relationships exist between the independent variables. PO fit and PJNS fit have a large relationship ($r = 0.557, p < .01$), indicating that NCHDs with high levels of PO fit will also have high levels of PJNS fit. A large, positive, statistically significant, relationship between PJNS fit and PJDA fit ($r = 0.641, p < .01$), which suggests that NCHDs who have perceived high levels of PJNS fit will also tend to experience perceived high levels of PJDA fit.

Several medium, statistically significant, relationships exist between the independent variables, PO fit ($r = 0.472, p < .01$), PJNS fit ($r = 0.334, p < .01$) and PJDA fit ($r = 0.310, p < .01$). A small, positive, statistically significant relationship exists between PS fit and PHC fit ($r = 0.229, p < .01$).

Three medium, statistically significant, positive, relationships exist between PJNS fit ($r = 0.470, p < .01$), PJDA fit ($r = 0.419, p < .01$) and PHC fit ($r = 0.356, p < .01$). PO fit has a medium, positive, statistically significant, relationship with PJDA ($r = 0.495, p < .01$) and PHC fit ($r = 0.349, p < .01$). A small positive statistically significant relationship exists between PO fit and task performance ($r = 0.325, p < .01$), indicating that a higher levels of PO fit can increase the performance of NCHDs work.

PJNS fit has a medium, positive, statistically significant, relationship with PHC fit ($r = 0.320, p < .01$) and PJNS fit has a small, positive, statistically significant, relationship with task performance ($r = 0.167, p < .01$). PJDA fit has a medium, positive, statistically significant, relationship with task performance ($r = 0.389, p < .01$) and a small, positive, statistically significant, relationship with PHC fit ($r = 0.192, p < .01$). Task performance has a small, positive, statistically significant relationship with PHC fit ($r = 0.194, p < .01$).
The bivariate correlations matrix (Table 4.12) presents the relationships among all independent (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC fit) and dependent variables (general adjustment, interaction adjustment, work adjustment, job satisfaction and task performance). As mentioned in Chapter 2 and 3 of this study, cross-cultural adjustment consists of three facets (general, interaction and work), which when combined together measure overall cross-cultural adjustment (Black, 1988). PE fit is an umbrella term consisting of several dimensions. In this study, PE fit consists of five dimensions (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC). Assuming that each of the dimensions of PE fit are of equal importance, it is appropriate to combine them into one overall measurement of PE fit by obtaining the overall mean score. Factor analysis was run on all fit dimensions and displayed that they all loaded onto one component. Both job satisfaction and task performance were treated as overall work-related outcomes, where the factor analysis showed that they loaded onto one component and the mean score was obtained to generate overall work-related outcomes. Table 4.13 presents the findings from Spearman’s correlation matrix of the overall relationship between PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes.

4.4 Correlation Analysis of Overall Relationships

Table 4.13 Bivariate Correlations Matrix- Overall Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Overall Cross-Cultural Adjustment</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Overall PE Fit</td>
<td><strong>.580</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Overall Work-Related Outcomes</td>
<td><strong>.427</strong></td>
<td><strong>.682</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
A large, statistically significant, relationship exists between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment \((r = 0.580, p < .01)\), suggesting that NCHDs who experience high levels of overall PE fit also experience an increase in their overall cross-cultural adjustment. Overall cross-cultural adjustment had a medium, statistically significant, relationship with overall work-related outcomes \((r = 0.427, p < .01)\), suggesting that NCHDs with higher levels of overall cross-cultural adjustment experience higher levels of overall work-related outcomes. A large, positive, statistically significant, relationship exists between overall PE fit and overall work-related outcomes \((r = 0.682, p < .01)\). Such a relationship suggests that NCHDs with high levels of overall PE fit experience higher levels of work-related outcomes.

Model 4.1 below demonstrates a medium, positive, statistically significant, relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment. Furthermore, the model shows that both overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment have a strong, positive, statistically significant, relationship with overall work-related outcomes. NCHDs who experience high levels of overall fit (measured by high scores on fit scales), experience increased overall cross-cultural adjustment (measured by high scores on cross-cultural adjustment scale). In addition, NCHDs with higher levels of overall PE fit and overall adjustment have increased overall work-related outcomes (measured by high scores on work-related outcome scales).

The above findings suggest that there is a statistically significant relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes. These findings support hypotheses A and B presented in the research literature:

Hypothesis A: There will be a positive, statistically significant, relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment.

Hypothesis B: There will be a positive, statistically significant relationship, between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes.
Having established the relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and their impact on overall work-related outcomes, three important questions arise: 1) which dimensions of PE fit (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC) explain the most variance in cross-cultural adjustment? 2) which dimensions of PE fit (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC) and facets of cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work) contribute most to the variance explained in work-related outcomes (task performance and job satisfaction)? and 3) which dimensions of PE fit (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC) explain the most variance in work-related outcomes (task performance and job satisfaction) when the facets of cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work) are used as intervening variables? This study uses path analysis to establish direct and indirect relationships among these variables. Prior to running path analysis, Baron and Kenny’s (1986) four step approach must be followed to determine if using intervening variable(s) (cross-cultural adjustment in this study) is viable (discussed in Chapter 3). If there is evidence of 1) a direct relationship between the dimensions of PE fit and the facets of cross-cultural adjustment, 2) a direct relationship between facets of cross-cultural adjustment and both work-related outcomes, and 3) a direct relationship between the dimensions of PE fit and both work-related outcomes, then there is support for using the facets of cross-cultural adjustment as intervening variables. Hence, step one of the data analysis
approach is to investigate the relationships between the dimensions of PE fit (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA, and PHC fit) and the facets of overall cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work adjustment) using regression analysis.

4.5 Multiple Regression Analysis of the Data

This section presents the results of the multiple regression analysis. As outlined in Chapter 3, all of the multiple regression analyses were carried out using SPSS. All three dependent variables of cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work adjustment) were assessed individually with the independent variables (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC fit) to determine the relationship between them. Regression analyses were run on job satisfaction and task performance (independent variables) and both cross-cultural adjustment and PE fit variables (dependent variables). The results of each are presented in the following section.

The backward elimination procedure was employed in the analysis. Initially the regression equation for the full set of predictors is determined. Then for each variable in turn both the reduction in $R^2$, which would occur if the variables were deleted and the $F$ ratio associated with that deletion are computed. The variable that yields the smallest non-significant $F$ ratio is deleted. The entire process is then repeated with the remaining predictors and continues in this manner until all $F$ ratios are significant or until the deletion of another variable would produce an $R^2$ significantly lower than the $R^2$ for the full set (Pallant, 2010).

4.5.1 Step One: Multiple Regression of General Adjustment and PE Fit Variables

Descriptive statistics for the general adjustment multiple regression model, including controls for PE fit variables, are presented in Table 4.14.
### Table 4.14 Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Adjustment</td>
<td>4.8834</td>
<td>1.05315</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>3.5295</td>
<td>.76483</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organisation Fit</td>
<td>3.3498</td>
<td>.70902</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job NS Fit</td>
<td>4.5063</td>
<td>1.44218</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job DA Fit</td>
<td>5.2156</td>
<td>1.21177</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture Fit</td>
<td>3.1739</td>
<td>.69142</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The backward regression approach was employed to determine the relationship all fit variables had with general adjustment. Variables with high significance were pulled out from the data and the test was rerun. This method continued until all remaining fit variables were significant. The residual plots were examined for genuine linear relationships and variables that were not useful were removed. The adjusted $R^2$ was continuously noted as a method of evaluating the fit of the model. Chapter 3 discussed the preliminary analyses that were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity.

The $R^2$ indicates how much of the variance in the dependant variable (general adjustment) is explained by the model (which includes the variables of PE fit). In order to assess the statistical significance of this result it is necessary to look at the ANOVA Table. This tests the null hypothesis that the multiple $R$ in the population equals 0. The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 26.2%, $F (5,357) = 25.401$, $p < .001$ (Table 4.14: Model 1). When taking all five variables into account (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC fit) the model explained 26.2% of overall general adjustment.
### Table 4.15 Regression Results: General Adjustment and PE Fit Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>General Adjustment</th>
<th>General Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.117*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organisation Fit</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job NS Fit</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job DA Fit</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.167**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture Fit</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.389***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UB** = Unstandardised Coefficient, **SB** = Standardised Coefficient

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05

In order to determine which PE fit variables included in the model contribute to the prediction of general adjustment, it is important to examine the coefficients. Variance inflation factor (VIF) and variance proportion were analysed and indicated no issue with multicollinearity. PHC fit made the strongest unique contribution to explaining general adjustment (β = 0.389) and was statistically significant (sig. = 0.000). The beta for PJDA fit was lower (β = 0.167) but made a statistically significant contribution to explaining general adjustment (sig. = 0.006), and to a lesser degree PS fit (β = 0.117) made a statistically significant contribution to the model (sig. 0.025). PJNS fit and PO fit held very weak contributions (PJNS β = 0.014, PO β = 0.007,) and neither were statistically significant (PJNS sig. = 0.883, PO sig. = 0.913).

Person-organisation fit was deleted from the model and the test was rerun. The $R^2$ did not change with the deletion and remained at 26.2%. Upon examination of the coefficient tables, PJNS fit presented a significance level of sig = .801 and was the next independent variable to be removed from the model. Studentized residuals were plotted against the predicted values (Appendix E) and the model presented one outlier (case 3) that, when deleted from the data, resulted in a small increase in the $R^2$ (28.1%).
The total variance explained by the new model (Table 4.1: Model 2) as a whole was 28.7%, \( F (3,361) = 48.448, p < .001 \). According to Kinnear and Gray (2009), this model is considered to have a large relationship as the \( R^2 \) is greater than 10%. With both PO fit and PJNS fit removed, the model showed that all remaining independent variables were significant. VIF and variance proportion were analysed and indicated no issue with multicollinearity. Both PHC fit (\( \beta = 0.413; \text{Sig.} = 0.000 \)) and PJDA fit (\( \beta = 0.193; \text{sig.} = 0.000 \)) make the strongest unique contribution to explaining general adjustment. To a lesser degree PS fit (\( \beta = 0.117 \)) makes a statistically significant contribution to the model (sig. 0.014). The multiple regression model for general adjustment is presented below.

**Multiple Regression Model for General Adjustment**

\[
\text{General Adjustment} = 1.509 + 0.158 \times \text{person-supervisor fit} + 0.165 \times \text{person-job DA fit} + 0.662 \times \text{person-host culture fit}.
\]

The multiple regression model takes the form of ‘\( y = a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 \ldots + bnx \)’ where \( Y \) is the dependent variable that the equation is trying to predict, in this case general adjustment. \( B \) stands for the independent variables that are being used to predict \( Y \) (PS fit, PJDA fit and PHC fit). \( A \) is the \( Y \)-intercept of the line. The values of \( a \) and \( b \) are selected so the square of the regression residuals is minimised. The residual plots were examined for genuine linear relationships for PS fit, PJDA Fit and PHC fit and tables are presented in Appendix F.

An increase of one unit in general adjustment will, on average, increase PS fit by 0.158. An increase of one unit in general adjustment will, on average, increase PS fit and PJDA fit by 0.165. An increase of one unit in general adjustment will, on average, increase PS fit, PJDA and PHC fit by 0.622. In order to determine if the demographic variables had influence on the model a test of the between-subjects effect was run. The results (Appendix G) presented that none of the demographic variables were found to be significant and the relationships found
between general adjustment and PE fit variables remained significant when all relevant demographics were taken into account.

4.5.2 Multiple Regression of Interaction Adjustment and PE Fit Variables

Descriptive statistics for the interaction adjustment multiple regression model including controls for fit variables are presented in Table 4.16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Adjustment</td>
<td>4.1080</td>
<td>.86828</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>3.5295</td>
<td>.76483</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organisation Fit</td>
<td>3.3498</td>
<td>.70902</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job NS Fit</td>
<td>4.5063</td>
<td>1.44218</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job DA Fit</td>
<td>5.2156</td>
<td>1.21177</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture Fit</td>
<td>3.1739</td>
<td>.69142</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Backward regression approach was used to determine the relationship that all PE fit variables had with interaction adjustment. Variables with a high significance were pulled out from the data and the test was rerun. This method continued until all remaining fit variables became significant. The residual plots were examined for genuine linear relationships and variables that were not useful were removed. The adjusted $R^2$ was continuously noted as a method of evaluating the fit of the model. Chapter 3 discussed the preliminary analyses that were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity.
Table 4.17 Regression Results: Interaction Adjustment and PE Fit Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Interaction Adjustment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Interaction Adjustment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organisation Fit</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job NS Fit</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.548**</td>
<td>8.665</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.522**</td>
<td>11.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job DA Fit</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>-1.484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture Fit</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>1.617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>29.240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136.790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UB= Unstandardised Coefficient, SB= Standardised Coefficients
***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05

The $R^2$ indicates how much of the variance in the dependant variable (interaction adjustment) is explained by the model (which includes the variables of PE fit). In order to assess the statistical significance of this result, it is necessary to look again at the ANOVA Table. The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 29.1%, $F (5,357) = 29.240$, $p < .001$ (Table 4.17: Model 1). When taking all five variables into account (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC fit) the model explained 29.1% of overall interaction adjustment.

In order to determine which PE fit variables included in the model contribute to the prediction of the interaction adjustment, it is important to examine the coefficients. VIF and variance proportion were analysed and indicated no issue with multicollinearity. PJNS fit makes the strongest unique contribution to explaining interaction adjustment ($\beta = 0.548$) and was statistically significant (sig. = 0.000). The contributions for the remaining PE fit variables were weak. Person-organisation fit was the first independent variable to be removed from the regression as it had the highest significance (sig. = .248; $\beta = .069$). The $R^2$ did not
change significantly with the deletion of PO fit ($R^2 = 28.8\%$). PJDA fit ($\beta = -0.075; \text{sig.} = 0.198$) was the next independent variable to be removed from the data due to its high significance.

The regression was rerun and the $R^2$ was 28.5%. PS fit was removed from the regression as it had the highest significance ($\beta= -0.089; \text{sig.} 0.63$) after PJDA fit was removed. The $R^2$ after the regression was rerun was 27.8%. Following this PHC fit was removed from the regression model as it had the next highest significance ($\beta= 0.079; \text{sig.} 0.92$). After removing four of the five independent variables (PO, PJDA, PS, and PHC fit), the remaining independent variable (PJNS fit) remained significant ($\beta = 0.522; \text{Sig.} =0.000$). VIF and variance proportion were analysed and indicated no issue with multicollinearity. The total variance explained by the model as a whole after the backward regression was completed was 27.2%, $F (1,366) = 136.790$, $p < .001$ (Table 4.17: Model 2). The multiple regression model for interaction adjustment is presented below.

**Multiple Regression Model for Interaction Adjustment**

\[
\text{Interaction Adjustment} = 2.693+0.314 \times \text{person-job NS fit}
\]

The multiple regression model takes the form of ‘$y = a+b_1x_1+b_2x_2 \ldots b_nx$’ where $Y$ is the dependent variable that the equation is trying to predict, in this case interaction adjustment. $B$ signifies the independent variables, which are being used to predict $Y$ (PJNS fit). $A$ is the $Y$-intercept of the line. The values of $a$ and $b$ are selected so the square of the regression residuals is minimised. An increase of one unit in interaction adjustment will on average increase PJNS fit by 0.314. Studentized residuals were plotted against the predictor value and were shown to be consistent with the assumption of the regression model (Appendix H).

In order to determine if the demographic variables had an influence on the model, a test between-subjects effect was run. The results (Appendix I) suggested that none of the demographic variables were found to influence the
relationship between interaction adjustment and PJNS fit, and the relationship between interaction adjustment and PJNS fit remained significant when all relevant demographics were taken into account.

4.5.3 Multiple Regression of Work Adjustment and PE Fit Variables

Descriptive statistics for the work adjustment multiple regression model, including controls for PE fit variables, are presented in Table 4.18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Adjustment</td>
<td>5.0659</td>
<td>1.16103</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>3.5295</td>
<td>0.76483</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organisation Fit</td>
<td>3.3498</td>
<td>0.70902</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job NS Fit</td>
<td>4.5063</td>
<td>1.44218</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job DA Fit</td>
<td>5.2156</td>
<td>1.21177</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture Fit</td>
<td>3.1739</td>
<td>0.69142</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Backward regression approach was used to determine the relationship that all PE fit variables had with work adjustment. Variables with high significance were pulled out from the data and the test was rerun. This method continued until all remaining fit variables became significant. The residual plots were examined for genuine linear relationships and variables that were not useful were removed. The adjusted $R^2$ was continuously noted as a method of evaluating the fit of the model. Chapter 3 discussed the preliminary analyses that were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity.

The $R^2$ indicates how much of the variance in the dependant variable (work adjustment) is explained by the model (which includes the variables of PE Fit).
In order to assess the statistical significance of this result, it is necessary to look again at the ANOVA Table. The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 26%, $F (5,357) = 25.061, p < .001$ (Table 4.19: Model 1).

Table 4.19 Regression Results: Work Adjustment and Fit Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Work Adjustment</th>
<th>Work Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organisation Fit</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job NS Fit</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job DA Fit</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.311***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture Fit</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.309***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R²            | .260 | .275 |
| F             | 25.061 | 68.610 |
| DF            | 5    | 2    |
| N             | 362  | 364  |

UB= Unstandardised Coefficient, SB= Standardised Coefficients

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05

In order to determine which PE fit variables included in the model contribute to the prediction of the work adjustment, it is important to examine the coefficients. VIF and variance proportion were analysed and indicated no issue with multicollinearity. PJDA fit ($\beta = 0.311; \text{sig.} = 0.000$) and PHC fit ($\beta = 0.309; \text{sig.} = 0.000$) make the strongest statistically significant contribution when explaining work adjustment. The contributions by the remaining PE fit variables were deemed weak. PJNS fit was the first independent variable to be removed from the regression as it had the highest significance ($\text{sig.} = 0.463; \beta = 0.048$). PJNS fit was deleted from the model and the test was rerun. The $R^2$ did not change significantly with the deletion and remained extremely close to the original 26% at 25.9%.

After PJNS fit was deleted from the model, the next independent variable to be removed due to its high significance level was PO fit ($\text{Sig.} = 0.462, \beta = 0.043$).
The $R^2$ remained very close to the original $R^2$ at 25.8%, suggesting that the assumption for deletion was correct. One remaining independent variable still presented a high significance level of sig = 1.08. Person-supervisor fit was deleted from the equation and the model was rerun and indicated that all remaining independent variables were statistically significant to the work adjustment regression model. The $R^2$ for the work adjustment model was 25.2%. When studentized, residuals were plotted against the predicted values (Appendix J) and the model presented one outlier (case 3). Deleting the outlier from the data resulted in an increase in the $R^2$ to 27.5% (Table 4.19: Model 2). VIF and variance proportion were analysed and indicated no issue with multicollinearity. The multiple regression model for work adjustment is presented below.

**Multiple Regression Model for Work Adjustment**

\[ \text{Work Adjustment} = 1.609 + 0.321 \times \text{person-job DA fit} + 0.566 \times \text{person-host culture fit} \]

The multiple regression model takes the form of ‘$y = a + b1x1 + b2x2 \ldots bnx’$ where $Y$ is the dependent variable that the equation is trying to predict, in this case work adjustment. $B$ stands for the independent variables that are being used to predict $Y$ (PJDA fit and PHC fit). $A$ is the $Y$-intercept of the line. The values of $a$ and $b$ are selected so the square of the regression residuals is minimised. An increase of one unit in work adjustment will on average increase PJDA fit by 0.321. An increase of one unit in work adjustment will on average increase PJDA fit and PHC fit by 0.566. The residual plots were examined for genuine linear relationships for PJDA fit and PHC fit and tables are presented in Appendix K).

In order to determine if the demographic variables had an influence on the model, a test between-subjects effect was run. The results (Appendix L) presented that none of the demographic variables were found to influence the
relationship between work adjustment, PJDA and PCH fit and the relationship between work adjustment, PJDA and PHC fit remained significant when all relevant demographics were taken into account.

Step one of the analysis investigated the direct relations between the dimensions of PE fit and the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment. The results indicated that PS fit, PJDA fit and PHC fit had a statistically significant relationship with general adjustment. PJNS fit was the only dimension of PE fit that had a statistically significant relationship with interaction adjustment. Finally, PJDA fit and PHC fit had a statistically significant relationship with work adjustment.

4.6 Step 2: Multiple Regression of Overall Adjustment and Work-Related Outcome Variables –Direct Relationship-

Step two of the data analysis approach (Baron and Kenny, 1986) was to investigate the relationship between the intervening variables and the dependent variables. The intervening variables-which are the independent variables-(general, interaction and work adjustment) and the dependent variables (task performance and job satisfaction) were investigated using regression analysis. The results are presented in section 4.6.

The results of the regression analysis for overall cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work adjustment) and work-related outcome variables (task performance and job satisfaction) are presented in Table 4.19. The VIF and variance proportion were analysed and indicated no issue with multicollinearity. The studentized residuals were plotted against the predicted values and the model presented no issue with outliers. Demographic variables had no influence on the model and residual plots were examined and found genuine linear relationships.

Work adjustment was the only cross-cultural adjustment variable that had a statistically significant positive relationship with task performance ($\beta = 0.313; \text{sig.} = 0.000$). The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 15.2%, $F$
(3,362) = 21.645, p < .001 (Table 4.20). When assessing the relationship of overall cross-cultural adjustment with job satisfaction, the regression model indicated that work adjustment was again positively and significantly related to job satisfaction (β = 0.228; sig. = 0.001). General adjustment was also found to have a positive statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction (β = 0.159; sig. = 0.021). The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 12.9%, $F(3,364) = 18.023$, p < .001 (Table 4.20).

### Table 4.20 Regression Results: Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Outcome Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Adjustment</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Adjustment</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Adjustment</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UB= Unstandardised Coefficient, SB= Standardised Coefficients

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05

Step two of the data analysis approach investigated the relationship between the intervening variables (general, interaction and work adjustment) and the dependent variables (job satisfaction and task performance). The results of the multiple regression analysis indicated that work adjustment had a statistically significant relationship with task performance and both work and general adjustment were found to have a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction.
4.7 Step 3: Multiple Regression on PE Fit and Work-Related Outcome Variables –Direct Relationship-

Step three of the data analysis approach (Baron and Kenny, 1986) is to investigate the relationship between the independent variables (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC fit) and the dependent variables (task performance and job satisfaction) using regression analysis. The results are presented in section 4.7.

The results of regression analysis for PE fit (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC fit) and work-related outcomes variables (task performance and job satisfaction) are presented in Table 4.20. Again through an examination of the VIF and variance proportion, multicollinearity was not a problem. Studentized residuals were plotted against the predicted values and the model presented no issue with outliers. Demographic variables have no influence on the model and residual plots were examined and found genuine linear relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.194***</td>
<td>3.661</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.180***</td>
<td>4.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organisation Fit</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.150*</td>
<td>2.387</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job NS Fit</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>-.286***</td>
<td>-4.371</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.376***</td>
<td>7.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job DA Fit</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.400***</td>
<td>6.443</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.280***</td>
<td>5.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture Fit</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.107*</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td></td>
<td>.514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>22.176</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression analysis demonstrated that all PE fit variables had a statistically significant relationship with task performance. PJDA fit had the highest statistically significant positive relationship with task performance ($\beta = 0.400$; sig. = 0.000). PJNS fit had a negatively, statistically significant, relationship with
task performance ($\beta = -0.286; \text{sig.} = 0.000$). In addition, person-supervisor fit was found to have a positive, statistically significant, relationship with task performance ($\beta = 0.194; \text{sig.} = 0.000$). Both person-organisation fit ($\beta = 0.150; \text{sig.} = 0.017$) and person-host culture fit ($\beta = 0.107; \text{sig.} = 0.033$) were found to have a positive, significant relationship, with task performance. The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 23.9%, $F(5,354) = 22.176, p < .001$ (Table 4.2).

The regression analysis showed that three PE fit variables have a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction. PJNS fit had the highest, statistically significant, positive, relationship with job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.376; \text{sig.} = 0.000$). PJDA fit had a positive, statistically significant, relationship with job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.280; \text{sig.} = 0.000$) and person-supervisor fit had a positive, statistically significant, relationship with job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.180; \text{sig.} = 0.000$). Person-organisation and person-host culture fit did not yield a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction. The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 51.4%, $F(5,346) = 75.445, p < .001$ (Table 4.2).

The above backward regression models demonstrate that there is a direct relationship between 1) PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment variables 2) cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcome variables and 3) PE fit and work-related outcome variables. Statistically significant relationships exist between PE fit, facets of cross-cultural adjustment and both work-related outcomes, hence using the facets of cross-cultural adjustment as intervening variables is deemed appropriate by the researcher (Baron and Kenny, 1986). The next step (step four) brings these three regression models together and identifies the direct and indirect relationships between PE fit and the work-related outcome measures (task performance and job satisfaction) when using the facets of cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work adjustment) as intervening variables. An extension of multiple regression is used called path analysis, as this allows us to identify both direct and indirect relationships simultaneously as discussed in detail in Chapter 3 of the thesis.
4.4 Step 4: Path Analysis

Path analysis determines the overall model fit and parameter estimates. Abnormal data increases the likelihood of a model being rejected that may not be false and indicate that particular parameter estimates are statistically significant different from zero when it may not be the case. LISREL allows the modeller to use generalised least-square (GLS) instead of the maximum likelihood (ML), which is used by default in LISREL to calculate the overall model of chi-square test, parameter estimates and standard errors where data is assumed to be abnormal. It is recommended in path analysis to use the maximum likelihood estimator when fitting a model to data that has been drawn from a population with variables that are assumed to be normally and continuously distributed in the population from which the sample is gathered. There were no significant differences between the standard parameter estimates using GLS and ML. Hence, the data presented in the following section is drawn from the ML analysis.

4.4.1 Overall Model Fit

The original framework, model 1, does not fit the data (Chi-squared =224.65 , df= 18, P =0.0000, RMSEA =0.178) as indicated by path model 1: Explaining the Overall Relationship between PE Fit, Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Work-Related Outcomes in Appendix M). The significance value of the root mean square of error approximation (RMSEA) is above the acceptable level of 0.08 as suggested by Steiger (1990). It is normal that some adjustments are made to the model as some paths that were significant in the multiple regression analysis may become insignificant in the path analysis with the introduction of intervening variables. With the use of modification indices to the framework results, LISREL suggests four modifications, which were then made to the output model. Two paths were removed from the model, the PS fit path to general adjustment and the PJDA fit path to general adjustment. Two additional paths were added to the model: the work adjustment path to general adjustment and an interaction
adjustment path to job satisfaction. With the suggested modification completed, the output model 2 (see Figure 2. Path Model 2: Explaining the Overall Relationship between PE Fit, Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Work-Related Outcomes) offers a better fit than the input model 1, with the increase of Chi-square, decrease of P-value and RMSEA below 0.08 (Chi-Square = 31.95, DF =19, P = 0.03167, RMSEA = 0.043). The RMSEA of the output model 2 is 0.043 indicating that it is a good fit for the data (<0.08). The Chi-square in the output model 2 is 31.95, suggesting that the second model is a good fit. Ullman (2001) identifies that two or less reflects good fit. Kline (1998) says three or less is acceptable. Some researchers allow values as high as five to be considered as a model adequate fit (e.g. Schumacker and Lomax, 2004). Less than 1.0 is a poor model fit. Hoelter’s critical N (CN), also called the Hoelter index, is used to judge if sample size is adequate. By convention, sample size is adequate if Hoelter's CN > 200. CN for the output of model 2 is 416.20, indicating that the second model is a good fit. The comparative fit index (CFI) devised by Bentler (1990) suggests that CFI close to 1 indicates a very good fit. Output model 2 for this research fits the data well according to this assumption. The CFI for the output model is 0.99. CFI should be equal to or greater than 0.90 to accept the model, indicating that 90% of the covariation of the data can be reproduced by the given model.

4.4.2 Predicative Ability of the Model

Job satisfaction explains the most variance of the work-related outcomes variables at 61% (R² = 0.61). Task performance explains a medium amount of the variance of outcome variables at 28% (R² = 0.28). General adjustment explains the most variance of the cross-cultural adjustment domains at 53% (R² = 0.53), interaction adjustment accounts for 27% (R² = 0.27) of the variance explained and work adjustment accounts for 25% (R² = 0.25) of the variance of cross-cultural adjustment.
The path diagram indicates that the four fit variables (PS, PO, PJNS and PJDA) correlate with each other, which is expected. In addition, it also supports the correlation matrix and regression analysis identifying that PHC fit has significant correlations with all four existing fit variables (PS = β= 0.23, p < .05; PO = β= 0.35, p < .05; PJNS = β= 0.32, p < .05; and PJDA = β= 0.19, p < .05). The path analysis holds that PHC fit has a significant, positive, relationship with general adjustment (β= 0.21, p < .05). However, unlike the regression analysis no statistically significant relationship was found between PS fit, PJDA fit and general adjustment.

PO fit had no relationship with any of the cross-cultural adjustment variables as suggested in the regression analysis. In line with the regression, the path model identifies that only one strong relationship between overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall PE fit exists in the model, namely PJNS and interaction adjustment (β= 0.52, p < .05). PJDA fit and PHC fit have a medium relationship with work adjustment (PJDA β= 0.33, p < .05, PHC = β= 0.33, p < .05) as indicated also in the regression model.

The path diagram (Diagram 2: Path Model 2) indicates that work adjustment has a strong relationship with general adjustment (β= 0.61, p <.05), which has been noted previously in the correlation analysis. Work adjustment has a positive, significant, relationship with task performance (β= 0.24, p < .05) as indicated also by the regression analysis. Unlike the regression model, work and general adjustment were found to have no relationship with job satisfaction. However, interaction adjustment suggests a medium, negative, relationship with job satisfaction (β= - 0.36, p < .05). Similar to the regression model, PS fit (β= 0.18, p < .05), PO fit (β= 0.15, p < .05) and PJDA fit (β = 0.33, p < .05) had a positive, significant, relationship with task performance. PJNS fit has a negative, direct, relationship with task performance. (β= -0.27, p < .05). In addition, PJNS fit was also found to have an indirect, negative, relationship with job satisfaction through interaction adjustment (β= - 0.19, p< .05). No significant direct path existed between PHC fit and task performance but an indirect relationship was found to exist between the two through work adjustment (β= 0.08, p< .05.). PS fit
(β= 0.18, p< .05,) has a positive relationship with job satisfaction and PJNS (β= 0.62, p < .05) has a significant relationship with task performance. PJDA fit (β= 0.26, p < .05) has a direct relationship with task performance, as suggested in regression analysis. Furthermore, the path analysis suggests that PJDA fit has an indirect relationship with task performance through work adjustment (β= 0.08, p< .05,).
Diagram 2. Path Model 2 Explaining the Overall Relationship between PE Fit, Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Work-Related Outcomes
4.4.3 Hypotheses Testing

Direct Relationships: Overall PE Fit and Overall Cross-Cultural Adjustment

Sub-hypotheses A1 and A3 are rejected as no direct relationship was found between PS fit and all three facets of cross-cultural adjustment, and PO fit and all three facets of cross-cultural adjustment respectively. In the backward regression analysis, a small, positive, relationship was found between PS fit and general adjustment. However, when taking all other variables into account in model 2, this relationship was lost. Sub-hypotheses A6 is partially accepted, while no positive, direct relationship was found between PJDA fit and interaction adjustment, a positive, direct relationship exists between PJNS fit and interaction adjustment (A6) ($\beta = 0.52$, $p < .05$), suggesting that NCHDs with higher levels of PJNS fit have higher levels of interaction adjustment. Sub-hypothesis A8 is accepted as a positive, direct relationship exists between PHC fit and general adjustment ($\beta = 0.21$, $p < .05$). This suggests that NCHDs with higher levels of PHC fit experience higher levels of general adjustment. In addition to this finding, a positive, direct relationship exists between PHC fit and work adjustment ($\beta = 0.33$, $p < .05$), therefore partially rejecting sub-hypothesis A9 (that no relationship will exist between PHC fit and work adjustment). This suggests that NCHDs with higher levels of PHC fit experience higher levels of and work adjustment. Sub-hypothesis A4 is accepted as a positive, direct relationship exists between PJDA fit and work adjustment ($\beta = 0.33$, $p < .05$), which suggests that NCHDs with higher levels of PJDA fit experience higher levels of work adjustment.
**Direct Relationships: Overall Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Work-Related Outcomes**

Sub-hypotheses B1 and B3 are rejected as no relationship is found between general adjustment and job satisfaction (B1), or between work adjustment and job satisfaction (B3). Sub-hypothesis B2 is rejected as a negative relationship exists between interaction adjustment and job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.36$, $p < .05$), unusually suggesting that an increase in NCHDs’ interaction adjustment decreased their job satisfaction. Sub-hypotheses B8 and B9 are accepted as no relationship is found between general adjustment and task performance (B8), and interaction adjustment and task performance (B9).

**Direct Relationships: PE Fit and Work-Related Outcomes**

Sub-hypotheses B4, B7, B11 and B13 are accepted. PS fit has a positive relationship with job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.18$, $p < .05$) (B4), suggesting that NCHDs with high levels of PS fit have high levels of job satisfaction. PJNS fit ($\beta = 0.62$, $p < .05$) and PJDA fit ($\beta = 0.26$, $p < .05$) has a positive relationship with job satisfaction (B7), suggesting that NCHDs with increased PJNS and PJDA fit have increased levels of job satisfaction. PS fit has a positive relationship with task performance ($\beta = 0.18$, $p < .05$) (B11), suggesting that NCHDs with high levels of PS fit have high levels of task performance, and PO fit has a positive relationship with task performance ($\beta = 0.15$, $p < .05$) (B13), suggesting that NCHDs with high levels of PO fit have high levels of task performance. Partial support is found for sub-hypotheses B14, as PJDA fit has a positive relationship with task performance ($\beta = 0.33$, $p < .05$), which suggests that NCHDs with high levels of PJDA fit have high levels of task performance. Unusually PJNS fit has a negative relationship with task performance ($\beta = -0.27$, $p < .05$), suggesting that NCHDs with high levels of PJNS fit decrease their task performance. This result
is discussed in further detail in Chapter 5 of this research. Sub-hypothesis B6 is rejected as PO fit has no relationship with job satisfaction.

**Indirect Relationships**

Sub-hypotheses B4.1, B6.1, B11.1 and B13.1 are rejected. No indirect relationship exists between PS fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction (B4.1). No indirect relationship exists between PO fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction (B6.1). No indirect relationship exists between PS fit, work adjustment and task performance (B11.1). No indirect relationship exists between PO fit, work adjustment and task performance (B13.1).

No support was found for sub-hypothesis B7.2 where we anticipated that there would be a positive, indirect relationship, between PJDA fit, interaction and work adjustment, and job satisfaction. While no indirect relationship exists between PJDA fit, interaction and work adjustment, and job satisfaction, a negative indirect relationship exists between PJNS and job satisfaction through interaction adjustment (β= -0.19, p < .05).

Sub-hypothesis B7.1 suggests that a positive, indirect, relationship will exist between PJNS fit, interaction adjustment and job satisfaction. However, this research found a negative indirect relationship exists between PJNS and job satisfaction through interaction adjustment (β= -0.19, p < .05), therefore not supporting sub-hypothesis B7.1. For every one unit increase in PJNS leads to a decrease in NCHDs job satisfaction. This finding is unusual as one may expect that NCHDs reporting high levels of PJNS fit and high levels of interaction adjustment would also report higher levels of job satisfaction. This finding is discussed in detail in Chapter 5 of this thesis. PJNS has a total relationship with job satisfaction of β= 0.43, p < .05. This relationship is calculated by adding the direct and indirect relationships. This means that there is a predicted unit change
of 0.43 in job satisfaction, which is due to a unit change in PJNS if all the other variables are left untouched.

Support was found for sub-hypothesis B14.1, which states that a positive, indirect, relationship will exist between PJDA fit, work adjustment and task performance. PJDA has an indirect, positive, relationship with task performance through work adjustment ($\beta = 0.08$, $p < .05$). This suggests that a one unit increase in PJDA fit leads to a 0.08 unit increase in task performance. PJDA has a total relationship with task performance (addition of direct and indirect relationships) of $\beta = 0.41$, $p < .05$. This is interpreted as a 0.41 predicted unit change in task performance, which is due to a unit change in PJDA, as long as all the other variables in the model are left untouched except for changes originating in the hypothetical unit change in PJDA.

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter presented the key findings of the research conducted to investigate 1) the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment, and 2) the relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance).

A detailed description of the sample was given in section 4.2. The majority of respondents were male, between the ages of 31-40, married and mainly from Africa and Asia. Of the respondents who were married, a large percentage had their spouse and family with them in Ireland. The majority of NCHDs’ registration was specialist or generalist, followed by trainee specialist and then NCHDs on internship. Of all the respondents, 210 had been working in Ireland for over three years and did not have previous international work experience before their current position. The majority of NCHDs stated that they did not have a realistic preview of what their job and life would be like in Ireland prior to coming. Of the NCHDs who had received a realistic preview of working and living in Ireland, they mentioned that the information was supplied from friends.
already working in Ireland and not by the hospitals. The vast majority of NCHDs received no intercultural training prior to departure or upon arrival. Over half the NCHDs admitted having difficulty understanding the Irish accent upon arrival, with the biggest difficulty occurring whilst trying to understand other Irish doctors and patients. Just over half the NCHDs said it took less than six months to understand the Irish accent, 95 NCHDs stated it took between 6 months and two years to understand the Irish accent and a small amount reported that after two years they still did not understand the Irish accent. The vast majority of NCHDs proclaimed they would not feel sorry to leave Ireland, the hospital they worked in or their current position they held after their contract ended. The NCHDs were asked if they could choose freely, where they would prefer to live and the highest response rate to this question was their home country.

Section 4.3 presented the bivariate correlations matrix of all independent (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC fit) and dependent (general adjustment, interaction adjustment, work adjustment, task performance and job satisfaction) variables. Following this, section 4.4 addressed the overall relationship between PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes. Each of the five dimensions of PE fit were combined into one overall measurement of PE fit by obtaining the overall mean scores. This was also done for overall work-related outcomes and overall cross-cultural adjustment. The bivariate correlations matrix was presented on the three overall measurements (overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes). The results demonstrate that a positive statistically significant relationship exists between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes, accepting hypotheses A and B presented in Chapter 2 of this research (see Table 4.22).

Once the overall relationship was determined, it was necessary to investigate the relationship between the individual dimensions of overall PE fit (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC fit), overall cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work adjustment), and overall work-related outcomes (task performance and job satisfaction), allowing the researcher to investigate the extent of the variance explained by each of the variables. The research adopts Baron and Kenny's (1986) four step approach to investigating the direct and indirect relationships.
between the dimensions of PE fit and work-related outcomes using the facets of cross-cultural adjustment as intervening variables. Step one involved investigating the relationship between the independent variables (PS, PO, PJDA, PJNS and PHC fit) and the intervening variables (general, interaction and work adjustment) using backward multiple regression. The results demonstrate that PS fit and PJDA fit explain the most variance in general adjustment (section 4.5.1), PJNS fit explains the most variance in interaction adjustment (section 4.5.2) and PJDA fit and PHC fit explain the most variance in work adjustment (section 4.5.3). The second step of Baron and Kenny’s (1986) step approach was to investigate the relationship between the intervening variables and the dependent variables (task performance and job satisfaction) using backward multiple regression. The results demonstrate that work adjustment explains the most variance in task performance and work adjustment and general adjustment explain the most variance in job satisfaction (section 4.6). The third step of Baron and Kenny’s (1986) step approach was to investigate the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables. The results show that all PE fit variables (PS, PO, PJDA, PJNS and PHC fit) have a statistically significant relationship with task performance, with PS, PJDA and PJNS fit having a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction. All the three steps of Baron and Kenny’s (1986) approach find a direct relationship between the independent, dependent and intervening variables. From these results it was deemed appropriate (Preacher and Hayes, 2004) to investigate the indirect and direct relationships between the dimensions of PE fit, facets of cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes in step four. Section 4.4 presents the results of step four using path analysis. A visual model is presented that demonstrates the direct and indirect relationships between PE fit and work-related outcomes when the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment are used as intervening variables. Section 4.4.4 answers the sub-hypotheses A and B that were given in the literature. A summary of the results are presented in Table 4.22. In the next chapter the key findings will be discussed in light of enfolding literature.
### Table 4.22 Revision of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis A</td>
<td>There will be a positive, statistically significant, relationship between PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis A1</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between PS fit and the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment: a) general, b) interaction, c) work adjustment</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis A3</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between PO fit and the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment: a) general, b) interaction, c) work adjustment</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis A4</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between PJDA fit and work adjustment</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis A5</td>
<td>No direct relationship will exist between PJNS fit and work adjustment</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis A6</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between PJNS and PJDA fit and interaction adjustment</td>
<td>Partially Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis A7</td>
<td>No direct relationship will exist between PJNS fit and PJDA fit and general adjustment</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis A8</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between PHC fit and general adjustment</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis A9</td>
<td>No relationship will exist between PHC fit and interaction and work adjustment</td>
<td>Partially Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses B</td>
<td>There will be a positive, statistically significant, relationship between PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment, and work-related outcomes</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis B1</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between general adjustment and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis B2</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between interaction adjustment and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis B3</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between work adjustment and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis B4</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between PS fit and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis B4.1</td>
<td>A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PS fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis B6</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between PO fit and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis B6.1</td>
<td>A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PO fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis B7</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between PJDA and PJNS fit and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis B7.1</td>
<td>A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PJNS fit, interaction and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis B7.2</td>
<td>A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PJDA fit, interaction and work adjustment and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis B8</td>
<td>No direct relationship will exist between general adjustment and task performance</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-hypothesis</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>No direct relationship will exist between interaction adjustment and task performance</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between work adjustment and task performance</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between PS fit and task performance</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11.1</td>
<td>A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PS fit, work adjustment and task performance</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between PO fit and task performance</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13.1</td>
<td>A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PO fit, work adjustment and task performance</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>A positive, direct relationship will exist between PJNS and PJDA fit and task performance</td>
<td>Partially Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14.1</td>
<td>A positive, indirect relationship will exist between PJDA fit, work adjustment and task performance</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-hypotheses 2, 5, 8, 12, and 12.1 are deleted from this table as they relate to PG fit which is excluded from the study due to an unreliable scale measurement (see Chapter 3)
Chapter 5 Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

The core aims of the research were to ascertain 1) the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment, and 2) the relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance). Past research suggests that high levels of PE fit impact positively on employee outcomes, such as cross-cultural adjustment (e.g. Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), yet little is known about the process through which PE fit relates to cross-cultural adjustment. As discussed in the literature review, successful cross-cultural adjustment consists of expatriates adjusting to the host culture, the job role and interacting with HCNs while on the international contract (e.g. Black, 1988; Black et al., 1991; Hechanova et al., 2003; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2003; Peltokorpi, 2008; Festing and Maletzky, 2011). When combined, these three facets of cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work adjustment) measure overall cross-cultural adjustment (e.g. Black and Gregersen, 1990; Black and Gregersen, 1991; McEvoy and Parker, 1993; Shaffer, Harrison and Gilley, 1999; Selmer, 2005; Selmer, 2009; Selmer, 2011).

The dominant approach of past studies on PE fit has been to examine the fit between the individual and one aspect of the work environment (cf Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). The reality, however, is that an individual does not only interact with one aspect of the host environment, they are required to interact with and fit into various aspects of the host environment simultaneously (Jansen and Kristof-Brown, 2006). Hence, this research investigates several dimensions of PE fit individually (person-supervisor fit, person-organisation fit, person-job fit and person-host culture fit) and also combines them in order to establish overall PE fit to living and working in the host environment. With regards to work-related outcomes in PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment literature, two commonly cited (Kraimer et al., 2001; Shaffer et al., 2006; Osman-Gani and
Rockstuhl, 2008) work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance) are combined in this research to measure overall work-related outcomes.

Chapter 4 of this research presented the findings of the data analysis and highlighted a number of key results. This chapter is divided into two main sections: Section A and Section B so that different sections can be referred to later in this Chapter. The intention of the first is to draw together these key findings and discuss them in light of the enfolding literature provided in Chapter 2 of the study. Section B presents the theoretical, methodological and empirical contributions alongside the practical implications of this research. In addition, this section will also examine the limitations inherent within the research with the view to providing some suggestions for future research.

**Section A: Discussion**

The following section discusses the research findings on the relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes.

**5.2 Relationship between overall PE fit and overall CCA and WRO**

This research found evidence to support the claim that there is a positive relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment, leading us to accept hypothesis A, that there will be a positive, statistically significant, relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment. The finding suggests that NCHDs who perceive higher levels of PE fit (consisting of PS, PO, PJDA, PJNS and PHC fit) experience an increase in their overall cross-cultural adjustment (consisting of general, interaction and work adjustment). Therefore, it is suggested that an increase in NCHDs’ PE fit is likely to increase their adjustment to working and living in Ireland. At the outset it was recognised that overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment were likely to have a
positive relationship with each other, as PE fit had been defined as a method for understanding the process of adjustment between individual and the environment. The finding indicates that when goodness of fit is achieved between the individual and the various aspects of the environment combined (e.g. supervisor, group, organisation and job) a certain degree of overall adjustment is obtained.

This finding supplies empirical evidence that mirrors past literature by Jansen and Kristof-Brown (2006), who found that adjustment is a consequence of good PE fit. The results of this research indicate that if expatriates perceive high levels of overall PE fit they also perceive high levels of overall cross-cultural adjustment. It was established in the literature review that high levels of cross-cultural adjustment reduces expatriate uncertainties and withdrawal cognitions in the host culture. Managing turnover is of great importance to organisations and indeed those who recruit expatriates. It is in an organisation’s interest to decrease their level of turnover, as this is known to be a costly process. The finding in this research can supply organisations with additional insight into the factors that may influence and aid cross-cultural adjustment. From this finding we suggest that the various dimensions that make up overall PE fit (PS, PO, PJNS, PJDA and PHC fit) have the ability to influence the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work adjustment). The findings of this research indicate that high levels of overall PE fit increases overall cross-cultural adjustment, which can reduce uncertainties and therefore turnover. Thus, the researcher suggests that is likely that poor levels of overall PE fit will reduce overall cross-cultural adjustment, which increases uncertainties and turnover.

Within an organisation’s selection and recruitment process, particular attention should be paid to employing expatriates who ‘match’ or ‘fit’ the various aspects of the host environment (work and non-work). This ‘match’ or ‘fit’ can be achieved in the employee selection practices by using established strategies to assess overall PE fit. For example, in a cross-cultural context, résumé screening can be used at the early stages of the selection process to identify individuals who have the ability and technical skills required for the position. Following the screening process, researchers note that the employment interview is the single
most important situation in which the concept of fit plays a major role (cf Sekiguchi, 2004). Assessing overall PE fit within an interview can provide valuable information for HR in relation to the individual’s values, personality and beliefs, all of which can create a profile of the person. When recruiting and hiring expatriates for an international contract, HR may find it useful to consider what values employees believe are important. While the initial selection and recruitment process is vital in identifying the individuals who are more suited to the organisation, continuous policies and procedures need to be put in place to maintain a good PE fit. The findings of this research indicate that good overall PE fit has a positive relationship with overall cross-cultural adjustment, thus it is likely that failure to nurture the overall PE fit relationship could lead to maladjustment, resulting in increased intent to quit the contract prematurely.

One could easily presume that overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment are very similar constructs, as adjustment itself is a label used to describe the person-environment relationship (Caplan, 1987). Taking into account that the terms ‘fit’ and ‘adjustment’ have in some cases been used interchangeably when discussing PE fit, one could easily conclude from such literature that both constructs are very alike in nature. These claims have been based on theoretical assumptions rather than sound empirical evidence. The findings of this research indicate that this is not the case. This research indicates that there is a relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment. However this relationship does not have such a strong correlation that one could presume both models are measuring the same phenomenon. In fact, the findings suggest a medium relationship exists between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment. The strength of the relationship found between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment informs us that both models are related and also independent of each other. The overall PE fit investigates the degree of ‘fit’ an employee has both within and outside the organisation, whilst overall cross-cultural adjustment measures the degree to which an employee feel they have adjusted to various aspects of the host culture, making PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment two distinct concepts. If an employee indicates that they have high levels of overall PE fit this does not mean that they have adjusted to the various aspects of the host culture, it simply means that they perceive a
degree of fit between themselves and the environment (inside and outside of work). For this reason, future researchers should avoid using the terms ‘fit’ and ‘adjustment’ interchangeably when measuring PE fit. Both constructs are distinct to some degree and should be treated as such within literature.

This research not only investigates the relationships between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment, it also explores the relationships between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes. Two prominent work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance) were discussed in detail in the literature review, and were combined to establish the overall work-related outcomes. These work-related outcomes are viewed as fundamental outcomes PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment (Takeuchi et al., 2002; Lee, 2005a&b).

The finding from this research supplies us with clear evidence that there is a positive relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes, accepting that there will be a positive, statistically significant, relationship between overall PE fit, overall adjustment and overall work-related outcomes (hypothesis B). This finding broadly echoes previous research suggesting that the various dimensions of overall PE fit have a positive relationship with job satisfaction and task performance (e.g. Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Arthur et al., 2006; Hoffman and Woehr, 2006; Vogel and Feldman, 2009). While both work-related outcomes in adjustment literature have been somewhat under researched (cf Kristof-Brown et al., 2005) the general finding is consistent with past research, suggesting a relationship between cross-cultural adjustment, job satisfaction and task performance (e.g. Lee, 2005b; Hechanova et al., 2003; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2004; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Selmer and Fenner, 2009a). This finding indicates that NCHDs with higher levels of overall PE fit experience higher levels of overall cross-cultural adjustment. This relationship in turn increases their overall work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance). Individuals who feel they fit in with the various dimensions of the environment in this research report an increase in their overall adjustment, thus increasing their work-related outcomes. For organisations this should be of particular importance as it suggests that
expatriates with high levels of PE fit have higher levels of cross-cultural adjustment which then increases their job satisfaction and task performance. We have already established in the previous section that higher levels of overall PE fit are likely to increase overall cross-cultural adjustment, therefore reducing uncertainties and premature termination of an international contract. In addition to this finding we can now suggest that this positive relationship influences work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance). Expatriates who perceive high levels of overall PE fit are likely to experience higher levels of overall cross-cultural adjustment and higher levels of work-related outcomes. This finding again highlights the importance of organisations establishing and maintaining practices that focus on increasing expatriates’ overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment, as they may have the ability to influence expatriates’ job satisfaction and task performance.

Considering the multiple levels of PE fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes simultaneously supplies us with the broader picture on the overall relationship between the three constructs, as discussed above. However, it is necessary to investigate the unique contributions each dimension of PE fit has with the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment and both work-related outcomes in order to clearly understand the essence of the relationships. As mentioned, in this research overall PE fit is an umbrella term that consists of person-supervisor, person-organisation, person-job demands-abilities, person-job needs-supplies, and person-host culture fit. Likewise, overall cross-cultural adjustment consists of general, interaction and work adjustment and overall work-related outcomes comprises of job satisfaction and task performance. To understand and explore the extent of the various connections between the dimensions of PE fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcome constructs within this study, it is important to assess each of the domains that make up the three constructs. The results of these findings are discussed in the following sections of this chapter.

The subsequent section will start by discussing the direct relationships found in this research between PJDA fit, the three facets of adjustment (general, interaction and work adjustment) and both work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance. The indirect relationship will then be
discussed between PJDA fit and task performance through work adjustment. The use of cross-cultural adjustment as an intervening variable in the relationship between overall PE fit and overall work-related outcomes is justified in both Chapter 2 and Chapter 4 of this research. In order to use the dimensions of cross-cultural adjustment as intervening variables one must have logical reasoning as to why such a relationship may exist. This reasoning is based on theoretical evidence presented in the literature review of the relationships between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment. One must also use a step approach in the analysis to determine if the dependent, independent and intervening variables have a relationship with each other. The backward multiple regression analysis conducted in Chapter 4 indicates that a relationship exists between PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment, between cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes, and between PE fit and work-related outcomes. Hence using cross-cultural adjustment as an intervening variable is justified but this is not to say that the directions of the relationships cannot be reversed in another study. For example, a relationship may very well exist between cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes when using the dimensions of PE fit as intervening variables. The following section discusses the relationship found in this research between PJDA fit, adjustment and work-related outcomes.

5.3 Person-job demands abilities fit, CCA and WRO

5.3.1 PJDA fit direct relationships with work adjustment, task performance and job satisfaction

Person-job demands-abilities fit is described in Chapter 2 as the abilities that the individual has to fit the demands of the job (Cable and DeRue, 2002). The finding in this research suggests a positive, direct relationship between PJDA fit and work adjustment, accepting hypothesis A4 that a positive, direct relationship will exist between PJDA fit and work adjustment. This finding indicates that NCHDs who feel their abilities match the requirements of the job experience an
increase in PJDA fit, which then increases their work adjustment. This finding echoes past research such as Brewster (1993), Parker and McEvoy (1993), Caligiuri (1997), Kraimer et al., (2001). They suggest that there is a relationship between the expatriate fit to the job encountered abroad and the degree of cross-cultural adjustment they achieve while overseas. The finding also supports Morley et al., (2006) who claim that by assessing the fit between the expatriate and their job it is possible to make more predictions relating to the level of work adjustment achieved on their assignment.

The findings of this research indicate that no relationship exists between PJDA fit and interaction adjustment, partially rejecting sub-hypothesis A6 that a positive, direct relationship will exist between PJNS and PJDA fit and interaction adjustment. In this study, interaction adjustment refers to the degree of interaction NCHDs have with HCNs and the comfort they feel about interacting with supervisors, peers and subordinates whilst in Ireland. The literature review noted that expatriate adjustment to the new job role can involve a socialisation process. Expatriates can acquire the task skills, social knowledge and behaviours required to become an organisational member and work effectively with the HCNs in the organisation. HCNs can supply a new employee with information on the norms and values both inside and outside the organisation, which can aid their work adjustment, therefore this research anticipated that PJDA fit would have a relationship with interaction adjustment. However, in this study NCHDs with increased levels of PJDA fit did not indicate any relationship with interaction adjustment as a result of their PJDA fit. One possible reason for this finding could be the causality of the relationship. As mentioned, interacting with HCNs can influence expatriate work adjustment (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005), as expatriates can obtain the task skills, social knowledge and behaviours required from HCNs. This suggests that interaction adjustment can have a relationship with PJDA fit, indicating that the direction of the relationship may be different from what was investigated in this research; the relationship between PJDA fit and interaction adjustment. At this point it is important to reiterate that path analysis in this study does not claim causation. Its aims are to investigate the direct and indirect relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes.
The findings presented in this research are unique to this study and one should avoid generalising the results. The researcher urges further empirical investigation into the relationship between PJDA fit and interaction adjustment paying attention to causation. For example, future studies could investigate the causation of the relationship between both variables to determine the direction of the relationship that explains most of the variance.

As noted in the literature review, both PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment are linked with positive outcomes, such as job satisfaction and task performance. The findings indicate a direct relationship between PJDA fit and both work-related outcomes, partially accepting hypothesis B7 that a positive, direct relationship will exist between PJNS and PJDA fit and job satisfaction, and hypothesis B14 that a positive, direct relationship will exist between PJNS and PJDA fit and task performance. The finding in this research suggests the NCHDs who perceive their abilities to match the requirements of the job have an increase in their task performance and job satisfaction. This is consistent with past research (i.e. Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown, 2005; Cable and DeRue, 2002; Vogel and Feldman, 2009), who found PJ fit to have a positive relationship with performance and job satisfaction. Such a finding brings to light the importance of fit between the abilities of the individual with the demands of the job during the recruitment and selection process, as successful PJDA fit in this study results in increased work adjustment.

If expatriates are not adjusted to work and life in the host culture context, then they are likely to perform poorly at their foreign assignment (Ones and Viswesvaran, 1997). The results of several expatriate adjustment studies (e.g. Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al, 2005; Ramalu et al., 2010; Takeuchi, 2010) generally indicate that maladjustment on an international assignment can result in premature departure. Significant costs are associated with an expatriate’s failure and early withdrawal from their contract. Selmer (2008) posed that the cost of a single expatriate assignment ranges from USD$300,000 to USD$1 million annually. This finding highlights the importance of establishing and maintaining a good fit between the individual’s abilities and the demands of the job. Increased levels of PJDA fit are likely to result in increased levels of job satisfaction and task
performance, both of which may have the ability to decrease the expatriate’s intent to quit the job, thus reducing the cost associated with premature departure.

5.3.2 PJDA fit indirect relationship with task performance through work adjustment

It was previously established that there is a direct relationship between PJDA fit and task performance. However, the findings of this research also indicate that PJDA fit has a positive, indirect relationship with task performance through work adjustment. This relationship is logical since PJDA fit emphasises the importance of job proficiency. The findings indicate that when NCHDs perceive their abilities to match the requirements of the job, they experience an increase in their work adjustment, which in turn increases their task performance. This indirect relationship is an exciting finding to report because, to the researcher’s knowledge, it is the first empirical finding linking PJDA fit to task performance through work adjustment. The findings suggest that expatriates who perceive a fit between their abilities and what the job demands experience an increase in their psychological comfort with various aspects of work (i.e. managing authority relationships) referred to as work adjustment. This work adjustment then has the ability to increase an individual’s level of task performance, which complies with past research suggesting that successful work adjustment increases work outcomes such as task performance (Nicholoson and Imaizuni, 1993; Parker and McEvoy, 1993; Breiden, Mohr and Mirza, 2006; Shaffer et al., 2003; Selmer and Fenner, 2009a).

This research not only suggests a positive relationship between PJDA fit and work adjustment, it also suggests that this relationship positively influences an expatriate’s perceived task performance. Several researchers (i.e. Osman-Gani and Rockstuhl, 2008; Takeuchi, Yum and Tesluk, 2002) have highlighted the importance of task performance in determining successful expatriate adjustment and intent to quit. When expatriates perceive high levels of task performance they are less likely to quit their assignment prematurely. This research suggests
that when expatriates perceive that their abilities meet the demands of the job they experience higher levels of work adjustment, which then leads them to perceive higher levels of task performance, thus reducing intent to quit the contract prematurely. When expatriates feel they have the ability to do what the job demands of them they perceive an increase in their work adjustment. We know from the literature review that work adjustment to a new role is fundamental to subsequent outcomes in the role. Therefore, when an expatriate feels they have reached a degree of psychological comfort with the various aspects of their work, they experience higher levels of task performance and expatriates who perceive high levels of task performance feel they perform better at work. Identifying and understanding the factors that can aid high performance levels at work are beneficial to any organisation, as higher performance levels can lead to higher profitability and decrease staff turnover. This research supplies the first empirical evidence to suggest that expatriates who perceive good PJDA fit also experience higher levels of work adjustment, and consequently higher levels of work adjustment increase their task performance. The finding in this research indicates that HR focus should be directed towards increasing the individual’s PJDA fit, seeing that good PJDA fit can increase work adjustment, which can increase task performance, thus reducing intent to quit prematurely. HR needs to continue paying attention to hiring individuals whose abilities meet the requirements or demands of the job. In the case of existing employees, HR should continue to ensure they supply training and development courses as needed to increase good PJDA fit.

In addition to the above indirect findings, a positive, indirect relationship also exists between PJDA fit and general adjustment through work adjustment. This finding suggests that NCHDs who have increased levels of PJDA fit experience an increase in their work adjustment, thus increasing their general adjustment. When expatriates feel that their abilities match the demands of the job, they report an increase in their work adjustment, which in turn increases the comfort and familiarity they have with the host culture. Several researchers state that general adjustment is linked with negative withdrawal cognitions (cf Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2004). Therefore, it is not only important for HR to ensure PJDA fit in an attempt to increase expatriate work adjustment but also to increase
expatriate’s level of general adjustment, which can reduce the likelihood of intent to quit the assignment prematurely.

5.4 Person-job needs supplies fit, CCA and WRO

The following section discusses the relationship found in this research between PJNS fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes. As mentioned, PJDA fit compares the individual’s capacity to provide what is necessary for successful completion of the job. In contrast, PJNS fit equates the attributes of the job with the individual’s needs.

5.4.1 PJNS fit direct relationships with interaction adjustment, task performance and job satisfaction

PJNS fit can be described as the perceived congruence between the individual’s needs and the environment’s ability to fulfil their desires, wants and aspirations (Cable and DeRue, 2002; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). In this study, PJNS fit investigates the fit between an NCHD’s perceived needs and the organisation’s ability to fulfil or supply these desires, wants and aspirations. Thus, PJNS fit is the degree of congruence between what one values or needs and what one receives from a job. The findings in this study suggests a positive, direct relationship between PJNS fit and interaction adjustment, partially accepting sub-hypothesis A6 that a positive, direct relationship will exist between PJNS and PJDA fit and interaction adjustment. This finding confirms past research suggesting a relationship between PJ fit and the degree of expatriate adjustment on an international assignment (Brewster, 1993; Parker and McEvoy, 1993; Mendenhall and Wiley, 1994; Harrision, Chadwick and Scales, 1996; Ayacn, 1997).
The findings indicate that NCHDs with higher levels of perceived PJNS fit experience higher levels of interaction adjustment. This result seems reasonable. When NCHDs perceive they have good PJNS fit - when their needs are met by the organisation - they experience an increase in their interaction adjustment, allowing them to interact with HCNs inside and outside of work with a certain degree of comfort. Achieving successful interaction adjustment while on an international contract can reduce expatriate uncertainties about the job role and also the norms and customs of the host culture, aiding overall cross-cultural adjustment. HCNs can offer valuable insight into the customs, norms and values of the host culture and organisation, reducing any uncertainties the expatriate has about working and living in the host culture. The positive, direct relationship suggested between PJNS fit and interaction adjustment in the findings of this research emphasises that good PJNS fit can positively influence interaction adjustment among expatriates, reducing uncertainties and intent to quit the assignment prematurely. This can have practical implications for HR when recruiting and selecting expatriates to fill vacancies in their organisations. The finding highlights the importance of ensuring that the expatriate’s needs are supplied by the job. When expatriates perceive good PJNS fit, they experience an increase in their interaction adjustment. As mentioned previously, various groups of people (e.g. HCNs and friends already working in the organisation) can provide the expatriate with valuable information about the job, norms and values of the host organisation and culture. This information can aid expatriate adjustment by reducing uncertainties and this uncertainty reduction is one of the foundations of successful cross-cultural adjustment and negatively related to intent to quit.

In addition, a positive, direct relationship was found between PJNS fit and job satisfaction, partially accepting sub-hypothesis B7 that a positive, direct relationship will exist between PJNS and PJDA fit and job satisfaction. This finding seems reasonable and is consistent with past research indicating a positive relationship between PJ fit and job satisfaction (e.g. Sekiguichi, 2004; Kristof-Brown, 2000; Cable and DeRue, 2002; Vogel and Feldman, 2009). Past research suggests that job-related constructs are associated with an employee’s attitude about the job (Shore and Martin, 1989; Edwards, 1991). This may very
well be the case, as PJNS fit has a positive, direct relationship with job satisfaction in this study. Job satisfaction refers to a positive emotional state resulting from the overall evaluation of one’s jobs and it is linked with low turnover tendency (i.e. Downes, Thomas and Singley, 2002; Peltokorpi, 2008). As mentioned, PJNS fit is the congruence between the employee’s needs and the rewards they receive in return for their service and contribution on the job, i.e. pay, benefits and training. If an employee is satisfied with the rewards they obtain for carrying out their job then it is likely that they will be satisfied with their job as a result. It can be suggested that expatriates who achieve good PJNS fit are likely to experience increased levels of job satisfaction in their host organisation, which has the ability to reduce their intent to quit.

This finding highlights the importance of ensuring that expatriates’ needs are met by their job. HRM need to be aware of what expatriates want from their jobs, which could be done for example in appraisal interviews by asking the expatriate what they want to achieve in the job and then determining if the expatriate’s suggestions are achievable and if so, considering a way to supply them. High levels of PJNS fit in this research is related to higher levels of interaction adjustment and job satisfaction, so if an expatriate’s needs are supplied by the job they are more likely to have increased levels of interaction adjustment and job satisfaction, thus reducing their uncertainties and intent to quit.

It is also worth mentioning the negative relationship found between PJNS fit and task performance in this research. Task performance is defined as the successful execution of work-related duties such as attaining specific goals or accomplishing definable projects (Harrison and Shaffer, 2005). The expectation in most research is that expatriates who achieve high levels of work-related fit perform well at work. Hence, the finding in this research is unexpected and partially rejects sub-hypothesis B14 that a positive, direct relationship will exist between PJDA and PJNS fit and task performance. Task performance is cited in past research as an outcome of good PJ fit (e.g. Edwards, 1991; Sekiguchi, 2004; Vogel and Feldman, 2009) and it is difficult to speculate why this is not the case in this study. The finding in this study indicates that NCHDs who view their needs to be met by the hospital report a decrease in their task performance.
It is important to note here that task performance in this study was measured by NCHDs’ levels of perceived task performance and not actual task performance. This in itself may be able to explain this somewhat unusual finding. Perceived performance is based on how the expatriate themselves rate their own performance. So, if an expatriate rates their task performance poorly, this may not be how their manager would rate their actual task performance. The important issue in the finding of this research is why does increased PJNS fit decrease NCHDs’ perceived levels of task performance? In other words, why do NCHDs feel that they experience decreased levels of task performance when they perceive their needs are supplied by their job?

As successful task performance consists of the individual’s ability and motivation to perform the job (Carter and Shelton, 2009), one possible reason for this finding could be that NCHDs experience a lack in motivation once they feel that their needs are being met by the organisation, leading to a decrease in their perceived level of task performance. Maslow (1943) suggests that needs are organised into a hierarchy of relative importance. At different stages in life we all have different needs but once these needs are met we move onto a ‘new’ need. It is not that the old need is less important but rather we have achieved it. In other words, a want is no longer a want once it has been satisfied. We are aware from the methodology chapter in this research that the majority of NCHDs come to Ireland for a job that offers better conditions and pay than in their home country. This indicates that the NCHDs are motivated by the need to secure a job that supplies them with what they want. According to the findings in this research, NCHDs perceive high levels of PJNS fit indicating that their needs are met by the job. Because their needs have been met by the job, NCHDs may feel they have decreased levels of task performance. This decrease in task performance may be brought about by intrinsic work motivational issues, for example NCHDs were motivated to work in Ireland but once that need was met their motivation to work in Ireland became less important to them as it was fulfilled. Goal theory suggests that employees will expend greater effort towards achieving performance goals that they believe will result in important outcomes (Locke and Latham, 1990). The NCHDs could be comparing their task performance in their host organisation to that in their home organisation prior to securing a job in
Ireland. They may feel that they had higher levels of task performance in their home organisation because they believed it would result in important outcomes (job in Ireland). Now that they are working in Ireland their motivation may have shifted to something else, thus making them feel like they have decreased levels of their perceived task performance, as they may not be placing the primary focus on acquiring a job in Ireland. Getting a job in Ireland is no longer their active motivation because they have achieved it. Thus NCHDs may perceive a decrease in their task performance purely because the focus of their needs have changed.

This section so far has discussed the direct relationships found in this study of PJNS fit, interaction adjustment, job satisfaction and task performance. An indirect relationship was also found in this research between PJNS fit and job satisfaction through interaction adjustment. The following section (5.4.2) will discuss this finding in further detail.

5.4.2 PJNS fit indirect relationships with job satisfaction through interaction adjustment

The results of this research suggest a negative, indirect relationship between PJNS fit and job satisfaction through interaction adjustment, therefore rejecting sub-hypothesis B7 that a positive, indirect relationship will exist between PJNS and PJDA fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction. The results suggest a negative relationship between PJNS fit and job satisfaction when interaction adjustment is an intervening variable. In this study, NCHDs who perceive that their needs are supplied by the job experience an increase in their interaction adjustment, although these high levels of interaction adjustment decrease their job satisfaction.

The direct relationship between PJNS fit and interaction adjustment was discussed in the previous section (section 5.4.1). The results suggest that an increase in NCHDs’ PJNS fit positively increases their interaction adjustment.
As mentioned, interaction adjustment refers to the ease an expatriate has with talking and interacting with host country nationals both inside and outside of the organisational setting. Thus, the results suggest that when an expatriate feels that their needs are met by the organisation (PJNS fit) they experience an increase in their interaction with HCNs in general (interaction adjustment). This interaction with HCNs can be vital for expatriates, as HCNs can inform them of the appropriate behaviours, norm, values and work-related expectations within the host environment. It would be logical therefore to anticipate from this that high levels of interaction adjustment can lead to increased levels of job satisfaction consistent with past research (*cf* Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer and Luk, 2005). Interaction with HCNs can reduce expatriates uncertainties about the new job role, the organisational culture and organisational behaviour. When an expatriate obtains a degree of comfort with their job and responsibilities, it seems plausible to suggest that they are likely to experience a degree of job satisfaction.

However, the findings of this research are unexpected and inconsistent with past research. The results indicate that NCHDs who report high levels of PJNS fit experience an increase in their interaction adjustment, but such interaction adjustment actually decreases their job satisfaction. This suggests that NCHDs with higher levels of interaction adjustment experience lower levels of job satisfaction within the hospitals. While this result is unexpected, the researcher offers one possible explanation for the finding. During the primary data collection, after participants had completed the questionnaire, several NCHDs spoke to the researcher about their experience of working in Ireland. Furthermore, some NCHDs wrote additional information on the back of the questionnaires they returned. While a mixed method approach was not adopted in this study, the researcher did take notes on the comments in a separate book, as they could offer additional insight in explaining the findings from the data analysis. NCHDs told the researcher that when they spoke to Irish doctors about work they perceived a disparity in the treatment of Irish doctors and NCHDs in the hospitals. The researcher kept a log of this information and out of the entire sample, over half (162) of the NCHDs had made additional comments about how they perceived the hospitals treated them differently to native doctors. The NCHDs informed the researcher that they became aware of two separate training
schemes within Irish hospitals, one for Irish doctors and the other or non-Irish doctors. All NCHDs who offered additional qualitative information indicated that they noticed that fewer non-national doctors were making it onto specialist training schemes than their Irish counterparts. Several reports have been published in medical newspapers about this issue. It has been suggested that non-Irish doctors reach a glass ceiling where it is near impossible for them to get promoted (cf. Kelly, 2010). Kelly also acknowledges that there seems to be two training systems in Ireland, one for NCHDs and the other for Irish doctors. He describes it as the ‘elephant in the room’. Very few NCHDs want to complain to management about this as they fear they will lose their jobs. There is a grave amount of evidence in these reports suggesting that NCHDs are not treated fairly when on contract in Irish hospitals. It is not the researcher’s aim to enter such a debate, as it would warrant another thesis. However, taking into account the qualitative information obtained from the NCHDs, it was clear that such issues caused a certain degree of frustration as they felt they were being treated differently within the Irish hospital setting to that of their Irish counterparts. Some NCHDs also noted that after speaking with Irish doctors they became aware that their pay and benefits were not on par with their Irish colleagues either. One doctor stated, ‘we find out we work longer hours for less pay than the Irish doctors do, I mean they are the ones who tell us this’.

Another NCHD articulated that ‘we have same level of qualifications as them (the Irish doctors) but they are given more opportunity and credit for their work than we are, the hospital tells us we are the same but we see from talking with Irish doctors that we are not….the hospitals tell us one thing and we learn another thing from the Irish doctors’. Drawing from these findings the researcher considers it reasonable to suggest that the NCHDs who have the PJNS fit experience an increase in interaction adjustment, however after talking with HCNs, the NCHDs perceive they are being treated unequally at work, hence they experience a decrease in their job satisfaction. According to Adams (1963), perception of equity is the extent to which an employee perceives he is treated fairly relative to comparable others inside and outside the organisation. When NCHDs feel they are not being treated the same as Irish doctors within the hospital, naturally this can lead to feelings of dissatisfaction with their job. This
is supported by equity theory, which states that employees will feel demotivated if they perceive unfair treatment compared to others inside the organisation that employs them.

The researcher considers the qualitative findings mentioned above important in attempting to explain the unexpected relationship between PJNS fit, interaction adjustment and job satisfaction found in this research. All NCHDs who offered additional qualitative information indicated that talking with HNCs in work made them feel they were being treated differently by the organisation to their Irish counterparts. As previously stated, successful interaction adjustment with HNCs supplies expatriates with information about the job role, responsibilities, norms and values. In the case of this research, NCHDs may be acquiring information for HNCs that in turn makes them question equality issues in relation to their job, resulting in a decrease in their job satisfaction. A decrease in job satisfaction can have effects on intent to quit the contract prematurely (e.g. Ramalu et al., 2010; Takeuchi et al., 2002; Takeuchi, 2010). The author acknowledges that this is only one possible explanation for the findings, therefore it is suggested that research should continue to explore the linkages between interaction adjustment and task performance of NCHDs in Ireland, in order to unravel potential explanations for finding.

5.5 Person-organisation fit, CCA and WRO

Chapter 2 defines PO fit as the compatibility between the individual and the organisational culture. It highlights the importance of creating an organisational culture that holds consistent with the values of the organisation. PO fit in this study has a positive, direct relationship with task performance, accepting sub-hypothesis B13 that a positive, direct relationship will exist between PO fit and task performance. This suggests that NCHDs who perceive good PO fit experience an increase in their task performance. The finding is consistent with Kristof-Brown et al., (2005), Hoffman and Woehr (2006), Cadwell and O’Reilly (1990), and Arthur et al., (2006) who found a relationship between PO fit and
task performance. In this research, NCHDs with increased levels of PO fit experience an increase in their task performance. PO fit refers to the congruence between the individual’s values and those of the organisational culture. Thus, NCHDs who perceive that their values are similar to that of their host organisation (hospital) experience higher levels of task performance with their job. The results of this research seem reasonable and suggest that the more an expatriate fits with the organisation, the more likely they will perceive higher levels of task performance. With a positive relationship suggested in this research between PO fit and task performance, the important question for HR becomes how can an organisation leverage this knowledge? As PO fit in this research is conceptualised as the degree of congruence between an individual’s values and the values of the organisation, PO fit cannot be taught. The reason for this is that the individual’s values are well-established prior to obtaining the job and they are not likely to change significantly as a result of employment. Therefore, HR should continue to look for applicants whose values match the organisation’s values. Organisations generally do this by implementing selection tools carried out by a consultancy firm or the organisation themselves (i.e. PO fit tests, and interviews that investigate the congruence between the expatriate values and the organisational values). This way HR can identify the expatriates, whose values match those of the organisation, thus increasing the likelihood of PO fit and as a result an expatriate’s perceived level of task performance.

5.5.1 PO fit direct relationships with overall CCA and job satisfaction

Drawing from past research presented in the literature review, this study anticipated that PO fit would have a positive, statistically significant, relationship with overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes. PO fit can be described as the degree of ‘fit’ an individual has with the organisational culture of the workplace. The findings indicate that while there was a positive relationship between PO fit, overall-cross cultural adjustment and job satisfaction these relationships were not statistically significant. These findings therefore
reject sub-hypotheses B6, which states that a positive, direct relationship will exist between PO fit and job satisfaction, and B6.1: a positive, indirect relationship will exist between PO fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction. These results indicate that a high level of PO fit among NCHDs does not influence their overall cross-cultural adjustment or their perceived level of job satisfaction. The NCHDs in this study perceive their individual values to match those of their organisations’ but this ‘fit’ does not impact significantly on their overall adjustment or job satisfaction. One possible reason why no statistically significant relationship was found between PO fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction could be related to the sample used in this study.

The medical profession is a tightly established profession, which focuses on the well-being and care of patients. This commitment is translated into nearly every medical professional code that has been promulgated, including the Hippocratic Oath, which was the first statement of moral conduct to be used by physicians assuming the respect for all human life. Brennan (2002) identifies the three prominent commitments of all medical professionals as 1) commitment to the profession, 2) commitment to honesty with all patients, and 3) commitment to improving the quality of care. The Hippocratic Oath and Brennan’s three commitments highlight the importance that doctors pledge to their vocation. As the most profound commitment for doctors is to the patient’s care, this research suggests it is likely that NCHDs have a stronger commitment to their profession than to the particular organisation in which they work. NCHDs are starting out in the medical profession and it is likely that their focus remains heavily on their commitment to their chosen vocation. A study investigating the difference in commitment between law students and medical students found that the medical students were more likely to view their career as the only satisfactory one for them and it would be their principle source of gratification throughout their lives (Graser, 1960). This proposes that the primary commitment of doctors is indeed to their particular profession and not to the particular organisation they work for. The findings of this study indicate that NCHDs have high levels of PO fit, suggesting that they see the values of the organisation as similar to their own. This finding is not unusual, as hospitals in general provide an environment where
patients can be treated and they employ doctors who can supply the care that is required. Therefore, NCHDs are likely to perceive that they fit into the organisational culture of the hospital, as both the hospital and NCHDs are committed to supplying the necessary care to patients.

While we cannot conclude that NCHDs’ commitment to the medical profession is the reason why PO fit has no statistically significant relationship with overall cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction, we can offer it as a possible explanation for the findings. It could very well be the case that as NCHDs advance in their careers and become consultants, there will be a greater increase in the relationship between PO fit, cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction. Consultants who have worked in the medical profession for a number of years have become experts in their field. Their commitment to the profession at this stage may become second nature to them and they may begin to focus on the particular hospital, its reputation and how this affects their career and status. However, as NCHDs are young medical professionals at the early stages of their careers it is likely that their primary commitment at this point is to their profession and to a lesser degree their place of work. This is not to say that they have no commitment to the particular hospital they work in. Rather, upon starting out as a doctor, they are more committed to their profession than the particular hospital they work in. It is likely that once NCHDs become consultants a noticeable increase would be found in their commitment to the individual organisation they work in.

5.6 Person-Host Culture fit and general and work adjustment and WRO

The findings of this study suggest a positive relationship between PHC fit and general and work adjustment, accepting sub-hypothesis A8 that a positive, direct relationship will exist between PHC fit and general adjustment. The literature review notes that expatriates can be influenced by the host culture when on an international assignment. The inclusion of the novel domain (PHC fit) within the
PE fit construct was essential for this research to adequately determine the overall relationship between PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment. PHC fit in this research is defined as an expatriate’s perceived value congruence between their home and the host culture.

The findings indicate that of the various PE fit dimensions, PHC fit has the strongest relationship with general adjustment. Black and Stephens (1989) define general adjustment as the degree to which an individual feels comfortable and gains familiarity with the general living conditions in the host culture such as food, housing and other non-work factors. PHC fit investigates how individuals perceive they fit into the host culture (non-work related). When PHC fit is achieved it is suggested that an expatriate has reduced their uncertainty about the host culture and has become aware of the different behaviours and norms that are held in their new environment. This PHC fit in turn has a positive influence on their perceived general adjustment through uncertainty reduction, which has been suggested to increase cross-cultural adjustment to a new environment (Black et al., 1991; Grove and Torbiorn, 1985; Hofstede, 2005). This finding seems reasonable and suggests that NCHDs who perceive value congruence between their home and host culture (PHC fit) are more likely to experience higher levels of general adjustment. It can be deduced from this that NCHDs who perceive their values and norms as being similar to that of the host culture will then become more content and adjusted in general to the host culture.

Furthermore, the findings suggest that PHC fit has a positive, direct relationship with work adjustment. This suggests that NCHDs who perceive high levels of PHC fit have increased levels of work adjustment. As mentioned, work adjustment is the degree of cross-cultural adjustment that an individual has about their job responsibilities and working conditions in the host culture. It is possible that when the NCHDs feel more comfortable with their surroundings (PHC fit) they experience more positive feelings towards their job and working conditions in the host organisation. This supports Takeuchi et al., (2002), who suggest that positive feelings towards the host country could result in positive feelings toward the work situation. The researcher suggests that expatriates who experience an increase in their PHC fit are likely to experience an increase in their work
adjustment, as they have more positive feelings with regards to the overall host environment. As this finding is unexpected in the study, the author advises further research to be conducted into the relationship between PHC fit and work adjustment. The results of such research would offer more insight into the validity of the relationship found in this study.

In addition to the direct relationship between PHC fit and work adjustment, the findings indicate a positive, indirect relationship between PHC fit and task performance through work adjustment. This finding suggests that NCHDs who perceive a high PHC fit have increased work adjustment, which in turn increases their task performance. While research that relates cross-cultural adjustment to high performance is scant (Haslberger, 2007), this research supports Selmer and Lauring (2009) who found work adjustment to be positively correlated with work effectiveness (performance). NCHDs with high levels of PHC fit tend to have higher levels of work adjustment, which in turn increased their task performance. These findings suggest a link between work and non-work factors when considering the relationship between PHC fit and cross-cultural adjustment. It can be suggested from both findings above that the relationships found reflect the spill-over effect between work and non-work related variables.

Spill-over theory suggests that the experiences in one’s life domain (e.g. work) may spill over to another life domain (e.g. non-work) and vice versa (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn and Snoek, 1964; Caligiuri, Hyland, Joshi, and Bross, 1998). The spill-over relationship has been seen recently in international adjustment research (i.e. Takeuchi et al., 2002; Grotto and Lyness, 2010). When assessing the cross-cultural adjustment of an expatriate, it becomes clear that the boundaries between life domains are more permeable than for HCNs working in their own environment. Selmer and Fenner (2009b) and Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., (2005) note that whilst on an international assignment, separation lines between work domains (WD) and non-work domains (NWD) are not split, thus expatriate stress in the WD is likely to spill over into their NWD. Coupled with this, Black et al., (1991) also indicate that expatriate adjustment outside of the work domain can have an impact on the work. Drawing from the above, it is reasonable to suggest that PHC (NWD) fit has a spill-over relationship with work adjustment and task.
performance (WD) in this research. This finding suggests that an increase in non-work PHC fit can also increase WD such as task performance through work adjustment.

The findings emphasise the importance of assessing expatriate PHC fit, as good PHC fit can positively influence not only general adjustment but also work adjustment. When high levels of PHC fit is achieved, expatriates can also experience an increase in their task performance through work adjustment, indicating that PHC fit can have a spill-over relationship with work-domains of cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes. These findings can be important for HR when recruiting expatriates. Management should continue to investigate the congruence between the expatriate and the host culture. This has been done in the selection process by administrating PHC tests (like the PHC fit questionnaire in this study) or by asking probing questions that can identify the expatriate’s own cultural values and norms. HR can then assess the expatriate’s perceived norms and values against the host cultures values and norms to determine a certain degree of ‘fit’.

5.7 Person-supervisor fit, CCA and WRO

In Benson and Pattie’s (2009) research on high-quality leader-member exchange, they found that a good relationship between the expatriate and their host supervisor increased their work and interaction adjustment. The findings in this study do not support this claim. No relationship was found between person-supervisor fit and the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work adjustment). PS fit refers to the congruence of values between the employee and their supervisor. Ahmad (2008) advocates that when the values of the supervisor and the employee are similar, the employee becomes more satisfied with their job as a whole. This claim is supported by the findings of this research, as a positive, direct relationship exists between PS fit and both work-related outcomes, accepting sub-hypothesis B4 that a positive, direct relationship will exist between PS fit and job satisfaction, and sub-hypothesis
B11 that a positive, direct relationship exists between PS fit and task performance.

The positive, direct relationship between PS fit and job satisfaction in this study indicates that NCHDs who experience an increase in their PS fit also experience an increase in their job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with past research, which suggests a positive relationship between PS fit and job satisfaction (cf Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Amos and Weathington, 2008). In the literature review, job satisfaction was defined as a positive emotional state resulting from the overall evaluation of one's jobs (Shaffer and Harrision, 1998). NCHDs who perceive congruence between their values and the values of their supervisor report an increase in their job satisfaction, suggesting that they are satisfied with their job in the hospital. This finding signifies the importance of creating good PS fit within an organisation, as PS fit can influence expatriate job satisfaction. For example, expatriates who perceive little congruence between themselves and their supervisor are likely to experience a decrease in their job satisfaction. This decrease in job satisfaction can lead to increased levels of intent to quit the contract prematurely (cf Shaffer and Harrison, 1998; Peltokorpi, 2008).

Coupled with the positive relationship between PS fit and job satisfaction, a positive relationship exists in the findings between PS fit and task performance. Task performance is defined in the literature review as the successful execution of overseas duties, including the attainment of specific goals or the accomplishment of definable projects (Harrison and Shaffer, 2005; Kraimer et al., 2001). Past research suggests that the quality and frequency of PS fit interactions is an important influence on an individual's performance (Liden and Graen, 1980; O'Reilly, 1977). Of the PE fit dimensions, it is clear that PS fit has received little empirical attention (cf Krisof-Brown et al., 2005), however, Kristof-Brown et al.,'s meta analyses suggests a relationship between PS fit and task performance consistent with this research. The findings in this study refute Meglino et al.,'s (1989) findings that a negative relationship between PS fit and performance. NCHDs with increased levels of PS fit experience increased levels of task performance and vice versa. Hence, individuals who perceive congruence
between their values and their supervisor’s values are likely to experience a
degree of success in the execution of the new job.

Both findings above suggest that selecting expatriates whose values and beliefs
match those of their supervisor should be an important concern for HRM when
recruiting an international employee. As with PJDA and PJNS fit, the likelihood
of a good PS fit can be determined in recruitment interviews. Through questions
HRM can establish the values and ethical beliefs of the expatriate and compare
them to the values and beliefs of the prospective supervisor. When a ‘match’ or
‘fit’ is made between the perceived values of the expatriate and the supervisor is
it likely that PS fit will occur, which can result in increased levels of job
satisfaction and task performance and a decrease in the intent to quit. In addition,
as PS fit is an under-researched dimension of PE fit, the researcher urges future
studies on the relationship between PS fit, job satisfaction and task performance.

5.8 Additional Findings

The findings of this research indicate no relationship exists between general
adjustment and job satisfaction, rejecting sub-hypothesis B1 that a positive,
direct relationship will exist between general adjustment and job satisfaction.
This finding does not support Takeuchi et al., (2002), who found a positive
relationship between general adjustment and job satisfaction in their correlation
tables, or Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al.,’s (2005) meta analyses, which found a
positive relationship between general adjustment and job satisfaction. Past
research suggests that the relationship between general adjustment and job
satisfaction has not received much attention (cf Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005),
so empirical results linking general adjustment to job satisfaction are scarce. The
researcher proposes that further empirical investigation should be carried out on
the relationship between both constructs. Many of the existing studies do not
define the individual relationship between the three facets of adjustment and job
satisfaction. The author suggests that when investigating the relationship between
overall cross-cultural adjustment (consisting of general, interaction and work
adjustment) and job satisfaction, academics should also identify the relationship between the three facets of cross-cultural adjustment and job satisfaction, which would build much needed knowledge on these relationships.

In addition, the regression analysis in this research found a positive, direct relationship between work adjustment and job satisfaction, supporting past research suggesting a positive relationship between work adjustment and job satisfaction (Shaffer and Harrison, 1998; Bhaskar-Shrinivas, 2004; Bhaskar-Shrinivas 2005; Selmer and Fenner, 2009a). However, this relationship was lost when path analysis was conducted on the data. In the methodology chapter, the author discussed the difference between regression and path analysis. Regression analysis is limited to investigating the direct relationships between variables, while path analysis has the ability to investigate the direct and the indirect relationship among variables. The traditional regression analysis in this research may have yielded a biased estimate because of the ignored indirect relationships (Ahn, 2002). When taking all variables into consideration, no relationship was found between work adjustment and job satisfaction in this study, rejecting subhypothesis B3 that a positive, direct relationship will exist between work adjustment and job satisfaction.

The findings of this study also indicate a direct relationship between work and general adjustment. This finding indicates that NCHDs with higher levels of work adjustment experience higher levels of general adjustment. In addition, the findings also indicate a positive, indirect relationship between PJDA fit and general adjustment through work adjustment. This suggests that NCHDs who perceive their abilities to match the demands of the job experience an increase in their work adjustment that in turn increases their general adjustment.

An explanation for the relationship between work and general adjustment could be the long hours that doctors work in the hospitals and the considerable amount of time they are ‘on-call’. The NCHDs spend substantially more time within their work setting than they do outside it. This is due to the long hours they are required to undertake as part of their job role in Ireland. Dr John-Paul Kennedy writes ‘I would like to point out that NCHDs (Non consultant hospital doctors) are still being forced to do 90 hours per week in many hospitals around
the country’ (Donegal Daily, 2011). Several NCHDs informed the researcher that they are regularly scheduled to do two 28-hour and one 24-hour shifts in a six-day period. Due to the considerable amount of time NCHDs spend in their working environment, it is not surprising that work adjustment has a significant relationship with their general adjustment. Several NCHDs informed the researcher that they viewed the hospital as their work and general life in Ireland. Some even joked and asked ‘what is the real world like outside? We have not seen it in a long time... for us this is the real world’. Drawing from this, the explanation provided seems reasonable considering the sample in this research.

Section A above discussed the findings presented in Chapter 4 of this study, and considered them in light of the evolving research presented in Chapter 2. Section B of this chapter considers the contributions of the thesis alongside its limitations and recommendations for future research.

Section B: Conclusion

5.9 Contributions of the Thesis

Outlined below are the theoretical, methodological, empirical and practical contributions this thesis has made to both literature and research on international human resource management.

5.9.1 Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Contributions

Several decades of research has been conducted on factors that measure cross-cultural adjustment and what constitutes successful expatriation to a host country (Black, 1988; Black, 1989; Black et al., 1991; Hechanova et al., 2003; Selmer and Fenner, 2009a; Selmer and Fenner, 2009b; Howe-Walsh Schyns, 2010). Past
theories of cross-cultural adjustment, such as Lysgaard’s (1955) u-curve theory and Oberg’s (1960) culture shock have been criticised for being over simplistic in nature and measuring the modes of cross-cultural adjustment rather than what the individual is adjusting to in their new environment (Black and Stephens, 1989). Taking such issues on board, Black (1988) developed a multi-dimensional model of cross-cultural adjustment consisting of general, interaction and work adjustment. Despite the criticism of the model (cf Huang, 2005) it has been repeatedly validated (Selmer, 2005; Black et al., 1991; Shaffer and Luk, 2005) and remains one of the most utilised frameworks of adjustment to date.

Person-environment fit research has gained increasing popularity in recent years (Verquer, Beehr and Wagner, 2003; Morley, 2007). Overall PE fit is comprised of several domains (person-supervisor, person-group, person-organisation and person-job) that investigate the congruence of the individual to the environment. For example, person-supervisor fit examines the degree of fit between the individual values and the values of their supervisor. If the employee perceives their supervisor as being similar to themselves, they are likely to experience good PS fit, and so on.

The outcomes of this research make a significant theoretical contribution. Foremost, despite both models being evident in decades of adjustment research, no study to date has investigated the relationship between both frameworks in the manner in which has been attempted here. This research has provided empirical evidence to suggest that both overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment have a positive relationship with each other. The strength of this relationship indicates that expatriates with high levels of PE fit are likely to experience higher levels of overall cross-cultural adjustment. This advances our theoretical understanding of the relationship between both models. The strength of this relationship suggests that overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment are related but are not measuring the same concept. PE fit measures how an expatriate ‘fits in’ to the various aspects of the host environment while cross-cultural adjustments measures how an expatriate adjusts to living and working in the host culture. It can be suggested from this study that expatriates who perceive higher levels of PE fit on an international assignment are likely to also perceive
higher levels of cross-cultural adjustment. According to the empirical findings of the research, PE has the ability to influence an expatriate’s cross-cultural adjustment.

Another theoretical and empirical contribution made by this research is the relationship found between overall PE fit and overall work-related outcomes when using overall cross-cultural adjustment as an intervening variable. Again, to the author’s knowledge, no past research has theoretically or empirically investigated this relationship in the same manner as this research. The empirical results suggest that an expatriate with higher levels of PE fit experience higher levels of cross-cultural adjustment increasing their work-related outcomes.

In addition to examining the macro relationship between the three models, this research investigated the micro relationship between the various dimensions of each model. Theoretically, this provides us with a clearer understanding of how 1) the various dimensions of PE fit directly influence the facets of cross-cultural adjustment, 2) the various dimensions of PE fit directly influence both job satisfaction and task performance, 3) the three facets of adjustment influence job satisfaction and task performance, and 4) the various dimensions of PE fit indirectly influence job satisfaction and task performance when mediated by cross-cultural adjustment.

The inclusion of a person-host culture dimension to PE fit is another strong theoretical and methodological contribution of this research. Past measurement of PE fit concentrated on an employee’s fit within an organisational setting (the environment) and did not include cross-cultural forces that can create fit or misfit between the expatriate and their host culture. This research developed and included a dimension that investigated an employee’s fit to the host culture outside of work. The inclusion of PHC fit adds a cultural component to overall PE fit, thereby allowing the model to assess expatriate adjustment to the host environment. It has come to the attention of the researcher that Nawab et al., (2011) also suggested the inclusion of a cultural dimension to PE fit. Interestingly however, their person culture fit scale has a strong resemblance to Black’s (1988) model of adjustment. For example, Nawab et al., (2011) person culture fit consists of three dimensions, social setup of host culture, interaction
with the host nationals, and fluency in the host’s national language. These are
similar to Blacks’s two dimensions of adjustment, general and interaction
adjustment. Taking a closer look at these dimensions, Nawab’s et al., (2011)
social setup of the host country asks participants to rate their adjustment to
several factors (living conditions in general, housing conditions, food, shopping,
cost of living, entertainment, and health care facilities) on a 7-point likert scale,
ranging from 1- very poor to 7- excellent. This is similar to Black’s (1988)
general adjustment dimension that asks participants to rate on a 7-point likert
scale the degree to which they feel adjusted to living conditions, housing
conditions, food, shopping, living conditions, entertainment/recreation facilities
and opportunities, and health care facilities in the host culture. In addition,
Nawab’s et al., (2011) interaction with host nationals’ dimension (socialising
with host nationals, interacting with host nationals on the work, and interacting
with host nationals off work) resembles Black’s (1988) interaction
adjustment dimension (speaking with host nationals, interacting with host
nationals on a day-to-day basis, and interacting with host nationals outside of
work).

We know from the results of the present study that PE fit and cross-cultural
adjustment, while related to each other, are in fact measuring different concepts.
Thus, measuring person culture fit on a scale that resembles Blacks model of
adjustment may indeed have caused Nawab et al., (2011) to measure cross-
cultural adjustment and not person-culture fit at all. However, the scale devised
in this research followed the structure of the well-established scales measuring
PO fit so this potential problem can be avoided.

Finally, the research provides methodological and empirical contributions to the
area of self-initiated expatriation in the public health care sector. Little is known
about public sector expatriates and their situation since research on them is very
sparse (Anderson, 2001; Selmer and Fenner, 2009a). In addition, no research to
date has been conducted on NCHDs’ self-initiated expatriation to public sector
hospitals in Ireland. This study has addressed both shortfalls in empirical
research. Data was collected from NCHDs working in the public health care
sector in Ireland and these NCHDs are considered to be self-initiated expatriates as they actively apply for medical positions abroad.

5.9.2 Practical Contributions

The current study also has practical implications for organisations and individuals considering overseas assignments. International human resource management literature suggests that self-initiated expatriation is on the increase due to the global economic climate (Howe-Walsh, 2010). Management need to have a multifaceted understanding of how expatriates adjust to working and living in a host culture in order to predict/determine the likelihood of expatriate success. Past theories of cross-cultural adjustment have been criticised for their sometimes tunnelled approach to measuring cross-cultural adjustment (Huang, 2005). This research offers a more dynamic and detailed approach to measuring expatriate adjustment that can be used in both the selection process and when designing policies and practices for retention within an organisation. The researcher encourages organisations to identify expatriates’ degrees of overall PE fit with the various aspects of the host culture and organisation (i.e. PS, PO, PJ and PHC fit) in the selection and recruitment stage. Expatriates who have higher levels of overall PE fit with the host organisation and culture are more likely to experience higher levels of overall cross-cultural adjustment, which is negatively linked in past research to intent to quit prematurely.

Consequently, the findings in this research indicate that individuals who experience good overall PE fit are likely to experience successful cross-cultural adjustment (general, interaction and work), influencing their job satisfaction and task performance. Organisations typically select employees based on their job knowledge and technical competences (Sinangil and Ones, 2001). These factors alone, however, do not account for a successful assignment or for effective performance of employees working outside their home countries (Black et al., 1991). The results of the study suggest that in order to determine successful work-related outcomes attention needs to be paid to how an expatriate
perceives their fit and adjustment to the host culture and working environment. Organisations should therefore identify and select expatriates who perceive overall PE fit. This PE fit can increase expatriates’ perceived levels of overall cross-culture adjustment, task performance and job satisfaction, thus reducing intent to quit the contract prematurely.

As organisations are becoming increasingly competitive, using PE fit in the selection and retention process to identify individuals who are likely to achieve higher levels overall cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes may be extremely beneficial. HRM can recognise individuals who are willing to contribute to the organisation beyond the basic job requirements and individuals that have the ability to ‘fit in’ to the various aspects of the host environment and culture. Finding a good fit for the job and environment increases the likelihood of successful cross-cultural adjustment, which in turn generally increases job satisfaction and task performance.

### 5.10 Research Limitations

While this thesis offers several contributions on both theoretical and empirical levels, some limitations must be considered. Firstly, this study adopts a cross-sectional research design and examines the opinions of expatriates at only one point in time. It is recommended that future researchers conduct longitudinal studies, which test the findings of this report.

Secondly, the sample in this study is limited to NCHD expatriates working in public hospitals in Ireland. Thus, generalisation of the results should be made with appropriate caution. It is recommended that the same questionnaire, or an abbreviated form, could be used for expatriates from other public and private sectors in Ireland. Such additional efforts will further confirm the validity and generalisability of the findings.

Thirdly, person-group fit was excluded from the study as the scale was deemed unreliable by the researcher. Therefore, the relationship between PG fit, the
facets of cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes could not be established in this research.

Fourthly, method bias - the findings of this research were collected using self-rated scales. Attention was paid to the possibility of inflationary bias. Inflationary bias is a potential concern when both the criteria and predictors are self-reported (Crampton and Wagner, 1994). There is a danger of using self-reported measures as the individuals can often view themselves differently from how their co-workers or supervisor would view them (Kealey and Protheroe, 1996). Self-reported data can also be susceptible to consistency motif where the individual tries to maintain a consistent line in a series of answers or seek out a pattern within the question that they feel the researcher is looking for (Jenkins and Ward, 1965). In order to minimise this, the questions were randomly ordered where possible.

Finally, when using path analysis it is important determine how to treat missing values within the research. In order to retain as much of the data set as possible, an expectation-maximisation (EM) algorithm was employed. This is an iterative procedure that follows two definite steps. The expectation (E) step computes the value of the E likelihood and the maximisation (M), where the expected values for the missing data are obtained from the E step, are substituted and then the likelihood function is maximised as if no data was missing to obtain parameters estimates. The SPSS Missing Values Analysis (MVA) model employs the EM approach to handle missing data. Field (2005) notes that the EM algorithm is becoming increasingly recommended by statisticians, as the approach incorporates the retention of variables and scale items that have missing data rather than deleting the entire cases. Bunting, Adamson and Mullhallm (2002) also argue that EM is the most statistically sound technique when dealing with missing data.

In spite of these limitations, the study makes a significant contribution to the literature by empirically demonstrating the significant relationship PE fit, cross-
cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes of NCHDs currently working in Irish public sector hospitals.

5.11 Recommendation for Future Research

The current research offers several benefits that contribute to the already growing body of research on expatriation and cross-cultural adjustment. Several suggestions for future research seem noteworthy.

A clearer understanding of how the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment contributes to job satisfaction and task performance is needed. It is recommended that additional work and non-work related outcomes variables be measured. In addition, the research should assess expatriate adjustment objectively prior to hiring and then track their work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance) once they are working in the organisation. This would aid decision-makers and human resource professionals in the design of appropriate selection methods.

At the outset of this research, attention was drawn to the substantial body of research on expatriate adjustment in private sector, mainly multi-national organisations. However, it appears that little research has been conducted on expatriation within the public sector (Selmer and Fenner, 2009a). The framework may be usefully replicated in future studies, examining public sector self-initiated expatriation outside of the hospital setting. In addition, future studies should gather data from multiple sources wherever possible, for example other public sector workers, in order to increase the reliability of the advanced model of cross-cultural adjustment offered by this research.

In terms of the scales used in the primary data collection, two recommendations are given. Firstly, as mentioned in Chapter 3, Vogel and Feldman (2009) note that there are not many scales in existence that measure PG fit effectively. Because of this the author suggests that further research should be conducted into factors that influence PG fit and from that, a revised scale should be devised for
measuring PG fit. Secondly, because of the method-based bias that may occur in self-report scales, as mentioned in the research limitation, further research should be conducted by using a third party (i.e. managers or co-workers) to objectively rate the individual performance levels.

Lastly, the aim of this study was to investigate the relationships between 1) overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment, and 2) overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance). Path analysis was used to determine the direct and indirect relationships between the three constructs; however, this study does not claim causation. It was the author’s intention to first investigate if and to what extent did relationships exist between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes. The author recommends further research to investigate the causal relationships between the three constructs.

5.12 Concluding statement

This research aimed to 1) investigate the relationship between overall PE fit and overall cross-cultural adjustment, and 2) investigate the relationship between overall PE fit, overall cross-cultural adjustment and overall work-related outcomes (job satisfaction and task performance). Despite the novel findings in this study, this researcher is not suggesting that the relationships between PE fit, cross-cultural adjustment and work-related outcomes has been sufficiently examined. Rather, it is the researcher’s hope that this study has helped delineate gaps in the literature and will serve to stimulate future research in the domain of PE fit and cross-cultural adjustment.
APPENDIX A: Questionnaire
What are the objectives of this investigation?

The objectives of this study are both theoretical as well as practical in nature. This investigation aims to determine if a relationship exists between fit theory and cross cultural adjustment. This study will not only contribute significantly to cross-cultural adjustment literature by presenting a building block, whereby further research can be conducted, but it is also envisaged to have notable implications for human resource personnel (HR) in the Irish health care sector.

How long will it take to complete the questionnaire?

The questionnaire will take about 10 minutes to complete. We ask you not to consult with your colleagues when you complete it (i.e. if you need clarification, you can ask the researcher).

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time. If you decide to withdraw or not participate, you will not be penalised in any way.

Is my information and participation kept confidential?

Yes, your name is not required on the questionnaire at any stage. You remain anonymous to all other people. In the case of publication this investigation does not allow the identification on individual participants.

Will I receive a summary of the results of the study?

Should individual participants wish to view the results of this study they can do so by emailing/writing to me at the provided contact information (see instruction sheet). However, please note that the final results will only be available in about two years time. Hence, I have to ask for you patience.

If you have concerns about this study and wish to contact someone independent, you may contact

The chairman of the University of Limerick research ethics committee

c/o Vice President Academic and Registrar’s Office

University of Limerick

Limerick

Ireland

Tel: (061) 202022
Instructions

You may keep this page if you wish.

Please read all the questionnaire carefully. Most questions can be answered by ticking the appropriate box provided. NOTE: This is not a test. There is no right or wrong answer.

Please answer all questions. Occasionally, you may find that the response options do not fit your circumstances exactly. In this case, please give the answer that comes closest to your situation.

Some questions may seem very similar to you. However, they address different aspects of the question content. Therefore, think about each question separately before answering. It is very important that you do not ‘skim through’ the questions, and that you consider each question before answering.

Please return the completed questionnaire to the person/office in which you received it. If you prefer, you can post it to the address provided below.

All your answers will be dealt with in strictest confidence. No publication originating from this research project will allow the identification of individuals. Your identity will not be revealed to the organisation you work for.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher:

Eimear-Marie Nolan via email at eimear.nolan@ul.ie or by telephone on 087-0544439 or by mail: Eimear-Marie Nolan, FG-155, Graduate Centre, Foundation Building, University of Limerick, Castletroy, Limerick.
Participant Consent Form

Please hand back with completed questionnaire

I, the undersigned, have read and understand the Participant Information Sheet, including the voluntary nature of participants, and have agreed to partake in this study.

I declare that I have given full consent to Eimear-Maire Nolan, Kemmy Business School, University of Limerick, Ireland, to use the information contained in this completed questionnaire for the completion of her PhD and also to use in the publication of academic articles.

I understand that this information will be used for academic purposes only and that all reporting will be done on an aggregate level, therefore, no individual’s responses will be reported. All of the information I provide will be held securely and always treated with the strictest of confidence.

Signed
**Section A – General Preparation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: Into which of the following age groups do you fit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Under 20  
| ☐ 21-30  
| ☐ 31-40  
| ☐ 41-50  
| ☐ 51-60  
| ☐ 61+    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2: Are you...?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Male  
| ☐ Female    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3: Please state your nationality below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4: Please state the country below where you have spent the largest proportion of your life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5: Into which of the following categories do you fit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Married/Co-habiting  
| ☐ Single  
| ☐ Separated/Divorced  
| ☐ Widowed    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5a: If you ticked ‘married/co-habiting’, is your partner accompanying you on your assignment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Yes  
| ☐ No    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6: Do you have children under the age of 18 for which you have caring responsibilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Yes  
| ☐ No    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6a: If yes, is your child(ren) accompanying you in Ireland while on your assignment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Yes  
| ☐ No    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7: How long have you been working in Ireland?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Under 6 months  
| ☐ 6-11 months  
| ☐ 1-2 years  
| ☐ 2-3 years  
| ☐ 3+ years    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8: How did you apply for you current job in Ireland?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Through an agency  
| ☐ Self-applied  
| ☐ Other (please state how below)    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 9: What medical registration do you have in Ireland?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Internship registration  
| ☐ Trainee specialist registration  
| ☐ Specialist registration  
| ☐ General registration  
| ☐ Visiting EEA Practitioner  
| ☐ Other (Please state below)    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 10: Did you have international work experience prior to your contract in Ireland?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Yes  
| ☐ No    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 10a: If yes, for how long?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Under 6 months  
| ☐ 6-11 months  
| ☐ 1-2 years  
| ☐ 3+ years    |

Please state in which country(below)
Question 11: Prior to your arrival, did you get a realistic preview of what life in Ireland would be like?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Question 12: Prior to your final decision to come to Ireland, did you make a look-and-see trip?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Question 13: Prior to your departure, did you receive any intercultural training?

☐ Yes  ☐ I do not remember  ☐ No

   If yes, who was the training provider?

   __________________________________________________________

   ☐ I do not remember

   ☐ No

Question 14: Upon arrival in Ireland, did you receive any intercultural training?

☐ Yes  ☐ I do not remember  ☐ No

   If yes, who was the training provider?

   __________________________________________________________

   ☐ I do not remember

   ☐ No

Question 15: Prior to your departure, did you get a realistic preview of your future job in Ireland?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Question 16: While working in Ireland have you experienced difficulty understanding the Irish accent?

☐ Yes/Sometimes  ☐ of other Irish doctors  ☐ of Irish patients  ☐ socially  ☐ No

Question 17: How long did it take you to get used to the Irish accent and understand what was being said fully?

☐ Under 6 months  ☐ 6-11 months  ☐ 1-2 years  ☐ 2+ years  ☐ never

Question 18: If you were able to choose freely which country to live and work in, which would be your first choice?

☐ Ireland  ☐ My home country  ☐ Some other country, which:  ☐ I cannot say

   __________________________________________________________

Question 19: Preferred place of residences and work

After your contract in Ireland will have expired, will you feel sorry or not feel sorry to ……

Feel sorry  Not feel sorry  No feelings

☐ …leave Ireland?  ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ …leave the place (hospital/clinic etc) you are currently working for?  ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ …leave the job you currently hold?  ☐ ☐ ☐
Section B
Your overall experience of living and working in Ireland

It is completely normal for an individual to have difficulty adjusting to living and working in a foreign country. Please indicate (with a circle) the degree to which you are adjusted or not to the following items living in the host location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance standards and expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/recreation facilities and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with host nationals outside of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with host nationals on a day-to-day basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking with host nationals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialising with host nationals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific job responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C
Your Job and the Organisation you Work for in Ireland

The statements below refer to your job and the organisation you work with in Ireland. Please indicate (with a circle) the degree to which you personally agree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Working with the other people in my group is one of the best parts of this job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is a good fit between what my job offers me and what I am looking for in a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In general, I like working at the hospital, clinic etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The match is very good between the demands of my job and my personal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I get along well with the people I work with on a day-to-day basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The attributes that I look for in a job are fulfilled very well by my present job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My abilities and training are a good fit with the requirements of my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In general, I do not like my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There is not much conflict among the members of my group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The job that I currently hold gives me just about everything that I want from a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My personal abilities and education provide a good match with the demands that my job places on me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If I had more free time, I would enjoy spending more time with co-workers socially</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. All in all, I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There are some people I work with I try to avoid when possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate the degree of fit you experience between your values and the values of the host culture in the following areas:

1. Values
2. Ethics
3. Attitudes
4. Work-family balance
5. Politics
6. Religion
7. Dress
8. Personal style
9. Interaction with host country nationals (outside of work)

Section D
Your experience of living in the host culture (Ireland)
Please indicate (with a circle) how similar or different do you think the host location is compared to your home country in the following aspects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Using health care facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Available quality and types of food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transportation systems used in the country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. General living costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Everyday customs that must be followed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. General housing conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. General living conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate (with a circle) the extent of fit you experience between your values and the values of the host culture in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent are the values of the host culture similar to your own values?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent is the host culture a good match for you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent do you feel you are able to maintain your values in the host culture?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent do your personal values match the host culture?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent are the things you value in life similar to the things the host culture values?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent do you feel your values prevent you from fitting in to the host culture because they are different from your values?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To what extent does the host culture fulfill your needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please ensure that:

- CONSENT FORM is SIGNED
- All FIVE pages of the questionnaire are completed

Thank you very much for your participation
APPENDIX B: Ethical Approval
Dear Eimear,

Many thanks for your research ethics application which has been reviewed by the KBS Research Ethics Committee. I am pleased to inform you, that your application has been given research ethics approval, subject to you confirming that all data will be stored on a password protected computer.

Kind regards

Michelle

Michelle Cunningham
Administrator
KBS Research Ethics Committee
Kemmy Business School
University of Limerick
Limerick
APPENDIX C: Assessing Normality
Tables AB.1 to AB.10 illustrate the distribution of all variables in the research. It is evident from the superimposed curve that some of the distributions are abnormal.

Table AB.1 Distribution of General Adjustment

![Graph of General Adjustment]

Table AB.2 Distribution of Interaction Adjustment

![Graph of Interaction Adjustment]
Table AB.3 Distribution of Work Adjustment

![Histogram of Work Adjustment]

Table AB.4 Distribution of Person-Supervisor Fit

![Histogram of Person-Supervisor Fit]

Table AB.5 Distribution of Person-Organisation Fit

![Histogram of Person-Organisation Fit]
Table AB.6 Distribution of Person-Job NS Fit

Table AB.7 Distribution of Person-Job DA Fit (before transformation)

Table AB.8 Distribution of Person-Host Culture Fit
This visual examination will not be sufficient when identifying whether the distribution from the superimposed curve is small enough to conclude that the curves are approximately normal. The mean scores versus the trimmed mean score should be the next thing to examine when assessing normality. The original means were compared to the new trimmed mean (removes the top and bottom 5% of the cases and calculates a new mean) to determine if the extreme scores had a strong influence on the mean (Table AB.11).

When the values are very different, further investigation is required. All means are close except for person-job NS and job satisfaction variables. Following this a second test was undertaken to establish the skewness and kurtosis scores,
which provide information about the distribution of scores for the various variables. The skewness values provide an indication of the symmetry of the distribution while the kurtosis scores indicate the peakedness of the distribution. If distribution was perfectly normal one would expect to obtain a skewness and kurtosis value of 0, which tends to be an uncommon occurrence in social science studies (Pallant, 2010). Positive skewness indicates a positive skew where scores are clustered around the low values (left hand side of a graph) while negative skewes sees the scores clustered around the positive right hand side of the graph. Positive kurtosis values indicate that the distribution is clustered to the centre of the graph (peaked) with long tails. Kurtosis with negative values (below 0) show that the distribution is relatively flat (too many cases in the extremes).

Table AB.11 Distribution of Mean, Trimmed Mean, Skewness and Kurtosis for all Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor List</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>5% Trimmed Mean</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General adjustment</td>
<td>4.8834</td>
<td>4.9040</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction adjustment</td>
<td>4.1080</td>
<td>4.1019</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work adjustment</td>
<td>5.0659</td>
<td>5.1034</td>
<td>-.419</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-supervisor fit</td>
<td>5.5295</td>
<td>5.5587</td>
<td>-.638</td>
<td>1.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-organisation fit</td>
<td>5.3498</td>
<td>5.3531</td>
<td>-.725</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-job NS fit</td>
<td>4.5063</td>
<td>4.5167</td>
<td>-.478</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-job DA fit</td>
<td>5.2156</td>
<td>5.2989</td>
<td>-1.046</td>
<td>1.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-host culture fit</td>
<td>3.1739</td>
<td>3.1804</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>5.4869</td>
<td>5.5758</td>
<td>-1.120</td>
<td>1.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task performance</td>
<td>5.3115</td>
<td>5.3433</td>
<td>-.439</td>
<td>-.188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of large samples (as with this research: n=369) significant values can arise from even small deviations of normality (Field, 2005). The z-score criterion that can be used from skewness and kurtosis statistics would to determine that their significance should not be used for this sample (n=369). Instead, DeVaus
(2002) suggests that skewness of greater than one indicates a non-symmetrical distribution. This rule of thumb is adopted in the research and by examining the results (Table AB.11) of the skewness and kurtosis it is clear that two variables are in violation of this. The results present that all variables except two are considered normal in the research. Both person-job DA (-1.046) and job satisfaction (-1.120) are negatively skewed with values greater than 1. As a rule of thumb, data may be assumed to be normal if skew and kurtosis is within the range of +/- 1.0. Schumacker & Lomax, (2004:69) state that skew and kurtosis with the range of +/- 1.5 or even 2.0 can be considered to be normal. The data in this research is therefore assumed to be normal.

A further test of normality used is the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. This test determines if the difference between the observed distribution and a theoretically normal distribution is small enough to be due to chance. A non-significant result (sig. = >0.05) indicates normality, significance less than 0.05 indicates that the distribution is probably not normal. Table AB.12 illustrates the results from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality. All variables are significantly below 0.05. Only one variable (general adjustment sig = .001) has a significance greater than .000 suggesting all variables distributions are non-normal. This contradicts the skewness and kurtosis results that suggested that all but two variables were normal.
Table AB.12 Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality of all Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>K-S Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General adjustment</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction adjustment</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work adjustment</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-supervisor fit</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-organisation fit</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-job NS fit</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-job DA fit</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-host culture fit</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task performance</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality suggests that all the variables in the research are non-normal it is important to note that the visual examination and the skewness and kurtosis statistics indicate that the curves approximate a normal distribution. Coupled with this, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test can gather significant results from only small deviations in normality in small sample sizes. As this is social science research, Morgan and Griego (1998) articulate that rules associated with normal distribution are less rapidly applied in the social sciences due to the perceptual nature of the data collected. This supports the use of parametric tests for the data collection in this research.

Both person-job DA fit and job satisfaction scales are shown to be negatively skewed with values of greater than 1. In order to correct the non-normality of the scales it is recommended to do reflect and square root transformation (Tables AB.13 and AB.14). The Skewness and kurtosis of reflect and square root transformation of person-job DA skewness is 0.427 and kurtosis 0.166, and job
satisfaction is skewness 0.543 and kurtosis 0.060. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test remained at 0 for both cases.

Table AB.13 Distribution of Person-Job DA Fit (after transformation)

Prior to running the correlation matrix, regression and path analysis, preliminary analysis was conducted to check for violations of the assumption of linearity and homoscedasticity. This was conducted using scatterplots for each of the variables, which can provide a better idea of the relationship between them. Coupled with this, the scatterplots also controls for outliers (isolated data points), which can influence results if they go unidentified. In addition, the scatterplots can determine the relationship between the variables prior to performing the correlation analysis. Pearson’s bivariate correlations analysis does assume normality but it does not require data to be very normal. To ensure that the above
non-normality variables reached this assumption Spearman’s correlation analysis was run. This is a rank correlation and does not need the assumption of normality. By examining the results of both correlation analyses it was evident that the relationships found between variables using Pearson’s correlation were similar to those found using Spearman’s correlation. Thus, the data in this study meets Pearson’s assumption of normality.

Multiple regression analysis does not assume normality however it does not like data to be highly skewed or kurtotic. The assumptions of multiple regression are based more around the distribution of the residuals, so checking the residuals for normality and constant variance is important. Path analysis assumes normality of data in order to analyse it effectively. It has, however, several ways of dealing with non-normality distributed variables that have underlying continuous distribution. Maximum likelihood (ML) is one such method and it can be used where the distributions of the sample are approximately normal (Cudeck and Browne, 1983). This method was compared to other techniques used for non-normal data and it was noted that very little distortion will occur if ML is used where the variables have skewness and kurtosis between -1 and 1+ (Muthen and Kaplan, 1985).

**Checking for Outliers**

Analyses of the normal P-P plot regression standardised residuals for all variables indicated that they meet the assumption of normality, as all points lie in a reasonably straight diagonal line. This would suggest that no major deviations from normality exist. The scatterplot of the standardised residuals for general, work and interaction adjustment, as well as task performance and job satisfaction showed that the residuals were roughly rectangular in distribution with most of the scores concentrated in the centre (along the 0 mark). The scatterplots indicated the presence of few outliers, which Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) defines as cases that have standard residuals of greater than 3.3 or less than -3.3. The presence of a few outliers is not uncommon in larger sample sizes (Pallant,
2010) and it was decided that no further action would be taken. This confirms that the data meets the assumptions of outliers.

Mahalanobis distance is another recommended way to check for outliers (Pallant, 2010). In order to identify the outliers, the critical chi-square value must be determined using the same number of dependent variables as the degrees of freedom. For the first three dependent variables (general adjustment, interaction adjustment and work adjustment), the degrees of freedom used is 5. Tabachnick and Fidel (2007) suggest using an alpha level of .001. The critical value is 20.52. Mahalanobis distance was examined to see if any cases exceed the critical value. Table AC.15 indicated that the maximum mahalanobis distance for general adjustment was 32.103, which exceeds the critical value of 20.52. Upon further investigation three cases exceeded the critical value, Case 300, 306 and 322. The same results are displayed for interaction and work adjustment (Table AB.15)

| Table AB.15 Residuals Statistics: General, Interaction and Work Adjustment |
|-----------------------------|--------|-------|--------|--------|------|
|                             | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Std. Deviation | N    |
| General Adjustment          | Mahal. Distance | 0.212 | 32.103 | 4.974 | 4.625 | 362  |
|                             | Cook’s Distance   | 0.000  | 0.142  | 0.003 | 0.011 | 362  |
| Interaction Adjustment      | Mahal. Distance | 0.212 | 32.103 | 4.974 | 4.625 | 362  |
|                             | Cook’s Distance   | 0.000  | 0.121  | 0.003 | 0.009 | 362  |
| Work Adjustment             | Mahal. Distance | 0.212 | 32.103 | 4.974 | 4.625 | 362  |
|                             | Cook’s Distance   | 0.000  | 0.176  | 0.004 | 0.013 | 362  |

Table AB.16 presents information on the cases that have standardised residual values > 3.0 or < -3.3. Two cases are found in the data (case number 003 and 306) with residual values of -5.183 and -3.141 respectively. These two cases
recorded a total perceived general adjustment score of 1.00 (very unadjusted) while the model predicted value for case 003 was 5.7205 (somewhat adjusted/adjusted) and 3.8608 for case 306 (somewhat unadjusted). These two cases are extremely unadjusted in terms of their general adjustment while the model predicted that case 003 would be highly adjusted to general adjustment and case 306 would be adjusted slightly more than stated. Cook’s distance (Table AB.15) is used to check if these two cases have any undue influence on the results for the model as a whole. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007:75) suggest that cases with values larger than 1 are a potential problem, the maximum value for Cook’s distance for general adjustment in this data is 0.142, suggesting no major problems.

**Table AB.16 Casewise Diagnostics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Std. Residual</th>
<th>General Adjustment</th>
<th>Predicted Value</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>-5.183</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.7205</td>
<td>-4.72046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>-3.141</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.8608</td>
<td>-2.86083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: General Adjustment*

Examination relating to unusual cases was conducted on the dependent variable interaction adjustment in the Table AB.17. This table presents information on the cases that have standardised residuals values > 3.0 or < -3.3. Two cases are found in the data (case number 124 and 178) with residual values of 3.603 and 3.490 respectively. These two cases recorded a total perceived interaction adjustment score of 6.50 (adjusted/completely adjusted) while the model predicts a value of 3.8469 and 3.9297 (normal/somewhat adjusted). These two participants are have high interaction adjustment, while the model predicted that they would have somewhat unadjusted scores to interaction adjustment.
Table AB.17 Casewise Diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Std. Residual</th>
<th>Interaction Adjustment</th>
<th>Predicted Value</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.603</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>3.8469</td>
<td>2.65310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.490</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>3.9297</td>
<td>2.57034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Interaction Adjustment

Cook’s distance (Table AB.15) for interaction adjustment was used to check if these two cases have any undue influence on the results for the model as a whole. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest that cases with values larger than 1 are a potential problem. The maximum value for Cook’s distance in this data is 0.121, suggesting no major problems.

Table AB.18 Casewise Diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Std. Residual</th>
<th>Work Adjustment</th>
<th>Predicted Value</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>-4.861</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.8898</td>
<td>-4.88976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>-3.498</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.5184</td>
<td>-3.51835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Work Adjustment

Further examination relating to unusual cases for work adjustment was conducted in Table AB.18. This table presents information on the cases that have standardised residuals values > 3.0 or < -3.3. Two cases are found in the data (case number 003 and 306) with residual values of -4.861 and -3.498 respectively. These two cases recorded a total perceived work adjustment score of 1.00 (very unadjusted) while the model predicts a value of 5.8898 and 4.5184 (normal/somewhat adjusted). These two participants are had very low work
adjustment while the model predicted that they would have somewhat normal work adjustment. Cook’s distance (Table AB.15) is used to check if these two cases have any undue influence on the results for the model as a whole. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007:75) suggest that cases with values larger than 1 are a potential problem, the maximum value for Cook’s distance in this data is 0.176, suggesting no major problems.

For the remaining two dependent variables (job satisfaction and task performance) the degree of freedom used is 8. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest using an alpha level of .001. The critical value is 26.125. Mahalanobis distance was examined to see if any cases exceed the critical value. Table AB.19 indicated that the maximum mahalanobis distance for task performance and job was 42.333, which exceeds the critical value of 20.52. Upon further investigation, seven cases exceeded the critical value (case 003, 092, 178, 300, 306, 322, and 366).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table AB.19 Residuals Statistics: Job Satisfaction and Task Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Mahal. Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook’s Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance Mahal. Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook’s Distance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further examination relating to unusual cases for task performance was conducted in the Table AB.20. This table presents information on the cases that have standardised residual values > 3.0 or < -3.3. One case was found in the data (case number 208 with a residual value of -3.048. This case recorded a total perceived task performance score of 2.44 (hardly characteristic) while the model predicts a value of 5.1805 (strongly characteristic). These participants had very low perceived task performance while the model predicted that they would have high task performance.
Table AB.20 Task Performance Casewise Diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Std. Residual</th>
<th>Task Performance</th>
<th>Predicted Value</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>-3.048</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>5.1805</td>
<td>-2.73610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Task Performance

Cooks’s distance (Table AB.19) for task performance was used to check if this case had any undue influence on the results for the model as a whole. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest that cases with values larger than 1 are a potential problem. The maximum value for Cook’s distance in this data is 0.148, suggesting no major problems.

Further examination relating to unusual cases for job satisfaction was conducted in the Table AB.21. This table presents information on the cases that have standardised residuals values > 3.0 or < -3.3. Three cases are found in the data (case number 203, 267 and 268) with residual values of 3.039, -3.144 and -3.390 respectively. These three cases recorded a total perceived work adjustment score of 5.67, 2.33 and 1.67, while the model predicts a value of 3.4932, 4.5821 and 4.0918. Cook’s distance (Table AB.19) for job satisfaction was used to check if these two cases have any undue influence on the results for the model as a whole. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest that cases with values larger than 1 are a potential problem. The maximum value for Cook’s distance in this data is 0.078, suggesting no major problems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Std. Residual</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Predicted Value</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.039</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>3.4932</td>
<td>2.17352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>-3.144</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.5821</td>
<td>-2.24872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>-3.390</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.0918</td>
<td>-2.42510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction
APPENDIX D:  Factor Analysis
Factor Analysis

There are two main issues that highlight whether the data set is suitable for a factor analysis. Firstly, the size of the sample is important. In smaller sample sizes the correlations coefficients can be less reliable among variables and are it can be difficult to generalise the results of the analysis. It has been advocated that a sample size above 300 is suitable for a factor analysis (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007) or having 10-15 cases per variable (Field, 2005). This research has 10 measured dependent variables, hence 15 cases x 10 variables = 150 samples are required. The sample size for the research is 369, proving this assumption to be met.

The second issue for consideration of the suitability of the data for factor analysis is the strength of the intercorrelations among the items. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) recommend inspecting the data for correlations >0.3 and if few are found then the data may not be suitable for factor analysis. All items correlated with each other and none were found to be particularly large, therefore multicollinearity was not an issue for this research sample. The Bartlett test of sphericity is used to test for multicollinearity in the data. The significance level should be below .05 (p <0.05) for a factor analysis to be considered appropriate as it indicates that no significant relationship exists between variables. Table AC.1 illustrates the results of this test below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table AC.1 Barlett’s Test of Sphericity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) is another measure of sampling adequacy (Table AC.2). The KMO index ranges from 0 to 1 and indicates the proportion of variance among variables that is common variance. The closer the value is to 1.0 and greater than 0.7 indicates that factor analysis may be useful (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). Values less than 0.5 suggest that results from a factor analysis
may not be helpful. For the person-host culture scale the KMO significance was 0.874 which indicates that factor analysis may be useful.

**Table AC.2 Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sampling Adequacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture</td>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Extraction**

Factor extraction determines the smallest amount of factors that can be utilised to best represent the interrelations among a given set of variables. At this point, the researcher needs to identify if they want to generalise the results from the sample to the population, called inferential methods or also referred to as descriptive methods towards the sample collected. The two main techniques used in factor analysis are principle component analysis (PCA) and factor analysis (FA). Even though these two methods are similar in many ways and in research sometimes seen as being interchangeable, they are in fact different. PCA finds a simple solution using the smallest number of factors possible to do so. It also explains as much of the variance in the original data set as possible (Pallant, 2007) and is the most commonly used factor analysis, and therefore has been used in this research for person-host culture fit scale.

It is possible to use a number of techniques that can inform a researcher about the number of factors to retain in a factor analysis. The first such technique is known as Kaiser’s criterion or more commonly referred to as the eigenvalue (of the R-Matrix). It represents the amount of the total variance explained by a particular factor. Only factors with an eigenvalue of 1.0 or above are retained for further analysis (Field, 2000). This research went by Kaiser’s rule of thumb and no eigenvalues below 1.0 were retained.

Cattell’s Scree Tests (Cattell, 1966) was also used in the handling of the data generated from the research as another technique in determining how many
factors to retain. The scree tests plots the eigenvalue for each factor on the graph. Cattell suggests that all factors above the elbow of the scree plot should be retained as they contribute to explaining most of the variance in the data set. The final technique which is gaining increasing popularity in social science research is Horn’s Parallel Analysis (Horn, 1965). Parallel analysis compares the sizes of the eigenvalues with ones that are obtained from a randomly generated data set of the same size. All eigenvalues that are higher than the corresponding values from the actual data set are retained. It has also proven to be the most accurate method of identifying the eigenvalues to retain, as Kaiser’s criterion and Cattell’s scree tests can overestimate the number of components to retain. This research employs a standalone Windows programme called Monte Carlo PCA for Parallel Analysis, which computes eigenvalues by performing a Monte Carlo simulation.

**Factor Rotation and Interpretation**

Once the numbers of factors in the research are determined the next step is to interpret them. Factor loadings help indicate the importance of a particular variable to a particular factor. In general, factor loadings of an absolute value above 0.3 are considered important but it is worth noting that such an assumption is dependent on the sample size. Stevens (1992) recommends that sample sizes of 50 should have a loading of 0.722 to be considered significant, for 100 the loading should be greater than 0.512, for 200 is should be greater than 0.364, for 300 it should be greater than 0.298, for 600 it should be greater than 0.210 and for 1000 it should be greater than 0.162. As this research has a sample size of 369 factor loadings greater than 0.298 are considered to be significant.

In order to interpret factors that can be difficult, they can be rotated. This does not change the underlying solutions but it presents patterns of loadings (variables clumped together) in a way that is easier to understand (Pallant, 2007). As there are two main approaches to rotation, either orthogonal (uncorrelated) or oblique (correlated), it is up to the researcher to determine which one suits their particular
data. If the variables are seen as independent of each other orthogonal methods such as varimax are used.

**Factor Analysis and Reliability of the Person-Host Culture Fit**

**Factor Analysis of Person-Host Culture Fit Scale**

**Table AC.3 Rotated Component Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the values of the host culture similar to your own values?</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is the host culture a good match for you?</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel you are able to maintain your values in the host culture?</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do your personal values match the host culture?</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the things you value in life similar to the things the host culture values?</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel your values prevent you from fitting in to the host culture because they are different from your values?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the host culture fulfil your needs?</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.
The factor analysis for person-host culture fit displayed the presence of one factor with seven items (Table AC.3). All items exhibited a factor loading of greater than 0.329, which is in the guidelines suggested by Stevens (1992), and the Cronbach alpha was .796. All items loaded on component one except item six: ‘To what extent do you feel your values prevent you from fitting in to the host culture because they are different from your values?’ which was a reversed score item and loaded strongly on component two. This item was excluded from the scale and the factor analysis was run again.

### Table AC.4 Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the values of the host culture similar to your own values?</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is the host culture a good match for you?</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel you are able to maintain your values in the host culture?</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do your personal values match the host culture?</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the things you value in life similar to the things the host culture values?</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the host culture fulfil your needs?</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.

After item 6 was deleted from the scale, person-host culture fit displayed the presence of one factor (6 items) with all items loading on component one (Table AC.4). Again all items exhibited a factor loading of greater than 0.329, which is in the guidelines suggested by Stevens (1992), and the Cronbach alpha increased
to .846 indicating the high reliability of the scale. Parallel analysis confirms the one factor solution (Table AC.5).

**Table AC.5 Parallel Analysis Comparison of Person-Host Culture Fit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Number</th>
<th>Actual eigenvalue From PCA</th>
<th>Criterion value from parallel analysis</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3434</td>
<td>1.1637</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>1.0888</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>1.0260</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>0.9700</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>0.9102</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>0.8413</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proceeding table (Table AC.6) summarises the main descriptive statistics for all the scales used in the research. The post-factor analysis of person-host culture scale and the mean, median, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum ranges of the scales are also presented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Adjustment</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>4.8834</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>1.05315</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Adjustment</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>4.1080</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.86828</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Adjustment</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>5.0659</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>1.16103</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>3.5295</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>.76483</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organisation Fit</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.3498</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>.70902</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job NS</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>4.5063</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
<td>1.144218</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job DA</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>5.2156</td>
<td>5.3333</td>
<td>1.21177</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>3.1739</td>
<td>3.1667</td>
<td>.69142</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>5.4869</td>
<td>5.6667</td>
<td>1.14960</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>5.3115</td>
<td>5.5556</td>
<td>1.05110</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E: General Adjustment Model Summary
Studentizied residuals were plotted against the predicted values for general adjustment.

General Adjustment Model Summary

General Adjustment Model Summary - After Deletion -

General Adjustment Model Summary (after deletion)
APPENDIX F: Partial Regression Plot - General Adjustment -
The residual plots were examined for genuine linear relationships for person-supervisor fit, person-job AD fit and person-host culture fit. The tables for these are presented below.

**Partial Regression Plot**

Dependent Variable: General Adjustment

![Graph]

**Partial Regression Plot**

Dependent Variable: General Adjustment

![Graph]
APPENDIX G: Test Between-Subject Effects - General Adjustment-
In order to determine if the demographic variables had an influence on the model a test between-subjects effect was run. The results (presented below) indicate that none of the demographic variables were found to be significant and the effects found between general adjustment and fit variables remained significant when all relevant demographics were taken into account.

Table AF.1 Tests of Between-Subjects Effects General Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>108.647</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.391</td>
<td>7.601</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>16.241</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.244</td>
<td>19.315</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time working in Ireland</td>
<td>4.411</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.206</td>
<td>2.623</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Registration</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty understanding Irish accent</td>
<td>1.887</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job DA Fit</td>
<td>7.870</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.870</td>
<td>9.360</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture Fit</td>
<td>47.940</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.940</td>
<td>57.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>4.918</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.918</td>
<td>5.849</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>287.569</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9022.792</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>396.217</td>
<td>359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .274 (Adjusted R Squared = .238)
APPENDIX H: Interaction Adjustment Model Summary
Studentized residuals were plotted against the predictor value and were shown to be consistent with the assumption of the regression model for interaction adjustment. These results are presented below.

Interaction Adjustment Model Summary
APPENDIX I: Test Between-Subject Effects – Interaction Adjustment-
In order to determine if the demographic variables had any influence on the model, a test between-subjects effect was run. The results (presented below) indicate that none of the demographic variables were found to be significant and the effects found between interaction adjustment and person-job NS fit remained significant when all relevant demographics were taken into account.

Table AH.1 Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Interaction Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>77.153</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.144</td>
<td>9.439</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>133.590</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133.590</td>
<td>245.156</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time working in Ireland</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Registration</td>
<td>2.498</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>1.942</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty understanding Irish Accent</td>
<td>1.605</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job NS Fit</td>
<td>61.026</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.026</td>
<td>111.991</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>188.542</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6433.604</td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>265.695</td>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .290 (Adjusted R Squared = .260)
APPENDIX J: Work Adjustment Model Summary
When studentized residuals were plotted against the predicted values, the model presented one outlier (case 3) that when deleted from the data presented an increase in the $R^2$ to 27.5% (Model 2). VIF and variance proportion were analysed and indicated no issue with multicollinearity.

**Work Adjustment Model Summary**

![Graph showing studentized residuals against unstandardized predicted values.](image)

**After Deletion**

Work Adjustment Model Summary (after deletion)

![Graph showing studentized residuals against unstandardized predicted values after deletion.](image)
APPENDIX K:  Partial Regression Plot -Work Adjustment-
APPENDIX L: Test Between-Subject Effects - Work Adjustment
In order to determine if the demographic variables had an influence on the model, a test between-subjects effect was run. The results presented below indicate that none of the demographic variables were found to be significant and the effects found between work adjustment and both independent variables remained significant when all relevant demographics were taken into account.

**Table AK.1 Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Work Adjustment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>144.747</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.047</td>
<td>9.524</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>18.730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.730</td>
<td>19.715</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.383</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.692</td>
<td>1.781</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time working in Ireland</td>
<td>4.106</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.053</td>
<td>2.161</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Registration</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>4.175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.087</td>
<td>2.197</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty understanding Irish Accent</td>
<td>3.493</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job DA Fit</td>
<td>42.716</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.716</td>
<td>44.972</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Host Culture Fit</td>
<td>53.513</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.513</td>
<td>56.338</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>324.847</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9726.778</td>
<td>359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>469.594</td>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .308 (Adjusted R Squared = .276)
Appendix M:  Diagram 3 Path Model 1 Explaining the Overall Relationship between PE Fit, Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Work-Related Outcomes
Diagram 3 Path Model 1 Explaining the Overall Relationship between PE Fit, Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Work-Related Outcomes
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