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Abstract

As the globalization of business activities become more and more prevalent, a lot of expatriates have to be dispatched to the overseas market places. Previous studies have found that expatriate failure is a serious issue which not only could incur the loss of company sales and profits, but also may result in expatriate loss of confidence, self-esteem, and reputation. A lot of studies have focused on the adjustment of expatriate. This study extends the adjustment issues by integrating expatriate intelligence and family adaptability to develop a more comprehensive framework. Ten research hypotheses were developed and validated through a Meta-analysis by collecting 341 studies of previous literature during 1988-2013. The results indicate that, expatriates emotional and cultural intelligence can motivate their adaptation to new culture surrounding with better human relations. Expatriates who get better support from their family and parents with lower work-family conflict will inhibit stress and promote the capability for better adjustment. Finally, expatriates with better social capital will enhance them to adjust in the new environment because of social support, organizational support and affective commitment.
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I. Introduction

Research Background

International assignments usually play a central role in building global international skills. Expatriate experience could be one of the most important criteria for an employee to be promoted to the “executive suites” (Daily, Certo, & Dalton, 2000). Therefore, it is important to understand why some expatriates adjust well to foreign environments while others do not.

Despite abundant interest, a large gap remains in our understanding of which factors can determine the success of expatriation. Most of previous expatriate studies have dominated on “stressor-stress-strain paradigm” that are “expatriate-centric” without considering the effects of other stakeholder (Black, Mendehall, & Oddou, 1999; Hechanova, Beehr, & Christansen, 2003; Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005; Takeuchi, 2010).

The second concerned dimension is expatriate intelligence. Although the important role of intelligence to predict job performance in the domestic setting is well established, only few studies have been conducted by using intelligence as predictors of expatriate success (Mol, Born, Willemsen, & Van Der Molen, 2005). Among others, cognitive intelligence (IQ), emotional intelligence (EQ), and cultural intelligence (CQ) deserve particular attention.

The third major dimension related to “expatriate-centric” studies is learning. Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, and Luk (2005) contended that expatriates’ proficiency in a host country language can be very helpful to obtain necessary information, and to facilitate interaction and adjustment. Lee and Croker
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(2006) and Selmer (2005) all suggested that expatriate training can facilitate better communication with locals, which will be very helpful for adjustment.

The influences of spouses and family support on expatriate adjustment is significant (Herleman, Britt, & Hashima, 2008; Kraimer, Wayne, & Jaworski, 2001). Parental demand has also significant effects on expatriate adjustment (Waxin, 2004). Finally, according to Takeuchi (2010), the influence of family-to-work conflict on expatriate adjustment has not been really examined (Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley, & Luk, 2001). However, from the viewpoint of time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based conflict, it may be considered that family-work conflict has a negative effect on expatriate adjustment and performance.

Another perspective that needs to be considered is social capital. Based on social exchange theory (Guzzo, Noonan, & Elron, 1994; Takeuchi, Wang, Marinova, & Yao, 2009) and social capital theory (Adler & Kwon, 2002), the social capital perspective argued that, overtime, if the relationship prove mutually satisfying, each party is expected to contribute more toward the maintenance and development of the relationship. Recent studies have emphasized that leader member exchange (LMX, Kraimer et al., 2001), perceived organizational support (POS, Kupka & Cathro, 2007), organizational citizenship behavior (OCB, Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006) and expatriate’s affective commitment (Blau, 2003; Lee, Carswell, & Allen, 2000) as some of the most influential factors for social capital. Higher social capital may have significant implications for the effectiveness or success in terms of expatriate adjustment and performance.

As previous expatriate research has been predominant at the “expatriate centric” topic, other research issues were largely ignored. Recently, Takeuchi (2010) called for the attention of expatriate research from the perspective of the “stakeholder”, which may include the influences of spouses/family members, parent company and host country nationals on expatriate adjustment. Takeuchi (2010) has identified nine research questions without empirical validation. This study intends to integrate these two streams of research and develop a more comprehensive expatriate effectiveness model based on expatriate-related perspective, family-related perspective and social exchange perspective. The proposed multiple interfaces of expatriate adjustment are shown in figure 1.

2. Literature Review

Emotional Intelligence (EQ)

The notion of “emotional intelligence” originally appeared in two 1990 academic journal articles (Mayer, Dipaolo, & Salovey, 1990; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Salovey and Mayer (1990, pp. 189) gave their first definition of EQ as “the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions”. Based on this, a widely adopted definition is “the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 10).

This study adopts the integrated four-dimensional definition of EQ as proposed by Davies, Stankov, and Roberts (1998). First, appraisal and expression of emotion in one’s self, which relates to an individual’s ability to understand his/her deep emotions and to be able to express emotions naturally. People who have good ability in this area will have sense and acknowledge their emotions better than others will (Wong, Law, & Wong, 2004). Second, appraisal and recognition of emotion in others which relates to an individual’s ability to perceive and understand the emotions of the people around them. People who rate highly in this ability are very sensitive to the emotions of others as well as able to predict others’ emotional responses (Wong & Law, 2002). Third, regulation of emotion in one’s self, which relates to the ability of a person to control his/her emotions, enabling a more rapid recovery from psychological
distress. A person with high ability in this area would be able to return quickly to normal psychological states after rejoicing or being upset. Such a person would also have better control of his/her emotions, and would be less likely to lose his/her temper (Law, Wong, & Song, 2004). Finally, the use of emotion to facilitate performance, which relates to the ability of a person to make use of emotions by directing them towards constructive activities and personal performance. A person who is competent in this EI dimension would be able to encourage him/herself to do better continuously and to direct his/her emotions in positive and productive directions (Cote & Miners, 2006).

Expatriates Intelligences
Expatriate intelligence has been recognized as an important determinants for expatriate adjustment and performance. In particular, expatriate’s emotional intelligence (EQ) can enhance social capital, while cultural intelligence can promote adaption. Recently, many studies have attempted to improve cultural understanding at an individual level. The reasons why people from different backgrounds act as they do can be related to a primary part of human thinking – intelligence – seen as the capability to solve problems and adapt to changing situations. In 2003, Earley and Ang proposed the Cultural Intelligence (CQ) approach to capture the ability to adapt across cultures, and it reflects a person’s capability to gather, interpret, and act upon radically different cues to function effectively across cultural settings or in multicultural situations. There are three core elements of CQ: cognition (thinking, learning, and strategizing); motivation (efficacy and confidence, persistence, value congruence and affect for the new culture); and behavior (social mimicry, and behavioral repertoire) (Ng & Earley, 2006).

The cognitive facet of CQ refers to the information-processing aspects of intelligence, and it can be conceptualized by the self-concept theory (Earley, 2003). The second facet of CQ refers to its motivational aspect. Cultural intelligence reflects self-concept and directs and motivates adaptation to new cultural surroundings (Earley & Peterson, 2004). The behavioral aspect of CQ suggests that adaptation is not only knowing what to do and how to do it (i.e., the cognitive element) and having the related motivation, but also having the response needed for a given situation in one’s behavioral repertoire. Thus, CQ reflects a person’s ability to acquire or adapt behaviors appropriate for a new culture (Earley & Peterson, 2004). In this study, the three dimensions of CQ serve as the main independent variables in order to identify their effects on cross-cultural adjustment, effectiveness, and performance.

Expatriate International Experience
International experience is a multidimensional concept that varies along several dimensions. This study follows Takeuchi et al.’s (2005) categorization of international experience, which includes work and non-work related experiences. Moreover, this study recognizes that experiences have a time component (e.g., Goodman, Lawrence, Ancona, & Tushman, 2001; Shaffer et al., 1999). At any given time, an experience can be conceptualized as one that has occurred in the past, is currently occurring, or will occur in the future (e.g., Goodman et al., 2001). This study will focus on past and present experiences because they are more likely to influence employees’ current attitudes and behaviors (Takeuchi et al., 2005). Furthermore, individuals differ in the extent of their country-specific experience (Hofstede, 1980). Prior international experience in the same culture as the one where an expatriate is currently assigned is likely to influence the level of adjustment.

Expatriate Cultural Values
Based on the results of previous studies (Hofstede, 1980, 1994), there are five cultural factors, or values, that are universal for a nation. These values include power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, masculinity, and Confucian dynamic (Lee & Croker, 2006). Power distance is the extent to which less powerful members of institutions and organizations accept that power is distributed unequally (Hodgetts & Luthans, 2000). Countries with people that obey the orders of their superiors are regarded as having high power distance. Previous studies have found that organizations in lower power-distance countries (such as Japan) will be more decentralized and have flatter organizational structures. By contrast,
organizations in higher power-distance countries (such as USA) will be more centralized and have taller organizational structures (Hodgetts & Luthans, 2000).

**Family/Spouse Support**
Among the most prominent stress factors that expatriates struggle with is the ‘loss of social support provided by organization family and friends’ (Harvey, 1995, p. 226). Yet, it is not only the loss of close family and friends, but also the deprivation of the entire community at their home base many expatriated families have to cope with. Copeland and Norell (2002, p. 255) identified social support as a ‘buffer against stress and a positive associate of emotional well-being’. Social support has been defined by Shumaker and Brownell (1984, p. 13) as ‘an exchange of resources between at least two individuals perceived by the provider or the recipient to be intended to enhance the well-being of the recipient’. While Leavy (1983, p. 5) defined social support as "the availability of helping relationships and the quality of those relationships." Family support in particular has been identified as a critical source of support for expatriates (Guzzo, 1996; Tung, 1981) due to the spill-over effect that family support can have on work outcomes (Brett & Werbel, 1980; Caplan & Killilea, 1976).

**Family Adaptability**
Olson et al. (1979, p.12) defined family adaptability as "the ability of a marital / family system to change its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress." This definition can be extended to the dimension of family behavior as “flexibility”, which represents a family is easily changed to response the environmental demands. Ali et al. (2003) further indicated that the adaptive ability of a family is essential to response the changes within the family and the external environment. According to family system theory, if the family is able to handle the changing internal relations for responding the external demands, such family will be better to adapt itself to new circumstances than others (Olson et al., 1984).

**Parental Demand**
Takeuchi, Lepak, Marinova, and Yun (2007) examined the family-related issues and concluded that parental or family demands (e.g., Osherson & Dill, 1983; Bedeian et al., 1988; Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001) are an important stressor relevant for families to adjust to fit the external environment changes. From work-family conflict perspective, parental demands are generally expected to exhibit a negative relationship with general adjustment. Shaffer and Harrison (1998) found that family responsibilities (marital status and number of children) of expatriates and expatriate’s job satisfaction were negatively related. Increasing the amount of parental demands is likely to induce stress in spouses and expatriates (Takeuchi, 2010).

**Work-to-family Conflict**
In organizational behavior research, the work and family interface (e.g., work-family conflict) has been an increasingly popular topic (see meta-analysis by Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Existing research in this area has established the existence of work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict as distinguishable constructs that should both be considered (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). Work-to-family conflict occurs when work activities interfere with family responsibilities, and family-to-work conflict occurs when family activities interfere with work responsibilities (Netemeyer et al., 1996).

**Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)**
In a review of the Leader-member exchange (LMX) literature, Liden et al. (1997) stated that “LMX has been found to be related to an impressive set of important individual and organizational outcomes [and] for the most part, LMX is positively associated with favorable attitudes such as job satisfaction and behaviors such as organizational citizenship”. However, a gap exists in the relationship between LMX and employee adjustment of a job transfer, which can be viewed from social support perspectives (Kraimer et al., 2001).
According to Kahn and Quinn (1970), social support can be evaluated by three elements: support-aid, affect and affirmation. In term of support-aid, supervisors will provide certain employees with information that goes beyond the employment contract, so expatriates in a high-quality LMX relationship can obtain information and assistance, serving as supportive aid. Empirical research has confirmed that LMX is positively related to information and assistance (Kraimer et al., 2001; Major et al., 1995). Moreover, affect, is captured within the dimensionality of LMX, which can be examined by interpersonal attraction. Academic research has found that interpersonal attraction can be considered as an element and predictor of a high-quality exchange relationship (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Liden et al., 1993; Liden et al., 1997; Wayne et al., 1997). Affirmation is normally concerned about professional respect (Liden et al., 1993).

Organizational Support
Research on social support has acknowledged that individuals may obtain support from various sources such as organizations, coworkers, supervisors, friends, and families (e.g., Kupka & Cathro, 2007; Seeman et al., 1985). This study adopts that social support from the organization and supervisor will be important for expatriates. Organizational support theory (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) assumes that employees develop global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. The theory further posits that perceived organizational support (POS) is encouraged by the tendency of employees to assign the organization humanlike characteristics (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Levinson (1965) noted that actions taken by agents of the organization are often viewed as indications of the organization’s intent, rather than attributed solely to the agents’ personal motives.

On the basis of this personification, individuals develop general views concerning the degree to which supervisors value their contributions and care about their well-being (perceived supervisor support, or PSS; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). Because supervisors act as agents of the organization, who have responsibility for directing and evaluating subordinates’ performance, employees would view their supervisor’s favorable or unfavorable orientation toward them as an indication of the organization’s support (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Levinson, 1965; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). This study asserts this view and defines perceived organizational support as individuals’ care about their well-being (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988).

Aycan’s (1997) model of expatriate acculturation highlighted the important role that organizations play in the acculturation of expatriates. Other scholars also argued that organizational support may be an important determinant of employees' adjustment following a transfer (Payne, 1980). A second source of support that can occur on the job is that from the supervisor. Research has examined supervisor support as an important source of support for dealing with stress at work (e.g., Fisher, 1985; Ganster, Fusilier, & Mayes, 1986).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)
Organ (1988, p.4) defined organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as “behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient functioning of the organization”. Organizational citizenship behaviors are usually performed by employees who are willing to work beyond their obligations and duties for supporting the interests of the organization (Bambale, 2011). Although such interests may not directly benefit individual employees, OCB could have a beneficial cumulative effect for individual employees in the long term.

OCBs can be exhibited in various situations. For instances, employees can help fellow workers, when they have difficulty in performing their work. Employees also can exhibit OCBs in the following situations: avoiding things that destroy the organization image; avoiding spending extra time in achieving objectives; and performing job beyond requirements (Organ, 1988). In other words, OCB typically refers to the extra role that individual employees behave (Bove et al., 2009). LePine et al. (2002) claimed that the exact dimensionality of the OCB construct is unclear, however empirical research has used Organ's
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(1988) taxonomy and operationalized by the dimensions of Podsakoff et al. (1990): altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship (not complaining about trivial matters), courtesy, and civic virtue (maintaining an awareness of matters that effect the organization).

**Affective Commitment**

There are multiple definitions and conceptualizations of the organizational commitment construct. Porter et al. (1974) defined organizational commitment as the strength of individuals’ identification with and involvement in a particular organization. This is substantiated in later works by Steers (1977) and Mowday et al. (1979, 1982). The most widely accepted definition of organizational commitment, according to Tumulty et al. (1995), is ‘the relative strength of an individual’s linkage to the organization’ (Mowday et al., 1979; p.226). This definition is further characterized by three factors which are ‘a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization’ (Porter et al., 1974, p. 604).

Current research supports the multidimensionality of expatriate commitment (Fields, 2002) and that it has components that can be classified into three themes. Other researchers have further refined these three distinct themes into affective, normative and continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991, Laschinger et al., 2000; Manion, 2004). Affective commitment is an ‘employee’s liking for an organization includes identification with involvement in the organization’ (Fields, 2002, p. 43). Normative commitment designates ‘the feeling of obligation to continue employment’, while continuance commitment indicates the awareness the employee that related to the ‘costs associated with leaving the organization’ (Fields, 2002, p. 43).

Despite the multidimensionality issues, there is a debate among scholars about which level of analysis can be applied: organizational or occupational level. Previous discussion mainly discussed about organizational commitment. However, occupational commitment has become an increasingly important construct for study, particularly on the increasing of recent workplace dynamics, including: organizational restructurings, increased employee job insecurity perceptions and contingency workforce growth (Cappelli et al., 1997; Hall & Moss, 1998; Nollen & Axel, 1996), several scholars (e.g. Handy, 1994; Johnson, 1996; Meyer & Allen, 1997) have suggested that employee commitment may be shifting from the organization to one’s occupation (Blau, 2003).

Occupational commitment refers to the ‘psychological link between an individual and his/her occupation that is based on an affective reaction to that occupation’ (Lee, Carswell, & Allen, 2000). This study will adopt the occupational commitment, because expatriation assignment reflects the expertise of particular person. If the expatriates have no commitment to their occupation, they tend to switch to other occupation than fulfill expatriation assignment.

**Expatriate Stress**

The coping literature helps our understanding of stress on expatriates. Lazarus and Folkman (1984), for example, identified life-changes as a potential source of stress, when they are appraised as life-threatening or challenging. Since an expatriate assignment involves life-changes, at a minimum relocation and separation from family, stress seems likely, and research is confirming this relationship (Ward & Kennedy, 2001). Several other studies confirm that assignments are linked to increased levels of psychosocial stress (Torbiorn, 1982; Furnham, 1990; Ward, Bochner & Furnham, 2001). In one rare study using a control group, Anderzén and Arnetz (1999) found increased levels of stress-related hormones in expatriates that were not present in the non-moving control group. The expatriates also experienced significant deterioration in mental well-being, and decreased work adjustment, when compared to the non-moving group, and to their own pre-departure level, so they concluded that international relocation is associated with an accentuated psycho-physiological stress response.
This study asserts the idea of Jex (1998) that expatriates’ stress refers to expatriates collectively feel crisis and anxiety, during their abroad assignment. Crisis indicates a sense of urgency and hinders expatriates to function effectively (Akgun et al., 2006). Specifically, crisis distorts expatriates’ sense making and information processing, making them unable to plan, reason and understand the situation accurately, and limiting individuals’ prior knowledge on the potential interactions between process and project variables, and their consequences (Pauchant & Mitroff, 1990). Anxiety is a fear of social situations, where expatriates receive themselves to be vulnerable to negative evaluation by others (Verbeke & Bagozzi, 2000). Anxious expatriates selectively focus on threatening information and tend to interpret ambiguous information in a negative manner. This leads to biases in their judgments and recollections of unpleasant social events, recalling negative information (memory biases), incorporating negative self-perception and metaperception (Akgun et al., 2006).

Cultural Adjustment
Cultural adjustment is defined as the degree of psychological comfort an expatriate has with the various aspects of a host culture (Vianen, De Pater, Kristof-Brown, & Johnson, 2004). Three specific areas of cultural adjustment have been distinguished in the literature (Black & Stephens, 1989): adjustment to (1) the general environment (degree of comfort with general living conditions, such as climate, health facilities and food); (2) interaction with host country nationals; and (3) work for performance standards, job and supervisory responsibilities. When an expatriate is adjusted on each of these dimensions, an individual will experience “satisfaction, perceived acceptance from hosts, and ability to function during everyday activities without severe stress” (Brislin, 1981, p. 271).

In an extensive review of the extant domestic and foreign work adjustment literature, Black et al. (1991) proposed a comprehensive integrated model of international adjustment which focuses on several major sets of factors that influence these dimensions as determinants of adjustment. Black et al.’s (1991) three dimensional models (general work, and relationship) has subsequently received much empirical support (e.g., Parker & McEvoy, 1993; Shaffer et al., 1999). For instance, Shaffer et al. (1999) provided evidence of the three dimensions of adjustment, and found that job factors are antecedents of expatriate adjustment, arguing it is the role clarity of the job that facilitates expatriate adjustment. In order to extend the explanatory power of Black et al.’s (1991) model, this study empirically tests the effects of CQ on expatriate adjustment.

Knowledge Transfer Performance
The willingness of a group or individual to work with others and share knowledge to their mutual benefit can facilitate the behavior of knowledge transfer (Syekh-Ikhsan & Rowland, 2004). Davenport and Prusak (1998) indicated that knowledge transfer involves two actions which are “transmission (sending or presenting knowledge to a potential recipient) and absorption by that person or group” (p.101). They further claimed that “transmission and absorption together have no value unless they lead to some change in behavior, or the development of some idea that leads to new behavior” (p.101). Even though knowledge transfer is very important in an organization, the actual transfer of knowledge within organizations is still problematic for managers (Jacob & Ebrahimpur, 2001). Argote (1993) argued that one of the reasons that knowledge is problematic and difficult to transfer is causal from “some of the knowledge acquired thorough learning by doing is idiosyncratic to the particular constellation of people, technology, structures, and environmental conditions” (p.42). Obviously, knowledge transferred to the right person at the right time is extremely important for organizations. Teece (2000, p.38) argued that “knowledge, which is trapped inside the minds of key employees, in the file drawers and databases, is of little value if not supplied to the right people at the right time.” Wang, Tong, and Koh (2004) posited that knowledge transfer is a process of systematically organized exchange of information and skills between entities, which can be viewed by two aspects: management knowledge (i.e., managerial skills, marketing/sales skills, HRM skills, corporate culture and values, business strategy thinking and techniques) and technological knowledge (i.e., manufacturing- related knowledge, product-related knowledge). Whether knowledge transfer is successful or not can be judged by whether the recipient units
can accumulate and assimilate new knowledge. Sveiby (1997) suggested that three questions can be used to examine the performance of knowledge transfer: (1) how fast is the knowledge transferred? (2) how accurately is the knowledge transferred? and (3) how reliable is the knowledge?.

Subsidiary-headquarter Relationship
Pisoni, Onetti, and Fratocchi (2010) indicated that headquarter–subsidiary relationships are assumed that local subsidiaries are normally controlled by the headquarters while the subsidiaries are conceptualized as a node within a complex inside and outside the MNC network of relationships (Bartlett & Goshal, 1989; Forsgren, 1989; Bartlett, Doz, & Hedlund, 1990; Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1990; Forsgren & Johanson, 1992; Snow, Miles, & Coleman, 1992; Holm, Johanson, & Thilenius, 1993; Nohria & Ghoshal, 1994). Company headquarters aim to centralize decision-making activities and maintain a control system on the overall business. Doz (1986) further stated that in some industry, local governments want local subsidiaries to acquire a relevant role within the internationalized company, as it will foster the local economic development (Doz, 1986).

Subsidiary Performance
Previous studies mostly employ financial performance as the consequence of the expatriation success (e.g., McNulty, DeCieri, & Hutchings, 2009). The direct effect of expatriation success is claimed as due to the cost reduction related with foreign operations, so that the organization is able to generate better financial performance. Another perspective, however, is performance related to non-financial measurements. Organizations that send their expatriates can create better customer satisfaction and enhance their business image, and thus potentially improve business reputation in host countries. Good reputations provide the rationale for a cross-sectional relationship between reputation and financial performance (Fombrun, 1996). Specifically, good reputation may enable the organization to charge premium prices, attract better applicants, enhance their access to capital markets, and attract investors (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990). Based on that, this study operationalizes organizational performance as based on expatriates’ perceptions (Eiadat et al., 2008) of their firms’ financial and non-financial performance.

3. Research Design and Methodology: Meta-analysis

Research model
Since previous studies have focused more on “expatriate-centric” studies and very rare studies have integrated expatriate-related perspective, family-related perspective, and social capital perspective into a more comprehensive model of expatriate adjustment and performance, it is expected that the results of this study can provide very important references on promoting expatriate performance.

Figure 1 – Research Framework
The research framework of this study is shown in Figure 1. It proposed that both expatriate-related and family-related factors are influential variables for expatriates’ stress, adjustment, and performance. As suggested, expatriate intelligence, expatriate capability, expatriate international experience, and expatriate culture values are the key components of expatriate-related factors, while family/spouse support, family adaptability, parent demand, and family-to-work conflict are the key components of family-related factors. Previous studies have treated expatriate-related factors and family-related factors as two independent issues. However, based on the real world situation, this study suggests that expatriate-related factors would have significant impacts on family-related factors. Furthermore, this study also assume that both expatriate-related factors and family-related factors have significant influences on social capital factor, which would also influence the stress, adjustment and performance of expatriates. Based on an integration of recent studies, this study proposed leader-member exchange (LMX), organizational support (POS), organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and affective commitments as four major factors for social capital.

**Procedures**

To have a thorough literature review on each of the research hypotheses, meta-analysis is adopted. Meta-analysis is a statistical procedure used to combined data from multiple studies. When the treatment effect (or effect size) is consistent from one study to the next, meta-analysis can be used to identify this common effect (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). This meta-analysis searched the empirical studies from different scientific database. The data was collected electronically in management, psychology, social science, business, marketing, health, and organizational behavior. First of all, this research looked for the coefficient correlations of three of the most important determinants of expatriate stress, adjustment, and performance, which are expatriate-related factors, family-related factors, and social capital factors by using ProQuest, JSTOR, SAGE, Emerald, ScienceDirect, WileyInterScience, Dissertation Abstract, Thesis Abstract, and Google Scholar. This research used them with multiple keywords to identify relevant journals, thesis, and dissertations. Correlations of each research hypothesis were collected for further analysis. After completing the search process, it obtained 341 studies which were usable for this meta-analysis. These results are showed in the last part of this meta-analysis research. Furthermore, in the references part, the meta-analysis’s data sources are showed with star.

**Statistical Test**

After integrating the correlation coefficient (r) of each study, a confidence interval is presented for each effect size and its significant. Rosenthal (1979) stated that when the mean effect size is significant, a fail N is calculated. Then, it estimates the number of non-significant and unavailable studies that would be necessary to bring the cumulative effect size to a non-significant value (known as the “file drawer problem”). This statistic analysis is an indication of the difficulty of the result. Confidence interval were also be analyzed. The criterion of 95 percent confidence interval was adopted to prove whether the hypothesis is accepted.

Moreover, Lipsey & Wilson (2001) explained about another Q-statistic which is an analysis of homogeneity of the effect size distribution. It is distributed as a chi-square with degree of freedom = n-1, where n = number of studies. This test has assumed that all of the effect sizes are estimating the same population mean is a reasonable assumption. The criterion for Q-statistic is Q value should be higher than Chi-square. It means the null hypothesis of homogeneity is accepted. Then, the variability across effect size does not exceed what would be expected based on sampling. If the null hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected, differences in effect size may be attributed to factor other than sampling, therefore, the heterogeneity between the variance is exist.

4. **Results of Meta-Analysis**

**Selected Papers for Meta-Analyses**

Table 1 shows the studies included in the meta-analysis. This meta-analysis evaluated each study for measuring the relationship between expatriate stress, cultural adjustment, performance, and their determinants.
### Table 1. Studies Included in the Meta-Analytic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies Alphabetically by Source and Codes for Hypotheses Tests&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adeyemo, 52, (E-SC; I-SC), 2007</td>
<td>León &amp; Finkelstein, 55, (C-SC), 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali et. al., 20, (FA-A), 2003</td>
<td>Lepine, et al., 59, (S-P), 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali, et al., 14, (S-P), 2011</td>
<td>León &amp; Finkelstein, 55, (C-SC), 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ang, Dyne, &amp; Begley, 38, (C-SC; E-SC), 2006</td>
<td>Lepine, et al., 59, (S-P), 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela &amp; Nguyen, 68, (I-P), 2011</td>
<td>Liu, 18, (E-A), 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedeian, Burke, &amp; Moffett, 36, (PD-A), 1988</td>
<td>Lu, 45, (FS-P; I-F), 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardi, 28, (S-P), 1997</td>
<td>Luo, 33, (C-P), 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron &amp; Khazanchi, 53, (S-P), 2010</td>
<td>Matthews, Conger and Wicrama, 71, (WF-S), 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caligiuri, 47, (S-A), 1998</td>
<td>Moon, Choi, &amp; Jung, 10, (I-A), 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caligiuri, 62, (FS-A; OS-A; S-A), 1999</td>
<td>Nguyen, 68, (I-A), 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caligiuri, 47, (FS-A; A-P), 1998</td>
<td>Oredein &amp; Alao, 49, (E-S), 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan &amp; Lam, 57, (LM-S; OS-S), 2008</td>
<td>Özabaci, 51, (I-F), 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi, 46, (A-P; OS-A), 2009</td>
<td>Parasuraman &amp; Simmer, 38, (PD-S), 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, 41, (C-SC), 2006</td>
<td>Ping &amp; Yue, 9, (I-P; I-SC), 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldman &amp; Bolino, 34, (E-SC), 2000</td>
<td>Ramalu, Shamsudin, &amp; Subramaniam, 13, (I-P; X-P), 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaspöler, 33, (I-A), 2007</td>
<td>Ramalu, Wei, &amp; Rose, 17, (I-A), 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaspöler, 67, (E-S), 2007</td>
<td>Ramalu, Wei, &amp; Rose, 16, (I-P; X-P), 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furuya, et al., 72, (OS-A), 2007</td>
<td>Ramalu, Probst, Chia, Maloles, &amp; Kong, 24, (OC-S), 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginley, 40, (OS-A), 2007</td>
<td>Rose &amp; Ramalu, 15, (I-P), 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goerzen &amp; Beamish, 44, (X-P), 2007</td>
<td>Rose, et al., 15, (X-P), 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hechanova, et al., 3, (FA-A; E-A; A-P), 2003</td>
<td>Semadar, Robins, &amp; Ferris, 74, (I-P), 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtbrügge &amp; Mohr, 66, (C-P), 2004</td>
<td>Shaffer, 70, (OS-A), 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtbrügge &amp; Mohr, 8, (X-P), 2004</td>
<td>Shaffer, et al., 20, (E-A; FA-A), 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey P. Shay and Sally Baack, 18, (AC-A), 2006</td>
<td>Wallace, 27, (FS-SC; PD-SC), 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiao &amp; Hardie, 30, (C-P), 2009</td>
<td>Wang &amp; Takeuchi, 73, (OS-A), 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelidbari, Dizgah, &amp; Jourshari, 29, (I-P), 2012</td>
<td>Waxin, 20, (OS-A), 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim &amp; Slocum, 42, (E-A), 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kraimer &amp; Wayne, 40, (S-A), 2004</th>
<th>Westman &amp; Exzion, 38, (FS-S), 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kraimer, et al, 54, (A-P; S-A; S-P; OS-A), 2001</td>
<td>Wilson, et al, 3, (S-P), 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraimer, Shaffer, &amp; Bolino, 11, (E-SC), 2009</td>
<td>Wu &amp; Ang, 62, (E-A), 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krikman &amp; Kim, 58, (I-P), 2009</td>
<td>Zin, 60, (FS-SC), 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam, Schaubroeck, &amp; Aryee, 38, (C-P), 2002</td>
<td>Zin, 60, (FS-SC), 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence &amp; Kacmar, 12, (LM-S), 2012</td>
<td>Zin, 61, (PD-SC; WF-SC), 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Magnini, &amp; Kim, 19, (I-SC), 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aCodes in parentheses: I = expatriate intelligence, X = expatriate international experience, C = expatriate cultural value, FS = family/spouse support, FA = family adaptability, PD = parental demand, WF = work-family conflict, LM = LMX, OS = organizational support, OC = OCB, AC = Affective Commitment, S = stress, A = Adjustment, P = performance.*


The following 10 research hypotheses were identified in this meta-analysis: (1) expatriate intelligence, international experience, and cultural value have positive influence on the factors of family related perspective; (2) Expatriate’s intelligence, international experiences, and cultural values have positive influences on the factors of expatriate’s adjustment and negative influences on the factors of expatriate’s stress; (3) Expatriate’s family/spouse support, family adaptability, and parental demand, and family-to-work conflict have influences on the factors of expatriate’s stress and adjustment; (4) Expatriate’s
intelligence, international experiences, and cultural values have positive influences on the factors of social capital; (5) Expatriate’s family/spouse support, family adaptability, and parental demand, and family-to-work conflict have influences on expatriate’s social capital; (6) Expatriate with higher LMX, organizational support, OCB, and (d) affective commitment result in lower expatriate stress and higher expatriate adjustment; (7) Expatriate’s intelligence, international experiences, and cultural values have positive influences on the factors of expatriate’s performance; (8) Expatriate’s) family/spouse support, family adaptability, and parental demand, and family-to-work conflict have significant influences on the factors of expatriate performance; (9) Expatriate’s stress in terms of risk and anxiety has negative influences on the factors of expatriate adjustment; (10) Expatriate’s stress has negative influences on expatriate performance; Expatriate adjustment has positive influences on expatriate performance. Two criterions were used for the inclusion of this meta-analysis: (1) correlation studies had to present the correlation coefficient (r) or the standardized regression coefficient for each of the research hypotheses, (2) studies of group contrasts had to present the related statistic (t-test, F-ratio with one df in the numerator) for the above research hypotheses (Matos, et al., 2007). Then, all of the criteria should convert to r coefficients using CMA software. Since Byron & Khazanchi (2010), Shrinivas and Shaffer (2005, and Hechanova (2003) have explained that correlation coefficient r was easier to interpret and most of meta-analytical review user as a criteria, this research used it for the further analysis. All identified studies were then examined in term of following relevant variables: authors, year, journal, total sample size, variables, and effect size. Furthermore, based on Lipsey & Wilson (2001) study, the magnitude of effect size (r) can be categorized as small (r < 0.1), medium (r = 0.25), and large (r > 0.40).

**Research Results**

There are 10 research hypotheses to be evaluated in 341 studies. The total sample size of this research is 135,063 with various amounts of sample size in each hypothesis: 14,964 samples as the highest number and 279 samples as the smallest among 341 studies. Furthermore, Table 2. shows the results of meta-analysis for result of the relationship expatriate stress, adjustment, and performance, with their determinants which are expatriate-related factors, family-related factor, and social capital factors. Besides, these hypotheses are also illustrate the relationship among determinants. Then, the results are analyzed to test the hypotheses using meta-analytic technique as explained above.

For the relationship between expatriate-related perspective and family-related perspective (hypothesis 1), the results show that, expatriate intelligence (r= 0.257; medium effect) and experience (r= 0.134; low effect) have positive influence on family-related perspective. Cultural value (r=-0.038; low effect) has negative influence on family-related perspective. For the relationship between expatriate-related perspective and expatriate stress/adjustment (hypothesis 2), the results show that, expatriate intelligence (r= 0.310; medium effect) have positive influence on expatriate’s adjustment and it also have positive influence on expatriate’s stress (r= 0.028; low effect). This result was opposite from the hypothesis. International experience (r=0.055; low effect) has positive influence on expatriate’s adjustment and negative influence on expatriate’s stress (r=-0.07; low effect). Lastly, cultural value (r=-0.173; low effect) have negative influence on expatriate’s adjustment and positive influence on expatriate’s stress (r= 0.028; low effect). For the relationship between family-related perspective and expatriate stress/adjustment (hypothesis 3), the results show that, family/spouse support (r= 0.076; low effect) have positive influence on expatriate’s adjustment and negative influence on expatriate’s stress (r=0.257; medium effect). Family adaptability (r=0.303; medium effect) has positive influence on expatriate’s adjustment. However, for the relationship between family adaptability and stress is not applicable because the number of study did not fulfill the criteria (less than 2 studies). Parental demand (r=-0.101; low effect) have negative influence on expatriate’s adjustment and positive influence on expatriate’s stress (r=0.025; low effect).
Table 2. Results of Meta-Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyp.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>k Studies</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Effect Size &amp; 95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Heterogeneity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>LCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Expatriate Intelligence</td>
<td>Family Related Perspectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Expatriate Experience</td>
<td>Family Related Perspectives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c</td>
<td>Expatriate Cultural Values</td>
<td>Family Related Perspectives</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Expatriate Intelligence</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11442</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Expatriate Experience</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c</td>
<td>Expatriate Cultural Values</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11751</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>Family/spouse support</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>Family Adaptability</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5819</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3c</td>
<td>Family Demand</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3d</td>
<td>Work-to-Family Conflict</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>Expatriate Intelligence</td>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2863</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>Expatriate Experience</td>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5409</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4c</td>
<td>Expatriate Cultural Values</td>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7205</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a</td>
<td>Family/spouse support</td>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b</td>
<td>Family Adaptability</td>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5c</td>
<td>Family Demand</td>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5d</td>
<td>Work-to-Family Conflict</td>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13992</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a</td>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6b</td>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3279</td>
<td>-0.283</td>
<td>-0.314</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6c</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>-0.312</td>
<td>-0.306</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6d</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>-0.190</td>
<td>-0.267</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7a</td>
<td>Expatriate Intelligence</td>
<td>Expatriate Performance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4275</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7b</td>
<td>Expatriate Experience</td>
<td>Expatriate Performance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2636</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7c</td>
<td>Expatriate Cultural Values</td>
<td>Expatriate Performance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8a</td>
<td>Family/spouse support</td>
<td>Expatriate Performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8b</td>
<td>Family Adaptability</td>
<td>Expatriate Performance</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8c</td>
<td>Family Demand</td>
<td>Expatriate Performance</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8d</td>
<td>Work-to-Family Conflict</td>
<td>Expatriate Performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2169</td>
<td>-0.656</td>
<td>-0.679</td>
<td>-0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Expatriate Adjustment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Expatriate Performance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14964</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>-0.201</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate Adjustment</td>
<td>Expatriate Performance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12082</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lastly, work-to-family conflict (r=-0.165; low effect) have negative influence on expatriate’s adjustment and positive influence on expatriate’s stress (r= 0.335; medium effect). For the relationship between expatriate-related factors and social capital (hypothesis 4), the results show that, expatriate intelligence (r= 0.374; medium effect) have positive influence on social capital. International experience (r=-0.072; low effect) and cultural value (r=-0.001; low effect) have negative influence on social capital. For the relationship between family-related perspective and social capital (hypothesis 5), the results show that, family/spouse support (r= 0.096; low effect) has positive influence and family adaptability negative influence (r=-0.147; low effect) on social capital. Then, parental demand (r=0.115; low effect) has positive influence and work-to-family conflict has negative influence (r=-0.164; low effect) on social capital.

For the interrelationship between social capital and stress/adjustment (hypothesis 6 and hypothesis 7), the results show that, LMX (r= 0.156; low effect) has positive influence on expatriate’s adjustment and negative influence (r=-0.283; medium effect) on expatriate’s stress. Organizational support (r=0.173; low effect) has positive influence on expatriate’s adjustment and negative influence (r=-0.232; low effect) on expatriate’s stress. Hypothesis 6 is not applicable because the number of study did not fulfill the criteria (less than 2 studies). Affective commitment (r= 0.017; low effect) has positive influence on expatriate’s adjustment and negative influence (r=-0.386; medium effect) on expatriate’s stress. Furthermore, the results for hypothesis 7 show that, expatriate intelligence (r= 0.194; low effect) and cultural value (r=0.031; low effect) have positive influence on expatriate performance. However, international experience (r=-0.007; low effect) has negative influence on expatriate performance. For the relationship between family-related factors and expatriate performance (hypothesis 8), the results show that, family/spouse support (r= 0.006; low effect) has positive influence on expatriate performance. However, for hypotheses 8b and 8c are not applicable because the number of study did not fulfill the criteria (less than 2 studies). Then, work-to-family conflict (r=-0.656; large effect) has negative influence on expatriate performance. For the effects of expatriate stress on expatriate adjustment (hypothesis 9), the results show that, expatriate stress (r= -0.194; low effect) has negative influence on expatriate adjustment. For the effects of expatriate stress/adjustment on expatriate performance (hypothesis 10), the results show that, expatriate stress (r= -0.186; low effect) has negative influence and expatriate adjustment (r=0.208; low effect) has positive influence on expatriate performance. Furthermore, all of these results are also supported by 95% confidence interval which indicates that the hypotheses are supported. Most of the Q-values are higher than Chi-square which indicates that those hypotheses are significantly heterogeneous from the variance attributed to factors rather than from the sampling errors.

5. Conclusions

From the findings, this study can be concluded as follows: first of all, expatriates who have good intelligence that can be cognitive, emotional, or cultural intelligence, will motivate adaptation to new cultural surroundings (Early & Peterson, 2004). They can manage and act wisely in human relations (Thorndike, 1920). From the study result it also showed that there are interrelationships between expatriate-related factors and family-related factors. It means they will easier and more capable of adjusting themselves into new environment (Early and Ang, 2003). Expatriate cultural value has negative influence on almost all of the variables because cultural value as more like power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, masculinity, and confucian dynamic which cannot be generalized into the same effect (Hofstedee, 1980, 1994; Bond, et. al., 1987). It seems to suggest that expatriates with less supportive family-work environment tend to have less family/spouse support and family adaptability.

Secondly, family-related perspective is also an important factor on influencing expatriates’ performance. It is because expatriates who can interact with family and get support from family members can improve their performance. Otherwise, expatriates who do not get support from family and higher parental demand or work-family conflict will reduce their performance (Allen, Herst, Bruck & Sutton, 2000). Furthermore, family-related perspective is also needed to enhance adjustment and inhibit stress.
Expatriates with higher capability will make them capable to adopt an appropriate leadership styles for the host environment (Liden, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2000). In other cases, employee in host country like to develop relationship with expatriates (Takeuhci, 2010). Therefore, it expatriates will not face difficulties with adjusting themselves because they get support from other employee and also organization.

Thirdly, expatriate with good social capital will be easier to adjust themselves in new environment because of social support, such as Leader Member Exchange (LMX), organizational support, OCB, and affective commitment, can reduce uncertainty in novel situations (Kraimer et al., 2001). It is because expatriates, who develop a relationship with host employee will have good networking (Au and Fukuda, 2002). In contrary, if they do not do that, they will face an uncertainty conditions that can increase their level of stress.

Finally, adjustment and stress have an important on expatriate performance. If expatriates can adjust themselves in the new environment, their performance will as good as in their home country. It is consistent with statement of Kraimer and Wayne (2004). Otherwise, expatriates, who have a high level of crisis will make them unable to plan, reason and understand the situation accurately that will impact on their adjustment and performance (Pauchant and Mitroff, 1990). They will be difficult to adjust and cannot perform in their best. Furthermore, anxiety expatriates also have a negative influence on adjustment and performance. It is because they feel less confident with themselves to solve the problem or to face the new environment (Akgun et al., 2006).

There are several limitations in this study. Form the results, there are some not applicable value came out because of limited for meta-analysis. Some hypotheses only have small number of studies (less than two studies) that cannot be calculated and analyze in meta-analysis research. Therefore, future study can solve this problem by extending the study period to a longer period. Furthermore, some other factors that have influence in this expatriation model should be added for future research, such as the friend’s support, home country community in host country, cross-culture training, or mentoring behavior. Besides, even though the literature has comprehensively surveyed, it cannot guarantee a full coverage of all available studies. In addition, several studies could not be included due to insufficient information.

Moreover, this meta-analysis contributed the understandings of expatriate performance by developing a comprehensive model that integrate expatriate-related perspective, family-related perspective, and social capital perspective for expatriate assignment and adjustment. Since many of previous studies on expatriate adjustment and expatriate performance have dominated on "stressor-stress-stream paradigm" that are more "expatriate- centrics" without considering the effect of stakeholders, this study integrated the three perspective of concerns into a more comprehensive research model and empirically test the variability of the model. The specific contributions of this research could be described as follows:

1. This research developed a research model by extending the concept from "expatriate-centrics" perspective to family-related perspective and social capital perspective as the influential variables for expatriate adjustment and effectiveness. Since previous studies have rarely discussed about the influences of stakeholders on expatriate adjustment, the results of this study have enhanced the understandings on how expatriate adjustment can be influenced by factors other than expatriate's EQ, CQ, and IQ.

2. This research identified the interrelationship between expatriate-related perspective, family-related perspective and social capital perspective. These interrelationships have never been tested in the context of expatriate adjustment. The results showed that the integrative effects of these three perspectives on expatriate adjustment and effectiveness have offered a new research direction for expatriate adjustment and management.

3. This research simultaneously integrated more variables from expatriate-related perspective, family-related perspective, and social capital perspective to justify their influences on expatriate adjustment and effectiveness. Although these three perspectives are critical for expatriate adjustment, from the best knowledge of the author, none of previous studies have done the same efforts.
Research Contribution

The research contributed our understandings by developing a comprehensive model that integrate expatriate-related perspectives, family-related perspective, and social capital perspective for expatriate assignment and adjustment. Since many of previous studies on expatriate adjustment and expatriate performance have dominated on "stressor-stress-stream paradigm" that are more "expatriate-centric" without considering the effect of stakeholders, this study aims to integrate the above three perspective of concerns into a more comprehensive research model and empirically test the variability of the model. The specific contributions of this study could be described as follows:

1. This study aims to develop a research model by extending the concept from "expatriate-centric" perspective to family-related perspective and social capital perspective as the influential variables for expatriate adjustment and effectiveness. Since previous studies have rarely discussed about the influences of stakeholders on expatriate adjustment, the results of this study have enhanced our understandings on how expatriate adjustment can be influenced by factors other than expatriate's personality, intelligence, capability and cultural values.

2. This study aims to identify the interrelationship between expatriate-related perspective, family-related perspective and social capital perspectives. These interrelationship have never been tested in the context of expatriate adjustment. The integrative effects of these three perspectives on expatriate adjustment and effectiveness have been evaluated in this study through meta-analysis. The results have offered a new research direction for expatriate adjustment and management.

3. This study further contribute to expatriation literature by employing expatriate performance, knowledge transfer performance, headquarter-subsidiary relationship, and subsidiary performance as the major factors for expatriate effectiveness. Previous studies mainly emphasize the accomplishment of expatriation tasks and the relationship with local co-workers to measure expatriate performance. This study further extends the constructs of expatriate effectiveness into knowledge transfer, headquarter subsidiarity relationship, and subsidiary performance. Based on that, this study has added additional factors which may contribute more on the expatriation literature.

4. This study adopted qualitative, in which a series of literature review and meta-analysis were included. Since previous studies tend to adopt a piecemeal approach that a multiple perspective concept of expatriate adjustment is still not well established. This study has fill these research gaps and the study results are suggested for further validation.
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