

Review of: "Beyond culture shock: entering the complex world of Global South expatriates' adaptation"

Maryam Bala Kuki¹

¹ Nottingham Trent University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments:

This paper examines the cultural adjustment of expatriates. I can see that expatriates from the south are specifically chosen by the authors as a result of the limited research on the subject, this shows a contextual gap that you are bridging, although to me the paper need an amount of work to support a clear argument and contribution.

I think in essence the contribution of this research is to be one of the first studies to look at the question of culture and adjustment from the perspective of expatriates from colonized nations as most studies in this area were mostly confined to expatriates from industrialized nations. However, a recurrent theme in expatriation studies investigated in the past 40 years revolves around the cultural adjustment of expatriates worldwide, hence much has been investigated in this area. To offer a good contribution to knowledge and practice, the authors really need to clearly narrow down who exactly are expatriates from the south (which region)? This applies to the west as well – which countries are you referring to in your study? And what and what studies has be done in this regions and what is missing. This will help identify which gap you are bridging exactly.

Although you mentioned the south as “expatriates for formerly colonised nations and emerging economies” this does not come across clearly to the reader. Studies have been carried out on African and Indian expatriates living and working in Industrialized countries.

1. **Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?**

The purpose in Abstract could have been more explicit - the subject of investigation (global south expats) is not clear and why it was worth investigating. Overall, Abstract should clearly emphasise the purpose of this study and its originality – this is missing in the Abstract.

You mentioned in the Abstract: “This paper is one few to highlight the global south expatriates’ adaptation issues that are poorly addressed in the literature with reference to Global South expatriates”. Again you need to be very clear. If there are other few studies that highlighted this gap, it is worth including them to further support your argument.

You mentioned in the Abstract: “The expatriate literature is often biased towards Western expatriates, ignoring the situation of psychological insecurity caused by psycho-social factors that hamper Global South expatriates’ integration”. You need to narrow down and be clear as there is a lot in the literature on expatriates from colonized nations and

emerging economies.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources?

The literature review needs work to position the paper within the conceptual framing and claim a clear contribution. The paper would be strengthened by developing the literature. Although the authors draw upon relevant material in the literature to frame their study. The authors might usefully consider drawing upon some of the recent literature in this area to further support the claim that the expatriate literature is often biased towards western expatriates, ignoring global south expatriates since this is one of the contribution of the study.

The conceptual foundation for the paper is currently rather briefly explained and not entirely clear. it will be good to establish your view on cultural adjustment a bit more robustly, and more clearly bring the cultural and social factors into it. Although HR factor is central to the paper, it is fairly linked to the other concepts and the conceptual framing. A couple of papers might be of use, to help you connect all the factors which you introduce as a key concept.

Or, look at it from another perspective - think about which literature you want the paper to contribute to, is it the cultural aspect - cultural distance or social support aspect – family issue or management aspect – HR issues? Then that bit has to be much more developed throughout the study. This will help provide a clear contribution outlined in the introduction to the paper.

The discussion likewise needs more depth. The findings would be more explicit and robust by strengthening the literature. This will enable key points to be drawn out more clearly in the discussion.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate concepts or other ideas? Are the methods employed appropriate?

The research design is not well justified. The authors need to clearly explain all the methods used in their study. The methodology would also be strengthened by making explicit how the research questions were formulated and how the themes were clearly derived.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?

The findings would be more explicit and robust by strengthening the conceptual foundation. Key points in the findings need to be drawn out more clearly to further strengthen the discussion.

5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research?

Some implications outlined.

