Abstract
Previous research has shown that immigrants’ approach orientation positively predicts their attitudes towards contact with host nationals (Matschke & Sassenberg, 2010). The present research builds on this previous work by investigating the extent to which immigrants’ independent vs. interdependent problem-solving style moderates the relation between approach-avoidance orientation and social integration. Interdependent problem-solvers rely on other people to achieve their goals. This interdependence was expected to reduce the influence of approach-avoidance orientation on integration among immigrants. Immigrants to Australia (N = 137) completed a questionnaire that included measures of approach-avoidance orientation and problem-solving style. Participants also completed three measures of social integration: (1) proportion of Australian friends, (2) feelings of inclusion in Australian society, and (3) satisfaction with employment, accommodation, and life in Australia. Consistent with previous research, there was a positive relation between approach and social integration and a negative relation between avoidance and social integration. Consistent with predictions, problem-solving style moderated the relation for approach orientation: Only immigrants who were independent problem-solvers showed a significant positive relation between approach and social integration. The results are discussed in relation to Gable’s (2006) model of approach and avoidance social goals and motives, and the implications for immigration services are considered.
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Immigrants’ Social Integration as a Function of Approach-Avoidance Orientation and Problem-Solving Style

1. Introduction

Social integration refers to the quantity and quality of social connections and interactions that people have with others. In the context of immigration, the term integration is often used to refer to a type of acculturation strategy in which immigrants have regular contact with host nationals and maintain their original cultural identity (e.g., Berry, 1997). This strategy can be distinguished from strategies in which immigrants reject their original cultural identity and/or do not have regular contact with host nationals (i.e., assimilation, separation, marginalization; Berry, 1997). In the present article, we use the term social integration in a broader sense to refer to the quantity and quality of contact between immigrants and host nationals irrespective of the degree of cultural identity maintenance (for a similar conceptualization, see Matschke & Sassenberg, 2010).

Social integration has three important benefits for immigrants. First, it facilitates intergroup contact (Allport, 1954) and, consequently, improves intergroup relations between immigrants and host nationals (Martinovic, van Tubergen, & Maas, 2009; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Second, it enables immigrants to access the social capital of host nationals and, consequently, access better employment and lifestyle opportunities (Martinovic et al., 2009). Third, it can help to reduce health risks that may be elevated among immigrants, such as psychological distress and the risk of suicide (Dalgaard & Thapa, 2007; Kposowa, McElvain, & Breault, 2008). Given these benefits, it is important to investigate personality and social psychological processes that may facilitate social integration among immigrants.

In the present research, we investigated approach-avoidance orientation as a predictor of immigrants’ social integration, and we considered problem-solving style as a potential moderator of this relation. We begin by considering how approach-avoidance orientation might affect immigrants’ social integration.

1.1 Approach-Avoidance Orientation

Based on Elliot and Thrash (2002), we conceptualize approach orientation as a general tendency to strive towards positive stimuli and avoidance orientation as a general tendency to avoid negative stimuli. Gable and colleagues (Gable, 2006; Elliot, Gable, & Mapes, 2006) found that social goals and motives that represented an approach orientation predicted satisfaction with social bonds and a greater frequency of positive social events. In contrast, social goals and motives that represented an avoidance orientation predicted anxiety about social relationships and a greater impact of negative social events on relationships. In other words, an approach tendency facilitated the development of positive social relationships, whereas an avoidance tendency inhibited relationship development.

Gable (2006) proposed separate processes by which approach and avoidance social goals and motives affect social interactions. People with strong approach social motives and goals are thought to be more likely to seek out, create, and take advantage of positive social situations and opportunities. In contrast, people with strong avoidance social motives and goals react more negatively to negative aspects of their relationships, and this reaction is thought to have a detrimental impact on their relationships.

Matschke and Sassenberg (2010) recently applied Gable’s (2006) theorizing to the area of immigration. Consistent with Gable, they found that social approach strategies positively predicted German immigrants’ pro-integration attitudes towards Dutch nationals. Contrary to Gable, social avoidance strategies were unrelated to immigrants’ contact attitudes.

In summary, previous research has shown that approach-avoidance social motives and goals predict social integration (Elliot et al., 2006; Gable, 2006) and immigrants’ attitudes towards social integration (Matschke & Sassenberg, 2010). However, it is unclear whether
the relation between approach-avoidance orientation and social integration is relatively stable across individuals or whether individual difference variables moderate the size of this relation. This is an important issue from both a basic theoretical perspective and an applied perspective. From a basic theoretical perspective, the identification of moderating variables will allow us to confirm and refine theoretical explanations of the relation between approach-avoidance and social integration. From an applied perspective, the identification of moderating variables will allow us to predict with greater precision which immigrants are most and least likely to integrate into their host societies. In the present research, we investigated problem-solving style as a potential moderator of the relation between approach-avoidance and social integration.

1.2 The Moderating Effect of Problem-Solving Style

People often rely on others to help them to solve their problems and achieve their goals. For example, people seek support from others in order to adhere to medical regimes (Uchino, 2004) and achieve their personal and relationship goals (Brunstein, Dangelmayer, & Schultheiss, 1996; for a recent review, see Fitzsimons & Finkel, 2010). Recent research has found that this interdependence can have deleterious effects on people’s goal motivations. Fitzsimons and Finkel (2011) found that people’s motivation to achieve personal goals was reduced when they thought about the ways in which their romantic partners could help them to achieve those goals. The researchers concluded that people had outsourced their self-regulation to their partners.

Based on this previous research, we hypothesised that approach-avoidance orientation would be least likely to predict social integration among immigrants who tend to rely on others to solve their problems and achieve their goals. These interdependent immigrants should outsource their social integration to others. For example, they might rely on family and friends to invite them to social gatherings, introduce them to host nationals, and facilitate subsequent social interactions. Consequently, their own approach-avoidance orientation should have little bearing on the extent to which they become integrated in the host society.

In contrast, approach-avoidance orientation should be more likely to predict social integration among immigrants who have an independent problem-solving style. Independent immigrants should rely more on their own motivation and ability than on other people to enable their social integration. In particular, following Gable’s (2006) model, independent immigrants with a strong approach orientation are likely to be proactive in seeking out, creating, and taking advantage of positive social situations and opportunities with host nationals.

1.3 Summary of Hypotheses

Based on research that has investigated the relation between approach-avoidance orientation and social relationships (Gable, 2006; Elliot et al., 2006; Matschke & Sassenberg, 2010), we predicted that immigrants’ approach orientation would be positively related to their social integration, and that immigrants’ avoidance orientation would be negatively related to their social integration.

Based on research that has investigated the relation between interdependence and goal motivations (Fitzsimons & Finkel, 2010, 2011), our central hypothesis was that individual differences in problem-solving style would moderate the size of the relation between approach-avoidance and social integration. Specifically, we hypothesised that this relation would be stronger for independent problem-solvers than for interdependent problem-solvers because independent problem-solvers are more likely to rely on their own personality in order to achieve social integration. In contrast, interdependent problem-solvers are more likely to delegate the task of their social integration to others.

2.0 Pilot Test of the Independent-Interdependent Problem-Solving Scale
In order to test our central hypothesis, we required a general measure of individual differences in the tendency to work on one’s own or seek help from others to solve problems and achieve goals. Although several measures of help-seeking exist in the literature, they are tied to specific contexts such as psychology counselling or education (Fischer & Turner, 1970; Karabenick, 2003), and so they are not appropriate for an immigration context. Consequently, we developed our own general measure of independent and interdependent problem-solving.

We developed and collated six items that measured people’s preference for independent problem-solving (e.g., “In general, I do not like to ask other people to help me to solve problems”) and six items that measured their preference for interdependent problem-solving (e.g., “I like to get advice from my friends and family when deciding how to solve my personal problems”). Two of the items were taken from Triandis et al.’s (1986) Individualism-Collectivism scale, two were taken from Singelis’ (1994) Self-Construal Scale, and one was based on Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier (2002, p. 9). The remaining items were generated by the first author. The full list of items is available in the online supplemental material.

To test the reliability and validity of the Independent-Interdependent Problem-Solving Scale (IIPSS), we asked first-year psychology undergraduate students from an Australian university to complete the IIPSS and a series of related measures. The sample consisted of 312 students (267 women and 45 men) who had a mean age of 22.48 years (SD = 7.34).

We reverse-scored the interdependent items and then included the 12 IIPSS items in an exploratory factor analysis with principal axis factoring and an oblique rotation (promax with Kaiser normalization, $K = 4.00$). Examination of a scree plot revealed a single factor before the plot changed direction and tailed off. This factor accounted for 33.03% of the variance and had an eigenvalue of 3.96. Eleven of the 12 items loaded at greater than .33 on this factor. The remaining item had a relatively poor loading (.17). This item was from Singelis’ (1994) Self-Construal Scale (“Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me”). The inclusion or deletion of this item did not have a substantial effect on the internal consistency of the scale (as $= .80$ and .81 respectively). Consequently, we retained the item in the final version of the scale.

Confirming its convergent validity, the IIPSS was negatively related to Cross, Bacon, and Morris’ (2000) Relational-Interdependent Self-Construal scale ($r = -.34, p < .001$) and Goldberg et al.’s (2006) 10-item Extraversion scale ($r = -.19, p < .001$). Supporting its predictive validity, the IIPSS was positively related to participants’ self-reported likelihood that they would search the internet to find a solution to a problem at university ($r = .13, p = .026$) and negatively related to their self-reported likelihood that they would ask another student to help them with a university problem ($r = -.31, p < .001$). Taken together, these results provided evidence that the IIPSS represents a reliable and valid measure of independent vs. interdependent problem-solving.

### 3.0 Method

**3.1 Participants**

Participants in the main study were 137 immigrants to Australia. There were 85 women and 52 men. They had a mean age of 49.54 years ($SD = 16.36$), and they came from 46 countries. The most frequent country of origin was the UK (27.0%), followed by the USA (7.3%), Estonia (7.3%), Malaysia (4.4%), and the Netherlands (4.4%). The relatively large number of UK immigrants is consistent with national immigration statistics. Almost one quarter of participants had been in Australia for less than 3 years, and half had been in Australia for less than 9 years. Their length of time in Australia ranged from 2 months to 63 years ($M = 17.4$ years, $SD = 18.63$ years).
3.2 Measures

3.2.1 Predictor variables: Approach-avoidance orientation and problem-solving style. We measured approach-avoidance orientation using Lockwood, Jordan, and Kunda’s (2002) Regulatory Focus Scale. This scale contains two 9-item subscales that measure promotion focus (e.g., “I frequently imagine how I will achieve my hopes and aspirations”) and prevention focus (e.g., “I am anxious that I will fall short of my responsibilities and obligations”). The concepts of promotion and prevention are similar to the concepts of approach and avoidance. Although there are some conceptual and operational differences between these constructs (Elliot & Thrash, 2010), these differences are not relevant to the present research. Consequently, we considered Lockwood et al.’s scale to be an appropriate measure of approach-avoidance for the purposes of our research. Consistent with this decision, Lockwood et al.’s measure has large correlations with measures of approach and avoidance (rs ≥ .55; Elliot & Thrash, 2010).

Participants responded to the items in the Regulatory Focus Scale using a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Good reliability was obtained for each subscale (α = .86 for both). We computed separate means for approach and avoidance orientations.

We measured problem-solving style using the IIPSS. The main study showed that this scale had good internal reliability (α = .77). As in the pilot test, we reverse-scored the interdependent items before computing the average of all of the items. Hence, larger scores indicated a stronger independent problem-solving style and a weaker interdependent problem-solving style.

3.2.2 Outcome variables: Social integration. We measured social integration using three measures. The first measure assessed the quantity of participants’ social relationships with Australians (rather than co-ethnics or other immigrants). Participants indicated the proportion of people among their current friends in Australia who were Australians. Responses were made on a 5-point scale (1 = none, 5 = almost all).

The second measure assessed feelings of social inclusion using an adapted version of Spivey’s (1990) Inclusionary Status Scale. We adapted the nine items in this measure to refer to Australia and Australians (e.g., “people in Australia often seek out my company”; “I often feel like an outsider at social gatherings in Australia”, reverse scored). Participants responded to items using a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). This scale had very good internal reliability in the present research (α = .92).

The third measure of social integration assessed participants’ satisfaction with their immigrant life. Specifically, participants indicated how satisfied they were with (a) their employment, (b) their accommodation, and (c) their life in Australia (1 = extremely dissatisfied, 7 = extremely satisfied). This scale showed acceptable internal reliability (α = .70). However, the distribution was negatively skewed (skewness = -.62, SE = .23), and could not be corrected by exclusion of outliers. To meet assumptions of normality, the variable was submitted to log-transformation, and then reflected back so that high scores indicated greater satisfaction.

The questionnaire also contained a series of additional measures. Further details about these measures and their results are available in Watt, Ramelli, and Rubin (2010).

3.3 Procedure

The questionnaire was introduced as an investigation of “migrant adjustment in Australia”. Participants took approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Multicultural organizations in the state of New South Wales and listed in the Ethnic Communities Reference Book, Online Edition (2008) were contacted to ask their assistance in distributing hard copies of the questionnaire to their members and clients or to distribute a...
link to an online version of the questionnaire on their website. Completed hard-copy questionnaires were returned using a prepaid envelope.

3.4 Design of the Analyses

We predicted that approach orientation would be positively related to social integration, avoidance orientation would be negatively related to social integration, and problem-solving style would moderate the relation between approach-avoidance orientation and social integration such that the relation would be stronger for independent problem-solvers than for interdependent problem-solvers. To test these hypotheses, a moderation regression analysis was conducted for each indicator of social integration (proportion of host friends, inclusionary status, and satisfaction). Each analysis included age and length of stay as control variables. Each analysis also included the following predictor variables: approach orientation, avoidance orientation, independent problem-solving style, and the interactions of approach orientation and avoidance orientation with independent problem-solving style. The interaction terms were computed by first standardizing the variables to center them and then multiplying the standardized variables together.

We included participants’ age in our analyses because previous research has found that immigrants’ age is negatively related to their identification with the host culture (Cheung, Chudek, & Heine, 2011) and their social integration over time (Martinovic et al., 2009). We also included length of time since moving to the host country in our analyses because previous research has found that this variable is positively related to social integration (Martinovic et al., 2009). Some participants had been in Australia for a very long time (up to 63 years), creating outliers. These extreme values were excluded from the analyses that are reported below, but they were included when computing the mean and standard deviation values that are reported in Section 3.1 above. Multivariate outliers were identified using Mahalanobis distances ($α = .001$), and these individuals were excluded from each analysis. Variance inflation factors were scrutinized for each regression analysis as a check for multicollinearity, but none indicated a problem of this nature.

Variables were coded so that higher scores indicated more approach and avoidance, more independent problem-solving, a larger proportion of host friends, and greater feelings of inclusion and satisfaction.

4.0 Results

4.1 Preliminary Analysis

We excluded 29 participants who had 5% or more missing values. Our final sample consisted of 108 participants (68 women, 40 men). Our sample size varied slightly between different analyses due to missing values on individual measures (e.g., proportion of Australian friends).

Descriptive statistics and correlations between variables are presented in Table 1. Among the predictor variables, there was a large positive correlation between approach and avoidance orientation (cf. Lockwood et al., 2002). Approach and avoidance orientation both correlated quite weakly with independent problem-solving and in a negative direction. The three outcome variables (proportion of host friends, inclusionary status, and satisfaction) showed medium positive correlations with one another.

4.2 Tests of Hypotheses

Table 2 provides the results of our moderated regression analyses. We discuss the results for each outcome variable below.

4.2.1 Proportion of Australian friends. Consistent with our hypotheses, approach orientation related positively with proportion of Australian friends ($β = .32, p = .004$) and avoidance orientation related negatively with proportion of Australian friends ($β = - .35, p = .001$). Furthermore, there was a significant interaction between approach orientation and problem-solving ($β = .25, p = .02$).
To examine this interaction, we followed the approach recommended by Aiken and West (1991). We split the sample into independent problem-solvers (one standard deviation above the mean) and interdependent problem-solvers (one standard deviation below the mean). Separate regression analyses with age, length of stay, approach orientation, and avoidance orientation as predictors of proportion of Australian friends were then conducted for the independent and interdependent problem-solving groups. As predicted, there was a significant positive relation between approach orientation and proportion of Australian friends among independent problem-solvers ($\beta = .67, p = .01$) but not among interdependent problem-solvers ($\beta = .20, p = .41$).

### 4.2.2 Inclusionary status.
As predicted, approach orientation related positively with inclusionary status ($\beta = .32, p = .002$) and avoidance orientation related negatively with inclusionary status ($\beta = -.49, p = .001$). Again, there was a significant interaction between approach orientation and problem-solving ($\beta = .29, p = .006$).

To investigate this interaction, we again created groups for independent and interdependent problem-solvers at one standard deviation above and below the mean and conducted a regression analysis with age, length of stay, approach orientation, and avoidance orientation as predictors of inclusionary status for each group. As predicted, there was a significant positive relation between approach orientation and inclusionary status among independent problem-solvers ($\beta = .67, p = .02$) but not among interdependent problem-solvers ($\beta = .06, p = .78$).

### 4.2.3 Satisfaction.
Approach orientation related positively with satisfaction ($\beta = .26, p = .01$), and avoidance orientation related negatively with satisfaction ($\beta = -.31, p = .003$). Furthermore, there was a significant interaction between approach orientation and satisfaction ($\beta = .38, p = .001$). Decomposition of the interaction using the same method as above showed a significant positive relation between approach orientation and satisfaction among independent problem-solvers ($\beta = .65, p = .01$) but not among interdependent problem-solvers ($\beta = .29, p = .15$).

## 5.0 Discussion

### 5.1 Summary of Results
Consistent with previous research (Gable, 2006; Elliot et al., 2006; Matschke & Sassenberg, 2010), we found a significant relation between approach-avoidance orientation and social integration. Approach orientation was positively related to (a) the proportion of friends in the host country, (b) feelings of inclusion in the host country, and (c) satisfaction with employment, accommodation, and life in the host country. Avoidance orientation was negatively related to these three aspects of social integration.

The present research makes a significant contribution to previous research in this area by identifying problem-solving style as an important moderator of the relation between approach orientation and social integration. Consistent with predictions, only immigrants with an independent problem-solving style showed a significant relation between their approach orientation and social integration. This relation was nonsignificant among immigrants who had an interdependent problem-solving style.

### 5.2 Theoretical Implications
The present research has three important implications for Gable’s (2006) theoretical model of approach and avoidance social motives and goals. First, our research confirms the generalizability of Gable’s model to immigration contexts. Matschke and Sassenberg (2010) provided initial evidence of this generalizability. However, their evidence was limited. They found that group-related approach strategies predicted social integration attitudes but that, contrary to Gable’s model, group-related avoidance strategies did not predict social integration. (See Matschke and Sassenberg, 2010, for an explanation of this null finding.) The present research provides more comprehensive support for Gable’s model. We found that
both approach orientation and avoidance orientation were significantly related to three different measures of social integration.

Second, we identified problem-solving style as an important moderator of the relation between approach-avoidance and social integration. Independent immigrants with a strong approach orientation were most likely to integrate with host nationals, and independent immigrants with a weak approach orientation were least likely to integrate. However, there was no significant relation between approach orientation and social integration among interdependent migrants. Hence, the present findings qualify Gable’s (2006) model in an important way: Social approach tendencies only facilitate social interactions among independent problem-solvers; they do not facilitate social interactions among interdependent problem-solvers. Following Fitzsimons and Finkel (2011), this moderating effect is likely to occur because interdependent problem-solvers rely on other people to help them with the task of social integration, and this interdependence reduces the influence of their approach-avoidance orientation on the outcome of that task.

Third, problem-solving style only moderated the relation between social integration and approach orientation. Although avoidance orientation predicted social integration, this relation was not moderated by problem-solving style ($ps \geq .09$). This empirical divergence between approach and avoidance orientation is common in the literature, and it justifies their consideration as independent constructs (Gable, 2006). This divergence is also consistent with Gable’s model. As discussed in the Introduction, Gable proposed separate processes by which approach and avoidance social goals and motives affect social interactions and relationships. An approach orientation involves seeking out, creating, and taking advantage of positive social situations and opportunities. This process is most likely to occur among independent problem-solvers and least likely to occur among interdependent problem-solvers, who delegate this process to others. In contrast, an avoidance orientation involves negative reactions to negative aspects of social relationships. This avoidance process should be equally influential amongst both independent and interdependent problem-solvers. Hence, the divergence between approach and avoidance orientation in the extent to which their relation with social integration is moderated by problem-solving style is theoretically consistent with Gable’s (2006) model.

The present research also builds on recent evidence that people sometimes outsource their self-regulation. Fitzsimons and Finkel (2011) found that people’s motivation to achieve health goals and academic goals was reduced when they thought about their romantic partners. The present research extends this line of work from motivations to actual goal outcomes. We showed that immigrants’ approach orientation is less likely to predict their social integration when they are interdependent problem-solvers.

### 5.3 Applied Implications

The present research also has important implications in the specific area of immigration. We did not find a significant direct relation between problem-solving style and social integration. Hence, interdependent problem-solving did not lead to better social integration than independent problem-solving. However, in an analysis of mean values, we found that immigrants with an independent problem-solving style and a strong approach orientation were the most integrated into Australian society. This result held for all three indices of social integration.

Based on these results, immigration services should encourage immigrants to (a) take charge of their own integration (i.e., independent problem-solving) and (b) make proactive efforts to achieve this integration (i.e., approach orientation). Of course, such services should provide practical help and assistance to immigrants, including in relation to their social integration. However, the present research suggests that immigration services may also
benefit immigrants by providing them with the motivation and skills to approach social situations with host nationals in an independent manner.

5.4 Limitations and Future Research

Our conclusions are limited by the cross-sectional nature of our research design. In particular, the causal direction of the relations between our predictor and outcome variables is ambiguous. For example, it is possible that greater social integration causes immigrants to become more concerned about approach and less concerned about avoidance. Future researchers may wish to employ a longitudinal design in order to overcome this interpretational ambiguity.

It is also important to consider the generalizability of our results in two ways. First, it is possible that our results vary as a function of cultural context. In particular, Western cultures are more likely to encourage approach motivation, whereas non-Western cultures are more likely to encourage avoidance motivation (e.g., Hamamura, Meijer, Heine, Kamaya, & Hori, 2009). Consequently, the relations between approach, avoidance, problem-solving, and social integration may be different in non-Western cultures.

Second, we have demonstrated our results in an immigration context. However, in theory, our results should generalize to any situation in which people attempt to integrate with the members of a group that they have recently joined. For example, future research could investigate how approach-avoidance orientation and problem-solving style predict the social integration of new students at university (e.g., Watt & Badger, 2009).

6.0 Conclusions

The present research identified an important moderator of the relation between approach-avoidance orientation and social integration among Australian immigrants. Approach orientation only predicted social integration among independent problem-solvers, not among interdependent problem-solvers. This moderating effect suggests that Gable’s (2006) model of approach and avoidance social motives and goals may only predict social integration in the case of independent problem-solvers, and that interdependent problem-solvers may engage in a form of self-regulatory outsourcing in which they rely on other people to help them with the task of social integration. Based on the present research findings, immigration services should encourage immigrants to adopt an independent and approach orientation to their integration in order to achieve the highest levels of integration, inclusion, and satisfaction in their host society.
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Table 1
*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Length of stay (months)</td>
<td>157.12</td>
<td>167.67</td>
<td>.768**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictor variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Avoidance orientation (1–7 scale)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Approach orientation (1–7 scale)</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.240*</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Independent problem-solving (1–7 scale)</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.257**</td>
<td>-.256*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Proportion of host friends (1–5 scale)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-.216*</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Inclusionary status (1–7 scale)</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.329**</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.586**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Satisfaction (log transformed)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>-.230*</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Results of Moderated Multiple Regression Analyses onto Proportion of Host Friends, Inclusionary Status, and Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Err</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of Australian friends</strong> $\left( R = .47, \text{ adj. } R^2 = .16, \ p &lt; .001 \right)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay (months)</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.510</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach orientation</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance orientation</td>
<td>-.325</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>-3.286</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent problem-solving</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach*Problem-solving</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>2.289</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance*Problem-solving</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.586</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusionary status</strong> $\left( R = .55, \text{ adj. } R^2 = .25, \ p &lt; .001 \right)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.437</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>4.019</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay (months)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach orientation</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>3.207</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance orientation</td>
<td>-.553</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.494</td>
<td>-4.952</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent problem-solving</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach*Problem-solving</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>2.827</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance*Problem-solving</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-6.26</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction (log transformed)</strong> $\left( R = .54, \text{ adj. } R^2 = .29, \ p &lt; .001 \right)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay (months)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach orientation</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>2.553</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance orientation</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>-3.016</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent problem-solving</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach*Problem-solving</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>3.648</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance*Problem-solving</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>-1.718</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>