APPENDIX II

Statistical Analysis

A total of 216 respondents answered all or part of the survey. Of the 216 respondents, 173 answered as members of the diaspora, and 41 as non-immigrant European inhabitants. Of those who identified their diaspora residency, most listed places in the United States, but 3 listed Canada, 2 listed Australia, 1 listed New Zealand, and 1 listed Germany. Of the group who listed which generation emigrated, 4 listed themselves, 21 listed parents, uncles, or aunts, 61 listed grandparents, 33 listed great-grandparents, and the remainder listed great-great-grandparents or earlier, so the sample is multigenerational-immigrant. The majority of respondents were between 46 and 75 years of age, and 58% were men. Exhibit 1 summarizes the frequencies of demographic variables.

Exhibit 1
Frequencies for Demographic Variables

		N	Percent		N	Percent
Residency				Age		
	Diaspora	173	81	18-30	5	2.3
	Europe	41	19	31-45	19	8.8
Gender				46-60	50	23.3
	Male	125	58.1	61-75	95	44.2
	Female	75	34.9	Over 75	31	14.4
Generation (Immigrant Ancestry of Respondent)						
	1st	4	2.7			
	2nd	21	14.1			
	3rd	61	40.9			
	4th	33	22.1			
	Earlier	30	20.1			

Measures

The questionnaire had 4 main parts. The first part asked respondents to spend a few minutes viewing two different photo *collages* comprised of 17-30 different photos. The first *collage* depicted scenes with traditional foods, entertainment, clothing, family structures, religious activities, music and dancing, gender roles, work roles, buildings, and educational activity. The second *collage* depicted scenes with modern commercial foods, global entertainment, diverse family structures, technology-enhanced activity, institutional education, commercial buildings, work roles, and global financial markets. Photos for each *collage* were similar for the diaspora and European versions, but there were minor adaptations to enhance the possibility of familiarity in the different locations. Respondents were then asked to rate how much they agreed with the statements listed in Exhibit 2 when applied to each photo set—once for the traditional set and once for the modern set. Interspersed with the items for the traditional set were a truncated set of items taken from a measure of evoked nostalgia developed and validated by Pascal, Sprott, and Muehling (2002): makes me feel nostalgic, evokes fond memories, reminds me of the good old

days, is a pleasant reminder of the past, makes me reminisce about a previous time, and helps me recall pleasant memories. The third part of the survey asked respondents multiple-item opinions about current immigration, immigrants, and emigration, and the fourth part asked demographic questions and provided a space for open-ended comments.

Exhibit 2

Items Used for Cultural Orientation Photo Set Evaluation

Item*	Modern Item Name	Traditional Item Name
Makes me feel secure in my personal relationships	ModPersSec	TradPersSec
Gives me a sense of belonging	ModBelong	TradBelong
Makes me uncomfortable or nervous**	ModUncomft	TradUncomft
Makes me feel financially secure	ModFincSec	TradFinc Sec
Gives me an opportunity to be myself without judgment from others	ModCloseFr	TradCloseFr
Makes me feel like I will always have close friends and family members	ModBeMyself	TradBeMyself
Feels exciting or adventurous	ModExciting	TradExciting
Feels familiar or comfortable	ModComft	TradComft
I understand and identify with the lifestyle depicted here	ModIdentify	TradIdentify

*1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Slightly Disagree 4=Neither Agree Nor Disagree 5=Slightly Agree 6=Agree 7=Strongly Agree
**Reverse-scored

Exploratory factor analysis using principal components with varimax rotation was performed on all measures. The nostalgia measure converged on a single factor, which is consistent with prior research (Pascal, Sprott, and Muehling, 2002), and elicited strong internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha of 0.932. Exhibit 3 lists the results of factor analysis on cultural orientation, with three factors emerging—traditional orientation, modern orientation, and cultural discomfort. Scores for each of the factors were used for further analysis as dependent variables. Factors emerged as expected, with consistency of feelings about both traditional and modern photo sets. There was some range restriction for the third variable—cultural discomfort—most respondents rated discomfort very low for both sets of photos. Because of the range restriction, the third variable was not useful for further analysis as a dependent variable. Item loadings greater than 0.5 were relevant to scoring and identification with the emergent factors. Internal consistency for Traditional and Modern Orientation were strong, with Cronbach's alpha of 0.871 for both factors.

Exhibit 3

Traditional-Modern Orientation Factor Analysis

Rotated Component Matrix[a]

	Orientation Component			
	Traditional	Modern	Discomfort	Communalities
ModPersSec	-.035	**.805**	-.049	.651
ModBelong	-.060	**.855**	.001	.735
ModUncomft	-.145	.479	**.660**	.686
ModFincSec	.148	**.535**	-.497	.555
ModCloseFr	.063	**.799**	-.011	.643
ModBeMyself	.027	**.717**	-.148	.536
ModExciting	.179	**.543**	-.204	.369
ModComft	-.009	**.728**	.292	.616
ModIdentify	-.145	**.717**	.197	.574
TradPersSec	**.779**	.056	-.093	.619
TradBelong	**.850**	-.028	.038	.725
TradUncomft	.448	-.114	**.613**	.589
TradFincSec	**.581**	.112	-.443	.547
TradCloseFr	**.805**	.113	-.026	.661
TradBeMyself	**.798**	-.039	-.108	.650
TradExciting	**.607**	.024	-.155	.393
TradComft	**.779**	-.013	.230	.660
TradIdentify	**.761**	-.120	.235	.649

	Initial Eigenvalues			After Rotation		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
Modern	4.818	26.765	26.765	4.814	26.745	26.745
Traditional	4.447	24.706	51.472	4.447	24.706	51.451
Discomfort	1.595	8.859	60.331	1.598	8.880	60.331

One additional measure of internal consistency was determined by comparing factor means with omnibus choices of which sets of photos were preferred by respondents—the traditional set, the modern set, both sets equally, or neither set. One-way ANOVA results show significant difference between groups for Traditional Mean Score ($F=10.504$, $df=3$; $p<0.001$) and Modern Mean Score ($F=15.135$, $df=3$; $p<0.001$) in the expected directions, with respondents preferring the Traditional set of photos scoring 5.09 on the traditional items compared to 3.7 on the modern items. Respondents who found both sets equally agreeable had more centrist item scores, and those who found neither set agreeable had the lowest mean item scores.

Exhibit 4

Means by Photo Set Preference

Photo Set Preference	N	Percent	Traditional Orientation Mean Score	Modern Orientation Mean Score
Trad	120	56	5.0925	3.7009
Mod	21	10	4.4048	4.1369
Both	51	24	4.5662	4.8227
Neither	15	7	3.8929	3.7667

In addition to these factors, two other items were assessed as independent variables —an item determining feelings of financial security (I feel financially secure) and an item asking the respondent if technology was changing the community more than immigration. These items were less invasive than asking income and education levels.

The dependent variable items underwent exploratory factor analysis using principal components with varimax rotation as well. Results are presented in Exhibit 5. Items were chosen to measure feelings regarding emigration, economic effects of immigration, and cultural effects of immigration. Several sources were consulted regarding typical measures of immigration, including Cox, Lienesch and Jones (2017), Gallup (2019), and the Guardian (2019). After selection of items, they were reviewed through a small focus-group pilot study, and then modified based on feedback from respondents. The exploratory factor analysis resulted in three different factors—feelings about emigration, feelings about immigration effects at the societal level, and feelings about immigration effects at the personal or daily-life level. Items were retained if their loadings were 0.50 or greater. Internal consistency was measured using Cronbach's alpha, with the following results: Emigration: 0.571, Societal: 0.846, and Personal: 0.815.

Exhibit 5

Migration (Emigration and Immigration) Affect -- Factor Analysis

Rotated Component Matrix[a]

	Migration Component			
	Societal	Personal	Emigr	Communalities
I feel sad when close friends and family move to another place	.010	.239	**.778**	.662
I miss my close friends and family	-.019	-.178	**.626**	.424
Friends and family leaving my community upsets me more than immigration	.187	.155	**.774**	.657
I don't mind working with non-European immigrants	.185	**.814**	-.031	.698
I'd feel fine if someone in my family marries an immigrant	.376	**.631**	.137	.558
I don't mind when someone with an accent waits on me or serves me	.123	**.718**	.063	.535
Immigrants do a good job in the workplace	.314	**.665**	.104	.552
I don't mind immigrants from faraway places, even non-Europeans	.548	**.568**	-.007	.623
Immigrants improve my financial condition	**.501**	.366	.109	.397
Immigrants are good for the economy	**.639**	.564	.000	.726
I am concerned that immigrants are changing my community**	**.763**	.313	-.113	.692
Immigrants threaten my way of life**	**.798**	.131	.136	.673
Immigrants from unfamiliar places tend to increase crime**	**.733**	.164	.041	.566
Illegal or undocumented immigration bothers me**	**.698**	.185	.101	.532

	Initial Eigenvalues			After Rotation		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
Society	5.570	39.784	39.784	3.529	25.206	25.206
Personal	1.603	11.447	51.230	3.083	22.018	47.225
Emigration	1.124	8.025	59.256	1.684	12.031	59.256

RESULTS

Summary Statistics

Means and standard deviations for independent and dependent variables are presented in Exhibit 6. The sample was slightly more Traditional (Mean=4.804, sd=0.997) than Modern (Mean=4.033, sd=1.081) in its orientation. Traditional scenarios evoked a high degree of Nostalgia on average (Mean=5.632, sd=1.055), and respondents tended to feel Financially Secure (Mean=5.58, sd=1.388). The sample as a whole believed Technology was affecting their community more than immigration (Mean =5.35, sd=1.520), although there was more variation in those last two beliefs than in the other independent variables.

Exhibit 6

Summary Results

	N	Minimum*	Maximum*	Mean*	Std. Deviation
Traditional Orientation Score	206	1.88	7.00	4.8038	.99742
Modern Orientation Score	210	1.00	7.00	4.0339	1.08170
Nostalgia Score	207	2.00	7.00	5.6317	1.05530
Financial Security	196	1.00	7.00	5.58	1.388
Technology Change	198	1.00	7.00	5.35	1.520
Immigration's Societal Effect	204	1.17	7.00	4.7023	1.30484
Immigration's Personal Effect	201	1.50	7.00	5.6308	1.01165
Emigration	201	1.00	7.00	5.2150	.98919

*1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Slightly Disagree 4=Neither Agree Nor Disagree 5=Slightly Agree 6=Agree 7=Strongly Agree

The sample as a whole was more positive than negative about immigration, more so at the personal level (Mean=5.63; sd=1.011) than at the societal level (Mean=4.702, sd=1.304), but still positive. The difference at the two levels might be attributable to some response bias at the personal level, with respondents reluctant to express personal negative feelings about immigration or immigrants. On the other hand, the results may also be due to one of the remedies often suggested as a means of improving relations with unfamiliar others—getting to know someone at a personal level can improve international and inter-ethnic relations. The sample as a whole viewed emigration from the community with sadness or as a disruption to the community (Mean=5.215; sd=0.989).

Independent Variable Effects

Analysis included 2 main tests about immigration (societal and personal) and emigration: differences between the European and diaspora community and stepwise regression on each dependent variable.

MANOVA was performed on the dependent variables using *Community* as the independent variable (European or Diaspora). Results of the MANOVA were highly significant using Wilks' Lambda ($F=6.116$, $df=3$, $p<0.001$), so post hoc t-tests were performed. In addition to differences in the dependent variables, 3 independent variables were explored for differences among *Community*: *Traditional Cultural Orientation*, *Modern Cultural Orientation*, and *Emigration*. Exhibit 7 summarizes the results of means-testing. Members of the European community were less likely to have a *Modern Cultural Orientation* than those in the Diaspora community, but there were no significant differences in *Traditional Cultural Orientation* or in feelings of *Nostalgia*. For the dependent variables, all showed significant differences between members of the European community and the Diaspora community. Europeans were slightly less positive about immigration at both the personal and societal levels, and were less disheartened about *Emigration* than Diaspora members.

Exhibit 7

Tests of Means for Factors and Dependent Variables

Factor	Community	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Traditional Cultural Orientation	Diaspora	166	4.7818	.97486	203	.517	-.11559
	European	39	4.8974	1.10875	52.657	.552	
Modern Cultural Orientation	Diaspora	169	**4.1094***	1.07098	207	.038	.39440
	European	40	**3.7150***	1.09565	57.946	.044	
Nostalgia	Diaspora	167	5.6475	1.00798	204	.659	.08340
	European	39	5.5641	1.26214	49.910	.702	
Dependent Variables							
Immigration's Societal Effect	Diaspora	166	**4.7950****	1.2095	200	.002	.72002
	European	37	**4.0060****	1.2613	49.509	.006	
Immigration's Personal Effect	Diaspora	164	**5.7373****	.96666	198	.001	.59146
	European	36	**5.1458****	1.09606	47.674	.004	
Emigration	Diaspora	164	**5.2988***	.95243	198	.010	.46545
	European	36	**4.8333***	1.08818	47.473	.022	

Next, regression analysis was performed on each of the three dependent variables using all the independent variables: *Community* (1=Diaspora, 2=Europe), *Traditional Cultural Orientation*, *Modern Cultural Orientation*, evoked *Nostalgia*, *Financial Security*, felt *Technological Change*, *Gender* (1=Male, 2=Female), and *Age*. Exhibit 8 shows the correlation matrix for the continuous independent variables. As expected, evoked *Nostalgia* is correlated with *Traditional Cultural Orientation*; and felt *Financial Security* is associated with *Modern Cultural Orientation*, felt *Technological Change*, and *Age*. In order to limit the effect of multicollinearity on the regression analyses, stepwise regression was used to determine which variable(s) had the largest influence on each dependent variable. Exhibit 9 presents the results.

Exhibit 8

Correlation Matrix

	Traditional Cultural Orientation	*Modern Cultural Orientation*	*Nostalgia*	*Financial Security*	*Technological Change*	*Age*
Traditional Cultural Orientation	1					
Modern Cultural Orientation	.006	1				
Nostalgia	.772**	-.032	1			
Financial Security	.047	.207**	-.018	1		
Technological Change	-.066	.020	-.044	.231**	1	
Age	-.133	.057	-.016	.190**	.034	1

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

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

Exhibit 9

Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression on
Immigration's Societal Effect*, *Immigration's Personal Effect* and *Emigration

Regr No.	Dependent Variable	Significant Independent Variable	Overall Model- F	Sig	Std B-Coeff	Adj R-Sq	t	Sig
1	*Immigration's Societal Effect*		11.156	.000		0.137		
		Technological Change			.251		4.342	.000
		Traditional Cultural Orientation			-.238		-2.708	.007
		Modern Cultural Orientation			.186		2.299	.023
2	*Immigration's Personal Effect*		8.711	.000		0.138		
		Technological Change			.187		2.599	.010
		Community			-.236		-3.222	.002
		Age			-.232		-3.220	.002
		Financial Security			.144		2.055	.041
3	*Emigration*		7.061	.000		.087		
		Gender			-.209		-3.012	.003
		Technological Change			.173		2.489	.014
		Nostalgia			.167		2.415	.017

For feelings about societal effects of immigration, the most significant influences were *Traditional Cultural Orientation*, *Modern Cultural Orientation*, and feelings that *Technological Change* is affecting the community more than immigration. Respondents with a *Traditional Cultural Orientation* responded less favorably to *Immigration's Societal Effect* (β=-0.238, t=-2.708, $p<0.01$), whereas *Modern Cultural Orientation* had the opposite effect (β=0.186, t=2.299, $p<0.05$). Respondents who felt that *Technological Change* is affecting their community more than immigration responded most favorably to perceived *Immigration's Societal Effect* (β=0.251, t=4.342, $p<0.001$). Feelings of *Immigration's Personal Effect* were also strongly affected by *Technological Change* (β=0.187, t=2.599, $p<0.01$). Other variables affecting feelings

of *Immigration's Personal Effect* were *Community* membership (β=-0.236, t=-3.222, $p<0.01$), *Age* (β=-0.232, t=-3.220, $p<0.01$), and *Financial Security* (β=0.144, t=2.055, $p<0.05$). Europeans have less positive feelings about *Immigration's Personal Effects*; *Age* was negatively related to feelings about *Immigration's Personal Effect*, and *Financial Security* tended to increase positivity of *Immigration's Personal Effects*. Last, sad or disconcerting feelings about *Emigration* were more associated with women (β=-0.209, t=-3.012, $p<0.01$) than men. Those who felt strong *Technological Change* (β=0.173, t=2.489, $p<0.05$) and *Nostalgia* (β=0.167, t=2.415, $p<0.05$) were also more strongly affected by *Emigration* or people leaving their communities. Overall, each dependent variable was affected by a feeling that *Technological Change* is affecting respondents' communities more than immigration, while *Immigration's Societal Effect* were also influenced by respondents' cultural orientations. *Financial Security*, *Age*, and national *Community* membership (Europe vs. Diaspora) also influenced *Immigration's Personal Effect*, while *Gender* and *Nostalgia* influenced feelings about *Emigration* from the community.