CHAPTER SEVEN

THE MODEL OF TAIWANESE IMMIGRANTS' DESIRE TO RE-EMIGRATE

7.1 Dissatisfaction and acculturation as two intermediate variables

In the previous chapter, it was found that the two patterns of dissatisfaction and three demographic variables are significant in explaining the desire to re-emigrate. In this chapter an effort is made to examine the model of Taiwanese immigrants' desire to re-emigrate from South Africa.

In order to do that, the discriminant analysis identifying the dissatisfaction variables between high and low desire to re-emigrate in Table 6-13 is used again, so as to measure the level of high dissatisfaction among the Taiwanese who are the primary subjects of this study. The purpose this analysis is expected to serve is:

(i) to identify the level of dissatisfaction that can be fitted to Taiwanese immigrants;
(ii) to discriminate low and high dissatisfaction among Taiwanese immigrants.

Because the standardized discriminant functions of the five dissatisfaction variables (see Table 6-13) can correctly be classified for 98 percent of the respondents into high and low desire to re-emigrate, the five functions (see Table 6-13) are used to measure the level of the Taiwanese immigrants' desire to re-emigrate.
As to acculturation level, the 10 discriminant function coefficients in Table 5-2 are used to measure to the level of Taiwanese immigrants' acculturation level.

7.2 Social-economic achievements, adaptive abilities and family ties as independent variables

In the previous chapter, the effects of the 15 demographic variables on the desire to re-emigrate were discussed. In doing that, we tried to use three indices (see Table 7-3) representing the personal characteristics which affect the level of acculturation, dissatisfaction and desire to re-emigrate: SOECACHV (factor 1), ABILHAND (factor 2) and FAMITIES (factor 3). Each of these three indices is a compositive variable construct, and will be organized by the following analysis.

First, an attempt is made to find out whether there is any relationship among them. The correlation coefficients between the demographic variables appear in Table 7-1.

BANCINCO has a significant negative relationship with V207, FAMITAI, V206 and a positive relationship with V309, V210, VC244 and VB213. This means that those Taiwanese immigrants who have a higher credit balance with regarding to living expenses (BANCINCO), and a higher occupational position (V210), are more likely to own a business (V206), have more money transferred from overseas (V301), have a higher educational level (V210), have stayed longer in South
Africa (VC244), have a better English writing ability (VB213) and less family in Taiwan (FAMITAI).

V207 has a significant negative relationship with V309, V210, VC224, V219 and VB213. It can be said that those Taiwanese immigrants, who have a higher occupational position in South Africa (V207), have had more money transferred from overseas (V309), a higher educational level (V210), have stayed longer in South Africa (VC244), are more likely to own a house (V219), and have a better English writing ability (VB213).

V309 has a significant negative relationship with V122, V308 and a positive relationship with VB213. This means those Taiwanese immigrants, who have had more money transferred from overseas (V309), are more likely to have an extended family (V122), have more contact with friends or relatives in Taiwan (V308) and a better English writing ability (V309).

V210 has a significant negative relationship with V205, V443, V444 and a positive relationship with VB213. This is to say those Taiwanese immigrants, who have a higher educational level (V210), are the more likely to be Christian (V205), need less help with living (V443) and business affairs (V444), and have a better English writing ability (VB213).

V122 has a significant negative relationship with V205 and a positive relationship with V308 and V414. This means
that Taiwanese immigrants, who have a nuclear family structure or live alone (V122), are more likely to be Christian (V205), have more contact with friends or relatives in Taiwan (V308) and are more dissatisfied with the services given by the embassy of The Republic of China (V414).

VC244 has a significant negative relationship with V206 and V444, that is to say, those Taiwanese immigrants, who have stayed longer in South Africa (VC244), are more likely to own a business (V206) and need less help in business affairs (V444).

V205 has a significant negative relationship with VB213. This means those Taiwanese immigrants, who are Christian (205), have a better English writing ability (VB213).

FAMITAI has a significant positive relationship with V443. This means those Taiwanese immigrants who have more family in Taiwan (FAMITAI), need more help in living affairs (V443).

V443 has a significant negative relationship with V219 and VB213. That is to say those Taiwanese immigrants, who need more help in living affairs (V443), are less likely to own a house (V219) and have a poor English writing ability (VB213).

V219 has a significant negative relationship with V206 and V414. That is to say those Taiwanese immigrants, who are not likely to own a house (V219), are less likely to own a
business (V206) and are more dissatisfied with the services given by the embassy of the Republic of China (V414).

V444 has a significant negative relationship with VB213, that is to say these Taiwanese immigrants need more help in business affairs (V444), and have a poor English writing ability (VB213).

Our purpose is to investigate the relationships found among the demographic variables. Table 7-2 indicates that a preliminary analysis yielded six factors which had an eigenvalue (scree test) which indicated that the steep "take off" point was between the third and fourth factors, suggesting a three factor solution as optimal.

The three factors solution in Table 7-3 accounts for only 43.1 percent of the total variance, whereas the six factor solution accounts for 66.2 percent. Regardless of the difference in the amounts of variance explained by the two solutions, the results of both factor analyses yield indirect but convincing evidence for the demographic variables dealing with personal characteristics.

In Table 7-2, the first three factors are basically identical to the three factors in Table 7-3. These three factors represent socio-economic achievement in the receiving country, abilities in handling problems and family ties with the sending country (Taiwan). In addition, V219 (own a house in South Africa) and V414 (services given by the embassy of
the republic of China) emerged as independent factors.

When the number of dimensions was reduced in the three-factor solution, the first factor, SOECACHV included three variables - BANCINCO, VC244 and V206; the second factor, ABILHAND includes five variables - V210, V205, V443, V444 and VB213; and the third factor, FAMITIES includes four variables - V309, V122, FAMITAI and V308.

Why was it that V205 (religion) clustered with personal abilities in handling problems (ABILHAND)? The possible explanations are firstly, a Taiwanese Christian has a better educational level and a better writing ability. Secondly, a Christian participates in more activities such as church activities than a non-Christian. Why was it that V309 (the money transferred from overseas to South Africa) clustered with family ties with the sending country? The possible answer is that immigrants will have weaker family ties when they transfer all of their capital from the sending country.

In summary, these factor analyses show the following:

(i) Occupational status (V207), income (V217) and period of stay in South Africa (VC244) are more or less determined by achievement in the receiving country. This phenomenon can be termed personal socio-economic achievement in the receiving country.

(ii) Educational level (V210), English language ability
(V213), the need to be helped in living and business affairs (V443), and religion (V205) can be determined from groups of abilities to handle problems in the receiving country. This phenomenon might be termed personal adaptive abilities in handling problems in the receiving country.

(iii) Frequency of contact with friends or relatives (V308), the immediate family structure in the sending country (V122), and the amount of foreign currency that has been transferred from overseas to the receiving country (V309) could be determined for groups of people who keep family ties in the sending country. This phenomenon can probably be termed personal family ties with the sending country.

7.3 Path analyses

We attempted to reach the following two major aims by means of the path model:

(i) To test the tenability of the causal linkages among six important variables -- socio-economic achievement, abilities in handling problems, family ties, acculturation level, dissatisfaction level, and desire to re-emigrate -- as depicted in the path model in Chapter Five; and

(ii) To test the hypotheses, presented in Chapter Six, regarding the relationships between the desire to re-emigrate and each of the three sociological variables -- socio-
economic achievement, adaptive abilities in handling problems, and family ties.

7.3.1 Original path model

Path analysis is an analytic scheme to test a theoretical causal framework established by a researcher with regard to a set of variables. The variables included in the present causal model are divided into two groups: exogenous variables and endogenous variables. An exogenous variable refers to a variable whose variance is assumed to be the result of factors outside the system. Accordingly, the causes behind the variation in the exogenous variables remain uninvestigated. An endogenous variable, on the other hand, is one whose variance is assumed to be determined by exogenous or other endogenous variables included in the causal system.

In Figure 7-1, which is the original model with path coefficients entered, SOECACHV, ABILHAND, and FAMITIES are exogenous variables. ACCUL, TAISATRE, and TAIMOVE are endogenous variables.

Because this is a recursive model, paths among the variables have unidirectional arrows which indicate that the causal flow in the system operates in one direction. This simply means that a variable cannot be a cause and an effect of another variable at the same time. For example, ACCUL being an effect variable of SOECACHV, cannot also be a causal
variable of SOECACHV. As the paths in the diagram show, SOECACHV, ABILHAND, and FAMITIES are assumed to be causes of the endogenous acculturation variable ACCUL. Again, ACCUL becomes a new exogenous variable along with SOECACHV, ABILHAND and FAMITIES and these are assumed to be causes of the endogenous dissatisfaction variable, TAISATRE. In the final path, TAISATRE being a new exogenous variable in addition to SOECACHV, ABILHAND, FAMITIES and ACCUL. It is assumed to be a causal variable for yet another endogenous variable TAIMOVE.

Curved lines with arrowheads at both ends denote the correlations between the exogenous variables, which remain unanalyzed in the system. The three terms, u, v, and w, in the model denote effects of all the variables apparently influencing the endogenous variables but missing in the system.

Because it is almost impossible to explain all the variance of a variable, it is extremely important to specify these terms, which are commonly labelled disturbance variables, in the system. Each disturbance variable, u, v, and w, represents "the proportion of the standard deviation ... of the endogenous variable" that is caused by all variables outside of the set under consideration (Kenneth, 1969: 12-15).

The absence of the linkages among the disturbance terms
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indicates that the intercorrelations among those terms are assumed to be zero, which is an important assumption for solving the ordinary least-squares regression equation (Spaeth, 1975: 53-89). It is also assumed that these disturbance terms are uncorrelated with any other variables in the system.

The implication of these two assumptions is that no important variables have been omitted from the model which might affect any two of the variables in the system simultaneously.

A path coefficient, which "indicates the direct effect of a variable taken as a cause of a variable taken as effect" (Kerlinger and Pedhajur, 1973: 310-314), always has two subscripts. The first subscript refers to the dependent variable and the second to the independent variable. According to Figure 7-1, the direct effect of SOECACHV on ACCUL is represented by the path coefficient symbol $P_{41}$.

Causal relationships among the variables in a path model can also be described by a set of equations. Every single endogenous variable in the model can be expressed by an equation consisting of the variables upon which the endogenous variable is postulated to rely, and a term representing the effect of disturbance variables, i.e. the influence of the variables not included in the model.

Path coefficients in the equation indicate the magnitude
of predicted change in the dependent variable as a result of a unit change in the independent variable.

The causal relationships of the variables in Figure 7-1 may be described by the following equations if the variables are expressed in standard score form (Z score):

\[ Z_4 = p_{41}Z_1 + p_{42}Z_2 + p_{43}Z_3 + p_{4u}Z_u \]  
\[ Z_5 = p_{51}Z_1 + p_{52}Z_2 + p_{53}Z_3 + p_{54}Z_4 + p_{5v}Z_v \]  
\[ Z_6 = p_{64}Z_4 + p_{65}Z_5 + p_{6w}Z_w \]

Under the assumption that each of the disturbance terms is not correlated with other variables in the equation in which it appears, and that the independent variables are also not correlated among themselves, the solution for the path coefficients is identical to the ordinary least squares solution for beta weights in a multiple regression analysis (Kerlinger and Pedhajur, 1973: 317).

The path coefficients in Figure 7-1 were obtained by three regression analyses. First, ACCUL was regressed on SOECACHV, ABILHAND, and FAMITIES. Next, TAISATRE was regressed on the same three variables along with ACCUL. Then, finally, TAIMOVE was regressed on the two intermediate variables, ACCUL and TAISATRE. These path coefficients also appear, with their significance levels, in the first rows of each panel in Table 7-5.

Before an attempt was made to interpret the meaning of
those path coefficients, we had to find out if this model was a tenable one and, if not, how it should be "trimmed" (Heise, 1969). While noting the usefulness of path analysis as an important analytic tool for theory testing, Kerlinger asserts (1973: 317):

Through its application one can determine whether or not a pattern of correlations for a set of observations is consistent with a specific theoretical formulation ... A correlation between two variables can be expressed as a composite of the direct and indirect effects of one variable on the other. Using path coefficients it is therefore possible to reproduce the correlation matrix (R) for all the variables in the system ... what if one were to delete certain paths from the causal model? This, in effect, will amount to setting certain path coefficients equal to zero. The implication is that the researcher conceives of the correlation between the two variables whose connecting path is deleted as being due to indirect effects only. By deleting certain paths the researcher is offering a more parsimonious causal model. If after the deletion of some paths, it is possible to reproduce the original R matrix, or closely approximate it, the conclusion is that the pattern of correlations in the data is consistent with the more parsimonious model.

It was attempted to reproduce the original correlation matrix, in order to determine whether or not a model is tenable in terms of the path coefficients' "goodness of fit" in reproducing, or approximating, the original correlations among the variables.

The correlation between any pair of variables in the equations, (1), (2), and (3) [earlier in this section] can be written in terms of the paths deriving from common independent variables (Duncan, 1971: 121). Specifically, consider the correlation between SOECACHV and ACCUL, $r_{14}$. Since $z_1 = (X_1 - \bar{X}_1) / S_1$ and $z_4 = (X_4 - \bar{X}_4) / S_4$, ...
we have
\[ r_{14} = \frac{\sum (X_1 - \overline{X}_1) \cdot (X_4 - \overline{X}_4)}{N \delta} = \frac{\sum Z_1 Z_4}{N}. \]

Now, substituting equation (1) for \( Z_4 \), we have,
\[ r_{14} = \frac{1}{N} \frac{Z_1 Z_4}{1/N} = \frac{1}{N} Z_1 \left( P_{41} Z_1 + P_{42} Z_2 + P_{43} Z_3 + P_{4u} Z_u \right) \]
\[ = P_{41} \frac{\sum Z_1 Z_4}{N} + P_{42} \frac{\sum Z_1 Z_2}{N} + P_{43} \frac{\sum Z_1 Z_3}{N} + P_{4u} \frac{\sum Z_1 Z_u}{N} \]

This is equivalent to the expression
\[ r_{14} = P_{41} + P_{42} r_{12} + P_{43} r_{13} \quad (4) \]

Because the covariance of two variables in standard form
\[ \frac{\sum Z_1 Z_2}{N}, \quad \frac{\sum Z_1 Z_3}{N} \] is their simple correlation, and the variance of a variable in standard score form \( \frac{\sum Z_1 Z_u}{N} \) is 1, and a recursive model assumes that each of the disturbance terms is not correlated with any variables in the system, \( P_{4u} \sum \frac{Z_1 Z_u}{N} = 0 \). This is the basic theorem of path analysis which takes the general form of
\[ r_{ij} = \sum_{q} P_{iq} r_{jq} \]

Where \( i \) and \( j \) denote two variables in the system and the index \( q \) runs over all variables from which paths lead directly to \( X_i \) (Duncan, 1971: 121).

Applying this general form, we obtain the following expressions for all the correlations between each of the
exogenous variables and each of the endogenous variables, and between all the endogenous variables.

\[ r_{15} = P_{51} + P_{52}r_{12} + P_{53}r_{13} + P_{54}P_{41} \]  
\[ r_{16} = P_{64}P_{41} + P_{64}P_{42}r_{12} + P_{64}P_{43}r_{13} + P_{65}P_{51} + P_{65}P_{52}r_{12} \]  
\[ + P_{65}P_{53}r_{13} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{41} \]  
\[ r_{24} = P_{41}r_{12} + P_{42} + P_{43}r_{23} \]  
\[ r_{25} = P_{52} + P_{51}r_{21} + P_{53}r_{23} + P_{54}P_{41}r_{21} + P_{54}P_{43}r_{23} \]  
\[ r_{26} = P_{64}P_{42} + P_{64}P_{41}r_{21} + P_{64}P_{43}r_{23} + P_{65}P_{52} + P_{65}P_{51}r_{21} \]  
\[ + P_{65}P_{53}r_{23} + P_{65}P_{54}r_{21} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{42} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{43}r_{23} \]  
\[ r_{34} = P_{43} + P_{41}r_{31} + P_{42}r_{32} \]  
\[ r_{35} = P_{53} + P_{51}r_{31} + P_{52}r_{32} + P_{54}P_{43} + P_{54}P_{42}r_{32} \]  
\[ + P_{54}P_{41}r_{31} \]  
\[ r_{36} = P_{64}P_{43} + P_{64}P_{41}r_{31} + P_{64}P_{42}r_{32} + P_{65}P_{53} + P_{65}P_{51}r_{31} \]  
\[ + P_{65}P_{52}r_{32} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{41}r_{31} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{42}r_{32} \]  
\[ + P_{65}P_{54}P_{43} \]  
\[ r_{45} = P_{45} \]  
\[ r_{46} = P_{64} + P_{65}P_{54} \]  
\[ r_{56} = P_{56} \]  

Reproduction of the original correlations can be done easily using the above equations. \( r_{14} \), for example, can be obtained by:

\[ r_{14} = P_{41} + P_{42}r_{12} + P_{43}r_{13} \]

\[ = (.08) + (.67)(.30) + (-.11)(-.18) \]

\[ = .30 \]

The original \( r_{14} \) is .12. The reproduced correlation seems to be bigger than the original correlation, so that we
can rule out any major discrepancy between the two
correlations. The complete set of correlations, both the
original and reproduced, appear in Table 7-4.

An examination of the Table indicates that two of the
twelve relevant correlations had a discrepancy greater than
.05, a reasonable criterion suggested by Kerlinger
(1978: 318). The greatest discrepancies occur in the
coefficients involving two variables between which the
original path model ignored the direct effect; these are \( r_{16} \)
and \( r_{26} \).

While drawing the causal framework of the six variables,
I postulated the relationships between the three exogenous
variables (social-economic achievement, abilities in handling
problems, and family ties) and the final endogenous variable
(degree of desire to re-emigrate) only by way of the two
intermediate variables, thus ruling out any potential direct
effects not mediated by those two types of acculturation and
dissatisfaction levels.

Because this total exclusion of direct effects was a
potential reason for the poor reproduction of the original
correlations, we were led to search for an alternative model
which could approximate the original correlations better.
While doing that, it was decided to remove paths whose
coefficients turned out to be negligible. Though Blalock
(1968: 155-170) has introduced an intricate procedure in
deleting a non-significant path, for the sake of simplicity
and because of a few non-significant beta weights, it was decided to adopt Duncan's (1971: 123) suggestion that the betas which are non-significant and negligible be deleted. As shown in Table 7-5 (compare Figure 7-1) six paths - P41, P43, P51, P52, P53 and P54 - turned out to be statistically non-significant and negligible. The path between SOECACHV and ACCUL (P41), FAMITIES and ACCUL (P43), SOECACHV and TAISATRE (P51), FAMITIES and TAISATRE (P53), TAISATRE and ACCUL (P54) were statistically non-significant, but the variables were important in terms of the theoretical framework, and also the strength of the path coefficients was much greater than 0.1, which led me to retain the variables in the first alternative model.

According to Figure 7-2, in the first alternative model, the paths leading from SOECACHV to ACCUL, TAISATRE and from ABILHAND to TAISATRE were deleted. In addition, three direct paths leading from SOECACHV, ABILHAND and FAMITIES to TAIMOVE were introduced. Again, three regression analyses were used to obtain the new set of path coefficients. ACCUL was regressed on ABILHAND and FAMITIES, and TAISATRE on FAMITIES. Finally, TAIMOVE was regressed on the five other variables in the system.

As it turned out (see Figure 7-2), the direct path leading from FAMITIES to TAIMOVE (P63) seemed to be not only statistically non-significant but also substantively negligible, which ultimately led me to delete the path. The
regression was run again with TAIMOVE as the dependent measure and SOECACHV, ABILHAND, ACCUL and TAISATRE as independent measures. Thus, the final alternative model, which is reported on, appears in Figure 7-3.

As indicated by the $R^2$'s in Table 7-5, the deletion of four paths ($P_{41}$, $P_{51}$, $P_{52}$ AND $P_{63}$) seems to cause no major problems in overall prediction of endogenous variables. In the first panel, for example, even when the path from SOECACHV to ACCUL is removed, the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) remains essentially the same. In the second path, as well, it is shown that the path from SOECACHV and ABILHAND to TAISATRE can be removed without losing a significant amount of predictive power.

In the third panel (see the TAIMOVE row), when the path between FAMITIES and TAIMOVE was removed, $R^2$ slightly increased indicating that, in a predictive sense, there is no evidence that FAMITIES plays any role in the direct determination of one's degree of desire to re-emigrate.

7.3.2 Alternative path model

As indicated in Table 7-5, the path coefficients are partially statistically significant. Following the same procedure for reproducing the original correlations described in the preceding section, the correlations were computed to determine whether this alternative model is more tenable than
the original one in terms of its ability to reproduce the original correlations.

Because the path linkages were different, the equations had to be rewritten:

\[ r_{16} = P_{16} + P_{64}P_{14} + P_{65}P_{15} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{41} + P_{62}r_{12} + P_{64}P_{42}r_{12} + P_{64}P_{43}r_{13} + P_{65}P_{53}r_{13} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{42}r_{12} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{43}r_{13} \]

\[ r_{26} = P_{62} + P_{64}P_{42} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{42} + P_{64}P_{43}r_{23} + P_{65}P_{53}r_{23} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{43}r_{23} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{41}r_{12} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{42}r_{12} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{43}r_{23} \]

Table 7-6 reveals that all correlations can be reproduced with discrepancies of less than .05. In view of the relatively smaller discrepancy between the reproduced and the original correlations in this model, compared to the original path model, this is clearly a more tenable one.

The implications of these path analysis results require
a thorough examination of Table 7-7, especially the proportions of direct and indirect effects in the total correlations between the variables. As stated earlier, the path coefficients entered in the Table are identical to the beta weights in a multiple regression analysis.

Since these coefficients take the standardized form, it is possible to compare the relative importance of the independent variables in influencing the dependent variables. In the row in which acculturation level is the dependent variable, for example, for every increase of 1 standard deviation in socio-economic achievement, acculturation level increases by .08, and for every increase of 1 SD in ability to handle problems and family ties, acculturation level increases by .67 SD and decreases by .11 SD respectively.

TAISATRE is apparently the strongest direct determinant of the desire to re-emigrate (TAIMOVE), and 100 percent of its total effect \( (P_{42} / r_{24} = .57 / .57 = 1.00) \) is direct effect. The next strongest determinant of TAIMOVE is ACCUL with its direct path coefficients of -.21. The original effect of this variable is more than 100 percent of its total effect \( (r_{46} = -.11) \). The remainder consists of two different kinds of effects - direct and indirect effects, as decomposed in the following equation.

\[
\begin{align*}
r_{46} &= P_{64} + P_{65}P_{54} \\
&= -.21 + .10 \\
&= -.11
\end{align*}
\]
The two terms in the above equation are the non-spurious effects of ACCUL on TAIMOVE.

The third strongest determinant of TAIMOVE is SOECACHV with its direct path coefficients of .17. The direct effect of this variable is more than 100 percent of its total effect ($r_{16} = .12$). The remainder consists of two different kinds of effects, as decomposed in the following equation:

\[
  r_{16} = P_{61} + P_{62}P_{12} + P_{64}P_{14} + P_{65}P_{15} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{41} + P_{64}P_{42}r_{12} \\
  + P_{64}P_{43}r_{13} + P_{65}P_{53}r_{13} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{42}r_{12} + P_{65}P_{54}P_{43}r_{13} \\
  = .172 - .045 - .017 + .040 + .008 - .042 - .004 - .014 \\
  + .020 + .002 \\
  = .12
\]

The discrepancy of the coefficient is .03. The first five terms in the above equation are the non-spurious effects of SOECACHV on TAIMOVE; of the five terms, $P_{61}$ is a direct effect, and $P_{62}P_{12}$, $P_{64}P_{14}$, $P_{65}P_{15}$, $P_{65}P_{54}P_{41}$ are indirect effects, the effect of socio-economic achievement mediated by TAIMOVE, thus, we notice that 9 percent of which is indirect ($0.014/0.158 = 0.09$), and 32 percent of the total effect is spurious ($0.158/0.12 \times 100\% - 100\% = 32\%$). It is clear from these patterns of effect that an immigrant's socio-economic achievement in the receiving country affects his or her desire to re-emigrate directly from the most positive part, rather than being mediated by acculturation and dissatisfaction levels.
The proportion of the influence of one's socio-economic achievement on the desire to re-emigrate which is mediated by acculturation and dissatisfaction levels is slightly less than one tenth.

The remaining five terms in the above equation are spurious effects represented by the influence of SOECACHV on TAIMOVE due to its correlations with the other two exogenous variables. Spaeth (1975: 75) claims that the decomposition of spurious effects should rarely be of interest to an analyst: "The fact that the effects are spurious is sufficient. Moreover, most compound paths involving three or more variables will be of little interest since the product of three decimal numbers will be small unless each is relatively sizable".

Adaptive abilities (ABILHAND) has a slightly weaker direct effect on the desire to re-emigrate ($P_{62} = -0.15$). We notice that 138 percent of the total effect is non-spurious, only 32 percent of which is indirect ($-0.071/ -0.22 = 0.32$). The remaining negative 38 percent, of course, has spurious effects produced by ABILHAND'S earlier causes. The nonspurious effect of Family ties (FAMITIES) on TAIMOVE has an indirect effect only, which means that the main contribution made by family ties to an immigrant's desire to re-emigrate is in facilitating acculturation and reducing dissatisfaction levels.

All other effects of FAMITIES on TAIMOVE are the
spurious ones produced by their correlations with the other two exogenous variables. Family ties appears to have the least effect on the desire to re-emigrate either directly or indirectly according to these data.
Table 7-1: Product moment correlation coefficients among the individual components of demographic variables for Taiwanese immigrants (N=99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BANCINCO</th>
<th>V207</th>
<th>V309</th>
<th>V210</th>
<th>V122</th>
<th>VC244</th>
<th>V205</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V207</td>
<td>-0.58a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V309</td>
<td>0.33a</td>
<td>-0.26a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V210</td>
<td>0.18b</td>
<td>-0.34a</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V122</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.22b</td>
<td>-0.02a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC244</td>
<td>0.24a</td>
<td>-0.36a</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V205</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.35a</td>
<td>-0.30a</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMITAI</td>
<td>-0.19b</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V443</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.19b</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V219</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.22b</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V206</td>
<td>-0.40a</td>
<td>0.70a</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.22b</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V444</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.22b</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.21b</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V308</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.22b</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25a</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB213</td>
<td>0.22b</td>
<td>-0.28a</td>
<td>0.17b</td>
<td>0.68a</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.33a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V414</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.23b</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FAMITAI</th>
<th>V443</th>
<th>V219</th>
<th>V206</th>
<th>V444</th>
<th>V308</th>
<th>VB213</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMITAI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For explanations of the abbreviations, see Appendix 2.

a significant (p< .01).

b significant (p< .05).
Table 7-2: Factor structure of individual components of demographic variables: factor matrix for six factors (N=99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V207</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V309</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V210</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V122</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANCINCO</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC244</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V205</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMITAI</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V443</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V219</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V206</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V444</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V308</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB213</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V414</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts of variance accounted for by factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.2 %</td>
<td>20.9 %</td>
<td>12.0 %</td>
<td>10.20 %</td>
<td>8.8 %</td>
<td>7.3 %</td>
<td>7.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The underlined indicate primary loadings higher than .40 except variables with evenly split loadings such as BANCINCO, V414.
Table 7-3: Factor structure of individual components of demographic variables: Factor matrix for three factors (N=99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BANCINO</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V207</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V309</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V210</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC244</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V122</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V205</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMITAI</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V443</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V219</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V206</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V444</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V308</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB213</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V414</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts of variance accounted for by factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.1 %</td>
<td>20.9 %</td>
<td>12.0 %</td>
<td>10.2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The underlined indicate primary loadings higher than .40.
Table 7-4: Original versus reproduced correlation coefficients of the original path model \((N=97)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOECACHV</th>
<th>ABILHAND</th>
<th>FAMITIES</th>
<th>ACCUL</th>
<th>TAISATRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABILHAND</strong></td>
<td>(.30^a)</td>
<td>((n/a))</td>
<td>(-.18^b)</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMITIES</strong></td>
<td>(-.18^b)</td>
<td>(-.06)</td>
<td>((n/a))</td>
<td>((n/a))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCUL</strong></td>
<td>(.29^a)</td>
<td>(.67^a)</td>
<td>(.30)</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAISATRE</strong></td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAIMOVE</strong></td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>(.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-.07)^x</td>
<td>(-.07)^x</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(-.11)</td>
<td>(.60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Correlations among the exogenous variables cannot be reproduced, since no prediction equations were developed.

| a significant \((p< .01)\) |
| b significant \((p< .05)\) |
| x denotes coefficients with a discrepancy greater than .05 between the original and the reproduced correlations. |

Table 7-5: Standardized path coefficients for original and alternative path models of desire to re-emigrate \((N=97)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>SOECACHV</th>
<th>ABILHAND</th>
<th>FAMITIES</th>
<th>ACCUL</th>
<th>TAISATRE</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCUL</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.67^a)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.66^a)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAISATRE</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIMOVE</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>(-.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60^a</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First alternative</td>
<td>(.19^b)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>(.60^a)</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second alternative</td>
<td>(.17^b)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.21^b</td>
<td>(.57^a)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) significant \((p< .01)\)

\(b\) significant \((p< .05)\)
Table 7-6: Original versus reproduced correlation coefficients of the original path model (N=97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOECACHV</th>
<th>ABILHAND</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
<th>ACCUL</th>
<th>TAI SATRE</th>
<th>TAIMOVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABILHAND</td>
<td>.30(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILIES</td>
<td>-.18(^b)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUL</td>
<td>.29(^a)</td>
<td>.67(^a)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.30)</td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td>(-.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAI SATRE</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.10)</td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>(.10)</td>
<td>(.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIMOVE</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.57(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(-.16)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(-.11)</td>
<td>(.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Correlations among the exogenous variables cannot be reproduced, since no prediction equations were developed.

\(^a\) significant (p< .01)
\(^b\) significant (p< .05)
\(^x\) denotes coefficients with a discrepancy greater than .05 between the original and the reproduced correlations.
Table 7-7: Original correlations, direct, indirect, and spurious effects between the variables in the alternative path model (N=97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>SOECACHV</th>
<th>ABILHAND</th>
<th>FAMITIES</th>
<th>ACCUL</th>
<th>TAISATRE</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCUL</td>
<td>Original r</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.67&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.66&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spurious effect</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAISATRE</td>
<td>Original r</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spurious effect</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIMOVE</td>
<td>Original r</td>
<td>.15&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.57&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.57&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.17&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.21&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.57&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spurious effect</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> significant (p< .01)
<sup>b</sup> significant (p< .05)
Figure 7-1: Causal linkages and path coefficients in the original path model of desire to re-emigrate

Abbreviation: Original variable name

SOECACHV: personal socio-economic achievement in receiving country
ABILHAND: personal adaptive ability in receiving country
FAMITIES: personal family ties with sending country
ACCUL: acculturation level
TAISATRE: dissatisfaction level
TAIMOVE: degree of desire to re-emigrate
Figure 7-2: First alternative path model and path coefficients

[Diagram showing the relationships between variables such as SOECACHV(X1), ABILHAND(X2), FAMITIES(X3), ACCUL(X4), TAIMOVE(X6), and TAI SATRE(X5), with path coefficients indicated along the arrows.]
Figure 7-3: Final alternative path model and path coefficients
CHAPTER EIGHT

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of the study, reported in the previous chapters, are discussed in this chapter. The discussion consists of three parts.

Firstly, we focus on the methodological implications of the study by examining the discriminant analysis of acculturation.

Secondly, we note the theoretical implications of the findings from the path analyses and regression analyses; we concentrate on the acculturation and dissatisfaction levels as important intermediate variables in understanding Taiwanese immigrants' desire to re-emigrate.

Thirdly, we comment on the implications of this study for future empirical investigations of new immigrants' acculturation and dissatisfaction levels, and desire to re-emigrate.

8.1 Methodological implications of the study: Problems regarding the measurement of acculturation

The measurement problems were as follows:

Firstly, instead of testing an objective set of cultural distances, a set of cultural differences between the immigrant's original culture and the South African culture was analyzed. Berry's definition of acculturation, which suggests five phases in studying the process of acculturation was used, and 10 variables were chosen as the discriminant functions of acculturation. The following question was how
one determines whether or not these variables represent the acculturation level.

Secondly, satisfaction was usually tested as an intermediate variable for interurban migration before, but rarely with regard to new immigrants and their attitudes toward return migration or emigration to other countries. The question here is how one determines the chosen 6 dissatisfaction variables represent the dissatisfaction level of Taiwanese immigrants.

Thirdly, because it is extremely difficult to interview a return migrant's motivations for leaving South Africa, and because the desire to move underlines real migration, what we ultimately need to deal with is different in "motivations to emigrate" between emigrants and settlers. The question then is how one determines whether or not the chosen 5 motivation variables represent Taiwanese immigrants desire to move.

As a solution for these methodological problems, we proposed the use of cultural criterion groups representing the respective cultures under investigation. The results of the study, in which 99 new Taiwanese immigrants and 63 local born Chinese served as the criterion groups, demonstrate the usefulness of this measurement technique.

From the 28 variables representing the four phases of acculturation (see Table 7-1), the discriminant analysis identified 10 that discriminated at a very high level of significance. In some cases, as the results demonstrate, the
difference in acculturation levels are very significant. This is specifically demonstrated by the two groups' responses to V436 and VC213, in which the Taiwanese respondents showed a worse English speaking ability (VC213) and a stronger preference for a Chinese first name (V436) than local born Chinese in South Africa, and in which the local born Chinese respondents preferred both a Chinese or an English first name (V436) and had a more fluent English speaking ability (VC213) than the Taiwanese immigrants. The use of variables like VC213 and V436, without empirically testing the difference, would be grossly misleading in assessing the degree to which the immigrants are acculturated.

The results also indicate that the efficacy of the 10 discriminating variables varies greatly. As the discriminant function coefficients suggested (see Table 5-2), VC213 has almost five times as much discriminating power as V437. That is to say, the respondents' English speaking ability (VC213) contributes five times as much to the overall differences in acculturation level as the preference to the way of celebrating festivals (V437). The identified differences in the relative importance of the variables have an important implication for those who are concerned with the measurement of degree of acculturation.

We have to assume that relative weights exist among the variables discriminating the two cultures. In other words, some variables should represent differences between two
acculturation levels better than others. Where would the relative weights among the discriminating functions of acculturation derive from? The answer is from the group of immigrants, and from the Chinese members of the host culture in the environment in which cultural contacts take place.

By showing which value variables better differentiate between the "average Taiwanese" and the "average South African Chinese", the technique isolated some facets of the two cultures between which large cultural distances exist. The procedure also identified the relative importance of each variable in discriminating between the groups.

Those who regard themselves as South African Chinese (i) are taking on the hopes, aspirations and customs of South Africans, and (ii) are increasingly disregarding, forgetting, inhibiting, denying or suppressing the hopes and customs of the Taiwanese Chinese.

The procedure utilized in the present study does not require a separate index for ethnic cultural orientation. Because the discriminant function is derived by linearly combining a number of variables, enforcing maximum difference between the two cultural criterion groups, the single discriminant score signifies simultaneously one's degree of acculturation to the host culture and one's degree of departure from the home culture.

As to dissatisfaction level and desire to (re-)emigrate, the discriminant function also signifies one's degree of
dissatisfaction with the present environment and one's personal opportunities, as well as one's desire to settle in South Africa or to (re-)emigrate to another country.

These problems of measuring both the level of acculturation and deculturation, or both the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, or both the desire to settle or to (re-)emigrate, are somewhat related to the frequently-made claim about the differential level of acculturation among the natives of different cultures, or the differential levels of dissatisfaction among immigrants with different attitudes, or the differential desires to re-emigrate among immigrants.

In previous acculturation studies it has been found that immigrants from Europe to America needed to acculturate less than the Asians. The reason for this seems to be the differential proximity of the two groups of immigrants' cultures to the host culture.

When an immigrant faces a new and different culture, he is acculturated gradually, firstly by becoming familiar with the local language; and then by getting to know the new culture; and finally his personality and attitudes adapt and identify with the new culture.

To study the phases of acculturation, one must develop an instrument which can distinguish between different groups of immigrants. In order to control for the original cultural orientation of a group of immigrants a researcher should be
interested in the variables which represent language ability, cognitive, and personal identity.

Furthermore, the empirical test to establish the discriminating power of the measuring instrument should involve the use of criterion groups representing the two cultures. In other words, the variables and the relative weights in the discrimination function identified for a Taiwanese criterion group and a South African born Chinese criterion group cannot be applied in assessing the acculturation level of immigrants from a third culture, such as the Portuguese or Korean culture.

Not only is it possible that some other variables might have greater discriminating power for other cultures but it is also likely that the relative importance of each of the variables will change greatly when the Portuguese or Korean culture is compared with the South African culture.

The fact that the measuring instrument for the dependent variable varies from one group of natives to another does not necessarily mean that findings regarding to the relationships between acculturation and other independent factors cannot be generalized.

Assuming that a set of empirically verified cultural characteristics of the host culture should form the base for the measurement of acculturation level, the approach taken in this study was shown to be useful in achieving the goal of discrimination between different cultures. The approach is
not only useful in finding the relative importance of these characteristics, but also helpful for providing a direct instrument for measuring the acculturation level.

As to the method of measuring an immigrant's dissatisfaction level, the potential disadvantage of the approach taken in this study is the effect of different levels of dissatisfaction on the outcome of the study. Different dissatisfaction levels cause different ranges of feeling regarding socio-economic, political, residential and personal factors. For this reason, it seems almost imperative to develop dissatisfaction-specific instruments to measure the presumed differences between high and low dissatisfaction groups.

It should be noted that the approach taken in this study is based on the analysis of motivations. Because different motivations have different effects on an immigrant's desire to re-emigrate, it is imperative to develop motivation-specific instruments to measure the different levels of immigrant's desire to re-emigrate. Specifically, variables should be developed to reflect the presumed differences between high and low desire to (re-)emigrate.

The instrument measuring the desire to re-emigrate in this study is motivation-specific, but this approach should not result in motivation-specific findings any more than studies which take other methodological approaches in measuring the desire to re-emigrate.
8.2 Path models and hypotheses

The path coefficients, derived from the original model did not reproduce the original correlations between the variables in the model.

In the original model (see Figure 7-1) it was postulated that the effects of the three exogenous variables are exerted on desire to re-emigrate are exerted only through two intermediate variables. Because of the failure of the coefficients to confirm the original correlation of SOECACHV and ABILHAND, the potential direct effects of two of the three exogenous variables on desire re-emigrate were recognized.

When the model was reshaped into the one in Figure 7-3, socio-economic achievement turned out to have a proportionally significant direct effect on the desire to re-emigrate. Adaptive abilities had a less direct effect but was still significant, though not as much as its indirect effect mediated by acculturation.

The proportionately stronger direct effect of socio-economic achievement on the desire to re-emigrate suggests that being an immigrant with high socio-economic achievement implies a greater willingness to emigrate to another country notwithstanding the acculturation and dissatisfaction levels investigated in this study. This can be explained in that re-emigration may be caused by the occasional instance of bankruptcy, or decisions which have
little to do with acculturation and dissatisfaction.

However, it is also true that some types of intermediate variables were not investigated in this study, such as too much competition in a certain industry, for example the textile industry, in the host country.

The direct effect of socio-economic achievement on the desire to re-emigrate was proportionately higher than its indirect effect which suggests a rejection of the postulated role of acculturation and dissatisfaction as a mediating variable in this study.

In the case of adaptive ability, the direct effect on the desire to re-emigrate was also higher than its indirect effect. It suggests that having a high adaptive abilities as an immigrant implies a relatively greater willingness to settle in the host country.

As to the indirect effect, acculturation accounts for almost twice as much of the variance in the of desire to re-emigrate as dissatisfaction does. Through acculturation level and then dissatisfaction level, adaptive abilities have negative effects on the desire to re-emigrate. It inhibits dissatisfaction which has a positive effect on the desire to re-emigrate.

The negative effect of adaptive abilities on the desire to re-emigrate necessitates a reassessment of our theory on the role of dissatisfaction in the desire to re-emigrate.
Based on Spear's notion of satisfaction as the intermediate variable, and satisfaction as a function of adaptation for an immigrant, it was hypothesized that dissatisfaction in the initial or later period of immigration facilitates one's desire to re-emigrate, and the data support the hypothesized positive relationship.

This means that the decision to re-emigrate resulting from a high level of dissatisfaction with socio-economics, political, and personal opportunities as well as entertainment is based on one's attitude toward settling or re-emigrating, which may be called "external adaptation".

Family ties appear to have the least effect of any of the variables included in the path model. This finding is identical with past studies on motivation for migration which show that a regular exchange of information between immigrants and their family in the original country facilitates both emigration and re-emigration.

The indirect effect suggests that an immigrant will have stronger reason to return than just missing their families in the original country. On the other hand, family ties have a negative effect on acculturation. This explains the fact that family contacts in the original country limits the opportunities for acculturation.

In the case of acculturation level, the correlation with the desire to re-emigrate is negative, and is almost twice as high as the original correlation with the desire to re-
emigrate. This leads to the conclusion that acculturation inhibits dissatisfaction.

As a result of the above discussions and an examination of our findings, we arrive at the following conclusions:

(i) Hypothesis 1 (see page 62) is invalid. Although its original correlation is .29, its standard deviation is only .08 and not significant.

(ii) Hypothesis 2 (see page 62) is rejected. As a matter of fact, the more a Taiwanese immigrant has attained socio-economic achievement, the greater the desire to re-emigrate to another country which shows that re-emigrate has little to do with acculturation and dissatisfaction.

(iii) Hypothesis 3 (see page 64) reads:

The more adaptive abilities a Taiwanese immigrant has, the faster his or her acculturation.

is supported by the significant direct effect of adaptive abilities on acculturation level in the path model (see Figure 7-3 and Table 7-7). A unit increase in an immigrant's adaptive ability brings about a .66 unit increase in his or her acculturation level.

(iv) Hypothesis 4 (see page 64) is not accepted, because its correlation and path coefficients are not significant.

(v) Hypothesis 5 and 6 (see page 67) are not supported by this study. Because family ties does not have significant correlation and path coefficients with acculturation level and the desire to re-emigrate.
(vi) Hypothesis 7 (see page 70) reads:

The lower the acculturation level, the higher an immigrant's desire to re-emigrate.

is supported by the significant direct negative effect of acculturation level on desire to emigrate in the path model (see Figure 7-3 and Table 7-7). A unit increase in a Taiwanese immigrant's acculturation level brings about a 0.21 unit decrease in his or her desire to re-emigrate.

(vii) Hypothesis 8 (see page 70) is not supported by this study. Because the significant direct negative effect (-0.21 in Table 7-7) between an immigrant's acculturation level and desire to re-emigrate, but insignificant direct positive effect (0.18 in Table 7-7) between an immigrant's acculturation level and dissatisfaction level.

(viii) Hypothesis 9 (see page 70) reads:

The higher an immigrant's dissatisfaction level, the higher his or her desire to re-emigrate.

is supported by the significant direct effect of dissatisfaction level on the desire to re-emigrate in the path model (see Figure 7-3 and Table 7-7). An unit increase in a Taiwanese immigrant's dissatisfaction level brings about a 0.57 increase in his or her desire to re-emigrate.

8.3 Demographic variables: Determinants of acculturation, dissatisfaction and desire to re-emigrate

In general, the relationships between demographic variables emerged very manifestly in the factor analysis in
which three distinctive factors were identified; the first factor representing socio-economic achievement, the second adaptive abilities, and the third family ties with the original country. The relationship between the first factor and the second is positive, but the relationship between the first factor and the third factor is negative; the relationship between the second factor and the third factor is also negative. The results indicate that the demographic variables predict the acculturation level (internal adaptation) relatively better than the dissatisfaction level (external adaptation), which is considered to be an indication of a more complex web of motives, not investigated in this study. Recreation facilities (V451), Mass communications (V453), personal involvement in local political affairs (V456), social security (V457) and political stability (V458) were chosen as the primary predictors of the dissatisfaction level (see Table 6-14).

The function of discriminant analysis is to divide a set of significant variables into two groups which have different attributes. Apart from the other nine variables which are not chosen by discriminant analysis as predictors, there are many variables which should influence an immigrant's attitude, such as opportunities for occupational mobility, cooperation between employee and employer, free competition in the market, the expectation of foregoing investment in the future, etc.

For Factor 1 (see Table 7-1), V210 and V213 were
positively loaded, and V205, V443 and V444 negatively loaded. The emergence of Factor 1 should draw the attention of those who seriously study the phenomenon of adaptive dependency. Although it is not the only possible explanation for the emergence of this factor, one wonders if there is a convergence between the variables related to adaptation. The factor that the Taiwanese immigrants' English language ability (V213), educational level (V210), religion (V205), and need for help in living (V443) and business affairs (V444) grouped together suggests abilities to adapt. This finding stresses that the Taiwanese immigrants' need for assistance in adapting after arriving in South Africa. Because of their poor communicative abilities and non-Christian religion, which prevent them from seeking help through church organizations, their adaptation is inhibited.

Adaptive ability is the most important predictor for acculturation level, suggesting that this concept combined with language ability (V213), education (V210), religion (V205), need for help in living (V443) and business affairs (V444) can be useful in predicting the Taiwanese immigrants' level of acculturation. It is also a predictor for the desire to re-emigrate.

A higher adaptive ability is dependent on (i) a higher language ability and education, (ii) membership of a Christian church, and (iii) less need for help in living and business affairs.

Socio-economic achievement is an important predictor for
the desire to re-emigrate, suggesting that achievement in the socio-economic field can be used in predicting the Taiwanese immigrants' level of desire to re-emigrate from the host country. The interesting thing is that the higher the socio-economic success a Taiwanese immigrant has achieved in South Africa, the stronger his or her desire to re-emigrate. Regardless of the direction of causality, the two intermediate variables do not correspond with the rewards a Taiwanese immigrant receives. This phenomenon suggests that Taiwanese immigrants having socio-economic success, either a good income or their own business, probably face problems which are not investigated in this study.

Family ties is an accepted predictor for dissatisfaction, suggesting that the tie with families in Taiwan can be used in predicting a Taiwanese immigrant's level of dissatisfaction with the host country. This means that those Taiwanese immigrants who are more alone, whose children and immediate family are in Taiwan, who keep more frequent contact with their family, and who have transferred less capital to South Africa, are more dissatisfied. Family ties are also a predictor for acculturation which means that the stronger the family ties an immigrant has, the lower his or her acculturation level. But it does not have a direct effect on the desire to re-emigrate.

The disadvantage, using complex sets of variables as independent variables, is that the individual variables correlated with the dependent variables, such as accultura-
8.4 Implications of this study for future empirical studies of acculturation, dissatisfaction and desire to re-emigrate

As already noted, this study was geared at the outset to achieve two objectives: first, a methodological one and the second, a theoretical one. The methodological objective was met rather satisfactorily through the empirical study of the acculturation level of foreigner, and more specifically, of immigrants from Taiwan.

The study demonstrated the usefulness of the methodological technique by its high level of success in selecting what variables to predict acculturation, dissatisfaction and motivation to re-emigrate; and distinguish major differences between the two Chinese groups in South Africa. It also identified the relative importance of certain variables in differentiating the two cultures.

The theoretical objective of the study is to:

(i) demonstrate how demographic variables pertaining to socio-economic achievement, adaptive ability and family ties can be organized into sets of meaningful concepts which explain acculturation, dissatisfaction and desire to (re-) emigrate; and

(ii) demonstrate the effects of acculturation (which is a mode of internal adaptation) and dissatisfaction (which is a
mode of external adaptation) as two intermediate variables on the financially independent Taiwanese immigrants’ desire to re-emigrate.

It was hypothesized that there is a causal relationship between the three dependent variables, acculturation level, dissatisfaction level and desire to re-emigrate. Although some of the specific hypotheses were not confirmed by the empirical data, the findings generally support the overall contention that there is a relationship between acculturation, dissatisfaction and desire to re-emigrate.

In this study, as in most pioneering studies, several shortcomings must be pointed out:

Firstly, the number of cases included in the subpopulations were too small to guarantee a high level of statistical significance. Most of the results stemming from the comparison of different levels of dissatisfaction and the desire to re-emigrate need to be validated by similar studies using larger samples.

Secondly, the variables measuring acculturation and dissatisfaction must be refined, to encompass not only the effects of attitudes and personality on acculturation, but also variables such as internal value systems, social mobility, and opportunity costs which affect dissatisfaction.

Thirdly, the procedure introduced in this study to measure the acculturation and dissatisfaction levels needs to be empirically tested in a wide variety of situations and
countries and with different variables. It also needs to be tested among the populations of other nationality groups who emigrate to foreign countries.

Finally, as indicated in the results of the regression analyses and discriminant analyses of the relationships between acculturation, adaptive ability and desire to re-emigrate, it is apparent that adaptive ability is the most important factor affecting an immigrant's acculturation and desire to re-emigrate. Adaptive ability has a negative direct effect on the desire to re-emigrate; a strong positive direct effect on acculturation level; and a negative indirect effect on desire to re-emigrate. Under these circumstances, it is important to help Taiwanese immigrants to improve their adaptive abilities if both the South Africa government and the government of the Republic of China look forward to seeing Taiwanese immigrants settle permanently in South Africa and not occasionally migrating elsewhere.