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The psychological study of immigrants in receiving societies is of importance for two reasons. First, it can add to a better understanding of general principles of behaviour. If psychology is regarded as being the science of behaviour, and if 'a basic characteristic of behaviour is change' (Russell, 1978), then immigrant adjustment should prove to be a rich area for social psychological research, since there can be few better examples of change than when a person moves from one distinct socio-cultural milieu into another.

Second, the study of immigrants has real practical significance. This is particularly so in countries like Australia, where a large portion of the population is made up of immigrants and the children of immigrants. History is replete with examples of intolerance and discrimination against various cultural minorities. This has been, at least in part, due to ignorance and misconception about the characteristics of these groups, their adjustment and the alternative forms of relationship possible between majority and minority groups. It would indeed be utopian speculation to imagine that these problems might ever be completely resolved. Nevertheless, through the better understanding gained from the scientific study of immigrant and host group interactions, at least some of the difficulties associated with the settlement of immigrants might be minimised.

Immigrant adjustment is also a particularly stimulating and rewarding area for researchers who prefer an eclectic approach to the study of human behaviour. It is almost impossible to examine even relatively narrow questions about immigrant adjustment without drawing on the findings and concepts of other disciplines, such as demography, sociology, linguistics and history, to name only a few. Even within psychology, a broad range of specialities needs to be called upon in the examination of different problem areas, such as clinical psychology, child psychology and psycholinguistics.
More specifically, however, it might be asked, why study Latvians? The primary reason is that there is only a very limited literature on the adjustment of Latvian immigrants, much of which is in Latvian and thus inaccessible to most non-Latvian speaking scholars. A major aim of this investigation, therefore, is to both inform the reader as to what has so far been achieved in the study of Latvian immigrants and to add further to our understanding of their adaptation.

Another reason why Latvian immigrants are of interest is that their immigration was compressed into a very narrow time span. They were amongst the first post-war immigrants from Europe to arrive in Australia, beginning with the first transport ship in 1947. There were few Latvians in Australia before that time, so in a sense they were pioneers. Their immigration practically ceased at the beginning of the 1950s and there have been no significant additions through immigration since that time. Unlike many other Western and Southern European immigrant groups, there are no new arrivals keeping them abreast of contemporary cultural developments in the homeland. Nor is there a core of persons who are unassimilated because of their short period of residence; virtually all Latvian immigrants living in Australia have now been here for almost thirty years. Thus the adjustment of Latvians in Australia can be followed over time with few distracting or distorting influences: they present an ideal group for longitudinal investigation.

A further reason why Latvians are the subject of this particular investigation is that the present author is himself of Latvian descent, therefore there is an additional personal interest in the subject matter. While some might feel that this could impair the investigator's objectivity, it is felt that this is more than compensated for by the benefits of having access to resources and subjects which would be difficult for a non-Latvian to obtain. For example, a command of the Latvian language is required in order to be able to read much of the background literature and to communicate fluently with many older Latvians. Information gained by participant-observation is largely denied to the non-Latvian, unless he is able to establish a large number of social contacts and learns to speak the language, as was done in the exceptional case of Isaacs (1976) in her study of Greeks in Sydney. Therefore, the possession of an ethnic background can often be an advantage in the study of immigrants.

The present investigation, which consists of a series of studies conducted in 1977, concentrates primarily on Latvians in Australia,
though some reference is also made to Latvians in other countries as well as to other refugee groups – particularly Estonians and Lithuanians. However, many of the general principles of immigrant adjustment discussed can be applied to other immigrant groups.

A number of persons and organisations need to be thanked for their help during the course of this investigation. Special debts are owed to Dr D. Mulcahy and Professor N. T. Feather for their careful readings of initial draft manuscripts. I am also grateful for the kind co-operation of the leaders of the Latvian folkdancing groups and the teachers at the Latvian schools that participated in the surveys. My thanks must also go to the South Australian Mental Health Services for allowing access to admissions records for research purposes, as also to the Australian Bureau of Statistics for collecting and providing previously unpublished statistical data. Miss M. Secombe’s kind help was invaluable in the securing of the University of Adelaide education student sample. Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to the more than one thousand subjects to whom befell the often tedious task of completing questionnaires for this investigation.
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1
Basic Concepts

It soon becomes evident to anyone examining the literature on immigrant adjustment that a variety of terms and concepts are employed, often ill-defined. Frequently the same term is interpreted differently by different authors. Rather than presenting an exhaustive review of different usages, which would be little more than a semantic taxonomy, some key concepts used extensively in this study will be described together with a conceptual model of the relationships between immigrant and host groups which might also be of use to other researchers in this area.

Ethnicity
A number of terms are used in describing major groupings of people, often in ways which indicate a lack of clarity between their different meanings. This results from the fact that frequently these terms subsume similar populations. Those relevant here are race, citizenship, nationality, and ethnicity. Each of these terms is conceptually quite complex and only a brief characterisation and an indication of their differences will be noted here.

To begin with, race is a biological concept, referring to genetically determined differences between human groups. Citizenship is a political concept denoting formal allegiance to a particular state. Nationality is an ambiguous term. It originates from the political concept of a nation and denotes membership of a nation or state. In this sense it means the same as citizenship. However, it is also often used as a synonym for ethnicity. It would seem to be a term best avoided unless the sense in which it is used is made clear.

Ethnicity is the most difficult concept to describe, partly because there is little uniformity in the definitions offered by various writers (see Isajiw, 1974; Keyes, 1976). No analysis of the general concept of ethnicity or ethnic group will be presented here other than to observe
the obvious, i.e. that ethnicity is not synonymous with either race or nationality (in the political sense), though it is possible that race or nationality might be amongst the defining characteristics of some specific ethnic groups. Since the main subjects of this investigation are Latvians, a brief analysis of Latvian ethnicity, however, is warranted.

First, it should be noted that the defining characteristics of the ethnic group need not necessarily be identical with those which define an individual's ethnicity. For example, while common descent or ancestry might be a characteristic of the majority of members of various ethnic groups, it need not apply to every individual within a group, otherwise ethnicity would be immutable, i.e. one could not change one's ethnicity because descent cannot be altered. In the individual case, ancestry or descent determines what is commonly referred to as ethnic origin. This is illustrated in often heard self-descriptions such as: 'I'm French and German on my mother's side and my father is English with a bit of Scottish a long way back.' Thus, ethnic origin refers to one's forebears' ethnicity, but does not necessarily determine the present individual's ethnicity (see Irbe, 1965). For example, there are some persons in the Adelaide Latvian community who regard themselves, and are regarded by others, as Latvians, though their ethnic origin is Russian. Latvian has a precise word for such changes in ethnicity, pārtautosanās, which literally means re-ethnification. This is a useful concept and will be employed extensively in this investigation.

Latvian ethnicity can be divided into primary and secondary aspects (Putniņš, 1976a, 1977a). The primary aspects are language and identification, i.e. that one is capable of communicating with other Latvians in Latvian and that one regards oneself as being a Latvian. Both these aspects form the bare minimum of Latvian ethnicity and both must be present in order to be able to describe a person as being ethnically a Latvian. The remaining elements of Latvian ethnicity are described as being secondary because, although they enrich the life and culture of the group as a whole, no one of these elements is absolutely essential in order to describe a person as being a Latvian. For example, a person would still be regarded as being a Latvian though he might not know how to do a Latvian folkdance or might not enjoy eating some traditional foods. However, if one did not identify oneself as being a Latvian, or could not communicate with other Latvians in their own language – which is a repository of much more than just a means of communication (see Fishman, 1973) – it would seem
inappropriate to consider such a person as being ethnically a Latvian. Though there are norms concerning secondary elements such as dress, foods, religious beliefs, social values, folk traditions and so on, there are in each case individuals who do not conform to the norms but who are still regarded as Latvians. On the other hand, simply learning the Latvian language does not produce a Latvian—much as learning French in school does not produce classes of Frenchmen. Similarly, identification alone is not an adequate criterion of ethnicity in the case of Latvians. For example, if a person of some other ethnic origin decided to regard himself as being a Latvian, in the absence of any other Latvian ethnic elements, it is doubtful whether anyone but himself would seriously consider him to be such. Thus, it is suggested that language and identification are the most central elements of Latvian ethnicity. (Guboglo, 1974, has also pointed to language and identification as being core elements of ethnicity within most ethnic groups). A person who both speaks Latvian and identifies himself as Latvian could also be expected to possess at least some of the secondary elements, though no particular secondary characteristic would be obligatory in order to be regarded as a Latvian.

Through personal observation of Latvian communities and the attitudes of Latvians towards their ethnicity, it is apparent that there is no one description, accepted by all, of what constitutes a Latvian. The above analysis is thus prescriptive in that it is a suggestion, based on what seems to be most consistent with various usages and contexts, of how Latvian ethnicity might best be regarded.

Identification
From the above description we can see that language and identification are here regarded as important aspects of Latvian ethnicity. We know what the Latvian language is and it is a simple task to determine whether somebody speaks it. On the other hand, what identification is appears to be a little unclear. Not all authors who employ the term identification delimit its meaning and, furthermore, those who attempt to do so are not always in accord with one another, e.g. Richardson (1961a) and Johnston (1965). However, we need an adequate description of the phenomenon if we are to attempt to measure it with any accuracy and meaning.

The meaning of identification becomes clearer when that of the word identity is considered. In its simplest meaning, identity means oneness or sameness; a meaning reflected in its use in mathematics as
a symbol (≡) for absolute sameness. In psychology the element of sameness is still retained in the concept of identity. Other persons' perceptions of an individual (A) are that individual's identity. That is what others identify him as or equate him with. Thus:

\[ A = \text{label/description} = \text{identity} \]

This is from the perspective of looking from outside of A. From A's perspective, his perception of himself constitutes what has variously been called self-concept, self-identity, ego-identity, and self-image. When a person's perception of himself converges with his perception of another person or object, he then identifies with that person or object; or in other words, has an identification with that person or object. Within the context of ethnic identification, this means that a person's perception of himself converges with his perception of a particular ethnic group, i.e. there is a sameness or similarity in the perceptions of both self and the group.

Identification is also used in another related, though not identical, sense. Let us consider the case of a young boy who is said to identify with Superman. By this we do not mean that the boy really thinks he is Superman. Rather, we are saying that the boy wants to be like Superman, for in his fantasies and daydreams he imagines himself to be as such. This type of identification involves convergence between a person's perception of how he would like to be (his ideal-self - also known as ego-ideal) and his perception of the relevant other.

The degree of convergence or similarity determines the degree of identification. When self-concept (or ideal-self) is very similar to the perception of some other person, we speak of a high degree of identification. As the similarity diminishes so also does the degree of positive identification, to the point where there is no longer any significant similarity. It is possible to go beyond this neutral point and observe an increase in dissimilarity. In this last situation there is still a relationship between self-concept and the perceived object, but it is one of opposites - much like a negative correlation. It is a negation of sameness, such as might occur in a deeply religious person's conception of both self and the devil. The dissimilarity of the two might be described as negative identification.

The most common method of measuring identification in studies of immigrants has been to ask questions in the form of: 'Do you identify (feel, describe, think, see etc.) yourself as being an Australian.' This type of approach measures identifications which the subject is consciously aware of, i.e. of which the subject is sufficiently aware to
be able to apply a distinct label. From our preceding discussion of identification, however, we see that conscious awareness to the point of using a summary label, such as Australian, Italian, German etc., is not a necessary condition for identification to occur; as is also well known by advertisers. All that is necessary is that there be a degree of similarity between the perception of self and the identified other. The summary label can be regarded as a gestalt which might not always be perceived even though the separate parts are—much as in the adage of 'not seeing the wood for the trees'. To measure identification so as to include those aspects which perhaps have not crystallised into a gestalt, we need methods other than that typified by the question described earlier. A widely used method in studies of self-concept and identification (e.g. Lazowick, 1955; Williams, 1966), though little applied to immigrants, is the semantic differential technique (see Osgood et al., 1957). Profiles consisting of bi-polar adjective scale ratings can be obtained from subjects of how they see themselves (self-concept), how they would like to be (ideal-self) and any other concepts of interest to the researcher. These profiles can then be statistically analysed, compared with one another, and their relative similarities (degree of identification) judged.

Assimilation and Alienation

Assimilation, in the context of the study of immigrants and ethnic groups, refers to the process of becoming similar to some other group. This is usually from the perspective of the immigrant becoming more similar to members of the host group. Conventionally this has been taken to mean a diminution of differences between the immigrant and host groups by a process of adopting host group characteristics and rejecting characteristics typical of the original ethnic group. The end result, the totally assimilated immigrant, is regarded as virtually indistinguishable from the modal stereotype of typical host group members. The present author does not regard this conventional view as satisfactory. In order to explain why, we must first briefly examine the concept of alienation.

Alienation has a variety of meanings, both in sociology (Seeman, 1959) and psychology (Chaplin, 1968), though one common element

---

1 Acculturation is a term sometimes used in a manner similar to assimilation. However, the present author agrees with Frölich's description of acculturation as a 'now somewhat too inclusive and non-specific term' (1972, p.16).
in all its usages is the notion of estrangement. Kovacs and Cropley (1975a, 1975b) have employed this concept extensively in their study of immigrant groups. Their use of the term is similar to that which will be adopted in the present study, i.e. alienation within an ethnic context refers to the estrangement or detachment of a person from characteristics typical of his original ethnic group. It seems to the present author that an immigrant can become more similar to the host group, i.e. assimilate, by adopting host group characteristics independently of alienation from his ethnicity. This is consistent with Wilson’s general description of assimilation as ‘the process of incorporation of some aspect of the surrounding environment into the self or whole’ (1972, p.86). In the conventional view of assimilation, host and ethnic groups are seen as being at opposite ends of a single continuum. As an immigrant moves towards the host group by adopting host group characteristics, he simultaneously moves away from the ethnic group, giving up ethnic group characteristics. Thus, assimilation and alienation are seen as complementary processes, there being little need to distinguish the two since they are regarded as little more than different perspectives of the same phenomenon. The present author has elsewhere (Putniņš, 1976b) called this the unidimensional model of immigrant adjustment. It is illustrated in practice by such questionnaire items as, ‘Do you feel completely ethnic/mainly ethnic but a little Australian/half ethnic and half Australian/mainly Australian but a little ethnic/completely Australian?’ (see for example Feather and Rudzītis, 1974; Jaunzems, 1968).

Kovacs and Cropley’s main contribution to the study of immigrants has been to break away from this model by demonstrating that alienation and assimilation need not always be complementary. While still regarding assimilation as ‘impossible, without simultaneous, complementary processes of alienation’ (1975a, p. 117), they nevertheless considered it possible for alienation to occur without concomitant assimilation. An immigrant, in Kovacs and Cropley’s view, could become alienated from the ethnic group in a variety of ways without necessarily assimilating to the host group. For example, an immigrant might, for whatever reason, cease to have social contacts with ethnic group members. It does not follow, however, that in compensation he will automatically increase his social contacts with host group members. In cases where alienation is not compensated by assimilation, a state of alienation or isolation can be said to exist. This observation, which became a central part of Kovacs and Cropley’s
discussion of immigrant adjustment, will be returned to later in this investigation. For the present, however, we can note that while Kovacs and Cropley's model of immigrant adjustment is an improvement on the unidimensional model, it still fails to give an adequate account of the relationship between alienation and assimilation. They have succeeded in only partially separating the two processes by acknowledging alienation without assimilation but not the reverse. It is obvious on reflection, however, that the reverse is also possible. For example, a non-English speaking immigrant can assimilate by learning to speak English while still remaining proficient in his ethnic tongue. Similarly, a person who identifies himself as a member of a particular ethnic group could also acquire a simultaneous identification with the host group. This does not mean regarding himself as half ethnic and half Australian, but to feel both ethnic and Australian. The same applies to other areas of adjustment, such as social interaction, appreciation of foods, leisure activities and so on. Thus, in many instances assimilation is possible without alienation from one's ethnicity.

Assimilation without alienation, as described above, results in a condition that we shall call integration, i.e. when an immigrant possesses both host and ethnic group characteristics, thereby integrating the two within the one person. Simultaneous and complementary assimilation and alienation will here be denoted as re-ethnification, i.e. moving away from one's original ethnicity and adopting some other ethnicity. The end result of such a process is a person who is re-ethnified, i.e. who has changed his ethnicity. Re-ethnification within an Australian context can also be denoted as Australianisation. The popular meaning of 'assimilated' is similar to that of 're-ethnified' as described here. Though the author has previously used the term in this sense (Putniņš, 1976a), it seems that it would be less ambiguous and more consistent with the meaning of assimilation outlined to use 're-ethnified' when referring to an end state of simultaneous assimilation and alienation.

From the above discussion, it is seen that assimilation and alienation are here regarded as being conceptually independent dimensions. This has been called the *multidimensional model* and is illustrated in Figure 1. Some possible movements by an immigrant are indicated, together with their end states, by the arrows on the diagram. Though only an immigrant's movements are shown, it is possible for a receiving society member also to move along these two dimensions.
People’s attitudes towards these various possible movements have been described as ‘assimilation orientations’ (Taft, 1953). These will be discussed in greater detail later in this study.

The multidimensional model is presented in Figure 1 in its simplest form. Additional dimensions can be added in order to give a more complete description of an immigrant in relation to various groups by splitting the Australian or ethnic groups into sub-groups or by adding other ethnic dimensions orthogonally to the original ethnic and host group dimensions. For example, a young Polish boy growing up in a predominantly Greek neighbourhood in an Australian city might require three dimensions (Polish, Greek, Australian) to describe accurately his ethnic relationships.

While assimilation and alienation should be treated as conceptually independent, it is nevertheless possible that the two dimensions are empirically related. Whether this is in fact so, however, can only be decided from research evidence. Some data will be presented relating to this question in a later section.
A final point should be made about the nature of assimilation and alienation. As was earlier noted, ethnicity, at least as it applies to Latvians, does not consist of any one particular characteristic, but rather a number of different attributes, both primary and secondary. Similarly there are a large number of host group characteristics that the immigrant is confronted with. Adoption or rejection of these characteristics need not occur simultaneously. An immigrant can alienate or assimilate in one area without changing his behaviour in other areas. For example, an immigrant could socially assimilate by establishing regular contacts and friendships with Australians without necessarily identifying with Australians.

Many areas of immigrant adjustment can be divided into two aspects which Taft (1957) has called 'internal' and 'external'. A corresponding distinction into 'subjective' and 'external' has also been made by Johnston (1965). The internal or subjective aspect refers to the immigrant's perception or attitude in an area of adjustment, while the external aspect refers to the perception of an outside observer. Just as the various areas of assimilation and alienation can vary independently of each other, so also the internal and external aspects of adjustment in particular areas need not occur in unison. An immigrant might identify with Australians and yet not be identified as such by Australians themselves. Similarly, an immigrant might consider himself to have a good command of English, but might be regarded as virtually unintelligible by Australians.

From the above discussion we can conclude that assimilation and alienation need to be regarded as two separate processes. Furthermore, assimilation (or alienation) in one facet of immigrant adjustment can occur independently of changes in other areas.

The multidimensional model will provide the framework for an examination of Latvian immigrants in Australia. However, the contemporary attitudes and behaviour of a group can only be adequately understood in the light of preceding events. In other words, an historical perspective is necessary. To gain such a perspective, an overview of the history of the Latvian people, particularly their post-war migration and settlement in Australia, is presented in the next chapter. This has been done in some detail with the intention that the reader might thereby gain not only some factual information about Latvians but also a deeper impression — perhaps a 'feeling' — of what it might be like to be a Latvian immigrant in Australia. Though such an approach is often eschewed in psychological studies of
immigrants, it is considered that through a better understanding of the history and present social circumstances of Latvians, a fuller appreciation of their adjustment will be achieved than would be possible if only statistical data were relied upon.
Emigration and Settlement

Latvians are a north-eastern European people whose language, together with Lithuanian and Old Prussian, belongs to the Baltic branch of Indo-European languages (Fennell, 1978). Their ancestors entered the Baltic area between three and four thousand years ago, forcing the Finno-Ugrian dwellers (Estonians and Livs) northwards (Gimbutas, 1963). Those settlers who inhabited the area of present-day Latvia were initially differentiated into a number of tribes with their own territories and languages. From the end of the twelfth century, German crusaders gradually subjugated the various tribes, the process culminating in the formation of the State of the Livonian Order which existed for more than two and a half centuries. From the sixteenth to the end of the eighteenth centuries Latvian territory was variously controlled by Sweden, Russia, and the Polish-Lithuanian alliance. By 1795 all Latvian territories had been incorporated into Russia. With the exception of a brief incursion by Napoleonic forces in 1812, this situation did not alter until after World War I. As in many other countries, it was only during the nineteenth century, with the onset of the so-called ‘national awakening’ and the formation of a Latvian intelligenzia (previously higher education had usually entailed either Germanisation or Russification) that a feeling of unity emerged amongst the Latvian people. At that time all Latvian territory was part of Czarist Russia, with ultimate administrative control in the hands of the Russian authorities. However, economic control was effectively in the hands of the Baltic German landed nobility and urban bourgeoisie, who consequently also had considerable influence on political, social, and cultural life (Rauch, 1974). This period, which saw, as expressions of a newly developing national consciousness, the publication of the first major Latvian literary works and newspapers, the establishment of various Latvian societies and cultural events such as the Latvian song festivals, also saw attempts to Russify the local
population. For example, the Russian language was made compulsory for all school instruction (after the 1905 revolution the first two years of primary school were exempted from this requirement). However, nationalist sentiments strengthened, culminating in the proclamation of an independent Latvian republic on 18 November 1918. This was followed by a war of independence against both German and Russian forces. A peace treaty recognising Latvian territorial integrity was signed with the Soviet Union in 1920. The new government was soon recognised by other world powers and was subsequently represented in the League of Nations.

The Latvian parliament (saeima) was elected by universal suffrage according to direct proportional representation. By 1934, however, with 27 different political parties and groups represented in the 100 seat saeima, the then Prime Minister, Kārlis Ulmanis, carried out a coup d'état, dissolving the saeima and banning all political parties pending the adoption of a new constitution. Ulmanis justified this action by arguing the need for political stability, though whether such drastic actions were necessary or not is still debated within the Latvian émigré communities.

After the Soviet and German foreign ministers concluded a non-aggression treaty in 1939 (usually known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact) between the two powers, together with a secret protocol which formulated respective spheres of influence in Europe, the Soviet Union in 1940 presented ultimata to each of the three Baltic States: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Each country was subsequently occupied by Soviet forces. Émigré Latvians refer to this as the 'year of terror' because of the many deportations and arrests. These same countries were occupied by German forces in 1941. At least initially, many of the local population welcomed the Germans as liberators, some joining the German military forces voluntarily so as to be able to fight against the Russians. However, much of the local population was later to become disillusioned with the German authorities. The Latvian Jewish and Gypsy populations were almost totally exterminated, many Latvians were arrested, executed or placed in concentration camps and the hope of re-establishing an independent Latvian government was never realised. As the war continued and German manpower became scarcer, a compulsory draft was introduced in Latvia. By the end of the war, almost all men and youths who were suitable for military service had been inducted into the armed forces. It was at this point that the emigration of many Latvians who are now in the West began.
To regress briefly, however, a history of Latvian emigration could begin at the end of the thirteenth century when, according to one chronicle of the time, 100,000 Semigallians (one of the old Latvian tribes) left their homeland due to constant attacks by the German Livonian order and moved south into Lithuania (Germanis, 1974). Emigration in more recent times began with the emancipation of Latvian serfs in the nineteenth century, allowing — amongst other things — greater freedom of travel. A large number of Latvian settlements were established in Russia prior to World War I. Their numbers were swelled by refugees from Latvia in 1915 as the German army advanced into Imperial Russia. It has been estimated that there were close to one million Latvians in Russia, though the majority subsequently returned to Latvia after the war. Smaller scale emigration to Brazil and the U.S.A. also took place from the end of the last century up to World War II. These people emigrated for a variety of reasons. Some had economic motives, others political (particularly at the end of the 1905 revolution) and yet others religious (e.g. Baptist groups in Brazil). These earlier settlers, usually referred to as ‘Old Latvians’, have been described in a number of publications (see Akmentiņš, 1958; Augelli, 1958; Brüvers, 1970; Dūma & Paegltne, 1976; Kārklis, et al., 1974; Lidums, 1973; Veidemanis, 1960, 1962, 1963a) in relatively fine detail. In the case of Old Latvian settlers in Australia, however, only a few brief accounts of the life of these people have been published (see Andersons, 1968; Dunsdorfs, 1953; Krasnats, 1980; Nicis, 1953; Putniņš, 1980).

The first Latvian known to have arrived in Australia was a sailor who landed in Sydney in 1853. He subsequently wrote about his travels in a German magazine (Inland) in 1855. Interestingly, there had been plans in the seventeenth century by Duke Jacobus of Courland (an area of Latvia) to colonise Australia (Andersons, 1970), though obviously nothing came of this. After the 1905 revolution and a subsequent rise in the numbers of Latvian immigrants (which included a small number of anti-czarist terrorists who fled England after carrying out a series of violent robberies, Clarke, 1979), a Latvian society with its own library was formed in Sydney in 1913. This, however, ceased functioning at some time in the 1920s. Some attempts were made to form a new Latvian society but these were short-lived due to political discord amongst the immigrants. Despite the lack of success in founding a stable organisation, two social gatherings were regularly held each year; one on Latvian independence day
and one on Jānis day – the latter being a traditional name day celebration which coincides with the northern hemisphere summer solistice. It was at one of these functions that the first Latvian play in Australia was performed. Every year from 1929 onwards a program in commemoration of Latvian independence day was prepared for Sydney radio. These activities came to an end with the outbreak of World War II. In 1938 there were 427 persons living in Australia who were born in Latvia, the majority residing in New South Wales. With relatively few exceptions, these immigrants took little part in the communities established by post-World War II Latvian immigrants.

In 1945, with the German capitulation, Soviet power was re-established in Latvia. At that time some 120,000 Latvians were in the Western Zone of Germany, though the number of Latvians displaced was greater since many remained in the Russian Sector (Tabouri, 1972). Those in the Western Zone were made up of five groups:

1) those avoiding being caught up directly in the battle front or not wishing to live under Soviet rule;
2) those who had been compulsorily inducted for industrial or agricultural work in Germany due to the lack of German manpower (Proudfoot, 1957, estimated that there were 60,000 Latvian civilian workers in Germany at the beginning of 1944);
3) units of the Latvian Legion who surrendered to the British and Americans;
4) inmates of concentration camps;
5) Latvians who, by claiming some Germany ancestry or affiliation, migrated to Germany at the beginning of the first Soviet occupation under the Volksdeutsche repatriation scheme.

At the end of the war some Latvians repatriated voluntarily (Vernant, 1951). However, the vast majority chose to stay in the West, though often in politically uncertain and materially difficult circumstances. Political uncertainty was exacerbated by events such as the forcible repatriation by the Swedish government of a group of more than one hundred former soldiers (mainly Latvians) to the Soviet Union at the request of the Soviet government in January 1946 (Ģermanis, 1974). The Soviet Union maintained that all the Baltic refugees in the Western Zone were in fact Soviet citizens since the countries which originally issued their passports were now Soviet republics. Consequently it was requested that all such persons be repatriated. In the chaos immediately following the end of the war,
some people were involuntarily repatriated before a directive not to observe the Soviet request was issued by the Western allied authorities. Fears or hopes of a war between the Western powers and the Soviet Union were prevalent. Many hoped that the political situation would soon change, allowing return to the homelands in the near future. It was also hoped by many that emigration from Germany to more desirable host countries would soon begin. But as the years slowly went by in the crowded Displaced Persons (D.P.) camps without a definite response from other countries, people became disheartened and uncertain about the future, in many cases developing a physical and mental lethargy described by Bakis (1955) – a refugee Estonian psychologist who had lived in the camps – as 'D.P. apathy'. During this period, however, many émigré Latvian organisations were established which now function on a global scale. Latvian schools were established in most camps with large numbers of Latvians. Though most of these were closed down as people emigrated or left the camps to live elsewhere, one of these schools is still functioning as a full-time Latvian primary and high school (gymnasium) in Münster. A Baltic university was also founded in Hamburg (later moved to Pinneberg), though this ceased functioning once major emigration from Germany began (Dunsdorfs, 1978).

When emigration from Germany finally got under way, Latvians were dispersed all over the globe. The largest number went to the U.S.A. after the passing of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; this act initially contained provisions favouring Baltic immigrants (Baskauskas, 1976). Somewhat more than 40,000 Latvians entered the United States during the early post-war period (Kärklis et al., 1974). Larger Latvian centres were also established in Sweden (most of the members of which had fled directly from Latvia across the Baltic Sea), England, Canada, South America and Australia. Amongst those remaining in Germany were many who had difficulty in being accepted for immigration elsewhere. Each receiving country had preferences for particular types of immigrant such that those who had greatest difficulty emigrating were war invalids, the sick and the aged. For example, in 1953, when mass emigration from Germany was drawing to a close, there were more than six hundred Latvians in Germany suffering from tuberculosis (Silde, 1953).

After the United States, Australia has the largest number of Latvians living outside the Soviet Union. The exact number of Latvians who entered Australia after the war is not known since
various sources give slightly different figures, though 20,000 would be a very close estimate (Baltaks, 1960). After the, for many, seemingly endless forms to complete, screenings and stringent medical checks, the first D.P. transport arrived in Australia on 27 November 1947, with 262 Latvians on board. The number of Latvians disembarking increased up to 1949 when more than 10,000 arrived in Australia. The numbers subsequently declined so that by 1953 there were only 21 arrivals, while in the first half of 1954 there were more departures than arrivals (Dunsdorfs, 1968).

The types of people sought amongst the D.Ps by Australian immigration authorities were those who were 'healthy, free of fascist sympathies and ready to live anywhere and work at anything in Australia' (Jupp, 1966, p.7). The last condition entailed entering into a two-year work contract, which often meant unskilled or semi-skilled work, regardless of a person's educational or professional background. Usually some choice was offered with regard to employment, though sometimes family members were separated from each other whilst fulfilling the obligatory work contract (Grantskalns, 1964). At the end of the work contract period the immigrants were free to seek employment wherever they pleased, though some professional groups, such as medical practitioners, were to encounter considerable difficulty in having their qualifications recognised (Kunz, 1975). This situation was possibly more acute among Latvians than among many other immigrant groups due to the selective nature of their emigration and immigration. For example, there was obvious selectivity with regard to political orientation, it being more likely for anti-communists to flee the Soviet forces than for communist sympathisers. Also, as a result of their experiences during the first Soviet occupation, it was known that those who were identifiable as members of the bourgeoisie were at greater risk with regard to arrest or deportation. Consequently, members of the intelligensia are over-represented amongst Latvian refugees. For example, Dunsdorfs (1968) has estimated that 58 per cent of all medical practitioners and dentists, 70 per cent of all pharmacists and 42 per cent of all engineers left Latvia.

Concerning religious affiliation, according to 1935 Latvian census figures (cited in Dunsdorfs, 1968), the majority of Latvians were Lutherans (68 per cent). The next largest denomination was Roman Catholic (26 per cent). However, from 1954 Australian census figures
it is seen that only 11.8 per cent of Latvian immigrants were Roman Catholics. This is possibly due to the fact that most Catholics lived in the easternmost area of Latvia (Latgale), which, being closest to the Russian border was the first region to be occupied by Soviet forces.

In 1971 there were 14,478 persons resident in Australia whose birthplace was Latvia. Almost all of these are Latvians in the sense that they were regarded as Latvians rather than as some other ethnicity in official statistics such as pre-war census figures. Veidemanis (1963b) estimated that only 2.8 per cent of persons living in Milwaukee who had been Latvian citizens were not ethnically Latvians. This proportion is at least compensated for by those Latvians born in Russia during World War I but who are not counted as Latvians in birthplace statistics. It is unlikely that there is much difference between the U.S.A. and Australia in this regard. Population statistics based on country of birth can therefore be considered to be reasonable estimates of the number of Latvians born before 1945. However, there are no direct figures available about the numbers of persons living in Australia who were born in Germany and Australia to Latvian parents. The most recent estimate has been made by Dunsdorfs (1974), based on a sample of Latvians in Victoria. There are, however, some methodological drawbacks to his study, such as the assumption that the proportion of mixed ethnics (one Latvian parent) to mono-ethnics (both parents Latvian) is constant throughout Australia. This is almost certainly not the case. For example, Tasmania, which has a relatively small Latvian population, has a higher proportion of Latvian mixed marriages (66 per cent) (Putniņš, 1974), than Victoria (40 per cent) resulting in proportionally more mixed ethnics and fewer mono-ethnics than would be predicted from Dunsdorfs' figures. It is likely that Dunsdorfs' estimate of the number of Latvian mono-ethnics in Australia is greater than the real number due to overestimation in the states and territories that have smaller numbers of Latvians. This qualification needs to be borne in mind when considering his data. Dunsdorfs has estimated there to be approximately 24,600 Latvians in Australia. From his figures it can be calculated that the largest numbers are in New South Wales (8200), Victoria (7500) and South Australia (4300).

Murphy (1955a) noted that despite the government's policy to Australianise the new immigrants as quickly as possible (e.g. a quarter of the space in all ethnic newspapers printed in Australia had to be in English) the refugees appeared 'to be adjusting more rapidly to the
economic than to the social environment...' (p. 133). It is obviously difficult for any person to discard the accumulation of many years of socialisation and cultural learning and adopt a completely new identity overnight. Rather, this is a process which usually takes place over a period of time. The fact that many of the refugee immigrants were virtually penniless on arrival in Australia would lead them to initially be more concerned with establishing economic security than attempting to make inroads into Australian social life. Also, being political refugees, as most saw themselves, many felt an obligation - or what Kunz (1971) terms, an 'historic responsibility' - towards those who remained behind; an obligation manifested by maintaining their ethnicity and warning others of the fates which befell their countries. There was also still some hope, at least during the first few years in Australia, that the political situation might soon change and allow a return home.

During the period of independence (or 'bourgeois dictatorship', as described in Soviet literature, e.g. Mihailovs, 1976), there were large ethnic minorities in Latvia. Latvians at the time of the 1935 census accounted for 75.5 per cent of the population, which was then close to two million (Kurāts, 1962). The largest minorities were Russians (10.6 per cent), Jews (4.8 per cent), Germans (3.2 per cent) and Poles (2.5 per cent). All minority groups had their own schools - supported by the government - in which the language of instruction was that of the particular ethnic groups (Silkalns, 1960). Thus, the general principle of cultural autonomy for the various minorities was recognised. Such a background might also have discouraged the loss of ethnicity in Australia.

Another factor which might have retarded rapid Australianisation was the existence of some prejudice and discrimination. There had already been experiences of this in Germany, where the D.Ps were often called Verfluchte Ausländer! (damned foreigners). In Australia, the terms 'Reffo' or 'Bloody Balts' were often heard, though neither is any longer in common usage. Some discrimination could also be perceived in the area of employment, particularly with regard to the recognition of tertiary qualifications. The refugees were also sensitive about being called fascists, though this practice was generally confined to communist influenced unions (Jupp, 1966) and left-wing publications which often based their articles on Soviet publications designed to discredit and neutralise the political activities of the refugee groups (Martin, 1972). As a consequence, most of the
prejudice against Latvians was perceived to emanate from the Communist Party (Miculis, 1958). Relatively little unfriendliness or prejudice was perceived outside of this source. However, prejudice or discrimination is not always a one-sided affair — immigrants themselves often held discriminatory attitudes towards Australians. In the words of one Latvian at the time: ‘Look at those Australians; what do they know? They only speak one language, they eat dull and tasteless food, they wear drab, old-fashioned clothing, they have no culture’ (Gelsen, 1974). Such attitudes also hindered the rapid Australianisation of immigrants.

On arrival in Australia, Latvians quickly established a number of community organisations and activities. Organisations and coordinated activities exist at global, national and local levels. As an illustration of community organisation at the local level, Latvians in Adelaide can be taken as a good example. It is the community presently most familiar to the author and does not appear to differ in any socially significant aspect from other large Latvian communities in Australia.

The first post-war Latvian immigrants arrived in Adelaide in 1948. In the same year the Adelaide Latvian Society was founded (Berzzarins, 1953). Since then the number of Latvian organisations has proliferated and now includes both a Lutheran and a Catholic congregation; music, theatre, sport, art and craft, youth (including Scouts and Guides) and folkdancing groups; student and professional societies, and a number of other social and cultural organisations. (For more comprehensive listings of individual organisations see, Department of Social Security, 1977, and Latviešu kredītsabiedrību gada grāmata, 1980.) Also in Adelaide are the Australian and New Zealand Latvian Association central archives and Latvian music collection. The Adelaide Latvian Society has a library with over 3000 books (Zalums, 1970) and a small Latvian museum. There is a Latvian Saturday School for primary school age children where Latvian history, language, literature, geography, folkdancing and singing are taught. A high school, in many ways an extension of the Saturday school, has classes one evening a week. The Latvian language is taught there as a recognised South Australian secondary school language up to matriculation level. (In 1977 there were seven primary level Saturday schools in Australia with 410 students and three high schools with 120 students, Australijas latvietis, 24.2.1978.) A Latvian language course is also taught at the Flinders University of South Australia. An old folk’s home (Sidrabene)
has been established and there is a Latvian arts and crafts salon in the city which also sells Latvian language books and periodicals. The latter is privately owned but fulfils an important function in the community. There is a Latvian radio program on the community access radio. A community information bulletin is published every month and news and information about the Adelaide community are regularly published in the national Latvian newspaper (*Austrāļijas latvietis*).

A number of properties are owned and used by the Adelaide Latvian community, including a church, a large modern hall, and club rooms with bar and eating facilities which serve as focal points in the informal social life of the community.

The Latvian community is represented on a number of ethnic bodies though, because of obvious cultural and historical ties, the closest liaison is maintained with the Estonian and Lithuanian communities.

Various functions and activities are organised locally throughout the year, though the most extensive are held on a national level. Of these, the most important are the annual Latvian cultural festival and the Latvian youth festival. Both are held by rotation between the larger Latvian centres—including Adelaide.

From the above it can be seen that there is a potentially wide range of activities and facilities available to persons wishing to participate in the community life of Latvians in Adelaide.

Perhaps the most significant event in the political life of the community in recent years was the *de jure* recognition, by the Labor government in 1975, of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. Briefly, the background to this event (see also Dunsdorfs, 1975; Knight, 1979) is that while all countries acknowledge the fact of the incorporation of the three Baltic States into the Soviet Union (*de facto* recognition), few Western governments recognise the legality of the incorporation (*de jure* recognition). Consequently, many countries still recognise the diplomatic and consular representatives of pre-war Latvia, including Australia—there still being an honorary Latvian consul in Melbourne. The decision to recognise the incorporation of the Baltic States *de jure* caused a storm of protest from the Baltic communities. As the result of an intensive lobbying campaign, the Liberal-Country Party coalition adopted the revocation of the *de jure* recognition as one of its election platform policies—subsequently carried out within a few days of the coalition's return to office at the
end of 1975. In 1978, the federal caucus of the Australian Labor Party, by a unanimous decision, reversed the earlier Whitlam position on the issue of the Baltic States, and asserted that it would not oppose or attempt to alter the present government's policy regarding not recognising *de jure* the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. This series of events can be seen as a manifestation of the 'historic responsibility' felt by many post-war Baltic immigrants. It also testifies to relatively well co-ordinated activity both within and between the Baltic communities.

Most organised community activities are concerned with propagating Latvian culture and maintaining a strong anti-communist stance. These two goals have on occasion come into conflict with each other, providing the main ideological controversy within the community. The controversy centres on the question of contacts with Soviet Latvia (also referred to as 'occupied' Latvia by many émigrés) - a problem similar to that experienced by many other refugee communities, including Estonians (Raudma, 1978) and Lithuanians (Baskauskas, 1976; Pocius, 1977). Some Latvians see a need to have broader contact with present-day cultural life in Latvia, arguing that this is necessary in order to both maintain and to develop Latvian culture in the West and to lessen the trend in many areas for the two groups (i.e. in the West and in Latvia) to grow further apart. Others see this as a threat to their *raison d'être*. Any contacts between communities in the West with Soviet functionaries - which would be necessary in order to arrange concert tours, film screenings, art exhibitions or similar events - would be regarded as compromising their refugee status and anti-communist position. Thus, at the extremes there is what might be seen as a conflict of interests between cultural and political 'historical responsibilities'. Survey evidence (Grava, 1973; Putnins, 1977b), suggests that younger people tend to support a broadening of cultural contacts more so than do older Latvians.

The above illustrates that Latvians in the West are not ideologically single-minded and that disagreements do exist within the communities. More detailed research findings about the adjustment of Latvian immigrants in Australia, particularly with regard to the retention of their ethnicity, are presented in the next chapter.
At the outset, it would be appropriate to consider Australian attitudes towards immigrants, since the opinion climate of the receiving society could be expected to have some influence on the adjustment of newcomers. Two types of public opinion polls have been conducted since the beginning of post-war immigration. Some have sought opinions about whether the immigrant intake should generally be expanded or not. These types of surveys are relevant to determining the attitudes of the public toward the numbers of immigrants that are desirable at any one time, and as such are only indirectly relevant to determining attitudes towards immigrants as people. For example, while host society members might have little prejudice towards immigrants, they might nevertheless oppose further immigration at a particular time because of unfavourable economic conditions. Therefore, a review of surveys dealing with the general question of immigrant numbers will not be presented here. However, comparative surveys of the relative desirability of different ethnic groups are relevant because they can provide an insight into the degree of ethnocentrism prevalent in the host community. Other surveys that have a bearing on attitudes towards immigrants are those that include 'social distance' type items dealing with such questions as admission to kin by marriage, entering into personal friendship, acceptance as a neighbour, and so on.

Surveys in Melbourne in 1948 and 1949 reported by Murphy (1952) of preferences for fourteen different immigrant groups found large variation in the desirability of various groups. Predictably, the highest support was for English, American and Irish immigrants, with 97, 85 and 71 per cent respectively of those surveyed expressing the desire to 'let all in' or to 'encourage them' (1949 figures). 'Balts' (52 per cent) followed Swedes and French, but were higher than Germans, Jews, Italians, Greeks, Russians, Chinese, Indians, and Negroes. However,
the value of this survey with regard to Baltic immigrants is difficult to judge because it is uncertain whether 'Balts' was interpreted asrepresenting only Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians or whether it was taken to mean all refugees, since 'Balt' was often used in the vernacular to denote all D.P. immigrants, and was even at times generalised to all immigrants. Furthermore, at this time the Australian public was remarkably ignorant of just what D.Ps were. The results of Gallup polls conducted in August 1947 (one month after official announcement of the plan to accept D.P. immigrants) and in December 1948 are presented in Table 1.

**TABLE 1** Australian cross-section (n = 1600) in favour of or opposing 12,000 D.Ps coming each year to Australia (adapted from Murphy, 1952)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aug. 1947 (%)</th>
<th>Dec. 1948 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know what D.P. means</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False idea of what D.P. means</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favour</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from this Table, even in 1948, one year after the arrival of the first D.Ps, 36 per cent of the respondents did not accurately know what a D.P. was. However, amongst those who did know, opinions favouring D.P. immigration outnumbered opposing opinions two to one.

Surveys over a period of years (Hammond, 1954; Huck, 1968; Richardson, 1972; Richardson and Taft, 1968) of Australian preference towards the intake of migrants of various ethnicities indicate an increasing acceptance of non-British immigrants. While there still exists a hierarchy that reflects preferences for immigrants of similar background to the majority of Australians (what might be described as immigrant 'visibility', as is pointedly illustrated in Figure 2), the preference differential between British and non-British immigrants appears to be decreasing. Part of this decrease, however, might be an artifact of an increase of immigrants in the subject samples.
Results from surveys of social distance attitudes between Australians and various immigrant groups in Perth (Richardson, 1961b; Richardson and Taft, 1968) indicate generally favourable attitudes towards immigrants and a tendency for attitudes to become more favourable with time. Jaunzems (1968) also found that a majority of Australians in a Canberra survey regarded themselves as being favourably predisposed to Northern European immigrants.

While it seems that a majority of people surveyed have a degree of tolerance towards immigrants, there are nevertheless substantial minorities in each of the above surveys that have unfavourable attitudes. In general, however, it appears that the size of this minority is gradually declining. This is inferred not only from survey data but also from changes in community attitudes reflected in social welfare and educational policies that have become increasingly responsive and sensitive to migrant needs. Beswick and Hills (1972), on the basis of an extensive survey throughout Australia, concluded that ethnocentric attitudes were likely to decrease further. They identified the following factors as being related to a decline in ethnocentrism: (a) younger age, (b) increasing urbanisation; and (c) higher education.

They also found that immigrants tended to be less ethnocentric than local born residents, though Eastern Europeans proved to be an
exception (supported also by results from Feather and Wasyluck's 1973 study of Ukrainians). Thus the post-war increase in immigrants in Australia could be expected to have a diluting effect on general population attitudes. It is interesting to note that while Beswick and Hills found a positive relationship between ethnocentrism and age in their adult sample, the reverse appears to hold for adolescents, with unfavourable attitudes towards immigrants declining consistently between 11 and 18 years of age (Connell, 1973).

A majority of Latvians (85 per cent) surveyed by Jaunzems (1968) considered Australians to have favourable or neutral attitudes towards Northern European immigrants, while 97 per cent of the sample rated themselves as holding favourable or neutral attitudes toward Australians, with the percentage of neutral responses increasing with age. An earlier study by Mičulis (1958) in Perth found that a majority of her Latvian sample considered Australians to have a neutral disposition toward Latvian immigrants. An additional question — 'Have you found any persons or organisations unfriendly or prejudiced against you and other Latvian immigrants since you arrived here?' — was answered in the affirmative by 91 per cent of respondents. This result has, however, been misinterpreted by Richardson and Taft (1968) who reported that only 9 per cent of 'Baltic immigrants [Latvians] . . . thought that Australians are friendly and without prejudice against them' (p.51). From Mičulis's original study it is revealed that 82 per cent of those who perceived unfriendliness or prejudice saw the Communist Party as its source. It is incorrect to interpret this perception as applying to Australians in general.

A survey of Latvian families in the state of Washington (U.S.A.) found that 59 per cent of respondents would have some objection to a family member marrying a non-Latvian (Radziņš, 1961). Another study at almost the same time in Milwaukee, Wisconsin revealed that 49 per cent of interviewed subjects considered marriage with non-Latvians as undesirable (Veidemanis, 1963b). Dunsdorf's (1974) in a survey of Latvians in Victoria, found that 28 per cent of parent respondents would have some objection to their children marrying a non-Latvian. Skreja (1965) has pointed out that for Latvians monoeconomic marriage is a group boundary-maintaining mechanism that increases the probability of maintaining Latvian ethnicity. For example, surveys in the U.S.A. (Häzners, 1974; Kronliņš, 1969), Australia (Putniņš, 1974), and Germany (Silkalns, 1965) have consistently shown that very few children from Latvian mixed marriages
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speak Latvian. Thus, social distance with regard to marriage is seen by a significant portion of Latvians as being desirable in order to help maintain Latvian ethnicity. However, despite a sizable proportion of Latvians not favouring mixed marriages, the actual rate of such marriages in Australia has steadily increased, so that since the late 1950s a majority of new marriages involving first generation Latvians has been mixed marriages (see Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, 1951-66). It can be expected that the rate of mixed marriages amongst second generation Latvians will be greater than amongst the first generation and that the rate of mixed marriages will increase with a decrease in the size of the local Latvian community due to the more restricted choice of suitable Latvian marriage partners. For example, all married Latvians younger than 30 years of age in Hobart—which has a relatively small Latvian community—have non-Latvian spouses (Putnins, 1974).

In answer to the question whether it is desirable for Latvians to isolate themselves from Australians when outside of school, 15 per cent of surveyed Australian Latvians answered in the affirmative (Baltaks, 1960). This particular survey was, however, biased toward ethnic maintainers (low ethnic alienation), thus, the obtained affirmative percentage is likely to be higher than in a general population sample. Furthermore, we can expect a decline over time since length of residence has been found to be positively related to many aspects of immigrant re-ethnification (Goldlust and Richmond, 1974), though the relationship is not always a simple linear one (Weinstock, 1964) and regression can occur in individual cases (Taft, 1977a).

Summarising the above, it appears that Latvians in Australia perceive relatively little prejudice from the majority of Australians and generally have a favourable opinion of Australians. However, many Latvians are not completely accepting of host group members in what is perhaps the closest of all social relationships—marriage. This appears to be related to a desire to maintain Latvian ethnicity.

Baltic immigrants have been found to be generally satisfied with life and work in Australia (Jaunzems, 1968; Jonikas, 1958; Meiliunas, 1976; Mitulis, 1958; Taft, 1965; Zubrzycki, 1964) and appear to be no less satisfied than Australians and other immigrants. This is so despite the downward social and occupational displacement experience by many of them. Dunsdorfs (1974) obtained a significant positive relationship between general satisfaction with life in Australia and an index of re-ethnification \( r = .32 \) for Latvians surveyed in Victoria.
Jaunzems (1968) and Jaunzems and Brown (1972) reported that satisfaction was not significantly related (at .05 or beyond) to a number of assimilation and re-ethnification measures with their Latvian subjects. They appear, however, to have miscalculated the significance levels of their correlations for a sample of 165. For example, their obtained Pearson correlations between satisfaction and favourable attitude toward Australia (.24), Australian identification (.21) and social participation with Australians (.21) are in fact all significant using two-tailed tests. Taft (1965) has also reported that satisfaction is positively related to identification with Australia and, to a lesser extent, with 'acculturation' (earlier, Taft, 1961, adopted Richardson's, 1961a, definition of acculturation as 'the acquisition and adoption of knowledge, beliefs, and behaviour patterns similar to those prevailing in the host society').

While tentative relationships between various facets of the adjustment process can be described, firm conclusions can seldom be made. Often relationships found in one study fail to be replicated in others because of different measuring instruments and/or subject sampling methods and a lack of clarity and consistency with respect to conceptualisations of the fundamental processes involved in immigrant adjustment. For example, Taft and Doczy (1961/62) have written that in order to measure identification with Australia, it is necessary to rely on oblique measures, such as naturalisation, mixing with Australians and perceived congruence with Australian ways of thinking' (p.33). It seems to the present author that 'identification' is a misnomer for these measures, of which only the last appears to have some validity as an 'oblique' measure of identification. The first two measures are highly suspect as identification measures. Naturalisation, i.e. when an immigrant formally adopts the citizenship of the host society, thus acquiring certain privileges and obligations, might be better described as a measure of civic assimilation. Naturalisation can occur for a variety of reasons and need not necessarily be related to other behavioural or attitudinal changes. Rivett (1966) has pointed out that naturalisation is looked upon as merely a formality by many immigrants while Jaunzems (1968) found that it was a poor measure of identification for Latvian subjects. Mixing with Australians, the second measure suggested by Taft and Doczy, simply lacks content validity as a measure of identification in the sense that there is no obvious connection between this measure and the definition of identification. Although mixing with Australians might be empirically related to identification, if it is used to measure a specific facet of
adjustment, then it should be employed as a measure of social assimilation rather than identification.

Most earlier studies have either implicitly or explicitly employed a unidimensional model of immigrant adjustment, i.e. their focus has been on re-ethnification, assuming alienation and assimilation to be simultaneous and complementary processes. Such an assumption, however, needs to be justified. If such justification is not forthcoming, then continued use of a unidimensional model might produce descriptive data that do not fully reflect the intricacies of immigrant adjustment, which in turn could hamper theoretical development in this area. It is only relatively recently that a multidimensional model has been employed as the basis for empirical research with ethnic groups (e.g. Maykovich, 1976; Penny, 1975; Putniņš, 1975; Smolicz, 1975). In each case it was found that there was not a simple linear relationship between ethnic and host group dimensions. If this is so, then at least some previous research might be descriptively incomplete and might need replication using instruments consistent with a multidimensional model.

Two factors that have been found to be negatively related to re-ethnification amongst Latvian immigrants in Australia are greater age (Dunsdorfs, 1974; Jaunzems, 1968; Putniņš, 1977) and higher education (Dunsdorfs, 1974; Eke & Zolte, 1967). No sex differences have been found in second generation Latvians on re-ethnification measures (Putniņš, 1975) and only a minimal sex difference in identification (with males being slightly, though significantly, more re-ethnified) has been found in first generation Latvian immigrants (Jaunzems, 1968). Jaunzems and Brown (1972), whose paper was based on Jaunzems’ (1968) earlier work, concluded that ‘informal social participation with Australians occurred more slowly for the women’ (p.67). This conclusion is, however, incorrect. Earlier in their paper it was reported that sex differences in this area were not significant, which is in conformity with Jaunzems’ original results.

Radziņš, (1961) found that a majority of the Latvian respondents in his survey indicated that at the time of their arrival in America they definitely expected to return to Latvia. By 1960 almost half still indicated that they would return if there was a change in the political situation. The proportion of returnees in other surveys (Dunsdorfs, 1974; Jaunzems, 1968; Jurevičs, 1961; Mičulis, 1958; Veidemanis, 1963b) has varied from a little more than a quarter to more than half of the respondents. Jaunzems (1968) found that an intention to return
to Latvia was negatively related to a number of assimilation and re-ethnification variables. However, Dunsdorfs (1974) found no significant relationship between an index of re-ethnification and intention to return. Figures presented by Dunsdorfs indicate a non-linear relationship, with intention to return declining in both the youngest and oldest age groups, apparently as a result of increasing re-ethnification and presumed difficulty in adopting a new lifestyle in the respective age groups. It is possible that the different results reported by Jaunzems and Dunsdorfs are due in part to age differences between their samples, though this cannot be verified at present due to the lack of comparable age-related sample statistics in the two studies.

Some findings from two recent studies help to cast light on the problem of determining the present state of Latvian ethnicity maintenance in Australia. Dunsdorfs' (1974) survey of first generation Latvians in Victoria in 1972 found that 68 per cent of the respondents read Latvian periodicals and that a majority are members of at least one Latvian organisation (mainly Latvian church congregations). Of the Latvian parent respondents, including those with non-Latvian spouses, 45 per cent spoke only in Latvian with their children while a further 38 per cent used Latvian at least sometimes. Thus, 83 per cent spoke at least some Latvian with their children. A survey in Adelaide in 1974 of mono-ethnic second generation Latvian university students (Putniņš 1975) found that 31 per cent spoke only in Latvian to their parents while a further 55 per cent used some Latvian with their parents. Slightly more than half were active participants in at least one Latvian organisation and 90 per cent had at least some Latvian friends. However, some erosion of ethnicity can be noted by the fact that 17 per cent replied that their fluency in spoken Latvian was very poor or totally absent. Also, active language use is declining within the second generation, as is evidenced by the finding that 43 per cent speak only English with their siblings at home. The general impression is that Latvian ethnicity has been maintained to a considerable extent in both the older and younger Latvian generations, though gradual loss of active linguistic skills is evident, particularly in the second generation.

Latvians, compared to other immigrant groups in Australian cities, are geographically widely dispersed, i.e. there is very little tendency to form ethnic neighbourhoods or suburbs on the basis of residential concentration (Martin, 1972; Rose, 1958). Latvian community associa-
tions have been described as ‘stable’ (i.e. most associations ever formed are still in existence) and ‘cohesive’ (as opposed to ‘fragmented’ or ‘divided’). The general pattern of community life most closely resembles that of Estonians in Australia, while more broadly there is considerable similarity with the Polish, Lithuanian and Ukrainian communities (Martin, 1972). The similarity of these communities has also been pointed out by Zubrzycki (1964), who presented data suggesting that Baltic settlers, compared to other immigrant groups, can be regarded as high ethnic maintainers. Taft (1965) reached a similar conclusion on the basis of a comparison of first generation Baltic immigrants and a variety of other ethnic groups. Such a conclusion would also appear to apply to second generation Latvians, at least as far as language maintenance is concerned, when comparing data for Latvians (Putniņš, 1975) to those for other immigrant groups presented by Smolicz and Harris (1976). This is related to what was earlier described as the historic responsibility felt by many Baltic immigrants. Horobin (1957) summarised this feeling when writing about Estonians (it applies equally well to Latvians) as follows: ‘There is no doubt that many do feel a sense of duty to remain unassimilated [unre-ethnified]; a duty to the people who remain in Estonia, perhaps, more than to themselves’ (p.248). This is also manifested in the strong nostalgic sentiments felt by many Latvians. For example, Jaunzems (1968) found that 75 per cent of her adult sample ‘often’ or ‘sometimes’ wished that they could be ‘back in Latvia with things the way they used to be before the war’. This sense of nostalgia permeates the Latvian community and its activities, with maintenance of ethnicity being the central concern of community life. There is insistence that the material manifestations of ethnicity be ‘ethnographically correct’, in contrast to the situation in Soviet Latvia where stylisation is common. Organised activities are generally more concerned with the preservation of Latvian culture than with its development. This orientation to the past (noted also by Horobin, 1957, in the case of Estonians), together with their motives for emigrating, has led Latvians to be, on the whole, politically conservative. This is seen not only in their community activities and their newspapers, but also in their voting preferences. Contrary to Dēliņš’s (1977) unsubstantiated assertion that, ‘Until, and including, the general election in May 1974, the general overall voting pattern in the Latvian community was almost identical to that of the Australian electorate as a whole’, studies by Zembers (1972) and Karnups (1977)
indicate conservative voting patterns, with considerably less support expressed for the Australian Labor Party than for the Liberal and Democratic Labor parties. Similar results with Estonians in Australia have been obtained by Suur (1978). These studies, however, are restricted with regard to their sampling procedures – a common problem in surveys of immigrants.

While research which is concerned with investigating relationships between variables is less affected by non-representative sampling (the main requirement being that there is satisfactory dispersion in the variables under investigation), surveys which attempt to establish the incidence of particular attitudes or behaviours (what might be called social psychological demography) require representative sampling. This is often difficult to achieve because truly random sampling requires that the probability of inclusion in the sample should be equal for all subjects in the population under study. In order to do this it must be potentially possible to contact all population members. This in practice means that there must be an information source available which contains the names and addresses of all the relevant population. In the case of Latvian immigrants in Australia, no one such exhaustive listing exists. Community lists by no means include all Latvians in a given area, and are not representative of Latvians in general due to a bias towards persons active in the community, i.e. ethnic maintainers. Telephone directories are neither exhaustive nor representative listings, there being an upward socio-economic bias amongst those who possess a telephone compared to those who do not. Telephone directories also do not include first names, which can be useful in cases where surnames are not typically Latvian or have been anglicised. Electoral rolls do not include all Latvians. Aside from those eligible for registration who have not done so, only naturalised citizens can legally vote. Thus, un-naturalised Latvians and those under 18 years of age are absent from electoral rolls. There also appears to be a bias for Latvian university graduates to naturalise more rapidly than less educated groups (Kunz, 1971). Furthermore, a sample based on the selection of Latvian-sounding names could be expected to under-represent those Latvian women who have married non-Latvians and have consequently changed their surnames.

Another problem encountered in survey work with Latvians is the securing of subject co-operation. This is a problem frequently encountered with Eastern European refugees, as noted by both Zubrzycki (1964) and Martin (1965). Certainly Latvians are no
exception. Proske (1972) found Latvian parents reluctant (compared with Australians) to allow their children to be tested in a study of bilingualism in Adelaide. There was some opposition expressed against Grava’s (1973) survey in Adelaide of attitudes towards cultural relations with Latvia, while a student survey by Grantskalns (1964) – also in Adelaide – aroused such suspicion and fear amongst some Latvians that the matter was even raised in the Australian Federal Parliament (see Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, 1964). In the tense atmosphere of the time, Jaunzems (1968) changed the location of her study from Adelaide to Canberra. Resistance and suspicion was also encountered in a survey of Latvians in Hobart (Putnins, 1974). This is not to say that such behaviour is typical of all Latvians or even of a majority. However, it does occur with sufficient frequency to warrant some examination of its causes.

From practical experience, the greatest suspicion of surveys and questionnaires is to be found amongst older Latvians. Amongst the second generation, i.e. those born in Australia, resistance to participation in surveys on the basis of politically oriented suspicion is negligible. The origin of cautious attitudes amongst the older immigrants is to be found in the war-time experiences of older Latvians, when a lack of discretion could result in arrest, deportation, or worse. The uncertainty of their future in the D.P. camps, the attempts by the Soviet Union to persuade the Western allies to repatriate all those who had lived in Soviet occupied territory, the stringent selection procedures by immigration authorities from countries to which these people hoped to immigrate, all reinforced a very cautious approach to strangers asking questions. An extreme illustration of such fears by some refugees was the case of an elderly Lithuanian couple, who, according to press reports, lived in almost total isolation in a cave near Sydney for 28 years out of fear of the Soviet KGB (The News, 12 Feb. 1979).

Even after arrival in Australia, events still occurred which did little to allay their fears. For example, the Royal Commission (Owen, et al., 1955), established after the defection by Petrov from the Soviet embassy in Canberra, reported that one of Petrov’s tasks had been to collect information about Latvians in Australia and that a person who was active in the Melbourne community had, in return for payment, co-operated with Petrov. Another example concerns the propaganda newspaper Dzimtenes Balss (Voice of the Homeland) which is published in Latvia for free postal distribution to émigré Latvians. Many people
receive this newspaper without ever having requested it from the publishers. A personal acquaintance of the author related how even before he had moved into a new home, this unsolicited newspaper had been appropriately re-addressed. Such events lead many to suspect that there are persons passing on information about Latvians in the West to Soviet authorities. The net result of these experiences has been to make many older Latvians very wary of revealing personal information in surveys, particularly when anonymity is not guaranteed. These are problems which will require practical consideration later in this study.

The next chapters will deal with recent research into a number of areas concerning Latvians in Australia together with some limited investigation of Estonians and Lithuanians in Australia and Latvians in other countries.
Studies in Western countries have often found higher rates of psychopathology amongst immigrants than host populations (Kiev, 1973). Eastern European refugees have been identified as being at particularly high risk with regard to psychiatric illness (Krupinski et al., 1973; Krupinski, 1976). While Baltic immigrants are usually included in general samples of Eastern Europeans, separate results are seldom given. Amongst the few exceptions is Cade (1956) who gave figures for the numbers of schizophrenic admissions to a major psychiatric centre in Melbourne by country of origin — including Latvia and Lithuania — over a three-year period. Calculation from these figures indicates that while the proportion of Latvian and Lithuanian males in the general male population was .39 per cent, they accounted for 1.52 per cent of schizophrenic admissions. Latvian and Lithuanian females at the same time accounted for .32 per cent of the general population and .46 per cent of female admissions for schizophrenia. Further calculation shows that the observed excess of Baltic admissions was significantly greater than the expected incidence ($\chi^2 = 2.73, p < .05, df = 1$) for males, though not for females ($\chi^2 = 0.28, p > .1, df = 1$). However, the absolute numbers of Baltic immigrant admissions were very small, particularly for females, and the incidence rates were not standardised for age.

Krupinski et al. (1973) included Baltic immigrants in their study of Eastern European psychiatric admissions to Victorian Mental Health Services facilities — though their only independent reference to Baltic immigrants was to note a high rate of alcoholism compared to the other Eastern European groups. To judge from tabular data presented by Krupinski and his co-workers, this finding applied mainly to male subjects. Cade and Krupinski (1962) and Krupinski and Stoller (1965) found that, when incidence rates for alcoholism were corrected for age, there was little difference between Australian and Eastern
European males. This suggests that the incidence rate of alcoholism for Baltic immigrants might be higher than the Australian rate. Unfortunately, Krupinski et al. (1973) did not provide data concerning the statistical significance of the difference between the Baltic and other Eastern European groups, therefore making any such inferences speculative. It is interesting to note, however, that a high rate of alcoholism can be presumed to exist in Latvia at present. While statistics on alcoholism in the various Soviet republics are not available, an indirect estimation is possible. If it is assumed that the number of deaths due to alcohol poisoning is related to the incidence of alcoholism, then it is seen that whereas 279 persons died from alcoholism and accidental alcohol poisoning in Australia in 1972 (unpublished figures obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics), more than 300 persons died from alcohol poisoning in the same year in Latvia (Vitolins, 1973). Since Latvia has less than a fifth of the population of Australia, it would be reasonable to infer that alcoholism is more common in Latvia than in Australia. If the higher rate of alcoholism for Baltic immigrants reported by Krupinski et al. (1973) is significant, then cultural factors might play a role in the explanation of this phenomenon.

Murphy (1955b) has described the psychiatric admission rates of Eastern European refugees in Great Britain. He found that they were considerably higher than those of the general population. Within the refugee group, Latvians and Estonians had the lowest rates, though inspection of the figures presented by Murphy suggest that their rates were still higher than those of the general population. However, the relevant data presented were crude admission rates only, uncorrected for differences in age distribution. Furthermore, no separate significance levels were reported for any of the Baltic figures, though Murphy did note that despite large variation in the female rates, differences between the various refugee female groups were not significant because of the small numbers involved.

From the above it can be seen that while there is suggestive evidence that the psychiatric admission rates of Baltic immigrants are higher than those of host populations, there is no conclusive evidence that this is so. A similar situation prevails with regard to the incidence of suicide.

Suicide incidence rates amongst immigrants have not been extensively studied and there are few published studies in this area with Australian populations. Whitlock (1971) examined the suicide
rates of sixteen immigrant groups in Australia, including some Eastern European groups – though not Baltic immigrants. Each sex of each immigrant group had higher (though not always statistically significant) crude rates of suicide than in their countries of origin. Compared to the native-born Australian crude rates, Southern Europeans tended to have lower rates of incidence whilst Eastern Europeans had higher rates than native-born Australians. A similar pattern is revealed in figures describing the incidence rate of suicide for each sex in each ethnic group across three broad age categories. The number of significant departures from the expected rates, however, was proportionally lower than for the whole group rates; partly because of the very small expected and observed frequencies obtained after division into separate age categories. A more appropriate procedure would have been to standardise the whole group rates for age rather than examine the age-specific incidences separately, particularly since many groups were numerically quite small to begin with.

Murphy (1955b) presented incidence rates of suicide amongst both Latvian and Ukrainian refugees in Great Britain. He found that Latvian males and females had higher rates than both those of the host population and of pre-war Latvia. The Ukrainian male rate was higher than that of the host population, though not the female rate. Once again, however, the incidence rates were not standardised for age and the absolute numbers (particularly for females) were small.

As is the case with psychiatric admissions, there are indications that suicides occur more frequently amongst Baltic immigrants than host populations, though once again, only suggestive evidence is available. The aim of this section is to present data which will allow a more definite statement on this issue, at least with regard to Baltic immigrants in Australia.

Study I
The numbers of suicides by Baltic immigrants by sex and country of birth, together with Australian total suicide figures by age for the five calendar year period from 1970 to 1974, were provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Since suicide rates differ between the sexes and various age groups, and since the age-sex structures of Baltic immigrants (by country of birth) differ significantly from those of the Australian population, the calculation of crude rates without
standardisation for age and sex characteristics could produce misleading results. Therefore, using 1971 Australian census figures in conjunction with the suicide statistics mentioned above, the predicted numbers of suicides in five age groups (25–34, 35–44, 45–54, 55–64, 65+) for each sex in each Baltic group were calculated. The calculations were based on the null hypothesis expectation that Baltic suicide rates will not differ significantly from those for the general population. The expected numbers of suicides were then obtained by summing those predicted for the various age groups within a particular Baltic sex group. Persons less than 25 years of age were not considered in these calculations since only .97 per cent of all those who were born in one of the Baltic countries and living in Australia at the time of the 1971 census were in this age group.

Admissions to psychiatric facilities were taken as an index of the incidence of psychopathology amongst Baltic immigrants. South Australian Mental Health Services records were checked for an eight-year period from 1 July 1967, to 30 June 1975, and all admissions by persons born in one of the Baltic countries were noted. Only patients who were 30 years of age or older on admission were recorded. Because there are very few persons in Australia who were born in the Baltic countries after 1945, by 1975 (the last year for which records were examined) there would be only a negligible number of persons under 30 years of age. In addition, only patients in diagnostic categories where social or other nonphysical environmental factors might contribute to the aetiology of the disorder were considered. Therefore patients in the South Australian Mental Services 'short-list' diagnostic categories of Senile and Pre-Senile Dementia, Other Organic Psychoses and Non-Psychotic Mental Disturbances Associated with Physical Condition, were excluded from the study.

Figures for the same age and diagnostic groups over the same period for the total South Australian population were compiled from the statistical appendices of the Mental Health Services annual reports. In a manner similar to that described above for suicides, the 1971 South Australian census figures were used together with the obtained patient statistics to calculate the predicted numbers of psychiatric admissions and registrations in five age groups (30–39, 40–49, 50–59, 60–69, 70+) for each sex in each Baltic group, based on the null hypothesis assumption that the Baltic admission rates will not differ significantly from those of the general population. These
statistics were calculated separately for all inpatient admissions, all out and day patient registrations, and all patients who recorded their first contact ever with Mental Health Services within the period under study.

The first category (all inpatient admissions) refers to the total number of admissions, not of persons, since re-admissions are also included. The second category (all out and day patient registrations) also refers to the total number of registrations rather than individual persons seen. Furthermore, unlike inpatient admissions, out and day patients who carry over from the end of one financial year to another are all registered anew. These persons are therefore registered twice even though they may have undergone one course of treatment. The third category (first contact ever with Mental Health Services) contains all in, out and day patients who had not had any earlier contact with Mental Health Services. Chi-square tests can therefore be applied to the data for this last group since all the observations are independent of each other.

Results
The numbers of both observed and expected inpatient admissions for Baltic immigrants in South Australia are presented in Table 2. Examining this table, it is seen that the Baltic inpatient admission rate is 2.0 times that of the general population rate after standardisation for age and sex. This appears to be constant across the different ethnic and sex groups.

**TABLE 2** Psychiatric inpatient admissions for Baltic immigrants in South Australia by sex and country of birth (1967–1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed Expected</td>
<td>Observed Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonians</td>
<td>18 (11.0)</td>
<td>29 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvians</td>
<td>72 (39.8)</td>
<td>55 (27.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanians</td>
<td>50 (22.2)</td>
<td>21 (12.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Baltic</td>
<td>140 (73.0)</td>
<td>105 (50.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out and day patient registrations for Baltic immigrants are presented in Table 3. Inspection of this table reveals that Baltic
immigrants are registered as out and day patients 1.8 times more frequently than the rates for the general population of a similar age and sex structure. Further inspection also reveals that there is variation between some of the groups, e.g. between Latvian and Lithuanian males, though whether these differences are meaningful is difficult to tell.

### TABLE 3 Psychiatric out and day patient registrations for Baltic immigrants in South Australia by sex and country of birth (1967–1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonians</td>
<td>14 (8.5)</td>
<td>39 (14.8)</td>
<td>53 (23.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvians</td>
<td>36 (30.9)</td>
<td>60 (39.9)</td>
<td>96 (70.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanians</td>
<td>40 (17.2)</td>
<td>40 (18.7)</td>
<td>80 (35.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Baltic</td>
<td>90 (56.6)</td>
<td>139 (73.5)</td>
<td>229 (130.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 presents the numbers of Baltic immigrants who had their first recorded contact as patients with the South Australian Mental Health Services. From the figures presented in this table it is seen that the incidence of first contacts with Mental Health Services facilities for

### TABLE 4 Psychiatric first admissions and initial registrations for Baltic immigrants in South Australia by sex and country of birth (1967–1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonians</td>
<td>5 (5.7)</td>
<td>(5.2)</td>
<td>11 (10.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvians</td>
<td>35* (20.5)</td>
<td>30* (13.9)</td>
<td>65* (34.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanians</td>
<td>22* (11.4)</td>
<td>8 (6.6)</td>
<td>30* (18.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Baltic</td>
<td>62* (37.5)</td>
<td>44* (25.7)</td>
<td>106* (63.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .005 (one-tailed)
Baltic immigrants is 1.7 times greater than the general population rate after standardisation for age and sex characteristics. The overall deviation from the expected incidence is significant, though subgroups with small observed and expected frequencies do not reach significance.

Table 5 presents the numbers of Baltic immigrant suicides in Australia over a five-year period. The results in this table indicate that, after standardisation for age and sex, the overall Baltic immigrant suicide rate in Australia is 2.0 times greater than the general population rate.

**TABLE 5**  Suicides by Baltic immigrants in Australia by sex and country of birth (1970–1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonians</td>
<td>9**</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
<td>8**</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>17**</td>
<td>(5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvians</td>
<td>21**</td>
<td>(11.0)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(4.7)</td>
<td>29**</td>
<td>(15.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(6.1)</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Baltic</td>
<td>38**</td>
<td>(20.8)</td>
<td>21**</td>
<td>(8.6)</td>
<td>59**</td>
<td>(29.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$ 
** $p < .01$

Taken together, the figures presented in Tables 2, 3 and 4 strongly support the contention that the rates of psychiatric admissions within the Baltic communities are higher than those of the general population. Similarly, the figures in Table 5 support the proposition that the rate of suicide by Baltic immigrants is higher than that of the general population.

**Discussion**

Since there appears to be an overall elevation in suicide and psychiatric admission rates across the three Baltic groups, and considering their cultural and historical affinities, the following discussion will deal with Baltic immigrants in general rather than analysing each group separately. Also, throughout this discussion it will be assumed that the factors influencing differential suicide rates are much the same as those influencing psychiatric admission rates.
Both admission to a psychiatric facility and suicide can be taken to reflect poor psychological adjustment; a view supported by the relationship between suicide and mental illness (Stengel, 1973).

A number of factors have been suggested by researchers to account for differences in incidence rates of mental illness between some immigrant and host population groups. Ödegaard (1932) hypothesised that the higher rate of psychopathology amongst Norwegian immigrants in Minnesota was due to a higher probability of emigration amongst persons predisposed towards mental disturbance. It was suggested that pre-emigration personality is a prime factor in determining emigration and subsequent adjustment. More recently, Bagley (1968) concluded from a review of relevant studies that there is little evidence to support the idea that psychiatrically disturbed persons are more likely to emigrate than others. Furthermore, in the case of Baltic immigrants there were selective factors which would have favoured psychologically healthy persons to immigrate into Australia rather than those who were disturbed. Firstly, Nazi policies regarding the mentally ill or defective were such that few of those who entered German psychiatric hospitals survived the war. Murphy (1955b) has supported this proposition with the finding that amongst more than 200 D.P. psychiatric patients examined in Germany in 1947, only one had been previously hospitalised before 1945. The second selective factor was the screening procedure that all D.P. immigrants went through before being permitted to emigrate to Australia. Just as persons with physical disabilities had difficulty in being accepted by Australian immigration authorities, so presumably those with a known history of psychiatric disturbance, or who were obviously disturbed at the time of being examined, would also have had difficulty in gaining entry into Australia. It seems, therefore, that pre-emigration personality cannot adequately account for the higher rates of psychopathology observed amongst Baltic immigrants in Australia.

An insight into factors contributing to poor psychological adjustment amongst some Baltic immigrants is gained from the following comments by Brown (1970), who observed different immigrant groups in an industrial town in England:

By July 1948, there were about 300 Latvians in the Bedford area and 98 per cent of them were employed in the brick industry. Most were farm boys, though there were also several
professional men and university students. The brickyards, with utter impartiality, made labourers of them all...

To stay where they were could well mean carrying on as labourers, living in crowded hostels or bare lodging-houses, with little life they could call their own. For the older men, for those physically and mentally ill-equipped for work in the brickyards, for those borne down by harsh experience or personal loss during the war, this burden of realisation was especially hard to bear.

For some the burdens were too great. Several committed suicide. Others were broken in mind or retreated permanently from reality. One man still finds peace only in a mental hospital. He works helpfully there. From time to time, he has tried to leave. As soon as he is out of the gates he begins to shudder uncontrollably. He has to go back.

Many of the solitary men - even today, half of the Latvians in Bedford are single men - took to hard drinking. Some became alcoholics (p.50-2).

Murphy (1974), reviewing the literature concerning migration and mental health, has suggested that the following factors appear to be related to the differential incidence of psychopathology amongst immigrant groups:
(a) specific external stresses, such as racial or ethnic discrimination;
(b) relative minority status, i.e. differences in numerical strength;
(c) residential concentration versus dispersion;
(d) consistency between pre- and post-migration social and occupational status.

Murphy also pointed out that young unmarried males had been consistently found to be a high suicide group.

Briefly pursuing this last point, from 1971 Australian census data it is seen that while both Latvian and Lithuanian immigrant groups have a substantial male excess, Estonians have a slight female excess. Nevertheless, each Baltic group has a much higher proportion of males who have never married (Estonians, 14.9 per cent; Latvians, 14.9 per cent; Lithuanians, 17.9 per cent) than females who have never married (Estonians, 4.2 per cent; Latvians, 4.8 per cent; Lithuanians, 4.1 per cent). A possible interpretation of these figures is that, if it is assumed that women are generally more nurturant and affiliative than men (Hutt, 1972), Baltic women might be more willing to marry persons of some other ethnicity, particularly when the choice of potential partners within one's own group is limited. A higher rate of inter-ethnic marriages by Baltic women than men
explains the consistently higher proportion of single males in each Baltic group. If the higher proportion of single males was solely due to male/female numerical imbalance, then the proportion of single males would be much smaller amongst Estonians (remembering that there is a slight female excess amongst Estonians).

Returning to the first of the four factors identified by Murphy above, stress and rapidity of change have been related to a variety of maladjustive behaviours in a number of studies (Lauer and Thomas, 1976). This also has some relevance to Baltic immigrants. Amongst the stresses they have encountered are wartime experiences, the loss of homeland, forced migration and material hardship in the D.P. camps and during at least the initial period in Australia. Aside from the more specific stresses mentioned above, Baltic immigrants were exposed to the daily stresses of adjusting to a new environment. In most cases this was something that they have had to do at least twice in their lives, once in Germany and again in Australia – unlike most voluntary immigrants who usually come directly to Australia from their countries of origin. Furthermore, because of the circumstances surrounding their emigration from the Baltic countries, the unintentional separation of friends and relatives was common. After the war, the type of chain migration often witnessed amongst Southern European families could not take place because of the severe restrictions on emigration from the Soviet Union. As a consequence, Baltic immigrants frequently do not have the family supports that other immigrants often have.

Alternatives to family support groups are friendship and neighbourhood groups. These are, however, affected by the second and third factors mentioned by Murphy, i.e. relative minority status and residential concentration. The fewer there are of a particular immigrant group and the more dispersed they are, the lower will be their frequency of daily contact. This is the case with Baltic immigrants, who are numerically amongst the smallest immigrant groups in Australia and amongst the lowest on residential concentration indices (Martin, 1972; Rose, 1958).

The last factor pointed to by Murphy as being implicated in immigrant psychopathology was social and occupational displacement. Baltic immigrants were highly susceptible to this type of displacement because of the large proportion of professionally qualified persons amongst them. This is indicated by calculations from 1971 Australian census figures which show that, after standard-
isation for age across seven age groups, there were proportionally 2.2 times more Baltic males (by birthplace) with university degrees than the general male population and 3.8 times more Baltic females (by birthplace) with university degrees than the general female population. As was pointed out earlier, many refugees with tertiary education had difficulty in having their qualifications recognised in Australia. Krupinski et al. (1965) found that all the Eastern European psychiatric patients with tertiary education in their study had experienced a decline in social class status in Australia, whereas this only occurred in proportionally one in five cases amongst British immigrant admissions.

A later study of Eastern European psychiatric admissions by Krupinski et al. (1973) found only a nonsignificant trend for patients (Balts, Czechs, Hungarians, and Yugoslavs) to display greater negative inconsistency between educational and occupational levels than did a non-patient control group. A factor which might ameliorate some of the negative effects of downward occupational displacement, and thus weaken the relationship between such displacement and psychiatric breakdown, is social standing in the ethnic community. A person who was a prominent lawyer in his home country but who now works in a car factory might only be regarded as an assembly-line worker by Australians, but amongst his fellow countrymen he still retains his social prestige as a lawyer. This is well illustrated by Gelsen's (1974) description of a Latvian New Year ball in Adelaide: 'Every one of those process workers, firemen, railway porters, trench diggers, medical orderlies, nursing aides and domestics is having a good time, for tonight they are professional men again, public servants, merchants, officers of the armed forces, performing and creative artists'. In other words, social standing within the Latvian community is influenced not only by current occupational status, but also by the prestige of one's former occupation.

Reimanis (1965, 1967, 1972) found in a study of Latvians who had begun their vocational careers in Latvia but who were now living in the U.S.A., that while there were no significant relationships between present occupational level and a measure of anomie, there was a significant negative relationship between occupational level in Latvia and anomie. That is, as the former occupational level increased, anomie decreased. This cannot be assumed to be a general relationship because Reimanis's sample was restricted to subjects whose main social life was within the Latvian community. The results do, however,
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indicate that amongst those who participate in the ethnic community, the prestige associated with one's former occupation is largely maintained, thus minimising anomic attitudes. We might hypothesise that those persons who have encountered downward occupational displacement and who do not participate in the ethnic community will tend to be more susceptible to anomie and also psychiatric breakdown.

It is suggested that participation in the ethnic community and contact with fellow countrymen can have a positive effect on the psychological health of immigrants. Not only is the loss of status due to occupational dislocation not as pronounced within the immigrant group as within the host group, but within the ethnic community the immigrant need not feel a stranger. There he can share in the familiar experiences, memories, values, humour, nuances of language and so on which might often seem strange to him within the host group. Most adult immigrants probably need at least occasional contact with fellow ethnics. Very few adults who enter a new cultural milieu are capable of complete re-ethnification, i.e. fully embracing the host society and culture while abandoning entirely the behaviours and values typical of the original ethnic group — a view shared by a number of researchers (e.g. Draguns, 1977; Sommers, 1964).

Murphy's (1955b) conclusion at the end of an earlier study well summarises the common element in the factors influencing psychiatric breakdown and suicide discussed above: 'social or cultural isolation . . . [is] probably the major factor in producing excess mental disorder in refugees' (p.194). Emigration itself involves the migrant physically isolating himself from a familiar setting and moving to a place which, to a greater or lesser degree, is foreign to him. The tensions which this could be expected to produce would be magnified if the act of emigration is not wholly voluntary, as is the case with refugees. The isolation or lack of belongingness often experienced by immigrants is moderated by contacts with members of their own ethnic group; providing for many an anchor point in a sea of uncertainty. Minc (1972) also considers that the lack of a support group is a factor contributing to health problems amongst immigrants.

As was pointed out in our earlier discussion of alienation and assimilation, rejection of ethnic characteristics is not always necessary in order to assimilate into the host community. Maintenance of
ethnicity might well provide a stability in an immigrant's life which reflects itself in his or her psychological well-being, while alienation from ways of thinking and behaving which have been ingrained from early childhood can be seen as breaking a continuity; a break which for some might be disorienting. This could to some extent be compensated by replacing lost ethnic characteristics with those of some other group. In other words, assimilation might moderate the effects of alienation from the original ethnic group. If this argument is correct — it at least seems plausible — then those who could be expected to be at greatest risk with regard to mental illness are immigrants who are both alienated from their ethnic group and unassimilated to the host group. The resulting state of alienation is the same condition of social and cultural isolation which Murphy referred to in discussing the causes of mental disorder amongst immigrants. Some support is lent to this argument by Penny's (1975) finding that amongst Australian Aborigines, the highest rate of alcoholism was observed amongst those who were alienated from both the Aboriginal and white Australian cultures.

Kovacs and Cropley (1975a, 1975b) have also argued at length that alienation in various forms contributes to the poor adjustment observed amongst some immigrants. This is not to say that the state of alienation, i.e. the simultaneous estrangement from both the ethnic and host groups, is the sole factor involved in elevating the incidence of psychopathology and suicide in some immigrant groups. It is only asserted here that alienation from the ethnic group — the severing of ties with people, values and a way of life which have become intimately familiar — can have repercussions on the psychological adjustment of some immigrants. The order, stability and belongingness which these ties provided might be maintained by establishing new ones with some other group (usually the host group), though assimilation into another group by adult immigrants, particularly older ones, can seldom be expected completely to replace the original attachments to the ethnic group. For example, most adult immigrants will speak English with an accent and be thought of as 'New Australians' rather than just as Australians. Nevertheless, assimilation might at least partially compensate for what is lost when alienating from the ethnic group. Those who become estranged from both the host and ethnic groups and do not assimilate into some other group could be expected to risk poorer psychological adjustment when coping with the stresses associated with living in a new environment.
Some empirical evidence which has a bearing on this hypothesis will be presented in the next chapter dealing with personality and socio-cultural adjustment.
Personality and Immigrant Adjustment

Though the analysis and measurement of personality is a major study area within both academic and applied psychology, relatively little attention has been given to the relationship of personality and socio-cultural adjustment in immigrants. Personality traits influence differential responses to similar environments and are in turn influenced by different environments. For example, anxious and non-anxious persons are likely to respond differently in mildly stressful situations, while two persons who are similar at the outset are likely to develop different predispositions towards anxiety if one is constantly placed in stress provoking situations and the other is not. In view of the wide range of different responses and adaptations made by immigrants in receiving societies, it would be reasonable to expect some sort of interaction between personality factors and socio-cultural adjustment.

Amongst the earliest work in this area is a theoretical paper by Wentholt (1956) and an investigation by Brown (1956) of British immigrants in New Zealand, using a Rorschach technique. Wentholt's paper is, however, of limited value owing to lack of supporting empirical data, while Brown's study is based on an instrument of arguable validity.

A later study by Weinstock (1964) examined the relationship of Authoritarianism, Achievement Orientation, and Machiavellianism to 'acculturation' amongst post-1956 Hungarian immigrants in the U.S.A. Weinstock defined acculturation in a manner similar to the way the term re-ethnification is used in the present study, basing his usage on an explicitly stated unidimensional model of immigrant adjustment, i.e. failing to differentiate between alienation and assimilation. No relationship was found between authoritarianism and Weinstock's index of re-ethnification. However, the ten-item
authoritarianism scale contained three sub-scales, one of which correlated negatively with the other two thus making the internal consistency of the scale suspect.

A scale measuring 'high value for achievement and mastery' (achievement orientation) was found to have a low but significant correlation (.26) with a composite index of re-ethnification, while a ten-item Machiavellianism scale measuring manipulative and cynical tendencies was also found to have a low but significant correlation (.33) with the same index. Weinstock explained these findings in terms of the strong emphasis on achievement within American culture and the expectation that the 'hustler' type of personality will be more likely to succeed.

A study by Taft (1967) with seventy-five Dutch immigrants in Western Australia examined the relationship of a large number of personality and attitudinal measures to adjustment indices. The personality and attitudinal variables measured (using short forms) were: Flexibility, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Independence, Dogmatism, Authoritarianism, Anomie, Mistrust, Intelligence, and Alienation. The last scale contained 'items indicating non-participation in normal aspects of social life, e.g. “Do you think that children are generally a nuisance to their parents?”' (p. 24). In the following discussion only those relationships that were found to be significant at .05 or beyond (one-tailed test) are considered.

The first index, most of the items of which dealt with satisfaction with life in Australia, was named Social and Economic Adjustment by Taft. Correlations between this index and the personality traits suggest that highly satisfied subjects tended to be more intelligent (.24) and less mistrustful (−.21). A drawback in the use of this index was that the item scores were based on the subjects' responses to a survey conducted two years previously, i.e. the personality and satisfaction variables were not measured concurrently.

An identification index (scored in the Australian direction) based on a unidimensional adjustment model was negatively related to neuroticism (−.21) and mistrust (−.24).

A third index, labelled Cultural Adaptation, contained items which, to the present author, do not appear to be consistent. For example, one item asked, 'How well do you know English?', while another asked, 'What is your level of education?'. Though the two could be expected to be empirically related, the first item directly inquires about an adjustment made by an immigrant living in Australia while
the latter is a background variable which could be assumed to influence such adjustments but is not an adjustment as such. High scorers on this particular index were found to be less dogmatic (-0.34), anomic (-0.27), mistrustful (-0.41), and more intelligent (-0.38).

Finally, the Australianism Scale (Taft, 1962) — a measure of sociopolitical opinion norm convergence between immigrants and Australians — was found to relate negatively with dogmatism (-0.19), anomic (-0.25), mistrust (-0.33) and alienation (-0.26). Taft’s finding that neither extraversion nor neuroticism are related to Australianism scores has been replicated with a sample of ninety-one Latvian immigrants in Hobart (Putnins, 1974). It should be pointed out, however, that the Australianism Scale, while apparently a valid measure of one facet of the adjustment process (Putnins and Taft, 1976), has not yet been found to be empirically related to any other facet of immigrant adjustment (Putnins, 1977c).

The general picture which emerges is that trust in other people is the characteristic most consistently related to satisfaction, shifts in identification from the ethnic to the host group, cultural adaptation, and Australianisation of socio-political beliefs. Intelligence is also a factor influencing higher satisfaction levels and cultural adaptation. However, while the roles of trusting attitudes and intelligence in some facets of immigrant adjustment are understandable, other predicted relationships were not found. For example, flexibility and extraversion, both of which could be expected to aid adaptation to a new environment, were not related to any of the adjustment measures. Since all the personality traits were assessed using short-form measures, low reliability might have contributed to the lack of relationship between some of the variables. Furthermore, the interpretation of some of the obtained relationships is problematic. For example, though neuroticism was related to the identification index, it is not clear whether this relationship was due to the diminution of ethnic identification, the increase of Australian identification, or both.

A final point which needs to be borne in mind is that changes undergone by voluntary immigrants might have different psychological determinants and effects to those undergone by involuntary immigrants. Generalisation of results based on only one of these groups should, therefore, only be done with caution.

Some indirect evidence bearing on the last point has been provided by Richardson (1968) in a study of British immigrants returning to Britain from Australia. The subjects in Richardson’s study were
divided into two groups: those who were definite about returning to Britain permanently (permanent returnees) and those who were still undecided about the permanency of their departure (undecided returnees). While in both cases emigration was voluntary, the latter group are in some ways similar to refugee immigrants, who often are uncertain about the permanency of their departure. The undecided returnees scored significantly higher on a measure of neuroticism (described as being sensitive to situational stress) than the permanent returnees. This finding lends support to the argument that emigration is more stressful for refugees than voluntary migrants since the proportion of 'undecideds' could be expected to be much higher amongst refugees. No difference was found between permanent and undecided returnees on a measure of locus of control. A weakness in this study, however, is that the subject number was very small.

A later study by Richardson (1971), examining satisfaction with life in Australia for British immigrants, found a significant difference between satisfied and dissatisfied subjects on a measure of locus of control, with satisfied immigrants tending to score higher in the internal control direction (i.e. the belief that one's circumstances are controlled more by personal decisions than by external forces or luck). Neither independence, neuroticism nor anomie were found to relate significantly with satisfaction levels, supporting earlier results by Taft (1967).

The most recent investigation of personality and immigrant adjustment is a study by Kiploks (1976) of second generation Estonians in Adelaide. Using the High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ) (Cattell and Cattell, 1969), Kiploks found that those with a low level of ethnic alienation (ethnic maintainers) tended to be more intelligent, conscientious, shy (lack of social boldness), tough-minded (realistic rather than idealistic), group dependent and controlled than more alienated subjects. (Intelligence, as measured by the HSPQ, refers to more abstract forms of thought and higher scholastic mental ability.) Parallel to the finding of higher intelligence, more ethnic maintainers were found to intend entering occupations of high prestige than did low ethnic maintainers.

The finding of higher intelligence amongst the less ethnically alienated is open to a number of interpretations. Kiploks considers that higher intelligence is a result of involvement with the ethnic community, being influenced by the high regard for scholastic
achievement held by many Estonians. At least two alternative explanations, however, come to mind.

First, the reverse of Kiploks' argument might be true, i.e. higher intelligence, in Cattell's sense, might facilitate ethnicity maintenance amongst second generation Estonians because of the greater congruence between their intellectual values and those of the older generation. This congruence could be influenced by the proportionally large number of university graduates amongst first generation Baltic immigrants. Though similar statistics are not available for Estonians, it is also known that the proportion of Latvian university students and recent graduates from Australian universities is two to four times larger than for the general population (Dunsdorfs, 1967; Ozols, 1972; Putnins, 1975).

Secondly, it is possible that more intelligent people may see greater value in being bicultural and bilingual and thus might be more motivated to maintain their ethnicity.

The remaining four personality traits related to ethnicity maintenance in Kiploks' study are consistent with a description of the Estonian immigrant community as being socially cohesive and conservative; a description applying equally well to Latvian immigrant communities. The traits of increased self-control, conscientiousness, group-dependence, pragmatism and deference would facilitate membership of such a community.

From the above discussion, it can be seen that there exists a body of research evidence (though scant) which suggests links between certain personality traits and immigrant adjustment. On the whole, the relationships reported are in logical directions, though most are weak and some which could have been expected were not found. There are, however, a number of methodological weaknesses in most of these earlier studies, including the use of short-form personality scales of unknown or poor internal consistency and reliability, small subject numbers, and adjustment measures which fail to distinguish between alienation and assimilation. The present study aims to overcome some of these deficiencies and will examine the role of personality traits within a multidimensional adjustment framework.

Study II

Subjects
The group investigated were first generation monoethnic Latvian males. All the subjects were between the ages of 45 and 65 and
resided in Melbourne at the time of the study. This age group was selected so as to restrict the influence of age upon the variables under investigation. Furthermore, it was desired that all subjects be old enough to have undergone significant socialisation into the Latvian culture prior to arrival in Australia. The vast majority of these subjects arrived in Australia when between 15 and 40 years of age, i.e. between 1947 and 1952. Their length of residence ensures that all will have had sufficient time and opportunity to assimilate into the host population and/or alienate from Latvians had they so desired. Additionally, it has been the present author's experience that some Latvian subjects who are beyond retiring age have difficulty completing questionnaires, particularly if in English.

Only males were used in this study because of the difficulty in obtaining a representative sample of first generation Latvian females. This arises from the fact that Latvians have distinctive surnames that are readily recognisable to a native speaker. However, females who have married non-Latvians and have thus changed their surnames are difficult to trace in lists where the ethnic origin of the subjects is not specified.

The most comprehensive population lists readily available are the electoral rolls, voting being compulsory for most adults in Australia. These have the additional advantage of including the first names and sex of those enrolled. There are, however, three factors which detract from the representativeness of Latvian males who are drawn from these lists. The first is that not all those who are eligible to enrol do so. Though no statistics are available, we shall assume that this is only a minor source of error.

The second factor is due to some people anglicising their names, thus making them difficult to distinguish from other groups in lists such as electoral rolls. Baltaks (1961) conducted an extensive study of Latvian names in Australia and found that only 0.75 per cent were anglicised. This then can also be regarded as a relatively minor source of error.

The third factor arises from the criterion for enrolment on the electoral rolls. Only those who are Australian or British subjects are eligible for registration. As is the case with most immigrant groups, not all Latvians have become naturalised. Calculating from Australian census figures, in 1971 88.8 per cent of persons born in Latvia were Australian or British citizens while 11.2 per cent retained Latvian or some other citizenship. Calculating from figures obtained from the
Department for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, the number of persons born in Latvia and registered as aliens fell by 26.5 per cent between 1971 and 1976. This could be due to deaths, emigration or naturalisation. The latter might have increased after the federal government recognised the incorporation of the Baltic states into the Soviet Union; an act which aroused fears amongst some who still held Latvian passports that they might be regarded as Soviet citizens. In any case, it seems that by the time the present survey was conducted (September, 1977), less than 10 per cent of those born in Latvia were non-Australian or non-British citizens.

Those who retain their Latvian citizenship often do so as a symbolic allegiance to their earlier home country. Consequently, they are likely to be less alienated from the Latvian culture than those who have adopted some other citizenship. A sample from the electoral rolls can therefore be expected to be biased in slightly under-representing strong ethnic maintainers. In the present case, this bias is probably lessened by the expectation (though again, specific statistics are not available) that proportionally more persons retaining Latvian citizenship will be found in the older age groups. This expectation arises from the earlier observation that there appears to be a negative relationship between age and ethnic alienation and assimilation. From this it could therefore be expected that proportionally more persons over the age of 65 will be Latvian citizens than those who are younger. If this is so, then the bias caused by some people having a citizenship other than Australian or British would be slightly lessened in the age group sampled here.

The electoral rolls for the federal electoral areas of Balaclava, Chisholm, Henty, Higgins, Hotham and Isaacs were examined and all males with Latvian names were noted, including names which might have originally been Latvian but had been anglicised or otherwise changed. These electoral districts cover a large proportion of the southeastern Melbourne metropolitan area and contain a broad cross-section of different socio-economic classes, though the middle class, as in most Australian cities, predominates.

Questionnaire
The questionnaire consisted of an explanatory note, demographic background questions, items relating to ethnicity maintenance and assimilation, and the adult form of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975).
The demographic questions inquired about the subject's age, marital status, ethnicity of spouse, number of children, present occupation, level of education and the country where the subject's highest level of education was attained.

The next section contained ten questions concerning ethnicity maintenance and assimilation. Five areas were covered that were thought to be important facets of adjustment: language, knowledge of current community events, informal social interaction, identification, and formal social participation. The items specifically dealt with the subject's fluency in spoken English and Latvian (5-point scales); regularity with which Australian and Latvian newspapers were read (2-point scales); the frequency of social contact with Australians and Latvians (5-point scales); the degree of conscious Australian and Latvian self-identification (5-point scales); and the number of Australian and Latvian organisations to which the subject belonged (open-ended). All items were self-ratings and each area was covered by two items - one dealing with the Australian aspect and the other dealing with the Latvian. The assimilation and ethnicity maintenance items were presented in alternating order, with items dealing with the same topic, e.g. language fluency, being spaced five items apart and presented on separate pages. This was done so as to minimise the possibility of answers to items within the same topic area influencing each other.

Though the author in an earlier chapter suggested the measurement of identification by methods which tap unconscious elements such as the semantic differential, it was not practicable to incorporate such a technique in this study since it would have added considerably to the length of the questionnaire. It has been this author's experience that response rates are inversely proportional to the length of the questionnaire used, therefore an important consideration in designing the questionnaire was to keep its length to a minimum. Furthermore, the main purpose of the items presented was to form indices differentiating between degrees of ethnic alienation and assimilation which could subsequently be correlated with the personality measures. For the purposes of constructing such indices it was thought that relatively brief and simple items would be sufficient. This is not to say, however, that the items lack validity, though they are cruder than those which would be used in a study primarily concerned with the detailed analysis of specific areas of adjustment. The items relating to identification used here, where subjects were
required to rate themselves on five-point scales (e.g. from 'Very Australian' to 'Not at all Australian'), are still valid measures of conscious identification, though they do not — as was pointed out earlier — tap those aspects of identification that the subject might not be immediately aware of.

The EPQ is a 90-item questionnaire, worded in relatively simple language, containing Psychoticism (P), Extraversion (E), Neuroticism (N), and Lie (L) scales. It is very similar to the *Eysenck Personality Inventory* (EPI) (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1964). The main distinction between the EPI and the EPQ is the addition to the latter of the P scale.

As measured by the EPQ, extraversion describes a trait related to sociability, impulsiveness and a desire for exciting or stimulating activity, while neuroticism describes a trait related to anxiety and emotionality. Psychoticism is related to characteristics such as aggressiveness, impersonal attitudes and a lack of socialising constraints. Another description for the trait measured by this scale is ‘tough-mindedness’. According to the EPQ manual, both criminals and psychotics tend to score higher on this scale than do general population samples. However, just as with the N scale, the P scale does not measure symptoms, but rather a range of normal behaviours which only in extreme cases might lead to pathological states. A weakness in the construction of the P scale, however, is that the score distribution is strongly skewed, with little variation within the lower half of the score range (taken from the mean). One effect which this might have is to lower the size of correlations between P and other variables.

The Lie scale is used as a measure of dissimulation, i.e. of subjects exaggerating a favourable image of themselves. While being sensitive to deliberate faking, the L scale also appears to measure a stable personality trait which is largely independent of the P, E, and N scales. Research evidence suggests that high L scores tend to be conventional, conformist and conservative in nature (Eysenck, 1978). These traits could be expected to contribute most to the variance of L scores when there is little motivation to dissimulate.

**Procedure**

The electoral districts were exhaustively surveyed in sequence until the goal of 100 acceptances was attained. All subjects were personally contacted by the author. Many were found not to meet the sampling
criteria on either the basis of age or ethnic origin. In cases where subjects were initially not at home, the author visited again on subsequent occasions up to four times. In this way very few subjects were excluded from the survey due to inability to be contacted.

After the initial door-step introduction, reactions amongst those who were suitable for inclusion in the sample varied from something akin to greeting a long-lost relative through to initial suspicion, hostility and refusal to co-operate – though on the whole the responses were friendly and courteous. Eight persons who met the sampling criteria refused to participate in the survey. What is known about them is described below:

Subject 1: ‘We're Australians. We don't have anything to do with Latvians.’

Subject 2: Living together with other Latvians. Did not mind the demographic and adjustment items, but objected to the personality questionnaire. Became agitated about anonymity. Had been drinking.

Subject 3: Keeps to himself. Does not mix with either Latvians (‘because they fight too much amongst themselves’) or Australians.

Subject 4: Described himself as living quietly and not mixing much with either Australians or Latvians.

Subject 5: Has a Latvian spouse and participates in the Latvian community.

Subject 6: ‘We don't have much to do with Latvians.’

Subject 7: Active in the D.L.P. and various Latvian organisations. Did not mind the initial items, but objected to completing the personality questionnaire. Had doubts about the anonymity of the survey and expressed fears that his answers might be used against him politically.

Subject 8: No details known.

The purpose of the survey and how to complete the questionnaire were explained to each subject, with particular emphasis being placed on giving assurances of anonymity. Each subject was encouraged to scan the items so that any points which were not clear could be immediately dealt with. All subjects were requested to complete the questionnaire in private without consulting anybody else about their answers. An addressed post-paid envelope was supplied to each subject for the return of the completed questionnaires. One month after the last subject had been contacted, all persons who had been
given a questionnaire were sent a reminder note thanking them for their participation in the survey and encouraging those who had not yet returned their questionnaires to do so as soon as possible.

A total of seventy-nine questionnaires were returned, of which one was blank and one had completed the EPQ in such a manner that it could not be validly scored. Thus, useable returns constituted 77 per cent of those accepting questionnaires (71.3 per cent of those contacted who met the sampling criteria) in the case of the personality results and 78 per cent (72.2 per cent) in the case of the demographic and adjustment items.

Results
The average age of respondents was 55.7 years. Their marital states were as follows: married, 78 per cent; separated, widowed or divorced, 13 per cent; single, 9 per cent. Four subjects failed to give the ethnicity of their spouse. Amongst those who did, 72 per cent were married to Latvians, with an average of 1.5 children, and 28 per cent had non-Latvian spouses and an average of 1.8 children. The slightly larger number of children for subjects with non-Latvian spouses has also been described in an analysis by Dunsdorfs (1966) of census data relating to Latvian marriages in Australia, though the reasons as to why this is so are still not known.

Respondents' occupations were ranked in a hierarchy of occupational prestige using the method proposed by Congalton (1963). However, five subjects could not be rated due to either lack of response (1) or to insufficient detail (4). Educational level was ranked in an attainment hierarchy. Fifty per cent of the subjects had some tertiary education, though only 16.7 per cent had completed their courses of study and obtained degrees or diplomas. Sixty-four per cent had attained their highest level of education in Latvia while the remainder were evenly divided between Germany and Australia.

The responses to the adjustment items are summarised in the following description of a modal Latvian middle-aged male: He speaks Latvian very well, mixes socially with Latvians fairly often, is a member of one or more Latvian organisations, is likely to read Latvian newspapers regularly and feels either very or fairly Latvian. At the same time he speaks English fairly well, mixes socially with Australians occasionally, does not belong to any Australian organisations, almost certainly reads Australian newspapers and feels fairly Australian.
All the Latvian ethnicity maintenance item intercorrelations were positive, as were the Australian assimilation item intercorrelations.

The Latvian item scores were summed to form a Latvian Ethnicity Index (LATI), as were the scores of the Australian items to form an Australian Assimilation Index (AUSI). Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for both these indices and the EPQ scales were calculated. The results, together with additional descriptive statistics, are presented in Table 6. It appears from these results that the reliabilities of the various scales are adequate for research purposes. The higher LATI mean compared to that for the AUSI scale confirms the impression gained from examining the individual adjustment items that ethnicity maintenance has been stronger than assimilation into the Australian culture and society.

### Table 6: EPQ assimilation, and ethnicity maintenance scale reliabilities and related statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Possible score range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSI</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATI</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0–18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can treat the ethnic and host characteristic dimensions as orthogonal axes which define an ‘adjustment’ space in which the origin (0,0) is the point at which there is complete alienation from Latvian ethnicity and no evident assimilation into the host community; the subject is then completely isolated from both the ethnic and host groups, i.e. the subject is in a maximal state of alienation or isolation. As subjects move further away from the origin, their isolation decreases due to either a diminution of alienation from the ethnic group, an increase of host group assimilation, or

2 The use here of ‘alienation’ in a general sense refers to simultaneously low assimilation and low ethnicity maintenance, while ‘ethnic alienation’ refers specifically to the loss of ethnic characteristics (low ethnicity maintenance).
both. Using the LATI and AUSI scores as measures of these two dimensions, a Non-Isolation Index\footnote{The author apologises for this clumsy denotation; however, as indices are conventionally named in the higher score direction, and as no precise single word antonym of 'isolation' could be found, elegance of expression has been necessarily sacrificed for accuracy of meaning.} was constructed using the following formula:

\[
\text{Non-Isolation Index} = \sqrt{\text{AUSI}^2 + \text{LATI}^2}
\]

The Index is a measure of the distance from the origin based on the magnitude of both the AUSI and LATI scores. All the adjustment measures, including the Non-Isolation Index, were subsequently correlated with the personality scales and selected background variables. The results are presented in Table 7 and are discussed in detail in the next section.

\[\text{TABLE 7} \quad \text{Spearman rank-order correlations between EPQ personality scales, adjustment indices, and background variables for 78 Latvian males}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LATI</th>
<th>AUSI</th>
<th>Non-Isol. Index</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occup. status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATI</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSI</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Isol. Index</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup. status</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.69**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^* p \leq .05 \quad \text{(one-tailed)}\]
\[^{**} p \leq .01\]

Note. Both occupational status and educational attainment were scored so that higher status or attainment received numerically larger scores.
Discussion

The observed relationship between age and ethnicity maintenance is consistent with the results of Latvian and other immigrant group studies described earlier, which indicated that age is one of the most important background variables related to immigrant adjustment. While age was not significantly related to assimilation, it is likely that both the restricted age range and lower internal consistency of the AUSI scale compared to the LATI scale contributed to minimising the strength of any relationships which might exist. It seems probable that over a wider age range a significant negative relationship between age and assimilation would be found, though it might still be weaker than the relationship between age and ethnicity maintenance.

The observed lack of relationship between the AUSI and LATI scales clearly indicates that ethnic alienation and assimilation need to be analysed separately — not only conceptually but also empirically. This finding adds support to the argument for employing a multidimensional model in studying immigrant adjustment. Indeed, such a model need not be restricted to only immigrant adjustment, but could also be applied to other kinds of culture contact. It needs to be noted, however, that the adjustment items used in this study were subjective self-ratings rather than external measures. To take language fluency as an example, besides asking subjects to rate their own fluency, language competence could also have been measured by either obtaining ratings of fluency by an outside observer or by rating responses to an objective test of language fluency. The empirical independence between ethnic alienation and assimilation observed here applies only to their subjective aspects. Whether or not independence of these processes would also be indicated if external or objective measures were used can only be answered by further research.

Occupational status and educational attainment were highly correlated and both had very similar correlations with the other variables. Both occupational status and level of obtained education are related to social class, which in turn has a substantial relationship with intelligence (Eysenck, 1973). Of the adjustment measures, occupational status and educational level had their highest correlations with the Non-Isolation Index. If we assume a relationship between occupational status and education respectively with intelligence, then these results are consistent with Taft’s (1967) finding that intelligence is related to some areas of assimilation and Kiploks’ (1976) finding that
less ethnically alienated subjects tended to be more intelligent and had higher occupational aspirations. Though the support given to these earlier findings by the results reported here is only indirect, they do lend credibility to the notion that intelligence is a factor influencing immigrant adjustment, with more intelligent subjects tending to be both more ethnic and more assimilated.

It is reasonable to assume that, given the survey conditions of complete anonymity and the relatively low correlation between N and L, that little dissimulation has occurred in the EPQ responses. If this is the case, then, as was suggested by Eysenck (1978), the L scale can be treated as measuring a stable personality trait related to ‘conventional, conformist and conservative’ (p.84) attitudes. The reverse of these characteristics might be described as independence, i.e. being less traditionalist and less resistant to change. It is seen that there is a significant negative correlation between L and assimilation. This is in agreement with the expectation that those who are less conventional, conformist and conservative will be less inhibited in the adoption of new social and cultural behaviours. It had also been expected that L scores would be positively related to ethnicity maintenance, given the earlier description of the Latvian immigrant community as being basically conservative and cohesive. This was not found to be the case. No significant relationship was found between L and LATI scale scores. Feather and Rudzitis (1974) also found no significant difference between Latvian second generation ethnic school attenders and non-attenders (attenders generally being more ethnic than non-attenders) on a measure of conservatism. These findings run counter to both expectation and the suggestive evidence from Kiploks' study that personality characteristics consistent with conservatism are positively related to ethnicity maintenance. While results in the present study failed to support the hypothesis that L scale scores under conditions of low motivation to dissimulate would be positively related to ethnicity maintenance, it is felt that the roles of such characteristics as conservatism and conformity in Latvian ethnicity maintenance still require further clarification.

Extraversion scores were positively related to AUSI scale scores, confirming the expectation that characteristics such as sociability and stimulus seeking would favour assimilation. Extraversion was not related to ethnicity maintenance, which was also in accord with expectation. It was reasoned that extraversion would be likely to encourage the seeking out of new or different contacts, activities and
behaviours, but that it would have little influence on those that were already established, as would be the case with the subjects studied here who had had extensive exposure to Latvian society and culture until at least their adolescent years.

Neuroticism scores were found to be negatively related to ethnicity maintenance, as had been predicted in the earlier discussion of immigrant mental health. It was argued that immigrants' involvement with their ethnic group could provide a sense of belongingness and stability which might make them less susceptible to various types of dysfunctional behaviour. Because for older immigrants ethnic characteristics have been so intimate a part of their lives, the loss of these characteristics might prove to be destabilising beyond whatever positive effects assimilation might have, particularly as complete assimilation is seldom possible for such immigrants. The relative influence of these two processes on N scores was as expected, i.e. the AUSI-N correlation was smaller than the LATIN correlation. Although the AUSI-N correlation was in the expected direction, with an increase in AUSI scores being associated with a decrease in N, it failed to reach statistical significance.

As was argued above, in cases where ethnic alienation has occurred, the loss of ethnic characteristics might be compensated, at least partially, by adopting host group characteristics. It could therefore be expected that higher N scores would be found amongst persons who were both ethnically alienated and unassimilated, while higher levels of ethnicity maintenance and assimilation would be associated with lower N scores. The negative correlation between the Non-Isolation Index and N was significant, confirming this expectation. Furthermore, the size of the Non-Isolation Index-N correlation was not diminished in magnitude compared to the LATIN correlation. This would not have occurred if AUSI scores contributed only random variance to the relationship between N and the Non-Isolation Index (remembering that this index is a combination of both the AUSI and LATI scores). The size of the Non-Isolation Index-N correlation in fact increased slightly in comparison with the LATIN correlation, though the increase was very small. This suggests that assimilation has only a weak effect on N scores when it interacts with ethnic alienation. However, the only marginal increase in the size of the Non-Isolation Index-N correlation may have been influenced by the Non-Isolation Index's score distribution. Inspection of a scattergram plot of the AUSI and LATI scores revealed that, while there was
a wide score distribution for both these variables, there are few cases of combined low AUSI and LATI scores, i.e. low Non-Isolation Index scores. For example, the subject with the lowest Non-Isolation Index score can be described from his adjustment item responses as follows: Does not speak Latvian very well but speaks English very well; does not regularly read Latvian newspapers but does regularly read Australian newspapers; does not mix socially with Latvians at all but does so with Australians fairly often; feels to some extent Latvian and only a little Australian; does not belong to any Latvian or Australian organisations. Subjectively, this does not impress as being an extreme case of isolation or alienation. The apparent truncation of Non-Isolation Index scores at the lower end of the score distribution has in all likelihood diminished the strength of this Index's correlation with N.

The P scale did not correlate significantly with any of the adjustment indices. While the N, E, and L scales were developed and validated through earlier forms over a long period of time and have an extensive literature describing their use, particularly with the EPI, the P scale is a much more recent addition to the Eysenck test repertoire and is thus more experimental. Expectations regarding the scale's relationships with the adjustment measures were therefore much more tentative than those for the other personality dimensions.

Since both criminals and psychotics tend to score higher on the P scale than normal populations (data in the test manual show that criminals in fact have mean scores higher than those for psychotics), a more appropriate name for the P items might be the Asocial Scale. Use of the word 'asocial' here is not meant to imply shyness or lack of interest in meeting other people (there was no significant relationship between the P and E scales), but rather to a tendency to behave in ways which transgress social norms. It was speculated that such a predisposition might be negatively related to integration into both the immigrant and the host groups. The results in Table 8, however, seem to indicate that this is not the case. It is still possible that there might be at least weak relationships between the traits measured by the P scale and immigrant adjustment, though various factors may have inhibited their observation in the present study. For example, it was earlier noted that the lower half of the P scale score range was very restricted. The P scale also had the lowest internal item consistency of the personality measures. Both these factors would attenuate the strength of any relationships. There is also the possibility that there
were few genuine high P scorers amongst the subjects studied here. If the description that the P scale taps behaviours which are asocial, be they 'crazy', illegal or otherwise deviant, is essentially correct, then it is possible that persons exhibiting behaviours consistent with high P scores would be the least likely to respond in a voluntary survey such as this one. The lack of response from 27.8 per cent of the subjects initially approached in connection with the survey was certainly large enough to influence the results if some such systematic bias existed between responders and non-responders. These comments, however, are only speculative. At present there is no evidence for a substantial relationship between P scale traits and Latvian immigrant adjustment.

One limitation of the present study is that the causal order between personality traits and socio-cultural adjustment cannot be definitely established. For example, while we might suspect that extraversion will foster assimilation, we have no direct evidence to demonstrate that this rather than the reverse (i.e. that assimilation fosters extraversion) is the case. This can only be done using a longitudinal research design.

In summary, it appears that the general hypothesis that there would be significant relationships between personality traits and immigrant adjustment has been confirmed. More specifically, it was found that assimilation was quite strongly related to both extraversion and independence (their multiple correlation with assimilation was .53) while ethnicity maintenance was related to emotional stability. Emotional stability was also related to a combined index of ethnicity maintenance and assimilation (Non-Isolation Index). There was evidence to suggest that assimilation might interact weakly with ethnicity maintenance to enhance slightly the latter's relationship with emotional stability. There was also indirect support for earlier research findings that intelligence is a factor influencing immigrant adjustment. An important finding was that, in the areas investigated here, ethnic alienation and assimilation were empirically independent dimensions. In addition, each had a different pattern of intercorrelations with the personality measures, further supporting the need for not only their conceptual differentiation but for the separate analysis of each of these adjustment processes.

A further application of the multidimensional adjustment model, though in a different area to that just dealt with, is described in the next chapter.
It was earlier suggested that the two primary elements determining whether someone is ethnically a Latvian were command of the Latvian language and identification with Latvians. Though neither of these two areas has been comprehensively researched amongst Latvians, there is an extensive literature dealing with bilingualism and language maintenance in other immigrant groups. At the same time the disciplines of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics are both constantly refining their theoretical insights. Since there is little reason to believe that the underlying processes relating to language propagation, acquisition, competence, and bilingualism are any different amongst Latvians, it could be assumed that much of what has been learnt about other European ethnic groups is also applicable to Latvian immigrants. Differences that might exist are more likely to be of degree rather than of kind.

The situation regarding ethnic identification is somewhat different. Work has been done on the development of ethnic awareness in children (an area which will later be examined in more detail) and related areas such as psychological aspects of prejudice and ethnic stereotypes. However, psychological research examining ethnic identification in adolescent and adult immigrants has not been altogether satisfactory. There are a number of reasons for this.

Firstly, there has been a lack of conceptual clarity and consistency regarding both use of the terms *ethnicity* and *identification* and the underlying model of immigrant adjustment. These problems were discussed earlier and need not be dealt with again in detail except to note that the treatment of these conceptual problems is not mere pedantry. The analysis of concepts and models has an important bearing on how empirical work will proceed and should not be ignored or dealt with lightly.
Secondly, much of the research in this area has been relatively superficial and descriptively incomplete. Incompleteness has resulted where a unidimensional model of immigrant adjustment has been employed as a basis for questionnaire item design, giving the impression that identification with host and ethnic groups can be described by a simple inverse linear relationship: i.e. as one increases the other decreases in direct proportion. As was seen earlier, both on theoretical and empirical grounds, such a model is not always an accurate reflection of the true state of affairs. Superficiality has arisen when ethnic and host groups respectively are treated as unitary concepts. While this is sometimes justifiable, frequently subtleties in identification are obscured. Though we may, for the sake of brevity and convenience, speak of Greeks, Germans, Vietnamese and so on, it is often forgotten that these are not necessarily homogeneous peoples and that a person might identify with some subgroups and not with others. Though ethnic groups could be broken down into an almost infinite number of subgroups, for the purposes of empirical research a halt must be called at some point before such fractionation becomes impractical and unwieldy. Some account, or at least awareness, of the fact that individuals and subgroups within various ethnicities are not all uniform replicas of each other is nevertheless required. This point is particularly relevant to Latvians who have established active communities in many parts of the world. There is, besides the problem of their identification with Latvians in general and their various host communities, the question of their perceptions of Latvians living in the same host country, in other host countries, and in Latvia. Furthermore, it is evident from participant-observation that their views of their past (whether accurate or distorted) and hopes for the future (whether realistic or utopian fantasy) are interwoven with their current perceptions of themselves.

In an attempt to gain a better understanding of ethnic identification in Latvian immigrants it is necessary, at least to some extent, to take cognizance of these geographic and temporal groupings.

There has also been a reliance in most studies on questionnaire measures which tap conscious identification. While these are valid indices of at least one aspect of identification, sole reliance on such measures has fostered superficiality by ignoring those aspects of identification which subjects might not be immediately aware of, or which, as discussed earlier, have not yet crystallised into a gestalt. The use of procedures such as the semantic differential and related
techniques, e.g. repertory grid, avoid this problem. Furthermore, these methods are fully consistent with the analysis of identification as being the degree of similarity between one's self-perception and perception of others.

The first application of such procedures to the study of Latvian immigrants was carried out by Lejējs (1964) using a version of the Q-sort technique with Latvian students at an Australian university who had arrived in Australia as infants. The results of this study were, however, inconclusive and were flawed by a number of methodological weaknesses. Lejējs herself suggested that the semantic differential might be a more promising approach for the measurement of ethnic identification.

Kangeris (1972) used the semantic differential in a study of forty Latvian students from the U.S.A. and Germany who were attending the Latvian gymnasium in Münster, West Germany. His application of the semantic differential was based on earlier work by the German social psychologist P. Hofstätter (1966/67, 1970) who used the semantic differential in analyses of national stereotypes. Hofstätter employed correlational and factor analytic techniques in the analysis of his data, as did Kangeris. This last fact is mentioned because it is not completely clear how semantic differential data should be best analysed. There are arguments that distance measures ($D$) are more accurate than correlations - a problem which will be discussed later. While Kangeris' study was only exploratory in nature, his results did suggest that there were differences in identification with various Latvian and host subgroups. There was also suggestive evidence of differences in identification between students from Germany and the U.S.A. One result was of particular interest; the Latvian group least identified with by both Latvian student groups was Latvians in Latvia.

A later study using the semantic differential examined ethnic identification in forty-two second generation Latvian university students attending the University of Adelaide (Putnīns, 1978a). Distance measures were used as indices of profile similarity. It was found that those subjects who were least alienated from Latvians on a number of socio-cultural measures displayed the greatest differentiation in their identifications. They positively identified with the concepts *Latvian (in general), Latvian in Australia* and *Latvian in America*, were neutral toward the concept *Australian* and identified negatively with *Latvian in Latvia*. The last appears to be consistent with Kangeris' earlier finding. As the degree of ethnicity maintenance decreased, so
also did the degree of positive identification with the first three concepts mentioned above. The result is important because it indicates that ethnic identification as measured by the semantic differential is related to other aspects of ethnicity in a logically consistent manner. Identification with the concept **Australian** altered little with increasing ethnic alienation while the concept **Latvian in Latvia** in the more ethnically alienated subjects was similar to their perception of **Latvian (in general)**. This appears to have arisen as a result of their lack of knowledge and interest about Latvians in Latvia due to their greater ethnic alienation. To fill the void, as it were, they have projected their perception of Latvians in general onto this group.

From the above it can be seen that our knowledge about ethnic identification in Latvian immigrants is extremely limited. Furthermore, the studies to date have been only exploratory and concerned largely with testing the usefulness of the semantic differential in this type of research. There were methodological problems in these earlier studies, not the least of which has been how best to analyse semantic differential data. Relatively small subject numbers have also been a problem. For example, in the last study described there were only ten subjects in the low ethnic alienation subgroup.

The aim of the present study is to both verify some of the earlier research findings and to explore further the current status of ethnic identification in second generation Latvians. Second generation subjects are of interest because they provide a continuity with the earlier studies, allowing results to be more readily compared than would be the case with an older first generation sample. An additional interest in these subjects lies in the fact that the continuation and direction of Latvian communities in the West (that they will continue for at least one more generation seems very likely – at least in the larger centres) will be determined by this generation. There are also problems with respect to use of the semantic differential with first generation immigrants which arises from varying language skills amongst such subjects. Their competence in either Latvian or English is not uniform, a fact which presents difficulties since the semantic differential could be presumed to be more sensitive to linguistic skills than other types of questionnaire. The only way in which this problem could be circumvented is if equivalent form translations are used, but as any bilingual person knows, exact translation from one language to another is seldom possible, particularly where nuances of subjective
meaning are involved as is the case with semantic differential scales. On the other hand, while there is variation amongst second generation subjects in their Latvian language skills, it is reasonable to assume that their competence in English is little different from that of host group members of the same age.

Study III

Subjects

As was stated above, part of the aim of this study is to explore further ethnic identification amongst those who will ultimately determine the course of Latvian community life in years to come. For this purpose subjects who are relatively active in the ethnic community were required. For various reasons, however, it would be a difficult task to obtain a random sample of such subjects. A reasonably representative and accessible subject group which would closely approximate a random sample of second generation ethnic maintainers are participants of Latvian folkdancing groups. It has been the present author's observation that most second generation Latvians who still retain ties with Latvian ethnicity have at some time participated in a local folkdancing group. Such groups are found almost anywhere where there is a large enough number of young Latvians to provide sufficient dancers. The author has also failed to observe any consistent differences between those who participate in folkdancing groups and other second generation Latvians who could be regarded as ethnic maintainers (even having 'two left feet' does not appear to deter people from joining a folkdancing group).

Subjects were drawn from every folkdancing group in Adelaide (Lielais Auseklītis, Mazais Auseklītis, Jandāliņš), Melbourne (Ritenītis, Daugavieši-Sakta, Saultē, Sprīdītis), and Sydney (Rota, Jautrais Pāris). The criteria for inclusion in the sample were that subjects be between 15 and 30 years of age and have at least an elementary command of the Latvian language. A total of 144 questionnaires were received. However, three subjects were outside the age limits set, three questionnaires had incomplete semantic differential responses and two subjects' language skills were below the criterion level. These subjects were excluded from further analysis. Thus 136 usable questionnaires were returned. There was one refusal to participate in the survey.
Since there is a possibility that regional differences might exist amongst Latvians with respect to their identifications, it was considered worthwhile obtaining results using the same questionnaire with subjects living outside Australia. To this end a listing of Latvian folk-dancing groups (Rullīņa, 1972) was consulted and all groups in the U.S.A., Canada and Britain who had given a contacting address and who were thought likely to have subjects meeting the selection criteria given above were sent letters inviting their participation in the survey. The information regarding the groups and their addresses was, however, at least five years old at the time of this investigation and thus a portion of it could be expected to be out of date. To the thirty-two letters sent, ten replies were received. However, three of these were received almost half a year after the initial letters of inquiry had been posted and thus were too late to be considered for the present study. Of the remaining seven replies, four folkdancing groups in North America had subjects who met the sampling criteria in numbers comparable with those of the folkdancing groups surveyed in Australia. While it had been anticipated that questionnaire results would be obtained from all four groups, difficulties arose with one group in that the author's administration instructions were not adhered to. This group was subsequently dropped from the study. The three remaining groups were based in widely separated centres. These were groups from Montreal (Ačkups), Boston (Bostonas tautas deju kopa) and Seattle (Trejdeksnītis). Each of these cities has a Latvian population of more than a thousand with community activities similar to those in the Australian cities from which subjects were drawn. For example, each city has a Latvian community centre, Latvian church organisations, Latvian Saturday schools, choirs and of course folk-dancing groups. The author is not aware of any significant differences between the above Latvian communities and those of similar size in other North American cities. The lack of response from many of the other folkdancing groups is probably more a function of the attitudes of particular group leaders than of the folkdancers themselves. A total of fifty-five questionnaires was received, though two were excluded from further analysis due to incomplete responses to the semantic differential items. Thus fifty-three completed questionnaires were used in the North American subject analysis.

Since, as was indicated previously, there is evidence to suggest that there has been some fragmentation of ethnic identification amongst second generation Latvians in the West, it would be of interest to
know whether a similar condition exists amongst young Latvians living in Latvia regarding their perceptions of themselves, Latvians in general and Latvians living in the West. Though the questionnaire would need to be administered in Latvian to such subjects, thus preventing the direct comparison of individual semantic differential scales, the degree of profile similarity between the relevant rated concepts could nevertheless be compared with the results for subjects in the West. A written inquiry was made to a professor of the Latvian State University, explaining the purpose of the study, the type of items used in the semantic differential and suggesting, for convenience, a university student sample. It was also pointed out that the questionnaire items could be altered if their content or format was for any reason unacceptable. The reply was that the rector of the university had failed to grant permission for the conduct of such a survey.

**Questionnaire**

Eight concepts were rated with the semantic differential. *Myself* was used as a measure of self-concept. For the purpose of verifying the results of previous research, three concepts were the same as those that had been used in an earlier study by the author (Putniņš, 1978a), namely, *Australian, Latvian in Australia,* and *Latvian (in general).* In the case of subjects in the U.S.A. and Canada, the words *American* or *Canadian* were substituted where necessary. *How I would like to be* served as a measure of ideal self-concept. As was discussed earlier, it is possible for identification to occur at two levels, both that of how a person desires to be as well as how a person actually perceives himself to be. Hence the inclusion of the latter concept. Identification with Latvians in Latvia was explored by examining this concept in a temporal sequence representing the past, present and the future. The concepts used were: *Latvian in Latvia (before World War II), Latvian in Latvia (at present), What a Latvian in a Latvia which had regained political independence at some future time might be like.* Whether the sentiment expressed in the last concept is realistic or not is not here an issue of concern. The justification for this concept's inclusion is that it is thought to be relevant to how Latvians in the West see both themselves and their relationship to Latvians in Latvia. An independent Latvia is certainly one of the main political goals upheld by many Latvians in the West.

Twelve seven-point bipolar adjective scales were used to rate each of the above concepts. These were (in the order in which they
appeared on the questionnaire): Lazy-Hardworking; Radical-Conservative; Insecure-Secure; Idealistic-Realistic; Tense-Relaxed; Strong-Weak; Passive-Active; Valuable-Worthless; Inferior-Superior; Aggressive-Defensive; Mature-Youthful; Happy-Sad. These particular adjective pairs were selected partly in order to tap the main semantic dimensions (Evaluation, Potency, Activity) described by Osgood et al. (1957), and partly on the basis of their apparent relevance to the concepts judged. Most of the scales had been used in an earlier study of ethnic identification (Putniņš, 1978a), where they had worked quite well in judging concepts similar to those in the present study.

The questionnaire was split into two parts. For convenience, the two parts will continue to be referred to as one questionnaire, even though the separate parts were administered to different subjects. The reason for this is that the responses to both parts of the questionnaire were later pooled and treated as though describing the same population. Part one contained the concepts Latvian in Latvia (at present), Myself, What a Latvian in a Latvia which had regained political independence at some future time might be like (henceforth referred to as Latvian in Latvia in the future) and Latvian (in general). Part two contained the concepts Australian (American, Canadian), Latvian in Latvia (before World War II), Latvian in Australia (America, Canada) and How I would like to be. Concepts to be rated within each questionnaire part were presented in a systematically varied order representing all possible position combinations. The two parts of the questionnaire were distributed in alternating order, with each subject receiving only one questionnaire part. It was thus very much a matter of chance as to which section of the questionnaire was received by any particular subject. This was done so as to avoid creating any systematic differences between subjects who completed either the first or second part of the questionnaire.

Division of the questionnaire into two parts was done for two reasons. Firstly, the subjects who participated in this survey completed the questionnaires during breaks at their dancing rehearsals. The co-operation of the folkdancing group leaders was secured partly on the understanding that the test administration would not take up too much of their time. This seemed to be a reasonable arrangement since nobody is under any obligation to participate in such surveys. Willingness to assist the investigator should, where possible, not be abused by prolonging what is for most people a somewhat tedious task. The excellent response rate and the small number of incomplete
questionnaires is probably in part due to the use of relatively brief forms. Secondly, short questionnaires tend to minimise what are sometimes despairingly referred to as 'Mickey Mouse responses', i.e. when due to either boredom or an aversion to the task, subjects respond with haphazard, random, deliberately misleading or humourous answers. Whatever form this type of response takes, its effect is to decrease the accuracy with which the questionnaire responses genuinely reflect the feelings, thoughts or behaviours of the subjects under study. The restriction of such responses is another argument in support of the brief questionnaire.

A brief explanation of the purpose of the survey and a set of instructions regarding the procedure for completion of the semantic differential scales were presented on the first page of both sections of the administered questionnaire. The instructions were a slightly modified version of those proposed by Osgood et al. (1957, pp. 82-4). There followed seven questions relating to each subject's sex, age, whether both parents were Latvians, rated ability to speak Latvian, what language(s) were spoken with parents, time elapsed since last attendance at a Latvian function and whether the subject had ever been to Latvia. The last item was asked because it is possible that this might be a factor influencing their perceptions of Latvians in Latvia.

Regarding the relevance of the use of English for the Montreal subjects, the author consulted a person who had recently arrived from Canada and who had been active in the Latvian community in Montreal. All the younger Latvians in Montreal known to the informant spoke English fluently. Furthermore, if a second language was used in the home it was invariably English rather than French with the possible exception of a few persons of mixed French-Canadian and Latvian parentage. Since almost all the subjects were expected to be of monoethnic background, it was thought that no modification of the questionnaire was necessary.

The minimum level of competence in spoken Latvian for inclusion in the sample was being able to at least 'conduct a simple conversation in Latvian'.

**Procedure**

All test administrations with subjects in Australia were personally supervised by the author. All suitable subjects present at the folk-dancing rehearsals were offered questionnaires after a brief talk explaining the purpose of the study. It was emphasised that subjects
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should complete their questionnaires without discussion amongst themselves or looking at each other's responses. It was also requested that each semantic differential scale be completed independently and that subjects should not refer back to see how similar items had been answered earlier.

Letters explaining the administration procedure were sent to the leaders of each of the North American folkdancing groups who took part in the survey, the aim being to make these test administrations as similar as possible to those carried out in Australia. How to deal with questions most commonly asked by subjects regarding the questionnaire was also dealt with. Each group leader was invited to contact the author before administering the questionnaire if he or she had any queries relating to the survey.

Results

The Australian and North American samples were similar in their responses to the subject background items. The vast majority of the subjects were of monooethnic Latvian parentage. Their mean ages were 19.0 and 19.2 years respectively. There was a slight female subject excess in both groups (58.6 per cent and 53.8 per cent). The majority rated their Latvian language skills to be as good as their spoken English or at least as being adequate in most situations. A majority also spoke Latvian either exclusively or mainly at home with their parents and had attended a Latvian function within the last month. Very few subjects had ever been to Latvia.

The mean semantic differential scale ratings for each concept were calculated separately for the Australian and North American samples. The mean concept profiles thus obtained were further used to calculate the linear distance \( D_{ij} \) between the concepts in a space defined by the semantic differential scales using the following formula derived from Euclidian geometry:

\[
D_{ij} = \sqrt{\sum d_{ij}^2}
\]

where \( i \) and \( j \) are any two concepts and \( d \) is the difference between scores on a scale with which the concepts \( i \) and \( j \) have been rated. These distances are presented in Table 8.

Another measure of profile similarity is the correlation coefficient. It has the disadvantage, however, of not being sensitive to differences
TABLE 8 Distances (Ds) between concept profiles for Australian and North American second generation Latvian subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL now</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL future</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latv. in gen.</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am./Can.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latv. in W.W.II</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL pre-W.W.II</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Australian figures are above the diagonal, North American figures are below the diagonal. Concept headings in the above table are abbreviated from: Latvian in Latvia (at present); Latvian in Latvia in the future; Latvian (in general); Australian/American/Canadian; How I would like to be; Latvian in Australia/America/Canada; Latvian in Latvia (before World War II).

in both profile scatter and elevation. For example, the profiles obtained by plotting the mean semantic differential scale scores for the concepts Myself and Latvian (in general) are presented in Figure 3, while the profiles for Myself and How I would like to be are presented in Figure 4. It is obvious at a glance that the profiles in Figure 3 are more similar than those in Figure 4, despite the fact that the latter profiles are more highly correlated than the former. The relative size of the $D$ scores, however, describes more accurately the similarity of the profiles, with the distance between Myself and How I would like to be being greater than that between Myself and Latvian (in general), in accord with the impression gained by visual inspection of the profiles. The reason for the high correlation between Myself and How I would like to be, despite the differences between the two profiles, is that the subjects' ideal self-concept seems to be generally an exaggeration of their self-concept. The mean profile for Myself is an evaluatively positive one. Subjects tend to perceive themselves as being happy rather than sad, as valuable rather than worthless, as strong rather than weak and so on. In assessing how they would like to be, these
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traits have been responded to in the same direction as for *Myself* but in a more extreme form, with a consequent increase in profile scatter. Thus the profile scores vary in the same directions from the scale mid-points, giving a high correlation, even though the actual scores are quite different. Hofstätter (personal communication, 1978) has found that there is considerable agreement between *D* scores and correlations, citing correlations of −.84 and −.92 between the two measures. The present author in an earlier study (Putnīns, 1978a) also found a close relationship (*rho* = .79) between these two measures. However, the relationship is not a perfect one and though there might be general agreement, correlations can in individual cases be misleading, as in the case described above.

**Figure 3** Mean scale ratings for *Myself* and *Latvian (in general)*

![Graph showing mean scale ratings for *Myself* and *Latvian (in general)*](image)

One reason why the use of correlations to measure the degree of profile similarity is attractive to researchers is that the results are more readily interpretable than are *D* measures as they are normally used. Distances are relative measures of similarity in that they indicate which concepts are closer than others. Correlations have the same property, but in addition are able to distinguish between random patterns and those which appear to be meaningfully related. It would be useful to establish a reference point for *D* scores that is similar in interpretation to a correlation of near zero. This is desirable because we would like to be able to say whether concept *i* is positively
identified with or not relative to such a neutral point rather than just saying that concept $i$ is closer to self-concept than is concept $j$. Cattell (1949) both recognised this problem and suggested a solution by use of the profile similarity measure $r_p$. This measure is essentially a transformation of $D$ using standardised scores with respect to each profile component. The resulting coefficient has a distribution which is approximately normal with a range from $-1.0$ to $+1.0$ and a mid-point of zero. Furthermore, it can be interpreted in a fashion similar to the more familiar correlation coefficient. The $r_p$ coefficient is useful when each profile element is treated as being equally important. It is probable that certain scales of the semantic differential will be treated by subjects as being more relevant or important in judging differences between certain concepts. For example, it is likely that the bi-polar scale Traditional-Modern would be more relevant to distinguishing between a broad range of cultural groups (with a subsequent increase in score dispersion) than would a scale like Hard-Soft, even though the latter dimension might also contribute to perceived differences between such groups. Weighting each of these scales equally by using standard scores would obscure the fact that they are not treated equally by subjects in their ratings. This problem does not arise with the use of $D$ measures, though we are still handicapped with the problem of establishing a neutral reference point.
A possible solution to this problem which, though not as mathematically elegant as that proposed by Cattell (1949), is not as restricted in application as the $r_p$ coefficient, is to utilise the relationship between $D$ and correlations. Cronbach and Gleser (1953) have pointed out that $D$ and $r$ are mathematically related, though $D$ utilises more profile information than does $r$. The generally close empirical relationship between the two measures further suggests that $D$ scores might be calibrated by comparison with correlations. For this purpose, Pearson product-moment correlations between all concept pairs for both the Australian and North American samples were calculated.

The Spearman rank-order correlation of $0.94 (n = 42)$ between $D$ and $r$ in the present study is very high. ($Ds$ and $rs$ between How I would like to be and other concepts were not included in the calculation of the above correlation because, for reasons discussed earlier, correlations with this concept are misleading with respect to profile similarity when compared to visual inspection of the profiles.) Despite the high correlation between the two measures, scattergram plots of $D$ against $r$ and $r^2$ respectively revealed curvilinear relationships, thus preventing the use of linear regression to determine what magnitude of $D$ approximates a correlation of zero. An alternative was to average all the $D$ scores for profile pairs that had correlations near zero (between $+0.10$ and $-0.10$). Once again excluding pairs involving How I would like to be, the mean $D$ for such profile pairs (ranging from $4.28$ to $5.05$) was $4.74$. This then is approximately the distance at which concepts can be judged to be relatively independent of each other. Taken from the position of Myself in semantic space, this is the distance at which other concepts can be said to be no longer positively identified with by the subjects.

In order to present the relationships between the various concepts in a form that more readily facilitates comprehension of their total configuration, multidimensional scaling analyses were performed separately on the Australian and North American subject $D$ matrices using a nonmetric multidimensional scaling procedure developed by Young (1968a). This technique derives the geometric configuration in Euclidean space which, within the dimensional limits imposed by the investigator, most accurately represents the interrelationships between the data elements. In the present case it was found that both matrices could be adequately described in a two dimensional space. The program output includes two indices of 'goodness of fit', i.e. of
how close is the correspondence between the final derived configuration and the original data proximities. One such index needs, according to Young (1968b), to exceed .999 for a satisfactory solution. This was exceeded with index scores of 1.00000 in both analyses. The other index, called 'stress', was .001 in both solutions. Criteria values for the latter index suggested by Kruskal (1964) indicate that the quality of both solutions can be regarded as 'excellent'. When both solutions were graphed, it was evident that the configurations were very similar. In order to make this more apparent, the Australian subject configuration was rotated by hand in a clockwise direction about the axes intercept by 5.5° relative to the North American subject configuration. The resulting correspondence, presented in Figure 5, is seen to be so close that there is little need to distinguish between the two configurations. The accuracy of both configurations can be further checked by referring to the relative distances between the various concepts given in Table 8 and comparing them to those plotted in Figure 5. It will be seen that there has been very little distortion of the original data. This figure is, however, a synoptic representation. For more precise information regarding the relative distances between the rated concepts the reader should refer to Table 8.

The outer circle in Figure 5 represents the distance \( D = 4.74 \) from Myself (plotted from the midpoint between the positions of this concept for the two samples) at which a concept can be regarded as ceasing to be positively identified with. From this graphical representation it can be seen that there is a central clustering of concepts indicating strong positive identification by subjects with Latvian (in general), Latvian in Australia/America/Canada, Latvian in Latvia in the future and Latvian in Latvia (before World War II).

Weaker identification is displayed with the concepts Australian/American/Canadian and How I would like to be, while Latvian in Latvia (at present) is not at all positively identified with.

Discussion

The positive identification displayed with Latvians in their host countries and Latvians in general confirms earlier results (Putninš, 1978a) with a more restricted sample of second generation Latvian ethnic maintainers. Identification with Latvians in Latvia appears to be fragmented, with pre-war Latvians and Latvians after an imagined change of regime being positively identified with, but not present-day
Figure 5  Configurations derived by multidimensional scaling for concepts rated by 136 Australian ( ○ ) and 53 North American ( ● ) second generation Latvians. The circular boundary represents the distance, plotted from Myself, at which subjects cease to positively identify with other concepts.

Latvians in Latvia. Comparison of the profile scores for the last concept with ratings for self-concept indicates that Latvian in Latvia (at present) is seen in an evaluatively negative light. This is further confirmed by reference to Figure 5, where it can be seen that Latvian in Latvia (at present) lies in the opposite direction to How I would like to be relative to Myself. Since ideal self-concept can be assumed to represent a desirable and evaluatively positive state of being, it is evident that Latvian in Latvia (at present) is not only the concept least identified with but is also the most evaluatively negative. Members of the various host groups are also regarded as more evaluatively negative than
either Myself or the other Latvian concepts in the central cluster. Despite this, some degree of positive identification, albeit weaker than with various Latvian concepts, appears to exist with host group members – a finding similar to that reported in the preceding study of first generation Latvian immigrants. Though subjects in an earlier study (Putniņš, 1978a) displayed less inclination to identify with host group members than did those described here, the relative degree of identification (the host group being less identified with than various Latvian groups) is consistent between the two studies. It is also evident in the present study that, for the concepts examined, positive identification occurs at the level of perceived actual self rather than of ideal self.

An earlier suggestion that the primary identification of second generation Latvian ethnic maintainers is with a concept of Latvians in exile appears to require revision in view of the positive identification expressed with Latvians in Latvia both in the past and in the future. It would seem rather that the general conception of Latvians identified with by these subjects is one of Latvians perceived to be politically independent. As politically motivated immigrants, most Latvians see those who remained in Latvia as now being in a state of forced political subserviency, whereas Latvians in the West and Latvians both in the past and in a possible future are seen to be free to determine their own political fates.

While undoubtedly there are a number of objective differences between Latvians in the West and those who are presently in Latvia, it is not certain whether these alone completely account for the lack of positive identification with present-day Latvians in Latvia. The main factors which might influence the apparent psychological alienation from Latvians in Latvia at present are:

1) geographic separation;
2) personal and cultural isolation;
3) socio-political and economic differences.

The first factor does not appear to be of great significance since there are Latvian groups in other geographically distant areas which are identified with, e.g. Latvians in America by Australian Latvians (Putniņš, 1978a).

Personal isolation has occurred to a marked degree. Both tourist travel and emigration by people in Latvia to the West is very restricted. It is also evident from subjects’ responses to the relevant questionnaire item that few second generation Latvians in the West
have ever visited Latvia. It had been thought, since Europe is more readily accessible from North America than from Australia, that perhaps more North American subjects had travelled to Latvia. This might in turn have altered their perceptions of Latvians in present-day Latvia compared to those of the Australian subjects. This hypothesis was not confirmed since none of the North American subjects had been to Latvia and in fact there were no significant differences between the Australian and North American subjects in their identifications. There is empirical evidence from studies of various types of sojourners within other ethnic groups which suggests that travel across national boundaries often has an effect on how other peoples are perceived (Steinkalk and Taft, 1977), though this could not be verified in the present study since the number of Australian Latvians who had visited Latvia was so small that reliable results could not be obtained.

Cultural contact is also very limited. For example, no Latvian bookshops in Australia sell literature printed in Soviet Latvia and to date no Soviet Latvian performers or creative artists have ever held an exhibition or performed before a Latvian audience in Australia. There have been a few instances of artists from Soviet Latvia presenting themselves before Latvian publics in North America, though this practice has up to now been very limited and the general situation in North America does not differ much from that in Australia. This isolation is to some extent reinforced in the Latvian Saturday schools where the teaching of Latvian history usually ceases with the end of World War II. It would indeed be of interest to find out whether greater exposure to the personal lives and cultural activities of Latvians in present-day Latvia would in any way alter the perceptions of second generation Latvians in the West. A possible way of testing this would be to involve some of the tourist groups (made up largely of Latvians) which regularly travel to Latvia from various points in Europe and North America during the summer months in a pre- and post-travel survey.

Differences in both economic and socio-political policies between the Western countries where Latvian immigrants live and the Soviet Union should be obvious and need not be dwelt on at any length here. (Those who are unfamiliar with daily life in the Soviet Union are referred to Hedrick Smith’s, 1976, excellent work, The Russians). The main point in connection with these policies is that, rightly or wrongly, those of the Soviet Union (including Soviet Latvia) are
inevitably presented in an evaluatively negative manner by older Latvians who compare them unfavourably with those of pre-war Latvia and those of their host countries. In a highly simplified form, it could be said that the following notions about Latvians have been instilled in the second generation by their elders:

1) Life was basically good in Latvia before the war.
2) Latvian immigrants in the West are much better off than those who remained in Latvia.
3) Life in Latvia would be good once again if the Russians left and Latvia became politically independent.

These notions have been subsequently reflected in the identifications of second generation Latvians. Latvians in Latvia are identified with in respect to how they once were and might be again, but not with how they are now. Not only is the concept *Latvian in Latvia (at present)* not positively identified with by the respondents, it is also seen as being quite distant from the concept *Latvian (in general)*, despite the fact that approximately 90 per cent of all Latvians live in Latvia. Those who live in Soviet Latvia are no longer seen as being representative of the conception of what Latvians are generally like expressed in the subjects' ratings of *Latvian (in general)*. It would appear that the constant reinforcement of evaluatively negative impressions, by the older generation of Latvian immigrants, in respect of the situation in which Latvians in Latvia presently live, has been a major influence in determining the apparent psychological alienation of second generation subjects from this group. Whether these negative evaluations are accurate or not in their entirety, or have been presented at the expense of downplaying positive aspects of life in Soviet Latvia, cannot be determined here. An examination of whether changes in identification occur as a result of increased contact with Soviet Latvia by means such as tourism might, however, cast some light on the answers to these questions.

The most general conclusion from this study is that in order to gain more than just a relatively superficial description of ethnic identification it is necessary to examine subgroups within the relevant ethnic group. Furthermore, this needs to be done within a multidimensional framework, thereby allowing identifications with different concepts to vary independently of each other. In practice, the semantic differential technique can be readily adapted to meet these requirements. This method has the additional advantages of not requiring direct assessment of identifications by subjects and, through examination of
the individual scales, being able to indicate in what ways various concepts are differentiated.

More specifically, it was found that positive identification occurred with how the subjects actually perceived themselves to be rather than with how they would like to be. There were no notable differences between the results for Australian and North American subjects. It would appear from background information that the two samples are similar in many respects and that similar factors have probably shaped their present identifications. Both groups displayed strong positive identification with a variety of Latvian concepts. A common element in these concepts appeared to be that they all represented what the subjects perceived to be free Latvians, i.e. politically self-determining. Positive identification, though weaker than with the former concepts, was expressed with host group members. Evidence for fragmentation in ethnic identification was found in the manner in which present-day Latvians in Latvia were perceived. This group, which represents the vast majority of Latvians in the world, was identificationally neutral for the respondents. Furthermore, this concept was seen as being quite different from the other Latvian concepts, including Latvian (in general). In view of the earlier suggestion that one of the necessary elements of Latvian ethnicity is identification, is it possible that, with respect to the perceptions of second generation Latvians, two distinct Latvian ethnicities now exist – one in the West and one in Latvia? The author has elsewhere suggested (Putniņš, 1979) that, although both groups are related by a common language and common origin, other factors have led them to be seen as being quite dissimilar. Their relationship with each other is perhaps like those which exist between the different English or Spanish speaking peoples around the globe. The main difference between the Latvian case and the fragmentation of other ethnic groups is that many Latvians in the West still hope that they might once again converge with Latvians in Latvia at some time in the future. For the present, however, younger Latvian ethnic maintainers, few of whom have been to Latvia, can be said to be psychologically alienated from Latvians in Latvia.

We will next examine some problems relating to the development of differential ethnic identification amongst second generation Latvians.
The development of identification in children has been the subject of many studies. In the area of identification with social groups defined by race, ethnicity or nationality there exist a number of relatively comprehensive reviews of previous research (see Brand et al., 1974; Davies, 1968; Pushkin and Veness, 1973). This area of research, however, is apt to be somewhat confusing. This is due to the large variety of measuring techniques used; the rather loose and often interchangeable use of the terms ethnicity, nationality and race; an almost complete lack of explanation as to just what is meant by identification and the frequent failure to distinguish preference, identification, and recognition of differences, i.e. differentiation.

It appears that most studies have focused on the development of racial awareness, primarily between white and black peoples (e.g. Bloom, 1971; Proshansky and Newton, 1973). Undoubtedly, the pressing social issues relating to race in many parts of the world have precipitated this emphasis. Lasker (1929, cited by Pushkin and Veness, 1973) concluded that children became aware of racial differences from about five years of age onwards. There has subsequently been little evidence to dispute Lasker's basic conclusion. However, as Aboud and Mitchell (1977) have pointed out, up to approximately age eleven children use mainly concrete cues in their social perceptions. Thus the results obtained in studies of racial awareness are not necessarily generalisable to perceptions of ethnic or national groups that are not significantly different from the subjects in physical appearance.

Another line of research has been the examination of the child's concept of nationality at different ages. Evidence from a number of studies (e.g. Tajfel, 1966; Tajfel et al., 1970; Tajfel et al., 1972) indicates that preferences for one's own country and countrymen as opposed to
others already exist at six to seven years of age; this is so despite the fact that children at this age have not yet acquired a proper conception of nations or foreigners. These concepts are developed and refined over a period of time and are used fairly accurately only at about eleven years of age, i.e. with the beginning of the formal operations stage of cognitive development. For example, in their study Piaget and Weil (1951) found that most nine-year-olds could not comprehend that one could be both Swiss and Genevan at the same time. It is this limited or primitive understanding of such concepts which prompted Jahoda (1962) to suggest that research using methods such as ranking nationalities in order of preference is ‘somewhat doubtful’ since the extent of the young child’s comprehension is restricted. Furthermore, it is uncertain as to just how good a correspondence exists between the development of awareness of nations and of ethnicities. Geographic separation between countries might be an important concrete dimension facilitating the differentiation of other nations from one’s own, which in turn might lead to preference for one’s own country on the basis of familiarity and proximity. This rudimentary differentiation between nations might be embellished by crude physical stereotypes gained through media such as comics and children’s stories. The author can himself remember having an impression at an early age of the Dutch as people who wore wooden shoes and lived on barges which drifted through a landscape of tulips and windmills. Such gross exaggeration of physical stereotypes might not occur under conditions where ethnic groups who are not significantly different in physical appearance are in daily contact with each other. There have been, however, surprisingly few studies examining such situations.

Hartley et al. (1948a, 1948b) and Radke et al. (1949) obtained results suggesting that Jewish children in the U.S.A. became aware of their ethnic background from about five years of age onwards. The degree to which these results can be generalised to other ethnic groups is, however, not clear. Though a verbal response might be made by a child correctly identifying his ethnicity, this might merely reflect what the child has been told he is, without indicating any deeper understanding or significance to the child. Jamias et al. (1971) have suggested that, ‘if the child responds yes when asked “Are you a Canadian?” or “Are you a Filipino?”, it is difficult to assume that ethnic affiliation is a salient feature of the child’s identity’ (p.157). This type of direct questioning formed part of the approach used by Hartley et al. (1948a,
It is also possible that in an environment in which prejudice and discrimination might not be uncommon that both the differentiation of groups and knowledge of one's own group membership might be learnt very early in life through a process of social conditioning — earlier perhaps than by children in a more tolerant and accepting setting.

The problem which we will investigate in the present study is that of establishing the approximate age at which differential identification occurs between host and ethnic groups in circumstances where the host and ethnic groups are not evidently different in physical appearance or material culture; are in daily contact with each other; are able to communicate with each other fluently; and are not residentially segregated or subject to obvious discrimination or prejudice. Such conditions apply to almost all second generation Northern European immigrants in Australia, as well as those first generation immigrants from the same region who arrived at a very young age. Many of the more obvious cues facilitating the distinction of host and ethnic groups which were present in most earlier studies are absent in these subjects. Taking second generation Latvian children in Australia as an example, all of them attend Australian schools (there being no full-time Latvian schools in Australia), speak English without a distinguishing accent or foreign idiom, have at least some Australian playmates and are physically indistinguishable from their Australian peers. In the absence of the more concrete differences which exist between various other groups, particularly different racial groups, it might be hypothesised that greater differentiation between identification with Australians and one's own ethnic group respectively might occur with the acquisition of more abstract forms of reasoning. In the Piagetian theory of intellectual development this is suggested to occur from about eleven years of age onwards (Ginsburg and Opper, 1969).

Study IV

Subjects
Second generation Latvians were the subjects of the present study. Since it was necessary to examine subjects who were relatively unalienated from Latvians — in order for there to be positive identification with the ethnic group against which to gauge identification
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with Australians – Latvian school attenders were selected. Subjects were drawn from the pupils attending Latvian Saturday schools and Latvian high school language classes in Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney. These schools and classes are conducted in the local Latvian community centres. The age range examined was 8 to 30 years. Almost all the subjects were monoethnic Latvians i.e. both parents are Latvians. The few non-Latvians who were studying Latvian in the high school classes were excluded from the study.

A total of 240 questionnaires were received, though 16 were discarded due to incomplete responses. There was an approximately even number of male (48.4 per cent) and female (51.6 per cent) respondents. A large majority of the subjects (91.1 per cent) described themselves as being able to speak Latvian either ‘very well’ or ‘fairly well’. There were no subjects who were without any command of Latvian.

Questionnaire

As in the preceding study, the semantic differential was used to measure ethnic identification. This technique has previously been applied to young children, though usually using 5-point rather than 7-point scales. This convention was also followed in the present study. Fitzgerald and Roberts (1966) compared the semantic differential with a games and activities inventory (used as a measure of psychosexual interests) in an investigation of the development of gender identification in children between 6 and 10 years of age. It was found that there was little relationship between the two as measures of identification, though the semantic differential yielded results which were generally consistent with theoretical expectations. The authors concluded that their results argue for the validity of the semantic differential as a measure of identification while casting doubt on the value of at least some other measures. This finding, together with the apparently meaningful results obtained using this technique with adolescent and adult subjects, increases confidence in the validity of using the semantic differential as a measure of identification across different age groups.

Written instructions were presented on the first page of the questionnaire. These were similar to those used in the previous study. Below the instructions were three background questions inquiring about the subject’s age, sex and rated ability to speak Latvian (5-point scale). Concepts rated were: *Myself* (used as a measure of self-concept),
Latvian and Australian. The three concepts to be rated were presented in a systematically varied order representing all possible position combinations. Each concept was rated on the following twelve bipolar adjective scales (in the order presented): Lazy-Hardworking; Happy-Sad; Stupid-Intelligent; Beautiful-Ugly; Dishonest-Honest; Strong-Weak; Worthless-Valuable; Strict-Easygoing; Interesting-Boring; Polite-Rude; Affectionate-Unaffectionate; Worried-Relaxed. These adjective pairs were selected on a similar basis to that in the previous study, i.e. coverage of a broad range of meaning and relevance to the concepts judged.

Procedure
All suitably aged subjects of Latvian background present at the schools at the time of the questionnaire administrations – all of which were personally supervised by the author – were included in the subject sample. With the older subjects (11 years and upwards) it was sufficient, after some introductory remarks, for them to read the instructions and then proceed with the questionnaire. The written instructions were also read out to the younger classes. In addition, a simplified verbal explanation with examples presented on the blackboard was given. This seems to have been satisfactory since few subjects, even in the youngest ages, had difficulty in understanding the response procedure. A few 8- and 9-year-old subjects, however, were uncertain as to the meaning of the Affectionate-Unaffectionate scale. This was explained to them as meaning Loving-Not Loving.

Results
Distance scores between each concept pair were calculated from the mean scale ratings for each one-year age group from 8 to 17 years and for all subjects 18 years and older. The numbers of subjects in each age group were as follows: 8 years, \( n=22 \); 9 years, \( n=25 \); 10 years, \( n=20 \); 11 years, \( n=24 \); 12 years, \( n=38 \); 13 years, \( n=22 \); 14 years, \( n=11 \); 15 years, \( n=18 \); 16 years, \( n=13 \); 17 years, \( n=14 \); 18+ years, \( n=17 \). The \( D \) scores for each age group are graphically presented in Figure 6.

The Myself-Latvian distances across the different age groups are consistently and significantly lower than either the Myself-Australian or Australian-Latvian distances (in both cases \( T=0, n=11, p < .005 \) one-tailed), indicating that differential identification with the host and ethnic groups occurs at a young age (at least by 8 years) and, in the case of ethnic maintainers, continues through to adulthood.
Figure 6  Distances between three rated concepts by age for 224 second generation Latvians in Australia

Though with some variation, the Myself-Australian and Latvian-Australian distances are roughly twice the size of the Myself-Latvian distances across the different ages (see Figure 7). These ratios are consistent with results both in the preceding study (see Table 8) and for the low ethnic alienation subject subgroup examined in an earlier study (Putnins, 1978a).

Discussion
The qualitative changes in the child’s perception of foreigners and other nations which Piaget and Weil (1951) described as occurring at about eleven years of age do not appear to be paralleled by quantitative changes in ethnic identification as measured by the semantic differential. Greater differentiation amongst the rated concepts is evident only at fourteen years and later. It is possible as the subjects
Figure 7  Relative distances (averaged across 11 age groups) between three rated concepts for 224 second generation Latvians in Australia

become older and enter high school Latvian language classes, usually at around thirteen to fourteen years of age, that their commitment to Latvian ethnicity becomes more self-motivated than is the case with younger children, who are usually sent by their parents to Latvian Saturday school whether they want to go or not. Such an increase in voluntary commitment might in turn be reflected in either a more sophisticated or a more chauvinistic perception of differences between various groups, which in either case might lead to greater group differentiation. On the other hand, it is possible that those
subjects who continue on from the primary Saturday school to Latvian high school classes are those who perceived greater differences between various groups to begin with, particularly with regard to the differentiation of Australian from both Latvian and Myself. Which of these explanations is the more plausible can only be determined by longitudinal research in which a group of young primary school children is followed through into late adolescence. The control implicit in a longitudinal cohort research design highlights one of the methodological weaknesses of the present study, which is that the backgrounds of the subjects at different ages cannot be assumed to be the same because of possibly increasing selectivity of subjects with increasing age.

The Myself-Latvian distance is approximately half that of the Myself-Australian and Australian-Latvian distances across most ages. Thus, the relative distances observed between these concepts in previous studies with late adolescent and adult Latvian subjects are confirmed and also found to apply to subjects of even lower age – to at least eight years. There is no readily evident pattern of systematic change in these ratios with age, including little, if any, difference between the ratios up to and after eleven years of age. The greater distance of Australian from Myself and Latvian respectively relative to the distance between the latter two concepts appears to be established long before the acquisition of formal operational modes of logic. In other words, the development of differential identification neither depends upon nor appears to be enhanced by certain developments in the child’s abstract reasoning skills.

As was mentioned earlier, up to about eleven years of age, children’s social perceptions tend to be mainly determined by concrete cues. While in many respects the differences between Anglo-Australians and Australian born second generation Latvians are less obvious than those between various racial groups, geographically separated national groups, ethnic groups subject to discrimination and prejudice, and so on, the differences are nonetheless apparent enough even to young children for them to identify more with one group than the other. Factors such as command of a second language, participation in activities and traditions not shared with the host group (including attendance at Latvian schools) and modelling of some parental attitudes towards the host group probably all contribute to the observed differences in identification with the host and ethnic groups.
The finding that differential identification already occurs at an early age has implications for teachers working in the area of multicultural education. If one of the aims of such educational programs is to improve the understanding and appreciation of different ethnic groups, both in order to broaden children's cultural horizons as well as to minimise the development of prejudice and discriminatory attitudes, then the results obtained in this study argue for the introduction of such programs at a very young age, probably before the age of eight. As is well known to educationalists, remediation, once behaviours and attitudes have been established, is always a more difficult task than is intervention during the formative stages. Such programs could well be integrated with foreign language teaching, there being a general consensus of opinion that language skills are more readily acquired at an early age.

Following on from the above, the next study will examine the attitudes of both Australians and immigrants towards various possible relationships between host and ethnic groups in Australia, including one alternative already mentioned, viz. multiculturalism.
The manner in which different ethnic groups living in close proximity adjust to each other has been a problem throughout man's history. In attempting to arrive at a clearer conceptualisation of the various types of inter-group relationships possible between immigrants and their receiving societies, Taft (1953) proposed a model which contained three alternative forms of adjustment (also described in independent work by Gordon, 1964). These, according to their outcomes, were called monism, pluralism and interactionism.

Monism describes the situation where immigrants are absorbed into the host group by discarding their original ethnicity and adopting host group characteristics; in other words, re-ethnification of immigrants is near total and no basic changes are made to the host group.

Pluralism, on the other hand, is a situation where neither the host nor ethnic groups undergo major change. Adaptations made by immigrants are those which are minimally required for the continued existence of the nation, such as observance of the laws of the land and the prevention of inter-group friction by mutual tolerance. Otherwise, both immigrant and host groups agree to preserve independently their respective social and cultural backgrounds.

Interactionism can be viewed as being in some ways a compromise between the pluralist and monist approaches in that it assumes changes to occur in both the immigrant and host groups. These changes occur as the result of interaction between the various groups through a process of increased sharing of elements from each other's cultures so that eventually a new ethnicity is created. Beginning with groups of diverse backgrounds, through interchange a new common culture arises, being a synthesis of elements drawn, in possibly varying proportions, from all the original groups.
Taft (1963) presented results from a number of studies in Perth, Western Australia, that had used questions designed to tap people's opinions about which of the three above options was thought to be the most desirable. Taft called such opinions 'assimilation orientations', though we will here refer to them as *adjustment orientations* so as to encompass both alienation and assimilation. His results, which included data for Latvians, indicated that approximately two-thirds of the respondents supported the interactionist approach and one-third supported monism. There were very few supporters of the pluralist option. In general, less support for monism was expressed by females than by males. Furthermore, immigrants of non-British background approved the monist alternative less frequently than did either Australians or British immigrants. The group which expressed least approval of monism were Latvians (4 per cent support). These findings, including the observation of particularly low support for monism amongst Latvians, have been replicated with other subject groups by Putniņš (1974) and Harris and Smolicz (1976).

A limitation of the above model, and the subsequent research based on it, is that it omits some modes of host-ethnic group fit. Taft's conceptualisation, which appears to be implicitly based on a unidimensional model, is not exhaustive of all the ways in which ethnic and host groups could adjust to each other. Earlier in this work it was described how a multidimensional model could be applied to better understanding the adaptation of individual immigrants. This same model can also be applied to groups. Treating ethnicity and host characteristics as independent dimensions, we can graphically represent the outcomes of the various adjustment alternatives. Figures 8, 9 and 10 illustrate the end states resulting from pluralist (separatist), monist (host conformist) and interactionist (synthetic) approaches respectively. There is, however, at least one major adjustment alternative not considered in Taft's original model. This alternative is similar to the earlier described state of integration in the individual immigrant (see Figure 1), though in application to many individuals it will be referred to as *multiculturalism*. This alternative is illustrated within a multidimensional adjustment framework in Figure 11. It can be seen from this figure that multiculturalism describes the situation where ethnic group members adopt host group characteristics, i.e. assimilate, while in large measure retaining their original ethnic characteristics. These different characteristics are activated in different settings. For example, a German immigrant might speak in
English with Anglo-Australians but in German with others of German descent.

It will be noticed in Figure 11 that only movement by the ethnic group is shown. This does not, however, preclude the possibility of host group members also adopting some ethnic group characteristics, though generally it could be expected that this would occur to a lesser degree than assimilation by immigrants. For example, there has been
an upsurge in the popularity of 'ethnic' foods in Australia without in
any way diminishing the acceptability of traditional Australian dishes.
Foods are one of the most easily transferable secondary ethnic
characteristics. The acceptance by Australians of various newly intro-
duced foods has not, however, been paralleled by penetration in
primary areas of ethnicity such as language and identification.

A somewhat similar orientation model to that proposed here has
been described by Berry et al. (1977), who, by dichotomising attitudes
towards both host and ethnic groups, produced a quadrant model of
adjustment orientations. One of these orientations ('deculturation')
describes the rejection of both host and ethnic groups. Since few
persons could be expected to support such an orientation, the authors
paid it no further attention, just as the present author has done. The
remaining three orientations described by Berry et al. correspond to
those of pluralism, monism and multiculturalism as described here.
One orientation overlooked in this quadrant model, however, is that
of interactionism, i.e. both host and ethnic groups changing so as to
become more similar to each other, finally producing a hybrid culture
which is common to all.

Berry et al. went on to construct a scale measuring approval of
multicultural ideology. Although the construction of this scale has
some weaknesses, it is of interest to note that there was overall
support for the multicultural orientation. Amongst the subject
characteristics that were found to be most closely related to approval
of multiculturalism were higher education, younger age, lower
ethnocentrism scale scores and a relatively high ranking amongst a
number of personal values for 'a world at peace'.

The multicultural alternative, as distinct from pluralism, monism
and interactionism, has also been described by Smolicz and Secombe
(1977), who refer to it as the 'dual system solution', i.e. when a person
becomes competent in at least two cultures and can move with ease
from one to the other. Taft himself has considered this possibility in
later papers (e.g. Taft, 1972, 1977b), though he has recently reiterated
his model (Taft, 1975) without any significant alteration in substance
to how it was originally presented in 1953, i.e. without provision for a
multicultural alternative. Interactionism in Taft's model is seen as a
gradual fusion of various diverse groups leading to eventual converg-
ence. Convergence also occurs in the multicultural context in that,
with the assimilation of immigrants, the host culture becomes
common to all, though a pluralistic diversity is also maintained
through the retention of ethnic (i.e. non-host) cultures by immigrants.
It might be argued that multiculturalism, as outlined here, is but a step in a process that will eventually lead to complete convergence, and that in this sense it is merely a stage within either the monist or interactionist approaches. While this might be true in some cases, the multicultural situation, at least in principle, can be an end state in itself and therefore needs to be distinguished from other adjustment orientations.

The aim of the present study is to determine what the distribution of immigrant adjustment orientations is when a multicultural alternative is included amongst the choices offered to respondents.

Study V

Subjects
Since schools are important institutions in shaping the future attitudes and behaviours of children, having also been described by Smolicz (1972) as 'the principal agency of Anglo-conformism' (p.59), it seemed relevant to examine the attitudes of future teachers in Australia towards how immigrants and receiving society members might best adjust to each other. To this end, the questionnaire used in this study was distributed to all part-time and full-time Diploma in Education students present at lectures at the University of Adelaide during the time of the survey. Of the 212 questionnaires returned, three were incorrectly completed and therefore discarded from further analysis.

A group of subjects approximating a general population sample was obtained in Klemzig, a metropolitan Adelaide suburb. Of the 480 questionnaires distributed, 368 were returned (76.7 per cent), though 28 of these could not be properly analysed and were thus excluded from the final results.

The last group examined were monoethnic Latvian males living in Sydney. Males with Latvian sounding names were noted from the electoral rolls for Bradfield, Chifley, Cook, Dundas, North Sydney, Parramatta, St George, and Sydney (all are electoral districts within metropolitan Sydney) until a list of seventy names and addresses was obtained. The procedure was the same as that used in the earlier described study of personality and adjustment in Latvian males, where the sample was also selected from electoral rolls. Only males were surveyed for the same reason as in that earlier study, i.e. the difficulty of obtaining a near representative sample of Latvian females when choosing subjects only on the basis of having a Latvian
sounding name. Of the seventy questionnaires sent, seven were returned because the subjects no longer resided at the address contacted. One respondent was of mixed ethnic parentage and was thus not included in the final sample. Of the remaining sixty-two subjects, forty returned completed questionnaires, i.e. a response rate of 64.5 per cent of contacted subjects.

The total number of respondents in all the groups surveyed was 590.

**Questionnaire**

A necessarily brief one page questionnaire was used containing items relating to the subjects' age, sex, ethnic background of first and second generation immigrants, ability to speak languages other than English (not counting those that may have been learnt in school) and four statements describing different immigrant adjustment orientations, of which the subjects were asked to choose the one they most agreed with. These statements are presented below:

Migrants should give up their cultures and languages and become like Australians

(Monism)

Migrants and Australians should learn about each other's cultures and languages, becoming more similar to each other and eventually forming one new common culture and language

(Interactionism)

Migrants should learn about the Australian way of life and learn to speak English while being encouraged to retain their original cultures and languages

(Multiculturalism)

Migrants should retain their cultures and languages and Australians theirs, there being no need for either to learn about the other's language or culture

(Pluralism)

**Procedure**

The education students completed and returned the questionnaires during their lectures, the questionnaire administrations being supervised by a staff member of the University of Adelaide Department of Education.

The Klemzig subject sample was obtained by distributing questionnaires to persons attending a polling booth in Klemzig during the 1977 Australian Federal elections. Since voting is compulsory for all
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Australian citizens who are 18 years or older, it was thought that a fairly representative sample could be obtained in a short time by surveying voters on election day. The survey was personally conducted by the author who stood near the entrance to the polling booth from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m., offering questionnaires to people as they arrived. In all twelve persons refused to accept questionnaires. Those accepting questionnaires either completed them immediately or took them inside the polling booth for completion. Not all of the latter, however, were subsequently returned.

Some biases obviously exist with such a sample. Unnaturalised immigrants are not represented at all. Similarly, a few immigrants whose English was so poor that they could not understand the questionnaire were not included in the sample. There might also be some differences between persons who vote at different times of the day – the booths being open from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. The restriction of the survey to one geographic area also had its hazards regarding representativeness. On the last point, however, earlier research on adjustment orientations has indicated that the proportions of subject preferences for the different orientations vary little between different cities in Australia.

Each subject in the Latvian sample received the questionnaire by post together with an explanatory letter and an addressed post-paid envelope in which to return the completed questionnaire. Approximately four weeks after the questionnaires had been posted a reminder note was sent to all subjects.

Results

Results were analysed separately for male and female subjects. The Klemzig sample was divided into three subgroups: Australians, British immigrants (including a few subjects from other English speaking countries such as Ireland and the U.S.A.) and immigrants from non-English speaking countries. The Diploma in Education students were divided into similar subgroups, though because of the small number of British immigrants (20 females, 16 males) these subjects were pooled with the Australian students. Analysis of the British student results before division into male and female groups revealed that their adjustment orientation preferences were little different from those of the Australian subject sample.

The distributions of adjustment orientation preferences amongst the various groups are presented in Table 9, where it can be seen that
102 Latvians in Australia

**TABLE 9** Immigrant adjustment orientations for various Australian and immigrant samples (n=590)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Orientation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians (Klemzig)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British immigrants (Klemzig)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-British immigrants (Klemzig)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians &amp; British (Dip.Ed.)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-British immigrants (Dip.Ed.)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvians (Sydney)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians (Klemzig)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British immigrants (Klemzig)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-British immigrants (Klemzig)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians &amp; British (Dip.Ed.)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-British immigrants (Dip.Ed.)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

pluralism received negligible support (0.7 per cent of all subjects). Monism was chosen most frequently in the Klemzig Australian male
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sample, followed by Klemzig British immigrant males and Klemzig Australian females. Few subjects in the remaining groups expressed agreement with the monistic orientation. Interactionism was supported by about a quarter of the respondents in all groups. Multiculturalism proved to be the most popular alternative, being chosen by between half and three-quarters of the subjects in the different groups.

Regarding the ability to speak languages other than English, 24.9 per cent of the total Klemzig sample and 26.3 per cent of all the education students reported being able to speak one or more languages other than English. These percentages are very similar to that obtained (27.5 per cent) in a recent study with more than four hundred Adelaide high school students (Putniņš, 1978b). The extent of multilingualism in the Australian and British immigrant samples is very limited: only 3.2 per cent of all the Australian and British immigrant subjects in the Klemzig sample reported being able to speak one other language. Slightly more (6.9 per cent) of the Australian and British background education students reported being multilingual. On the other hand, some atrophying of ethnic linguistic skills is evident in the non-British samples, with 85.6 per cent of the Klemzig immigrant sample and 88.0 per cent of the immigrant background education students stating that they had command of at least one other language.

Discussion

Results for the pluralist and monist orientations were in many respects similar to those obtained in earlier research. Pluralism proved to be the least popular orientation in all the groups examined, while monism received sizable support only in the general population (i.e. Klemzig) Australian male, Australian female and British male immigrant samples, though the percentage support for monism within these groups (ranging from 13.3 per cent to 18.0 per cent) was less than that for similar groups (20 per cent to 47 per cent) reported by Taft (1963). This is possibly a reflection of the previously observed increase with time of tolerance towards immigrants by persons of predominantly Anglo-Saxon background living in Australia.

The Australian and British immigrant background education students expressed little support for monism, in contrast to the general population samples. This is consistent with Beswick and Hills'
(1972) findings that ethnocentrism tends to increase with subject age and decrease with the number of years of education – the education students being both younger, and presumably, more highly educated than the general population samples.

Whereas approximately two-thirds of all respondents in earlier studies chose interactionism as the preferred adjustment alternative, only about a quarter of the respondents selected this orientation in the present study. The decline in support for interactionism – sometimes referred to as the ‘melting-pot’ approach – is due to a majority of subjects in all groups examined selecting the multicultural orientation. The large support expressed for multiculturalism indicates, as far as popular opinion is concerned, that it is an approach to the problem of immigrant and host group relationships which needs serious consideration. It also highlights the inadequacy of earlier research through the omission of this orientation amongst the choices offered to respondents. However, while the three orientations of monism, pluralism and interactionism fail to embrace all possible adjustment orientations, the addition of multiculturalism still does not exhaust all possibilities. Other variations of adjustment orientations are conceivable. For example, while the four orientation alternatives presented to subjects in the present study were phrased in a very general manner and applied broadly to the various areas of culture and language, it is possible to adopt different orientations in different spheres of cultural life. An example of this would be if immigrants were to adopt a multicultural approach in the area of language, a plural approach to family structures, a monistic approach regarding dress and an interactionist approach with respect to foods (a good example of the latter being the pineapple pizza).

Although the emphasis in the present survey has been on changes by immigrants rather than by the host group, it is possible within a multicultural context for host group members also to adopt some aspects of the cultural life of various immigrant groups. As was earlier mentioned, this has already occurred to some extent in the area of foods. Although, as is seen in the survey results above, relatively few Anglo-Australians can speak languages other than English, this might change in the future. The notion of multicultural education has become popular amongst Australian educationalists in recent years, and to judge from the large proportion of education students supporting multiculturalism, this trend is likely to continue. The gradual introduction of immigrant languages into school curricula has made
these languages accessible not only to children of immigrant background, but also to Anglo-Australians. The teaching of foreign languages at early ages, as has happened in some primary schools (following the example of many European countries), has added further to the chances of bilingualism increasing amongst Anglo-Australians.

Multiculturalism in many aspects of the lives of immigrants in Australia is already a reality. Whether this will be maintained, particularly with regard to the considerable linguistic resources which Australia has at present, will largely depend not only on the attitudes and behaviours of individuals, but also on changes within important socialising agencies within the community, particularly schools. Whether such changes will occur to a degree sufficient to sustain immigrant cultures for more than one or two generations still remains to be seen.

Regarding Latvian immigrants and their adjustment orientations, the results obtained in this study were consistent with prior expectations. Monism was not selected by any Latvian respondents. Similarly, pluralism received negligible support, possibly because many see this alternative as being impractical without geographic segregation of the groups involved, as occurs to a large extent in countries such as Belgium and Canada. Certainly this is not the case in present-day Australia. While residential concentrations of some ethnic groups do occur, there appears to be a trend for such concentrations to decline over time (Burnley, 1977). Reversal of this trend, so that contacts between different groups are minimised, is probably seen as not being feasible, irrespective of whether it would be desirable or not.

Of the remaining two orientations, multiculturalism allows retention of ethnicity to a greater degree than does interactionism. Latvian male immigrants not only chose the multicultural alternative more frequently than interactionism, as did all the other groups surveyed, but chose multiculturalism proportionally more often than any other male subject group. While the differences between the results for the Latvian and student samples are only marginal, comparisons of the Latvian sample with the Australian and immigrant general population samples reveal more substantial differences. The Latvian subjects selected the multicultural orientation significantly more often than either the Klemzig Australian ($\chi^2 = 5.13, df = 1, p < .05$) or non-British ($\chi^2 = 2.68, df = 1, p = .05$) samples. There was a similar, though non-significant trend ($\chi^2 = 2.07, df = 1, .05 < p < .10$) in comparison with
the Klemzig British immigrant subjects. This result is likely to be a manifestation of the earlier discussed 'historic responsibility' felt by many refugees toward the perpetuation of their traditional cultures, the continuation of which is seen as being under threat in their homelands. This is particularly so for non-Russian groups whose territories are within the Soviet Union. Such attitudes explain why Latvians chose multiculturalism more frequently than did other groups, including the non-British immigrant samples — which were largely made up of voluntary immigrants.

In summary, we have seen that the vast majority of respondents, including Anglo-Australians, expressed support for adjustment orientations which, to greater or lesser degrees, allow maintenance of immigrant cultures and languages. The most popular orientation selected was multiculturalism; an orientation which involves immigrants becoming proficient in the host culture and language while at the same time preserving their original ethnic characteristics. A greater proportion of Latvian immigrants chose the multicultural alternative than did other groups. Historical factors relating to their emigration are likely to have heightened the motivation of these subjects to preserve their culture, the desire for which may be interpreted as being reflected in their support for multiculturalism. There was some support for earlier research findings indicating weaker ethnocentric attitudes in subjects of younger age and higher educational attainment.

More generally, the utility of the multidimensional immigrant adjustment model was further demonstrated by the results of this study. Multiculturalism, which proved to be the most frequently selected adjustment orientation, can only be properly conceptualised within a multidimensional framework, i.e. when ethnic and host characteristics are seen to lie on independent dimensions. Failure to separate these two dimensions leads to a restriction of possible adjustment alternatives, which in turn limits the possible scope of empirical research.
Summary and Conclusions

It will be evident that the present investigation has had a dual purpose. While the main subjects studied were Latvian immigrants in Australia, a major aim having been to further our understanding of their cultural and social adjustment, the study of these subjects has also served to demonstrate the heuristic value of the multi-dimensional immigrant adjustment model. Both these aims were pursued through two strands of empirical research: one examining psychological well-being and personality in relation to the adjustment of first generation Latvian immigrants, the other being the examination of problems related to ethnic identification in second generation Latvians. Both these lines of research led to consideration of adjustment orientations, a topic that was examined in greater detail in the final study.

With regard to specific research findings, it was found that the incidences of psychopathology and suicide amongst Baltic immigrants, including Latvians, were higher than those observed for the general population. It was argued that the poorer psychological adjustment of some of these immigrants might be in part due to various forms of alienation. Social and cultural isolation, economic hardships, loss of status by former professional workers, loss of homeland and various other stresses inherent in the process of migration have probably all contributed to increasing the risk of psychological maladjustment. While these stresses are to some degree inevitable, they might be cushioned or minimised if immigrants maintained ties with their original ethnic groups and cultures. For many this might provide support, stability and a sense of continuity which could aid them in coping and adapting to a society and culture which is less familiar to them. In other words, a multicultural approach that allows immigrants to maintain their ethnic cultures while assimilating to the host group could prove to have benefits for
the mental health of first generation immigrants. Some support for this view was offered by the finding with first generation Latvian immigrants that increased alienation from the ethnic group was related to an increase in scores on a personality scale measuring emotionality and anxiety (neuroticism). In this same study it was also found that extraversion and independence were quite strongly related to assimilation. The latter relationships were in the expected direction in that more independent persons could be expected to feel less constrained by previous socialisation to adopt new behaviours, while sociability could be expected to aid the establishment of new social contacts outside of one's original membership group.

Second generation Latvians were examined with regard to their ethnic identification. Fragmentation in this area was evident amongst samples of second generation ethnic maintainers in Australia and North America. These subjects displayed positive identification with various Latvian groups, including Latvians in Latvia before World War II and Latvians as they might be imagined to be at some time in the future should Latvia again become politically independent. Weaker positive identification was expressed with host group members. Latvians in Latvia at present were perceived in a quite different manner from the other Latvian groups, with no positive identification being exhibited in this instance. Various factors have probably contributed to the apparent psychological alienation from present-day Latvians in Latvia. These are likely to include lack of personal and cultural contacts; real differences between the respective socio-political and economic systems under which Latvians in Latvia and those in the West live; and evaluatively negative attitudes reinforced by the older generation of Latvian immigrants. The last often resembles an overlearning procedure aimed to ensure that their children will never be attracted to communist ideology. What effect this will have on the émigré Latvian communities in the long term is difficult to predict. One possibility is that the lack of identification with not only the circumstances in which Latvians in Latvia at present live, but with the people themselves, might eventually lead to a decrease in political activity directed towards issues concerning Latvians in Latvia. In other words, as identification decreases so the manifestations of empathy and concern might also decrease. It would be of interest to clarify further the factors influencing ethnic identification by determining both the perceptions of first generation Latvians with respect to different Latvian subgroups and
the identifications of voluntary immigrants in Australia regarding their ethnic subgroup.

Problems relating to ethnic identification amongst second generation Latvians were further pursued by examination of the development of differential identification between host and ethnic groups. It was found that such differentiation was already evident in subjects eight years of age. This finding might have implications for educational programs aimed at fostering better understanding and increased tolerance between different ethnic groups and members of receiving societies. Such programs are likely to have their greatest effect if introduced at the time when differential identification and attitudes towards various groups are in the formative stages of development. Further studies will, however, be required to determine to what degree the results with Latvian subjects generalise to other ethnic groups.

The trend in recent years for multiculturalism to be espoused by various public figures such as Al Grassby, a former Australian Federal Minister of Immigration and later Commissioner for Community Relations, was reflected in majority support for such an orientation in a variety of groups surveyed, including Latvian immigrants. In the case of many Latvians in Australia, both first and second generation, multiculturalism is already the status quo. Most subjects have retained their Latvian ethnicity to a considerable degree while at the same time being socially accepted by host-group members and being familiar with both the host culture and language. A similar situation obtains in a number of other ethnic groups in Australia. Studies with second generation Latvians (Galeja, 1969; Proske, 1972) have indicated that bilingual, i.e. linguistically integrated, Latvian children do not appear to be disadvantaged with regard to either intellectual development or social adjustment compared with children whose knowledge of Latvian is poor or monolingual host group children.

While multiculturalism is to a large extent a reality in Australia, the question arises as to whether this will continue to be so in the future. Survey results suggest that few Anglo-Australians and British immigrants have active command of other languages while some erosion of ethnic language skills is evident amongst non-British immigrants. Although changes are occurring in the Australian educational system, with an increase in multicultural and immigrant language teaching programs, a relatively recent and very extensive survey found that only 3 per cent of non-British background children were studying the
language of their ethnic origin in Australian schools (Smolicz and Harris, 1977). This situation may change somewhat in the next few years, though it still remains an open question as to whether retention of ethnic characteristics to any significant degree will continue beyond the third immigrant generation.

At a more general level, the various studies described here have illustrated the use of the multidimensional adjustment model in different facets of research on immigrants. The results obtained lend support to the notion that the separation of ethnic and host characteristics into independent dimensions is not only a valid theoretical distinction, but is in large measure consistent with concrete reality, i.e. adoptions and rejections of host and ethnic characteristics often do occur independently of one another. It is the present author's opinion that through the application of this model to empirical research a more accurate picture of immigrant adjustment is gained than is offered by research which fails to distinguish between the processes of alienation and assimilation.
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The series of studies presented in this book constitute the most detailed psychological investigation so far of Latvians anywhere in the world. It discusses the history of Latvian immigration and settlement in Australia, mental health, personality characteristics and immigrant adjustment and other aspects of the Latvian community in Australia. It will be invaluable in assisting better understanding of the problems faced by immigrants in Australia.