CULTURE CONFLICT IN AUSTRALIA: REACTIONS TO INTERGENERATION DISPARITY IN SECOND-GENERATION IMMIGRANT AND AUSTRALIAN ADOLESCENTS

Michael D. Hills

This thesis was submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in The Australian National University

August, 1973

This thesis describes original research carried out by the author in the Department of Psychology of the Australian National University from February 1967 to August 1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Social psychological research of the type described in this report is only possible with the assistance, encouragement and advice of members of the society which is being studied. The author is therefore indebted to a great many individuals and organisations for their assistance in making this study a reality.

Indebtedness to my supervisor, Dr. D. G. Beswick, of the Australian National University, is beyond recompense. His interest, encouragement, and technical expertise have been unfailingly available over six years. Sufficient appreciation cannot be expressed.

Thanks are also due to the Department of Psychology, Australian National University, for the facilities and financial support which were offered and accepted with gratitude. Professor Gibb, Professor Provins, Dr. Margaret Middleton and Dr. Darroch have played a considerable part both in getting the study under way and offering advice and positive criticism of the first version of the report. Readers whose critical comments were useful in preparing a second version include Mr. I. J. McKissack, Department of Psychology, University of Waikato, New Zealand; Professor G. M. Vaughan, Department of Psychology, University of Auckland, New Zealand; and Professor S. B. Hammond, Department of Psychology, University of Melbourne, Victoria. My thanks are due to them. Computer programming assistance by Mr. Paul Moens, Departmental Research Assistant, was invaluable. Similarly, the care taken by Mrs. Jess Giddings and Mrs. Nola Blundell in typing the questionnaires was deeply appreciated.

Fieldwork for a pilot study was with the assistance of Mr. Fairbairn, New South Wales Secretary of the Good Neighbour Council. My thanks are extended to him.

The Melbourne fieldwork was carried out from a base at the Faculty of Education, Monash University, and thanks are offered to its staff, both academic and clerical, for making this possible. Especial gratitude is expressed to Professor Taft, Professor in Psychology, and to Mr. McCulloch, Senior Lecturer in Education, for assistance in making contact with the Melbourne community.

Primary contact with the organisations involved with immigrants in Melbourne was through the Good Neighbour Council of Victoria. Its secretary at that time, Miss Thelma Jarrett, and two of its council members, Fr. Murphy and Fr. Boyazoglu, were extremely helpful and full gratitude is extended to them.

Through them and the Monash University Education Faculty contact was established with a number of workers with immigrant families in Melbourne. Appreciation of their interest and practical assistance is expressed to each of: Rev. David Cox, European-Australian Christian Fellowship; Mrs. Gordon, the United Kingdom Settlers Association; Mr. Allan Farmer, Mrs. Madeleine Reid, and Mrs. Bobby Shaw, Noble Park Psychology and Guidance Branch of the Victorian Education Department; Mr. Thomson, Clayton Technical College; Miss Fitzpatrick, Dandenong Girls' High School; Mr. Nuttall and Miss Simpson, Doveton Technical College; Mr. Douglas and Mr. Hunter, Vermont High School; Fr. Antonio, Scalabrinian Fathers, Carlton; Br. Nangle, Christian Brothers College, Clifton Hill; Sr. Mary Adela, Academy of Mary Immaculate, Fitzroy;

Sr. Mary Thomas and Sr. Concepta, S. Euphrasia School, Abbotsford; Mr. Nicklyn, Mr. Horswell and Mr. Cracknell, Fibremakers Ltd.; Mrs. Huebner, Robert Bosch Co.; Mrs. Unikowski, Political Science Department, Melbourne University; Mrs. Lier, Holland-Australia Club, Northern Suburbs Branch; Mrs. Ihle, Australian German Welfare Society; Dr. Benyei, Australian Council of Churches; and Fr. Morakis, Greek Community Church, Praharan.

Moreover, the readiness with which the families involved in the study opened their doors made fieldwork a pleasure rather than a task, and this was deeply appreciated.

The author was extremely fortunate in the unusually accurate and devoted expertise applied by two typists to this report. Mrs. Heather Drury typed the whole of the first version, including the tables and appendices, and Mrs. Diane Rattray typed the text of the report in its present form. Their patience and care are gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, whatever this project has achieved is due as much to my wife as to myself. The long hours of coding data, sorting schedules, and correcting and completing proofs (with the assistance of Mrs. Maureen Kaye) were only exceeded in their value by her complete belief in the study and its author. Without her, neither would have reached fulfilment.

ABSTRACT

The adolescent born into the host society of his immigrant parents has to adapt to the cultures of both his parents and his peers, yet has full recourse to neither. Culture conflict appears probable. Conversely research on the contemporary Western adolescent describes him as maturing into a rapidly changing society so different from that in which his parents grew up that he too is in a state essentially of culture conflict. Literature on the adolescent and Australian immigration predicted greater conflict for immigrants' children, although some writers expected less than that found in the United States.

Questionnaires were administered in the Melbourne homes of 107 second generation 14-16-year-olds and their parents from the United Kingdom, Holland, Germany, Italy and Greece, plus 39 Australian children and their parents, matched on the child's age, sex, scholastic achievement, religion, and socioeconomic status of parents.

Absolute differences on items of two value scales indicated degree of disparity between the social norms of the child and those of his parents. Australianism Disparity measured disagreement on broad social issues, and Intergeneration Disparity on familial norms. Categories of predicted adolescent reactions to conflict derived from consistency theory were rejection of parents, rejection of peers, rejection of social mores, and alienation. Instruments designed to measure these variables were satisfactory, excepting indices of Australianism Disparity and identification with parents.

Australian children scored higher on Australianism Disparity than immigrants, especially Northwest Europeans. I-G Disparity means

did not differ as all children reported some disagreement, but did not realise how great it was and all groups thought their peers were less conforming than they were themselves. Northwest European children identified more closely with their parents than Australian or United Kingdom children. Peer-group identification was highest in United Kingdom children and lowest in Northwest European children. Rejection of social mores by Northwest Europeans was less than by Australian and United Kingdom children. European children evinced less alienation than Australian or United Kingdom adolescents, although the means for all groups were above the third quartile of Hughes' adult standardisation sample. Children of all groups scored higher than their parents on Australianism, when scored following Taft's original specifications, but the difference was greater for European than for Australian or United Kingdom children.

Australianism Disparity correlated with rejection of social mores, especially for Southern European children, but did not predict other reactions for any group. Greater I-G Disparity predicted stronger rejection of parents, particularly in European children, although Southern European adolescents in conflict at the same time gave evidence of attempting to identify with both parents and peers. It correlated with identification with peers, but most strongly for United Kingdom and Southern European children. Both rejection of social mores and alienation were predicted by I-G Disparity for all groups.

Thus disparity of norms between parents and child predicted rejection of parents by European subjects, identification with peers by United Kingdom and Southern European children, and rejection of society

and its conventions by all groups. Although conflict reactions were more widespread in Southern European children than in others, the strongest finding was that all groups experienced conflict and reacted by rejecting adult society and its mores. Second-generation adolescents, and especially Southern Europeans, were in somewhat greater conflict than were Australians, but this was a small proportion of the dissatisfaction with adult society evident in all groups. Although the nature and extent of the conflict aroused varied to some degree in the children interviewed, the generation gap and its consequences were substantial both in second-generation adolescents and in their Australian peers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	vi
LIST OF APPENDICES	xviii
LIST OF TABLES	xx
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Outline of this Report	6
CHAPTER 2 A CONTEMPORARY DEFINITION OF CULTURE CONFLICT	7
Culture Conflict and the Generation Gap	12
Changes in Contemporary Society	14
Family Changes	14
Changes in the Adolescent Self	15
Changes in Education	16
Societal Changes	17
Effects of Social Change on Adolescent Relationships	20
Contemporary Parent-Adolescent Relationships	20
Contemporary Peer-group Relationships	22
The Socialization Function of the Contemporary School	24
Adolescent and Adult in Contemporary Society	26
CHAPTER 3 PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES OF ADOLESCENT CULTURE CONFLICT	31

page

Influential American Studies 31

Overseas and Australian Studies - A Link 43

Two Australian Studies of the Second Generation 45

CHAPTER 4 CONFLICT BETWEEN CULTURES AND THE GENERATIONS EXPERIENCED BY AUSTRALIAN-BORN ADOLESCENT CHILDREN OF AUSTRALIAN AND IMMIGRANT PARENTS 53

Advanced Acculturation of the Second Generation 58

Prejudice in Australians 70

Tension between Parents 74

Adolescent Independence 82

Specific Clashes 88

The Family 100

Causes of Culture Conflict Specific to Cultural Groups 120

United Kingdom 121

Northwest Europeans 123

Southern Europeans 124

Conclusion 127

CHAPTER 5 A MODEL FOR THE STUDY OF CULTURE CONFLICT 130

The Measurement of Culture Conflict and its Consequences 133

page

CHAPTER 6 SUBJECTS, SAMPLE CONTROLS AND PROCEDURE 142

PILOT STUDY 142

SUBJECTS 142

Selection of Subjects - Immigrant 146

Selection of Subjects - Australian 148

SAMPLE CONTROLS 150

Familial Controls 150

Birthplace of Parents 150

Socioeconomic Status 152

Contact with Both Parents 155

Years since Immigration 157

Age of Parents 159

Subject Controls 160

Age of Subjects 160

Birthplace of Child 162

Age of Subject at Date of Parents' Immigration 164

Years of Secondary Education of Subjects 166

Proportion of Children Working 168

Sex Distribution 168

Proportion of Subjects in State Schools 171

Religion 173

INTERVIEWING PROCEDURE 175

CHAPTER 7 SCALES USED TO MEASURE VALUE DISPARITY 182

page

Australianism Disparity 186

Intergeneration Disparity 191

Combined Self-Parents Disparity 192

Combined Peers-Parents Disparity 196

Combination of the Self-Parents and Peers-Parents Disparity Scales 200

CHAPTER 8 MEASURES OF ADOLESCENT REACTION TO INTERGENERATIONAL VALUE DISPARITY 209

(1) Measurement of Identification with Parents 209

(a) Parental Compliance 209

(b) Parental Deference 212

(2) Measurement of Identification with Peer Group 215

Peer-Group Importance Indices 217

(a) Number of Friends Listed 217

(b) Relative Age of Friends 217

(c) Distance of Friends' Homes from that of Respondent 218

(d) Proportion of Friends in a Different School or Occupation 218

(e) Number of Activities Engaged in with Friends 219

Combination of Measures to form the P.G.I. Index 220

page

(3) Measurement of Rejection of Social Mores 222

(a) The Wrongdoing Rating Scale 223

(b) Socially Unacceptable Behaviour Questionnaire 224

Correlation between Measures of Rejection of Social Mores 227

(4) Rejection of Society as a Whole 227

Alienation 228

CHAPTER 9 COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES ACROSS NATIONAL AND CULTURAL GROUPS 236

Analysis of Results 236

Comparison with Australian Control Group 236

Differences among Immigrant Sample Mean Scores 240

Comparison of Mean Scores across National and Cultural Groups 240

A. PARENT-CHILD VALUE DISPARITY 242

(1) Australianism Disparity 242

(2) Intergeneration Disparity 244

B. SCORES ON MEASURES OF REACTION TO DISPARITY 246

(1) Identification with Parents 246

(a) Parental Compliance 246

page

(b) Parental Deference 247

(2) Identification with Peers 252

(3) Rejection of Social Mores 255

(a) Socially Unacceptable Behaviour 256

(b) Wrongdoing Rating Scale 259

(4) Rejection of Both Reference Groups 261

Alienation 262

CHAPTER 10 PREDICTION OF REACTION MEASURE SCORES FROM DISPARITY MEASURE SCORES 268

Analysis of Results 268

Comparison with Australian Control Group 269

Differences among Immigrant Sample Correlations 270

Multiple Correlation 270

A. IDENTIFICATION WITH PARENTS 272

(1) Parental Identification and Australianism Disparity 272

(a) Parental Compliance and Australianism Disparity 272

(b) Parental Deference and Australianism Disparity 273

(c) Multiple Correlation: Parental Identification Measures as Predictors of Australianism Disparity 273

page

(2) Parental Identification and Inter-generation Disparity 273

(a) Parental Compliance and I-G Disparity 273

(b) Parental Deference and I-G Disparity 280

(c) Multiple Correlation: Parental Identification and I-G Disparity 280

(3) Multiple Correlation: Disparity Measures as Predictors of Identification with Parents 283

(a) Disparity Measures and Parental Compliance 283

(b) Disparity Measures and Parental Deference 283

B. IDENTIFICATION WITH THE PEER GROUP 286

(1) Australianism Disparity 286

(a) Peer-Group Importance and Australianism Disparity 286

(2) Intergeneration Disparity 288

(a) Peer-Group Importance and I-G Disparity 288

(3) Multiple Correlation: Disparity Measures as Predictors of Peer-Group Importance 290

page

C. REJECTION OF SOCIAL MORES 292

(1) Australianism Disparity 292

(a) Wrongdoing Rating and Australianism Disparity 292

(b) Socially Unacceptable Behaviour and Australianism Disparity 292

(c) Multiple Correlation: Measures of Rejection of Social Mores as Predictors of Australianism Disparity 296

(2) Intergenerational Disparity 298

(a) Wrongdoing Rating and I-G Disparity 298

(b) Socially Unacceptable Behaviour and I-G Disparity 300

(c) Multiple Correlation: Measures of Rejection of Social Mores as Predictors of I-G Disparity 300

(3) Multiple Correlation: Disparity Measures as Predictors of Rejection of Social Mores 304

(a) Disparity Measures and Wrongdoing Rating 304

(b) Disparity Measures and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour 306

page

D. ALIENATION 308

(1) Alienation and Australianism Disparity 308

(2) Alienation and I-G Disparity 309

(3) Multiple Correlation: Disparity Measures as Predictors of Alienation 312

CHAPTER 11 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS 317

THE SIZE OF THE GAP 320

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS IN INTER-GENERATIONAL DISPARITY 324

Australianism Disparity 326

Intergeneration Disparity 332

REACTIONS TO INTERGENERATION CULTURE CONFLICT 333

Total Sample 333

Instruments 337

Differences between Cultural Groups in Reaction to Intergenerational Conflict 344

Identification with Parents 345

Peer-Group Importance 347

Rejection of Social Mores 351

Alienation 353

BIBLIOGRAPHY 357

APPENDICES 374

APPENDICES

Demographic Data Sheets - Parents and Children

APPENDIX I — Parents

APPENDIX II — Children

Questionnaires

APPENDIX III — I-G Questionnaire - Parents

APPENDIX IV — Opinion Questionnaire

APPENDIX V — I-G Questionnaire - Teenagers I

APPENDIX VI — I-G Questionnaire - Teenagers II

APPENDIX VII — I-G Questionnaire - Teenagers III

APPENDIX VIII — You and Your Friends Questionnaire, Pt. 1

APPENDIX IX — You and Your Friends Questionnaire, Pt. 2a

APPENDIX X — You and Your Friends Questionnaire, Pt. 2b

APPENDIX XI — You and Your Friends Questionnaire, Pt. 2c

APPENDIX XII — Attitudes Questionnaire

APPENDIX XIII — Social Importance Questionnaire

APPENDIX XIV — Behaviour Questionnaire

APPENDIX XV (a) — A - Scale Answer Sheet

APPENDIX XV (b) — A - Scale

Statistical Corrections used in making Multiple Comparisons

APPENDIX XVI — Calculation of Critical t Values for the Comparison of Mean Scores of the Australian Control Group and Immigrant Samples

APPENDIX XVII Calculation of F Ratios required for Significant Differences between pairs of Immigrant Samples

Demographic Data Sheet - Australian Control Group Selection

APPENDIX XIX Personal Data Schedule

LIST OF TABLES

		page
6.1	Birthplaces of Immigrant Parents	151
6.2	Mean Scores on Broom-Jones Scale of Socio-economic Status by Father's Occupation	154
6.3	Mean Scores on Lancaster-Jones Rating Scale of Melbourne Suburbs	156
6.4	Number of Children for whom Both Parents were Contacted, One Parent was Unavailable or One Parent was dead	158
6.5	Age, Years since Immigration, and Age at Immigration of Parents	161
6.6	Mean Age in Years of All Children	163
6.7	Birthplace of Immigrant Children	165
6.8	Mean Age in Years of Immigrant Children at Date of Parents' Immigration. Australian-born Subjects Scored Negatively	167
6.9	Mean Years of Secondary Education for All Children	169
6.10	Number of Children Working and Number of Children at School	170
6.11	Sex Distribution Among Children	172
6.12	Number of Children at Church Schools	174
6.13	Methods by which Questionnaires were Administered to Parents	180

page

7.1	Correlation between Australianism Scores of Child and Parents	189
7.2	Comparison of Self vs Actual Parents Mean Score with Self vs Perceived Parents Mean Score	195
7.3	Comparison of Peers vs Actual Parents Mean Score with Peers vs Perceived Parents Mean Score	199
7.4	Comparison of Combined Peers-Parents Mean Score with Combined Self-Parents Mean Score	201
7.5	Correlation of Combined Peers-Parents Mean Score and Combined Self-Parents Mean Score	203
7.6	Social Importance Mean Scores	206
8.1	Correlation Matrix of P.G.I. Measures	221
8.2	Variables, Measures and Questionnaire Titles	231
9.1	Australianism Disparity Mean T-Scores	243
9.2	Mean Intergeneration Disparity T-Scores	245
9.3	Parental Compliance Mean T-Scores	248
9.4	Parental Deference Mean T-Scores	250
9.5	Peer Group Importance Mean T-Scores	253
9.6	Mean Raw Scores on Components of Peer Group Importance Measure	254
9.7	Socially Unacceptable Behaviour Mean T-Scores	257
9.8	Comparison of Immigrant Cultural Group Mean Scores on Socially Unacceptable Behaviour Measure	258

page

9.9	Wrongdoing Rating Scale Mean T-Scores	260
9.10	Alienation Scale Mean T-Scores	263
9.11	Series of F-tests of Differences between Pairs of Means on Alienation Scale	265
9.12	Comparison of Immigrant Cultural Groups on Alienation	264
9.13	Mean T-Scores on Disparity and Reaction Measures for National and Cultural Groups	267
10.1	Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Parental Compliance T-Scores	274
10.2	Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Parental Deference T-Scores	275
10.3	Multiple Correlation between Parental Identification Predictors and Australianism Disparity Criterion	276
10.4	Correlation between Intergenerational Disparity (Actual) and Parental Compliance T-Scores	279
10.5	Correlation between Intergenerational Disparity and Parental Deference T-Scores	281
10.6	Multiple Correlation between Parental Identification Predictors and Intergenerational Disparity Criterion	282
10.7	Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Parental Compliance	284
10.8	Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Parental Deference	285

page

10.9 Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Peer-Group Importance T-Scores 287

10.10 Correlation between Mean Intergenerational Disparity and Peer-Group Importance T-Scores 289

10.11 Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Peer-Group Importance Index 291

10.12 Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Wrongdoing Rating T-Scores 293

10.13 Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour T-Scores 295

10.14 Multiple Correlation between Social Mores Rejection Measures and Australianism Disparity 297

10.15 Correlation between Intergenerational Disparity and Wrongdoing Rating T-Scores 299

10.16 Correlation between Intergenerational Disparity and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour T-Scores 301

10.17 Multiple Correlation between Social Mores Rejection Measures and Intergenerational Disparity Index 303

10.18 Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Wrongdoing Rating 305

10.19 Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour 307

page

10.20 Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Alienation T-Scores 310

10.21 Correlation between Intergenerational Disparity and Alienation T-Scores 311

10.22 Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Alienation 313

10.23 Prediction of Reactions to Conflict by Australianism Disparity 315

10.24 Prediction of Reactions to Conflict by I-G Disparity 316

XVI.1 Error rates adjusted by Bonferroni t method 398

XVI.2 Critical values of t required for Australian vs Immigrant comparisons 399

XVII.1 Values of F' for 3-group and 5-group comparisons 400

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

"Most young migrants - about 97 per cent - settle down well to life in Australia;" (Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council, 1960, p.3). This statement, somewhat surprising in both its serenity and specificity, was made in a Report by a Special Committee of the Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council chaired by the Honourable Mr. Justice Dovey, in Feburary, 1960.

Australia had been absorbing immigrants and their families into its society at an average rate equivalent to approximately one per cent of its population per annum for 13 years (1947-1960). Two major reasons behind the encouragement of this immigrant influx were development and defence. However a third reason, and equally important, was simply to populate Australia in order to counter the claim that it was not doing its share in feeding and housing the world's rapidly growing population, but to do so with Europeans rather than Asians (Price, 1971). Children, therefore, were very important. Many had arrived with their families and others had been born of immigrant parents in Australia. Consequently Australian society, particularly its social scientists and officials, wanted to know how the children of immigrant families were coping with life in Australia. An answer provided to their enquiries was the Dovey Report.

It was based on a survey of the opinions of a sample of 1,000 teachers, who were sent a questionnaire asking how immigrant children were faring in their classes. A number of statements in addition to the one cited above were made in the Report claiming that immigrant children were assimilating well and quickly. Australian children were

reported as friendly and accepting, and the scholastic achievement of immigrant children in the schools was described as excellent. Leadership by immigrant children was asserted to be better than average by 41 per cent of teachers. Little difference between immigrant children and their Australian peers in school social activities was found. And so the Report continued. Problems were recognised, but the overall tone was optimistic and reassuring.

Serious doubts concerning methods of sampling, questionnaire design and administration, and interpretation of findings have been expressed about the Report (Brennan, 1960; Caldwell, 1960). Nevertheless it was important in the questions it raised. Are children of immigrants in Australia assimilating more successfully than their parents? Are they as happy as, or perhaps happier than their Australian peers? Are children of immigrant parents from different cultural backgrounds assimilating with equal ease? Do children born in Australia of immigrants experience the same problems and cope with them in the same ways as do children who immigrate with their parents? Are immigrant children accepted by their Australian peers as equals? Finally, what is the quality and size of the "generation gap" between immigrant children and their parents? Is it greater or smaller than that experienced by their Australian peers?

Many authors (see the two extensive bibliographies on Australian immigration edited by Price, 1966a, 1971) have discussed these questions and suggested answers to them. However the great majority have written from a demographic or sociological viewpoint, and much of the work surveyed in the following chapters is of this nature. Relatively few psycho-

logical investigations into the processes of assimilation and adjustment in the immigrant child have been reported. Some notable exceptions include Oeser & Hammond, 1954; the work of Taft and his colleagues (Taft, 1965); Adler, 1966; Heiss, 1966; Kern, 1966; Richardson, 1967; Doczy, 1969; and Johnston, 1969. However the majority of these were concerned with the immigrant family as a whole, rather than with the psychology of the child. Moreover they concentrated primarily on children who had immigrated with their parents, often not discriminating between them and second-generation children of immigrants.

The study reported here therefore sets out to investigate some of these questions within a social psychological frame of reference. Previous work (Hills, 1966; Vaughan, 1964), in New Zealand, had found that a popularly held image of lack of prejudice, ethnic equality, and strong identification by children of a minority group with the majority society was not in accord with the facts. More importantly, it had been able to make some positive suggestions of ways of dealing with a problem which, although unrecognised by many adults, was causing personality conflict for a large number of ethnic-minority children. The present study attempted to shed some light on whether or not the widely-held opinion epitomised by the Report cited above was soundly based. If it were, and children of immigrants were experiencing little difficulty in assimilating, the interesting question would be raised of why this was so in Australia when studies in the United States (Child, 1943; Sherif & Sherif, 1964; Singer & Singer, 1969) had found the stress undergone by immigrant children, and especially second-generation immigrant children, to be both peculiar and intense. If it were not, and

such children were experiencing excessive conflict, it was hoped to suggest at least areas and ways in which their problems could be examined, and perhaps to put forward means of coping with them.

Obtaining the representative sample necessary to establish reliable findings of this type for all immigrant children was impracticable for an investigation of this size. Consequently a limited age-group was sought. Studies overseas (Sherif & Sherif, 1964) and in Australia (Dunphy, 1969) showed that the adolescent aged between 14 and 16 years is more likely than younger or older children to be in a situation of having to choose between his parents and his peers as reference groups. Therefore it was decided to restrict the project to subjects of this age range. Research overseas (Child, 1943) had found intergenerational culture conflict to be greater in the second-generation child of immigrants than in either children who had immigrated with their parents, or children of host society parents. Investigations in Australia by Zubrzycki (1964) and Hay, Arens & Kern (1967) had suggested that this might be the case in Australia also. Therefore, if tension between the child and either his immigrant parents or his Australian peers existed, it was considered that it should be most evident in the Australian-born child of immigrant parents.

Although there were immigrants from many cultural backgrounds in Australia in 1970, the largest groups in 1954, when the 15-year-old was born, were from the United Kingdom, Southern Europe, Eastern Europe, and Northwest Europe, in that order (Pyne & Price, 1971). However most Eastern European families had been refugees, who have been shown to experience problems of assimilation not common in immigrants of other

backgrounds (Kunz, 1971; Martin, 1965). They were therefore excluded from the sample for the study. The largest Southern European national groups were from Italy and Greece, and most Northwest Europeans were either German or Dutch. For these reasons the groups selected were from the United Kingdom, Italy, Greece, Germany and the Netherlands.

A major fault in one of the few previous studies of second-generation children in Australia, by Johnston (1969), was the lack of an Australian control group with which to compare and contrast findings concerning immigrant children. A group of adolescent Australians, comparable in age, sex, scholastic achievement, religion, and the socioeconomic status of their parents, was also included in the sample for the present study.

Finally, the city with the largest concentration of immigrants in Australia in 1954 (and in 1970) was Melbourne (Australian Year Book, 1954, 1970). Consequently it was there that the sample was sought.

This study is therefore an examination of the incidence and consequences of intergenerational conflict in the adolescent child of immigrant parents from the United Kingdom, Northwest Europe, and Southern Europe, and of similar conflict in a matched group of Australian children. It was carried out in Melbourne, Australia, in 1970, using questionnaires administered in the homes of a total sample of 146 children and their parents.

Outline of this Report

Chapter 2 discusses definitions of the phenomena being examined, culture conflict and the generation gap, while Chapter 3 introduces

some of the classic work on these concepts reported both from overseas and from Australia. Chapter 4 reviews the literature available in Australia on the adolescent child of immigrant parents and possible sources for him of conflict with both his parents and his host society peers. Chapter 5 offers a model for the study of reactions by the individual to culture conflict, on which the present study is based. The sample and procedure of the present study are presented in Chapter 6, and Chapters 7 and 8 describe the measures used of independent and dependent variables. Results are described in detail in Chapters 9 and 10. A summary of findings and conclusions drawn from them are set out in Chapter 11.

CHAPTER 2. A CONTEMPORARY DEFINITION OF CULTURE CONFLICT

The phenomenon with which the present study is concerned is the conflict aroused in the adolescent child as he attempts to internalise the mores and norms of the culture in which he is growing up, but finds these to be at some degree of variance with those inculcated in him by his parents. It has been found to be particularly strong in children born of immigrant parents in a host society (eg., Child, 1943). Such an adolescent is in constant contact with his parents, who have matured in a culture other than the one he knows, and who, to some extent, whether deliberately or unwittingly, attempt to impart elements of it to him. Concurrently his personality is being shaped, and he is seeking a self-identity, in the only culture he knows, while attempting to assimilate into it by following its tenets of behaviour and belief. Where these differ from the values taught him by his parents, he is in an emotionally disturbing situation. His two most important reference groups are making conflicting demands upon him, and he must resolve the conflict or remain in a state of tension. This will be further discussed in Chapter 5. The aim at present is to spell out what is meant by "culture conflict".

Conflict itself can be conceived of in at least two ways. It may refer to a disparity between the social norms of two cultures, without reference to the individuals adhering to those cultures. For instance, where capitalism is the norm in one culture and in another communism prevails, it may be said that the norms of the two cultures conflict. If the two cultures are in close proximity, and relevant norms extremely conflicting, intersocietal tension ensues. Witness West and East Germany.

More relevant for the present study perhaps is conflict between the cultures of the Aborigine and White Australian (Stevens, 1972a).

Psychologically, however, conflict is usually conceived of as occurring within the individual. For instance, Chaplin defines it as involving "the simultaneous occurrence of two or more mutually antagonistic impulses or motives" (Chaplin, 1968, p.102). It arises when the person has to choose between two mutually incompatible behaviours, the motives for each being approximately equally powerful. For the purposes of the present study, it is thought of as occurring when an individual must choose between two incompatible norms to cope with a situation. This may occur within one culture. For instance, on seeing a stranger being menaced, should an Australian follow the precept of "She'll be right, mate," and look the other way, or "Give a man a fair go", and interfere? He will feel some conflict, resulting in stress which will be relieved only when he makes a decision.

Culture conflict may be viewed as a particular form of this. It is the conflict experienced by an individual who identifies closely with two cultures, and who finds that each offers a norm of behaviour for a situation, but that they are incompatible. This form of culture conflict is that experienced by the adult immigrant whose homeland mores and values are at variance with those of his host society. It is experienced by the Italian who has lived in Australia for some years, would dearly love to converse with a new arrival in Italian on a crowded public transport, yet identifies sufficiently with his society of adoption to want not to be regarded as a foreigner by host society peers around him. Such culture conflict also results in stress, which the individual will seek to reduce.

It is important to distinguish the unique circumstances of culture conflict. It can be conceived of as occurring only where an individual must choose between two mutually incompatible behaviours, and where the norms, value schema, mores, call them what you will; of one culture from which he derives his own values, dictate that one alternative should be chosen; while the norms of a second culture with which he also identifies sufficiently to consider its values his own, ordain that the opposite course of action should be followed. The essence of culture conflict is that it occurs as a result of simultaneous identification by one individual with two cultures. As Doczy (1967, 1969) points out, assimilation difficulties experienced by immigrants are often not the result of culture conflict, although loosely labelled so. They may arise through a lack of knowledge of the new culture, so that the immigrant simply finds himself in a situation with which he has not had to cope before, and has no recourse to acquired norms to guide his behaviour. A newly arrived Southern European in an Australian pub might be an example of this. Who should buy the drinks? What should be bought? Who should he talk to? What should he talk about? He is in a state of tension, but not necessarily tension arising from culture conflict.

Conversely conflict experienced by immigrants in their host society may not necessarily be culture conflict as they could well have experienced similar stress in their homeland. The mores of only one society are involved. Thus familial stress resulting from the wife's going out to work cannot always be said to result from culture conflict, as such stress, while possibly originating from the immigration situation, could nevertheless have arisen in the homeland also, had the wife gone

out to work there. Similarly, such stress may well be experienced by families of the host society. Culture conflict can only be said to have arisen when the norms of one society dictate one course of action and the norms of another ordain its opposite, the individual to at least some extent identifying with both simultaneously.

Thus when the Southern European woman has assimilated far enough into her Australian host society to want to go out to work, as do so many of her Australian working-class peers, yet still identifies strongly with her homeland culture, where the norm is that a woman's place is in the home and not a factory; she is in a state of culture conflict and likely to experience stress as a result. However the United Kingdom immigrant wife who experiences apparently similar stress when having to make the same decision cannot be said to be in a state of culture conflict. Equally large proportions of her peers go out to work in her homeland society, and presumably she would have felt the same tension there. It has arisen, in her case, from causes other than that of simple clash of cultural norms.

However the particular form of culture conflict with which the present study was concerned is that experienced by the second-generation adolescent child as a consequence of his attempts to identify with both his immigrant parents and his host society peers. The second-generation child of immigrants is growing up in what, to his parents, is a host society, but to him, is his total social environment. Normally he will identify closely with it and adopt its mores and values as his own. Yet there are a number of life areas, such as those involving familial and sexual relationships, for which his parents will also feel

it their duty to provide sets of values and norms. To a greater or lesser extent, these parent-inculcated norms will be those acquired by the parents themselves as they matured in their homeland culture. Some of these will be sufficiently similar to those of the host society to be reasonably appropriate to it. Other homeland mores the parents will recognise as inappropriate for the new society and will replace with host society norms. A further group will be of little importance, or be readily modifiable, so causing little tension even where conflict does occur. But some will be at variance with those of the host society, yet be salient enough to be strongly inculcated both by parents and by social agencies outside the family such as the school and the peer group. Culture conflict occurs as the child has to cope with situations to which such conflicting sets of norms apply and stress is experienced as a result.

For instance, the Southern European adolescent girl is taught by her parents that she should go out alone only with the young man she expects to marry - if at all (Price, 1963a). On the other hand Australian society, represented especially by her peers and the mass media, asserts that dating with several boys from at least mid-adolescence is the acceptable, desirable norm (Dunphy, 1969). Frequently she will be offered the opportunity to go out, at least in a group, and sometimes alone, with young men, and is placed in a conflict situation, experiencing sometimes severe stress, as a result. This is not a situation in which she would have been placed had she been growing up in her parents' homeland society. Nor is it a situation in which her Australian peers find themselves. It is not over how late, or with how many boys, or at how

young an age, she may go out, that conflict is aroused, but over whether she should go out at all. She is in a situation of conflict caused by the divergent mores of two cultures. She identifies to an extent with both, yet they are prescribing mutually incompatible behaviours.

Johnston (1969) would say that a state of "culture tension" exists between the girl and her parents, and that she is experiencing "culture conflict" as a result. However Johnston sees culture conflict as a state of confusion and stress caused within the individual by his being unable to select with which of two familiar cultures he should identify. This is illogical, as, if the individual identifies with neither, then neither will exert pressure on him to conform to its norms and no conflict will be experienced. It is suggested rather that culture conflict is the situation arising when an individual identifies with two cultures simultaneously, but finds that they have conflicting mores in some lifespace areas. Culture tension, or dissension with representatives of those cultures - parents, peers, etc., - is symptomatic of such conflict, but is not the conflict itself.

Culture Conflict and the Generation Gap

However a final, and crucial, definition has yet to be made. What is a culture? For it may be argued that the present-day teenager in Western technological societies is in a situation of culture conflict himself. While identifying closely with the parents with whom he has grown up, and from whom a great proportion of his mores and values have been learnt, he finds himself in many situations where alternative mores and values, acquired largely from his peer group, direct conflicting

behaviour. This experience, commonly known as the "Generation Gap", is by no means new of course - a disparity of beliefs between the generations has been noted by authors since the Greek philosophers - but the discrepancy between the belief systems of the old and the young today may be thought of as not only greater in extent and rate of increase than ever previously, but different in nature. Modern young people disagree not only with the means by which society is achieving its ends, but with the ends themselves. If it is accepted that this is true, then it can be said that for modern Western technological society, of which Australia is an integral part, the adolescent's parents grew up and acquired their norms and values in one culture, while he is maturing in another. He identifies with, and attempts to reconcile, two cultures, as does the immigrants' child.

The following sections will therefore examine some of the evidence available to show just what sorts of change are occurring. Changes in the family, the self, education, and society in general are covered; and the results of these on adolescent relationships with their parents, their peers, schools and wider adult society discussed.

It should be noted that this is a summary review only. Time and space preclude detailed examination of the survey and experimental work leading to the conclusions stated. Nonetheless wideranging sources of such information are available, and a number are cited. The interested reader is particularly referred to such recent publications as Brown (1973); Clark & Clark (1972); Ficker & Rigterinck (1972); Johnston, Dokecki & Mowrer (1972); Weisz (1970); and Wrenn & Ruiz (1970) for greater detail.

Changes in Contemporary Society

Family Changes. Families are smaller, and nuclear rather than extended. A number of causes contribute, but most important are perhaps the steady climb in socioeconomic status combined with urban drift (Hurlock, 1972; Musgrove, 1966). At the same time they are less stable. High social, vocational and spatial mobility have resulted from the vast increase in size of businesses plus the ready availability of transport and communication (Hurlock, 1972). The wife's role is less frequently that of the mother only, and more often that of mother plus income earner (Hurlock, 1972; Musgrove, 1966). Consequently material aspects of the home, such as house, furnishings, etc. have become as important as close relationships (Hurlock, 1972). This is accentuated by the rapid increase in occurrence of divorce, separation and remarriage. At the same time, the father's role is less clearly sex-defined and he takes a greater part in child-rearing (Hurlock, 1972; Musgrove, 1966).

This greater social mobility has resulted in high achievement aspirations by many parents for their children, with relatively cold relationships being complemented by a greater willingness on the part of parents to "sacrifice" for the education of their children (Hurlock, 1972). A widespread change in attitudes, including a parental knowledge of Freud (Jencks & Riesman, 1967) has resulted in permissive child-rearing, with the typical family being child-centred rather than focussing on adult activities. Children mature accustomed to greater responsibility and less adult control (Cole & Hall, 1970; Hurlock, 1972). This is accentuated in Australia by its being a welfare state, which reduces

dependence on the family for the working adolescent (Martin, 1972), and by the ready availability of employment. As a result adolescent children spend less time in the home - both work and recreation are typically outside it (Hurlock, 1972). Even within it, the major form of recreation is television, which does little toward cementing family relationships. The same mass media communication, via television, radio, magazines, etc., means that adolescents are aware of alternatives to their family's way of life, and indeed to the family way of life altogether. Such awareness, heightened by contact with immigrants, is greater than has ever previously been the case (Brown, 1973).

The family which has produced the modern adolescent is consequently different in a number of basic respects from that in which his parents grew up.

Changes in the Adolescent Self. The adolescent produced by the modern family also differs from the average adolescent of a generation or two ago. To start with, evidence suggests that actual physical puberty occurs at an average of two years earlier than it did two generations ago (Cole & Hall, 1970). In 1925 that average age of puberty for boys was 14 - 15, compared with 12 - 13 in 1970; and for girls was 13, compared with 11 - 12 at present. Similarly maturity and experience develop earlier and to a greater depth as a result of television, films, magazines, and books, as well as education (Jencks & Riesman, 1967). Both physically and mentally, then, the adolescent matures earlier than did his parents.

Perhaps more important, however, is work by Bronfenbrenner (1962) and Burton (1963). They have shown that moral development results from

socialisation experiences, not simply maturation. Socialisation differs between groups of differing socioeconomic status. Low socioeconomic status parents are more authoritarian and teach their children what ought to be done under pain of punishment for disobedience, while middle-class parents foster in their children the development of self-critical responses (Aronfreed, 1968). Thus as the proportion of middle-class families increases, Western society becoming more middle-class, self-critical responses also increase as the basic form of morality. This is demonstrated in the successful English child (Musgrove, 1966), who is described as withdrawn and solitary, conscientious and self-critical, rather than other-directed. It would seem relevant to Australian society also, where the great majority of the adolescent population are reasonably well educated, living in middle class suburbs in homes belonging to their parents. This was less true of their parents, and much less so of the grandparents who raised their parents through World War I and the Depression.

Changes in Education. The role of educational institutions in the formation of the typical adolescent personality has also changed. Not only does the universality of education mean that today's adolescent is more aware of social problems outside his own small world (Brown, 1973; Cole & Hall, 1970), but a greater proportion of his socialisation takes place in educational institutions, rather than at home as the responsibility of his parents (Hurlock, 1972; Jencks & Riesman, 1967). Attending from at least the age of five, and often from four, and until at least 15 or 16, he has contact with a wide variety of other individuals, heter-

ogeneous in race, sex, socioeconomic status and morality (Jencks & Riesman, 1967; Musgrove, 1963; Phillips, 1962). Religion plays a decreasing role in education, and students are more self-sufficient and respecting of knowledge rather than money or authority (Anderson & Beswick, 1972; Jencks & Riesman, 1967; Sears, 1969). They see freedom of speech and behaviour as a right, not a privilege (Brown, 1973). That this is applicable in Australian schools was demonstrated by a survey of high-school opinion in which pupils strongly advocated colleges for senior students, involving pupil-participant government and non-authoritarian teaching (Anderson & Beswick, 1972). Their attitude toward the school and its role in their social development was very different from that of their parents which had produced the system in which they were enrolled.

Societal Changes. So far, then, it has been suggested that the modal adolescent himself, his family, and his educational environment all show evidence of rapid change over the past generation or two generations. Both the degree and rapidity of these changes result in conflict for him as he matures, identifying with his parents and having learnt their mores, while growing into an individual living in a family and attending an educational institution each requiring norms which at times conflict with those of his parents. However these forms of conflict can be seen as elements of an even wider and all-encompassing situation of change. Society as a whole is changing rapidly, in many areas already requiring values and behavioural norms differing from those suitable for the society into which his parents were born.

Such change is more rapid now, over a greater proportion of humanity, than ever before (Brown, 1973; Cole & Hall, 1970). It is occurring at a speed sufficient to leave many of the mores of one generation inapplicable to situations in which the next finds itself. Moreover modern communication networks, with television and radio via satellite and undersea cable, produce contemporaneous change in societies spread across the world, and in the mass populations of those societies (Brown, 1973). Communication and transport has also produced global interdependence of nations and societies which a generation ago had not heard of one another's existence. Similarly migration has resulted in intermarriage and close interethnic contact causing both less isolation, and the weakening of ties between nations previously linked for defence against others once distant and now neighbours. An example of this is the weakening of Australian-United Kingdom ties and the improvement of Australian relations with Asian and South-East Asian countries (Encel, 1971).

This combined with fear of nuclear war and the knowledge that modern war involves the whole population, not merely armies, has resulted in a widespread pacifist value, contrasting with the fervent nationalistic, patriotic pride in the size of fighting forces of only a generation ago (Brown, 1973). On the other hand, crime and violence resulting from the ready anonymity of vast megalopolises is widespread (Brown, 1973; Cole & Hall, 1970) and experienced by members of all socioeconomic groups, rather than by the lowest alone, as in previous generations. The megalopolis itself is symptomatic of the vast population growth which has taken place with such rapidity (Weisz, 1970), originally arising

from the Agricultural Revolution, hastened by the Industrial Revolution, but given an unprecedented spurt during the past generation by medical innovation, and in Australia as a result, immigration.

Consequently the modern adolescent has grown up aware that enormous numbers of people are living at subsistence level. On the other hand, television tells him that foreign aid and food technology are improving the food resources of India, China and Indonesia (Encel, 1971). Nevertheless Australia is one of the few empty lands still available for migration from overcrowded countries, and he has played and sat in school beside peers of many nationalities (Price, 1971). Simultaneously the size and complexity of the society in which he lives causes relatively severe restriction on the freedom of the individual, who has a resultant greater need for recognition and respect from his associates in order to compensate. In some societies this is achieved by tighter ingroup cohesion and greater prejudice against members of ethnic outgroups, as in the Southern United States, but in Australia has had the effect of reducing prejudice against Aborigines and promoting greater acceptance of ethnic outsiders (Encel, 1971). This is promoted by increased awareness and factual knowledge gained from the television screen.

The modern adolescent has also developed in an affluent society. Food, clothes and housing are readily available and goods considered luxuries or never known in their youth by his parents (transistor radios) are seen as essentials. Concomitantly he is aware that members of other societies, and even his own, are not in such a state. The poverty-wealth contrast is as great as, if not greater than, it was in previous generations.

Nevertheless the average teenager is affluent, and expects money and lodgings from his parents. Concurrently he has been reared permissively and sees it as his right to come and go where, when and with whom he pleases, in contrast with the more parentally dominated family in which his parents grew up (Brown, 1973).

This leads to the final point to be made here, that religion plays an ever decreasing part in his life. He attends church less, hears comparatively little of it at school, and takes less note of it in sizing up acquaintances or members of outgroups such as Aborigines or Jews (Encel, 1971).

Thus the society in which the Western teenager is growing up, in which he is learning to live, and from which he is acquiring his values and mores, differs in many essentials from the one experienced by his parents and from which they derived their norms. Results of these changes are discussed in the following sections.

Effects of Social Change on Adolescent Relationships

Contemporary Parent-Adolescent Relationships. Consequently, as a result of the changes outlined above, the modern teenager no longer views his parents as the primary source of social mores. The mobility of modern society results in his acquiring attitudes which may differ markedly from those held by his parents (Hurlock, 1972; Musgrove, 1966). For instance the Australian adolescent is much less prejudiced against Aborigines than are his parents (Taft, 1970), and does not have the same attitudes toward Asians, immigrants or Negroes as they have (Encel, 1971). In short, he is less ethnocentric (Beswick & Hills, 1972).

He learns his life-role from school and the peer group, not his family (Jencks & Riesman, 1967). This is especially likely to be true of Australia, where overemployment means ready employment and financial independence for the adolescent at an early age. At most his parents are the source of high need achievement resulting from ready social mobility (Musgrove, 1966) and are models for the development of self-critical responses, rather than of actual behavioural mores (Bronfenbrenner, 1962; Burton, 1963). Thus Anderson & Beswick (1972) found in their adolescent respondents a strong desire for mutual respect between the generations, in contrast to the respect accorded the aged by the young of a generation ago.

The working mother establishes a relationship which, by her child's adolescence, is relatively cool (Musgrove, 1966). On the other hand, the father tends to take an ever greater part in child-rearing (Hurlock, 1972), although this may not yet be as true of Australia as it is of the United States (Adler, 1966).

If the parents can cope with this, and establish mutual respect, then tension need not be excessive, and doubtless in many families is not. However the rapidity of the changes occurring causes many parents to find it difficult to understand their teenagers' experiences, with resultant confusion and indecision. Such uncertainty on the part of their parents makes them appear weak exemplars in their children's eyes, causing disrespect and poor modelling (Hurlock, 1972).

Adolescents perceive themselves as more permissive, more liberal, more in tune with the modern world (Sears, 1969), and a world-wide rebellion against age is resulting (Brown, 1973). Television, films and

other mass media have led to an awareness of other societies and of other family patterns which enables adolescents to criticise their own parents and family life to an extent and depth previously unequalled. Hurlock suggests (Hurlock, 1972, p.434), and the present author would agree, that the disparity arising from these circumstances is equivalent to the culture gap experienced between parents and children of families emigrating to a host society, or from rural society to the urban life of the metropolis.

Contemporary Peer-group Relationships. Another type of relationship which is undergoing rapid change, partly as a result of the familial changes outlined above, is that between the adolescent and his peers. Finding his parents inadequate as models, he turns from them to his peers as his other major reference group (Cole & Hall, 1970), identifying with youthful liberalism as he rejects the conservatism of older generations (Sears, 1969). With less emphasis on family chores and recreation, and more on schooling, mass entertainment, sport and club membership, the modern adolescent has comparatively little to do with his parents and much more opportunity to establish strong relationships with his peer group (Hurlock, 1972; Jencks & Riesman, 1967).

This is accentuated by the earlier onset of puberty, which the average modern adolescent reaches fully two years before his grandparents did, yet is also aggravated by later admission into fully adult roles. Education and vocational training often continue into the twenties, with full acceptance as a responsible adult being denied until it is completed (Cole & Hall, 1970; Jencks & Riesman, 1967). This situation

is further exacerbated by an earlier need to prove sexuality by dating, etc., arising from the less clearly defined sexual roles of modern Western society. Moreover the sex mores of that society are changing rapidly. There is less inhibition concerning contraception, freer access to abortion, and even acceptance of homosexuality (Ficker & Rigterink, 1972). Consequently the adolescent turns to his peers, of both sexes, as a reference group. The society in which he has to learn to live is more complex than any that has gone before, and consequently he has a greater need for close relationships, which he may most readily find with peers of the opposite sex.

While rejecting the conservatism and authoritarianism of older generations, the adolescent is nonetheless a conformist. The density of modern urban living results in a greater emphasis on one form of other-directed morality - but the others are his peers (Cole & Hall, 1970; Dunphy, 1969). This is evidenced in the results of experimentation such as that of Collins & Thomas (1972). In an Australian sample, they found adolescents to be more conforming to peer-group confederates in an Asch-type situation than were either younger or older Subjects. Indirect evidence is also supplied by Musgrove's (1966) findings that adolescents who are successful by adult standards are withdrawn and solitary. By conforming to the norms of their parents' generation they sacrifice close peer-group relationships and cathect on to school and work instead. It is not surprising that Anderson & Beswick's (1972) High School survey Respondents felt that one of the most important aspects of modern education is experience in coping with peer relationships.

The Socialization Function of the Contemporary School. The school plays a major role in the socialisation of the modern child, and does so for a greater proportion of children, for a longer period and over a wider area of their lifespace, than has been the case for previous generations. Parents are more willing to make sacrifices for their children's education (Hurlock, 1972) and the child's life-role evolves from his education, not from his family. This is despite a reluctance on the part of most educational authorities to play a pseudo-parental role, and can often result in a sense of irresponsibility to adults on the part of the adolescent and a reliance on his peers (Jencks & Riesman, 1967).

Nevertheless there is a widespread acceptance that education is essential and should be equally available to all, irrespective of sex, and including disadvantaged groups such as members of ethnic minorities, the children of immigrants, those of low intelligence or retarded, and the children of the poor. It is increasingly believed that the school should help teach the child to cope with life's problems, especially those with which his parents have had little experience, such as drugs, or for which their mores are considered out of date, such as sexual relationships.

What is taught is also changing. The content of traditional subjects ranging from English to Mathematics is substantially different from that taught a generation ago, but of greater importance is the increasing salience of social science and its attempts to teach an understanding of the society into which pupils will move on leaving school. There is an increasing interest in languages and cultures outside those which are immediately relevant, while greater emphasis is also being

placed on interaction between the school and the society which it serves, with community experience as a recognised facet of education (Anderson & Beswick, 1972). Religious dogma, on the other hand, receives comparatively little attention, an example of a widespread trend toward rejection of organised religion (Anderson & Beswick, 1972; Ficker & Rigterink, 1972). An even more widespread revulsion against war is apparent (Ficker & Rigterink, 1972).

The means by which schools educate their pupils have also changed radically. Apart from myriad teaching aids, ranging from dustless chalk to language laboratories, the principles behind teaching methods have altered. For instance the authoritarian teacher-pupil relationship is widely discouraged as being inappropriate for pupils behaving according to a self-critical rather than a 'realistic' morality (Anderson & Beswick, 1972; Bronfenbrenner, 1962; Burton, 1963). The self-sufficient pupil, respecting knowledge, not money or power, is a result (Jencks & Riesman, 1967; Musgrove, 1966). Similarly, while competitiveness has grown to be the dominant more in all education systems, there is some reaction against this amongst young people, who see self-improvement for its own sake as a more worthwhile goal (Anderson & Beswick, 1972). This is especially true of tertiary institutions where students are in increasing contact with others from all socioeconomic strata, and of varying academic prestige. Greater contact with students living together, married, returning from vocations to tertiary study, or pursuing post-graduate studies, results in wider social experience and greater tolerance of individual differences than formerly.

Previous generations have dreamed of making education available to all. They have at last succeeded, and as a result their offspring

are growing up into a society very different from that they themselves knew.

Adolescent and Adult in Contemporary Society. The three preceding sections have outlined results from the viewpoint of the modern adolescent of changes occurring in the family, the role of the peer group, and the school. It was suggested under a previous heading that society as a whole is also undergoing rapid change, and the present section describes effects of this in terms of changing relationships between adolescent and adult in contemporary society.

Young people, finding the norms of older society to be at variance with their own, frequently rebel against them, and against the older members of society adhering to them. Rebellion rather than tolerance is almost inevitable for several reasons. For instance, as society becomes more middle-class, morality becomes more self-critical, rather than authoritarian, as the older generations would have it. Consequently adolescents reject both the authoritarian morality of the older generation, and adult attempts to impose it (Bronfenbrenner, 1962; Burton, 1963).

With previously unequalled resources of education and current affairs knowledge from mass communication, youth are aware of societal inadequacies. Concomitantly they are powerful in both fiscal and numerical terms to an unprecedented degree (Brown, 1973). Yet they are admitted to adulthood later, regarded as apprentices to maturity for longer, than ever before (Cole & Hall, 1970). Consequently childrearing is discontinuous with adult life. As parents do not know what adult life

will involve by the time their child reaches adult status, they are unable to prepare him directly for adult living. This results in insecurity and maladjustment in children and uncertainty and inadequacy in parents and teachers, causing almost inevitable tension between the generations (Hurlock, 1972).

In modern Western society adolescents are taught that anxiety is negative and to be avoided, yet experience it as a result of the difficulties of adolescent identity formation and the inadequacy of adult models cited above. Nevertheless they are not taught to cope with normal, necessary anxiety and need assistance. To gain it they turn to their peers and with them employ motor bikes, cars, sex, protest and drugs as forms of relief (Ficker & Rigterink, 1972).

Thus the importance of the adult world is frequently denied, and anything antiauthority seen as worthwhile. Drugs and promiscuity provide both anxiety relief and expression of aggression against the adult world. This leads to even greater non-acceptance by adults, and further rejection of their authority by the young; and so the cycle continues (Jencks & Riesman, 1967).

This pervasive youth versus age rebellion is world-wide, partly as a result of mass communication, and partly as a result of similarity of situation across cultures, within the Western world at least. Television, radio and news media result in contemporaneous rifts in attitude concerning topics as diverse as race, war, money, conformity, and mass communication itself, but; as Brown (1973) points out, any one of these is but a symptom and no one issue is the cause, as general rebelliousness occurs in countries without one or more of them (for example, South America, Japan, Canada, the United Kingdom, France).

It is reflected in a disparity of values between the generations in a number of areas. For instance the young almost universally exhibit less racial prejudice than do their parents (for Australian evidence of this, see Taft, 1970; Beswick & Hills, 1972). Similarly, as the 1972 United States presidential elections suggested, it is reflected in politics. Young people are more liberal, are less cynical concerning politics and believe in the party system, yet see themselves as rebelling against the establishment and, in many countries, are without direct political power; although the increasing popularity of the 18-year-old vote may be giving the lie to this (Sears, 1969). A final instance is in the use by the young of religion as a form of protest. "Jesus freaks" in the United States, a more widespread retreat to a simplistic form of religion as a haven from drugs, and a refusal to attend the established forms of Church, are all evidence of this (Ficker & Rigterink, 1972). They are probably less important in Australia, where the church plays a relatively minor social role, but are more important in Europe.

Consequently it is suggested that there is a world-wide trend toward a rapidly growing gap between the adolescent and his parents, accompanied by an increasing tendency for the young to regard adulthood as something to be rejected and rebelled against, rather than as a model to be emulated and as a goal eventually to be attained. It is granted that most of the evidence cited is from overseas, and much of it from the United States where change, and consequently intergenerational stress, is greatest. Nevertheless the societies in which it has been shown to be occurring do not differ in major relevant respects from that of

Australia, and the Australian adolescent is very aware of what is occurring overseas. Consequently there seems no reason to suppose that Australian society should be immune to this phenomenon, and every reason to expect that it should be occurring to at least some extent here also.

Therefore it was postulated that a substantial generation gap would be found in the Australian families of the present study; that the modern Australian adolescent is growing up in a society which differs substantially in many of its basic norms and values from that into which his parents were born. He, too, is experiencing culture conflict.

For if a culture is defined as the set of norms, values and beliefs common to a group and distinguishing it from others as a unique society, it may be argued that the differences in culture between the second-generation immigrant adolescent group and the Australian host society adolescent group are no greater, and may be comparatively less, than are those of each with its preceding generation. The modern adolescent, be he born of immigrant or native-born parents, will find himself in a situation requiring him to react to a significant proportion of crucial circumstances in one way, and those of his peer group to do so in another.

Nonetheless it cannot be forgotten that the second-generation adolescent does experience discrepancy between parentally-inculcated norms and those of his host-society peers also, and that this will arouse conflict within him. Thus he will experience culture conflict from two sources, and should manifest more intense stress as a result.

This chapter has thus discussed definitions of culture conflict and concluded that, for the purposes of the present study, it is the conflict experienced by the adolescent who identifies simultaneously with two cultures. Commonly one is that imparted by his parents and the other that into which he perceives himself as maturing. When he finds that parts of the two value schema clash, he experiences culture conflict. It was then argued that evidence, mainly from overseas, but some also from Australia, suggests that the average teenager is growing up into a rapidly changing society. As a result, its culture differs in sufficient essentials from that into which his parents matured for him to experience a form of culture conflict also.

Aims of the present study, then, included assessment of, firstly, the degree of culture conflict experienced by the second-generation immigrant adolescent, and, secondly, by a carefully matched sample of his Australian peers. It attempted to discover the degree to which culture conflict experienced by the second-generation child exceeds that sustained by his host society peers, the extent to which he manifests resultant stress by comparison, and whether there are differences in the forms such manifestations of stress might take for adolescents born of parents from differing cultural backgrounds.

The following two chapters discuss evidence and research methodologies taken into consideration when designing an investigation to fulfill these aims.

CHAPTER 3. PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES OF ADOLESCENT CULTURE CONFLICT

This chapter briefly outlines reports of culture conflict occurring in immigrant and host society adolescents, which strongly influenced the conception of the present study. The relevance of American studies to the Australian situation is inferred from a piece of research on the social development of the Australian adolescent, and the chapter concludes by examining two recent and important psychological studies of conflict in adolescent immigrant children in Australia.

Influential American Studies

As has been suggested, the second-generation child experiences both intergeneration tension resulting from societal change, and culture conflict arising from discrepancies between the host society and that in which his parents grew up. Modern authors suggest that one is at least as important as the other, or even that conflict consequent upon intergeneration differences may be more salient than culture conflict.

However major studies of second-generation adolescents carried out in the United States a generation ago found culture conflict to be a pervasive phenomenon.

The classic American study in this area is that of Child (1943). In his Italian or American? The second generation in conflict, he described in detail the situation of children of Italian immigrants growing up in New York in the years immediately preceding World War II. He pointed out that the culture of the adolescent's immediate social group, both adult and peer, is in effect the means by which society transmits

socialising forces to him, and is therefore psychologically very important as inconsistencies and gaps within it result in conflict and insecurity in the individual.

Child discussed a number of lifespace areas in which American and Italian cultures of that period diverged in either the strength or direction of their norms. Writing about a situation extant 30 years ago, and involving cultures differing considerably from those of Australia and Italy today, he found discordance in some areas similar to that found between the two generations throughout the Western world by modern authors. These included communications, recreation, family structure, sexual mores, expression of aggression, economic attitudes and religion. In modern Australian society, not only the immigrant, but also the host society adolescent family experiences tension in these areas. However others are as specific to the immigrant family today as they were then, such as language, eating and drinking mores, sport, and superstition, and have been described by modern Australian authors also (for example, Borrie & Packer, 1954; Johnston, 1969; Price, 1963a; Taft, 1965). The degree to which the second-generation child resembled peers of his host culture varied, but some disagreement with both them and his parents was practically universal.

For example most second-generation adolescents spoke both Italian and English, but their Italian was not as fluent as that of their parents, while their English was poorer than that of adolescent Americans. Food preferences more closely approximated those of parents than those of peers. However other important sources of disagreement can be seen to parallel those described by modern students of intergeneration conflict.

Mores which Child found to discriminate the second-generation adolescent from both his parents and his host-society peers may well still cause discord between the modern Australian second-generation adolescent and his parents, but are less likely to differ from those of his host society peers. Moreover, even where they do, his peers are probably experiencing similar friction with their own parents.

For instance Child found communication habits such as gesturing and joking to differ from those of both parents and peers. Drinking habits were similar to those of American peers among boys, but differed little from those of their parents among girls.

Family structure was more patriarchal and authoritarian than that of equivalent American families. Moreover family cohesion and emphasis on mutual responsibility was also strong in comparison. This contributed toward slower integration of second-generation young people, as they married selected spouses of their own nationality, spent a large proportion of their spare time with their families, and built up peer groups consisting largely of members of their own cultural group.

Sex roles were more sharply defined, emphasising responsibility and dominance in males, and subservience and preoccupation with home duties in females. Again this prevented integration of both boys and girls into the American peer group, but again is an area of tension not peculiar to immigrant families. Physical aggression was more freely tolerated, especially in young men, and not displaced into competitive social mobility, as in young Americans. In fact upward social mobility was not aspired to. Its unavailability in Italian society made security at their working-class level more important to immigrant parents, and

the norm which they inculcated in their American-born children. This was another source of variation from the American norm of aspirations toward upward social mobility, particularly strong at that time, but a further cause of intergenerational conflict in the 1970's.

Child then assessed the strength of agencies of acculturation such as school, youth clubs, mass media, and the American Roman Catholic Church, and described them as clashing with the two major communicators of Italian culture: the family and ghetto society. As both sources of influence were strong on the adolescent child of immigrants, he was in a stressful situation. Some clashes were specific (for example, whether to hand over all pay to parents as the Italian family expected, or to retain at least some financial independence, as would be the norm for the American working adolescent), and demanded a decision one way or the other. Whichever course was taken meant disagreement with the other reference group. Alternatively, stress resulting more from insecurity than from disagreement occurred when the child had to decide which optional mode of behaviour to adopt in one situation rather than another. Having continually to decide whether a person should be spoken to in Italian or in English gave rise to this type of stress.

Conflict was interpreted using learning theory. Reward in the form of acceptance was offered by both groups, as an alternative to punishment in the form of rejection. The American-born child of immigrants was described as often not only having to choose which route he should take toward a social goal (for example, speak English or Italian in order to communicate?), but having to decide toward which of two incompatible goals he should strive (for example, upward social mobility

or low-status security?). His basic dilemma was whether to attempt to become assimilated, or to strive to conform to his family's societal norms. Either choice was shown to result in acceptance by one social group and rejection by the other. Thus the second-generation child of immigrants was in a situation of unavoidable conflict, resulting in personality strain. Once again it is suggested, however, that this is a situation typical of the modern adolescent. It may not be as salient as it is for the second-generation child, but it is essentially the same.

Assuming that the frustration and tension caused by this conflict were too strong for the child to ignore, and thus would motivate him to attempt to reduce them, Child then postulated five possible types of response. The second-generation adolescent could respond to one culture only, rejecting, or at least ignoring, the other. He could respond alternately to one and then the other. A compromise, falling half-way between the two behaviours being demanded, could be attempted. If none of these was effective, it was suggested that he would either remain in a state of inertia, or would attempt to escape the conflict-arousing situation.

Child found that compromise was not resorted to as it did not remove pressure from either direction, that alternating responses were a form of behavioural inconsistency resulting in insecurity and personality disintegration which were typically avoided, and that inertia, or blocking, in effect was a form of psychosis. Consequently the two forms of response most commonly employed were rejection of one culture and integration into the other, or withdrawal from the situation by

minimising the affective salience of both the host society and the ethnic group.

Child's report was thus an important guideline, and in some respects a model, for the present study. Second-generation children of immigrants in Australia have also been shown to be in a situation of discordance, the mores of their parents' societies and of their Australian host society peers differing to some extent along similar dimensions (see for example Borrie & Packer, 1954; Price, 1960, 1963a; Taft, 1965; Zubrzycki, 1964). However, Child was writing 30 years ago, and the widespread, rapid change described in previous sections has introduced a further element into the situation. In the United States in the 1930's culture conflict experienced by the second-generation immigrant adolescent far outweighed the intergeneration disparity of norms and values experienced by his host society peers. In Australia at the present time, however, friction between the generations in the host society could well be at least as salient. While the Australian teenager would differ comparatively little with his parents over language or food, areas of dissension described as important by Child, such as attitudes to recreation, sexual mores, family relationships, and attitudes to social mobility, have been described by modern authors as relevant to the majority of Western teenage families, and not solely to those of immigrant parents. Consequently Child's model of alternative responses by the adolescent to culture conflict could be applied with equal validity to both the Australian second-generation adolescent child of immigrants and to his Australian peer, born of Australian parents. Chapter 5 sets this model out in more detail.

Child's work was a notable and pioneering attempt to make a case study of the integration of the children of immigrants from one cultural group into the society of another. A number of similar studies have been made, mostly sociological in orientation. A notable example is that of Whyte (1943, 1955), who analysed in detail the establishment and maintenance of peer-group gangs and societies as reference groups alternative to those offered by their parents but found inadequate, by second-generation children of Italian immigrants in Chicago. (For a brief history of the sociological study of immigration, see Zubrzycki, in Price, 1960).

Illustrative of more recent overseas reports is a persuasive yet well-documented study of the slow assimilation of immigrants into American society by Glazer & Moynihan (1963). They describe dissension between, amongst others, first-generation and later generation Italian immigrants. The village family, source of most Italian immigrants to both the United States and Australia (Price, 1963a), was strongly patriarchal. Glazer & Moynihan showed this to be discrepant with American norms imparted to the child of immigrants by his host-society peer group, and the ensuing conflict to result in the street gang of peers becoming a very important reference group for second-generation children of immigrants, as Whyte had found 20 years earlier. The relatively dominant position of the mother in the Australian household (Adler, 1966; Adler & Taft, 1966) predicts a similar disparity between the norms of Italian immigrant parents and those of their Australian-born children's peers. Nonetheless the widespread change to lowered dominance by either parent described in preceding sections as occurring through-

out the Western world, suggests some disagreement between the generations over this familial norm in Australian families also.

Discussing values imparted to the second-generation child by his family, Glazer & Moynihan claimed the American norms of individual responsibility and upward social mobility to be at variance with Italian family mores of conformity and rejection of middle-class values. Supporting Child, they described the adolescent as being exhorted to behave according to one set of values by his teachers and peers, and another by his family. The gangs formed by boys in response to the resultant conflict rejected both societal and parental values, and established their own sets of norms. Another value over which contention occurred was that placed on education. Teachers and American peers valued this highly and urged immigrants' children to remain in school as long as possible, while immigrant parents expected their children to leave school and contribute to the family income at the earliest possible opportunity. A further clash cited by Glazer & Moynihan was that between the strictly Roman Catholic upbringing and schooling of Italian immigrants' children, with its religious orientation and sexual segregation, and the American host-society norm of state-controlled, secular, coeducational schooling.

Again it is suggested that these clashes are not peculiar to the immigrant family in the modern world, including Australia, but occur in areas in which some degree of friction is found in average teenage families also. Adolescents whose parents are not immigrants nevertheless differ from them in the values placed on individual responsibility, upward social mobility, education, and religion.

Moreover a number of qualifications must be allowed before generalising from Glazer & Moynihan's survey to the Australian situation. They were writing of immigrant parents from an Italy at least a generation older (the United States greatly restricted immigration after 1924). The group about which they wrote was very large (over one million), yet lived in one area of New York City. In contrast, the parents of most second-generation children in Australia arrived after World War II, and although many live in ethnic enclaves in metropolitan centres, these are nowhere near the size of that in New York, and involve their inhabitants in far more contact with the host culture and other immigrant groups.

Nevertheless Glazer & Moynihan were writing less than a decade ago; Australian and American societal norms are increasingly, not decreasingly, similar as Western technological culture becomes more homogeneous; and the parents of modern second-generation adolescents grew up in pre-World War II Italy. Consequently the findings of Glazer & Moynihan were viewed as worthy of consideration, at least for purposes of comparison.

However Child's (1943) work was also pioneering in that it was written to a psychological, rather than a sociological, frame of reference. The psychology of reactions by the second-generation child of immigrants to being suspended, as it were, between two cultures, has aroused increasing interest since. Hurlock's (1972) comments on the similarity of intergenerational tension and culture conflict, made in a general text on the adolescent, have already been noted above. In their exten-

sive review and summary of the literature on adolescent psychology, Singer & Singer (1969), after discussing the growing importance of his peer group to the teenager, concluded that alienation, particularly normlessness, occurred more frequently in the children of minority group and immigrant parents. They described it as resulting from discrepancies between the child-rearing patterns of the minority group and those of the host society, lack of knowledge on the part of parents of majority-group values, tension between the parents themselves, and failure by the adolescent to achieve social acceptance by conformity to parental values. Consequent social alienation was found to result in rebelliousness, rejection of parents and close adherence to the peer group; in depression, neurosis and addiction to drugs or alcohol; or in overidentification with parents and their subculture. Nevertheless Singer & Singer also discuss the rapidity of social change in modern Western industrialised society with consequently confused patterns of desirable behaviour, and describe it as a primary cause of tension between parents and adolescents, and thus of adolescent conflict.

Jessor, Graves, Hanson & Jessor (1968) reported a large-scale study which is an example of a number of studies carried out specifically on the psychology of the minority-group adolescent in the United States. In their discussion of personality and social deviance, they described three elements of the personality and the conditions under which they instigated deviant, rather than socially acceptable behaviour. They labelled these the Perceived Opportunity Structure, the Personal Belief Structure and the Personal Control Structure. Reduced perceived opportunity was shown to cause frustration and resultant increased pressure

toward the use of illegitimate means of obtaining socially desirable goals such as prestige and power. Disruption of personal beliefs was demonstrated to result in the attenuation of self-control over the use of such illegitimate means, as was a poorly developed personal control structure.

These processes were found to be more likely to occur in the adolescents of ethnic minority groups. Deviance arose from the frustration of recognition and affection needs by less freedom of movement. Similarly, parents were viewed as a negative reference group, as their conformity to host society norms failed to bring satisfaction of those needs, and socially unacceptable means of satisfaction were sought. Alienation among these young people was high, when defined as feelings of isolation, an absence of values shared with either their parents or the host society, little sense of responsibility for others outside their own-race peer group, and a predominance of pessimism concerning the future. They saw their behaviour as externally controlled and felt little motivation to strive for socially acceptable goals. Poor parent-child relationships resulted in low internalisation of norms and a weak superego, and they tended to look for immediate gratification, had a short time span, and experienced disrupted home and school environments causing them to turn to their equally poorly adjusted peers as a primary reference group.

Although the adolescent children of the American Indian and Spanish-speaking Mexican-American minority groups studied by Jessor *et al.* were in a fairly extreme situation of culture conflict, the social learning principles they exemplified would nonetheless seem applicable

to other less severe conditions. Examples might be Negro youth in Chicago (Hauser, 1971); the alienated, isolated immigrant young people found in Melbourne Detention Centres (Hay, Arens & Kern, 1967); or even the identity-seeking, rebellious youth of modern Western technological society described by Cole & Hall (1970), Hurlock (1972), Brown (1973) and others.

For example, Sherif & Sherif (1964), in their definitive study of the reference groups of adolescents, showed that the great majority of adolescents in modern industrialised American society are in a predicament caused by the rapidity of social change. Similarly, a number of cross-cultural studies of adolescence (for example, Erikson, 1963) also show adolescence in Western cultures other than the United States to be a period of confusion over roles and a search for identity. Needing norms on which to base their behaviour, the adolescents studied by Sherif & Sherif found those of their parents inapplicable and out of date, and the standards of society as a whole changing so rapidly that no generally accepted set of norms was available. Consequently they turned to their peers as a reference group and established their own value schema. The greater the gap between himself and his parents, the sooner and more completely the adolescent came to see his peers as providing the most relevant and clearly defined norms.

Nevertheless Sherif & Sherif also pointed out that the second-generation child of immigrants experiences an aggravated degree of dissension with his parents concerning his means of reaching adulthood and those of which they approve. Applying the principle that a group faced with opposition from other groups will tend to become more closely knit, Sherif & Sherif predicted and found greater solidarity within groups of

second-generation children of Mexican-Americans. These young people felt rejected, not only by their parents, but by their American peers also. Although recognising the same social mores as did their higher status American peers, they demonstrated less adherence to them, and saw toughness and individual status as more important than economic achievement. The culture conflict which Sherif & Sherif viewed as experienced by all adolescents they found to be exacerbated in the case of second-generation children of immigrants.

Overseas and Australian Studies - A Link

That these findings concerning the search by the adolescent for security, social norms and a self-identity, are relevant for Australian teenagers also, was shown by the work of Dunphy (1969). Although he does not refer to the Sherifs, his analysis of the role of the peer group as a reference group for the adolescent produced results that in many ways were similar to theirs. He, too, found the peer group to be all-important as an avenue of expanding social contact, the primary imparter of heterosexual mores and sexual roles, and a means of achieving independence from the parents. As did the Sherifs, he found conformity to adolescent group norms to be a prerequisite for acceptance into membership, and this conformity most strongly required of group leaders. Group leaders and the norms they exemplified were identified with by adolescent group members, and displaced the parents as the primary socialisation force for children between the ages of fourteen and sixteen. Adolescents expressed rejection of their parents and the value systems associated with them, and acquired their own value schema from their

peers. Thus the peer group, and particularly the dominant, high-status members of it, became a reference group with whom the adolescent closely identified.

Dunphy's main study was of normal, non-deviant, middle-class adolescents, similar to the upper- and middle-class groups among those studied by Sherif & Sherif. However a specific case study of a delinquent group from a working-class background revealed norms of secrecy, rejection of all adult authority, intense group solidarity, and admiration of toughness rather than achievement as the most desirable social trait. These findings also were very similar to those of Sherif & Sherif when examining lower socioeconomic status adolescents. Finally he commented, just as they did that the clique, or small face-to-face group, was a means of developing and expressing sociability in the adolescent, and neither a denial nor a preventative of it, as many adults seem to think.

Consequently, although Dunphy made no explicit reference to the children of immigrants, his study was useful as it made that of Sherif & Sherif, and hence other similar American work, appear highly relevant to Australian conditions also. Australia, like the United States, is a rapidly changing, industrialised Western society. Thus it was in confirmation of expectations that Dunphy also found teenagers to be at variance with their parents over social norms, and to be turning to their peer group as a primary reference group in consequence.

Moreover Dunphy demonstrated the importance of conformity as an Australian adolescent more, and the necessity of a close association with Australian adolescent culture, in the attainment of peer-group

membership. Teenagers who did not conform, whether from recalcitrance or ignorance, were not only not accepted, but were rejected by their peers. This in its turn suggested that the findings of Sherif & Sherif concerning the intensified difficulties experienced by second-generation children of immigrants should also apply in Australia. Growing up in a host society, of parents born overseas, they are experiencing culture conflict resulting not only from rapid societal change, but from the disparity between the culture of their parents and that of older generations of Australians also.

Two Australian Studies of the Second Generation

Two major contributions have been made toward the psychological study of the second-generation adolescent child in Australia, those of Johnston (1969) and Doczy (1967, 1969).

As discussed above, Johnston made the valuable distinction between culture tension and culture conflict. She described culture tension as a state of stress between the two generations in an immigrant family resulting from differences in the rate of assimilation, and culture conflict as the personal disorientation and insecurity actually experienced by an individual as a result of such stress. The distinction is accepted, and the term culture conflict reserved in the remainder of the present report to refer to the psychological state of strain experienced by an individual perceiving disparity between two sets of value schema with which he identifies.

Johnston also made a theoretically interesting distinction between external and internal (subjective) assimilation. Moreover she

achieved some intriguing findings, such as the fact that unassimilated children of assimilated parents did not experience intergenerational tension, whereas assimilated children of unassimilated parents frequently reported severe strain.

Nevertheless the findings of her report will not be discussed in further detail here for a number of reasons. (1). As Johnston herself admits, it was methodologically unsound. Respondents, both parents and children, were questioned by an own-race interviewer (Johnston). Biassed responses, particularly from children, were inevitable and could well have influenced the findings of a researcher attempting to demonstrate that children of her own ethnic group were not becoming Australianised. A control study employing an Australian investigator would have lessened such doubts. Moreover the measure of culture tension used was response to direct questioning of Respondents as to whether or not they considered that tension existed between the generations, or between the cultures. Another measure, perhaps projective, correlating with this very direct query would have provided some concurrent validation for the findings.

(2). Results were confusingly presented and analysed, with Respondents often being grouped to achieve the maximum value of chi-square (almost the sole statistic used), and subtotals in some tables not corresponding with those in others. (3). The ages of children interviewed ranged from 13 to 19, encompassing the whole of adolescence. The work of researchers such as Sherif & Sherif (1964) and Dunphy (1969), and reviews by authors such as Singer & Singer (1969), Cole & Hall (1970), or Hurlock (1972) show that the child's personality, reference groups

and social interaction typically change dramatically during this period. Although Johnston did split her sample into "Older" and "Younger" for some analyses, more care in matching for age would have been desirable.

(4). The second-generation children studied were compared only with one another and with the ratings of two judges (one of them Johnston). A control group of Australian peers would have added greatly to the value of the research. (5). The one reasonably objective finding that delinquency occurred in boys who were assimilated but whose parents were not, was based on eight Respondents. Johnston admitted that this was inadequate, and at the same time preferred not to view such behaviour as resulting from culture conflict within the individual.

(6). Most importantly in the present context, the study was of adolescents whose parents had been refugees, and as such was considered to be tangential to a study of the children of voluntary immigrants. Martin (1965) and Kunz (1968), among others, have shown the refugee family to be anomalous in both its past experiences and present adjustment, and not comparable with volitional immigrant families.

Overall, Johnston's report was disappointing. A useful theoretical approach was tested by subjective, non-standardised collection of data and simple analysis of it. While her conclusion that culture conflict did not occur in the families she studied may have been correct, the basic argument on which it was founded was that they seemed to her to be "a lot of happy, well adjusted people without any signs of social disorganisation" (Johnston, 1969, p.65) and was not convincing.

A much more informative study of second-generation adolescents in Australia is that by Doczy (1967, 1969). He interviewed 59 immigrant

boys, 22 Australian-born sons of immigrants, and a control group of 81 Australian peers. Variables on which the groups were matched included school grade, living with both parents, age, intelligence, age of parents, age difference between parents, and the socioeconomic status of fathers' occupations. Data was obtained by structured interview, questionnaires and teacher rating scales.

Doczy provides a detailed theoretical summary and discussion of work on the assimilation of second-generation immigrants into the host society, to which the interested reader is referred. However, much of the work covered was published prior to World War II, in the United States, and, as he points out, was sociological rather than psychological in orientation. The need for up-to-date, Australian, psychological studies was stressed, a need such as the present study is an attempt to fill.

He was preoccupied with the study of assimilation of second-generation adolescents into the host society of their parents. A number of possible theoretical approaches were listed, among them the balance theory of Heider (1958) which had been adopted for the present study and is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5 below. However Doczy was interested in assimilation rather than conflict per se, and employed the models of Taft and Richardson (Taft, 1965) which nominated stages through which the individual has to pass before achieving complete assimilation into a host society. These were supported, but are tangential to the present study, so are not discussed in detail here.

Nevertheless a number of highly relevant methodological points were noted. An Australian control group was used, enabling comparison

of first- and second-generation immigrant adolescents, not only with one another, but with their host society peers also. In this he improved on the work of Johnston discussed above, and provided a precedent for the present study. This group was matched with that of immigrant adolescents according to the socioeconomic status of their fathers' occupations. Following the Taft-Richardson model, the adolescent's assimilation was viewed as dependent upon both satisfaction with his own life-role, and the degree to which he perceived his parents as satisfied. Both of these sources of satisfaction, or lack of it, are partly dependent on the standard of living, particularly in comparison with that of members of the peer group. As the average Australian family enjoyed a higher standard of living, if for no other reason than that of seniority of residence, an artificial difference in satisfaction levels may have been found, had socioeconomic status not been controlled. Doczy therefore equated immigrant and host society families for socioeconomic status, and provided a precedent for a similar procedure in the present study.

On the other hand, no attempt was made to match for religion. Although the majority of the immigrant sample were Roman Catholic, while most Australian families were Protestant, it was claimed that this is an essential element of the cultural gap which is being bridged by the process of assimilation. This, too, was considered relevant to the present study. As Doczy pointed out, any attempt at matching by religion would both be difficult and make a study of reduced interest, as many Australians but few European immigrants are Church of England, and a great proportion of immigrant families are Roman Catholic while this is true of a much smaller percentage of the native-born Australian pop-

ulation. Moreover native-born Australians include few Greek Orthodox, Dutch Reformed, or German Lutherans among their ranks.

As have Martin (1965) and Kunz (1968), Doczy also noted that refugee parents are a special case. Past experiences of concentration and refugee camps override cultural background, and socioeconomic status in the host society often differs greatly from that experienced in the homeland. He therefore attempted to avoid the children of refugee parents, as did the present study.

An important distinction was drawn between the child's perception of cultural differences, and the actual size of the gap. The perceived was frequently found to be greater than the actual discrepancy. Adolescent children of immigrants thought that they differed more from their Australian peers than was actually the case. Nevertheless the child's perception of his degree of acculturation predicted satisfaction, identification and hence assimilation, whereas his actual similarity to his host society peers did not. Thus the relevant measure when assessing culture disparity as a predictor of culture conflict is perceived, rather than actual, differences. Supporting this conclusion was evidence that an important source of actual indices, teacher ratings, were unreliable, possibly invalid, and incomplete. Doczy's warning against using this source was heeded.

Similarly he expressed regret at not having obtained parental responses as data on the extent to which the familial culture differed from that of the host society. The adolescent's own predictions of his parents' probable responses were recorded, and the evidence on disparity between perceived and actual culture differences cited above

casts strong suspicion on the reliability and validity of this information. Again Doczy's reservations were noted as highly relevant.

Finally, and of some importance, Doczy also commented on the uniqueness of culture conflict. He defined it as "the clash between the values and norms of the old and new country, leading to tension between the immigrant and his child, an emotionally disturbing, more or less enduring experience for the 'marginal' individual" (Doczy, 1967, p. 27); and differentiated it from conflict arising from apparently similar sources, but equally probable of occurrence in the immigrant's homeland. As will be apparent from previous sections of this chapter, this distinction was valuable. However he made no mention of the other form of conflict with which it may be confused, that between the generations in the host society.

In fact it is suggested that at least one of his findings, that Australian boys averaged only 15.8 out of 20 on a slang test, whereas 80% of an adult standardisation sample had scored 20/20, could be evidence of such a disparity between the generations. Similarly, particular problem areas revealed by his interview data, concerning employment, adjustment to the physical (urban?) environment, social control, and heterosexual relationships, are comparable to those cited in the literature on the generation gap in the Western world, and discussed above.

Thus Doczy's report was valuable when assessing the findings of the present study. Although the basic design of this research had been largely shaped by the time Doczy's work became readily available, his discussion and conclusions concerning conflict definition, measurement and sampling all provided support for the thinking behind the

design of the present study, as will be seen in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8. Similarly some of his findings assisted in the evaluation of other work on stress in the second-generation adolescent child of immigrants in Australia, set out in Chapter 4.

Thus examples of basic American studies of culture conflict in second-generation immigrant adolescents have been cited in this chapter (Child, 1943; Glazer & Moynihan, 1963; Jessor et al., 1968; Sherif & Sherif, 1964; Singer & Singer, 1969; Whyte, 1943, 1955). Dunphy's (1969) study of conflict experienced by both the normal and the deviant Australian teenager was then used to link these overseas studies with the two major psychological reports on tension and conflict experienced by the adolescent child of immigrant parents in Australia (Doczy, 1967, 1969; Johnston, 1969).

Finally Doczy's study, as perhaps the closest to a precedent, was discussed in detail, a number of parallels and discrepancies with the present study being noted. Doczy provided a useful summary of overseas work on the second-generation adolescent. The following chapter surveys the research into the adolescent child of immigrants in Australia to date, attempting to distinguish between conflict arising from assimilation difficulties and culture conflict. Chapter 5 offers a model for the study of culture conflict, irrespective of whether culture is defined by geographical boundary, age, or, more properly, by uniqueness of its system of values and beliefs.

CHAPTER 4. CONFLICT BETWEEN CULTURES AND THE GENERATIONS EXPERIENCED BY AUSTRALIAN-BORN ADOLESCENT CHILDREN OF AUSTRALIAN AND IMMIGRANT PARENTS.

"Children whose parents are both immigrants often find that their greatest problem lies in the clash between their parental culture and their Australian environment. When they make Australian friends at school and bring Australian customs back into the home there is sometimes friction between them and their parents, who are still thinking in terms of European customs and values. This does not mean that there is no friction in other homes. We are all aware of the tension that occurs in any family between parents and children, particularly with teenagers wishing to branch out on their own and become independent of adult authority. But when this is allied to a marked cultural difference between the customs and values of the parents and the Australian customs and values that children are bringing back from school, there is sometimes severe tension." (Price, C. A., 1963b, p.15).

This observation by perhaps the foremost scholar of Australian immigration was the stepping-off point for the present research. This study is an attempt to measure the nature and degree of the tension between adolescent children and their parents in Australia, and to ascertain the extent and types of differences between Australian-born children whose parents are immigrant, and those whose parents are Australians, in the tensions they experience and the psychological means they employ to cope with them. As Price says, tension between teenagers and their parents occurs in any family, and many of the causes of immigrant family discord described by authors to be cited in this chapter

are experienced by Australian teenagers also. However, some are not, and these also are examined.

In another publication Price (1963a) inferred extensive conflict and increasingly intense stress for second-generation children, especially of Southern European parents, in their attempts to cope with and adjust to two cultures simultaneously, but commented that little research had been carried out into this in Australia at the time of his writing. Although the Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council Report (1960) quoted in Chapter 1 sparked some interest in immigrants' children in Australia, little has been published to this date (December 1971) specifically on immigrant children relative to the number of studies on immigration in general (Price, 1966a, 1971). Notable exceptions are Adler & Taft (1966); Johnston (1969); Doczy (1967, 1969). Price (1971) reports that this is changing, and that the next few years should see more information available, particularly concerning the second-generation child of immigrant parents. As second-generation children now constitute approximately 27% of the total immigrant contribution to Australia's population growth since 1947 (Pyne & Price, 1971), this is highly desirable. The present study is one attempt to begin to fill this gap.

To date most publication on the assimilation and adjustment of the children of immigrants in Australian society has been in the context of wider examinations of immigrants as a group or of the assimilation of the family as a whole. As will be seen, some field studies have been published, but much information has also appeared via conferences and seminars on problems of immigration. Highlights among

these have been the Conference on Immigration Research convened by the Department of Demography, Australian National University in 1960 (Price, 1960a); the seminar organised by the Standing Committee for the Mental Health of Migrants at the University of New South Wales in 1963 (Matsdorf, 1963); and the National Conference of the Australian Council for Social Service in Brisbane in 1968 (Throssell, 1968). The major contribution to the psychological study of immigration has been that by Taft and his colleagues at the University of Western Australia (Taft, 1965), while for the student of the integration of the immigrant family into Australian society, work by Price (1963a); Zubrzycki (1964); a number of authors contributing to a book edited by Stoller (1966a); and survey results published by Hay, Arens & Kern (1967) provide much useful information.

A number of common themes emerge from writings on the child of immigrants in Australia concerning the likelihood of tension between himself, his parents, and his Australian peer group. It is widely agreed or at least implied that the potential for friction between parent and child is greater within the immigrant family than within its Australian equivalent. Causes of discord suggested, while many and varied, cluster around themes such as tension between the parents themselves; the effects of Australian prejudice against immigrants; the homeland roots of the immigrant parents; the advanced acculturation of second-generation children compared with that of their parents; specific clashes over social norms such as food and language preferences; and the inability of the immigrant family structure to cope with the stress of acculturation and assimilation.

This chapter therefore sets out the evidence for heightened tension between parents and adolescent in the immigrant family, focussing upon each of these themes in turn. A number of authors found or suggested varied reactions to such tension, and these are also described where appropriate. A theory of the nature and consequences of the culture conflict arising from such tension is presented in chapter 5.

However, as argued in chapter 2, the second-generation child of immigrants is not unique in experiencing disagreement with his parents. Intergenerational conflict is widespread throughout Western industrial society in the 1970's. Not only is it often intense, but it increasingly involves basic social values. Thus the Australian adolescent is also at variance with the older generation, not only over how to regulate Australian society, but also over what sort of society it should be. Perusing writings on the immigrant adolescent, it is apparent that a number of the issues over which friction occurs between him and his parents also cause friction between the Australian adolescent and his parents. That is, what some authors have viewed as culture conflict can more parsimoniously be explained as intergeneration conflict, and common to all adolescent families in Australia, whether the parents are native-born or from overseas.

Nevertheless, as was also stressed in chapter 2, intergeneration conflict itself can be viewed as a form of culture conflict. The society into which the contemporary teenager's parents were born differed so radically from that into which he is maturing, that culture conflict very similar to that experienced by the immigrant family appears inevitable.

On the other hand, it is probably that some causes of tension between the immigrant adolescent and his parents are not experienced by the Australian family. They arise from the fact that the cultures from which immigrant parents have come, and which they attempt to transmit to their offspring, are at variance to a greater or lesser extent with the culture in which their Australian-born children are growing up. Parents are either unaware or disapprove of certain Australian values and norms, and inculcate their own. This results in culture conflict for the child. He must either attempt to live according to one set of values at home and another when with his peer group at school or work, or not adhere to the norms of one or the other, with resultant stress in either case. This type of situation is also described in this chapter.

Finally, the amount of disparity from the host society culture varies from one homeland culture to another. United Kingdom parents do not disagree with Australian norms to nearly the same extent as do Southern European parents, nor over the same mores. Thus children of parents from differing backgrounds experience differing amounts and types of tension. The final section of this chapter summarises such differences found in the literature on the adolescent child of immigrants in Australia.

It should be noted that some cited investigators were writing about Southern European immigrants who had begun to arrive prior to World War II, or were settling in enclaves established before the great influx of the 1950's (eg., Borrie & Packer, 1954; Oeser & Hammond, 1954;

Price, 1963a). Although it can be claimed that their findings were relevant for immigrant groups in the 1950's, the social situation in the 1970's could well be different, with much larger numbers, more intense urban concentrations and a continuing flow of new immigrants providing renewed contact with homeland cultures. Nevertheless, the parents of children who were born in Australia and are now 15 years old arrived in the 1950's or earlier. Similarly, it was the pre-World War II culture of their homeland in which the present-day adolescent's parents grew up, and from which they obtained their values and norms. The findings of these investigators are therefore still considered highly relevant.

A second point to be borne in mind is that many studies, when discussing immigrants, include in this category refugees and displaced persons. A detailed analysis of refugee families showed them to be a highly diverse group, in a complex situation (Martin, 1965). This was a major influence on the decision not to include refugee families in the present study (see chapter 6). Thus some findings cited concerning stress in immigrant families may be inappropriately strong for the present study, referring to samples including refugees. Where this occurs, it is because authors have not reported sufficient detail to enable findings concerning refugees to be separated from those concerning immigrants in general. Overall, however, distortion should not be excessive.

Advanced Acculturation of the Second Generation. The rapid acculturation and even assimilation of children born and reared in the host society, in contrast to the slower and never complete acculturation of their

parents, is perhaps the most universally acknowledged source of conflict for the second-generation adolescent, in Australia or elsewhere.

Overseas, the work of Deutsch & Collins (1965), for example, suggests that rejection of the older generation results in differing attitudes toward members of the host society held by the adolescent and his parents. They showed that prejudices toward an outgroup tend to diminish following greater contact between the potentially prejudiced individual and the outgroup under certain conditions. The second generation child experiences greater contact with his Australian peers under such conditions than do his parents with adult Australians. Consequently his attitude toward Australians is more accepting than that of his parents, with ensuing disagreement and tension between the two generations.

The first condition for prejudice reduction laid down by Deutsch & Collins was contact with members of the outgroup who are not behaving in a manner consistent with the beliefs of the prejudiced. While it is known that immigrant parents tend to believe Australians to be prejudiced against them (Emery & Katz, 1950; Johnston, 1969; and see section below), it is very likely that their adolescent child's Australian peers do not behave in such a manner toward him. Beswick & Hills (1969, 1972) found a strong correlation between age and ethnocentrism in Australia. Young Australians are less prejudiced than their elders. The adolescent child of immigrants experiences less antipathy from his peers than do his parents from adult Australians.

Secondly, Deutsch & Collins pointed out that such experiences must be compelling. School and peer-group relationships between adoles-

cents are difficult to ignore (Connell et al., 1957). Thirdly, they claimed that contact between the prejudiced and the outgroup must occur in circumstances which make the outgroup members' non-stereotyped behaviour appear genuine. Again, contact between schoolchildren is more likely to be genuine than is that between, for example, the immigrant mother and shop assistants, or the immigrant father and his Australian boss and workmates (Rooth, 1968). Fourthly, it was stressed that social forces toward non-prejudiced behaviour should be acting on the ingroup member to encourage him to dismiss his prejudices. Schoolteachers are such a force; powerful and anti-prejudiced. They are highly educated and education correlates with openmindedness (Beswick & Hills, 1969, 1972). Immigrant parents are less likely to experience such social forces. Finally, contact must be on an equal-status level. The status of children at school more closely approximates equality than does that of the immigrant adult and his boss or employees.

The combination of these circumstances therefore suggests that, irrespective of the degree to which he is identifiable as a member of the ethnic group of his parents, the Australian-born adolescent child of immigrants is more likely to experience positive relationships with his Australian peers than are his parents. Over the very important norm of the value placed on relationships with members of the host society, then, he is likely to experience dissension with his parents.

Further causes of stress between immigrant parents and their more acculturated second-generation adolescent children were suggested by the work of Patterson (1965). In her work on West Indians in London, she was studying an immigrant group and a host society differing in

many respects from those of Australia. Nevertheless she made a number of general points, and some specific ones, which would seem relevant to all such children, irrespective of race or colour.

They identified strongly with the culture of the peer-group into which they had been born, as these were the only society they knew.

However their parents were reluctant to allow them to form heterosexual relationships with peers of the host society, fearing that progeny of an interethnic marriage would be reared lacking any knowledge of their grandparents' culture. Patterson also found that the lack of an extended kinship group, especially grandparents, meant that practices concerning childrearing and childminding for working parents had to be changed, with consequent disruption of parent-child relationships.

She also found second-generation children to experience friction with their host society peers. Although born into and maturing in United Kimgdom society, they nevertheless had to cope with the prejudices and stereotypes of that society, concerning their parents' culture, but also directed at them as involuntary representatives of that culture. Although prejudice experienced by the adult was stronger, it was also keenly felt by the adolescent, to whom acceptable mores, peers' attitudes, self identity and the peer group as a reference group were extremely important. Thus his advanced acculturation resulted in friction with both his parents and his peers. This experience of being in conflict as a result of disharmony with both reference groups is typical of the second-generation child, and not generally shared with other adolescents.

Many studies in Australia reported or implied conflict of this type, and predicted reactions such as personality disorganisation, alien-

ation and rebellion by the second generation adolescent at a level over and above that of his host society peer (eg., Kern, 1966).

The rapid absorption of host society norms from teachers and peers, and the disparity between them and those of parents, were factors cited by Radziowski (1963, 1964) as causes of personality stress in the second-generation child. He set out a number of types of reaction to such stress, observed by him as a metropolitan psychiatrist, honorary consultant to a large psychiatric institution. Personality disorganisation took forms such as the displacement of hostility toward parents on to their homeland culture, with a lack of any real identification with Australian culture leading to insecurity, anxiety and poor peer-group relations. Conversely, over-identification by some second-generation children with the Australian peer-group culture produced familial stress resulting from their rejection of parents and older, overseas-born siblings. This in turn in some cases caused the mother to attempt to regain affection by induction of guilt and obligation in the child, with resultant insecurity and anxiety in his relations with both his family and his Australian peer group. A high need for academic achievement was sometimes found also, with a consequent clash with Australian peer-group standards of relative equality and a high regard for sporting prowess.

Another common reaction was that of playing the "clown" role in his peer group, exaggerating and ridiculing aspects of the parental homeland culture, and often accompanied by regressive behaviour and personality instability. An alternative reaction, particularly among children called upon to translate and to assist with conducting family

finances, was one of premature maturity, with concomitant withdrawal and depression. Finally Radziowski described the rejection of social mores in the form of rebelliousness and social delinquency often found in second-generation adolescents rejecting both their parental culture and that of the non-accepting Australian host society.

While the sample of second-generation adolescents encountered by Radziowski as a psychiatrist was necessarily those suffering extreme tension, usually from strong cultural conflict, his was one of the darkest pictures of second-generation adolescents painted in the literature concerning immigrants in Australia. It should be noted, however, that while the causes of such conflict may be unique to second-generation children, their reactions to it are similar to those of the Australian teenager at variance with his parents. He, too, could displace hostility on to their culture or overidentify with it. He may react by an exaggerated need for achievement (Musgrove, 1966) or by playing the clown role and ridiculing adult standards. He may mature too early, or give evidence of rejection of adult mores by rebelliousness and delinquency. The point being made is that the second-generation child is in an aggravated form of the culture conflict which leads to such tension between the generations.

Zubrzycki (1964) also found intergenerational tension in immigrant families to result from discrepancies between the behaviour patterns of European-born parents and their Australian-reared children. Moreover the apparent irrelevance or even meaninglessness of their parents' standards to Australian-reared adolescents led to either personality disorganisation and disorientation, or to rebelliousness and re-

jection of their parents' mores. However, even in the highly industrialised area from which his sample came, little delinquency was found. Zubrzycki suggested as a reason the relative youth of most second-generation adolescents at the time of his study, but predicted an emergence of the results of intergenerational conflict in the forms of a higher incidence of mental disorder and delinquency in the Australian-born offspring of immigrants.

Reports some years later in the same State of disproportionate numbers of second-generation adolescents in Detention Centres (Hay, Arens & Kern, 1967), and experiencing mental breakdowns (Stoller, 1966b, 1968) would seem to bear out this prediction.

Figures cited by Hay et al. were particularly pertinent to the present study. After an extensive although not well sampled survey of young people, and particularly of adolescent immigrants and children of immigrants in Victoria, a brief chapter presented some data concerning the inmates of two Detention Centres run by the Victorian Child Welfare Department. Respondents were aged between 14 and 17 years. Boys were mostly petty criminals and State wards from broken homes, while the majority of girls were on charges of immorality and vagrancy. Especially relevant to the present study, however, were the proportions in the Detention Centres of immigrant and second-generation children.

Of the 142 respondents, only 46 per cent were Australian-born of Australian parents. Children who had immigrated with their parents made up 19 per cent of the total, while 35 per cent were the children of immigrants. The disparity of these figures becomes apparent when they are compared with the proportions within the total population cal-

culated by Price (1971). He estimated that of adolescents between the ages of 15 and 19, 78 per cent are Australian, 14 per cent children who have immigrated with their parents, and 8 per cent the Australian-born children of immigrants. Thus the proportion of immigrant children in the two Detention Centres was approximately as expected (19 per cent compared with 14 per cent), but the proportion of second-generation children of immigrant parents was inordinately high (35 per cent compared with an expected 8 per cent).

Hay et al. offered no explanation for this disproportionate number of second-generation delinquent adolescents, but provided some incidental data. For instance Detention Centre inmates were less happy and optimistic than the average teenager, had experienced more dissension with their parents, and had formed closer relationships with their peers as opposed to their parents and relatives, than had the remainder of the sample of youth in Victoria. Social interaction of an informal nature was extremely important to them. These findings refer to the whole Detention Centre sample, not specifically to second-generation immigrant children, but nevertheless suggest reasons for the greater number of Australian-born children of immigrants who were delinquent, and for some of their reactions to the situation of stress in which they found themselves. It was to explore further into phenomena such as these, as Hay et al. suggested should be done, that the present study was undertaken. It was assumed that Detention Centre children were extreme cases, who had withdrawn or had been forcibly removed from the conflict situation. More useful data was anticipated from a study of adolescents still in the conflict situation, that is, children who were

growing up in Australian society while living at home with their family from another culture.

Another authority whose claims bore out Zubrzycki's prediction that faster acculturation of second-generation children than of their parents would lead to stress was Stoller (1966b, 1968). He used as a basis information available to him as Chief Clinical officer of the Mental Health Authority, Victoria, and Director of the Mental Health Research Institute of Victoria. He asserted that, while delinquency and truancy were not common among second-generation children at the time of his writing, adolescents and young adults whose parents were immigrants evinced a higher proportion of mental breakdowns, the most important of a number of causes cited being intergenerational conflict.

Oeser & Hammond (1954) also reported that the children of immigrants were assimilating much more rapidly and completely than were their parents, and personal disorientation and uncertainty regarding reference groups as a result was predicted by Benyei (1960) and described by Listwan (1960). That this intergenerational stress arising from rapid acculturation of second-generation children can occur in a rural as well as in the urban environment was shown by Tully (1960). However, it is probably more typical of urban groups, experiencing frequent and unceasing contact with the host culture from an early age (Price, 1963a). As most post-war immigrant families settled in the metropolises, such discord is common. Price also commented to the effect that the traditionalism of upbringing varies from family to family, and between different generations of immigrants. This gives rise to disagreement between second-generation children and their parents not only concerning

mores being adopted from Australian society, but over beliefs and behaviour being learned from members of their own ethnic group. Even further insecurity and anxiety concerning identity formation and social interaction for the second-generation child is suggested.

Evidence concerning this clash between immigrant generations over acculturation into the host society was provided by Emery & Katz (1950). They demonstrated that Jews born in Australia were more likely to regard Australians as a reference group than were Jews born in either East or West Europe. Moreover the Australian-born Jew desired change in his own national group in order to reduce interethnic friction more than did the Jew born in Europe. Although discussing a somewhat atypical group, Emery & Katz nevertheless showed the child of immigrants to be ready to view the host society as a reference group and to prefer accomodation by his own ethnic group more than does the first-generation immigrant. This suggests that the Australian-born child differs from his parents in his attitudes on these two issues and that this difference could well result in intergenerational conflict.

It was noted that, while Taft (1952) severely criticised the work of Emery & Katz, he nevertheless agreed that his analysis of their data supported these two particular findings; of greater salience of Australians as a reference group to the Australian-born Jew, and his desire for change in his own ethnic group toward Australian mores, rather than vice versa.

However another side of the picture was painted by Doczy (1967, 1969). In a detailed study of 59 immigrant boys, 22 second-generation and 81 Australian peer adolescents, he found that although Australian-

born children of immigrants differed less from the Australian control group than did boys who had themselves immigrated, they had not progressed far toward assimilation. He therefore asserted that the frequently expressed claim that children of immigrants are rapidly and fully assimilated is invalid.

In this he is supported by Johnston (1969). However, Johnston also claimed to have found no evidence of internal conflict or emotional maladjustment among Australian-born children of immigrants in Western Australia, and with this Doczy did not agree. He showed that the second-generation child while more fully assimilated than his parents, is by no means fully assimilated. He consequently suffers uncertainty concerning his peer and parental reference groups resulting in internal conflict, emotional maladjustment, and poor identity formation. It is insufficient for the boy to be acculturated as objectively measured; he has to perceive that such acculturation has been achieved before self confidence and security can be attained. While Johnston agreed with this, she described most of her sample as having done so, while Doczy did not. For reasons set out in the previous chapter greater credence is given Doczy's findings than those of Johnston. Relevant for the present study, nevertheless, is that when Johnston did find her Respondents to be experiencing culture tension, it was because their parents were relatively unassimilated, while the children had made substantial advances along a continuum of acculturation.

Similarly Adler (1966) and Adler & Taft (1966), reporting on a number of soundly based empirical studies, claimed that second-generation children do acculturate much faster than do their parents. They

found complete assimilation of parents to be rare, even in United Kingdom families after seven years' residence. Moreover immigrant parents were reported to attempt to impose homeland values on their children, although second-generation children were found to score higher than their parents on participation in Australian society. Consequently disagreement and tension within the immigrant family, while decreasing from an initial post-immigration high, remained at a level significantly above that of the comparable Australian family. This was despite great changes which occurred in the immigrant family structure as immigrants accomodated toward the norms of the Australian host society, with its typically matriarchal family.

Thus theory, evidence from other cultures, and Australian evidence all suggest that acculturation of the second-generation child is more rapid than that of his parents. A number of findings indicate that this causes tension between the generations as parents continue to live according to one set of mores, and their Australian-born children grow up in a society holding values and norms differing from them to some extent. Several studies predicted, and others reported, personality disorientation and conflict for the child as a result. However one study (Johnston, 1969) found little evidence of conflict within the child; another found less difference in acculturation rates than might be supposed (Doczy, 1967, 1969); and a third suggested that the immigrant family does acculturate as a whole fairly rapidly, although not completely (Adler & Taft, 1966). Overall, however, it would seem that discrepancies between the mores of his parents' homeland culture and those of the only culture he fully understands, that of the host

society, are for the second-generation adolescent child of immigrants a source of intergeneration conflict not experienced by his Australian peer.

Prejudice in Australians. It will be recalled that an important source of conflict for the second-generation child in the United Kingdom is the attitudes of members of the only society he knows toward him as an involuntary representative of his parents' homeland culture (Patterson, 1965). Although immigrants in Australia are not generally distinguishable by skin pigmentation (with the exception of some Southern Europeans), language quickly identifies the parent, and the close contact of the peer group rapidly reveals the home background of the second-generation child to his peers. Thus immigrant parents, and, to a lesser extent, their Australian-born children, form a potential outgroup in Australian society.

Beswick & Hills (1969, 1972) found Australians to be more ethnocentric than immigrants as a group, with the exception of refugees from Eastern Europe. Furthermore they showed, as Blalock (1967) predicts, and Patterson (1965) found in very different societies, that prejudice against newcomers is especially common in the lower socioeconomic strata of society. As the great majority of immigrants move into Australian society at the level of skilled tradesman or below (Australian Year Book, 1970; Davidson, 1966), prejudice against them in their workmates and neighbours is to be expected. The father finds himself greeted familiarly at work, and perhaps invited to the pub, but closer relationships are comparatively rarely offered. As will be discussed more fully

later, the mother typically has few contacts outside her home, and those she does make, even at work, are usually superficial. Evidence that this attitude is reflected in official policy is offered by Encel (1971).

Such a social environment produces insecurity and a sense of isolation in the parents, with concomitant rejection by them of Australians. It was often described as a major reason for a retreat to the society of other immigrants of the same ethnic group, including the establishment of ethnic clubs and societies. Thus the Australian-born child of immigrants commonly has parents who feel abnormally rejected and insecure, and finds it unusually difficult to identify with them as a primary reference group.

The tension aroused in immigrant families as a result of Australian prejudice was analysed by Oeser & Hammond (1954). They described the Australian host society as passively indifferent to the needs of immigrants. Immigrants are expected to assimilate completely into Australian society. However the stereotypes of national characteristics held by Australians and their reluctance to provide effective assistance toward assimilation means that many adult immigrants are forced to fall back on other members of their own ethnic group for support and social stimulation. The resultant subcultural enclaves forming within the metropolises in turn are disapproved of by Australians, so increasing the rift between them and the large numbers of immigrants arriving. Borrie & Packer (1954) also found that beliefs on the part of Australians in "Nordic superiority" and in the inferiority of cultures differing from their own, result in social segregation of the adult immigrant.

Thus adjustment to Australian society for many immigrants involves identification with an own-race group, with its own set of con-

ventions and values. However Oeser & Hammond and Borrie & Packer also reported that the children of immigrants were assimilating much more rapidly and completely, thus suggesting that disparity between the value schema of the two generations is likely.

These reports described the situation soon after World War II, but later investigators also reported that although the Australian community has become more accepting, immigrants still find that they are not invited into Australian homes nor encouraged to join established clubs and societies (eg., Tully, 1960). Southern Europeans, for instance, reported being rejected in the pub and at work, although they felt positive toward Australian society as a whole for its acceptance of them and a high proportion had become naturalised (Benyei, 1960). Even then, they reported little contact with Australians out of working hours (Rooth, 1968) and feeling "second-class citizens" (Benyei, 1960, p.85).

The prejudice they meet from Australians is also significant as a source of tension between parents themselves. In his study of Southern European immigrants, Price (1963a) found prejudice and distrust demonstrated by Australians to be a cause of tension within immigrant families. Immigrant mores of extreme thrift, strong kinship ties, use of a foreign language in public, residence in monoethnic enclaves, and differing values concerning working hours, living conditions and social mobility were seen as major causes of rejection by host society members.

Radziowski (1963, 1964) made the point that a child's personality is the joint product of the culture in which he grows up and the upbringing given him by his parents. Consequently strain between immigrant parents and their host society, and between the parents themselves,

results in personality stress for their Australian-born children. Anxiety and insecurity were suggested as occurring more frequently in immigrant parents, a major cause being the mistrust and excessive demands for assimilation expressed by Australians.

However it should be noted that the lack of adaptation to minority groups by Australians and their requiring from immigrants complete assimilation, while very real, does not perhaps concern immigrant parents as deeply as Australians might believe (Adler & Taft, 1966). The outcome of this is that, although immigrant parents acculturate markedly, they nevertheless continue to identify with their homeland culture to a fair degree and attempt to inculcate it in their children. This makes necessary extensive adaptation by the second generation before they are accepted by the peer group which is becoming an increasingly important reference group to them as adolescents, with resultant conflict and insecurity.

Finally, the children of immigrants also experience prejudice against them from their host society peers. An example of this was also reported by Adler & Taft (1966). In the largest and most definitive study so far conducted of the assimilation of immigrant families and their second-generation children into Australian society, they found that the children of immigrants were expected by their peers to conform more closely to group norms than were their Australian age-mates. Concurrently they were seen as less able to do so by both themselves and Australian children. To be accepted by the peer group, Australian children were required to be good-looking, cheerful and skilful at sport. The more specific and demanding criteria of acceptance for the children

of immigrants included consistent group participation, a sense of humour, participation in sport, non-assertiveness, tidiness and a lack of restlessness.

However these are in accord with the criteria set by adolescent crowds for the acceptance of new members described in the United States by Sherif & Sherif (1964) and in Sydney by Dunphy (1969). The situation for the second-generation child is not different, but more intense.

Thus the effect on the second-generation child of Australian prejudice against immigrants is not so much a direct experience of conflict arising from prejudice against him as a representative of his parents' culture by members of the host society. Rather it causes his parents to continue to identify with their homeland culture instead of assimilating into the host society, attempting to pass its norms and values on to him. Similarly it means that his parents find it difficult to relate successfully with the society of which they are attempting to become a part, and also causes tension between the mother and father themselves. These stresses result in personality disorientation and identification difficulties for the Australian-born adolescent. However he cannot be said to be suffering in this case from culture conflict himself so much as from familial tension arising from the attempts of his parents to move from their homeland culture into another which is ambivalent about accepting them.

Tension between Parents. Such tension between parents can result in displacement by them of hostility on to the child, and in rejection of them by him as a respected reference group (Singer & Singer, 1969).

Zubrzycki (1964) found this to be so in the course of his detailed analysis of the situation of a large group of immigrant families in an Australian industrial area. Difficulties cited as causes of such tension included financial problems, illness, finding suitable employment for adolescents, clashes of role structure concepts, household management problems, changes in the socioeconomic status of the husband and concomitant rejection by his wife, and excessive drinking. These were all seen as symptoms of poor assimilation into Australian society. They are not, of course, peculiar to the immigrant family, but that such tension is greater between immigrant parents than between Australian parents was shown by Adler (1966; Adler & Taft, 1966). He administered Day at Home items to the children of both recently settled and long-established immigrant families and measured tension between parents by the number of items on which they were reported by their children to disagree. Children whose parents had resided in Australia for periods ranging from two to seven or more years were questioned. It was found that tension between parents decreased as norms converged on to those of the typical Australian family, but that it continued to be at a level higher than that of the Australian family even after long residence, and even in United Kingdom families. As mentioned above, this was attributed by Adler & Taft primarily to parents' recognition of non-acceptance by their Australian host society, but on Zubrzycki's evidence could be assigned other origins also.

Other causes of tension between parents more intense or more widespread among immigrant families have also been suggested. An important one is the stress associated with low socioeconomic status, sometimes accentuated as the result of immigration.

For example, that low socioeconomic status can cause tension between immigrant parents resulting in greater inadequacy in the eyes of their adolescent children as a reference group was shown in the United States by Sherif & Sherif (1964). Both high and low socioeconomic status parents became steadily less effective in supplying such needs as a place and associates for pleasure, personal recognition, stable relationships and the development of personal identity, as the adolescent child developed, but these needs were less satisfied by low socioeconomic status immigrant parents than by higher socioeconomic status indigenous parents. Nonetheless, as stated in the previous chapter, Sherif & Sherif also stressed that all adolescents experience incompatibility between their means of attaining adulthood and those sanctioned by their parents. For second-generation children this is simply aggravated.

Similarly, Jessor et al. (1968) found the needs for recognition and affection of immigrant parents of low socioeconomic status to be more frustrated by less freedom of social movement, causing frustration and personal maladjustment despite conformity to host society norms. Their adolescent children perceived this failure to satisfy these needs, viewed their parents as a negative reference group, and sought other, less socially acceptable means of satisfying the same needs.

In Australia, the results of a random survey of the Greek immigrants assisted by the World Council of Churches up to 1960 supplemented by a small number of follow-up interviews, were reported by Benyei (1960). He found that, compared with the Australian host society, Greek socioeconomic status was low, as was level of education. Benyei made the insightful comment that although the majority of second-generation Greek

adolescents did not read or write Greek, neither did their illiterate parents. He found that Greek adults claimed that Australians were prejudiced against them, and were themselves antipathetic in turn toward members of their host society. Greek immigrant parents were outwardly acculturated (a large proportion were naturalised), but not assimilated into Australian society. This gave rise to an uncertainty regarding reference groups in second-generation children, and he concluded that personal disorientation in Australian-born children of Greek immigrants, while not then prevalent, was likely to occur as greater numbers of them reached adolescence and adulthood.

Even though of a relatively high socioeconomic status, an immigrant family may still experience tension if parents find that language and qualification differences bring about a fall in socioeconomic status in the host society. This is most common in families from a Northwest European background (Radziowski, 1963, 1964; Rooth, 1968). Alternatively, in lower income families the mother may be forced to work, resulting in an excessive preoccupation with financial difficulties, neurosis and tension between herself, her husband and her children. Such stress is particularly prevalent in the families of Southern European immigrants - poorly educated, with largely working class, low-paid occupations, and residing in poverty-stricken, innercity areas (Jupp, 1966).

Other results of such tension between immigrant parents were suggested by Listwan (1960) in his observations on the mental health of immigrants. Effects on immigrant fathers of the strain involved in adapting to a new culture were found to be either a depressed reluctance to perform a normal day's work, or, more frequently, an obsessive

preoccupation with financial security and attempts to increase it by long hours of work. Listwan suggested that a desire to escape from the physical and social strain of the work situation often resulted in loss of employment, insecurity, rejection of Australia and overidentification with the homeland. Conversely an excessive motivation to achieve in the immigrant parent frequently caused feelings of inferiority, poor marital relations, and rejection by the husband of his less assimilated wife. Listwan concluded by emphasising the effect of stress between parents on the emotional adjustment of their children. He asserted that such tension often occurred between immigrant parents, with consequent disruption of the family and disorientation for the second generation.

This problem is not peculiar to Australia, but is common where intercultural migration occurs (Barnouw, 1963). A further reason for it is that the parents' original reason for emigration may have been poor adjustment to their homeland in the first place (Radziowski, 1963). Irrespective of the cause, the child of immigrants is more likely to have suffered the experience of living with maladjusted parents.

In addition, familial tension can arise as parents from a rural background in the homeland from which they immigrate find the urban environment into which they come more complex and less secure (83 per cent of the Australian population resides in urban areas - Australian Year Book, 1970). For example, most Italian immigrants to Australia came from village communities to settle in inner-city urban areas (Price, 1963a). Difficulties arise as traditional sex roles prove inappropriate, the extended family is often split and contracted, and children come

to expect relationships with their parents, especially their fathers, at variance with those acceptable in their homeland culture. Intrafamilial tension often results, with both fathers and boys rejecting the home as a source of need satisfaction, and seeking companionship in peer groups outside it. This is similar to the descriptions given by Glazer & Moynihan (1963) of the Italian community in New York. However both Price and Glazer & Moynihan point out that the close urban environment containing a large monoethnic enclave provides a cushion against culture shock for the first generation, so may prevent a great deal of tension in the family also.

However it does prolong the period of potential gap between the home and host society value schema being absorbed by the second-generation child. Another way in which this occurs, and a further cause frequently mentioned of tension between immigrant parents, and between parents and their children, is the typically slower assimilation into Australian society of the immigrant mother.

One cause of this is the high incidence among Southern European immigrants of men immigrating alone, returning for a wife, and starting their families in Australia (Borrie & Packer, 1954; Price, 1963a). This means marked cultural dissimilarity between the immigrant parents and their Australian-born child, causing friction in the home and thus difficulty for him in identifying with his parents. It is true that Borrie & Packer were describing immigration prior to the post-World War II influx, and that this situation may not now hold as strongly. Nonetheless immigration for Southern Europeans after 1947 continued to be largely chain migration, with the same factors operating for at least

some years (Price, 1963a). Consequently the Australian-born child of Southern European parents who was 15 years old in 1970 would probably have had similar experiences and been in a similarly stressful situation.

For instance, in her report of a largely successful attempt to integrate an Italian immigrant group into a rural community, Tully (1960) described a number of causes of prejudice and tension between immigrants and the Australian host community. She found Australians to be hostile toward immigrants, while Italians, partly in reaction, were withdrawn and pessimistic concerning relations with Australian society. They played little part in local affairs and experienced only restricted contact with Australians. However this was especially true of women, and although the program planned generally succeeded in increasing contact for both men and children between the two ethnic groups, Australian women remained non-accepting, and Italian mothers continued to confine their activities almost entirely to their own homes. One result of this was a withdrawal by adolescent children of immigrants into their ethnic community after leaving school. Family ties in this case were stronger than the attraction of the Australian peer group. The important point is that the children apparently felt that they had to make a choice.

A more general reason for the slower acculturation of the mother is the fact that she has less contact with Australian society than has her husband, who works, or her children, who attend school. Again this is particularly true of Southern European families where few mothers are permitted to go out and work (Radziowski, 1963, 1964). A result of this can be estrangement and depression, giving rise to neurosis

and family disintegration. Banchevska (1966) also stressed the role of the non-working immigrant mother as a cause of intrafamilial culture conflict. She was described as reluctant to change her own values, experiencing little contact with Australian culture, and attempting to prevent adoption by her children of Australian peer-group norms. Her English is commonly much weaker (Kern, 1966). What contact she has is not particularly close, for example with shop assistants and bus conductors (Rooth, 1968). She is reluctant to join clubs and societies (Rooth, 1968; Tully, 1960). The typically isolated immigrant mother often attempts to relieve her loneliness by overpossessiveness of her spouse and overidentification with her adolescent children (Stoller, 1968).

Thus the potential for tension between parents as a result of incongruity between their homeland norms and those of the society into which they are attempting to assimilate is probably greater in Southern European than in United Kingdom and Northwest European immigrant families. Culture disparity is greater. However, in actuality this is probably not realised. The United Kingdom and, more particularly, the Northwest European, family settles in the suburbs and aspires to rapid assimilation with consequent security, both material and emotional. However complete assimilation is rare, so that parental tension and conflict are aroused, with hostility displaced on to the child, and difficulty for him in satisfying needs for identification, affection and security.

On the other hand, continued contact for Southern Europeans with their homeland culture and frequent arrivals of members of it into a

near neighbourhood, or even the home, results in parents clinging to the ways of their homeland (Price, 1954, 1964). An effect of this in the metropolises is the growth of relatively large ethnic enclaves, which form a protection against culture shock for adult and newly arrived immigrants, but give rise to conflict and divided loyalties in the Australian-born adolescent resident in them. Although these enclaves are not the size of the large ghettos described in the United States by Child (1943), Whyte (1943) or Glazer & Moynihan (1963), they are not inconsiderable (Lancaster-Jones, 1960, 1964). They have similar, although not such pronounced effects of retarding the assimilation of parents while their Australian-born children, attending school and mixing with peer groups usually containing at least some Australians, steadily become more like their host society peers in their attitudes, values and behaviour. To what degree those peers are like their own parents in these respects is another question again.

Adolescent Independence. With the parents experiencing greater everyday stress, encountering prejudice from Australians, and seeing their adolescent children growing away from them into the new society, it is not surprising that a particular norm over which dissension between the generations was often reported concerns the degree to which the teenager should be permitted independence of his parents. It was frequently stated that the Australian adolescent is allowed more freedom of thought, speech and movement than is his European counterpart. Consequent attempts by European-born parents to restrict their Australian-born child to a degree and type of social interaction acceptable in

their homeland causes tension between them and him and conflict for the child. However it must not be forgotten that the Australian family is currently passing through a period of rapid change in this norm also, and that friction between parents and children concerning it is by no means unique to the immigrant family.

That the intergenerational conflict concerning independence may be more intense for second-generation children than for their host-society peers was suggested by Martin (1965). The most consistent response made to a questionnaire she administered to refugee immigrant parents was a strong agreement that Australian children are allowed too much freedom, are overindulged and underdisciplined, and show insufficient respect for their parents and elders. However one can easily imagine a sample of Australian parents reporting identical sentiments.

Nonetheless the chain migration typical of Southern European migration has developed and maintained subcultures whose norms are at variance with those of the Australian host society (Jupp, 1966). One of these norms is a greater degree of respect expected by parents and old people from the younger generation. Thus the Australian-born child is not only taught that this is correct, but meets age-mates who readily conform, having recently immigrated. At the same time, he has life-long Australian friends who do not. Conflict for him would seem inevitable, and, while not basically different from that experienced by his Australian peer, more intense.

Nevertheless, some of the situations concerning independence or lack of it in which the second-generation child finds himself are unique.

For example, teachers of immigrants' children have reported that discussions with parents of a child often involve the child himself as an interpreter (Carey, 1959). This is disconcerting and restrictive for teachers and a role reversal for the children. Carey herself experienced the effects of this phenomenon, and suggested results such as inordinately early independence, too great a burden of responsibility for such household duties as financing and purchasing, and difficulty for the children, especially of Northwest European families, in moving from a dominant position in the family to a submissive one at school. It also reduces the child's respect for his parents, and consequently decreases the degree to which he perceives them as a reference group (Stoller, 1966b).

Moreover the wide availability of employment in Australia encourages independence in 16-year-olds which is contrary to the homeland mores of close kinship ties and authoritarian patriarchal domination of the family. Similarly, while pressure from Southern European parents on their children to leave school and work would seem to be in accord with this teenage norm, the accompanying requirement that their earnings should be handed over to the family funds certainly is not (Hay et al., 1967).

Another point relevant here is that Australian teenagers are seeking independence of their mother, while it is the father who has dominated the immigrant child's family up to adolescence (Adler, 1966). This will be discussed more fully later.

Allied to this is the finding that in Southern European families the relationship between parent and child tends to become more rigid

as the child grows older (Krupinski, 1968). This is in contrast to the relaxation of parent-child relations typical of British-Australian and Northwest European families. What is cause and what effect here is not clear. However assuming at least some contact between Southern European adolescents and their peers from other ethnic groups, some rejection of their parental norms and consequent familial tension would seem inevitable.

The second-generation child is caught between two loyalties. He experiences a divergence between loyalty to his immigrant parents and their nationality, and a shame associated with their deviation from the norms of the society in which he is growing up (Banchevska, 1966). The effect of this tension may not be lessened by a similar tension being experienced between Australian peer-group adolescents and their parents, but rather this may promote closer identification by the second-generation child with his Australian peers.

However when other authors saw differing expectations between the generations concerning the degree of discipline by parents of adolescents as a cause of tension between parents and second-generation children, they were portraying a situation which could simply be described as one common to most families containing adolescent children in Australia today. At most, the second-generation child of immigrants can be said to be experiencing no more than a somewhat more intense form of a type of conflict his Australian peers also experience to a greater degree than have adolescents of recent generations in Western society.

For example Price (1966c) commented on the effect of overemployment in Australia on the relationship of second-generation children

with their parents. Their opportunity to leave school early and obtain relatively highly paid jobs fosters an independence which their parents find difficult to accept. Similarly they tend to reject the attitudes of parental respect and financial thrift no less than they disagree with their parents' belief in the desirability of an education extended beyond the minimum leaving age. However this description would seem equally applicable to the Australian adolescent growing up in the same society, of parents raised in the Depression and who had matured during World War II.

Nevertheless Price claimed it to be particularly true of Northwest European and United Kingdom immigrants who, after an assisted passage, then establish homes in the suburbs. Their children thus grow up with a peer group consisting largely of Australians, resulting in intergenerational conflict for the second-generation child as a result of differences between the mores of his peer group and those of his parents. In contradiction to the argument of Jupp (1966) outlined above, Price suggested this discord for United Kingdom and Northwest European families to be more than that resulting from the chain migration which brings most Southern European families to Australia. Such migration has produced large ethnic enclaves, with consequently greater transmission to the second-generation child of homeland mores and attitudes, but at the same time less contact for him with his Australian peers and thus less conflict. So Price argues.

Such cushioning might well be effective even in the relatively small enclaves in Australia for immigrant parents, who are seeking it (Rooth, 1968), but whether it fulfills this function, or merely aggravates

a situation of conflict for the Australian-born child, is open to debate. The point is that the values over which Price found friction to be occurring are precisely those over which it occurs throughout Western society, and not uniquely in the immigrant family (Zubrzycki, 1964, 1966).

Similarly the oft-quoted tension aroused by Northwest European parents' applying pressure on their children to overachieve academically, with consequent rejection by the peer group (eg., Stoller, 1966b), is no doubt often experienced by the children of upwardly mobile middle-class Australian parents also (Harris, 1962).

A final example. Mol (1968), in a large-scale survey of religion in Australia, found what he termed an "authoritarian syndrome" to be especially prevalent among Italian and Greek respondents. One of the traits was a belief that the child should obey and not presume to think for himself. However many Australian respondents displayed this syndrome also. Italian and Greek second-generation children are not in a different situation - it is simply that a greater proportion of them are in it, and for many it is more intense (Rooth, 1968).

These are only some examples of a tendency in the literature to see as an "immigrant" problem something which is widespread throughout Australian society. However it is not claimed that all situations of intergeneration tension are experienced by both immigrants' and Australian children. For instance, daughters of immigrant parents sometimes really are in a situation of conflict arising from differences in the cultures of their parents and the host society, as will be discussed below.

Specific Clashes. Apart from disagreement over the extent to which the adolescent should be permitted independence, there are a number of other sources of tension between parent and child which appear to be unique to the Australian-born child of immigrants. He experiences the tensions felt by his Australian peer, but these are aggravated by clashes over other norms, both behavioural and ethical, which are not commonly seen as areas of stress in the lifespace of the average Australian adolescent.

For instance language difficulties was a commonly cited source of conflict between the two generations.

Borrie & Packer found Italian to be the usual language at home, while English was universally used at school. In Benyei's (1960) study of Greek families, most children were expected to speak Greek in their homes. Taft (1960) reported that Dutch immigrants, contrary to a belief widely held among Australians, found English difficult to learn. The child of United Kingdom parents also, must learn and use the slang of his Australian peers to be fully accepted by them, yet be able to converse with his parents in their vernacular (Richardson, 1960).

Use of a foreign language in public arouses the distrust and suspicion of Australians (Price, 1963a). Conversely, immigrant parents faced with the prospect of an Australian daughter-in-law fear the language barrier which they perceive as likely to exist between mother and daughter-in-law, and also between future grandchildren and their grandparents. Moreover future generations of the family would be less likely to learn the language of their forebears. Tension is also aroused by pressure

from parents on the Australian-born child to spend his spare time in ethnic evening classes learning the homeland language (Price, 1963a). In addition, as mentioned above, the solution of parental language difficulties by use of the second-generation child as translator leads to feelings of being overburdened with responsibility and experience of incongruity between roles of dominance and submission (Carey, 1959; Hay et al., 1967).

Use of the old-world language in the home results in personality stress in the child (Radziowski, 1963). Language used, especially in the home, was an important discrepancy in the behaviour patterns of European-born parents and their Australian-born children in an industrial area (Zubrzycki, 1964). Even after residence in Australia for seven years or more immigrant parents were found to score much lower than their second-generation children on use of English (Adler & Taft, 1966). The typically authoritarian European immigrant family causes particular stress for second-generation children as they realise that their English is better than that of their parental reference group (Stoller, 1968).

Banchevska (1966), Kern (1966) and Zubrzycki (1966) also named difference of primary languages between immigrant parents and their Australian-born children as a primary cause of intergeneration stress - a cause reasonably specific to the immigrant family and not shared to a great extent by the Australian peers. Admittedly slang used differs from generation to generation in Australian society also, so some lack of communication occurs. However it is not nearly as acute as that in the immigrant household where the parents use one language for every-

day communication and the teenagers use another, or wish to and are forbidden to do so (Krupinski, 1968).

Food preferences were found by Child (1943) to be a source of discord in American Italian families, and were also described by a number of Australian authors as causing disagreement between immigrant parents and their Australian-born children (eg., Price, 1963a). Borrie & Packer (1954) found the Italian immigrant mother to be socially isolated from her Australian neighbours, and food prepared to be essentially the same as that eaten in the homeland village (Price, 1963a). Adler & Taft (1966) found that immigrant parents attempt to impose their own food preferences on their families more than they do, for example, norms concerning dress and grooming. Differing norms concerning food preferences were cited by Banchevska (1966) as an example of the irrelevance of his parents' culture to the Australian-born child of immigrants. The Australian practice of drinking beer, and large quantities of it, was found to be disapproved of by Dutch (Taft, 1960) and Greek (Benyei, 1960) parents, among others.

However it should be noted that both Doczy (1967, 1969) and Johnston (1969) found that objectively measured acculturation in terms of factors such as language and food preferences are insufficient as indicators of acculturation of the immigrants' child. It is necessary for the child himself to perceive that acculturation has been achieved. Only when such perceived acculturation exists can the satisfaction necessary for complete assimilation develop. Nevertheless it is argued that the adolescent, eating school lunches, visiting friends' homes,

discussing everyday matters with them in playground and street, and being taught Australian homecraft, soon acquires a taste which becomes a preference for Australian food. On the other hand, with palates accustomed to homeland dishes, and little opportunity for the mother to learn new recipes even if she wished to, immigrant parents usually prefer non-Australian meals. It would be difficult for either generation to ignore the disparity in preferences, and for at least some disagreement to be prevented. This is an area of potential friction between the generations more likely to be encountered by the immigrant family than the Australian.

It is not completely without parallel, of course. Food fashions change in Australian culture also. Health foods, vegetarianism, minimum cooking, and adoption by younger generations of foods introduced by immigrants can result in disagreements between the generations over food even within the Australian home. However it is suggested that this is not as serious a division as that which the authors cited above found frequent in the immigrant family.

Another area involving personal preferences on which the immigrant parent and adolescent child have been found to differ is that of clothing and grooming. However familial tension over these norms is common in Australian families also. Indeed it has been claimed that it is more salient for Australian teenagers than for their immigrant peers (Hay et al., 1967; Krupinski, 1968). Tension in this area is simply a facet of the universal generation gap and is not as important as are other tension sources (Adler & Taft, 1966). Nevertheless it is mentioned as it differs somewhat in cause and type.

For instance Patterson (1965) found that differences between clothing acceptable to West Indian immigrants to the United Kingdom and to members of their host society to be a common cause of tension not only between the generations, but between immigrant adults and their host society peers also. Lighter, more colourful and less concealing clothing was the norm in the tropical climate of the West Indies, and it was not only unsuitable for the United Kingdom climate, but was disapproved of by United Kingdom society. In general the same phenomenon in reverse was found to occur in Australia. European-born parents are accustomed to heavier, more enveloping garb, and oppose the desire of Australian-born children to wear shorts, miniskirts and brief swimming costumes. Similarly, Australian-born adolescents, especially of Southern European parents, do not accept or admire the heavy, long skirts of dull colour or black material typically worn by their mothers (Banchevska, 1966). That she would not dress as a married woman should is one of the reasons why a prospective Australian daughter-in-law would be discouraged by the boyfriend's Southern European parents (Price, 1963a). Linked with this is disagreement over acceptable hairstyles, particularly between boys and their more traditional parents. It is repeated, however, that this tension is similar to the tension also experienced in many Australian homes and is by no means peculiar to the second-generation child.

Adoption by the second-generation child of Australian attitudes toward <u>music</u>, <u>gambling</u> and, more especially, <u>sport</u>, were also frequently mentioned as sources of intergenerational conflict within Australian

immigrant families. However music also causes tension in the Australian household. Parents do not typically subscribe to the pop music of the day, while the teenager wants to listen to it on radio and record as frequently and at as high a volume as he can.

However a small additional aggravation occurs in some immigrant families. Carey (1959), in an impressionistic description of immigrant children in the Latrobe Valley, Victoria, reported that secondary school children of immigrant parents were very unenthusiastic about learning the songs and dances of their parents' culture. Nevertheless some, particularly Greeks, are encouraged to do so in ethnic night schools, and report feelings of being suspended between two cultures as a result (Price, 1963a).

While the vast majority of Australian parents indulge in gambling of various types, most allow teenagers to do so only with reluctance. Thus this activity causes some tension in most Australian families. Nevertheless Australian teenagers know that eventually they will be allowed, and even expected to participate in lotteries, betting on horse-races, etc. Taft (1960) reported a disapproval on the part of Dutch parents of the Australian attitude to gambling in general. Their children would presumably feel that they were to be denied participation in one of the pursuits of their peer group. However this is not likely to be particularly important.

More salient is the discrepancy between Australian and immigrant parental attitudes to <u>sport</u>. This is probably one of the areas of life on which the two generations of Australians are most firmly in agree-

ment. Children are encouraged to participate from an early age and typically are supported and encouraged throughout childhood and adolescence, while adults maintain a keen interest in the achievements of both their own children and their local and national heroes, often participating themselves well past parenthood. Sport is an extremely important facet of Australian family life and a great deal of time and money is devoted to it. An important point to note is that it is participation in sport which is so important in Australian society, in contrast with the spectator role more the norm for the average European.

That such skill at sport is essential for peer-group acceptance in Australian adolescent society was shown by Doczy (1967, 1969). He also found that skill at Australian sports and recognition of famous Australians, many of them sportsmen, were two of the measures of assimilation on which second-generation children and their parents differed most widely. Australian-born children were very aware of the importance of sport and were attempting to acculturate along this dimension to the extent of leaving their parents far behind. Adler & Taft (1966) claimed that no excessive amount of conflict resulted from the tension aroused, but it would seem that some at least must occur. This is one norm necessary for peer-group acceptance to which the second-generation child will conform, even if his parents do not approve. Doczy's respondents were not assimilated on other indices, but on this one they were. It was important to them.

However immigrant parents tend not to share this attitude on arrival, and attitudes to sport is one of the most reliable indicators of acculturation (Adler & Taft, 1966). Thus the Greek parents in Benyei's

(1960) sample disapproved of the attitudes of the adolescent child's Australian peers toward sport. This is also true of Italians (Price, 1963a). Similarly, Northwest European parents also disapprove of the Australian emphasis on sport, preferring their children to achieve academic success and so making peer-group acceptance more difficult for them (Radziowski, 1963, 1964).

Nevertheless, their attitude to sport is one of the dimensions along which the immigrant child moves most rapidly away from his parents, acculturating more quickly than they do, and encountering opposition from them as he does so (Borrie & Packer, 1954; Kern, 1966).

Thus the expectation by Australian society that the adolescent devote a considerable proportion of both his time and his money to participation in sporting activities is not shared by immigrant parents. It is often seen as either a waste of time which should be devoted to education, or as a distraction interfering with gainful employment and an unnecessary drain on family income. Moreover, where sport as such is not rejected by parents from Europe, the type of pastime popular with their adolescent child's peer group (for example, football, cricket, tennis, swimming and surfing) is not in accord with their own preference for organised spectator sports such as soccer (Taft, 1965). They do not encourage their child to join the largely sport-based clubs and societies of the Australian teenage world (Hay et al., 1967; Price, 1963a).

This last statement is decreasingly true as ethnicly based clubs become more important in, for example, the soccer competitions in the eastern States, and it is not denied that dissension over the relative

importance of sport versus academic or occupational achievement occurs in some Australian families also. Nevertheless it is contended that the salience of sport in Australian society is one norm over which more tension is likely to occur between the generations in the immigrant household than in the Australian.

The mention above of work and income introduces a further area in which dissension between the generations is often found in immigrant families. The preoccupation of most immigrant parents with financial security (Price, 1963a; Radziowski, 1963, 1964) and their accompanying attitudes of thrift and economy clash with adolescent desires for such items as clothing, spending money, and, as he grows older, a car. Again this is true of many Australian households also, but once more the situation is aggravated for the immigrant family by circumstances not experienced by Australians.

European immigrant parents, especially from Southern Europe, are typically very poor when they arrive, poorly educated, and go into low-income occupations (Jupp, 1966). Consequently they are preoccupied with the establishment of financial security. This in itself can be a source of tension in immigrant families (Radziowski, 1963, 1964; Zubrzycki, 1964), and thus of a troubled family background for the second-generation child. Moreover their children are expected to leave school at an early age and give a large proportion of their earnings to the family budget (Krupinski, 1968). This is at variance with the practice typical of the Australian family of allowing the adolescent to do as he wishes with his earnings after paying a commonly small amount

of board (Hay et al., 1967). These differences in parental practices could well cause tension in the second-generation child, mixing with Australian peers who are usually permitted to buy more luxury items than he is and, as they start earning, to control their own incomes.

That tension over finance in immigrant families might differ from that in Australian families was suggested by Adler (1966). He found that the father controls all expenditure in most immigrant families, while in the typical Australian family it is the mother who does so. The intergeneration stress may not be greater, but it is between the immigrant adolescent and the paternal head of his family rather than with his mother, as is the experience of the typical Australian teenager. The father, as head of the family, is responsible for finance also and is expected to control all earnings and expenditure, including those of his children (Price, 1963a).

Hay et al. (1967) also found that working immigrant young people were expected to contribute a greater proportion of their paypacket to the family budget than were their Australian peers. Nevertheless, these same young people, largely of Southern European parentage, reported feeling overburdened with responsibility for money matters. They had to help run family finances for parents uncertain in a strange society about the management of the money they were working so hard to obtain.

It was also reported that young girls are not expected to go out to work before marriage by many Southern European parents. Thus the Australian norm of expecting a girl to go out to work between school and marriage is unacceptable to many Southern European families (Price, 1963a). They keep their daughters at home, yet find it financially

difficult to support them (Carey, 1959). Intrafamilial tension and conflict for the second-generation adolescent would seem inevitable.

However it is emphasised that this is partly an aggravation of intergeneration conflict found in the Australian family also, and partly a set of circumstances unique to the Australian-born child of immigrants. The Australian adolescent also wants more spending money than he gets, would like it sooner, and probably feels some resentment at being advised on how to spend it. But he has to contribute less of it back into the family budget, is not expected to assist his parents in planning family expenditure, and is under less pressure to leave school to earn. Moreover Australian girls are encouraged to go out and work, earn, and control their own finances much as are their brothers, and are not expected to remain at home under the supervision of their parents until marriage. Both intergeneration conflict and culture conflict are occurring in the immigrant family.

Another source of tension involving degree of independence of the adolescent is the attitudes of parents to the education of their children. Differences between immigrant and Australian parents over education are in both directions.

Southern European adolescents are frequently removed from school as soon as the law allows (and occasionally sooner) and expected to start work in order to bolster the family income (Benyei, 1960; Krupinski, 1968), in occupations necessarily of low socioeconomic status. Another cause of this attitude is the parents' own low level of education, especially in Southern Europeans (Jupp, 1966). In addition, Southern European

girls are usually taken from school early, as education is not considered necessary for them. Although not permitted to work, they are expected to play a woman's role in the family organisation while awaiting marriage (Banchevska, 1966; Hay et al., 1967). Delinquency can result. Seventy-five per cent of Hay et al's (1967) sample of Detention Centre inmates had left school before attempting the Intermediate Examination, and the majority of these were the children of immigrants.

On the other hand Northwest European immigrant parents are more interested in the children's education, tend to value it more highly, and attempt to keep them at school after their Australian intellectual and socioeconomic peers have been allowed to leave and go out to work (Hay et al., 1967). This results in a clash with Australian peer-group standards of equality and of a high regard for sporting participation and ability (Radziowski, 1963, 1964).

Similarly, many United Kingdom and Northwest European second-generation children want to leave school earlier than they are allowed in order to obtain the relatively highly paid jobs readily available in Australia, rejecting their parents' belief in the desirability of an education extended beyond the minimum leaving age (Price, 1966c). Moreover, while some immigrant parents arouse hostility in their child by the pressure on him to study and work hard in order to improve his socioeconomic status, the resulting aspirations toward upward social mobility by the adolescent and achievement of it by the young adult Australian-born child of immigrants often causes tension between the two generations (Zubrzycki, 1964).

Thus United Kingdom and Northwest European parents tend to offer their children more, and Southern European parents less, education than

the second-generation child feels is appropriate. However this type of tension arises in many Australian families also. The accent on upward social mobility, for which education is a prerequisite, is greater than ever before, and at the same time, the availability of jobs is very great. Thus the dissension described above is not unique to immigrant families. What does distinguish them is the relative consistency of the direction of disagreement within cultural groups. Southern European adolescents want more and Northwest European children less education than their parents feel they should have. Australian families vary in this.

The Family. This introduces perhaps the most important realm of dissension between immigrant parents and their Australian-born children; the familial structure, the roles of its members, and its place in wider society. These all differ from group to group, distinguishing to varying degrees between Australian and immigrant.

The authoritarian, patriarchal nature of the European family, in contrast to the family typical of the more recently established, less traditional societies, such as that of the United States, has been commented on by many previous investigators (for instance, Child, 1943; Glazer & Moynihan, 1963; Singer & Singer, 1969). That this is so in Australia also, and results in tension between himself and both peer group and parents for the adolescent child of immigrants, was suggested by a number of the reports cited above.

In summary, the immigrant family is more authoritarian than the Australian family, and parents find the host society norm of relative

independence for the teenager difficult to accept (Kern, 1966). In Southern European families the father is the authoritative and responsible head of the family, with control over members' occupations, leisure-time activities, income and its spending, relations with other families, and responsibility for arranging marriages for his children (Price, 1963a). These norms contrast strongly with those of the Australian matriarchal, nuclear family living in a relatively welfare state. Southern European children are expected to think for themselves less (Mol, 1968), and be more deferent to their parents (Borrie & Packer, 1954), with the situation sometimes being aggravated by the possessiveness of parents insecure in a new society (Radziowski, 1963, 1964).

Overall, then, immigrant children are expected to be more family oriented, although the peers with whom they mix are Australians rather than kin, or even young people of their own ethnic group (Hay _et al._, 1967; Taft, 1960).

On the other hand, Stoller made a worthwhile point when he suggested that the authoritarian structure typical of the European immigrant family could be a source of strength and security for its Australian-born offspring. However he went on to aver that it cannot cope satisfactorily in its new society with such potential crises as illness, unemployment and disagreement with neighbours, and with the Australian attitude of "give a bloke a fair go" (Stoller, 1968).

Australian teenagers also experience friction with their parents over authoritarianism. They, too, feel restricted and oversupervised and are making unprecedented demands for independence and freedom of thought. It is argued therefore that the conflict experienced by the

second-generation child described here is in one sense simply an exaggerated form of the generation gap universal within Western society.

Nevertheless it does differ in an important way. The immigrant family from Europe is patriarchal, while the Australian family is much more matriarchal, the mother playing a much greater role in both making and executing decisions. This contrasts particularly with the relationships within Southern European families, where the father plays a role far more dominant over his wife and offspring; but contrasts to an extent with the norm for Northwest European families also.

Perhaps the work throwing most light on this problem was that of Adler (1966). He used the Day at Home questionnaire on a large sample (N = 1,525) of 12-year-olds. This instrument measures the role of each parent relative to the other in making and executing decisions affecting the family, as the child perceives it. Adler found that cultural differences were reflected in discrepancies between Australian and immigrants' children in their perception of their parents' roles. Mothers played a much more pervading role in Australian families than in immigrant families. The Australian mother both made and executed the decisions in practically all areas of family life. This was in contrast to the immigrant family, whose father played an important part in areas of familial social and recreational activities, expenditure, and disciplining and caring for children. Although immigrant families were found to become more similar to those of their host society the longer they had been in Australia, significant differences were still to be found after seven years in the areas of child care and control, house-

hold duties and expenditure. This was true of both United Kingdom families and of Adler's total sample of immigrants. Compared with the matriarchal Australian family, the immigrant family is patriarchal in structure.

Consequently Australian parents play very separate roles, the father working and spending his leisure time with other men, while the mother runs the house, rears the children, and has her own circle of female friends. In contrast, both United Kingdom and Northwest European fathers tend to take a greater part in household affairs, their role in bringing up the children becoming increasingly important as the family grows older and the mother goes out to work again (Adler, 1966; Krupinski, 1968). Fewer Southern European mothers work, but although the parental roles are separated as much as they are in the Australian family, the father, rather than the mother, is the dominant force acting on the family's adolescent children (Krupinski, 1968).

Thus the second-generation adolescent has a relationship with both father and mother which differs from those experienced by his Australian peers. On the one hand his relationship with his father is closer, presumably making his father's support easier to obtain when he experiences dissension with his Australian peer group. At the same time, however, his perception of his parents' roles during adolescence, and his expectations concerning his own sex and familial roles in adulthood, are very different from those of his Australian peers. Interaction with those peers, and particularly heterosexual interaction, could well bring him into disagreement with either his parents and the mores which they are attempting to inculcate, or with his peers and the norms typical of the society in which he is growing up. Uncertainty concerning either

reference group leads to conflict and delayed self-identity formation. This is a form of conflict not typically experienced by the Australian teenager.

Consequently it is not surprising that personality and behaviour disorders are more prevalent among children born of parents from the United Kingdom, Western Europe and Eastern Europe (Krupinski & Stoller, 1966) than among Australian or Southern European adolescents. Krupinski & Stoller suggest that this is caused by disagreement between second-generation children and their parents over mores concerning family life and relationships, and sexual mores and freedom of interaction. They quote unpublished work by Verberne (1963) reporting that immigrant parents of juvenile delinquents were more authoritarian and less ready to change than were those of a matching group of Australian juvenile delinquents. They also suggested that although Southern European families are also authoritarian, they have not disintegrated and still provide a stable home background, thus preventing the high incidence of personality disorder found in the children of immigrant parents from other birthplaces.

Following on from this, the differing attitudes of the Australian and European societies to the place of women in society is a further example of irrelevance of his parents' homeland culture to the Australian-born child (Banchevska, 1966). Compared with the Australian woman, the immigrant wife is expected to be more submissive, and not to venture far alone beyond home or work. Mothers participate little in local affairs, and Australians offer them relatively little social contact (Borrie & Packer, 1954; Carey, 1959).

Among Southern European immigrants in particular, despite wide variation, the average age of marriage is younger than for Australian women, and the birthrate and family size greater (Price, 1963a). In the Southern European village culture, the father is the absolute head of the family, with both mother and children expected to play dominated and submissive roles. Chain migration has transmitted this to Australia fairly substantially, where Southern European women still play a subservient role and do not move out of the home (Benyei, 1960).

Thus the child of immigrant parents, particularly Southern Europeans, lives in a family differing from that of his Australian peer. His mother is submissive and has relatively little contact with society outside the home. This is at variance with the picture of society presented to him by his host culture, particularly by his peer group, and overseas studies have shown that this can result in the street gang of peers becoming an important reference group for second-generation adolescents (Glazer & Moynihan, 1963; Whyte, 1943). Conversely it may result in overidentification with his parents' norms, and estrangement from the peer group (Child, 1943). Moreover, the incongruity of immigrant family status concepts with those of the host society can cause instability in the family as a whole. Whatever the reaction, it arises from an uncertainty regarding his parental reference group for the second-generation adolescent, with concomitant personality disorganisation and instability, characterised by difficulties in self-identity formation (Zubrzycki, 1964).

Even more relevant for the adolescent are his parents' attitudes to heterosexual interaction. Australian parents allow their adolescent

children to date, mix with members of both sexes, and to attend coeducational schools. Once again, nevertheless, this is an area of behaviour causing tension in the home of the typical adolescent.

In the Australian family little attempt is made by the parents to transmit sexual mores to the adolescent until after the onset of puberty. The drives which such norms are intended to control are already operating, and the behaviour which they are meant to structure has already been taking place. The child has often devised his own means of coping with his sex needs, and developed a set of sex mores for himself by the time his parents overcome their hesitance to communicate with him on the topic. The reference groups he has used to develop this set of mores are commonly television, films, magazines, and above all, his peer group. And the set of norms he evolves will commonly differ quite markedly from that which his parents then attempt to impose. Dissension and conflict would seem inevitable and are certainly very common.

At the same time, the very social mores themselves are changing with a rapidity making the change visible to the younger generation. This tends to result in all the parents' attempts to impose norms being dismissed as out of date and irrelevant to modern society. Many parents are aware of this rapid change also, and wonder whether their child might not, after all, just be right. Thus they are unsure of themselves, and the child is left without the security of the adult reference group to which the adolescent of a generation or two ago was able to turn. Tension over sexual norms is greater in the Australian family today than in previous generations. Arguments over at what age dating should

begin, how late pairs should be allowed out, and where and with whom boys and girls should be allowed to go, are even more common and intense.

Yet this problem is even more complex in the immigrant family. The child of immigrant parents, particularly from Southern Europe, is often, even typically, not allowed to have these experiences at all; or at best much later and in a more restricted form than is his Australian peer.

The role and status of women in Southern European culture differs markedly from Australian conventions. Single girls are not allowed to work outside the home or peasant farm, and are expected not to go out alone, nor to converse with men not members of their close kinship group (Price, 1963a). This has been transmitted to Australia, where social interaction with the other sex for the girl occurs only after her often arranged marriage, and she is carefully shielded and guarded against it until then (Borrie & Packer, 1954). She is not permitted to go to work after leaving school (Carey, 1959), but is expected to work in the home (Hay et al., 1967; Krupinski, 1968). When she does go out, it is with a chaperone (Zubrzycki, 1964).

This was not true only of small numbers of families in the early years of migration. The Greek immigrants on World Council of Churches assisted passages represented in the previously mentioned survey by Benyei in 1960 made up approximately 18 per cent of the total post-war Greek immigration up to 1960 (derived from Price, 1971). He found that, as a rule, marriages were still arranged and that girls were expected to remain at home. An effect was that they had relatively restricted contact with their Australian peers, with consequent poor acculturation.

However, if relationships are established, the differing attitudes of the second-generation adolescent and his parents toward social contact with opposite-sex peers can still give rise to strain (Price, 1963a). The Southern European young man, and even more emphatically, young woman, does not go out with members of the opposite sex simply for pleasure. If he or she does establish a heterosexual relationship, it is purely with the aim of marriage. It would be especially difficult to accomodate this convention to the Australian adolescent expectation of dating being at least possible, and socially almost obligatory, from the early teens (Banchevska, 1966). Price & Zubrzycki (1962a, 1962b) showed that inter-marriage between Southern European immigrants and British-Australians was extremely rare. Less than 10 per cent of Southern European marriages in 1960 were to spouses not Southern Europeans themselves, or at least their descendants, compared with over 30 per cent of United Kingdom immigrant marriages being to spouses outside their own birthplace grouping.

This evidence, coupled with Price's (1963b) argument that inter-marriage is the most reliable indicator of complete assimilation, suggests that the assimilation of Southern European young people into Australian society is slower than many would believe.

This restriction on contact with opposite-sex peers outside the ethnic group does not apply only to Southern European girls. Price painted a detailed, convincing picture of the feelings of Southern European parents faced with the prospect of an Australian daughter-in-law. A "foreign" woman would eventually become the family matriarch. A language barrier would exist between mother and daughter-in-law, and also between future grandchildren and their grandparents. Future generations of the

family would be less likely to learn the language of their forebears. Disruption of the wide kinship links and extended, rather than nuclear, family system would occur. The chain of migration would be lacking a link. The mother-in-law would be denied her traditional role in child care and household management. The husband would sacrifice his position of complete and final authority, and his sons in turn would never learn to expect it. Similarly the woman and her daughters would not evince the required respect for men. Finally she would have, and would inculcate in her progeny, different attitudes to social occasions, social behaviour, self-expression, expenditure, clothing, entertainment, and a number of other elements of a way of life (Price, 1963a, p.263). It is not surprising that intermarriage by their Australian-born children with British-Australian peers is not encouraged by Southern European parents.

A further complication pointed out by Price is that insecurity and uncertainty concerning discrepant mores of heterosexual relationships occurs for immigrant children not only because their parents differ in their conceptions of right and wrong from the norms of Australian society, but because traditionalism of upbringing varies from family to family and generation to generation within ethnic groups also. The child has no consistent adult reference group, so turns to his peers instead (Price, 1963a).

Stricter sexual mores are not confined to Southern European groups. Dutch parents, a substantial proportion of whom are Roman Catholic, name the freedom of heterosexual interaction typical of Australian society as one of its aspects of which they disapprove most strongly (Taft,

1960). They pass their own attitude on to their children, who then find themselves at odds with the prevailing norms of the Australian peer group. An effect for Northwest European adolescents is voluntary withdrawal from the Australian peer group in the school playground (Carey, 1959). Children of Northwest European parents stayed together, Carey found, unable or unwilling to conform sufficiently to the host society peer group to become a part of it.

Jupp (1966) also claimed that tension occurred in Northwest European as well as in Southern European families over the correct male and female roles. However he argued that in the metropolises (Carey's study was in a small industrial town), residence in the cultural enclaves set up and maintained by chain migration often allows reasonably close identification by the Southern European child with his parents. In contrast, the Northwest European child, mixing with suburban peers, is more reluctant to alienate them than he is his parents.

This is supported by Krupinski & Stoller's (1966) contention that a result of overstrictness concerning sexual mores, coupled with close contact with Australian society, is the high incidence of personality disorder found in the children of United Kingdom, Northwest European and Eastern European immigrants, but not in those of Southern European parents. They also claim that delinquency in the children of immigrants is more commonly associated with authoritarian attitudes and "old fashioned" social mores in the parents, than in the children of Australian parents.

Overall, then, it is apparent that discrepancy between the norms of the two generations is even greater for immigrant families than it

is for the typical Australian family. This is least often stated to be the case for United Kingdom families, fairly consistently shown to be so for Northwest European families, and by far the most strongly evident in reports on Southern European immigrants. Compared with her Australian peer, the immigrant girl is expected to wait until she is older before she goes out with boys, and if her parents are Southern European, may not be permitted to go out alone with boys at all. Although restraint on the boy is less, girls from his own ethnic group are not permitted to form relationships with him, and Australian girls disapproved of and discouraged. The adolescent child must either reject the mores of his parents concerning this, either arguing, lying or rebelling to do so; or openly refuse to adopt the norms of his host society peer group. Tension over heterosexual interaction even greater than that current in Australian families would seem inevitable.

Overseas investigators of immigration from traditional into industrial societies have found the modal family of the homeland societies of the immigrants concerned to be extended, in contrast with the nuclear family of the host society (Child, 1943; Patterson, 1963). Consequently the family itself provides a correspondingly greater proportion of the adolescent's total social experience, when compared with that of his host society peer. Norms and mores of the older generation have greater opportunity for transmission, and less time is available to the adolescent for interaction with his peers, thus impeding the inculcation of peer-group norms. This difference between the cultures of the parents of the immigrants' child and that of his host society peer can there-

fore lead to incompatibility and consequent tension between the child and his peer group. Some evidence on this point is available in Australia also.

While the culture from which Southern Europeans came, and which chain migration has maintained, differs from Australian culture along various dimensions, perhaps the most important is the strength of communal and kinship ties (Price, 1963a; Zubrzycki, 1964). Most Southern European immigrants to Australia come from small towns, villages and islands. The extended family rather than the nuclear family, and the village community rather than the nationality or ethnic group as a whole, are their relevant social units. This is in contrast to the Australian nuclear family, identifying with its State and Commonwealth. National politics are important in Australia, where voting in both State and Federal elections is compulsory, but politics on a national scale are not typically of concern to Southern Europeans, preoccupied with local communities and kinship groups.

A closely associated cause of intergenerational stress in immigrant homes is the disruption of kinship groups by the greater mobility of Australian, compared with European society (Jupp, 1966). This is true for other groups as well as Southern Europeans. For example, Taft (1960) found Dutch immigrants to disapprove of the relatively lower significance of home life in Australia. Moreover the insecurity and rebellion, and an increasing incidence of personality disorder found by Stoller (1966b) in United Kingdom, Northwest European and Eastern European second-generation children was closely associated not only with contention over sexual mores, but with this question as well. The avail-

ability of employment for 16-year-olds in Australia provides an independence which is incompatible with immigrant homeland mores of close kinship ties.

Thus second-generation adolescents feel a greater sense of responsibility toward their parents and homes than do their Australian peers (Hay et al., 1967). The same survey provides further evidence of this when it shows that immigrant adolescents and young adults belong to fewer clubs and societies than do their Australian peers.

The family, then, is more salient to the child of European immigrant parents than it is to his Australian peer. The Northwest European adolescent is expected to spend more time with his family and to regard it to a greater extent as the focus of his social life. However, as with the Australian host society, the Northwest European family is typically nuclear. Parents and offspring live together. Having other kin such as grandparents, uncles and aunts, and cousins under the same roof is the exception rather than the rule.

The child of Southern European parents, however, is not only expected to remain more closely integrated within his family than is his Australian peer, but typically lives within an extended family group. Although not necessarily in the same home, siblings, cousins and grandparents remain in close contact with one another. As mentioned above, chain migration accentuates this by providing a continuous source of new members of the kinship group, to whom assistance and accomodation are customarily offered, and with whom close relationships are ordinarily established.

From the point of view of the second-generation child, this more salient, and in the case of the Southern European adolescent, extended,

kinship group means less contact with his peer group. Conflict occurs for him between their demands for his time, conformity and loyalty and those of his family. He must either remain a relatively fringe member of his peer group or appear to his family to be rejecting traditionally close ties with it. This form of tension for the adolescent with at least one of his primary reference groups, and probably to some extent with both, is by definition culturally unique to the child of immigrants, and not experienced as such by his Australian peer.

Conflict is aroused in the second-generation child not only over his position within his kinship group, but within society as a whole. A basic norm in industrial societies is encouragement of self-betterment and upward social mobility. In Australia this typically middle-class more is held even by working-class families (Taft, 1965), although in no section of Australian society is it as powerful a force as it is in large middle-class sections of American and Northern European societies (Harris, 1962).

However, Northwestern European parents tend to pressure their adolescent children to achieve this upward mobility to an even greater extent than do the parents of the Australian host society. This pressure on him to work and study hard in order to improve his socioeconomic status tends to arouse hostility in the child as he realises that it is stronger than that to which his peers are subject. Moreover the resultant achievement of upward social mobility by young adult Australian-born children of immigrant parents often causes tension between the two generations (Zubrzycki, 1964). Divergent reality percepts and levels

of aspiration result in stress within the family and hasten its disintegration as children grow up (Zubrzycki, 1966).

Thus the Northwest European child risks either rejection by his Australian peers for trying to make himself better than they are and devoting too much of his time to schoolwork and too little to his peer group, or castigation by his parents for being lazy and not holding to the Protestant ethic.

Southern European children, on the other hand, are expected to leave school early and remain at the socioeconomic status level of their parents. For example, in a sample of Greek immigrant families upward social mobility was not aspired to, as financial security at the accustomed status level was more important (Benyei, 1960). Second-generation children went to work in low-status occupations as soon as they were of school leaving age.

Nevertheless the mobility of Australian society causes tension in Southern European families as kinship group disruption occurs (Jupp, 1966). Most Australian-born children whose Southern European parents settled in rural areas move into the metropolises as soon as they attain independence (Tully, 1960). Similarly, urban young people tend to move out into the suburbs from the inner city areas where the majority of older Southern European immigrants dwell. This disrupts typical plans for sons to run family shops and small businesses, or at least to fill the role of family provider, and for daughters to take over the running of the home when parents grow old. The frequent rise in socioeconomic status also engenders disruption of relations between parents and their young adult offspring (Price, 1963a).

Thus the Southern European child who does well is expected to be generous to his family and assist in their battle for security at their present level. If he does so, he has difficulty conforming to Australian peer-group norms of owning up-to-date clothes, records and so on, and of aiming at ownership of a car. If he uses the high wages available on the Australian labour market for his own ends, and perhaps aims at eventually purchasing a house in the suburbs, his family feel he is growing away from them. In either case he must choose between the mores of one reference group or the other, and as a result will encounter antipathy from the group to whose ideals he does not conform.

Both the Northwest European and Southern European second-generation child, then, experiences some dissension with his parents concerning social mobility, the former because his parents wish him to aim too high, and the latter because he is not allowed to aim high enough. Proportions of Australian children experience one or the other of these forms of disagreement with the older generation also, as Australian society, along with all other Western industrialised societies, becomes ever more mobile, both horizontally and vertically. However the evidence suggests that, for the children of European-born parents at least, conflict resulting from such discord is more common and more intense than it is for their Australian peers.

One reaction available to the child is to reject the adult norm of self-betterment altogether, giving up trying to be better than his friends, or trying to earn more only to have it appropriated by his family. Hay et al. (1967) found some evidence of this being more common among immigrants' children when they showed that some do not necessarily

live up to their parents' expectations of them. They reported that of the 30 working Australian-born children of immigrants interviewed in their sample of the youth of Victoria, 11, or more than one third, had jobs of a lower socioeconomic status than those of their fathers. This was in contrast with the Australian group of 154, of whom only 19, or approximately 12 per cent, were in occupations of lower status than those held by their fathers. Approximately half of each group were in equal-status positions, and the remainder, approximately 40 per cent of the Australians, but only one eighth of the second-generation children, were upwardly socially mobile. Whether or not they claimed to agree with the Australian norm of self-betterment, a significant proportion of the admittedly small group of Australian-born children of immigrants whom Hay et al. interviewed were failing to adhere to it.

A final issue to be mentioned over which tension occurs in the immigrant family is the importance of religion. Friction over religious observance and the influence of the church is more frequent in immigrant than in Australian families (Hay et al., 1967; Jupp, 1966).

To Southern Europeans as a group, religion is extremely important, although the Roman Catholicism practised by Italian peasants is very different in its accentuation of saints and personal protection, from that of the approximately 25 per cent of Australians who are Roman Catholic (Australian Year Book, 1970; Price, 1963a). Religious observance is also extremely important in the Greek home (Benyei, 1960). Price pointed out that the chain migration bringing out the great proportion of Southern European immigrants to Australia promoted the main-

tenance of these attitudes and values among families long after settlement. This leads to a feeling of suspension between two cultures in the second-generation child, whose peers either belong to no church at all, or attend a very different one, allowing it to play a far less important part in their lives than his parents expect him to.

The actual teachings of the Roman and Orthodox churches, as they are perceived by immigrant parents, can have effects leading to intrafamilial stress also. In a large-scale survey of religion in Australia, Mol (1968) found among a small but extreme group what he termed an "authoritarian syndrome". Many individuals displaying this set of attitudes were non-Australian-born, and especially Italian or Greek. They expressed attitudes of anti-semitism and disapproved of Asian immigration into Australia. They adjusted their relationships with others according to the perceived social standing of themselves and those individuals - not an Australian more. Poorly educated, they were members of a close friendship circle, usually within the local church. Particularly relevant for the present study was their belief that the child should obey and not presume to think for himself.

A substantial proportion of Northwestern European immigrants are Roman Catholic, and in a study by Taft (1960) of Dutch immigrants, 35 per cent reported seeing important differences between the Roman Catholic churches of the Netherlands and Australia. They disapproved of Australian attitudes to drinking, gambling, the relatively lower significance of home life in Australia, and the freedom for young people of heterosexual interaction.

Thus European immigrant parents attempt to make religion play an important role in the life of their Australian-born children. Religion,

and particularly the external observance of it, plays a decreasing part in Australian life (Clark, 1962). Italian immigrants are almost all Roman Catholic, and Greeks are Orthodox, while a large proportion of Northwest Europeans are either also Roman Catholic, or belong to relatively strict Protestant churches such as the Lutheran or the Reformed. The great majority of Australians are Protestant, although relatively few attend church regularly, and the 25 per cent who adhere to Roman Catholicism belong to a faith seen by Northwest Europeans as differing in important respects from that of Europe (Taft, 1960). Thus European parents and their children differ in religion from the majority of the Australian host society.

An equally important point, however, is that religion is typically more salient in European immigrant homes, both Northwest and Southern European, than it is for Australian families. This is true especially of families who have been assisted by a church organisation during or after migration. For instance the World Council of Churches has sponsored out a large number of migrants. Moreover many churches such as the Dutch Reformed, the Greek Community, the Lutheran, etc., have established ethnically defined congregations in the host society. These are specifically aimed at assisting the immigrant to adapt to his new society by providing him with a continuing basic element of his homeland culture. A result is strong identification by the parents with the church concerned.

Consequently the second-generation child is more often expected to attend church and church schools, to pay greater deference to members of the clergy, and to adhere more unquestioningly to the systems of

mores and morals laid down by his church than is his Australian peer. He must comply with the norms of his family and risk peer-group questioning and derision, or conform to peer-group behaviour, and face contention with his family.

Again, however, this does not apply only to the second-generation child. Orthodox, organised religion has been steadily declining in its influence on family life for many generations, at an ever increasing rate. Modern Australian children see it as even less relevant to their lives and society than their parents do, and some dissension over church attendance, attitudes to clergy, and adherence to religious norms occurs. However the role of the church in Europe, and even to some extent in the United Kingdom, is still important. Parents reared in Europe and children growing up in Australia are separated by a wider and deeper division over religion than are the generations in Australian families.

Causes of Culture Conflict Specific to Cultural Groups

This chapter so far has described a number of causes of culture conflict and intergeneration tension set out in the varied descriptions available. Specific reference has been made to the children of immigrants from the United Kingdom, Northwest Europe (Germany and Holland) and Southern Europe (Italy and Greece). These cultural groups are not equally affected by the causes of conflict described, and some of the forms of tension are experienced by the adolescents of one or two of the groups only, and are not generally applicable to all second-generation immigrants. This section briefly examines the forms and intensities of such conflict claimed in the literature to be experienced by children of specific cultural backgrounds.

United Kingdom. Little research has been done on United Kingdom immigrants (Price, 1971), although they are by far the largest group. However research into their reasons for emigrating and their adjustment to Australian life has been reported by Appleyard and by Richardson (both authors have published a number of reports but convenient summaries are available in Price, 1960; and in Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council, 1967). Most authors accentuate the eas with which United Kingdom immigrants assimilate into Australian society (Borrie & Packer, 1954; Burnley, 1971; Jupp, 1966; McCaughey, 1970; Oeser & Hammond, 1954; Price, 1963b; Taft, 1965).

For instance, in a psychological study of comparative rates of assimilation, United Kingdom parents became the most assimilated, followed by those from Northwest Europe, with the least assimilated being Southern European parents (Adler & Taft, 1966). However complete assimilation was rare even in United Kingdom parents after seven years' residence. In a demographic study of the same question, more than 30 per cent of United Kingdom immigrant marriages were shown to be to spouses from outside their own birthplace grouping, compared with the Southern European rate of less than 10 per cent (Price & Zubrzycki, 1962a, 1962b).

United Kingdom immigrants have similar cultural norms, disperse widely through residential suburbs, are accepted by Australians, and are of upper working or middle-class socioeconomic status. However they do have some difficulties. Appleyard (1960) supported an hypothesis originally set up by Borrie, that United Kingdom immigrants have difficulties in adjustment to Australian society because they expect it to be almost identical to that of the United Kingdom, and come unprepared

for change. Nonetheless changes are required, ranging from learning and using the Australian vernacular to acceptance of the Australian norm of free, but not close, social interaction (Richardson, 1960). United Kingdom immigrant mothers consequently tend to become homesick, while fathers frequently displace aggression arising from frustration on to their job and workmates. This is in contrast to the European immigrant, who expects to have to change, and therefore recognises and finds easier to accept differences between himself and his host society (Price, 1963b).

These findings suggest the situation of the Australian-born child of United Kingdom immigrant parents to be unique among immigrant groups. On the one hand, he is very similar to his Australian peer group in language, dress, food preferences and cultural background. On the other, his parents are often dissatisfied with Australia and Australians, but consider the onus for change to be on the host culture, not themselves. Thus parents from the United Kingdom are likely to oppose the adoption by their teenage child of the norms and values of his Australian peer group. However writers discussing the children of United Kingdom parents have pointed out that intergeneration tension is relatively low for them as the norms of their parents and those of the Australian peer group do not differ more than do those of the Australian generations (Adler, 1966; Adler & Taft, 1966; Price, 1963b). Moreover Adler & Taft found United Kingdom children to be well accepted by their Australian peers, and to identify strongly with them. In other words, children of United Kingdom parents experience the intergeneration conflict typical of Australian society, perhaps accentuated by a somewhat

greater gap between the generations, but not resulting from what could be called essentially culture conflict.

Northwest Europeans. Although children of Dutch and German parents were considered to experience somewhat more conflict than were United Kingdom children, it was not generally described as abnormally severe. A possible exception is the child of refugee parents of Northwest European nationality, but is not being considered here.

Adolescents of Northwest European parentage are reasonably well accepted by their Australian peers (Adler & Taft, 1966) and their parents integrate without too much difficulty into Australian society (ibid.). Important reasons are their parents' predominantly upper working or middle-class background (Borrie & Packer, 1954), which includes a suburban home among its lifegoals, and a relatively good level of education (Radziowski, 1964) which makes such a home feasible for most families (Price, 1966). This means greater contact between second-generation children and their Australian peer group (Burnley, 1971; Hay et al., 1967). For example 80 per cent of the Northwest Europeans in the Victorian sample of Hay et al. listed Australians as their closest friends. While only a third of the Southern Europeans chose own-race peers exclusively, United Kingdom and Northwest European young people felt that they interacted with their Australian peers more satisfactorily than did the Southern Europeans (Hay et al., 1967).

However some cultural differences causing conflict for Northwest European adolescents were reported, such as language difficulties (Taft, 1960), a greater emphasis on upward social mobility (Radziowski, 1963;

Seward & Williamson, 1969), a stronger religious conviction (Borrie & Packer, 1954; Glazer & Moynihan, 1963; Price, 1968), and a typically more authoritarian family structure (Radziowski, 1963; Taft, 1960). To varying degrees, each of these can be seen as a dimension along which the Northwest European homeland culture of the parents of these children differs from that of Australia, and consequently that each causes a degree of culture conflict.

One form of reaction to this is to identify with their parents' ethnic group, rejecting their Australian peers (Carey, 1959) and evincing a strong desire for self-betterment despite peer-group pressure to conform to a norm of relative equality (Hay et al., 1967; Radziowski, 1963). Nevertheless, as mentioned above, most Northwest European second-generation adolescents tend to identify strongly with their Australian peer group. Consequently they experience both the intergeneration conflict found throughout Australia in general as well as some culture conflict and are in a position of somewhat greater tension than are Australian teenagers.

Southern Europeans. It was widely claimed that the intergenerational tension and consequent conflict for the second-generation child caused by immigration is greater in Southern European families than in other immigrant groups. The homeland culture of the parents is more at variance with that of the Australian host society than are those of other immigrant groups. Consequently culture conflict arising from a variety of areas of discord is experienced. At the same time contact with the Australian peer group is extensive. Although not as well integrated

as United Kingdom and Northwest European families, Southern European second-generation adolescents still have significant proportions of Australian friends. Two-thirds of the Southern European young people interviewed by Hay et al. (1967) included Australians among their closest friends. Nevertheless intermarriage rates are low (Price, 1963b) and indicate that the ethnic enclave forms the social environment for the great majority of Southern European adolescents. Thus culture conflict is probably more salient in the life of the second-generation child of Southern European parents in Australia than is the intergeneration conflict which he shares to some extent with his Australian peers.

Social assimilation of his parents is slower (Adler & Taft, 1966; Benyei, 1960; Borrie & Packer, 1954; Jupp, 1966; Price, 1960, 1963a, 1968; Radziowski, 1964; Rooth, 1968; Stoller, 1968; Taft, 1965) and Australian prejudice against them is greater (Adler & Taft, 1966; Benyei, 1960; Borrie & Packer, 1954; Emery & Katz, 1950; Hay et al., 1967; Mol, 1968; Oeser & Hammond, 1954; Price, 1963a; Tully, 1960). An important cause of this slower acculturation is chain migration. Southern European immigrants are typically sponsored by kin and arrive to reside in ethnic enclaves. These promulgate adherence to homeland mores and, while cushioning culture shock for adults, create difficulties impeding peer-group acceptance for their children (Benyei, 1960; Borrie & Packer, 1954; Burnley, 1971; Jupp, 1966; Price, 1960, 1963a; Rooth, 1968).

Intergeneration conflict is aggravated to such an extent that it can be called culture conflict by the extended, patriarchal authoritarian Southern European family. This arouses for the adolescent born

in Australia problems of identification, divided loyalties, conflict over heterosexual interaction and sex roles, possessiveness in parents, and an inability to cope with the rapid change of modern technological society which, in Australia, are greater than those which would be experienced by Southern European adolescents growing up in Italy or Greece (Banchevska, 1966; Borrie & Packer, 1954; Carey, 1959; Child, 1943; Glazer & Moynihan, 1963; Kirscht & Dillehay, 1967; Mol, 1968; Price, 1963a; Radziowski, 1963, 1964; Stoller, 1968; Zubrzycki, 1964). Krupinski (1968) highlighted the position of the Southern European adolescent when he pointed out that the Australian and United Kingdom child is given an increasing degree of freedom by his parents as he matures through adolescence, while the child of Southern European parents experiences greater, rather than less, constraint as he grows older.

His parents are more dogmatic in their adherence to the Orthodox or Roman Catholic faiths (Benyei, 1960; Borrie & Packer, 1954; Glazer & Moynihan, 1963; Kirscht & Dillehay, 1967; Price, 1960, 1963a; Rooth, 1968), again a norm conflicting both with changing Western technological society and with the Australian host society in particular. Finally, Southern European parents are almost all of low socioeconomic status, at least on arrival. They have working-class mores rather than the middle-class values of Australians and of the United Kingdom and North-west European immigrants, with little aspiration toward upward social mobility or the education necessary for it. This too is at variance with the norm of the Australian host culture (Benyei, 1960; Child, 1943; Glazer & Moynihan, 1963; Hay et al., 1967; McCaughey, 1970; Price, 1963a; Stoller, 1968; Taft, 1965; Zubrzycki, 1968).

Thus the evidence points toward a situation in Australia where the intergeneration conflict to be found throughout the modern Western world, while being experienced also by the children of Australian parents, is aggravated by culture conflict to a small degree in United Kingdom families, and somewhat more for the adolescent children of Northwest European parents. Children of Southern European parents probably experience less conflict consequent simply upon rapid social change (Hay et al., 1967; Krupinski, 1968), that is, intergeneration conflict, but a great deal more tension as a result of marked differences between the homeland cultures of their parents and that of the Australian host society; in other words, culture conflict.

Conclusion

Overall, however, many of the values over which writers in Australia claimed the second-generation child to be experiencing dissension with his immigrant parents are those over which discord is occurring between parents and their adolescents throughout the Western world. In the era of rapid technological change and mass communication of innovation, the gap between the generations in Australia is very great, as was argued in Chapter 2. Thus the Australian-born child of immigrant parents is probably not in a situation equivalent to that of his counterpart in the United States prior to World War II, when the classic studies of Child (1943) and Whyte (1943) were carried out. Then and there, host society peers, although they may have felt their parents to be old-fashioned and out-of-date, still felt secure in the culture in which they were growing up. They may have felt that their parents did not

know how to handle the world's affairs, but the two generations were reasonably agreed on which affairs to handle.

In contrast, the American second-generation child was not certain of what was important and what unimportant; not only were his parents unable to teach him how to achieve socially approved goals, but they were uncertain of what those goals were, and in fact often substituted others derived from their homeland culture. It was when this occurred that culture conflict ensued. Thus the American second-generation adolescent was isolated in his suspension between two cultures.

However, in Australia in 1970 the second-generation child is not alone in experiencing such conflict. The Australian adolescent also doubts that the values held by his parents are those to which he wants to hold. He, too, has aims in life which differ in important ways from theirs, and which he feels they do not understand. This is especially important during adolescence when life values are being adopted, and self-identity being sought. Thus both the adolescent children of immigrants and the children of Australians have primary reference groups, their parents, whose values and mores they find are incompatible with those of the society into which they are maturing, or at least are irrelevant for it. This causes intergeneration conflict.

In addition, however, the parents of immigrants' children have brought with them values and norms from their homeland cultures which are also at variance with those of the host culture. To varying degrees, they attempt to transmit these to their Australian-born children, growing up in Australian society. This is a further cause of intergenerational tension in immigrant families, with concomitant culture conflict being

aroused in the second-generation adolescent. It is strongly evident in the Southern European family, much less so in those of Northwest Europeans, and, compared with the intergeneration conflict described above, is of little importance to the child of United Kingdom parents.

Consequently it was postulated that evidence of disparity between the generations, and of stress arising from the conflict caused by such disparity, would be found in adolescent children of parents from all cultural backgrounds, both Australian and immigrant, but that the tension manifested would be approximately equal in Australian compared with United Kingdom children, somewhat stronger in children of Northwest European parents, but particularly evident in the Southern European second generation child. He has to cope with stress arising both from intergeneration conflict and from marked culture conflict.

CHAPTER 5. A MODEL FOR THE STUDY OF CULTURE CONFLICT

The evidence and arguments outlined in the preceding chapters suggest that culture conflict, although aggravated to a greater or lesser extent, is experienced by both immigrant adolescents and those of the Australian host society. However the resources available for coping with such conflict available to the host society adolescent differ from those accessible to the child of immigrants. This chapter discusses the extent of that difference and suggests a framework for the study of the consequences of culture conflict upon the behaviour of the child.

It has been asked (Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council, 1960; Johnston, 1969; Taft, 1965) whether immigrants to Australia are not sufficiently similar in culture to their host society to preclude this conflict in their children, or at least of any more than that experienced by their host society peers. The evidence outlined in the previous chapter of cultural differences both between various immigrant populations and between immigrants and Australians suggests that they are not. A second question is whether findings of conflict in adolescents in the United States and other Western societies are particularly relevant to the contemporary Australian situation. Modern society is more flexible and adaptive than was that of the United States to which the great numbers of immigrants went earlier this century, and in Australia skin colour is not available as a means of classifying immigrants as out-group members as it is in, for instance, the United Kingdom. The evidence cited of acknowledged causes of interethnic tension, such as ethnocentrism in Australians, again gives rise to doubt.

A further query is whether improved communications have not made the Western world sufficiently homogeneous yet flexible to avert serious interethnic tension, and consequently aggravated conflict of this type. That sufficient progress has not yet been made is evidenced by the difficulties of assimilation of adult immigrants often described. Many are never completely acculturated and practically none ever fully assimilated.

Finally, it has been suggested above (and see Taft, 1965) that tension between the generations, and resultant conflict for the adolescent is as common and intense within Australian families as it is within those of immigrants. The work of Dunphy (1969) and others lends support to this proposition, and it may well be so.

Important also, however, is the adequacy of the means of coping with such conflict available to the adolescent. The average Australian adolescent is reasonably secure in both family and peer group to the extent that he can identify with both without necessarily being strongly rejected by the other. Both are a part of the society which has produced him. The common heritage of social norms and goals shared by his two major reference groups is greater than that shared by the equivalent reference groups of his second-generation peer. To a greater or lesser extent, each of the two generations with which he daily interacts is able to recognise the motives, methods and aspirations of the other, even though it may not agree with them.

For the child of immigrants, coping with incompatibility between peers and parents is more complex. They are members of two discrete ethnic groups, each with some prejudice against the other. This

increases the likelihood of a choice he might make to model himself on one reference group being perceived by the other as rejection, and being actively opposed. It commonly arises from ignorance, both by Australians of immigrant homeland social norms, and by immigrants of the Australian way of life. To at least some extent the second-generation child, suspended between them, is ignorant of both. Yet inter-ethnic differences in social aspirations and acceptable ways of attaining them are frequently sufficiently great to force him to choose between them.

Thus the child born in a host society of immigrant parents and grown to adolescence is in a situation of strain, resulting in personality conflict. He must reconcile values taught him by his parents with those imparted by the host society, especially those held by his peer group. Although all immigrant individuals experience inconsistency between the norms acquired in their homeland and those which are acceptable to the society into which they have moved, coping with such discrepancies causes greater conflict for the second-generation adolescent than for his parents. They can fall back on the cultural values of their homeland if they are ignorant of, or cannot reconcile those of their adopted culture, but he cannot. In similar contrast, he does not have a consistent childhood experience to rely upon when he has to choose between one of two conflicting mores, as do his older siblings, born in their parents' homeland. On the other hand, the values he does assimilate as he grows toward and enters adolescence are frequently unacceptable to his family. Studies outside Australia (Child, 1943; Glazer & Moynihan, 1963; Jessor et al., 1968; Patterson, 1965; Sherif & Sherif,

1964; Whyte, 1943) have reported the resultant stress and insecurity as strong enough to inflate delinquency and psychopathology rates in second-generation children of immigrants.

The present study therefore set out to discover whether culture conflict in Australian adolescents was as exclusive to the second-generation children of immigrant parents as previous writers had argued. It also sought to investigate the significance of such conflict for both the second-generation adolescent and his host-society peer. It then attempted to map out differences between second-generation members of the major Australian immigrant national and cultural groups in the forms of reaction to culture conflict they displayed. Finally, it ventured to compare Australian and second-generation adolescents in terms of the means by which they coped with such conflict.

The Measurement of Culture Conflict and its Consequences. As stated in previous chapters, culture conflict was conceived of as an internal state of the individual, unobservable in itself to the investigator. Verbal self-report, particularly from adolescents to an adult research worker from an ethnic outgroup, was considered unreliable as a measure of it. Therefore it was decided to infer the presence and intensity of conflict in any one individual from the degree to which a situation of conflict-arousing tension existed for him, and from the incidence of behaviours reported by him which theory would predict were attempts to reduce such conflict.

Consequently, in order to conduct an empirical enquiry into culture conflict and reactions to it, the elements of a situation in

which such conflict was likely to occur had to be discerned and instruments designed to measure their dimensions. Similarly, the means available to the adolescent of coping with conflict had to be differentiated, and means of assessing them devised.

This section outlines a model of culture conflict. It then provides operational definitions of the variables involved and lists the instruments used to measure them. These instruments are described in detail below, in chapters 7 and 8.

The framework within which the cause and effects of culture conflict were conceptualised was the area of social psychology commonly known as consistency theory. This evolved from the balance theory of Heider (1958) and has produced theories of attitude change such as the congruity model of Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum (1957), the balance model of Abelson & Rosenberg (1960) and Festinger's (1957) dissonance theory.

Brown (1965) points up the common basis of the various consistency theories as the abhorrence by the individual of inconsistency in his personal relationships. To form a satisfactory relationship with another person or group the individual must not only like them, but be liked by them. Furthermore, both he and they must like and dislike the same things, and to approximately the same degrees. Such symmetry in relationships has a high positive value. For the purposes of the present study the relevant relationships were seen as those between the adolescent, his parents, and his peer group. The objects toward which to achieve a condition of equilibrium all three elements must hold consistent attitudes, were the social mores being inculcated in the adolescent.

Parents and peers are the adolescent's two most important reference groups (Singer & Singer, 1969). The definition of reference group used was "any group with which an individual identifies (with or without being a member) and which he uses as a guide for proper conduct or for developing goals" (Chaplin, 1968, p.417). Having identified with his parents as a result of childhood experiences, and with his peer group as an increasingly important medium of social interaction (Dunphy, 1969; Sherif & Sherif, 1964), the adolescent has a strong desire to have a positive relationship with both. According to consistency theory, for him to be able to do this he must perceive of each group as approving of the same behaviours and having the same goals as the other, and those condemned by each must also be identical. When they differ, equilibrium is destroyed. The child identifies with both groups, yet one approves while the other does not. Tension occurs, conflict is aroused, and the child seeks to reduce it. Five possible means of doing so were postulated.

He may reject one or the other of the two reference groups. He then identifies with one and rejects the other, so that a discrepancy between them contributes toward equilibrium rather than detracting from it. In effect, this is two alternatives; rejection of parents or rejection of peers. A third alternative is his dismissal as unimportant the object over which they differ (in the present case, a social norm), permitting perception of them as disagreeing but reducing the strength of the conflict aroused in consequence. Fourthly, he may reject both groups, so allowing disaccord between groups on effectual social norms to be acknowledged, but reducing resultant conflict by lowering the

salience of the groups who differ concerning them. Finally, a fifth reaction is possible. Perception of the whole situation as salient could be rejected. He may refuse to recognise as occupying central areas of his lifespace both the reference groups and the norms over which they are at variance. In effect this is schizophrenic withdrawal, an extreme reaction resorted to only in desperation by a small minority. Rather than a means of coping with conflict, it is a denial of its existence, and likely to lead to other, at least equally severe, forms of personality strain.

It was therefore considered necessary to measure four types of reaction as being available to the adolescent as means of coping with conflict resulting from perception of his two primary reference groups as disagreeing over social norms and goals. The fifth, schizophrenic withdrawal, was viewed as extreme, turned to by relatively few adolescents, and requiring intensive interviewing to uncover. Consequently no specific attempt was made to measure it.

Nevertheless, four of the adolescent's possible reactions to culture conflict were assessed, including:

(1). He could accept his parents as his basic reference group, continuing to identify with them, and rejecting his peer group as unimportant. An indication of the extent to which he did this could be gained from the degree to which his behaviour followed the mores he perceived his parents as holding, rather than those adhered to by his peer group. In other words, not simply the similarity he perceived between himself and his parents, but the extent to which he modelled himself on them and not his peers (Bronfenbrenner, 1958).

(2). He could turn to his peers as his primary reference group, identifying with them and adhering to their behavioural and aspirational norms rather than those of his parents. This could be assessed from the salience to him of his peer group and the degree to which his behaviour patterns conformed with theirs.

(3). He could dismiss as not to be seriously heeded the set of social norms over which the two groups disagreed. This would be indicated by his viewing the flouting of social mores as not particularly wrong, and by the freedom with which he was prepared to admit transgressions against them.

(4). He could reject both the reference groups as not providing an adequate model for behaviour or beliefs. As these are the two most important reference groups provided by society, rejection of them both is tantamount to alienation from society itself. Estimation of the degree of rejection of both groups simultaneously would therefore be possible by measurement of feelings of alienation.

In a model situation, these alternatives are two pairs of polar opposites. Responding in a positive direction toward one element involves making a negative response toward the other, on each dimension.

However, as has been stressed above, the typical adolescent has not discovered his self-identity; he is still seeking it. Similarly he has yet to establish his life-style; it is not yet fixed. Moreover where friction occurs, it occurs over time, and it must be assumed that he has been searching for means of reducing the resultant conflict over a period of years. He may well try more than one method of tension

reduction, and yet continue to employ previously tested means which have become firmly embedded behaviour traits.

Therefore he may at any one point in his development react in one way without necessarily evincing behaviour which is its logical complement, or may demonstrate responses of two or more types simultaneously. For example, he may reject his parents although he does not necessarily identify unusually closely yet with his peers, or he may reject both peers and parents even though mores over which they differ have lost salience for him. The consistency model was employed to ensure that measurement of all types of reaction to culture conflict available to the adolescent should be included, rather than to suggest that some might be excluded.

Consequently it was not predicted that a child reacting strongly in one way would not react in another also. Children experiencing strong, long-term conflict were expected to show evidence of several, or even all, types of reaction simultaneously. It was therefore considered meaningful to examine separately the extent to which perceived culture conflict produced each type of reaction in a child, rather than to attempt to predict for him one type of reaction and not another.

The elements of a situation in which the adolescent is likely to experience culture conflict have been discussed in detail in chapter 2 above. It was concluded that culture conflict is aroused in the modern adolescent when he perceives his parents' societal mores as requiring him to react to a significant proportion of crucial circumstances in one way, and those of his peer group to do so in another. It was

also stressed that, if this definition of culture conflict is accepted, then not only the second-generation immigrant adolescent, but the contemporary Australian teenager also, is liable to experience it.

Thus the model presented above is applicable to the study of the conflict consequent upon divergence of the norms of their parental and their peer reference groups experienced by all adolescents, and irrespective of whether such divergence results from the child's parents having been born overseas, or from their having been born a generation previously into a culture differing markedly from that into which he is maturing.

Consequently it was considered necessary to assess the degree to which the norms and values of both the Australian and the second-generation adolescent's reference groups diverged, and in particular the extent to which he perceived them as diverging. Having thus estimated the potential of the situation for arousing conflict in the child, the degree to which he actually experienced it and the manner in which he coped with it, could be gauged from the strength of the types of manifest reaction measured.

Following Zubrzycki (1960), a distinction was made between the norms required for behaviour affecting relationships with primary reference groups and those involving interaction with secondary reference groups. Consequently two types of mores were considered relevant; those concerning broad social conventions, and those involving relatively specific family-oriented norms including the teenager's personal goals and his behaviour with relation to his family. One of the independent variables measured was therefore the degree of discrep-

ancy between the general social mores of parents and those seen by the adolescent as being held by his generation, indicated by scores on an instrument given the title Australianism Disparity; while a second was the amount of disparity between the norms espoused by parents and those of their children involving behaviour particularly salient to the adolescent and his family, assessed on an Intergeneration Disparity scale.

The dependent variables were the types of reaction made by the adolescent in his attempts to cope with the conflict aroused by these two areas of friction over social mores. Rejection of parents was also assessed in two ways, employing the Parental Compliance and Parental Deference measures. Salience of and conformity with the peer group was tapped by a five-element composite instrument, the Peer-Group Importance index. The degree to which societal mores were rejected by the child was indicated by responses to the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire and the Wrongdoing Rating scale. Estrangement from both reference groups and hence society as a whole was inferred from scores on an Alienation scale. The theoretical bases and development of these instruments are described in chapters 7 and 8.

A further aim, it will be recalled, was to assess differences in the degrees of culture conflict experienced, and in the means of coping with it employed, by adolescents born to immigrant parents from varying homelands, and similarly to compare second-generation adolescents with their Australian peers. A third independent variable was therefore the cultural group of the child's parents as defined by the homeland from which they had come. Families whose parents had reached adulthood in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Germany, Italy and

Greece, but whose adolescent children had grown up in Australia, were interviewed, together with a matched control group of Australian adolescent children and their parents.

The following chapter describes the selection of these families, the controls utilised in matching them with one another, and the procedure followed in contacting and interviewing them.

CHAPTER 6. SUBJECTS, SAMPLE CONTROLS AND PROCEDURE

PILOT STUDY

A year prior to the main study, a Pilot Study was conducted. Fifty-two Subjects (12 United Kingdom, 6 Dutch, 9 German, 6 Italian, 6 Greek, 13 Australian) and their parents were contacted using the procedure to be described below, and interviewed. They were taken from Sydney, Wollongong and Canberra; Melbourne being left to supply Respondents for the main study. Data was used to refine previously untested instruments employed, items being omitted or reworded where lack of an item-total correlation or Respondents' comments indicated this to be necessary. Post-response interviews and discussions were obtained with most families, and further items for some instruments derived from the information gained. Final questionnaire layout, scoring and coding were also based on the experience gained in the Pilot Study. These modifications made it impossible to pool the results with those of the main study, and the numbers in each group were too small to enable significant comparisons to be made. Consequently the results are not reported here. Nevertheless it was an integral element of the project as a whole, and sincere appreciation is due the New South Wales Good Neighbour Council who made it possible.

SUBJECTS

Subjects for the main study were 146 children and their parents resident in Melbourne, Australia. The children were aged 14, 15 or 16 years and of an average age of 15 years 6 months. A control group of 39 of these children were Australian-born of Australian parents and

grandparents, while the remaining 107 were what are commonly known as second-generation children of immigrants. Born of immigrant parents, they were either Australian-born or had arrived there at an average age of approximately one year, to undergo almost all their socialization experiences in a culture newly adopted by their parents. Subjects of both sexes were interviewed, 80 boys and 66 girls.

Two major considerations influenced the selection of the second-generation immigrant sample. A range of cultural backgrounds was desired, so that effects found could be generalised beyond the results of differences between an Australian and any particular non-Australian background. Nonetheless, a group from each background sufficiently large to permit adequate statistical comparison between groups was needed.

The Pilot Study had highlighted the difficulty of obtaining second-generation immigrant children from within the population, so samples from only the largest national groups in Australia were considered (1966 census, reported in the 1970 Yearbook). These were immigrants from the United Kingdom (approximately 1,000,000), Southern Europe (approximately 450,000), Eastern Europe (approximately 310,000) and Northwestern Europe (approximately 210,000). As refugees were considered to be a special case (Martin, 1965; Taft & Goldlust, 1970) and most Eastern European-born immigrants were refugees, immigrants born there were omitted. Two major subgroups made up each of the Northwest European and Southern European immigrant populations; Dutch and Germans, Italians and Greeks. Consequently, equal numbers from each of these nationalities were sought.

Although these populations appear at first glance to be large, when it is considered that the parents of the ideal 15-year-old Aus-

tralian-born Subject needed to have arrived in Australia during or before 1954, as adults, to have had a child in 1954, that the main non-refugee immigrant influx did not commence until 1950, and that Melbourne is only one of five major immigrant concentrations in Australia (the 1954 census found it to contain 20 per cent of the immigrant population for that year), it will be realised that the populations to be sampled were relatively small.

The official Report on the Commonwealth Census of 1954 gives the number of immigrants of each birthplace living in Australia, and in Melbourne. In 1954, 51.6 per cent of the 1,286,466 immigrants resident in Australia were from the United Kingdom, and 18 per cent of these lived in Melbourne. Of the 4.0 per cent of Australian immigrants who were from the Netherlands, 14 per cent were Melbourne residents. Germany had supplied 5.1 per cent of Australia's immigrants, and 20 per cent of these resided in Melbourne. Of the Italian-born making up 9.3 per cent of the total Australian immigrant population, 25 per cent had settled in Melbourne. Exactly 2 per cent of all immigrants had come from Greece, of whom 22 per cent were in Melbourne in 1954. The Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council Report (1961), basing its tables on Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics Demography Bulletins, shows that 17,960 children were born in Australia in 1954 into families both of whose parents were immigrants. Knowing from the percentages given above the sizes of the various birthplace groups in Melbourne, and assuming that the number of children born to each group was approximately proportionate to its size, the number of children born in Melbourne in 1954 to the selected ethnic groups could roughly be estimated to

be 1,700 of United Kingdom parents, 100 of Dutch parents, 190 German, 420 Italian, and 80 of Greek parents.

Aimed for then, were samples from these populations of 30 children born in Australia of United Kingdom parents, 15 of Dutch parents and 15 of German parents, making a total Northwestern European sample of 30; plus 15 of Italian parents and 15 of Greek parents to give a total Southern European group of 30. Actually obtained were 35 United Kingdom, 17 Dutch, 16 German, 19 Italian and 20 Greek, from 30, 15, 15, 15 and 16 families respectively.

Details of the selection of these children are discussed below.

The Australian sample was taken to provide a comparison group so that an indication could be obtained of the degree to which conflict aroused in the child of immigrants exceeded or differed in nature from that caused in host society children by the gap widely held to exist between generations in industrialised Western societies (for example, Sherif & Sherif, 1964). Ideally an Australian child should have been matched with each second-generation immigrant child. As this was beyond the resources of the project, a sample one-third the size of that of immigrants' children was sought, matching it on major dimensions discussed in detail below.

It is not claimed that the immigrant sample proportionately represents nationalities of second-generation immigrant children in Australia. Rather it is suggested that they are a group of children varying along other dimensions but in a common situation of having grown up in a society other than that in which their parents matured. Similarly the Australian control group children are simply a group closely

matching the second-generation immigrant children in most important respects except that of having reached adolescence in the culture into which both their parents and all their grandparents had been born.

Selection of Subjects - Immigrant

Several possible avenues of contact with second-generation children of immigrants were explored. The Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics was able to provide detailed information on areas densely populated with residents born overseas, but was not able to assist in tracing children born of them in Australia. Similarly, both the Commonwealth and Victorian State Departments of Immigration were eager to assist and able to indicate suburbs and schools containing large proportions of non-Australian-born children. They were also able to provide valuable information on the numbers and nationalities of immigrants arriving between 1946 and 1955, but were unable to suggest means of finding children born of those immigrants since their arrival. Schoolteachers and principals spoken to found that more often than not they were unable to discriminate second-generation children of immigrants from Australian children in their classes. School rolls did not contain information on the birthplaces of parents. One method considered was the distribution of questionnaires asking for personal information from schoolchildren, but subsequent experience using this method to select the Australian control group substantiated fears that information from several schools and many hundreds of children would have had to have been obtained in order to achieve the numbers required.

Consequently the Good Neighbour Council of Victoria was approached. This is an independent, although government-assisted organisation which

coordinates the efforts of many voluntary organisations working to promote the integration of immigrants throughout the Australian community. Through its secretary Miss Thelma Jarrett, it was able to provide contact with community leaders, church and welfare workers, and association secretaries, representing large numbers of Australian residents who had been born overseas but had resided in Australia 15 years or more.

Notable among these organisations were the Holland-Australia Club and the Klaverjas Federation (Dutch), The Australian-German Welfare Society and the Robert Bosch Company (German), the Catholic Immigration Office and the Scalabrinian Fathers (Italian), the Greek Community Church, the Australian Council of Churches and the European-Australian Christian Fellowship (Greek), and the United Kingdom Settlers Association, Fibremakers Limited and the Catholic Immigration Office (United Kingdom).

Through each of these contact with two or three families was established. After interviewing each family further contacts were requested and were almost invariably suggested although many were found to be unsuitable once contacted. Nonetheless these in turn were asked for further contacts, and so on. Thus families were contacted in a network across the metropolis, until sufficient of each group had been interviewed.

Care was taken not to confine contacts to any single circle of friends, nor to remain within too restricted a range of fathers' occupations. For example, a valuable United Kingdom contact was a policeman and although he suggested several families whose fathers

were also policemen, no others were interviewed. Similarly, the Robert Bosch Company had personnel almost all of whom are German-born, but only two families actually employed by the firm were included. They, in turn, suggested others whose fathers were in other employment. In this way a range of opinion, attitudes and values was encountered.

Selection of Subjects - Australian

The primary objective when selecting a group of Australian children was to obtain a sample matched as closely as possible with the immigrant children already tested. Behind this was the aim discussed under SUBJECTS above of providing a control group against which to assess the relative effects of conflict caused by parental migration, compared with that resulting from the rapidity of social change alone. The operational definition of "Australian" was an Australian-born child both of whose parents and all of whose grandparents had also been born in Australia. As complete pairing with the 107 immigrant Subjects was infeasible, a cluster-matched sample one-third the size of the immigrant group was taken.

It was primarily selected with the aid of the Noble Park Psychology and Guidance Branch of the Victorian Education Department, with whom contact was originally made through the Monash University Education Faculty. Through the Branch contact was established in turn with the heads of several state high schools in the Eastern suburbs (Clayton Technical School, Dandenong Girls' High School, Doveton Technical School and Vermont High School). In addition the Catholic Immigration Office, through the Scalabrinian Fathers, provided contact with St. Brigid's

Roman Catholic School; the Christian Brothers College, Clifton Hill; the Academy of Mary Immaculate, Fitzroy; and the St. Euphrasia Roman Catholic School, Abbotsford.

Preliminary matching of the Australian sample with the immigrant group was on seven variables; sex, age, whether Catholic or non-Catholic in religion, socioeconomic status by father's occupation, socioeconomic status by suburb of residence, whether working or at school, and, if at school, whether at a state or Catholic Church school. Other variables such as parents' age etc., were checked after the interview.

Immigrant children were plotted on a grid representing these seven variables and a number of cells were observed each to contain several Subjects. For example, there were five boys aged between 14.0 and 14.11 years who were Protestant, attending a state school, and living in a Class $\underline{V}$ suburb (Broom, L. & Lancaster-Jones, F., 1969). Their fathers' occupations ranged from clerk to unskilled labourer.

Counting down the columns, every second immigrant Subject plotted in a cell containing two or more Subjects was then matched. Thus the Australian sample was matched against the modal immigrant sample rather than against the total. So it could be argued that two-thirds, rather than one-third, of the immigrant sample was matched.

This was done by having all pupils in the third and fourth years of the State schools complete a questionnaire asking for demographic details on self, siblings and parents (see Appendix XVIII). Taking the seven matching variables as criteria, a description of each subject required was made out, and the questionnaires searched until a child fitting it exactly was found. The home addresses and telephone numbers

of these children were then obtained from the school, and their parents contacted. The Roman Catholic schools had more detailed information on their pupils and were able to preselect Australian-born of Australian parents children, who then completed the same questionnaire on siblings and progenitors. A similar procedure of contact was then followed with them. Only in one case was this unsuccessful, the child being ill. Thirty-nine Australian children and their parents were interviewed.

The degree to which this procedure produced a matching sample can be judged from the following sections.

SAMPLE CONTROLS

In selecting the samples an attempt was made to control a number of demographic variables by keeping them standard. Children were equated along some dimensions in the course of their selection, while information was collected on other variables in order to check on their uniformity after sampling had been completed.

They included both variables affecting the child's family and those concerning only himself. Familial controls will be discussed first, followed by those more particularly concerning the Subject.

Familial Controls

Birthplace of Parents. Information was obtained from parents concerning their actual place of birth. Table 6.1 shows the birthplaces of all immigrant parents. Where parents were not actually born in their country of nationality they were asked to what nationality they had considered themselves as belonging before coming to Australia. All claimed to

Table 6.1. Birthplaces of Immigrant Parents

Birthplace	N
England	34
Scotland	13
Ireland	9
Wales	2
Total United Kingdom	58
Netherlands	26
Outside Netherlands, but of Dutch parents	1
Total Dutch	27
West Germany	17
East Germany	4
Outside Germany, but of German parents	9
Total German	30
Northern Italy	9
Central Italy	13
Southern Italy	5
Sicily	3
Total Italian	30
Northern Greece	1
Central Greece	1
Southern Greece	8
Greek Islands	10
Greek Cyprus	6
Egypt, of Greek parents	3
Total Greek	29
Total Immigrant Sample	174

have been of the nationality designated in selecting the sample. Martin (1965) shows that relationships both between refugee parents, and between them and their children, are atypically affected by factors beyond those of differences in cultural background between parents and child. Refugee parents were therefore avoided.

All Australian children were at least fourth-generation Australians. That is, both parents and all four grandparents had been born in Australia. Post-interview discussion revealed that some could claim to be fifth- or even sixth-generation Australians.

Socioeconomic Status. Children were matched carefully on socioeconomic status. It will be recalled that a major area of contention between the generations causing conflict for the modern adolescent is the amount of authoritarian control which parents exercise over their families. This is greater in lower socioeconomic status families, and results in an other-directed, rather than self-critical, form of morality development in the child (Bronfenbrenner, 1962). Demographic and sociological studies (Martin, 1965; Price, 1963b; Zubrzycki, 1968) show that immigrant groups can differ greatly in socioeconomic status. Moreover Doczy (1967) argued that Australians of otherwise equivalent education and qualifications tend to attain higher socioeconomic status than do immigrants (see chapter 2, above). Thus differences between groups in the amount of discordance found could have been at least partly attributable to variance in socioeconomic status if it had not been controlled. Consideration of items such as "Driven when you're under the influence" (Socially Unacceptable Behaviour), or "Going to school until aged at least 17 or 18" (Intergeneration Disparity) illustrates this point.

Thus although there was some variation within groups (see below), care was taken to keep socioeconomic status as uniform as possible across immigrant groups, and it was taken into consideration when matching the Australian control group subjects with their second-generation immigrant peers.

This was done by selecting only families from the lower end of the socioeconomic status scale as indicated by the father's occupation. As expected most Southern European families contacted were of lower socioeconomic status. More difficulty was experienced in finding lower socioeconomic status Northwestern Europeans, especially Germans, and several families were rejected on this count. The greater numbers of United Kingdom immigrants made selection of a lower socioeconomic status group from among them easier. However to check on the equivalence of the samples in socioeconomic status two measures were taken.

The first was socioeconomic status as manifested by the father's occupation. In the seven cases where the father was dead socioeconomic status was estimated from the late father's occupation rather than from that of the mother. Recorded in detail, the father's occupation was later rated according to the 17-point Broom-Jones Scale of Socioeconomic Status (Broom, L. & Lancaster-Jones, F., 1969). Two other rating scales, the modified 10-point Broom-Jones Scale used in the Henderson Poverty Study in Melbourne (McCaughey, 1970), and the Congalton 7-point scale (Congalton, 1969) were also tried, but were found to be both restricted in sensitivity and more difficult to use. The mean and standard deviation of the Broom-Jones ratings of each subsample are shown in Table 6.2. Although the mean scores ranged from 10.80 (Italian) up to 8.87

Table 6.2. Mean Scores on Broom-Jones Scale of Socioeconomic Status by Father's Occupation

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N Families	30	15	15	30	15	15*	30	90	31	121
Mean S.E.S. Rating	9.97	9.13	8.87	9.00	10.80	9.47	10.13	9.70	10.61	9.93
S.D.	2.70	2.85	2.09	2.50	3.02	2.60	2.90	2.75	3.11	2.87

*The occupation of one Greek father was unknown.

(German) a one-way analysis of variance revealed no significant difference from the overall sample mean of 9.93 (F = 1.35, df = 5, 115, NS.). Similarly a series of t-tests between selected pairs of means showed that the Australian sample mean of 10.61 was not significantly different from that of any one immigrant group or from the total immigrant mean of 9.70.

The second indicator of socioeconomic status used was the Lancaster-Jones Suburb Rating for the Melbourne suburb in which each family lived (Lancaster-Jones, F., 1967). Although families came from a large number of suburbs, from Altona in the West to Doveton in the East, and Thomastown in the North to Seaford in the South, an attempt was made to take families from suburbs of ratings five to eight only (using the SES/ETH version of the ranking scale). The extent to which this was successful can be judged from Table 6.3 showing the mean and standard deviation of the suburb ranking scores for the families of each subsample. Again the range is from the Italian (6.53) to the German (4.93) groups, but an analysis of variance found no significant variation across the groups from the total mean of 5.35 (F = 2.20, df = 5, 116, NS.). Moreover the Australian sample mean of 5.39 was not significantly different on a series of t-tests from that of any one group or from the total immigrant mean of 5.34.

Contact with Both Parents. It was assumed that both mother and father are strong influences on the schema of values established by the child and both parents were interviewed wherever possible. As is discussed in Chapter 7 the mean of their responses was normally used when scoring

Table 6.3. Mean Scores on Lancaster-Jones Rating Scale of Melbourne Suburbs

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N Families	30	15	15	30	15	16	31	91	31	122
Mean Suburb Rating	4.97	5.47	4.93	5.20	6.53	5.19	5.84	5.34	5.39	5.35
S.D.	1.69	1.86	1.24	1.60	1.93	1.89	2.02	1.68	1.56	1.65

the scales employed to measure Intergenerational Disparity and it was this mean with which were compared the responses of the child reflecting the values held by himself and his peer-group.

Table 6.4 shows the number of children in each group for whom only one parent was contacted. For over 90 per cent of the children both parents were interviewed. Five fathers and one mother were unavailable. All were absent, no face-to-face refusals from parents being received. Seven fathers were dead. It would have been preferred to avoid children of widows as the parent-child relationship is atypical, but the small Subject pool and pressure of time made this difficult. A χ^2 test for goodness of fit over the total sample using Yates' correction for small expected frequencies showed no significant variation between groups in the proportion of children for whom only one parent was contacted ($\chi^2 = 8.60$, $df = 5$, $.20 > p > .10$). Similarly two-by-two corrected chi-square comparisons of the Australian sample with each immigrant subsample and the total immigrant group revealed no significant difference. No children of divorced or separated parents were included.

Years since Immigration. When contacting an immigrant family the year of immigration was ascertained. Later an exact date of arrival in Australia was obtained. This was then compared with the first day of the month in which the interview took place and a precise period of residence calculated. Where mother and father differed (infrequent) the mean of their residence periods was used.

Of the 91 immigrant families, only six had been in Australia less than 12 years, and only six more than 20 years (mean = 15.8 years,

Table 6.4. Number of Children for whom Both Parents were Contacted, One Parent was Unavailable or One Parent was Dead

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
Both Parents Contacted	33	14	16	30	19	16	35	98	35	133
One Parent Unavailable	1	1	0	1	0	2	2	4	2	6
One Parent Dead	1	2	0	2	0	2	2	5	2	7
TOTAL	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146

SD = 3.3 years). That is, 87 per cent of the immigrant families had arrived in Australia between the beginning of 1950 and the end of 1957. This meant that although the backgrounds from which they had come may have varied to some degree as the European economies started to expand again after World War II, the Australia to which they had migrated could be thought of as reasonably constant in this respect.

Mean years since immigration for nationalities ranged from 14.7 years (Dutch) to 16.6 years (United Kingdom). Analysis of variance indicated barely significant variance across the five groups (F = 2.44, df = 4, 169, with 2.43 required for significance at the .05 level). Further analysis showed that most of this could be attributed to the longer residence in Australia of the United Kingdom sample (mean = 16.6 years) compared with the other immigrant groups (mean = 15.4 years). However, this difference of just over one year was considered not likely to be of any practical import, and that it was found significant illustrates the uniformity of Australian residence period across the immigrant groups. Such uniformity also means that the 15-year-old child from each immigrant group was living with parents who had had similar periods of experience of Australia.

Age of Parents. A further check was made on the ages of the parents at immigration. This was consistent across all nationalities, ranging from 26.4 years (Greek mothers) to 30.3 years (Dutch fathers). The overall mean was 28.6 years, SD = 6.8 years. Similarly then, it is suggested that each set of parents had been influenced to approximately the same extent by their homeland background. A one-way analysis of variance gave F = 0.35, df = 4, 168, NS.

The recording of years since immigration also allowed an estimate to be made of the age of the child at the date of his parents' immigration, if he was not Australian-born. This is discussed below, under Subject Controls.

The mean age of both Australian and immigrant parents at the interview date was also calculated, to check that children from each group were facing a similar gap in years between themselves and their parents. Again this was equable, ranging from 41.1 years (Greek mothers) to 46.6 years (United Kingdom fathers). The overall mean was 44.2 years, SD = 6.0 years. There was no significant difference across groups. On a one-way analysis of variance $F = 0.61$, $df = 5, 225$, NS. Moreover the Australian group means of 42.4 years for mothers and 44.7 years for fathers did not differ significantly on a t-test from the mean age for the parents of any one immigrant group or from the overall immigrant means of 43.0 years for mothers and 46.0 years for fathers. Table 6.5 shows the age, years since immigration and age at immigration of parents.

Subject Controls

Age of Subjects. The principal criterion used when selecting Subjects was age. For reasons described above it was hoped to interview 15-year-olds only. However the difficulties encountered in finding Australian-born children of immigrant parents forced this criterion to be relaxed, with 14- and 16-year-olds being accepted also. Although the mean ages of nationality groups ranged from 15.2 years (Dutch) to 15.8 years (German), a one-way analysis of variance revealed no significant variation between groups from the total sample mean of 15.5 years, SD = 0.8 years

Table 6.5. Age, Years since Immigration, and Age at Immigration of Parents

			United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
				Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
Mothers		N	30	15	15	30	15	16	31	91	30	121
	Age	Mean	43.7*	44.5	42.3	43.4	42.8	41.1	41.9	43.0	42.4	42.5
		S.D.	6.3	6.5	4.3	5.6	5.6	5.0	5.3	6.0		
	Years since Immigration	Mean	16.8	14.6	15.3	15.0	15.4	14.7	15.0	15.6	-	-
		S.D.	3.9	2.4	2.8	2.6	3.5	1.6	2.7	3.2	-	-
	Age at Immigration	Mean	26.6*	29.9	27.0	28.5	27.4	26.4	26.9	27.3	-	-
		S.D.	7.3	7.3	4.6	6.3	6.5	5.7	6.1	6.6	-	-
Fathers		N	28	12	15	27	15	13	28	83	28	111
	Age	Mean	46.6	45.1	44.9	45.0	46.5	46.4	46.4	46.0	44.7	45.7
		S.D.	6.2	6.1	5.0	5.5	5.8	5.2	5.5	6.6		
	Years since Immigration	Mean	16.3	14.8	15.3	15.0	17.2	15.6	16.5	15.9	-	-
		S.D.	3.1	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.5	4.8	3.8	3.3	-	-
	Age at Immigration	Mean	30.2	30.3	29.7	30.0	29.2	30.8	30.0	30.1	-	-
		S.D.	6.9	6.6	5.7	6.1	5.6	8.7	7.2	6.8	-	-

*One UK mother refused to give her age

(F = 1.17, df = 5, 140, NS.). A series of t-tests showed that the Australian sample mean of 15.4 years did not differ significantly from that of any one immigrant group or from the overall immigrant mean of 15.5 years. Consequently it was assumed that the groups were equivalent in age. Table 6.6 shows N, mean age in years and SD for each group.

Birthplace of Child. Initially it was hoped to select as second-generation immigrant Subjects only children born in Australia, of immigrant parents. Because of the difficulty experienced in finding such children this was relaxed to acceptance of children described by their parents as aged two years and less at the date of their parents' immigration. Although the child learns a great deal before he is two, it is contended that most of this socialization being within the family, it will be much the same whether the parents are recently arrived or are still in their country of origin. It is not relevant to the type of interaction about which they were to be interviewed later (for example, attitude to school, opposite-sex friends, etc.). Weaning, toilet training and early vocalisation, while milestones along the course of socialization and differing to some extent between nationalities, are not as varied across these cultural groups as are such factors as socialization of sex, dependency, aggression and competence, which processes are only beginning to be undergone by the age of two (Singer & Singer, 1969). And it is by the socialization of these drives that the value schema measured in the adolescent by this study are built up. Similarly the amount of contact with the peer-group and its influence are relatively unimportant before this age. Consequently of the 107 immigrant children interviewed, 50 had been born outside Australia.

Table 6.6. Mean age in Years of All Children

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Mean Age	15.49	15.21	15.79	15.49	15.71	15.41	15.55	15.52	15.39	15.48
S.D.	0.82	0.71	0.92	0.87	0.87	0.92	0.91	0.87	0.74	0.84

As mentioned above only six immigrant families had arrived in Australia more than four years before the child's birth and it was expected that the child born of immigrant parents less than three years before coming to Australia would not differ greatly from the child born to similar parents soon after their arrival. Nonetheless a check on the proportion of children born overseas within the different national groups was made. Table 6.7 shows the number of children within each group born outside Australia, compared with the number born in Australia. There was no significant variation between nationalities in these proportions ($\chi^2 = 5.92$, $df = 4$, $.30 > p > .20$). As mentioned above, all Australian Subjects were Australian-born, of Australian-born parents and grandparents.

Age of Subject at Date of Parents' Immigration. Following the reasoning set out in the section above, it was attempted to select only children who had been two years old or less when they arrived in Australia. This was done by asking this information of the parents when arranging an interview. However a post-test comparison of parents' immigration date and child's exact age revealed that even this had not been entirely successful, and that 13 per cent of the immigrant sample children had been three years old when they arrived in Australia. An analysis of variance of the mean age of Subjects at the date of parents' immigration across the immigrant groups was therefore calculated to check that children of no one nationality might have had more experience of their homeland than those of another. Subjects born in Australia were scored negatively with the number of years their parents had been in Australia

Table 6.7. Birthplace of Immigrant Children

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL	
Born in Parents' Homeland	12	10	9	19	7	12	19	50
Australian-born	23	7	7	14	12	8	20	57
TOTAL	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107

when the child was born. Table 6.8 shows N, mean age at immigration and SD for each immigrant nationality.

Mean scores ranged from the parents having been in Australia 1.35 years at the date of the child's birth (United Kingdom) to the child having been 0.60 years of age at the date of the parents' immigration (Dutch). However a one-way analysis of variance showed no significant variation across the five groups from the total mean of -0.30 years, SD = 3.00 years (F = 2.02, df = 4, 102, NS.).

It was thus concluded that although approximately half of the immigrants' children tested had been born out of Australia, the national groups did not differ significantly from one another in either the proportion of overseas-born children, or in their age when they and their parents had arrived in Australia.

Years of Secondary Education of Subjects. Cognitive development and social status among adolescent peers was considered to be related to level of education. Consequently education level, measured as years of secondary education, was recorded in detail. For example a child in fourth year at high school, interviewed in May, was recorded as having had 3.3 years of secondary education; that is, three years and one term. Levels were then compared across nationalities. Means ranged from 3.1 years (Dutch) to 3.7 years (German) but an analysis of variance across the six groups revealed no significant deviation from the overall mean of 3.3 years, SD = 0.88 years (F = 0.99, df = 5, 140, NS.). Similarly the Australian mean of 3.4 years was shown by a series of t-tests not to differ significantly from that of any one immigrant group or from

Table 6.8. Mean Age in Years of Immigrant Children at Date of Parents' Immigration. Australian-born Subjects Scored Negatively

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL	
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107
Mean Age at Parents' Immigration	-1.35	0.60	0.57	0.59	-0.50	0.25	-0.12	-0.30
S.D.	3.40	2.38	2.18	2.28	2.73	2.94	2.87	3.00

the total immigrant mean of 3.3 years. All groups were therefore considered as equivalent in education level. Table 6.9 shows N, mean years of secondary education and SD for each nationality.

Proportion of Children Working. Education is compulsory in Victoria only until a child is aged 15 years. It was consequently probable that some of the 15- and 16-year-olds tested should have left school.

Relationships between the child and his parents, and with his peer-group, will presumably change as he commences work. Dependence on parents, for example, will decrease and variation in peer-group membership increase. These changes will, however, take time.

Table 6.10 shows the number of children in each nationality who had been working six months or more, six months or less, or were still at school. Although six of the 35 United Kingdom Subjects (17 per cent) were working, compared with the overall total of 13 of 146 (9 per cent), a chi-square test using Yates' correction for small expected frequencies found the groups to fit reasonably well to the desired model of equality ($\chi^2 = 7.40$, $df = 5$, $.20 > p > .10$). A two-by-two comparison of the United Kingdom sample with the Australian control group was also not significant ($\chi^2 = 3.03$, NS.). It was thus assumed that an approximately comparable proportion of each group was working.

Sex Distribution. It is recognised that relationships between adolescent boys, their parents and their peers, could well differ from those between girls and their parents and peer-group. However size of Subject pool and pressure of time made infeasible the selection of children of one sex only, so several safeguards were taken.

Table 6.9. Mean Years of Secondary Education for All Children

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Mean Years Secondary Education	3.32	3.11	3.66	3.38	3.47	3.14	3.30	3.33	3.37	3.34
S.D.	0.72	1.08	0.97	1.07	0.94	1.00	0.99	0.94	0.69	0.88

Table 6.10. Number of Children Working and Number of Children at School

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
Working 6 months or more	4	1	1	2	0	0	0	6	1	7
Working less than 6 months	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3
Total Working	6	1	1	2	0	1	1	9	1	10
At School	29	16	15	31	19	19	38	98	38	136
TOTAL	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146

Parents were asked to respond to the Intergeneration Questionnaires as they would concerning both boys and girls of the Subject's age, and perusal of their responses revealed few differences. Subjects were asked to respond in terms of their own experience, taking their sex into account. Finally an effort was made to interview approximately equal numbers of boys and girls within each national group. Table 6.11 shows the number of boys, girls and total N for each group. Although boys made up somewhat more than half the sample (54.7 per cent), and this was accentuated for the Greek subsample, a chi-square test for goodness of fit using Yates' correction across the nationalities found variation in proportions not to be excessive ($\chi^2 = 3.32$, df = 5, $.70 > p > .50$). A series of two-by-two comparisons using a corrected chi-square test showed the Australian proportion of 22 boys to 17 girls not to differ significantly from those of any one immigrant group or from the total immigrant proportion of 58 boys to 51 girls. Groups were therefore assumed to be equivalent in sex distribution.

Proportion of Subjects in State Schools. After his parents and his peers the child's third major source of values is his school and its staff. Church schools in particular and specifically Roman Catholic schools view imparting of social values as an important function. A variable on which it was attempted to match the immigrant groups with one another and with the Australian control group was consequently whether or not the child attended a church school.

Of the 98 immigrant children interviewed who were still attending school, 28, or 28.3 per cent attended church schools. 26.3 per

Table 6.11. Sex Distribution Among Children

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
Male	16	9	8	17	11	14	25	58	22	80
Female	19	8	8	16	8	6	14	49	17	66
TOTAL	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146

cent of the Australian school children interviewed attended church schools. These figures correspond reasonably closely with the proportion for the total Victorian population of 24.9 per cent (Australian Year Book, 1970).

Table 6.12 shows the number of Subjects in state schools, the number in church schools (all but one Roman Catholic) and the total number of Respondents for the five immigrant groups and the Australian control group. Over the six groups a χ^2 test revealed a marked discrepancy ($\chi^2 = 25.76$, $df = 5$, $p < .001$). Two-by-two comparisons showed this to be due entirely to the preponderance of Roman Catholic schoolchildren among the Italian subsample and the lack of Greek church school pupils. The Australian sample closely matched the United Kingdom, Dutch and German proportions, but contained insufficient church school Subjects to match the Italian group, and too many to be considered equivalent to the Greek sample. This will be discussed further under Results.

Overall, however, the Australian control group matched the United Kingdom, Northwest European and Southern European samples closely and the total immigrant sample exactly ($\chi^2 = 0.00$) in its proportion of state and church school pupils.

Religion. Nevertheless it is not implied that an attempt was made to control for religion. It was viewed as an aspect of the culture into which the adolescent was maturing, and, moreover, an element which other research had shown to be a cause of contention between the generations. Similarly it was seen as one of the dimensions along which the cultural backgrounds of the parents of the second-generation children varied.

Table 6.12. Number of Children at Church Schools

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
Church School	9	2	5	7	13	0	13	29	10	39
State School	20	14	10	24	6	19	25	69	28	97
Total at School	29	16	15	31	19	19	38	98	38	136
Working	6	1	1	2	0	1	1	9	1	10
TOTAL	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146

Thus it was accepted that all Italians were Roman Catholic, Greeks Orthodox, most Germans either Lutheran or Catholic, most Dutch either Reformed or Catholic, and the majority of United Kingdom and Australian families Protestant, particularly Church of England, but with a sizeable majority of Roman Catholics.

It is claimed, then, that over a number of basic variables the immigrant subsamples matched one another sufficiently closely to allow differences between them in responses to the measures used to be considered not merely artifacts arising from sampling differences, but as actual variation in responses to the scales themselves.

Moreover it is contended that the Australian sample matched the immigrant sample, and subsections of that sample, closely enough on those variables to be considered an equivalent criterion or control group.

INTERVIEWING PROCEDURE

Once a potential Subject and family had been selected contact was made with the father, if possible, and a time arranged at which the interview could take place. The father was specifically approached where this was feasible as the Pilot Study had shown that arrangements made through the mother without the father's knowledge were often subsequently rejected by him. This contact was frequently by telephone, although some families were approached at the door. It was explained who the Interviewer was; who had recommended the family to him; that the project was examining the ideas and beliefs of young people in Aus-

tralia today; and that some indication of his parents' attitude was also sought. That the Interviewer was a New Zealander was mentioned in all cases, with the suggestion to non-Australians that they were therefore free to comment on things Australian without offending him, and to Australians that he did not necessarily understand all local social mores and would need some explained in detail. Anonymity of the child and parents was stressed, and the purely research, non-commercial, non-governmental nature of the project emphasised.

This procedure resulted in only one refusal. An Australian father explained that his child was ill, and likely to remain so for some time. In all other cases, once initial acceptance was obtained, full cooperation was in effect given.

An average of approximately one hour was spent interviewing each family, although this varied considerably. Factors affecting duration included degree of acceptance (ranging from sitting on an Australian back porch to being invited to a Greek name-day party), difficulty with English on the part of some non-Australian parents, and time of day.

Although some interviewing was conducted during the day on weekends, most took place in the evening. This was to ensure that the child and both parents were interviewed concurrently, to prevent any discussion of the questionnaires occurring before responses were made. Two families were interviewed on the typical evening, and five or six on most weekends. Data was collected during the months of January, February, May and August, 1970.

A standard procedure was adopted. The purpose and method of the study were briefly explained to parents and child as a group, ques-

tions answered, and the questionnaires distributed clipped into a manilla folder, one set plus a pencil to each person. The concepts of generation gap or culture conflict were avoided. It was then suggested that the child might like to work in the privacy of another room, as he had more to do than had the parents. This was to remove him from immediate parental influence. In most cases this suggestion was followed, and in no case did the parents actually see their child's responses.

Where parents read their own questionnaires and answered them themselves, attempts at discussing items were quashed, often with a promise of discussion after responding had been completed. The Interviewer endeavoured, and was successful in most cases, to be seated between the parents, or in the homes where the child remained in the same room, between the child and his parents. This was to prevent communication between respondents. If other family members were present they were either encouraged to leave, or were engaged in conversation, in an attempt to prevent their influencing responses in any way.

All children read their own questionnaires and answered them themselves. Very little difficulty was experienced with comprehension by the children and questions from them on procedure were rare. The occasional query on interpretation was carefully although politely rebuffed. The order in which questionnaires were read and responded to was the same for all children and no child required questionnaires to be read out or translated.

Parents were interviewed using one of three methods. Preferred was self-administration, with the parents reading the questionnaires themselves and responding to them by checking the appropriate alter-

natives. This meant that each parent gave his or her own opinion and was not influenced by the other's expressed belief. Of the United Kingdom and Australian parents contacted, 95 per cent were interviewed in this way, as were 40 per cent of the Northwest European parents.

The next preferred procedure was offered when a parent asked for assistance or appeared to be having difficulty understanding what he was reading, usually by taking an inordinate amount of time to make his responses. The procedure employed was to read the items out to each parent separately and record his responses. That a respondent had understood an item was checked by repeating his response to him and obtaining his assent to its statement before recording it.

For example: "Mass-produced goods are better than hand-made goods" (Item 7, Australianism Questionnaire). "No." "You don't feel that mass-produced goods are better than hand-made goods." "Yes, that's right."

The parent was also encouraged to elaborate upon his responses, so providing extra information which assisted the interviewer in verifying that the items as read had been understood. Interpretation of expressions was sometimes necessary. For example: "Mass-produced means made in large quantities in a factory." Again care was taken to obtain independent responses.

Questionnaires were read out in this manner to 60 per cent of the Northwestern parents and to 44 per cent of the Southern European parents interviewed.

Some Southern European parents, especially mothers, found the concepts involved difficult to comprehend in English. This was par-

ticularly true of the Australianism Questionnaire items. Every attempt was made to interview in English, with careful checking that items had been understood. A number of the key words were learned in all four languages and used to assist communication. This was often successful, as the average immigrant parent had lived in Australia for more than fifteen years.

However translation was unavoidable when interviewing two-thirds of the Southern European mothers and a third of the fathers. Another family member, often an elder sibling of the Subject, was then employed as a translator, although in some families where this was not practicable the father was asked after giving his own responses to translate for the mother. Occasionally the child, always after he had completed his own responses, was asked to translate. It was explained to the translator that he must be careful not to influence the respondent's opinion in either way. The interviewer was able to follow the translations to a small extent and often supplied the key words, as mentioned above. Again verification of the parent's comprehension of the item and her response was attempted by repeating her opinion and obtaining her assent that it was what she had really meant. Frequently a parent for whom translation of the original item was necessary then replied directly to the interviewer with a statement in English, aiding assessment of whether or not they had understood the item correctly. Again elaboration upon responses was encouraged, often offered in English, and assisted in verification of comprehension. Gesture and facial expression were also helpful.

Table 6.13 shows the forms of administration used for the parents of each nationality.

Table 6.13. Methods by which Questionnaires were Administered to Parents

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
Self-Read										
Mothers	28	5	4	9	1	0	1	38	28	66
Fathers	27	9	5	14	0	1	1	42	28	70
Total	55	14	9	23	1	1	2	80	56	136
Read Out										
Mothers	2	10	11	21	6	3	9	32	2	34
Fathers	1	3	10	13	9	8	17	31	0	31
Total	3	13	21	34	15	11	26	63	2	65
Translated										
Mothers	0	0	0	0	8	13	21	21	0	21
Fathers	0	0	0	0	6	4	10	10	0	10
Total	0	0	0	0	14	17	31	31	0	31
TOTAL	58	27	30	57	30	29	59	174	58	232

Parents not requiring assistance typically completed their questionnaires after approximately ten minutes. The folders were then recovered, responding method checked, and information about the family then requested orally. The Interviewer recorded this information on the relevant data sheets for both parents and child (see Appendices I, II). Parents were then engaged in conversation until the child had finished, to prevent their influencing his responses. When he had completed his questionnaires his responses were quickly checked and suggestions sought of further Subjects, usually with some success. The family were then thanked, their anonymity assured, and left. Name and address were entered on data sheets after leaving the house in case further contact should become necessary.

CHAPTER 7. SCALES USED TO MEASURE VALUE DISPARITY

As stated in chapter 5, an independent variable in this project was the degree of divergence between the value systems of the child and his parents. Assessment of this required measurement of the values adhered to by the child, those of his parents, and the disparity between them. Culture tension in the child's family, and the consequent likelihood of his experiencing culture conflict, were then inferred from the disparity of values found.

One strategy would have been to design a scale of values applicable to both generations, apply it to each, and compare the resultant total scores. In effect this would have meant obtaining a difference score for each child on the value scale.

The low reliability of difference scores is frequently used as an objection against them (for example, Cronbach, 1970, p.368; Ferguson, 1966, p.383; Thorndike & Hagen, 1969, pp.195-198). Low reliability results from taking the differences between total scores derived from each of two separate sets of sub-scores, which themselves are correlated. These may be scores on the items of two discrete scales, or the scores of pairs of Respondents to the items of one scale. Assuming the reliabilities of the two sets of sub-scores to be fixed, the reliability of the differences between total scores made up from them will not only suffer from error contributed by both original sources, but will further decrease with an increase from zero of the correlation between them.

It was felt that this objection could well apply to the present study. Being measured by each of the Australianism Disparity and Intergeneration Disparity instruments in turn was the disparity between res-

ponses by the child and those of his parents to the items of one scale. Although the child might disagree with his parents on many items, he was likely to disagree with his own parents somewhat less than he would with a random sample of other children's parents. Thus the possibility of a low, but significant correlation between the scores of children and their parents on a value scale over the sample as a whole could not be discounted. Analysis of Pilot Study data and preliminary analysis of main study data confirmed this (see next section).

Thus to measure value disparity using difference scores derived from the responses of the two generations to the one scale would have required a highly reliable instrument. Moreover, if two separate, complete scales had been employed, the dimensions which each was to measure would have had to have been determined. The building of such scales would have been a complete project in itself.

However what was needed was an indicator of dissension between the child and his parents. This required a sampling of values adhered to over which dissension was likely to occur, with no assumption necessary of an underlying dimension of radicalism-conservatism or, for that matter, of Australianism-nonAustralianism, on the part of either generation within each family. All that was required was an indication of the relative frequency with which the child and his parents disagreed over salient norms. If, as expected, disagreement on a number of these values was found, it could then be inferred that conflict was occurring for the child over the basic value schema of the two generations.

The alternative method adopted, therefore, was to ascertain the child's response to each of a number of value statements, and to compare

it with his parents' response. A difference, irrespective of its direction, was taken to indicate disagreement. These differences were then summed to give a score representing disparity between the child and his parents. Disparity was not assessed by the difference between total scores on two scales of values, but by a scale of which each item measured discrepancy between the two generations over a particular norm. The disparity score was therefore the sum of discrepancies between child and parents on a number of items. Consequently the procedure involved scaling items of contention rather than estimating contention by the difference between total scale scores.

This procedure precluded the particular objection of low reliability of difference scores outlined above, as it was the absolute difference between responses made to each item which provided a disparity score for that item. This was in contrast to the usual procedure which amounts to taking the algebraic difference between responses to items, so allowing the two series of items themselves to be considered alternative scales. It was not assumed that the two sets of items making each disparity measure were separate scales in themselves. Rather, the primary score for an item was whether or not there was a discrepancy between the two responses to that item, regardless of the direction of such a discrepancy, and it was on these scores that item analysis was performed. What was important was the reliability of the disparity items, as measured by the internal consistency of the disparity scale which they constituted, not the reliabilities of the two sets of items to which responses were originally made. As far as the writer is aware, this procedure has not been used elsewhere in the measurement of parent-

child disagreement. It involves fewer assumptions than the usual method, and is subject to no more error, and probably less. Its use means that findings can be regarded with greater confidence.

All disparity items were in a form which permitted the Respondent to answer by ringing either "Yes" or "No". This had several advantages. Most importantly, it meant that a discrepancy between a child and his parents was more likely to be meaningful and not merely the result of a chance difference in interpretation by Respondents of their own responses, as could have occurred had a more finely graduated rating scale been used. As far as the children were concerned, it was a better introduction to questionnaire responding, as Cox & Leaper (1959) had found, in their investigations into the construction of scales for use with children. Finally, it was efficient to code. Inevitably, in gathering some 26,000 answers from a total of 378 respondents, items were occasionally omitted. When this occurred an arbitrary score of 1.5, half-way between Yes and No, was substituted. Where parents' responses were obtained, those of both parents were elicited and their mean for each item calculated to be used as the parental response to that item with which the child's response was to be compared.

For example, if father replied "Yes" (score = 1) and mother "No" (score = 2), the parental score was taken as 1.5. Regardless of the response the child then made, he would meet opposition from one of his parents, which was reflected in the disparity score of 0.5 (ie., 1.5 compared with either 1.0 or 2.0). On the other hand, if the child's parents agreed with one another in disagreeing with him, the dissension received twice the weight by being scored 1.0. If all three agreed, a disparity score of 0.0 resulted.

Where only one parent's answers were available, they were regarded as representing those of the absent parent also. Responses were obtained from both parents for 91.1 per cent of the total sample.

Two measures were derived according to the procedure outlined above. They consisted of disparity scores between the child and his parents on Taft's Australianism scale, and a composite score obtained from four measures of disparity between the child and his parents on a set of items designated the Intergeneration scale. Detailed descriptions of them are presented below.

Australianism Disparity

The Australianism scale was developed by Taft and his colleagues at the University of Western Australia (Taft, 1965). It was designed to measure attitudes which best discriminated between Australians and immigrants on social and political issues. It consisted of 28 statements on issues ranging from "The clergy should keep completely out of politics" to "A good way for a man to spend his spare time is with a group of friends around a keg of beer" (see Appendix IV), with which the Respondent was asked whether he agreed or disagreed. Validation studies found Australians to agree with 12, and to disagree with 16, of these items significantly more often than did European immigrants. Overall, Australians tended to be more conforming, fond of multifarious but superficial social contacts, egalitarian yet tough-minded, optimistic and secure, than were immigrants.

These items were found by Taft to be the most effective from a pool in discriminating between immigrant and Australian. For the

purposes of the present study it was consequently assumed that they were a representative sample of general social issues over which culture tension was likely to arise between the immigrant parent from a European culture and his second-generation adolescent child growing up in Australia. Taft's items were therefore used in assembling a scale, according to the method outlined above, to measure disparity between the beliefs held concerning general social issues by the second-generation child and his immigrant parents. Taft offers weightings ranging from 1 to 4 reflecting the degree to which different items discriminated between immigrant and Australian. As it was this property which was salient for the present study, these weightings were used. The discrepancy score for each item (0.0, 0.5, or 1.0) was multiplied by the weighting for that item.

A slight modification was made based on pilot study experience which showed that the responses suggested by Taft of "Agree" and "Disagree" frequently had to be explained to immigrant parents. "Yes" and "No" were used instead.

Initially it was thought that an estimate of the degree of dissension between the generations on a known dimension such as Australianism could be useful in itself as an indicator of culture tension. However, as stressed above, such an estimate was considered possible only if Australianism could be measured reliably and on one dimension.

Analysis of Pilot Study data, however, showed that when total scores only were used, an alpha coefficient of only .23 ($\underline{N}$ = 119) was obtained, suggesting that the scale was not reliable. This analysis was performed after giving items the direction and weighting stipulated

by Taft (1965). The mean score for the parents of each family was then taken, and correlated with the score obtained by their child. Parents' and children's scores were positively and significantly correlated (r = .27, N = 52, $p < .05$ on a two-tailed test), and it was assumed that practically all the reliable variance of difference scores would be accounted for by this correlation.

Consequently statisticians' cautions concerning difference scores were heeded, and a preliminary analysis made of main study data. Again each child's score was correlated with the score obtained by his parents, and the results are shown in Table 7.1.

It can be seen that, as with the Pilot Study, intrafamilial scores were positively correlated for the sample as a whole. As discussed in the preceding section, this meant that the scale would have had to return an unrealistically high reliability coefficient before difference scores based on scores obtained on the scale as a whole could have been employed. Closer inspection of Table 7.1 shows that the European immigrant sample contributed most to this intrafamilial correlation. As information here concerning differences in value schema between the generations was at least as important as elsewhere, it was (with some reluctance, it must be acknowledged) decided to score the responses as disparity items.

Nevertheless in the interests of further research with the Australianism Scale in its original form, the responses to it were also scored according to Taft's original specifications. These scores were then analysed using a mixed design two-factor repeated measures analysis of variance, comparing both cultural groups and generations. Following

Table 7.1. Correlation between Australianism Scores of Child and Parents

	United Kingdom	Northwest European			Southern European			TOTAL IMMIGRANT	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	-.15	.57	.79	.62	.43	.14	.32	.41	.00	.32
t_r	0.89	2.71	4.81	4.43	1.95	0.61	2.05	4.61	0.00	4.05
2_r	NS	<.02	<.001	<.001	<.10	NS	<.05	<.001	NS	<.001

this, a lineal trend analysis was performed. The results of these analyses are reported in detail in Chapter 11.

However it is emphasised that the items from this scale were used in the main study as individual measures of conflict between the generations over societal values, not as a unified measure of Australianism. Suffice it to say here that the validity of the items as representing values over which immigrants and Australians might differ was demonstrated, in that Australian and United Kingdom Respondents (parents and children combined) scored significantly higher than did Respondents from European immigrant families.

An item analysis of the Australianism Disparity measure so derived was carried out. Taft's finding that only 10 items out of 28 correlated with the total score at the .05 level of significance or better was not improved upon when the items were used as a disparity measure. Only six items correlated with the total score at this level when the correlation was corrected for the contribution of the item to the total. A coefficient alpha reliability estimate of .32 was still unsatisfactory, and a need for further refinement of the scale as a value disparity measure was recognised. Time precluded this however, so results from all 28 items of the scale were used, as it measured discrepancy between values from an area different from that assessed by the second disparity measure, the Intergeneration Disparity scale (see next section). In a discussion of the study of immigrant adjustment, Zubrzycki (1960a) stressed the need for study of the relationship of the immigrant with both primary and secondary reference groups. The Intergeneration Disparity scale (I-G Disparity scale) dealt with dis-

crepancy between values concerning relationships within a primary reference group, the family. On the other hand, the Australianism Disparity measure referred to values relevant to a secondary reference group, Australian society as a whole. It measured the degree to which the child differed from his parents on topics of broad social relevance, in contrast with the disparity measured by the I-G Disparity scale, which dealt with much more personal, family-role issues.

Intergeneration Disparity

This section describes the instrument evolved to assess the disparity between values held by the child and his parents concerning activities over which friction frequently occurs within the family between the adolescent and his parents.

A list of teenage activities over which parents and their adolescent children were likely to disagree was obtained from a number of sources. The basic concept of the scale was suggested by Connell, Francis & Skilbeck (1957) in their study of adolescents in Sydney. They found 10 items relevant in measuring dissension between 14- and 15-year-olds and their parents. Topics covered ranged from "Driving a car" to "Drinking alcohol". Boys and girls did not differ in their responses to these when they were questioned regarding the beliefs of the "group" compared with those of their parents. The wording of the items was pretested for the present study with a small sample of Australian teenagers. They agreed that all referred to areas of tension between the average Australian teenager and his parents. The wording of five items was modified in accordance with the suggestions of this group, and five were used in their original form.

The work of a number of investigators (eg., Price, 1963a; Taft, 1965; Zubrzycki, 1964) of immigrant integration into Australian society suggested seven additional items as being activities over which the child of immigrants often disagreed with his parents as a result of Australian peer-group pressure. They included topics such as "Arguing with their parents occasionally if they feel they themselves are right" and "Buying lottery tickets". Another two items were included as being relevant for the contemporary teenager: "Taking drugs" and "Girls using 'the Pill'". A total of 19 items had then been assembled.

The Pilot Study (N = 52 children, 67 parents) in Sydney, Wollongong and Canberra showed only two of these items to be unrelated to general adolescent-parent conflict. One ("Dancing") had been used by Connell et al. (1957) and the other ("Looking after his own finance") suggested by the work of Zubrzycki (1964). Others all correlated significantly with the total score for at least one nationality group, and most for the sample as a whole. These 17, some with minor wording modifications suggested by experience with pilot subjects, were therefore employed in designing four measures of intergenerational disparity.

Combined Self-Parents Disparity. Two measures, the Self versus Actual Parents discrepancy score and the Self versus Perceived Parents measure of disparity, were coalesced to form the Combined Self-Parents disparity scale.

Each of these consisted of a comparison score. Adolescents were asked whether or not they themselves believed in people their age engaging in each of the list of 17 activities "about which younger and

older people often disagree" (see Appendix V). Thus they were asked to assign a positive or a negative value to each of these activities.

Parents were also asked whether or not they believed in young people of their child's age pursuing the activities. This provided an index of the value placed on them by the child's parents. They were asked to make responses separately with reference to boys and to girls (see Appendix III). The mean score of the two parents' responses for young people of their child's sex was then compared on each item with the child's response. The differences were summed and the resulting score designated Self versus Actual Parents disparity. Where responses were obtained from only one parent, his or her response was assumed to be equivalent to the other had it been available.

A measure was then obtained of the child's perception of his parents' beliefs by asking him whether or not his parents would believe in people of his age being permitted to indulge in such behaviour (see Appendix VII). This indicated the values which he perceived his parents as holding. Again each response was compared with that he had made when asked whether or not he himself believed young people his age should be involved in such activities. The differences were summed and the resulting score taken to represent the child's perception of the disparity between his own values and those of his parents. It was designated the Self versus Perceived Parents disparity score.

Taking both these measures was originally considered necessary for two reasons. The primary cause of intergenerational stress was presumed to be the child's perception of the disparity between himself and his parents, rather than the actual size of such a gap. However

it was accepted that some children might well be reluctant to describe fully such a gap to an adult stranger. Hence an estimate of the actual difference was also considered necessary.

The data in Table 7.2 suggested that this procedure had probably been justified. The mean Self versus Perceived Parents score was consistently lower than was the mean Self versus Actual Parents score (for the total sample, Self vs Actual Parents, $\bar{X}$ = 5.56; Self vs Perceived Parents, $\bar{X}$ = 4.45; t = 5.67, df = 143, $p < .001$). Overall, children reported their parents as agreeing with them more than they in fact had. This was true for all groups. Although the mean difference between the two disparity scores appeared to be lower for Australian control group children (mean difference = 0.74) than it was for immigrant children (mean difference = 1.24), this difference in misperception was not significant (t = 1.13, df = 143, NS). Further analysis showed that such difference as there appeared to be between Australian and immigrant children was largely due to the belief by a number of Australian children that their parents agreed with them less than they did in reality. Few immigrant children thought this. Nevertheless, taken as a group Australian subjects' misperception was in the same direction as was that for all immigrant groups. They perceived more agreement between themselves and their parents than genuinely occurred. (For Australian subjects, Self vs Actual Parents, $\bar{X}$ = 5.54; Self vs Perceived Parents, $\bar{X}$ = 4.80; t = 1.69, df = 37, $p < .05$ on a one-tailed test, justified as it had been predicted that children would be reluctant to disclose the full size of the intergenerational gap.)

The variation between individual children in the degree to which this misperception occurred was considerable. It ranged from an Aus-

Table 7.2. Comparison of Self vs Actual Parents Mean Score with Self vs Perceived Parents Mean Score

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	34	16	16	32	19	20	39	105	39	144
Self vs Actual Parents $\bar{X}$	5.68	5.16	4.58	4.87	6.51	5.61	6.04	5.57	5.54	5.56
Self vs Perceived Parents $\bar{X}$	4.52	3.99	3.51	3.75	4.79	4.45	4.62	4.33	4.80	4.45
Difference	1.16	1.17	1.07	1.12	1.72	1.16	1.42	1.24	0.74	1.11
t S.A.P.-S.P.P.	2.87	3.29	2.35	3.96	2.53	2.60	3.63	5.83	1.69	5.67
p (1-tailed)	$<.01$	$<.01$	$<.05$	$<.001$	$<.05$	$<.01$	$<.001$	$<.001$	$<.05$	$<.001$

tralian child who thought that his parents disagreed with him on six more items (out of seventeen) than they actually did, to two subjects, one United Kingdom and the other Italian, who perceived their parents as disagreeing with them on eight fewer items than was in fact the case. This suggested that the hypothesised need for some information on both actual and perceived disparity was well founded.

Nevertheless the scores on the two measures proved to be significantly correlated ($r = .58$, $p < .001$). This was considered high when the reliabilities of the two scales were taken into account. Coefficient alpha for the Self versus Actual Parents scale was .53, and for the Self versus Perceived Parents scale, coefficient alpha = .64. It was therefore considered legitimate to take the mean of the scores on the two scales for each subject and regard it as one score, thus simplifying the presentation of findings, while allowing both actual and perceived conflict to influence the index.

Reliability of the combined index did not greatly exceed what could be expected from the intercorrelation of the two subscales considered as two halves of a total scale (Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient = .74; coefficient alpha = .80). No other dimension was significantly involved. Only two individual items failed to correlate significantly with the total score (correlation coefficient corrected for contribution of the item to the total).

Combined Peers-Parents Disparity. To measure the degree of discrepancy between values held by the child's peers and those held by his parents, two further measures, the Perceived Peers versus Actual Parents score

and the Perceived Peers versus Perceived Parents disparity, were obtained and combined.

Comparison scores were again calculated. The seventeen items described in detail above were employed, but this time the child was asked whether or not most of his friends believed in young people his age engaging in such behaviour (see Appendix VI). Ideally his friends themselves would have been approached also to be asked their attitudes, but this being impracticable, the child's perception of what his friends thought was obtained and used as an index of the values placed on the items by his peer group. Two comparisons were then made.

The mean of the child's parents' actual responses to each of the same items was first compared with that reported as being made by his peers to that item. Parents' responses were averaged, differences between parents' and perceived peers' responses on each item summed, and omissions handled as described in the Self-Parents section above. The summed score was designated the Perceived Peers versus Actual Parents disparity.

Similarly the child's perception of his parents' values was compared for each item with that he reported his peers as holding. Again omissions were replaced by half-way scores and discrepancies summed, to give a Perceived Peers versus Perceived Parents score.

The use of two measures here was for reasons similar to those outlined above, in the Combined Self-Parents Disparity section. The major cause of stress was considered to be the child's perception of differences between the value systems of his two major reference groups, so that measurement of the Perceived Peers versus Perceived Parents

disparity was essential. However it was considered that some children might be reluctant to disclose to a stranger the actual size of such a gap. A measure approximating that of the genuine disparity between peers and parents was therefore considered desirable. As mentioned above, actual responses of the child's peer group would have been a preferred index with which to compare the responses of his parents. As this information was not obtainable, the child's prediction of his peers' responses was used, and compared both with his perception of his parents' responses, and with their actual responses.

Data in Table 7.3 suggested that this precaution of taking a measure of both perceived and actual disparity had been justified. Over the total sample the gap perceived by children as existing between the values of their peer group and those of their parents was smaller than that which in fact occurred between the responses made by their parents and those the children had predicted their peers would make. (Perceived Peers vs Actual Parents, $\bar{X} = 7.77$; Perceived Peers vs Perceived Parents, $\bar{X} = 6.74$; $df = 144$, $p < .001$.) Again variation between individual children was considerable, ranging from a Greek child who, out of seventeen items, saw his parents as disagreeing with his peers on no less than eleven fewer than they did in fact, to three Australian subjects and a German child, each of whom predicted that his parents disagreed with his peers' responses on five items more than occurred in reality.

However the two measures again correlated strongly ($r = .59$, $p < .001$) when the reliabilities of the two scales were considered. For the Perceived Peers versus Actual Parents measure coefficient alpha

Table 7.3. Comparison of Peers vs Actual Parents Mean Score with Peers vs Perceived Parents Mean Score

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	38	145
Peers vs Actual Parents $\bar{X}$	7.65	8.01	6.65	7.31	8.11	9.10	8.61	7.90	7.44	7.77
Peers vs Perceived Parents $\bar{X}$	6.67	7.34	6.29	6.83	5.75	7.82	6.81	6.77	6.67	6.74
Difference	0.98	0.67	0.30	0.48	2.36	1.28	1.80	1.13	0.77	1.03
t P.A.P.-P.P.P.	2.02	1.25	0.42	1.15	4.07	2.22	4.37	4.38	1.66	4.60
p (1-tailed)	$<.05$	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	$<.001$	$<.05$	$<.001$	$<.001$	N.S.	$<.001$

was .58, and for the Perceived Peers versus Perceived Parents scale it was .67. The results from the two scales were therefore pooled for each child and the combined score used as the index of disparity between peers and parents. As with the Combined Self-Parents index, the reliability of the Combined Peers-Parents index did not greatly exceed that expected from the correlation between the two subscales making up its whole. The Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient = .74, while coefficient alpha = .82. Thus the combined scale was measuring little more than the variable tapped by each of its two halves. Only one item failed to correlate significantly with the total score (the coefficient for each item being corrected for its contribution to the total).

Combination of the Self-Parents and the Peers-Parents Disparity Scales

The Combined Self-Parents and Combined Peers-Parents disparity scales were expected to measure different aspects of intergenerational conflict. The Combined Self-Parents score estimated the degree to which the child saw his parents as holding values differing from those he held himself, whereas the Combined Peers-Parents score indicated the discrepancy between the systems of values he considered his two primary reference groups to hold.

Comparison of each child's scores on the two scales appeared to support this expectation (see Table 7.4). Parents' responses were an element of both scores, and therefore confounded the measurement of differences between them to some extent. Nevertheless, for every group peers were seen by the child as differing from his parents in their value schema more than he himself did, and this finding was sig-

Table 7.4. Comparison of Combined Peers-Parents Mean Score with Combined Self-Parents Mean Score

		United Kingdom	Northwest European			Southern European			TOTAL IMMIGRANT	Australian	TOTAL
			Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
	N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Combined Peers-Parents	$\bar{X}$	7.16	7.69	6.45	7.09	6.94	8.48	7.73	7.40	7.07	7.30
Combined Self-Parents	$\bar{X}$	5.13	4.60	4.07	4.33	5.67	5.05	5.35	4.97	5.19	5.03
Difference		2.03	3.09	2.38	2.76	1.27	3.43	2.38	2.43	1.88	2.27
t C.P.P.-C.S.P.		6.41	4.39	4.80	6.48	4.07	4.82	5.63	10.44	5.82	11.93
p (1-tailed)		$<.001$	$<.001$	$<.001$	$<.001$	$<.001$	$<.001$	$<.001$	$<.001$	$<.001$	$<.001$

nificant for all groups at better than the .001 level (for the total sample, Combined Peers-Parents, $\bar{X}$ = 7.30; Combined Self-Parents, $\bar{X}$ = 5.03; t = 11.93, df = 145, $p < .001$).

However the two scores also correlated at a level similar to that of the correlations between the subscales described above (r = .57, df = 144, $p < .001$). A significant positive correlation between the two scores was found for all groups (see Table 7.5).

To check whether correlations between scores on the two scales differed significantly between groups, a test was made of the sources of variance of the correlations using a formula given by Kendall (1957) and discussed in detail by Beswick (1971). It involved the partitioning of the sums of squares of the values of Fisher's z_r, and estimating the sum of their variance about a mean z_r value calculated by weighting the z_r for each sample by the size of that sample. This formula is set out in full here, as it was used frequently in subsequent analysis. Thus:

$$\chi^2_{k-1} = \Sigma[w(z - \bar{z})^2]$$

where $w = n - 3$

k = number of subgroups

$$\bar{z} = \frac{\Sigma[z(n - 3)]}{N - 3k}$$

n = number of subjects in each subgroup

N = total number of subjects

Chi-square for the variance of the correlations between Combined Self-Parents and Combined Peers-Parents scores over the six nationalities = 7.30, df = 5, $.05 < p < .10$, and for the four cultural subgroups χ^2_{vr} = 1.91, df = 3, NS. It was concluded that the differences between correla-

Table 7.5. Correlation of Combined Peers-Parents Mean Score and Combined Self-Parents Mean Score

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Correlation	.67	.55	.46	.53	.84	.36	.49	.55	.66	.57
t_r	5.12	2.52	1.91	3.47	6.41	1.63	3.46	6.71	5.40	8.38
p (1-tailed)	<.0005	<.025	<.05	<.005	<.0005	N.S.	<.005	<.0005	<.0005	<.0005

tions across national or cultural groups could be due to sampling error, and that the correlations for subgroups (see Table 7.5) did not differ significantly from the correlation for the total sample of .57. Furthermore the correlation for the Australian control group (.64) did not differ significantly from that for any other single subsample when tested as a series of comparisons between correlations.

Thus although children of all groups reported their peers as differing from their parents far more than they themselves did, those who saw a small discrepancy between their own values and those of their parents, also saw a small gap between the values held by their peers and those of their parents. Similarly, those who perceived greater disagreement between their parents and themselves also reported a larger gap between their parents and their peer group.

Consequently, the mean of each child's score on the two scales was taken and designated his Intergeneration Disparity score (I-G Disparity score).

Reliability of this index was assessed in two ways. Considering each response as a separate item, making a scale of 68 items in all, a reliability coefficient was calculated. Coefficient alpha = .85. To check that treating items scored 0.0, 0.5 and 1.0 as continuously scored items had not excessively inflated this value, a second coefficient was calculated dealing with the four subscales as the items. Coefficient alpha = .81. The I-G Disparity scale was therefore considered to have satisfactory reliability.

To ensure that information was not being lost by combining these two scales into one, their powers of prediction relative to each Reac-

tion measure (see next chapter) for each subgroup and for the total sample were compared, using t for the significance of the difference between two correlations for correlated samples (Ferguson, 1966, p.189). This allowed for the degree to which the two scales were correlated for each sample.

Of 60 such comparisons made between correlations for subsamples, only six were significant at better than the .05 level. It was therefore assumed that the Combined Peers-Parents and Combined Self-Parents scales were measuring much the same variable, and should be treated as one scale.

Nonetheless some differences between correlations for the total sample were significant and are discussed in the presentation of results. Generally, however, the I-G Disparity scale is considered as an entity.

An exception was when correlating it with scores on the Parental Compliance index (see Chapter 10). When testing for the prediction of Parental Compliance by I-G Disparity, only the Self versus Actual Parents and Perceived Peers versus Actual Parents components of the I-G Disparity scale were used, in order to remove a factor common to the two measures which would have rendered spurious a correlation between them. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 10.

To ensure that the items making up the I-G Disparity scale were equally salient for the different subsamples, a Social Importance score was obtained. This questionnaire was placed later in the battery, separate from the intergenerational scales. Children indicated on a 10-point scale how important each activity was to them (see Appendix XIII). Table 7.6 shows N, mean score and SD (standard deviation) for

Table 7.6. Social Importance Mean Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Social Importance $\bar{X}$	3.93	3.75	3.53	3.64	4.09	4.46	4.23	3.97	4.20	4.03
S.D.	0.83	1.31	0.60	1.03	1.22	1.16	1.20	1.07	1.39	1.17

each group and the total sample. Analyses of variance across the mean scores revealed no significant difference between the mean score of any of the six nationalities (F = 1.54, df = 5,140, NS) or of the four cultural groups (F = 2.17, df = 3,142, NS) and the mean score for the total sample of 4.03 on the 0 to 9 scale, with its SD of 1.14.

Children from all national and cultural groups valued the activities making up the scale as, on the average, "Moderately important", and subgroups did not differ significantly in this. The equal salience of the scale content for all groups, plus the internal consistency of the composite index for the total sample, was evidence in favour of the validity of the scale for all groups as a measure of discrepancies between the values attached by the child and those attached by his parents to activities salient to the teenager.

The I-G Disparity scale was therefore accepted as a satisfactory measure of the degree to which friction occurred for the adolescent with his parents over the value of activities particularly relevant to him. Thus the independent variable of disparity between the value systems of the child and his parents was measured by two instruments: the Australianism Disparity scale described earlier in this chapter, and the I-G Disparity index depicted above.

Although the I-G Disparity index was used as a single measure, the analysis of its components described in detail above showed that the adolescent perceived a markedly greater gap between his peers and his parents than between himself and his parents (Table 7.4). This was evidence of the dilemma in which the contemporary adolescent finds him-

self, both the child born in Australia of immigrant parents, and his host society peer, whose parents are failing to assimilate to the rapidity of social change. His parents say he must behave in one fashion; his peers urge him to do otherwise. The Australianism Disparity scale is one predictor of the extent of this disagreement concerning behavioural norms and values. The I-G Disparity index is a better one at least as far as internal consistency is concerned.

Both will be referred to in discussing the need for the adolescent to resolve culture conflict. Faced with such disparity between his two primary reference groups, conflict is aroused in the child which he will strive to reduce. The theoretical discussion in chapter 5 suggested that means available to him of doing this include overidentification with one or the other of his two primary reference groups, rejection of them both, or dismissal as unimportant of the mores over which they conflict. The next chapter describes the measures used to assess the extent to which the adolescent, both second-generation and Australian control group, employed each of these various means to solve his dilemma and so reduce the conflict arising from it.

CHAPTER 8. MEASURES OF ADOLESCENT REACTION TO INTERGENERATIONAL VALUE DISPARITY

The previous chapter described the scales developed to measure value disparity, an independent variable in this study. The dependent variables were the various forms of adolescent reaction to intergenerational value disparity. Presented in this chapter are the measures developed to explore the manner in which adolescents of the various subsamples reacted to disparity of values between themselves and their parents, and the intensity with which they did so.

It is divided into four sections, dealing with measures of identification with parents, identification with peers, rejection of social mores, and rejection of society as a whole.

(1) Measurement of Identification with Parents

One means available to the child of reducing the conflict arising from a perception of disparity between the value schema of his parents and his peers is to identify closely with his parents, ignoring or rejecting his age-peers as an important reference group. Two measures of this reaction to intergenerational culture conflict were employed, Parental Compliance and Parental Deference.

(a) Parental Compliance. This was an index of the degree to which the child conformed to what he perceived as being his parents' values. As Bronfenbrenner (1958) pointed out, simple perception by an individual of a group as being similar to himself does not amount to identification with it. Identification can only be inferred if he gives evidebce of

modelling himself on the group by behaving as he sees its members behaving, and as he believes they wish him to act. Therefore the child was asked to report the extent to which his behaviour conformed with what he believed to be his parents' expectations of him.

This was done by taking a measure of summed absolute differences of a type similar to those used in assessing value disparity. The child was again presented with the 17 activities employed in measuring I-G Disparity (see previous chapter), but was now asked to write, in blanks provided, "'Yes' for activities which you yourself have sometimes done, and 'No' beside things you have never done" (See Appendix V). These responses on the Behaviour measure were then compared with those made to each of the activities when, later in the battery, he was asked "Do your parents believe in young people your age doing the things listed below? Read each activity and put a ring around the answer which you feel your parents would give" (See Appendix VII). This was designated the Parental Mores measure.

Note that this latter set of responses was among those used in building the composite I-G Disparity index. Consequently, when correlating Parental Compliance with I-G Disparity, these particular data were removed from the composition of the I-G Disparity index. This was to avoid spurious correlation between the two results arising from use of the same data in arriving at the scores for each. This will be discussed more fully when presenting correlational results. For the moment, the important point is that now a comparison was being made between the child's perception of his parents' mores and his actual behaviour, whereas the I-G Disparity index examined discrepancies be-

tween the beliefs of the two generations. That the two were not necessarily the same thing will be argued when presenting the results.

To return to the mechanics of the measure: an item on which the child reported his behaviour as corresponding with that which he believed conformed to his parents' wishes was scored 1, while one on which his behaviour differed from his perception of his parents' norms for him was scored 0. The occasional item left blank was allotted an arbitrary half-way score of 0.5. Scores were then summed. The higher the total score, the greater was the child's reported compliance with his parents' wishes. As with all measures used, scores were converted into normalised T-scores to facilitate comparison between statistics for sample sections. The use of T-scores also expedited the comparison of group mean scores on the different scales used in the project, with their diverse maximum possible scores and various total sample means and standard deviations.

The first part of the Parental Compliance measure suffered the highest non-response rate of all measures employed. Six (4.1%) of the 146 children omitted responding to it, while all subjects completed the second part concerning parents' mores for them. This may have been the result of qualms aroused when the child was asked what he actually did, in contrast with being questioned on what he believed he ought to do. The cultural group most affected was Southern Europeans. In addition to one Dutch respondent, one Greek and four Italian children neglected or refused to complete it, making the numbers for these nationalities 16, 19 and 15 respectively, and reducing the number in the Southern European cultural group by 12.8 per cent, from 39 to 34. When calcula-

ting differences in mean scores and correlations for national and cultural groups, the mean scale score for the total sample ($\bar{X}$ = 5.0) was substituted as the score of those failing to respond.

(b) Parental Deference. A second measure was taken of the child's tendency to see his parents rather than his peers as his most important reference group. This was the Parental Deference index. It was obtained by asking of the child how frequently he did not join in the activities of his friends because his parents disapproved, and modifying this information by requesting of him an estimate of how often the desire to conform with his peers was strong enough to overcome parental injunctions. Two questionnaires were employed.

The Parents over Peers measure asked him to "circle (Yes) for any activity that your friends do, but you don't, because you know your parents would disapprove" (See Appendix XI). The Peers over Parents questionnaire, presented earlier in the battery, had asked him to "circle (Yes) for any activity which you sometimes do because your friends do, even though you know your parents wouldn't be too keen about it if they knew" (See Appendix X). To encourage the child to respond freely he was shown, in differing randomised orders on the two questionnaires, a list of 36 examples of the types of teenage activities about which information was wanted. Recognition rather than recall was required.

The basic concept of the list came from Connell et al. (1957), but it was greatly expanded by including items suggested by studies of the Australian adolescent (Dunphy, 1969; Hay et al., 1967; Oeser & Hammond, 1954). Further activity categories for Parents over Peers

were obtained by asking respondents themselves to add to the list on blank lines provided "Anything else your friends do, but you don't because you feel your parents would disapprove". Similarly the Peers over Parents activity list was expanded by requesting children to "list anything else you and your friends sometimes do together, although your parents would disapprove if they knew". Both questionnaires finished by instructing "If you can think of nothing else, please write 'Nothing else'". This aimed at inducing extra responses and discouraging children from simply leaving the spaces blank. A frequency count was taken of suggestions made, categories were formed, and activities mentioned by three or more subjects were converted into brief item statements.

Items obtained in this way in the pilot study were included in the list presented to subjects of the main study and shown in Appendices X and XI. However, main study children were also asked to supplement the list with any additional relevant activities they thought should be there. A frequency count on main study data produced four additional scoring categories for the Parents over Peers measure, "smoking", "drinking", "delinquent activities", and "forming heterosexual relationships". (Note that a number of respondents specifically separated this from "Going out on a date", which they saw as a formal outing with one other person, and "Getting around with the gang" which was thought of as being with a large group but for other social purposes. It was therefore scored separately and included responses such as "girl-chasing", "talking with boys on the phone", etc.). All respondents were then scored on these also, giving a total of 40 activities on the measure.

The same procedure employed on the Peers over Parents measure yielded the four additional activity categories already mentioned, plus "going out without parents' knowledge", "fighting", "truancy", and "staying out late at night". The total number of activities scored for this measure was therefore 44. Adolescents added more when asked what they did with their peers despite parental disapproval than they did when indicating in what activities they did not join their friends because parents disapproved.

On each questionnaire "Yes" responses were scored 1, and answers of "No" scored 0. These were then summed and the score expressed as a percentage of the total number of items for that measure. To obtain an estimate of the degree to which the child modelled himself on his parents rather than on his peers, the Peers over Parents percentage was then subtracted from the Parents over Peers percentage. However it was apparent when doing this that a response set was operating, in that children who answered "Yes" to a large number of items on one, often also gave a large proportion of affirmative responses on the other. This was shown by the correlation between the two subscales being positive, not negative as expected, and highly significant (r = .42, df = 144, $p < .001$). Children who responded freely concerning deference to their parents also did so over conformity to their peer group. To control for this response set, the difference between scores on the two sets of items was expressed as a proportion of the sum over both sets of percentages of affirmative responses.

An example will clarify this: Parents over Peers score = 10/40 = 25%; Peers over Parents score = 22/44 = 50%. Difference = 25 - 50 = -25.

Sum of percentages = 25 + 50 = 75. Parental Deference score = $\frac{-25}{75} \times \frac{100}{1}$ = -33.3. To remove minus scores, 50 was then added, making the score for the example above = +16.7. Scores were then converted into T-scores, and it was on these that analysis was finally carried out.

The final score used, then, was normally distributed, took into account responses to both questionnaires, and was adjusted to reduce the effect of a set toward either extreme or minimal responding. A higher T-score indicated greater deference to parents, and thus a closer identification with them as a reference group.

One United Kingdom and one German child did not respond to the Parents over Peers section of the measure, and the mean for the total sample was substituted. All children answered the Peers over Parents questionnaire.

(2) Measurement of Identification with Peer Group

Parents are the most important reference group for the child until adolescence is reached, when social interaction and self identity increase in importance and his needs grow for groups with which he can identify (Singer & Singer, 1969). Consequently the measures of parental identification described above were seen as largely negative indicators. They tended (although not completely) to ask to what extent the child was breaking away from his parents as a reference group rather than how closely he identified with them. In contrast, it is at adolescence that the peer group becomes increasingly influential as a reference group providing and endorsing norms of behaviour and belief. Parents steadily decline from a position of omnipotence while the peer group becomes increasingly important.

Consequently the child to whom peers were especially salient was taken to identify strongly with his peer group. This importance of peers was assessed using five different indices, including number of friends, their age relative to that of the child, the distance of their homes from his, whether or not they were in occupations different from his, and the amount of interaction with them which he reported. Information on each of these was obtained from the You and Your Friends questionnaire, Part 1 (see Appendix VIII), and Part 2a (see Appendix IX).

Following a suggestion by Connell et al. (1957), the child was presented with a description of intensities of friendship, ranging from "best friend" to "member of the crowd". These correspond to terminology also found by Dunphy (1969) to be used by Australian teenagers. The respondent was then asked to indicate whether he had a best friend, belonged to a small group, or was a member of a crowd. This preliminary reading and responding provided each child with a standard definition of "friend". It also involved him in answering the questionnaire fully and openly. He then listed his friends in a table provided, giving each his name and description (to improve validity of reporting), age, sex, suburb of residence, country of birth, and school or job. The You and Your Friends questionnaire, Part 2a followed, offering the list of 36 activities described in the Parents over Peers section above, and asking, without implying evaluation, the number of activities in which he often engaged with his friends.

From this information the five indices of importance to the child of his peer group were derived. These were subsequently inter-

correlated and combined into one measure, Peer-Group Importance (P.G.I.). The following section describes these indices, and a subsequent section outlines the method by which the information from them was pooled.

Peer-Group Importance Indices

(a) Number of Friends Listed. The greater the number of friends reported and similarly the more effort the child was willing to put into describing his peer group, the more important to him they were presumed to be. Scores ranged from 0 to 22, having a positively skewed distribution with mode = 5, median = 5.4, and mean = 7.2. Because the distribution was skewed, scores were ranked and treated as an ordinal measure. This enabled comparison and pooling with other indices.

(b) Relative Age of Friends. The importance of a child's friends to him as a reference group was considered to be reflected in the relationship between his own age and theirs as reported by him. The older a child's friends were, compared with himself, the more he was assumed to see them as a reference group. The actual age reported was probably reasonably accurate, but this was not really important, as it was the child's perception of his friends as being older than he was himself which was considered to reflect his seeing them as a group to be respected and to whose mores he should adhere. The mean age of each child's friends was therefore calculated and his own age subtracted from it. A positive score thus indicated his friends to be older than he was, and a negative score represented younger friends.

Scores ranged from -2.2 years to +3.4 years. Distribution was highly peaked and symmetrical, but bimodal, peaking at -0.5 and -0.1,

and having a median of -0.21 and a mean of -0.08 years, with a SD of 0.08 years. As they were bimodally distributed, these scores were also ranked to make them comparable with other indices.

(c) Distance of Friends' Homes from that of Respondent. It was assumed that the child willing, and perhaps desiring, to travel some distance from his parents' home to contact his friends, viewed them as more important to him than did the respondent who simply formed his acquaintance with age-peers living nearby. A measure with rule and scaled map was therefore taken of the distance in miles of the suburb of residence of each friend from the suburb in which the child's family lived. The mean of these across all a respondent's friends was calculated and designated his Distance of Friends' Homes score.

Mean distance ranged from 0.0 miles (that is, all in the same suburb) to 31.3 miles. The distribution was greatly skewed, the mode being 0.0, the median 1.31 and the mean 2.24 miles, so that ranks rather than raw scores were employed in pooling with other indices.

(d) Proportion of Friends in a Different School or Occupation. A measure of the care with which a child selected his friends, and thus an indicator of their salience to him as a reference group, was the proportion of his friends who were in schools or occupations differing from his own. Each friend of each respondent was scored 0 or 1 according to whether or not he was in the same school or occupation as that in which the child himself was known to be, and the proportion of friends in a different school or occupation expressed as a percentage.

Proportions ranged from 0.0 per cent to 100.0 per cent, with a primary mode at 0.0 per cent and a secondary mode at 100 per cent.

The median was 28.5 per cent in a different occupation and the mean 35.5 per cent. These percentages were then ranked from first rank = 100 per cent of friends in a different school or occupation to the last position = 100 per cent in the same establishment.

(e) Number of Activities Engaged in with Friends. Finally the child was asked to respond to the activities listed in the You and Your Friends questionnaire, Part 2a, by ringing "'Yes' beside those which you OFTEN do with your FRIENDS, and 'No' for things you do only rarely or not at all" (See Appendix IX). The 36 activities listed were those described when discussing the Parents over Peers measure above. This was his first reading of this list, and no evaluation of them was requested or implied. Ample blank space was provided for the child to add "anything else you and your friends OFTEN do together", which had not been listed. As mentioned above, he was asked to write "Nothing else" if applicable, rather than just leaving the blank lines empty.

A post-test count produced nine further categories of activity, each mentioned by several respondents. They were:-

Shooting

Playing billiards

Forming heterosexual relationships

Drinking

Playing or singing with a musical group

Horse riding

Playing chess

Going for a walk

Travelling to school or work together (seen by the child as a specific item of social interaction with selected friends.)

These increased the possible total score to 45, "Yes" being scored 1 and "No", 0. No respondent omitted this questionnaire. Scores ranged from 2 to 32 and their distribution approximated the normal, with a mode of 18, median of 16.7 and a mean of 15.6. Although scores were normally distributed, ranks were again used for comparison and pooling purposes.

Combination of Measures to form the P.G.I. Index

It was predicted that these measures would positively intercorrelate sufficiently over the total sample to permit their pooling together as one index. Spearman's rho coefficients suggested that this was the case, as all correlations were positive, and only two of the matrix of 10 rhos failed to reach significance at the .05 level (see Table 8.1). The measure most strongly correlated with others was Relative Age of Friends and the weakest index was Distance of Friends' Homes.

A Kendall's coefficient of concordance (Ferguson, 1966) was calculated for the rankings of the five sets of scores. After correction for ties, $W = .35, \chi^2 = 242.56$, $df = 139$, $z = 5.32$, $p < .001$. This highly significant concordance was taken as sufficient to justify the pooling of the measures into one index.

Each child's ranks on each of the five indices were therefore summed and their mean taken to give a combined score. The distribution of the resulting raw scores was symmetrical, with a mode in the 75-79 range, a median of 73.7 and a mean of 73.1. The SD was 25.8, T-scores for the total sample were then calculated from the mean rank

Table 8.1. Correlation matrix of P.G.I. Measures

	(b) Age of friends	(c) Distance between homes	(d) Friends' occupations	(e) No. of activities
(a) No. of friends	.17 *	.30 ***	.17 *	.14 *
(b) Age of friends		.14 *	.29 ***	.37 ***
(c) Distance between homes			.09	.11
(d) Friends' occupations				.24 **

*** $p < .0005$ (1-tailed)

** $p < .01$ (1-tailed)

* $p < .05$ (1-tailed)

scores to facilitate comparison and correlation with other scores. A high T-score indicated a high rating of the importance of the peer group and vice versa.

Five children reported having no friends. They specifically said so and did not merely leave the questionnaire blank. This made it impossible to score them on the measures Relative Age of Friends, Distance of Friends' Homes, or Proportion of Friends in a Different School or Occupation. However it placed them at the bottom of the first index, Number of Friends. This was considered a valid reflection of the salience of their peer group to them, especially when scores on the independent index Number of Activities were examined. Only one of these five children answered "Yes" to more than six activities, compared with the mean score for the total sample of 15.6. The mean of the two scores Number of Friends and Number of Activities was therefore used as the P.G.I. score for these five children when comparing the mean scores and correlations with disparity measures of national and cultural groups.

For all respondents, then, the score resulting from the normalisation of the mean of the ranks of scores on the five measures outlined above was designated the Peer-Group Importance score (P.G.I. score) and employed as an index of identification with peers.

(3) Measurement of Rejection of Social Mores

Assessment of two of the means available to the child of reducing the conflict arising from disparity between the social mores of his two main reference groups have been described. He may strongly identify with his parents and either ignore or reject his peer group,

or he may turn more readily to his peers as a salient reference group. A third conflict-reducing reaction is to reject as salient the mores themselves over which his parents and his peers disagree. This may enable him to retain a positive attitude toward both groups, while perceiving that they differ from one another in their views of the social acceptability of some behaviours. Hence, the child's attitude to a number of activities which are frequently sources of contention between adult authority and the adolescent was measured, using two instruments, the Wrongdoing Rating scale and the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire. This section describes these measures, and concludes by examining their relationship to one another.

(a) The Wrongdoing Rating Scale. The extent to which the child accepts social mores as norms for his own behaviour is reflected in the degree to which he regards the transgression of them as wrong. The Wrongdoing Rating scale was a measure of his perception as reprehensible behaviour commonly considered so by society at large. The child was presented with a list of 20 activities, each accompanied by a 10-point scale, and asked to circle "the one number that shows exactly how wrong you think it is" (see Appendix XII). They ranged from "doing things on the spur of the moment" to "getting into trouble with the police". Based on the Attitudes toward Deviance Questionnaire used by Jessor et al. (1968), it was extensively modified in wording. A group of Australian adolescents was shown each statement and asked to rephrase it as they themselves would say it. This proved successful, with very few misunderstandings occurring in the pilot study, and these being prevented by

slight modifications before use in the main study. Alpha coefficients of reliability for the four cultural groups ranged from .89 to .91, with a coefficient of .91 being obtained for the total sample.

Respondents were told that they should allocate rating scores as follows:-

Not Wrong = 0

A Little Bit Wrong = 1, 2 or 3

Wrong but not Very Wrong = 4, 5 or 6

Very Wrong = 7, 8 or 9

Scores for all items were then summed, giving a total possible range of 0 to 180. The range of scores obtained in fact was 19 to 160. One United Kingdom respondent omitted the scale and the mean score for the total sample was inserted for him in subsequent analysis. This overall mean was 97.1, or an average rating of 4.85 on each item. Thus, on the average, children considered the activities listed to fall halfway up a scale of wrongness. Scores were negatively skewed, with the mode in the range 110-120, the median at 101.0, and the mean at 97.1. To make them suitable for comparison and correlation with other measures, raw scores were therefore converted into T-scores. A higher T-score represented greater rejection of social mores, or rating of misdemeanours as not wrong. Conversely a lower score on the Wrongdoing Rating scale indicated greater concurrence with the mores of society.

(b) Socially Unacceptable Behaviour Questionnaire. The child's attitude to social mores was assessed by the Wrongdoing Rating scale. The Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire obtained a self-report

of actual behaviour contravening those mores. Presented later in the battery, it told the child "We're interested now in how often people your age do different things. This is something social scientists need to know more about for teenagers, and we think the best way to find out is to ask you. No one else will see your answers, and your name will be separated from your answer sheet. So we hope you'll be honest and frank in your answers, to help us get an accurate picture." Care was taken during interviewing to ensure that responses were not revealed to parents.

The child was again shown the 20 activities described in (a) above, and asked "How often have you: 1. Smoked on the school grounds?" and so on through the list (See Appendix XIV). A four-point response scale of:-

Very often

Several times

Once or twice

Never

was provided for each item and scored 3, 2, 1 and 0 respectively.

Activities and interests were discussed with many children after the test battery had been completed. A number mentioned scrapes they had had with school authorities and parents, or talked of the old-fashioned outlook parents had on what was right and wrong. A few spoke of tangles with police in bars and poolrooms, and with "the gang". One Greek boy, who helped his parents run a shop, took the interviewer out into a back room and over a cup of coffee described a series of breaking and entering episodes with two or three other boys (the number

varied) at the instigation of a leader who was now in a detention centre. An Italian described the ways in which he and his mates "worked" the fun houses, profiting from both gambling and tinkering with the coin-in-the-slot machines while distracting the manager's attention.

Where such unsolicited information was offered, the interviewer checked the child's responses immediately after leaving the house. Invariably he had ringed response alternatives which accurately reflected the behaviour and attitudes he had described orally. Furthermore all children responded to this questionnaire. This information and willingness to respond was taken as evidence for the validity of the questionnaire as an estimate of the amount of socially unacceptable behaviour in which respondents indulged.

Scores were summed across all items. A range of 3 to 46 out of a possible 60 was obtained. Inspection of the response distribution showed that it did not take the form of a J-shaped conformity curve but was approximately normal, although positively skewed, with a mode in the range 14-15, a median of 15.8 and a mean of 17.8. Split-half reliability coefficients for the four cultural groups ranged from .87 to .90, with a coefficient of .895 being obtained for the total sample. Moreover the mean represented an average response equivalent to either "Very often" on 6 of the 20 items, or "once or twice" on 18 of them. Thus social desirability had not affected responses to any appreciable extent, and scores were taken as both reliable and valid indicators of the occurrence of socially unacceptable behaviour in the sample. T-scores were used, a higher score indicating a greater amount of self-reported disregard for social convention, and a lower score greater acceptance of social mores.

Correlation between Measures of Rejection of Social Mores. The Wrongdoing Rating scale and the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire were validated against one another by calculating a product-moment correlation between scores on them. Over the total sample the two measures correlated highly significantly (r = .65, df = 144, $p < .0005$ on a 1-tailed test). The variance of the within-group correlations about the mean correlation for the total sample was not significant when comparing either the six nationalities (χ^2 = 2.53, df = 5, NS) or the four cultural groups (χ^2 = 1.86, df = 3, NS). No one immigrant group differed significantly from the Australian control group in the degree to which the two measures correlated. This high positive correlation suggested that they were measuring very similar aspects of the same variable.

However both measures were retained because of differential predictive validity to be discussed with the presentation of correlational results. The Wrongdoing Rating scale measured the affective and cognitive aspects, and the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire the conative facet, of the child's attitude to social mores.

(4) Rejection of Society as a Whole

A fourth means is available to the individual of reducing the conflict experienced when two reference groups diverge in the values they place on objects or behaviours which are salient to him. He may reject both groups as having failed to provide an adequate positive model for his own behaviour and attitudes. Thus the child may experience feelings of rejection of both parents and peers, in addition to sensing

rejection by these two reference groups, when he perceives them as disagreeing in the values they place on salient activities and mores.

Alienation. Discussing the concept of alienation, Hughes (1968, p.13) described "a tenacious sense of estrangement from society" as central Individuals in a social world insufficiently structured, especially as a result of the loss or lack of traditional values, were described as experiencing this in the form of anomie. He presented a scale measuring alienation with data indicating satisfactory reliability and validity. Seventeen of its 24 items were shown to measure the alienation facets of Powerlessness and Isolation. Other items measured Meaninglessness, Normlessness and Self-estrangement.

These feelings of frustration by society and alienation from it are those experienced by the child who rejects and feels rejected by both of the two reference groups most salient for the adolescent. He is alienated from society in general and his immediate society in particular.

Hughes' Alienation scale was therefore administered. Single word alterations were made to five items to make them suitable for 15-year-olds.

Examples of scale items used, and the format in which they were presented are:-

A) Our community is an easy and pleasant place to live in.

B) Our community is a difficult place to live in.

and

A) For most people these days it is more important to make money than to make friends.

B) For most people, it is more important to make friends than to make money.

It was titled the A-Scale. Following instructions on an Answer Sheet, the child read each of a set of 24 cards (see Appendices XV(a) and XV(b)). These were given to him when he reached this point in the test battery. He was instructed by the Interviewer to turn over one card at a time, read it carefully and respond to it before going on to the next. He ringed either A) or B) on the Answer Sheet to indicate which of the two statements on each card came closest to saying what he felt. Thus Hughes' procedural recommendations were approximated as closely as possible, although his suggestion of face-to-face administration was not followed and a "Can't decide" response was not permitted.

Items were scored in the directions stipulated by Hughes, with an alienated response receiving a score of 1 and its alternative 0. These were summed, giving a possible range of 0 to 24. The range obtained was 2 to 18, with a mean of 10.19 and a SD of 3.09. The distribution of scores was not skewed, although it was to some extent bimodal, with 14 children scoring close to the mean at 10 while 38 scored 7 or 8, and 22 scored 12. Because of this bimodal distribution, T-scores were derived to facilitate comparison and correlation with other measures, a higher score indicating greater alienation. The median was 9.9 and it was noted with interest that, if doubled to 19.8, as it would be using Hughes' scoring system, this figure falls within the upper quartile (18 - 48) of the scores of his standardisation sample. As a group, the adolescents tested expressed strong feelings of alienation.

One Australian child omitted the scale and the mean score for the total sample was substituted for him in analysing results.

The Alienation scale concluded the battery of questionnaires administered to the child.

Four dependent variables were assessed by the instruments described in this chapter. Identification with parents was estimated from scores on the Parental Compliance and Parental Deference measures. Identification with peers was judged from responses to the indicators making up the Peer-Group Importance index. Rejection of social mores was indicated by the Wrongdoing Rating scale and the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire. Finally, rejection of both reference groups was inferred from scores on the Alienation scale.

For ease of reference, Table 8.2 shows the two independent variables and the four dependent variables, the names used in the text of the indices measuring them, the subscales comprising those indices, and the title given to each of these subscales in the questionnaire battery administered to children and their parents.

Results are presented in the following two chapters. The first provides a summary of the differences found between the mean score of national and cultural groups on each of the two measures of disparity between the mores of parents and adolescents, and on each of the indices gauging the four types of reaction to such disparity. The second sets out the correlations found between scores on each of the disparity measures and scores on the measures of reaction. It also describes differences between the correlations obtained for the various national and cultural groups.

Table 8.2. Variables, Measures and Questionnaire Titles

Independent Variables		
Variable	Names used in text of Measures and Subscales comprising them	Titles of Questionnaires providing data
Intergenerational conflict on broad social issues	Australianism Disparity	Opinion Questionnaire (administered to both child and parents)

CONTINUED ...

Table 8.2. (Continued)

Variable	Names used in text of Measures and Subscales comprising them	Titles of Questionnaires providing data
Intergenerational conflict over activities important to the teenager	Intergeneration Disparity	
	(a) Self versus Actual Parents	I-G Questionnaire - Parents, and I-G Questionnaire - Teenagers I(a)
	(b) Self versus Perceived Parents	I-G Questionnaire - Teenagers I(a), and I-G Questionnaire - Teenagers III
	(c) Perceived Peers versus Actual Parents	I-G Questionnaire - Parents, and I-G Questionnaire - Teenagers II
	(d) Perceived Peers versus Perceived Parents	I-G Questionnaire - Teenagers II, and I-G Questionnaire - Teenagers III

CONTINUED ...

Table 8.2. (Continued)

Dependent Variables		
Variable	Names used in text of Measures and Subscales comprising them	Titles of Questionnaires providing data
(1) Identification with Parents	(a) <u>Parental Compliance</u>	
	(i) Behaviour	I-G Questionnaire - Teenagers I(b)
	(ii) Parental Mores	I-G Questionnaire - Teenagers II
	(b) <u>Parental Deference</u>	
	(i) Parents over Peers	You and Your Friends Questionnaire, Pt 2c.
	(ii) Peers over Parents	You and Your Friends Questionnaire, Pt 2b.

CONTINUED ...

Table 8.2. (Continued)

Variable	Names used in text of Measures and Subscales comprising them	Titles of Questionnaires providing data
(2) Identification with peer group	Peer-Group Importance	
	(a) Number of friends	You and Your Friends Questionnaire, Pt 1.
	(b) Relative age of	You and Your Friends Questionnaire, Pt 1.
	(c) Distance of friends' homes	You and Your Friends Questionnaire, Pt 1.
	(d) Proportion of friends in a different school or occupation	You and Your Friends Questionnaire, Pt 1.
	(e) Number of activities	You and Your Friends Questionnaire, Pt 2a.

CONTINUED ...

Table 8.2. (Continued)

Variable	Names used in text of Measures and Subscales comprising them	Titles of Questionnaires providing data
(3) Rejection of social mores	(a) Wrongdoing Rating scale (b) Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire	Attitudes Questionnaire Behaviour Questionnaire
(4) Rejection of both reference groups	Alienation scale	A-Scale

CHAPTER 9. COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES ACROSS NATIONAL AND CULTURAL GROUPS

Throughout the presentation and discussion of results, immigrant groups will be referred to as "United Kingdom", "Northwest European", including "Dutch" and "German", and "Southern European", including "Italian" and "Greek". Despite this, it should be borne in mind that the adolescents making up these samples were not immigrants themselves, but the second-generation children of immigrant parents from those sources, and had not experienced intensive contact with any society outside Australia, at least since infancy. More than half of them had been born in Australia, and all of these 14- to 16-year-olds had grown up from their earliest years within Australian society.

Analysis of Results

Two main techniques were employed in comparing the mean scores of subsamples on each of the measures described in the two preceding chapters. Mean scores for immigrant groups were first compared with the mean score of the Australian control group. Following this, the mean scores for the immigrant subsamples were compared with one another. This section describes the statistics used to conduct these analyses.

Comparison with Australian Control Group. As described in the chapter on sampling and procedure, the Australian sample was selected to match the immigrant samples on demographic, scholastic and socioeconomic variables. This was with the specific aim of providing a control group of host society peers with which each of the immigrant groups could

be compared. Consequently any difference found between the Australian sample and an immigrant subsample was assumed to reflect actual differences in the variables being measured, and not to be merely a sampling artifact. The mean score for each immigrant group was therefore compared in turn with that of the Australian control group by a *t*-test for independent samples.

A test was first made of the significance of the difference between the mean for the Australian control group and that of the immigrant group as a whole (N = 146, df = 144).

In Australian studies of immigration (eg., Price, 1966, 1971), Dutch and German immigrants are commonly included together in the classification "Northwest Europeans", and Italian and Greek immigrants placed in the "Southern European" category. This was also done in the present study. A further immigrant category regarded as comparable was that of children whose parents were from the United Kingdom. These three major regional categories of immigrants were designated "cultural", as distinct from "national", groups. Consequently a series of comparisons was next carried out between the mean score for the Australian control group and those for the United Kingdom, Northwest European and Southern European cultural groups (degrees of freedom ranging from 70 to 76).

Tests were also made of the differences between the Australian control group mean score and those of the five immigrant nationality samples (degrees of freedom ranging from 53 to 72). This was because the children of the two national groups within both the European immigrant cultural samples very possibly could have differed from one

another in their experience of and reactions to culture conflict. For instance, Price (1963a) stressed the variety of homeland backgrounds from which Southern Europeans came, and the effects of such variation on the degree and type of assimilation of the immigrant family into Australian society.

From previous work on Australian immigration outlined in the review of the literature, it was predicted that each immigrant subsample should differ from the Australian control group on at least some of the measures of both the amount of conflict experienced, and their reactions to such conflict. Therefore the multiple comparisons undertaken were considered legitimate. However, performing a series of comparisons could have resulted in an excessive number of Type I errors. Consequently the t value required for each level of the significance of the differences was adjusted upwards before the null hypothesis was rejected. The Bonferroni t method of adjustment is applicable where the number of comparisons to be made between groups does not greatly exceed the number of groups involved (Miller, 1966). As five comparisons were to be made between six groups, and three contrasts drawn between four groups, this method was adopted.

The method employed to calculate the error rates, and the critical values of t required for the comparisons made between the Australian control group and the immigrant samples, are detailed in Appendix XVI.

In a project subject to the vagaries of survey-type research, a t value significant at least at the five per cent level is normally required before allowing rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore a difference between groups in the present study was required to be

significant at the .05 level, or preferably better, before being accepted as a finding which could be stated with confidence. However it was an exploratory study with few precedents and none in Australia. Moreover, the t values required had already been adjusted upward. Consequently where a result accorded well with theory or with other findings, a 10 per cent level was ordinarily accepted as indicating a significant trend toward a difference. Such a difference was considered to be a finding which should at least be further investigated in follow-up studies before being either fully accepted or rejected.

Nevertheless, it is also necessary to remember that the findings of this study related only to a small sample of Australian-born children of immigrants living in Melbourne, Australia. Reference to Italian immigrants alone demonstrated the importance of this. There were not the relatively large numbers of pre-World War II Italian immigrants engaged in rural industries which were a protection against culture shock for Italian settlers in Queensland (Borrie & Packer, 1954). Melbourne was not a rapidly growing small city as is Perth (Taft, 1965). Italians did not farm large areas of market garden on the outskirts of the metropolis as they did in Sydney (Price, 1963a), and there was no equivalent of the large country and sporting club which Sydney Italians have founded. Finally, the large ethnic enclaves of Melbourne were very different from the groups of farmers in the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area (Tully, 1960). Similar differences between other groups of immigrants living in Melbourne and their ethnic equivalents in other parts of Australia could also be cited. Generalizations from the findings of this study to other groups, or to immigrants in general, must therefore only be made with caution.

Differences among Immigrant Sample Mean Scores. Following comparison of each immigrant group with the Australian control group, immigrant group mean scores were then compared with one another. Two one-way analyses of variance for independent samples of unequal size were performed. The five nationalities (United Kingdom, Dutch, German, Italian and Greek) were compared, as were the three cultural groups (United Kingdom, Northwest European and Southern European). If either F ratio obtained was significant at the .05 level or better, the group means were then compared pair by pair to ascertain which samples had contributed the between groups variance making the F ratio significant.

Although some a priori hypotheses concerning specific comparisons had been set up, not all were substantiated, some were reversed, and other findings had not been predicted. Consequently all post-analysis comparison of means was treated as a posteriori searching of the data, and precautions taken accordingly. The Scheffé method was employed (Edwards, 1960), as a five-group intercomparison required ten comparisons of pairs, which was considered to exceed the approximately equal numbers of groups and comparisons cited by Miller (1966) as being a criterion for the applicability of the Bonferroni t method. Following Scheffé's recommendation, reported by Ferguson (1966), the 10 per cent level of significance was accepted. Values of F at this level were obtained from Fisher & Yates (1963). The calculation and size of the required F ratios is presented in Appendix XVII.

Comparison of Mean Scores across National and Cultural Groups

The remainder of this chapter presents a description of the main findings resulting from the comparison of the mean scores of sub-

samples on the measures employed. It is divided into two main sections and a number of subsections, which are numbered to facilitate cross-reference.

Section A presents the differences found between the samples on the two measures of value disparity between parent and child, (1) Australianism Disparity and (2) Intergeneration Disparity. Section B is concerned with the variation between groups in their responses to the measures of reaction to this value disparity. These reactions were classified into four types. Identification with or rejection of parents (1) was assessed by (a) Parental Compliance and (b) Parental Deference. Identification with or rejection of the peer group (2) was measured by the Peer-Group Importance index. Degree of rejection of social mores (3) was tapped by (a) the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire and (b) the Wrongdoing Rating scale. Finally, the extent to which subjects rejected both reference groups (4) was inferred from their scores on the Alienation scale.

The raw scores on each measure were converted into T-scores, and it was on these T-scores that all estimates of differences between groups were based. Each table shows the number of children in each national and cultural group, in the total immigrant subsample, and in the total sample for the study. For each of these groups the mean and standard deviation of their scores on the measure concerned are given, remembering that where a subject failed to respond to a specific scale, the mean score for the total sample on that scale was substituted as his score.

In addition the results of comparing each immigrant group with the Australian control group are presented by showing t, degrees of

freedom and significance of the difference between their mean scores. In all comparisons the probability level of the difference between immigrant groups and the Australian control group was adjusted by the Bonferroni *t* method described above. The results of the analyses of variance performed to compare the mean scores of immigrant groups with one another are given in the text.

A. PARENT-CHILD VALUE DISPARITY

(1) Australianism Disparity

There was a greater disparity of responses to the Australianism Disparity scale between Australian parents and their children than between immigrant parents and theirs, with the disparity between European children and their parents being especially small. Moreover, no immigrant group mean differed significantly from the total immigrant sample mean.

Table 9.1 shows results for the Australianism Disparity scale. The T-score mean represents a mean raw score of 27.30 from a possible total score of 66.0, and the T-score standard deviation (SD) is equivalent to a raw score SD of 6.36, with a range of 7.0 to 40.5. The Australian control group ($\bar{X}$ = 53.6) scored significantly higher than did the immigrant sample as a whole ($\bar{X}$ = 48.5, t = 2.85, $p < .01$), with both the Northwest European ($\bar{X}$ = 47.1, t = 2.50, $p < .05$) and the Southern European ($\bar{X}$ = 48.8, t = 2.50, $p < .05$) groups scoring significantly lower than the Australian sample. The mean United Kingdom score ($\bar{X}$ = 49.4), although differing in a similar direction, was not significantly

Table 9.1. Australianism Disparity Mean T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Mean	49.4	48.1	46.0	47.1	50.8	46.9	48.8	48.5	53.7	49.9
S.D.	8.85	12.07	9.72	11.05	7.14	10.54	9.25	9.77	9.42	9.94
	Comparison of Australian and Immigrant Mean Scores									
t	1.97	1.83	2.68	2.70	1.13	2.45	2.50	2.85	-	-
df	72	54	53	70	56	57	76	144	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	<.05	<.05	N.S.	<.10	<.05	<.01	-	-

lower. Analyses of variance showed that the five immigrant nationalities did not differ significantly from one another (F = 0.74, df = 4,102, NS), and that neither did the three immigrant cultural samples (F = 0.52, df = 2,104, NS).

Thus on a scale of general social values Australian children and their parents disagreed more than did immigrant children and theirs. Immigrant groups did not differ from one another on this scale.

(2) Intergeneration Disparity

No immigrant group mean score on the I-G Disparity index differed significantly from the Australian control group mean score, and no immigrant group differed significantly from the total immigrant sample mean.

Table 9.2 shows results for the I-G Disparity index. The T-score mean represents a raw score mean of 6.18 from a possible total of 17.0, and the SD a raw score SD of 2.15 with a range of 1.5 to 11.1, remembering that this is the mean result from four subtests of intergenerational disparity. Although there appeared to be some variation across the groups, with mean scores ranging from Germans ($\bar{X}$ = 46.3) to Greeks ($\bar{X}$ = 52.9), it was found to be insignificant when the wide variation of individual scores within groups was taken into account. Thus no significant difference from the Australian control group mean score occurred, and analysis of variance was not significant across the five immigrant nationalities (F = 0.97, df = 4,102, NS) or across the three immigrant cultural subsamples (F = 1.22, df = 2,104, NS).

Therefore, although a wide range of individual disparities between children and their parents was found on the I-G Disparity scale,

Table 9.2. Mean Intergeneration Disparity T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Mean	50.3	49.6	46.3	48.0	50.5	52.8	51.7	50.1	49.8	50.0
S.D.	9.56	11.11	7.28	9.60	10.26	10.58	10.49	10.03	9.71	9.95
	Comparison of Australian and Immigrant Mean Scores									
t	0.21	0.05	1.28	0.77	0.26	1.09	0.83	0.17	-	-
df	72	54	53	70	56	57	76	144	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

no group differed as a whole from the overall mean in the degree to which children and their parents disagreed on values particularly relevant to the teenager and his family.

B. SCORES ON MEASURES OF REACTION TO DISPARITY

(1) Identification with Parents

Two measures of identification with parents were taken. (a) Parental Compliance compared the child's report of his behaviour involving the 17 items of the Intergeneration scales with his perception of his parents' wishes concerning the same items. The I-G Disparity index had measured the value he placed on those activities by asking him what he thought he ought to be allowed to do, while Parental Compliance now asked him what he actually did and so obtained an indication of the extent to which his behaviour complied with his parents' mores.

(b) The Parental Deference index questioned him concerning a wide range of adolescent activities, and assessed the extent to which he obeyed his parents despite his peers' urgings not to do so, compared with the degree to which he conformed with his peer-group although he felt his parents would disapprove.

(a) Parental Compliance. No immigrant group mean score differed significantly from the Australian control group mean score, and no immigrant subsample differed significantly from the mean for the total immigrant sample.

Results for the Parental Compliance measure are given in Table 9.3. The overall T-score mean was equivalent to a raw score mean of 12.01 from a possible total of 17.0. An SD of 2.38 and raw scores ranging from 4.51 to 16.0 were obtained. The mean of 12.01 indicates that the average child was prepared to admit behaviour deviating from the norms which he perceived his parents as holding on five of the 17 activities listed. Note that six children omitted the questionnaire constituting the first part of this measure. The mean score for the total sample was substituted for this missing data.

Although mean scores ranged from German children ($\overline{X}$ = 53.4) down to Italians ($\overline{X}$ = 47.2), variation across groups was small compared with intragroup variation. No immigrant group differed significantly from the Australian control group mean score. Analysis of variance was not significant across the five immigrant nationalities (F = 1.57, df = 4,102, NS), nor across the three immigrant cultural groups (F = 0.78, df = 2,104, NS).

Thus there was no variation between groups as a whole in the degree to which children indicated regarding their parents as a reference group by claiming to behave as they thought their parents would wish.

(b) Parental Deference. Northwest European children were more ready to refuse to join their peers in activities of which their parents disapproved, and reported less behaviour engaged in with their friends of which they felt their parents would disapprove if they knew. They deferred more to their parents and conformed less to parentally disapproved behaviour of their peer group.

Table 9.3. Parental Compliance Mean T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Mean	49.0	50.5	53.4	51.9	47.2	53.3	50.3	50.4	48.9	50.0
S.D.	8.79	9.16	6.56	8.13	10.90	10.30	11.02	9.55	10.25	9.77
	Comparison of Australian and Immigrant Mean Scores									
t	0.06	0.57	1.60	1.36	0.56	1.53	0.59	0.82	-	-
df	72	54	53	70	56	57	76	144	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

Table 9.4 shows findings for the Parental Deference index. The T-score mean for the total sample represents a Parental Deference raw score of 56.5 from a possible total of 100, with a mid-point of 50. That is, when the average child's responses to the Peers over Parents questionnaire were subtracted from his responses to the Parents over Peers measure, and expressed as a percentage of the total number of his affirmative replies to the two instruments, the resultant mean score was on the positive side of zero. The average child reported that he obeyed his parents a little more than he conformed with his peers. Index scores ranged from 0 to 100, with an SD of 29.25. One United Kingdom and one German respondent omitted the Parents over Peers scale, and the mean score for the total sample was substituted in each case. All children answered the Peers over Parents questionnaire.

Australian children scored the lowest (mean T-score = 48.1) on the composite Parental Deference index made up from these two scales, and German subjects the highest ($\bar{X}$ = 56.1, t = 3.03, $p < .05$). This difference was the only one shown to be significant by a series of t-tests of differences between the mean scores of immigrant nationalities and that of the Australian control group. However, when the immigrant cultural groups were compared with the Australian control group, the difference between the Australian mean score and that of the Northwest European sample was significant (Northwest $\bar{X}$ = 54.9, t = 3.28, $p < .01$). The United Kingdom and Southern European group means did not differ significantly from that of the Australian control group.

Although analysis of variance showed differences between the five immigrant nationalities to be significant (F = 2.53, df = 4,102,

Table 9.4. Parental Deference Mean T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Mean	48.4	53.8	56.1	54.9	48.9	49.8	49.4	50.8	48.2	50.1
S.D.	9.55	8.19	9.36	8.85	9.28	8.93	9.11	9.60	8.37	9.36
	Comparison of Australian and Immigrant Mean Scores									
t	0.12	2.29	3.03	3.28	0.31	0.68	0.60	1.49	-	-
df	72	54	53	70	56	57	76	144	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	$<.05$	$<.01$	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

$p < .05$), a series of F tests between pairs of means revealed that no two differed significantly after the level of F required had been corrected by the Scheffé method. The difference most closely approaching significance was that between the United Kingdom and German groups ($F = 7.40$, $df = 1,102$, NS; $F = 7.96$ being required for significance at the .10 level). An analysis of variance across the three immigrant cultural subsamples, however, showed differences between them to be more highly significant ($F = 4.85$, $df = 2,104$, $p < .01$). Further analysis found the mean for the Northwestern European cultural group to be significantly different from those of both the United Kingdom ($F = 8.30$, $df = 1,104$, $p < .05$) and Southern European ($F = 6.36$, $df = 1,104$, $p < .05$) subsamples. The United Kingdom and Southern European groups did not differ significantly ($F = 0.19$, $df = 1,104$, NS). Inspection of Table 9.4 shows the Northwestern European children to have a higher mean score than those of either the United Kingdom or Southern European groups.

Thus Northwestern European adolescents, and especially German children, deferred more to their perception of their parents' wishes, despite peer-group urgings, than did the Australian control group and both of the other immigrant cultural subsamples. Therefore parents were inferred to be a more important reference group for Northwest European children than were their peers.

Overall, then, it was found that groups did not differ from one another in their behavioural compliance with their parents' wishes concerning the items of the Intergeneration Disparity scale. However when pressure from the peer-group was introduced, as in the Parental Deference measure, Northwest European children responded more to their

parents as a reference group than they did to their peers, compared with both the Australian control group and the United Kingdom and Southern European immigrant groups. Northwest European adolescents identified with their parents, rather than their peer-group.

(2) Identification with Peers

The degree to which the child identified with his peers, and therefore saw them as a reference group, was inferred from his score on the composite Peer-Group Importance measure. United Kingdom children saw their peer-group as more important to them than did the Australian control group, and a strong trend toward the peer-group as being more important to the United Kingdom sample than to Northwest European children was also found.

Results for the Peer-Group Importance measure are presented in Table 9.5. It will be recalled that the T-scores of which the mean for each group is shown were derived from a normalised distribution of the means of ranks on each of the five measures making up the composite Peer-Group Importance index. To assist in giving substance to the T-score means, Table 9.6 shows means, standard deviations and range of raw scores on each of the component measures for the total sample. Scores on the composite measure were obtained for all respondents.

Mean T-scores ranged from the Dutch ($\bar{X}$ = 46.7) to the United Kingdom respondents ($\bar{X}$ = 53.7). The United Kingdom mean score was significantly higher than that for the Australian control group ($\bar{X}$ = 48.5, t = 2.17, $p < .05$), but none of the other immigrant national or cultural groups differed significantly from the control group mean.

Table 9.5. Peer Group Importance Mean T-scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Mean	53.7	46.7	48.9	47.8	51.5	49.1	50.3	50.6	48.5	50.1
S.D.	11.46	8.62	8.91	8.83	6.72	11.56	9.59	10.30	8.77	9.96
	Comparison of Australian and Immigrant Mean Scores									
t	2.17	0.68	0.14	0.34	1.28	0.22	0.83	1.13	-	-
df	72	54	53	70	56	57	76	144	-	-
p	<.05	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

Table 9.6. Mean Raw Scores on Components of Peer Group Importance Measure

Component Measure	Mean	S.D.	Range
Number of Friends	7.17	5.15	0 - 22
Mean age of friends minus Respondent's age, in years	0.08	0.80	-2.2 - +3.4
Mean distance of friends' homes from Respondent's home, in miles	2.24	3.81	0.0 - 31.3
Percentage of friends in different school or occupation	35.5	34.2	0.0 - 100.0
Number of activities engaged in with friends	15.60	5.91	1 - 32

Analysis of variance across the five immigrant nationalities gave no significant result (F = 1.66, df = 4,102, NS). However across the three immigrant cultural groups F was significant at the 10 per cent level (F = 2.91, df = 2,104, $p < .10$, with F = 3.09 being required for significance at the .05 level). Mean scores of the three immigrant cultural subsamples were therefore compared. The higher score of the United Kingdom group was significantly different from that of the Northwest European sample, after correction by the Scheffé method (F = 5.74, df = 1,104, $p < .10$). The Southern European sample did not differ significantly from either of the other two immigrant cultural groups.

It was inferred from the greater importance of the peer-group to adolescent children of United Kingdom immigrant parents that they identified more closely with their peers. They had more friends, who were on the average older than they themselves were. To make friends they went further from home, and outside their school or job, and they engaged in a greater variety of activities with them. Whereas evidence presented in the previous section showed that children from Northwest Europe identified more with their parents than did other groups, this evidence suggested that children whose parents had immigrated from the United Kingdom turned more to their peers as a reference group.

(3) Rejection of Social Mores

Two measures were taken of the degree to which the child rejected social mores. He was presented with a list of socially disapproved behaviours and asked how often he had engaged in them, giving a measure of Socially Unacceptable Behaviour. Earlier in the battery,

he had been asked to rate each of these behaviours on a Wrongdoing Rating scale, indicating how wrong he thought they were. The less wrong he considered such behaviour, the greater his rejection of social mores was assumed to be. This section describes the results for the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire and the Wrongdoing Rating scale, indicating differences between groups in the degree to which they rejected social mores.

(a) Socially Unacceptable Behaviour. Both the Australian and United Kingdom samples reported more frequent socially unacceptable behaviour and thus greater rejection of social mores than did the Northwest European group, and the immigrant sample as a whole tended to report fewer misdemeanours than did the Australian control group.

Table 9.7 gives the results for the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire. The mean T-score for the total sample represents a mean raw score on each item of 0.89, remembering that the scale on each item was:

Never = 0
Once or twice = 1
Several times = 2
Very often = 3

Thus the normal respondent reported having behaved in a socially unacceptable manner "Once or twice" on the average item. The raw score SD obtained was 0.40 and scores ranged from a mean of 0.15 to 2.30 on each item. All children responded to this questionnaire.

The highest scoring group on the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire was the Australian control group (mean T-score = 52.6)

Table 9.7. Socially Unacceptable Behaviour Mean T-scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Mean	52.5	46.1	46.3	46.2	49.1	47.8	48.4	49.1	52.6	50.0
S.D.	9.35	9.27	8.72	9.01	11.02	8.96	10.04	9.76	9.75	9.88
	Comparison of Australian and Immigrant Mean Scores									
t	0.03	2.28	2.20	2.82	1.19	1.80	1.82	1.90	-	-
df	72	54	53	70	56	57	76	144	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	$<.05$	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	$<.10$	-	-

and the lowest the Dutch children ($\bar{X}$ = 46.1). Compared with the Australian control group, the total immigrant sample showed a significant trend toward scoring lower on this scale ($\bar{X}$ = 49.1, t = 1.90, df = 144, $p < .10$). However, of the cultural groups making up the total immigrant sample, only the Northwest Europeans had a mean score significantly lower than that of the Australians ($\bar{X}$ = 46.2, t = 2.82, $p < .05$).

An analysis of variance across the five immigrant nationalities was not significant (F = 1.90, df = 4,102, NS), but a similar analysis showed the three immigrant cultural groups to differ significantly (F = 3.78, df = 2,104, $p < .05$). A series of F tests between pairs of groups (see Table 9.8) following this significant F ratio revealed the difference between the United Kingdom ($\bar{X}$ = 52.5) and Northwest European ($\bar{X}$ = 46.2) cultural groups as contributing the significant variance after a Scheffé correction.

Table 9.8. Comparison of Immigrant Cultural Group Mean Scores on Socially Unacceptable Behaviour Measure

Comparison	F_a	p
United Kingdom and Northwest European	7.29	$<.05$
United Kingdom and Southern European	3.28	NS
Northwest European and Southern European	0.97	NS

a Degrees of freedom = 1,104

Thus both the Australian control group and the United Kingdom children reported more frequent misdemeanours than did the Northwest

European group, while a tendency for the immigrant sample as a whole to report socially unacceptable behaviour less often than did the Australian control group was also noted.

(b) Wrongdoing Rating Scale. A similar pattern emerged in the results for the Wrongdoing Rating scale. Compared with the Australian control group, the immigrant sample as a whole rejected social mores less by rating the listed behaviours higher on a scale of wrongness. Again within the immigrant sample, however, it was the Northwest European children who saw them as most wrong and the United Kingdom children who rated them as least offensive.

Results for the Wrongdoing Rating scale are shown in Table 9.9. The mean T-score for the total sample represents a mean raw score of 4.85 on the 0 to 9 rating scale for each item. It will be recalled that the child was asked to equate the following headings with the appropriate scale points:

Not wrong = 0

A little bit wrong = 1, 2 or 3

Wrong = 4, 5 or 6

Very wrong = 7, 8 or 9

As a group the children therefore viewed the average listed activity as falling in the middle of the "Wrong" category. Mean raw scores on each item ranging from 0.95 to 8.00, with a standard deviation of 1.54, were obtained. One United Kingdom child omitted the scale and the mean for the total sample was substituted for his score. The T-scores were reversed, so that a higher score indicated a lower wrongness rating, or a greater rejection of social mores.

Table 9.9. Wrongdoing Rating Scale Mean T-scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Mean	51.7	46.6	45.6	46.1	49.6	47.5	48.5	48.8	53.2	50.0
S.D.	9.56	8.99	7.80	8.45	10.88	8.93	9.98	9.66	10.04	9.96
	Comparison of Australian and Immigrant Mean Scores									
t	0.67	2.31	2.69	3.19	1.24	2.12	2.06	2.41	-	-
df	72	54	53	70	56	57	76	144	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	<.05	<.01	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.05	-	-

Compared with the Australian control group ($\bar{X}$ = 53.2), the immigrant sample as a whole scored lower on rejection of social mores ($\bar{X}$ = 48.8, t = 2.41, $p < .05$). However it was the Northwest European cultural group ($\bar{X}$ = 46.1, t = 3.19, $p < .01$) who differed most from the Australian control group.

A one-way analysis of variance showed the five immigrant nationalities not to differ significantly from one another (F = 1.61, df = 4,102, NS), but the variance between the means for the three immigrant cultural samples was significant at the 10 per cent level (F = 2.98, df = 2,104, $p < .10$, with F = 3.09 being required for significance at the .05 level). As this was in accord with the findings for the other measure of rejection of social mores, Socially Unacceptable Behaviour, subsequent comparison of pairs of means was performed. As with the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour results, the United Kingdom children ($\bar{X}$ = 51.7) scored significantly higher than did the Northwest European sample ($\bar{X}$ = 48.5, F = 5.89, df = 1,104, $p < .10$) after a Scheffé correction.

Thus on both measures of rejection of social mores, it was found that Australian children stood out as rejecting them to a greater extent than did the immigrant sample as a whole, and that within the immigrant sample it was the United Kingdom children who rejected social norms most, while Northwest European adolescents did so least of all.

(4) Rejection of Both Reference Groups

Strength of alienation was taken as an indicator of the extent to which the child rejected and felt rejected by society as a whole.

The two reference groups typically provided by modern Western industrialised society as most important to the adolescent are his parents and his peer group. Rejection of both these groups was the fourth means available to the child of reducing conflict caused by discrepancies between the mores held by them. The degree to which the child reacted in this way to tension arising from intergenerational culture conflict was therefore inferred from his score on the Alienation scale.

Alienation. Children of the Australian control group tended to be more highly alienated than were the two European immigrant cultural groups, and were significantly more so than were the Northwest European children. Moreover, the United Kingdom sample demonstrated greater alienation than did either the Northwest European or the Southern European subsamples, with adolescents of the German nationality group standing out as the least alienated of all.

Alienation scale T-score findings are given in Table 9.10. The mean for the total sample represents a raw score mean of 10.19 alienated responses from a possible total score of 24.0. A raw score SD of 3.09 and scores ranging from 2.0 to 18.0 were obtained. One Australian child omitted the Alienation scale and the mean score for the total sample was substituted.

The United Kingdom sample had the highest mean T-score ($\overline{X}$ = 53.2) and the German children the lowest ($\overline{X}$ = 44.4). The Australian control group mean of 52.4 was shown to be significantly higher than that of the German nationality children ($\overline{X}$ = 44.4, t = 3.07, $p < .05$) and that of the Northwest European sample as a group ($\overline{X}$ = 46.2, t = 2.77,

Table 9.10. Alienation Scale Mean T-scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Mean	53.2	47.8	44.4	46.2	48.4	47.5	48.0	49.1	52.4	50.0
S.D.	8.86	11.40	6.01	9.34	10.29	9.85	10.08	9.92	9.35	9.87
	Comparison of Australian and Immigrant Mean Scores									
t	0.41	1.55	3.07	2.77	1.42	1.82	1.97	1.75	-	-
df	72	54	53	70	56	57	76	144	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	$<.05$	$<.05$	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	$<.10$	-	-

$p < .05$). Furthermore, it tended to be higher than the mean for the immigrant sample as a whole ($\bar{X} = 49.1$, $t = 1.75$, $p < .10$), although this was entirely due to the mean scores of the four European immigrant nationalities, as the United Kingdom immigrant sample had a mean score higher, if anything, than that of the Australians.

A one-way analysis of variance showed differences across the five immigrant nationality groups to be significant ($F = 2.78$, $df = 4,102$, $p < .05$). A series of F tests between pairs of means with the required F adjusted by the Scheffé method gave the results shown in Table 9.11. Differences between the United Kingdom sample and the other immigrant nationalities contributed most of the variance, with the difference between the United Kingdom and German mean scores reaching significance at the .10 level. The mean score for the United Kingdom children was higher than that for each of the other immigrant nationalities.

However, more highly significant variance across the three immigrant cultural groups was found ($F = 5.07$, $df = 2,104$, $p < .01$). A series of comparisons between pairs of means subsequent to this significant overall F ratio showed the United Kingdom Alienation score ($\bar{X} = 53.2$) to be significantly higher than that for either the Northwest European ($\bar{X} = 46.2$) or the Southern European ($\bar{X} = 48.0$) immigrant cultural groups (see Table 9.12).

Table 9.12. Comparison of Immigrant Cultural Groups on Alienation

Comparison	F_a	p
United Kingdom and Northwest European	9.23	$< .05$
United Kingdom and Southern European	5.56	$< .10$
Northwest European and Southern European	0.63	NS

a Degrees of freedom = 1,104

Table 9.11. Series of F-tests of Differences between Pairs of Means on Alienation Scale

United Kingdom x	Dutch	F = 3.67	N.S.
	German	F = 9.12	$p < .10$
	Italian	F = 3.05	N.S.
	Greek	F = 4.48	N.S.
Dutch x	German	F = 0.98	N.S.
	Italian	F = 0.04	N.S.
	Greek	F = 0.01	N.S.
German x	Italian	F = 1.49	N.S.
	Greek	F = 0.90	N.S.
Italian x	Greek	F = 0.09	N.S.

Total Variance: $F = 2.78$, $df = 4, 102$, $p < .05$

Thus the total sample for this study split into two groups along the dimension of rejection of society in general as expressed in feelings of alienation from it. Australian control group and United Kingdom children did not differ significantly from one another. Similarly, the mean scores of Northwest European and Southern European groups were not significantly different. However both the Australian control group and the United Kingdom sample scored significantly higher on Alienation than did either the Northwest European or the Southern European adolescents.

Table 9.13 summarises the main findings presented in this chapter. In addition to the N for each group, it shows the mean and standard deviation of the T-scores obtained by that group on each of the two measures of Disparity, and on each of the six measures employed to assess the four dimensions of reaction to that disparity. The following chapter presents the results obtained when the two Disparity measures were employed as predictors of reactions to the conflict arising from disparity between the value schema of the two generations for each of the national and cultural groups.

Table 9.13. Mean T-Scores on Disparity and Reaction Measures for National and Cultural Groups

		United Kingdom	Northwest European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
			Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
	N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Australianism Disparity	$\bar{x}$	49.4	48.1	46.0	47.1	50.8	46.9	48.8	48.5	53.7	49.9
	S.D.	8.85	12.07	9.72	11.05	7.14	10.54	9.25	9.77	9.42	9.94
I-G Disparity	$\bar{x}$	50.3	49.6	46.3	48.0	50.5	52.8	51.7	50.1	49.8	50.0
	S.D.	9.56	11.11	7.28	9.60	10.26	10.58	10.49	10.03	9.71	9.95
Parental Compliance	$\bar{x}$	49.0	50.5	53.4	51.9	47.2	53.3	50.3	50.4	48.9	50.0
	S.D.	8.79	9.16	6.56	8.13	10.90	10.30	11.02	9.55	10.25	9.77
Parental Deference	$\bar{x}$	48.4	53.8	56.1	54.9	48.9	49.8	49.4	50.8	48.2	50.1
	S.D.	9.55	8.19	9.36	8.85	9.28	8.93	9.11	9.60	8.37	9.36
Peer Group Identification	$\bar{x}$	53.7	45.7	48.9	47.8	51.5	49.1	50.3	50.6	48.5	50.1
	S.D.	11.46	8.62	8.91	8.83	6.72	11.56	9.59	10.30	8.77	9.96
Socially Unacceptable Behaviour	$\bar{x}$	52.5	46.1	46.3	46.2	49.1	47.8	48.4	49.1	52.6	50.0
	S.D.	9.35	9.27	8.72	9.01	11.02	8.96	10.04	9.76	9.75	9.88
Wrongdoing Rating	$\bar{x}$	51.7	46.6	45.6	46.1	49.6	47.5	48.5	48.8	53.2	50.0
	S.D.	9.56	8.99	7.80	8.45	10.88	8.93	9.98	9.66	10.04	9.96
Alienation	$\bar{x}$	53.2	47.8	44.4	46.2	48.4	47.5	48.0	49.1	52.4	50.0
	S.D.	8.86	11.40	6.01	9.34	10.29	9.85	10.08	9.92	9.35	9.87

CHAPTER 10. PREDICTION OF REACTION MEASURE SCORES FROM DISPARITY MEASURE SCORES

The previous chapter presented results obtained when the mean scores of the national and cultural groups on each measure were compared with one another and with the mean score of the Australian control group. If a group reacted to intergenerational culture conflict in any of the four types of reaction suggested as possible, the correlation between subjects' scores on a conflict measure and the measures used of that type of reaction was expected to be positive and significant.

For example the correlation between Southern European children's scores on the Australianism Disparity scale and the Wrongdoing Rating scale was positive and significant ($r = .36$, $p < .05$). This was interpreted as showing that the Southern European children reacted to greater conflict arising from disparity between themselves and their parents over general social values by rejecting social mores, reflected in a lower rating of the wrongness of breaking them. Conversely the Southern European child whose general social values diverged less from those of his parents was more accepting of social norms and rated transgression of them as worse.

Analysis of Results

Consequently the product-moment correlation coefficients between scores on the Australianism Disparity measure and each of the reaction measures, and between the Intergeneration Disparity index (I-G Disparity index) and each of the reaction measures were calculated. This was done for each nationality subsample, for each cultural group and the

Australian control group, for the total immigrant sample, and for the total sample including the control group.

A significance level of .05 on a two-tailed test was ordinarily required before a correlation was accepted as a significant finding. However, as discussed in the previous chapter, this was an exploratory study with little precedent. Therefore a correlation significant at the 10 per cent level was taken to indicate a significant trend which was worthy of comment and should be further investigated before being either accepted or rejected as a general finding. It was considered more important to generate hypotheses for future research in this area than to maintain a particularly strict guard against type I errors.

A significant correlation between a disparity measure and a reaction measure for one group was accepted as showing that children from that subsample reacted in such a manner, without necessarily implying that they did so more than did other groups. Assessment of whether or not the correlation for one group differed from that for others was carried out in two ways, described in the following sections.

Comparison with Australian Control Group. The correlation for each group was compared with that for the Australian control group. A z score employing Fisher's z_r transformation was calculated, a .05 level of significance on a two-tailed test required, and the z score necessary adjusted by the Bonferroni t method, taking t for infinite degrees of freedom as equivalent to the z_r required. The correlation for the immigrant sample as a whole, then that for each of the three cultural groups, and finally the correlation for each immigrant nationality, was compared with that for the Australian control group.

Differences among Immigrant Sample Correlations. Secondly the correlations for immigrant groups were compared with one another. Kendall's chi-square test of the source of variance across all the correlations was first applied, as described in Chapter 5. If this was significant, the correlation for each immigrant group was then compared with that for each of the others, using Fisher's z_r transformation to obtain a z value, but again adjusting the z value required by the Bonferroni t method.

Using this combination of methods it was possible to demonstrate differences between national and cultural groups in their typical reactions to intergenerational culture conflict.

The correlations between pairs of measures were obtained for each group. They are shown in tables below. Each table shows the number of subjects, the correlation between T-scores on each measure, the t value of the correlation, and its significance level. These data are given for each nationality, each cultural group, the immigrant sample as a whole, the Australian control group, and for the total sample. In addition these tables show the z score and its significance level for the difference between the correlation obtained between the measures for each immigrant group, and that obtained for the Australian control group.

Multiple Correlation. Two measures were employed of disparity of values between parents and their children; Australianism Disparity and I-G Disparity. A multiple correlation was therefore calculated with each reaction measure as a criterion and the two measures of disparity as

its predictors. This was done for each group and for the total sample. Similarly, two measures were used to assess each of the reactions of identification with parents; Parental Compliance and Parental Deference, and of rejection of social mores; Socially Unacceptable Behaviour and Wrongdoing Rating. Consequently additional multiple correlations were calculated for each of these variables, with the two measures of it being regarded firstly as separate predictors of Australianism Disparity, and secondly of I-G Disparity. Thus where two measures of a theoretical variable were employed, it was possible to estimate the degree to which they were complementary rather than being simply replicates of each other.

Tables are therefore also provided for each form of reaction measured showing the intercorrelation between the two disparity measures and the correlation of each with the reaction measure scores. The multiple correlation derived from these is also given, together with an F ratio indicating its significance. A second F ratio demonstrates the significance of the improvement of the R value obtained over the larger of the two product-moment correlations from which it was derived. Again these relationships between scores are shown for each nationality, each cultural group, the immigrant sample as a whole, the Australian control group, and for the total sample.

Similar tables are provided for Identification with Parents and Rejection of Social Mores, showing the multiple correlations obtained when each of the two measures used to assess these variables was considered as a predictor of each of the measures of disparity. The term "predictors" is used here in a purely technical sense, and the informa-

tion is provided to allow assessment of the relationship to one another of the measures used of these forms of reaction to intergenerational disparity of norms.

This chapter therefore describes the correlations obtained between measures of each type of reaction and the two disparity indices, together with the multiple correlations derived from them. The scores used were in all cases normalised T-scores, for the reasons of correction and convenience given in the previous chapter. To facilitate comparison of results across measures and to enable the multiple correlations to be calculated with equal sample numbers for all three relevant correlations, respondents who omitted a mean score were given the mean score for the total sample. When following this procedure the precaution was taken of calculating the correlations for each group with missing data cases excluded. No correlations were significantly altered by the substitution of the total sample mean score for omitted responses.

A. IDENTIFICATION WITH PARENTS

(1) Parental Identification and Australianism Disparity

(a) Parental Compliance and Australianism Disparity. The Australianism Disparity measure did not predict scores on Parental Compliance for the group as a whole (r = -.06, NS). Nevertheless a trend was noted for Southern European children to see their parents as a less important reference group when they diverged from their parents' opinions on the Australianism items (r = -.30, $p < .10$). However no immigrant group correlation differed significantly from the correlation for the

Australian control group. Moreover the correlations did not vary significantly about their mean for the five nationalities (χ^2 = 5.02, df = 4, NS), nor for the three immigrant cultural groups (χ^2 = 3.71, df = 2, NS). These results are shown in Table 10.1.

(b) Parental Deference and Australianism Disparity. No relationship was found between scores on Australianism Disparity and those on Parental Deference for any subgroup or for the total sample (r = -.04, NS), and immigrant groups did not differ significantly from one another or from the Australian control group in the degree to which scores on these two measures correlated (see Table 10.2). The correlations for the five nationalities did not vary significantly about their mean (χ^2 = 1.38, df = 4, NS), and neither did those for the three immigrant cultural groups (χ^2 = 0.90, df = 2, NS).

Thus children who differed with their parents on general social issues did not necessarily refuse to identify with them.

(c) Multiple Correlation: Parental Identification Measures as Predictors of Australianism Disparity. As the zero order correlations of both Parental Compliance and Parental Deference with Australianism Disparity were not significant, neither were the R values obtained by pooling them as predictors of it (see Table 10.3).

(2) Parental Identification and Intergenerational Disparity

(a) Parental Compliance and I-G Disparity. In measuring Parental Compliance the child's reported behaviour was compared with his perception

Table 10.1. Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Parental Compliance T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	- .10	.07	.40	.17	- .32	- .22	- .30	- .11	.13	- .06
t	0.60	0.27	1.64	0.93	1.39	0.97	1.91	1.14	0.60	0.71
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations with Australian Control Group									
z	0.96	0.19	0.92	0.16	1.53	1.21	1.86	1.24	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

Table 10.2. Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Parental Deference T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	- .08	.07	.20	.11	- .21	- .04	- .11	- .05	.11	- .04
t	0.43	0.26	0.75	0.62	0.86	0.16	0.68	0.53	0.66	0.50
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations with Australian Control Group									
z	0.75	0.13	0.28	0.02	1.05	0.50	0.93	0.82	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

Table 10.3. Multiple Correlation between Parental Identification Predictors and Australianism Disparity Criterion

		United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
			Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
	N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Parental Compliance & Parental Deference	r	.29	- .06	.57	.23	- .32	.17	- .07	.15	- .06	.10
Parental Compliance & Australianism Disparity	r	- .104	.07	.40	.17	- .32	- .22	- .30	- .11	.13	- .06
Parental Deference & Australianism Disparity	r	- .08	.07	.20	.11	- .21	- .04	- .11	- .05	.11	- .04
	R	.11	.10	.40	.18	.46	.22	.33	.12	.17	.07
	F_R	0.21	0.07	1.26	0.51	2.10	0.45	2.14	0.71	0.55	0.34
	df	2,32	2,14	2,13	2,30	2,16	2,17	2,36	2,104	2,36	2,143
	p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Improvement:	F_{R-r}	0.07	0.07	0.03	0.18	2.14	0.00	0.68	0.13	0.50	0.19
	df	1,32	1,14	1,13	1,30	1,16	1,17	1,36	1,104	1,36	1,143
	p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

of his parents' mores concerning that behaviour. Two of the four subscales contributing to the I-G Disparity score involved these same responses concerning the child's perception of his parents' values. Any relationship found between scores on the Parental Compliance and I-G Disparity measures would therefore have been partly spurious. To avoid this a score made up of only the actual parent-child disagreements on the intergeneration items was calculated. It combined the Self versus Actual Parents and Peers versus Actual Parents disparity scores.

The correlation of these two scales (r = .60, $p < .001$) was high when their reliabilities are considered. For Peers versus Actual Parents, coefficient alpha was .67 and for Self versus Actual Parents coefficient alpha was .53. Consequently the correlation between the two was considered sufficient to combine them into one measure. The mean of scores on them was therefore taken for each child as his Actual I-G Disparity score. To check that this was measuring the same dimension as were the Self versus Perceived Parents and Peers versus Perceived Parents measures, the correlation of means of scores on the two subscales with scores on Actual I-G Disparity were calculated. This relationship was similar and significant (r = .59, $p < .001$).

In effect then, the Actual I-G Disparity score discussed in this section is equivalent to the I-G Disparity score used elsewhere, but with the element held in common with the Parental Compliance measure removed.

Actual I-G Disparity predicted scores on Parental Compliance strongly for Northwest European and Southern European children in a negative direction. Although the correlations for United Kingdom im-

migrant children and the Australian control group were in the same direction, they were insignificant (see Table 10.4).

The overall correlation between the two measures was highly significant ($r = -.35$, $p < .001$) and this was mainly due to the relationships for the Northwest European ($r = -.46$, $p < .01$) and Southern European ($r = -.57$, $p < .001$) groups. The Australian control group correlation ($r = -.19$, NS) did not differ significantly from that for any of the immigrant groups. However analysis of variance of the correlations for the three immigrant cultural groups revealed a trend toward difference between them ($\chi^2 = 5.14$, $df = 2$, $p < .10$). Subsequent comparisons showed the United Kingdom sample correlation to be smaller than that for Southern European children ($z = 2.22$, $p < .10$). Differences across the five immigrant nationalities were not significant ($\chi^2 = 7.06$, $df = 4$, NS).

The overall negative correlation indicated that the child in a state of conflict over disparity of mores with those of his parents behaved less in accord with the norms he perceived them as holding. This contrasted with the child whose parents' values differed less from his own; he saw them as an important reference group and behaved in accordance with his perception of their wishes. However it was noticeable that this correlation was negligible for children of United Kingdom parents, and not significant for the Australian control group. An indication was thus obtained that the relationship between similarity of parental values to his own and identification with his parents might be stronger for the child of European parents than for those of the two English-speaking groups.

Table 10.4. Correlation between Intergenerational Disparity (Actual) and Parental Compliance T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	- .11	- .54	- .29	- .46	- .70	- .49	- .57	- .41	- .19	- .35
t	0.65	2.46	1.11	2.90	4.01	2.39	4.23	4.55	1.18	4.41
p	N.S.	$<.05$	N.S.	$<.01$	$<.001$	$<.05$	$<.001$	$<.001$	N.S.	$<.001$
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations with Australian Control Group									
z	0.33	1.29	0.31	1.25	2.23	1.18	1.95	1.24	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

(b) Parental Deference and I-G Disparity. Scores on the I-G Disparity measure did not predict scores on the Parental Deference index (r = .06, NS) and in this respect the immigrant subsamples did not differ significantly from the Australian control group (see Table 10.5). The correlations for the immigrant groups did not vary significantly about their mean for the five nationalities (χ^2 = 5.54, df = 4, NS) or among the three culture groups (χ^2 = 0.51, df = 2, NS).

Children whose norms concerning adolescent behaviour differed from those of their parents nevertheless did not disobey them in order to conform with their peers.

(c) Multiple Correlation: Parental Identification and I-G Disparity. The Parental Deference score did not add significantly to the ability of the Parental Compliance measure to predict scores on the I-G Disparity index. Multiple correlations between the two parental identification measures and the Actual I-G Disparity score are shown in Table 10.6. The Actual I-G Disparity score was employed throughout the calculations for this table to avoid contamination by the common elements of the full I-G Disparity index and the Parental Compliance measure.

Multiple correlations for the total sample, the Northwest European and Southern European cultural groups, and children of the Italian nationality subsample were significant. However almost all of this prediction resulted from the negative correlation of Parental Compliance with the Actual I-G Disparity, and the greatest improvement achieved was not significant.

Table 10.5. Correlation between Intergenerational Disparity and Parental Deference T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	.01	.36	- .36	.04	.36	- .01	.17	.04	.12	.06
t	0.07	1.49	1.42	0.21	1.57	0.05	1.06	0.39	0.71	0.69
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations in the Australian Control Group									
z	0.44	0.82	1.52	0.32	0.84	0.44	0.23	0.41	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

Table 10.6. Multiple Correlation between Parental Identification Predictors and Intergenerational Disparity Criterion

		United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
			Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
	N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Parental Compliance & Parental Deference	r	.29	- .06	.57	.23	- .32	.17	- .07	.15	- .06	.10
Parental Compliance & Actual I-G Disparity	r	- .11	- .54	- .29	- .46	- .70	- .49	- .57	- .41	- .12	- .345
Parental Deference & Actual I-G Disparity	r	- .08	.38	- .38	- .03	.41	- .03	.19	- .00	.09	.02
	R	.12	.64	.39	.47	.73	.49	.59	.41	.14	.35
	F_R	0.24	4.84	1.13	4.21	8.85	2.75	8.63	10.50	0.38	9.96
	df	2,32	2,14	2,13	2,30	2,16	2,17	2,32	2,104	2,36	2,143
	p	N.S.	<.05	N.S.	<.05	<.01	<.10	<.001	<.001	N.S.	<.001
Improvement:	F_{R-r}	0.08	2.88	0.12	0.22	1.33	0.07	1.19	0.40	0.24	0.53
	df	1,32	1,14	1,13	1,30	1,16	1,17	1,32	1,104	1,36	1,143
	p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

(3) Multiple Correlation: Disparity Measures as Predictors of Identification with Parents

(a) Disparity Measures and Parental Compliance. The Australianism Disparity measure did not improve significantly upon the ability of the Actual I-G Disparity index to predict scores on the Parental Compliance measure (see Table 10.7). The Actual I-G Disparity score was again used throughout to avoid spurious findings resulting from common elements of the Parental Compliance and I-G Disparity indices.

Although multiple correlations for most groups and for the total sample were significant, almost all of this resulted from the negative correlation of the Parental Compliance and Actual I-G Disparity scores, and no multiple correlation improved significantly upon it.

(b) Disparity Measures and Parental Deference. Multiple correlations between the two measures of Disparity and the Parental Deference index are shown in Table 10.8. The complete I-G Disparity index scores were employed, and will be throughout the remainder of this chapter.

None of the multiple correlations for nationalities, cultural groups or the total sample approached a level of significance, and none improved significantly upon the product-moment correlations comprising it. The two measures of disparity combined were no more able to predict Parental Deference scores than either had been when considered as an individual measure.

Thus the findings presented in sections A(1b), A(2b) and A(3b) showed that amount of culture conflict as measured by the Australianism Disparity and I-G Disparity indices did not predict the degree to which

Table 10.7. Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Parental Compliance

		United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
			Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
	N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Australianism Disparity & Actual I-G Disparity	r	.19	- .40	- .26	- .30	.24	.32	.28	.08	.12	.08
Australianism Disparity & Parental Compliance	r	- .10	.07	.40	.17	- .32	- .22	- .30	- .11	.13	- .06
Actual I-G Disparity & Parental Compliance	r	- .11	- .54	- .29	- .46	- .70	- .49	- .57	- .41	- .19	- .35
	R	.14	.56	.44	.46	.71	.50	.59	.41	.24	.35
	F_R	0.32	3.18	1.58	4.09	8.33	2.77	9.59	10.73	1.14	9.76
	df	2,32	2,14	2,13	2,30	2,16	2,17	2,36	2,104	2,36	2,143
	p	N.S.	<.10	N.S.	<.05	<.01	<.10	<.001	<.001	N.S.	<.001
Improvement:	F_{R-r}	0.23	0.51	0.56	0.03	0.79	0.11	1.19	0.79	0.88	0.18
	df	1,32	1,14	1,13	1,30	1,16	1,17	1,36	1,104	1,36	1,143
	p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

Table 10.8. Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Parental Deference

		United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
			Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
	N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Australianism Disparity & I-G Disparity	r	.20	- .35	- .40	- .34	.10	.40	.25	.04	.13	.06
Australianism Disparity & Parental Deference	r	- .08	.07	.20	.11	- .21	- .04	- .11	- .05	.11	- .04
I-G Disparity & Parental Deference	r	.01	.36	- .36	.04	.36	- .01	.17	.04	.12	.06
	R	.08	.42	.36	.14	.43	.04	.23	.06	.15	.07
	F_R	0.10	1.46	.97	0.29	1.82	0.01	1.02	0.21	0.41	0.39
	df	2,32	2,14	2,13	2,30	2,16	2,17	2,36	2,104	2,36	2,143
	p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Improvement:	F_{R-r}	0.02	0.72	0.05	0.19	1.16	0.00	0.94	0.15	0.32	0.29
	df	1,32	1,14	1,13	1,30	1,16	1,17	1,36	1,104	1,36	1,143
	p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

the child reported obeying his parents' wishes in spite of friends' urging of him to do otherwise.

This was in contrast to the results for the Parental Compliance scale, which showed that European children in particular reported behaving as they believed their parents wished them to when I-G Disparity scores were small, and reported behaviour contrary to the mores which they perceived their parents as holding when the discrepancy between generations was large.

B. IDENTIFICATION WITH THE PEER GROUP

(1) Australianism Disparity

(a) Peer-Group Importance and Australianism Disparity. Scores on the Peer-Group Importance (P.G.I.) index were not predicted by scores on the Australianism Disparity scale. Discrepancies between children and their parents on broad social issues did not necessarily result in children turning to their peers as a reference group. In general this was true for all subsamples although there was a hint that such a relationship might hold for a small number of immigrant children (see Table 10.9).

The correlation for the total sample was not significant (r = .09, NS). No individual group scores correlated significantly, although before transformation to T-scores correlations for both the United Kingdom (r = .29, $p < .10$) and total immigrant (r = .18, $p < .10$) samples suggested trends toward a positive correlation. The disappearance of these findings with transformation of scores to a normalised distribution

Table 10.9. Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Peer-Group Importance T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	.27	.26	.13	.19	- .29	- .02	- .06	.15	.00	.09
t	1.60	1.03	0.50	1.07	1.24	0.07	0.37	1.52	0.03	1.04
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations with Australian Control Group									
z	1.15	0.85	0.43	0.79	0.97	0.04	0.24	0.79	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

indicated that they resulted from a few extreme cases and should probably be disregarded. Nevertheless they are mentioned here because the results presented in the previous chapter showed the peer group to be more important to the United Kingdom child than it was to other groups, and because I-G Disparity scores were found to correlate significantly with P.G.I. for United Kingdom children (see Below). This will be discussed further later.

Correlation for the Australian control group (r = .00, NS) did not differ significantly from that for any immigrant nationality or cultural group, or from that for the total immigrant sample. Moreover the correlations for the five immigrant nationalities did not differ significantly (χ^2 = 4.12, df = 4, NS) and neither did those for the three immigrant cultural groups (χ^2 = 2.10, df = 2, NS).

(2) Intergeneration Disparity

(a) Peer-Group Importance and I-G Disparity. Greater disparity between children and their parents in values especially relevant to the teenager significantly predicted a readiness to turn to the adolescent peer group as a reference group for both the United Kingdom and Southern European children. This was strong enough in these two groups to result in the total immigrant and total sample correlations being significantly positive also (see Table 10.10).

The correlations for the Australian control group (r = .01, NS) and the Northwest European sample (r = -.01, NS) were negligible. However those between the two measures for the United Kingdom (r = .43, $p < .01$) and Southern European (r = .32, $p < .05$) groups were significant.

Table 10.10. Correlation between Mean Intergenerational Disparity and Peer-Group Importance T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	.43	.03	- .01	- .01	.38	.33	.32	.28	- .01	.21
t	2.74	0.13	0.04	0.03	1.70	1.47	2.03	2.96	0.03	2.96
p	$<.01$	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	$<.05$	$<.01$	N.S.	$<.01$
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations with Australian Control Group									
z	1.93	0.12	0.02	0.00	1.36	1.17	1.42	1.50	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

They contributed to the significance of the correlation for the immigrant group as a whole (r = .28, $p < .01$) and of that for the total sample (r = .21, $p < .01$). The correlation for the Australian control group proved not to be significantly different from those for these two subsamples. Analysis of variance showed the correlations for the immigrant groups not to vary significantly around their mean correlation for either the five nationalities (χ^2 = 3.29, df = 4, NS) or the three cultural groups (χ^2 = 3.59, df = 2, NS). Nevertheless the United Kingdom results in particular are mentioned here because of the importance to them of the peer group shown by the high mean score of United Kingdom children on P.G.I. and the relationship of it with Australianism Disparity mentioned above.

(3) Multiple Correlation: Disparity Measures as Predictors of Peer-Group Importance

Table 10.11 shows multiple correlations between the two disparity measures and the P.G.I. index. They demonstrate that while the I-G Disparity index predicted P.G.I. scores for the United Kingdom and Southern European groups, inclusion of the correlations of Australianism Disparity with P.G.I. did not significantly improve this.

Although R for each of the United Kingdom, total immigrant and total samples was significant and a trend appeared for the Southern European cultural group, no R value improved significantly upon its single predictors.

As a general finding, the child of United Kingdom or Southern European parents turned to his peers as a reference group when he dif-

Table 10.11. Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Peer-Group Importance Index

		United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
			Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
	N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Australianism Disparity & I-G Disparity	r	.20	- .35	- .40	- .34	.10	.40	.25	.04	.13	.06
Australianism Disparity & Peer-Group Importance	r	.27	.26	.13	.19	- .29	- .02	- .06	.15	- .00	.09
I-G Disparity & Peer-Group Importance	r	.43	.03	- .01	- .01	.38	.33	.32	.28	- .01	.21
	R	.47	.29	.14	.20	.50	.36	.35	.31	.01	.22
	F_R	4.52	0.64	0.13	0.61	2.72	1.30	2.49	5.46	0.00	3.79
	df	2,32	2,14	2,13	2,30	2,16	2,17	2,36	2,104	2,36	2,143
	p	<.05	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	N.S.	<.10	<.01	N.S.	<.05
Improvement:	F_{R-r}	1.42	0.26	0.03	0.12	2.31	0.50	0.86	2.09	0.00	0.81
	df	1,32	1,14	1,13	1,30	1,16	1,17	1,36	1,104	1,36	1,143
	p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

fered from his parents on behavioural norms specifically relevant to the teenager within his family, but did not necessarily do so when he and his parents disagreed concerning wider social conventions.

C. REJECTION OF SOCIAL MORES

(1) Australianism Disparity

(a) Wrongdoing Rating and Australianism Disparity. The Australianism Disparity measure significantly predicted scores on the Wrongdoing Rating scale for Southern European children in a direction opposite to that for the Australian control group. This correlation also tended to be in a direction opposite to that for the Northwest European subsample (see Table 10.12). Southern European children whose general social values diverged more from those of their parents rated the behaviours forming the items of the Wrongdoing Rating scale as less wrong than did children from the same group whose values more closely resembled those held by their parents. Australian control group and Northwest European children did not do this.

Correlations between Australianism Disparity and Wrongdoing Rating scores were positive for Southern European (r = .36, $p < .05$) and United Kingdom (r = .18, NS) groups, and negative for the Australian control group (r = -.26, NS) and the Northwest European cultural sample (r = -.17, NS). The Southern European correlation differed significantly from that for the Australian children (z = 2.74, $p < .05$), as did that for the immigrant sample as a whole (z = 2.18, $p < .05$).

Moreover analysis of the variance of the correlations for the three immigrant cultural groups showed them to tend to vary about their

Table 10.12. Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Wrongdoing Rating T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	.18	- .28	- .02	- .17	.45	.29	.36	.15	- .26	.08
t	1.08	1.15	0.09	0.98	2.08	1.29	2.33	1.56	1.66	1.00
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	N.S.	<.05	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations with Australian Control Group									
z	1.88	0.07	0.76	0.38	2.39	1.90	2.74	2.18	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	N.S.	<.05	<.05	-	-

mean (χ^2 = 5.03, df = 2, $p < .10$). Further analysis showed most of this to be attributable to the difference between Northwest European and Southern European correlations (z = 2.23, $p < .10$). Analysis of the degree to which the five immigrant nationality correlations differed revealed no significant variation (χ^2 = 5.32, df = 4, NS).

(b) Socially Unacceptable Behaviour and Australianism Disparity. The findings presented above were borne out by the relationship between Australianism Disparity and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour scores. Immigrant children whose responses to the Australianism Disparity scale differed from those made by their parents reported more behaviour contravening social conventions than did those whose responses were similar to their parents' responses. This was again most evident in Southern European children, and tended to be in contrast with the findings for the Australian control group (see Table 10.13). A hint of inconsistency between belief and action was found for Northwest European children.

Despite the non-significant correlation for the Australian control group the correlation for the total sample was positive and significant (r = .18, $p < .05$). All immigrant groups, including Northwest Europeans (cf. results in preceding section), contributed toward this (r = .24, $p < .02$). The strongest single result was that for Southern European children (r = .31, $p < .10$). Similarly the Southern European group was the only immigrant subsample to show a trend toward differing from the correlation for the Australian control group (r = -.10, z = 1.79, $p < .10$), although the immigrant sample as a whole also tended to differ in this way (z = 1.78, $p < .10$).

Table 10.13. Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	.19	.11	.27	.17	.25	.38	.31	.24	- .10	.18
t	1.09	0.41	1.05	0.97	1.06	1.73	1.99	2.52	0.61	2.24
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	<.10	<.02	N.S.	<.05
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations with Australian Control Group									
z	1.19	0.65	1.17	1.11	1.18	1.69	1.79	1.78	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	<.10	<.10	-	-

No significant difference between immigrant correlations was found for either the five nationalities (χ^2 = 0.77, df = 4, NS) or the three cultural groups (χ^2 = 0.45, df = 2, NS).

However an interesting hint of contrast with Wrongdoing Rating results was found for the Northwest European group. Whereas their Wrongdoing Rating scores had correlated negatively, if anything, with Australianism Disparity, their Socially Unacceptable Behaviour responses showed a trend toward contrast by correlating more positively (t = 1.85, $p < .10$) with it. Neither correlation was significantly different from zero, but the difference between them was. Thus Northwest European children who disagreed with their parents over general social standards tended to react by misbehaving, although they thought it wrong to do so. This supported the conflict apparent from the Parental Compliance finding that I-G Disparity resulted in disobedience by Northwest Europeans, and the Parental Deference result of their stating that they would nevertheless conform to their parents rather than their peers.

(c) Multiple Correlation: Measures of Rejection of Social Mores as Predictors of Australianism Disparity. The two measures of rejection of social mores were found to predict scores on the Australianism Disparity measure for the immigrant children as a whole, and especially for the Southern European group, but each did so in a similar fashion and combining them did not improve the degree of prediction found (see Table 10.14).

Scores for all subsamples on Wrongdoing Rating and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour correlated positively and highly significantly

Table 10.14. Multiple Correlation between Social Mores Rejection Measures and Australianism Disparity

		United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
			Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
	N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Wrongdoing Rating & Unacceptable Behaviour	r	.70	.30	.58	.42	.63	.76	.68	.64	.65	.65
Wrongdoing Rating & Australianism Disparity	r	.18	- .28	- .02	- .17	.45	.29	.36	.15	- .26	.08
Unacceptable Behaviour & Australianism Disparity	r	.19	.11	.27	.17	.25	.38	.31	.24	- .10	.18
	R	.20	.35	.35	.32	.45	.38	.37	.24	.28	.19
	F_R	0.67	0.95	0.92	1.72	2.06	1.41	2.84	3.15	1.51	2.66
	df	2,32	2,14	2,13	2,30	2,16	2,17	2,36	2,104	2,36	2,143
	p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	<.05	N.S.	<.10
Improvement:	F_{R-r}	0.19	0.63	0.75	2.44	0.04	0.00	0.34	0.00	0.32	0.34
	df	1,32	1,14	1,13	1,30	1,16	1,17	1,36	1,104	1,36	1,143
	p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

with each other, but much less with Australianism Disparity. Consequently the multiple correlation values improved only slightly upon the zero order correlations, and findings overall were similar to those for the relationship between Australianism Disparity and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour.

The immigrant sample, and particularly Southern European children, saw social mores as less important and adhered to their perception of them less when the discrepancy was greater between the general values held by their parents and themselves. However this was measured equally well by both measures employed, and either would have sufficed.

(2) Intergenerational Disparity

(a) Wrongdoing Rating and I-G Disparity. The greater the disparity between child and parents on specifically teenage behavioural norms the more the child rejected social conventions in general, as reflected in his rating of breaking them as less wrong. Similarly the child who agreed more strongly with his parents' values viewed the transgression of social conventions as worse. This relationship was consistent across all groups and no difference was found between the immigrant sample and the Australian control group in this respect (see Table 10.15).

The correlation between Wrongdoing Rating and I-G Disparity for the total sample was positive and highly significant (r = .42, $p < .001$). Immigrant groups did not differ from the Australian control group and the small χ^2 values obtained in analysing the differences between the correlations for the immigrant groups showed that all groups contributed to this effect. This was true across the five immigrant

Table 10.15. Correlation between Intergenerational Disparity & Wrongdoing Rating T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	.46	.55	.36	.48	.36	.46	.39	.44	.40	.42
t	3.00	2.57	1.44	3.08	1.58	2.18	2.54	4.98	2.67	5.50
p	<.01	<.05	N.S.	<.01	N.S.	<.05	<.02	<.001	<.02	<.001
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations with Australian Control Group									
z	0.31	0.63	0.15	0.42	0.17	0.23	0.08	0.22	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

nationalities (χ^2 = 0.62, df = 4, NS) and between the three immigrant cultural groups (χ^2 = 0.27, df = 2, NS).

(b) Socially Unacceptable Behaviour and I-G Disparity. Children whose I-G Disparity score was low reported less socially unacceptable behaviour than did those whose values concerning teenage behaviour differed more from those of their parents. Conversely rejection of social conventions, in the form of behaviour reported as contravening them, was higher for children who diverged from their parents. This was equally true for all groups including the Australian control group (see Table 10.16).

Again the overall correlation was positive and highly significant (r = .43, $p < .001$). Although the Northwest European children did not appear to contribute toward this as strongly as did the other groups the difference between the correlation for them and that for the Australian control group was not significant (z = 0.52, NS). Moreover analysis of variance revealed no significant variation across the five immigrant nationalities (χ^2 = 2.18, df = 4, NS) or the three cultural groups (χ^2 = 2.11, df = 2, NS).

(c) Multiple Correlation: Measures of Rejection of Social Mores as Predictors of I-G Disparity. For all groups the combined Wrongdoing Rating and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour scales predicted scores on the I-G Disparity index. Children whose values concerning teenage behaviour differed to a greater degree from those of their parents rated contravention of standards as less wrong, and reported more frequent

Table 10.16. Correlation between Intergenerational Disparity and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	.56	.26	.33	.27	.58	.43	.50	.45	.39	.43
t	3.90	1.02	1.32	1.58	2.96	2.02	3.51	5.18	2.55	5.65
p	<.001	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.01	<.10	<.01	<.001	<.02	<.001
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations with Australian Control Group									
z	0.94	0.46	0.20	0.52	0.87	0.16	0.57	0.40	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

socially unacceptable behaviour than did children whose values did not greatly disagree with those of their parents. This predictive power held for both the immigrant sample and children in the Australian control group.

However, despite the high positive correlation between the two measures of rejection of social mores, which suggested that they might be measuring much the same thing, combining the two produced significantly better prediction of the disparity between children's values and those of their parents for both the total sample and the immigrant sample within it (see Table 10.17).

For each immigrant cultural group and for the Australian control group $\underline{R}$ was significant. This effect was strong for both the total immigrant sample ($\underline{R} = .49$, $\underline{p} < .001$) and the total sample ($\underline{R} = .46$, $\underline{p} < .001$). Moreover the multiple correlation involving both measures improved prediction for both the immigrant group as a whole ($\underline{F} = 5.09$, $\underline{p} < .05$) and for the total sample ($\underline{F} = 6.03$, $\underline{p} < .05$).

Thus while the relationships of both the Wrongdoing Rating score and the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour score with the I-G Disparity index were strong, measuring both enabled better assessment of this relationship than was achieved by either scale individually. Both rating of the wrongness of breaking social conventions, and reported behaviour contravening those conventions, were important aspects of the degree to which a child rejected social mores when he and his parents differed in their opinions of what teenagers should and should not be allowed to do.

Table 10.17. Multiple Correlation between Social Mores Rejection Measures and Intergenerational Disparity Index

		United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
			Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
	N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	104	39	146
Wrongdoing Rating & Unacceptable Behaviour	r	.70	.30	.58	.42	.63	.76	.68	.64	.65	.65
Wrongdoing Rating & I-G Disparity	r	.46	.55	.36	.48	.36	.46	.39	.44	.40	.42
Unacceptable Behaviour & I-G Disparity	r	.56	.26	.33	.27	.58	.43	.50	.45	.39	.43
	R	.57	.56	.39	.49	.58	.47	.50	.49	.44	.46
	F_R	7.73	3.22	1.17	4.74	4.14	2.45	5.98	16.47	4.21	19.54
	df	2,30	2,14	2,13	2,30	2,16	2,17	2,36	2,104	2,36	2,143
	p	<.01	<.10	N.S.	<.05	<.05	N.S.	<.01	<.001	<.05	<.001
Improvement:	F_{R-r}	0.47	0.18	0.35	0.23	0.00	0.33	0.20	5.09	1.24	6.03
	df	1,32	1,14	1,13	1,30	1,16	1,17	1,36	1,104	1,36	1,143
	p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.05	N.S.	<.05

(3) Multiple Correlation: Disparity Measures as Predictors of Rejection of Social Mores

(a) Disparity Measures and Wrongdoing Rating. For the Australian control group the two disparity measures combined were better predictors of Wrongdoing Rating scores than was either individually, although the relationship was positive for one and negative for the other. Among immigrant groups a trend was found toward improved prediction by the use of both disparity scales for the Southern European children, the relationships between all three scores being positive (see Table 10.18).

The relationship was significant for all cultural groups, and strong for the immigrant ($R = .46$, $p < .001$) and full sample ($R = .42$, $p < .001$) totals. However R values for Northwest European children and the Australian control group resulted from negative correlations between Wrongdoing Rating and Australianism Disparity scores plus positive correlations with the I-G Disparity index, whereas both relationships were positive for the Southern European and United Kingdom children.

Improvement of prediction by use of both disparity measures was significant for the Australian control group ($F = 4.73$, $p < .05$). A trend toward improvement evident for the total immigrant sample was almost solely the result of improved prediction for Southern European children ($F = 3.56$, $p < .10$).

However these improvements were achieved in different ways. Wrongdoing Rating scores for Australian children correlated negatively with Australianism Disparity scores, and positively with I-G Disparity scores. Thus Australian children who rated misdemeanours as less wrong

Table 10.18. Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Wrongdoing Rating

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Australianism Disparity & I-G Disparity r	.20	- .35	- .40	- .34	.10	.40	.25	.04	.13	.06
Australianism Disparity & Wrongdoing Rating r	.18	- .28	- .02	- .17	.45	.29	.36	.15	- .26	.08
I-G Disparity & Wrongdoing Rating r	.46	.55	.36	.48	.36	.46	.39	.44	.40	.42
R	.47	.56	.38	.48	.55	.47	.48	.46	.51	.42
F_R	4.59	3.21	1.12	4.59	3.45	2.44	5.24	13.92	6.29	15.32
df	2,32	2,14	2,13	2,30	2,16	2,17	2,36	2,104	2,36	2,143
p	<.05	<.10	N.S.	<.05	<.10	N.S.	<.05	<.001	<.01	<.001
Improvement: F_{R-r}	0.35	0.18	0.26	0.00	2.26	0.30	3.56	2.78	4.73	0.59
df	1,32	1,14	1,13	1,30	1.16	1,17	1,36	1,104	1,36	1,143
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	N.S.	<.10	<.10	<.05	N.S.

held general social values differing from those of their parents, but agreed with their parents in their beliefs regarding what young people of their own age should be permitted to do. In contrast Southern European children who saw social misbehaviour as less wrong diverged from their parents in their conceptions of both general social values and more specific teenage family-related norms.

(b) Disparity Measures and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour. As shown above, both Australianism Disparity and I-G Disparity correlated significantly with Socially Unacceptable Behaviour. However the two disparity measures combined were better able to predict misbehaviour than was either index alone, although the relationships between the three measures varied between groups (see Table 10.19).

For all groups except the Northwest European sample, a significant R value was obtained. United Kingdom and Southern European children who differed more from their parents on Australianism Disparity also did so on I-G Disparity, and this was significantly and positively related to a rejection of social conventions indicated by a higher incidence of reported misbehaviour. For the Australian control group the two predictors correlated positively. Nevertheless, although the relationship of Socially Unacceptable Behaviour with I-G Disparity was also positive, it correlated negatively with Australianism Disparity for Australian children.

On the other hand, Northwest European children who differed from their parents to a greater extent on Australianism Disparity nonetheless were inclined to agree with them on the teenage-relevant items

Table 10.19. Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Australianism Disparity & I-G Disparity r	.20	- .35	- .40	- .34	.10	.40	.25	.04	.13	.06
Australianism Disparity & Unacceptable Behaviour r	.19	.11	.27	.17	.25	.38	.31	.24	- .10	.18
I-G Disparity & Unacceptable Behaviour r	.56	.26	.33	.27	.58	.43	.50	.45	.39	.43
R	.57	.33	.55	.39	.61	.48	.53	.50	.42	.45
F_R	7.58	0.86	2.85	2.74	4.83	2.64	7.09	17.47	3.74	18.59
df	2,32	2,14	2,13	2,30	2,16	2,17	2,36	2,104	2,36	2,143
p	<.01	N.S.	<.10	<.10	<.05	<.10	<.01	<.001	<.05	<.001
Improvement: F_{R-r}	0.26	0.69	3.64	2.84	0.91	1.22	1.89	6.69	0.97	4.48
df	1,32	1,14	1,13	1,30	1,16	1,17	1,36	1,104	1,36	1,143
p	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.05	N.S.	<.05

of the I-G Disparity index, and combining these two relationships also tended to predict higher Socially Unacceptable Behaviour scores (R = .39, $p < .10$).

For the sample as a whole, the pattern was a low correlation between the two predictors, combined with a positive correlation between each and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour, producing a highly significant R value. This was true for both the immigrant sample and the total sample.

Combining the two disparity measures improved their power to predict Socially Unacceptable Behaviour scores for both the immigrant sample (F = 6.69, $p < .05$) and for the sample as a whole (F = 4.48, $p < .05$). However the only improvement apparent for any single group was a trend for German children (F = 3.64, $p < .10$).

To summarise: for the sample as a whole, the two disparity measures were not only significant predictors of Socially Unacceptable Behaviour scores in themselves, but combined were better able to predict reported social misdemeanours than was either score alone; for while they showed little relationship with one another, both correlated positively with scores on the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour scale. This is discussed in chapter 11.

D. ALIENATION

(1) Alienation and Australianism Disparity

Scores on the Australianism Disparity measure did not predict Alienation scores (r = .05, NS). Thus divergence between these broad

social values held by parent and child did not result in a significantly greater incidence of alienated responses (see Table 10.20). However a trend toward this relationship in Italian children ($r = .41$, $p < .10$) was noted as it concurred with the correlation found between I-G Disparity scores and Alienation (see next section). No immigrant group correlation differed significantly from that for the Australian control group, and differences between immigrant groups were not significant across the correlations for the five nationalities ($\chi^2 = 4.22$, $df = 4$, NS) or the three cultural groups ($\chi^2 = 2.14$, $df = 2$, NS).

(2) Alienation and I-G Disparity

For the sample as a whole greater disparity between the values held by the child and those of his parents concerning activities particularly relevant to the teenager predicted a higher Alienation score. This was generally the case for all subsamples, although less so for United Kingdom children (see Table 10.21).

The overall correlation between Alienation and I-G Disparity was highly significant ($r = .30$, $p < .001$). All groups contributed toward this, the individual correlations for the Australian control group ($r = .34$, $p < .05$) and the Southern European sample ($r = .36$, $p < .05$) reaching significance, and a trend being evident for North-west European subjects ($r = .30$, $p < .10$). Scores for the Italian children as a separate group also correlated significantly ($r = .50$, $p < .05$). This was in accord with the trend toward a relationship mentioned above as being found for Italian children's scores on the Australianism Disparity and Alienation scales. The correlation for the United Kingdom group was not significant.

Table 10.20. Correlation between Australianism Disparity and Alienation T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	.03	- .29	.04	- .17	.41	.02	.18	.04	- .03	.05
t	0.15	1.19	0.15	0.98	1.83	0.10	1.11	0.38	0.16	0.65
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations with Australian Control Group									
z	0.21	0.88	0.20	0.61	1.52	0.17	0.88	0.32	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

Table 10.21. Correlation between Intergenerational Disparity and Alienation T-Scores

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
r	.20	.26	.33	.30	.50	.25	.36	.29	.34	.30
t	1.19	1.04	1.28	1.94	2.38	1.10	2.37	3.15	2.20	3.78
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	<.05	N.S.	<.05	<.01	<.05	<.001
	Comparison of Immigrant Correlations with Australian Control Group									
z	0.61	0.28	0.05	0.19	0.65	0.34	0.12	0.26	-	-
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-	-

However no immigrant group correlation differed significantly from that for the Australian control group, and an analysis of variance for the immigrant groups revealed little variation among the five immigrant nationalities (χ^2 = 1.33, df = 4, NS) or the three cultural groups (χ^2 = 0.52, df = 2, NS).

(3) Multiple Correlation: Disparity Measures as Predictors of Alienation

Both immigrant and Australian control group children who saw their generation as disagreeing with their parents over what a teenager should and should not be permitted to do, were also more alienated than were those children whose teenage values did not differ greatly from those of their parents. For Italian children, moreover, measurement by the Australianism Disparity scale of the discrepancy between general social values held by the two generations, in combination with the I-G Disparity score, significantly improved this prediction of alienation. This was not true for other groups, or for the sample as a whole (see Table 10.22).

For immigrants and for the sample as a whole, the overall relationship was significant (R = .30, $p < .01$). However this resulted from a low positive intercorrelation between the predictors, a low positive relationship between Alienation and Australianism Disparity, and a substantial positive correlation of it with I-G Disparity.

Improvement of the two scales combined over the ability of I-G Disparity to predict Alienation scores was negligible over the total sample (F = 0.18, NS). However this was not true for Italian children.

Table 10.22. Multiple Correlation between Disparity Measures and Alienation

	United Kingdom	North West European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
		Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Australianism Disparity & I-G Disparity r	.20	- .35	- .40	- .34	.10	.40	.25	.04	.13	.06
Australianism Disparity & Alienation r	.03	- .29	.04	- .17	.41	.02	.18	.04	- .03	.05
I-G Disparity & Alienation r	.20	.26	.33	.30	.50	.25	.36	.29	.34	.30
R	.20	.34	.38	.31	.62	.26	.37	.30	.35	.30
F_R	0.69	0.90	1.06	1.56	4.92	0.63	2.93	4.95	2.46	7.17
df	2,32	2,14	2,13	2,30	2,16	2,17	2,36	2,104	2,36	2,143
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.05	N.S.	<.10	<.01	<.10	<.01
Improvement: F_{R-r}	0.00	0.44	0.53	0.19	3.41	0.12	0.35	.05	0.19	0.18
df	1,32	1,14	1,13	1,30	1,16	1,17	1,36	1,104	1,36	1,143
p	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	<.10	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

For them both Australianism Disparity and I-G Disparity correlated substantially and positively with Alienation, resulting in a significant R value ($R = .62$, $p < .05$) and a trend toward improvement ($F = 3.41$, $p < .10$). Italians were thus the only group for whom an improvement in predictive power was indicated after combining the two disparity measures to predict Alienation.

Table 10.23 summarises the main correlational findings for Australianism Disparity. The N for each group is shown, together with the correlation for that group between Australianism Disparity and each of the six measures of the four types of reaction to disparity. Where such correlations reached significance beyond the 10 per cent level, the degree to which they did so is indicated. Table 10.24 presents a similar summary of predictions achieved by the I-G Disparity scale. Again N for each group is shown, together with the correlation between I-G Disparity and each of the six conflict reaction measures for that group. Probabilities beyond the 10 per cent level are also given.

These two chapters have presented in detail the results obtained by the project. The following chapter offers interpretations of these findings, relates them to work by previous investigators, and suggests implications for further research.

Table 10.23. Prediction of Reactions to Conflict by Australianism Disparity

r Australianism Disparity by:		United Kingdom	Northwest European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
			Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
	N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Parental Compliance	r	-.10	.07	.40	.17	-.32	-.22	-.30	-.11	.13	-.06
	p							<.10			
Parental Deference	r	-.08	.07	.20	.11	-.21	-.04	-.11	-.05	.11	-.04
	p										
P. G. I.	r	.27	.26	.13	.19	-.29	-.02	-.06	.15	.00	.09
	p										
Socially Unacceptable Behaviour	r	.19	.11	.27	.17	.25	.38	.31	.24	-.10	.18
	p						<.10	<.10	<.02		
Wrongdoing Rating	r	.18	-.28	-.02	-.17	.45	.29	.36	.15	-.26	.08
	p					<.10		<.05			
Alienation	r	.03	-.29	.04	-.17	.41	.02	.18	.04	-.03	.05
	p					<.10					

Table 10.24 Prediction of Reactions to Conflict by Intergeneration Disparity

r I-G Disparity by:		United Kingdom	Northwest European			Southern European			TOTAL IM.	Australian	TOTAL
			Dutch	German	TOTAL	Italian	Greek	TOTAL			
	N	35	17	16	33	19	20	39	107	39	146
Parental Compliance	r	-.11	-.54	-.29	-.46	-.70	-.49	-.57	-.41	-.19	-.35
	p		<.05		<.01	<.001	<.05	<.001	<.001		<.001
Parental Deference	r	.01	.36	-.36	.04	.36	-.01	.17	.04	.12	.06
	p										
P. G. I.	r	.43	.03	-.01	-.01	.38	.33	.32	.28	-.01	.21
	p	<.01						<.05	<.01		<.01
Socially Unacceptable Behaviour	r	.56	.26	.33	.27	.58	.43	.50	.45	.39	.43
	p	<.001				<.01	<.10	<.01	<.001	<.02	<.001
Wrongdoing Rating	r	.46	.55	.36	.48	.36	.46	.39	.44	.40	.42
	p	<.01	<.05		<.01		<.05	<.02	<.001	<.02	<.001
Alienation	r	.20	.26	.33	.30	.50	.25	.36	.29	.34	.30
	p				<.10	<.05		<.05	<.01	<.05	<.01

CHAPTER 11. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Topics covered in this chapter include the size of the generation gap, or disparity of values between parents and adolescents; the effectiveness of the measures and model employed in examining it; differences between the cultural groups in the degree of intergeneration disparity; and comparison and contrast of groups in the reactions of their members to the conflict aroused by such disparity. In each section an attempt is made to relate findings to those of major investigations previously conducted, and to set out implications of the findings of the present study for further research. Results are not presented again in detail where it can be avoided as it is presumed that the presentation and brief summaries of findings already offered are sufficient to allow discussion of them to flow freely without interruption.

Limitations of the measures used have been discussed in preceding chapters and are enlarged on here only where they seem particularly relevant to data interpretation. Similarly relationships between previous and present findings considered to be most useful in explanation and fruitful in interpretation and further prediction are discussed. However the comprehensiveness of chapters 2, 3 and 4 makes possible finely detailed linking of previous research findings with those of the present study. Consequently some suggestions are made below concerning other contrasts and comparisons which could be drawn, although the interested reader could no doubt discern further interrelationships also.

The previous two chapters have set out in detail the results from the comparison of mean scores and the intercorrelation of scores.

Findings have been presented for the sample as a whole, for the immigrant sample compared with the Australian control group, and for each immigrant cultural group and nationality. With few exceptions, analysis of results for the immigrant subsamples in terms of the five national groups revealed little more than did comparison of the three immigrant cultural groups. As expected, Dutch and German children responded similarly to most measures, and Italian and Greek responses differed less from one another than they did from those of other groups. The bulk of the discussion in this chapter therefore refers to the four cultural groups: adolescent children reared in Australia by parents from the United Kingdom, Northwest Europe, Southern Europe, or Australia itself. Exceptions are noted appropriately.

Cautions are repeated however. These findings are from a sample of 146 children and their parents from the Melbourne metropolitan area. Interviewing procedure with parents was not as standard as might have been desired. Children and parents responded in English to a battery of questionnaires, and their responses (approximately 87,000 altogether) were analysed and interpreted *en bloc*. The sample was not representative, and when "the Australian child" or "the Southern European adolescent" is mentioned as having responded in one way or another, it is the average response of a relatively small (N = 33-39) group which is being discussed. A further limitation is that children of parents from only these six cultural backgrounds were interviewed and findings presented here are not necessarily capable of being generalised to other immigrant groups.

Moreover families selected were of predominantly low socioeconomic status. This was deliberate, as lower socioeconomic levels pro-

vided the greatest pool of subjects, yet it was desired to keep socio-economic status constant. Work cited in chapter 2 suggested that the greater permissiveness of middle-class child-rearing should result in greater intergenerational disparity. On the other hand the more authoritarian upbringing of the working class child may well mean that what frustration he does experience arouses greater conflict for him. Whatever the case, socioeconomic status was kept constant in the present study, and findings are not necessarily applicable to families of higher socio-economic status.

Finally the data collected is extremely varied and extensive, so that analysis of it in other ways is possible. For instance, item analysis in terms of criterion prediction of several of the scales used would be useful. It would be worthwhile discovering on just what social norms parents and their children differed, and in exactly what types of misbehaviour these adolescents indulged. Similarly, factor analysis of such measures as the Australianism Disparity scale and the Parental Deference index could give relevant and probably useful information. In fact, to this end as mentioned in chapter 7 above, an analysis of the Australianism Disparity scale is presented and discussed in detail.

However this project was commenced with four specific aims in mind. It was hoped to measure the amount of value disparity between the generations in both immigrant and Australian adolescent families. The relative significance of the culture conflict caused by such disparity to the second-generation immigrant adolescent compared with his Australian peer was to be assessed. Measurement was attempted of differences in the degree of such conflict between children whose parents

had immigrated from various homelands. Finally it was hoped to discriminate between the diverse reactions to such conflict being employed by Australian adolescents compared with second-generation immigrant adolescents, and by second-generation adolescents differing from one another according to the homeland of their parents.

These, therefore, were the questions to which answers were sought, and they provide the main themes of the following discussion. In seeking them, measures were adopted, adapted or devised, and a model of reaction to intergenerational culture conflict was formulated to provide a framework on which to hang them. The success or otherwise of both measures and model is therefore also discussed.

THE SIZE OF THE GAP

One aim of this study was to discover the extent to which intergenerational culture conflict occurred in Australia, and especially amongst immigrant groups. On the Australianism Disparity scale, the mean score for the total sample was 27.30 from a possible total of 66.0. If the weightings of the individual items are disregarded, this corresponds to a mean score of 11.65 from a possible of 28.0. Thus the average adolescent disagreed with his parents on approximately 40 per cent of a set of statements concerning broad social issues.

Disparity between behaviour acceptable to the two generations in areas of activity especially relevant to the teenager was examined in four ways. When the child's responses were compared with those he expected to be made by his parents on the Intergeneration Disparity scale of 17 items, the total sample mean = 4.45. Comparing children's

responses with those actually made by their parents, a mean of 5.56 was obtained. The responses predicted by the child to be made by his peer group differed from those he expected his parents to give on an average of 6.74 items, and from those actually made by his parents by an average 7.78 items. Thus differences found ranged from the gap perceived by the child between himself and his parents of 26 per cent to that between his perceived peers and his parents' actual responses of 45 per cent. The average of these four estimates of disparity was 36 per cent of items.

Hence, on items dealing with broad social issues, a substantial intergeneration gap was found. The discrepancy between parents and children on questions concerning behaviour relevant to the teenager was slightly smaller, but still approximately 40 per cent. A sizeable generation gap does exist in Australia. However children perceived the disparity between themselves and their parents on teenage mores as smaller than it was in fact, and reported their peer group to differ from their parents to a greater extent than they did themselves. Differences were in the same direction for all groups, and most were highly significant. Such consistency across a large number of children from homes varying in cultural background suggests that they recognised that a disparity between their parents' mores and their own did exist, but that they projected some of their own failure to conform with adult conventions on to their peers.

Dunphy (1969) described the adolescent in modern Western society as in a marginal position, hovering between his family and adult society. As discussed in chapter 2, adolescence is lengthy in industrialised

society because the family gives relatively little assistance to the teenager in attaining either the occupational or the sexual roles of adult society. Moreover rapid technological change requires skills and values to be learnt which cannot be imparted to the adolescent by his parents. Finally adult society is inconsistent in defining the adolescent's social roles. The peer group offers the security and acceptance which the adult world fails to provide and consequently becomes the major source for him of social norms. Dunphy found that peer-group leaders were the primary interpreters and imparters of these norms. The adolescent identified closely with them, in that he cited them as examples of his ideal self and named them rather than peers of equal group status, as his associates. They became, in effect, parent surrogates. Dunphy's findings were supported by those of the present study. Adolescents were moving away from their parents in their search for norms of social behaviour, and gave evidence of this in the substantial proportion of behavioural norms over which they disagreed with their parents. Similarly, Dunphy showed that, in a group of Australian adolescents, it was between the ages of 14 and 16 years that the greater part of these changes occurred. This corresponds with the age span of the teenagers involved in the present study.

Finally, Dunphy pointed out that most adolescents are unaware of the extent to which they are replacing their parents with peer-group leaders as their most important models of behaviour and beliefs. This again was supported by the findings of the present study mentioned above. The child saw his peers as disagreeing with his parents to a greater extent than he himself did, and did not realise the degree to which he also differed from them.

Connell et al. (1957) found only a moderate degree of discrepancy reported by adolescents between themselves and their parents, but their subjects' responses also demonstrated that the teenager saw his peer group as more liberal than his parents. Moreover, when dissension over norms did occur between the two generations, children conformed with their peers rather than with their parents. The findings of the present study suggested that this was not only still true, but that such dissension arose over a wider range of issues than it had for families 13 years previously in the Connell et al. study.

Consequently the evidence summarised in chapters 2 and 3 concerning the increasing gap between the generations in the Western world would appear relevant to Australia also. Contemporary society is changing rapidly in its typical familial structure, the socialisation role of its schools, the type of morality being inculcated in its adolescents, and in the relationships offered the adolescent by his peers and adult society as a whole. The rapidity of this change is causing the generation gap to be more important now than ever before. That such a gap exists in Australia also is suggested by the findings of the present study.

Thus there is a substantial generation gap between parents and adolescents in Australia, although the adolescent tends not to realise how large it is, and depicts his peers as being the young people who really differ markedly from the norms of his parents. Future investigators of intergenerational disparity would therefore be advised to obtain information on the size of the gap perceived by the child as existing between his peer group and his parents, as well as on the extent to which he reports himself as differing from them.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS IN INTERGENERATIONAL DISPARITY

Almost without exception, writers on the assimilation of immigrants into Australian society have argued that the discrepancy is greater between norms held by immigrant parents and their Australian-born adolescent children than is the generation gap between Australian parents and their children. Similarly, studies of children in other societies where large-scale immigration has occurred such as the United States (Child, 1943; Glazer & Moynihan, 1963) and the United Kingdom (Patterson, 1965) found that the second-generation child was commonly in a state of more severe conflict than was either the immigrant child or his indigenous peer. He had no childhood experiences of a culture with norms similar to those of his parents. His parents themselves were often tense and insecure as they attempted to cope with a new society. He met prejudice from host society peers for which he could see no justification. And so it continued (see chapters 2, 3 and 4).

Such intergenerational conflict in the child has been predicted to occur particularly during adolescence (Zubrzycki, 1964). Prior to puberty, in a modern industrialised society such as Australia, the child's life is dominated by his parents, from whom he learns social and behavioural norms and with whom his most satisfying relationships are established. During adolescence social interaction, a morality based on the ability to think in terms of formal operations (Flavell, 1963), a code of adult behaviour, and a self-identity become increasingly important (Singer & Singer, 1969). The adolescent looks beyond his parents and family for satisfaction of these needs. His peers and their values become far more salient for him (Boehme, 1966). Consequently, disparity

between the beliefs and behavioural norms of his peers and his parents arouses greater conflict in him than it had prior to adolescence. If differences exist between the background of his parents and that of his host society peers in addition to the common effect of rapid change in modern society, it has frequently been argued that even greater conflict is aroused (eg., Radziowski, 1963, 1964). Thus it is frequently contended that the intensity of such conflict is determined by the number of issues over which the generations differ, rather than by the resources available to both child and parents in their attempts to cope with such intergenerational disparity. If this is true, the second-generation child of immigrant parents should score higher than does his Australian peer on a measure of value disparity between the generations as well as on measures of conflict reaction.

On the other hand, the evidence and arguments concerning the culture gap between generations in contemporary technological society summarised in chapter 2 suggests that, in 1970, the temporal gap between the generations may be so great as to equal or even exceed the effects of geographical differences. Taft (1965) suggests that this might be so. Doczy (1967, 1969) described the main cause of culture conflict in immigrant families as the more rapid assimilation into the host society by second-generation adolescents than by their parents. Having been reared in traditional societies, in relatively authoritarian families, parents were unable to adjust to change as rapidly as were their offspring, born into a host society which was itself rapidly changing. Students of intergenerational conflict in contemporary society ascribe it to the inability of parents to keep pace with the changes

in modern society, while their adolescent children have comparatively little difficulty in doing so (Hurlock, 1972). The similarity between the descriptions is striking. The major source of conflict for second-generation immigrants studied in pre-World War II New York by Child (1943) was the difference between the culture of their parents and that of their peers. The rapidity of change in modern technological society described, for instance, by Brown (1973), suggests that the native-born Australian adolescent may be experiencing conflict of a very similar nature. If so, he should score as high on a measure of intergenerational value disparity as do his Australian-born adolescent peers whose parents are immigrants, although his reactions to the conflict caused by such disparity may differ from theirs.

A major aim in conducting this research was therefore to discover whether the culture gap between immigrant parents and their Australian-born adolescent children was greater than or equal to that between Australian parents and their children. The Australianism Disparity scale and the Intergeneration Disparity index were employed to measure this variable.

Australianism Disparity

A significantly greater disparity was found between Australian children and their parents than was found for the immigrant sample as a whole. Both the Northwest European and the Southern European groups of adolescents disagreed with their parents less than did the Australian children. Although the United Kingdom sample mean score was also lower, the difference was not significant. However analysis of variance showed

the variation across immigrant mean scores to be small. For the moment, then, the immigrants can be thought of as a group, and as a group they evinced less intergenerational disparity of norms than did Australians.

This supported a finding by Hay et al. (1967), who showed immigrant children to agree more closely with their parents than did Australian young people on a series of questions concerning the centrality of the family in their social life. It also supported Johnston's (1969) assertion that second-generation children do not assimilate quickly, and retain attitudes toward social interaction and the host society which are very similar to those of their parents. Similarly, Taft (1965) claimed that, although children of immigrants had weaker ties with Australia than did their parents, so did Australian children. Taft set out in detail Richardson's theory of assimilation, which states that satisfaction and identification with a culture are necessary before assimilation into it can occur. He claimed that young people, both Australian and immigrant, are dissatisfied with the traditional "Australian way of life", and do not therefore identify with it (Taft, 1963, 1965). However, as immigrant parents are not completely acculturated, the gap between them and their children is, if anything, smaller than that between the Australian generations.

To examine this in greater depth, data obtained in the present study was analysed further. Children and their parents were scored on the items of the Australianism Scale following Taft's original specifications. That is, they were scored on his concept of "Australianism" (Taft, 1962). A mixed design analysis of variance for a two-factor experiment having repeated measures (Winer, 1962, pp.376-378) was per-

formed. Variation between parents and children, between cultural groups, and the interaction between them, was tested using an unweighted means solution. Contrary to Taft's report of weaker ties with Australia in adolescents, children as a group scored significantly higher on Australianism than did their parents (Children $\bar{X}$ = 33.50, Parents $\bar{X}$ = 29.73, F = 41.41, df = 1,142, $p < .001$). However variance across the cultural groups was also significant (F = 11.81, df = 3,142, $p < .001$). Further comparison of the cultural group means, remembering that these were the mean scores for parents and children combined, showed no difference between Australian ($\bar{X}$ = 33.49) and United Kingdom ($\bar{X}$ = 33.78) groups. However the Australian group mean differed significantly from those of the Northwest European ($\bar{X}$ = 31.03, F = 5.39, df = 1,144, $p < .05$) and the Southern European ($\bar{X}$ = 28.29, F = 26.28, df = 1,144, $p < .001$) groups. Similarly, significant differences were found between the mean score of the United Kingdom group and those of the Northwest European (F = 6.41, df = 1,144, $p < .05$) and the Southern European (F = 27.77, df = 1,144, $p < .001$) groups. Finally the Northwest European and Southern European groups also differed significantly (F = 6.71, df = 1,144, $p < .01$). Thus Australian and United Kingdom families scored at the same level on the Australianism Scale, each scoring significantly higher than the Northwest European cultural group, who in turn scored significantly higher than did the Southern Europeans. This provides some evidence toward validating Taft's claim that the scale discriminates between Australians and European immigrants. As the scale was originally designed more than a decade ago, this information is useful. Furthermore, the adult respondents had resided in Australia

an average of 15.8 years, while Taft's subjects had immigrated a maximum of 9 years before being questioned. Taft's distinction between European and United Kingdom immigrants was also shown to be wise, as no difference was found between Australian and United Kingdom mean scores.

Particularly relevant for the present study, however, was the interaction between the two main effects. The work of Taft and his colleagues (Taft, 1965), combined with that of writers on Southern Europeans in Australia (Borrie & Packer, 1954; Price, 1963a) suggested that the gap between parents and children should be least for Australian families, greater between United Kingdom parents and their children, even more substantial for Northwest Europeans, and greatest of all in Southern European families. However the interaction was not significant after the analysis of variance (F = 1.75, df = 3,142, NS). Notwithstanding, the differences between the mean scores of the two generations increased steadily in the direction predicted, from Australian (Mean difference = 1.72) to United Kingdom (Mean difference = 3.66) to Northwest European (Mean difference = 4.30) to Southern European (Mean difference = 5.47). Assuming a continuum of cultural distance from the host culture in approximately equal steps from Australia to United Kingdom to Northwest Europe to Southern Europe (see chapter 4), a linear trend analysis of the interaction (Winer, 1962, pp.273-276) was carried out. Of the variance due to the interaction, the linear x linear component accounted for 96.7 per cent and was significant (F = 5.06, df = 1,143, $p < .05$). Similarly, a significant difference in trend between the two generations was found for the simple effect of Australianism gap for different cultural groups (F = 35.30, df = 1,2,

$p < .05$). Further analysis showed the differences between the mean Australianism scores of parents and children were not significant for Australian ($F = 0.53$, $df = 1,143$, NS) or United Kingdom families ($F = 2.39$, $df = 1,143$, NS). However parents and children differed significantly in both the Northwest European ($F = 3.30$, $df = 1,143$, $p < .10$) and Southern European ($F = 5.34$, $df = 1,143$, $p < .05$) cultural groups.

Therefore Australian and United Kingdom parents did not differ from their children in their belief in the "Australian way of life". Northwest European parents and to an even greater extent, Southern European parents scored lower on Taft's Australianism Scale than did their adolescent children. The picture here is thus the antithesis of that seen in Australianism Disparity results. Although Australian children disagreed with their parents' social mores to a greater extent than did immigrant children, it was not over the typical Australian image that they did so. European children of immigrants were more Australian than their parents, while Australian and United Kingdom adolescents were not.

This suggests that Taft's Australianism Scale is measuring something more than Australianism as such, and that further analysis of it should be performed before using it for that purpose. A study enabling examination of the external correlates of individual items should be revealing concerning the factors which it is measuring. It would appear, for instance, that it is also sensitive to the rapid social change which writers overseas (Sherif & Sherif, 1964; Singer & Singer, 1969) have pointed to as causing the ever-widening gap between parents and their children. The evidence cited above suggests that this is occurring

in Australia also. Although Australian children do not disagree with their parents on Australianism, they do dissent from them on other social mores also tapped by the Scale, presumably of greater generality. On the other hand, while second-generation adolescents do not dispute their immigrant parents' attitudes to life in general, they come closer to the Australian ideal than do their parents, and this is especially noticeable in Southern European families.

From Australianism Disparity results, then, the answer to the question of whether there is greater disparity of values between immigrant parents and their Australian-born children than there is between Australian parents and theirs, is that there is not. If anything, Australian children disagreed with their parents with greater frequency than did their second-generation peers. The narrower issue of whether children of immigrants are more like Australians in their social beliefs than are their parents was answered in the affirmative, at least as far as Northwest European and Southern European families were concerned.

The discussion presented here in some detail also supports the use in the present study of the items of the Australianism Scale as a Disparity measure, rather than in its original form. When simple amount of disagreement between parents and children, that is, intergenerational disparity, was measured, results were opposite to those found when the degree of Australianism evident in the two generations was assessed. Use of the scale as an Australianism measure rather than as an index of Disparity would have been misleading. A final note of caution should be sounded concerning these findings. In both Taft's

original work and in the present study, the Australianism scale was not internally consistent. This emphasises the need for further refinement of it.

Intergeneration Disparity

On the Intergeneration Disparity measure no significant difference was found between the parent-child disagreement evident in the various national or cultural groups or in the Australian control group. Australian children disagreed with their parents over activities relevant to the teenager as much as did immigrant children. This again refutes the arguments of the many authors cited in the review of Australian literature on immigrant families, that second-generation children are in an aggravated situation of disagreement with their parents over behavioural mores. They do disagree, but no more than do Australian children and their parents.

Thus Taft's (1965) argument was supported that intergenerational friction is common to all cultural groups in modern industrialised society. Similarly Dunphy's (1969) findings that Australian children were rebelling against their parents were also supported. Johnston (1969) suggested that disagreement between immigrant children and their parents ("cultural tension") did not give rise to culture conflict to an excessive extent because they identified with the homeland culture from which their parents had come. The Australianism Scale findings discussed above found this not to be true for the sample of the present study. However, her subjects were Polish refugees, and it was unfortunate that she provided no comparable data for Australian families. Culture tension also occurs for them, but is resolved in other ways.

However Johnston's distinction between culture tension, as the amount of disagreement over social mores between parents and children, and culture conflict, as the uncertainty and insecurity in the child resulting from such tension, is useful here (Johnston, 1969; Taft & Johnston, 1967). The present study looked not only at the amount of disagreement between parents and children (culture tension), but also at the ways in which they attempted to resolve the culture conflict arising from it. The following section discusses the results obtained concerning the varied reactions measured to culture conflict.

REACTIONS TO INTERGENERATIONAL CULTURE CONFLICT

The theory outlined in chapter 5 argued that four means are available to the adolescent of reducing the conflict aroused by disparity between the mores imparted by their two most salient reference groups. Where peers and parents disagreed sufficiently to arouse conflict, the adolescent could react by rejecting his parents, rejecting his peers, rejecting the system of norms over which they disagreed, or by rejecting society as a whole. This section discusses the degree to which these reactions occurred in the sample as a whole, and in the different groups comprising it.

Total Sample

The only reaction predicted by scores on Australianism Disparity was rejection of social mores as measured by the Socially Unacceptable Behaviour questionnaire. Correlations with other reaction measures were insignificant. Thus children who disagreed with their parents

over the general social issues measured did not give evidence of experiencing severe conflict as a result. Moreover those who did feel some conflict resolved it by rejecting the norms over which disagreement occurred, rather than rejecting either or both of the reference groups from whose norms the disagreement arose. Furthermore, the correlations for different groups between Australianism Disparity and conflict reaction measures in no case varied significantly from one another.

It would appear that the differences between Australian and immigrant homeland societies on broad cultural norms such as attitudes to women, social mobility, language, sport and food are not salient enough to the teenager to arouse strong conflict in him. He is sufficiently flexible to adapt to the different norms. Thus the assumptions by a large number of writers on the second-generation child that such disparities must cause conflict in the child were not supported. Rather, Taft's (1965) suggestion that modern Western society is homogeneous yet flexible enough to allow such differences to occur without arousing strong conflict between differing subcultures within them would seem to have been confirmed; at least as far as adolescents are concerned.

On the other hand, disagreement over the values attached to mores particularly relevant to the teenager caused stronger conflict. Disparity between parental and adolescent norms of behaviour and belief of concern to the teenager, such as dating, driving a car, staying out late at night, and leaving home, was measured by the Intergeneration Disparity (I-G Disparity) index. Scores on this measure correlated significantly for the total sample with scores on measures of all four

modes of reaction. Disparity between parents and adolescents predicted rejection of parents as measured by Parental Compliance, identification with peers as shown by Peer-Group Importance (P.G.I.), rejection of social mores indicated by both Wrongdoing Rating and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour, and rejection of society as a whole, inferred from Alienation scores. Note that subjects in a state of conflict rejected their parents rather than identifying with them, and identified with the peer group rather than rejecting it. This is in accord with the finding of Connell et al. (1957), that where conflict occurred adolescents followed their peer group rather than their parents.

An important inference to be made from these results is that the model presented in chapter 5 of adolescent reaction to intergenerational conflict was validated in that predictions derived from it were confirmed. Assuming that disagreement over salient norms between the adolescent's two most important reference groups does arouse conflict within him, it was predicted that he would attempt to reduce it by identifying with one or the other of the two reference groups while ignoring or rejecting the other, by rejecting the norms over which conflict occurred, or by rejecting both reference groups as inadequate exemplars on which to model his own behaviour and beliefs. As a group the sample gave evidence of employing three of these means of tension reduction. The one not utilized was rejection of peers, and this is logical when the overriding salience of the peer group to adolescents is taken into account (Singer & Singer, 1969).

These four types of relationship between the adolescent, his parents, his peers, and their respective social norms, are therefore

offered as a useful and theoretically sound categorization of reactions by the adolescent to intergenerational culture conflict.

Child (1943) suggested as possible five types of response to intergenerational culture conflict. The "rebel" and "in-group" responses were equivalent to what are referred to here as peer-group identification and parental identification. Child's escape or "apathy" response was similar in nature to alienation. The adolescent withdraws from society as a whole in an effort to avoid the conflict situation and minimise the effect of belonging to a minority out-group within an antipathetic host society. Working with second-generation children of Italian parents, Child found these to be the three forms of reaction to intergenerational conflict most frequently manifested.

A fourth was alternate switching of allegiances, or "self-compromise", and was found only rarely. However it can be seen as equivalent to the reaction of rejection of social mores found to be most common in the present study. In an attempt to maintain a positive relationship with both reference groups the child rejects as not worthy of consistent compliance the norms over which the two groups differ. The response most frequently made by adolescents in Australia in 1970 was that made least often by children in a similar situation of conflict in New York in 1939. The modern adolescent appears to have been educated to have a greater ability to adapt to change than was possessed by his predecessors a generation ago.

The fifth response Child mentioned is that of "blocking", where the adolescent remains in a state of conflict, unable to perceive a way out, and becomes inert and unresponsive. Child suggested that this

might be a form of psychosis, and the evidence of schizophrenic withdrawal in second-generation children cited by Australian workers (Listwan, 1960; Radziowski, 1963, 1964; Stoller, 1968) lends support to this suggestion. However, this was considered in the present study to be an extreme reaction, not likely to be found with sufficient frequency in a study of this scale to warrant specific attention.

Thus Child's categorization, based on a casework approach with a large group of second-generation adolescents of one nationality in a different host society 30 years ago, was found by the present study to be still relevant. However, his categories were refined, to an extent redefined, and tied to a theory based in social psychology rather than derived from learning theory as were his.

The present study therefore also achieved the aim of development of a theory of adolescent reaction to intergenerational conflict which provides a satisfactory framework for the study of differences and similarities between groups of adolescents in their reactions to such conflict.

Instruments

A battery of questionnaire measures was developed for the assessment of both intergenerational friction and the four basic reactions to the conflict arising from it. When measuring intergenerational disparity, disagreement over both broad social conventions and specific familial norms was assessed. This followed Zubrzycki's (1960a) advice that relations with both primary and secondary reference groups are important in the assimilation of the migrant.

The Australianism Disparity scale was not satisfactory in its internal consistency and should be further refined, probably into at least two separate scales. It should be converted into two measures, of disagreement on Australianism, and of disparity of social mores in general, before being used in further research. Item analysis and factor analysis, in terms of both internal consistency and criterion group predictive validity, would be a worthwhile approach.

However the I-G Disparity index proved to have satisfactory internal consistency, and to predict conflict in adolescents, both indigenous and second-generation children of immigrants. It is offered as a useful measure of culture tension (Johnston, 1969; Taft & Johnston, 1967) between adolescents and their parents. That its specific measurement of cultural norms inculcated in the child was more useful than the general measurement attempted by the Australianism Disparity scale supports the conclusion by Wesley & Karr (1966) that specific rather than global topics are more useful when designing instruments for cross-cultural research.

Measurement of identification with parents was less successful. To discover whether the measures used, Parental Compliance and Parental Deference, were measuring the same dimension, a correlation coefficient was computed. No significant relationship over the total sample was found (r = .10, t = 1.21, df = 144, NS). Moreover, correlations for national groups ranged from negative for Italian (r = -.32, NS) to positive for United Kingdom (r = .29, $p < .10$) and German (r = .57, $p < .05$) samples. The variance of the within-group correlation coefficients across the six nationalities (Australians included) was sig-

nificantly greater than expected (χ^2 = 9.53, df = 5, p < .10) and subsequent comparisons showed the Italian and German correlations to differ significantly after correction of the z score required by the Bonferroni t method (z = 2.63, df = 33, p < .05).

Thus United Kingdom and German subjects who reported behaviour conforming to parents' mores also refused to join their peers when peer-group behaviour was felt to be parentally disapproved. For other groups, and for the sample as a whole, there was no consistent relationship between the scales. It was concluded that no evidence for the validity of the scales had been found for the sample as a whole, but that the predicted positive relationship between scores on them had been demonstrated for the United Kingdom and German subsamples.

A second validation criterion for the two scales was their relationship with the P.G.I. index. This measured identification with peers, and according to the theory of reaction being followed, would be more likely to correlate negatively than positively with measures of parental identification. Correlation over the total sample between Parental Compliance and P.G.I. scores was significant and in the predicted direction (r = -.22, df = 144, p < .01). However the variance of the correlations of the cultural groups was also significant (χ^2 = 6.52, df = 3, p < .10). The correlation for the Australian control group (r = .07, NS) was significantly different (z = 2.52, df = 76, p < .05) from that for Southern Europeans (r = -.48, p < .01) and from that for the immigrant sample (r = -.33, p < .001) as a whole (z = 2.13, df = 144, p < .05). Thus there was no relationship for Australian children between the importance of peers and compliance with parents. In

contrast, for immigrants and particularly Southern Europeans, identification with peers meant rejection of parents' mores.

However, when Parental Deference was correlated with P.G.I., the opposite occurred. Across the four cultural groups correlations varied significantly (χ^2 = 16.00, df = 3, $p < .01$) and the difference was again between Australian children and Southern Europeans (z = 4.00, df = 76, $p < .001$). However, strong identification with parents by Australian children now predicted seeing the peer group as unimportant (r = -.50, $p < .01$). In contrast, children of Southern European parents who identified strongly with them also regarded their peers as an important reference group (r = .38, $p < .02$).

Thus before any mention of peers had been made, Southern European children who later were going to say they saw their peers as an important reference group, for the present said that they did not model themselves on their parents. Subsequently however, when conforming to peers was suggested as an alternative to identifying with parents, these same children then said that they would obey their parents rather than conform with their peers. Similarly, Southern European adolescents who scored low on P.G.I. scored high on Parental Compliance (peers not mentioned) but low also on Parental Deference (peers suggested as an alternative reference group).

Hence the question of the validity of the two measures had not been answered. For the Australian control group, Parental Deference correlated negatively with importance of peers, while it was Parental Compliance which went with P.G.I. scores in the predicted direction for immigrants.

Nevertheless, interesting evidence of a situation similar to double bind for Southern European children had emerged. They gave evidence that, in principle, if they identified with their parents, they rejected their peers, and vice versa. In practice however, those who saw their peer group as important also claimed to be obedient to their parents rather than conform with that same peer group, and similarly, those who set little store by their peers nonetheless reported greater readiness to disobey parents in order to conform with the peer group. Practically the opposite was found for the Australian control group. In principle, modelling by Australian children on parents bore no relationship to importance of peers, but in practice, those who obeyed their parents saw their peer group as unimportant, while disobedient children had a strongly salient peer group.

Salmon (1969), on a sample of boys in the United Kingdom, found that children accepted by their parents both conformed and identified with either their parents or their peers. Parentally rejected children, on the other hand, attempted to conform with the norms of both reference groups, but did not identify with the values of either. Combined with the evidence discussed above, this suggests that Southern Curopean children experiencing intergenerational disparity feel more strongly rejected by their parents than do children of other groups. They attempt to conform to both parents and peers, but do not identify with the value system of either reference group.

Despite the information gleaned from results obtained using the Parental Compliance and Parental Deference measures, neither was shown to have satisfactory validity. Use of them in their present form

in further research is therefore not recommended. However refinement of the Parental Deference index would seem worthwhile. It discriminated strongly between adolescents of differing cultural groups, was ppowerful in prediction of differences in peer-group identification, has a larger number of items, contains a built-in control against a set toward extreme responses, and gave a wide distribution of scores on a standardised scoring system. Nevertheless a satisfactory measure of identification with parents has yet to be devised.

The Peer-Group Importance index, in contrast, was found to be both reasonably internally consistent, and valid as a measure of response to intergenerational conflict. Its positive correlation over the total sample with I-G Disparity, and the negative correlation of scores of the Australian control group on it with those on the Parental Deference index, suggest that it is a valid measure of adolescent identification with the peer group at the expense of parents.

Similarly, the two measures of rejection of social mores, Wrongdoing Rating and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour, proved to be reliable in that they correlated highly with one another, and valid in that high scores on each of them were predicted by high I-G Disparity scores. The correlation between Australianism Disparity and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour for the total sample, although low, was also significant, and adds further weight to the contention that Socially Unacceptable Behaviour is a valid measure of adolescent reaction to the conflict caused by intergenerational tension.

That Socially Unacceptable Behaviour and Wrongdoing Rating were measuring different aspects of the same variable was demonstrated by

the significantly greater multiple correlation obtained when relating both simultaneously with I-G Disparity. Seen as predictors rather than criteria, each showed a significant relationship with I-G Disparity, but together they were even better. Nevertheless further analysis to examine the reliability and validity of specific items, and to discover precisely what are the two aspects of the dimension which they tap would be useful, preferably with a more representative sample.

Finally the Alienation scale was also shown to be a valid assessor of reaction to intergenerational conflict for the total sample. As Hughes (1968) had already demonstrated its validity and reliability as a measure of alienation per se, this was not considered necessary here. However the finding that the median score for the total sample fell above the upper quartile of scores of Hughes' standardisation sample of Australian adults is worthy of further investigation. Whether contemporary adolescents are more alienated from society as a whole than are adults, as Taft (1965) would suggest, or whether lower socio-economic status means greater alienation, or whether adolescents simply express feelings of alienation more freely than do adults, are alternative hypotheses which should be tested. However, as mentioned above, other evidence from the present study would support Taft's contention that the typical modern adolescent experiences strong feelings of alienation from adult society.

The final comment to be made concerning the instruments used is that refusal and omission rates for all questionnaires were extremely low. A number of parents and many children offered the opinion that they found the instructions and items easy to follow and stimulating

to ponder. Adolescents especially made comments like "Gee, that was interesting. I hadn't thought about a lot of those things in that way before." They seemed pleased rather than suspicious that someone was taking an interest in them and their generation. Relatively few item response errors or omissions occurred, although children made almost no queries concerning procedure. The various formats of the instruments employed are consequently recommended for further use.

Differences between Cultural Groups in Reaction to Intergenerational Conflict

Differences between Australian adolescents and second-generation children of immigrants in the means employed of coping with the conflict arising from intergenerational tension; and differences in conflict reaction between second-generation children of immigrant parents from different cultural backgrounds, were originally seen as discrete areas of investigation in this study. The weight of evidence from many previous studies suggested that culture conflict for second-generation immigrant children was disparate in both quantity and quality from that experienced by Australian children. On the other hand, other studies of the contemporary adolescent indicated that not only the second-generation adolescent, but his Australian peer also, may well experience culture conflict in a modern Western technological society.

Findings suggested that this might be so. Both Australian and second-generation adolescents were found to express dissension from parental mores. If anything, Australian children disagreed with their parents with greater frequency than did their second-generation peers,

and reactions by both categories of children to the resultant conflict aroused were approximately the same. Nevertheless some differences were found and are discussed in this section, but the accent is on differences between separate but equivalent groups, rather than on comparing immigrant children with their Australian peers.

Identification with Parents. Cultural groups did not differ from one another in the extent to which they reported compliance with their parents as a general principle (Parental Compliance scores). However, when asked to report the extent to which they obeyed their parents despite peer-group pressure to do otherwise, Northwest Europeans showed greater Parental Deference than did other groups. Nevertheless, when scores on the I-G Disparity index were correlated with scores on these two measures, it was Parental Compliance which was predicted, and not Parental Deference. The correlation between I-G Disparity and Parental Compliance was negative and highly significant for all four European immigrant groups. Children who disagreed with their parents on behaviour relevant to the teenager also disobeyed them. On the other hand, while Australian and United Kingdom adolescents disagreed with their parents no less than did European children, and reported the same amount of disobedience, the two scores were uncorrelated. A United Kingdom or Australian child who saw his generation as disagreeing with that of his parents over their beliefs concerning what a teenager ought and ought not to be able to do, did not necessarily put his disagreement into practice.

Assuming that behavioural rebellion against parents' mores is a manifestation of attempts by the child to reduce conflict, it would

seem that, while intergenerational tension is approximately equal over all groups, the amount of conflict aroused as a result of it is greater in children of European immigrant parents. This is probably due to the greater authoritarianism claimed by many authors to be typical of the Northwest and Southern European family structures (eg., Glazer & Moynihan, 1963; Price, 1963a; Stoller, 1968; Zubrzycki, 1964). Singer & Singer (1969) pointed out that authoritarian parents, in their strong demands of obedience from the child, force him to choose either to identify with them, or to reject them as behavioural models. Krupinski (1968) argued that Southern European parents, in particular, become more authoritarian toward their children during adolescence, while Australian and United Kingdom parents allow them increasing freedom. That this is so was supported by the finding that European children evidencing dissension with their parents also reported that they disobeyed them, while Australian and United Kingdom children did not.

On the other hand, the fact that I-G Disparity did not predict Parental Deference in any group, including Northwest and Southern Europeans, suggests that Parental Deference was measuring something other than a reaction in the child to conflict resulting from intergenerational tension. Northwest European children deferred more to their parents, but not necessarily because they felt discord between themselves and the older generation. They obeyed their parents rather than conform with their peers whether or not they saw the two reference groups as differing in their social mores. Other means of tension release were employed by them. Previous authors cited in chapter 4 (eg., Glazer & Moynihan, 1963; Kern, 1966; Stoller, 1968) have described the

European family as authoritarian in its relationships. This would result in the obedience to parents found.

Overall, then, it was found that European children who experienced conflict with their parents over their beliefs concerning teenage behaviour reacted by disobeying them. However this was not necessarily accompanied by clear identification with their peers as a reference group. In fact, when asked to report conformity with their peers in spite of parental disapproval, Northwestern European children admitted to doing so less than did other groups. Moreover Italians (although not Greeks) who disagreed with their parents tended to reject their peer group also. Conflict was there, but it was not resolved by identification with the peer group at the expense of the parents.

Peer-Group Importance. Turning from the negative reaction of rejection of parents to the positive identification with the peer group, the United Kingdom adolescents stood out. Their peer group was more important to them than it was to other groups. That this was to a substantial extent the result of intergenerational disparity was demonstrated by the finding that United Kingdom children whose norms were more at variance with those of their parents also saw their peer group as more important to them. They had more friends, who tended to be older than they were themselves. They went further from home to meet them, and found them in schools and occupations different from their own. Finally they reported a greater degree of social interaction with them.

The peer group was providing them with the security, self-identity, and behaviour model which they felt their parents were no

longer able to offer. This is not surprising when the frequent finding (Adler & Taft, 1966; Burnley, 1971; Jupp, 1967; Price, 1968; Taft, 1965) is considered that United Kingdom immigrants, and more especially their children, assimilate more rapidly and completely into Australian society than do other groups. United Kingdom children are more readily accepted by their Australian peers and soon identify with Australia and Australians. Consequently they resolve conflict arising from friction between themselves and their parents by identifying with their peer group. They do not necessarily reject their parents, but simply replace them by their peers as a reference group.

Australian and Northwest European children did not do this. Although Australian children who had a highly salient peer group would conform to them rather than to their parents when urged to do so (Parental Deference), they did not do this only as a result of excessive intergenerational conflict, and did not necessarily reject their parents. They were simply turning to their peers as an important additional social group, as is the norm in modern Western society (see chapter 2, above, and Dunphy, 1969; Singer & Singer, 1969). Conversely, although Northwest European children saw their peers as less important to them, it was not because of a lack of dissent with their parents over behavioural norms.

Southern Europeans, however, were the other group for whom I-G Disparity predicted peer-group identification. Although their peers were no more important to them as a group than were those of Australian children, Southern European children who experienced tension with their parents over teenage mores saw their peers as particularly salient.

Nonetheless it will be recalled that, when asked whether they would conform with their peers rather than obey their parents, these same children had said that it was their parents to whom they would defer. The power of the authoritarian family (Price, 1963a) was stronger than the pressure and attraction of the peer group. Nevertheless this finding that I-G Disparity predicted P.G.I. was further evidence that although intergenerational disparity might be no greater for Southern European children than for other groups, the type and degree of conflict which resulted caused them to seek not one, but several, means of reducing it.

It should be noted that, except as a comparison group, Australian children have received comparatively little mention. Although they scored higher than did immigrants on Australianism Disparity, and equally with them on I-G Disparity, this intergenerational tension predicted neither identification with nor rejection of either parents or peers.

In contrast with both Northwest European and Southern European children, disparity between the mores of their generation and that of their parents did not result in a refusal to comply with parental wishes. Similarly, although they conformed with their peers rather than defer to their parents, in contrast to Northwest European children, this was not necessarily because they differed more with their parents. I-G Disparity did not predict Parental Deference among Australian adolescents. Moreover, unlike the United Kingdom children, a strongly salient peer group was not for them a reaction to intergenerational disparity. Thus although they experienced as much, if not more, disparity with

parental norms as did the children of immigrant parents, they did not react by marked rejection of or identification with either reference group.

Johnston's distinction between cultural tension and cultural conflict is again useful here (Johnston, 1969; Taft & Johnston, 1967). Australian and immigrant children experienced equal amounts of cultural tension, in that the disparity between their norms and those of their parents was equivalent for both. However, only in immigrant children did the conflict aroused cause a reaction to the two reference groups. United Kingdom children who experienced strong culture tension gave evidence of conflict aroused by identifying more closely with their peer group, although they did not necessarily reject their parents. Those Northwest European children for whom the generation gap was wider refused to comply with their parents' wishes, although they did not necessarily turn to their peers as an alternative reference group. Again, conflict was indicated. When disagreement concerning norms of teenage behaviour was strong between Southern European children and their parents sufficient conflict was aroused to cause them both to refuse to comply with their parents and to identify more strongly with their peers.

Thus, although the intergenerational gap was no wider for immigrant adolescents than it was for Australian children, the internal conflict aroused by it caused more stress, and resulted in greater and more diverse effort toward conflict reduction in the second-generation children of immigrant parents than it did for their Australian peers. Although few other empirical studies have specifically compared Aus-

tralian and immigrant adolescents (Doczy, 1969; Hay et al., 1967; Taft, 1965), this inference of culture conflict causing more stress for the second-generation child of immigrant parents supports the conclusions of a large number of observers of the Australian scene (eg., Benyei, 1960; Borrie & Packer, 1954; Carey, 1959; Krupinski, 1968; Price, 1963a, 1963b, 1971; Radziowski, 1963, 1964; Stoller, 1966; Zubrzycki, 1964).

Without the security resultant from a cultural heritage common with that of his parents, yet being only partly accepted as equal by his Australian peers, when the Australian-born child of immigrant parents experiences conflict arising from disagreement with his frequently authoritarian parents over norms of adolescent behaviour, he feels a stronger need to reduce it by rejecting one reference group or identifying with the other.

Rejection of Social Mores. A third means of reducing such conflict was postulated as being available to the adolescent. This was rejection of the social mores over which disagreement occurred, and with them other norms linked with them in the sense that they are prescribed by adult society as norms of adolescent behaviour. The striking finding here was that children of all groups who were experiencing culture conflict employed this means of reducing it.

Although the conflict aroused in the Australian child as the result of intergenerational disparity was not sufficient to cause him to reject his parents or identify particularly strongly with his peer group, it nevertheless did predict greater rejection by him of social mores. He rated wrongdoing as less reprehensible, and admitted to a

greater degree of socially unacceptable behaviour than did children of other groups, and this was predicted by his score on I-G Disparity.

In contrast, although United Kingdom children felt sufficient conflict to identify more strongly with their peer group, they also rejected the social norms of adult society. Nonetheless, they did this no more than did other groups. Northwest Europeans as a group identified more strongly with their parents than did other adolescents, and saw their peers as less salient. These findings were borne out by their lower mean score on both measures of rejection of social mores, compared with other groups. However, if experiencing a greater degree of inter-generational tension, they, too, rejected the norms of adult society. Finally, although Southern Europeans in a state of tension with their parents rejected them and identified with their peers, these reactions were not sufficient in themselves to reduce the conflict felt to an acceptable level. Southern European children scoring high on I-G Disparity rejected social mores also.

This finding of universal rejection of social mores by children in a state of disagreement with their parents, regardless of the social background from which their parents had come, can be seen as a comment on the position of the adolescent in modern Australian society. The mores accepted by his parents are not sufficient for him either as ideals deserving of a positive attitude (Wrongdoing Rating) or as models of behaviour (Socially Unacceptable Behaviour). This, plus the significantly higher score of Australian children on both measures, supported the findings of Dunphy (1969) in Australia, and suggests that the research of Sherif & Sherif (1964) and comment on the generation

gap by authors such as Hurlock (1972) in the United States is relevant to Australia also.

However findings obtained by the measures of rejection of social mores also supplied a hint that children of Southern European parents feel even greater conflict than do those of other groups, in that their Australianism Disparity scores also correlated with both measures of rejection of social mores. This was not true for other cultural groups. While disagreement with their parents over norms of teenage behaviour was the stronger predictor of rejection of social mores, dissension concerning general social issues did so also. This finding of wider areas of dissension giving rise to conflict for Southern European children gives weight to the claim by many authors (Adler & Taft, 1966; Hay et al., 1967; Jupp, 1967; Krupinski, 1968; Price, 1968; Radziowski, 1963, 1964; Rooth, 1968; Stoller, 1968; Taft, 1965) that cultural differences between the mores inculcated by their parents and those of the Australian host society are greater and more varied for Southern European children than they are for adolescents of other immigrant cultural groups. The low reliability of the Australianism Disparity scale could be seen as adding potency to this finding.

Alienation. Australian and United Kingdom children scored higher on the Alienation scale than did either Northwest European or Southern European adolescents. This finding again supported the interpretation offered above of results concerning rejection of social mores, that adult society is felt to be inadequate as a behavioural or aspirational model by the modern Australian teenager. Not constrained by an author-

itarian family from feelings and behaviour antithetical to adult society as are the children of Northwest and Southern European parents, British-Australian adolescents reject as a whole society as they see it.

The Australianism Scale results discussed earlier in this chapter indicated that the Australian adolescent believes in the general principles of the Australian way of life at least as strongly as do his parents. However the Australianism Disparity findings, the rejection of social mores results, and now his high alienation score, combine to form a powerful argument that he does not consider that his parents and the adult society of which they are a part are pursuing it with sufficient strength. Adults, to him, are inadequate. And remember that these were not long-haired young intellectuals, but the boys and girls, almost all at high school, of a perfectly ordinary group of working class Australian families.

This argument was strengthened by the correlational results, which showed Australian children who disagreed with their parents to score high on Alienation also. If in a state of dissension with their parents, they did not specifically reject them or their peer group as particular reference groups, but rejected society as a whole, together with its conventions. United Kingdom children did not do this to quite the same extent, as might be expected from their relatively high identification with their peer group, which is part of that society. The correlation for them between I-G Disparity and Alienation was not significant. Nevertheless it was positive, and did not differ significantly from that of the Australian group.

In partial contrast, European immigrant adolescents scored relatively low on alienation. Nevertheless, the lowest mean score obtained, that of Northwest European children, was 18.0 on Hughes' scoring system - the third quartile of the range of scores of his adult standardisation sample. Even the children of European immigrants feel alienated from adult society, although not to the extent that their Australian and United Kingdom peers experience these feelings of estrangement and normlessness. Moreover I-G Disparity scores again correlated with Alienation scores for both European immigrant groups.

Over the total sample, and to an almost unvarying degree, dissension with his parents over behavioural norms particularly relevant to the teenager predicted feelings in him of alienation from society as a whole. When placed together with the high alienation and rejection of social mores mean scores of the representatives of by far the larger proportion of young people in Australia, the children of United Kingdom and Australian parents, this indicates an urgent need for further research into adolescent dissatisfaction with the society in which they are growing up and their rejection of its values and conventions.

Thus this study found in the second-generation adolescent child of immigrant parents in Australia significant conflict arising from disparity between his values and those of his parents. Moreover groups who differed from one another in the cultural background from which their parents had come also differed in both the degree of conflict found and in the ways in which they coped with it. However

culture conflict from such a source proved to be but a small proportion of the intergenerational conflict being experienced by teenagers as a group, whether their parents came from Australia, the United Kingdom, or Northwest and Southern Europe.

The thousand teachers responding to the survey of the Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council mentioned in chapter 1 were not misjudging when they said that they could perceive few differences between immigrant children and their Australian peers in their adjustment to life in Australia. The findings of the present study would tend to support them. However the assumption by the Dovey Committee, and by many others, that Australian and immigrant adolescents are satisfied with the society in which they are living, and that they identify closely with the adult members of it, was not supported. Adolescents interviewed in this study, whether of immigrant or Australian parents, identified with the Australian ideal at least as strongly as did their elders. However it would appear that they did not feel that adult society was living up to that ideal and that they were searching for better means of attaining it than their parents were able to offer them.

The reader of the Dovey Report should not assume that because the immigrant's child is as well adjusted as is his Australian peer, both are happily settled. Rather, he should conclude that the degree of culture conflict to be found in the Australian child is similar to that being experienced by his second-generation immigrant peer, and that it is as real and as immediate a source of stress for one as it is for the other.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, D. L. The contemporary Australian family. Human Relations, 1966, 19, 265-282.

Adler, D. L., & Taft, R. Some psychological aspects of immigrant assimilation. In A. Stoller (Ed.), New faces: Immigration and family life in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1966.

Anderson, D. S., & Beswick, D. G. Canberra secondary school student survey, 1972. First report. Canberra: Australian National University (Mimeographed), 1972.

Appleyard, R. T. Socioeconomic determinants of British emigration from the United Kingdom to Australia. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University (Mimeographed), 1960.

Aronfreed, J. Conduct and conscience: The socialisation of internalised control over behaviour. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Australian Year Book, No. 56, 1970. Canberra: Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics.

Bacon, Margaret K., Child, I. L., & Barry, H. A cross-cultural study of correlates of crime. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 291-300.

Banchevska, Rachelle. A 'new way of life'. In A. Stoller (Ed.), New faces: Immigration and family life in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1966.

Barnouw, U. Culture and Personality. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1963.

Benyei, L. Greek and South Slav immigrants in Melbourne. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University (Mimeographed), 1960.

Beswick, D. G. Significance of the effects of moderator variables: Analysis of variance of correlation coefficients. Unpublished manuscript, Australian National University, 1971.

Beswick, D. G., & Hills, M. D. An Australian Ethnocentrism scale. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1969, 21, 211-235.

Beswick, D. G., & Hills, M. D. A survey of Ethnocentrism in Australia. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1972, 24, 153-163.

Blalock, H. M., Jr. Toward a theory of minority-group relations. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Boehme, Leonore. Moral judgment: A cultural and sub-cultural comparison with some of Piaget's research conclusions. International Journal of Psychology, 1966, 1(2), 143-150.

Borrie, W. D. Chairman's summing-up of conference: Future research. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University (Mimeographed), 1960.

Borrie, W. D., assisted by Packer, D. R. G. The assimilation of immigrants in Australia and New Zealand - an annotated bibliography. Canberra: Australian National University (Roneoed), 1953.

Borrie, W. D., assisted by Packer, D. R. G. Italians and Germans in Australia - a study of assimilation. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1954.

Brennan, T. Open discussion on the assimilation of migrant children. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University (Mimeographed), 1960.

Bronfenbrenner, U. The role of age, sex, class and culture in studies of moral development. In R. C. Johnson, P. R. Dokecki, & O. H. Mowrer (Eds.), Conscience, contract and social reality: Theory and research in behavioural science. New York: Holt, Rinehart, 1972. (Originally published: Research Supplement to Religious Education, July-August, 1962.)

Broom, L., & Lancaster-Jones, F. Career mobility in three societies: Australia, Italy, and the United States. American Sociological Review, 1969, 34, 650-658.

Brown, Ina C. Understanding race relations. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Brown, R. Social psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Burnley, I. H. The absorption of immigrants in Australia. In C. A. Price (Ed.), Australian immigration: A bibliography and digest, no. 2. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1971.

Burton, R. V. Generality of honesty reconsidered. Psychological Review, 1963, 70, 481-499.

Caldwell, J. C. Open discussion on the assimilation of migrant children. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University (Mimeographed), 1960.

Carey, Estelle. Migrant children and their problems. Unpublished manuscript, Australian National University, 1959.

Chaplin, J. P. Dictionary of psychology. New York: Dell, 1968.

Child, I. L. Italian or American? The second generation in conflict. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943.

Clark, C. M. H. Faith. In P. Coleman (Ed.), Australian civilization: A symposium. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1962.

Clark, Shirley M., & Clark, J. M. (Eds.) Youth in modern society. New York: Holt, Rinehart, 1972.

Cole, Luella, & Hall, Irma N. Psychology of adolescence. (7th ed.) Norwich: Holt, Rinehart, 1970.

Coleman, P. (Ed.) Australian civilization: A symposium. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1962.

Collins, J. K., & Thomas, N. T. Age and susceptibility to same sex peer pressure. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1972, 42, 83-85.

Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council. The progress and assimilation of migrant children in Australia: First report. Canberra: Commonwealth Government Printer, 1960.

Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council. The incidence of mental illness among migrants. Canberra: Commonwealth Government Printer, 1961.

Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council. Progress report: The departure of settlers from Australia. Report of the Committee on Social Patterns. Canberra: Commonwealth Government Printer, 1966.

Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council. The departure of settlers from Australia. Report of the Committee on Social Patterns of the Immigration Advisory Council. Canberra: Commonwealth Government Printer, 1967.

Congalton, A. A. Status and prestige in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1969.

Connell, W. F., Francis, E. P., & Skilbeck, Elizabeth E. Growing up in an Australian city: A study of adolescents in Sydney. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research, 1957.

Cox, F. N. Correlates of general and test anxiety in children. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1960, 12, 169-176.

Cox, F. N., & Leaper, Patricia M. General and test anxiety scales for children. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1959, 11, 70-80.

Davison, F. G. Economic aspects. In A. Stoller (Ed.), New faces: Immigration and family life in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1966.

Dawson, J. L. M. Aboriginal attitudes towards education and integration. In R. Taft, J. L. M. Dawson, & Pamela Beasley. Attitudes and social conditions. Part 2 of Aborigines in Australian society. (A series of studies sponsored by the Social Science Research Council of Australia.) Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1970.

Deutsch, M., & Collins, Mary. The effect of public policy in housing projects upon interracial attitudes. In H. Proshansky & B. Seidenberg (Eds.), Basic studies in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965. (Originally published: Interracial housing: A psychological evaluation of a social experiment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951.)

Doczy, A. G. The social assimilation of adolescent boys of European parentage in Western Australia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Western Australia, Perth, 1967.

Doczy, A. G. The social assimilation of adolescent boys of European parentage in Western Australia. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 39, 193-194. (Abstract)

Dunphy, D. C. Cliques, crowds and gangs: Group life of Sydney adolescents. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1969.

Edwards, A. L. Experimental design in psychological research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960.

Emery, F. E., & Katz, F. M. Social theory and minority-group behaviour. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1950, 3, 22-35.

Emery, F. E., & Katz, F. M. Dr. Taft's criticism - a rejoinder. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1952, 4, 24-27.

Encel, S. The nature of race prejudice in Australia. In F. S. Stevens (Ed.), Racism: The Australian experience. Vol. 1. Prejudice and xenophobia. Sydney: Australia & New Zealand Book Co., 1971.

Erikson, E. H. Childhood and society. (2nd ed.) England: Penguin Books, 1963.

Ferguson, G. A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford, California: Stanford, 1957.

Ficker, V. B., & Rigterink, J. M. (Eds.) Values in conflict. Massachusetts: Heath, 1972.

Fisher, R. A., & Yates, F. Statistical tables for biological, agricultural and medical research. (6th ed.) Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1963.

Flavell, J. H. The developmental psychology of Jean Piaget. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1963.

Glazer, N., & Moynihan, D. P. Beyond the melting pot. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1963.

Haines, N. L. Open discussion on the assimilation of migrant children. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University (Mimeographed), 1960.

Harding, J., Proshansky, H., Kutner, B., & Chein, I. Prejudice and ethnic relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology. (2nd ed.) Vol. 5. Applied social psychology. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Harper, Juliet F., & Collins, J. K. The effects of early or late maturation on the prestige of the adolescent girl. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 1972, 8, 83-88.

Harris, M. Morals and manners. In P. Coleman (Ed.), Australian civilization. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1962.

Hauser, S. T. Black and white identity formation: Studies in the psychosocial development of lower socioeconomic class adolescent boys. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Hay, R. G., Arens, B. A. J., & Kern, K. K. L. Survey of youth in Victoria. Canberra: Good Neighbour Council of Victoria & Commonwealth Department of Immigration Survey Section, 1967.

Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Heiss, J. Sources of satisfaction and assimilation among Italian immigrants. Human Relations, 1966, 19(2), 165-177.

Hills, M. D. A study of variables involved in the development of ethnic awareness and attitudes in children. Unpublished Master of Arts thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 1966.

Hurlock, Elizabeth B. Child development. (5th ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. The war between the generations. In Shirley M. Clark & J. P. Clark (Eds.), Youth in modern society. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972. (Originally published: The Record, 1967, 69, 1-21.)

Jessor, R., Graves, T., Hanson, R. C., & Jessor, Shirley L. Society, personality and deviant behaviour: A study of a tri-ethnic community. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Johnson, R. C., Dokecki, P. R., & Mowrer, O. H. (Eds.) Conscience, contract, and social reality: Theory and research in behavioural science. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972.

Johnston, Ruth. The assimilation myth: A study of second generation Polish immigrants in Western Australia. Research Group for European Migration Problems, No. 14. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969.

Jupp, J. Arrivals and departures. Melbourne: Lansdowne, 1966.

Kendall, M. G. A course in multivariate analysis. London: Griffin, 1957.

Kern, K. K. L. Immigration and the integration process. In A. Stoller (Ed.), New faces: Immigration and family life in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1966.

Kirscht, J. P., & Dillehay, R. C. Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A review of research and theory. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967.

Krupinski, J. Problems of the immigrant family. In H. Throssell (Ed.), Ethnic minorities in Australia: The welfare of Aborigines and migrants. Sydney: Australian Council of Social Service, 1968.

Krupinski, J., & Stoller, A. Family life and mental ill-health in migrants. In A. Stoller (Ed.), New faces: Immigration and family life in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1966.

Kunz, E. F. Refugees and Eastern Europeans in Australia. In C. A. Price (Ed.), Australian immigration. A bibliography and digest. No. 2. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1971.

Lancaster-Jones, F. The Italian population of Carlton. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University (Mimeographed), 1960.

Lancaster-Jones, F. Italians in the Carlton area: The growth of an ethnic concentration. Australian Journal of Politics and History, 1964, 10(1), 83-95.

Lancaster-Jones, F. A social ranking of Melbourne suburbs. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 1967, 3(2), 93-110.

Listwan, I. A. Immigrants and mental health: Further study. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University (Mimeographed), 1960.

Martin, Jean I. Refugee settlers. Canberra: Australian University Press, 1965.

Martin, Jean I. Community and identity: Refugee groups in Adelaide. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1972.

Matsdorf, W. S. (Ed.) Australian citizens of tomorrow. Proceedings of a seminar organised by the Standing Committee for the Mental Health of Migrants at the University of New South Wales. Sydney: New South Wales Association for Mental Health, 1963.

McCaughey, Jean. Migrants. In R. F. Henderson, Alison Harcourt, & R. J. A. Harper. People in poverty: A Melbourne survey. Melbourne, 1970.

Miller, R. G., Jr. Simultaneous statistical inference. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Mol, J. J. Ecumenicity in Australia. Unpublished manuscript, Australian National University, Canberra, 1968.

Musgrove, F. Population changes and the status of youth. In Shirley M. Clark & J. P. Clark (Eds.), Youth in modern society. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972. (Originally published: Sociological Review, 1963, 1, 69-93.)

Musgrove, F. The "Good Home". In Shirley M. Clark & J. P. Clark (Eds.), Youth in modern society. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972. (Originally published: In The family, education and society. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.)

Oeser, D. A., & Hammond, S. Social structure and personality in a city. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Patterson, Sheila. Dark strangers. A study of West Indians in London. England: Penguin, 1965. (Abridged) (Originally published: London: Tavistock, 1963.)

Phillips, A. A. The schools. In P. Coleman (Ed.), Australian civilization. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1962.

Piaget, J., & Weil, Anne-Marie. The development in children of the idea of the homeland and of relations with other countries. International Social Science Bulletin, 1951, 3, 561-578.

Price, C. A. European minorities in Australia, 1840-1940. Historical Studies, 1954, 6, 290-300.

Price, C. A. The education of immigrants in Australia. In Some studies in education of immigrants for citizenship. (UNESCO Educational Studies & Documents, 1955, No. 16.) Paris: UNESCO Education Clearing House, 1955.

Price, C. A. An historical approach to migration and assimilation. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1960. (a)

Price, C. A. (Ed.) The study of immigrants in Australia. Proceedings of a conference on immigration research convened by the Department of Demography, Australian National University. Canberra: Australian National University (Mimeographed), 1960. (b)

Price, C. A. A survey of the study of immigration and assimilation. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1960. (c)

Price, C. A. Overseas migration to and from Australia, 1947-1961. Migration, 1962, 2(2), 21-34.

Price, C. A. Southern Europeans in Australia. Sydney: Halstead Press, 1963. (a)

Price, C. A. Migrant youth and the Australian population. In W. S. Matsdorf (Ed.), Australian citizens of tomorrow. Sydney: New South Wales Association for Mental Health, 1963. (b)

Price, C. A. Chain migration and immigrant groups, with special reference to Australian Jewry. Jewish Journal of Sociology, 1964, 6(2), 157-171.

Price, C. A. Australian immigration, a bibliography and digest. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1966. (a)

Price, C. A. The Good Neighbour Movement and international understanding. Paper presented at the State conference of the Victorian Good Neighbour Council, Melbourne, October, 1966. (b)

Price, C. A. Post-war migration: Demographic background. In A. Stoller (Ed.), New faces: Immigration and family life in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1966. (c)

Price, C. A. 'White' restrictions on 'Coloured' immigration. Race, 1966, 7(3), 217-234. (d)

Price, C. A. Identification of ethnic minorities. In H. Throssell (Ed.), Ethnic minorities in Australia: The welfare of Aborigines and migrants. Sydney: Australian Council of Social Service, 1968.

Price, C. A. (Ed.) Australian immigration: A bibliography and digest. No. 2, 1970. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1971. (a)

Price, C. A. Overseas migration to Australia: 1947-70. In C. A. Price (Ed.), Australian immigration: A bibliography and digest. No. 2, 1970. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1971. (b)

Price, C. A., & Zubrzycki, J. The use of intermarriage statistics as an index of assimilation. Population Studies, 1962, 16(1), 58-69. (a)

Price, C. A., & Zubrzycki, J. Immigrant marriage patterns in Australia. Population Studies, 1962, 16(2), 123-133. (b)

Pyne, Patricia, & Price, C. A. Selected tables on Australian immigration, with commentary. In C. A. Price (Ed.), Australian immigration: A bibliography and digest. No. 2, 1970. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1971.

Radziowski, N. Two generations - transition or conflict? In W. S. Matsdorf (Ed.), Migrant youth: Australian citizens of tomorrow. Proceedings of a seminar organised by the Standing Committee for the Mental Health of Migrants at the University of New South Wales. Sydney: New South Wales Association for Mental Health, 1963.

Radziowski, N. The migrant and his adjustment. Address given to the New South Wales State conference of the Good Neighbour Council, Sydney, November, 1964.

Richardson, A. R. British immigrants in Western Australia. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1960.

Richardson, A. R. The assimilation of British immigrants in a West Australian community - a psychological study. Research Group for European Migration Problems Bulletin, 1961, 9, 1-75.

Rooth, S. J. Government responsibility for the European migrant. In H. Throssell (Ed.), Ethnic minorities in Australia: The welfare of Aborigines and migrants. Sydney: Australian Council of Social Service, 1968.

Salmon, Phillida. Differential conforming as a developmental process. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 8, 22-31.

Sears, D. O. Political behaviour. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology. (2nd ed.) Vol. 5. Applied social psychology. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Sherif, M., & Sherif, Carolyn W. Reference groups: Exploration into conformity and deviation of adolescents. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Singer, R. D., & Singer, Anne. Psychological development in children. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1969.

Stevens, F. S. (Ed.) Racism: The Australian experience. A study of race prejudice in Australia. Vol. 1. Prejudice and xenophobia. Sydney: Australia & New Zealand Book Co., 1971.

Stevens, F. S. (Ed.) Racism: The Australian experience. A study of race prejudice in Australia. Vol. 2. Black versus white. Sydney: Australia & New Zealand Book Co., 1972. (a)

Stevens, F. S. (Ed.) Racism: The Australian experience. A study of race prejudice in Australia. Vol. 3. Colonialism. Sydney: Australia & New Zealand Book Co., 1972. (b)

Stoller, A. (Ed.) New faces: Immigration and family life in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1966. (a)

Stoller, A. Old wine in new bottles. In A. Stoller, A. (Ed.), New faces: Immigration and family life in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1966. (b)

Stoller, A. Stress in immigrants. In H. Throssell (Ed.), Ethnic minorities in Australia: The welfare of Aborigines and migrants. Sydney: Australian Council of Social Service, 1968.

Taft, R. Minority group behaviour and reference group theory. A reply to Emery and Katz. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1952, 4, 10-23.

Taft, R. A psychological model for the study of social assimilation. Human Relations, 1957, 10, 141-156. (a)

Taft, R. The shared frame of reference concept applied to the assimilation of immigrants. Human Relations, 1957, 6, 45-55. (b)

Taft, R. Some subcultural variables in family structure in Australia. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1957, 9, 69-90. (c)

Taft, R. Is the tolerant personality type the opposite of the intolerant? Journal of Social Psychology, 1958, 47, 397-405.

Taft, R. Ethnic stereotypes, attitudes, and familiarity. Journal of Social Psychology, 1959, 49, 177-186.

Taft, R. Dutch, Polish and Hungarian immigrants in Western Australia. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1960.

Taft, R. The myth and migrants. In P. Coleman (Ed.), Australian civilization: A symposium. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1962. (a)

Taft, R. Opinion convergence in the assimilation of immigrants. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1962, 14, 41-54. (b)

Taft, R. Applied social psychology: Ecological studies of immigrant assimilation and scientific psychology. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1963, 15, 149-161.

Taft, R. From stranger to citizen: A survey of studies of immigrant assimilation in Western Australia. Perth: University of Western Australia Press, 1965.

Taft, R. Attitudes of Western Australians towards Aborigines. In R. Taft, J. L. M. Dawson, & Pamela Beasley. Attitudes and social conditions. Part 2 of Aborigines in Australian society. (A series of studies sponsored by the Social Science Research Council of Australia.) Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1970.

Taft, R., & Goldlust, J. The current status of former Jewish refugees in Melbourne. Melbourne: Monash University (Mimeographed), 1970.

Taft, R., & Johnston, Ruth. The assimilation of adolescent Polish immigrants and parent-child interaction. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behaviour & Development, 1967, 13(2), 111-120.

Thorndike, R. L., & Hagen, E. Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education. (3rd ed.) New York: Wiley, 1969.

Throssell, H. (Ed.) Ethnic minorities in Australia: The welfare of Aborigines and migrants. Sydney: Australian Council of Social Service, 1968.

Tully, Joan. Experiences in integrating Italian farmers into an extension programme and into the farming community of the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1960.

Vaughan, G. M. Ethnic awareness and attitudes in New Zealand. Victoria University of Wellington Publications in Psychology, 1964, No. 17.

Verberne, T. J. P. Australian and migrant juvenile delinquents compared. Unpublished manuscript, Melbourne, 1963. Cited by J. Krupinski & A. Stoller, Family life and mental ill-health in migrants. In A. Stoller (Ed.), New faces: Immigration and family life in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1966.

Weisz, P. B. (Ed.) The contemporary scene: Readings on human nature, race, behaviour, society, and environment. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Wesley, F., & Karr, C. Problems in establishing norms for cross-cultural comparisons. International Journal of Psychology, 1966, 1, 257-262.

Whyte, W. F. Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955. (Originally published: 1943.)

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Wrenn, R. L., & Ruiz, R. A. The normal personality: Issues to insights. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Wunderly, H. A survey of immigration and mental health in Australia. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1960.

Zubrzycki, J. Sociological methods for the study of immigrant adjustment. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1960. (a)

Zubrzycki, J. Problems in conducting surveys of immigrant groups: sampling, questionnaires, interviewing. In C. A. Price (Ed.), The study of immigrants in Australia. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1960. (b)

Zubrzycki, J. Settlers of the LaTrobe Valley. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1964.

Zubrzycki, J. The immigrant family: Some sociological aspects. In A. Stoller (Ed.), New faces: Immigration and family life in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1966.

Zubrzycki, J. Migrants and the occupational structure. In H. Throssell (Ed.), Ethnic minorities in Australia: The welfare of Aborigines and migrants. Sydney: Australian Council of Social Service, 1968.

PARENTS

E	HH

Name .....

Address .....

..... Phone .....

	Mother	Father
Name		
Birthdate		
Birthplace		
- Town	.....	.....
- Country	.....	.....
Migration Date		
Naturalisation		
- Yes / No	.....	.....
- Date	.....	.....
Return to Homeland		
- Yes / No	.....	.....
- Dates	.....	.....
Education (no. of yrs)		
- Primary - Homeland	.....	.....
- Australia	.....	.....
- Secondary - Homeland	.....	.....
- Australia	.....	.....
- Other - Homeland	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....
- Australia	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....
Religion		
- Creed	.....	.....
- Depth	.....	.....

CHILDREN

E HH

Surname .....

Address .....

.....

Number			
Name			
Birthdate			
Sex			
Birthplace - Town ..... - Country			
Religion - Creed ..... - Depth			
School - Name ..... - Suburb ..... - Ed. Authority			
Class - Year ..... - Grade			
Job - Type ..... - Left school			

	Sex	Age	Birthplace	Migration date
Other Siblings	.....	.....	.....	.....
	.....	.....	.....	.....
	.....	.....	.....	.....
	.....	.....	.....	.....
	.....	.....	.....	.....

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

I-G QUESTIONNAIRE - PARENTS

Below is a list of activities about which younger and older people sometimes disagree. We are interested in what you, as a parent think about these activities.

Do you believe in young people of your child's age doing the things listed below? Read each activity and put a ring around the answer which you feel is correct.

e.g.: (Yes) / No

Please fill in both the 'Boys' and 'Girls' columns.

		BOYS	GIRLS
1.	Driving a car	Yes / No	Yes / No
2.	Boys and girls dating	Yes / No	Yes / No
3.	Arguing with their parents occasionally if they feel they themselves are right	Yes / No	Yes / No
4.	Leaving home and flatting	Yes / No	Yes / No
5.	Betting	Yes / No	Yes / No
6.	Having modern haircuts	Yes / No	Yes / No
7.	Girls using "the Pill"	Yes / No	Yes / No
8.	Drinking alcohol	Yes / No	Yes / No
9.	Smoking	Yes / No	Yes / No
10.	Boys having an occasional fight.	Yes / No	Yes / No
11.	Going to school till aged at least 17 or 18	Yes / No	Yes / No
12.	Kissing and petting	Yes / No	Yes / No
13.	Buying lottery tickets	Yes / No	Yes / No
14.	Staying out late at night	Yes / No	Yes / No
15.	Taking drugs	Yes / No	Yes / No
16.	Reading things like comics, love comics, cheap paperbacks, record magazines, etc	Yes / No	Yes / No
17.	Doing household chores (more than just keeping his/her own room clean)	Yes / No	Yes / No

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions:

We are interested in people's opinions on some important topics. We would like to know how you feel about them. Read each statement carefully and then decide whether you agree or disagree.

Ring the answer which corresponds with your feelings about the statement.

e.g.: Yes / (No)

We are not interested in right or wrong answers to these questions. We just want to know how you feel about them. Take as much time as you need to answer each question carefully.

I feel that:-

1. On the whole, commercial broadcasting makes for better radio and TV programmes ..... Yes / No
2. The church should keep completely out of politics ..... Yes / No
3. Parents have a right to expect their children to support them when they are old .. Yes / No
4. One can hardly have more than one or two true friends in a lifetime ..... Yes / No
5. It is difficult for people to remain close friends when they hold completely opposed political opinions ..... Yes / No
6. The Anglo-Saxon races owe their leading position in the world to their outstanding qualities ..... Yes / No
7. Mass-produced goods are better than handmade goods ..... Yes / No
8. A person whose family has had a high social standing for many generations is entitled to some respect ..... Yes / No
9. It is all right for a girl to have dates with as many boys as she pleases ..... Yes / No
10. Flirting is not a fault in a female ..... Yes / No
11. Good manners are more important than a lot of knowledge ..... Yes / No

12. A pleasant but rather dull person is preferable to an intelligent but rather bad-mannered one ..... Yes / No

13. It is bad behaviour to address people by their first names when you hardly know them ..... Yes / No

14. People who try to help their neighbours and acquaintances are just as likely to become nuisances as to be helpful ..... Yes / No

15. It is better to live only for the day than to worry too much about the future ..... Yes / No

16. A country is far more enjoyable to live in when the people come from a wide range of racial and national backgrounds ..... Yes / No

17. Life is always unpleasant if you don't have a reasonable income and some savings to fall back on if necessary ..... Yes / No

18. A good way for a man to spend his spare time is with a group of friends round a keg of beer ..... Yes / No

19. Wine is a good drink to offer to a friend who just drops in for a visit ..... Yes / No

20. The newspapers give too much publicity to crimes ..... Yes / No

21. It is doubtful that humanity is in any sense progressing ..... Yes / No

22. It is sometimes right to sacrifice a human life for the sake of a principle ... Yes / No

23. Coloured races are in no way inferior to white races ..... Yes / No

24. The use by foreigners of their language in public places is objectionable ..... Yes / No

25. It is rare to find a politician who truly has the good of the people at heart ..... Yes / No

26. There is something wrong with the person who often wishes to be alone ..... Yes / No

27. It is a sad thing to see the passing of the old custom of special respect paid to women ..... Yes / No

28. Social education of children is more important than intellectual education .... Yes / No

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

I-G QUESTIONNAIRE - TEENAGERS I

Below is a list of activities about which younger and older people often disagree. We are interested in what you think about whether or not people your age should be allowed to do these things.

Do you believe in people of your age doing the things listed below? Read each activity and put a ring around the answer which you feel is correct.

e.g.: Yes / (No)

I believe in people my age:-

1. Driving a car ..... Yes / No ____
2. Boys and girls dating ..... Yes / No ____
3. Arguing with their parents occasionally if they feel they themselves are right ..... Yes / No ____
4. Leaving home and flatting ..... Yes / No ____
5. Betting ..... Yes / No ____
6. Having modern haircuts ..... Yes / No ____
7. Girls using "the Pill" ..... Yes / No ____
8. Drinking alcohol ..... Yes / No ____
9. Smoking ..... Yes / No ____
10. Boys having an occasional fight ..... Yes / No ____
11. Going to school till aged at least 17 or 18 ..... Yes / No ____
12. Kissing and petting ..... Yes / No ____
13. Buying lottery tickets ..... Yes / No ____
14. Staying out late at night ..... Yes / No ____
15. Taking drugs ..... Yes / No ____
16. Reading things like comics, love comics, cheap paperbacks, record magazines, etc .. Yes / No ____
17. Doing household chores (more than just keeping his/her own room clean) ..... Yes / No ____

You will have noticed a blank beside each question. Now work through the list once more and write in this blank "Yes" for activities which you yourself have sometimes done, and "No" beside things you have never done.

e.g.: Yes / (No) Yes

Remember your answers are completely confidential.

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

I-G QUESTIONNAIRE - TEENAGERS II

Here again is the list of activities about which younger and older people often disagree. This time we are interested in what your friends think about these activities.

Do your friends believe in people of your age doing the things listed below? Read each activity and put a ring around the answer which you feel most of your friends would give.

e.g.: Yes / (No)

My friends believe in people my age:-

1.	Leaving home and flatting	Yes / No
2.	Having modern haircuts	Yes / No
3.	Boys having an occasional fight	Yes / No
4.	Betting	Yes / No
5.	Drinking alcohol	Yes / No
6.	Going to school till aged at least 17 or 18	Yes / No
7.	Buying lottery tickets	Yes / No
8.	Driving a car	Yes / No
9.	Staying out late at night	Yes / No
10.	Kissing and petting	Yes / No
11.	Taking drugs	Yes / No
12.	Girls using "the Pill"	Yes / No
13.	Boys and girls dating	Yes / No
14.	Reading things like comics, love comics, cheap paperbacks, record magazines, etc ...	Yes / No
15.	Smoking	Yes / No
16.	Arguing with their parents occasionally if they feel they themselves are right	Yes / No
17.	Doing household chores (more than just keeping his/her own room clean)	Yes / No

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

I-G QUESTIONNAIRE - TEENAGERS III

Once more, here is the list of activities about which older and younger people often disagree. We are interested this time in what your parents think about these activities.

Do your parents believe in young people of your age doing the things listed below? Read each activity and put a ring around the answer which you feel your parents would give.

e.g.: (Yes) / No

My parents believe in people my age:-

1.	Going to school till aged at least 17 or 18	Yes / No
2.	Having modern haircuts	Yes / No
3.	Staying out late at night	Yes / No
4.	Arguing with their parents occasionally if they feel they themselves are right	Yes / No
5.	Driving a car	Yes / No
6.	Buying lottery tickets	Yes / No
7.	Drinking alcohol	Yes / No
8.	Leaving home and flatting	Yes / No
9.	Taking drugs	Yes / No
10.	Betting	Yes / No
11.	Reading things like comics, love comics, cheap paperbacks, record magazines, etc ...	Yes / No
12.	Boys having an occasional fight	Yes / No
13.	Boys and girls dating	Yes / No
14.	Doing household chores (more than just keeping his/her own room clean)	Yes / No
15.	Girls using "the Pill"	Yes / No
16.	Smoking	Yes / No
17.	Kissing and petting	Yes / No

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

YOU AND YOUR FRIENDS QUESTIONNAIRE, Pt 1

Introduction

We are interested in finding out what part a young person's friends play in his life. Would you please read this carefully and then answer the questions below as clearly and accurately as you can. Remember that we are interested in you as a person but we won't be linking your answers with your name, so you can be sure that you will remain completely anonymous. So please feel free to answer the questions realistically. Note, too, that everybody is different - there are no right or wrong answers - just put down what applies to you. Thank you.

Read carefully:-

(1) John is about your age. He has a best friend, Mark. John and Mark know two other boys who are also best friends. These four boys form a small group, who do many things together. They go to the pictures or the beach and visit each other's homes to play records or watch TV. These four also spend a lot of time with other young people whom they call "the gang".

(2) Ian is another boy, who calls no one person a best friend, but who knows two other boys, Brian and Bruce, very well. These three boys often go out together, or meet at one another's homes, as a group. They also get around a lot with a larger crowd, who often go to dances, the beach, or the pictures together.

(3) Ken has a best friend, Les, and they do most things, like surfing or listening to records, together, without worrying much about what other people are doing.

(4) Tom knows quite a number of young people, and, though he gets on alright socially when he has to, he has no close friends and says he is too busy to have time to worry about them.

You can see from these examples that friends can be of three types

- the best friend;
- the small group of three or four;
- the large group, gang, or crowd.

Notice that some people have friends of all three types, e.g., John; some have friends of two kinds, e.g., Ian; some have one friend, e.g., Ken; and some don't

(Please turn over)

want any really close friends, e.g., Tom.

Read the four descriptions again to make sure you understand what we mean by the three different kinds of friends.

Now answer the questions below as carefully as you can. Remember that we won't be connecting your answers with your name, so you can say what you really think.

First, answer these three questions by putting a ring around the correct answer for each one, e.g., Yes / (No)

1. Do you have a best friend? Yes / No
2. Do you belong to a small group? Yes / No
3. Do you belong to a crowd? Yes / No

If you answered (Yes) to any of questions 1, 2, or 3, please fill in the following table by writing down the FIRST NAMES ONLY of your friend(s), and, beside each name, put whether that person is a BEST FRIEND, a member of your SMALL GROUP, or a member of your CROWD; their AGE; their SEX (male or female); their SUBURB; their COUNTRY OF BIRTH; and the name of their SCHOOL or JOB.

FIRST NAME	BEST FRIEND; SMALL GROUP; or CROWD	AGE	SEX (Male/ female)	SUBURB	COUNTRY of BIRTH	NAME OF SCHOOL or JOB

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

YOU AND YOUR FRIENDS QUESTIONNAIRE, Pt 2a

Below are some of the things people often do together. Circle (Yes) for those which you OFTEN do with your FRIENDS, and (No) for things you do only rarely or not at all. Write in any things which you and your friends OFTEN do together, on the blank lines at the end of the list.

With my friends I often:-

1. Go dancing..... Yes / No
2. Go skating .... Yes / No
3. Go to the races Yes / No
4. Go to youth groups (e.g. Scouts, Guides) Yes / No
5. Get around with the gang ..... Yes / No
6. Go to fun parlours ..... Yes / No
7. Go to concerts. Yes / No
8. Follow hobbies (e.g. build model aeroplanes) ..... Yes / No
9. Go to bike or car races ..... Yes / No
10. Play sport .... Yes / No
11. Listen to pop records at someone's home .... Yes / No
12. Go to church .. Yes / No
13. Go for bike rides ..... Yes / No
14. Go to the pictures ..... Yes / No
15. Go boating, yachting ..... Yes / No
16. Go to Library, museum, Art gallery ..... Yes / No
17. Go hiking, picnicking .. Yes / No
18. Go fishing .. Yes / No
19. Go to discotheques ..... Yes / No
20. Go to pop music shows ..... Yes / No
21. Watch sport . Yes / No
22. Watch T.V. .. Yes / No
23. Go to milkbars Yes / No
24. Go to a Youth Club ..... Yes / No
25. Go bowling .. Yes / No
26. Go to parties Yes / No
27. Go surfing .. Yes / No
28. Go out on a date ..... Yes / No
29. Go downtown . Yes / No
30. Visit each other's homes Yes / No
31. Play cards .. Yes / No
32. Go camping or tripping .... Yes / No
33. Go driving or motorbike riding ..... Yes / No
34. Just talk together .... Yes / No
35. Study ..... Yes / No
36. Go swimming, to the beach, etc. Yes / No

Now, list anything else you and your friends OFTEN do together:-

.....

.....

.....

If you can think of nothing else, please write "Nothing else".

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

YOU AND YOUR FRIENDS QUESTIONNAIRE, Pt 2b

Most young people do some things because their friends do, although they know that their parents would disapprove if they knew. Look through the list again and circle (Yes) for any activity which you sometimes do because your friends do, even though you know your parents wouldn't be too keen about it if they knew. Circle (No) where either your friends don't do it, or your parents don't mind.

Remember, you're anonymous, so please be as frank as possible.

Although my parents disapprove, with my friends I sometimes:-

1. Go dancing ... Yes / No
2. Go boating, yachting ..... Yes / No
3. Go to the races Yes / No
4. Visit each other's homes . Yes / No
5. Go swimming, to the beach, etc Yes / No
6. Play sport .... Yes / No
7. Go for bike rides ..... Yes / No
8. Go to disco-theques ..... Yes / No
9. Go bowling .... Yes / No
10. Go skating .... Yes / No
11. Go to church .. Yes / No
12. Listen to pop records at some-one's home .... Yes / No
13. Watch T.V. .... Yes / No
14. Go to youth groups (e.g. Scouts, Guides) Yes / No
15. Play cards .... Yes / No
16. Go to a Youth Club ..... Yes / No
17. Get around with the gang ..... Yes / No
18. Go camping or tripping ..... Yes / No
19. Study ..... Yes / No
20. Go to parties Yes / No
21. Follow hobbies (e.g. build model aeroplanes) Yes / No
22. Go out on a date ..... Yes / No
23. Go to the pictures .... Yes / No
24. Go to Library, Museum, Art gallery ..... Yes / No
25. Go to milkbars Yes / No
26. Go to fun parlours .... Yes / No
27. Go hiking, picnicking .. Yes / No
28. Just talk together .... Yes / No
29. Go to pop music shows . Yes / No
30. Go to concerts Yes / No
31. Go driving or motorbike riding ..... Yes / No
32. Go to bike or car races ... Yes / No
33. Go surfing .. Yes / No
34. Go fishing .. Yes / No
35. Go downtown . Yes / No
36. Watch sport . Yes / No

Below, list anything else you and your friends sometimes do together, although your parents would disapprove if they knew:

.....

.....

If you can think of nothing else, please write "Nothing else".

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

YOU AND YOUR FRIENDS QUESTIONNAIRE, Pt 2c

However, most young people also don't do some things that their friends do, because they know their parents would disapprove. Work through the list again, this time circling (Yes) for any activities that your friends do, but you don't, because you know your parents would disapprove. Circle (No) beside anything that either your friends don't do, or that your parents don't mind.

Because my parents disapprove, I sometimes don't join my friends when they:-

1. Go dancing .... Yes / No
2. Play cards .... Yes / No
3. Go to the races Yes / No
4. Go to concerts Yes / No
5. Watch sport ... Yes / No
6. Go skating .... Yes / No
7. Watch T.V. .... Yes / No
8. Study ..... Yes / No
9. Go to milkbars Yes / No
10. Go boating, yachting ..... Yes / No
11. Go camping or tripping ..... Yes / No
12. Go to church .. Yes / No
13. Go out on a date Yes / No
14. Visit each other's homes Yes / No
15. Go driving or motorbike riding Yes / No
16. Go to Library, Museum, Art gallery ..... Yes / No
17. Go swimming, to the beach, etc Yes / No
18. Go to bike or car races ..... Yes / No
19. Go downtown . Yes / No
20. Go to parties Yes / No
21. Go to discotheques ..... Yes / No
22. Just talk together .... Yes / No
23. Go to youth groups (e.g. Scouts, Guides) Yes / No
24. Go to a Youth Club ..... Yes / No
25. Go to the pictures .... Yes / No
26. Go skating .. Yes / No
27. Get around with the gang Yes / No
28. Go fishing .. Yes / No
29. Go to fun parlours .... Yes / No
30. Go for bike rides ..... Yes / No
31. Go surfing .. Yes / No
32. Go bowling .. Yes / No
33. Go hiking, picnicking .. Yes / No
34. Listen to pop records at someone's home Yes / No
35. Go to pop music shows ..... Yes / No
36. Follow hobbies (e.g., build model aeroplanes) Yes / No

Anything else your friends do, but you don't because you feel your parents would disapprove:-

.....

.....

If you can think of nothing else, please write "Nothing else".

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE

I'm interested in how wrong you think different kinds of actions are. Most people think that something like murder is very wrong while something like skiting might be considered only a little bit wrong or not wrong at all. You can show how wrong you think something is by circling a number from 0 to 9.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

If you think there is no wrong in an action, circle the 0. If it is only a little bit wrong, circle the 1 or the 2 or 3. If it is wrong but not very wrong, circle 4 or 5 or 6. If it is very wrong, circle 7 or 8 or 9. In each case circle the one number that shows exactly how wrong you think it is.

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER:

1. To smoke on the school grounds.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

2. To flog things that don't belong to you.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

3. To go somewhere with friends.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

4. To forge your own notes from home.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

5. To get into trouble with the police.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

../2

6. To swear or curse.

Not Wrong	A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

7. To give the teacher a stir in the classroom.

Not Wrong	A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

8. To get home a little later than usual after school.

Not Wrong	A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

9. To drive when you're under the influence.

Not Wrong	A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

10. To copy other kids' homework.

Not Wrong	A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

11. To neck with your dates.

Not Wrong	A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

12. To disobey your parents.

Not Wrong	A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

13. To cheat on exams.

Not Wrong	A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

14. To do things on the spur of the moment.

Not Wrong	A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong			Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

../3

15. To get into fights with other kids.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong		Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

16. To have a grog-on with your friends.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong		Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

17. To lie to a teacher.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong		Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

18. To wag school.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong		Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

19. To drive a car without a licence.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong		Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

20. To go to the flicks the night before an exam.

Not Wrong		A Little Bit Wrong			Wrong		Very Wrong		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

SOCIAL IMPORTANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

We are interested in finding out how important a number of social questions are to young people. Below is a list of activities. There is often discussion and disagreement as to whether or not young people should engage in these activities. However, some of these activities are far more important to people your age than are others. It matters very much whether you are able to do some things or not, while other things are not so important.

We want you to ring a number on the scale under each activity to show how important it is to <u>you</u>.

For example:-

Wearing modern clothes.

0 1 2 3 4 5 (6) 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

1. Driving a car.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

2. Smoking.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

3. Boys and girls dating.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

4. Drinking alcohol.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

../2

5. Kissing and petting.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

6. Reading things like comics, love comics, cheap paperbacks, record magazines, etc.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

7. Betting.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

8. Taking drugs.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

9. Having modern haircuts.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

10. Staying out late at night

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

11. Leaving home and flatting.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

../3

12. Going to school till aged at least 17 or 18.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

13. Doing household chores (more than just keeping your own room clean).

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

14. Arguing with their parents occasionally if they feel they themselves are right.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

15. Girls using "the Pill".

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

16. Boys having an occasional fight.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

17. Buying lottery tickets.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not important at all — Moderately important — Very, very important

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

BEHAVIOUR QUESTIONNAIRE

We're interested now in how often people your age do different things. This is something social scientists need to know more about for teenagers, and we think that the best way to find out is to ask you. No one else will see your answers, and your name will be separated from your answer sheet. So we hope you'll be honest and frank in your answers, to help us get an accurate picture.

How often have you:

1. Smoked on the school grounds? Circle one answer

   Very often Several times Once or twice Never

2. Flogged things that didn't belong to you?

   Very often Several times Once or twice Never

3. Gone somewhere with friends?

   Very often Several times Once or twice Never

4. Forged your own notes from home?

   Very often Several times Once or twice Never

5. Got into trouble with the police?

   Very often Several times Once or twice Never

6. Sworn or cursed?

   Very often Several times Once or twice Never

7. Given the teacher a stir in the classroom?

   Very often Several times Once or twice Never

8. Got home a little later than usual after school?

   Very often Several times Once or twice Never

9. Driven when you're under the influence?

   Very often Several times Once or twice Never

10. Copied other kids' homework?

    Very often Several times Once or twice Never

../2

11. Necked with your dates?

Very often Several times Once or twice Never

12. Disobeyed your parents?

Very often Several times Once or twice Never

13. Cheated in exams?

Very often Several times Once or twice Never

14. Done things on the spur of the moment?

Very often Several times Once or twice Never

15. Got into fights with other kids?

Very often Several times Once or twice Never

16. Had a grog-on with your friends?

Very often Several times Once or twice Never

17. Lied to a teacher?

Very often Several times Once or twice Never

18. Wagged school?

Very often Several times Once or twice Never

19. Driven a car without a licence?

Very often Several times Once or twice Never

20. Gone to the flicks the night before an exam?

Very often Several times Once or twice Never

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

A - SCALE ANSWER SHEET

Instructions

Read each of these 24 cards carefully. Each card has on it two statements, numbered A) and B). Read both statements. Decide which one comes closest to saying what you feel and put a ring around either the A) or the B) for that card, to show which statement more nearly says what you think.

eg:- 1. A)
(B)

Do this for each of the 24 cards. Remember, your answers are completely confidential. Thank you.

1.	A)	9.	A)	17.	A)
	B)		B)		B)
2.	A)	10.	A)	18.	A)
	B)		B)		B)
3.	A)	11.	A)	19.	A)
	B)		B)		B)
4.	A)	12.	A)	20.	A)
	B)		B)		B)
5.	A)	13.	A)	21.	A)
	B)		B)		B)
6.	A)	14.	A)	22.	A)
	B)		B)		B)
7.	A)	15.	A)	23.	A)
	B)		B)		B)
8.	A)	16.	A)	24.	A)
	B)		B)		B)

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

A-SCALE

1. A) Our community is an easy and pleasant place to live in.
   B) Our community is a difficult place to live in.

2. A) In Australian society, people seem to get to the top mainly by chance or good fortune.
   B) In this society, the better people mostly get to the top.

3. A) Mostly, people are fair in their dealings with me.
   B) I often feel I am not fairly treated.

4. A) Nowadays, a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
   B) It is quite possible to plan one's life ahead with confidence.

5. A) In Australian society, most people can find contentment.
   B) For most people, the society we live in breeds discontent.

6. A) Often, people don't appreciate it when you do good work.
   B) People usually appreciate it when you do good work.

7. A) I sometimes feel my life is being pushed in directions where I don't want to go.
   B) Usually, I can control what happens in my own life.

8. A) My schoolwork is of real benefit to me.
   B) In my schoolwork, I feel exploited by other people.

9. A) I often feel I am only a cog in a big machine.
   B) In lots of important matters, my decision can affect what happens.

10. A) It's easy to find a job worth doing.
    B) It's hard to find a job worth doing.

11. A) I can normally do what I want to do in today's set-up.
    B) In today's set-up, I often feel frustrated and prevented from doing what I want to do.

/2...

12. A) In getting ahead in life, it's not what you know that counts, it's who you know.

    B) What counts in getting ahead is hard work and talent.

13. A) In Australian society, money will get you anywhere.

    B) In Australian society, people's respect for your character will get you a long way.

14. A) Most members of parliament and city councillors are sympathetic people and do a good job.

    B) Most politicians and city councillors are only in politics for what they can get out of it, and are not much good.

15. A) For most people these days it is more important to make money than to make friends.

    B) For most people, it is more important to make friends than to make money.

16. A) The individual these days has a good chance of finding sensible moral standards to live by.

    B) There is a lot of confusion about moral standards these days.

17. A) Life seems to be rather meaningless.

    B) On the whole, life makes good sense to me.

18. A) Life has a clear purpose.

    B) There is no clear purpose in life.

19. A) You have to be careful otherwise people will take advantage of you.

    B) Most people are quite trustworthy.

20. A) Most people are willing to help someone in need.

    B) In Australian society people often don't care what happens to others.

21. A) These days, a person doesn't really know who he can count on.

    B) You can usually be sure who you can count on.

22. A) I seldom feel lonely.

    B) I often feel lonely.

23. A) People usually accept and welcome you just as you really are.

    B) With most people, you have to put on a bit of an act.

24. A) I don't really feel at home in any group of people.

    B) I really feel at home with the people I mix with.

CALCULATION OF CRITICAL t VALUES FOR THE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF THE AUSTRALIAN CONTROL GROUP AND IMMIGRANT SAMPLES

For both Disparity and Reaction measures, the mean score of each immigrant group was compared with that of the Australian control group. Following Miller (1966), the error rate required for each set of comparisons was calculated using the formula:

$$\alpha_r = \frac{\alpha}{2r}$$

where α_r = error rate required for a set of r comparisons

and α = error rate generally accepted (.05 and .01)

This gave the error rates shown in Table XVI.1.

Table XVI.1. Error rates adjusted by Bonferroni t method

No. of Groups	2-tailed error rate equivalent to .10	2-tailed error rate equivalent to .05	2-tailed error rate equivalent to .01
6	.01	.005	.001
4	.017	.0083	.0017

Critical t values required for these error rates were then ascertained by graphical interpolation using the values provided by Fisher & Yates (1963). They are shown in Table XVI.2. When discussing the significance of

differences between the mean scores of Australian and immigrant groups it was to this table that reference was made.

Table XVI.2. Critical values of t required for Australian vs Immigrant comparisons

Group being compared	df	2-tailed equivalent of .10	2-tailed equivalent of .05	2-tailed equivalent of .01
		Immigrants		
Total sample	144	1.65	1.98	2.61
		Cultural Groups		
United Kingdom	72	2.17	2.46	3.04
N.W. Europe	70	2.17	2.46	3.05
Southern Europe	76	2.16	2.46	3.03
		Nationalities		
United Kingdom	72	2.38	2.61	3.22
Dutch	54	2.40	2.68	3.26
German	53	2.40	2.68	3.27
Italian	56	2.39	2.67	3.25
Greek	57	2.39	2.67	3.25

CALCULATION OF F RATIOS REQUIRED FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PAIRS OF IMMIGRANT SAMPLES

After a significant F ratio had been obtained from a one-way analysis of variance across the mean scores of the immigrant samples on either Disparity or Reaction measures, the immigrant groups were compared pair by pair. The F ratio required for significance was adjusted by the Scheffe method. For each pair an F ratio was calculated comparing the two mean scores but using the within-groups variance estimate obtained across the complete immigrant sample. The value of F for an accepted error rate was then ascertained with $df_1 = k-1$ and $df_2 = N-k$, where k = the number of groups being compared. This F value was then multiplied by k-1, giving F'. The F ratio between any two groups was then required to equal or exceed F' before the null hypothesis of no significant difference between them was rejected.

Comparing the five nationalities $df_1 = k-1 = 4$, and $df_2 = N-k = 102$. Comparing the three cultural groups $df_1 = 2$ and $df_2 = 104$. Table XVII.1 shows the F' values required for the two types of comparison, assuming df_2 in each case to equal approximately 100.

Table XVII.1. Values of F' for 3-group and 5-group comparisons

	df_1	
p	2	4
.10	4.70	7.96
.05	6.18	9.84
.01	9.64	14.04
.001	14.64	19.80

APPENDIX XVIII

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

PERSONAL DATA SCHEDULE

Would you please fill in the following information about yourself and your family.

Person	Sex (Male/ Female)	Date of Birth	Suburb of Resi- dence	Name of School or Type of job	Class (Year & Grade)	Country of Birth
SELF						
Brothers and Sisters 1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						

Where were these people born?

Your Grandparents - Mother's Mother .....

- Mother's Father .....

- Father's Mother .....

- Father's Father .....

Your Parents - Mother .....

- Father .....

What type of job does your father have? .....

What type of job does your mother have? .....
(If she does not work, write "Housewife").

What type of church does your family go to (e.g. Church of England, Roman Catholic, etc.) (if none write "None")

.....