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INTRODUCTION

Man's openness to all that is not himself is one of the most basic psychological issues. Openness is a matter of one's internal disposition. Yet it is affected by life situations that the person is in or has gone through.

This study deals with the question of openness and its various nuances that appear in persons who have gone through different life situations. Specifically, it attempts to explore (1) the difference in the openness between immigrant parents grown up in the old country and their sons and daughters raised in the new land, and (2) the relations that exist between their openness and some other social attitudes. Rokeach's (1956) Dogmatism Scale has been selected as the measure of the general disposition to openness. Other variables to be studied include status-concern, political alienation, social distance, life values, and preference for one's old country.

Dogmatism as the central variable of this study will be dealt with at some length at first. Then each remaining variable will be introduced and related to dogmatism while at the same time elucidating problems by presenting previous related studies. Consequently, the following chapter has a section for each variable and encompasses both the problems of this study and related literature.
CHAPTER I
PROBLEMS AND RELATED LITERATURE

Dogmatism

Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale has been selected as the measure of the open mind in this study for two reasons: (1) it taps various aspects of open-mindedness in a balanced and unprejudiced way, and (2) it has been proven as a reliable measurement. Both arguments need further clarification. The first pertains to the realm of theory; the second to methodology.

Rokeach's Theory of the Open and Closed Mind

Historically, Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) were the first to introduce a measurement of open- and closed-mindedness. They called it, the F (fascism) Scale. A few years later Rokeach (1956) constructed the Dogmatism Scale. In his book The open and closed mind (1960) he contended that although the theory and research of Adorno and his collaborators contributed greatly to the advancement of knowledge on authoritarianism and intolerance, still, due to a lack of proper naming, it has introduced a certain confusion. The F Scale was designed to measure underlying personality predispositions toward a fascist outlook on life, and it was also used as an indirect measure of prejudice. It was found that those who score high on the F Scale also tend to score high on measure of ethnocentrism, anti-Semitism, anti-Negro feelings and political conservatism. Nevertheless this fascism scale was often considered to be an "authoritarian personality scale."

Rokeach contended that the F Scale measures right-wing
but not general authoritarianism because it emphasizes conservatism and antidemocratic ideologies such as fascism. However, authoritarianism is not uniquely connected with conservatism, fascistic outlook, or right-wing ideologies. It may be found among any ideological orientation, among liberal as well as conservative viewpoints.

According to Rokeach, general authoritarianism primarily deals not with what is believed but the way it is believed, not with the content of cognitions but with their structure, not with specific beliefs but with the belief system as such. In the light of these distinctions, he looks at the nature of a belief system and discovers distinct properties of the open and closed mind.

A belief, according to Rokeach's theory, is a predisposition to action. A disbelief is a belief that a person rejects as false. The total belief-disbelief system is an organization of verbal and nonverbal, implicit and explicit beliefs and disbeliefs, sets, or expectancies.

The broad perspective of Rokeach's theory is elucidated in his treatment of a belief system. According to him, a belief system is organized along three dimensions: a belief-disbelief dimension, a central-peripheral dimension, and a time-perspective dimension. The belief system encompasses all beliefs that a person accepts as true. The disbelief system includes all beliefs that he rejects as false. Beliefs and disbeliefs vary according to the isolation-communication continuum and may be more or less differentiated within the system.
Central-peripheral dimension is distinguished according to the way a person acquires or accepts beliefs. The central region is composed of primitive beliefs that a person acquires about the nature of "self," "the generalized other," and the physical world. Peripheral region is comprised of beliefs derived from authority. The intermediate region represents the beliefs a person has about the nature of authority and on whom he depends to form a fuller picture of the world.

Time-perspective dimension refers to the person's beliefs about the past, present, and future and their interrelationship. This dimension varies from broad to narrow. A belief-disbelief system has a broad time perspective when it encompasses the past, present, and future as related to each other. On the other hand, the narrow time perspective belongs to a person who overemphasizes either one of the time elements without due consideration to other elements.

Rokeach theorizes that the open and closed mind (or low and high dogmatism) are but two extremes on a continuum. With respect to the belief-disbelief dimension, the open mind is characterized as follows: (1) its magnitude of rejection of disbelief systems is relatively low; (2) there is communication within and between belief and disbelief systems; (3) there is relatively little discrepancy in the degree of differentiation between belief and disbelief systems; and (4) there is relatively high differentiation within the disbelief system.
On the other hand, the closed mind possesses (1) relatively greater magnitude of rejection of disbeliefs, (2) greater isolation of parts within and between belief and disbelief systems, (3) greater discrepancy in the degree of differentiation between belief and disbelief systems, and (4) relatively less differentiation within the disbelief system.

With respect to the central-peripheral dimension, the open-minded person views (1) the world or situations as friendly and (2) authority not as absolute and people not to be evaluated according to their agreement or disagreement with such authority; moreover, (3) the structure of beliefs and disbeliefs perceived to emanate from authority is such that its parts are in relative communication. On the other hand, the closed-minded person views (1) the world or situations as threatening and (2) the authority as absolute and people to be evaluated according to their agreement or disagreement with such authority; moreover, (3) the parts of beliefs and disbeliefs emanating from authority will be relatively isolated.

With respect to the time-perspective dimension, the open-minded person has a relatively broad time perspective, whereas the closed-minded person possesses a narrow time perspective, more likely with a future orientation due to his tendency not to evaluate information on its own merits (one can be safely preoccupied with the distant future).
Thus the open and closed minds differ primarily in the way the person believes and thinks rather than in what he believes and thinks. This difference embraces (1) the way a person accepts or rejects beliefs (either relying on authority or on beliefs' own merits), (2) the way a person keeps his beliefs within his system (either interrelated or isolated, differentiated or undifferentiated), and (3) the way a person's non-cognitive needs influence construction and use of his belief-disbelief system.

The first two points have been elucidated by what has been explained heretofore. The third point needs some clarification. Rokeach (1960) defines the open mind in the following way:

The more open one's belief system, the more should evaluating and acting on information proceed independently on its own merits, in accord with the inner structural requirements of the situation. Also, the more open the belief system, the more should the person be governed in his actions by internal self-actualizing forces and the less by irrational inner forces (p. 58).

On the other hand, the more closed-minded the person, the more he is inclined to think and act not on the intrinsic merits of relevant information, but on irrelevant factors, such as unrelated habits, irrational ego motives, anxiety, power needs, external pressures, rewards or punishments by authority figures.

This final distinction reveals, what Rokeach (1960) calls, "a basic characteristic that defines the extent to which a person's system is open or closed (p. 57)." This property encompasses not merely cognitive aspects of
attitudes, but all attitudes and beliefs toward ideas, people, and authority itself. In this sense, Rokeach's concept of the open mind views the openness of the whole personality. This concept is unprejudiced and balanced. For these reasons the Dogmatism Scale which is based on this concept has been chosen for this study.

The Dogmatism Scale

Rokeach constructed the Dogmatism Scale to measure individual differences in openness or closedness of belief systems. By agreeing or disagreeing with certain statements one is assumed to reveal one's basic dispositions in accordance with the theoretical analysis of the belief-disbelief system.

The Scale went through a number of revisions from Form A to Form E in order to increase its reliability. It was compared with the F Scale and found to measure general authoritarianism, while the F Scale tapped "right" authoritarianism. Authoritarian left-of-center groups (Communists and religious non-believers) and authoritarian right-of-center groups (Catholics) scored relatively high on the Dogmatism Scale; however, only the authoritarian groups to the right of center scored high on the F Scale (Rokeach, 1960). The results of at least two other studies, one in 1960 and another more recent (Plant, 1960; Hanson, 1968), also support the findings.

Items on the Dogmatism Scale are positively scored statements with high agreement yielding high scores. Consequently, the question of agreement response set where subjects tend to agree rather than disagree when uncertain, has been raised
by Couch and Keniston (1960), Lichtenstein et al. (1961), and Peabody (1961, 1966). The question was answered by Rokeach (1960, 1963, 1967) who pointed to the lack of independent evidence confirming the ambiguity of the scale items and who reiterated the substantial findings linking the Dogmatism Scale scores to generalized authoritarianism.

The Dogmatism Scale has been found reliable (Rokeach, 1956, 1960). It has been and still is being widely used. Because of this substantial reliability, it is used also in this study. Dogmatism, Immigrants and Their Offspring

The subjects of this study are Lithuanian immigrants and their children raised in the United States and now studying in an American college. They represent two generations of, what Stonequist (1961) called, "marginal people." The older generation now lives in a new country, yet has been brought up in the old and very different culture. The younger generation has been raised in the new country, yet even now has certain familial ties to the culture of their parents. Such marginality is expected to accentuate the difference in their openness to ideas, to authority, and to people that surround them.

Theoretically, there are at least two reasons for similarity in dogmatism between immigrants and their children, and there are three reasons for dissimilarity.

The first reason for non-difference is the overall parent-child similarity. Several investigators (Fisher, 1948; Hirschberg and Gilliland, 1942; Queener, 1949) have
demonstrated that there is a correlation between attitudes of college students and those of their parents. The second reason for similarity is the common origin. Steward and Hoult (1959) proposed a hypothesis that "children of immigrants, as compared with children of the native-born, are authoritarian (p. 279)." Consequently, one may expect that college students of Lithuanian origin, to a certain degree, resemble their parents, even as far as dogmatism is concerned.

On the other hand, there are other factors that may widen the gap in dogmatic attitudes of the college students and their immigrant parents. They are: (1) age difference, (2) decrease of dogmatism in the American high school, especially, in college, and (3) the relatively low level of authoritarianism among American college students in general.

First, it has been generally found that the younger generation is less dogmatic than the older generation. For instance, Rokeach (1960) discovered significant difference in dogmatism mean scores between English college students and English adult workers, and between American college students and American veterans.

Secondly, significant decreases in dogmatism have been found in the United States from lower to higher grade levels in high school (Anderson, 1962; Pannes, 1963) and during attendance at college (Foster, Stanek, & Krassowsk, 1961; Lehmann, 1963; Marcus, 1964; Plant, 1965a, 1965b; Plant and Telford, 1966). Besides, Katz and Katz (1967) attributed
changes in college students' dogmatism scores over 18 months to the development of a "disagreement" response set.

Thirdly, at least one cross-cultural study of authoritarianism (Meade and Whittaker, 1967) reported American students to be significantly lower in authoritarianism as measured by the F Scale than students in India, Hong Kong, Rhodesia, Arabia, and Brazil.

In view of these factors, it seems that Lithuanian immigrant children, raised and attending college in the United States, possess a lower level of dogmatism than their parents. Thus a theoretical conclusion which is to be tested in this study is proposed, namely, that the difference in life situations of the students and their parents will be reflected in the difference of their viewpoints, as to their open- or closed-mindedness, and that this difference will be in the direction of lower dogmatism for the students, higher dogmatism for their parents.

Other Variables

Besides dogmatism, other variables were selected from areas which may be related to general openness: social distance for confrontation with other races and nationalities, political alienation for relatedness to the political system of the new country, status-concern for viewing socioeconomic position, two questions of certain preferences for relatedness to the new or old life situations; and finally the value survey to explore the hierarchy of leading life values.
Status-Concern

Status-concern is an attitude toward status and mobility or, more specifically, toward the value placed on symbols of status and in the attainment of higher status. Importance of status-concern was revealed in the results of Kaufman's (1957) study which showed that concern for status was more closely related to anti-Semitism than was authoritarianism, and the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-Semitism seemed to be largely explained by their mutual relationship to status-concern. Similarly, the results of other studies (Silberstein and Seeman, 1959; Seeman et al., 1966) suggested that attitudes toward status and mobility are more important than actual status.

This study examines the relation between status-concern and dogmatism among immigrant parents and their college-attending children. New immigrants in the United States very likely have a high status-concern. Moreover, Stonequist (1961), speaking about immigrants, stated that "The doubtful social status of the second generation gives rise to concern for status. This finds expression statistically in two important spheres: marriage and occupation (p. 98)."

Hence both immigrant parents and their college-attending children are expected to have a rather high degree of status-concern. At the same time, immigrant parents having had a more direct experience of status significance very likely should be more status-concerned than their sons and daughters.
Political Alienation

The openness or closedness of the person may be somehow reflected in his attitude toward political life of the country wherein he resides. The source of this attitude is not one-sided. Not the person alone, but also the political life, actual or, rather, perceived, molds this attitude. Olsen (1969) was the first to conceptualize political alienation into two distinct categories: (1) the feeling of political incapability, further comprised of guidelessness, powerlessness, and normlessness, and (2) discontent consisting of feelings of dissimilarity, dissatisfaction, and disillusionment. Olsen contends that the feeling of political incapability is forced upon the individual by his environment, whereas discontent is voluntarily chosen by him. It seems, however, that political discontent may, at least, partly or even fully be induced by the environment, while the feeling of inability may be due to personal incapacity.

Be it as it may, political alienation should be of a special interest in this comparative study of immigrants. By common sense, one expects older immigrants to feel politically more powerless and discontented than their sons and daughters who are more readily acculturated in the new country. Nevertheless, looking at the present situation, one can also expect the contemporary American students' much publicized discontent to be reflected in the political attitude of students of Lithuanian background.
Dogmatism should be also taken into consideration. High dogmatic persons very likely are politically more alienated than low dogmatic persons. It is expected that dogmatism is positively correlated to political powerlessness and discontent, among both parents and students.

This study seems to be the first, after Olsen himself, to use his Political Alienation Scale.

Social Distance

This study also attempts to measure social distance or the degree that a person allows a member of another race or nationality to associate with him. Thus this variable treats of social openness in regard to race and nationality.

The concept of social distance was introduced by Bogardus (1928) and since then his Social Distance Scale was widely used in sociological and psychological studies.

Social distance is of special interest in this study of an immigrant minority. Minorities often feel disadvantaged and sometimes even victimized; therefore they may easily become defensive and prejudiced (Allport and Kramer, 1946; Allport, 1954). The Lithuanian minority composed of immigrants after the second world war may be described as an "enclaved group." According to Bogardus (1959),

An enclaved group is one that cuts itself off from contacts with other groups. The group that enclaves itself uses social farness techniques in order to maintain its customs and traditions, and to protect them from what is considered to be an undesirable and dangerous invasion from outside people (p. 39).

Social distance may very well reflect this form of
national enclavement. However, there should be a difference between the old and young generations of immigrants. In general, members of the older generation are more tightly linked with the minority group than the members of the younger generation, especially those who attend college. Thus the social distance scores of immigrant parents are expected to reflect a rather high isolation and withdrawal, with high dogmatics higher on social distance than low dogmatics. On the other hand, among students this variable is expected to reflect both national minority group influences and, probably, to a greater degree, a qualified disregard for national and racial differences, namely, the attitude which is more characteristic of the American younger generation. It is hypothesized that high dogmatic students will remain close to the older generation in social distance while the low dogmatic students will be more similar to America's younger generation in social nearness.

Thus, this study expects to find a positive correlation between dogmatism and social distance. While one might expect this, the results of two somewhat similar studies show that this is not necessarily the case. Photiadis and Biggar (1962) found authoritarianism (as measured by the five-item version of the F Scale) to be positively related to social distance (as measured by Bogardus' Social Distance Scale). However, Gladstone and Gupta (1964) failed to find any difference between the high and low dogmatics (as measured by the Dogmatism Scale) for evaluation of national groups.
The results of this study may shed some light on the matter.

**Choices Between Lithuania and the United States**

Two questions deal with the immigrants' choices between the United States and Lithuania as far as their general preference and choice of residence is concerned. It is expected that immigrant parents will prefer Lithuania and return to Lithuania if it becomes independent, and that their sons and daughters will be more undecided or even lean toward the United States. It is also expected that dogmatism will correlate positively with preference for Lithuania among both generations.

**The Value Survey**

Rokeach's (1968) Value Survey is added to previous variables. It assesses a respondent's hierarchical arrangement of two kinds of values: terminal and instrumental. Terminal values refer to preferable end states of existence; instrumental, to preferable modes of conduct.

The survey's purpose in this study is to find out the differences, if any, between the choices of students and their parents (1) in ranking most and least important values, and (2) in preferring socially oriented values.

**Hypotheses**

On the basis of what has been said in previous sections, the following hypotheses are proposed to be tested.

(A) For the comparative study between the older and younger generations:
(1) Immigrant parents are significantly more dogmatic than their children brought up and attending college in the United States.

(2) Immigrant parents are significantly more status-concerned than their children brought up and attending college in the United States.

(3) Immigrant parents are significantly more politically alienated than their children brought up and attending college in the United States.

(4) Immigrant parents are significantly more socially distanced from other nationalities than their children brought up and attending college in the United States.

(5) Immigrant parents are significantly more inclined to return to Lithuania and to prefer Lithuania to the United States than their children brought up and attending college in the United States.

(B) For the correlational study of attitudes within each generation:

(6) Dogmatism is positively related to status-concern.

(7) Dogmatism is positively related to political alienation.

(8) Dogmatism is positively related to social distance.

(9) Dogmatism is positively related to preference for Lithuania and to the choice to return to Lithuania.

The Value Survey serves an illustrative purpose in this study. In this respect, no hypothesis is proposed.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects were 72 college students and their 52 parents, all second world war refugees from Lithuania and immigrants to the United States after the war.

The ages of the students ranged from 17 to 24, with a mean of 19.6 and a standard deviation of 1.7. Thirty-seven were male and 35 female. Forty-one were born in the United States and 31 in other countries: 21 in Germany, 4 in Canada, 2 in Austria, and 1 in each: Argentina, England, Poland, and Switzerland. All were brought up in America and at the time of this study were attending colleges in various parts of the United States. Thirty lived in Chicago, 8 in Cleveland, 7 in Cicero, Ill., 4 in Detroit, 4 in Wisconsin, 3 in Boston, 3 in the rest of Illinois, and 1 in each: Los Angeles, Rochester, N. Y., Atlanta, Ga., Washington, D. C., Ohio, and Worcester, Mass. All but five indicated that they are citizens of the United States. Two claimed citizenship of Lithuania, one of Canada, one of England, and one of Poland.

Of 52 parents, 27 were fathers and 25 were mothers. Their ages ranged from 40 to 70 with a mean of 52.6 and a standard deviation of 7.3. All but seven indicated Lithuania as their birthplace: five were born in Russia, one in Italy, and one failed to specify. All but six became naturalized.
citizens of the United States. Four retained the citizenship of Lithuania and two were citizens of Canada. Of them, at the time of this study, 27 lived in Chicago, 6 in Cleveland, 6 in Cicero, Ill., 2 in Los Angeles, 2 in New York, and 1 in each: Detroit, Rochester, N. Y., Atlanta, Ga., Boston, Worcester, Mass., Philadelphia, Pa., Washington, D. C., and New Jersey (besides, one did not specify the place of his residence). At the time there were 16 professionals (30.8%), 3 managers and officials (5.8%), 9 white-collar workers (17.3%), 7 skilled craftsmen (13.4%), 4 semiskilled laborers (7.7%), 12 housewives (23.1%), and 1 retired (1.9%). In Lithuania their occupations were: 19 professionals (36.5%), 2 managers and officials (3.85%), 7 white-collar workers (13.5%), 1 skilled craftsman (1.9%), 2 housewives (3.85%), 9 university students (17.3%), and 11 secondary school students (21.2%; moreover, one did not specify his occupation in Lithuania).

Instruments

An 8-page questionnaire was compiled consisting of the following tests: Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960), Status-Concern Scale (Kaufman, 1957), Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1928), Political Alienation Scale (Olsen, 1969), Value Survey (Rokeach, 1968), and two questions concerning Lithuania-America preferences composed by the investigator.

Form E was used for the Dogmatism Scale. It consists of 40 statements. Responses are scored along a +3 to -3 agree-disagree scale, with the 0 point excluded. These
scores are converted to a 1 to 7 scale by adding the constant 4 to each score. The range of possible scores is from 40 to 280. A high score indicates a high degree of dogmatism.

Kaufman's Status-Concern Scale consists of ten Likert-type items. Responding and scoring is done in exactly the same way as for the Dogmatism Scale. Range of possible scores is from 10 to 70 with high scores indicating high concern for status.

A 7-category Social Distance Scale was used for this study. The categories were: close kinship, personal friendship, neighbors, common employment, citizenship, visitor in one's country, and total exclusion. The races and nationalities chosen for the questionnaire were: Americans, English, Germans, Italians, Japanese, Jews, Lithuanians, Negroes, Poles, and Russians. The subjects indicated how closely they accept each nationality or race. The responses for each nationality were scored on a continuum of 1 (for close kinship) to 7 (for total exclusion). In this study the smallest score indicating the subject's nearest acceptance of each race was considered as characteristic. His Racial Distance Quotient was obtained by adding his characteristic scores for each nationality and dividing the sum by the number of all nationalities. The range of the Racial Distance Quotient is from 1 to 7 with high quotients indicating high social distance.

Olsen's Political Alienation Scale measures two distinct variables: the feeling of political incapability and discontent.
For each variable there is a 4-item scale with true-false responses. One point is given for each statement with which the respondent agrees. Scale scores run from 0 to 4 with high scores indicating high discontent or feeling of political incapability.

Rokeach's Value Survey consists of two lists: one contains 18 terminal values, the other 18 instrumental values. Subjects rank each list in the order of importance to them. In this study the subjects were asked to choose five most important values and three least important values from each list. To measure each sample's value rank order, each value chosen by the respondent as the most important of all was given +5, second most important +4, etc., the fifth most important value receiving +1. The values chosen as least important were given minus scores: the least important of all -3, the second least -2, and the third least -1. The group's overall score for each value was obtained by adding all positive scores given to that value and by subtracting all its negative scores. The group's value rank order was obtained by ranking all values separately for each list.

Two questions were added to the questionnaire. They read as follows:

Please put a plus sign on the left of each statement you agree with. Respond both to a and b sections.

a. I cherish Lithuania and the United States equally.
   I cherish the United States more than Lithuania.
   I cherish Lithuania more than the United States.

b. If Lithuania became independent
   I would return to Lithuania.
I would stay in the United States. At present, I can't make up my mind.

In correlations, the two questions (section a and b) comprised two separate variables. To each response +3, +2, and +1 scores were given: the highest, to preference for Lithuania; the middle, to indecision or equality; and the lowest, to preference for the United States.

Preliminary Testing

Because of many parents' imperfect command of English and some students' insufficient command of Lithuanian, it would be difficult to use one single language. Consequently, the questionnaire was prepared in two languages: English and Lithuanian.

The scales and the value survey was translated from original English text to Lithuanian by the author of this thesis. A preliminary test was conducted to examine the reliability of the translation. Ten subjects of the same Lithuanian immigrant population, five male and five female, with age ranging from 18 to 62 with mean of 36, filled out the questionnaire in one language and then in another with the interval of one day to two weeks. Table 1 presents the English-Lithuanian questionnaire testing group means, standard deviations, and Pearson product-moment correlations of all variables. The English-Lithuanian correlations were as follows: for dogmatism $r = .9951$, for status-concern $r = .9877$, for political alienation $r = .4984$ (the lowering of this correlation is due to one subject; without her the group's
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOG.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>RL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>173.30</td>
<td>38.70</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>33.91</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r )</td>
<td>.9951</td>
<td>.9877</td>
<td>.9982</td>
<td>.4984^a</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOG. ...... Dogmatism  
SC ......... Status-Concern  
SD ......... Social Distance  
PA ......... Political Alienation (sum of political discontent and incapability)  
PL ......... Preference for Lithuania  
RL ......... Return to Lithuania

^aThe lowering of this correlation is due to one subject's inconsistent responses. Without her, the group's \( r = 1.000 \).
for social distance $r = .9982$, and for preference statements $r = 1.00$. The value survey rank order correlation coefficient, $\rho = .8627$.

With these high correlations indicating high reliability, the Lithuanian translation was judged to be a satisfactory parallel form for use alongside the original English version.

Procedure

Fifty-one college students from various parts of the United States filled out the questionnaire in a summer camp. Additional 29 copies were distributed to students by mail or by hand, mostly in Chicago. Of them, 21 copies were filled out and returned by mail. Of 80 copies, mostly randomly distributed either to father or mother of these students by mail or by hand, 54 were filled out and returned by mail. Of them, two were found substantially incomplete. Eventually 72 students, 37 male and 35 female, and 52 parents, 27 fathers and 25 mothers, responded to this questionnaire. Sixty-nine students used the English language. Forty-nine parents used Lithuanian.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS

For the analysis of data, (1) $t$-scores were computed to find the differences between the attitudes of the students and their immigrant parents, (2) Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was obtained for all pairs of attitudes in each sample; (3) product-moment correlation coefficient was computed for parents' dogmatism and certain other attitudes; and (4) rank order correlation coefficient was obtained for student-parent value choices.

Differences Between Generations

Table 2 presents mean scores, standard deviations, and $t$-scores for the different variables among the students and their parents. Significant differences were obtained between the two generations on all variables, except political discontent. All significant differences were at 1% level, except the choice of return to Lithuania, which was significant at 5% level. In all variables mean scores of parents were higher than that of their children, but especially in dogmatism, social distance, and status-concern.

Correlations Within Generations

Tables 3 and 4 present Pearson product-moment correlations for all pairs of the variables among the immigrant parents and their children respectively. Among parents, the following positive correlations were found significant at 1% level: dogmatism and social distance, political incapability and discontent,
TABLE 2

IMMIGRANT PARENTS' AND STUDENTS' GROUP MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND T-RATIOS FOR THE DIFFERENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOG</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>RL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents (N=52)</td>
<td>177.75</td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (N=72)</td>
<td>148.21</td>
<td>35.51</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 6.5079^c 4.8892^c 3.3179^c 1.1305^c 5.0482^c 4.4003^c 2.3462^d \]

\[ ^a \text{DOG} \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{Dogmatism} \]
\[ ^b \text{SC} \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{Social-Concern} \]
\[ ^c \text{PI} \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{Political Incapability} \]
\[ ^d \text{PD} \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{Political Discontent} \]
\[ ^e \text{SD} \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{Social Distance} \]
\[ ^f \text{PL} \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{Preference for Lithuania} \]
\[ ^g \text{RL} \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{Return to Lithuania} \]

\[ ^{e} \text{Except for Social Distance, where N = 51.} \]

\[ ^{c} \text{Significant at .01 level.} \]

\[ ^{d} \text{Significant at .05 level.} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>RL a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism (DOG)</td>
<td>.54 c</td>
<td>.36 c</td>
<td>.29 d</td>
<td>.43 c</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status-Concern (SC)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.31 d</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Incapability (PI)</td>
<td>.38 c</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Discontent (PD)</td>
<td>.33 d</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for Lithuania (PL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35 c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aRL .......... Return to Lithuania

cSignificant at .01 level.

dSignificant at .05 level.
### TABLE 4

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION MATRIX FOR THE DIFFERENT VARIABLES AMONG STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>RL&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism (DOG)</td>
<td>.34&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.24&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status-Concern (SC)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.24&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Incapability (PI)</td>
<td>.47&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Discontent (PD)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance (SD)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for Lithuania (PL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Return to Lithuania

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .01 level.

<sup>d</sup>Significant at .05 level.
and preference for Lithuania and choice of return to Lithuania; significant at 5% level, dogmatism and political discontent, status-concern and social distance, and political discontent and social distance.

Among students, three correlations were significant at 1% level: dogmatism and status-concern, political incapability and political discontent, and preference for Lithuania and choice of return to Lithuania; besides, three correlations were significant at 5% level: dogmatism and political incapability, status-concern and political discontent (negative), and political discontent and preference for Lithuania.

**Sex Differences in Dogmatism**

No significant difference was found among male and female students in dogmatism ($t = .8942$). Male students' mean score was 150.41 with standard deviation of 19.16. Female students' mean score was 145.89 with standard deviation of 22.85.

Among parents, mothers were significantly more dogmatic than fathers ($t = 2.7755, \ p < .01$). The mothers' mean score was 188.04 with standard deviation of 26.37, whereas the mean score of fathers was 168.22 with standard deviation of 23.92. Because of this sex difference among parents, their lower significant correlations between dogmatism and the two political attitudes were computed for each sex. It was found that in both attitudes the fathers' correlation coefficient was considerably higher than that of the mothers ($r = .38$ over $.13$ in political incapability, and $.28$ over $.08$ in political discontent; see Table 5 for
the means and standard deviations of the variables, and Table 6 for the correlations). In all four cases the coefficient was not significant due to a small degree of freedom (df = 25 for males and 23 for females).

**The Value Survey**

The overall rank orders of terminal and instrumental values for the two generations are presented in Tables 7 to 10.

The following five terminal values were chosen by students as most important: wisdom, a world of peace, inner harmony, freedom, and salvation. As least important, were selected a comfortable life, pleasure, and social recognition as least of all. From among the instrumental values, students selected "honest," "loving," "broadminded," "intellectual," and "forgiving" as most important; and "ambitious," "capable," "obedient," "polite," and "clean" as least important.

From among the terminal values, parents chose salvation, family security, freedom, wisdom, and a world of peace as most important; and a comfortable life, pleasure, and social recognition as least important. As most important instrumental values, they ranked "honest," "intellectual," "responsible," "loving," and "courageous"; as least important: "obedient," "polite," and "clean" as least of all.

When correlating parental and students' value choices, a significantly high rank order correlation coefficient was obtained ($\rho = .88; p < .01$).
### TABLE 5

**IMMIGRANT FATHERS' AND MOTHERS' GROUP MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF DOGMATISM, POLITICAL INCAPABILITY, AND DISCONTENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism</th>
<th>Political Incapability</th>
<th>Political Discontent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>Fathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>168.22</td>
<td>188.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>26.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6

**IMMIGRANT FATHERS' AND MOTHERS' PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS FOR DOGMATISM, POLITICAL INCAPABILITY, AND DISCONTENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism:</th>
<th>Political Incapability</th>
<th>Political Discontent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

Differences Between Generations

Hypothesis 1: Immigrant parents are significantly more dogmatic than their children brought up and attending college in the United States. This hypothesis was strongly supported by the data of this study ($t = 6.51; p < .01$). Thus younger age combined with the influence of American education and the American way of life outweighs the influence of immigrant parents in regard to the formation of open- and closed-mindedness in their children.

Different life experiences appear to be powerful molders of the way people think and believe. Yet a certain affinity within the same generations of different cultures also appears to be quite striking. Raised-in-America Lithuanian students of 1970 (with the mean of 148.21) dogmatically were similar to English students of 1954 and American students of 1955 (with the means of 152.8 and 141.3-143.8 respectively; Rokeach, 1960). Steward and Hoult's (1959) hypothesis that "children of immigrants, as compared with children of the native-born, are authoritarian (p. 279)" finds no support in this study.

It is also interesting to note that, according to this study, the greatest generation gap among immigrants exists not between fathers and sons (with the means of 168.22 and 150.41 respectively), but between mothers and daughters (188.04 and 145.89, respectively; see Fig. 1). An educated
immigrant's viewpoint does not differ as much from his son's who is being educated in America, as an immigrant woman's viewpoint from her daughter's raised in this country.

Hypothesis 2: Immigrant parents are significantly more status-concerned than their children brought up and attending college in the United States. This thesis was rather strongly supported by the data ($t = 4.89$, $p < .01$).

The Lithuanian immigrants coming to this country seem to be aware of socioeconomic opportunities and, to some extent, eager to move ahead. Nevertheless this eagerness is only moderately high (mean is 43.73). Still, occupationally, they have fairly good means of enjoying good things in this life (the sample in this study represents only those whose children attend college; therefore their occupational status is not to be confused with that of all Lithuanian immigrants).

On the other hand, one may be somewhat surprised at the moderate status-concern by the college students of Lithuanian background (their mean score is 35.51). In accordance with Stonequist's (1961) suggestion, one would expect a higher concern for status among the members of the second generation of immigrants. Perhaps the appeal for status will come later, after college.

Thus the more educated Lithuanian immigrants seem not to let themselves be subjugated by the high standard of living in the United States. To some extent they use it, but they are not used by it. The students attend college and their parents have fairly good jobs. Nevertheless, their concern
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Positive Ranks</th>
<th>Negat-</th>
<th>Overall Positive Ranks</th>
<th>Negat-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for most important</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>values</td>
<td>values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scores</td>
<td>least</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>important values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Salvation            | 132     | 151                  | 1      | -19  | 6-7
| 2. Family security      | 102     | 105                  | 2      | -3   | 10-13
| 3. Freedom              | 96      | 98                   | 3      | -2   | 14
| 4. Wisdom               | 64      | 69                   | 4      | -5   | 9
| 5. A world of peace     | 54      | 54                   | 5      | 0    | 17-18
| 6. Inner harmony        | 43      | 44                   | 6      | -1   | 15-16
| 7. Happiness            | 30      | 33                   | 7      | -3   | 10-13
| 8. True friendship      | 26      | 26                   | 9      | 0    | 17-18
| 9. Equality             | 24      | 27                   | 8      | -3   | 10-13
| 10. Mature love         | 17      | 20                   | 11     | -3   | 10-13
| 11. Self-respect        | 9       | 10                   | 14     | -1   | 15-16
| 12. A sense of          |         |                      |        |      |     
|   | accomplishment         | 7       | 19                   | 12     | -12  | 8
| 13. A world of beauty   | 6       | 25                   | 10     | -19  | 6-7
| 15. An exciting life    | -51     | 0                    | 18     | -51  | 4
| 16. A comfortable life  | -74     | 6                    | 15     | -80  | 3
| 17. Pleasure            | -79     | 3                    | 16-17  | -82  | 2
| 18. Social recognition  | -87     | 3                    | 16-17  | -90  | 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall scores</th>
<th>Positive scores</th>
<th>Ranks for most important values</th>
<th>Negative scores</th>
<th>Ranks for least important values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Courageous</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Broadminded</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Capable</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Self-controlled</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Obedient</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>-108</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-113</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9

**OVERALL RANK ORDER OF TERMINAL VALUES CHOSEN BY STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall scores</th>
<th>Positive ranks most important values</th>
<th>Negative ranks least important values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wisdom</td>
<td>141 146</td>
<td>1 -5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A world of peace</td>
<td>128 128</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inner harmony</td>
<td>120 121</td>
<td>3 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Freedom</td>
<td>102 104</td>
<td>4 -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Salvation</td>
<td>84 103</td>
<td>5 -19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mature love</td>
<td>77 80</td>
<td>6 -3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. True friendship</td>
<td>74 74</td>
<td>7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Equality</td>
<td>63 66</td>
<td>8 -3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Happiness</td>
<td>60 63</td>
<td>9 -3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Self-respect</td>
<td>38 39</td>
<td>11 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Family security</td>
<td>30 33</td>
<td>12 -3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>28 40</td>
<td>10 -12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A world of beauty</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td>14 -19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. National security</td>
<td>-16 3</td>
<td>17 -49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A comfortable life</td>
<td>-71 9</td>
<td>15 -80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Pleasure</td>
<td>-82 0</td>
<td>18 -82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Social recognition</td>
<td>-85 5</td>
<td>16 -90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rank</td>
<td>Positive Ranks</td>
<td>Negative Ranks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Scores</td>
<td>Scores Least Important Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Honest</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Loving</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Broadminded</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intellectual</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Forgiving</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Courageous</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 Helpful</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 Responsible</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cheerful</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Independent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Logical</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Imaginative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Self-controlled</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ambitious</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Capable</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Obedient</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Polite</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Clean</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2: Immigrant parents are significantly more politically alienated than their children brought up and attending college in the United States. The data supported this hypothesis in regard to the feeling of political incapability but not in regard to political discontent. That is, parents feel political powerlessness to a significantly higher degree than the students (t = 3.32, p < .01; the parents' mean score is 2.12 and the students' 1.35). On the other hand, both just about equally feel high discontent (t = 1.13; NS; the parents' mean is 2.54 and the students' 2.28).

Parents feel just about as much discontent as powerlessness. Students feel much more discontent than incapable. The latter difference may plausibly be explained by two reasons: (1) Lithuanian students share the same high discontent of contemporary American students, and (2) through education and identification, they have acquired a feeling of competency to participate in the life of America. Meanwhile, for parents, American politics is still a strange land.

Applying Olsen's (1969) criterion of 2.00 (and above) for high political incapability and discontent, one finds a very high percentage of politically alienated immigrants in both generations: among parents, 59.61% feel powerless and 78.85% discontent; among students, 36.11% feel powerless and 54.72% discontent. Olsen (1969) found fewer
politically alienated among Americans: among a young adult group, age 21-29, 17.6% felt incapable and 29.4% discontent (with means of .94 and 1.12 respectively) and among an adult group, age 45-59, 31.4% felt powerless and 30.6% discontent (with means of 1.20 and 1.08 respectively). Only old Americans, age 60 and above, who, in a way, feel left out just as the immigrants do, had a high percentage of those feeling powerless and discontent (62.8% with the mean of 1.91, and 58.5% with 1.83).

It is of note that just as American women, so also Lithuanian immigrant women were more politically alienated than men. American women felt greater political incapability and discontent than men (their means were 1.48 and 1.24, as compared to men's 1.08 and 1.14). Even to a greater degree, Lithuanian women felt less capable and more discontented than men (their means were 2.68 and 3.00, as compared with men's 1.59 and 2.11).

In general, immigrants, especially women, who are more remote from public life, feel alienated from the politics of the country in which they reside. Through education, immigrant children make the first psychological approach to the American public life by sensing certain opportunities.

**Hypothesis 4:** Immigrant parents are significantly more socially distanced from other nationalities and races than their children brought up and attending college in the United States. This hypothesis was strongly supported by the data ($t = 5.05$, $p < .01$). The parents' Racial Distance
Quotient is quite high (2.55) and definitely reflects ethnic minority group defensiveness. Their children's Racial Distance Quotient is somewhat high (1.63); it may very likely reflect parental or minority group influence. However, significantly differing from their parents, students, most probably, manifest America's environmental influence, especially that of education.

Although the lists of races and nationalities differed, it is interesting to compare the Lithuanian students' Group Distance Quotient (1.63) with that of the foreign students' studying in Purdue University (Bardis, 1956) whose Group Racial Distance Quotient ranged from 1.22 (Hawaiians) to 1.72 (Greeks).

**Hypothesis 5:** Immigrant parents are significantly more inclined to return to Lithuania and prefer Lithuania to the United States than their children brought up and attending college in the United States. Parents preferred Lithuania to the United States much more than did their sons and daughters (t = 4.40, p < .01) and they were more inclined to return to Lithuania if it became independent (t = 2.35, p < .05).

Thirty-four parents (66.38%) preferred Lithuania, 18 (34.62%) valued both countries equally, and none preferred the United States. Twenty-five students (34.72%) preferred Lithuania, 36 (50%) valued both countries equally, and 11 (15.28%) preferred the United States.
Fig. 1. Sex difference between group mean scores of dogmatism among parents and students.
Twenty-three parents (44.23%) indicated their intention of returning to Lithuania if it became independent; again, 23 (44.23%) were undecided, and 6 (11.54%) indicated their decision to stay in the United States. Eighteen students (25%) manifested their willingness to return to Lithuania, 40 (55.56%) were undecided, and 14 (19.44%) indicated their choice to stay in the United States.

In these responses there were no surprises, except, perhaps, for the relatively small number of students wishing to stay in the United States and a relatively large number of those wishing to return to Lithuania. This is probably due to a selection factor, because the students who attended the summer camp under Lithuanian auspices and who comprised 70.83% of the subjects of this study could have been more patriotic-minded than the average students of Lithuanian origin.

Correlations Within Generations

**Hypothesis 6**: Dogmatism is positively related to status-concern. This hypothesis was supported for both parents ($r = .54$, df = 50, $p < .01$) and students ($r = .34$, df = 70, $p < .01$). This seems to follow in line with other studies. For instance, Kaufman (1957) found a still higher correlation between status-concern and "right" authoritarianism among non-Jewish "middle class" American undergraduate students ($r = .71$). The two variables seem to be closely related.

**Hypothesis 7**: Dogmatism is positively related to political alienation. In the case of parents, this hypothesis was
supported for both political powerlessness ($r = .36, df = 50, p < .01$) and political discontent ($r = .29, df = 50, p < .05$).

In the case of students, significant positive correlation was found between dogmatism and powerlessness ($r = .24, df = 70, p < .05$), but not between dogmatism and discontent ($r = -.01, df = 70, NS$). This latter insignificant correlation may be due to contemporary discontentment of American youth with the political establishment of this country. It seems that just as the increase in adult age positively correlates with political alienation (Olsen, 1969), so dogmatism positively correlates with a feeling of political powerlessness, at least, in unfavorable life situations such as the immigrant's lot or old age. However, discontent may be more subjective and, consequently, more elusive.

**Hypothesis 8:** Dogmatism is positively related to social distance. There is evidence for this hypothesis among the first generation ($r = .43, df = 49, p < .01$), but not among the second ($r = .10, df = 70, NS$). It appears to be true that high dogmatic immigrants are more socially distanced from other races and nationalities because of a double defensiveness due to minority group seclusion and insecurity of the closed-minded. On the other hand, the prediction for high dogmatic students to follow the minority group spirit and for the low dogmatic students to follow American tolerance appears not to be realized, since there is no significant correlation among students.

Thus, it seems that there is no dichotomy of influence
among students, cutting across dogmatism, at least not insofar as social distance is concerned. The findings of this study, apparently, show that dogmatism may accentuate social distance, especially in combination with some other factor, as, for instance, a minority group seclusion. Conversely, if dogmatism is not so high, as in the case of students, and if there are no other contributing factors, there may be no significant positive correlation between dogmatism and social distance.

The last observation may explain the discrepancy between the contrasting results of Photiadis and Biggar's (1962) and Gladstone and Gupta's (1964) studies. The failure of the former to find positive correlation between dogmatism and moral evaluation of certain national groups may be due to the fact that (1) the subjects of the samples lacked another accentuating variable which would interact with dogmatism, or (2) the general moral evaluation of nations was not sufficiently personal to evoke ethnocentrism, as the Social Distance Scale is.

**Hypothesis 2:** Dogmatism is positively related to preference for Lithuania and to the choice of return to Lithuania. This hypothesis found no support, neither among the first nor among the second generations. Among parents, the two preferential choices were negatively but insignificantly related not only to dogmatism but also to status-concern and political alienation. This seems to indicate that return to Lithuania and preference for Lithuania, at least,
among this sample of immigrants, are selected neither on a
dogmatic basis, not for economic-political reasons. Other
factors, such as love for the fatherland or mere sentiment-
ality, may be at work.

Furthermore, this study yielded other unhypothesized
 correlations. Some of them were rather commonplace, others
 not so. Among both parents and students, political powerless-
ness and political discontent, and preference for Lithuania
and desire for returning to Lithuania were positively cor-
related. These were obviously commonplace correlations.

Among parents, social distance stood out with its two
significantly positive correlations: one with status-concern
\( r = .31, \text{ df} = 50, p < .05 \) and the other with political
discontent \( r = .33, \text{ df} = 50, p < .05 \). The first correlation
appears to be in consonance, at least indirectly, with the
findings of other studies which show that upward or downward
status mobility go together with prejudice (Greenblum and
Pearlin, 1953; Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1950), although
Seeman et al. (1966) in a crosscultural comparison found
no effect of downward mobility on prejudice in Sweden.

In the present study status-concern may very likely
reflect either upward or downward mobility of the immigrants,
while its correlation with social distance may indicate the
prejudice of people in status flux. Therefore, the immig-
ants' reasons for prejudice appear to be not only racial,
but also socioeconomic.
The correlation of social distance with political discontent among the first generation represents a certain puzzle. Possibly, the explanation may be found in their common relationship with dogmatism.

There are at least three reasons to assert that among students, the outstanding variable is political discontent. First, it was the only variable in this study that did not differ significantly from that of their parents. All other variables being significantly lower, political discontent was almost as high as that of the parents'.

Secondly, dogmatism is among parents as political discontent is among students: it has the largest number of significant correlations with other variables. It has three, whereas parents' dogmatism has four such correlations.

Thirdly, students' political discontent has the only significant negative correlation in this study, namely, with status-concern. This correlation indicates that the students who are dissatisfied with American politics tend not to care about status-concern. This would imply that rather idealistic students are discontented with the American way of handling politics.

The last uncommon significant correlation is between political discontent and preferring Lithuania. That is, politically discontented students tend to choose Lithuania in preference to the United States or those students who prefer Lithuania tend to be dissatisfied with American politics.
Sex Difference in Dogmatism

No significant difference in dogmatism was found among male and female students in this study. This illustrates a tendency among sexes of contemporary young generation to be similar. The same trend is found in authoritarianism not only among students in the United States, but also in India, Hong Kong, Rhodesia, Arabia, and Brazil (Meade and Whittaker, 1967; the F Scale was used).

This similarity was not observed among parents. In contrast to other findings, mothers were significantly more dogmatic than fathers. Alter and White (1966) reported that American women scored consistently lower in dogmatism than men. This sex difference among American and Lithuanian adults may be a result of different upbringing and sex roles.

Mothers' mean scores were higher than men's not only in dogmatism but also in other variables such as political alienation, and social distance. The reason for this is not altogether clear. One possible explanation is that an immigrant man is a stranger to the American environment on one level, namely, as a minority member; an immigrant woman is a stranger on two levels, as a minority member and as more secluded within her home. A woman's fidelity to her group and to its traditional outlook may offer another explanation.

In interpreting sex difference, one should keep in mind that there is some evidence of differences between the sexes in defining dogmatism (Anderson, 1962; Becker, 1967; Ehrlich
and Bauer, 1966; Plant, 1965a; Plant and Telford, 1966; Vачchiano et al., 1967; Wolfer, 1967). This suggestion needs to be further investigated. At present it stands only as a warning not to make very definite conclusions.

The Value Survey

The purpose of the Value Survey was twofold: (1) to explore the differences in the choices of values between the older and younger generations, and (2) to compare their choices of social values.

The overall rank order of values chosen by students and their parents showed marked similarities. However, there were also some characteristic differences.

For terminal values, the greatest difference in ranking occurred for family security. Parents placed it in the second place, while students only in the eleventh. Five other values received moderately different ranking: salvation (first among parents, fifth among students), mature love (tenth and sixth), wisdom (fourth and first), a world of peace (fifth and second), and inner harmony (sixth and third). The other values received identical or very close ranking. Especially the second half of the overall rank order, from the twelfth to the eighteenth place, is identical with one slight change. Again, wisdom, a world of peace, freedom, and salvation are among the five top values chosen by students and their parents. The three least popular values for both generations are identical: a comfortable life, pleasure, and social recognition.

There are even fewer differences in the overall rank
orders of instrumental values (see Tables 8 and 10). Both groups selected "honest" as their most important value. Besides it, "loving," "broadminded," "intellectual," "courageous," and "helpful" were among the first seven adjectives chosen by both generations. Again, the three least important values were identical for both groups: "obedient," "polite," and "clean." The greatest difference in choices occurred for "responsible" (third for parents, seventh-eighth for students) and "forgiving" (ninth for parents, fifth for students).

Within the list of terminal values one can distinguish three types of social values: (1) narrow other-oriented (true friendship, mature love, family security), (2) broad self-oriented (social recognition), and (3) broad other-oriented (equality, a world of peace, and national security). In this study the comparison is made between generations only in regard to the third type of terminal values.

Students ranked equality as the eighth and parents as the ninth value. National security was slightly preferred by parents (fourteenth choice versus the fifteenth choice by students). The more pronounced discrepancy occurred in the choice of a world of peace: students chose it as the second most important value, whereas parents selected it as the fifth. This last discrepancy gave the students a slight lead over their parents in preferring social goal values.

It is more difficult to decide which instrumental values are to be considered social. "Helpful," "responsible," and
"broadminded" seem to have most broad social implications. In the choice of these three values, students lead in one ("broadminded," third place versus sixth) and parents lead in two ("helpful," seventh place versus seventh-eighth; and "responsible," third place versus seventh-eighth).

In conclusion, the following can be said: (1) Although there are certain differences among choices, the overall rank order correlation in the value choices between the two generations is very high. The differences reflect vocational (parents' preference for family security) and situational (students' desire for a world of peace) choices, and a difference in viewpoint (salvation as the parents' first selection). (2) In the choices of social values, students lead in preferring social goal values and parents in instrumental social values; yet the differences are very slight, so much so that hardly any significance can be attributed to it.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study has been to investigate (1) differences in and (2) correlations of dogmatism and some other social attitudes of Lithuanian immigrant parents and their children brought up and attending college in the United States. Seventy-two college students and 52 parents filled out a questionnaire consisting of Rokeach's (1956) Dogmatism Scale (Form E), Kaufman's (1957) Status-Concern Scale, Olsen's (1969) Political Alienation Scale, Bogardus' (1928) Social Distance Scale, Rokeach's (1968) Value Survey, and two statements concerning Lithuania-America preference.

In the analysis of data, (1) t-scores were computed to observe differences between attitudes of the two generations, (2) the product-moment correlation coefficient was obtained for all pairs of attitudes within each generation, (3) the product-moment correlation coefficient was computed for parents' dogmatism and certain other attitudes, and (4) the rank order correlation coefficient was obtained for student-parent value choices.

Significant differences between parents and students were observed in dogmatism as well as in all other attitudes, but one. Parents' mean scores were significantly higher than students' in dogmatism, status-concern, social distance, feeling of political incapability, preference for Lithuania and intention of returning to Lithuania. In political discontent alone, students approached parents. These marked differences
between the two generations are ascribed, to a great extent, to a difference in their total life situations.

In comparison with others, Lithuanian immigrants were high in political powerlessness, discontent, and social distance, moderate in status-concern, and about equal in dogmatism. These trends well represent a middle class ethnic minority group, as "marginal people," their college-attending children all-the-more so. The influence of the two cultures was apparent in students' attitudes, for instance, in relatively higher social distance and relatively lower political powerlessness.

Sex difference in dogmatism between generations was also investigated. No such difference was found among the younger generation. Mothers, however, were significantly more dogmatic than fathers. Besides, mothers were also considerably more politically alienated and socially distanced than fathers. Since in American studies, at least in dogmatism, women scored consistently lower than men, the opposite discrepancy among immigrant males and females most likely has its origin in their older cultural traditions whose influence the younger generation no longer feels.

Dogmatism was the outstanding attitude in the correlation matrix of parents. As hypothesized, it correlated positively with status-concern, social distance, political incapability and discontent. However, it did not correlate with preference for Lithuania nor with the intention to return to Lithuania, possibly, indicating that attachment to
Lithuania is not a matter of rigid and conservative tradition. Socially distanced parents tended significantly to show concern for status, probably manifesting connection between prejudice and status mobility, and to feel political discontent.

Dogmatism was second to political discontent in the correlation matrix of students. It correlated positively with status-concern and political incapability, whereas political discontent correlated positively with political incapability, preference for Lithuania, and negatively with status-concern. Thus politically discontented students tended to prefer Lithuania and not to care about status.

Additionally, there were two other rather obvious positive correlations among both generations: those who felt politically incapable also tended to be discontented with politics, and those who preferred Lithuania tended also to manifest their intention to return to it.

The Value Survey revealed a close similarity in the value choices between immigrant parents and students, with some characteristic differences. Parents' first two goal choices were religiously traditional salvation and vocationally significant family security, whereas students selected one general-human value and another contemporary-situational value, wisdom and world of peace. Honesty was the first instrumental value for both groups (with "loving" for students, and "intellectual-intelligent" for parents, as seconds). A comfortable life, pleasure, social recognition, "obedient," "polite," and "clean" were the least important values for
both generations.

For the choices of social values, students tended to take a lead in preferring terminal values, while parents instrumental ones. However, the difference was hardly significant.

In conclusion, although certain similarities between students and their immigrant parents were observed, grave differences in dogmatism and other social attitudes manifested a strong influence of different life situations upon these two generations.
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