

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVES OF  
OHIO APPALACHIANS: A REGIONAL STUDY

Ted L. Napier and Elizabeth G. Bryant

The Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology,  
The Ohio State University and The Ohio Agricultural Research  
and Development Center, 2120 Fyffe Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

Paper presented at the 3rd Annual Appalachian Studies Conference,  
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee, March  
21-23, 1980.

## ABSTRACT

Data were collected from a random sample of 1474 residents living in a five county area located within the designated Appalachian region of Ohio during the summer and fall of 1975. The focus of the study was upon the assessment of development priorities of the local populace. The study findings are employed in this paper to ascertain the validity of stereotypes commonly used to describe Appalachians and to determine the relative merits of individual deficits models for understanding unemployment. The findings are discussed in the context of alternative development strategies for rural Appalachian areas such as the study region.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PERCEPTIONS OF  
OHIO APPALACHIANS: A REGIONAL STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Appalachians have been characterized in the existing popular, as well as scientific, literature as being individualistic, suspicious of outsiders, localistic in terms of world perspectives, opposed to government involvement and control, opposed to socio-economic growth and social change, anti-intellectual, poverty stricken, dependent upon reference groups for information, traditionalistic, ignorant, and numerous other stereotypes which are not complimentary to Appalachian people (Coles, 1972; Ball, 1970; Fetterman, 1970; Caudill, 1963; Harrington, 1966; Quigley, 1969; Weller, 1965; Schwarzweller, 1970; Photiadis, 1970; Mayo, 1970; Loeff, 1971). Such descriptors suggest that Appalachians have internalized self-perceptions and attitudes which impede planned change programs from being implemented within the region and imply that the "culture of poverty" thesis advocated by Lewis (1966) is correct.

The culture of poverty thesis suggests that development problems can only be "attacked" via modification of the individual through changes in attitudes, knowledge bases, skills, values, beliefs and behavior. The individual is perceived to be deficient in the socio-cultural factors which are necessary to participate fully in the institutions of the society. Therefore, solutions to development problems are couched in changing the person to fit the system.

Many federal and state programs designed to ameliorate socio-economic problems in rural areas within the United States have tended to rely heavily

upon the individual deficits model as noted by the existing literature in the field of human resources development (Schultz, 1962; Becker, 1962; Jakubauskas and Baumel, 1967; McCollum, 1967; Bloch and Smith, 1977; Niland, 1972; Stromsdorfer, 1968; Colmen, 1967; Levitan, et al, 1972; Parnes and Kohen, 1975). The long history of manpower programs in Appalachia is evidence of the commitment to the human resources development model. The logic advanced in the human resources development model is that private and public investments in developing human skills will make the recipient of such investments more functional in the existing social structure. Subsequently, it is argued that an individual who has been "developed" in terms of "improved" human resources will be absorbed into the existing social system which in turn will reduce socio-economic development problems for the region. While the individual deficits model has been used extensively by governmental agencies, several researchers have raised questions about the model (Gurin, 1970: 277-299; Grubb and Lazerson, 1975; Niland, 1972; Patten and Clark, 1968; Ballante, 1972; Koenker, 1967: 134-142; Spitze, 1970: 197-218; Blaug, 1976; Napier, et al, 1979; Napier, 1979). These writers suggest that the model has some serious limitations and some even suggest the model may be an inappropriate strategy for bringing about rural development under certain circumstances (Napier, et al, 1979; Napier, 1979).

The two objectives of this paper are to examine with empirical data the validity of the stereotypes used to describe Appalachians noted above and to evaluate the relative merits of the human resources development model for understanding unemployment within a multi-county Appalachian area of Ohio. The findings will be discussed in the context of rural development policy.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

### The Research Situation

The region selected for investigation is a five-county area within the designated Appalachian counties of southeastern Ohio. The region is characterized by rolling hills and widely separated farmsteads and small villages. The primary occupations in the study area have traditionally been associated with the extractive industries (coal, timber and small scale agriculture) even though the occupational structure is slowly becoming more differentiated.

An examination of the socio-economic history of the region prior to the late 1970's will show a gradual reduction of socio-economic viability for many years. Outmigration prior to 1975 was very common since jobs in the local area were difficult to secure and opportunities for social mobility within the study region were quite limited. The social infrastructure of the multi-county region tended to reflect this history of decline. Services, both public and private, have been in a state of continual decline relative to other areas of the state and unemployment rates have remained high. Other indicators of a declining area have traditionally been identified with the region.

The socio-economic viability of the area looked rather bleak until several coal mines were opened in the early 1970's. The mines provided expanded employment opportunities but also created new interest in development planning among several groups to sustain the growth and, therefore, increase the probability that the recent surge of economic activity would not wane.

To aid in the planning process, a study was commissioned by the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center using Title V funds provided by the Rural Development Act of 1972 to ascertain the perceived

development needs of the region's populace. The study findings reported here were drawn from this study.

### Sampling

A systematic, random sample was drawn from the five-county study area (Napier, 1971; Napier, 1975; Napier and Wright, 1976; Napier, et al, 1977; Napier, 1976; Napier and Maurer, 1978). Interviewers were instructed to conduct an interview with an adult resident from each selected occupied dwelling. The interviewers were instructed to select every fifth occupied residence, with the initial dwelling chosen at random and to begin the selection process at different places in the sampling area each day. A structured questionnaire was developed and administered to the respondents via personal interview.

The location of each respondent's residence was noted on detailed county maps secured from the Ohio Department of Transportation which provided a means of pictorial display of the sampling distribution. Careful visual monitoring of the distribution of the sample during the data collection phase and subsequent evaluation after the data were collected revealed the sample was not clustered and approximated the population distribution by township.

The respondents drawn from villages and towns were selected using the same systematic sampling technique which was modified to be appropriate to more densely populated areas (streets were selected as the starting points for the sampling and the residences were systematically chosen). The village sample was also monitored with detailed maps showing location of respondents and evaluation of the distribution during and after the data collection revealed the village samples were not clustered.

Approximately 95 percent of the people selected to participate in

the study completed an interview and the total number of respondents to the study was 1474. The characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1.

(Table 1 Here)

The characteristics of the sample population indicate the study respondents were middle-aged people with very few children living at home. The study participants were basically working class people with moderate incomes. Most of the people were long-term residents of the region and had basically completed high school. Most of the respondents spent their early years in small towns or less densely populated areas (farm and rural nonfarm). A large majority of the respondents (80.4%) owned their homes and were not actively involved with many formal organizations.

A small minority of the respondents indicated they were farmers and most of those who were involved indicated they were farming only on a part-time basis. This finding partially explains why the mean farm size was only 104.0 acres. Also, the region is quite hilly and large scale agriculture is not common.

A relatively large number of respondents indicated that the primary income earner in the family had been unemployed at some time during the preceding year and that many remained without work for extended periods of time. Commuting to work was quite common as noted by the respondents who revealed they commuted an average distance of 11 miles one way each day.

#### Instrument Construction

A questionnaire was developed from previous research instruments used by the principal author of this paper and other development studies. The questionnaire was reviewed by community development professionals in the College of Agriculture at the Ohio State University and a pretest was

TABLE 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Study Sample (N=1474)

Sex of Respondents	44.8% Male	55.2% Female
Mean Age of Respondents	44.3 years	
Mean Length of Residence	30.6 years	
Mean Number of Children Living at Home	1.25 children	
Mean Number of Formal Organization Memberships	1.6 groups	
Percent Home Owners	80.4%	
Percent Unemployed at Sometime During Last Year (Excluding Retired)	25.9%	
Percent Engaged In Fulltime Farming	5.5%	
Percent Engaged In Parttime Farming	11.7%	
Mean Farm Size (For those Engaged in Farming)	104.0 acres	
Mean Education of Head of Household	11.5 years	
Occupation of Primary Income Earner	Frequency	Percent
Unclassified	61	4.1
Service Workers	116	7.9
Farmers	119	8.1
Unskilled Laborers	401	27.2
Skilled Blue Collar	375	25.4
White Collar	178	12.1
Manager-Administrator	86	5.8
Professional	138	9.4
Family Income (1974)		
\$ 0 - 2,999	149	10.1
3,000 - 5,999	244	16.5
6,000 - 8,999	257	17.5
9,000 - 11,999	301	20.4
12,000 - 14,999	198	13.4
15,000 - 17,999	122	8.3
18,000 and above	118	8.0
No response	85	5.8



conducted using a similar population to the one selected for research purposes. The questionnaire was revised and the data were collected in the summer and fall of 1975.

Data were collected about: attitudes toward various development options, willingness to commit limited resources to development efforts, priorities for development actions, use of information sources, and perceptions of geographical areas to which the respondents identified. Data concerning unemployment were also collected and used to test the relevance of the human resources development approach. The findings for these components of the study are presented in descriptive statistical form with reference made to multivariate analyses published in journal articles and research bulletins.

#### FINDINGS

The findings basically support the position that the common stereotypes used to describe Appalachian people are not appropriate for the study region. The respondents were very positive toward rural industrial development and held very positive orientations toward outdoor recreation development. The respondents were willing to commit resources for collective development efforts and perceived that socio-economic growth (expansion of jobs and industrial base) was the most important development problem within the study area. Sixty-seven percent of the study respondents identified with their county of residence as opposed to multi-county districts, the State of Ohio, or the Appalachian Region. The study participants used mass media, both printed and electronic forms, as their primary information sources rather than depending upon other people within the study area. Lastly, the human resources model was shown to be an inadequate model for understanding unemployment within the study region. Data relative

to each of these findings are provided below.

Attitudes Toward Rural Industrial Development

The descriptive data about attitudes toward industrial development are presented in Table 2.<sup>1</sup>

(Table 2 Here)

The findings presented in Table 2 show that the respondents were basically quite positive toward rural industrial development. The respondents believed they or members of their families would receive benefits from industrial development and believed the region as a whole would benefit. They also believed that industries should be encouraged to locate in the region.

The respondents did not believe that industrial development would destroy their community and fragment family relations. They held this view even if the industries attracted to the region employed primarily women.

Multi-variate analyses of the industrial attitude data revealed that people from different socio-economic strata held positive attitudes toward rural industrial development of the region.

These findings strongly indicate the Appalachians included in this study did not perceive socio-economic growth and expansion negatively. General assertions that Appalachians are suspicious of outsiders does not appear to be valid either since most people realize industries will attract people from outside the region (Summers, et al, 1976). Data collected about the possibility of outside people being attracted to the area revealed the respondents were positive toward such in-migration.

**TABLE 2: Attitudes of Survey Respondents to Industrial Development: Presented in Frequency Counts (Percentages Within Parentheses — N=1474)**

Question	Strongly Agree 5*	Agree 4*	Undecided 3*	Disagree 2*	Strongly Disagree 1*	Mean for Question Response
1. Industrial development in my region will benefit me or some member of my household.	720 (48.8)	489 (33.2)	76 ( 5.2)	126 ( 8.5)	63 ( 4.3)	4.1
2. The costs of industrial development in my region can be justified.	377 (25.6)	679 (46.1)	329 (22.3)	70 ( 4.7)	19 ( 1.3)	3.9
3. Industrial development is not needed in my region.	34 ( 2.3)	74 ( 5.0)	78 ( 5.3)	552 (37.4)	736 (49.9)	1.7
4. The disadvantages brought to my region by industrial development will offset the advantages.	61 ( 4.1)	205 (13.9)	225 (15.3)	614 (41.7)	369 (25.0)	2.3
5. Industrial development in my region will create many problems for people living here.	37 ( 2.5)	227 (15.4)	175 (11.9)	688 (46.7)	347 (23.5)	2.3
6. Industries should not be encouraged to locate in my region.	45 ( 3.1)	85 ( 5.8)	79 ( 5.4)	610 (41.4)	655 (44.4)	1.8
7. Industrial development of my region will provide many jobs for local people.	748 (50.7)	599 (40.6)	67 ( 4.5)	39 ( 2.6)	21 ( 1.4)	4.4
8. Industrial development will make my region a better place in which to live.	550 (37.3)	640 (43.4)	167 (11.3)	84 ( 5.7)	33 ( 2.2)	4.1
9. New industries employing mostly women would be harmful to family life in my region.	107 ( 7.3)	216 (14.7)	254 (17.2)	555 (37.7)	342 (23.2)	2.5
10. Industrial development will benefit my region.	611 (41.5)	694 (47.1)	94 ( 6.4)	50 ( 3.4)	25 ( 1.7)	4.2
11. New jobs are more important to me than the air or water pollution that new industries may cause.	217 (14.7)	399 (27.1)	267 (18.1)	402 (27.3)	189 (12.8)	3.0
12. Planned industrial parks are very important for industrial development.	326 (22.1)	773 (52.4)	277 (18.8)	80 ( 5.4)	18 ( 1.2)	3.9

\*Weighted values given to each designated response.

Source: Napier, Pierce and Bachtel, 1977, page 13.

### Attitudes Toward Outdoor Recreation Development

Data were collected about attitudes toward outdoor recreation as a development option. These data are presented in Table 3.<sup>2</sup>

(Table 3 Here)

These data demonstrate that the respondents believed that expansion of outdoor recreation facilities was a highly desirable development option even when such development efforts would attract tourists into the region. These findings can be interpreted as indicating the Ohio Appalachian respondents were not provincial nor opposed to socio-economic growth. Data collected about perceptions of tourists indicated the respondents perceived them in a positive manner (Napier, et al, 1977: 11) which suggests that suspicion of outsiders is not a valid descriptor of Appalachians within the study area.

The respondents believed that outdoor recreation development would benefit the region by generating jobs and stimulating economic growth. The people also believed that resources used to accomplish outdoor recreation development goals would be wise investments. Lastly, the respondents realized that the region needed such development programs.

Multi-variate analyses indicated that these feelings permeated all socio-economic groups represented in the study. When people believed they would benefit from the efforts they tended to be more supportive.

### Commitment of Resources To Development Efforts

Data were collected concerning willingness of local people to support industrial and outdoor recreation development programs. The findings demonstrated that the respondents were willing to cooperate in the accomplishment of collective community goals and that the support for

**TABLE 3: Attitudes of Survey Respondents to Outdoor Recreation Development: Presented in Frequency Counts (Percentages Within Parentheses - - N=1474)**

Question	Strongly Agree 5*	Agree 4*	Undecided 3*	Disagree 2*	Strongly Disagree 1*	Mean for Question Response
1. Outdoor recreation development of my region will provide many jobs for local people.	312 (21.2)	809 (54.9)	197 (13.4)	134 ( 9.1)	22 ( 1.5)	3.9
2. Outdoor recreation development will make my region a better place in which to live.	366 (24.8)	872 (59.2)	141 ( 9.6)	79 ( 5.4)	16 ( 1.1)	4.0
3. Outdoor recreation development is not needed in my region.	34 ( 2.3)	99 ( 6.7)	129 ( 8.8)	785 (53.3)	427 (29.0)	2.0
4. Development of outdoor recreation will benefit my region.	381 (25.8)	899 (61.0)	113 ( 7.7)	64 ( 4.3)	17 ( 1.2)	4.1
5. The costs of outdoor recreation development in my region can be justified.	226 (15.3)	705 (47.8)	422 (28.7)	97 ( 6.6)	24 ( 1.6)	3.7
6. The disadvantages brought to my region by outdoor recreation development will offset the advantages.	39 ( 2.6)	210 (14.2)	267 (18.1)	716 (48.6)	242 (16.4)	2.4
7. Outdoor recreation development in my region will create many problems for people living here.	17 ( 1.2)	124 ( 8.4)	200 (13.6)	845 (57.3)	288 (19.5)	2.1
8. My region will not benefit much from new outdoor recreational development.	33 ( 2.2)	137 ( 9.3)	159 (10.8)	832 (56.4)	313 (21.2)	2.1
9. Existing recreation facilities in my region are adequate for my needs.	171 (11.6)	557 (37.8)	196 (13.3)	391 (26.5)	159 (10.8)	3.1
10. Expansion of existing outdoor recreation and tourism attractions in my region will reduce my travel to other areas outside my region.	203 (13.8)	505 (34.3)	270 (18.3)	389 (26.4)	107 ( 7.3)	3.2
11. Outdoor recreation development is usually harmful to the environment.	13 ( 0.9)	67 ( 4.5)	136 ( 9.2)	848 (57.5)	410 (27.8)	1.9

\*Weighted values given to each designated response.

Source: Napier, et al, 1977, page 14.

cooperative problem solving permeated every segment and social class within the region (Napier and Maurer, 1978). Individuals who were most willing to commit resources for outdoor recreation and industrial development were those who perceived that the region, close family members, or they themselves would benefit from such development efforts.

The issues addressed in the commitment scale were taxation, zoning, and commitment of personal time. The first two require government involvement in the development process which brings into question the common belief that Appalachians fear government involvement in local affairs. Also, the willingness of the respondents to collectively pursue common goals suggests the individualistic orientation often associated with Appalachians is probably overstated.

Priorities For Development Action

The respondents were requested to rank the top three development problems within the study area which they believed to be the most important. These data were summarized using weighted rank orders to assess the relative ranking of development problems. The findings are presented in Table 4.

**TABLE 4: Weighted Rank Order of Problem Priorities in the Study Area: Survey Results (N=1474)**

Problem for Region	Frequency Multiplied by Weighting Factors	Weighted Score	Weighted Rank Order
		Sample Size	
Jobs and Industrial Expansion	2711	1.84	1
Drug Abuse	972	.66	2
Education	913	.62	3
Highway Improvements	889	.60	4
Crime, Vandalism and Trespassing	851	.58	5
New Housing	682	.46	6
Recreation Facilities	526	.36	7
Water Supply	362	.25	8
Sewage Improvements	361	.24	9
Solid Waste Pick-up	280	.19	10
Planning and Zoning	138	.09	11
Other	137	.09	12

Source: Napier, et al, 1977, page 7.

The findings presented in Table 4 show that the study populace perceived jobs and industrial development to be the single most important development issue. This issue was perceived to be much more important than the other issues evaluated. For example, the weighted value for jobs and industrial development is 1.84 which is almost 3 times greater than the weighted value for the issue ranked second. Inspection of the priorities given to the issues will show that the respondents were primarily concerned with community living and "quality of life" issues. The respondents were concerned with having secure work roles, a crime free social environment, and social amenities and public services. The respondents were apparently willing to accept the social changes and social consequences associated with economic development to achieve better life styles. Such behavioral orientations could not be defined as traditionalistic.

#### Sources of Information

Data were collected about the most frequently used sources of various types of information. These findings are presented in Table 5.

(Table 5 Here)

The findings demonstrate that mass media mechanisms for the dissemination of information were the most frequently used sources for every issue evaluated except agricultural information. The traditional mode of interpersonal interaction for the exchange of information was not frequently employed. The small number of people who do not seek information should also bring into question the idea that rural Appalachians are ignorant of contemporary issues in the community, region, nation and world.

The findings from the Appalachian study group are quite similar to previous research undertaken by the principal author of this paper to

**TABLE 5: Most Important Source of Information for Survey Respondents Presented in Frequency Counts with Percentages Within Parentheses (N=1474)**

Type of Information	Do Not Seek This Type of Information	Public Officials	Radio	County Extension Agent	Television	Newspapers	Family or Neighbors	Special Interest Magazines	Extension Bulletins	No Response
General Community Problems	72 ( 4.9)	318 (21.6)	239 (16.2)	39 ( 2.6)	67 ( 4.5)	485 (32.9)	245 (16.6)	2 ( 0.1)	3 ( 0.2)	4 (0.3)
Local News	2 ( 0.1)	1 ( 0.1)	623 (42.3)	3 ( 0.2)	197 (13.4)	530 (36.0)	115 ( 7.8)	0 ( 0.0)	1 ( 0.1)	2 (0.1)
Information About Your Occupation	524 (35.5)	125 ( 8.5)	57 ( 3.9)	73 ( 5.0)	18 ( 1.2)	131 ( 8.9)	113 ( 7.7)	382 (25.9)	40 ( 2.7)	11 (0.7)
New Development Programs	151 (10.2)	236 (16.0)	151 (10.2)	72 ( 4.9)	167 (11.3)	579 (39.3)	72 ( 4.9)	24 ( 1.6)	18 ( 1.2)	4 (0.3)
Recreation Activities	169 (11.5)	153 (10.4)	158 (10.7)	50 ( 3.4)	87 ( 5.9)	601 (40.8)	192 (13.0)	46 ( 3.1)	13 ( 0.9)	5 (0.3)
Taxing Issues	68 ( 4.6)	520 (35.3)	93 ( 6.3)	27 ( 1.8)	78 ( 5.3)	637 (43.2)	40 ( 2.7)	4 ( 0.3)	4 ( 0.3)	3 (0.2)
Local School Issues	117 ( 7.9)	402 (27.3)	127 ( 8.6)	14 ( 0.9)	31 ( 2.1)	622 (42.2)	148 (10.0)	5 ( 0.3)	7 ( 0.5)	1 (0.1)
Agricultural Information	283 (19.2)	19 ( 1.3)	90 ( 6.1)	618 (41.9)	29 ( 2.0)	139 ( 9.4)	68 ( 4.6)	42 ( 2.8)	183 (12.4)	3 (0.2)

\*The most important source of information for each issue is enclosed in boxes.

Source: Napier, Pierce and Bachtel, 1977, Page 19.



assess information sources used in rural areas (Ross and Napier, 1978). The patterns discovered among the Appalachian group are basically the same for other rural groups evaluated in non-Appalachian areas of Ohio.

#### Identification With Geographical Areas

A characteristic commonly associated with Appalachians is the "identification with place" orientation. The focus of the identification is assumed to be Appalachia but seldom, if ever, is the place of identification specified. To address this issue, the respondents were provided maps with different geographical areas specified and asked to choose the geographical area to which they identified. The areas varied from county to the multi-state federation termed Appalachia. More than 67 percent of the respondents chose county of residence and an additional 15 percent selected the county of residence and the counties immediately surrounding it as their area of identification. About 9.7 percent selected the multi-county study area. About 3.6 percent identified with Ohio and 2.4 selected the Appalachian region of Ohio. Only 2.3 percent of the respondents selected Appalachia as their place of identification.

These findings indicate that the concept "Appalachia" may have more literary meaning than it does as a geographical area of identification. The findings also suggest that macro-level geographical areas for addressing rural development problems are probably not appropriate.

#### The Human Resources Development Model

Unemployment information was collected about the primary income earner in each family represented in the study and used to assess the merits of the human resources development model as a development strategy for attacking rural unemployment problems. The literature noted in the introductory sections of this paper was reviewed to ascertain the relevant

factors to examine as predictive variables. The factors used to analyze the variance in length of unemployment of the primary income earner were: age, education, length of residence, number of children in the household, formal group memberships, and occupation. Multi-variate regression and discriminant analyses were conducted on the data set and the findings revealed that the variables selected for investigation were basically useless in predicting length of unemployment. Comparisons made between the employed and unemployed groups using the abovementioned variables also proved fruitless (Napier, et al, 1978; Napier, 1979; Napier, Maurer, and Bryant, 1979).<sup>3</sup>

The study data suggest that further investment in human resources without concomitant development of the economic infrastructure of the region is probably futile. The findings strongly indicate that pursuit of the human resources development strategy within the study region will probably result in continual outmigration of the best trained people. Even more tragic is the possibility that such an approach will produce a better educated and trained labor force on the local level that will remain unemployed.

It was concluded from the research that human resources development approaches alone will not serve to enhance the socio-economic viability of rural Appalachian areas such as the study region if the existing social infrastructure cannot absorb the newly trained people.<sup>4</sup> An alternative development approach focused upon expanding the local structural employment bases (private economic expansion in the production and service sectors) before enhancing human skills has been advanced from the study findings. It is argued that first priority for development action be given to the generation of permanent jobs within rural areas. It is

also argued that federal and state development funds be used to facilitate location of small, privately owned and operated industrial plants in rural areas. Small firms are usually preferable to large manufacturing firms because they have fewer adverse social and environmental impacts (Summers, et al, 1976) but an established pattern of generating benefits for local communities (Birch, 1979). Once permanent jobs have been created on the local level and the existing pool of human resources has been depleted, more emphasis should be placed upon human resources development programs.

In sum, the unemployment component of the regional study suggests that sole reliance on the human resources development approach is probably an inappropriate development strategy for rural areas which cannot absorb newly "developed" human resources. Thus, one must conclude that the use of the individual deficits model approach for rural Appalachian development must be questioned.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The study findings basically demonstrated that stereotypes commonly used to describe Appalachians could not be applied to the study population. Ohio Appalachians included in the study were modernistic in their development orientations and appeared to be willing to address collective socioeconomic problems which have been adversely affecting their lives. The respondents were very much concerned about "quality of life" conditions within their communities and region. They also appeared to be willing to commit personal and collective resources to community problem solving. Comparison of preliminary statistical analyses of data collected in a non-metropolitan multi-county region in California have shown the development orientations of the Ohio Appalachians to be very similar to the views

held by rural Californians. Other studies conducted by the principal author of this paper relative to the assessment of development priorities basically have produced similar findings to those reported here.

The study findings also suggest that development programs couched entirely in individual deficits models will probably never solve rural Appalachian development problems if the goal of such efforts is to improve the life styles of rural people. If the development goal of rural Appalachians is to achieve a community which can provide secure work roles, basic public and private services, recreational facilities, opportunities for social mobility, and the many factors that constitute the "good life", then they should consider alternative strategies to the human resources development model because such goals will probably never be accomplished by training people for jobs that do not exist on the local level.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. For a more detailed discussion of the industrialization findings see Maurer and Napier (1978) and Bachtel, et al (1979).
2. For a more detailed discussion of the outdoor recreation findings see Pierce and Napier (1980) and Bryant and Napier (1980).
3. Recent statistical analyses of data collected in northeast central California by the principal author of this paper basically reproduced the findings generated in southeast Ohio.
4. Billings (1974) and Walls (1976) recognized the limitations of the individual deficits model for understanding poverty in Appalachia. Billings (1974) failed to suggest an alternative while Walls' (1976) dependency explanation is open to severe criticism given the expanding production capacity of Appalachia without significant reduction in regional development problems.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bachtel, D.C., D.W. Thomas, and T.L. Napier  
1979 "A Comparative Analysis of Recent Urban to Rural In-Migrants and Long-Term Rural Residents' Attitudes Toward Rural Industrial Development", Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meeting in Burlington, Vermont, August 1979.
- Ball, Richard A.  
1970 "The Southern Appalachian Folk Subculture As A Tension-Reducing Way of Life", in Change In Rural Appalachia: Implications For Action Programs, John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwarzweller (eds.), University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia: 69-79.
- Ballante, Donald M.  
1972 "A Multivariate Analysis of A Vocational Rehabilitation Program", Journal of Human Resources, Vol. VII (2); 226-241.
- Becker, Gary S.  
1962 "Investment In Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis", Journal of Political Economy, Vol. LXX (5): 9-49.
- Billings, Dwight  
1974 "Culture and Poverty In Appalachia: A Theoretical Discussion and Empirical Analysis", Social Forces, 53 (2): 315-323.
- Birch, David L.  
1979 "The Job Generation Process", Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Program on Neighborhood and Regional Change (mimeograph).
- Blaug, Mark  
1976 "Human Capital Theory: A Slightly Jaundiced Survey", Journal of Economic Literature, Vol. VIX (3): 827-855.
- Bloch, Farrell E., and Sharon P. Smith  
1977 "Human Capital and Labor Market Employment", Journal of Human Resources, Vol. XII (4): 550-559.
- Bryant, Elizabeth G. and Ted L. Napier  
1980 "The Application of Social Exchange Theory to the Study of Satisfaction With Existing Outdoor Recreation Facilities", Chapter 12 in Outdoor Recreation Planning, Perspectives and Research, Ted L. Napier (ed.), Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, Dubuque, Iowa, (forthcoming fall of 1980).

- Caudill, Harry  
1963 Night Comes to the Cumberlands, Little, Brown and Company, Boston.
- Coles, Robert  
1972 Migrants, Sharecroppers, and Mountaineers, Little, Brown and Company, Boston.
- Colmen, Joseph G.  
1967 "The Challenge of the Manpower Crisis", Human Resources Development, Edward B. Jakubauskas and C. Phillip Baumel (eds.), Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa.
- Fetterman, John  
1970 Stinking Creek, E.P. Dutton and Company, Inc., New York.
- Ford, Thomas (ed.)  
1962 The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, University of Kentucky Press, Lexington.
- Grubb, W. Norton, and Marvin Lazerson  
1975 "Rally 'Round the Workplace: Continuities and Fallacies In Career Education", Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 45 (4): 451-474.
- Gurin, Gerald  
1970 "An Expectancy Approach To Job Training Programs", in Psychological Factors In Poverty, V.L. Allen (ed.) Markham Publishing Company, Chicago: 277-299.
- Hansen, Niles  
1970 Rural Poverty and the Urban Crisis, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Harrington, Michael  
1966 The Other America, Penquin Books, Inc., Baltimore.
- Jakubauskas, Edward B., and Phillip Baumel (eds.)  
1967 Human Resources Development, Iowa State University Press, Ames.
- Koenker, William E.  
1967 "Needed Directions In Human Resources Development For the College Bound", in Human Resources Development, E.B. Jakubauskas and C.P. Baumel (eds.) Iowa State University Press, Ames.
- Levitan, Sar A., G.L. Mangum, and Ray Marshall  
1972 Human Resources and Labor Markets, Harper and Row Publishers, New York.

- Lewis, Oscar  
1966 "The Culture of Poverty", Scientific American, 215:  
19-25.
- Loof, David  
1971 Appalachia's Children: The Challenge of Mental Health,  
University of Kentucky Press, Lexington.
- Maurer, Richard C. and Ted L. Napier  
1978 "Attitudes Toward Rural Industrialization" A Test  
of A Social Exchange Perspective", Economic and Soc-  
iology Studies Number 566, The Ohio State University.  
Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society  
Meetings in San Francisco, August, 1978.
- Mayo, Selz C.  
1970 "Some Observations On Planning Effective Programs of  
Directed Change In Rural Appalachia", in Change In  
Rural Appalachia: Implications For Action Agencies,  
John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwarzweller (eds.),  
University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia:  
221-229.
- McCollum, Sylvia G.  
1967 "Needed Directions In Vocational Resources Develop-  
ment For The Noncollege Bound", Human Resources Devel-  
opment, Edward B. Jakubauskas and C. Phillip Baumel  
(eds.), Iowa State University Press, Ames.
- Napier, Ted L.  
1971 "The Impact of Water Resource Development Upon Local  
Rural Communities: Adjustment Factors to Rapid Change",  
Ph.D. Dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, The Ohio State  
University.
- Napier, Ted L.  
1975 "An Analysis of the Social Impact of Water Resource  
Development and Subsequent Forced Relocation of Popula-  
tion Upon Rural Community Groups: An Attitude Study",  
Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center,  
Research Bulletin 1080.
- Napier, Ted L.  
1979 "Structural Versus Human Resources Models For Rural  
Development: The Case of Unemployment", Economic and  
Sociology Occasional Paper Number 662, Invited paper  
presented at the National Association of Development  
Organizations Annual Meeting, Albuquerque, New Mexico.



- Napier, Ted L., Richard C. Maurer, and Elizabeth Bryant  
1979 "The Relevance of a Human Resources Development Model For Understanding Unemployment Status Within Southeast Ohio", (working draft) Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, The Ohio State University.
- Napier, Ted L., and Richard C. Maurer  
1978 "Correlates of Commitment to Community Development Efforts", Journal of the Community Development Society, 9 (1): 12-27.
- Napier, Ted L., Richard C. Maurer, and Elizabeth G. Bryant  
1978 "Factors Affecting Unemployment Status Among Residents of a Lesser Developed Region of Ohio", Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, Research Bulletin 1104.
- Napier, Ted L., John M. Pierce, and Douglas C. Bachtel  
1977 "A Descriptive Analysis of a Five-County Attitude Study: Outdoor Recreation and Industrialization" Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, Research Circular 230.
- Napier, Ted L., and Cathy J. Wright  
1976 "A Longitudinal Analysis of the Attitudinal Response of Rural People to Natural Resource Development: A Case Study of the Impact of Water Resource Development", Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, Research Bulletin 1083.
- Napier, Ted L., and Elizabeth G. Bryant  
1980 "Attitudes Toward Outdoor Recreation Development: An Application of Social Exchange Theory", Leisure Sciences, (forthcoming).
- Niland, John R.  
1972 "Prior Labor Market Experience and The Effectiveness of Manpower Programs: Communication", Journal of Human Resources, Vol. VII (4): 554-559.
- Parnes, Herbert S., and Andrew I. Kohen  
1975 "Occupational Information and Labor Market Status: The Case of Young Men", Journal of Human Resources, Vol. X (1): 44-55.
- Patten, Thomas H., and Gerald E. Clark, Jr.  
1968 "Literacy Training and Job Placement of Hard Core Unemployed Negroes in Detroit", Journal of Human Resources, Vol III (1): 24-46.
- Photiadis, John D.  
1970 "Rural Southern Appalachia and Mass Society", in Change In Rural Appalachia: Implications For Action Programs, John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwarzweller (eds.) University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia: 5-22.

- Pierce, John M., and Ted L. Napier  
1980 "The Use of Perceptions Factors In Predicting Attitudes Toward Outdoor Recreation Development", Chapter 11 in Outdoor Recreation Planning, Perspectives and Research, Ted L. Napier (ed.), Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, Dubuque, Iowa, (forthcoming Fall of 1980).
- Ross, Peggy J., and Ted L. Napier  
1978 "Patterns of Communication In a Rural Population", Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, Research Bulletin 1095.
- Quigley, Michael  
1969 April Is The Cruellest Month, Kendall/Hunt Publishers, Dubuque, Iowa.
- Schultz, Theodore W.  
1962 "Reflections On Investments In Man", Journal of Political Economy, Vol. LXX (5): 1-8.
- Schwarzweiler, Harry K.  
1970 "Social Change and the Individual In Rural Appalachia", in Change In Rural Appalachia: Implications For Action Programs, John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwarzweiler (eds.), University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia: 51-68.
- Spitze, R.G.F.  
1970 "Problems of Adequacy In Rural Human Resources Development Concepts and Accomplishments", in Benefits and Burdens of Rural Development: Some Public Policy Viewpoints, The Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa: 197-218.
- Stromsdorfer, Ernst W.  
1968 "Determinants of Economic Success In Retraining the Unemployed: The West Virginia Experience", Journal of Human Resources, Vol. III (2): 139-158.
- Summers, Gene F., Sharon D. Evans, Frank Clemente, E.M. Beck, and Jon Minkoff  
1976 Industrial Invasion of Nonmetropolitan America: A Quarter Century of Experience, Praeger Publishers, New York.
- Walls, David S.  
1976 "Central Appalachia: A Peripheral Region Within An Advanced Capitalist Society", Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 4 (2): 232-247.
- Weller, Jack  
1965 Yesterday's People, University of Kentucky Press, Lexington.