Western Kentucky University
TopSCHOLAR®

Masters Theses & Specialist Projects   Graduate School

5-1971

Self-Orientation of Southern Appalachians

Arshad Rizvi
Western Kentucky University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses

Part of the Sociology Commons

Rivzi,

Arshad H.

1971

SELF-ORIENTATION OF SOUTHERN APPALACHIANS

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Western Kentucky University

Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Arshad H. Rizvi

May 1971

SELF-ORIENTATION OF SOUTHERN APPALACHIANS

APPROVED May 14, 1971 :
/(Date)

R. L. Yokley
Director of Thesis

Hart M. Nelsen

Craig H. Taylor

John Den Minter
Dean of the Graduate College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

iv

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Attitudes of Appalachians toward social change, and their
religious and educational orientations have come to demand a great
deal of attention in the field of sociology.[1] The values, life
patterns, roles, and subcultures of both the rural and urban
Appalachians have been subjected to empirical study, and directions
have been indicated that "further inquiry might take to provide the
knowledge needed to understand the chronic failure of some rural
people to gain access to the main stream of modern industrial and
commercial society."[2]

This thesis has as its aim the investigation of the
sociopsychological orientation of the people living in Southern
Appalachia. To determine the attitudes of self-orientation of the
Southern Appalachians, the present study includes, at the nearest
level, the family, and then progresses out to the community, the
region and the society. It is proposed that in comparison to the

---

[1] For a relatively exhaustive and well documented review of
the literature on Appalachia see: Hart M. Nelsen, A Review of the
Literature Pertaining to Appalachia, Stressing Attitudes to Social
Change and Religious and Educational Orientations (Bowling Green,
Western Kentucky University, 1967)

[2] Frederick C. Fliegel, The Low-Income Farmer in a Changing
Society, The Pennsylvania State University, College of Agriculture,
Agriculture Experiment Station, Bulletin #731, March 1966, p. 3.

1

urban population, the rural population has a more favorable attitude toward familism, localism, and regionalism; that is to say, residents of the rural area have the orientation to care more for their family than the collectivity (i.e., the community), and they desire to remain in the region.

One of the Pattern Variables as expounded by Talcott Parsons in his book, Toward A General Theory of Action, may serve as the theoretical framework for the present study. In the words of Parsons, "a pattern variable is a dichotomy, one side of which must be chosen by an actor before the meaning of a situation is determinate for him, and thus before he can act with respect to that situation."[3] This choice often takes the form of a dilemma growing out of the pattern variable of self-orientation-collectivity orientation. It consists of "the dilemma of private versus collective interests or the distribution between private permissiveness and collective obligation."[4] This dilemma "may be resolved by the actor either by giving primacy to interests, goals, and values, shared with the other members of a given collective unit of which he is a member or by giving primacy to his personal or private interests without considering their bearing on collective interests."[5] An attitude requiring or permitting the actor to pursue personal interests is self-oriented; an attitude requiring the actor to take the interests of the group or of other members into account is collectivity-oriented.

---

[3]Talcott Parsons, Toward a General Theory of Action, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), p. 77.

[4]Parsons, Toward a General Theory of Action, p. 80.

[5]Parsons, Toward a General Theory of Action, p. 81.

This thesis will examine attitudes of the Southern Appalachians in terms of their orientation regarding family, region, and the larger society and will employ one pattern variable of Talcott Parsons; namely, self-orientation-collectivity-orientation. The present study is timely and relates to a wide population. Apparently, no study of exactly this nature and with the purpose outlined above has been carried out to the present time. The study has importance in that it would not only explore relationships between some important variables but also test the utility of one of the pattern variables for organizing empirical data, at least on the descriptive level. Finally, it may contribute to a better understanding of the difficulties of Southern Appalachians.

The literature pertinent to the present endeavor (describing the attitudes of the people inhabiting the Southern Appalachian region) has been reviewed in Chapter II. Chapter III spells out the hypotheses, the nature of the sample, and the methodology. The scales used and the tests of significance employed are also discussed in this chapter. Chapter IV consists of the analysis of the data and also deals with the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses. Finally, in Chapter V, the overall conclusions are presented and suggestions made for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

While searching for literature on Appalachia that could be
utilized for background for the present study, we identified a large
number of studies dealing with the region, its environment and its
people.[6] After sifting the literature for relevant items, a
tentative selection was made which seems to provide sufficient
background for the study. The main emphasis in the review is placed
on those articles that have a clear bearing on the thesis topic;
namely, studies dealing with attitudes toward family, region, society
at large, traditionalism and change.

Almost all writings in this area recognize the fact that the
region has shown backwardness or a resistance to change; familistic
life, wherein the individual personality is shaped mainly by the
family, is considered to be customary and traditional. The kinship
group holds the dominant position, followed by religious institutions.
The family in the region is of the extended type with the father

---

[6]Bibliographies on Appalachia include: Robert F. Munn, The
Southern Appalachians: A Bibliography and Guide to Studies
(Morgantown: West Virginia University Library, 1961); Appalachian
Bibliography, compiled for the Appalachian Regional Commission
(Morgantown: West Virginia University Library, 1967); and Hart M.
Nelsen and Anne K. Nelsen, Bibliography on Appalachia: A Guide to
Studies Dealing with Appalachia in General and Including Rural and
Urban Working Class Attitudes Toward Religion, Education, and Social
Change, Bulletin #4 (Bowling Green: Western Kentucky University,
College of Commerce, Office of Research and Services, April, 1967).

taking the lead and the mother entrusted with the routine chores. Marriage sometimes takes place among kin. The family is a close-knit group because of emotional dependence; the newly-found conjugal unit prefers to locate near kinsmen.

Such is the impact of family upon the individual that any effort toward an "adjustment to the more secular outside world is thwarted" and the cultural world presented to its members by the family system acts as a barrier.[7] Pearsall points out that "neighborhood life continues to be centered in the family, and family routine follows the time pattern of the early hunting and patch farming culture. In this routine, with its implied concept of time, the local way of life is at variance with modern American culture as a whole."[8] In spite of the changes which have taken place over the years, practically all economic, educational, and recreational activity, as well as emotional support, occurs within the family circle. The family acts as the "center of the universe" for the individual.

Individualism, another characteristic of the inhabitants of the Appalachian region, was a product of frontier conditions and was produced by isolation and the harsh environment in which men were on their own.[9] It was first forced on the individual and later became

---

[7]Marion Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, (University: University of Alabama Press), 1959, p. 169.

[8]Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 80.

[9]Elmora Messer Matthews, Neighbor and Kin, (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press), 1966, p. 132.

a part of him.[10] Individualism was once regarded as a virtue but in

present day society, where complexity is increasing and more

cooperative efforts are needed, one finds it a stumbling block.[11] In

spite of that, individualism is to be valued because it offers a

chance to break away from the restraints and bounds of social norms.

However, Ford thinks that the trend is now on the decline in the

region.[12]

Religion as a social institution has a profound influence

upon the lives of Southern Appalachians. Ford comments that "it is

virtually impossible to treat meaningfully any aspect of regional

life without taking them [religious values] into account."[13]

Generally speaking, the people in the region cling to

traditions and are fatalistic in their approach toward life. The

repressive influences of fatalism can reduce to futility all efforts

made by the individual. Passive resignation--the belief that man

is powerless and events are fixed in advance for all time--can become

the approved norm, and undesirable conditions can be accepted as the

way of life. The fatalistic view of life perhaps was the outcome of

living in isolation, in a harsh and rugged natural environment. The

_____

[10]Jack E. Weller, Yesterday's People, (Lexington:
University of Kentucky Press), 1966, pp. 29-33.

[11]Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 32.

[12]Thomas R. Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism," in The
Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, ed. Thomas R. Ford.
(Lexington: University of Kentucky Press), 1962, p. 14.

[13]Thomas R. Ford, "Religious Thought and Beliefs in the
Southern Appalachians as Revealed by an Attitude Survey." Review
of Religious Research, Vol. III (Summer, 1961), p. 2.

early settlers were disillusioned by their relatively fruitless efforts to successfully cope with the environment.

Weller described the traditionalism in Southern Appalachian by contrasting "two ways, using two different sets of word parallels, each of which sets a slightly different stage for our thinking." The "progressive" outlook, held by most Americans, means looking forward with some optimism; and the "regressive" outlook, held by most inhabitants of this region, means not having pleasant anticipation. People living in Southern Appalachia are "existence oriented" as contrasted to "improvement oriented." Their efforts are aimed at obtaining only the very basic goods needed for survival.[14] According to Weller,

> This existence orientation makes the whole society very conservative in every aspect of life, almost passive in accepting the status quo, for things are all right as they are and change seems always for the worse.[15]

A passive acceptance of what life (defined within the "religious" Appalachian outlook) has to offer constitutes the older type of fatalism. The religious connotation can be seen when people submit by saying "if that's the way God wants it."[16]

Ford notes that this is to be found more among the populace comprising older people than the younger generation.[17] Ford also views fatalism more as a product of poverty than the direct result

---

[14]Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 33-35.

[15]Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 36.

[16]Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 36.

[17]Ford, "Passing of ......," p. 21.

of rural life, although in the region the two have a point of agreement.[18]

According to Pearsall, traditionalism means the perpetuation of old forms of behavior with little, if any, provision for change and adaptation.[19] The force of traditionalism can be seen in the following quotation from Little Smoky Ridge:

> Ways that were only temporary expedients on other frontiers here become folkways. Repeated generation after generation in the absence of alternative ways, they have become guiding principles, sacred in themselves and not to be questioned. Thus tradition defines as right and proper customs by which it is manifestly impossible to make a living at the present time.[20]

The farm family is generally considered to be more oriented toward tradition than the urban family. It is also generally agreed that the orientation toward tradition hinders the acceptance of change by the family. One example of this is the opposition to using credit that helps in acquiring additional capital and ultimately in the implementation of social change.[21]

The obstacles to change among commercial farmers in one of the agriculturally less prosperous Pennsylvania counties have been studied by Fliegel, who reports that "the data support the hypothesis that maximum involvement of family members in the farm work force, which has been characteristic of the family farm in the past, is

---

[18]Ford, "Passing of ......," p. 20.

[19]Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 130.

[20]Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 129.

[21]Fliegel, "Traditionalism in the Farm Family and Technological Change," Rural Sociology, Vol. XXVII, (March, 1962), p. 71.

associated with a traditional, negative attitude toward the use of credit."[22] The findings of this study support the general proposition that family characteristics which reflect a traditional orientation may serve as obstacles to change in other areas.[23]

Regarding individual striving and achievement, Ford found that among the rural population 57.5 percent believed that God is more pleased when people are satisfied with what they have as compared to 39.3 percent of the urban and 37.7 percent of the metropolitan residents. This indicates the high proportion of "passivists" in the total population and also suggests that "more is behind their response than simply other worldly orientation. . . ."[24]

Describing one type of personality in the region, Weller says:

The person-oriented individual also strived, but not for objects. His concern is to be a person within the group. He wants to be liked, accepted, and noticed, and he will respond in kind to such attention.[25]

The presence of an orientation of non-achievement among the rural poor is documented by Fliegel, who reports that a selected group of low-income farmers were oriented to the present rather than the future and tended to be passive in controlling the environment. Low income farmers from the start seem to be fatalistic toward better employment. They lack aspiration for a higher level of living.[26] He

---

[22]Fliegel, "Traditionalism in the ......," p. 72.

[23]Fliegel, "Traditionalism in the ......," p. 75.

[24]Ford, "Religious Thought and Beliefs ......," pp. 10-11.

[25]Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 50.

[26]Frederick C. Fliegel, "Obstacles to Change for the Low-Income Farmer," Rural Sociology, Vol. XXV, (Sept., 1960), pp. 348-351.

also suggested in another study that farmers who are low in aspiration would be favorably oriented to farming. "They tended to plan to stay in farming and to plan some positive changes on their farms."[27]

It is generally believed that physical and social isolation of an area contributes to its resistance to social change. Various forces like tourism, magazines, and newspapers help in breaking down artificial boundaries that a society may have built around itself. As far as the attitude of the Southern Appalachians toward outsiders and change is concerned, one may be reasonably sure that change of any kind is greatly resisted. The people are suspicious of outsiders as evidenced in the saying quoted by Weller: "If you want to be friendly, that is one thing, but if you want to do something for me or to me, that is another."[28]

Describing the reactions of the people to an article in a national magazine dealing with the problems of poverty, unemployment, and substandard housing, Weller states that:

> These criticisms of some obviously objective
> realities were taken angrily even by those
> who were the poor and the unemployed, and
> were living in substandard housing![29]

Pearsall is of the opinion that "the contact situations themselves may tend to increase the apparent conservatism by engendering

---

[27]Frederick C. Fliegel, "Aspirations of Low-Income Farmers and Their Performance and Potential for Change," Rural Sociology, Vol. XXIV, (Sept., 1959), p. 214.

[28]An interesting account as to how the change is resisted can be found in his book, Yesterday's People, pp. 98-100.

[29]Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 85.

suspicion, distrust, and the open resistance to both persons and ideas from the other culture."[30]

How change can be fanatically resisted in a community which is traditional and fatalistic can be seen in the following paragraph:

> County officials are not entirely to blame for the poor roads. One of the things "Aunt" Eliza Burton and her half-brother Lige Floyd agree on is this that they do not want roads near their property. Eliza disapproves of cars and complains about being too near the highway. Lige seems more concerned about the effect on his land of drainage from the road. After repairs had been made on the road a few years ago, one or the other of them dug a ditch which directed run-off down the middle of the road.[31]

It is most difficult for an outsider to introduce change as he is usually viewed with suspicion. Moreover, change cannot be brought about with the help of the local people who, because of their orientation toward their family and peers, cannot afford to be in a conspicuous position in their reference group or be in the limelight by proposing changes. They would be ostracized and rejected by the reference group.[32]

The role of women must be considered in a discussion of social change. Because they are entrusted with the task of the upbringing of children, they are in a better position than men to instill ideas and attitudes pertaining to change in their children. Although it is said that the role of the woman is centered more in the family and that she is less open to change and mobility,[33] there

---

[30]Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 144.

[31]Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 19.

[32]Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 59.

[33]Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 90.

is some contradictory evidence. Brewer points out that women tend to be more liberal toward change in regard to the Puritan morality, i.e., dancing, card playing, drinking, divorce, birth control practices, and buying on credit. In general, he found urban women to be the most liberal, while rural men "posed as the greatest defenders of the older moral patterns."[34]

In discussing the apparent willingness of Appalachian women to accept some degree of social change, several characteristics pertaining to the woman's role should be mentioned. Weller observes that the women are better educated than men and are able to get and keep a job more easily. Teaching is still highly esteemed (especially for women) and is the leading "professional occupation." While the "husband's role has decreased and his life has lost meaning, her life has taken on new meaning in the community or at work."[35] Some reversal of the male-female role is taking place. Weller even says that matriarchy is in the offing, since by virtue of the wife's strong position in the household, she is "able to make decisions and cope with the increasing complex world that is reaching in."[36]

Ford found that:

> Women generally held higher aspirations for their
> children than did men, possibly because the accom-
> plishments of children are more often considered
> to reflect credit or discredit upon the mother than
> upon the father.[37]

---

[34]Earl D. C. Brewer, "Religion and the Churches," in The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, ed. Thomas R. Ford, p. 209.

[35]Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 77.

[36]Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 77.

[37]Ford, "Passing of ......," p. 17.

Nelsen suggests that:

> While women conform, it appears to be the
> individualistic men who demand the conformity.
> Perhaps, then, isolation has had less of an
> effect upon women than men and perhaps women
> are more open to change than men.[38]

In 1966 Weller wrote that the "forces of change are underway."[39] He holds that migration, which has been taking place due to economic pressure, would bring some changes as the ties between the migrant and his family are strong and tend to bring him back.[40] Decreasing birth rate, new emphasis on education, changing roles of male and female, and more communication with the larger society are believed to be the harbingers of social change. It is to be borne in mind that limited employment opportunities, the old traditions, the built-in resistance and pressures work counter to all the forces making for change.

Indeed, economic deprivation, while having a great deal to do with preventing the advancement of a society, is not as much of a hindrance to progress and advancement as the apathetic and indifferent attitudes of the people themselves in regard to change and the improvement of the conditions of life. Some changes in the basic orientation of the people may be required, and readjustment in the face of demands made by changing conditions may be necessitated. To

---

[38]Nelsen, "A Review of Literature ......," p. 114.

[39]Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 134.

[40]Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 136.

reap the rewards of change some sacrifice in terms of traditional way of life is needed which may not be accepted by the people.[41]

When we consider the existence of "resigned communities" in American society, we must ask "how and why these patterns are satisfying in the present"[42] and what functions they are serving. Patterns of resignation serve the functions of minimizing the possibilities of change; and, based on the values of resignation, there ensues a situation that can be compared to social inertia. These patterns help in maintaining the sociopsychological structure of members of the community and restrict economic opportunities.[43]

That the region and its people must come to some kind of terms with the larger society that places high premium on progress through scientific means seems apparent because the "inroads of time" and the outside world cannot be held back much longer. "The handwriting is on the wall, but so far the message does not mean the same to all who see it."[44] It seems, however, that there is little awareness that changing conditions may require new kinds of knowledge and skills.

As for religion and the role it can play in the social and economic development of the region in the near future, it is hoped by some that with the achievement of more prosperity and less isolation, religion might lose its sectarian character, at least in

---

[41]Herman R. Lantz, "Resignation, Industrialization and the Problem of Social Change: A Case History of a Coal-Mining Community," in Blue Collar World, eds., Arthur B. Shostak and William Gomberg. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964. pp. 258-270.

[42]Lantz, "Resignation, Industrialization ......," p. 269.

[43]Lantz, "Resignation, Industrialization ......," p. 268.

[44]Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 143.

some areas.[45] However, in view of the use that depressed classes

often make of religion, i.e., an escape from unpleasant realities,

it still acts as a restraining force. Therefore, the prospects are

dim as to the future role of religion in heralding a new era or

initiating programs for the betterment of the area.

Vance sees industrialization and urbanization as the mainstay

of a rejuvenated Appalachia,[46] but Lantz (who describes an area

similar to Appalachia) questions whether such changes are in the

interest of the locals:

> Given the conditions . . . the skills and basic
> discipline necessary for industrialization would be
> lacking, and large numbers of workers would probably
> have to be imported, making of the resigned native a
> minority group in his own community with all the
> resultant antagonisms and potential for deviant
> behavior.[47]

Ford observes in this connection:

> That the Twentieth Century has come to the people of
> the Southern Appalachians is unquestionable. But
> whether the people of the Southern Appalachians have
> come to the Twentieth Century is, at least in the
> minds of many observers, a moot question.[48]

In sum, this chapter, drawing on selected writings on the

region that have relevance to our topic, has attempted to bring to the

fore some of the salient traits of the Appalachian culture. The

---

[45]Thomas R. Ford, "Status, Residence and Fundamentalist Religious Beliefs," Social Forces, Vol. XXXIX, (Oct., 1960), p. 43.

[46]Rupert B. Vance, "Social Change in the Southern Appalachians," in The South in Continuity and Change, ed. John C. McKinney and Edgar T. Thompson, Durham: Duke University Press, 1965, pp. 408-409.

[47]Lantz, "Resignation, Industrialization ......," p. 269.

[48]Ford, "The Passing of ......," p. 9.

Southern Appalachians appear to be familistic, set in their own ways, opposing social change, having a "regressive" outlook on life, clinging to what can be called the legacy of the old times; suspicious of outsiders; displaying life patterns and values that stand out as quite different from the central values of American culture.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODS

In ascertaining the attitude of self-orientation of Southern Appalachians, four major hypotheses were formulated.

Hypothesis   I: Self-orientation is positively related to familism.

Hypothesis   II: Self-orientation is positively related to regionalism (the desire to remain in the area).

Hypothesis III: Self-orientation is negatively related to willingness to accept social change.

Hypothesis   IV: Self-orientation is negatively related to acceptance of the larger society.

Besides the above hypotheses, the following additional hypotheses were tested.

Hypothesis   V: Self-orientation is more likely to be present in rural areas than urban areas.

Hypothesis   VI: Self-orientation is more likely to be present in the lower class than the upper class.

Hypothesis VII: Self-orientation is evidenced more by males than females.

The hypotheses were tested through a secondary analysis of data collected in the summer of 1958 by Thomas R. Ford and associates[49] in a household survey using scientific sampling techniques. Some 1466 interview schedules were obtained; 31.5 percent were from metropolitan residents; 19.1 percent from urban dwellers, and 49.4 percent from rural dwellers. The interviewing was done in the Southern Appalachian region, consisting of 190 mountain counties in Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. The data were gathered under a two-stage household survey of the area. The survey was administered by the Survey Operations Unit of the University of North Carolina.

The present analysis is aimed at the exploration of self-orientation of the population at the time of the sample and is not designed to describe the present attitudes of the people of Southern Appalachia in regard to self-orientation. While the data were not collected for the present purpose, the wide focus of the study facilitates the present secondary analysis.

It was our intention to use three scales: Familism Scale, Localism Scale, and Regionalism Scale. The scale scores would then be related to self-orientation. An attempt was made to scale the various items, but due to the lack of item-interrelationship, it was decided to use single items. Only one scale could be used,

---

[49]Thomas R. Ford, ed., The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962.

i.e., Familism, which was first conceived by John L. Dec,[50] but due

to one bad item, i.e., an item which was not positively interrelated

with the other items, it was revised.[51] Self-orientation was measured

through a single item.[52] The attitudes concerning regionalism and

willingness to accept social change were also measured through the

use of pertinent single items,[53] which acted as indicators of the

phenomena investigated.

---

[50]John L. Dec, "Attitudes Toward Non-Scientific Medicine in Southern Appalachia," (unpublished Master's Thesis submitted to the Department of Sociology, Western Kentucky University, May, 1971), p. 17.

[51]The Familism scale in its original form was comprised of the following questions: 1. Do you have any relatives who live nearby? (No = 0, Yes = 1); 2. Do you and your relatives feel free to call on each other for help? (No = 0, Yes = 1); 3. Do you think a person has an obligation to help relatives even if he does not feel close to them? (No = 0, Yes = 1); 4. If you were in trouble would you be more likely to turn to close friends or your relatives for help? (Friends and Unsure = 0, Relatives = 1); 5. You can tell how good a person is by how he takes care of his aging parents (Disagree and Unsure = 0, Agree = 1). The item excluded was: If you were in trouble would you be more likely to turn to close friends or your relatives for help?

[52]"Some people feel that when their legal rights are violated, they should try to handle the matter themselves, while others feel they should call in the law. (Handle it yourself= Self-orientation, Call in the law=Not Self-orientation)." The marginal distribution for this item was highly skewed, confounding statistical calculations.

[53]Items investigating Regionalism and change are as follow: Do you expect to live in this community always, do you know definitely that you will leave, or do you think there is a good possibility you may leave? (Possibly or definitely leave, Remain in the area.) Are you in favor of wives working outside the home if they want to even if their husbands make enough to support the family? (Approve, Disapprove). Do you think God is more pleased when people try to get ahead, or when they are satisfied with what they have? (Try to Get Ahead, Are Satisfied). Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself. (Disagree, Agree). Do you prefer a minister who has grown up in this area, or one who has come in from the outside? (Prefer from outside, Prefer from this area.)

Multivariate analysis was employed, utilizing standard cross tabulations with controls made at pertinent points. Gamma, an ordinal measure of association, together with chi-square, a test of significance, were used.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

The items for the revised Familism Scale are stated in Table 1, which reports item intercorrelations, point-biserial

TABLE 1

ITEMS IN THE FAMILISM SCALE[a]

Familism Item	Item Intercorrelations (Phi Coefficient)				Item Total r's[b]	Percent Positive Response
	A	B	C	D		
A. You can tell how good a person is by how he takes care of his aging parents. Disagree & Unsure=0; Agree=1	-	.06	.10	.11	.65	84.06
B. Do you have any relatives who live nearby? No=0; Yes=1		-	.08	.08	.70	78.22
C. Do you and your relatives feel free to call on each other for help? No=0; Yes=1			-	.11	.48	94.84
D. Do you think a person has an obligation to help relatives, even if he doesn't feel real close to them? No=0; Yes=1				-	.66	84.66

Scale Reliability=.277 (Obtained from Kuder-Richardson Formula 20)

[a]Total N=1336

[b]Point-biserial correlation coefficients

correlation coefficients, and the percentage of positive responses. To estimate the internal reliability of the scale, the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 was employed;[54] the value for r_{++} was .28, which meets the minimal level of acceptability. The item intercorrelations were computed using product moment correlation. Guilford[55] suggests that the coefficients should range between .10 and .60. The coefficients all hovered around the .10 level; and while some of the coefficients did not fall in the desired range, all four of the positive responses approached the minimal requirements. Finally, the point bi-serial correlations between the items and the total score were calculated. Guilford suggests that the item-test correlations range between .30 and .80, and all fell within this range.

The original sample consisted of 1466 respondents, but was reduced to 1336 after the exclusion of no-responses. Familism scores were calculated for all those respondents who answered all four questions. The first hypothesis was that a positive relationship exists between Self-orientation and Familism. From the percentages found in Table 2, it can be seen that these two items are not related, and, therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

The second hypothesis was concerned with the relation of Self-orientation to Regionalism, which was defined as the desire to remain in the area. Regionalism here was measured through a

---

[54]J. P. Guilford, Psychometric Methods, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1954), pp. 380-381.

[55]J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), p. 471.

TABLE 2

SELF-ORIENTATION AND FAMILISM[a] (IN PERCENT)

Self-Orientation	Familism	
	(low)	(high)
low (N=1170)	43.2	56.8
high (N=140)	41.4	58.6

Chi-square=.25; d.f.=1; P>.05; Q=.04

[a]The measures for these variables are discussed in the text.

single item, i.e., the respondents were asked whether they plan to live in their community, or would possibly or definitely leave. We must admit that this was not a good item because desire to remain in the area cannot be fully equated with plans to remain. Table 3 summarizes the results. Self-orientation and plans to remain in the area are not related.

TABLE 3

SELF-ORIENTATION AND PLANS TO REMAIN IN THE AREA
(IN PERCENT)

Self-Orientation	Plans to Remain in The Area	
	Possibly or Definitely Leave	Remain
low (N=1243)	30.2	69.8
high (N=148)	29.7	70.3

Chi-square=.00; d.f.=1; P>.05; Q=+.01

In regard to the third hypothesis, which was formulated to find out the willingness of the residents of Southern Appalachia to accept change, it was predicted that self-orientation is negatively related to willingness to accept social change. To measure willingness to accept social change an item was selected that asked the respondents: "Are you in favor of wives working outside the home if they want to, even if their husbands make enough to support the family?"

It was assumed that such a phenomenon would be more characteristic of an urban rather than a rural society (or modern rather than a traditional society). The relationship can be seen in Table 4, with sex of respondents used as a control. If one

TABLE 4

SELF-ORIENTATION, ATTITUDE TOWARD WORKING WIVES AND
SEX OF RESPONDENTS (IN PERCENT)

Sex of Respondents	Self-Orientation	Attitude Toward Working Wives		
		Disapprove	Approve	N
Female[1]	Low	68.7	31.3	821
	High	58.5	41.5	82
Male[2]	Low	66.4	33.6	399
	High	66.1	33.9	59
All[3]	Low	68.0	32.0	1220
	High	61.7	38.3	141

[1]Chi-square=3.04; d.f.=1; P <.10; Q=+.22
[2]Chi-square=.01; d.f.=1; P>.05; Q=+.01
[3]Chi-square=1.97; d.f.=1; P>.05; Q=+.14

accepts the .10 level as a minimal requirement, the relationship is significant for females only (but in the reverse direction from that expected), as can be seen in Table 4. But the relationship is not significant for males or the total sample. Females who are higher on self-orientation approve of working wives.

Another measure was used to ascertain the willingness on the part of Southern Appalachians to accept social change. The item selected was the belief whether God is more pleased when people try to get ahead or are satisfied with their present condition. This relationship is shown in Table 5, with residence controlled.

TABLE 5

SELF-ORIENTATION, RESIDENCE, AND BELIEF THAT GOD IS MORE PLEASED
WHEN PEOPLE TRY TO GET AHEAD (IN PERCENT)

Residence	Self-Orientation	Belief that God is More Pleased When People Try to Get Ahead		
		Are Satisfied	Try to Get Ahead	N
Rural[1]	Low	59.5	40.5	563
	High	71.0	29.0	76
Urban[2]	Low	41.2	58.8	605
	High	44.6	55.4	56
All[3]	Low	50.0	50.0	1168
	High	59.8	40.2	132

[1]Chi-square=4.25; d.f.=1; $P < .05$; Q=-.25
[2]Chi-square=.42; d.f.=1; $P > .05$; Q=-.07
[3]Chi-square=5.01; d.f.=1; $P < .05$; Q=-.20

Individuals who are more self-oriented are less likely to say that God is more pleased when people try to get ahead. When residence is controlled the relationship holds for rural respondents.

Still another measure of acceptance of social change might be the relative lack of anomie. It is assumed that anomic people are fatalistic and would accept traditional society. The anomie concept is used here in the sense Srole uses it. He describes this variable as "referring to the individual's generalized pervasive sense of 'Self-to-others belongingness' at one extreme compared with 'Self-to-others distance' and 'Self-to-others alienation' at the other pole of the continuum."[56]

Table 6 summarizes the responses to self-orientation and the anomie item. When class is used as a control, no significant relationship is found between anomie, and self-orientation among lower class individuals. The relationship is significant, however, for upper class[57] individuals as well as the total sample of respondents $(P < .05)$.

Let us turn now to the fourth hypothesis that predicted an inverse relationship between self-orientation and acceptance of society at large. One measure of the acceptance of the larger society

---

[56]Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corrolaries: An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXI, (Dec., 1956), p. 711.

For a well-written and detailed discussion of the concept also see: Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXIV, (Dec., 1959), pp. 783-791.

[57]Social class has been determined using a composite measure developed in Thomas R. Ford, "Status, Residence and Fundamental Religious Beliefs in the Southern Appalachians," Social Forces, Vol. XXIX, (Oct., 1960), p. 44.

TABLE 6

SELF-ORIENTATION, CLASS AND ANOMIE[a] (IN PERCENT)

Class	Self-Orientation	Anomie		
		Low	High	N
Low[1]	Low	41.8	58.2	471
	High	34.5	65.5	58
High[2]	Low	62.2	37.8	434
	High	42.4	57.6	33
All[3]	Low	48.9	51.1	1207
	High	37.3	62.7	142

[a]The anomie item is introduced in the text. Unsure responses are lumped with the anomie (agree) responses.

[1]Chi-square=.87; d.f.=1; $P > .05$; Q=+.16

[2]Chi-square=4.24; d.f.=1; $P < .05$; Q=+.38

[3]Chi-square=6.35; d.f.=1; $P < .05$; Q=+.23

would be whether the respondent would desire a minister from outside the Appalachian area or prefer one from the local area. Table 7 presents the findings on this item. It can be seen that the direction of the relationship is as predicted but that it reaches only .10 level of significance in the case of rural people and the total sample.

In addition to the four major hypotheses, there were additional hypotheses concerning the conditions under which self-orientation would be present, i.e., self orientation is more likely

TABLE 7

SELF-ORIENTATION AND DESIRE FOR MINISTER TO BE FROM THE AREA
(IN PERCENT)

Residence	Self-Orientation	Attitude Toward Regional Background of Minister		N
		Prefer Outside	Prefer From This Area	
Rural[1]	Low	79.9	20.1	597
	High	70.2	29.8	84
Urban[2]	Low	89.0	11.0	644
	High	89.2	10.8	65
All[3]	Low	84.6	15.4	1241
	High	78.5	21.5	149

[1]Chi-square=3.55; d.f.=1; $P < .10$; Q=+.26

[2]Chi-square=.07; d.f.=1; $P > .05$; Q=-.01

[3]Chi-square=3.22; d.f.=1; $P < .10$; Q=+.20

to be present among rural residents than among urban residents; is more prevalent among members of the lower class than among members of the upper class; and is more characteristic of males than of females.

Table 8 shows the relationship between self-orientation and residence. Self-orientation is significantly related (.10 level) to rural residence. An inverse relationship exists between self-orientation and social class at the .05 level (Table 9). Self-orientation is more characteristic of males than females (Table 10).

TABLE 8

RESIDENCE AND SELF-ORIENTATION (IN PERCENT)

Residence	Self-Orientation	
	Low	High
Rural (N=684)	87.6	12.4
Urban (N=714)	90.9	9.1

Chi-square=3.69; d.f.=1; P <.10; Q=-.17

TABLE 9

CLASS AND SELF-ORIENTATION (IN PERCENT)

Class	Self-Orientation	
	Low	High
Low (N=548)	88.5	11.5
High (N=487)	92.8	7.2

Chi-square=5.10; d.f.=1; P <.05; Q=-.25

TABLE 10

SEX AND SELF-ORIENTATION (IN PERCENT)

Sex	Self-Orientation	
	Low	High
Female (N=919)	90.5	9.5
Male (N=479)	86.8	13.2

Chi-square=4.09; d.f.=1; P <.05; Q=+.18

Earlier it was stated that self-orientation was not found to be related to familism. Since this was the case it was decided to test the same hypotheses in terms of familism in addition to self-orientation. For example, those high in familism were more likely to say that they plan to remain in the Appalachian Area (Table 11). A higher percentage of people with greater familistic attitudes planned to remain in the area (74.9%), in comparison to those who were low in familism (63.8%). The relationship is significant at the .05 level. It should be noted here that the differences remained when controlled by sex, residence, class, and education. (This is not shown in Table 11.)

TABLE 11

FAMILISM AND PLANS TO REMAIN IN THE AREA
(IN PERCENT)

	Plans To Remain In The Area	
Familism	Possibly or Definitely Leave	Remain in the Area
Low (N=572)	36.2	63.8
High (N=758)	25.1	74.9

Chi-square=19.80; d.f.=1; P<.05; Q=+.26

To measure the willingness to accept social change, the item concerning the attitudes of people toward working wives was utilized. The relationship between familism and attitudes toward working wives is summarized in Table 12. Unlike the findings for self-orientation and working wives, familism is related to this attitude for males

rather than females, as well as for the total sample (significant at .05 and .10 levels, respectively). It might be noted that the relationship was also significant in rural areas ($P < .05$), but not in the urban areas. (This is not shown in Table 12.)

TABLE 12

FAMILISM AND ATTITUDE TOWARD WORKING WIVES (IN PERCENT)

| Sex | Familism | Attitudes Toward Working Wives | | |
		Disapprove	Approve	N
Female[1]	Low	66.7	33.3	387
	High	68.2	31.8	475
Male[2]	Low	58.5	41.5	171
	High	70.9	29.1	268
All[3]	Low	64.2	35.8	558
	High	69.2	30.8	743

[1]Chi-square=.17; d.f.=1; $P > .05$; Q=-.04

[2]Chi-square=6.63; d.f.=1; $P < .05$; Q=-.27

[3]Chi-square=3.41; d.f.=1; $P < .10$; Q=-.11

In Table 13 the relationship between familism and the belief that God is more pleased when people try to get ahead is summarized. The relationship, while significant for the total sample ($P < .05$), disappears when class is controlled. This means that familism is not as closely associated with the belief as is social class. It might also be noted here that this relationship is significant in rural but not in urban areas (Q = .24).

TABLE 13

FAMILISM AND BELIEF THAT GOD IS MORE PLEASED WHEN PEOPLE TRY TO GET AHEAD (IN PERCENT)

| Class | Familism | God Is More Pleased When People Try To Get Ahead | | N |
		Are Satisfied	Try to Get Ahead	
Low[1]	Low	66.1	33.9	180
	High	66.4	33.6	310
High[2]	Low	23.0	77.0	230
	High	28.7	71.3	202
All[3]	Low	45.0	55.0	522
	High	56.0	44.0	720

[1]Chi-square=.00; d.f.=1; P>.05; Q=-.01

[2]Chi-square=1.52; d.f.=1; P>.05; Q=-.15

[3]Chi-square=14.10; d.f.=1; P<.05; Q=-.22

Table 14 reports the relationship between familism and anomie. The finding here is similar to that found in Table 13; while the relationship is significant for the total sample (P<.05), it disappears when class is controlled.

The responses for familism and the desire for the minister to be from the area are summarized in Table 15. The relationships (with residence controlled, as well as for total sample) are significant at least at the .10 level. Persons high in familism in rural areas are more likely to desire a local minister than persons low in familism, whereas persons high in familism in urban areas

TABLE 14

FAMILISM AND ANOMIE (IN PERCENT)

Class	Familism	Anomie		N
		Low	High	
Low[1]	Low	38.8	61.2	188
	High	41.7	58.3	314
High[2]	Low	63.7	36.3	237
	High	57.2	42.8	215
All[3]	Low	51.0	49.0	543
	High	44.4	55.6	745

[1]Chi-square=.30; d.f.=1; $P > .05$; Q=-.06

[2]Chi-square=2.28; d.f.=1; $P > .05$; Q=+.14

[3]Chi-square=5.73; d.f.=1; $P < .05$; Q=+.13

TABLE 15

FAMILISM AND DESIRE FOR MINISTER TO BE FROM THE AREA
(IN PERCENT)

Residence	Familism	Desire For Minister To Be From The Area		N
		Outside	Local	
Rural[1]	Low	84.1	15.9	227
	High	75.4	24.6	427
Urban[2]	Low	86.6	13.4	344
	High	91.0	9.0	333
All[3]	Low	85.6	14.4	571
	High	82.2	17.8	760

[1]Chi-square=7.21; d.f.=1; $P < .05$; Q=+.27

[2]Chi-square=2.81; d.f.=1; $P < .10$; Q=-.22

[3]Chi-square=2.72; d.f.=1; $P < .10$; Q=+.14

are more likely to desire an outside minister. Let us note here that it is possible that urban persons who were high in familism were more likely to perceive outside ministers as perhaps being rural in background, and perhaps these individuals were rural in background. The summary of the responses for residence and familism are shown in Table 16. It is clear that familism is more common to rural residents and that social class and familism are inversely related (Table 17). This relationship remains when residence is controlled.

TABLE 16

RESIDENCE AND FAMILISM (IN PERCENT)

Residence	Familism	
	Low	High
Rural (N=656)	34.9	65.1
Urban (N=680)	50.6	49.4

Chi-square=34.16; d.f.=1; P<.05; Q=-.31

Finally, Table 18 reports sex and familism. Within both the rural and urban areas, females tend to be less familistic than males, but the relationships are not significant at .10 level. The overall relationship, while significant (P<.05), is of little importance since the apparent relationship vanishes when residence is controlled. Proportionately, there were more females interviewed in the urban area. The urban dwellers were lower in familism than rural dwellers.

TABLE 17

CLASS AND FAMILISM (IN PERCENT)

Residence	Class	Familism		N
		Low	High	
Rural[1]	Low	35.1	64.9	330
	High	46.2	53.8	130
Urban[2]	Low	42.7	57.3	185
	High	58.0	42.0	352
All[3]	Low	47.7	52.3	620
	High	53.8	46.2	472

[1]Chi-square=5.29; d.f.=1; P <.05; Q=-.23
[2]Chi-square=11.94; d.f.=1; P<.05; Q=-.30
[3]Chi-square=4.20; d.f.=1; P<.05; Q=-.12

TABLE 18

SEX AND FAMILISM (IN PERCENT)

Residence	Sex	Familism		N
		Low	High	
Rural[1]	Female	36.4	63.6	387
	Male	32.7	67.3	269
Urban[2]	Female	51.7	48.3	489
	Male	47.6	52.4	191
All[3]	Female	45.0	55.0	876
	Male	38.9	61.1	460

[1]Chi-square=1.14; d.f.=1; P>.05; Q=+.08
[2]Chi-square=1.09; d.f.=1; P>.05; Q=+.08
[3]Chi-square=4.78; d.f.=1; P<.05; Q=+.12

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitude of
self-orientation of Southern Appalachians with regard to familism,
regionalism and willingness to accept social change. Making use of
the data collected by the Southern Appalachian researchers and
subjecting it to secondary analysis, the study tested seven
hypotheses. A familism scale and other pertinent single items
were utilized to explore attitudes.

The survey of the literature revealed that the people in
the area have manifested, over time, a tendency to cling to
traditions and have shown resistance to change, which has resulted
to a certain extent in the backwardness of the area and the relative
isolation from the cardinal values of American culture. This study,
taking this fact into account, investigated several areas of
attitudinal preference.

Although in some areas our hypotheses did not find statistical
support, the testing of other related hypotheses yielded significant
results. That women in general are assumed to be conservative and less
open to change is not supported by the findings of this thesis. Females
who are higher on self-orientation approve of working wives, which is
indicative of their being more open to change. Rural dwellers high
on self-orientation were found to be less open to change. The

direction of the relationship between self-orientation and acceptance
of the larger society was as predicted (for the rural area only), i.e.,
an inverse relationship between self-orientation and acceptance of
society at large.

Testing the same hypotheses used for self-orientation, we
found that a significant relationship exists between the familistic
orientation and regionalism. The differences remained when sex,
residence, class, and education were controlled. Unlike the
findings for self-orientation and working wives, males who are
high on familism disapprove of working wives. Familism is found
more among rural residents than among urban residents. There also
exists an inverse relationship between class and familism.

These findings appear to confirm results of earlier studies
describing Southern Appalachians. Therefore, while it may not be
true that people in the region display a homogeneous pattern of
beliefs and values, it can be said that in the preservation of old
values like familism and regionalism, they have shown firmness and
have been a source of some frustration to the efforts of those
working for the betterment of the area.

It is suggested that more adequate measures of self-orientation
should be devised, as the measure utilized here was found to be
inadequate. In addition, future studies of self-orientation should
be completed in areas outside of Southern Appalachia.

Our central interest in this thesis has been the exploration
of correlates of willingness to accept social change and the larger
society. It was believed that two variables--self-orientation and
familism--would be related to these attitudes as well as to each

other. Self-orientation has received too little attention from
researchers examining receptivity to social change. It has been shown
in this thesis that self-orientation and familism are unrelated to
each other, and thus future research on openness to change should
take into account both of these variables. Perhaps they can be
incorporated into a more inclusive measure of localism--cosmopolitanism
or perhaps a social-psychological measure designed to "locate"
individuals at different stages on the folk-urban continuum. The
pattern variables might well be utilized for developing such a
comprehensive index.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Ford, Thomas R., ed. The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey.
Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

_____. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill Book
Company, 1954.

Matthews, Elmora Messer. Neighbor and Kin: Life in a Tennessee
Ridge Community. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press,
1965.

Parsons, Talcott and Edward A. Shills, eds. Toward A General Theory
of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Pearsall, Marion. Little Smoky Ridge. University: University of
Alabama Press, 1965.

Weller, Jack. Yesterday's People. Lexington: University of
Kentucky Press, 1965.

ARTICLES

Brewer, Earl D. C., "Religion and the Churches," in The Southern
Appalachian Region: A Survey, ed. Thomas R. Ford.
Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962. 201-218.

Fliegel, Frederick C., "Obstacles to Change for the Low-Income
Farmer," Rural Sociology, Vol. XXV (Sept., 1960) 347-351.

_____, "Aspirations of Low-Income Farmers and Their Performance
and Potential for Change," Rural Sociology, Vol. XXIV
(Sept., 1959) 205-214.

_____, "Traditionalism in the Farm Family and Technological
Change," Rural Sociology, Vol. XXVII (March, 1962) 70-76.

Ford, Thomas R., "The Passing of Provincialism," in The Southern
    Appalachian Region: A Survey. ed. Thomas R. Ford.
    Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962. 9-34.

_____, "Religious Thought and Beliefs in the Southern
    Appalachians as Revealed by an Attitude Survey," Review of
    Religious Research, Vol. III (Summer, 1961) 2-21.

_____, "Status, Residence and Fundamental Religious Beliefs in
    the Southern Appalachians," Social Forces, Vol. XXIX
    (Oct., 1960) 41-49.

Lantz, Herman R., "Resignation, Industrialization, and the Problem of
    Social Change: A Case History of Coal Mining Community," in
    Blue Collar World. eds. Arthur B. Shostak and William Gomberg.
    Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. (1964) 258-270.

Seeman, Melvin, "On The Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological
    Review, Vol. XXIV (Dec., 1959) 783-791.

Srole, Leo, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An
    Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXI
    (Dec., 1956) 709-716.

Vance, Rupert B., "Social Change in the Southern Appalachians," in
    The South in Continuity and Change. eds. John C. McKinney
    and Edgar T. Thompson. Durham: Duke University Press,
    (1965) 407-417.

BULLETINS AND MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS

Appalachian Bibliography, Compiled for The Appalachian Regional
    Commission. Morgantown: West Virginia University Library,
    1967.

Fliegel, Frederick C., The Low-Income Farmer in a Changing Society.
    Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University, College of
    Agriculture, Agriculture Experiment Station, Bulletin #731,
    March, 1966.

Munn, Robert F., The Southern Appalachians: A Bibliography and
    Guide to Studies. Morgantown: West Virginia University
    Library, 1961.

Nelsen, Hart M., and Anne K. Nelsen, Bibliography on Appalachia:
    A Guide to Studies Dealing with Appalachia in General and
    Including Rural and Urban Working Class Attitudes Toward
    Religion, Education, and Social Change. Bulletin #4.
    Bowling Green: Western Kentucky University, College of
    Commerce, Office of Research and Services, April, 1967.