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Abstract

In *Disinheriting Appalachia*, the author sought to understand the phenomenon of cultural distancing thought to be occurring among Appalachian young people, especially of college-age. Research was executed over three studies. In Study One, two male and two female Appalachians between 65 and 75 years-old (approximately college age in 1960) were interviewed to gather information to create an averaged exemplar. In Study Two, these exemplars were presented as a male vignette and a female vignette across a randomized sample of psychology students at a small private Christian liberal arts college located in Appalachian Tennessee. Two male and two female subjects elected to be interviewed for Study Three. Study Three allowed for a greater picture of the perception of Appalachian life in 1960 from a college-aged standpoint. Main effects in regard to gender were found. Identification with the Appalachian region was also found to significantly influence responses on identification with the vignette examples.
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Disinheriting Appalachia grew out of research on the South and its mores and folkways. Appalachia is certainly a sui generis region, one whose proud culture stands apart from other regions of the United States. Previous research on the region indicates that many young, educated Appalachians seek to distance themselves from the region, or at least from the “Dumb Appalachian” stereotype that seems to pervade popular media. This stereotype does not necessarily reflect the whole population of the region, but, rather reflects a caricature of a very small subset of the Appalachian population. However, with the pervasiveness and verisimilitude of this caricature, the origins of the subjective miasma clouding the perception of the region for many become clear.
Chapter One: Review of Literature

“Surely no one wants to retain the past for its own sake—to keep the Appalachia that was synonymous with overworked, eroded, slashed, and burnt land, the Appalachia of poor education and cultural deprivation, the Appalachia that is synonymous with poverty. Granted, all that was and in some cases still is part of Appalachia, but only quixotic fools embrace unselectively the whole of a past as a model for the future or a comfort for the present”

(McDonald & Wheeler, 1983)
Appalachia is a region often depicted in popular American culture as left behind the progress ushered in by the revolutionary changes of the last century. Through television and other media depictions, the region and, more specifically, Appalachians are regarded as backward, slow to change, and seemingly permanently poverty-stricken. Due to this attitude, and the extreme poverty seen in the region, the United States Congress created the Appalachian Regional Commission in 1965 out of the President’s Appalachian Regional Commission, devised by President Johnson in 1964 (Appalachian Regional Commission, 2010).

Today’s Commission [ARC], still an active organization working for Appalachia and its people, was created as an advocacy agency whose goals, according to the ARC’s website, include a plan to:

Increase job opportunities and per capita income in Appalachia to reach parity with the nation, strengthen the capacity of the people of Appalachia to compete in the global economy, develop and improve Appalachia’s infrastructure to make the Region economically competitive, and build the Appalachian Development Highway System to reduce Appalachia’s isolation (Appalachian Regional Commission, 2010).

Each year, the ARC funds projects across the region to promote its goals of improving life for Appalachians. As aforementioned, the Commission created the Appalachian Development Highway System in order to increase the flow of goods (and subsequently, the Commission hopes, jobs) into and through the Appalachian region.
While the Appalachia of popular culture is typically one of hills and “hollers” deep in the farthest recesses of the Appalachian mountain range, the legislation which created the Appalachian Regional Commission defines the Appalachian region as:

A 205,000-square-mile region that follows the spine of the Appalachian Mountains from southern New York to northern Mississippi. It includes all of West Virginia and parts of 12 other states: Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia (Appalachian Regional Commission, 2010).

The region as defined by the Commission includes 420 counties in 13 states, stretching nearly the entire length of the Eastern Seaboard (Appalachian Regional Commission, 2010). A list of counties included in the ARC’s definition is attached in Appendix A, and maps of the region are attached in Appendices B and C. With so many people living across such a diverse area, many people who do not necessarily identify as Appalachians are included in the Appalachian region. Many major cities are included in this definition. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the largest of the Appalachian cities, is sometimes referred to by the derogatory nick-name “The Paris of Appalachia.” Author Brian O’Neill titled his 2009 work chronicling the modern history of the city as such, reflecting the Appalachian drive to take the worst and create from it the best possible.

Although the ARC’s definition is helpful as an overarching definition for Congressional budgetary allocation purposes, for the research in this document, and from this point onward, “Appalachia” will refer to three subregions of the ARC’s definition of the region: North Central Appalachia, spanning most of West Virginia and southern Ohio, Central Appalachia, covering the
eastern portion of Kentucky, as well as the north-central part of Tennessee, and several counties in southwest Virginia and southern West Virginia, and South Central Appalachia, encompassing the western portion of Virginia, western North Carolina, as well as the remainder of east Tennessee and two counties in middle Tennessee. The reason for this change is to better reflect the image of the region as portrayed in popular culture and to better fit the experiences of those Appalachians who took part in the research of this document. This brings the number of counties included in the definition of “Appalachia” from 420 to 230. A detailed list of the included counties may be found in Appendix D of this document and a map may be found in Appendix E.

Even with a firm geographic definition of what is “Appalachia,” one is left empty-handed as to what constitutes it and, moreover, what is exactly meant by the word “Appalachian.” A native Appalachian can often identify a non-local simply by the way he or she pronounces the name of the region. Often, non-natives pronounce the word “Appalachia” with a long ‘a‘ sound, while natives utilize a pronunciation with a soft ‘a‘ sound and a hardened ‘ch-‘.

This is the first of many differences in the speech patterns of native and non-native Appalachians studied by Kirk Hazen and Ellen Fluharty (2004), as evidenced in the following example outlining sociocultural differences at a Charleston, West Virginia high school among students:

Around the state capital of West Virginia, Charleston, high school students maintain strict social divisions between the suburbanites and those who live in more rural areas. These groups are divided by several socioeconomic indicators and mark their differences with their speech. The more rural Creekers, who live along creeks, follow Southern language variation patterns…; the Hillers, who
liver higher up both geographically and socioeconomically, display more
Northern language variation patterns. The *Hillers* social group in the high school
contains the children of professionals from other states and countries; the
*Creekers* are all native-born West Virginians whose families have been in the area
for at least several generations. The animosity between the two groups is in part
rooted in their different orientations: the *Creekers* want to live in Appalachia,
specifically the southern part, while the *Hillers* want out of their local community
and Appalachia in general. Southern and non-Southern are not simply geographic
areas, but identities. (55)

Hazen and Fluharty also found that speakers of Appalachian English were conflicted,
especially those speakers who are formally educated. One interviewee even went so far as to
state, “it was my perception and my personal choice that I didn’t want to sound like those other
people” (59). In keeping with the idea of cultural disassociation, there is perhaps no part of
Appalachian culture more distinct than its language, a variety of English which may very well
vanish due to the social perception of ignorance, low intelligence, little education, or other social
stigmas.

These social stigmas are relevant in contemporary Appalachia, but are also very relevant
in other American cultures, as evidenced in the Cross and Fhagen-Smith study (1996) of the
identity development of Black Americans. The Cross and Fhagen-Smith study views the
development of the Black self-identity through the lenses of self-hatred and idealization of
another cultural group, in this case, White Americans (Cross, et al., 1996). These lenses are
clearly applicable to Appalachian young people because of the aforementioned self-comparison,
exceptionally so when viewed in tandem with the aforementioned social stigmas, much akin to those experienced by Black Americans.

The author hopes to gain insight into Appalachian identity development and the hypothesized condition of disidentification through studies previously conducted and view that identity in terms of identification with like-others or identification with idealized unlike-others. Unlike-others are hypothesized to be idealized because they are seen as preferential to the self, akin to the idealization of White Americans seen in Cross’ study and the self-hate of Black Americans.

Also of particular importance, Elsa Germain’s study (2004) on the cultural identity of minority cultural rural Australian adolescents includes the following definition of cultural identity: “cultural identity can be defined as a process involving cognitive appraisal, which results from self-awareness achieved either through the collective experience within a membership group or the individual perception as we compare ourselves to a reference group” (134). This definition is particularly apropos to the Appalachian condition wherein thanks to the modern day advent of constant bombardment by social media and other outside sources, Appalachian young people have a basis of constant comparison with both membership groups and outside reference groups.

Popular culture has become a dangerous place for a number of social groups, but seemingly most specifically those persons who are associated with social groups perceived as lower in social standing than the cultural norm presented by the culture manufacturers in “televisionland”. The “Dumb Appalachian” stereotype seems to pervade even the most educated minds outside the region. It is by no stretch of the imagination, then, that Appalachians are
hypothesized to have become more and more distant from their heritage. As Dwight Billings notes in the introduction to *Confronting Appalachian Stereotypes: Back Talk from an American Region* (1999):

> it is the displacement of Appalachian peoples’ own narratives and the denial of their rich history of resistance by *The Kentucky Cycle* and the wider national culture-industry apparatus of which it is a part, that explains why the play has troubled him so deeply. Raising important questions about the politics of representation and who claims to speak for and about others, Norman provides a fitting conclusion to this volume by quoting the words of an Appalachian folk song: “Better listen to the voices from the mountains, they might tell you what you just might need to hear.” (Billings, 17)

The stage production which Billings refers to in the previous excerpt, *The Kentucky Cycle*, has been one met with much controversy. The play was received with criticism, much of which is contained in *Back Talk*. Even the Kennedy Center, an institution typically regarded as a home of elite minds, published a guide to *The Kentucky Cycle* which Billings says, “proceeds to deploy the region metonymically as the emblem for much that is wrong in America” (12).

Although portrayed in popular media as America’s “problem children,” Appalachians have a fierce sense of entitlement to what is theirs. It is not surprising, then, that Appalachians have a long history of community activism. One case-in-point is that of the residents of Bumpass Cove in the far reaches of mountainous Unicoi County, Tennessee. Unicoi County holds a very special title for the author--it is the place that he calls “home.” And it is, then, at
once fitting and horrifically tragic that one of the least talked-about environmental disasters in Tennessee took place there.

The film *You Got to Move*, produced by the Highlander Research and Education Center, told the gripping tale of the residents of Bumpass Cove in their own words. Bumpass Cove sits on the Nolichucky River on the Washington County border and is very near the former Embree Mines which produced iron and lead ore used in ammunition and for other purposes from the early-1800s to the mid-twentieth century (Wyman, 2002). However, following the end of mining activity, little economic development occurred in the communities.

Because of this economic stagnation, by the late 1960s a landfill opened and was welcomed with open arms because of the jobs promised to accompany its arrival. By the 1970s, hundreds of truckloads of seemingly innocuous refuse were dumped near Bumpass Cove. Gail Story, a resident of Bumpass Cove, noticed that she and other residents began to feel ill or take “passing out spells” whenever the trucks passed. Story even remarked that she had to lay her head in the freezer on a block of ice to keep from fainting. Also, patches of dead grass began to show telltale signs that the “garbage” entering the landfill was not civilian waste. It was not until a flood washed away the topsoil in the late 1970s that steel drums containing highly toxic materials were uncovered. Story and other residents began to mobilize. (Phenix & Selver, 1985)

Although they were not educated in the formal sense (Story did not receive a high school diploma) and even accused of being communists, the Bumpass Cove residents did not back down in the face of their land being ruined. At one point, as portrayed in *You Got to Move*, they even stood in front of the trucks bringing the noxious chemicals into their community. By 1979, the landfill had closed, the waste dumped in the landfill had been documented by Story and other
community members, and the State of Tennessee began working to clean up the deadly, dangerous site. (Phenix & Selver, 1985)

However, according to Couto and Guthrie’s *Making Democracy Work Better* (1999), there were limitations on the cleanup efforts:

Environmental degradation had gone too far to allow Bumpass Cove to be restored to its condition before the dumping began. Efforts to remove the toxic materials from the landfill made a bad situation worse. A backhoe ruptured several barrels during a removal effort. People who lived nearby were asked to evacuate their homes while the chemicals either evaporated or were covered with topsoil. (p. 119).

The account of Gail Story and her fight against being taken advantage of due to her level of education and poverty is only one of many documented in *You Got to Move*. People like Story have been mobilizing Appalachian citizens to fight against injustice and neglect for decades. This story is just a thread in the rich fabric of Appalachian citizenry, a fabric whose richness is better understood with the full comprehension of the dire situation which faced Appalachians in the early 1960s--leading to the creation of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Appalachia, more specifically, the South Central and Southern Appalachia subregions, faced a plight similar to the rest of the southeastern United States with regard to labor and manufacturing. Of particular interest was Tom Lee’s (2005) analysis of the growth of the Tri-Cities region of Appalachia in *The Tennessee-Virginia Tri-Cities: Urbanization in Appalachia, 1900-1950*. The Tri-Cities, as defined in Lee’s work, is comprised of Carter, Greene, Hawkins, Johnson, Sullivan, Unicoi, and Washington Counties in Tennessee and Scott and Washington
Counties in Virginia. Lee (2005) cites the availability of cheap labor as the reason for the creation of so many low-skill, low-wage manufacturing jobs. Manufacturing was at first relegated to small mills, but thanks to the efforts of Kingsport, Tennessee civic leader J. Fred Johnson and the Kingsport Improvement Corporation, with its “oligarchic oversight” planned the city of Kingsport and attracted new industry, most notably, the Eastman Kodak company’s chemical plant (Lee, 2005).

Elizabethton, Tennessee soon followed suit, and its Co-Operative Town Company attracted an industry which produced a mysterious new semi-synthetic fabric called rayon, Vereinigte Glanzstoff Fabriken (VGF), usually known more simply as American Glanzstoff (Lee, 2005). American Glanzstoff and the J. P. Bemberg Company opened two huge rayon mills which would employ thousands of willing Appalachian workers. Later, though, the city began to feel the strain of a series of poorly planned business deals, including a ten-year property tax exemption for both plants, and an expensive utilities extension from the city of Elizabethton:

In July 1925, the Carter County Court voted thirty-five to two to adopt a resolution promising to coöperate with Bemberg officials and to exempt the factory from county taxes for ten years beginning January 1, 1926. Their tax concession to Bemberg and a subsequent concession to a second rayon plant robbed the county of vital tax revenue…. Bemberg also secured rights to water from the Watauga River and a promise that a ten-inch water main from Elizabethton’s Mountain Spring Water Company would be constructed. Bemberg’s water consumption could easily exceed a million gallons per day at
full production. For its water, the plant agreed to pay three hundred dollars annually. (132)

Elizabethton felt the brunt of its poor planning for many years, and would later be rocked by labor unrest thanks to unchecked labor practices at the plants, beginning with the rayon strikes of 1929 (Lee, 2005). Elizabethton was not alone, however, and many factories in the south like American Glanzstoff and J. P. Bemberg were unable to remain competitive.

According to Lee, the United States Interstate Commerce Commission legally sanctioned differences in freight costs by railroads (then the backbone of transportation of goods) for southern industry beginning in the late 1800s. Manufacturers in the South (and thus, Appalachia as defined in this study) paid substantially more to ship goods to the thriving northern markets which so voraciously demanded and consumed them than did northern manufacturers to ship to the developing South (Lee, 2005). Even northern Appalachian industries competed against those in the southern part of the region. Steel production, for instance, in the South, was dominated by the “Pittsburgh Plus” system, wherein steel produced in southern steel towns like Birmingham, Alabama was charged at a rate which effectively placed a legally sanctioned tariff on southern goods (Lee, 2005).

This situation of unhappy labor and over-priced goods led to a sad climax in the mid-1950s as industries which once provided labor to a large percentage of towns, like Southern Potteries, Inc. in Erwin, Tennessee on January 31, 1957, closed their doors or decreased production and thereby, their workforce (Ruffin, F. & Ruffin, J., 2004). In fact, between 1950 and 1957 (the year of the closure of SPI), the aforementioned nine counties in Upper-East Tennessee and Southwest Virginia lost a combined 27,000 residents, more than the populations
of Johnson and Unicoi Counties, Tennessee combined, with each county losing over a thousand residents in that period. (Lee, 2005)

The above statistics paint a picture which is directly reflective of the situation which led to the creation of the Appalachian Regional Commission. As noted by David Whisnant in *Modernizing the Mountaineer* (1994), nearly 50 years after its creation, the Commission has made some progress in the region, but even those in executive positions at the ARC were unsure of its impact by the 1970s. In fact, when then-Executive Director Alvin Arnett was asked about the accomplishments of the Commission, he responded that it “sort of dippy-doodled along” (Whisnant, 1994).

However, maps of the Appalachian region reflecting distressed status across time tell a different story. From 1960 to 2011, the region has vastly improved in regard to the number of distressed counties. According to Wood’s “Progress and Challenges in Reducing Economic Distress in Appalachia,” (2000), “distressed counties have at least 150% of the U.S. average unemployment rate of 5.14%, at least 150% of the U.S. poverty rate of 22.1%, and 67% or less of the U.S. per capita market income of $1,639 or 200% poverty and one of the other two distressed indicators.” A fuller comprehension can be gleaned by looking at maps of the region (attached in Appendices F through L) indicating distressed status. The change between distressed status in 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000, 2010, and 2011 show a marked difference in the number of counties classified as distressed.

The out-flow of Appalachians related to the shut-down of industry and the loss of viable employment opportunities led to an outward migration, whose effect is still being felt today. The situation of the “Hillers” and “Creekers” around Charleston, West Virginia shows the vast gulf of
identity between those from outside the region and those native to it. The tale of Gail Story and her neighbors in Bumpass Cove illustrates the still-present need for better communication inside Appalachian communities and between generations to create greater bonds to our elders, and most importantly, to learn to share their bond to the land they call “home.” These bonds are what we hope to learn about in this study.
Chapter Two: Methodology

“Both the local-color writers and the Protestant home missionaries had a practical stake in promulgating their respective visions of Appalachia, for the validity of their efforts depended upon public acceptance of assertions that Appalachia was indeed a strange land inhabited by peculiar people, a discrete region in but not of America.

It should thus come as no surprise that they insisted vigorously on the accuracy of their vision of Appalachian otherness, or that their assertions were made more often in New York and Boston and Philadelphia than in Asheville or Knoxville.”

(Shapiro, 1978)
The research into Appalachian people and their identification with the region in *Disinheriting Appalachia* was conducted in three studies.

**Study One**

In Study One, four people of Appalachian origin were interviewed. The interviews were between 12 and 20 minutes each. Two men and two women were interviewed, each being between the ages of 65 and 75. This age range allows for better understanding of people who were between the ages of 15 and 25 in 1960. The year 1960 was chosen as the control year for the study due to the upheavals in cultural norms and mores which took place, as well as being prior to the creation of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Those persons who participated in Study One completed documents for informed consent purposes (attached in Appendix M). Following the completion of the informed consent document, each participant was interviewed by the author in a recorded session about a variety of topics in a semi-structured interview, allowing for a more natural response while the author was still able to steer the conversation to topics of particular interest. Each participant touched upon topics such as his or her childhood, experiences with friends, social events, education, and personal experiences after school, among others. Finally, each participant was asked whether he or she thought that young people (between the ages of 18 and 25) of today identify with their experiences. Interviewees were then debriefed using the debriefing form attached in Appendix N.
The interviews from male respondents were aggregated, and the recordings examined and content-analyzed for common themes in order to create a paragraph-long vignette describing a fictional Appalachian male named Bill (attached in Appendix O). The interviews from female respondents were handled in an identical fashion, and were combined to create a fictional Appalachian female named Claudelle (attached in Appendix P). Each vignette is designed as an averaged exemplar, that is, to take experiences from both men’s interviews and to aggregate these experiences into a seamless character whose personal characteristics are not identifiable with either interviewee.
Study Two

The aforementioned vignettes were used in Study Two as a pre-reading in coordination with one of two identical fifteen-item survey instruments scored on a five-point Likert scale, with one representing “strongly disagree,” and five representing “strongly agree.” Each vignette contained gender- and name-appropriate labels. The instrument was designed to assign a numerical value to the survey respondent’s level of identification with the character presented in the vignette. A total of 99 surveys were distributed to psychology students at a small Christian liberal arts college in Appalachia, 48 with Bill’s vignette (attached in Appendix O) and Opinionnaire Form A (attached in Appendix Q), and 51 with Claudelle’s vignette (attached in Appendix P) and Opinionnaire Form B (attached in Appendix R). The distribution was randomized across gender.

Each respondent was asked to complete an informed consent document (attached in Appendix S), one of the two, identical fifteen-item opinionnaires, and a short demographic questionnaire (attached in Appendix T) which included questions pertaining to Appalachian identity, gender, age, and place of birth, as well as place of birth of the respondents’ parents and grandparents. The questionnaire, therefore, created a measurable parameter for the hypothesized condition of disidentification and the changes in identity across two generations.

The responses from Study Two were used to answer four research questions:

Question One: Do college-aged Appalachians identify with the experiences of college-aged Appalachians 50 years ago (in 1960)?
Question Two: Do those people from Appalachian counties (as defined in this study) self-identify as Appalachians?

Question Three: How do the opinions of male and female respondents from those Appalachian counties differ in regard to identification?

Question Four: How do those opinions differ in response to identification with the experiences presented in Bill’s and Claudelle’s vignettes?

In order to best answer these questions, the results from Study Two were coded, entered, and processed using IBM’s PASW/SPSS program to provide quick, reliable insight into myriad variable combinations and accurate tabulation of results. Study Two participants were debriefed, as in Study One, with the form attached in Appendix N and were presented the option of further participation in the project thorough follow-up interviews, constituting Study Three.
Study Three

Study Three participants were properly informed and debriefed, using their consent on the Study Two forms. Two randomly selected male and two randomly selected female respondents between the ages of 20 and 27 were interviewed using a semi-structured format, allowing for full, content-rich responses while the author was still able to guide the conversation. Each recorded telephone interview lasted between 18 and 30 minutes.

The responses were content-analyzed for comparison purposes to the responses in Study One. Studies One and Three are comparable because they utilize the same semi-structured design, but follow a similar question-set, including questions on personal identity as an Appalachian person, as well as opinions on the experiences presented by the vignettes and also on their opinions on the region itself. The similarity of this question-set allows, again, for a broader and simultaneously more parallel view of Appalachian culture.
Chapter Three: Results

“We have now the opportunity to acknowledge that it has been this assumption which has generated, during the past decade, a new series of attempts to explain the ‘deviance’ of the mountaineers and of mountain life from the American norm, to integrate the region and its people into ‘modern’ American life, and to legitimize Appalachian otherness by reasserting the existence of an indigenous mountain culture which, if revived among the mountaineers and acknowledged by outsiders, will provide the ‘Appalachians’ with the desirable status of a distinct population in the pluralist American nation.”

(Shapiro, 1978)
Study One

As aforementioned, Study One consisted of four semi-structured interviews. Two women and two men, all of Appalachian origin, were interviewed by the author. The first interviewee, a 72 year-old female born in Carter County, Tennessee and currently living in Washington County, Tennessee, gave insight into conditions in both her childhood and her young adulthood.

The interviewee described herself as an Appalachian person. She had three sisters and a brother and described her family as very close. Her father was a machinist at local textile giant North American Rayon and her mother a housewife. She described her childhood as being a wonderful experience, although the family was poor. Regarding their socioeconomic status, she said, “we never knew we were poor. However, in retrospect, I know we were.”

Due to the family’s socioeconomic status, they were unable to hire help on the small farm upon which they depended for food, and the children were expected to equally contribute. The interviewee remarked, “we dug twenty bushel of potatoes ourselves and I don’t think young people would do that today.” The interviewee also added that her mother canned the food that they grew, and that, “mother was a stay-at-home mom and worked very, very hard.”

Perhaps in most stark contrast from the more convenient world of today in which ready-made clothes are cheaply and readily available, the interviewee reflected on her clothing as a child. She said that her mother made patterns for clothing by herself and created clothing for the children from empty feedbags from their animals. The interviewee added that at the time, feedbags were printed with patterns to be made into clothing. She also added that her mother created slips for the girls from corn meal bags.
The interviewee attended a small high school in rural Carter County, Tennessee, but left school at 16 to get married. She later obtained her diploma, and got licensure as a registered nurse. Reflecting on her life at college age, she noted that she was a housewife and held odd jobs while attending school to get her high school diploma and, later, her R. N. licensure. Her husband, initially a brickmason, later invested in radio and television stations, and the interviewee had the opportunity to move across the country. When talking about her experiences in moving around the nation, she added, “I never lived in Carter County again for a lot of years,” but that she had been, “very, very blessed,” by having experiences many of her friends from Carter County never had opportunities to have.

Interviewee one continued moving across the South before settling in Texas. She did, however, return, and has since retired from selling insurance. She does not think that college-aged people of today identify with her experiences growing up, especially in regard to work around the home, as aforementioned. She spoke of riding the bus to school, whereas many high school students today have their own cars. She also added that visiting with neighbor children was very rare, and was not allowed by her parents unless chores were completed.

The second interviewee is the sister of interviewee one, is 74 years-old, and is also a Carter County, Tennessee native. However, interviewee two has lived a life in great contrast to her sister’s. She has lived in Carter County her entire life, and remarked, “I have never, ever wanted to leave here and move somewhere else. I’m perfectly happy here in the mountains.” Her account of growing up was similar to her sister’s. Of growing up, she reflected, “We didn’t know we were poor… we kept the best we had for Sunday, to go to church… I didn’t know we were poor until, I guess somebody told us.”
Though the family was poor, interviewee two described giving and charity as central principals to her upbringing. She noted the poverty in the Appalachian region, but said, “I think a lot of people are really rich in a lot of things other than money,” and that, “it’s not what you have, really, it’s what you give away, and that can include yourself.” With those remarks, she also noted that generosity and being a good neighbor were far more important to her than material wealth.

The second interviewee also noted the fundamental nature of church to her raising in rural Carter County. She said that the family prayed together every night, and, as aforesaid, kept the best clothing they had for church on Sunday. She also spoke about her life at work and at home as a young adult. Interviewee two worked in sales at retailers and was also “the number one salesperson in advertisement” at the local newspaper. She said that her experiences working with the public allowed her to meet many people, and that, “I know somebody in just about every family… I feel like I’ve got an extended family. I feel like Carter County is mine.”

Interviewee two graduated high school and received licensure to become a Licensed Practical Nurse and, later, to become a beautician. When asked about her life in 1960, she responded that she was married and a mother of two boys. Her first home was a four-room house. Of her first home, she said, “the little house we bought had a bathroom, and I thought I was a millionaire!” When asked about young people today and whether they identify with her experiences growing up, she said that she does not think that young people today identify with yesterday’s slower pace of life. She also shared a story with the author about the day of her wedding. She said that on the day of her wedding, she had to take a bath in the middle of the kitchen in a washtub because her parents’ home had no indoor plumbing. Regarding the
experience, she asked, “how many girls your age, if they got married, could they take a bath in a big washing tub on their wedding day?”

Finally, when asked about whether she thought that Appalachian art forms like quilt-making, canning and preserving foods and sewing would fade away, she said that she thought a few people would carry on those arts, but that, “I never did learn how. That wasn’t my thing. I would’ve rather got out and cut down a tree, or built a house, or carried block and help build a foundation. I didn’t care for that little, tiny stuff. But, I hope it doesn’t fade away.”

Interviewee three, a 70 year-old male from rural Unicoi County, Tennessee, was interviewed by the author on January 13, 2011. Interviewee three is a self-described Appalachian person who described his life growing up in the mountains of Upper East Tennessee as “hard,” and “not good conditions, really.” The home where he grew up had no running water, no indoor plumbing, and no electricity. He also recounted an experience in the Blizzard of 1993 when some three feet of snow fell on Unicoi County and electric power service was interrupted for many days by saying he wondered, “how in the world did we survive?”

Perhaps the most interesting account from interviewee three was regarding his family and home-life. He grew up with a sister and two brothers, one of whom is profoundly developmentally disabled. Regarding his brother’s disability, interviewee three recognized the extraordinary difficulty of raising a child with special needs in the 1940s and 50s, especially in an area with limited resources and with limited education of the public about persons with special needs. The interviewee did, however, say that the members of the community were generally accepting and that he felt that his brother was never subject to prejudicial treatment.

Interviewee three reflected fondly upon his time in school, and mentioned, “I graduated
from Unicoi County High School the same year we got electricity at the house… 1958.” When asked about what the family thought about electrification, he added, “well, that was something else!” After his graduation, he moved north on the so-called “Hillbilly Highway” to Washington, D.C., where he was employed at the Main Post Office while living with relatives. When asked about his departure for the north, he said that it was primarily due to a lack of work in Erwin. As aforesaid in Chapter One, Unicoi County was among the counties in Upper East Tennessee hit hard by plant closures in the late fifties, triggering a mass-exodus of residents. He returned to Unicoi County, Tennessee after being drafted into the Army reserves. He was later employed at the Clinchfield Railroad in Erwin.

Interviewee three moved across the South with his job at the railroad, but again returned home upon his retirement. He looks most positively on his time in Mobile, Alabama. He expressed that seeing new parts of the country were helpful in forming his world-view and that he believed (in his experience) that education was the key to mobilizing Appalachia as an economically viable region. He also added, “the values of the… native Appalachian people, to me, we need to get some of those attitudes back,” and that (in regard to when he was college-aged), “back then, there were a lot of hard workers and, to me, we just take everything for granted anymore and don’t put the effort in.”

Interviewee four is a 65 year-old male from Unicoi County, Tennessee and was interviewed on December 21, 2010. Interviewee four was born and raised in rural Unicoi County, save for a two year period in which the family moved to Jonesborough, Tennessee when he was eight years-old. The family, like many in rural Upper East Tennessee, raised tobacco for income and had a small subsistence farm. In the interviewee’s words, “that was the only way we
had to survive.” Indeed, as evidenced in the preceding accounts in Study One, survival was the order of the day for many poor rural farmers and necessity dictated preserving and storing foods to get through the cold winter months in the Tennessee mountains.

The interviewee views the education system of his youth as being far different than today’s. He attended a small school, Rocky Fork School, a few miles from the family home before construction was completed on a more modern facility nearer Flag Pond, Tennessee. He attended and graduated from Unicoi County High School in nearby Erwin, Tennessee. His fondest memories were of playing basketball, especially versus Johnson City, Tennessee’s Science Hill High School. He recalled several games in which he played against current University of South Carolina coach Steve Spurrier. He humorously noted, “we had a pretty good time.”

Interviewee four still lives in Flag Pond today. However, like so many other residents, he left Appalachia for work elsewhere before returning to marry and settle. He served in the armed forces for several years and after being discharged went to work for a local factory. He worked at Hoover Ball and Bearing Company (later Hoover Universal) before leaving the company to continue work in the ball bearing and roller industry at a then-newly founded local company, NN Ball and Roller, Inc. in the early 1980s.

Interviewee four most identifies Appalachia as the land, the Appalachian Trail, and especially the mountains. He identifies as an Appalachian person, saying, “well, yes, I was born and raised here in the Appalachian Mountains.” Although he believes that young people may be able to identify with his experience, he believes that modern technological advances are changing the cultural paradigm and views them (in contrast with other interviewees) as not
necessarily bad, but rather as “game-changers.” Of the changes which have swept Appalachia, he said, “that’s took all the Appalachian experience away. Of course, progress tells a story, I guess.” Like all of the previous interviewees, he views education as central to success, adding, “learn as much as you can, because that’s the future.”
Study Two

Study Two was administered to 99 psychology students, 30 male and 69 female, at a small Christian liberal arts college in East Tennessee (Figure One). Of all respondents, 65 responders lived in locations classified as Appalachian by this study (again, as listed in Appendix C). The remaining 34 lived in locations not classified as Appalachian (Figure Two). In terms of sheer identity, 26 of the 65 Appalachian respondents personally identified as Appalachian persons (hereafter known as “identifying Appalachians”). Another three respondents identified as Appalachian persons, while they did not live in locations considered Appalachian by this study (hereafter known as “identifying non-Appalachians”). The remaining 39 Appalachian respondents did not personally identify as Appalachian persons (hereafter known as “non-identifying Appalachians”). A further 31 respondents were not considered Appalachian persons by this study, nor did they identify as such (hereafter known as “non-identifying non-Appalachians”) (Figure Three). The vignettes were randomly distributed, with 13 male and 35 female respondents receiving the “Bill” vignette, and 17 male and 34 female respondents receiving the “Claudelle” vignette, for a total of 48 responses to the “Bill” vignette and 51 responses to the “Claudelle” vignette (Figures Four and Five).

Analyses of Variance Between Identifying v. Non-identifying Appalachians

The identifying Appalachians and non-identifying Appalachians were analyzed for their identification characteristics. When run within an ANOVA, the first identification parameter,
dealing with shared like-interests, showed a difference between these two groups. Identifying Appalachian were more likely to identify ($\bar{x}=2.96$, $n=26$) with the experiences presented in the vignettes than were non-identifying Appalachians ($\bar{x}=2.38$, $n=39$) ($F=5.096$, $p \leq 0.05$) (*Figure Six*). Also, non-identifying Appalachians were much less likely ($\bar{x}=1.67$, $n=39$) to identify with the childhood experiences presented in the vignettes than were identifying Appalachians ($\bar{x}=2.54$, $n=26$) ($F=10.214$, $p \leq 0.01$) (*Figure Seven*).

The third identification parameter of interest, whether the respondents life was like the life of the subjects of the vignettes, showed similar results, with identifying Appalachians showing higher levels of identification ($\bar{x}=2.12$, $n=26$) than non-identifying Appalachians ($\bar{x}=1.62$, $n=39$) ($F=6.160$, $p \leq 0.05$) (*Figure Eight*). Further data analysis supported the hypothesis that identifying Appalachians are more likely to identify with the experiences of their grandparents than are non-identifying Appalachians. The fourth identification parameter, asking whether respondents had friends like the subjects presented in the vignettes, showed identifying Appalachians again responding higher ($\bar{x}=3.73$, $n=26$) than non-identifying Appalachians ($\bar{x}=3.08$, $n=38$) ($F=4.627$, $p \leq 0.05$) (*Figure Nine*). Further, when asked if the lives of Appalachians today were similar to the vignettes, identifying Appalachians responded more positively ($\bar{x}=3.19$, $n=26$) than did non-identifying Appalachians ($\bar{x}=2.68$, $n=38$) ($F=3.985$, $p \leq 0.05$).
Initial Factor Analyses

The data were factor analyzed in order to reduce the data into more insightful “super-variables.” These “super-variables” are simply categories of traits or identification parameters into which respondents’ answers were constrained. The categories were compared to discern how identifying Appalachians identify in contrast with non-identifying Appalachians and non-identifying non-Appalachians. A total factorial could not be completed as the n-value was too small for identifying non-Appalachians (n=3).

The first factor analysis showed overall loading onto four “super-variables” or factors when all responses were analyzed (n=99). The first factor, comprising attributes such as listening skills, trustworthiness, kindness, likability, and future success of children in school, can be defined as the “social attribute identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=3.914). The second factor, comprising identification with childhood experiences and similarity between lives of Appalachians currently of college-age and the vignette example, can be defined as the “past similarity identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=2.146). The third factor, comprising attributes such as whether respondents would be friends with the vignette subjects, like interests, similarity in life experiences, and whether respondents have friends like the vignette subjects, can be defined as the “current social identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=1.278). Finally, the fourth factor, comprising attributes like competitiveness and intelligence, can be defined as the “impersonal attribute identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=1.086). These four factors made up a total of 64.8 per-cent of all responses.
The second factor analysis was run strictly on responses from respondents defined as Appalachian by this study (n=65) and found loading onto five factors. The first factor comprised attributes such as trustworthiness, listening skills, kindness, likability, and future success of children in school and can be again defined as the “social attribute identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=4.155). The second factor comprised identification with childhood experiences, similarity in life experiences, and like interests, and can be defined as the “past-present similarity” factor (Eigenvalue=1.895). The third factor, comprised of attributes like competitiveness, intelligence, and whether respondents have friends like the vignette subjects, can be defined as the “impersonal attribute identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=1.552). The fourth factor, comprised solely of whether respondents would be friends with the vignette subjects, can be defined as the “friendship likelihood identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=1.119). Finally, the fifth factor, comprised of only opinions on similarities between lives of Appalachians currently of college-age, can be defined as the “personal similarity identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=1.002). Combined, these five factors made up a total of 74.787 per-cent of all responses.

A third factor analysis was run strictly on responses from respondents defined as non-Appalachian by this study (n=34) and found loading onto four distinctly different factors. Factor one, composed of attributes like intelligence, future success of children in school, intelligence, trustworthiness, and kindness, can be defined as the “social identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=4.302). Factor two, composed of identification with life experiences, similarity in childhood experiences, and likability, showed an inverse correlation between respondents’ opinions on whether the subject of the vignette was likable and his or her identification with the vignette’s life or childhood experiences. This factor can be defined as the “unlike-friend
identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=2.179). Factor three, composed of opinions on whether respondents would be friends with the vignette subjects, whether respondents have friends like the vignette subjects, like interests, and similarity between lives of Appalachians currently of college-age and the vignette example, can be defined as the “friendgroup identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=1.612). Finally, factor four, composed only of opinions on competitiveness, is the “competition” factor (Eigenvalue=1.203). These four factors made up 71.51 per-cent of all responses.

Further Analyses and Creation of the Consolidated Similarity Variable (CSV)

Data were further analyzed in a comparison of non-identifying Appalachians and identifying Appalachians versus gender and their identification with a consolidated similarity variable and their opinion on the likability of the vignette subjects, measured by question 5 in the opinionnaire instrument. The consolidated similarity variable (CSV) was composed of opinions on childhood similarities in question 3 and current-life similarities in question 6.

Identifying Appalachian males answered more positively ($\bar{x}=2.42$, $n=7$) than non-identifying Appalachian males ($\bar{x}=1.5455$, $n=11$), identifying Appalachian females ($\bar{x}=2.2895$, $n=19$), and non-identifying Appalachian females ($\bar{x}=1.6786$, $n=28$) to the CSV. Interestingly, both identifying and non-identifying Appalachian females ($\bar{x}=1.9255$, $n=47$) responded more positively to the CSV than did identifying and non-identifying Appalachian males ($\bar{x}=1.8889$, $n=18$). When compared with the likability parameter, though, identifying Appalachian males answered least positively ($\bar{x}=3.71$, $n=7$). Non-identifying Appalachian males answered more
positively ($\bar{x}=3.82, n=11$), with non-identifying Appalachian females answering even more positively ($\bar{x}=4.21, n=28$), with identifying Appalachian females answering most positively ($\bar{x}=4.32, n=4.32$). When compared as gender groups, females answered more positively ($\bar{x}=4.26, n=47$) than males ($\bar{x}=3.78, n=18$).

**Consolidated Similarity Variable Correlations in Identifying and Non-identifying Appalachians**

The CSV and likability variables were further combined to create a third, distinctive variable through repeated measures, the consolidated similarity and likability measure (CSLM). The CSLM did not show significant across-gender variance, but did show significance when compared with identifying and non-identifying Appalachian respondents ($p \leq 0.05$). Identifying Appalachians responded more positively to the CSLM ($\bar{x}=2.359, n=26$), than did non-identifying Appalachians ($\bar{x}=1.612, n=39$). However, there was a difference of only 1/1000th of a point between responses of identifying Appalachians ($\bar{x}=4.015, n=26$) and non-identifying Appalachians ($\bar{x}=4.016, n=39$) in regard to likability of the vignette subject.

A correlation was run to compare responses of all Appalachian respondents, whether identifying or non-identifying. The measure compared the correlation between similarity in childhood experiences as measured by question 3, similarity in the lives of the vignette subjects to most Appalachians of college age (life similarity) in question 11, likability as measured by question 5, and the CSV as described above.
In this correlation, life similarity was found to be very significantly correlated with similarity in childhood experiences ($r=0.495$, $p \leq 0.0005$, $n=65$) and the CSV ($r=0.813$, $p \leq 0.0005$, $n=65$). Further, similarity in childhood experiences was found to correlate very significantly with response to the CSV ($r=0.908$, $p \leq 0.0005$, $n=65$). Notably, likability was not found to be significantly correlated with any of the aforementioned measures.

A second correlation was run to compare the responses of non-Appalachian respondents. Again, the measure compared the correlation between similarity in childhood experiences, life similarity, likability, and the CSV. In the second correlation, life similarity was found to be very significantly correlated with similarity in childhood experiences ($r=0.602$, $p \leq 0.0005$, $n=34$) and the CSV ($r=0.879$, $p \leq 0.0005$, $n=34$) while it was inversely correlated with the likability parameter ($r=-0.489$, $p \leq 0.001$, $n=34$). Similarly, the likability measure was found to be very significantly inversely correlated with the CSV ($r=-0.564$, $p \leq 0.0005$, $n=34$). Lastly, the CSV was found to be very significantly correlated with responses on similarity in childhood experiences ($r=0.910$, $p \leq 0.0005$, $n=34$).

A further, third correlation was run to compare the responses of identifying Appalachians. Again, the measure compared the correlation between similarity in childhood experiences, life similarity, likability, and the CSV. In this correlation, responses on childhood experiences were found to be very significantly correlated with the CSV ($r=0.834$, $p \leq 0.0005$, $n=26$), as were responses on life similarity with the CSV ($r=0.732$, $p \leq 0.0005$, $n=26$). No other variable combinations were found to be significant in this correlation.

Lastly, a fourth correlation was run to compare the responses of non-identifying Appalachians. Again, the measure compared the correlation between similarity in childhood experiences,
experiences, life similarity, likability, and the CSV. Like childhood experiences were found to correlate very significantly with responses on both life similarity (r=0.585, p≤0.0005, n=39) and the CSV (r=0.929, p≤0.0005, n=39). Further, like life experiences were found to correlate very significantly with the CSV (r=0.843, p≤0.0005, n=39).

**Gender Main-Effect**

ANOVA was utilized to find a gender main-effect when viewed in the parameters of competitiveness, as measured in question 4, and likability, as measured in question 5. Men were found to view the subjects presented in the vignettes as more competitive (\(\bar{x}=2.80, n=30\)) than did women (\(\bar{x}=2.25, n=69\)) (F=5.570, p≤0.05) (*Figure Ten*). Conversely, women viewed the subjects as more likable (\(\bar{x}=4.30, n=69\)) than did men (\(\bar{x}=3.87, n=30\)) (F=6.259, p≤0.05) (*Figure Eleven*).

Likability opinions as related to gender were further explored by crossing likability with form type, that is, whether the vignette subject was male or female, and gender. Men who had Bill’s vignette scored lowest on likability (\(\bar{x}=3.46, n=13\)), while men who had Claudelle’s vignette scored next lowest (\(\bar{x}=4.18, n=17\)). Women who had Claudelle’s vignette scored higher than either of these groups (\(\bar{x}=4.29, n=34\)), while women who had Bill’s vignette scored highest on the vignette subject’s likability (\(\bar{x}=4.31, n=35\)) (F=4.545, p≤0.05) (*Figure Twelve*).
Factor Analyses Across Genders

Two further factor analyses were run based on gender effects. The first factor analysis based on gender showed loading onto four factors across all male responders (n=30). The first factor, composed of responses on attributes like listening skills, kindness, trustworthiness, intelligence, future success of children in school, and likability, can be defined as the “positive trait identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=4.914). The second factor, comprising opinions on similarity between lives of Appalachians currently of college-age and the vignette example, whether respondents would be friends with the vignette subjects, and like interest, can be defined as the “personal similarity” factor (Eigenvalue=2.016). The third factor, composed of identification with life experiences and childhood experiences, can be defined as the “experiential similarity” factor (Eigenvalue=1.544). The fourth factor, composed solely of opinions on competitiveness, can be defined as the “competitive trait” factor (Eigenvalue=1.195). These four factors made up 74.373 per-cent of male responses.

Lastly, the second gender-based factor analysis showed loading onto four factors across all female responders (n=69), as in the previous factor analysis. However, the difference lay in the response-load on each variable.

The first factor, comprising attributes such as listening skills, trustworthiness, kindness, likability, and future success of children in school, contains an identical question-set to the “social attribute identifier” factor identified in the factor analysis run across the entire survey sample (Eigenvalue=3.503). The second factor, composed of identification with like interests, similarity in life experiences, whether the respondent would be friends with the vignette subjects,
similarity in childhood experiences, and whether respondents have friends like the vignette subjects, can be defined as the “friendgroup-experiential identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=2.204). The third factor, composed of attributes like competitiveness and intelligence, again contains an identical question-set to the “impersonal attribute identifier” factor found in the factor analysis run across the entire sample (Eigenvalue=1.420). Finally, the fourth factor was comprised only of opinions on similarity between lives of Appalachians currently of college-age and the vignette example, and was strikingly similar to the fifth factor identified in the factor analysis run on all Appalachian responders as the “personal similarity identifier” factor (Eigenvalue=1.185). The sum of these four factors was equal to 63.934 per-cent of total female responses.
Study Three was administered, as noted in Chapter Two, to two women and two men of college age (between the ages of 18 and 27 in this study) who participated in study two. Study Three consisted, as in Study One, of four semi-structured interviews. The first interviewee was a twenty year-old female, born and raised in Marion County, Tennessee. She did not identify with the Claudelle vignette as presented in the opinionnaire.

Regarding Claudelle’s childhood experiences, interviewee one said, “my upbringing was not the same as hers, my upbringing was more modern,” and, “for her upbringing, I would not, in today’s time, call that normal.” The interviewee elaborated on those differences by saying that she thought that larger families (the vignette presented Claudelle as having four siblings) were not as close-knit today, especially with the differences in the home structure with the modern two-income family rapidly becoming the norm. She also said, “there’s some families that are just not close-knit, they have four siblings… and they don’t even really know each other. People don’t have to… spend time or hang out with their friends or family because they can have constant contact with them.”

Interviewee one also noted that Claudelle’s work experience was probably unusual in 1960, but that it was normal for women to be in the workplace today. She said, “that was probably unusual then, but it’s not impossible or weird,” and that, “I can imagine that if I’d lived 50 years ago, I would think that was strange.” The interviewee also noted the differences between culture in 1960 and today. Of culture and cultural attitudes, she said, “I think that was a much more simple time than today.”
Also, although the interviewee is from Marion County, Tennessee (included in the Appalachian Regional Commission’s definition of Appalachia, and this study’s definition, as well), she said that she did not identify with Appalachia. She even said, “I’m not from Appalachia, so I didn’t hear about it until I moved here… I never, ever heard about it until I moved here.” When asked about what she associates most with the region, she identified the mountainous geography of the region and, most especially, the coal mining activity so present in the central subregion of Appalachia.

Interviewee one, along with each subsequent interviewee, cited technology and advances in communication as the greatest catalyst for cultural and identity changes in the Appalachian region. She said, “technology is good, it’s helpful, it’s useful… but at the same time, it’s been proven that anything is possible without it.” She reflected on the overuse of technology and expressed doubt regarding the ability of Americans to do without computers, the internet, or other advances. She also saw canning, quilting, and sewing, activities which were a common theme among interviewees in Study One, as being left behind due to technology, a view which also seemed to hold across the sample.

The second interviewee, a twenty-one year-old female from York County in coastal Virginia, also did not identify with Claudelle’s experiences. She said that Claudelle seemed, “very hard working,” and Claudelle’s childhood experiences were, “definitely different than anything I’ve ever experienced… no one really grew up that way where I’m from.” She identified the proximity of resources, most specifically food resources like supermarkets, as making a difference in the experiences of young people today in contrast with the childhood experiences of the sample in Study One. She said that readily available clothing at retailers also
changed the experience of having handmade clothes as a child. She reflected, “none of my friends or I ever had to have handmade clothes, and if we were to grow our own food, it was mostly for recreation, like for fun, as a hobby… it was never a means of sustenance.”

Interviewee two, like interviewee one, noted the prevalence of two-income families as being causes for shifts in family relationship patterns. She also noted that, in her opinion, people having two children at 21 years-old (the age presented in the vignette) was not the norm today. She said that she, like interviewee two in Study One, viewed church attendance as both vital and central to life then and today.

When asked about her identification with the reason, interviewee two presented a sort of cognitive dissonance about her own Appalachian identity. Although she is originally from the Tidewater region of Virginia, she said that she identified Appalachia as a “dream place,” and viewed it as idyllic in nature. When talking about Appalachia, she said, “I like it a lot better.” Perhaps most interesting was her response when asked if she identified as an Appalachian person. She said, “no. I want to say yes, but I think because I didn’t grow up here, I can’t say that… but I want to be… I’m still learning!” She also remarked, “I admire the people that are from this region.” She also identified history and family roots as being far deeper than in other regions of the United States.

Like interviewee one, interviewee two thinks that canning, quilting, sewing, and other Appalachian arts are going away. She said, “I do think that they’re kind of going away, and I wish that they wouldn’t…. There’s nothing better than opening up a can of homegrown green beans. I think they’re great!” Interviewee two seemed to be excited about many facets of Appalachian culture and cited cultural activities like canning and quilting as centrally important
to the Appalachian cultural paradigm. She also added, “I think they’ll die out if we don’t be intentional about teaching and showing and using… If we don’t be intentional about showing our kids how to can… or sew, or, you know, do those things, I think they will die out.”

When asked about the cultural heritage being passed onto the next generation of Appalachians, interviewee two said, “it’s something that’s deep rooted, it’s something that’s just kind of in the blood of people…. Hold onto it and cherish it, because it’s definitely different than any other place…. It’s definitely a tangible difference.” She said that Appalachian values and history should be preserved and that she “admires” and “respects” older Appalachians for their hard work and their work ethic. She also added some thoughts about older Appalachians saying she would, “thank them for keeping some of the traditions alive and to teach me more, because I want to learn more of them!”

Interviewee three, a twenty-seven year-old male from Tazewell County, Virginia, thought that Bill’s vignette seemed “semi-normal” for the area, even in a modern context. The interviewee grew up with hand-me-down clothing from older siblings, and said that he understood Bill’s childhood experiences. He did remark that he thought Bill, “had it a bit rougher,” than most children in the United States today, but that he did identify somewhat with Bill’s experiences. In reference to the experiences presented in the vignette, interviewee three said, “we didn’t have a lot of money, so I can relate a little bit to the way he grew up.”

When asked if he identified personally as an Appalachian, he responded, “regretfully, yes, I do. I can’t deny what I am.” When asked why he regretted identifying as an Appalachian person, he remarked that he believed his own education to be inferior to people from other places and that he sees racism and bigotry as problems which plague the region. In fact, interviewee
three said that those factors were contributory to his moving away from his hometown. When asked if he would return home at any point in his life, he responded, “If I was to return to Grundy, it would probably be in my oldest of ages… at the very end of my life.”

Interviewee three stands in sharp contrast to interviewees one and two in two ways. First, he identifies himself as an Appalachian person. Second, and perhaps the starkest difference, he regrets identifying as such, and even said that going home to visit today is very difficult. He even pointed out socio-cultural differences between the people in the Tennessee Valley (where the study was conducted) and the people in his home in Southwest Virginia. He said the biggest differences were dialect and vocabulary. He also remarked that people were less helpful in the Valley than at home, but cited the small population of Grundy, less than 1,000 by 2009 Census Bureau estimates (American FactFinder, 2010), as a factor in all three areas. He also said that the economy was still very much a negative factor in his hometown, but that some improvements had taken place over the last several years.

Interviewee three said that he was not surprised that the experiences which composed the vignette happened in 1960, but also said that many people in his home region still had the same experiences today. He added, “a lot of the attitudes are the same as they always have been… we always said that going back to Grundy was like stepping back in time.” The interviewee also reflected that he thought that people from larger cities had many more advantages than he did growing up. He said, “they had more opportunities than we ever would’ve…. They don’t know how hard it was for us to branch out and get away from those mountains.”

The third interviewee was also asked his opinions on whether Appalachian arts would be practiced in future generations. He expressed that, much like previous interviewees in Study
Three, technology has replaced the need for many of the old ways of doing things, but also lamented, “I’ve noticed in my generation, there’s not many people picking it up… it’s not really needed anymore. I kind of find it sad…. It’s part of our cultural heritage that we’re going to lose.” Finally, interviewee three also said, “there was so much stuff that needed to be lost that’s gone as well,” but that he believed, “it’s important to know where you come from.”

Interviewee four is a twenty-one year-old male from Knox County, Tennessee and was interviewed on January 24, 2011. The interviewee is from one of the largest cities in Appalachia as defined by this study, and as defined by the Appalachian Regional Commission, Knoxville, Tennessee. Although his hometown is defined as Appalachia, the interviewee did not at all identify as Appalachian, and repeatedly stated, “I’m from Knoxville… so none of my family’s from that region.” He said that he believed that the Appalachian region had not changed very much when compared with its condition in 1960. He said that he had seen many films on the Johnson Administration’s efforts with the Appalachian Regional Commission, but still identified the region primarily with social issues including alcoholism, drug abuse, and most specifically, methamphetamine manufacturing.

Interviewee four said that he believed that the people of Appalachia had, “fallen on hard times,” and that they should be able to identify with the experiences of 1960. The interviewee remarked that he believed that due to today’s throw-away society and affluenza, the Appalachian art forms aforementioned may cease to exist. He also said that he thought that quick availability and cheap prices at retail giants like the Wal-Mart Company continue to make creation of home-made goods obsolete.
The interviewee’s definition of the Appalachian region was, perhaps, the most interesting part of the interview. He defined Appalachia as stretching along the North Carolina-Tennessee border, into Southwest Virginia, and then the whole of southeast Kentucky, and also made a point to exclude West Virginia from his definition, citing it as too culturally different to be included. When he was given the Appalachian Regional Commission’s definition of the region, he said that he was especially surprised by the inclusion of north Georgia, Knoxville, Tennessee, and most especially, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Upon reflection of the Commission’s definition of the Appalachian region, interviewee four said that he saw the counties surrounding Knox County, Tennessee (especially Grainger, Jefferson, and Union Counties, Tennessee) as Appalachian. He however, disagreed with Knoxville’s inclusion, and said, “Knoxville doesn’t seem to identify with as large of a geographic region… it’s sort of a city unto itself,” and that, “I’ve got the accent, but I’m from Knoxville, you know? I don’t know if the culture of Appalachia was ever too much there.”
Chapter Four: *Discussion*

“And we have now the opportunity to ask under what circumstances a definition of Appalachia as a strange land inhabited by a peculiar people proves useful in the present, and how, and to whom.”

*(Shapiro, 1978)*
Study One formed the foundation for the research in this thesis. The participants were instrumental in gaining insight into both their experiences in Appalachian culture and their observations on how that culture is changing over time. They also shared their observations on the identification of college-aged Appalachians with their experiences.

While interviewees one and two obviously shared similar experiences through childhood, their lives were very different by high school. As noted in chapter two, interviewee one left high school at 16, while her older sister stayed in high school and graduated. Also, while interviewees one, three, and four left the region for work, interviewee two stayed in her native Carter County, Tennessee. Interviewee two took particular pride in sharing her work experience. But, both interviewees one and two identified the importance of church life to their lives as children and as adults. Both male interviewees shared similar childhood experiences, with all interviewees in Study One living on subsistence farms in their early years.

The female interviewees were most certainly notable, with both attaining higher levels of education than their male counterparts in this study. Interviewee three’s experience immediately following his high school graduation is certainly of note, as he followed the lead of so many other Appalachians and headed north for work on the “Hillbilly Highway.” This phenomenon came about when, as aforementioned, economic recession hit the Appalachian region in the late 1950s. Interviewee four also left the region, but came back after just a few years.

The interviewees’ experiences while growing up were very interesting, with all noting that their mothers were homemakers who canned most of the foods the respective families
ate. All spoke of difficult conditions while growing up, and talked about how they thought that technology was changing the Appalachian experience. Also, all noted the “values of old” and that young Appalachians should look to those values in order to form their worldviews. Interestingly, though, those who had moved away said that their experiences away from home had helped in shaping their experience set and value systems.

Interviewee four said, “progress tells a story,” and that holds very true in the story of Appalachia and the great strides of progress made through social programs and the Appalachian Regional Commission. Progress’ story is also told in the great strides in technology made between the 1960s and today, and that technology’s adoption in what was once considered the most isolated region of the United States.

These and other experiential anecdotes formed the bases of the construction of two vignettes presented in Study Two. The names for the vignette subjects were taken from experiences by the author. While Bill is a common name in multiple parts of the nation, Claudelle’s name came about from a story told by interviewee one. She told of a woman whose husband had recently passed away. Claudelle asked a family friend to sing at the funeral, and among the sacred songs to be sung was the popular Christmas tune “Jingle Bells.” While the singer sang the peppy song as solemnly as possible, Claudelle realized that she had meant to say the gospel song “When They Ring Those Golden Bells.” Upon hearing this story, the author immediately decided to name the female vignette subject after this dear lady whose grief-stricken mistake created a hilarious story passed on for many years. This, among myriad other examples, reflects the rich tradition of oral history--whether sad and sorrowful or merry and hysterical--that has been passed down between Appalachians for many generations.
Study Two

Because the vignettes were based on personal experiences, the answers provided by the 99 respondents provided even deeper insight into the perceived condition of cultural distancing. While the author did not initially intend to process data from non-identifying non-Appalachians as thoroughly as identifying and non-identifying Appalachians, the differential between the two groups was certainly present and was, frankly, astounding. The two groups certainly showed marked differences. These differences were ascertained through factor analysis of responses of identifying and non-identifying Appalachians when compared with non-identifying non-Appalachians. As noted in Chapter Two, a total factorial analysis could not be performed on the groups of responders classified as identifying non-Appalachians due to an extremely small population sample.

While Appalachians (whether identifying or non-identifying) loaded characteristics onto five axes—the social attribute, past-present similarity, impersonal attribute, friendship likelihood, and personal similarity super-variables—of character identification and evaluation, non-Appalachians (again, whether identifying or non-identifying) loaded those characteristics on four distinctly different axes—the social identifier, unlike-friend, friendgroup, and competition super-variables.

These different viewpoints were thought to be part of the “Mental Boundary” hypothesis, first proposed in this research by Dr James E. Collins, II, a faculty member at Carson-Newman College who assisted greatly in the statistical modeling of this project. The Mental Boundary was thought to be a two-fold thought pattern. Identifying Appalachians were hypothesized to
identify with the experiences presented in the vignettes, non-identifying Appalachians were hypothesized to show cognitive distancing from the vignette examples (whether consciously or otherwise). Non-Appalachians (whether identifying or non-identifying) were thought to simply not identify with the vignette examples due to their physical separation from the region during their formative years.

Initial analyses of variance showed statistically significant differences between identifying and non-identifying Appalachians in regard to identification with the vignette examples. Further analysis through the consolidated similarity variable (CSV) saw identifying Appalachian males respond more positively than non-identifying Appalachian males, as well as identifying and non-identifying Appalachian females. However, when the likability parameter alone was measured, the groups switched their views, with identifying Appalachian males answering least positively while other measured groups scored higher.

The Mental Boundary hypothesis was partially supported through the initial ANOVA between identifying and non-identifying Appalachians. This ANOVA showed that self-identifying Appalachians were more likely than non-identifying Appalachians to identify with the experiences presented in the vignettes. Also, it showed a strong correlation between identification with the childhood experiences presented in the vignettes and identification. Identifying Appalachians were much more likely to identify with those childhood experiences than were non-identifying Appalachians.

Significant correlations were also found in regard to general identification with the life experiences of the vignette subjects, like friendgroups, and identifying Appalachians of today with the vignette examples. Identifying Appalachians answered higher on each of these
parameters than non-identifying Appalachians. While these correlations and the ANOVA do provide significant support for the Mental Boundary hypothesis, similarity in childhood experiences was found to be more closely associated with prediction of positive correlation with identification of life similarity and the CSV.

While the Mental Boundary hypothesis was not strongly supported, a difference in geographic origin was determined to play a role in identification. Non-Appalachian responses on likability were found to be extremely strongly inversely correlated with life similarity. Conversely, non-Appalachian respondents were shown to have a strong correlation between life similarity, similarity in childhood experiences, and the CSV, among other correlations in that response-set mentioned in Chapter Three.

A gender-based main effect was found in an ANOVA on gender contrasted with competitiveness and likability. Men found the vignette subjects more competitive (whether they had Bill’s or Claudelle’s vignette) than women. However, women viewed the subjects as more likable than men. This view of likability may be linked to social role theory proposed by Eagly in 1987, and later supported by Eagly, Wood, and Diekman in *Social Role Theory of Sex Differences and Similarities* (2000). According to the Social Role Theory, a social organization’s features, especially division of labor as related to gender, are the “root cause of sex-differentiated behavior.” Further, the theory explains that the traditional assignment of females to domestic roles within the home lead to “a pattern of interpersonally facilitative and friendly behaviors that can be termed communal” (Eagly, et. al., 2000). The theory also says that the assignment of males to the employment roles outside the home leads to “a pattern of relatively assertive and independent behaviors that can be termed agentic” (Eagly, et. al., 2000).
These behaviors are thought to contribute to the aforementioned identification of the vignette subjects as competitive by men, who typically follow agentic behavior patterns, and the increased likability identified by women in the subjects, who typically follow communal behavior patterns. In fact, further factor analyses based upon these gender effects found that all male respondents loaded responses onto four super-variables--positive trait, personal similarity, experiential, and competitive factors--while all female respondents loaded responses onto a different four super-variables--social attribute, friendgroup-experiential, impersonal attribute, and personal similarity factors--more reflective of the overall sample.

All of these factors found a greater difference between men and women than was previously predicted. Again, these differences may be attributable to Social Role Theory. Also, the Mental Boundary hypothesis was partially supported by data collected, but found that while self-identification is a significant predictor of identification, similarity in childhood experience was found to be a better predictor, especially in regard to the CSV and life similarity.

As noted in Chapter Two, Study Two was administered in order to find answers to four research questions:

Question One: Do college-aged Appalachians identify with the experiences of college-aged Appalachians 50 years ago (in 1960)?

The answer to question one is multi-faceted. While many respondents did identify the vignette subjects as likable, kind, or competitive, on the whole, identifying Appalachians were found to identify more with those experiences than did non-identifying Appalachians or non-identifying non-
Appalachians. However, similarity in childhood experiences was found to be a more reliable and accurate predictor or overall identification.

Question Two: Do those people from Appalachian counties self-identify as Appalachians?

Simply put, more people from Appalachian counties (n=65) did not identify as Appalachians (n=39) than did identify (n=26).

Question Three: How do the opinions of male and female respondents from those Appalachian counties differ in regard to identification?

Again, the answer to question three is multi-faceted. While main-effects were found in regard to gender and opinions on competition and likability, these are thought to be more attributable to the traditional agentic male role and communal female role than some other factor associated with self-identification. While approximately 38 per-cent of Appalachian males (n=18) were considered identifying Appalachians (n=7), approximately 40 per-cent of Appalachian females (n=47) were considered identifying Appalachians (n=19). This result could, however, be attributable to the small population sample of males in this study.

Question Four: How do those opinions differ in response to identification with the experiences presented in Bill’s and Claudelle’s vignettes?

The answer to question four is more clear-cut than the other research questions. Simply put, the men who had either vignette scored lowest on likability, while women who had either vignette scored highest. This
again suggests that males tended to assume the agentic role while women assumed a communal role, influencing their identification more than identification with the region or whether the person was from Appalachia or not.
While Study One provided the foundation for Studies Two and Three, Study Three was perhaps most important because of its comparability to Study One. Study Three, similar to Study One, was administered to two males and two females who responded to Study Two and elected to have follow-up interviews. Three of the respondents were defined as Appalachians by this study. However, interviewees one and four did not at all identify as Appalachians in their interviews. Interestingly, while interviewee two was not defined as Appalachian by this study, she expressed her desire to “become” an Appalachian. In stark contrast, interviewee three did identify as Appalachian, but said so with hesitancy, and said, “regretfully, yes.”

Interviewees one, two, and four said that they did not identify with the childhood experiences of the vignette subjects. However, interviewee three did say those experiences were “semi-normal” for the area he grew up in. He also said that he identified somewhat with the experiences presented in Bill’s vignette. He identified poverty, lack of employment, and education as reasons for his departure from Southwest Virginia. He also said that he thought that attitudes in Southwest Virginia had changed very little since the 1960s.

In retrospect, interviewee three exhibited attitudes similar to the self-hatred previously found in Black children, as discussed in Chapter One. The interviewee’s self-deprecating insights about his own education, the people in the region he calls home, and even about the comparison of himself to people from urbanized Appalachia, are akin to attitudes expressed in both Cross’ study (1996) and the Black Doll, White Doll study performed by Kenneth and Mamie Clark (1950). Perhaps this self-hatred is reflective of the internal conflict experienced by
other Appalachian who may wish to identify themselves as Appalachian, but, due to perceived societal expectations, or “escapist” wishes on the part of the individual find themselves torn between “home” and the “outside world.” The most striking example of this escapist thought pattern is the statement made by interviewee three regarding his home: “they don’t know how hard it was for us to branch out and get away from those mountains.”

While interviewee two expressed that she wished to escape to the mountains of Appalachia, interviewee three wished to escape from the mountains, showcasing the dissonance between those outside the region and those who call it home. Notably, while interviewee two idealized Appalachia as a “perfect place,” and interviewee three found that going to his hometown was “like stepping back in time,” interviewees one and four did not even identify themselves as Appalachians. Both were from urbanized areas in Tennessee, with interviewee one coming from Chattanooga, Tennessee, and interviewee four from Knoxville, Tennessee. Interviewee one had, “never, ever heard about” the region before she came to school in Appalachia, and interviewee four knew of Appalachia, but identified it by geographic boundaries like mountain ranges rather than as a large region of the United States.

These four interviewees reflected a change in thought from the participants in Study One. While those interviewees identified their hometowns in rural Upper East Tennessee as Appalachian, only one out of three Appalachian subjects correctly identified their hometowns as such.
General Discussion

The results from the three studies allowed for a fuller picture of the minds and thought processes of both Appalachian and non-Appalachian people. With portraits of four different Appalachians between the ages 65 and 75, this study was able to construct a portrayal of life in 1960. Study Two allowed for concrete, quantitative analysis of the identification of students at a small Christian liberal arts college in Appalachia with those four individuals’ life experiences. To complete the picture of identification, four respondents to Study Two were randomly selected to provide their personal perspectives on the vignette subjects and on the region itself.

This project gave significant support to the hypothesis that young Appalachians are distancing themselves from the region, either through cognitive distancing and escapism, or simply because of a lack of shared experiences. Research for Chapter One provided insight into the history of the Appalachian region and its people. As noted, even Appalachians create differences in social groups between themselves, as in the case of the Hillers and Creekers around Charleston, West Virginia. Many speakers of Appalachian English are conflicted, expressing that their regional accent may make them sound less educated than their peers with different accents, as noted by Hazen and Fluharty (2004).

Also of note is the self-hatred felt by many Appalachians and their idealization of the “outside” populations, as noted in the Study Three interview with participant three. This self-hatred is, again as noted, similar to the self-hatred expressed by Black Americans in their hypothesized idealization of White Americans in Cross’ (1996) study of identity development. While some self-appointed “culture critics” may typify Appalachians as America’s “problem
children” as noted by Billings (1999), those who identify as Appalachians see the region’s inhabitants as good-natured and overcoming mountaineers. Even in times of crisis, such as the Bumpass Cove Disaster in the 1970s, Appalachians have proven again and again that their resolve can overcome obstacles, just as Gail Story and her neighbors did (Phenix & Selver, 1985). From Pittsburgh to Knoxville, many comparisons and contrasts may be made of the people of the region. However, one tie binds them all together: they are all part of the sui generis region called Appalachia.
Chapter Five: Limitations, Future Implications, and Conclusion

“One cannot go out into the hollows of eastern Kentucky or along the ridges of western North Carolina without realizing there are thousands of people throughout the mountains with a great deal to say. Seldom before has anyone stopped to listen to them.”

(Shackleford & Weinberg, 1977)
Limitations

Study One initially sought to provide interview results from four Appalachian women and four Appalachian men. However, due to limits on time, this was not feasible. While the smaller interview group may have slightly changed the results of Study One, the author feels that the like experiences from all Study One participants provided an adequate picture of life in rural Appalachia in 1960. Conversely, the addition of subjects who grew up in urbanized areas in Appalachia may have changed these results somewhat.

Study Two was limited in its sample size. While this study did have 99 respondents, they are not necessarily reflective of Appalachia overall, especially since all were high school graduates at a private liberal arts college. This level of education can differ from the overall population of Appalachia. Also, many students at the college where the study was administered are of middle- to upper-socioeconomic status backgrounds. This also does not necessarily reflect the overall makeup of Appalachia. Finally, the large proportion of female respondents to male may have influenced the results of Study Two.

Study Three had the same limitations as both Studies One and Two. While the original thesis sought to interview four male and four female subjects, this number was reduced, again due to time limitations. Further, because the interviewees were selected solely on the basis of the time of receipt of their reply on whether they were available to interview, they were not selected based on Appalachian origin. Again, a larger sample may have potentially influenced the results found in Study Three. However, the responses from students were very content-rich and were extremely helpful in comparison with Studies One and Two.
Future Implications

This research most certainly carries with it the potential for future research in the field of both regional and cultural identification as well as being a potential harbinger of identification trends in the future. The author hopes that this work will create an impetus to spur other Appalachians to ask the all important question, “why is the place that I call home the way it is?” This and myriad other questions must be explored if a region regarded as benighted and lost to progress is ever to overcome its situational circumstances and stand as a beacon of distinct regionality and customs. Our Appalachia is one which is at an ideological crossroads. While many speak of progress, few speak of our precious societal customs and what will come of them as “progress” takes root.

To understand where our region is headed, we must look backward. The people who were of college age in the 1960s have seen an era of unrivaled change within the region. Within the 47 years between the creation of the Appalachian Regional Commission and today, those inhabitants have seen much change. From the electrification of rural farms to new factories moving in (and old ones moving out) to new ribbons of superhighway carving through mountainsides, our elders have been eyewitnesses to the change and progress ushered in by the Commission.

With this change and progress, though, have come other, less desirable changes. A changing region with an ever-worsening case of social and cultural amnesia is not one which can stand alone as Appalachia has for so many years. As interviewee three in Study One noted, “progress tells a story.” That story has unfolded over the last 47 years and will continue into the
future. It is then that social researchers should not allow the distinct nature of the Appalachian mores and folkways to simply become a footnote to the tale of advancement. Rather, they should be, “intentional,” as interviewee two in Study Three noted, about their study and promotion of the Appalachian cultural paradigm to help clear the fog of social perception about and allow embracement of our Appalachia.
Conclusion

The construction of this project was based upon several factors, one being my Appalachian heritage, another being a story told by my Uncle Bucky. He described his experiences living in Nashville, Tennessee, and said, “you could always tell the old money from the new money. The old money always asked, ‘who was your Mama before she married?’” This question led to a long process of refining my research question. While first seeking to study the mores and folkways of the South, I soon discovered that while Southern culture in general had been studied in-depth, the region I call home had little psychological research, especially in regard to how well people identify with the “old way” of doing things.

As mentioned in the acknowledgement section of this paper, my step-father Paul always says, “if you always do what you’ve always done, you’ll always get what you’ve always got.” This holds especially true in regard to Appalachian life and culture. It seems that our mores and folkways are under attack from all sides, with more and more voices calling Appalachians undereducated and unintelligent. If we, the Appalachians, do not defend our way of life from not only outside criticism and undue pity, but also the cognitive distancing pervading the minds of so many Appalachians, then our connection with and love of the mountains will almost certainly float away with the mist that covers them.
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Figure One: Participants by Gender

- Female Participants (n=69): 70%
- Male Participants (n=30): 30%
Figure Two: Participants by Region

- Appalachian Participants (n=65) 34%
- Non-Appalachian Participants (n=34) 66%
Figure Three: Appalachian Participants by Self-Identification

- Identifying Appalachian Participants (n=26)
- Non-identifying Appalachian Participants (n=39)
Figure Four: Total Participants per Vignette Subject

- Bill (n=48) 52%
- Claudelle (n=51) 48%
Figure Five: *Gender of Vignette Subject v. Gender of Respondent*

- Male Respondents to “Bill” Vignette (n=13)
- Male Respondents to “Claudelle” Vignette (n=17)
- Female Respondents to “Bill” Vignette (n=35)
- Female Respondents to “Claudelle” Vignette (n=34)
Figure Six: *Identification with Vignette v. Self-Identification Among Appalachian Respondents*

Identifying Appalachians (n=26)  Non-identifying Appalachians (n=39)

Mean Identification Score

*p < 0.05*
Figure Seven: Identification of Similar Childhood Experience Among Appalachian Respondents

Identifying Appalachians (n=26) vs. Non-identifying Appalachians (n=39)

Mean Similarity Score

*p ≤ 0.01
Figure Eight: Identification of Similar Life Experience Among Appalachian Respondents

Identifying Appalachians (n=26)  Non-identifying Appalachians (n=39)

Mean Similarity Score

*p ≤ 0.05
Figure Nine: Responses on Similarity of Members of Friendgroup to Vignette Examples

Mean Friendgroup-Member Similarity Score

Identifying Appalachians (n=26)  Non-identifying Appalachians (n=39)

*p ≤ 0.05
Figure Ten: *Responses on Perceived Competitiveness of Vignette Examples Between Genders*

![Bar graph showing mean competitiveness scores for male and female participants.](image)

- Male Participants (n=30)
- Female Participants (n=69)

Mean Competitiveness Score

* *p ≤ 0.05*
Figure Eleven: Responses on Perceived Likability of Vignette Examples Between Genders

Male Participants (n=30)  Female Participants (n=69)

3.7  3.85
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Mean Likability Score

*p<0.05
Figure Twelve: Responses on Perceived Likability of Vignette Examples by Vignette Gender and Respondent Gender

- Male Respondents to “Bill” Vignette (n=13)
- Male Respondents to “Claudelle” Vignette (n=17)
- Female Respondents to “Bill” Vignette (n=35)
- Female Respondents to “Claudelle” Vignette (n=34)

Mean Friendgroup-Member Similarity Score

*p ≤ 0.05
Appendix A: Appalachian Counties as Defined by ARC

The official text of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 and subsequent amendments and revisions define Appalachia as the following, according to The Appalachian Regional Development Act (1965):

As used in this Act, the term “Appalachian region” or “the region” means that area of the eastern United States consisting of the following counties (including any political subdivision located within such area):

In Alabama, the counties of Bibb, Blount, Calhoun, Chambers, Cherokee, Chilton, Clay, Cleburne, Colbert, Coosa, Cullman, De Kalb, Elmore, Etowah, Fayette, Franklin, Hale, Jackson, Jefferson, Lamar, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Limestone, Macon, Madison, Marion, Marshall, Morgan, Pickens, Randolph, St. Clair, Shelby, Talladega, Tallapoosa, Tuscaloosa, Walker, and Winston;

In Georgia, the counties of Banks, Barrow, Bartow, Carroll, Catoosa, Chattooga, Cherokee, Dade, Dawson, Douglas, Elbert, Fannin, Floyd, Forsyth, Franklin, Gilmer, Gordon, Gwinnett, Habersham, Hall, Haralson, Hart, Heard, Jackson, Lumpkin, Madison, Murray, Paulding, Pickens, Polk, Rabun, Stephens, Towns, Union, Walker, White, and Whitfield;

In Kentucky, the counties of Adair, Bath, Bell, Boyd, Breathitt, Carter, Casey, Clark, Clay, Clinton, Cumberland, Elliott, Estill, Fleming, Floyd, Garrard, Green, Greenup, Harlan, Jackson, Johnson, Knott, Knox, Laurel, Lawrence, Lee, Leslie, Letcher, Lewis, Lincoln, McCreary, Madison, Magoffin, Martin, Meniffee,
Monroe, Montgomery, Morgan, Owsley, Perry, Pike, Powell, Pulaski, Rockcastle, Rowan, Russell, Wayne, Whitley, and Wolfe;

In Maryland, the counties of Allegany, Garett, and Washington;

In Mississippi, the counties of Alcorn, Benton, Calhoun, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Clay, Itawamba, Kemper, Lee Lowndes, Marshall, Monroe, Noxubee, Oktibbeha, Pontotoc, Prentiss, Tippah, Tishomingo, Union, Webster, Winston, and Yalobusha;

In New York, the counties of Allegany, Broome, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Otsego, Schoharie, Schuyler, Steuben, Tioga, and Tompkins;

In North Carolina, the counties of Alexander, Allegany, Ashe, Avery, Buncombe, Burke, Caldwell, Cherokee, Clay, Davie, Forsyth, Graham, Haywood, Henderson, Jackson, McDowell, Macon, Madison, Mitchell, Polk, Rutherford, Stokes, Surry, Swain, Transylvania, Watauga, Wilkes, Yadkin, and Yancey;

In Ohio, the counties of Adams, Athens, Belmont, Brown, Carroll, Clermont, Columbiana, Coshocton, Gallia, Guernsey, Harrison, Highland, Hocking, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lawrence, Meigs, Monroe, Morgan, Muskingum, Noble, Perry, Pike, Ross, Scioto, Tuscarawas, Vinton, and Washington;

In Pennsylvania, the counties of Allegheny, Armstrong, Beaver, Bedford, Blair, Bradford, Butler, Cambria, Cameron, Carbon, Centre, Clarion, Clearfield, Clinton, Columbia, Crawford, Elk, Erie, Fayette, Forest, Fulton, Greene,

In South Carolina, the counties of Anderson, Cherokee, Greenville, Oconee, Pickens, and Spartanburg;


In Virginia, the counties of Alleghany, Bath, Bland, Botetourt, Buchanan, Carroll, Craig, Dickenson, Floyd, Giles, Grayson, Highland, Lee, Montgomery, Pulaski, Rockbridge, Russell, Scott, Smyth, Tazewell, Washington, Wise, and Wythe;

All the counties of West Virginia.**

Through amendments and reforms to the Appalachian Regional Development Act, Edmonson, Metcalfe, Nicholas, and Robertson Counties, Kentucky, Montgomery and Panola Counties, Mississippi, Ashtabula, Mahoning, and Trumbull Counties, Ohio, Lawrence, Lewis, and Morgan
Counties, Tennessee, and Henry and Patrick Counties, Virginia have been added to the
Commission’s definition of Appalachia, bringing the total number of counties included to 420.
*The original legislation contained spelling errors which have been corrected for this document.
**The following are the counties of West Virginia included in the Commission’s definition:
Barbour, Berkeley, Boone, Braxton, Brooke, Cabell, Calhoun, Clay, Doddridge, Fayette, Gilmer,
Grant, Greenbrier, Hampshire, Hancock, Hardy, Harrison, Jackson, Jefferson, Kanawha, Lewis,
Lincoln, Logan, Marion, Marshall, Mason, McDowell, Mercer, Mineral, Mingo, Monongalia,
Monroe, Morgan, Nichola, Ohio, Pendleton, Pleasants, Pocahontas, Preston, Putnam, Raleigh,
Pandolph, County, Ritchie, Roane, Summers, Taylor, Tucker, Tyler, Upshur, Wayne, Webster,
Appendix B: *Map of Appalachia as Defined by ARC*
The Appalachian subregions are contiguous regions of relatively homogeneous characteristics (topography, demographics, and economics) within Appalachia. This classification was developed in the early history of the ARC and provides a basis for subregional analysis. ARC revised the classification in November 2009 by dividing the Region into smaller parts for greater analytical detail and by using current economic and transportation data. This classification is used only for research purposes and not to allocate ARC funds.

Map Created: November 2009.
Appendix D: Appalachian Counties as Defined by *Disinheriting Appalachia*

The following are the counties included in the definition of Appalachia used in this study:

In Kentucky, the counties of Adair, Bath, Bell, Boyd, Breathitt, Carter, Casey, Clark, Clay, Clinton, Cumberland, Elliott, Estill, Fleming, Floyd, Garrard, Green, Greenup, Harlan, Jackson, Johnson, Knott, Knox, Laurel, Lawrence, Lee, Leslie, Letcher, Lewis, Lincoln, McCreary, Madison, Magoffin, Martin, Meniffee, Monroe, Montgomery, Morgan, Owsley, Perry, Pike, Powell, Pulaski, Rockcastle, Rowan, Russell, Wayne, Whitley, and Wolfe;

In North Carolina, the counties of Alexander, Allegany, Ashe, Avery, Buncombe, Burke, Caldwell, Cherokee, Clay, Davie, Forsyth, Graham, Haywood, Henderson, Jackson, McDowell, Macon, Madison, Mitchell, Polk, Rutherford, Stokes, Surry, Swain, Transylvania, Watauga, Wilkes, Yadkin, and Yancey;

In Ohio, the counties of Adams, Athens, Brown, Clermont, Gallia, Highland, Hocking, Jackson, Lawrence, Meigs, Monroe, Morgan, Noble, Perry, Pike, Ross, Scioto, Vinton, and Washington;

In Tennessee, the counties of Anderson, Bledsoe, Blount, Bradley, Campbell, Cannon, Carter, Claiborne, Clay, Cocke, Coffee, Cumberland, De Kalb, Fentress, Franklin, Grainger, Greene, Grundy, Hamblen, Hamilton, Hancock, Hawkins, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Loudon, McMinn, Macon, Marion, Meigs, Monroe, Overton, Pickett, Polk, Putnam, Rhea, Roane, Scott, Sequatchie, Sevier, Smith, Sullivan, Unicoi, Union, Van Buren, Warren, Washington, and White;
In Virginia, the counties of Alleghany, Bath, Bland, Botetourt, Buchanan, Carroll, Craig, Dickenson, Floyd, Giles, Grayson, Highland, Lee, Montgomery, Pulaski, Rockbridge, Russell, Scott, Smyth, Tazewell, Washington, Wise, and Wythe;

The Appalachian subregions are contiguous regions of relatively homogeneous characteristics (topography, demographics, and economics) within Appalachia. This classification was developed in the early history of the ARC and provides a basis for subregional analysis. ARC revised the classification in November 2009 by dividing the Region into smaller parts for greater analytical detail and by using current economic and transportation data. This classification is used only for research purposes and not to allocate ARC funds.

Map Created: November 2009.
Distressed Counties in Appalachia 1960

Distressed counties have at least 150% of the U.S. average unemployment rate of 5.14%, at least 150% of the U.S. poverty rate of 22.1%, and 67% or less of the U.S. per capita market income of $1,639, or 200% poverty and one of the other two distressed indicators.

Data Sources:
Appendix G: Map of Economically Distressed Counties, 1970

Distressed Counties in Appalachia
1970

Data Sources:
Poverty: Census data from USDA, ERS, 1970.
Appendix H: Map of Economically Distressed Counties, 1980

Distressed Counties in Appalachia 1980

Distressed counties have at least 150% of the U.S. average unemployment rate of 5.52%, at least 100% of the U.S. poverty rate of 12.4%, and 67% or less of the U.S. per capita market income of $7,666, or 200% poverty and one of the other two distressed indicators.

Data Sources:
Appendix I: Map of Economically Distressed Counties, 1990

Distressed Counties in Appalachia
1990

Economic Status
Distressed (106 counties)

Data Sources:
Appendix J: Map of Economically Distressed Counties, 2000

County Economic Status in the Appalachian Region, FY 2000

Economic Status
- Distressed (111 Counties)
- At-Risk (42 Counties)
- Transitional (22 Counties)
- Competitive (22 Counties)
- Attainment (10 Counties)

Distressed counties have at least 150% of the U.S. three-year average unemployment rate of 6.3%, at least 150% of the U.S. poverty rate of 10.1%, and 67% or less of the U.S. per capita market income of $23,405, or 200% poverty and one of the other two distressed indicators.

Data Sources:
Appendix K: Map of Economically Distressed Counties, 2010

County Economic Status in Appalachia, Fiscal Year 2010
(Effective October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)

The Appalachian Regional Commission uses an index-based county economic classification system to identify and monitor the economic status of Appalachian counties. See the reverse side for a description of each economic level.

Map Created: October 2009.

Counties Economic Levels
- Distressed (82)
- At-Risk (79)
- Transitional (229)
- Competitive (24)
- Attainment (6)
The Appalachian Regional Commission uses an index-based county economic classification system to identify and monitor the economic status of Appalachian counties. See the reverse side for a description of each economic level.

Map Created: March 2010.
ATTITUDES STUDY

You are being invited to participate in a research study about Attitudes. This research project is being conducted by Tyler Engle and supervised by Dr. April Dye in the Psychology Department, a division of the School of Social Sciences, of Carson-Newman College. The objective of this research project is to better understand the attitudes of people toward others.

There are no known risks if you decide to participate in this research study, nor are there any costs for participating in the study. The information you provide will help me understand attitudes toward others. The information collected may not benefit you directly, but what I learn from this study should provide general benefits to Psychological research.

This interview is strictly confidential. Data will be held on a secured, password protected disc and only the researcher and those persons authorized by the researcher will have access to this data. Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may discontinue participation at any time.

If you have any questions or concerns about completing this interview or about being in this study, you may contact me at 423.220.7100 or at tnengle@cn.edu, or Dr. Dye at 865.471.2086 or adye@cn.edu.

After the study you will be completely debriefed as to the purpose and nature of the study.

Signature: _______________________________________

Date: _______________________________________

Name (Printed): _______________________________________
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Appendix N: Debriefing Form

Debriefing for

DISINHERITING APPALACHIA: A STUDY OF THE DISAPPEARING REGIONAL IDENTITY OF APPALACHIAN “YOUNG’UNS”

Thank you for participating in today’s study. We hope you found the experience to be interesting, and we hope that you learned something about how psychological research is currently conducted.

In this research, we hope to learn more about the identification of Appalachians of today with Appalachians of approximately their grandparents’ age. We are especially interested in Appalachian people of college age. In this research, we seek to understand the stereotypes, both positive and negative, associated with this group, as well as the reasons for disidentification. We are also specifically interested in how these stereotypes are changing over time.

If you have further questions, please contact Tyler Engle, tnengle@cn.edu, 423.220.7100; or Dr. April Dye, adye@cn.edu, 865.471.2086.

If you’d like to read research related to this work, you can get more information from these articles:


Thank you for participating in this study.
Much research in psychology depends on participation by individuals like yourself
Appendix O: *Male Vignette, “Bill”*

Bill is a twenty-one year old male from a small community in Unicoi County, Tennessee. He was raised on a small rural farm. His mother was a housewife and his father was a tobacco farmer. Bill has four siblings and considers his family to be very close-knit. The family grew most of their food and bought very few items in a weekly trip to the supermarket in town. His clothes were handmade by his mother.

Today, Bill is married and has two children, a two year-old son and a six month-old daughter. He is extremely active in his church congregation. Bill was honorably discharged following two years’ service in the armed forces. He lives in a small home with his wife and works as a supervisor on the county road department. Bill knows many people in the community and has a large friend-group.
Appendix P: Female Vignette, “Claudelle”

Claudelle is a twenty-one year old female from a small community in Carter County, Tennessee. She was raised on a small rural farm. Her mother was a housewife and her father worked at a local textile plant. Claudelle has four siblings and considers her family to be very close-knit. The family grew most of their food and bought very few items in a weekly trip to the supermarket in town. Her clothes were handmade by her mother.

Today, Claudelle is married and has two children, a two year-old son and a six month-old daughter. She is extremely active in her church congregation. She lives in a small home with her husband and works as a part-time advertising salesperson at her local newspaper and was previously employed at a local department store. She attends classes at night and hopes become an RN soon. Because of her work as a salesperson, Claudelle knows many people in the community and has a large friend-group.
Appendix Q: Opinionnaire Form A

Please circle the response that best fits your level of agreement with each statement according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.) I think that I would be friends with Bill.

1  2  3  4  5

2.) My interests are like Bill’s.

1  2  3  4  5

3.) My childhood experiences are like Bill’s

1  2  3  4  5

4.) Bill is a competitive person.

1  2  3  4  5

5.) Bill is a likable person.

1  2  3  4  5

6.) My life is like Bill’s.

1  2  3  4  5

7.) Bill is a kind person.

1  2  3  4  5
8.) I have friends who are like Bill.

9.) Bill is intelligent.

10.) I think that Bill’s children will be successful in school.

11.) Most people my age from Appalachia have lives similar to Bill’s.

12.) Bill is trustworthy.

13.) Bill is a good listener.

Bill’s experience is typical of people from Appalachia...

14.) Today.

15.) In 1960.
Appendix R:  *Opinionnaire Form B*

*Please circle the response that best fits your level of agreement with each statement according to the following scale:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.) I think that I would be friends with Claudelle.

1  2  3  4  5  

2.) My interests are like Claudelle’s.

1  2  3  4  5  

3.) My childhood experiences are like Claudelle’s.

1  2  3  4  5  

4.) Claudelle is a competitive person.

1  2  3  4  5  

5.) Claudelle is a likable person.

1  2  3  4  5  

6.) My life is like Claudelle’s.

1  2  3  4  5  

7.) Claudelle is a kind person.

1  2  3  4  5
8.) I have friends who are like Claudelle.

9.) Claudelle is intelligent.

10.) I think that Claudelle’s children will be successful in school.

11.) Most people my age from Appalachia have lives similar to Claudelle’s.

12.) Claudelle is trustworthy.

13.) Claudelle is a good listener.

Claudelle’s experience is typical of people from Appalachia...

14.) Today.

15.) In 1960.
Appendix S: Sample Study Two Informed Consent Form

ATTITUDES STUDY

You are being invited to participate in a research study about Attitudes. This research project is being conducted by Tyler Engle and supervised by Dr. April Dye in the Psychology Department, a division of the School of Social Sciences, of Carson-Newman College. The objective of this research project is to better understand the attitudes of people toward others.

There are no known risks if you decide to participate in this research study, nor are there any costs for participating in the study. The information you provide will help me understand attitudes toward others. The information collected may not benefit you directly, but what I learn from this study should provide general benefits to Psychological research.

This survey is confidential. If you choose to participate, do not write your name on the questionnaire. However, if you wish to participate in the follow-up interview portion of this study, you should fill in the appropriate blanks below. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may discontinue participation at any time.

If you have any questions or concerns about completing the questionnaire or about being in this study, you may contact me at 423.220.7100 or at tnengle@cn.edu, or Dr. Dye at 865.471.2086 or adye@cn.edu.

After the study you will be completely debriefed as to the purpose and nature of the study.

Signature: _______________________________________

Date: _______________________________________

Name (Printed): _______________________________________

MAKE A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BLOCK.

☐ YES, I would like to participate in a follow-up interview to provide further research into this topic.

☐ NO, I do not wish to participate.

If YES, please provide the requested contact information:

E-Mail Address: _______________________________________

Telephone Number: (_____) _____ . _____

Best time to contact: _____ : _____ _____ AM PM
Appendix T: Demographic Questionnaire

MAKE A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BLOCK.

GENDER:
☐ MALE
☐ FEMALE

DO YOU PERSONALLY IDENTIFY AS AN APPALACHIAN PERSON?
☐ YES
☐ NO

PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR AGE: __________

PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR CLASSIFICATION: __________

WHERE DO YOU MOST IDENTIFY AS HOME?

____________________ ____________________ _____
CITY    COUNTY  STATE

WHERE ARE YOUR PARENTS FROM?

____________________ ____________________ _____
CITY    COUNTY  STATE

WHERE ARE YOUR GRANDPARENTS FROM?

____________________ ____________________ _____
CITY    COUNTY  STATE