Western Kentucky University
TopSCHOLAR®

Masters Theses & Specialist Projects | Graduate School

12-1-2011

Job Skills, Tolerance, and Positive Interactions: The Gendered Experiences of Appalachian Migrants

Kelli Brooke Alford
Western Kentucky University, kelli.alford@topper.wku.edu

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

Part of the Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons, Family, Life Course, and Society Commons, Gender and Sexuality Commons, Inequality and Stratification Commons, Place and Environment Commons, Rural Sociology Commons, and the Sociology of Culture Commons

Recommended Citation
Alford, Kelli Brooke, "Job Skills, Tolerance, and Positive Interactions: The Gendered Experiences of Appalachian Migrants" (2011). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 1135.
http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/1135

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact connie.foster@wku.edu.

JOB SKILLS, TOLERANCE, AND POSITIVE INTERACTIONS: THE GENDERED EXPERIENCES OF APPALACHIAN MIGRANTS

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Sociology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for the Degree
Master of Arts

By
Kelli Brooke Alford

December 2011

JOB SKILLS, TOLERANCE, AND POSITIVE EXPERIENCES: THE GENDERED EXPERIENCES OF APPALACHIAN MIGRANTS

Date Recommended 11-15-2012

Amy C. Krull

Dr. Amy Krull, Director of Thesis

Douglas Clayton Smith

Dr. Douglas Smith

Stephen B. Groce

Dr. Stephen Groce

Kenneth C. Doerner 25-JAN-2012

Dean, Office of Graduate Studies and Research Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to express my most sincere gratitude to my thesis committee, Dr. Amy Krull, Dr. Doug Smith, and Dr. Steve Groce. Without the supportive assistance, suggestions, and insights of my committee the completion of this study would not have been possible. Thank you so much, Dr. Krull, for diligently revising draft after draft of my thesis and for making me reexamine my first impressions of my research. I would also like to thank Dr. Krull for all of her patience in dealing with my many stressors, worries, and doubts throughout this process. Thank you to Dr. Smith for providing me with the data to carry out this study, and of course thank you, Dr. Groce, for all of your guidance.

I would also like to thank Dr. Jerry Daday for giving me the opportunity to work and become more familiar with this database in his data analysis course. The skills I learned in Dr. Daday's class and the assistance he provided allowed me to gain a strong statistical foundation for my thesis. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. James Kanan and the Sociology Department in general for igniting an interest in Sociology at the beginning of my college career that has continued to my graduate education.

I also am also very thankful for all of the sociological friends and acquaintances I have gained throughout graduate school. It has been an honor to learn with you and from you.

Finally, I want to thank my family for their love, their unyielding support, and for compelling me to pursue a discipline that I love. Without that advice, I might never have continued my education in Sociology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES ……..... vii

ABSTRACT viii

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....… 1

CHAPTER II THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE.....… 3

Gender Stratification Theory …….....… 3

Intersectionality and The Matrix of Domination.....… 5

CHAPTER III LITERATURE REVIEW.....… 9

General Disadvantage Among Appalachian Migrants.....….. 9

Inequality and Traditional Gender Roles of Appalachian Females..... 11

Occupational and Economic Disadvantage of Appalachian Females.....… 16

Gendered Explanations for Job Relocation…….. 23

Hypotheses……24

CHAPTER IV RESEARCH METHODS..... 27

The Data……..... 27

Dependent Variables……..... 30

Independent Variables…… 31

Method of Analysis…….. 34

CHAPTER V ANALYSES.....… 35

Job Skills, Gender, and Control Variables..... 35

Tolerance, Gender, and Control Variables..... 38

Positive Interactions, Gender, and Control Variables……...… 42

Insignificant Region/Education Variable…… 44

CHAPTER VI CONCLUSIONS..... 45

APPENDIX A Correlation Matrices.....….. 49

REFERENCES 50

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1. Demographics ……..... 29

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics …… 33

Table 3. Correlation Matrix: Dependent Variables 49

Table 4. Correlation Matrix: Independent Variables .....…..... 49

Table 5. Logistic Regression: Job Skills, Gender, and Control Variables 36

Table 6. Effect of Year Moved on Why Moved ……..…… 38

Table 7. Logistic Regression: Tolerance, Gender, and Control Variables 39

Table 8. Logistic Regression: Positive Interactions, Gender, and Control Variables ……..... 43

JOB SKILLS, TOLERANCE, AND POSITIVE INTERACTIONS: THE GENDERED EXPERIENCES OF APPALACHIAN MIGRANTS

Kelli Brooke Alford December 2011 52 Pages

Directed By: Drs. Amy Krull, Stephen Groce, Douglas Smith

Department of Sociology Western Kentucky University

The following study examines gendered learning experiences of a population of Appalachian migrants surveyed from the late 1970s to the early 1990s. The respondents who participated in the survey used for this study began their lives in Appalachia. These respondents then left Appalachia for various other areas in the country and even around the world only to ultimately return to the mountainous region later in their lives. To begin, theory will be introduced concerning the stratification of gender in the Appalachian economic landscape, as well as a theoretical framework placing Appalachian women in an interlocking web of oppression with other subjugated cultural groups. This outsider kinship found among Appalachian women and other socially ostracized groups, I argue with the support of theory, will foster an atmosphere of tolerance and positive interaction among Appalachian females and the people they meet in their new homes. Literature will also be presented regarding the heavily skewed nature of the role of women versus men in Appalachian society and economy. Using logistic regression, various aspects of migrant experiences away from Appalachia will be examined and analyzed, including the acquisition of job skills, tolerance-based knowledge, and positive interactions with neighbors in their new environment.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"She was all the time looking beyond the mountains…Big Ridge was like a prison for her; she wanted to see the rest of the world."

The above passage appears in an Appalachian themed article by Barbara Ellen Smith (2001). This quote recounts a description Smith's father once told of her grandmother, Lelia Belle Fridley, a lifetime resident of Appalachia. Smith tells the hard lived story of many of her female ancestors, their toil in the fields, the numerous children they cared for, the abusive husbands they were forced to endure, and the gender roles to which they were socialized from birth to adhere to. Smith's father reminisces about his mother's longing spirit, and it seems simple to romanticize about what could have been had Lelia broken away from the Appalachian Mountains. Still, what would her experiences have been like were she granted the opportunity to leave?

The following study will examine the role of gender on various experiences of Appalachian migrants. Beginning, I will explore through theory and literature the divided social and economic world of Appalachian society. While the past describes a subjugated history for females in Appalachia, their current social standing is not much better. Traditional gender roles and ideals about a female's "place" in society still exist and are largely practiced in this region (Rezek, 2010 and Egan, 2000). Additionally, although the general socioeconomic condition of all Appalachians may be

negatively divergent from the rest of America, Appalachian women seem to embody more of the disadvantage that is endemic to the region. Knowing the above, would it make any difference if Appalachian women migrated to various places, perhaps changing their views and actions as they traveled? In this study I will examine data from Appalachians who migrated out of the region and later returned. Looking at topics such as job skills, tolerance, and positive interactions with others I will try to gauge the experiences of these migrants and determine if any major differences occurred between genders during their journey.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The history of Appalachia points to a society where men actively participate in the outside workforce while women predominately stay at home (Rezek, 2010). Because of the heavily divided division of labor that is found in Appalachia this pattern poses a significant problem to Appalachian females in terms of occupational opportunities and economic security. Additionally, the indifference and sometimes disdain that Appalachian women feel from their own communities often makes them an ostracized group within their own culture (Smith, 1999 and Brooks, 1999). Using the theory of stratification, labor divisions among Appalachian men and women will be examined to display persistent traditional gender roles in Appalachia, which deny the value of women gaining job skills. The debasement of women in Appalachian culture will also be viewed through the lenses of intersectionality and the "matrix of domination" to demonstrate the potential for empathy and understanding between Appalachian women and other groups in broader society.

Gender Stratification Theory

At the heart of social stratification lies the division of economic superiority and inferiority. This theme is no different when specifically examining the stratification of males and females in society. In a business-minded twist on the Golden Rule, Rae Lesser Blumberg (1984) in his theory of gender stratification states, "he who has the gold makes the rules" (p. 23). Despite advances in equality among men and women in today's

society, men still seem to have most of the gold. In complex political economies, such as the one found in the United States, men are often in control, leaving women subject to a male-biased economic system (p. 27). Primarily, the only civilizations where women are found to have great economic power are in hunter/gatherer groups, horticultural societies, and cultures that embrace bilateral inheritance (p. 42). The resource extractive occupations largely found in Appalachia, which predominantly pride the work of men (Isserman and Rephann, 1993; Latimer and Oberhauser, 2005; Oberhauser, 1995) leave little room for the egalitarian social and economic environment found in the three previously listed types of societies. Blumberg additionally points out "the lower women's relative economic power, the more likely they are to be oppressed physically, politically, and ideologically" (p. 75). If this is true, then the women of Appalachia are indeed physically, politically, and ideologically oppressed.

Marisa C. Young (2010) in her study of precarious work settings also finds that gender stratification leads to social and economic inequality. She claims that gender stratification theory underlines the differences between men and women in their ability to gain workplace rewards such as an increased salary or extra benefits. Women, Young argues, are not primarily employed in low-paying, peripheral jobs because they choose to be, but rather because their potential employers are biased in their opinions of the kinds of work women should be allowed to do (p. 78). Young states that employers may continue to create a gendered division of labor for three reasons (p. 79):

- Traditional structural values placing men above women in various jobs
- The misconception that females are "too emotional" to be employed in some occupations

- And “statistical discrimination,” or discrimination based on conventional ideals of women

Additionally, Young (2010) stresses that because traditional gender roles persist in society women fail to have the same opportunities as men to further their careers. Although women may work outside the home, domestic tasks such as child rearing, cooking, and cleaning often confine women to a limited career path. These traditional gender identities even compel some women to forego marriage and motherhood altogether in favor of being successful in their respective careers (p. 78).

These elements of gender stratification seem to typify the inequality and traditional roles of men and women found in the Appalachian economic sphere. As it will be discovered in the literature review of this study, conventional and conservative gender roles pervade Appalachian culture (Smith, 1999; Brooks, 1999), and a clear picture of which gender maintains most of the economic power is unmistakably defined (Isserman and Rephann, 1993; Latimer and Oberhauser, 2005; Oberhauser, 1995; Rezek, 2010; Tickamyer and Tickamyer, 1988). Therefore, supported by the perspective of gender stratification and the mindset of traditional gender discrimination found in Appalachia, I will contend that Appalachian women will be less likely than men to gain job skills upon moving to a new location. After all, why would women need to acquire job skills when they are culturally restricted to the home?

Intersectionality and the Matrix of Domination

Over the past several decades, the study of gender has taken a shift from the once monolithic ideology of white, middle class women to now consider how various other sociocultural categories interact with gender and sex. Groupings such as race, ethnicity,

class, sexuality, age, and nationality are now being examined for the way they mingle with gender to create a more specific study in feminist thought that can fit the lived experiences of women of various backgrounds. This interlocking network of gender studies known as "intersectionality" was formally introduced in 1989 by American professor of law, Kimberle Crenshaw (Lykke, 2010, p. 50).

In her book concerning intersectional theory, methodology, and writing, Nina Lykke (2010) gives the following broad definition of intersectionality:

> …intersectionality can, first of all, be considered as a theoretical and methodological tool to analyze how historically specific kinds of power differentials and/or constraining normativities based on discursively, institutionally and/or structurally constructed sociocultural categorizations such as gender, ethnicity, race, class, sexuality, age/generation, dis/ability, nationality, mother tongue and so on, interact, and in doing so produce different kinds of societal inequalities and unjust social relations. (Lykke, 2010, p. 50)

She argues that these various socially defined categories should not be seen as add-ons to the study of gender, but instead they should be examined for how they are interwoven into the identity of the women being studied. Additionally, Lykke adds to her own definition of intersectionality by emphasizing that this concept is epitomized by the way gender and sociocultural groupings can "intra-act" with one another and not simply "interact." Interaction, she claims, is merely a process that occurs *at the boundaries* of various phenomena. However, intra-action is an interplay *among these boundaries* that allows for mutual influence and change (p. 51). This "intra-active" approach to studying intersectionality that both Lykke and myself prefer has been described by Leslie McCall (2005, p. 1773-1774) as intracategorical.

Also using the intracategorical approach to intersectionality is *Black Feminist Thought* author, Patricia Hill Collins (1990). Collins emphasizes the intertwined relationship of cultural divisions such as gender, class, race, ethnicity, and age in a concept she entitled "The Matrix of Domination." She points out that traditional models of oppression only focus on the bifurcated relationships of either/or, such as powerful or weak, minority or majority, black or white, male or female. Instead, the matrix of domination asserts that groups can be "both/and" (p. 225). To illustrate this both/and concept, consider the sociocultual attributes of white women. They can be both the oppressor, because of their race, and the oppressed, due to their gender. Collins argues that when studying groups within the matrix there are very few "pure victims or oppressors" (p. 229). There is a great potential for overlap among categories such as gender, economic class, religion, nationality and myriad other descriptors once thought to divide but can now be seen as ties that bind.

Continuing, Collins asserts that throughout the ages minorities like "people of color, Jews, the poor, white women, and gays and lesbians" have all been connected by the label of the "Other" (p. 225). The matrix of domination that unites these "Others" has no hierarchical form, but instead offers a network of relationships where practically everyone is the subordinate or superior at once or simultaneously (p. 226-227). Thinking about race, class, gender, and other sociocultural identifiers in this intermeshing manner can, by Collins' account, lead to greater empathetic understanding for all social groups. Collins emphasizes that through understanding the matrix of domination, "Each group becomes better able

to consider other groups' standpoints without relinquishing the uniqueness of its own standpoint or suppressing other groups' partial perspectives" (p. 236).

Because of the verstehen-like quality presented in intersectionality and the matrix of domination, I find these theories to be quite appropriate for the study of gender differences in Appalachian migrants. As it will be emphasized in the literature review of this study, the migrating populations of Appalachia came from extremely humble beginnings that followed them to their new homes (Alexander, 2006). Appalachian women, however, not only faced the harsh reality of a poverty-stricken life, but were also subjugated within their own culture by traditional gender norms concerning what women can and (for the most part) cannot do (Smith, 1999; Brooks, 1999). Therefore, the concepts of intersectionality and the matrix of domination can place Appalachian women in the interconnected web of oppressed and oppressor, leading to empathetic intra-action with other sociocultural minority groups in their new location. As a result, I believe that the subjugated women of Appalachia will be more likely than Appalachian men to adopt notions of tolerance by "intra-acting" with groups in their new locations such as women of all races, ethnicities, social classes, and creeds, as well as economically disadvantaged populations from all walks of life. This empathetic quality should also allow Appalachian women to interact positively with new peers upon moving to another location.

CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following chapter will examine aspects specific to the overall poverty of Appalachian migrants, traditional gender roles in Appalachia, the poor economic plight of Appalachian females, and explanations for occupational migration that are largely steeped in gendered reasoning. First, literature will be presented, which looks at the disadvantaged nature of Appalachian migrants during the "Great Migration" and how they distinctively differed from their non-Appalachian Southern counterparts. A section concerning the prejudicial treatment of Appalachian females in their own culture will also be presented, as well as literature concerning the disadvantaged and downtrodden outlook for women in the Appalachian economic sphere. Finally, a small portion of this literature review will be devoted to examining the gender-specific logic behind moving, or not moving, for job relocation. Following the discussion of literature, hypotheses concerning the provided theories, literature, and data will be given and described.

General Disadvantage Among Appalachian Migrants

Throughout the twentieth century native inhabitants of the Appalachian region of the United States have made their way to various other places throughout the country. Although once ignored in the scope of the "Great Migration," some scholars are now accounting for the large mass of Appalachian and Southern migrants that journeyed from their original homeland to new destinations (Alexander, 2006). Calling this mass exodus

the “Southern Diaspora,” researchers are pointing out the myriad differences that characterized the seemingly homogenous group of people leaving southern states in the mid and later decades of the twentieth century (p. 219). Scholars of this phenomenon are quick to point out that although one might think the people of Appalachia can just be grouped with other Southern migrants, the Appalachian migrant’s story of settling in a new environment is quite different from their southern counterparts (p. 220).

Compared with southern migrants, Appalachian migrants were more likely to be generally disadvantaged, which included higher rates of unemployment, lower incomes, lower-status jobs, and lower levels of education (Alexander, 2006). Additionally, Appalachian migrant families were much more likely to be female-headed, which also ensures a lower median household income. During the 1980s, 21 percent Appalachian homes were poverty-stricken in contrast to only 12 percent in the general southern migrant population (p. 232). Significantly, over one-third of Appalachians who ended up in northern cities by 1980 were from West Virginia and Kentucky (p. 230), a population strongly related to the sample I will later discuss. Sadly, that population entered and remained in poverty after relocating (p. 234). Appalachians residing in large cities maintained lower incomes than many southern black migrants and even lower incomes than international immigrant groups that had journeyed to American metros. Economically, Appalachians often embodied the traits of groups from Eastern Europe, Korea, and South American more so than other southern migrants in large cities (p. 235-239). Individuals traveling from Appalachia were more likely than their southern equivalents to come from the poorest, most rural, and most destitute places in the south. Migrants from Appalachia had much less success in the job market than their southern

brothers, usually being significantly younger and undereducated (p. 239). Judging from this picture of unemployment, low incomes, lack of education, and all around poverty, one might assume that often the experiences shared by Appalachian migrants could be negative in nature.

Inequality and Traditional Gender Roles of Appalachian Females

As harsh as Appalachian life may be for all of its citizens, there is also a gendered side to the plight of Appalachian history and migration. Barbara Ellen Smith (1999) argues that many historians and researchers often dismiss or ignore female accounts of the Appalachian life. A long history of sexism and misogyny has characterized Appalachia, as well as the literature concerning what is known about the region. For centuries, the women of Appalachia have been neglected of the proper agency and autonomous infrastructure needed to provide them equality (p. 4). Employment in coal and other earthly resources has long favored the work of men (p. 5). Many laws, rules, and regulations have been largely enacted at the behest of men to benefit men, and even decisions concerning spiritual matters have primarily been attributed to the role of men in the clergy of Appalachian society (p. 4). The heroic tales of Appalachian citizens standing up to outside forces (land opportunists, anti-union coal companies, interloping "ivory-tower" academics) have completely been idolized stories of male courage, ignoring that women had any part in upholding the integrity of the Appalachian environment (p. 5). In fact, it once seemed as though the only attention paid to women in Appalachia regarded stories of grave indiscretion or possibly even gender-defying behavior (p. 6). Some accounts even posit that the family pig played a more integral role in settling the Appalachian frontier than did the mothers, daughters, and sisters of the

region (p. 5-6). Early Appalachian culture, encompassing traditions that continue to discourage Appalachian women today, largely confined females to the household and left them little means of escape.

Shannon Brooks, a former resident of Appalachia, wrote in 1999 about the plight of many Appalachian women she knew growing up in southwestern Virginia. Boldly, she claims that Appalachian culture commonly "denigrates the very women that it relies upon." Brooks noted that many women she knew as a young woman maintained little if any influence or respect in or out of their Appalachian homes (p. 157). Among the necessary but unappreciated tasks performed by the women Brooks studied were growing crops, canning food from their gardens for the winter, and working in factories (p. 158). These women were not free to choose whatever trade they wanted. Brooks mentions that most women who ventured from their household posts to gain worldly employment were met with great suspicion and mistrust in their Appalachian communities (p. 161). Clearly, from her description the patriarchal culture that obviously existed (and still largely exists [Rezek, 2010]) in Brooks' account of Appalachia systematically and socially withheld women from achieving their true endeavors and venturing out to pursue a life beyond the kitchen.

A prime example of the lack of recognition paid to females in Appalachian society is evidenced in Sherry Cable's 1992 study of the Yellow Creek Concerned Citizens organization (YCCC) of Bell County, Kentucky. This social movement group was formed by eastern Kentuckians to combat the poisoning and destructive habits of the Middlesboro Tanning Company (p. 39-40). Cable's research discovered when structuring tasks within the YCCC traditional gender obligations were adhered to by granting men

job duties relating to formal leadership while women were relegated to “organizational housekeeping” (p. 42). Men were elected to the positions of president and vice president, while women served as secretary and treasurer in the YCCC. Cable even went as far as to label the type of work women provided in the YCCC as “shitwork,” a term Barrie Thorn conjured from her own research into the female role in the Draft Resistance Movement of the 1960s and 1970s (p. 43). Women of the YCCC held bake sales, car washes, took meeting minutes, and meticulously maintained files concerning agreements and communications with state government and EPA officials. All of this work was vital to YCCC and their message, but the primary position of the female YCCC members was to stay in the background and not receive credit for their part in the group’s movement (p. 44). One female participant in the YCCC movement interviewed by Cable even stated, “Women have done everything except stand up front and speak” (p.45).

Although their participation in the YCCC did broaden the role of females in Appalachian society, Cable (1992) points out that YCCC women are reluctant to compare their triumphs with those in the Women’s Movement. Working in the YCCC did bring a measure of equality to the women within the movement; however, those same women who took part in the advancement still ardently defend traditional gender roles (p. 45). Citing long held notions telling Appalachian women to “wait on your husband and your kids” and to “have total respect for the man of the house,” YCCC women largely refused to embrace their new social advantage. Further examination into the Yellow Creek movement leads us to believe that work obligations would not allow men to organize and maintain the structure of the YCCC. Instead, the apparent flexible nature of being a homemaker made it more efficient for women to do most of the work within the YCCC

(p. 46-47). Cable's research serves to further exemplify an ingrained notion, perpetuated even by those on the lower end of the stratification spectrum, of female inequality in Appalachian society.

In her study concerning gender role patterns and support systems for young Appalachian mothers, Jan Rezek (2010) found that men often control property and influence affairs outside the home, but within the home women continue to perform much of the work. Rezek states that the concept of "gendered spaces" is clearly alive in the present culture of Appalachia. Citing another work within her study, Rezek states that Carol Stephens (2005) found in her essay concerning Appalachian health care that the family is the most important element in Appalachian society and that the mother is the key element within the family. As with many forms of socialization, gender norms thrown down the generational lines of Appalachian families serve to designate female expectations in mountain culture (p.137). As for her own research, Rezek discovered that a system of family members was crucial in assisting new, young, and often single mothers in rural Appalachia. However, this supportive group usually consisted of female-only family members, most of the time the matrilineal grandmother of the newborn (p. 143). Again, Rezek's work shows the prevailing culture of traditional gender expectations abiding in Appalachia. Even in the face of family strains such as a single teenage mother, men associated with the circumstances (i.e., father of the teenage girl and/or father of the teenage girl's child) were reluctant to help in the dilemma (p. 134-139).

In a 2000 report presented by Rita Egan, survey results of Appalachian Kentucky college students were presented concerning their views on poverty, welfare, and work.

The views of many of these students seemed to also reflect the gender bias expressed in the information above. Over half the students surveyed agreed that mothers should never put their careers ahead of taking care of their families. Additionally, students who agreed with the previous statement were more likely to believe that women should stay at home and raise their children until their offspring can enter a local school system. Concerning women staying at home, male students were more likely to agree with this notion (p. 7). Beyond these findings, 42 percent of respondents believed that mothers who were on welfare should be made to work for their benefits, despite whether their children are school-aged or not (p. 6-7). Interestingly, many respondents who consented to the previous statement also thought that daycare services should be provided to welfare mothers so that they could work instead of staying at home with their children (p. 7). An incongruous attitude may be conveyed in the answers of the Appalachian college students surveyed. Although it seems that the respondents felt mothers should always take care of their families first before their careers, poorer mothers on welfare should be excluded from taking care of their children in favor of working for their welfare benefits. According to these students' responses, the freedom and responsibility of a mother to stay at home and raise her children should be only given to mothers who are wealthy enough to deserve this privilege. The author notes that the attitudes of her sample are not representative of the Appalachian Kentucky region as a whole (p. 3-4). However, knowing that these particular college-level respondents are in the top academic tier of the Appalachian region, the attitudes of their non-college peers might be even more conservative than their own. This investigation seems to point out a remaining conventional mindset of gender roles in Appalachian culture.

Research concerning Appalachian men and women's various means of literate interactions even proposes a gendered view of communication, writing, and other forms of expression in the region. Puckett (1992) proposes that the communicative ability of women in Appalachia is often seen as a "God-given" talent, one that is not valued or needed in the make-up of Appalachian men (p. 5). This gendered view of literacy obviously affects Appalachian children while they attend school and continues to follow them into adulthood in the jobs they enter and the families they create (p. 10). The author additionally suggests that these disparities in literacy can potentially affect communication between outside groups and those brought up in Appalachian culture (p. 6). This research will relate somewhat to future hypotheses in this paper concerning interactions among Appalachian migrants and those they encounter upon moving to a new area.

Occupational and Economic Disadvantage of Appalachian Females

In 1988, Tickamyer and Tickamyer noted the persistent poverty and disadvantage that has plagued the Appalachian region throughout the decades, although various interventions and programs from the state and federal level have attempted to reduce this unfortunate characteristic. The two authors also go on to cite evidence that Appalachian women are far more likely than Appalachian men to become poor, remain poor, consistently fall in and out of poverty, and to pass their poverty on to their children. Primarily, female disadvantage in the wage labor force, their predominance in unpaid labor, and state policies toward women's work has maintained this disproportionate disadvantage for women (p. 876). Additionally, sex segregation into low-wage secondary jobs and deskilling of traditional female jobs such as clerical work continue the cycle of

poverty into recent decades. As if working outside the home was not a great enough burden on women, females must also balance work at home. Some women carry the sole responsibility of caring for children and maintaining their household, even if a spouse is present who could contribute to domestic work. Tickameyer and Tickamyer also point out the state policies provide their own way of segregating women in the economic sphere. Family and welfare assistance programs patronize the work of women whether in the household or in the actual labor force. Government assistance has primarily been portrayed as a privilege instead of a right, and the stigma that accompanies welfare often creates a negative stereotype for the women who receive it. This unconstructive view of mothers on welfare is far more damning than the unemployment and Social Security benefits that men primarily receive (p. 877).

Continuing with Tickamyer and Tickamyer's (1988) research, they found that Appalachian families are disproportionately poverty-stricken as opposed to other regions in the U.S. Female-headed households with children are the most represented group in this disadvantaged demographic. In fact, at the time of their study families with a single mother as the lone provider made up 52 percent of the total population of families living in poverty in the central Appalachian region, a region specific to this study (p. 880). These authors point out, "It is not that the factors which create male poverty do not apply to women, but rather that women bear additional burdens which increase their risk." Gendered work opportunities, such as the biased role of men in the coal mining industry, continue to separate women from higher earning occupations (p. 888).

Appalachian research presented by Sally Maggard in 1999 found that often the work of Appalachian women produces very little to no financial capital, but nonetheless

their role is vital to the upkeep of their household (i.e., caring for children, cooking meals, cleaning the house, washing clothes, etc.) (p. 24). Although Appalachian women are often limited in their means of acquiring the proper agency to independently provide for themselves, Appalachian females in the workplace often find their occupation as a means of escape from their everyday lives (p. 21). Additionally, in attempts to further their occupational status, Appalachian women will often take on the role of student while still having to juggle their role of full-time workers and full-time mothers/wives/meal-preparers/laundry attendants/custodians/caregivers…When economic strain is placed on Appalachian families, it is usually the woman of the house who is obligated to put her educational or further occupational accomplishments on hold to contribute to the overall family livelihood. Maggard suggests that gender roles and biases play a major part in the way women are able to gain education, job skills, and workplace knowledge. The traditional functions of gender in Appalachia are attributed to women remaining servants of household and familial work without much opportunity for occupational expansion (p. 22-24).

Knowing that Appalachian culture heavily relies on traditional gender roles to delineate labor activities, Ann M. Oberhauser (1995a) examined the home-based work Appalachian women often engage in to supplement their household income (p. 51). Oberhauser contends that classic examinations of economic structures have ignored the true importance of female home work and unpaid labor (p. 52). She also touches on the fact that traditional gender roles in Appalachia prevent women from seeking education, vocational training, and well-paying jobs. Because of their traditional economic responsibilities, female Appalachians are also less likely to work away from their homes

(p. 54). Decreases in mining and other resource extractive occupations for men often lead to women taking on the responsibility of working from their home to support their family (p. 53). Many women interviewed in Oberhauser's study admit that their families could "get by" on one income (the husband's), but without the additional money brought in by Appalachian females, simple necessities like gas for traveling and shoes for their children's new school year would be unaffordable (p. 66). Although various forms of home work provide much needed extra income for Appalachian families, traditional gender norms often lead husbands to resent their wives. Even negative stigmatization from the larger community against Appalachian women is perpetrated when women provide monetary income for their families (p. 65). Oberhauser also states that because female Appalachian household jobs take place in the home and involve conventional "female" skills, many people in Appalachian culture do not recognize this form of labor as actual work. Instead, the decorative crafts, clothing, food products, and various other types of home-based goods produced by Appalachian women are merely seen as an addition to the work they already perform in the household (p. 66).

In another article related to the work of women in Appalachia, Oberhauser (1995b) again points out the region is certainly dependent on female work, yet such work is readily disparaged by the wider community. She contends that women not only maintain the difficult task of keeping their households in working order, but they are also responsible for reproducing and raising an Appalachian labor force to work in the coal mines, lumber yards, and various other agricultural employment fields. Oberhauser claims that Appalachian women provide a free service to coal companies by giving them healthy, able workers to extract their coal. Females not only are denied help from their

husbands in raising their families and maintaining their homes, but coal companies are also largely negligent in providing any assistance to the families they employ (p. 225).

Continuing, Oberhauser (1995b) claims that, “the almost total exclusion of women from formal sector work and their confinement to domestic labor,” is a causal reason for Appalachian women’s enduring poor socioeconomic status. She points out that Appalachian women from West Virginia were basically forbidden from entering coal mining and lumber mill jobs, but are disproportionately employed in low-paying positions and over represented among the region’s poor (p. 226). Quite the opposite of traditionally male-characterized jobs, the occupations that Appalachian women can obtain are often described as unskilled, part-time, and low-paid (p. 227). Oberhauser cites that in 1993 the primarily male-dominated mining sector produced wages of $17.58 an hour while the very female retail sector only paid $6.35 an hour. Appalachian women in West Virginia are also more likely than females in the overall American population to be hired in low-paying occupations, to report low participation in the labor force altogether, and to have very high rate of unemployment (p. 229). Appalachian females who do try to enter the labor force are at a disadvantage simply because usually they have only cared for their families and homes and have not developed marketable job skills. The obstacles of finding affordable childcare, conforming to traditional values, obtaining minimal education, and various other stumbling blocks often prevent women in Appalachia from finding employment and rising up out of poverty (p. 235-238).

Census data from years 1990 to 2000 also seem to indicate the lower social and economic standing of women in the Appalachian region. In their 2005 study, Latimer and Oberhauser found that although economic activity is increasing among women in

Appalachia, the socioeconomic rift between males and females in the area has changed very little, if at all (p. 270). Compared with white men, females (along with people of color) are at a much greater risk for unemployment and underemployment in the rural workforce. Notably, the rugged, harsh, and isolated characterization of the Appalachian region makes it difficult for citizens, women even more so, to find employment outside the area (p. 273). As suggested previously, industries that Appalachia has long depended on (coal mining, timber harvesting, mineral excavation, etc.) have been exclusively run and owned by white males. Where service sector jobs have been introduced into the area, women have been largely employed, but this is usually because employers find they can exploit women for cheap labor (p. 274). Additionally, while the status of being married is a statistically positive change for men, married women often do not work in lieu of familial duties, and if they do work their hours are dictated by their roles as mothers and wives and limited by their minimal job skills (p. 276). Scholars note that women are more likely to work part-time and be paid far less than their male counterparts (p. 278). This trend extends to the women of Appalachia. In addition, the more rural an Appalachian state is, the greater odds traditional gender roles, and the results of those roles, will be compounded in their society (p. 279). Sadly, while women are more likely to bear the burden of being the leader of a single-parent home, their yearly income is likely to be around $10,000 less than their male equivalents (p. 282-283).

Other researchers have also found a connection between traditional values, marriage, and work in rural settings. Isserman and Rephann (1993) discovered that the employment of one spouse outside the home usually results in increased work hours in the home by the spouse left behind, which for Appalachians usually means the wife.

Having young children in the household also indicates that a mother's work will be largely confined to the home. Although wages may go up in a given area, this is usually only good news for the man of the house, leading to higher male employment while leaving women to care for housework. Only when husbands become unemployed are females expected to contribute to the family income by venturing into the outside labor market (p. 543). Additionally, changes in work hours or military assignments for males usually call for the female of the family to comply and make ready the family for significant male-driven work changes. The authors also point out, as previously noted, that the staple labor markets in Appalachia (coal, forestry, agriculture, etc.) are dominated by males, thus producing few active women in these primary sectors. Additionally, men are more likely than their female equivalents to be employed in the high-wage markets in Appalachia, whereas women are over-employed in low-wage workplaces (p. 544). Scholars note that high-wage employment is vastly associated with union activity, therefore putting women at a disadvantage for this labor asset. Isserman and Rephann also point out that women, when they do look for employment in Appalachia, are more likely to seek jobs that are closer to the home and more conducive to the occurrences of family life since their traditional gender roles define their primary duties in the household (p. 545). As previously mentioned, the authors find that a single parent female household will usually denote the female in question participating in the labor market. Where there are "easy entry" occupations, females disproportionately make up this sector, while men dominate the skilled and resource extractive workforce. Additionally, women are less likely to continue their education in Appalachia compared with men (p. 560).

Gendered Explanations for Job Relocation

Interesting literature also exists concerning gender views and migration for job opportunities. Shauman (2010) discovered that despite region, the "man of the house" largely determines long-distance moves for employment. Even when the female occupational prestige and contribution to family income is considered, these factors do not extensively change the outcome of occupational family migration (p. 375). One might think that despite gender, if the opportunity arises for either spouse to move the family for greater economic gain that spouse would have the upper hand. However, Shauman found that even when wives make more money than their husbands and are the main breadwinners for the family, decisions to move the family for job-driven reasons are primarily left up to the husband (p. 376). Often, the male career is viewed as the principal occupation even when the wife works as well (p. 378). Only when wives are active in a full-time, highly attached job does the likelihood of migration decrease (p. 383-385). However, as it was noted earlier, females (especially in Appalachia) are not usually employed in full-time job sectors with strong attachment to their workplace, so this decrease in migration would not occur very often. Interestingly, men with a baccalaureate or graduate school education largely increase the odds of job migration, but women with a college education highly decrease the odds of an occupational move (p. 383). In this vein, Shauman found that as occupational advantage skills increase (i.e., education, job skills, experience, etc.), they are positively linked to moving when found in men but a negative influence on migration when found in women. Also, families are more likely to move when female employment in the starting environment translates into similar occupations in other job markets (p. 385). This finding is somewhat similar to the notion

mentioned above concerning females being highly employed in “easy entry” occupations. Significantly, when men and women’s occupational status are on an even keel, the change for job migration is largely in the favor of male preference (p. 389). The results of Shauman’s article were part of a study covering the entire nation in an investigation of gendered occupational migration patterns. It can most likely be assumed that in a region where traditional gender roles are the norm (Appalachia) these effects may certainly be magnified.

From the previous literature noted, it seems that a strong depiction of gender inequality exists in the Appalachian region. This inequality is apparent in the household, the workplace, and in Appalachian society. Knowing this obvious gender disparity exists in the region it would be very little surprise if these cultural gender norms affect Appalachian migrants’ culmination of job skills, acquired ideals of tolerance, and positive interactions with others upon moving to a new region. Continuing, I will look at each of these issues and how they are divided (if at all) among the gender lines of a sample of Appalachian migrants.

Hypotheses

Before moving into the research methods portion of my investigation, I will first propose the following three hypotheses:

1. Female respondents will have fewer odds than male respondents of learning job related skills in their new location.
2. Female respondents will have greater odds of adopting tolerance-based ideas when migrating to a new area than male respondents.

3. Respondents who are female will have greater odds of reporting positive interactions with new people upon relocating to a different region than male respondents.

As observed in the literature earlier, the dichotomous division of labor that occurs between males and females in Appalachian society is extremely pervasive. Therefore, it would only seem plausible to assume that women would generally acquire fewer job skills when moving to a new place. If the traditional gender roles of Appalachian culture followed these respondents to their new location, women would remain in the home without need to learn new skills while men venture out into the job market to provide for their families.

My next two hypotheses hinge on the principle of empathy and the aforementioned theories of intersectionality and the matrix of domination. From devalued domestic work to lack of educational opportunities; from jealous husbands to only being able to obtain low-paying, peripheral jobs; from being labeled a "welfare mom" to being viewed with suspicion from one's community for not participating in gender-accurate roles, the women of Appalachia are *blatantly* discriminated against within their own culture. She is denied proper agency for independence merely because she is female. The work she can do is degraded and overlooked by men and other women in Appalachian society. Any hope of breaking out of the bondage that is Appalachian culture is dashed by the reality that she has little if any education or job skills and the likely burden of taking care of several children. The discrimination that befalls the women of Appalachia is not only social in nature it is also systematic, blocking women from specific job opportunities, training, and education. Because of the secondary status afforded to

Appalachian women it only seems logical that they would understand and empathize with the plight of other subjugated minorities, thus increasing their likelihood of tolerance toward other cultures and groups in a new, less homogenous environment. Additionally, if women are better able to empathize with others in their new setting, then their interactions with these people might be more characteristically positive than male Appalachians who have faced a small amount of adversity in their lives before moving away from the mountains.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH METHODS

This section will first take a closer look at the database analyzed in this study. A discussion of the initial data gatherer, the method of collecting the data, the population for this study, and the researcher who coded the raw survey into a workable database will first be given. Following this, a table including various demographic characteristics of the participants involved will be provided. Along with a more in depth assessment of the dependent variables used in this research, the core independent variable, as well as the independent control variables will be examined. A descriptive statistics table will additionally be provided for the dependent and independent variables in this research, and finally a portion concerning the method of analysis used for the study will be presented.

The Data

For this project, a data set was utilized that captured the various demographics, opinions, and views of Appalachian migrants. Specifically, most of the respondents moved from the Appalachian region of Kentucky with a few respondents reporting Appalachian Virginia and West Virginia as their initial home. Peggy Davis, professor of sociology at Pikeville College in Pike County, Kentucky (an area located in Appalachia), was the primary investigator in this research. Beginning in the middle part of the 1970s, this data continued to be collected until the early 1990s. Dr. Davis then gave her data to Dr. Phyllis Puffer, professor of sociology at Big Sandy Community and Technical

College, also in Pike County, Kentucky. Dr. Puffer coded the data and then made her database available to Dr. Douglas Smith, Department Head of Sociology at Western Kentucky University. In turn, Dr. Smith allowed me to make use of this resource for the present study.

In her initial data collection, Dr. Davis asked her students to seek out neighbors, relatives, friends, and acquaintances they knew that had at one time moved from the Appalachian region to another location but later returned to the area. Thus, the population of respondents used in Dr. Davis' study comprised a convenience sample. Once potential respondents were located, students administered an open-ended survey containing a series of thirty-seven questions concerning the respondent's personal traits, their time in Appalachia, and experiences in the location to which they migrated. A total of 946 observances were made in the original study and 226 variables were created. From the preliminary interviews, Dr. Puffer broke down many open-ended answers into smaller, more concise categories of information.

Table 1 displays various demographic characteristics of the respondents in this survey. Particularly, these identifiers breakdown by percentage the respondents' gender, age upon taking the survey, total education, if the respondent was employed in their new location, the region the respondent moved to, if the respondent was in the military, and the year respondents initially moved away from Appalachia. Standard demographic information requesting traits such as the respondent's race, religion, and income were not part of the initial survey instrument and are therefore not used in the table below. Most of the descriptive indicators in Table 1 are related to the independent variables that will be discussed later in this section.

Table 1. Demographics

	N = 964
Gender	
Male	50.48%
Female	49.52%
Age	
19-30	8.25%
31-40	18.50%
41-50	37.00%
51-60	24.52%
61-70	9.30%
Over 70	2.43%
Total Education	
Less than High School	30.85%
High School	43.04%
Some College	13.92%
Bachelors	7.77%
Post Bachelors	4.42%
Employed in new region	
Yes	22.12%
No	77.88%
Region moved to	
North	65.18%
South	19.70%
West	3.14%
Military	11.71%
In the Military?	
Yes	19.34%
No	80.66%
Year left Appalachia	
1930-1949	5.19%
1950-1959	24.87%
1960-1969	44.55%
1970-1979	15.03%
1980 and above	10.37%

Dependent Variables

For the purposes of this paper, I employed several of Dr. Puffer's initial variables in the survey and through recoding, reduced them into even more specific variables than Dr. Puffer first structured them as. Considering the dependent variables chosen in this investigation, this deductive method of making a broad, wide-ranging set of responses into a more specifically themed variable was largely utilized. In the original survey, an open-ended question was asked inquiring of the respondent, "Did you learn any new ideas, behaviors, things while you were away?" From this broad question, Dr. Puffer compiled two variables (among several others) that comprised positive/neutral learning experiences (644 observations). There were 54 different positive/neutral responses and 36 response categories for the negative learning experiences variable. From the original positive/neutral learning experiences category, I created three new binary categorical dependent variables that asked (with a response of yes or no) if the respondent had a specific learning experience while in their new area. The first new variable pertained to job skills respondents obtained in their new locale and contained specific responses such as establishing better interpersonal relations, learning to work hard, and becoming a better listener. The second variable regarded tolerance-based beliefs migrants learned while in their new location. Specific responses embodied in this variable included knowledge about women's rights, greater tolerance for other races and cultures, and accepting "outsiders" among other answers included. Finally, the last new variable created dealt with positive interactions Appalachian migrants had with the people they encountered in their new location. Some responses in this category pertained to learning

the language and humor of locals, making friends, and believing that their new neighbors were “friendlier” compared their previous acquaintances in Appalachia.

Independent Variables

Gender was chosen as the core independent variable for this paper. It is a nominal variable that was part of the original survey instrument created by Dr. Davis. Although when considering data analysis gender is typically coded as male having the value of a one and females that of a zero, for my purposes I reversed that order because my study focuses on the gendered effects, if any, that may appear in the dependent variables. The literature cited earlier related to the oppressed nature of women in Appalachia, and for the theme of this research I felt it necessary to highlight outcomes specifically associated with women in Appalachia.

Several control variables were also utilized in this project. Age of the respondent, as well as total years of education served as two controls variables (both interval/ratio level variables). The original age variable was squared to reduce the likelihood of a curvilinear relationship. A total education variable was created by combining two originally separate variables that measured education accumulated in Appalachia and in the respondent’s new location. Whether or not the respondent reported having a job in their new location was also made a control variable. This variable resulted in a binary categorical variable after recoding Dr. Puffer’s original employment question.

The region where the respondent migrated to was also utilized as a control variable (nominal level of measurement) for this study. Original responses in the primary investigator’s variable concerning the destination of the respondent were recoded into categories representing locations in the North, South, West, and Military. Being involved

in the military influenced many respondents' choice and ability to leave Appalachia. Several of these military respondents reported moving to numerous different places. Many scholars have cited the significance of the military as a culture and society all its own (see Hall 2011a and 2011b; Greene, Buckman, Dandeker, and Greenberg 2010; and Keats 2010). Consequently, I chose to make the military a region unto itself, instead of grouping it in with another region or leaving these respondents out of the study altogether. To add the region variable to my logistic regression equation, I created four dummy variables for each region response. When writing the syntax for the regression command, I chose to leave out the southern region as a comparison to the rest of the areas, as the South would likely be similar to Appalachia more so than the other regions. Leaving the North, West, and Military regions in the logistic regression analysis would more than likely shown greater changes in their association to the dependent variable than would the southern region.

Another variable I included as a control gauges whether or not the respondent said they were able to "fit in" in their new location. This binary categorical variable was produced from Dr. Puffer's original variable that contained several different responses. For my needs I simply recoded these answers down to yes or no in response to the question, "Did you have any trouble fitting in there?" It is my assumption that despite gender, those respondents reporting that they did not fit in might characterize their time in their new region as somewhat negative thereby affecting their learning experiences as well.

Finally, an interval/ratio level variable associated with the year the respondents left their Appalachian homes for a new location was used as a control variable. Knowing

that notions concerning gender roles change from decade to decade, I felt it necessary to take into consideration the period respondents moved away from Appalachia to see if it would yield any influence over a respondent's ability to obtain job skills, adopt views of tolerance, or interact positively with peers. Depending on the year the respondent left, standards about gender at the time could produce limitations on job prospects, social affiliations, child-rearing practices, and various other aspects of a respondent's life.

Provided below is a descriptive statistics table referencing independent and dependent variables used in this study. Correlation matrices (Tables 3 and 4) containing all of the dependent and independent variables can be found in the Appendix A.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	St. Dev	Min.	Max.
Dependent Variables				
Job Skills	0.031	0.459	0	1
Tolerance	0.300	0.458	0	1
Positive Interactions	0.467	0.499	0	1
Independent Variables				
Gender	0.505	0.500	0	1
Age (squared)	2356.075	1133.345	361	7569
Total Education	11.735	2.908	2	22
Employment Status	0.779	0.415	0	1
Region	0.617	1.004	0	3
"Fit in"	0.895	0.307	0	1
Year (last two digits of year)	64.538	10.309	30	95

Method of Analysis

Because the dependent variables used for this study were binary categorical, logistic regression was utilized for this investigation. Using the data analysis and statistical software program Stata, I created three separate tables containing two models each. The first model is used to convey the effects of gender on the dependent variables, followed by a second model containing all control variables to determine if they exert any change on the possible effects of gender on the dependent variables. Each dependent variable exhibits a unique learning experience; therefore it was more appropriate to create three distinct tables to reflect any effects the independent variables may have on the dependent variables.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSES

The following three subsections analyze and elaborate upon the relationships between job skills, tolerance, positive interactions, and gender. Six previously introduced independent control variables will also be considered for any effect they produce in relation to the aforementioned dependent variables and core independent variables. One last portion will briefly examine the influence, if any, of a newly created independent variable on the three dependent variables.

Job Skills, Gender, and Control Variables

Displayed in Table 5 is the association between job skills learned by the respondent in their new area (dependent variable), gender (core independent variable), and the remaining independent control variables. From Model 1 in Table 5, it is clear that a significant relationship between gender (specifically for the female gender) and job skills obtained upon moving to a new location. The results from this first model suggest that female respondents have approximately 75 percent fewer odds (1 - .253 = .747) than their male counterparts of acquiring job-related skills in their new location. When adding the control variables to the equation in Model 2, the odds ratio (.272) goes up somewhat for female respondents. Controlling for all other variables, females still have about 73 percent fewer odds than male respondents of gaining job skills. Both of the associations between gender and job skills are significant at the .001 level, meaning that there would

only be a .1 percent chance of being wrong when rejecting the null hypothesis. This table does support my first hypothesis concerning female respondents and job skills. Additionally, literature cited earlier regarding traditional Appalachian values surrounding gender roles and participation in the workplace, carry over to my initial analysis.

Table 5. Logistic Regression: Job Skills, Gender, Control Variables

	Model 1	Model 2
(Job Skills)	O.R./(se)	O.R./(se)
Female	***0.253	***0.272
	(0.049)	(0.057)
Age (Squared)		1.000
		(0.000)
Total Education		1.031
		(0.036)
Employment (New Location)		1.660
		(0.473)
North		1.208
		0.317)
West		0.551
		0.340)
Military		0.869
		(0.310)
“Fit In?”		1.417
		(0.506)
Year (Moved from Appalachia)		*0.973
		(0.013)
Pseudo R-Square	0.075	0.101

Only one other independent variable was significant in association to learning job skills. Although only significant at the .05 level (5 percent likelihood of incorrectly

rejecting the null hypothesis), Model 2 shows that with every one year increase in the year that respondents reported moving to their new location those respondents also had 3 percent fewer odds of learning job skills than their Appalachian migrant predecessors. This statistic seems inconsistent. General knowledge concerning changing social mores about gender, sex, and the labor force would lead us to believe that with time Appalachian women (and women in general) would increasingly enter the workforce and therefore need a wider range of job skills. This would, presumptively, increase the number of respondents reporting having learned job skills with each increase in year of move from Appalachia, changing from primarily men learning job skills to more women and therefore a greater overall population acquiring job skills. However, perhaps this association is merely pointing out the incessant culture of conservative gender roles that dominate Appalachian society. Conceivably, the reality of moving away from such a traditional, gender-segregated region was not enough to cause change in sharply defined work expectations. Maybe men continued to adopt job skills, and Appalachian women remained in the household even in their new environment.

In addition to this possibility, the reasoning for a decrease in job skills through the years could even be attributed to changing motives for leaving Appalachian. Perhaps the migrants at first left for job opportunities, but later decided to leave for educational prospects or just to get away from the mountains. To try to examine likelihood of this premise, a simple cross tabulation was created to gauge the influence, if any, of the year respondents reported leaving Appalachia upon the reason respondents cited for moving to another location. A variable measuring why the respondent left Appalachia was recoded into only two responses from the original five responses that Dr. Puffer initially created.

These two remaining responses are moving for employment/education purposes and moving for “other” reasons. That cross tabulation is shown below in Table 6.

Table 6. Effect of Year Moved on Why Moved

	1930-1949	1950-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	1980 and above	Totals
Other	4 (8.16)	16 (6.81)	34 (8.10)	26 (18.84)	15 (15.46)	95 (10.12)
Employment/ Education	45 (91.84)	219 (93.19)	386 (91.90)	112 (81.16)	82 (84.54)	844 (89.88)
Totals	49 (100.00)	235 (100.00)	420 (100.00)	138 (100.00)	97 (100.00)	939 (100.00)

Pearson Chi2(4) = 19.52 Pr = .001

Although the percentage and number of people moving for employment or educational reasons does go down slightly after 1969, judging from the table a majority of respondents continued to primarily migrate for employment and educational reasons. This evidence appears to disprove the notion that Appalachian migrants moved throughout the years for more varied reasons than simply job purposes. Although this argument did not seem to explain the relationship between the year moved and job skills, the very small odds ratio percentage and the low confidence interval, along with the non-representative sample population of this study should be considered when exploring this relationship further.

Tolerance, Gender, and Control Variables

Table 5 displays the association between gender and tolerance in the first model. The influence of independent control variables on tolerance is seen in the second model. Again we see a strong significant relationship between gender and the dependent variable, this time being characteristics concerning tolerance. Female respondents in

Table 7, Model 1 have 115 percent greater odds than males of learning tolerance-based ideas and notions. The relationship is significant at the .001 level.

Table 7. Logistic Regression: Tolerance, Gender, and Control Variables

	Model 1	Model 2
(Tolerance)	O.R./(se)	O.R./(se)
Female	***2.154	***2.483
	(0.395)	(0.508)
Age (Squared)		1.000
		(0.000)
Total Education		0.981
		(0.034)
Employment (New Location)		1.044
		(0.235)
North		*0.567
		(0.136)
West		1.386
		(0.695)
Military		1.354
		(0.432)
“Fit In?”		0.762
		(0.223)
Year (Moved from Appalachia)		0.987
		(0.013)
Pseudo R-Square	0.024	0.044

Continuing to Model 2 containing all control variables, we see that gender and tolerance maintain their association. In fact, when controlling for all of the other independent variables the odds of female respondents obtaining tolerance-based ideas increases from 115 percent to 148 percent greater odds compared with male respondents. Again, this association is significant at the .001 level. Another association also exists

between respondents moving to a northern area and tolerance. Interestingly, Appalachians who migrated to the North have around 43 percent less odds compared with people who migrated to the south of developing tolerance beliefs, net of the remaining independent variables. This relationship is only significant at the .05 level.

Although, the relationship in Table 7 concerning females having greater odds than males of gaining notions tolerance seems to make relative sense, the other relationship between people who move to the North and tolerance is quite puzzling. One might assume that a group of people (in this case women) often characterized as the victims of discrimination and inequality might empathize with the plight of other negatively stigmatized groups (as suggested by the Matrix of Domination), therefore adopting a more tolerant view of outsiders. However, as for northern migrants being less open to these ideals, this association is rather baffling since one often thinks of northern regions as more heterogeneous, diverse, and less isolative, therefore adapting its inhabitants to a more accepting, tolerant view of various groups of people. One possible explanation for this, although it cannot be confirmed, may concern the shock many Appalachians experience upon moving to such a drastically different region. Some migrants may have secluded themselves away from various other groups, and if enough immigrants from their own region were present in their new location, Appalachians could have formed their own cohesive, close-knit community, not subject to the beliefs of outside groups.

James Branscome in his work *Appalachian Migrants and the Need for a National Policy Change* (as cited in Ergood and Kuhre, 1976, p. 70-73) notes several negative aspects in the lives of Appalachian migrants upon moving to northern, metropolitan areas. Lack of assimilation in urban regions and ignorance upon the part of the migrants'

new peers were often well documented occurrences in the phenomenon of Appalachian migration. Considering Appalachian migrants who moved from the region after World War II to the early 1970s, Branscome stated that many Appalachian Migrants were "disillusioned and frustrated" upon settling in northern areas such as Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Chicago. Although some migrants eventually ascribed to the culture and identity of their new urban setting, Branscome points out that many Appalachian migrants failed to assimilate to city life and ended up living in ghettos after moving away from the mountains (p. 70). Not only did Appalachian migrants often reject urban cultural norms, but also many people they encountered upon moving ignorantly believed stereotypes and long held biases against Appalachians. Even urban schoolteachers described their Appalachian migrant students as lazy and malicious in comparison to their other students. Branscome even described the negative reaction of a federal incentive program recruiter to Appalachian migrants in the city, who reported not wanting to work with Appalachian people because they were "scared and prejudiced" (p. 72-73). Knowing that Appalachian migrants often failed to assimilate and were viewed through a prejudiced eye by many of their new neighbors in northern, metropolitan settings this may provide some small insight as to why Appalachians who moved to the North, in this present study, were less likely to learn ideas of tolerance.

In addition to Branscome's study concerning negative urban reactions to Appalachian migrants, James M. Glaser and Martin Gilens (1997) provide interesting insights into interregional migration and racial attitudes among southern and northern migrants. Although their first examinations of southern migrants traveling to the North revealed that this population became more liberal in their racial attitudes upon moving,

Glaser and Gilens also point out that their study could not control for specific racial attitudes that may vary in the cities, towns, and neighborhoods located within the overall regions observed in their research (p. 78-79). Therefore it could be possible that the migrants in this present study may have heavily migrated to an area where positive racial attitudes and tolerance in general were less likely the norm, thereby learning fewer tolerance based beliefs compared with Appalachian migrants that moved elsewhere. Additionally, Glaser and Gilens reference "group conflict theory" and its proposal that racial perceptions can change based on clashes for limited resources between different racial groups. For example, the authors note that where there are large populations of African Americans (like in many metropolitan areas [p. 75-76]) white populations in that area maybe more hostile in their opinions of blacks because of the resource competition they pose and the political power they can yield (p. 72-73). Following the reasoning of group conflict theory, one might assume that Appalachian migrants moving to northern areas could possibly learn less about tolerance as a result of a possible struggle for limited resources against other races and ethnic groups.

Positive Interactions, Gender, and Control Variables

Finally, Table 8 addresses the dependent variable concerning positive interactions migrants had with their neighbors in their new location. This table shows the association between this dependent variable and the six independent variables. In my third hypothesis I proposed that females would have greater odds than their male counterparts of experiencing positive interactions with their new peers. Judging from the results of Model 1 in the eighth table my hypothesis is supported. Observing the outcome of Model 1, Females have 114 percent greater odds than male respondents of reporting positive

interactions with people in their new environment. This association between positive interaction and gender is significant at the .001 level.

Table 8. Logistic Regression: Positive Interactions, Gender, Control Variables

	Model 1	Model 2
(Positive Interactions)	O.R./(se)	O.R./(se)
Female	***2.142	***2.327
	(0.354)	(0.422)
Age (Squared)		1.000
		(0.000)
Total Education		0.986
		(0.031)
Employment (New Location)		1.206
		(0.255)
North		0.841
		(0.187)
West		1.277
		(0.616)
Military		0.880
		(0.271)
“Fit In?”		0.803
		(0.222)
Year (Moved from Appalachia)		1.007
		(0.012)
Pseudo R-Square	0.026	0.030

Model 2 also shows a significant relationship between gender and positive interaction, even when controlling for all other independent variables. The odds of female respondents having positive interactions with peers in their new location actually increases from Model 2 to Model 1. Migrant females have 133 percent greater odds than male migrants of reporting learning experiences associated with positive interactions with

others, net of the remaining independent variables. Again, this relationship is significant at the .001 level, with no other independent variables showing significant associations with the dependent variable.

Insignificant Region/Education Variable

In an effort to more closely examine the role of stratification among Appalachians who moved to the North, a variable was created and analyzed which combined the variables of “North” and “total education.” This variable took into consideration the influence, if any, moving to the North and having certain levels of education would have on gaining job skills, learning ideas of tolerance, and reporting positive interactions with peers. When added to the three logistic equations studied for this research, the new region and education specific variable did not produce a significant relationship with any of the dependent variables. Therefore, there were no significant interactions between region and education.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Although evidence in this study acknowledges the hardships of all Appalachian people through the ages, a clear picture of inequality among Appalachian women has been undoubtedly defined. For many decades the women of Appalachia and their contributions to society have been marginalized, ignored, and abused (Smith, 1999; Cable, 1992; and Brooks, 1999). Recent literature (Latimer and Oberhauser 2005) maintains this is still largely true. From analysis of the data used in this study, it seems that perhaps some link can be assumed between the patriarchal society of Appalachia and the learning experiences observed by the respondents of this research. Returning to one of the first inquiries of this study I asked if moving to a new location would have any impact on the lives of Appalachian females. From examining the data it appears that although some aspects did change (increased tolerance) in the lives of Appalachians, others stayed the same (lack of job skills).

Seeming to mirror the literature provided concerning female economic and occupational disadvantage in Appalachia, a strong relationship was shown between gender and job skills in Table 5. This outcome argued that female respondents had fewer odds than male respondents of obtaining knowledge useful in the workplace upon migrating to a new area. This relationship was maintained even when adding control variables such as age, years of education, being employed, the region the respondent

moved to, if the respondent stated that they “fit in” in their new home, and the year they left Appalachia.

Another significant relationship was found between gender and learning tolerance beliefs. Supporting my second hypothesis, female migrants had greater odds than did their male equivalents of adopting tolerance-based ideas. This hypothesis was sustained even with the presence of independent control variables. My third hypothesis, arguing that female respondents would have greater odds of reporting positive interactions with people in their new region, also was supported by the logistic data analysis. The presence of control variables did not disrupt this strong association. Although it cannot be confirmed, theoretical evidence regarding intersectionality and the matrix of domination may provide some answer why female Appalachians were more likely than men to learn ideas of tolerance and report getting along better with their neighbors.

Concerning potential drawbacks in this research, it should be stressed that the population used for this study is not a representative sample of the Appalachian region. Findings should therefore not be generalized to the broader Appalachian population. Additionally, a relatively small respondent population should also be taken into account when considering the validity of the regression results. The variable selection offered in the initially coded database did not include demographic identifiers such as race, income, religion, and political persuasion. To more sufficiently study the aspects of stratification as they apply to gender and Appalachian migrants these socioeconomic indicators would be useful to examine. Also, my reasoning for recoding the broad answers given for the dependent variables used in this study could more than likely be called into question.

Then again, the original coder of this data could also more than likely be questioned about why she created the initial learning categories that she did.

Noticeably, the data provided clear divisions between the male and female experiences of Appalachian migrants. Although some might argue that general inequality between men and women causes this disparity, literature cited earlier would lead us to believe a more severe pattern of gender exclusivity exists in the economy and culture of Appalachia. Concerning job skills, since this survey ended in the early nineties it would be encouraging to believe that employment and economic outcomes have become more balanced for Appalachian women. However, recent literature (Hall 2009) would suggest that the economic plight of women in Appalachia has changed very little. Although it is promising that Appalachian women appeared to learn more about tolerance and report more positive interactions with their new neighbors than migrant men, my conjecture about why that may be (because women are an ostracized group in Appalachia and can relate to other ostracized groups) is truly tragic. The evidence presented in this population seems to assert that traditions and norms and expectations cannot be eradicated simply by moving away from the place that perpetuates those ideas, at least not where job skills are concerned. Standards regarding women in the household certainly seemed to follow migrants from Appalachia all the way to their new home. Hope for a future egalitarian Appalachia may exist in the migrant women who reported learning about the tenants of tolerance, along with their positive “intra-active” ability to spread those beliefs.

In the future, research that is more representative of the entire Appalachian region would better serve to identify continuing stumbling blocks for gender equality in the area. A more advanced survey that can properly recognize gender stratification as well as the

various demographic characteristics of Appalachians would be a welcome improvement to this initial investigation. Once and if these gender disadvantages are known, proper action plans for how to achieve gender parity in Appalachia will more readily fall into place.

APPENDIX A

Correlation Matrices

Table 3. Correlation Matrix: Dependent Variables

	Job Skills	Tolerance	Positive Interactions
Job Skills	1		
Tolerance	-0.3039	1	
Positive Interactions	-0.3912	0.5285	1

Table 4. Correlation Matrix: Independent Variables

	Gender	Age	Education	Employment	Region	"Fit In"	Year Left
Gender	1						
Age	0.0824	1					
Education	0.0999	-0.2831	1				
Employment	0.3572	0.1515	-0.0874	1			
Region	0.17	-0.0485	0.1432	0.0118	1		
"Fit In"	0.0705	0.0719	0.0262	0.092	0.01	1	
Year Left	0.0525	-0.69	0.2967	-0.1031	0.0835	-0.092	1

REFERENCES

Alexander, J.T. (2006). "Defining the Diaspora: Appalachians in the Great Migration." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 37:2 219-247.

Blumberg, R. L. (1984). "A General Theory of Gender Stratification." *Sociological Theory* 2 23-101.

Brooks, S. (1999). "Coming Home: Finding My Appalachian Mothers through Emma Bell Miles." *NWSA Journal* 11:3 157-171.

Cable, S. (1992). "Women's Social Movement Involvement: The Role of Structural Availability in Recruitment and Participation Processes." *The Sociological Quarterly* 33:1 35-50.

Collins, B. H. (1990). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* London, UK: HaperCollinsAcademic.

Egan, R. (2000). "Gender Differences in Central Appalachian Students' Attitudes Toward Poverty, Welfare, and Work." Retrieved from *ERIC EBSCOhost.*

Ergood, B., and B.E. Kuhre (1976). *Appalachia Social Context Past and Present.* Dubuque, IA Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Glaser, J. M. and M. Gilens (1997). Interregional Migration and Political Resocialization: A study of racial attitudes under pressure. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61:1 72 86.

Green, T., J. Buckman, C. Dandeker, and N. Greenberg (2010). "The Impact of Culture Clash on Deployed Troops." *Military Medicine* 175:12 958-963

Hall, D.J. (2009). "The Impact of Human Capital-Based Education and Training Programs on an Economically Marginalized Rural County In Appalachia." Retrieved from *Proquest LLC, ERIC EBSCOhost.*

Hall, L.K. (2011a). "The Importance of Understanding Military Culture." *Social Work in Health Care* 50:1 4-18.

---------- **(**2011b). "The Military Culture, Language, and Lifestyle." *Families Under Fire: Systemic Therapy with Military Families*, 31-52. New York, NY US:

Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Isserman, A.M. and T.J. Rephann (1993). "Geographical and Gender Differences in Labor Force Paticpation: Is there an Appalachian Effect?" *Growth and Change* 24 539-578.

Keats, P.A. (2010). "Soldiers Working Internationally: Impacts of Masculinity, Military Culture, and Operational Stress on Cross-Cultural Adaptation." *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling* 32:4 290-303.

Latimer, M. and A.M. Oberhauser (2005). "Exploring Gender and Economic Development in Appalachia." *Journal of Appalachian Studies* 10:3 269-291.

Lykke, N. (2010). *Feminist Studies: A guide to Intersectional Thoery, Methodology and Writing.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Maggard, S.A. (1990). "Schooling, Work Experience, and Gender: The Social Reproduction of Poverty in Appalachia." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society March 25th, 1990. Retrieved from *ERIC, EBSCOhost.*

McCall, L. (2005). "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs* 30: 3 1771-1800.

Oberhauser, A. M. (1995a). "Gender and Household Economic Strategies in Rural Appalachia." *Gender, Place, and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 2:1 51-70.

-------- **(**1995b). "Towards a gendered Regional Geography: Women and Work in Rural Appalachia." *Growth and Change* 26:2 217-244.

Puckett, A. (1992). "'Let the Girls do the Spelling and Dan will do the Shooting:' Literacy, the Division of Labor, and Identity in Rural Appalachian Community." *Anthropological Quarterly* 65:3 137-147.

Rezek, J. (2010). "Gender Role Patterns: How They Factor Into Support for Young Mothers in Rural Appalachia." *Journal of Appalachian Studies*, 16:1/2 131-143. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Shauman, K.A. (2010). "Gender Asymmetry in Family Migration: Occupational Inequality or Interspousal Comparative Advantage?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72: 375-392.

Smith, B.E. (1999). "'Beyond the Montains:' The Paradox of Women's Place in Appalachian History." *National Women's Studies Association Journal* 1:3 1-17.

Stephens, C.C. (2005). “Culturally Relevant Health Care for Southern Appalachian Women." *Appalachian Cultural Competency: A Guide for Medical, Mental Health, and Social Service Professionals,* ed S.E. Keefe, 97-217. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Tickamyer, A.R. and C.H. Tickamyer (1988). “Gender and Poverty in Central Appalachia.” *Social Science Quarterly* 69:4 874-891.

Young, M. C. (2010). “Gender Differences in Precarious Work Settings.” *Relations Industielles / Industrial Relations* 65:1 74-9.