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CHAPTER I

AN ECOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION OF CONTEMPORARY SEA ISLAND SOCIETY

LOCATION OF THE ISLANDS

The five Sea Islands stretch along the Atlantic Sea Coast, south of the city of Charleston, South Carolina. The Ashley River Bridge completed in 1922 connects the nearest sea island, James, to the southern tip of the city of Charleston. James Island is about two miles from Charleston.

The Wappo (Stono) River separates James from Johns Island by way of the Maybank Highway; Johns is five miles from Charleston. The Wadmalaw Creek separates Johns from Wadmalaw Island. Wadmalaw's eastern body gulfs around the south easterly tip of Johns Island. On the north westerly side, the Wadmalaw Sound separates Wadmalaw and Yonges Islands. Yonges Island (also known as St. Pauls Island) is neighbored on its north westerly side by the communities of Hollywood, Ravenal and by Megget to the northeast. Many native islanders ignore the distinction and consider these communities as part of the large island.

Edisto the most distant island is forty-two miles from Charleston. The Edisto beach area located on the southern tip of the island sits in the Atlantic Ocean. Edisto is
the largest of the Sea Islands.

**POPULATION DISTRIBUTION**¹

A total of 44,340 people live on the five Sea Islands. Approximately 48% of this population is Black. Nearly 65% of the White Sea Islanders reside on James, the most densely populated island. James is the only island on which Whites are the clear cut majority. This case is increasingly reversed as distance from the mainland increases.

The detailed population description for each island is as follows:

James Island's total population is 24,197. There are 11,880 males and 12,317 female residents. Five thousand and twenty-eight of James Island's residents are Black. The median age of people on James Island is 23.9 years. Over 42% of the population is under eighteen years old and 4.4% sixty-five years old and over.

Seven thousand five hundred and thirty people live on Johns Island. Over four thousand of these residents are White. About 41% of this population is Black. The median age on the island is 20.7 years, 5.4% are 65 years and over. Children under eighteen years old are 45% of the total population.

Wadmalaw has 2,024 people. There are 963 males and 1,061 females. The median age is 19.6 years. Forty-seven point three percent are under eighteen years and 6.8% of the island's people are 65 years old and over. Over 90% of Wadmalaw's population is Black.

Yonges (St. Pauls) Island has 9,235 residents; 6,314 of this total are Black. The median age is 19.9 years. Forty-six point five per cent of the population is under eighteen years and 6.7% 65 years old and older.

Edisto has 1,374 residents. There are 672 males and 702 females. The median age is 19.7 years. Nine per cent of this community is 65 years and over, 46.1% are under eighteen years old. One thousand one hundred and fifteen of Edisto's population is Black.

BLACK SEA ISLAND FAMILIES

Black islanders generally live on the inner acreage of the islands. This pattern exists and has been maintained for a number of reasons: (a) a strong agricultural history in which farmers built homes on or close to their planting acreage, (b) long term economic deprivation where Blacks could not afford new homes which in part contributed to (c) the generational building habit of constructing newer dwellings either close to or as extensions of existing houses.

With the exception of (imported) Black city and military
families living in housing developments on James Island, many island families pre-date the civil war. Many of these families carry the surnames of the large plantations of that era. These native families barring extreme tragedy do not actively move to different sites on or between islands. It is common place to find families who have maintained their residence since and before the turn of the century. While many of the islanders born before 1900 have visited major cities (i.e., Charleston, New York, Washington, D.C., Savannah, etc.) fewer have visited all five of the Islands. Those that have, did so by car and report that these visits came after 1940. Before this period those who visited adjacent islands did so by walking and by muledrawn carts.

While Whites have been coming onto and suburbanizing the fringe areas of the Sea Islands, Black Islanders are leaving and dying out. It is extremely rare to find Black parents with children age eighteen and over who report all their children either at home or living on the Islands. The fact that the median age of the island population descends with distance from the mainland and where higher percentages of Black families reside supports this migrating trend. The component of change caused by birth versus death rates for the county between 1960-1970 shows a net migration of -6.3%. For Blacks this change rate was -19.7%. Furthermore, Wadmalaw in this period lost about
-13% of its residents.

SEA ISLAND RELIGION

The most dominant institution in Sea Island society is the church. There are numerous churches on each island. These churches are Protestant in denomination and are about equally divided among Methodist and Baptist congregations. These congregations may have as few as forty or as many as two hundred members. Each congregation supports the operational expenses and contributes to the maintenance of the church facility. Ordinarily this facility is a large one room, single floor, cinder block building. The size and renovation are generally determined by the financial resources of the congregation. In some cases, along with renovation the church has been enlarged by one or two rooms.

Until the late 1950's each congregation tried with all effort to have its own Pastor, but this became increasingly difficult, so today, even the larger membered congregations have reduced their Sunday services to a bi-monthly schedule. The Sunday gathering is really the time of the community's elders. The entire day revolves around church attendance and relaxing in the Spirit of the Lord. Sunday services generally start for the congregation at 11:00 A.M. and concludes near 2:30 P.M. Afterwards there may be elder meetings or evening prayer attended primarily by the senior congregation members. The nature of the Sea Island religions
services as depicted in the literature is still rather accurate and need not be entertained here, except to say that the general patternings of the services and demonstrations of faith via "shouting" has remained as a center of church services.

The Church Structure

The Pastor is the head of each church. There may or may not be a pastor "in training" to assist as needed. Under the Pastor is the Elder Council of Deacons. This body is comprised of the oldest male members of the congregations. The Deacons Council, through a committee structure, runs the affairs of the church. Next in the structure are the Elder Mothers, followed by the general congregations. Aside from their committee responsibilities, the Elder Deacons take part in Sunday services. An extremely learned body, the Elders are easily as able in the scriptures as the Pastors. Their learned abilities and oratorical skills are particularly evident during Funeral services. In these services, the Deacons take turns recalling through their eyes the life of the deceased person. Their eulogies delivered by these Soul stirring orators are the highlighted feature of the rites.

The Practice of the Sea Island Religion

The islander does not simply outgrow religion. On the
islands a man's worth is measured by his religious dedication. This is so much the case, that the question of out-growing religion, or active versus the inactive participation of the congregation is not a legitimate concern. The practice of weekday religion is more vigorous than the Sunday demonstrations of faith.

Here on the Islands, religion penetrates every aspect of life. It is rare to encounter islanders who are not learned in the scriptures. This includes islanders who because of personal conflicts with the church's institutionalized style, no longer attend Sunday services. The blunt of this disagreement is usually focused at the church's social inactivity; they say the church simply is not doing enough.

The Church's Doings

Before the coming of community action programs, helping neighbors in need was the exclusive role of the church. To some extent, the church is still the most active agent in this regard. Whose analysis shows that congregation members make up the policy making bodies of all the community action programs on the island. It appears, now that these program resources are available, the church has taken a more indirect role. Rather than continuing the tradition of neighbor helping neighbor, neighbors in need are now directed to available program resources. When the need is
outside the realm of the existing programs, the older traditional methods of helping are reenacted.

The Young Islander and the Church

Geme ta ole timb religion, geme ta ole timb religion, geme ta ole timb religion. It be good enoub fer ma mama, it be good enoub fer ma papa, it be good enoub fer me. It be good enoub fer me.

This ole song of religion dedication still has meaning and is still the path taken by younger islanders. But the path these days is not taken without hesitation. Younger islanders spend a great deal of time in discussion of the worths and limitations of the church. The focus of much of this discussion is on the dominance of Elders. The younger islanders feel that the Elders are maintaining the church in the ole manner which excludes their influence. Elders in turn suggest that the practice of religion is a long time faith, that the young ones are recent to their belief and have not paid the religious dues which warrants keeping company (having input into the church) with the ole time practitioners. In spite of the disagreements the young continue to participate in the church.

SEA ISLAND MAGIC MEDICINE:
A CONSEQUENCE OF NECESSITY

Sea Islanders have never had ready access to medical personnel. There are only two doctors on the islands. Both the doctors and a new health clinic system are recent to the
islands. In the absence of medical people, the islanders have historically maintained and relied on home remedies. Because home remedies were the only form of medicine available these practices have continued, particularly among the elder population who have been more deeply rooted in its use.

To the outsider these practices and medical beliefs may seem absurd. The practices however have gained the attention of trained medical persons who are on the island cataloging these remedies.

At the extreme or the most proficient practitioners of the home remedy art are called "Hand Workers." Perhaps the most widely known practitioner of this art was the late Dr. Buzzard of Beaufort County, South Carolina. People from all over the nation come to the islands in search of the Hand practitioners. They come for potions, cures, advice and to have old hands renewed.

A Christian people, these practitioners in no way uphold the sterotypical images commonly portrayed in the literature. These practitioners generally attribute their skills as holy gifts which through dedicated practice and study, their art has been refined to meet the needs of their patients.

Mentally these practitioners have stored extensive files of illness-cure remedies. These mental files are
usually a work accomplished over a seventy-year span. Discarding dysfunctional potions and retaining those which work, these practitioners claim their greatest skill is that of memory. An oral people, who rely heavily on the remembered word, practitioners claim that they are simply extraordinarily adept in this process. This ability enables them to recall those remedies which were of proven effectiveness in similar cases.

It is difficult to accurately gage how effective this practice has been. Nevertheless one measure comes through examining the health habits of islanders. First the islander would try the family remedy for an illness, if this does not work medical doctors are consulted, if the illness persists then the hands practitioners are sought. The continued existence of these practices on the islands suggests that these latter practices are effective.

Hand Practitioners - What They Can Do

Practitioners are regarded as having the ability to perform effectively in the following areas:

1. Heal the physically sick.
2. Bring and change the luck element.
3. Change the habits or doings of wayward people.
4. Unite man and woman in pleasant relationships.
5. Protect the body from harm.
EXAMPLES OF DAILY ROUTINES OF SEA ISLANDERS

Sister Carrie.--I can't help but turn around. Sister Carrie at 77 is up at 6:00 A.M. these days. During the school season all the children in the community stop at her gap to warm themselves by the fire and eat the pastries she prepares for them. A great grandmother, Sister Carrie has raised thirteen children. In reflecting on her fifty-one year marriage, she says "da women ta dae ain't wife lik en ma dae. Ca'n member but one dae I ain't had supper steamn hot an d table fer ma husbin." What Sister Carrie did not include was that during those years her day started at 4:30 A.M. By 5:30 A.M. breakfast had been prepared and she was on her way to the fields. She worked the field until 2:30 P.M. when she stopped and headed home to prepare the supper meal. After the evening meal and when the dishes had been cleaned Sister Carrie spent the remaining hours either sewing or shelling beans until the light disappeared. At which time, the family gathered for evening prayer as the final act of the day.

Decon Decon.--Decon Eugene at eighty-three years still breaks his ground with mule and plow. He begins his day at 5:30 A.M. and ends when there is just no more light to work by. The decon has raised eleven head of children, all of whom are away in New York. He and his wife live close to their land, only when tragedy becons are they away. In
telling why there are not more of his generation around now to keep company he says "en d last years I ca'n waak lik I en d past. Dey'll be many mo ob ma time round here da dae, butbiln d white man's bridges and railroad kill musa us out. Wen dem come from d railroad waak dey body wae dead. I tri ta tel dem ta lern to make lik waak, but dey mules n at age fifty dey waz tiad ole men. Oderwize dey'll be many mo ob ma people wete me tadae."

Reverend Gripe.—The right Reverend Gripe differentiated between human and inhuman labor. Born in 1893, this man refused to work for the large white farmers. He worked and maintained his own land, but when there was an extra penny in "fightin d white man field" he refused. Once he went to lime house store (Captain Limehouse, the head of a powerful family in the area) to buy steak meat. Captain Limehouse a noted nigger whipper asked "where a nigger git steak money?" The six foot three inch two hundred plus pound Reverend Gripe replied "by not waakin ya fields," at which Limehouse laughed and dismissed the Reverend as crazy. Taking insult the Reverend jumped in his new Nash automobile and went then and thereafter to the city for his steak meat.

RACE RELATIONS ON THE ISLANDS

Now with bridges and interconnecting paved roadways
the Sea Islands have been recognized as ideal for suburban living. Consequently in the past five years there has been an onslaught of Whites moving onto the Islands. Whites as a result of this migration are the majority population on Johns in addition to James Island. The coming of Whites to the Sea Island has not, as in earlier migration, been limited to the two islands close to Charleston City. The number of Whites on the three most distant islands has also steadily increased during the past decade. The areas surrounding central Charleston report a growth of 33.9% during this period. In 1960, 65% of Charleston's county's population lived outside the central city; by 1970 this percentage increased to 72.1.

Whites, the Islands new population, have generally concentrated their living to the waterfront acreage of the islands. As this acreage is diminished and the number of Whites increased, suburban developments are emerging on the inland acreage. So far this trend is particularly the case for James and Johns Islands.

The illustration of an incident in the life of Reverend Gripe is by no means isolated. There are Black families who have never conformed to the colonial status to which they have been assigned. Then there are islanders who follow and swallow wholeheartedly the deificatous trails and tales of the "bossman system."
Only twice since the turn of the century has there been a large scale threat of open conflict between the races. The earliest threat was in 1922 and was caused by the beating of a Black woman on the island by a White man. The island's men set out to retaliate. Whites were attacked and beaten in Charleston and atmosphere was tense throughout the county. Then in 1970 the city sanitation and hospital workers went on strike. As the months past without much movement toward settling the disagreements the Black now jobless community became increasingly tensed and similar repeats of attacks on Whites by Blacks were reported.

The relationship between the races has never been "peaches and cream." Because Whites maintain a tight hold on the economic patterns on the islands, islanders are to some degree reluctant to physically express their feelings. Shooting incidents between the races, while not common, can be anticipated from time to time. The older islanders who have slaved in the fields of the large farmers have not forgotten the degrading condition under which they were economically obligated to function for some thirty-five cents per day. Younger islanders, also well aware of this history, simply refuse to repeat the pattern. The extent to which they are successful in breaking down the colonial economic patterns on the island will determine the future
of Blacks on the Sea Islands.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SEA ISLANDERS BLACK WORK FORCE

The following 1970 census figures are for the rural non-farm population of Charleston county and as such can only serve as an indirect indicator of the characteristics of the Black Sea Island labor force. These figures will be followed for comparison with those generated by a more specific survey of the islanders sponsored by the United Methodist Church.

The total number of persons in the rural labor force is 12,485. This work force is comprised of 8,014 males and 4,606 females. Jobs in different areas of manufacturing engaged the highest number of workers (2,319). The wholesale-retail trades employed 2,271 workers. The personal service industry which includes private household workers was the next big employer (1,970). Five hundred and eleven workers were employed in the agricultural industry.

While the median annual income of rural families was $6,895, 28.4% of this population had incomes below the poverty line. The income deficit of this segment was $2,152. There were 2,390 families with these incomes under poverty level. Female head of households had a median income of $3,816. This 1,271 member female work force had
an unemployment rate of 3.1%, which compares to a 3.7% ratio for male workers. Females were the heads of 836 of the families with poverty level incomes.

On a county basis, the median annual income of Black workers was $4,635. Black female head of households earned a median income of $3,162. Six thousand nine hundred and forty-one or some 44.6% of the 15,576 Black families in the county had incomes below the poverty line. The median income of families below the poverty line was $2,193. Fifteen per cent of the total number of families were receiving public assistance.

The 1960 census reported 10% of the Sea Island families with incomes under $1,000; 65% of this work force earned less than $2,000. This United Methodist Church survey reports a 15% unemployment rate across the islands. Employment in "the area is of a seasonal nature and most people are out of active employment for a large part of the year."²

The discrepancies between these figures are apparent. First hand exposure to the islands would suggest the accuracy of the latter figures. However, the methodological limitations of the church survey effort makes the reported estimates suspect. For example, the researchers were on the islands only one week, during which time they concentrated

their time and energy in interviewing the leadership personnel of each island, and consequently relied quite heavily on the estimations they provided. The error possibilities which accompany this procedure as the basis for later projection statements are well noted.

HOUSING ON THE SEA ISLANDS

There are 11,557 housing units on the five Sea Islands. The median number of persons per unit is 4.01; 3,743 of these units are occupied by Black families. The median number of persons per Black occupied unit is 4.65.

The by island breakdown shows a total of 6,642 units on James Island. One thousand one hundred and twenty-eight of the total are units occupied by Black families. There are 4.63 Blacks and 3.64 Whites per units.

Johns Island has a total of 1,875 units, with 4.01 persons per unit. Blacks occupy 678 of these units and there are 4.58 Blacks per unit.

Wadmalaw Island has 477 units and 4.24 persons per unit. Three hundred and seventy-two of these units are Black occupied, with 4.62 persons per unit.

Yonges Island has 2,224 units and 4.15 persons per unit. Blacks occupy 1,326 of these units; there are 4.78 Blacks per unit.

There are 329 units on Edisto Island, and 4.18 persons per unit. The persons per unit average for Black household
is 4.67. Edisto has 239 Black occupied units.

Precise data on the secondary characteristics of Black Sea Island housing units were unavailable. The following figures are based on a total of 3,685 rural units and 613 rural farm units in Charleston County and can consequently serve only as a general indicator for the secondary characteristics of Black Sea Island households. Only 1,547 of the rural units have all plumbing facilities. One thousand three hundred and eighty-six of these units are renter occupied. The overwhelming majority (3,381) of the units have no inside water facilities. One thousand six hundred and forty-five of the units were constructed before 1939 and 1,384 between 1940 and 1949. One thousand three hundred and twenty-seven of the units are valued at less than $5,000. The median size of rural units is 4.05 rooms.

Of a total of 18,952 Black occupied units in the county, 8,142 units are owner occupied. Of the owner occupied units 2,988 were occupied in 1949 or earlier and 1,069 of the renters have a similar residency pattern. The median size of all Black occupied units is 4.7 rooms. The median size of owner occupied units is 5.7 and 4.0 for renter units. The median monthly rent paid is $41.00 for units without and $48.00 for units with all plumbing facilities.
Structure and Content of Household Units

The traditional family household is situated in a large gap. Three, five or more units may have been built in this gap. This would be the home of one family. These units may be either individual and/or units with multiple extensions. The general patterns of these units is circular to semi-circular. The units themselves are wood structures built in a block "A" fashion. This structure is pillowed off the ground some twenty-two inches. Those units built in the fifties to early sixties were but cinder block models of this basic structure. Out at an extreme point of the semi-circle sits a half blocked "A" structure, the "outhouse." More, inside plumbing units are being added on to houses, but the outhouse is commonly seen. Inside these older units some families have both gas and stove cooking options. Exclusive use of the pot belly stove may be the dominant habits in some sectors. Only use of gas stoves would be the more probable behavior of James Island residents. This is likely because wood is not as available. On James Island there is less wooded acreage, but newer and more expensive units. The floor space in many of these older and more commonly seen dwellings is some nine feet wide by thirty odd feet long. This space tends to be divided into living room, kitchen and one or two bedrooms. These units contain the minimum of old furniture and a heater.
There are also those units which are adequately furnished, and contain inside plumbing facilities. These homes tend to be new or recently improved. Built during the 1950's, more of the middle age islanders live in houses of this type.

Some sections contain new or recently built homes; these are more rarely seen and tend to be occupied by islanders in their late twenties and thirties who have been employed at an adequate wage over a period of years.

A SUMMATION STATEMENT

The roots of exploitation are deep on the Sea Islands. That information and those program services which would help ease the yokes of oppression are but slowly being metered into the community. In the mist of this oppression, the islanders continue to show spirited strength in maintaining traditional family patterns and the unique customs. They are not diving foolishly into imitation of the suburban elements to which they are gaining greater exposure. Certainly features of the suburban life style are and will continue to be adopted into native family patterns. But these elements will be added with modification. It is too early to speculate on the forms these modifications will take. However, it is rather certain that those elements of suburbanization which would drastically effect the traditional functioning and design of island families if, ventured into
at all, will, in coming, have to be made consistent with and have minimal impact on the family as it now exists.

No doubt, the continued existence of the Sea Islands as an exclusively Black community will be difficult to retain. The extent to which the Sea Islands retain their unique Black character will hinge on the economic resourcefulness of the younger islanders and on whether those who have left are willing to return and reclaim their Sea Island heritage.
CHAPTER II
OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

Discipline is one means the parent has of guiding the socialization of its young. Parental discipline behavior ranges from verbal persuasion to the use of force. Differences of mode, in technique, and attitude toward discipline have been noted across class and cultures. Perhaps no two parents discipline their children in exactly the same way. Likewise children react and are affected differently as the methods, beliefs, and situations differ. The behavioral scientist tries to determine and measure whether there is discernible patterning to the differences.

Discipline behavior is but part of the overall pattern of interactions occurring within the family environment. While it is difficult, study of the total environment in which discipline behavior occurs provides the more valid indication of the affects of particular features on discipline interactions.

Roy's investigation raises the question of whether differences in discipline behavior is more related to

environmental or to cognitive variables? The literature strongly suggests the cognitive relationship. Subsequently the impetus has been on study of the effects of permissive discipline on later cognitive growth, i.e., intelligence, educational attainment, language style, etc. In this preoccupation, the other side of the coin—the effects of the environment—have been relatively neglected.

Roy found that as the number of rooms in the household increases, parents reported less use of physical punishment. Likewise as the parents' perception of safety in the community increased physical punishment decreased. Positive relationships were reported for number of children in family, age of parent and child, and the use of physical punishment. Her comparison between sex and the use of discipline aggression showed that females maintained the more consistent pattern. The affective potential of environment was clearly shown.

This section can be concluded by returning to the Roy investigation. If the direction and concerns of the subsequent research is a measure, the implication of Roy's study has not been followed up. Her report stands as a warning that the cognition related superiority found for children reared in middle class situations, may be more a function of environment than of the language enrichment the parent offers. The lack of systematic knowledge in this area is multiplied
when the discipline practices of Black parents are considered.

Differences in cultural reference, experiences and economic disposition act as antecedents of parental discipline behavior. A fundamental concern of those engaged in comparative discipline research has been in controlling the differences in cultural reference and economic status among Black families. The inability to control these factors, particularly that of cultural history is a glaring limitation of much of the comparative discipline research.

For example the commonly reported positive relationship between class and use of physical discipline does not appear to be the pattern for Black parents. In contrast, the reported tendency is for Black parents to use physical discipline across class lines. Billingsley reiterates the conceptualization of a sliding class scale to account for the above tendency. He maintains that because Black parents tend to cluster at the bottom of class ranges, they retain more of the behaviors and attitudes of parents in the lower adjacent class category.


However, differences in the obstacles to social mobility encountered by Black and White parents may also underly the cross-class use of physical discipline by Black parents. Similarly the influence of an urban versus a rural cultural experience as an affective force on the discipline habits of Black parents must also be considered. Concurrently, what changes in the discipline habits of Black parents occur as a consequence of family migration from rural to urban environment?

Herskovits in explanation of the physical disciplining habits of Black parents offers a historical base for this behavior trait. He suggests that beating, yelling, shouting and whipping are forms of discipline used throughout West African societies. Furthermore, he proposes the retention of similar discipline practices among Blacks in the United States.

The problems of controlling the antecedent factors which influence discipline behavior is no doubt difficult. This difficulty is particularly highlighted among Black parents. Perhaps the single most difficult element to control is that of the cultural cohesiveness and life experience of Black parents. Nowhere in the United States is there more uniformity in life experience and cultural

---

cohesiveness than in Sea Island society.

The following quote by Crum rather clearly notes the Gullah people as a unique research population:

In a very real sense the history of these people furnishes a key to the whole race situation in America. In their isolation the Gullahs provide materials for an interesting social study. It is significant that nowhere on the continent can a purer African culture be found. Until recent years the whole area has been cut off from the rest of the world. The cultural and geographical isolation of these (blacks) offers an absolutely unique situation to the student interested in human relations.  

PRIOR GULLAH RESEARCH

The Gullah dialect and studies of folk beliefs are the features of Sea Island communities which have been most frequently researched. The earlier studies aimed at isolating the origin of Gullah identified the dialect as a corrupted form of old English learned from lowly European immigrants. On the other hand, Crum proposes that the extraordinary politeness and gentle manners which have

---


10 Crum, op. cit., p. 4.
become characteristic of Sea Islanders were a result of early exposure to "cultured" White plantation owners. The conflicting feature of these two notions is evident. Turner's research cleared up much of the confusion relative to the origin of Gullah.  

His report that the dialect is highly reflective of linguistic systems common to West Africa provides a geographical origin of Gullah Blacks. That the Gullah dialect has features which are identifiable as distinctly West African linguistic habits is consistent with the research which places West Africa as the origin of the Gullah Blacks. Donnan offers the following list as illustrative of the African origin of Sea Islanders:

- Gambia to Sierra Leone
- Liberia and the Ivory Coast
  (Rice and Grain Coasts)
- Guinea Coast (Gold Coast to Calabar)
- Angola and the Congo

Herskovits, Crum and others propose that the relatively recent arrival of West Africans to the Sea Islands and the isolation of these islands has been conducive to the retention of African cultural elements. Herskovits suggests that the last population of Africans coming directly to the Charleston Sea port was about 1850. Researchers are in agreement that nowhere in the United States

---

11 Lorenzo Turner, Africanism in the Gullah Dialect (Chicago, 1949).

are more distinctly West African patterns encountered as are found among Sea Island communities. It has also been suggested in the dialect research and folklore collections, that as distance from the mainland increases, more distinctly West African cultural traits are encountered. Similarly, older Sea Islanders tend to mirror West African cultural patterns to larger extents and in purer forms than younger islanders. These reports support the notion that the factors of isolation and of recent arrival have operated to enhance the protection and subsequent retention of Africanism among Gullah Blacks to an extent unique in the United States.

THE PROBLEM

The significance of Sea Islanders as a people who because of their unique situation have retained overt manifestations of their West African heritage is clearly noted in the literature. While he argues against the retention position in general, Frazier could not deny the exception of Sea Islanders. He writes:

During the process of adjusting themselves to American civilization, the majority of the Negroes have sloughed off completely the African heritage.\(^\text{13}\)

In view of Turner's work (1939) among Sea Islanders, Frazier modifies his position, "African patterns of thought and

\(^{13}\)Frazier, op. cit., pp. 3-21.
behavior could survive only where the Negroes were isolated and where there was sufficient common understanding among them to give significance to African survivals."\textsuperscript{14}

In contrast to Frazier's assertion of the complete destruction of the African family organization among American blacks. Dubois\textsuperscript{15} believed that careful research would reveal traces. While many aspects of the Sea Island experience have been studied, systematic investigations of the African family organization as proposed by Dubois has not been attempted among Sea Islanders. In this regard, Turner warns that Sea Islanders often exhibit African behavioral features only among the intimate circles of the family. However, if the essential role of the family in cultural transmission is understood, then systematic information on Sea Island child rearing may provide clues on the extent of the survival of African elements among Island families. Furthermore, such an investigation may provide a retrospective glimpse at the processes of de-Africanization of the American black family.

Parson's collection of Sea Island folklore identifies attitudinal patterns and beliefs which are clearly of West

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.

African origin. It seems quite clear that Sea Islanders have (with modifications) retained cultural patterns which are unmistakably West African in origin. However, the extents and directions of cultural adaptation of Sea Islander—as a consequence of the American experience—is open to question. Certainly, Sea Islanders have not assimilated the American ethos to the extent evident among northern urban Blacks, but no doubt the Sea Islands as a cultural entity is in a state of change. In warning that the Gullah dialect may be unintelligible to Blacks outside of that particular linguist community, Dalby indirectly suggests that the assimilation of Gullah Blacks to mainland (U.S.) cultural norms has been slow. It seems that as more U.S. Blacks strive toward greater identification with their African heritage, the assimilation rates and the resulting cultural adaptations evident among Sea Islanders becomes increasingly important as a means of gaining retrospective insights on the processes of de-Africanization.

The related and important question of the present investigation is whether in addition to the retention of linguistic Africanisms Sea Islanders also retain other

---

16 Elsie C. Parson, *Folklore of the Sea Islands, South Carolina in Folklore Society* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1923).

elements of their cultural heritage? On a broader level, Africanisms have been clearly cited in the music and dancing patterns of mainland Blacks. Likewise the gospel music of the Sea Islands is viewed as highly permeated with African cultural entities. In the same vein, the African features of Sea Island religious beliefs and ceremonies are well established. The African features in the dancing patterns of Sea Islanders has been noted also.

The survival of African Cultural traits in the family structuring and in the child rearing habits and beliefs of Sea Islanders has not been carefully researched. Data of this sort is disjointed, and comes primarily as an indirect contribution of the numerous collection of Sea Island folklores. This literature does note some child rearing features which are common to Sea Islanders and to Blacks elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere who are of West African heritage. The following are examples of these commonly held beliefs:

A child born with a face caul is able to see supernatural forces and is able to see visions of ancestors.

Charms, necklaces, braceletlets have the power to protect against supernatural affliction and to ward off disease.

The hair and nails of people can be used in "conja" to bring harm. Consequently the parent warns the child not to have strangers comb hair or to cut nails. Parent may also instruct child to destroy residue hair and nails.
Babies are passed over the coffin of ancestors during burial rites.

Children born feet first are gifted and able to manipulate binding constraints.

Children may be named according to season of birth, birth order, and of birth date.18

In a more recent research effort Kiser suggests that grandparents assume a major responsibility in the Sea Island family.19 This investigation suggests that the role of grandparents was primarily due to: (a) the migration of younger parents to urban cities while leaving behind offsprings to the care and rearing traditions of grandparents, (b) the seasonal employment patterns whereby the parent temporarily leaves the Island in search of jobs on the mainland.

Undoubtedly these factors do act as antecedents, however, the extent to which this behavior is affected by cultural tradition has not been entertained. Hence it is uncertain whether the status accorded elder Sea Islanders and their family roles are primarily related to environmental factors or more so to the survival of West African cultural elements. There is reason to suggest that the functioning of elders in the Sea Island family and

particularly of the status accorded are reflective of West African family and tribal traditions. Among West African tribes, it is a general rule that elders are charged with the responsibility of maintaining and teaching the tribe and family linkage and histories. In this role, elders act as judges of whether younger parents are rearing children in the traditional mold. Sea Island elders are charged with similar responsibilities. In earlier times, the island elders were responsible for making and interpreting the Black law. Disputes between neighbors or families were settled by indigenous elder councils. Only disputes which drew the attention of the White world were brought to the White man's court. The isolation of the Sea Islands often made the elder councils of each island the primary legal body. Likewise, the few numbers of Whites inhabiting the islands supported the functioning of the elder councils.

Although their functions have been limited, the elder Sea Island councils have been retained to date. The extent to which the high status accorded elders in the Sea Island household has changed, as a consequence of assimilation can only be postulated. Similarly, the literature offers few clear statements on commonality of roles and of attitudes toward elders found among Sea Island and West African parents. Finally, there are few statements comparing Sea Island and West African child rearing practices.
Consequently, as more Black parents seek knowledge of their West African heritage and strive to rear their children in an African framework, the potential contribution of Sea Island child rearing research is evident.

The Sea Islander is known in contemporary Black folklore as funny talking and quick to fight. The other view is that the Sea Islander is extremely religious and quick to pray. Perhaps the single most recurring report is of the cultural cohesion of Sea Island communities. It is this cohesiveness which makes Sea Islanders a unique source for research on discipline behavior.

Certainly the relative isolation of Sea Island communities adds to the possibility that its inhabitants would have similar life histories, beliefs and attitudes. These factors have been shown to act as correlates of discipline behavior. The cohesiveness of the Sea Island communities suggest that the Islanders may have similar predispositions toward discipline. Consequently, the Gullah people are a unique source of data of the effects of antecedent conditions on discipline behavior.

In the continued absence of systematic data on Sea Island family systems, it may be difficult for significant numbers of Black parents to develop clear conceptions of child rearing within a West African heritage. Hence, before undue emphasis is placed on direct comparisons of West
African and the child rearing practices of Black American parents a clear conception of Sea Island child rearing beliefs and practices may be an essential prerequisite. Until this prerequisite research is completed, projected relationships between Sea Island and West African child rearing must be viewed as merely conjecture. The intent of this investigation is to outline the child rearing discipline habits of Sea Islanders.

THE SEA ISLAND FAMILY

Because of their lower socio-economic status the use of physical punishment manifested in parental discipline may be commonly reported by Sea Island parents. However the factors of isolation and clearly defined social patterns may negate that of socio-economic status, and have the effect of diminishing the use of physical punishment. Or these factors may have the opposite influence of increasing the use of physical punishment.

The relatively small living space of Sea Island households coupled with a high proportion of extended family situations could produce a high use of physical punishment in discipline. Similarly the low educational attainment levels and occupational status would suggest high use of physical punishment among Sea Island parents. That whipping as a form of discipline commonly found among West African peoples would be also common to Sea Island parents is
consistent with the postulation that Gullahs have maintained West African cultural traits.

At present the extent to which these relationships will hold for Sea Island parents can only be postulated. There exists in the literature few clear statements describing the rearing practices and beliefs of Gullah Blacks. Neither is it clear how these rearing practices and attitudes have been formed or modified as a consequence of time, isolation, and/or as a result of the American experience. Likewise the extents to which the discipline practices and beliefs of Sea Islanders is commonly held across generations can only be postulated. It is not clear whether younger islanders hold attitudes toward discipline which mirror the views of older islanders, or if there is a trend toward more attunement to the rearing practices and discipline methods commonly found among urbanized youths. Neither is the literature clear on the discipline attitudes and practices of island parents in comparison to their elders. The intent of the present investigation is to provide some indication of the discipline practices and beliefs of Gullah Blacks, and to provide a historical perspective of these practices and beliefs and to thereby tentatively assess the extent and direction of change.

PURPOSES OF THE RESEARCH

This research investigation has four primary aims:
1. To identify the parental discipline practices and beliefs of Gullah Sea Islanders.

2. To compare the discipline practices and beliefs of Gullah Islanders across three generations.

3. To identify the parameters of asocial behavior and their disciplinary consequences among Sea Islanders.

4. To gage the influence of isolation (measured by distance from the mainland) on the discipline habits and attitudes of Gullah Islanders.

One goal of the study is to clearly identify the discipline habits of Gullah parents. Secondly, the comparative emphasis is aimed at measuring the direction and extent of change in discipline habits and beliefs across three generations. Finally, the intent to gage the affective influence of isolation on the discipline habits and views of Gullah Islanders.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

In order to generate the information outlined under the study purposes, Sea Island family units were the most appropriate source of data. With the same aim, these family units were identified in each of the five Sea Islands communities. The cross-generational interest of the study was satisfied by the membership of each family unit.

STUDY DEFINITIONS

Family Unit.—The family unit consisted of six members. A unit contained three groups with two (sex-paired)* members in each group. The three groups of a family unit were: (1) grandparents, (2) parents and (3) children. Group I members were grandparents, either of maternal or paternal linkage. Group II members were parents and siblings of group I members. Group III members were children. Group III members were either adopted, step and/or the own children of group II members.

Family Unit Structure.—Unless conceptualized in exaggerated forms, the comparison of the structural resemblance

*There were more female members in group I. The ratio was nineteen females and nine males.
of the Sea Island family unit to traditional concepts of
the extended family would be erroneous. The extended de-
sign on the islands is the family gap. Within this gap
elder or grandparents either share or maintain a separate
dwelling. The family gap living situation is the most
prevalent family structure on the Sea Islands. In this
structure whether or not grandparents maintain separate or
shared living quarters has little to no effect on their
roles and functions; therefore, the extended versus nuclear
family design was irrelevant and was not used.

STUDY SAMPLE

Sample Source.—Family units resided on the five Sea
Islands of Charleston County, South Carolina. These is-
lands, listed sequentially in terms of distance from
Charleston City, were James, Johns, Yonges, Wadmalaw and
Edisto Islands.

Sample Size.—The sample size consisted of fourteen
family units; six members were in each unit. The total
size of the sample was eighty-four respondents.

Same Conditions.—Four family units were from James
and four were from Edisto Islands. Two family units each
were from Johns, Wadmalaw and Yonges Islands. There were
a total of twenty-eight members in each generational group.
There were forty-seven females and thirty-seven males.
PROCEDURES

The initial task was to compile listings of the Black families on each island. This task was accomplished by interviewing residents of each island. The postal workers among those interviewed were knowledgeable of the names and addresses of the islands' Black families. Black school teachers who live and work on the islands were helpful in estimating the number and ages of children in the families. Elder Black islanders were helpful and very adept at outlining the kinship trees and in detailing the composition of the families. When a list for each island containing the names of at least twenty families had been compiled, the first task was considered complete. Based upon the available information on family composition, only families which met the study's definition of a family unit were included on the five lists.

The second task was to authenticate the composition of the listed families and then to elicit the participation of family units meeting the study definition. Each family named on the lists was coded with randomly assigned three digit numbers. Then slips of paper containing these three digit numbers were produced for each listed family. By island of residence, these numbered slips were dropped into one of five shoe boxes. Each shoe box was labelled to represent one island. All the boxes had covers. The covers
had slit openings in their middle. Each box was thoroughly shaken after the slips were dropped into them. Before the first slip was drawn and after each subsequent draw the box was shaken. The drawing method was to blindly reach into the box and pick up one single slip of paper. This procedure was repeated ten times for each box. After ten slips had been drawn, the numbers on each slip was matched with the number and corresponding family names on the list for that island. When these ten families had been identified and noted, the slips were returned to the box from which they had been drawn. This overall procedure was repeated for each of the five boxes. The ordering of the boxes and consequently the drawing order corresponded with distance from the mainland. In this scheme, the James Island box was first and the Edisto Island draw was last.

The second task under this set was to authenticate the family compositions of the selected family units. Using the available entries, the researcher showed up at the address or family gaps of the tentatively selected units. At this point the researcher explained his purposes, which was always prefaced by a detailed description of the researcher's family linkage. Then, at what the researcher deemed an appropriate point in the discussion, inquires were made about the composition of the family units. As a result of these inquiries only those units which met the
study's unit definition were asked to participate and with their elders' consent, scheduled for later interviews. Those families whose unit structures were outside the study's definition were engaged in extended general conversation during this initial contact, but were not scheduled for later interviews.

**TABLE 1**

**THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Unit Interviews</th>
<th>Island Unit Resided on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two trial unit administrations on Johns Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Four family units on James Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Two family units on Johns Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Two family units on Wadmalaw Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Two family units on Yonges Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Four family units on Edisto Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2**

**THE INTERVIEWING TIME LINE**

| Two weeks | James Island       | 24 interviews |
| One "     | Johns Island       | 12 "          |
| One "     | Wadmalaw Island    | 12 "          |
| One "     | Yonges Island      | 12 "          |
| Two "     | Edisto Island      | 24 "          |
| Seven weeks | 84 interviews  |
TABLE 3

SCHEMATIC OF UNIT INTERVIEWING PATTERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>James</th>
<th>Johns</th>
<th>Wadmalaw</th>
<th>Yonges</th>
<th>Edisto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewing Places.—The family gap was the site of the interviews. Interviews were conducted both in and out of doors. The actual sight of the interview was left to the discretion of the interviewee. In some cases the location turned out to be under large oak trees, on porches; other interviews were conducted in parked cars, in open fields and even in row boats.

Interview Pattern.—The group interview was not used. It was not possible to absolutely isolate some respondents (i.e., mothers with young children). However, a concerted effort was made to insure privacy and confidentiality during the interview. This effort was relaxed in the interviewing of children, but children were not interviewed when in close company of adult members of the unit.

Instrument Pre-Testing.—Two family units from Johns Island were used in the pre-administration of the instrument. As a result of the pre-test inactivities the length of the structured questionnaire was reduced by nine questions. The open response phase of the instrument was
deleted in total. The first reducing action was taken because these questions elicited an extremely wide range of responses and was therefore judged as irrelevant and tangential to the experience of the respondents. The second deletion was taken because the complete instrument was too time consuming and tedious to complete.

The second major modification was in the method of administration. It quickly became evident that insisting on the absolute isolation of respondents was a hindrance to and heighten the inhibitions of the interviewees. The adopted procedure was to insist on interviewee privacy only to the extents to which privacy was feasible. See Appendix A for study instrument and subject categorization form.

INTERVIEW PROCEDURE

The presence of the researcher in the Family Gap obviously disturbed the family activities. To counteract this effect the researcher made pre- or non-interviewing visits to each Gap before actual interviews were begun. The purpose of the pre-visits were to acquaint the researcher with the family members (their patterns) and as importantly to have the family get adjusted to the researcher. These visits lasted as long as was necessary for this adjustment to take place. These visits lasting from "day clesn" until late in the evening hours provided the
researcher ample opportunity to explain the nature of the research effort and to alleviate any concerns which were voiced. When the researcher was satisfied that these objectives had been met, the actual interviews were begun.

When all members of a unit had been interviewed, this procedure was repeated at the next Family Gap. When all interviews were completed on one island, the researched moved on to the next island repeating the same procedures until the interview schedule was completed.

INTERVIEW METHOD

The participation observation interview was used as the data collection method. A structured interview utilizing thirteen questions was administered. Each interview was conducted from a structured format. After the respondent had designated where the interview was to be held, the actual procedure was to engage the respondent in conversation about the family. The focus of the conversations were initially directed at general aspects of the family and as the discussion continued the researched directed the content of the conversation by directly asking each question on the instrument. Respondents were allowed to answer questions in as much detail as they wanted. The researcher followed each complete response with the question "does dat about cover it?" If the respondent said yes, the researcher asked the next question. If the response was no, the
researcher asked "vaat else need be sai?" and respondents were allowed to complete their answers before the next question was asked.

RECORDING RESPONSE

A structured response sheet was used to record responses. This sheet contained a listing of each question and the possible responses. When a response was one of the listed responses, the researcher merely checked that response. When responses were offered for which no previous categories existed, these responses were entered under the category "other" for that question.

At the end of each interviewing day the researcher added those responses in the other category to the list of possible responses. The final activity of the day was to tabulate the responses.

RESPONSE MEASUREMENT

Responses for question Number 3 were scaled on a five point design. Twelve of the questions had pre-established response categories. Each question was followed by a list of from three to eight separate response categories. "Other" was the last response category of each question. Responses which did not fit into existing categories made up the other categorical responses (see questionnaire, Appendix A).
Schematic of the Scale Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Everytime</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quest.</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDY CONSIDERATIONS

Adjusting to the Sea Island environment was a crucial prerequisite to the successful conduct of this research effort. Even though the researcher is a native speaker of the Gullah dialect a period of adjusting or tuning into this speech pattern was necessary.

These adjustments were expedited by time and by gaining as much exposure to the dialect as possible.

Through the pre-administration activities it became clear that the interviewing schedules would have to be flexible and modified in consideration of the summer habits of the islanders. What this meant along with other things was that the researcher had to conduct the interviews of women folks at a time when the daily chores were completed and the women were relaxing from the summer heat. For working members of the family weekend and late evening interviews were most appropriate.

During the trial administration family members were obviously anxious about being isolated from the family and discussed their anxiety with the researcher. It was apparent that this procedure operated in opposition to a rather free flowing interaction style among family members.
Consequently, this procedure was relaxed to some degree during the actual interviews.

Had not the researcher been a native of the Sea Islands this research effort would have been immensely more difficult. In part this difficulty could be attributable to the workings of other researchers in this area. In particular, many of the islanders voiced deep concern over the book written by Carowan *Ain't we Got a Right to the Tree of Life*. These islanders felt this work was by no means an accurate representation of their life style or beliefs. But because of the native heritage of the researcher many families agreed to participate in hopes of the writer being more able to accurately present the ethos of the Sea Island people.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

Statistical inference was the method of data analysis. The chi-square and the Fisher Exact Test were used to compute significance at either the .05, .01 or .001 level.

The following analysis of relationship between the variables island, generation, and sex were conducted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Island (1,2,3,4,5) by questions one thru thirteen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Generation (1,2,3) by questions one thru thirteen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Sex (1,2) by questions one thru thirteen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Island by generation by questions one thru thirteen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V Island by sex by questions one thru thirteen.

NULL HYPOTHESIS

I a) $H_0: M_1 = M_2$
Respondents across the five islands will report no significant difference in the use of physical punishment.

b) Alternate hypothesis: $H_0: M_1 \neq M_2$

II a) $H_0: M_1 = M_2 = M_3$
There will be nonsignificant differences in the use of physical punishment across generations.

b) Alternate hypothesis: $H_0: M_1 \neq M_2 \neq M_3$

III a) $H_0: M_1 = M_2$
Males will report no more use of physical punishment than females.

b) Alternate hypothesis: $H_3: M_1 \neq M_2$

DISCUSSION OF HYPOTHESES

The research is not clear on how discipline is applied in extended family situations. In households in which grandparents are present there is more opportunity for value transmission. One result may be less variation in discipline behavior across generations. The extended family structure no doubt adds to the chance for value conflicts to occur. However, the high cultural status accorded Sea Island elders may tend to negate the chance for the occurrence of value conflicts. It is also likely that younger Sea Islanders whose values conflict with their parents may
have left the island, or they maintain separate households. The end result might mean greater uniformity in discipline attitudes among Sea Islanders in general and particularly those in extended family situations.

The most uniform discipline patterns may occur in families where mothers have clearly defined discipline roles, and when grandparents are members of the household. While the more common report that maternal grandparents are generally more involved in the rearing of grandchildren than paternal grands, the presence of either grandparents in the household may result in more uniform application of discipline punishment(s).\(^\text{20}\) Despite reports that grandparents tend to reject roles as disciplinarians of grandchildren, in the Black extended family situation grandparents may be much more active in this role. If the mother has no, or has an inconsistent discipline role, maternal grandparents may tend to be more permissive than paternal grandparents. This assumption is based upon the generally closer affiliation and attitudinal similarities between mother and her parents than between father and his parents. As a general view both paternal and maternal male grandparents may tend to be more restrictive of grandchildren than female grandparents. This trend would tend to be effected and modified

in light of mother's discipline role.\textsuperscript{21} As an overall judgement, extended families may tend to have the more restrictive discipline pattern. This assumption is based on the relationship between family living space and discipline behavior. Sea Island homes tend to be small and confining which should allow for further test of this relationship.

Isolated Sea Island parents may use physical punishment in disciplining more than parents living nearer to mainland. This tendency may be anticipated for two reasons: (1) Sea Islanders may occupy lower positions on the socioeconomic scale than mainland parents, (2) Sea Island communities are cohesively structured. This community cohesiveness is reflected in their practice of the discipline philosophy of two for one. Under this practice any misbehaving child can be disciplined by any member of the community. As the practice goes, after disciplining the child, the neighbor reports the child's misbehavior to the parent. The parent in turn has the responsibility of thanking the neighbor for a good deed. After which the child is again beaten on two accounts: (1) because of the misbehavior and (2) because the child's misbehavior has case "bad light" on the parent.

The elder Sea Islanders are active disciplinarians. Because of their roles as community disciplinarians coupled with the large number of households in which elders are primarily responsible for disciplining, elders will provide opportunity to assess the effect of age on disciplining pattern. Because of the status positions elders hold in Sea Island communities and because of the isolation factor, it can be anticipated that physical discipline would be found to be particularly prominent. Elder Sea Islanders may also report rather unique disciplining techniques which are either in present use, or which have become extinct. This possibility exists because the isolation of the Sea Island supports the retention of West African cultural patterns.

Some islands are more inaccessible than others. A measure of the effect of isolation on discipline patterns and techniques will be obtained through cross island comparisons. It is anticipated that there will be a linear relationship between degree of isolation and use of physical discipline.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The results reported here are on the use of physical discipline. In this review it must be emphasized that use of physical discipline is by no means exclusive; but rather is but one type of interaction in the overall discipline pattern. Verbal discipline interactions are very much a dimension of the broader pattern. To regard the use of physical discipline as the only or even as the dominant interaction to the neglect of others is a serious error in judgement.

The data organization and analysis represented in Tables 4, 5, and 6, are the one by one organization (1-1-1-1-1) where each one represents one Island.

VARIABLE OF ISLAND

A Chi Square was not computed on question one, because all respondents reported use of physical and verbal discipline. Question one was, "Waak kin ob punishment di ya use?" A .02 level of significance was found between the variable of island and question two, "How oben beetn fer dis?" The responses were: everytime, often, sometime. The Chi Square value was found to be 40.40 with 8 degrees of
### TABLE 4
(1-1-1-1-1) ISLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Island by Question 2</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>.02 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 3</td>
<td>40.40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 4</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.41 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 5</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.51 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 6</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.30 (.05)</td>
<td>NS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 7</td>
<td>34.84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.41</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 8</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.30 (.05)</td>
<td>NS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 9</td>
<td>42.40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.27</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 10</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.03 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 11</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.03 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 12</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.51 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 13</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.34 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Null test question*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation by Question 2</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>.01 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.49 (.05)</td>
<td>NS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.07 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>.001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.03 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Null test question
**TABLE 6**

(1-1-1-1-1) SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex by Question 2</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>NS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>41.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.99 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.49 (.05)</td>
<td>NS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>.01 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.59 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.82 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.82 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.99 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.07 (.05)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Null test question*
freedom (df). The critical value was 39.29. Forty-one percent of the Yonges Island, and 37.5% of Edisto respondents said that they were beaten for a social behavior everytime. On the near islands, only 4.2% of the respondents indicated the everytime response. Consistently 66.7% of the James and 83.3% of the Johns Island respondents selected the often response. The responses were somewhat consistent across the islands in the percents saying they were beaten sometime. From James to Edisto, these percents were: 29.2, 8.3, 16.7, 29.2.

The relationship between the variable of island and question six, "How ole ya wen ya git d last beetn?" was nonsignificant at the .05 rejection level. The responses were: Fourteen to Sixteen, Seventeen to Nineteen, Twenty to Twenty-two, Twenty-three to Twenty-five and Twenty-five to Thirty. The Chi Square value was 10.22 at 16 df, the critical value was 26.30, the highest percent (25%) of respondents who indicated that their last beating were between 14-16 years were residents of Edisto and Wadmalaw. Twelve point five percent of the other islanders agreed. Over 57% of the islanders said beatings ended between 17-23 years. Six point three percent of the James Islanders said beatings were continued into the 25-27 range.

The relationship between the variable of island and question eight, "Wen ya waz gitten d mas beetn, how oben?"
was nonsignificant at the .05 rejection level. The Chi Square value was 19.66 while the critical value at 16 df was 26.30; the responses were: Six or less times per year, one time a month, three times a month, once weekly, twice weekly. None of the James Islanders said physical discipline was metered out as infrequently as six times a year. In contrast 16.7% of the Johns, Yonges and Edisto Islanders said beatings were this infrequently. Four point two percent of the James, and 8.3% of the Wadmalaw respondents said beatings during their peak periods were as frequent as twice weekly. None of the respondents on the other islands said beatings were this frequent. Over 68% of all the islanders indicated that the frequency of beating was between one to three times a month.

**TEST OF THE ISLAND NULL HYPOTHESIS (H₀: M₁ = M₂)**

Respondents across the five islands will report no significant difference in the use of physical punishment.

1. Question two, "How oben beetn fer dis?" was used to test H₀: M₁ = M₂. This question is a measure of the relationship between the frequency with which use of physical punishment followed asocial behavior and island affiliation. The Chi Square value was 18.69, while the critical value at 8 df was 18.17. This relationship was significant at the .02 level. With a .02
significance level, \( H_0: M_1 = M_2 \) was rejected in favor of the alternative \( H_1: M_1 \neq M_2 \).

2. Two tangential tests of this \( H_0: M_1 = M_2 \) were conducted. Questions six and eight were used for this purpose. Question six, "How ole ya wen ya git d last beetn?" is in essence a measure of the relationship between the duration of use of physical punishment and island affiliation. As such this relationship was considered as a tangential measure of the Null Hypothesis. The Chi Square value for question six and island affiliation was 10.22, while the critical value at 16 df was 26.30 (.05). In this case the chance hypothesis was uphelded.

3. Question eight, "Wen ya waz gitten de mas beets, how oben?" was a measure of the frequency of beets during peak disciplinary stages and island affiliation. While this relationship was a more direct measure of the Null Hypothesis than question six it was still a tangential test. The Chi Square value was 19.66, while the critical value at .05 with 16 df was 26.30. The Null Hypothesis was uphelded. The two tangential tests supported retention of the Null Hypothesis. However because of the directness of the first test and the determined significance power (02), the Null Hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative \( H_1: M_1 \neq M_2 \).

4. Although the most direct test of the relationship between
island affiliation and use of physical punishment was significant at the .02 level, the alternative hypothesis was upheld with some reservation. This caution is warranted because the majority of the island relationships were nonsignificant. For example parents across the five islands indicated that both sexes received the same punishment (question 5). Similarly, there were nonsignificant relationships between island affiliation and: (a) the boundaries of asocial behavior (question 9), (b) use of both beating and scolding in discipline (question 11), and (c) the generations across the islands indicated similar problems in rearing today's children in the traditional mold (question 10).

VARIABLE GENERATION

Significance was determined at the .01 level for the relationship between variable of generations and question two, "How oben beent fer dis?" The responses were everytime, often, sometime. Chi Square was computed at 15.36 with 4 df. The critical value was 13.28. Forty-six point four percent of the children indicated they were punished often and sometime. While 14.3% of the parents indicated punishment was sometime and 60.7% said often. Conversely, 28.6% of the grandparents and 25% of the parents said they were punished everytime. Only 7.1% of the children indicated they were punished everytime.
At the .05 rejection level the relationship between the variable of generation and question six, "How ole ya wen ya git d last beatn?" was significant. The responses were: Fourteen to Sixteen, Seventeen to Nineteen, Twenty to Twenty-two, Twenty-three to Twenty-five, Twenty-seven to Thirty, with 4 df the critical value was 9.49, the Chi Square value was 2.96. Twenty-five percent of the grandparents and 10.7% of the parents said beatings were terminated between 14-16 years. Fifty percent of the parents and 39.2% of the grandparents said beatings end between 17-19 years. Thirty-five point seven percent of the grandparents and 39.4% of the parents indicated beatings were continued after the youngster reached 20 years.

The relationship between question eight, "Wen ya waz gitten d mas beatn, how oben?" and the variable of generations was significant at the .001 level. The responses were: six or less a year, one a month, three a month, one a week and two a week. Twenty-eight point six percent of the grandparents said they were beaten six or less times per year, while only 3.6% of the parents shared this frequency pattern. Sixty point seven percent of the grandparents, 46.4% of the parents and 39.3% of the children shared the one beating per month pattern. Seventeen point nine percent of the children and parents reported beatings as frequently as one per week. Three point six percent
of the grandparents also reported beatings as frequent as one per week. Only children (7.1%) reported beatings as frequently as twice a week.

TEST OF THE GENERATION NULL HYPOTHESIS ($H_0: M_1 = M_2 = M_3$)

There will be nonsignificant differences in the use of physical punishment across generations. $H_0: M_1 = M_2 = M_3$.

1. The relationship under measurement was between generation membership and use of physical punishment. The same rationale for the use of questions two, six, and eight developed in the test of the first Null Hypothesis also applies here. Again question two is the direct and questions six and eight are tangential measures of the relationship.

2. Under the direct test the relationship was significant at the .01 level. The Chi Square value was 15.36, while the critical value at 4 df was 13.28. The first of the tangential measures was insignificant. The critical value at (.05) with 4 df was 9.49, while the Chi Square value was 2.96. In this case the $H_0: M_1 = M_2 = M_3$ was supported. The second indirect test of the relationship (question 8) was significant at .001. At 8 df the critical value was 26.12 while the Chi Square value was 26.37. These significance levels (.01, .001) are the basis upon which the Null Hypothesis was
rejected in favor of the alternative $H_2: M_1 = M_2 \neq M_3$.

3. Significant generational differences in discipline behavior and attitudes were clearly noted. As a matter of fact nine of the generational relationships were significant. Five of these relationships were significant at the .001 level. It is extremely clear that the generations differ in application of and in attitudes about discipline. There were however, nonsignificant differences across the generations relative to: (a) the age at which children are no longer beaten (question 6), (b) the causes of the last beating (question 7), and (c) on the boundaries of asocial behavior (question 9).

**VARIABLE OF SEX**

The relationship between the variable of sex and question two, "How oben beert fer dis?" was nonsignificant at the .05 rejection level. The responses were: *everytime*, *often*, *sometime*. The critical value was 5.99 at 2 df the Chi Square was 2.11. Sixteen point two of the males and 32.4% of the females said the *everytime* reaction ratio was used by their parents. Fifty-four percent of the males and 59.6% of the females thought physical discipline often followed asocial acts. More males (29.7%) selected the *sometime* reaction ratio than did the females (77%).

The relationship between the variable of sex and
question six, "How ole ya wen ya git d last beeth?" was nonsignificant. The responses were: Fourteen to Sixteen, Seventeen to Nineteen, Twenty to Twenty-two, Twenty-three to Twenty-five, and Twenty-seven to Thirty. The Chi Square value was 8.80. The critical value at 4 df was 9.49.

Twenty-seven point three percent of the females and 4.3% of the males said they received their last beating between 14-16 years respectively. Thirty-nine point one percent and 48% of the males and females said their last beatings were between 17-19. Twenty-four point three percent of the females said they were beaten after age 20. This compares to 66.5% if the males who were beaten after age 20.

The relationship between the variable of sex and question eight, "Wen ya waz gitten d mas beeth, how oben?" was significant at .01. The responses were: Six or less a year, one a month, three a month, one a week and two a week. Only 5.4 percent of both sexes said beatings during peak periods were as frequent as twice weekly. Seventeen percent of the females said they received six or less beatings per year, which compares to a 2.7 percent for males. Thirty-five point one percent of the males and 59.6 percent of the females said beatings were no more frequent than once a month. Seventeen percent of the females and 35.1 percent of the males reported beatings as frequent as three times per month. Weekly beatings were reported by 21.6% of the
males and 9.4% of the females.

TEST OF THE SEX NULL HYPOTHESIS \( \text{H}_0: M_1 = M_2 \)

Males will report no more use of physical punishment than females.

1. This was a measure of the relationship between the variable of sex and use of physical punishment. The rationale which applied to the use of questions two and eight in the above two cases also applies here. Question five, "Bo n Gal beet d sami?" was also used in this test. In this case question five is the most direct measure of the relationship between sex and use of physical punishment. Under question five the relationship was nonsignificant at .05. The critical value with 2 df was 5.99, while the Chi Square value was 2.73. The relationship was also nonsignificant under question two, the Chi Square value was 2.11 with 2 df the critical value was 5.99 at the .05 level of significance.

2. The relationship was significant under question eight. The critical value with 5 df was 13.28, while the Chi Square value was 15.42. The level of significance was .01. Because the direct and one of the tangential test were nonsignificant, the \( \text{H}_0: M_1 = M_2 \) was upheld.

3. Only four of the relationships between the sex of the respondent and discipline practices and beliefs were
significant. The broad inference is that male and female Sea Islanders are closely agreed in their discipline attitudes and behaviors. They were not agreed however relative to the question of the causes of punishment.

4. This relationship was significant at the .001 level. Males tend to indicate that fighting was the primary cause of punishment, while females indicated chores as the prime cause. The sexes were not agreed (.05) about the age at which children are too old for physical punishment. However the dominant tendency was for the sexes to be agreed. Enlight of the eight relationship in which there were nonsignificant differences between the sexes, the null or chance hypothesis was retained.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Crum\textsuperscript{22} claimed that the Gullah people have no interest in the future. This researcher found the case to be the opposite. The Gullahs, the elders in particular, are constantly looking ahead to the day on which their life patterns will be judged fitting to "keep eternal company in the Great Kingdom." Their life paths and worldly efforts are aimed at nothing else than at the day when their deeds will be reviewed. It is with the religious context, that the discipline behaviors of the Gullah people must be understood. Malicious acts of child abuse, and the heavy handed parent are frowned upon. Discipline acts for the Gullah, are aimed primarily at keeping the child "en d steppn of d Lord," meaning that the purpose of much of the discipline behavior is to prepare the child for demands of living the religious existence. Dr. Spock's notions of child rearing have no relevance in the Gullah household. Here the teachings contained in the Bible are the guide posts the parent follows. Discipline manifested as physical punishment appear to be no more frequent than the verbal

\textsuperscript{22}Crum, \textit{op. cit.}
means of socialization. The sternness of the religious behaviors of the Gullah people are metered down into their discipline behavior. Among these people the 99.9% effort toward adherence to religious commandments as in child rearing just is not good enough. The only acceptable effort is all the way. This often reached quest for total commitment in religious activities is the basis upon which the obedience of children are judged. This must be constantly in mind when interpreting the discipline behaviors of Gullah parents.

Gullah parents are constant observers of the behavior of children. The boundaries around what constitutes asocial behavior are clearly understood and learned early. The child in turn knows full well what behaviors will elicit which response by the parent. In accord with the religious teachings, the parent will not hesitate to punish disobedient behavior. Punishment though is not always or most frequently manifested in its physical form, but rather the form of discipline used will depend on any number of factors in the environment. The prime determinant being the overall behavior of the child. Gullah parents emphasized to this researcher that discipline must be tended with mercy. "Billie ya ca'n trazh dem all d timb, ya gotta scol some en beet some." They felt total reliance on physical discipline in disregard to the overall behaviors and
mannerism of the child was extremely unjust. They say the teachings of the Lord make clear that if the parent blindly follows the bully path results in the child losing respect. In this belief, parents with guided deliberation employ the discipline interaction.

It must be emphasized that these interactions are just not that frequent. Gullah children are respectful and obedient, behaviors which are less than that are not tolerated. In turn rarely does the Gullah parent discipline the child who has been socialized properly.

The Gullah parent on the nearer islands agreed that the properly socialized child is not a problem. This child is on the right path. But they are concerned about factors in the environment which act to make for proper rearing of children increasingly difficult. As these parents see it and as was supported by the study, on the nearer islands the effects of greater exposure to mainland life styles makes it increasingly difficult to rear children to "the proper" levels of obedience. Elder Richardson explains the situation this way: "d paren should be shami while d roun en de high skire, lib en n out of sin. D chillin got no choice dan ta act lik d paren. It ain't d chilln falt mind ya, it d blame ob d paren. Dey responsible fer d chil, dey must brin d chil ta d wae ob d bible. I jus dan't no waat goina happen ta d chilln ta dae. Ef d paren dan't see ta
it quik, dey is head fer d fira en brim stan. But it ain't dey falt."

The relationship being described here explains the higher tolerance of today's parents and is explicable in part by generational differences and in part by the exposure element--distance from mainland. In the case of exposure, the more distant Gullah families are more isolated from the mainland socializing influences. An effect of this more limited exposure is more adherence to "the discipline habits of ole." This adherence was reflected in the lower tolerance (reaction ratio) of parents on the distant islands. In further explanation, the work habits of women on the near islands contribute to their being the most tolerant parents. The occupational habits of these women frequently take them into the households of White families of higher economic status. When this Gullah parent is exposed to an alternate discipline pattern, this exposure may then underly the differences in tolerance found between sexes and islands.

The tolerance of differences may only be a function of exposure time. The case here is that parents who are engaged in the work force spend less time with their children than do elder parents. Hence the working parent would not be as quick to react to disobedience on the part of children than would grandparents who are actively engaged in child
rearing for longer periods each day. Women on the more distant islands are less likely to be engaged in work outside the home. They also showed the tendency to be less tolerant than mothers on the near islands. This relationship adds supports to the rationale that exposure to mainland social patterns, and the daily duration of interactions with children are key elements in the measured differences in the discipline habits of women both across generations and islands. It might also be added that the work habits of the women on the nearer islands both in terms of the nature of the labor and its consequence of a higher income base also contributes to the differences.

However this is not the total explanation. It is also important to consider that the more isolated Gullah families place more emphasis on the assignment to children of chores which were central to the operation of the family unit. These tasks rather than being assigned to provide the child with a sense of responsibility are assigned on the assumption that the child already has competent work habits. Consider for the moment the child whose task is to draw water, to cut wood and handle the chicken coop. If the child neglects these chores there would indeed be serious consequences. For this neglect would noticeably disturb the operations of the household. Those households on the more distant islands being supplied only with wood burning
stoves would come to a halt if wood was not cut in time for meals to be prepared. On the near islands with household supplied with only gas stoves or with both, the child's negligence would not have such dire consequences. In view of this it is easy to see how the chores of children on the far islands would be a more serious matter, and why such households tend to operate on an *everytime reaction ratio*. In contrast, parents on the near islands can more afford the gift of tolerance toward neglected chores, and to react to disobedience on a *sometime basis*.

Differences across the generations were much more frequent than across island and sex. The element which underly much of the differences was "*en ma dae*" references of parents and elder parents. The way this works is that each parent tries to rear children like they were reared. The demands of the environment in which grandparents were reared differ from the household patterns under which parents were reared. The main differences other than that of exposure were in labor habits. Grandparents were reared in farming households. Consequently as children, the grandparents were up before day-break and actively engaged in burdensome farm labor. In these farming households the tasks and responsibilities of children were even more clearly defined than they are today or in the childhood of the present parent generation. Similarly the consequences
of not completing tasks were harsh because chores were meaningful to the household. It is reference to this agrarian life and the demands for the obedience of children upon which grandparents draw. That the generation of parents now share significantly different childhood references than their parents merely illustrates the component of change in the agricultural habits on the islands. In agreement with this, parents reared in more distant households, where the farm habit is comparatively more active tend to mirror the views of the preceding generation. A similar positive relationship between exposure to the farming habit and the cohesiveness of discipline behavior across the two generations exist on the near islands. The generational differences found in this study can certainly be attributed to the farming versus non-farming pattern. This rationale was expressed vividly by Grand Flower, who at 78 years sees big differences in the rearing habits of her day and those of today. "Billie, let ma tell ya son, we haad no timb fer fooln. Wen d cock taak en bernean we up wete de fas cro. I go ta git d waata en me sista she giz d wod. Wey be fa d life ob dae comin we haad d bakfaz redi. Abta we done wete d poz en plata wen goin ta d fiel. Dey we waak pu en sed en d grun or piken en pulen dat wat don redi, we dey til d timb com n fer fix d supa den bak ta dat huse we goin. We giz d mel fer d men fak, den we carie it ta d fiel we
sta en d fiel til d lite nea goin. Billie, ma un I tel ya
dey no timb fer d chilln to b disobedient."

Today's children are not reared in the farm habit. Few of the parents have had long exposure to the patterns in which the elders were reared. It is consequently the differences in exposure and work habits which underly changes in the generational views of Gullah parents. The significance of differences in the discipline view of the two generations illustrates not only that the "en ma dae" reflections of parent and elder parent differ, but it is also a measure of the direction of change. Grandparents were the most frequent to respondent "ma paren use beeth everytime," while parents and children said often and sometimes more frequently. As a matter of fact, twice as many parents cited they were punished sometime than did elders. The direction of change between the generations is clearly that in each subsequent generation parents are less apt or as quick to punish the child.

Still another point to be considered in looking at the relative tolerance of the female parent is that of role differences. Males consistently cited fighting as one of the chief reasons for being disciplined. On the other hand not getting the chores done was a prime reason for disciplining girls. This is explained in that males had few household responsibilities and were not disciplined for
"undone" house chores while girls were. Upkeep of the house was clearly the female role. When you also consider that females more frequently reported that they were disciplined on an everytime ratio, role differences are again indicated.

It must be clearly understood that the difference in part may be attributable to the greater likelihood that the social behavior of female children would be committed in or close to the house, than would be the case for males. This suggests that the female asocial acts could be more readily noticed. In part, parents and elders in particular may just be more lient with male children. Certainly the "man chill" attitude is prevalent here. Since females outnumber males, a premium is placed on male children. Among island parents, tolerant attitudes toward males may also be a unique cultural reflection of an African habit.

In summation, there were few areas in which significant differences exist across the islands. Islanders are quite agreed in their discipline attitudes. Much of the preceding discussion must be seen in the persceptive of broader level homogenity across the five islands. The most noticeable implication is that the isolation of the Sea Islands has to a large extent protected the cultural cohesiveness of the island community. Notions of the broad scale influence of the mainland elements on island
discipline habits is not the case. While the generational factor was upheld, the dominant pattern was the absence of significant differences across islands and particularly across sex lines.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The Sea Island family is a cohesive unit. Many of the tested generational relationships were significant. These differences between generations were primarily attributed to effect of changing economic patterns, and rates of exposure to mainland patterns. The island work force are now engaged primarily in 9-5 work patterns. The pattern takes this force into job situations in metropolitan Charleston. While the island men tend to work in clusters in the different industries in the region, women are heavily engaged in domestic service work. The projected results are that women because of the nature of their employment were much more exposed and consequently influenced by the tolerant discipline habits of Whites and mainlanders. In contrast, the clustering work habits of males, in which members of families are employed by the same employer has operated to negate the influence of the new work pattern on male parents. The more demanding work requirements which accompanies the maintenance of a farm habit was also discussed. It was said that the farm habit upon which the elder islanders base their discipline references was unknown to
the island children. The parents themselves have been away from this habit for nearly as many years as they were engaged in it. Consequently, the stern disciplinary demands of the farm habit was not being transferred to this generation of young islanders. In this light, the childhood histories of the elder parents was discussed. It was seen how the harsh work habits required in farming families demanded the obedient behavior of children. Under the burden of farm labor, parents were less tolerant of disobedience than parents are today. The reason given was again differences in occupation. It was also said that parents living in isolated communities were apt to discipline children more quickly than parents who have jobs, because they spend time with their children. For the farming parents, the fatigue element was said to diminish their tolerance level, and that isolated households operate in an everytime reaction ratio. These religious beliefs were introduced as elements which influence frequency and methods of discipline. Gullah Island parents, in this vein, strived to rear children under, and by guidance of the Bible. In discussing the sex role differences, parents tend to more rigidly enforce discipline on female children. This relationship was explained along two lines. The first was the status that the male child has on the islands. Here a dominance of females places a premium upon male children.
The notion that this attitude may be a reflection of an African habit was briefly mentioned. Because females tend to commit asocial acts within the family gap, this was offered in explanation of sex differences in disciplining. Fighting was considered outside the female role, but a common behavior of males. The reason for fighting as a more frequent behavior of males on James Island was explained in terms of the greater exposure of near islanders to mainland patterns.
APPENDIX

THE STUDY INSTRUMENT

I. Grandparents M or P Sex ____ Year of Birth ____
   Parents _______________ Sex ____ Year of Birth ____
   Children _______________ Sex ____ Year of Birth ____

II. Where were you born? ____________________________

III. On which Island were you born? ________________

IV. Where is the house you were born in? ___________
    Where is the house you were reared in? ______ same
    ______ different

    How many rooms in the house you were reared in? ___

V. Did you live with your mother and father? ________
    Yes, No, other __________________________________

VI. What other adults lived with you? ________________

VII. Who lives with you now? age, sex, number
     grand parent ___________________________________
     parent _________________________________________
     children _______________________________________
     relative _______________________________________
     other _________________________________________
Appendix—Continued

DISCIPLINE QUESTIONNAIRE FORMAT

1. Waat kins ob punishmen di ys parens use?
   a) beetn
   b) scoldn
   c) beetn n scoldn
   d) other

* 2. How oben waz ya beet fer dis tinzs?
   a) fightn
   b) stealn
   c) lying
   d) strike parent
   e) field chores
   f) house n yard chores
   g) other

3. How oben waz ya punish a mont?
   a) everytime
   b) often
   c) sometime
   d) few times
   e) never

4. Wen waz d chilln ta ole fer beetn?
   a) make own libn
   b) behave respectfully
   c) wen own house
   d) wen marrie
   e) wen twenty-one
   f) wen carrie own britches
   g) neben too ole
   h) other

5. Di bo N gal giz punish d sami?
   a) both beet n scold
   b) both beet n scold
   c) both beet n scold
   d) fer different reasons

* 6. How ole waz ya wen ys giz beet ferd last time?
   a) 14-16
   b) 17-19
   c) 20-22
   d) 23-25
   e) 27-30
   f) 30 plus

7. Waat waz d kase fer ya last beetn?
   a) fightn
   b) field chores
   c) house n yard chores
   d) child care
   e) sassi talk
Appendix—Continued

8. Wen ya waz fitten dmas beetrn how oben?
   a) six or less a year  
   b) one a month  
   c) three a month  
   d) one a week  
   e) two a week

9. Waat d waaaze tin a chil can do?
   a) field chores  
   b) house n yard chores  
   c) sassi talk  
   d) cheat, steal or lie  
   e) neglect chilln  
   f) curse  
   g) go to creek  
   h) fightn

10. Ca ya rea y chil now a dae lik ya rea?
   a) less control to dae  
   b) chilln bold tadae  
   c) more troble n d chilln face tadae  
   d) grandparents spoil d chilln now a dae

11. Do beettm go wete scoldn?
   a) talk n beet  
   b) talk first den beet  
   c) haad head mak soft behin

LOVE RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE FORMAT

12. Who di ya turn ta en time ob trouble?
   a) family  
   b) God  
   c) neighbor

13. Waat feeln waz behin ya parents beettm n scoldn?
   a) love  
   b) teach christian ways  
   c) to behave right  
   d) do right tinz  
   e) so can hab good life  
   f) mad at me  
   g) cas I be bad  
   h) other

*Null hypothesis test questions.
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