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ABSTRACT

The Study of Intended Distance Based on the Migration Intention of Utah High School Senior Students

by

Pyoung Kim, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1977

Major Professor: Dr. Michael B. Toney
Department: Sociology

This study examines the relationship between the distance 1975 high school seniors intend to move, referred to as intended distance, and socio-economic and psychological factors. The research is based on information collected from separate samples of about 900 graduating seniors from the rural, urban and metropolitan areas of Utah. Utilizing the type of boundary that would be crossed in carrying out an intended move as the proxy for distance, it was found that 14 percent of the youth intended to live most of the rest of their lives out of Utah. While rural youth were more likely to intend to move in the overall tabulations, they were least likely to intend to leave the state. Metropolitan youth were slightly more likely to be planning to leave Utah than were urban youth.

Out of 15 variables hypothesized to be associated with the students' intended distance, it was found that community evaluation, interpersonal relations, community satisfaction, and religion, are significantly related for rural, urban and metropolitan students. This seems to indicate that social and psychological aspects of potential migrants' community
life are more important than other background variables when the level of urbanization at the place of origin is considered.

This leads us to the conclusion that actual distance in the stream of migration may have different significance according to various socio-economic and psychological factors surrounding these migrants.

(98 pages)
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study attempts to explain the relationship between intended distance as dependent variable and various socio-economic, demographic, and psychological factors as independent variables in the process of migration. The research focuses on migration intentions of 1975 high school graduates throughout Utah.

Migrants' intentions or plans, although not migration per se, represent the initial important phase of the migration decision-making process. This is the phase in the process when the many factors are employed in evaluating alternative destinations.¹

This research analyzes the relationship between these factors at this phase in the decision-making process.

The impact of migration is very pervasive for the individual as well as for society as a whole. The significance of migration is described by Thomlinson as follows:

For the individual, migration may be a step toward a higher rank and better economic or social living conditions. For the society, it can be a means of correcting an imbalance between the supply of workers and jobs and between consumers and production.

Migration disturbs the age-sex composition, thus altering marriage prospects and perhaps the birth and death rates. Often, too, it destroys existing social bonds and institutional ties, replacing old allegiances with membership in new churches, schools, factories, and cliques.²

The consequences of migration are critically important for many aspects of society. Their impact influences the essential core of labor force, economic development, urban development, and redistribution of the population. They even affect education and social structure.

The volume of migration in the United States has been so great that Thomlinson refers to this country as "a nation of nomads."\(^1\) According to the 1970 Census of Population, 47.0 percent of the total population changed houses between 1965 and 1970. During this five-year period, 23.3 percent moved to a different house in the same county, and 17.0 percent to a different county in the same state. About 7 percent moved to another state.\(^2\) At the time of the 1970 census, approximately one-fourth of the total population was found to be born in a different state from that in which they resided. Certainly, the volume and impacts of migration make it an important process for study.

In Utah, population change due to migration was -6.5 percent in the period 1930-1940, 1.2 percent in 1940-1950, and 9.4 percent in 1950-1960.\(^3\)

There has been rapid change in the urban and rural populations in Utah during the last three decades. In 1950 the urban population was 65.3 percent. In 1960 it was 74.9 percent, and in 1970 it was 80.4 percent.\(^4\)

Population change among Utah's counties between 1960 and 1970 ranged from an increase of 52.9 percent for Davis County to -42.8 percent for

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 214.


\(^3\)Ibid.

\(^4\)Ibid., Table 18: Urban and Rural Population (on the basis of current urban definition).
Daggett County. Overall, most of the counties in Utah lost population during this period with population decrease confined to the fourteen rural counties.

Previous research has shown distance to have a key role in the migration decision of individuals.¹ Great distance between places generally operates as an obstacle to the flow of people between them. This may be due to the economic cost associated with moving, the lack of information concerning distant places, the breaking of social ties entailed in long-distance moves, or a combination of such factors.

Distance may have a different level of influence on groups with varying levels of resources or ability to overcome obstacles. This study will examine distance to places where various classes of people intend to move, thereby providing information about the influence of distance on migration intentions.

**Conceptual Definitions**

The dependent and independent variables in this study are defined as follows:

**Dependent variable**

1. Intended distance. This is defined by the type of boundary between the respondents' present residence and the place to which the respondents indicated they intended to move in the future. In this study,


intended distance categories are: within county, within state, contiguous states, and non-contiguous states. This is a common proxy used in the measurement of distance.

Independent variables

1. Occupational aspiration. Occupational aspiration is defined as one's own desire for a specific kind of occupation in the future.

2. Occupational orientation. This concept is defined as one's own personality patterns related with socio-cultural norms toward one's own occupation in the future. In this study, this concept means achievement or security orientation related with occupation.

3. Family status. This concept is defined as one's parents' marital status with respect to intact or broken family.

4. Family cohesion. The above concept of family status, being an objective aspect of one's family, family cohesion is defined as one's subjective emotional feeling including a sense of obligation and beliefs concerning one's own attachment toward one's family of orientation.

5. Community evaluation. As subjective feelings about one's own present community, this concept is defined as the level or degree of satisfaction as evaluated by one's own likes and dislikes regarding the general aspect of one's community.

6. Interpersonal relations. This concept is defined as one's own evaluation concerning people in the present community on the basis of one's relationship with other people.

7. Degree of participation. This concept is defined as one's level of involvement toward school, church, and other community activity as a type of social attachment toward the present community.
Statement of the Problem

The following questions correspond to the objectives of this study as well as the main problems which will be attacked in this thesis.

1. To what extent are intended residences distributed among various distance categories?

2. What is the relationship between intended distance and various socio-economic factors?

In examining the relationship between intended distance as an intervening obstacle and other variables, this thesis attempts to examine the relationships with reference to three categories of residence, i.e., rural, urban, and metropolitan areas. These three categories signify ordinal levels of urbanization. It is to differentiate between rural, urban, and metropolitan areas as distinctive social categories which are assumed to influence the specific ways of life of the inhabitants.

Justification of the Study

In his first law of migration, Ravenstein\textsuperscript{1} mentioned that the great body of migrants proceed a short distance. He studied the relationship between migration flow and distance. Negatively, its importance was expressed by Donald Bogue as follows:

Because only fragmentary data have been available until recently, it has been almost impossible to form even a vague notion of the extent to which distance acts as a barrier to internal migration in the United States.\textsuperscript{2}


\textsuperscript{2}Donald Bogue, "Migration and Distance," \textit{American Sociological Review}, 14, 1949, p. 236.
In Everett Lee's theory of migration\(^1\) presented as an attempt for the development of a general schema, distance is mentioned as the most studied of the intervening obstacle which migrants intend to overcome between every two points of origin and destination.\(^2\) According to Kammeyer and McClendon,\(^3\) Everett Lee's theory of migration is one of the typical theoretical frameworks that appeared in the late 1960's. Lee's definition of migration seems to be simple and vague. Migration is "a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence."\(^4\) Lee excluded the continual movement of nomads and migratory workers on the basis of his definition.

But this point may be congruous with his view that conclusions are to be deduced from what would seem to be self-evident propositions. He proposed four different groups of factors which are self-evident and omnipresent for any kind of voluntary spatial mobility, except temporary moves of nomads or migratory workers. They are:

1. Factors associated with the area of origin.
2. Factors associated with the area of destination.
3. Intervening obstacles.
4. Personal factors.

He also differentiated between +, 0, and - factors on the basis of whether certain factors attract, or repel migrants, or were indifferent for potential migrants. Actual or potential migrants are viewed to respond differently to the same +, 0, and - factors.

\(^{2}\)Ibid., p. 193.
\(^{4}\)Everett Lee, op. cit., p. 191.
Apart from his theoretical starting points, Lee explained volume of migration with aggregate socio-cultural instances. According to him, volume of migration varies with such factors as the degree of diversity of areas, the diversity of people, the difficulties of surmounting intervening obstacles, fluctuation in the economy, and so on.¹

In connecting the volume of migration with the difficulty of surmounting the intervening obstacles, among which distance is mentioned as the most important, Lee's explanation is without reference to each migrant's personal-psychological situation.

To tunnel under the Berlin wall is a hazardous task not to be undertaken lightly; nor was sea passage to the Americas in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. There are many other instances in history where the removal of obstacles has set in motion large flows of migrants, and others in which the imposition of new obstacles or the heightening of old ones has brought about the sharp diminution of a long continued flow.²

Kammeyer and McClendon also pointed out that Lee's conceptual model of migration, focusing on the perception and the decision making of the individual, formulates a hypothesis which is of no relevance to the individual's perception of the situation.³

It can be pointed out that Lee's conceptual framework was not fully connected with congruous hypotheses in his own model. What is attempted in this study is to grasp the meaning of distance on the basis of Lee's personal-psychological conceptual framework.

¹Everett Lee, op. cit., pp. 194-198.
²Everett Lee, op. cit., p. 196.
³Kenneth C. W. Kammeyer and McKee McClendon, op. cit., p. 218.
Young adults are especially important as the most potential migrants. In her study, Dorothy Thomas concluded that the only generalization that could be made in regard to migration differentials in internal migration was that migrants tended to be young persons in their late teens.\(^1\) Everett Lee also emphasized the importance of the life cycle in his theory of migration as follows:

Another important difference between the factors associated with area of origin and area of destination is related to stages of the life cycle. For many migrants the area of origin is that in which the formative years have been spent and for which the general good health ....\(^2\)

In this regard, high school graduation must be one of the most important stages of the life cycle. Moves to other areas must have significant meaning for their families and communities as well as themselves.


\(^2\)Everett Lee, op. cit., p. 192.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review does not discuss all the major studies in migration. It covers those studies primarily focusing on the decision-making process with reference to actual or potential migrants' socio-economic and psychological factors as they relate to distance and migration. Some empirical studies on the aggregate level are reviewed because their emphasis on migrants' socio-economic or psychological factors are relevant for the main focus of this study.

Perspectives on Migration

It is a well-known fact that there has been too little theoretical work in the study of migration. We have had an abundant number of empirical studies, but little theory to guide such studies.

In the last decade a number of theories in migration have been developed and proposed that can guide empirical studies. These theoretical orientations show that the stage of the study of migration is getting out of mere emphasis of descriptive data and empirical research.

Everett Lee's theoretical model mainly emphasizing the personal-psychological basis of migrants is one of those representative frameworks which emerged in the late 1960's. Such personal-psychological import in


2Kammeyer and McClendon, op. cit., p. 214.
Lee's model impinges upon the concept of "push-pull" regarding migratory behavior as reaction to repulsive and attractive factors surrounding actual or potential migrants.

Examining variations in the rates of in-migration, out-migration, net-migration, and total migratory activity between metropolises in the northeastern and northcentral regions of the United States between 1935 and 1940, Anderson concluded that net migration can be explained purely in terms of the push-pull theory of migration.

Landis discussed push-pull conceptualization differentiating between voluntary and compulsive moves on the basis of whether the act of migration is to direct toward a higher vertical plane or to seek relief. He concluded that rural girls moving to cities achieve superior occupational and economical status than rural people remaining behind.

Peterson differentiated between conservative and innovating types of migration in his general typology, depending on how they are defined by the activating agent. Innovating migration in Peterson's typology may be more concerned with pull factors, while conservative migration may be more concerned with push factors rather than pull factors.

Mayo tried to understand changes as the new direction in the American way as an ideal in terms of a series of social movement. Mass movement


of populations is the first among four distinctive movements in American society. Mass migration as collective behavior generated from social momentum in Peterson's typology\(^1\) can also be regarded to have the same frame of reference as mass movement of population as social movement. The act of migration may be social movement on the aggregate level. It is also related to personal-psychological push-pull factors on the individual level.

But the real basis of migration as social movement, or behavioral results from push-pull factors, can be provided with specific socio-cultural patterns of value orientation, which are unique in a given society.

If migratory behavior on the individual level can be regarded as reaction resulting from individual decision making toward various kinds of betterment, it can be presupposed that the general pattern of decision making on the aggregate level influenced from broad-value orientation in a given society influences people to move.

For example, in a society where achievement is easy and more highly valued than ascription, the pull factors will be favorable for attracting people to determine to migrate on the individual as well as aggregate level.

Parsons pointed out that the dominant pattern of value orientation of the American culture is the occupational system.\(^2\) Adaptive aspects of this system are necessary, which may be interpreted as modes of adaptations to the exigencies of institutionalizing the value patterns.

The explanation given by Parsons seems to provide Lee's theory of migration with a more general theoretical basis. Parson's explanation

\(^1\)W. Peterson, op. cit.

circumscribes the direction of value orientation of each migrant accepting migration as a reaction toward better achievement recognized in society.

Actually, various empirical studies examined the act of migration as a behavioral response primarily related with achievement motivation toward better education, occupation, and other factors. Migratory behavior was viewed as a behavioral result mainly determined by the decision-making process which is strongly influenced by general socio-cultural values and achievement orientations in the modern American society.

Crockett\(^1\) examined effects of educational level, social class background, and strength of achievement motive on mobility. He concluded that strength of achievement motive exerts noticeable influence on upward mobility, especially among those who lack any college training.

Expected relationships between strength of achievement motive and mobility are found to be absent among persons from upper middle-class background, while they are found to be present among persons from the other social class groups.

From the interviews in 1956 with families of 386 Negro migrants from Western Chickasaw County, Mississippi, Rubin\(^2\) found that the dominant motive among them was work opportunities and the fact that established relatives provide communication sources and other aids.

Masouka\(^3\) concluded that economic and occupational motivations played the most important part in the migration of southern-born notables from the region of their birth.


In his study concerning the Standard Metropolitan Areas of the United States during the 1940-50 decade, Balakrishnan\textsuperscript{1} concluded that migration rates were related to both the economic and non-economic measures. He confirmed that internal migration follows a pattern of differential opportunity among communities, and that selectivity in migration can be explained by differences in the meaning of opportunity for various types of migrants. He also concluded that non-economic factors played an important part in the distribution of population.

Solomon\textsuperscript{2} concluded that evaluation of specific aspects of rural versus urban conditions of living was different among the married sons and daughters of native born who were open-country residents of Broome County, New York.

Various studies have also examined the interrelationships between motivation toward some other factors and migration. Middleton and Grigg\textsuperscript{3} studied the level of educational and occupational aspirations between rural youths and young people in the city. He concluded that rural youths have lower aspirations than young people in urban areas for the white population only, and more particularly for the white male segment. He failed to obtain any significant rural-urban differences in the aspirations of Negroes, which is surprising.


Forman\textsuperscript{1} studied the relationship between attitudes toward migration and social class values. He concluded that the necessity to move to obtain a desired job is negatively associated with class, but not with status, and lack of attachment to area is positively associated with status but not class. A favorable attitude toward mobility was found to be closely related with middle-class values.

In his study concerning young couples staying on farms in Adair County, Kentucky, Hansen\textsuperscript{2} showed that the social and economic factors of education, standard of living, income, and ability to project future needs, go hand in hand in influencing young farm couples to stay on the farm.

Winston\textsuperscript{3} studied the importance of educational status in the complex and highly mobile society. It was shown that a person with low educational status is strongly bound to his immediate groups and situations and is handicapped in his potential responses of attracting situations in other areas. On the other hand, the literate person was found to have a larger potential range of stimulation and to be better equipped to handle new situations arising in other areas.

Most of the following empirical studies examine the importance of education, occupation, other factors, or the interrelationships among them in a specific stream of migration. The basic assumption of this review of literature is that those empirical studies mostly done on the aggregate level are also relevant in explaining the individual level of motivation in American society, explained as the same socio-cultural boundary.


Occupational Selectivity

The significance of occupation can be found in the studies examining it in socio-cultural context, or other studies relating occupation with prestige or family of orientation. The main portions of the empirical studies here are those examining the relationship between occupation and other factors, which are manifested with distinctive socio-economic status of migrants in the stream of migration.

In their study with the responses of a representative sample of 107 college freshmen, Garbin and Bates\(^1\) investigated the relationship which exists between the prestige evaluation of the occupations in terms of 20 specified occupational traits. The most significant correlates of occupational prestige were: "Interesting and challenging work, intelligence required," and "scarcity of personnel who can do the job."

The highest relationship between groups of occupational traits and prestige were: "Intelligence and training requirements" and "rewards of the work." They\(^2\) also obtained similar findings from their study of 490 individuals representing six diverse groups concerning their evaluation of 30 occupations as to prestige and 20 different occupational traits.

Hodge et al.\(^3\) found a correlation of .99 between prestige score derived from the 1947 study of occupational prestige and a 1963 replication of it. Scientific occupations were increasing in prestige. Culturally

---


oriented occupations were falling, and artisans were enjoying a mild upward trend. But it was found that the structure of occupational prestige is remarkably stable through time as well as space.

An individual's choice of occupation, especially the male, was found to be influenced by the father's occupation. Pihlblad and Gregory\(^1\) studied the question as to what extent occupational choice is influenced by parental occupation, and at what occupational levels a shift in the occupation of sons most often occurs.

Information concerning the occupations of the fathers of a sample of Missouri youths who completed their high school education and the youths' own occupation ten to twelve years later, showed that the most significant shift was away from farming and agricultural pursuits toward the professions, clerical work, and business pursuits. The tendency to gravitate toward the same occupational level as that of their fathers was most marked among the children of professional and white-collar workers, and less so among children of manual workers. Nearly all persons occupied in farming were found to be sons of farmers. They\(^2\) also concluded that it seemed reasonable to conclude that a father's occupation exercises about twice the influence of test intelligence on occupational choice.

Scudder and Anderson\(^3\) studied father-son vocational status in the process of migration. In their study, they concluded that vocational status of sons was affected by general social status of parents as well.

---


as their vocational rankings, especially within the group of white-collar fathers, and that sons migrating out of small or moderate-size communities were more likely to rise above their parents' occupational status than sons remaining in their home town.

In his study, Turner\(^1\) examined the minority status of the Negro with reference to education and job position. He concluded that the minority status of the Negro leads to a lessened correlation between education and job position. It was indicated that for men, but not women, in the rural South, this relationship was fully accounted for by characteristics of the range of occupations available to the Negro.

Duncan and Hodge\(^2\) found another aspect of the same kind of inequality. Using data from the Chicago portion of the 1951 Six-City Survey of Labor Mobility, they found a correlation of about .3 between respondents' occupational status and those of their fathers. Sons of farmers and non-whites were handicapped by comparison with respondents of non-farm origin and whites.

The comprehensive meaning of occupation, or its relationships with other factors in a specific stream of migration was examined in the following studies. In his dissertation, Rahman\(^3\) concluded the following findings:

1. A high rural birthplace and childhood environment are related with longer socio-economic achievement levels.

---


2. Father's occupational status has a statistically significant bearing on son's current occupational status and intergenerational occupational gains.

3. Father's education is related to the son's current occupational status.

4. The higher the frequency of migration, the higher is the current occupational status of the respondents.

Geurin in his study with 126 individuals, found that variables showing a significant relationship to the change in the Occupational Aspiration Score between 1965 and 1971 were Occupational Aspiration as measured in 1965; willing to move out of the state to get the job and salary he wants; has plans for technical training; and has plans for college in the next five years.

From the interview conducted with 25 Austrian scientists who live and work in the United States and who consider themselves as either emigrants or near emigrants, Schmiedeck found that two motivations underlying their decision to migrate to the United States were professional identification and an attachment to their children.

In his study of southern-born notables, Masouka found that there were no unique factors motivating them to emigrate from the region of their birth. Economic and occupational motivations were found to play the most important part in the migration of these individuals.


3E. C. Masouka, op. cit.
Using a sample list of 912 male graduates for the years 1948, 1950, 1952, 1954 and 1956 from five Minnesota rural high schools, Coller concluded that all the findings were related to three aspects of geographic mobility-range, destination, and frequency of migration. Variables most significantly associated with range were found to be occupational aspiration, military experience, and career advancement.

From the analysis of census data on migration patterns between 1955 and 1960 for 12 large metropolitan areas, Taeuber and Taeuber concluded that nearly all streams of migrants were of a higher average socio-economic status than non-migrants. And the circulation of persons of higher levels of educational attainment and occupational status was found to have the net effect of diminishing the socio-economic level of central city populations and augmenting the socio-economic level of suburban populations.

In Tarver's study in which he examined the intercounty migration rates, it was found that professional workers had significantly higher rates than ten major occupational groups. The rates among the detailed occupational groups varied significantly. Male workers moved more frequently than female workers.

Lively examined the relationship between occupation and range of mobility. He found that the professional and semi-skilled groups showed significantly greater mobility than the other socio-economic groups.

---


From the reports on the residence and occupation in 1950-1952 of 1,553 males and 1,862 females in 116 small Missouri communities, Pihlblad and Gregory\(^1\) found that emigration from the small towns of Missouri was selective of the professions: students, most of whom were probably embarking on professional careers, and skilled workers.

These empirical studies indicate that occupational selectivity plays an important part in the stream of migration. They also indicate that choosing an individual's occupation is influenced by the father's occupational status, or social status of the family of orientation, and that each occupational group has different import in the stream of migration.

**Educational Selectivity**

The importance of education in an individual's social position in contemporary society was examined in various studies.

With data from England, Sweden, and the United States, Anderson\(^2\) tested the assumption that in contemporary society vertical mobility depends on formal education. He found that the upward mobility group is comprised mainly of persons with typical schooling.

In Prehn's\(^3\) study, it was concluded that upward mobility through higher education was relative to status of origin, and that postgraduate and professional courses were necessary for high-status-of-origin graduates to achieve either status stability or upward mobility.

---

\(^1\)C. T. Pihlblad and C. L. Gregory, op. cit.


Shannon and Krass\textsuperscript{1} confirmed the general proposition that a high level of education opens the door to opportunity in the work with limited verification from their data.

Evidence was present by Eckland\textsuperscript{2} to suggest that social class and college graduation are significantly related, especially among the college entrants who were only average students in high school.

Glick and Miller\textsuperscript{3} concluded that the completion of additional increments of education, especially college, is associated on the average with increased earning power, but that this relationship is much less pronounced for non-white than white men.

In the process of migration, the significance of education was studied as an isolated factor or a portion of migrants' general socio-economic status.

Landis\textsuperscript{4} found that rural youth migrating to urban areas were better educated than rural youth remaining behind but less well educated than urban youth with whom they took up residence.


Crockett\textsuperscript{1} examined the effects on mobility of educational level, social class background, and strength of achievement motive. The attainment of some college education was shown to enhance greatly the likelihood of upward mobility and reduce the likelihood of downward mobility. Strength of achievement was shown to exert noticeable influence on upward mobility, especially among young persons who lacked any college training. His analysis showed both the absence of expected relationships between strength of achievement motive and mobility among persons from upper middle class background, and the presence of such relationships among persons from the other social class groups.

Winston\textsuperscript{2} concluded that persons of low educational status, in the complex and mobile society of today, are bound to their immediate groups and situations, and are handicapped in their potential responses to attracting situations in other states. The literate person, on the average, was found to have a larger potential range of stimulation and was better equipped to adjust to new situations arising in other areas.

From the analysis of the 1960 United States Census data on lifetime and recent migration, Suval and Hamilton\textsuperscript{3} found that the correlation between migration and education varied by age, sex, and color. Gross migration, both to and from the South, was positively correlated with education and there was little difference between the educational level of in- and out-migrants. Gross migration rates among the white population, both to and from the South, were greater than those among the non-white population


at all educational levels. He concluded that areas with large expanding metropolitan populations were attracting well-educated migrants, and rural areas of the South were continuing to lose more educated populations than they gained.

Brown\(^1\) presented the evidence of selective migration, as revealed by the comparison of emigrants and immigrants on the basis of education and occupation. In his intracohort analysis of the occupational distributions of white and Negro males from 1930 to 1940 and 1940 to 1950, Hare\(^2\) found a trend of convergence between the occupational distributions. The factor of education was found to be of special importance to the Negro's mobility during periods of substantial occupational change.

From the analysis of interstate migration for college enrollment on the basis of public and private reports dating from 1887 to 1958, Groat\(^3\) found that the patterns of student migration varied greatly by type or institution (public or private) as well as by level of training involved (graduate or undergraduate). Economic variables correlated highly with total population migration but were not found to be similarly correlated with student migration.

With national data for the periods 1935 to 1940, 1940 to 1947, and 1949 to 1950, Shyrock and Nam\(^4\) found an essentially direct association


between the migration rate and the number of years of school completed by adults. Out-migration from the South was selective of the college educated, and in-migrants to the South were very high in educational attainment.

Hobbs\(^1\) examined selective factors in internal migration as a function of the socio-economic gradient in his study. He concluded that the forces which governed migration were most selective of young, single males with a greater amount of education.

**Economic and Other Non-Economic Factors**

It is generally accepted that economic status is deeply associated with educational and occupational status in contemporary society. Some of the following studies mainly emphasizing the importance of economic factors can be recast on the basis of occupation, education, or general socio-economic factors related with migrants. As a matter of fact, most studies examined economic factors, together with other non-economic factors.

Anderson\(^2\) examined variations in the rates of in-migration, out-migration, net-migration, and total migratory activity between metropolises in the northeastern and north-central regions of the United States between 1935 and 1940. It was indicated that those migration rates can be substantially explained by four measures: percentage of unemployed in the labor force, mean rent, population size, and location of the metropolis.

---


\(^2\) T. R. Anderson, op. cit.
In his study, Price concluded that a high proportion of out-migrants were found in areas with high wages in 1935, followed by decreasing wages, small urban proportion, decreasing retail sales from 1935 to 1939, and small increases or actual decreases in expenditures for farm implements and machinery.

Balakrishnan studied net migration in the Standard Metropolitan Areas of the United States during the decade 1940 to 1950. He found that migration rates were related to both the economic and non-economic measures.

In his study, Hamilton concluded that there is a relationship between variations in departure rates and the economic status of the families involved.

Lowry confirmed that economic factors were stimulating factors of many in-migrants, but not for out-migrants.

In their articles with the same title, "Is out-migration affected by economic conditions?" Wrighten and Gatons emphasized the importance

---


of the information factor, while Miller\(^1\) stressed emphasis on the higher mobility of those who have moved previously.

In Sjaastad's\(^2\) study, the important factors were found to be distance, male median income, and local government expenditure.

Campbell\(^3\) concluded that small families, and young people with fewer responsibilities, were more likely to return to the South. High level of education and income were also cited as related positively to the trend to migrate. Social factors followed by economic factors were found most often to be given as reasons for migration to the South.

Brown, et al.\(^4\) found the importance of relatives at destination as a motive for persons leaving eastern Kentucky communities.

Informational or communicational factors were also studied in some studies. Denton\(^5\) found that a job informational network existed among the workers moving frequently. Such networks keep them informed as to the location of jobs.


In his study with 430 eighth- and twelfth-grade boys in a Georgia County, Payne found that informal interpersonal situations contributed most to the formation of their occupational, migration, and educational expectations.

Bohlen and Wakeley examined the relationships between intention to migrate and subsequent actual migration. They found that factors such as communication with parents, socio-economic status of family, parental educational levels, age of parents and attitude toward farm life were related to migration patterns of respondents.

The significance of general socio-cultural background was studied with reference to the stream of migration. Martinson examined aspects of personal adjustment that are related with, and perhaps causative of, migration from rural communities to urban areas. It was indicated that social aggressiveness was an important factor in the complex of influences in the migration of girls, and that academic achievements in high school and urban-oriented interests were most important in the complex of factors resulting in the migration of boys.

In Beshers and Nishiura's study, it was indicated that the differential characteristics of streams of migration may be regarded as consequences of social and cultural constraints upon the head of a household.


As a part of socio-cultural background, community of orientation was indicated to have meaningfulness. Lipset’s study indicated that the larger a person’s community of orientation, the more likely he was upward mobility.

With the data from a national sample survey, Freedman and Freedman found that those reared on farms were concentrated in low-status positions, as measured by education, income, occupation, or self-perception of class. Forman found that expectation of mobility is strongly related with community satisfaction. He concluded that favorable attitudes to mobility were closely associated with middle-class values.

Various studies examined demographic factors in the stream of migration. Bowles found that the migration rates for young people were high in all areas in the decade 1940 to 1950. Rates for children and persons 25-44 were low in most areas during the same period.

Price found that non-white migrants, more than white migrants, tend to be single persons or childless couples and to be more concentrated in the highly employable ages.

---


Migration of Negroes from the South was studied by Hamilton.¹ Causal factors in this migration were found to be the high rate of natural increase in the South, mechanization of southern agriculture, and other socio-economic factors. At the same time, the highest rate of migration was found among young people from 18 to 25 years of age, and their migration was selective of the best educated.

A relatively comprehensive study related to most of this review of literature was done by Turner.² He examined attitudes, motives, and characteristics of the migrants in present-day migration to Kalamazoo, Michigan. First, he categorized all respondents' answers concerning the reason for moving, which are shown on the next page (Table 1).

The most dominant reason was found to be economic or job-related with 57.3 percent of the total cases. It was shown that the most important factor in economic or job-related considerations was that of moving to take a job. The remainder of the cases were almost equally distributed among factors related to friends and relatives, or goodness of living.

The main analysis of Turner's study showed the degree of association between his five background variables (age, education, socio-economic status, veteran status, and sex and marital status) and 30 types of possible differences concerning motives, attitudes, and characteristics. In his results, it was found that non-economic factors such as health, home, and a liking for the job were more often mentioned as the reason for mov-


Table 1. Reasons given by Turner's respondents for moving away from the old location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Economic or job considerations</strong></td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job opportunities better at the new location</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work not available, or was otherwise unsatisfactory</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically to look for a job</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was transferred on the job</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take a job (not referred to as a transfer)</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. The influence of friends and relatives</strong></td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To join in-laws or parents</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To join brother or sister</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be near own or spouse's home</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get away from relatives</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get married</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The persuasion or influence of relatives</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To join son or daughter</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The persuasion or influence of friends</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited friends or relatives and stayed</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People were unfriendly</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of spouse</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced from spouse</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Conditions related to goodness of living but not including friends, relatives, economic factors, or job considerations</strong></td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor access to places of interest and amusement</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing was poor at old location</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found better living quarters at the new location</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not like dirt and city atmosphere generally</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living conditions (unspecified) were poor</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness in family forced a move</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better educational and cultural opportunities at new locale</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo provided better environment for children</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate and geographic reasons</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting and fishing opportunities at new location</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal and private reasons, not diverged</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To retire</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became tired of staying in one place</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War loosened bonds to the old location</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General dislike for old location</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General liking for new location</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Miscellaneous reasons

6.3

---

Turner, R. H. op. cit.
ing in the upper socio-economic group. Job-related reasons were most often mentioned by the upper educational group, which was found to have fewer numbers of relatives at the new location. Attractive influence of the new location, information concerning job-related factors, and consultation with the spouse, were more closely related with the upper socio-economic and upper educational group.

Distance of Migration

Distance has generally been regarded as one of the major factors in the study of migration differentials. In Ravenstein's famous Laws of Migration, the major stream of migration is explained with the factor of a short distance.¹

In the concept of Lee's "intervening obstacles," defined as a set of obstacles between every two points of origin and destination, and which may be slight in some instances and insurmountable in others, distance takes the most important and omnipresent obstacle.²

Distance as a migration differential has been regarded important enough to deeply influence the stream of migration. But what really matters is to find out in what way distance can influence the process and trend of migration, and more specifically, what kind of generalization concerning distance can be possible with reference to other variables surrounding migrants to understand the meaning of distance as an important factor.

¹Ravenstein's first Law of Migration is that the great body of our migrants only proceed a short distance and migrants enumerated in a certain center of absorption will ... grow less (as distance from the center increases). Everett Lee, op. cit., p. 189.

Migration is famous for its unpredictability, mostly concerned with such factors as personal histories, likes and dislikes, socio-environmental factors, opportunities, and aspiration. All these features of migration may be obstacles to found any definite generalization for the meaning of distance in migration.

Surmounting a given distance must have different meaning in different societal circumstances having various levels of technology or transportation systems. But consistent suggestion from the following empirical studies is that distance as a factor is important enough through which streams of migration can be understood.

From the analysis of intercounty census data, based on the place of residence in 1955 and 1960, Suval and Hamilton\(^1\) found that educational status increased with distance of migration for all sex and color groups. With the data of 13,361 youths aged 18 to 24, Day and Landis\(^2\) found that there is a low but significant correlation between educational status of migrants and distance of migration. This relationship was found to be more pronounced among males than females. The most significant relationship was found between high educational status and long-distance migration.

In Turner's\(^3\) study it was also found that those with high educational status made more moves averaging 400 miles or more than those with low educational status.

---


\(^3\)R. H. Turner, Ibid.
Brown found that rural Negroes migrating to Louisiana between 1950 and 1960 from noncontiguous parishes have higher median years of education than those migrating from contiguous parishes.

Three studies, done by Zipf, Bogue and Thompson, and Stouffer on the aggregate level will be examined and theoretical suggestions from examining their studies will be mentioned and reviewed again on the personal-psychological level.

1. Zipf's model. In terms of the intercity movement of persons, Zipf tried to explain the streams of migration focusing on distance and population size. Using highway, railway, and air data for an arbitrary set of cities during 1933-1934 in the United States, he showed "unmistakable positive correlation" between the number of passengers carried and their corresponding value of $\frac{P_1 P_2}{D}$ ($P_1, P_2$: the size of the total population at the place of origin and destination; $D$: distance between the two places).

He tried to analyze the streams of migration with three variables, the shortest transportation distance and the size of population of the two places. His essential theoretical points are given as follows:

The intercommunity movement of goods and of persons between any two communities ... will be directly proportionate to the product, $P_1 P_2$, and inversely proportionate to the distance, $D$.


3Ibid.

4Ibid.
Analytically, his model can be expressed with the following two propositions separating both of the two basic factors.

1. With the same distance, the number of movers is proportionate to the product, \( P_1 \cdot P_2 \).

2. With the same amount of the product \( P_1 \cdot P_2 \), the number of movers is inversely proportionate to the physical distance between the two cities of origin and destination.

With these two propositions, the following three plausible cases of migration will be helpful to examine his model more precisely.

Case 1.

\[ \text{Case 1.} \]

\[ \text{City C} \]

\[ \text{City A} \rightarrow \text{City B} \]

In this case, larger numbers of migrants move to City B from City A than from City A to City C, in spite of the fact that the distance between City A and B is much farther than that between City A and City C.

One typical case of an example can be the stream of migration toward California, caused by the discovery of gold.

As far as we are concerned with Zipf's model, we cannot but rely on the total population size of origin and destination, and distance between them to explain this kind of concentration of migrants toward a specific area.

Mostly, the more population a city of destination has, the more diversities of economic chance we can expect. These diversities may attract more migrants toward the destination. But some special factors at the place of destination, which can be independent of the size of population, can also strongly attract more migrants, as was shown in the case of
migration to California caused by the discovery of gold. Needless to say, such cases of migration cannot be explained with Zipf's model.

It must be mentioned that all factors associated with societal or environmental situations, independent of population size, are not considered correctly in his model. In other words, his model is much too simplified to explain the kind of complex structural characteristics in the streams of migration. Distance as a factor is emphasized excessively without the supplement of other important factors, except the size of population.

Case 2.

City A ←—— City B

In this case, what is called stream and counterstream of migration is depicted. We know that the product $P_1 P_2$, and the distance between the two cities is the same for both stream and counterstream.

The expected explanation from Zipf's model for this case is that the number of migrants for both flows is equal or similar, which is unacceptable compared with the actual data of migration. We recognize another shortcoming of his model in the sense that it cannot explain this kind of directional flow of migration. Certain characteristics of migrants, or the differences of socio-economic and environmental factors between the two places, may be to the point in this case. But it is absolutely impossible to explain these flows of migration with his model.

Case 3. In this case, we have a number of flows of migration between different pairs of cities, having the same distance between the two places.
In the following figure, numeric numbers are given as the size of population for all the areas, and we recognize that the product $P_1 P_2$ is the same for all flows of migration in this case. Thus, can we expect approximately the same number of migrants for all these flows of migration? Actual data of migration will not allow a positive answer to this question.

Overall, these three examples of migration require more scientific explanations in terms of causality. Zipf's model cannot present definite answers concerning the question of why people move and what other factors are closely related with different amounts of distance in the streams of migration. Mere existence of different distances and different sizes of population cannot be said to cause migrants to move.

Distance and size of population can cause or stimulate migrants to decide to move through certain unique factors favorable to the move.

2. Bogue and Thompson's\textsuperscript{1} study. In this study, we find different approaches toward the meaning and influence of distance in the streams of migration. Their study utilized the enumeration of migrants taken as a part of the Sixteenth United States Census. They examined three inquiries to explain the meaning of distance as one of the principal factors influencing the number and characteristics of migrants. The important findings from their study are as follows:

\textsuperscript{1}D. J. Bogue and W. S. Thompson, "Migration and Distance," American Sociological Review, Vol. 14, 1949, pp. 236-244.
1. The amount of distance to be traveled is one of the factors closely related to the rate of leaving one point for any other point.\(^1\)

Assuming that the influence of migration, or the frequency with which the attractive "pull" of another community or the expulsive "push" of the community of origin is successful in creating migration, may be measured by the rate of out-migration, they came to the conclusion that the decline of attractive power with increasing distance is so large that the logarithm of the rate of departure, rather than the rate itself, tends to be a linear function of the distance traveled.\(^2\)

2. For their second inquiry, they questioned what part distance of migration plays in effecting a redistribution of population. They came to the following conclusion with regard to this inquiry:

   a. Distance restricts the movement of urban population less than it does the movement of rural population.\(^3\)

   With their data, they found that a higher proportion of the migrants who leave an urban area, or its vicinity, travel to the more distant zones than migrants who leave rural areas, and the greater the distance to be traveled, the greater this parity between urban and rural tends to become.\(^4\)

In their third inquiry, which is the most relevant to this thesis, they examined whether there are sex and color rate differentials in the

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 240.
\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 238-239.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 242.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 242.
distance which migrants travel. They came to the following two con-
cclusions:

a. Distance is less of a brake upon the movement of males than
upon the movement of females.¹

In this study it was found that with increasing distance the rate
for males becomes progressively larger than that for females; although
the rates for females and males are almost identical for short-distance
migration.²

b. Color differential tended to be greatest at the very shortest
and longest distance.³

It was found that the white population was far more migratory than
the non-white population in the 1935-1940 period, although the phenomenon
of decreasing rate of migration with increasing distance is exhibited by
both groups.⁴

In their first and second inquiries, distance as a factor is re-
lated with aggregate stream of migration. This factor is related with
two important socio-economic variables, sex and color, in the third in-
quiry. These findings provide basic ground that other important socio-
economic and personal-psychological variables surrounding migrants can be
related with distance in migration.

¹Ibid., p. 243.
²Ibid.
³Ibid., p. 243.
⁴Ibid.
In Peterson's typology of migration, he differentiated four migratory forces: ecological push, migration policy, higher aspiration, and social momentum; each of which has a corresponding type of migration. Free migration in contemporary society is associated with higher aspirations of migrants. This could mean that personal-psychological aspirations can be channeled through the same type of migration as social movement, in which identical pattern of dominant value orientation in Parson's theory can be found. That is, various patterns of migration accompanied by different amounts of distance can be assumed to have a certain variation of motivation pattern dominated by the same value orientation.

Day and Landis studied the relationship between the level of education and distance with a sample of 13,361 civilian youth, most of whom were between the ages of 18 and 24. Their parental homes were in the state of Washington. He found a low but significant relationship between these two variables. The strongest relationship was found between a high level of education and long-distance migration.

Utilizing data from the rural Alabama community, Sanford, in his study, concluded that the emigrants displayed greater ambition, energy, and superiority by moving a greater distance than the immigrants.

---


In Lively's¹ study, no significant correlation was found between the number of changes of domicile and radical distance of circulation. But the professional and semi-skilled groups were found to show significantly greater mobility than the other groups.

Theoretical Framework

The need for theory construction in the study of migration selectivity seems to be apparent from the review of literature. What is necessary is the integration of various demographic, socio-economic and psychological approaches toward more comprehensive theories which are relevant for the actual or potential migrants and their surrounding situations.

In her review of literature concerning selectivity of migration, Elizabeth Suval² modified the basic causation model proposed by Trimmer. She proposed her modified model as recommendation for theory and research in the study of migration selectivity. The model which she modified is shown as follows:

![Diagram](characteristics of place of origin and place of destination and intervening obstacles as perceived by) → **SYSTEM** → age, education, sex, occupation, race, other conditions, including those affecting motivation → migration


This model seems to be based completely on Lee's conceptual basis. The migration process is regarded as a result of the system composed of various socio-demographic factors affecting motivation determining a move. Such a system as a whole is described to grasp various characteristics of origin and destination and intervening obstacles for the final decision to migrate.

In the basic model of this thesis, the intention to migrate is formulated through the decision-making system in which intention to migrate is set up as a final result. Migration intention is to be produced from various socio-demographic and psychological variables such as sex, education, occupational aspiration, community evaluation, and other conditions which are assumed to influence actual or potential migrants perceiving various characteristics of the place of origin and destination and intervening obstacles.

Intended distance expressed in migration intentions is viewed as a possible manifestation of the interaction of various factors in the decision-making system. That is, the existence of the degree of repulsive or attractive aspects of all the factors is assumed with reference to long or short intended distance of migration. Strongly attractive factors at the place of destination may cause potential migrants to overcome long distance as an intervening obstacle. On the other hand, social ties at the place of origin may cause them not to move a long distance.

This same model will be applied to three different categories of residence: rural, urban, and metropolitan areas.
The basic model of this thesis is given as follows:

(characteristics of place of origin and place of destination and intervening obstacles as perceived by) → Decision-making System

sex
race
occupational aspiration
other conditions → Migration Intention

intended distance

Hypotheses

Accepting major suggestions in various studies concerning the relationship between a number of factors and the streams of migration, the following factors are connected with intended distance expressed as a part of migration intention. The influence of these factors toward migration intentions is expected to manifest itself through intended distance with different amounts of distance. The following hypotheses are those to be tested in this study.

1. The student's intended distance in migration intentions is positively related with the status of the family of orientation.

Various studies showed educational and occupational selectivity in long-distance migration. Broadly speaking, migrants' socio-economic status is indicated to influence distance of migration. The status of the family of orientation may provide young students important socio-economic ground. Furthermore, the student's family of orientation may provide the students with attractive or expulsive ground on the psychological basis related with push or pull factors in migration. Strong attachment toward their family of orientation will be a social tie influencing the students not to move a long distance.
On the other hand, strong expulsiveness toward their family of orientation may cause them to move a long distance. Objectively, this part of the hypothesis is tested with the following indicators.

a. Father's educational status
b. Father's occupational status
c. Parents' family status (broken or intact family)

The subjective aspect of this hypothesis is tested with the student's feeling of family cohesion, indicating the student's emotional feeling of belonging and attachment.

d. The student's family cohesion

2. The student's intended distance in migration streams is positively related with the student's occupational aspiration and orientation.

These two concepts of occupational aspiration and orientation were defined earlier. They refer to any specific job and psychological attitude related with future occupation.

3. The distance which the student intends to migrate is positively or negatively related with various aspects of community or community life.

In terms of "push" or "pull" factors, the present community may play an important part in the decision of the student whether to move or not. How far the student intends to move may be deeply related with likes or dislikes, satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and subjective evaluation concerning the student's present community. This part of the hypothesis is tested with the following objective and subjective indicators.

a. The student's community evaluation
b. The student's interpersonal relations in the present community
c. The student's degree of participation toward community activities.
d. The student's satisfaction concerning the present community

4. The distance the student intends to migrate is positively related with the number of the student's past moves and negatively with the student's length of residence in the present community.

Both of these two independent variables, the number of past moves and the length of residence are measures of social ties. To have a strong social attachment in the present community, one must have a relatively long period of time with few past moves.

5. The student's intended distance in migration intentions is related with the student's sex and race.

6. The student's intended distance in migration intentions is related with the student's religion.

Summary

In this chapter, various empirical studies related with migration differentials have been reviewed.

Consistent suggestions from these studies are that migration is selective of certain groups with distinctive educational, economical, occupational, and other non-economic status.

Two studies related with distance as a factor in migration were examined. As a result of discussion, it was pointed out that distance as an important factor of migration was not fully understood in Zipf's study with reference to the other variables surrounding migrants.

In Bogue and Thompson's study, identical methods of approach as used in this study, and relevant findings, were explained.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Sampling

The population studied were senior public high school students in Utah at the end of the academic year of 1974-1975. There are 29 counties and 92 high schools, and the total number of high school students in the population was 22,000. From them, 3,600 students, which equaled 16.4 percent of the total population, were selected through the method of multi-stage stratified random sampling. Approximately 70 percent of the total sample responded and were utilized as being proper data for this study.

The characteristics of the place of residence, i.e., rural, urban, and metropolitan, are one of the essential foci of this study. They signify the level or urbanization based on the size of population. About 1,200 students were selected from each of the three categories of residence. Among 29 counties in the State of Utah, those counties with less than 2,500 inhabitants were classified as rural, those with 2,500 inhabitants but less than 50,000 were categorized as urban, and those with more than 50,000 inhabitants were classified as metropolitan. From these classifications of the total counties, it was identified that there were 4 metropolitan, 13 urban, and 12 rural counties. It was found that there were 15,000 senior students in metropolitan counties, 6,000 in urban, and about 1,200 students in the rural counties.
To select 1,200 students from the three categories of residence, 100 percent of the senior students were selected from rural counties, 20 percent from urban, and 8 percent of the senior students were selected from the metropolitan counties. Schools were then selected randomly from each group of counties except for the rural counties.

Mostly, the total senior class of each school was selected. Exceptions were the five metropolitan schools and two of the urban schools. In these cases, teacher classes, where the teachers were in charge of attendance and other arrangements of the senior students were selected from each of these schools randomly.

**Questionnaire**

All the items in the questionnaire were designed to be consistent with the basic theoretical framework of this thesis. They can be grouped with questions concerning factors at origin and destination, personal-psychological, and demographic factors. More specifically, respondents were asked about their plans, personal evaluation and attitudes toward their present community, family situation, and socio-economic factors concerning their present community and other communities where they intend to migrate. The questionnaire has 43 open and closed-ended questions.

To collect information, an administered and a mailed questionnaire were utilized. Most of the information was collected by an administered questionnaire, and a mailed questionnaire was adopted to increase the response rate. To differentiate between these two questionnaires, the administered questionnaire was covered blue, and the mailed was covered white.
In May 1975, graduate students at Utah State University delivered the questionnaires to the schools or the classes chosen as proper samples. Verbal and written instructions were delivered to all classroom teachers to help them administer the questionnaire.

A letter of explanation was attached to each questionnaire for the students. Most of the questionnaires were mailed back in 2 or 3 weeks. The response rate was 65 percent complete and 10 percent partials. Another set of the questionnaires was delivered to the schools with a low response rate. As a result, the total response rate was about 70 percent complete, or 2,500 responses from 3,600 potential respondents.

**Statistical Method**

The main focus of this study is to identify and compare significance of various socio-economic, demographic, and personal-psychological factors according to the different amount of distance, as is expressed in the student's intention to migrate. Intended distance is categorized with five different ordinal categories, i.e., intending to stay in the same community, to migrate within the present county within the present state, to contiguous states, and to non-contiguous states.

It is generally accepted that non-migrants are differentiated with migrants in the study of migration. Those intending to stay in the present community, the first category in intended distance of this study, are actually non-migrants. In this study, they are regarded as intending to move with 0 distance. That is, distance aspect of those non-migrants is accepted to provide the origin of the intended distance categories. Basic assumption is that non-migrants are also influenced by the same decision-making system as migrants in their decision not to migrate.
Proportions and cross tabulations are used, together with Chi-square and Gamma, in order to analyze these relationships and to measure their degrees of association.

The significance of various factors was compared according to the three different levels or urbanization, i.e., rural, urban, and metropolitan areas. Major analysis and comparison are dependent upon the method of proportions and cross tabulations.

**Operational Definitions**

**Intended distance**

This concept was defined to show how far the student intends to move as expressed in the student's migration intention. For this thesis, one place of intended destination right after graduation, and another place for the remainder of life, were asked with two different questions.

The United States Bureau of the Census utilized three different categories in the study of migration: within state, between contiguous states, and between non-contiguous states. The basic rationale for these differentiations is that state boundaries are very important in terms of socio-cultural areas.

Modifying this Bureau of the Census method, similar kinds of differentiations were utilized in this study.

Those intending to stay in their present community are regarded as those with no intention to migrate. The other respondents with intention to migrate were categorized into the following 4 groups on the basis of the area to which they wish to move.

1. Other communities within the present county
2. Other counties within the State of Utah
3. Contiguous states

4. Non-contiguous states

These categories are not exact measures of actual distance intended in the student's migration intentions.

Regarding this problem, Bogue and Thompson\(^1\) explain two categories of distance in their study, i.e., within-state and between contiguous states as follows:

The distances traveled by "within-state" migrants are much shorter, on the average, than those traveled by migrants between contiguous states. This difference is due partly to the fact that the maximum distance which within-state migrants can travel is smaller than the maximum distance which migrants between contiguous states can travel.\(^2\)

By the same token, moves between non-contiguous states may require longer distances than those between contiguous states, especially contiguous states bordering on Utah which are geographically intermountain regions and which may be considered as similar socio-cultural areas. State boundaries may have important administrative implications for migrants deciding where to move.

The different categories utilized in this study include implications as possible measures of actual distance on the ordinal level and socio-cultural implication as well.

Contiguous states refer to the states: Idaho, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming. Non-contiguous states refer to all the other states except Utah and the contiguous states.

\(^1\)Bogue, D. J. and W. S. Thompson, op. cit., pp. 236-237.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 236.
To prepare analysis in the next chapter, one example of cross tabulation explaining the relationship between the categories of intended distance and family cohesion as an independent variable is shown below. This refers to three different categories of residence: rural, urban, and metropolitan areas (Table 2).

Table 2. Intended distance and family cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
<td>Medium (%)</td>
<td>High (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
<td>Medium (%)</td>
<td>High (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
<td>Medium (%)</td>
<td>High (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migration intention and intended place of destination

Migration intention is defined as the student's plan or aspiration to migrate or not. Intended place of destination refers to the specific place that the student intends to move to as manifested in migration intention.
An operational measure of these two concepts is based on the student's responses concerning two questions asking where he or she wants to reside right after graduation and for the remainder of his or her life. Migration intention right after graduation may be strongly influenced by an educational motive to go to college, and so this place of destination may be a temporary place of residence.

Migration intention for the remainder of the student's life is related with the place of residence in the long run. This place may be well selected by the students.

A direct method differentiating those with intention to migrate and those without is to compare the name of the respondents' present community with two names of the specific places indicated in the following two questions.

Question 5

Most students seem to have several places in mind in which they might live after graduation. Please complete the chart below about the places in which you are most likely to live after graduation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 7

Where do you think you are most likely to live most of the remainder of your life?

City_________________ State____________

Those respondents indicating that they plan to live in other places are regarded as having intention to migrate.

In this part of operational definitions, two dependent variables were explained. The independent variables will be explained in the next chapter where each of them will be analyzed regarding their relationship with the dependent variable.
Limitations

This study focuses on the initial phase of the decision-making process in migration, which is not perfectly related to actual migration. This is why a follow-up study would greatly extend this study.

Five different categories of distance are utilized instead of actual mileage from sociological perspective. This does not indicate that actual mileage is irrelevant to this study.

What is statistically examined is the relationship between the dependent variable and 14 independent variables. This also does not indicate that only these 14 variables are important in the study of migration intention.

What is more crucial for this study is that the independent variables are examined with one-to-one relationship with the dependent variable. It cannot be mentioned which one is the most contributory independent variable, and how interaction between some of the independent variables affects the dependent variable. This comes from the fact that only proportions and cross tabulations are utilized as statistical method with Chi-square and Gamma. No advanced statistical methods are adopted. This is due to data limitation, especially sample size.

Summary

Various points related with methodological approaches of this study were mentioned in this chapter. Essential methodology of this study was survey research with the administered questionnaire. Cross tabulation and proportions are major tools to test the significance and the degree of association for each relationship between the variables.
CHAPTER IV

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTENDED DISTANCE AND VARIOUS INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

In this chapter an attempt will be made to analyze the degree of relationship between intended distance and various personal-psychological socio-demographic, and economic variables. For this part of the analysis, only those students answering the name of place for their migration intention for the remainder of their lives have been utilized as proper data. Before each of the hypotheses are tested, a general description relevant to the essential part of the analysis is given.

Out of the 2,525 students, the total sample size of this study, percentages and the actual number of those students with same place of intended destination for two different periods of time are as follows:

- Same community: 871 students (34.5%)
- Within-county: 124 students (4.9%)
- Within-state: 590 students (23.4%)
- Contiguous states: 104 students (4.1%)
- Non-contiguous states: 154 students (6.1%)

It was found that 27.0 percent of the total students did not give an answer to the question asking this information.

If we regard those students with intended place of destination for the above type of migration intention as 100 percent, percentages of the students for each of the categories of intended distance are given as follows:
Same community 47.3%
Within-county 6.7%
Within-state 32.0%
Contiguous states 5.6%
Non-contiguous states 8.4%

Those students with intended place of destination are categorized again with the three categories of the students' residence: rural, urban, and metropolitan areas. Percentages of rural, urban and metropolitan students are given according to the categories of intended distances (Table 3).

Table 3. Intended distance by rural, urban, and metropolitan students  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural (%)</th>
<th>Urban (%)</th>
<th>Metro (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous-states</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(638)</td>
<td>(450)</td>
<td>(755)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 167.2  df.8  Gamma = 0.21  Significant at .05

It is remarkable that the percentage of rural students intending to stay in their present community is 31.5, compared to 53.6 percent for the urban, and 56.8 percent for the metropolitan.

Almost twice the percentage of urban and metropolitan students intend to stay in the same community compared to rural students.
It was found that the majority of rural students intend to move from their present community but to stay within-state boundary. This percentage of rural students is higher than any of the urban and metropolitan students for the corresponding categories.

Association of the relationship in Table 3 shows strongly negative direction. It indicates that rural students are more likely to move farther and that metropolitan students are more likely to move shorter distances.

For the major part of the analysis in this chapter, each hypothesis will be testified as to its degree of association and significance. An overall comparison will be made between rural, urban, and metropolitan students.

Father's educational status

1. The higher a father's educational status is, the farther the student is likely to intend to move.

This hypothesis is confirmed only for metropolitan students (Table 4). The negative relationship is found for this group of students.

The percentage of metropolitan students intending to stay in the same community appears to be positively related to the father's educational status. 40.9 percent of the metropolitan students whose fathers have an education lower than high school intend to stay in the same community. This percentage corresponds to 53.3 percent of those whose fathers have a college-level education. For the two categories of within-county and within-state, the percentage distribution seems to decrease as the father's educational status becomes higher. The negative relation of the metropolitan students indicates that this group is more likely to intend to move a shorter distance as their fathers' educational status increases.
Table 4. Intended distance by father's educational status for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Less than H.S. (%)</th>
<th>High school (%)</th>
<th>College+ (%)</th>
<th>Less than H.S. (%)</th>
<th>High school (%)</th>
<th>College+ (%)</th>
<th>Less than H.S. (%)</th>
<th>High school (%)</th>
<th>College+ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(83) (206) (160) (50) (128) (154) (44) (180) (384)

Rural: Chi-square = 9.99 df.8 Not significant at .05 Gamma = -0.02
Urban: Chi-square = 5.0 df.8 Not significant at .05 Gamma = 0.01
Metro: Chi-square = 16.3 df.8 Significant at .05 Gamma = -0.122
Father's occupation

2. The student whose father has a blue-collar occupation is more likely to intend to move farther than the student whose father has a white-collar occupation.

In their study concerning spatial social distances in a metropolitan community, Duncan and Duncan\(^1\) utilized 8 selected indicators of the relative socio-economic status of the major occupation groups. These are shown as follows:

1. Professionals, technical, and kindred workers
2. Managers, officials, and proprietors
3. Sales workers
4. Clerical and kindred workers
5. Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers
6. Operatives and kindred workers
7. Service workers
8. Laborers, farm labor, and farmers

Two broad categories of occupation in this study are "white-collar" for the categories 1, 2, 3 and 4; and "blue-collar" for the rest of these categories. This concept of occupational aspiration is measured by the following two questions, one for the student, and one for the student's father.

Question 10

In the long run, what career (job) do you plan to engage in?

Question 25

Present or last occupation of father:

\(^1\)Duncan, O. D. and B. Duncan, "Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification," American Journal of Sociology, 9, 1955, pp. 495-499
This hypothesis is confirmed only for the metropolitan students, and the relationship is found to be positive (Table 5). It has been found that a higher percentage of metropolitan students whose fathers have a blue-collar occupation intend to move within-county, within-state, contiguous states, and non-contiguous states than those metropolitan students whose fathers have a white-collar occupation. This relationship of metropolitan students indicates that the metropolitan students whose fathers have a blue-collar occupation are more likely to intend to move farther than those whose fathers have a white-collar occupation.

**Occupational aspiration**

3. Students aspiring to a blue-collar occupation are more likely to intend to move farther than students aspiring to a white-collar occupation.

This hypothesis is confirmed only for rural students but not for urban and metropolitan students (Table 6).

The relationship of rural students is found to be negative. It indicates that rural students desiring a blue-collar occupation are more likely to intend to move a shorter distance than those desiring a white-collar occupation.

Percentages of rural students desiring white- and blue-collar occupations intending to stay in the same community are found to be less than those of urban and metropolitan students. Percentages of rural students desiring white- and blue-collar occupations intending to move within-state are 54.8 and 39.4 percent, which are higher than the corresponding percentages of urban and metropolitan students.

Overall, the negative relationships of rural, urban, and metropolitan students indicate that students desiring white-collar occupations...
Table 5. Intended distance by father's occupation for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

| Intended distance | Rural | | | | Urban | | | | Metro | | |
| | Father's occupation | | | | Father's occupation | | | | Father's occupation | | |
| | White-collar (%) | Blue-collar (%) | | | White-collar (%) | Blue-collar (%) | | | White-collar (%) | Blue-collar (%) | |
| Same community | 28.9 | 31.8 | | | 53.9 | 57.4 | | | 62.4 | 43.4 | |
| Within-county | 8.7 | 11.0 | | | 1.8 | 5.6 | | | 4.7 | 13.9 | |
| Within-state | 57.0 | 45.8 | | | 29.1 | 25.9 | | | 18.8 | 25.9 | |
| Contiguous states | 2.0 | 6.0 | | | 6.7 | 5.6 | | | 4.2 | 6.6 | |
| Non-contiguous states | 3.4 | 5.4 | | | 8.5 | 5.6 | | | 9.9 | 10.2 | |
| TOTAL | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | (149) | (299) | | | (165) | (162) | | | (404) | (166) | |

Chi-square = 7.6  df.4  Gamma = -0.01  Not significant at .05
Chi-square = 4.7  df.4  Gamma = -0.1  Not significant at .05
Chi-square = 25.1  df.4  Gamma = 0.24  Significant at .05
Table 6. Intended distance by occupational aspiration for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White-collar (%)</td>
<td>Blue-collar (%)</td>
<td>White-collar (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(347)</td>
<td>(208)</td>
<td>(263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 23.5 df.4  
Gamma = -0.24  
Significant at .05

Chi-square = 7.0 df.4  
Gamma = -0.25  
Not significant at .05

Chi-square = 0.69 df.4  
Gamma = -0.008  
Not significant at .05
Occupational orientation

4. The more the student is directed toward achievement, the farther the student is likely to intend to move.

Another aspect related to occupation in this study is the aspect of socio-cultural norms or personality patterns. It is occupational orientation toward achievement or security. Achievement orientation is related with vertical, mainly upward mobility, while security orientation is related to horizontal mobility.

The above concept is measured by the following question, which came from Boulding's study concerning consumer behavior.

**Question 11**

Would you please rank the things on the list below about a job you would most prefer, which comes next, which third, and so forth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A job in which:</th>
<th>Rank from 1 (most preferable) to 6 (least preferable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Income is steady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Income is high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. There is no danger of being fired or unemployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Working hours are short</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Chances for advancement are good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The work is important:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gives a feeling of accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above question, Item a, steady income; and Item c, no danger of being fired, are indicated to represent two typical norms concerning security orientation. Item e, good chances for advancement; and f,  

---

a feeling of accomplishment, are intended to represent achievement orientation. Therefore, all students who rank Items a and c as 1, 2, or 3, or those who rank a and c higher than e and f will be regarded as "security-oriented." Those who number both e and f as 1, 2 or 3, or those who rank both e and f higher than a and c will be regarded as "achievement oriented."

This hypothesis is confirmed for none of the rural, urban, and metropolitan students (Table 7). But those three relationships are found to be slightly positive. This indicates that the students with achievement orientation are slightly more likely to move farther than those with security orientation.

Sex

5. Female students are more likely to intend to move farther than male students.

This hypothesis is confirmed for the rural and urban students, but not for the metropolitan students (Table 8). The relationship is found to be positive for rural students, and negative for urban students. It is indicated that female rural students are more likely to intend to move farther than males, and female urban students are more likely to intend to move shorter distances than male urban students.

Race

6. Non-white students are more likely to intend to move farther than white students.

The above hypothesis is confirmed for the rural and metropolitan students, but not for the urban students (Table 9).

For rural and metropolitan students, the relationships are found to be positive. It is indicated that non-white rural and metropolitan stu-
Table 7. Intended distance by occupational orientation for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td>Occupational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orientation</td>
<td>orientation</td>
<td>orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security (%)</td>
<td>Achievement (%)</td>
<td>Security (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td>(190)</td>
<td>(266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(121)</td>
<td>(143)</td>
<td>(158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(158)</td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td>(172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(158)</td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td>(172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(158)</td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td>(172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td>(190)</td>
<td>(266)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 7.3 df.4  
Gamma = 0.2  
Not significant at 0.05

Chi-square = 2.0 df.4  
Gamma = 0.07  
Not significant at 0.05

Chi-square = 3.2 df.4  
Gamma = 0.11  
Not significant at 0.05
Table 8. Intended distance by sex for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th></th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (%)</td>
<td>Female (%)</td>
<td>Male (%)</td>
<td>Female (%)</td>
<td>Male (%)</td>
<td>Female (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(295)</td>
<td>(342)</td>
<td>(216)</td>
<td>(232)</td>
<td>(351)</td>
<td>(402)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 21.7 df.4
Gamma = 0.2 Significant at .05

Chi-square = 20.1 df.4
Gamma = -0.16 Significant at .05

Chi-square = 7.0 df.4
Gamma = -0.1 Not significant at .05
Table 9. Intended distance by race for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Metro Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White (%)</td>
<td>Nonwhite (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>White (%)</td>
<td>Nonwhite (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>White (%)</td>
<td>Nonwhite (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 67.4 df.4
Gamma = 0.4
Significant at .05

Chi-square = 8.5 df.4
Gamma = 0.37
Not significant at .05

Chi-square = 11.4 df.4
Gamma = 0.38
Significant at .05
dents are more likely to intend to move farther than whites.

For rural white and non-white students, percentages intending to stay in the same community and to move within-state are found to be higher than any of the corresponding percentages of urban and metropolitan students.

**Parents' status**

7. The student who comes from a broken family is more likely to intend to move farther than the student with an intact family.

This concept is defined as the student's parents' marital status. It is measured with the following question:

**Question 16**

Are your parents:

- ( ) Living together
- ( ) Separated
- ( ) Divorced
- ( ) Mother dead
- ( ) Father dead

All the responses to the above question are categorized into two groups: broken and intact family status. Only the first answer (living together) means intact family. The rest of the answers are regarded as broken family status.

This hypothesis is confirmed only for rural students, but not for urban and metropolitan students (Table 10). It is indicated that rural students who come from a broken family are more likely to intend to move farther than those with an intact family.

**Family cohesion**

8. The lower the family cohesion is, the farther the student is likely to intend to move.
Table 10. Intended distance by parents' status for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural Parents' status</th>
<th>Urban Parents' status</th>
<th>Metro Parents' status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intact (%)</td>
<td>Broken (%)</td>
<td>Intact (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 11.3  df.4  Gamma = 0.18  Significant at .05
Chi-square = 3.8  df.4  Gamma = -0.16  Not significant at .05
Chi-square = 5.8  df.4  Gamma = 0.1  Not significant at .05
This concept refers to the student's emotional feelings, including a sense of obligation and beliefs concerning their own attachment toward their families of orientation. It is measured by the following question which is a scale composed of four statements.

Question 24

Here are statements about how people may feel about their families. Beside each of the statements listed below, please indicate whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), undecided (U), disagree (D), strongly disagree (SD) with the statement with respect to your own family.

a. One ought to discuss important plans with his/her family ... SA A U D SD

b. One should confide more fully in the members of his family ... SA A U D SD

c. Home is the most pleasant place in the world ... SA A U D SD

d. A person should be willing to sacrifice everything to his family ... SA A U D SD

The combined possible total score from the above four statements ranged from 4 to 20. This range was divided to form three ordinal categories: high, medium, and low degrees of family solidarity.

This hypothesis is confirmed for urban and metropolitan students, but not for rural students (Table 11).

All three relationships are found to be positive. It is indicated that students with lower family cohesion are more likely to intend to move farther than those with higher family cohesion.

Community evaluation

9. The lower the student's community evaluation is, the farther the student is likely to intend to move.
### Table 11. Intended distance by family cohesion for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (%)</td>
<td>Medium (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
<td>High (%)</td>
<td>Medium (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
<td>High (%)</td>
<td>Medium (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(281) (262) (82) (197) (184) (63) (232) (345) (165)

Chi-square = 13.6 df.8
Gamma = 0.16
Not significant at .05

Chi-square = 16.5 df.8
Gamma = 0.06
Significant at .05

Chi-square = 35.7 df.8
Gamma = 0.16
Significant at .05
This concept is defined as the degree of satisfaction concerning the student's present community as evaluated by the student's likes and dislikes. This concept is measured by the following question:

Question 33

List about five characteristics (features) of your community that you like most and five you dislike most in order of importance.

In this study, the number of the student's likes and dislikes is used as the criteria for community evaluation. Those students who listed more likes than dislikes are regarded as those who are more satisfied with their present community. The score ranged from 5, indicating highest positive evaluation, to the lowest, -5. This range was divided into three categories to form an ordinal scale.

This hypothesis is confirmed for all of the rural, urban, and metropolitan students (Table 12). The degree of association seems to be positively related with the level of urbanization.

Gamma statistics for metropolitan students are the largest. Urban students come next, and they are smallest for rural students.

It is indicated that students with low community evaluation are more likely to intend to move farther than those with high community evaluation.

Interpersonal relations

10. The lower the student's interpersonal relations, the farther the student is likely to intend to move.

This concept is defined as the students' evaluation of people in their communities on the basis of their relations with other people. This concept is measured by the following question with 6 items.

Question 34

Here are statements that describe how people in their
Table 12. Intended distance by community evaluation for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community evaluation</td>
<td>Community evaluation</td>
<td>Community evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+  (%)</td>
<td>0  (%)</td>
<td>-  (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>28.5 31.2 21.7</td>
<td>56.4 50.0 36.6</td>
<td>63.2 43.9 36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>12.1 5.5 10.9</td>
<td>3.8 1.2 0.0</td>
<td>8.5 5.7 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>50.7 46.8 41.3</td>
<td>28.0 25.0 26.8</td>
<td>17.2 25.2 30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>4.6 7.3 13.0</td>
<td>5.9 7.1 12.2</td>
<td>2.8 8.1 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>4.3 9.2 13.0</td>
<td>5.9 16.7 24.4</td>
<td>8.3 17.1 26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 100.0 100.0</td>
<td>100.0 100.0 100.0</td>
<td>100.0 100.0 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 18.1 df.8  
Gamma = 0.14  
Significant at .05  

Chi-square = 22.97 df.8  
Gamma = 0.27  
Significant at .05  

Chi-square = 47.4 df.8  
Gamma = 0.38  
Significant at .05
local communities often feel about each other. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement regarding your own community. Follow the same procedure as with question #24.

a. Real friends are hard to find in this community . . . . . . . SA A U D SD

b. Almost everyone is polite and courteous to you . . . . . . . SA A U D SD

c. People in this community give you a bad name if you insist on being different . . . . . . . SA A U D SD

d. I feel very much I belong here . . . SA A U D SD

e. People are generally critical of others in the community . . . . SA A U D SD

h. You are out of luck here if you happen to be different . . . . SA A U D SD

The above scale is adopted from Fessler's (1952) study proposing a large composite scale to measure community solidarity. Item analysis was used to check the validity of the above 6 items, which ranged from .7 to .76 as the correlation coefficients. From the above 6 items, the scale ranged from 6, low interpersonal relations; to 30, high interpersonal relations. The range was also divided into three different categories: high, medium, and low-degrees of interpersonal relations.

The above hypothesis is confirmed for all rural, urban, and metropolitan students (Table 13). All three relationships are found to be positive and the degree of association seems to be positively related with the level of urbanization.

It is indicated that students with lower interpersonal relations are more likely to intend to move farther than those with higher interpersonal relations. This trend becomes stronger as the level of urbanization increases.
Table 13. Intended distance by interpersonal relations for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (%)</td>
<td>Medium (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous-states</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(322)</td>
<td>(225)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 34.9 df.8  
Chi-square = 17.0 df.8  
Chi-square = 85.4 df.8

Gamma = 0.115  
Gamma = 0.2  
Gamma = 0.35

Significant at .05  
Significant at .05  
Significant at .05
Participation

11. The lower the student's participation is, the farther the student is likely to intend to move.

This concept refers to the student's level of involvement toward school, church, and community activities. As part of social ties in the present community, it is expected to resist any intention to migrate.

This concept is measured by the following question with 10 items.

Question 36

Here is a list of some high school, church and community activities and organizations. Please supply the requested information about your participation in each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Participation</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports teams</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music groups (band, voice, etc.)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic productions</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHA</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor societies</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student government</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church-connected groups</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls League, Boys League</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores for the above question ranged from 10 to 15. All the scores are divided into three ordinal scale-high, medium, and low-degrees of participation.
This hypothesis is confirmed only for metropolitan students. It is not confirmed for rural and urban students (Table 14).

With regard to metropolitan students, it is indicated that students with a lower degree of participation are more likely to intend to move farther than students with a higher degree of participation.

**Number of past moves**

12. The more a student has moved in the past, the farther the student is likely to intend to move.

The above hypothesis is confirmed only for the metropolitan students (Table 15). For this group of students, the percentage of those who have moved twice or more is much higher than those who have only moved once in all the categories, except the same community category. It is indicated that students with a higher number of past moves are more likely to intend to move farther than those with a fewer number of past moves.

**Parents' length of residence**

13. The longer the parents length of residence is, the farther the student is likely to intend to move.

This hypothesis is confirmed for the rural and metropolitan students, but not for urban students (Table 16). All three relationships are found to be negative. It is indicated that students whose parents have stayed longer in the present community are more likely to intend to move a short distance.

**Community satisfaction**

14. The less a student is satisfied in his community, the farther the student is likely to intend to move.
Table 14. Intended distance by degree of participation for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural Participation</th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Participation</th>
<th></th>
<th>Metro Participation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (%)</td>
<td>Medium (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
<td>High (%)</td>
<td>Medium (%)</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 7.8 df.8
Gamma = 0.07
Not significant at .05

Chi-square = 8.1 df.8
Gamma = -0.08
Not significant at .05

Chi-square = 16.1 df.8
Gamma = 0.07
Significant at .05
Table 15. Intended distance by the number of past moves for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th></th>
<th>Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (%)</td>
<td>2+ (%)</td>
<td>1 (%)</td>
<td>2+ (%)</td>
<td>1 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(320)</td>
<td>(294)</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>(234)</td>
<td>(374)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 8.9 df.4  Gamma = 0.19  Not significant at .05
Chi-square = 11.9 df.9 df.4  Gamma = 0.19  Significant at .05
Chi-square = 51.0 df.4  Gamma = 0.4  Significant at .05
Table 16. Intended distance by parents' length of residence for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural (Length of residence (years))</th>
<th>Urban (Length of residence (years))</th>
<th>Metro (Length of residence (years))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-15 (%)</td>
<td>15+ (%)</td>
<td>-15 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(230) (327) (203) (208) (310) (388)

Chi-square = 11.7 df.4  Chi-square = 9.1 df.4  Chi-square = 40.5 df.4
Gamma = -0.2  Gamma = -0.17  Gamma = 0.38
Significant at .05  Not significant at .05  Significant at .05
The above hypothesis is confirmed for all the rural, urban, and metropolitan students (Table 17). The degree of association for urban and metropolitan students is stronger than that for rural students. It is indicated that students with less community satisfaction are more likely to intend to move farther than those who are more satisfied.

Religion

15. Non-LDS students are more likely to intend to move farther than LDS students.

This hypothesis is confirmed for all rural, urban, and metropolitan students. It indicates that religion is an important social tie for those intending to move a shorter distance, and also push factor for those intending to move a farther distance (Table 18).

At the beginning of this chapter, it was mentioned that 27.0 percent of the total sample did not give a proper answer to the question asking the specific place of intended destination. These "no response" and "don't know" groups are now cross tabulated with reference to their place of residence and their father's education and religion.

The percentage distribution for rural, urban and metropolitan students increases as their fathers' education becomes higher (Table 19).

With reference to religion, it is indicated that a higher percentage of LDS students did not give a proper answer as their level of urbanization in their residence became lower. This very phenomenon was found also for those who responded.

More information which may be relevant to this study, is the reason students have to move, with intended place of destination given with reference to intended distance. This is due to the possible importance of reason to move in relation to intended distance.
Table 17. Intended distance by community satisfaction for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th></th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied (%)</td>
<td>Less satisfied (%)</td>
<td>Satisfied (%)</td>
<td>Less satisfied (%)</td>
<td>Satisfied (%)</td>
<td>Less satisfied (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 12.8 df.4  
Gamma = 0.28  
Significant at .05

Chi-square = 27.2 df.4  
Gamma = 0.47  
Significant at .05

Chi-square = 48.6 df.4  
Gamma = 0.41  
Significant at .05
Table 18. Intended distance by religion for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LDS (%)</td>
<td>Non-LDS (%)</td>
<td>LDS (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(572)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>(394)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(157)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(372)</td>
<td>(237)</td>
<td>(188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(256)</td>
<td>(105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 68.8 df.<,.05
Gamma = 0.48
Significant at .05

Chi-square = 49.1 df.<,.05
Gamma = 0.55
Significant at .05

Chi-square = 63.2 df.<,.05
Gamma = 0.25
Significant at .05
Table 19. No response and "don't know" groups versus those who responded for intended destination by fathers' education and religion for the rural, urban and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers' education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S.</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LDS</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Those who responded</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers' education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S.</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LDS</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actually, two questions are asked about the students' intended place of destination, one right after graduation, the other for the remainder of the students' lives.

Question 5

Most students seem to have several places in mind in which they might live after graduation. Please complete the chart below about the places in which you are most likely to live after graduation.

In the above question, reasons for preferring the place are asked.

Question 7

Where do you think you are most likely to live most of the remainder of your life?

City__________ State__________

As the students' intended place of destination comes from Question 7, the reason to move, answered in Question 5, may be different from the reason to move in Question 7. The reason to move for the remainder of the students' life was not asked in the original questionnaire.

These two questions were combined so that the reason to move could be analyzed. It is a report on only a portion of the sample for which data are available. That is, only those students giving the same name of intended destination were utilized for this purpose. It is expected that a relatively definite intended place of residence might be given by doing this.

The students' reason to move was grouped with familial, educational, recreational, and occupational categories. Familial reason means to be near parents, relatives, friends, or spouse. Educational reason means to go to school. Recreational reason to have a better recreational or entertainment opportunity or climate. Occupational reason indicates such reason related with job, or earning the best money from a job.
The relationship between intended distance and reason to move is illustrated in Table 20. It has been found that 32.5 percent of the rural students with intended place of destination wish to move for familial reasons. This percentage is 42.8 for urban students, and 44.9 for metropolitan students. It is indicated that rural students are least likely to intend to move for familial reasons compared to urban and metropolitan students.

Of the rural students, 21.6 percent intend to move for educational reasons. This percentage is 18.1 for urban and 14.3 for metropolitan students. It is indicated that rural students are most likely to intend to move for educational reasons, which implies that educational reasons are more important for rural students in determining to move than other students.

Percentages of those intending to move for recreational reasons are 40.5 for rural, 33.6 for urban, and 36.6 for metropolitan students. Rural students are more likely to intend to move for recreational reasons that urban and metropolitan students.

With reference to occupational reasons, 5.4 percent of the rural students intend to move for this reason. This percentage is 5.5 for urban and 4.2 for metropolitan students.

**Summary**

The relationships examined in this chapter are shown with their degrees of association in Table 21. Out of 15 independent variables, only community evaluation, interpersonal relations, community satisfaction and religion are significantly related for students in the rural, urban and metropolitan areas of the state.
Table 20. Intended distance by reason to move for rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended distance</th>
<th>Familial (%)</th>
<th>Educational (%)</th>
<th>Recreational (%)</th>
<th>Occupational (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(175)</td>
<td>(116)</td>
<td>(218)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(163)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-county</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-state</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous states</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous states</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(280)</td>
<td>(89)</td>
<td>(228)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21. Independent variables significantly related with intended distance and degrees of association measured as Gamma for the rural, urban, and metropolitan students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's educational status</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's occupation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational aspiration</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational orientation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's status</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family cohesion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community evaluation</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of past moves</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's length of residence</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community satisfaction</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Empty cells without Gamma statistics mean not significant relationships
It can be said that these four independent variables indicate various aspects of community life. This points out that the religious and socio-psychological factors which students have in their community environment are more important than the other independent variables in their decision to migrate a certain distance when their place of residence is considered.

This fact also indicates that important push or pull factors related to how far they intend to move for the rest of their lives are found from the students' community of origin rather than from other socio-economic variables surrounding them.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study has investigated the relationship between the distance between the place where youth were living at the time of graduation from high school and the place where they intend to spend the most of the rest of their lives. A key finding of the research was that rural youth were more likely to intend to leave their present county of residence than were urban or metropolitan youth. However, the metropolitan and urban youth were more likely to intend to move to another state, and thereby their movement would be a greater distance than the movements of rural youth. Of the 15 independent variables, only community evaluation, interpersonal relations, community satisfaction and religion were significantly related to intended distance for rural, urban, and metropolitan youth. The subgroups most likely to intend to leave Utah, with respect to each of the four variables, were (1) those evaluating the community most negatively, (2) those with the most dissatisfaction with their interpersonal relationships, (3) those least satisfied with the community and (4) non-Mormons. Other variables were related to the distance the graduating seniors intended to move for particular sectors of residence.

The main foci of this study were:

1. To investigate the distribution of intended places of residence among distance categories in order to determine if great distance impeded migration.

2. To investigate the relationship between intended distance and 15 socio-economic variables.
These two problems were examined with the differentiation of rural, urban, and metropolitan students, assuming that each of these categories played different roles in influencing the decision-making system of migration process.

The method of survey research with the administered questionnaire was utilized. The population of this study was the total male and female senior students in public high schools in Utah during the academic year of 1975. It was found that 73.0 percent of them gave an answer for the place of intended destination for the remainder of their lives.

A descriptive explanation concerning the total sample was that 47.3 percent of those with intended place of destination wished to stay in the present community, while 32.0 percent of them intend to move within-state boundary.

Among those with intended place of destination, it was found that 86 percent of the students intend to move within the State of Utah, while only 14 percent of them intend to move to other states.

This indicates that state-boundary has an important meaning and that the streams of migration may be studied effectively with the dichotomy of within-state and out-of-state category. When students with intended place of destination were divided with rural, urban, and metropolitan students separately, it was found that the percentage of rural students intending to stay in the same community is lower than that of urban and metropolitan students.

The percentage of rural students intending to move within-county and within-state was found to be much higher than that of urban and metropolitan students. With regard to the categories of contiguous-states and non-contiguous states, percentages of rural, urban and metropolitan stu-
dents ranged from 11 to 15. This very relationship between intended dis-
tance and the categories of rural, urban, and metropolitan students was
found to have strongly negative association with -0.21 as its Gamma.

It was indicated that rural students are more likely to intend to
move a farther distance compared to the urban and metropolitan students,
and the metropolitan students are more likely to intend to move a shorter
distance than the rural and urban students.

The strongly negative association between the student's intended dis-
tance and levels of urbanization in the place of origin indicated that the
rural area has more expulsive factors than urban and metropolitan areas.
The metropolitan area is found to have more attractive factors compared
to rural and urban areas for the potential migrants.

Out of 15 independent variables, it was found that community evalua-
tion, interpersonal relations, community satisfaction, and religion are
significantly related to rural, urban, and metropolitan students.

It was indicated that students' religion, and such factors related
with their community lives, are more deeply related to the main focus of
this study than the other variables.

Among the above independent variables, the father's educational status,
occupational aspiration, and parents' length of residence were negatively
related with the dependent variable. An important indication from this
fact is that intended distance has a different meaning when the levels of
urbanization in the place of origin is considered.

Even if distance of migration is "omnipresent" in Lee's theory as
the most important intervening obstacle, the level of urbanization of
origin may command different significance of distance.
It was found that there were more differences than similarities in the significance of the independent variables when the rural, urban, and metropolitan categories of residence were considered. This indicates that the different characteristics between the rural, urban, and metropolitan areas as distinct social categories must be studied comprehensively.

A complete study of the migration process focusing the decision-making system must include various aspects of socio-economic and personal-psychological factors. These factors may be great in number and almost impossible to be comprehensively covered in a single study.

The essential focus of this study, intended distance, should be clearly differentiated from actual distance of move as migration intention should be clearly differentiated from the actual stream of migration. As this study dealt with the preliminary stage of migration, the follow-up study with exactly the same problems as this study will be greatly contributory in assessing it as a whole and illuminating a wide area of further research related with this study.
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