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LABOR STRUCTURE AND LABOR PROBLEMS
UTAH SHEEP RANCHES

Summary

Findings

The unique work conditions of shepherding are the center of the labor problem on sheep ranches. These conditions have only a limited appeal on the open labor market. Shepherding calls for highly specialized skills which are acquired only by practical experience and training. In addition, for permanence of employment, a personality type is required that is adaptable to the work and living conditions of the range.

Three things are important in reference to the problem of labor turnover on sheep ranches in Utah.

- First, of major concern is the number of regular workers who are leaving the sheep enterprise for work in industry. A fourth of the workers who left sheep ranches during 1952-53 went into nonfarm work. Relatively few left industry in this same period to work on sheep ranches.

- Second, some concern is shown in the large number of workers who move from one ranch to another. More than half of the regular workers in 1952 and 1953 changed jobs, usually to find work on other sheep ranches.

- A third factor is retirement. Sheepherders in Utah are an aging group. Fifty-seven percent of those not related to the ranch operator were 45 or more years old in 1953 compared with 27 percent in the same age group in the United States labor force.

Rates of turnover are also associated with the marital status of the herders. Married workers with families living on the range have the best record of stability. These workers had a turnover rate of only 20 percent in 1952 and 1953 as compared with 35 percent for workers with families in the area but not with them on the range, 45 percent for single workers, and 62 percent for divorced workers. Forty-eight percent of the workers are single or are unattached.

Rates of discharge of workers for incompetence and for age or disability are high. Discharges for unreliability and for drunkenness are also frequent. The high rate of discharge for incompetence indicates that ranchers are looking for a better, more skilled type of worker than they are able to find.

The labor supply problem on sheep ranches in Utah is localized more in the more densely populated area of the state. Supplies of seasonal labor tend to be inadequate in the same areas in which it is difficult to hold regular workers.

Traditionally, sheep ranch workers of Utah have been of local origin, but new types of labor are now used with success on some ranches. These
include Spanish-American, Basque, and Indian workers. They are most numerous in the northern and southeastern parts of Utah.

The new types of labor add a new aspect to the labor problems. Cultural differences between workers and between employers and workers often lead to misunderstanding and thus to increased turnover. Ranchers find that it is desirable to hire workers who are most compatible. Thus, they hire all Anglo-American or Spanish-American or Basque. This practice tends to complicate recruitment since the employer, regardless of the availability of workers, is limited to select from those who are culturally alike. As the Anglo-American has become harder to obtain, operators have hired more Spanish-Americans. They now constitute 26 percent of the labor force on sheep ranches. A few Indians and Basque herders have also been employed.

The labor problem on sheep ranches is being met by raising wages, improving the working and living conditions of the workers, and recruiting new types of labor. Ranchers regard advances in wage rates and improvement in camping facilities as most effective ways to hold workers. Some ranchers emphasize the importance of friendly relations with their workers.

By 1953, wage rates had been advanced to an average of $212 a month for regular sheep-ranch workers. In addition, board and camp facilities were furnished. Operators also used other special incentives to keep workers on their ranches.

The raising of wages to obtain and keep workers has tended to create wage spirals which have increased production costs. Ranch operators find it increasingly necessary to use labor to the best possible advantage.

**Recommendations**

Undoubtedly more men would be attracted to sheepherding if it were not for the general public attitude toward the desirability of herding as a vocation. A better public relations job needs to be done if more workers are to be attracted to sheep ranches. In some countries of Europe herding sheep is an honored occupation. There are certain characteristics of sheepherding, if they were only known, that are desirable and attractive. Pay, for instance, is relatively high. Camp facilities have been modernized and improved. Mechanization of the operation and improved roads increase communication, and reduce some of the more difficult work. The summer range, in certain areas, is on forest reserves where good roads abound. These permit families to live on the range for a portion of the year while workers are engaged in their regular work. Work on the sheep ranch allows a sense of freedom and independence which is not characteristic of most jobs in industry. Many personality types who dislike regimentation, clock punching, or definite routine time schedules, and who like the out-doors, would find work on sheep ranches inviting.

The work relations between manager and worker on a sheep ranch are different in many ways from those usually found in other occupations. In addition to satisfactory wages, to keep good workers content with working conditions on a particular ranch, the boss usually needs to develop strong
personal ties with his men. For best results, he concerns himself with their personal problems and needs. Frequent visits to camp and expressions of satisfaction and encouragement go a long way in keeping men satisfied on the job. Keeping the camp well supplied with food, and making the camp facilities as comfortable and livable as possible also help reduce labor turnover. Most herders like the freedom of doing their job the way they think best. Ranchers should give some consideration to this feeling of independence in their men. Finally, employers need to be concerned not only with the skills but with the personality of their men. Compatible workers, especially where human contacts are few, build morale that results in continuity of employment.

There are numerous sources of manpower in the Utah area. The problem is to get the potential workers directed into this line of work. High birth rates in Utah have provided a source of labor in the past. Industrial growth, however, has made the recruitment of the Anglo-American for work on sheep ranches more difficult. Consequently, ranchers have turned to new sources for their labor supply. In Utah, they have at their back door-step, two important sources of labor—the Spanish-American and the Indian, some of whom have already had experience in handling sheep. While Indians have not been used to any great extent, it does appear that there are real potentialities in using this source of labor. Sheepmen might do well in exploring the possible development of this manpower resource for future use.

The ability to herd sheep is not dependent on race, color, or nationality. Training and cultural traditions play an important role in molding and shaping contented sheepherders. In parts of Utah, the operators of sheep ranches are most satisfied with the Anglo-American workers. The problem here is the competition that sheepmen have to contend with in hiring men for ranch work.

Spanish-American workers are being used extensively on the sheep ranches in Utah. Many ranchers find these workers have skills and interest in the work that make good sheepherders.

In hiring the Spanish-American, the procedure recommended by some ranchers is to make a trip to New Mexico or other states and select workers with discrimination. Their hired helpers of Spanish-American origin are also in a good position to recommend others who have the proved qualities that make for good sheepherding.

Indians have also been used with good success in the southeastern part of Utah. The Navajo, by tradition and training, is accustomed to this kind of work. Language difficulties, the barrier of cultural differences, and the desire of the Indians to return to the reservation have conditioned some sheepmen against hiring them.

To meet the needs of sheepmen in the Intermountain Area, experienced Basque herders have been imported to the United States under special legislation. Many sheepmen in parts of this area are dependent upon Basque labor. This condition does not exist in Utah. When the problem of hiring local workers becomes acute, labor has been available where sheepmen were
willing to turn to other sources of help such as Spanish-American and the Indian.

The employment problem of sheep ranchers in the Intermountain West appears to justify more than emergency measures. It calls for a comprehensive and long-range planning effort. An industry as important as the production of lambs and wool should not from a national defense point of view, be allowed to become dependent on outside sources of labor. The drying up of old sources of labor should warrant the establishment of a specialized program to recruit and train persons adapted to this line of work. Such an educational program might logically be achieved through the cooperation and assistance of such agencies as the Extension Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, the wool-growers associations, and the Intermountain Indian School in Brigham City.
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Purpose and Background of Study

This study deals with the problem sheep ranchers have in recruiting workers to meet their labor needs. Consideration is given to the composition of the work force on sheep ranches, to wages, the amount and causes of labor turnover, and to ways to reduce turnover. Labor recruitment practices are also discussed and evaluated in terms of available sources of farm labor, the possibilities of maintaining a stable supply, and the effect of farm labor problems on recent changes in the operations of sheep ranch enterprises. The primary focus of attention is on regular hired labor on Utah sheep ranches, although seasonal labor is given some consideration.

The study is not exhaustive or general in scope and does not represent the general labor situation of sheepmen in the whole Intermountain Area. Nevertheless, certain labor conditions described in this report are typical of those in other states and should be of general interest. It will be evident that sheep ranching in Utah has had its own unique development in relation to local geographic, social, and economic conditions.

This publication is designed primarily for sheepmen and various public and private agencies who are concerned with the problem that sheep ranchers have in recruiting workers to meet their labor needs.

Economic Aspects of the Sheep Industry

Utah occupies a central location in the range sheep area of the Intermountain States. The 1950 census enumerated 1,101,324 sheep in Utah. This represented an investment of $26,263,122.

For more than a decade with the exception of one or two good years, sheepmen in the West have complained that they were in a financial squeeze between high costs of production and low prices for lambs and wool. There are several reasons for these complaints. At the beginning of World War II, workers began to leave sheep ranches for shipyards, defense plants, and other places of employment where wages were high.

See issues of the National Wool Grower from 1942 to 1952 for statements of sheepmen about the economic condition of the industry.
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Table 1. Stock sheep and lambs: Number of farms and value, Utah, and number, 11 Western States, 1930 to 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Stock sheep and lambs, Utah</th>
<th>Value per head, Utah</th>
<th>Total value, Utah</th>
<th>Number of stock sheep and lambs in 11 Western States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thousands</td>
<td>dollars</td>
<td>thousand dols.</td>
<td>thousands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>26670</td>
<td>25,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2775</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>18048</td>
<td>26,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>2770</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>10331</td>
<td>25,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7716</td>
<td>24,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>10003</td>
<td>24,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>10876</td>
<td>23,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>15938</td>
<td>22,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>15732</td>
<td>21,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>15164</td>
<td>21,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>13419</td>
<td>21,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>15038</td>
<td>21,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>15728</td>
<td>21,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>21175</td>
<td>22,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>22098</td>
<td>20,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>18675</td>
<td>19,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>17510</td>
<td>17,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>18057</td>
<td>15,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>19035</td>
<td>13,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>24174</td>
<td>12,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>27710</td>
<td>12,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>25888</td>
<td>11,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>40226</td>
<td>11,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>45749</td>
<td>12,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>25098</td>
<td>12,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The number of farms reporting sheep declined almost as rapidly. The number of such farms in Utah, according to the census, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>6417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>4328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>4476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sheepmen tried to meet this competition by raising wages and giving added gratuities. The average wage rate for shepherders was $65 a month in 1940, but by 1945 it had risen to $155 a month.2 The cost of camp supplies per worker increased from $20.00 to $37.50 a month. Other costs mounted somewhat more slowly and the cost of labor became an increasingly large percentage of all costs. It constituted 28 percent in 1945 as compared with 22 percent in 1940.

During most of this period prices of lamb and wool were kept from rising by government price ceilings. When the ceilings were removed

---

sheepmen found that wool prices were still subject to competition with imported wool.

Prices improved materially in 1950 and 1951 but sheepmen still believed that they were not given adequate support in government programs. They exhibited comparative cost figures with their chief competitor as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost per head</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hired labor</td>
<td>$3.02</td>
<td>$ .52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearing</td>
<td>.40 (est.)</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash costs</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They asked for protective tariffs that would check the decline in the domestic wool industry.

The decline of Utah wool industry can be measured roughly in terms of stock sheep. The total numbers of such sheep in Utah and in the 11 Western States are listed in table 1.

In addition to the cost-price situation, sheepmen point to three other factors as involved in the decline of the sheep industry. These are:

1. reduction of grazing privileges on public lands,
2. inability to obtain enough satisfactory labor, and
3. change over to cattle production.

More than half of the land area in the Western States is owned and managed by the federal government. Sheepmen claim that in the 16 years from 1934 to 1950 grazing permits on the public domain were reduced in terms of animal unit months by 43 percent.\(^3\)

Equally important has been the difficulty of obtaining skilled herd- ers to handle their sheep. According to Hochmuth:

The difficulty in obtaining good labor and herd- ers is the paramount reason given by most ranchers for converting from sheep to cattle. Sheep herding is a specialized type of animal husbandry. A poor or untrained herder can destroy a large investment in a matter of hours by poor judgment or lack of initiative. The younger generation of native-born Americans are not attracted to sheep herding as an occupation.\(^4\)

The fact that workers have moved away from sheep ranches while new ones are slow to come in has raised a problem of labor recruitment among sheepmen in many areas of the West. Increased wages were not a sufficient lure so sheepmen began to ask for importation of foreign workers. In July 1950 Congress passed a special act admitting 250 alien sheepherders. In April 1952, 500 more were admitted. In June 1952 the Omnibus Immigration Act was amended to provide that 50 percent of the immigrant quotas for any country would be held for people who had skills needed in the United States.

Repeated efforts were also made by leaders in the sheep industry to include livestock workers among those imported from Mexico. The Mexican government has not favored such importation, preferring short term importation of seasonal workers.

**Changes in Ranch Operations During the Preceding Five Years**

Although it is possible that the sheep industry may be declining in other parts of the Intermountain Region because of difficulty associated with labor, this does not appear to


\(^{4}\)National Wool Grower, May 1952.
## Table 2. Average number of regular and seasonal workers per Utah sheep ranch, by size of herd, 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of worker</th>
<th>Average worker per ranch by size of herd</th>
<th>500 to 999</th>
<th>1000 to 1999</th>
<th>2000 to 2499</th>
<th>2500 to 2999</th>
<th>3000 to 3999</th>
<th>4000 to 5999</th>
<th>6000 to 6999</th>
<th>7,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular hired workers (Dec. 1953)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in winter herding period*</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in summer herding period†</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in lambing period‡</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All seasonal workers hired during year</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid family members (other than operator)§</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The lowest employment period is during the winter months. Essentially only the regular hired workers are employed during this period. These are the workers who were hired for year-round employment.

† For summer herding bands of sheep are divided. Some additional workers are needed. The regular and seasonal workers that work through the summer are included here.

‡ The high peak of employment is in the lambing period. The figures here include all the regular and seasonal workers during this period excluding the shepherders.

§ Paid family workers other than operator are included as hired workers.
be true on the sample ranches in Utah. While 56 of the ranchers interviewed had reduced the size of their flocks within the preceding 5 years (table 2), only one stated that the reduction was a result of labor problems. Twelve ranchers reduced their flocks because of weather conditions, 6 because of the low price of wool, and 16 for miscellaneous reasons. The answers indicated some shift toward cattle production apparently associated with a better price situation and with fewer managerial problems.

There is a definite tendency for sheep ranchers to purchase more land. Over half of those interviewed purchased more land during the 5-year period, while only 10 percent sold any land. Large operators were especially active in acquiring larger holdings. Operators stated that the land purchases were not necessarily to allow for an increase in the size of their flocks. Some bought additional land for security purposes so that they could care for their present flocks more adequately.

The Labor Structure on the Sheep Ranch

Bands of sheep were introduced into Utah in the early settlement period. They were cared for mainly by local churches or as community cooperative projects. Young men in the community were employed as herders. Ownership was gradually transferred to individuals, usually to the young men who had gained experience with the church and community bands. At this stage, production of sheep became essentially a family enterprise and it has remained so in most areas of the state.

In recent years the trend has been in the direction of increased dependence on hired labor and on types of hired labor that are new to the area. At one time workers were hired largely from the local residents who

often used this type of employment as a step to obtain their own ranch. Recently ranchers have hired more Spanish-American herders, and a few have hired workers imported from foreign countries.

The Annual Cycle in the Sheep Enterprise

The care of sheep in Utah is extensive in character. In winter the sheep are ranged on the lowland desert areas of Utah or adjacent states (fig. 1). In spring they are moved to the ranch headquarters, or to the spring-fall range area, for lambing and shearing (fig. 2). In summer they are moved into the mountains where more abundant rainfall provides summer pasture (fig. 3). In fall the sheep are moved back to the ranch headquarters area where the herd is culled, the lambs and cull sheep are sold, and the ewes are bred. Then the herd is again moved to the winter range.
Movement of the flock is limited to the range area that is owned or leased, or on which grazing privileges have been obtained. The distance that the sheep are moved in the course of a year varies greatly. The longest moves are from Rich County in northeastern Utah to the Nevada desert. This means going around the southern end of the Great Salt Lake, a distance of some 200 or 300 miles.

The historical practice has been to trail the sheep from one range to another. Now more than half the sheep are moved by truck or train, particularly when the ranges are far apart.

**Numbers and Types of Workers**

In general, the operator is in charge of the ranch. Eighty-five percent of those interviewed in the survey stated that they participated in the ranch work. If an operator has a large number of sheep broken into several bands he may hire a manager to share his responsibilities. Operators of small ranches are generally aided by some unpaid family labor. On larger operations, this type of assistance is less common (table 2).

According to the survey data, the typical ranch had from 2,500 to 3,000 sheep and it employed from 3 to 4 regular farm workers. The rancher spent about $12,000 annually for hired labor, $8,000 of which went for regular labor and the rest for seasonal help. Enterprises ran somewhat larger than this in the northeastern counties and somewhat smaller in the southwestern part of the state.
The regular hired labor force is composed largely of herders. In the present study they constituted 70 percent of all regular workers, while camp tenders constituted 22 percent. The remaining 8 percent was made up of foremen, ranch hands who did all-round jobs including crop production, and a few other workers who did such jobs as trucking and running the feed lot.

The 166 sheep ranches surveyed had an average of 3.4 regular hired workers in December 1953 when the interviews were made. In general, there was approximately 1 such worker per 1,000 head of sheep except that the proportion ran higher on the smaller ranches.

Winter herding was done largely by the regular hired workers. The peak employment period on sheep
Winter herding
November to April*

Spring lambing†
April to June*

Summer herding and
feed production
June to September*

Fall culling and
marketing
September to
October*

Fig. 4. Seasonal labor use on Utah sheep ranches. This labor use pattern is characteristic of ranches with approximately 4,000 to 5,000 stock sheep. Only the regular hired workers remain during the winter herding period. The additional workers during the other periods indicate the need for seasonal workers. The brown figures depict hired family workers and the black figures all other hired workers.

* The labor use seasons have no sharp break on the calendar, but merge into each other, thus the overlapping in months.
† Sheep shearers are not included in the graph. When the sheep are sheared in the spring, shearing crews usually are hired by contract.

ranches was at lambing time when the number of workers nearly doubled. It rose to a total of 6.5 per ranch. The increase was proportionately much greater on small than on large ranches.

Summer herding called for a few more workers than winter herding. In general, there was little change in number of workers on small ranches but 2 or 3 were added on the larger sheep enterprises.

The average number of seasonal workers hired on these ranches in the course of a year was 6.4. This figure includes workers for lambing, shearing, (does not include shearing crew), summer herding, and for production of feed crops (fig. 4).

The ranchers were asked what proportion of the work in selected major operations was done by themselves, by regular hired workers, and by seasonal labor. Of the many types of workers who were active in the lambing season, the ranchers gave credit
Table 3. Percentage of major seasonal operations performed by family, regular hired, seasonal, and exchange labor by size of sheep operation, Utah sheep ranches, December 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation and type of labor used</th>
<th>All ranches</th>
<th>Size of flock</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>Under 2,000</td>
<td>2,000 to</td>
<td>3,000 and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,999</td>
<td>over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lambing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid members operator’s family</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid members operator’s family</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular hired workers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal and exchange labor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer herding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid members operator’s family</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid members operator’s family</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular hired workers</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal and exchange labor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production of feed crops</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid members operator’s family</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid members operator’s family</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular hired workers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal and exchange labor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trucking to range or market</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid members operator’s family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid members operator’s family</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular hired workers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, including contract haulers</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the regular hired workers for doing the largest volume of work (table 3). Both seasonal workers and the ranch operator contributed substantially.

Regular hired workers did the bulk of the summer herding but they were assisted by paid members of the operator’s family, by seasonal labor, and by the operator himself.

Production of feed crops was handled largely by the ranch operator but he was assisted by both regular and by seasonal workers. Trucking of sheep either from range to range or to market was done largely by contract haulers, but it was sometimes done by regular hired workers or by members of the operator’s family (fig. 5).

**Range Life**

Range life is rugged but it is gradually being improved. It is characterized, first, by high mobility, second, by social isolation, and third, by lack of regular family contact. Modern means of transportation have made the task of moving the flock from range to range easier, but the job still calls for high mobility within each range area. The modern sheep wagon is now rather comfortable despite limited space. Ordinarily, it contains a gas light, a double bed,
Social isolation is still a problem although it is being broken down by better roads into the deserts and mountains and by more automobiles, radios, and other ways of keeping in contact with the outside world.

Shepherders still lack in social contacts but they place a high value on those they have. More than one herder in a camp means continued and close association of workers living in crowded quarters away from other people. The workers must be congenial or strained relations may easily arise.

Few shepherders are able to maintain the customary patterns of family life. While 60 percent of the 688 workers reported on individually in the 1953 survey were married, only 12 percent had their families living with them on the range.

A herder is responsible for the sheep night and day. His job lasts 7 days a week and almost 365 days a year. Of the workers reported on in this survey 36 percent were with the sheep on the range for 355 days or more, an additional 34 percent were on the range from 325 to 354 days, and 30 percent were there for less than 325 days. Many of the latter group had not yet been employed for the full year. Managers allow a day now and then for the herder to go to town or to visit his family. Some permit a week or two for vacation. Some herders, however, have spent many years without a vacation.

On the range, a herder has direct
responsibility for the care of the sheep. He safeguards their health, keeps them moving on the best range areas, and protects them from possible dangers. His day starts at daybreak. After checking the sheep and directing them to the area he wants them to graze, he may have some free time in the afternoon. Later in the day, he guides them to the spot where he wants them to bed down for the night. He must be skilled in keeping an accurate check on the number of sheep. Some herders are adept at making estimates. When sheep stray
the herder must round them up (fig. 8).

His task is not strenuous but it is demanding.

There is really little monotony in it. The sheep rarely act the same two days in succession. If they run one day, they are apt to be quiet the next. They herd differently in high wind from what they do in a gentle breeze. They travel with the cold wind and against the warm one. They are apt to graze contentedly where feed is plentiful and to string out and run where picking is poor. Herding at one season is so different from herding at another as almost to constitute a different job. No one herding day is exactly like any other day, and there is much more variety in them than there is in the days spent in an office or factory.⁷

The camp tender keeps the camp supplied with fuel and food for the men and dogs and provides salt for the sheep. When the camp must be moved, he attends to the details. In some cases, the operator performs this task; in others a hired hand takes care of one or more camps. In other cases, the responsibilities of herding, tending camp, and managing the operation may be shared.

This brief mention of life on the range and of the work routine of the

herder is included to call attention to the degree of specialization and uniqueness in the job of herding sheep. To most men who seek employment, such a job offers few inducements. What makes it less attractive, however, are some of the stereotyped ideas concerning the job which have emerged with the rise of wool production in the West. Of these, Wentworth has this to say:

In England, Scotland, and the Pyrenees, the shepherd was respected and praised; in the western United States he was maligned and traduced. More misinformation was current about him than any other class on the frontier, and the wildest vilifications of his character and personality were accepted as true. In many regions linguistic difficulties accounted for the disrepute in which herd­ers were held by homesteaders, cowboys, and other frontier classes. The general impression was that no man tending sheep could be a reputable citizen. 

These statements apply less to herders in Utah than has been tra­ditionally the case. In Utah much of the herding has been done by young men from the families who own the flocks. Yet if workers, and particularly the Anglo-American workers, are to be retained in herding sheep as a vocation, a more inviting conception of sheep herding needs to be built to place it among the honored, or at least approved, occupations.

**Characteristics of Regular Workers on Utah Sheep Ranches**

Family members and close relatives are still an important element in the labor supply on sheep ranches in Utah. This indicates a closely knit type of family operation. Thirteen percent of all regular hired workers reported on were related to the operator. The percentage, however, varied widely from one part of the state to another (table 4). Approximately a fourth of all regular workers in Summit and Wasatch Counties were related to the operator, but only 4 percent of those in the adjoining counties of Duchesne and Uintah were so related. Ordinarily relatives had more responsibility than other workers. In some instances they had some voice in the management of the ranch. They also differed from nonrelated workers in that more of them were married and fewer were single or divorced.

**Age Distribution of Operators and of Hired Workers**

The various groups of workers on sheep ranches present an interesting contrast in age composition. Almost half of the sheep ranchers were 55 years old or more, and three-fourths of them were 45 or older (table 5). For purposes of comparison, regular workers should be considered in two groups according to whether they were related to the operator. More than half of the related workers were under 35, and almost three-fourths were under 45. Hired workers who were not related to the operators tended to be an aging group. Fifty-seven percent were more than 45 years old. Apparently an important source of replenishment for sheep

---

Table 4. Proportion of regular hired workers who were related to the operator, Utah sheep ranches, December 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Regular hired workers</th>
<th>Not related to operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related to operator</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All workers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By area:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder, Cache, Rich, Weber, Morgan, Davis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele, Salt Lake</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit, Wasatch</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah, Juab, Sanpete, Sevier, Wayne</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute, Iron, Garfield, Kane</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne, Uintah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, Grand, San Juan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Counties grouped on the basis of the number of Anglo-American workers employed.

Table 5. Age of operators and of regular hired workers by relationship to operator, Utah sheep ranches, December 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Operators</th>
<th>All workers</th>
<th>Related to operator</th>
<th>Not related to operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator and workers</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20
ranch labor is from the operator's own family. Other local workers of ability are less attracted to this kind of employment.

Cultural Background

The cultural background of workers is highly important as ranchers have found that it is impractical to mix workers with diverse customs and standards. Sheep ranchers in some parts of the state are interested in hiring only Anglo-Americans, since where they spend much time on the range they prefer to fraternize with workers who have similar cultural backgrounds.

Anglo-Americans constitute the largest ethnic culturally alike group employed on Utah sheep ranches (table 6). High birth rates in Utah have contributed toward the maintenance of a supply of this type of labor, but in recent years local workers have been attracted to other employment (fig. 9).

Spanish-American workers have been employed extensively in the northwestern and southeastern parts of the state. Ranchers have made expensive trips into Texas and New Mexico to obtain this type of worker, but today many Spanish-American herders are applying for work on Utah ranches. Lack of community ties has been a disadvantage to these workers but as they become more numerous they will become more settled in the local communities.

Table 6. Ethnic background of regular hired workers by geographic area, on sheep ranches, Utah, December 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area by counties</th>
<th>Anglo-American*</th>
<th>Spanish-American†</th>
<th>Other‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All workers</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder, Cache, Rich,</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, Morgan, Davis</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele, Salt Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central area:</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit, Wasatch</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah, Juab, Sanpete,</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier, Wayne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute, Iron, Garfield,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area:</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne, Uintah</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, Grand, San Juan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>688</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Anglo-American group consists of people who grew up in the local area. Basque and Greek workers are not included although many of them have been in the area for a considerable time.
† Spanish-American refers to workers of Spanish, Spanish-Indian, or Spanish-Mexican origin.
‡ Includes 36 Basques, 14 Indians, and a number of Greek and unidentified workers.
Basque herders, in the main, have gone to Idaho and Nevada where their numbers are greater. Only 36 were contacted in the sample ranches in this survey. Basque operators favor Basque herders. In some instances they have brought relatives from their homeland to work on their ranches. In the home area of the Basques in the Pyrenees Mountains of Spain and France sheep husbandry is a common occupation. Farm families maintain small bands of sheep which they care for with a marked sense of affection. Although this kind of herding differs in many respects from the care of large bands of sheep, Basques adapt readily to the work on sheep ranches in America.

Basque herders are obtained with considerable difficulty. Ranch operators were active in seeking special legislation that would permit a limited number of Basque sheepherders to be brought into the United States. Those who came in were under a contractual agreement to remain in the employment of one operator until transportation and other entry costs were paid.

Greek operators have also been inclined to favor Greek herders. The supply of these herders is also limited. Indians have not been used extensively in this work. Only 14 were reported in the sample survey. Apparently, this large manpower resource has not been tapped, possibly because of lack of a training program. The cost advantages of such a program might be weighed against the advantages of importation.

Only 10 percent of the workers were not citizens of the United States. Of these, more than half had been in this country for more than 10 years. Only 8 workers were unable to speak English.

**Family Status**

Lack of normal family relationships becomes apparent in the classification of these workers according to marital status. Approximately half of the workers were married, a third were single, and the remainder were either widowed or divorced (table 7). Among workers not related to the operator, the proportion of single workers was still higher.

Only 12 percent of the workers had their families living with them on the range. Families of another 42 percent lived in the locality. Almost half of the workers, then, either had no families, or if they had families they did not live in the locality.

A related aspect of the picture is that such workers are a diminishing
Table 7. Selected characteristics of regular hired workers, Utah sheep ranches, December 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number and percentage of regular workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All workers</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship to operator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic background</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-American</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican alien</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependents</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and over</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family lives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the range</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the locality</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No family in the locality</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

population group. Almost half of the workers, 45 percent, had no dependents. An approximate fifth had one dependent, and a fourth had from 2 to 4. Only 11 percent had 5 or more dependents.

**Years Employed on the Reporting Ranch**

Almost half of the workers, 48 percent, had been on the reporting ranch for less than 2 years. Almost 70 percent had been there for less than 4 years (table 8). However, 15 percent had been on the same ranch for 11 years or more. Permanence of employment varied widely from one part of the state to another. In northwestern Utah 68 percent had been on the job for 2 years or less. In southeastern Utah this was true of only 18 percent. Apparently the problem of labor turnover is greater in counties situated near industrial areas.

Spanish-American workers have had shorter employment periods than workers in other groups. This may be because most of them have recently come to the area. Anglo-American workers should show the longest periods of employment, but they do not do so in all areas.
Table 8. Percentage of regular hired workers who had been employed on the reporting ranch a specified number of years, by selected characteristics, Utah, December 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristic</th>
<th>Years employed on reporting ranch</th>
<th>1 or less</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>11 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder, Cache, Rich,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, Morgan, Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele, Salt Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit, Wasatch</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah, Juab, Sanpete,</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier, Wayne</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute, Iron, Garfield,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uintah, Duchesne</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, Grand, San Juan</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-American</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status on reporting ranch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still working</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quit</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fired</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wages, Bonuses, and Other Work Incentives

Cash wages are not a complete measure of the remuneration received by sheepherders since their food and camp facilities are furnished without charge and in addition some ranchers pay bonuses and provide tobacco, liquor, and other noncash forms of remuneration. Yet they provide some basis for comparison of rates over a period of time, and between areas and groups of workers. The ranchers reported the beginning and the present cash wage for all workers now employed. Six workers started on their present jobs during the period 1915 to 1924 at an average beginning monthly wage of $48 (table 9). Those who started between 1925 and 1934 averaged slightly higher, $56. Since that time beginning wages for regular workers have increased almost fourfold. Within the same period of time the prices of lambs and of wool had increased threefold but had dropped by 1952 and 1953 (fig. 10). Since approximately one-fourth of the cash expenses on a sheep ranch are for
hired labor, the ranchers view their increased labor costs with considerable concern.⁸

**Wage Levels, December 1953**

Cash wage rates for the sheepherders at the time of the survey averaged $212 per month. Wage rates were fairly well bunched at $200, $225, and $250 a month but ranged from $70 to $400 (table 10). Wages of less than $200 were common only in the southeastern part of the state while wages higher than $225 were most common in the central counties (table 11).

Wage rates varied with several factors. Greatest of these was length of time on the ranch. Thirty-five percent of the workers who had been employed on the reporting ranch for 11 years or more received more than $225. Only 9 percent of the new employees were in this high wage group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of wage payment</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Average monthly wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average present wage</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average beginning wage for workers who began work in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-51</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944-46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁸cf. Hochmuth, *op. cit.*
with high wages were relationship to the operator and having a family living on the range. These three characteristics probably indicate some degree of managerial or other responsibility which warrants higher remuneration. Some of the lowest incomes went to young family members and to other workers who were learning the business.

Wages bore only a loose relation to age. Middle-aged workers averaged the highest pay. Workers 60 and over averaged less pay than younger employees.

Table 10. Monthly cash wages rates paid to regular hired workers on Utah sheep ranches, December 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate per month</th>
<th>Workers receiving each rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All workers</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Less than 0.5 percent

Anglo-American workers averaged somewhat better pay than Spanish-American and "other" herders, although only a fourth of the workers in the "other" group were paid less than $200.

Wage rate schedules on the larger ranches differed only slightly from those on the smaller ones.

**Bonus Payments and Profit Sharing**

More than a fifth of the regular workers received some type of bonus in addition to their regular pay. In most instances, this was a straight cash payment of from $25 to $200. Bonuses were more frequently given to high-paid employees than to those who received lower wages.

Some ranchers gave a special bonus in the lambing season to all workers, both regular and seasonal. Apparently this was done to encourage careful handling of the sheep and to reward workers for long hours of work in this critical period.

Bonus program sometimes shaded over into profit sharing and partnership arrangements. When the amount of the bonus payment depended on the profits earned during the year, the worker often came to be regarded as part of the management. Although key workers, and particularly those related to the operator, were sometimes regarded as partners in the enterprise, ranchers were still inclined to report the share of the profits paid to these workers as bonus for efficiency and good work.

Ranchers also drew no sharp distinction between bonus payments and gifts or privileges extended as work incentives. Some ranchers reported as bonuses gifts of tobacco and liquor, food furnished to workers’ families, and for winter family living on the range.
Table 11. Wages paid regular hired workers by selected characteristics, Utah sheep ranches, December 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristic</th>
<th>Percentage of regular workers receiving monthly wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under $200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwest area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder, Cache, Rich, Weber,</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, Davis</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele, Salt Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit, Wasatch</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah, Juab, Sanpete, Sevier, Wayne</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute, Iron, Garfield, Kane</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne, Uintah</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, Grand, San Juan</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of flock</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2,000 sheep</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-2,999</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 and more</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relation to operator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family location</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family lives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the range</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In locality</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in locality</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of worker</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic background</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-American</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years employed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and over</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers receiving bonus</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workers</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vacations with pay, and regular systems of pay increases.

**Insurance**

Seventeen percent of the workers were covered by some type of insurance paid for by the ranch operator. Usually this was straight accident insurance but a few ranchers provided both health and accident insurance.

Fifty-six percent of the ranchers gave their workers time off with pay when they were sick.

**Labor Turnover**

*Recent rapid increases in the number of well-paid jobs in nonfarm employment have attracted many workers away from farms and ranches in Utah. Many of the ranchers contacted were concerned as to the future prospects for a labor supply, and they had adopted elaborate measures to keep the workers they had. A look at the figures in table 12 will give some indication of the type of occupational adjustment that is going on. Although 67 percent of the workers hired by the ranchers had come from sheep ranches, only 44 percent after leaving continued to work on other sheep ranches. There was a slight shift toward work on cattle ranches and other farms but the big change was in the direction of non-farm employment. Only 7 percent of the workers hired had come from nonfarm jobs, while 24 percent obtained nonfarm employment after they left.*

A great deal of the turnover on Utah sheep ranches is not closely related to urban employment. Many workers, and particularly single men, circulate from ranch to ranch. There is a wage factor in this situation, also

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12. Type of employment engaged in by regular hired workers prior to employment on reporting ranch and after leaving that employment, Utah, 1952 and 1953</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On sheep ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On other ranches or farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The percentages in this column are based on the total number of workers on which the employer could report their subsequent employment. This was 203 out of 300 workers who had quit or were discharged during the 2 year period.
† Includes those in school and in the Army, and those who had done no work prior to this job.
‡ Includes retired, disabled, and unemployed workers.
a desire for change, i.e. seeing new country, dissatisfaction with the work conditions, and in some instances a lack of responsibility. More stability would be possible in the labor force of sheep ranchers if this drifting could be minimized.

The Rate of Labor Turnover

The operators reported both the total number of regular hired workers they had as of December 1953 and the number that had left their employment in 1952 and 1953. Using the total number of workers who had worked on a ranch in the 2-year period as a base, the rate of turnover per ranch was computed by obtaining the percentage of those workers who were no longer employed.

In 1952 and 1953, 1,169 regular workers were employed by the ranchers. Of these, 564 were still working at the time of the survey, and 607 had quit or had been fired. Fifty-two percent of all workers employed in the two years, therefore, was no longer employed on the same ranch in December 1953. This type of percentage constitutes the measure of turnover used in this report.9 It permits comparisons between various parts of the state and various types of workers.

An examination of rates of turnover for individual ranches indicates that there were two most common groups. More than a fourth of the ranches, 27 percent, had no labor turnover in the 2-year period (table 13). They are in sharp contrast to the other major group. The rate of turnover for almost half the ranches ranged between 40 and 79 percent. In over-simplified terms, around half or more of their workers had left them in this period. Only a few ranches had turnover rates of from 1 to 39 percent or of 80 percent or more.

Factors Related to Labor Turnover

The preceding rates of turnover apply to all 166 ranches and to 1,169 workers reported on in the survey. As no data were obtained for individual workers on ranches having 18 or more workers in the 2-year period, detailed information on turnover is limited to the 688 workers reported on 151 of the ranches. This change means a loss of data for some of the farms on which the rate of turnover was high. It also means an average rate of turnover of only 44 percent.

| Table 13. Turnover rates of regular hired workers on sheep ranches in Utah, 1952 and 1953* |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-----------|
| Percentage of turnover          | Ranchoes with stated percentages of turnover |
| All ranches reporting           | number         | percent  |
| None                            | 45             | 27       |
| 1-19                            | 8              | 5        |
| 20-39                           | 19             | 11       |
| 40-59                           | 42             | 26       |
| 60-79                           | 36             | 21       |
| 80 and more                     | 16             | 10       |

* Labor turnover as used in this table is the percentage of all regular hired workers employed in 1952 and 1953 who left or were discharged in that period.
Table 14. Rate of turnover of regular hired workers on sheep ranches in Utah, by selected characteristics, 1952 and 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristic</th>
<th>Workers who</th>
<th>Rate of turnover</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>number</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All workers reported on</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All workers reported on individually</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder, Cache, Rich, Weber, Morgan, Davis</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele, Salt Lake</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit, Wasatch</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah, Juab, Sanpete, Sevier, Wayne</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute, Iron, Garfield, Kane</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne, Uintah</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, Grand, San Juan</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background of workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-American</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other†</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of sheep enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2,000 sheep</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-2,999 sheep</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 and over sheep</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage rate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $200 per month</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200-225 per month</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $225 per month</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus paid workers</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus not paid workers</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous work experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm work</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm work</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other†</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to operator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Table 14. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristic</th>
<th>All workers</th>
<th>Rate of turnover</th>
<th>Workers who</th>
<th>Are still working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number dependents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None‡</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and over</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of family:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the range</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In locality</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other localities‡</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workers

- Not ascertained.
- ‡ Largely school attendance and unpaid family work.
- § Includes workers with no immediate family.

for the ranches that provided information on individual workers as compared with 52 percent for all ranches in the survey. 10

Of the 688 workers reported on individually, 56 percent were still employed at the time the survey was made, but 30 percent had quit and 14 percent had been discharged. Rates of total labor turnover and of quitting and discharging varied widely from one part of the state to another. They were least in the central and southeastern counties of Utah (table 14). In northwestern Utah the rate was 60 percent. Apparently ranches in the central counties are successful in holding Anglo-American workers. They also pay the highest salaries. Those in the southeastern counties have the advantage of a greater degree of isolation from the urban, industrial areas of the state. They were able to hold their workers despite the fact that the wages paid were not as high as those in other parts of the state. Dismissal rates in these areas were also low.

Throughout the state as a whole, rates of labor turnover were somewhat less for Anglo-American workers than for Spanish-American and other new types of labor. Problems apparently arise in connection with these types of labor which result in both a higher rate of quitting by the workers and a higher rate of dismissal.

Apparently rate of turnover was not related closely to size of farm enterprise. Although the large enterprises on which individual records for workers were not taken, had especially high rates of turnover, the medium-sized operations had lower rates than the small ranches. The largest differ-

---

10 Average rate of turnover for these ranches, figured on the basis of number of workers lost as related to the total number of jobs filled or unfilled was only 22 percent per year.
ence was in the proportion of workers who left voluntarily.

Turnover rates were especially low for high paid workers and for those who received bonuses. This does not necessarily mean that either high wage rates or bonuses are effective in reducing turnover as such payments were often reserved for relatives and other key workers who normally would have low rates of turnover.

Family relationships were significant as stabilizing factors. Married workers had a lower turnover than single, widowed, or divorced workers, and those with dependents a lower rate than workers without dependents. Workers who had their families living with them on the range had a turnover rate of only 20 percent, as contrasted with 35 percent for workers who had families nearby, and 53 percent for those who either had no families or whose families lived at some distance from their work.

**Reasons for Workers’ Leaving**

Ranchers could not say why approximately half the workers had left. This fact may indicate some lack of closeness between workers and employers. They were more definite in giving reasons as to why workers had been discharged (table 15). It should be kept in mind that the figures present only one side of the situation, and that the ranchers themselves may not know all the factors in every termination of employment. Usually when workers quit, they told their employers either that they wanted to work on another ranch or at a job that would pay higher wages. Two other factors are brought out by the reported reasons for leaving: (1) Workers sometimes had difficulty in getting along with other workers or with the boss; (2) Separation from the worker’s family was a frequent cause for dissatisfaction.

The regular workers may have included a few who did not have year-round status. Yet only 12 percent of the workers reported as discharged were dismissed because they were no longer needed (table 14). The causes for discharge most frequently mentioned can be combined into one broad category—dissatisfaction with the worker because of incompetence, laziness, lack of dependability, or drunkenness. It is apparent that the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for leaving</th>
<th>Regular hired workers number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers who left</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted work on another place</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted higher wages</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to be with his family</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to work for self</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t like other workers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker was independent</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker was lonely</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate was too cold</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers who were discharged</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent, lazy, not dependable</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad health, sickness, old age</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker not needed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rancher is satisfied only with workers who are highly dependable. Although the problem of incompetent or undependable workers appears to be especially great, it is even more surprising that a fourth of the discharges were owing to bad health, sickness, or old age. Apparently the rugged life associated with sheep herding takes quite a toll among these workers.

**Where the Workers Went**

As previously indicated, most of the movement of regular workers was from ranch to ranch (table 12). Only a few workers entered the labor force on sheep ranches from nonfarm employment but the exodus of workers to nonfarm jobs was highly significant. No general movement of workers into a particular area or industry was indicated. Instead they went into a wide range of jobs, many of which are found in the average community. For example, 8 went into carpentry and construction work, 5 into truck driving, 5 into coal mining, 4 to work on road construction, and 1 each to work in a lumber mill, steel plant, oil business, butcher shop, bar, gas company, and cafe. One went into business for himself, another took a municipal job, and another became a school teacher.

Although there is a challenge in stabilizing the labor turnover from ranch to ranch, the loss to urban occupations may be a matter of even greater concern. The net loss must be compensated for by new entrants into sheepherding, and as yet no adequate method of attracting and training such workers from local resources has been developed.

**Replacements**

At the time of the survey, replacements had been obtained for 77 percent of the workers who had left within the last 2 years. That 23 percent were not replaced does not indicate that replacements were not available for that proportion of the workers. As previously indicated, 12 percent of the workers had been dropped because they were no longer needed. Furthermore, ranchers sometimes take considerable time in an effort to find a good worker. They adjust to a temporary shortage either through help from family members or by putting a heavier load on the remaining workers.

Ordinarily this type of responsible ranch job would call for advance notice to the employer before the worker quit. Workers who quit, however, were not always considerate of their employers. About half of those who left gave the rancher less than 5 days’ notice and a fourth gave from 10 to 15 days’ advance notice.

The ranchers generally felt that the replacements they had obtained were as good or better than the workers who had gone. Forty-five percent of the replacements were reported to be about as capable as the previous workers, 35 percent as better, and only 20 percent as less capable. If these estimates are correct, the quality of the regular farm work force must have been improved in the last 2 years covered by the study.
Recruitment of Regular and Seasonal Workers

In obtaining workers, the sheep rancher is confronted with two major problems: (1) The need to exercise care in selecting a worker; and (2) the limited number of workers from which to select the specialized kind of help he needs. The care necessary in selecting workers leads many ranchers to seek personally for men who will qualify. In seeking these men, a rancher has several sources from which he may get assistance: other ranchers, other workers, friends and neighbors; such public agencies as the Utah State Employment Service, an affiliate of the United States Employment Service, or private agencies and services.

Recruitment Agencies

The Utah State Employment Service has local offices in the large centers of employment in Utah. These offices place both urban and agricultural labor and if they are unable to obtain workers locally they can have them recruited in other areas or states. Recently when capable herd-ers could not be located in the United

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16. Method of recruitment of regular hired workers by selected characteristics, Utah sheep ranches, 1952-53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How workers were obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected characteristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers reported by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background of worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of herd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-2,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 and more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes friends and other workers, when the initial effort was not made by the rancher or the worker.

34
States, this agency approved employer requests to recruit shepherders from Spain and France in accordance with provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Private nonprofit placement agencies who make no charge for their service have been in existence for some time in Utah. They occupy a well-established position in the placement field. Ordinarily their recruitment operations are carried on as a sideline to other business enterprises where they stand to gain through patronage from the persons they serve. The men who operate these noncommercial services become personally acquainted with many ranchers. They also learn through the "grapevine" of the qualifications of the workers who apply. Only those workers who have good records are likely to receive help in obtaining employment. This provides a highly selective type of recruiting assistance which appeals to many farm operators.

**How Workers Were Obtained**

The ranchers listed the ways in which they had obtained their regular hired workers in the 2 years preceding the survey. According to their reports, they had obtained more than half their workers through their own efforts (table 16). Apparently, whenever the operator initiated action to obtain workers he credited the placement to his own effort. The fact that he called on friends, on his workers, or on public or private agencies to help him did not in some instances transfer the credit for placement to them. Of 278 regular workers reported on as having been obtained through the ranchers' own efforts, a more detailed account as to how the worker was obtained is available on 99. About half of these workers had been contacted personally, and the rest were obtained through employees, friends, acquaintances, or through public or private agencies. In more than a fourth of the instances the initiative came from the hired worker who applied personally for the job.

Recruitment methods reported by the ranchers varied widely according to type of worker. Although the ranchers said they had obtained half of the local workers through their own efforts, they reported that they had obtained two-thirds of the Spanish-American and 90 percent of the miscellaneous groups of Basques, Indians, and Greeks in this way. Again, this may be the rancher's own view of the recruitment situation. The miscellaneous group was made up largely of Basques and many agencies in addition to the rancher had a part in their recruitment. Approximately a third of the Anglo-Americans had applied personally for employment but only a fourth of the Spanish-American workers and only 2 percent of the workers in the miscellaneous group had done so.

On the basis of wage rates, it was the workers who received above or below average wages who had obtained employment through personal application to the rancher. Workers recruited by the rancher were usually paid the average wage.

**Recruitment of Seasonal Labor**

Although recruitment of seasonal labor was regarded as a less fundamental problem than recruitment of
herders, it presented some difficulties to the ranchers. Actually the ranchers in the sample had employed an average of 6.6 seasonal workers in the course of the year. These might be required only for the lambing season, for summer herding, or for transporting the sheep. Ranchers were more likely to call on public or private employment agencies for this type of labor than for their more permanent help.

Table 17. Operators who report assistance from public and private agencies in obtaining regular or seasonal labor by selected characteristics, Utah sheep ranches, December 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristic</th>
<th>Proportion who received assistance from</th>
<th>Proportion who never received assistance from any public or private agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Employment Service</td>
<td>Private agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ranchers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder, Cache, Rich, Weber, Morgan, Davis</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele, Salt Lake</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit, Wasatch</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah, Juab, Sanpete, Sevier, Wayne</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute, Iron, Garfield, Kane</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne, Uintah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, Grand, San Juan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of flock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-2,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 or more</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background of workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-American</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ranchers reporting</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages in this column are also included in the two preceding columns, so columns 1, 2, and 4 add to 100 percent.
Extent of Use of Procurement Agencies for Regular and for Seasonal Labor

A few more than half of the ranchers reported that they had never received assistance from any public or private agency in obtaining labor. Approximately a third had received assistance from the State Employment Service and 12 percent from private agencies. Usually the ranchers who had patronized the private agencies had also received assistance from the State Employment Service (table 17).

Patronage of public and private agencies varied significantly from one section of the state to another. Ranchers in southeastern Utah reported no assistance from the State Employment Service and little from any other agency. Ranchers in south central Utah reported considerable use of the State Employment Service but no patronage of private agencies. Operators in northern Utah used both public and private agencies. Only 21 percent of the ranchers in Salt Lake and Tooele Counties had not received assistance from any agency. Apparently the employment agencies served most when they were conveniently accessible.

Operators of large ranches used employment agencies more than did the operators of smaller ranches. This was particularly true of the State Employment Service. Ranchers who patronized the State Employment Service paid higher wage rates on the average than those who patronized the private agencies. Those with the highest turnover of labor also patronized the public or private agencies. Apparently these percentages are associated with the fact that both low turnover and low patronage rates occurred in southeastern Utah.

Ranchers who employed Spanish-American and miscellaneous types of workers had received more assistance from private agencies than had those who employed Anglo-Americans. Ranchers with a high turnover of labor were also frequent patrons of such agencies.

The ranchers were asked to comment on the services rendered them by the State Employment Service. Some of them indicated that they had been able to obtain assistance there when other resources had failed. One group of ranchers preferred the private agencies because they were more selective as to workers. They wished the State Employment Service could get more reliable information on qualifications of workers who state they have had experience in handling sheep. Some ranchers suggested that the State Employment Service inaugurate a training program which would bring more young men into sheepherding as a life work. The conduct of such a program is not within the scope of responsibilities of the State Employment Service. The State Extension Service or the Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City might consider such a possibility with support from the woolgrowers associations.

Preferences for Workers With Particular Cultural Backgrounds

Sheep ranchers were asked to state which ethnic type of worker they preferred for regular hired employees and for shearing crews. Their judgment often was of limited value in assessing regular hired workers as
some ranchers had used only one kind of employee. It could be, then, that most ranchers preferred the Anglo-American workers because they had never used any other kind (table 18). Probably the more significant fact is that so many ranchers have come to prefer other types of workers than the Anglo-American.

An additional factor may have entered into these statements of preference. The type of workers a ranch-

---

### Table 18. Preference of Utah sheep ranchers for regular hired workers and for shearing crews of a specified ethnic background, December 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic preference and reason for preference</th>
<th>Ranchers reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ranchers reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Understand better</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Easier to get along with</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Do a better job, or are more dependable</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Only ones hired</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Stay on job better</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Better work</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Understand better</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Easier to obtain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Easier to please</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Only ones hired</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. More dependable and competent</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Know their sheep</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Only ones hired</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Understand sheep better</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shearing crews</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American crews</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. More accommodating</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cheaper (work faster)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Do a better job</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. More careful</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-American</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile union crew</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Do a better job</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Union crew</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Loyal to local workers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Easier to get along with</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Only ones hired</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Anglo-American</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Loyal to local workers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Do a better job</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Only ones hired</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
er already has limits his range of actual choice in obtaining new workers. The individual situation of these ranchers then may have influenced the responses to the inquiry.

Probably preferences as to shearing crews are best expressed by the fact that Spanish-American crews now shear the greatest number of sheep. Some ranchers reported that such crews not only cost less but that also they were more accommodating and did a better job. Anglo-American crews, of both the mobile and of the stationary types, received support on the quality of their work and on the basis of loyalty to one’s own ethnic group.

**Steps Taken to Reduce Turnover**

Ranchers with any regular hired workers who had stayed on their jobs for the entire 2 year survey period were asked whether they had taken any definite steps to make their workers want to stay. The results indicate that sheep ranchers have been most active along this line. Of 135 ranchers who were asked the questions, 99, or 73 percent said they had taken such steps. They reported having taken a total of 283 steps to hold their workers (table 19). Operators on large ranches reported a wider variety of steps taken than those on smaller ranches.

The step most frequently mentioned was improvement of camping facilities. More than half of the ranchers reported that they had made this type of change. Almost as many reported that they had tried to build up friendly personal relations with their workers, or that they had given their workers more freedom to do their jobs in their own way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 19. Steps taken by Utah sheep ranchers to hold workers, in the 2 years preceding the survey, December 1953</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steps taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchers who had taken any steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total steps reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved camping facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained friendly personal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave workers more freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised cash wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave vacation with pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lent money or gave food and tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept them comfortable and happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made work lighter by mechanization or fencing land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages are based on 135 operators. They add to more than 100 percent as most operators reported taking more than one step.
Increases in monetary returns to the workers had also been frequent. Thirty-six percent of the ranchers had raised wage rates in order to hold their workers and 22 percent had given larger bonuses. Less frequently mentioned were vacations with pay, loans of money, gifts of food and tobacco, and similar measures.

The operators were also asked which steps they regarded as most effective in keeping workers satisfied and on the job. Their answers varied somewhat from the frequency of the steps actually taken (table 20). An increase in wages was reported as the most effective measure while improving camping facilities was reported as second. Maintaining friendly relations and providing more freedom on the job apparently were regarded as less effective. According to some ranchers hired workers had become “material minded,” and they could only be satisfied by increases in pay. A minority of the ranchers based their judgment on such philosophies as “men who are on their own do better and are more contented,” “friendly relationships make them feel equal,” or “when a worker is well fed he is happy.” Some ranchers made no choice between the various steps. They said either that all steps were important or that the step to be taken depended on the type of worker.

Personal observation by enumerators at the time of the survey indicated that ranchers were well aware of the necessity of looking out for the comfort and convenience of their men. “My men,” said one rancher, “can have whatever kind of food they want to order. I make only one stipulation,—that none of the food is wasted.” Another operator stated that he provided a worker and his wife a modern trailer and paid them $400 a month. The wife acted as camp tender while the husband had charge of herding the sheep.

In another instance, the herder’s family was living with him at the top of the mountain. The rancher had furnished them with a camp wagon with sliding beds, in which the parents and two children could sleep comfortably (see figure 7). A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step regarded as most important</th>
<th>Number ranchers reporting</th>
<th>Percentage of ranchers who regarded a specific step as most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total ranchers reporting</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in wages</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved camping facilities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining friendly relations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom on job</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased bonus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Steps to hold workers on the job regarded as most important by Utah sheep ranchers, December 1953
road had been graded to the camp to permit automobiles to reach it.

Although the ranchers were quite expressive in relating past efforts to hold labor, they were more conservative in stating their plans for the future. When asked whether they planned to take any additional steps in the next year in order to hold workers on the job, only 19 said they had such plans. Apparently many of them wait until the problem arises before taking action. The plans reported also failed to follow the evaluation of steps as reported by the ranchers. This may be because all except one of these ranchers employed Anglo-American workers. Therefore, the steps planned were with regard to a particular type of worker. The plans may be listed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranchers reporting</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better camp and other improvements</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased wages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut wages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly relations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide old age security</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give bonus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence range and make work easier</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce size of flock</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adequacy of Seasonal Labor Supply

In considering adequacy of the labor supply, it must be kept in mind that ranchers feel that they need a particular kind of worker. They prefer one who is not only experienced in working with sheep but who can also adapt himself to the other workers on the ranch. A rancher may want all Anglo-American, Spanish-American, or Basque workers, and although there may be a surplus of workers generally, the particular type of experienced worker desired may be hard to find within the price range the operator is willing to pay.

Almost three-fourths of the operators reported an adequate supply of seasonal labor in 1953 (table 21). Slightly more than half said their supply had been adequate in the last 5 years. There were variations in reports of adequacy of the labor supply, however, from one part of the state to another. Approximately 90 percent of the ranchers in eastern Utah said they had had a sufficient supply of workers in 1953. In 15 counties in northern and south central Utah, however, a third of the ranchers said the supply of seasonal labor had not been adequate in that year. Reports on adequacy in the 5-year period also indicated a better labor situation in eastern Utah. Two-thirds of the ranchers in Wasatch and Summit Counties, however, reported that their seasonal labor supply had been inadequate at some time in the preceding 5 years.

These regional differences indicate that problems of labor supply are greatest in the northern part of the state where competition from non-farm employment is greater. Ranchers there have problems in regard to both seasonal and regular labor. Likewise ranchers in areas with less turnover of regular hired workers had less difficulty with seasonal labor as well. Large operators had somewhat more difficulty, both with regular and with seasonal labor.
Table 21. Percentage of ranchers who reported an adequate supply of seasonal workers in 1953 and from 1948-1953, by selected characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristic</th>
<th>Reporting adequate supply 1953 percent</th>
<th>Reporting adequate supply 1948-53 percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All ranchers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Box Elder, Cache, Rich, Weber,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morgan, Davis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tooele, Salt Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summit, Wasatch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah, Juab, Sanpete, Sevier, Wayne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piute, Iron, Garfield, Kane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duchesne, Uintah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbon, Grand, San Juan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of herd</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-2,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(regular workers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor turnover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(regular workers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wage rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(regular workers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200-225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality of Seasonal Labor**

Ranchers were asked whether their seasonal workers had "been able to do reasonably well the jobs you expected of them?" Sixty-two percent answered in the affirmative. The other 38 percent were asked in what way the seasonal workers had been lacking.

The numbers of ranchers who reported specified deficiencies were as follows:

- Lacking in experience: 31
- Lazy: 21
- Not dependable: 19
- No interest in work: 9
- Physically or mentally unfit: 6
- Drunkenness: 6
- Either too young or too old: 3

Many of these complaints are of the type that can be heard about farm workers anywhere. However,
the proportion of workers regarded as lacking in experience is unusually high. Some ranchers specified that the experience that was lacking was in the handling of sheep. These ranchers probably are pointing to a real problem. Workers on sheep ranches should have rather specialized training or experience. Possibly a formalized system of training, apprenticeship, or other ways of gaining experience might be devised by ranchers or by public agencies.

**Effect of Inadequacy or Incompetence of Seasonal Workers on Ranch Operations**

The ranchers were asked whether their sheep business had been affect-
ed by either the number or the quality of seasonal labor. Half of them stated that their business had been affected adversely. When asked as to how it had been affected, most of the ranchers said that it had been hampered by lack of experienced or dependable labor. Some ranchers gave more tangible evidence of adverse consequences. A fifth of them indicated that their profits had been reduced either by losses in the lambing season, or in other aspects of the ranch business. Three ranchers went so far as to say that inadequate or incompetent seasonal labor had caused them to reduce the size of their flocks.

**Appendix**

**Sampling Procedure**

In surveying the manpower situation on sheep ranches in Utah, a sample was desired that would apply broadly to such ranches throughout the state. A list of large farm operators compiled by the U. S. Census for its sample survey in 1953 was used as a basis for selecting respondents. Ranchers with less than 500 sheep were dropped from this group. The resulting list of 228 names constituted the basis for the sample used in the survey. During the enumeration all ranchers who had employed no regular hired workers in the previous year were also dropped from the survey. In addition, a few ranchers could not be contacted in 3 or 4 visits to their headquarters. Some were on the range and others were so mobile that no contact could be made. Completed schedules were obtained from 166 ranchers.

In order to save enumeration time and insure greater accuracy, a special sampling device was used to the number of individual hired workers on which a rancher reported. Ranchers who had employed from 1 to 5 workers in the 2 year survey period were asked to report on each worker. Those who had employed from 6 to 11 workers were asked to report on every other one selected on a randomized basis. Those who had employed from 12 to 17 workers were asked to report on every third worker also selected on a randomized basis. Ranchers who had employed 18 or more workers in the survey period were asked no questions about individual workers. This was on the assumption that they might not have detailed information about all their employees. Data on only those workers on whom they had information would have biased the results.

In tabulating the results, the data for ranchers who employed from 6 to 11 and from 12 to 17 workers were expanded by the appropriate figure to give them equal representation in the totals. This provided equal reporting for workers on 151 of the 166 ranches. The other 15 ranchers had approximately 40 percent of all regular employees. Data for these ranchers are included in general figures on number of workers, percentage of turnover, methods of reducing turnover, and changes in the size of the sheep enterprise. Data as to the individual characteristics of their workers, wage rates, and reasons for leaving were not obtained.

The count of ranchers and workers in the sample is given in appendix table 1.
## Appendix Table 1. Count of Ranchers and Workers in the Sample of Utah Sheep Ranches, 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranchers classified by number of regular hired workers during previous 2 years</th>
<th>All ranchers</th>
<th>Employed in previous 2 years</th>
<th>Reported on individually</th>
<th>Expanded total for workers reported on individually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranchers reporting regular hired workers</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 workers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11 workers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17 workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or more workers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>