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ABSTRACT

Migration Patterns of High School Vocational Agricultural Graduates of Utah in 1949 and a Comparison with Ohio Graduates

by

Keith L. Smith, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1976

Major Professor: Dr. Gilbert A. Long
Department: Agricultural Education

The purpose of the study was to determine the migration patterns of vocational agricultural graduates in Utah during the first 5 years following their high school graduation in 1969, and compare these patterns with Ohio graduates of 1963. Former graduates of 23 of the qualifying 28 departments were included in this study. A random sample of students were surveyed.

Forty percent of the 1969 graduates were engaged in agricultural occupations or agricultural study in college. A total of 30.6 percent of the graduates had moved from their home communities since graduating from high school. More than 88 percent of the migrants lived within 200 miles of their home community, with most (four of five) within 25 miles. There was a significant relationship between migration and current occupation. Seven other variables were not significantly related to migration as follows:

There were no statistically significant differences between migrants and nonmigrants with respect to residence of origin,
educational level of father, educational level of mother, number of older brothers, occupation of father, estimated level of income, and rank in graduating class. In addition, there were no significant differences between nonmigrants and migrants in terms of marital status, military experience, level of formal education, type of education beyond high school, and the LDS mission experience.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

America is a nation on the move. We move across the street, across the country and even across seas. In fact, migration is common, as is convincingly brought out in a report by the Conference Board (1974), a private research organization. They reported the following:

About 72 million Americans - 37 percent of the nation's population moved at least once between 1970 and 1974.
About three out of five families changing their places of residence relocate in the same county. Only about one out of five families leaves its county but stays in the same state.
About one out of five families moves to a different state. Between 1970 and 1974, roughly 15 million Americans changed their state of residence, causing marked shifts in population.
In short, there is in process a continuing geographical homogenization of the nation's population and economy. (p. 1)

The impact of technology accounts for a large part of the population mobility. Changes in the numbers and types of workers needed by employers take place continually throughout the country. The result is frequent local imbalances between labor demand and labor supply, and these are constantly in the process of correction as workers move to jobs and jobs to workers. A study done by Taqieeddin and Gardner (1973, p. 40) for Utah's 29 counties, backs this statement. They stated, in summary:
"The data of the study reveals a strong direct association between net migration and job availability. This relationship is consistent with theoretical expectation."
"Rural people have been especially affected by these changes," according to the Noland and Woodin study (1971, p. 1). They continue, "Due to the impact of mechanical, chemical, and biological innovations as well as effective programs of vocational education in agriculture, the number of farm workers required to produce the nation's food and fiber has been substantially reduced." To illustrate this, the Fact Book of U.S. Agriculture (1967, p. 16) stated, "In 1910, only seven persons were supplied farm products by one farm worker, in 1967, one farm worker supplied himself and 39 others." Swanson (1971) tells us that in 1970, one farm worker supplied himself and forty-three others. It can readily be seen, from these few statistics, that agricultural production today uses much less labor than it did in 1910. At the same time, the number of off-farm workers required to support agricultural production in such areas as processing, distribution, marketing, farm supply, and other agricultural services has increased tremendously.

As the agricultural economy continues to change, the demand for employees in off-farm agricultural occupations will increase, according to most economists. Many of these jobs may not be located in the typical rural or small urban community. Therefore, rural youth who want to pursue careers in off-farm agriculture will need to be prepared to obtain employment in communities other than the ones in which they receive their agricultural education.
In view of these changes, the changes in technology and the labor market, it is believed that pertinent information as to the mobility of vocational agriculture graduates would be useful in planning and improving programs of vocational agriculture. Vocational educators would then have a better idea about the necessity of looking beyond the scope of the local community in planning programs to meet the needs of their students. The concern is to prepare young people for gainful employment no matter where they choose to live. Discovering mobility characteristics becomes a matter of importance.

Noland and Woodin (1968) also realized the importance of such information. The title of their study was "Migration patterns of Vocational Agriculture Graduates in Ohio." Their study concentrated on the 1963 graduates of high school agriculture, as related to their migration patterns. The findings are interesting and could hold true for Utah. The question that arose, though, was their study valid and reliable for Utah? Could their data be open for selection or historical bias? Could historical events or conditions within Utah change the results of the study?

The problem, then, is the lack of a replication study, to see if the findings with Ohio graduates will hold true for Utah.
Purpose

The major purpose of this study was to determine the migration patterns of vocational agriculture graduates in Utah during the first five years following their high school graduation in 1969, and compare these patterns with Ohio in 1963.

Objectives

The objective of this thesis is to determine if there is a significant association between migration and selected characteristics of vocational agriculture graduates including the following:

Parents' socio-economic status

1. Occupation

Hypothesis - There is no significant association between the type of occupation of fathers (i.e., full-time farm, non-agriculture occupation, part-time farm, agriculture related, and deceased) and migration from home community by agriculture graduates.

2. Income

Hypothesis - There is no significant association between the estimated level of parent's income (i.e., less than $3,000; 3,000-6,999; 7,000-10,999; 11,000-14,999; 15,000 and up) and migration from home community by agriculture graduates.
3. **Education**

Hypothesis - There is no significant association between the level of education of the father (i.e. beyond high school, high school, 8th grade) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

4. **Education beyond high school**

Hypothesis - There is no significant association between the level of formal education attained beyond high school (i.e. high school, post high school) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

5. **Marital Status**

Hypothesis - There is no significant association between marital status of graduates (i.e. married, single) and migration from the home community by vocational agriculture graduates.

6. **Place of origin**

Hypothesis - There is no significant association between the residence of origin of graduates (i.e. farm, non-farm rural, urban, city) and migration from home community by vocational agriculture graduates.

**Population of the Study**

It was believed that the same type of population should be selected as in the Ohio study for purposes of comparison. It was felt in the Ohio study that recent graduates--those who had been out of school one or two years--would not have had enough time in the world of work to provide a reliable indication of the migration patterns of vocational
agriculture graduates in Ohio. On the other hand, graduates who had been out of high school ten years or longer were not suited for this investigation. It was believed they had been established in their work careers for an extended period of time and they would be less likely to provide a reliable indication of the relative influence of the variables under investigation.

As a result of reasoning already mentioned the Ohio study decided on graduates of five years. This has been done also in this study for the following reasons:

1. It was believed that 1969 vocational agriculture graduates were between 22 and 25 years old which placed them among that segment of the total population with the highest rate of mobility according to Pierson (1975). Therefore, a relatively high rate of migration was expected of this group.

2. It was believed that five years out of high school was ample time to permit the graduates to complete their formal education and/or military service, and to enter the world of work.

3. Graduates for 1969 would have had time to marry and begin raising their families which may have had an influence on their migration patterns.

4. Graduates out of school five years should be able to recall, with a reasonable degree of accuracy, the information elicited through the questionnaire in order to determine qualitative differences between migrants and nonmigrants.
5. It was believed that names and current mailing addresses for graduates out of school five years could be located with reasonable effort.

On the basis of the results of the Ohio study and the above reasons, it was believed this population would be best for the Utah study.

**Sampling Procedure**

In order to identify the sample for the study a list of the 48 vocational agriculture departments in Utah was compiled and 28 were selected based on the following criteria:

1. The vocational agriculture teachers had been teaching one or more years at the time of the study. In multiple teacher departments at least one of the teachers had been teaching one or more years.

2. The vocational agriculture department had been established prior to 1969 and had not been involved in a consolidation of more than two school districts since 1969.

It was believed that beginning teachers and teachers in departments which had been involved in extensive school district consolidations since 1969 would have difficulty in locating names and addresses of 1969 graduates.

The 28 qualifying agriculture departments were requested through two mailed letters and one personal contact to provide names and addresses for their 1969 graduates. The 28 departments were located in 17, or 59
percent, of the 29 counties in Utah and were distributed geographically in all portions of the state: north, south, east, west, and the central portions.

Teachers in 23 of the 28 selected departments or 82 percent provided the names and addresses of 345 graduates. Some chapters had as high as 46 graduates, while others had 8 graduates. The average number of graduates per department was 15. The non-respondent departments were in no particular area of the state and varied according to their size. Two were larger chapters, one a medium sized chapter and one a small chapter.

Collection from the agriculture teachers

As already mentioned, information sheets were sent to 28 qualifying agriculture departments. The following table explains the breakdown:

Table 1. Distribution of agriculture teachers response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to information sheet mailed</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usable responses</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A random sampling procedure was used on the 345 names of the graduates with the numbers 1 to 46. This would cover all of the graduates from the respondent schools. As a number was drawn it was recorded and all graduates who corresponded to that number on any of the 23 responding chapter roles were contacted by mail. Eighteen numbers were drawn for a total random sampling of 148 names, or 42.8 percent of the total sample.

Of the 148 persons to whom questionnaires were mailed usable data were collected from 85 for a response of 57.4 percent.

Table 2. Distribution of vocational agriculture graduates according to the response to the mailed questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient address</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Mission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Responses</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development of the Instrument and Data Collection

Two data-collecting instruments were necessary to obtain the information for this study. The first was the reporting form which was used by agriculture teachers to list the names, current mailing addresses, number of graduates, and a rank in the class of the graduate of 1969. Twenty-eight chapters were identified as meeting the already mentioned criteria to qualify for the questionnaire. Twenty three responded with usable data with five chapters choosing not to answer.

Three contacts were made of the teachers involved. Two letters were mailed, the first being sent on January 28, 1975, the second on February 24, 1975, and personal contact was made with the teachers involved on March 1 at the Mid-Winter Vocational Conference, at Orem, Utah.

The first letter to the agriculture teachers brought in 13 responses, or 56.5 percent of the eventual 23 respondents. The second letter brought in 8, of 34.8 percent out of 23. The personal contact brought in the last two to make the 8.7 percent of the 23 respondents. All together 23 out of the 28 responded for a total of 82 percent.

Letter return from agriculture teachers

Official Utah State University letterhead paper was used on the two letters sent to the teachers. Each letter was signed by the investigator and
the head of the Agriculture Education Department, Dr. Gilbert Long, to elicit a higher rate of return.

Table 3. Distribution of letter return from the selected agriculture teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact no.</th>
<th>Nature of contact</th>
<th># Returns</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>personal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second instrument was to the 1969 graduates who had been randomly selected. Three letters were mailed to these graduates over a two and one half month period. The first letter was mailed on March 31, 1975, to the 148 randomly selected graduates. The second was mailed May 16, 1975, and the third was mailed June 11, 1975. These letters contained the questionnaire needed to collect the pertinent data from the graduates.

In the first response 41 or 48.2 percent of the questionnaires were returned by the graduates. In the second response 33 or 38.8 percent more of the questionnaires were returned. In the third letter something different was tried. The first week of June in 1975 was the Utah vocational conference
at Utah State. It was suggested by the chairman of the committee, Dr. Long, that instead of having his signature along with the investigator on the letters that the agriculture teachers sign the letters of their particular students. This plan was followed on the third letter and the remaining 11 or 13% responded by sending in their questionnaires.

The questionnaire was made up with the help of the chairman, and the committee members. Also, thanks is expressed to Dr. Gardner of the Economics Department at Utah State University for his helpful suggestions on certain aspects of the questionnaire.

**Letter return from graduates**

The following table shows the distribution of letter returns from the 1969 graduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact no.</th>
<th>Nature of contact</th>
<th># Returns</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Distribution of letter return from the 1969 students
To accomplish the highest rate of return possible on both letters to the agriculture teachers and the three letters to the graduates and to insure validity, the following procedures were used:

1. All letters were individually typed, and neatly put together.

2. Letterhead paper of the Agriculture Education Department, Utah State University was used.

3. The reasons and purposes of the study were clearly stated to help the respondent in giving a valid response.

4. The importance of the response was stated.

5. A time period of two weeks was set for a reply.

6. The offer was made to send the respondent the results of the study.

7. The name was not required, to insure confidentiality of the questionnaire.

8. Follow up letters were sent to non-respondents reassuring them of the importance of the study.

9. Personal interviews with a random sample of the non-respondents was conducted to see if the response was similar.

All of these procedures helped to insure against "Experimental Mortality."
Validation of Response

In all studies validity is essential. To try and make this study more valid a telephone survey of the non-respondents was conducted. A random sample of 15 names were selected and contact was made with 11 for a 25 percent sample from the 44 non-respondents.

The non-respondents were asked seven questions from the questionnaire as follows:

1. Marital Status - A yes or no answer was asked as to marital status.

2. Service in the Armed Forces - Have you served in the armed forces?

3. Residence in High School - Did you live on a farm or off-farm while in high school?

4. Moved since graduation - Have you moved from your home community since graduation?

5. Current Occupation - Is your current occupation in agriculture?

6. Father's Occupation in 1969 - What was your father's occupation in 1969?

7. Education beyond high school - Have you had any schooling since high school?

These responses were then compared to the respondents by the following:
Observed frequency on mailed questionnaire returned = \( \frac{X}{85} = \frac{11}{11} \)

This was then put into chi square tables where no significance was found at the .05 level, for any of the seven characteristics compared.

Table 5. Comparison of selected characteristics of non-respondents to respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>(X^2)</th>
<th>(Chi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Farm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agriculture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agriculture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definition of Terms

Agriculture related. This would pertain to other than production agriculture, that would require skill in one or more areas of agriculture work. This would include plant science, animal science, agriculture mechanics and agriculture business management.

Graduate. One who graduated from a Utah high school in 1969 and had taken agriculture classes while attending at least one year.

Migration. A change in residence from the home community.

Non-mover. One who lived in the same house as when he was a senior in high school.

Local mover. The person has left the parental home but resides in the same community.

County mover. The person has left the parental home and community to reside in a different community but still lives in the same county.

Out of county mover. This would be anywhere outside the county the graduate lived in while attending high school. It would include also out of state and foreign country locations.
Man as the optimist, the curious, the restless, and the seeker has migrated since the dawn of time. Migration, as related to man, and his curious, restless, and optimistic nature, has found its place in the chronicles of time, since time began. Speaking to this point, G. W. Pierson (1973, p. 21) has stated:

Immemorially man has been an outcast and a wanderer. Since the Garden of Eden the descendants of Adam and Eve have been moving. Abraham lived in a tent, also King David, Moses and the children of Israel wandered 40 years, the restless Greek and curious Argonauts, Homer with the song of Odysseus, the medieval pilgrims, the Knights and their Quests, the Vikings, and the wandering Jew, all witness of man and his migration.

There are various types of migratory movements such as conquest, displacement, forced labor, controlled migration, and free individual movement. It is with free individual migration that we as educators and students of socioeconomic problems are primarily concerned, because this is the dominant type found in the United States.

Migration has been explained in many ways. Paul J. Schwind (1971) quotes Perloff and Wingo to explain migration in three stages in the United States. Perloff describes the first stage as agriculture production. The need for arable land, water, and space. The second stage is mineral
resources and the growth of industry. The third and the most recent comes in two ways. The importance of major market areas as population migrates to the climatically favorable regions. The example of this would be the huge migration to the west coast. The second way would be the footloose service with loose ties to the national market centers and the wide range of locations.

A review of the history of internal migration in the United States reveals that these three stages have taken place in the United States. If we begin with the early settlements along the Atlantic Coast more than 300 years ago, we see as new lands were opened settlers began to migrate toward the west in search of arable land, water, and new economic opportunity. The New England Farmer, for example, heard of the corn in Iowa that grew sky high in rich deep soil that would last forever.

In the second instance, as cities began to grow and industries develop people flocked to the cities because the farms (the Depression) were turning poor until today four out of five Americans live in a city (Pierson, 1973). The third stage has already been alluded to by the example of the West Coast. But there are other desirable climates and market centers. One just has to look at the growth statistics of Phoenix, Arizona to realize this.

These stages are the result of certain factors which cause the migration. One factor is economical. People search for greater economic opportunity. As Beale (1971, p. 5) pointed out, "People move for many
reasons, but the most common one is economic." Other factors are population pressure, depletion or exhaustion of resources, climatic fluctuation, and social maladjustment. In this last instance Utah is a good case in point. The westward movement of the Mormons to Utah is an example of this type of social pressure resulting in migration.

Next to the massive population movements created by the settlement of new frontiers in the United States, the single most significant aspect of human migration in the United States has been the rural-to-urban movement. The impact of this movement is illustrated by Beal (1971, p. 5) in The Yearbook of Agriculture:

Between 1960 and 1970, the population in metropolitan areas grew more than twice as rapidly as that in the small city and rural territory that makes up the nonmetro areas (17 percent compared with 7 percent). Since both populations would grow at about the same rate in the absence of migration, the difference is a clear indication of the movement of many people away from the nonmetro and into the metro areas during the decade.

This massive rural-urban movement has also resulted in a decrease in the percent of the total labor force engaged in farming. Mack (1965) pointed out that in 1900, 37.5 percent of all Americans at work were at farm jobs, but Malotky and Runyon (1971) tell us that in 1971 only 5 percent of our population was engaged in farming.

In explaining the rural-urban movement, Bowles (1957, pp. 1-11) suggested that migrations from farm to nonfarm areas in any period is usually in response to a search or need for:
1. economic opportunities in nonfarm areas
2. educational advantages
3. change of residence for retired persons
4. marital opportunities
5. service in the armed forces
6. other satisfactions

Critical issues, then, are: What are the characteristics of these migrants? Who migrates and who remains? Why is the migration process selective or is this universally applicable to all rural residents?

**Place of Residence**

Census surveys taken over a period of several years have provided substantial data about the residential mobility of the population according to type of residence; urban, rural-nonfarm, and rural-farm, for example. In an analysis of mobility by place of residence for the civilian population during the period from 1940 to 1950, Bougue (1957) found that the rural-nonfarm population had been more mobile than either urban or rural-farm population. In a similar analysis, Shyrock (1957) concluded that the residential mobility rate of the total rural-farm population wasn't very different from that of the urban population. He attributed these findings to the fact that the rural-nonfarm population tended to contain relatively more movers than the urban population, whereas the rural-farm population tended to contain fewer movers. Pierson (1973) concluded that farmers also are movers. He refers to the 1935 census from the Department of Agriculture in quoting that only 28 percent of all farm operators had been
on their farms for as much as ten years. Twenty six percent had been on less than two years. The average farm family was reported as staying only 5-6 years on the same farm.

Education

According to Drabick (1965) there is more migration with educational expectation. A study of 974 young adult males from the rural areas of Pennsylvania (Brown and Buck, 1961) failed to show an association between amount of education and migration. Also Thompson (1953, p. 304), in reviewing the census data on migration and education, 1935-40, stated that "... people with a good education have a high rate of migration," the "nonmetropolitan areas lost well-educated people to the metropolitan areas," and that "migrants (aged 25-34) between noncontiguous states contain a much higher proportion of persons with a college education or better 15.5 percent) than those between contiguous states (11.4 percent)."

In a study of migration patterns among rural young men in Eastern Kentucky, Schwarzwell (1964) failed to find a significant difference between migrants and nonmigrants with respect to the education of parents.

In view of the close association frequently existing between education and level of living, it could be expected that persons whose parents had attained a higher level of education would show higher rates of
migration. In support of this view, Blau and Duncan (1967) found that respondents whose fathers were high school graduates migrated at a somewhat higher rate than those with less well-educated fathers.

**Occupational Status**

The main group of movers in Pierson's (1973) estimation are middle-class people with savings, who are threatened by a loss of status or have an increase in wants.

Brown and Buck (1961) found that young men in the migrant categories came from families with slightly higher prestige ratings as rated on the North-Hatt Scale than those who remained in residence of origin. However, the difference was not significant and the investigators concluded that the relative prestige of parental occupations had little influence on the migration patterns of the offspring.

In addition to investigating the relationship between occupational prestige of parents and migration, Brown and Buck (1961) studied the relationship between type of occupation of parents and migration. Again, there was no significant relationship. However, there was a noticeable trend of greater urbanward movement for those respondents who reported farms as a place of residence but whose fathers were in nonfarm occupations. Possible explanations of this urbanward movement offered were that the parent recently left farming, but that the son still identified with
farm residence; that the parent was a part-time farmer, but that the major source of income was a nonfarm occupation.

Marital Status

A change in marital status is a significant event during one's life cycle. Referring to marital status, Bogue (1967, p. 212) has said:

Bachelorhood, marriage, widowhood, separation, and divorce represent a major type of culturally prescribed role and certain modes of behavior are expected of the individuals who occupy each status. The extent to which a given age group in the population is married or single is closely related to where its members live; what they purchase; whether or not the women work; the kinds of social organizations to which the age group belong; and the extent to which they are interested in certain community activities.

In view of the importance attached to marital status, one would expect it to exert influence on the migration patterns of young adults. Supposedly, married men who have wives and children to support would more likely be homeowners and have stronger community ties that would inhibit migration. On the other hand, the single young person might be thought to have fewer social ties and, therefore, greater freedom to migrate. Perhaps a married man would migrate in search of a better job to support his growing family, whereas a single young person without that economic pressure might be content to remain where he is.
State Report for Utah of Vocational Agriculture Graduates

A comparison of occupational status of graduates of the five previous years before 1969 would be helpful and add to the validity of this study. Table 6 was obtained from the report the agriculture teachers do each year for the state specialist. The table indicates that over this five year period a percentage of 39.2 is the average number of graduates in agriculture compared to the 40 percent figure that this paper reported for 1969. Other figures are listed below and can be compared to the findings of this study.

Summary of Ohio Study

In the Noland and Woodin study they selected high school vocational agriculture graduates of 1963 from 45 randomly selected vocational agriculture departments in Ohio. Their conclusions were based on the responses from 194 graduates or about 70 percent of those mailed questionnaires.

They asked questions in their questionnaires dealing with number of times moved, jobs held, education, both of themselves and their parents, marriage and background questions much like the areas that were covered in the Review of Literature. The following are their conclusions in brief.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agriculture</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Related</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Farming</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Agriculture (School)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(School) Agriculture</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ag. %</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occupational Patterns

1. The first positions assumed by a majority of the graduates after leaving high school were in nonagricultural occupations, those occupations not related to agriculture.

2. The fact that fewer graduates than expected were engaged in agricultural occupations might be partially attributed to the uncertainty faced by the 60 percent who had not fulfilled their military service obligation.

3. In terms of job stability and persistency, graduates employed in agriculture had held significantly fewer full-time jobs and had greater longevity per job than those nonagricultural positions.

4. Unemployment among the graduates was relatively low as evidenced by the fact that less than one of every five graduates had experienced any unemployment during the five year period since leaving high school. The total amount of time unemployed was equivalent to less than one percent of the potential employable time for all graduates.

Migration Patterns

1. Four out of every five graduates were living within 25 miles of their home community five years after graduating from high school and less than one in every ten graduates had moved more than 100 miles away from their home communities.
2. The major reasons why migrants left their parental homes were for marriage, to attend college, or to obtain a job. When all factors were considered for all residential moves completely per migrant, the major motivating force was because of a job.

3. Most of the migration occurred during the first two years after graduation with more graduates migrating during the first year than any other time.

4. Since most of the migrants moved during the early part of their first five years out of high school only limited migration can be expected of them in the future. Very few graduates had plans for future migration.

Relationship between selected characteristics and migration

1. There were significant relationships between migration and residence of origin, father's occupation, marital status, military experience, and current occupations.

2. There were no differences between migrants and nonmigrants with respect to level of education of parents, size of parental family, level of parental income, or rank in graduating class. In addition, there were no significant differences between nonmigrants and migrants in terms of level of formal education, type of form education beyond high school and the number of jobs held since graduation.
Summary

In summary, migration is not a new phenomena of human behavior. Various migratory movements have exerted an influence on the history of civilization since time immemorial. Within the context of a democratic society, each individual has had the right to move across the landscape as he deemed necessary in his quest for social and economic opportunity. Various factors are at work in the places of origin and other are associated with the area of destination. However, one has to be careful in classifying these factors because it is largely the individual's perception of the factor that influences his decision to move.
This section provides an overview of the graduates with a description of the graduates in terms of selected background characteristics, i.e. the residence of origin, the educational level of the parents, the estimated level of the parental income, the parents' occupation, and the number of older brothers. It also includes certain experimental factors that deal with occupational and educational experiences after high school. The section is completed with a table explaining the reaction to the vocational agriculture program.

Background Characteristics

These characteristics deal with those things which the graduate did not control, such as: his parents' occupation, the educational background of his parents, and his residence of origin. Nonetheless these factors are important and have a profound influence on the graduate's decisions in the future.

These background characteristics were taken from graduates of vocational agriculture of 1969. They were identified from 28 qualifying chapters located throughout the state. A random selection of 148 graduates were written to and a response was obtained from 85 for a 57.4 percent return.
Current Age

According to Pierson (1973) the more energetic and youthful are those who migrate. This could put these graduates at a good stage of migration. The ages varied between 22 and 24 with the majority being either 22 or 24. Only 15 percent were 23. This is an interesting situation. The conclusion might be that the graduates are rounded to the closest age. Ohio showed the same percentage of 22 year olds with 47 percent but went contrary to Utah in the 23 and 24 age group with 39 percent and 14 percent respectively.

Table 7. Distribution of vocational agriculture graduates by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vocational agriculture completed

In most of the agriculture departments in the state of Utah vocational agriculture is offered four years. In some of the departments however, it is only offered three years on the high school level.
The first two years are devoted to basic curriculum. The basic skills are taught in agriculture mechanics such as sharpening tool bits, electrical board, basic welding, basic oxy-acetylene and small projects. In agriculture science the first year is usually devoted to livestock production. Here the first year student learns the fundamentals of raising swine, dairy animals, beef, and sheep. The second year is set aside for plant science and basic soil science. The third and fourth year in agriculture science is for advanced work in livestock, plants and soils. With such topics as Livestock Management and Economics, Agronomy and greenhouse and advanced soils.

The third and fourth years in Agriculture Mechanics are for the advanced projects. This would include training in advanced welding using both arc and oxy-acetylene. Other courses have also been included in advanced agriculture mechanics, such as block laying, carpentry and advanced electrical work.

In Utah, there is a different situation than was noted in Ohio. In the study run by Noland (1968), 90.6 percent of all graduates completed all four years in Agriculture. In the situation of Utah, with less concentration of agriculture, the statistics differ somewhat. Only 33 percent completed four years of agriculture with 29 percent completing three years.
Table 8. Distribution of graduates by number of years of vocational agriculture completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years completed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that only 11.8 percent took the class for one year. Most of the students entering the program remained at least two or more years and 62 percent completed three or more.

Rank in graduating class

A different method than that used by Noland (1968) was utilized to determine the rank. He asked the graduates themselves how they ranked in their graduating class. It was decided a different way would be attempted by asking the agriculture teachers how the students ranked. It was believed that this method would elicit a more valid response, owing to the fact that people tend to cluster toward the mean especially when given three choices.
According to Drabick (1965) one should expect more migration with educational expectation. Thus, one would conclude that the students with the higher rank would be more migratory.

Table 9. Distribution of respondents by rank in graduating class as reported by agriculture teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper third</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle third</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower third</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not rank</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results were as expected, with more on the top and bottom than in the Noland (1968) study, where his middle section contained 64 percent of the graduates. It is ascertainable that some teachers did not rank all of their students, but distributed the 17.6 percent figure throughout the other figures would tend to augment the difference even further between the Ohio study and this study. In the lower third comparison Noland (1968) found 12.3 percent compared to this 18.8 percent without the non-ranked adjustment.
Residence of origin

The major categories used to describe the graduates' origin were farm, rural non-farm, and urban. In Utah a different situation exists than in Ohio. Noland reported that 80.4 percent of the Ohio graduates were from the farm. It was reported that only 34 percent of the Utah graduates came from farms. Most of the graduates, 41 percent, came from the urban-suburban areas.

Table 10. Distribution of vocational agriculture graduates by residence of origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural non-farm</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education of the father

According to psychologists like Biehler (1971), the educational level attained by the father would influence the son or daughter to a great extent. It has been said that if a parent is an avid reader the child will tend to copy
the trait. The same holds for education. If this is true, then the higher the educational level attained by the father, the higher the educational level the graduate would want to attain. This would put him in a more mobile part of society according to evidence gleaned from other sources (Drabick, 1965; Pierson, 1973; and Shyrock, 1957).

Table 11. Distribution of vocational graduates according to level of education of the father

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from 4 year college</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed trade or technical school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended high school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 8 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 8 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results of the study, approximately one fourth of the fathers availed themselves of the opportunity for further education after high school and most of the training was in the technical area. It is of interest to note that over 39 percent did not graduate from high school,
which may be due to the emphasis placed on education.

In Ohio, 10 percent of the fathers completed more post high school education with 50 percent not graduating from high school, an even more dramatic statistic than was Utah's.

Education of the mother

In the Ohio study (1968) Noland found more educated mothers all the way through. In his statistics over 16 percent of the mothers attended post-high school institutions compared with 10 percent of the fathers. Forty-six percent of the mothers graduated from high school compared to 40 percent of the fathers.

Table 12. Distribution of vocational graduates according to the level of education of the mother

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from 4 year college</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed trade or technical school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended high school</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 8 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 8 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compared to 60 percent of the fathers who completed high school, there were 74 percent of the mothers that graduated. However, while more mothers completed high school than fathers in the Utah study, more fathers took advantage of post high school education than mothers. Twenty one percent of the mothers attended either college or technical school compared to almost 25 percent of the fathers.

Number of older brothers

It was believed that the presence of older brothers might have an influence on whether one would stay on the parental farm. The farm would only be able to support so many and the younger ones might be forced to leave to find increased economic opportunity. This might be different for Utah with smaller farms and less people actually coming from farms. In the Ohio study 51 percent came from the farm. In Utah the number was 29 and the percentage was 34 percent.

Table 13. Distribution of vocational agricultural graduates by the number of older brothers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Older brothers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Blau and Duncan (1967) the oldest is least likely to leave the farm. The middle child is the most likely to leave because of some ahead of him and some behind.

**Occupation of father**

Some parents like their children to follow in their footsteps. Others like to see their children obtain a higher status profession than they received themselves. As witness of the change in agriculture to a point now of 5 percent of the U.S. population that feed the rest (Malotky, 1971, p. 39), it becomes evident that many fathers engaged in farming told their sons to seek a better station in life, or the son decided there must be a better way.

**Table 14. Distribution of vocational agricultural graduates by fathers occupation in 1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation of father in 1969</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time farming</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time farming</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag-related</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agriculture</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>130.6*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is over 100 percent because of the part-time farming situation. Some could be listed twice.
The data indicates that 34 percent were engaged in full-time farming. In the Ohio study over 50 percent were in full-time farming. It is interesting to note that Utah has more part-time farmers than in Ohio. Thirty one percent were part-time farmers in Utah compared to 26.5 percent in Ohio. This is probably consistent with the national trend to more part-time farming as a recent column by Brenner (1975) stated. About two out of every three American farm families get more income from jobs in town and other non-farm sources than from farming.

All those in farming both full and part-time, or agriculture related fields in Utah amounted to 77.6 percent or 66 of the 85 respondents.

**Estimated level of income**

The level of income could indicate the level of living, which could also indicate the finances available for education of the graduate. In the questionnaire the graduate was requested to list the family's net income before taxes in 1969. All but twelve granted the information.

A lack of sufficient funds at home could prevent a graduate from receiving a more formal education and could therefore, lead him in search of other expectations. If the farm was just big enough for one family one must move or expand the farm. If capital is short, migration would have to follow.
Table 15. Distribution of vocational agricultural graduates by the level of family income in 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 or less</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 6,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000 to 8,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000 to 10,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000 or more</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high amount in the 11,000 and over category was something that was not expected. Inflation must have affected the graduates' response. They assumed that their parents' income was more than it actually was because of giant increases in wages in the last few years. Statistics reveal, on the other hand, that Utah farmers did not make that much money annually. According to Lee (1975, p. 16) Utah farmers averaged less income than farmers in all the surrounding states. In 1974 this net income was $9,181. In 1971 barely over $4,000. This situation,
Lee continues, is in part brought on by urban sprawl. Farms being divided or cut up and becoming smaller. The responses ranged all the way from $3,000 to $75,000 a year with over 70 percent making $7,000 or more a year.

One more theory could be suggested to explain the higher wages. Many fathers were part-time farmers, 31 percent, that also held full-time jobs. This would make their gross income much higher than expected for farming.

**Experience Factors**

In the review of literature it was revealed that marriage, education, and occupation were experiences related to migration of youth. The military was also mentioned as a cause of migration. To these factors is added one factor peculiar to Utah. The LDS mission. The mission experience takes young men, usually the age of 19, and placed them in different parts of the world for two years of their life to teach and exhort people to accept Mormonism. It was the feeling that this exposure to the outside by a very significant part of the young population would be a stimulus for this segment to migrate more.

These experience factors give an overview of experiences since high school that could have caused migration in youth, and the type of factors which the graduate had a certain degree of control over.
Marital status

According to Bogue (1959) few events require more extensive change in activities, responsibilities, and habits than the change from single to married life. Decisions have to be made where the home is to be made. In the past this was easier because the boy and girl usually came from the same community so it was convenient to live close to both parental families. But today with the increase in communication, i.e. the car, a boy can go outside his community to find his wife. College life is available to more students than it used to be and meeting a girl at college or trade school long distances from home is very likely. The facts must be faced. Most of these girls have not come from farms. Used to the city life, a girl might have a great influence on her future mate and his choice of occupation.

Table 16. Distribution of vocational agricultural graduates according to their marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As compared to the Ohio study, Utah has more married graduates by 20 percent. There is the culture factor at work here again as far as Utah is concerned. Marriage is advocated by the Mormon religion and as over 70 percent of these graduates would be Mormon (Encyclopedia Americana, 1975, p. 833) this would have been a definite factor. As the Mormon Prophet Brigham Young stated (Widtsoe, p. 195):

But the whole subject of the marriage relation is not in my reach, nor in any other man's reach on this earth. It is without beginning of days or end of years; it is a hard matter to reach. We can tell some things with regard to it; it lays the foundation for worlds, for angels, and for the Gods; for intelligent beings to be crowned with glory, immortality, and eternal lives. In fact, it is the thread which runs from the beginning to the end of the Holy Gospel of Salvation—of the Gospel of the Son of God; it is from eternity to eternity.

As one can see, marriage is given importance in the Mormon culture.

Number of children

Of the 66 married graduates and the one divorced graduate over 73 percent had one or more children compared to the 60.3 percent in the Ohio study. This means an average of 1.1 child per married graduate or an average of .86 children per agriculture graduate respondent.
### Table 17. Distribution of married or divorced agricultural graduates by the current number of children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A stress is given Mormons to have children (Hugh B. Brown, 1971, p. 135). Brown stated: "To marry and rear children is a sacred mission, which is to continue throughout eternity . . . not only a divine injunction . . . but the real object of our being." This helps to explain the greater amount of children compared to Ohio, or even compared to national statistics. The birth rate among Mormons as of the end of 1974 was a little over 26/1000 (Ensign, p. 18). In the U.S., according to Mayer (1971, p. 17) it was 17 per 1000.

### Military service

The amount of time spent in the military would have a direct bearing on the amount of time available for employment or education beyond high school.
Table 18. Distribution of agricultural graduates by time in the military service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months or less</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 months</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data above it can be seen that about 26 percent of the graduates were involved in the military compared to 74 percent that were not. Much of the military service, in Utah, done by these graduates was in the National Guard. This would still allow them to hold down employment elsewhere but would limit, to a certain extent, the time available in their job. The Ohio study reported that 40 percent of the graduates served in some military capacity, which is a larger percentage than in Utah.

Education beyond high school

The social and economic climate is directly related to the level of education a person will attain. Of course other factors enter into the graduate's decision on further education. Utah families are large so there would be a lot of children that might want the education. There is
the decision whether to go on a mission. Almost 30 percent did.

This would postpone their education and deplete funds that would normally, for young men outside Utah, be used for advancement. Perhaps some of these factors accounted for the 19 percent that did not have any formal education after high school. Such items as marriage and military service would definitely have an influence.

Table 19. Distribution of agricultural graduates by type of formal education attained beyond high school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No additional education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade or technical</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-commercial school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence courses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Ohio study there were 52 percent that had no additional education. This is probably due in a large measure to the number of parents engaged in full-time farming. In Ohio it was over 50 percent in full-time farming. In Utah it was 34 percent in full-time farming.
This would cause more graduates to have to look elsewhere for employment. To be salable they would have to learn a skill. This could be why, in Utah, more went to college, 27 percent compared to 14.4 percent in Ohio and in the trade schools 26 percent compared to Ohio’s 9.8 percent. The farms in Utah are smaller on the average. The average farm in Utah is "being cut up and divided due to urban sprawl" as reported by Grant Lee in the Agriculture Statistics of Utah (1975, p. 16). This would leave farms which aren’t big enough to support more than one family, unless expansion is adopted.

In Utah education is stressed as is evidenced by the fact that Utah is one of the top in the nation in high school graduates and college attenders (25 percent of all high school graduates, in Utah, secure a B.S. degree) (Advisory Council, 1972, p. 10-11).

Occupational experiences

One of the specific objectives of the study was to find what occupation the graduate was engaged in now and what his plans were for the future. The four major occupational categories were full-time farming, part-time farming, agriculture related occupations and non-agriculture occupations. Others were included such as college whether agriculture or non-agriculture and if unemployed.

It is mentioned again that part-time farmers will be in two categories so the percentage will be over 100 percent.
Part-time farmers by current occupational field

Only 8 percent of the graduates responded that they were part-time farming. In Ohio, it was twice the amount with 17.5 percent saying they were engaged in part-time farming. This is interesting because Utah had more part-time farmer parents than did Ohio.

Table 20. Distribution of part-time farmers by current occupational field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational field</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-agricultural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural occupations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As to the main job of these graduates, two were in agriculture-related work while five were in non-agriculture related work. These percentages are much the same as Ohio. The two graduates who were in agriculture-related work planned on getting into full-time farming as soon as finances could be arranged. One of the graduates in the non-agricultural work expressed the same desire.
Current occupation of graduates

The distribution of 85 graduates showed 40 percent engaged in agriculture occupations including part-time farming and agricultural related college work. This is fairly close to the five year report of the graduates of vocational agriculture of 1964-68 carried out by Elvin Downs, a state specialist who has been previously mentioned (p. 24). This report considers only boys who completed two or more years of vocational agriculture where this paper takes in all who took a class in agriculture. He came up with 39.2 percent who were employed in some agricultural field for this five year period.

Table 21. Distribution of respondents of vocational agricultural graduates by current occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Field</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-agricultural</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Farm</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag-related</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time farming</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Mission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>108.2*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This total is over 100% because of the part-time farmer figure.
This is a pretty good average of boys in agriculture when
only 34 percent of their fathers were full-time farmers. In Ohio 51.4
percent of the fathers were full-time farmers and the total graduates
engaged in agriculture or agriculture-related work was 46 percent compared
to 40 percent in Utah. In Utah, 14 percent were in full-time farming, in
Ohio 15.5 percent. In Utah more were involved in agriculture-related work
than in Ohio. In Utah there were 14 percent compared to Ohio's 12 percent.
Of course this is comparing Ohio in 1963 to Utah in 1969 but a comparison
still can be made. As already pointed out in Utah's five year report from
1964-68 the figures did not change that much. The statistics were fairly
consistent although they showed a slight rise each year except for 1967. The
same type of 5 year report was taken for Ohio with little change in the 5 year
period.

Occupational plans for future

This distribution provides the reader with an indication of how the
respondents perceived their current occupation. Some viewed their current
jobs as a long term situation others only as a means to an end with a better
position or a more desirable job in the future. Still others, approximately
13 percent, were undecided about their future.
Table 22. Distribution of respondents of vocational agriculture graduates to occupation anticipated in the next 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-agricultural</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time farming</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture-related</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time farming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Total**             | 89 | 104.7*

*This total is over 100 percent because of the part-time farmer figure.

The most interesting figure is the full-time farming statistic.

The current jobs of the graduates give a figure of 12 or 14 percent. In the next five years five more intend to enter full-time farming. Three of these intentions are from the part-time farming area. The other two were from agriculture-related occupations. No one that was full-time farming now stated that they were leaving that occupation in the next five years. Agriculture-related occupations moved up 2 percent while part-time farming went down 3.5 percent. It was also interesting that almost all the undecided people were in non-agriculture related occupations. It seems that those in agriculture or agriculture-related occupations are more content with their job or have found the vocation which gives the greatest satisfaction.
In Ohio, there were three times as many undecided graduates or 37 percent. Less graduates, 15.5 percent, planned on full-time farming and less that planned on going into agriculture-related fields, 7.8 percent than in Utah. Some of the ag-related jobs planned for in Utah were interesting jobs. Such jobs as a slaughter yard operator, a fish biologist, animal science professor, and equipment (tractor) salesman. This ups the total of 40 percent now engaged in agriculture to 43.5 percent who plan on being in agriculture in the next five years with still 13 percent undecided.

**LDS mission experience**

The LDS mission is peculiar to Utah in that all male LDS members of 19 years of age and older are encouraged to serve for two years teaching others of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. They are called to all parts of the world where they are expected to spend all their time in teaching. Money is provided from the parents or through the savings of the individual. It is believed that because of this exposure to the outside world that these missionaries would be more prone to move than their friends who did not go on a mission.

It can be seen from table 23 that almost 30 percent of the respondents served on missions. Taking into consideration that about 70 percent of this population is LDS (Americana 1975, p. 833) or 60 graduates, this means that approximately 42 percent of the LDS graduates went on missions.
Table 23. The number of vocational agriculture graduates who served an LDS mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment status of wives of graduates

The majority of the working wives were either in cosmetics, including beauty operators, or working as secretaries. There was a total of five secretaries and four working in cosmetics or as beauty operators. The others held jobs such as Mountain Bell telephone operator, a medical technician, home interior display, data terminal operator, cook, and floral designer. The wife in floral design had a husband who was not included in agriculture-related work or farming. This is something to consider, as more women enter the work force, as to how they fit into the statistics of agriculture graduates.

As can be seen from Table 24, not many wives are working. Only 17 percent are working full-time with 29 percent working either full or part-time.
Table 24. Employment status of wives of 66 married graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These statistics are not much different than the statistics of Ohio. There were 68 percent who were not employed either full or part-time. Of course this was six years ago and a lot of women's liberation has flowed under the bridge. This statistic for Utah becomes more impressive in this light. The influence of the LDS Church enters again with strong suggestions to keep the mother in the home especially with young children. In an LDS conference address by Bishop Burke Peterson (1974, p. 31) he stated: "Again we say, unless the Holy Ghost has given you a confirmation that it is all right, don't go out of your home for hire." As already mentioned, 73 percent had one or more children. This is pretty close to our 71 percent figure on non-working mothers.
Appraisal of vocational agriculture

The following table is the statistics on the question asked, "If you had the opportunity to repeat your high school education would you take vocational agriculture?"

Table 25. The number of vocational agriculture graduates who indicated they would repeat vocational agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety-four percent of all the graduate respondents said they would take the course again. They made such comments as "I enjoyed and was interested in the course," "Very informative," "Very useful," and this from a stocktrailer builder, "I learned how to apply things learned in other classes." Those engaged outside agriculture also had very laudatory comments such as "I learned many things which applied to more than just agriculture" and "It is good to know how to do vocational things."
The five negative responses were not in any particular geographic area. One came from the southern end of the state, three from the center (different schools), and one from the northern part of the state. Three of the respondents did not give any reason just answering "no" and not responding to the "why" of the question. The other two gave these two responses: "I disliked the course," and the 2nd "There is a lack of sufficient pay in agriculture and I have lost my interest in it."

In Ohio the number of positive responses was 83 percent. Negative responses accounted for the other 17 percent.

Summary

Two major groups of characteristics have been summarized. Those dealing with background characteristics and characteristics classed as experimental.

The background characteristics are those that the graduate had experienced by graduation, such as his residence, the occupation of the father, the number of older brothers, and the education of the father and mother. The experimental factors are those which have taken place since graduation such as marriage, education beyond high school, occupational experiences, and appraisal of vocational agriculture.

In the background characteristics it was found that we were dealing with graduates mostly 22 or 24 with the most part, 46 percent, being 22. Most of these graduates had taken over two years of vocational agriculture,
about 88 percent. The greatest number, 33 percent, completed all four years. In the by rank in their graduating class, the agriculture teachers indicated that almost 30 percent were in the upper third of their graduating class with 34 percent in the middle third, and 19 percent in the lower third.

Most of the graduates did not come from a full-time farming situation. Sixty-six percent came from either an urban or rural non-farm background. Some of these students, though, had fathers that engaged in a little part-time farming.

The educational level attained by the father should have an influence on the son or daughter, as already mentioned. Those completing high school amounted to over 60 percent with 25 percent going on to post high school training. This post high school training was mostly in the technical area, with about 8 percent in the college group.

The mothers completed more high school than the fathers. About 74 percent of the mothers completed high school compared to 60 percent of the fathers that graduated. Most of the mothers that went on to post high school education went on to college. Of the 21 percent that took post high school training almost 19 percent was in the college area.

Most of the graduates did not have older brothers. Forty-four percent did not have older brothers while 33 percent only had one older brother.

Of the 85 fathers and their occupation in 1969, only 34 percent were in full-time farming. It is interesting though that over 30 percent were in part-time farming with 49.4 percent in non-agriculture occupations. All
together those fathers in farming, both full or part-time or in ag-related fields in Utah amounted to 78 percent or 66 of the 85 respondents.

Most of the graduates seemed to be well off as far as money in 1969. Sixty percent indicated that the family income in 1969 was above 9,000 a year. Forty percent indicated it was above 11,000. In 1969 this would put them in a pretty good financial situation.

**Experience Factors**

Most of the graduates were married as indicated by 78 percent that were, opposed to 21 percent that were not. This high percentage of marriages is in large part accounted for by the advocacy of marriage in the Mormon religion.

Of the 66 married graduates and the one divorced graduate over 73 percent had one or more children. This means an average of 1.1 child per married graduate or an average of .86 children per agriculture graduate or respondent.

Twenty six percent of the graduates were involved in the military compared to 74 percent that were not. Most of this military service was done in the National Guard.

Utah is one of the top in the nation as to high school graduates and college attenders. In the statistics this is brought out. Of the 85 graduates only 16 or 19 percent did not avail themselves of further education.
Twenty seven percent attended college or are still in the process. Twenty six percent have attended trade or technical school.

The four major occupational categories looked at were non-agriculture occupations, part-time farming, agriculture related occupations and non-agriculture occupations. Others were included such as college whether agriculture or non-agriculture and if unemployed.

Graduates engaged in part-time farming were few, with only 7 saying that they were doing some farming on the side. Three indicated though, that they were planning to go into full-time farming as soon as financial aid could be established or help from other sources secured.

In the distribution of the 85 graduates in their current occupation 40 percent showed that they were engaged in some agriculture occupation, 14 percent were in both full-time farming and agriculture related occupations, making 28 percent for these two areas. Another 8 percent were engaged in part-time farming with 3.5 percent in agriculture related college work.

In anticipated employment, 43.5 percent indicated they would be involved in some phase of agriculture in the future. The biggest increases came from the full-time farm category and the ag-related field, with 20 percent saying they planned on full-time farming and 19 percent planning on some ag-related field. There were 48.2 percent who said they would be in some non-agriculture field while 13 percent were as yet undecided.
The LDS mission experience was added because of a belief that this exposure to the outside world would influence them to be more prone to migrate, having experienced the world outside their parental home. Almost 30 percent of the respondents served on missions. This becomes a significant figure when taking into consideration that about 70 percent of this population is LDS. This means, then, that about 42 percent of the LDS graduates went on missions.

The majority of the working wives of graduates were either in cosmetics, including beauty operators, or working as secretaries. Due to a lot of young children and an LDS influence, most of the mothers were not working outside the home. The graduates reported that only 17 percent of their wives were in full-time jobs compared to the 71 percent who were not in either full or part-time work.

Ninety-four percent said that they would take agriculture again in high school if they had the opportunity to repeat that education. Such comments as "I enjoyed and was interested in the course," or "I learned how to apply things learned in other classes," were standard responses. Only five responded to the negative with only two making a statement as to why. One said he "disliked the course," and the other stated that "he had lost interest."
CHAPTER IV
PROFILE OF MIGRATION

Within this chapter, a profile of migration among vocational agriculture graduates is presented.

A comparison is made between those who migrated and those who did not migrate as related to certain characteristics. These characteristics are the number of residential moves, the reasons for each move completed by graduates, the future migration plans of graduates, and the location of future residence as indicated by the graduates. Other information is obtained from both migrant and non-migrant relative to other geographic mobility.

Following the discussion of geographic mobility among the graduates, results from testing a number of hypotheses are presented. These hypotheses were formulated in terms of relationships between migration and selected background characteristics and experimental factors discussed in the preceding chapter.

The chapter then concludes with a summary of the data presented: Migration patterns of vocational agriculture graduates. Two key terms should be kept in mind through the discussion in this chapter:

Non-migrant. A 1969 vocational agriculture graduate who resides in the same community as he did as a senior in high school (home community).
Migrant. A 1969 vocational agriculture graduate who resides outside the community he was in as a high school senior.

Sub-categories

Non-mover. A graduate who still resides in the parental home.

Local-mover. A graduate who has moved from the parental home but still resides in the home community.

County-mover. A graduate who has moved from the home community but still remains in the same county.

Out of county-mover. A graduate who has moved out of the home county.

Type of Geographic Mobility

Harold Beals (1965) found in his study of Wisconsin rural youth, that 60 percent had migrated from the home community six years after graduation. In the Noland (1968) study, he only had 31 percent which had migrated after five years, from their home community. The following tables compare graduates in Utah in each of the geographic mobility categories.

From Table 26 it is apparent that 30.6 percent of these graduates have migrated from their home community. This statistic is close to the findings of the Ohio study. In the Ohio study 31 percent of the graduates had not moved from the parental home. In Utah this figure is 20 percent.
Table 26. Classification of graduates according to the type of geographic mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-movers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local-movers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County-movers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of county-movers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here again Utah had less full-time farmers. Thus less help would be needed at home. Also a greater number of the Utah graduates were married, 78 percent compared to Ohio's 57 percent. This would bring more movement away from the parental home. All in all 69.4 percent are classified as non-migrants and 30.6 percent as migrants.

Residential moves by non-migrants

As already mentioned the American scene is characterized by a high degree of residential and geographic mobility among its population.

Everett Lee (1966, p. 120) points out:

One in five Americans changes his place of residence each year, one in fourteen moves from one county to another, and one in thirty migrates from one state to another. Rates of this order imply that the "average" American will live in fourteen houses, five counties and three states during the course of his lifetime.
Table 27. The number of residential moves completed by non-migrants since high school graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. of moves</th>
<th>Non-migrants</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-mover</td>
<td>Local-mover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest percentage had moved at least once during this five year period. Over 20 percent had moved twice and almost 12 percent had moved four or more times. The non-mover that had moved four or more times had moved five times in the five year period and was now back in his parental home but expecting to move shortly.

Thirteen graduates had not moved during the five year period. This accounts for 22 percent of the non-migrants but for only 15.3 percent of the total graduates in the study. This would mean that 84.7 percent of the graduates have changed residence one or more times in the five years since graduation. It is evident that these findings are consistent with Mr. Lee's figures.
Residential moves by migrants

Most migrants in Ohio had moved twice. Fifty seven percent of the migrants in Ohio had moved twice since graduation. Twenty five percent had moved but once. In Utah the statistics were a little different with equal numbers having moved two and three times, 38.5 percent. Just 3.8 percent had moved once, but over 19 percent had moved four or more times compared to 5 percent in Ohio.

Table 28. The number of residential moves completed by migrants after high school graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of moves</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>County movers</th>
<th>Out of county</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 26 graduates that migrated completed 75 changes of residence. This would mean 2.88 moves per graduate. In Ohio there was an average of 1.75 moves per graduate. This would imply that there is a total of one more move per Utah migrant than Ohio migrant.
Reasons for moving

Several reasons for moving were listed on the questionnaire to try and determine the biggest reason for migration. According to Beale (1971, p. 5) "People move for many reasons, but the most common one is economic." It would appear that the Utah graduates are no exception to this statement.

Table 29. The major reasons for each move completed by vocational agricultural graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for moving</th>
<th>Move 1</th>
<th>Move 2</th>
<th>Move 3</th>
<th>Move 4</th>
<th>Move 5</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Mission</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 84.7 percent or 72 of the 85 graduates who indicated that they had moved at least once during the five year period, the overwhelming majority had moved for economic advancement.
The biggest reason for moving appeared to be moving to go to college or trade school. Of the 72 graduates who moved at least once, twenty of them moved for schooling or 27.8 percent of the total first moves. The second greatest reason for the first move was marriage, as 16 indicated, or 22.2 percent.

The most frequent reasons for the second move were a job and the LDS mission. Of the 60 second moves 17 or 28.3 percent of the moves were either moving for a job or to go on an LDS mission.

The most frequent reason for the third move was college with 8 of the 27 moves or 29.6 percent of the total with a job as second with 6 of the 27 moves or 22.2 percent of the total.

The most frequent reason for the fourth move was a job as was the fifth.

As far as the total number of moves are concerned, moving for a job came out first with college, including trade and technical school, second. Forty moves altogether were credited to moving for a job with college close behind with 38 of the total moves. Altogether 176 moves were recorded by the graduates. Seventy eight of these moves were either for a job or school. In other words, 44.3 percent of the moves could be construed as economic advancement. One must not forget the 14 moves completed by the family which could probably be due to some economic condition or the 14 "other" reasons or the military with 16 moves.
In Ohio, 39.1 percent of the moves were for a job with 19 percent of the moves for college reasons. These were one and two respectively for Ohio also.

The reason for the greater number of college students, including trade and technical students from Utah has already been discussed earlier.

"Other" reasons for moving were new home, lower rent, better neighborhood, and simply, a desire for a change.

**Length of time in home community**

This table has important implications for planning post high school vocational education programs in agriculture. As can be seen from the table over 65 percent of the migrants moved from the home community the first 24 months after graduating from high school.

In comparing the county movers with the out of county movers not much can be said as to differences, except that the out of county movers seemed to be a little slower moving. At the end of two years 71.4 percent of the county movers had moved from their home community but only 58.3 percent of the out of county movers had. At the end of 4 years all of the county movers had migrated but two of the out of county movers were still yet in their home community.

In Utah the biggest migration took place one to two years after graduation with 34.7 percent leaving their home community. In Ohio the biggest migration took place less than 6 months after graduation from high
school with 28.3 percent migrating from their home community. The second largest migration from Ohio though, was the 1-2 year period just as the less than 6 months period was second in Utah.

Table 30. The length of time after graduation that migrants remained in their home community before migrating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Migrant classification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Out of county</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 mos.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 mos.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 4 yrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance migrants had moved from the home community

Of the 26 migrants, 23 were still within 100 miles of the home community or close to 89 percent of the total. The other three graduates were spaced in each of the remaining categories. One claimed to be 110 miles away from home, another 250 miles away and the third claimed to be 1500 miles away from the home community. In comparing these results with the Ohio study, there appears to be a close similarity. Forty-six of the 60
migrants in the Ohio study were still within 100 miles of the home community, for a total of 76.7 percent. Another 17 percent were within 200 miles of the home community for a total of 93.3 percent within 200 miles compared to Utah with 92.3 percent within 200 miles of the home community.

It would be reasoned that family ties are still strong and would keep the graduate close to home base to explain the high percentage still within 100 miles of the home community.

Table 31. The distance migrants had moved from the home community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Migrant classification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Out of county</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 to 200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 to 400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As could be expected the out of county migrants were farther away from the home community than the county migrants although 9 or 75 percent of the out of county were within 100 miles of the home community compared to 100 percent of the county migrants. In the Ohio study none
of the county migrants were over 25 miles away from the home community. All 22 county migrants were in the first category of less than 25 miles.

Future migration plans of non-migrants

One of the major concerns in planning vocational education programs in agriculture is that of determining the situation and assessing the needs of the clientele. The plans and expectations of the clientele should be taken into account, justifying the question, "Do you expect to establish a permanent home in the community in which you now live?"

The following table shows the graduates' responses.

Table 32. Future migration plans of nonmigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Non-migrants</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-movers</td>
<td>Local movers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The local movers planned on making things permanent a lot more than the non-movers. This stands to reason as the non-mover would eventually move into a home of his own unless he plans on taking over the parental home. This might be the case in some instances.

The local movers responded that 64.3 percent were permanent to the community. Only 12 percent said that their residence was not permanent and 24 percent indicated that they had not decided. Thirty five percent of the non-movers planned on their current community as permanent while 35 percent planned otherwise and 30 percent were reportedly undecided. All together 56 percent said that their current community was permanent with about 44 percent reporting no or undecided. In Ohio, address permanence was 67 percent, compared to 33 percent non-permanence.

**Future migration plans of migrants**

As can be seen in the following table, only 34.6 percent of the migrants thought of their current community as permanent with 38.5 percent reporting no and 37 percent undecided. A reason for the high figure in the no category could be for reasons such as away at school, on a temporary job, or planning on future advancement or change in job assignment.
Table 33. Future migration plans of migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Out of county</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of county movers were not planning on staying in the same community for the most part. Only 16.6 percent responded that they planned on making their current community permanent. Forty two percent reported no and 42 percent reported that they were undecided.

County movers reported that 50 percent of them would be permanent to their current community while 35 percent answered no and 14 percent were undecided.

In the Ohio record many similar statistics were noted. In out of county migrants 26 percent reported that their current community was permanent. County migrants answered that 64 percent of their homes were permanent to the current community for a total of 40 percent that indicated that their current community was permanent for Ohio.
Comparison of migration plans of non-migrant and migrant graduates

The following table is a comparison between the previous two tables.

Table 34. Comparison of migration plans of graduates who were non-migrants with plans of graduates who were migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans for future migration</th>
<th>Migrant classification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain in same community</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to different community</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparing the nonmigrants to the migrants as far as plans on staying in the same community, the contrast is quite striking. The migrants reported that 56 percent planned on staying in the same community compared to 35 percent of the migrants for a total of 49.4 percent or close to half of all graduates who planned on staying where they were.

Ten graduates in the migrant category reported wanting to move to a different location for a total of close to 39 percent. The non-migrants were less anxious to move with about 19 percent planning on any moving for a total of 24.7 percent of the 85 graduates who planned on changing residence to another community.
The migrants and non-migrants who were undecided about changing communities were pretty close percentage wise. Non-migrants reported 25 percent undecided with the migrants at 27 percent.

Of the 85 graduates this leaves 49.4 percent staying in the same community with 50.6 percent either changing or undecided about changing. Keep in mind that 72 of the 85 graduates have moved at least once during this five year period thus increasing the status of the undecided plans regarding movement.

More Ohio graduates planned to remain in the same community than Utah graduates. Fifty nine percent in Ohio reported planning to live where they were, compared to only 18 percent who planned on moving. This compares to 49.4 percent that planned to remain and 24.7 percent that planned to move in Utah. The undecided vote was much the same as Utah with 23 percent undecided about moving to a different community.

Location of future residence of graduates

Of the 18.7 percent of the non-migrants who responded that they planned on migration to a different community, 54.5 percent responded that they would be in an urban setting with 27.3 percent in a rural non-farm situation and two indicating movement to a farm or 18.2 percent.

Of the 38.5 percent of the migrants who planned on migration to a different community, 20 percent responded that they would be migrating to an urban community while 40 percent responded to either the rural setting or to the farm situation categories.
Table 35. Location of future residence as indicated by graduates planning future migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Non-migrant</th>
<th>Migrant</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural non-farm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 21 graduates or 24.7 percent of the graduates in the study who indicated they planned to establish a home in a different community, the largest percentage indicated they would move to an urban community.

Thirty three percent planned on moving to a rural non-farm community and almost 29 percent planned on moving to the farm. Actually this is quite an equal distribution and any one area does not completely dominate. It could be concluded that people move to the city for various reasons such as better access to business, the myth of improved education possibilities, improved job situation, or a gregarious nature that yearns for other individuals. Some of the desire of rural and farm living could be the love of the out of doors, love of animals, the desire for privacy, and last but not least, the love of the land. Whatever the reason, the above table shows quite an equal distribution of human wants and desires.
In Ohio the greatest amount of graduates wanted to go back to the farm, 56 percent. Only 15 percent indicated an urban setting. This is understandable considering some of the reasons already discussed.

Analysis of the Relationships between Migration and Selected Characteristics of the Vocational Agriculture Graduate of 1969

This phase of the study is to show if significant relationships between migration and selected characteristics of the graduate exist. Two major groups of factors (background and experimental) will be used which have already been discussed.

The basic format followed will be: 1) Procedures for testing the hypothesis, 2) Discussion of chi, 3) A list of hypotheses of background characteristics, 4) A table summarizing the characteristics, 5) the data and findings relating to each hypothesis discussed individually.

Procedures for testing the hypothesis

The following steps will be used:

1. Hypothesis in null form
2. Appropriate statistical test
3. A level of significance at .05
4. Value of the test computed
5. Decision about the hypothesis reached
Discussion of chi

1. Observed frequencies were cast in kxr contingency tables using the k columns for characteristics and the r rows for the groups. Thus, in each test that the chi square was used, r equalled two.

2. The expected frequencies for each cell were determined by finding the product of the marginal totals common to it and dividing this by N (N was the sum of each group of marginal totals and it represented the total number of observations).

3. The value of $X^2$ was computed with the following formula:

$$X^2 = \frac{(o-E)^2}{E}$$

4. The significance of the observed $X^2$ value was determined by referring to an appropriate table of critical values for chi square.

List of null hypothesis of background characteristics

1. There is no significant association between the residence of origin of the agriculture graduate (i.e. farm, non-farm rural, urban, city) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

2. There is no significant association between the level of education of the father (i.e. beyond high school, high school, 8th grade) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.
3. There is no significant association between the level of education of the mother (i.e. beyond high school, high school, 8th grade) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

4. There is no significant association between the number of older brothers and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

5. There is no significant association between the type of occupation of fathers (i.e. full-time farm, non-agriculture occupation, part-time farm, agriculture related, and deceased) and migration from home community by agriculture graduates.

6. There is no significant association between the estimated level of parent's income (i.e. less than $3,000; 3,000-4,999; 5,000-6,999; 7,000-8,999; 9,000-10,999; and 11,000 and up) and migration from home community by agriculture graduates.

7. There is no significant association between the rank in the graduating class (i.e. higher third, middle third, lower third) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

Summary of background characteristics

According to the summary table of these selected background characteristics, all were rejected at the .05 level of significance.
Table 36. Summary of the relationships between selected background characteristics and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background characteristics</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Residence of origin        | 1.7   | 2    | n.s.
| Educational level of father | 8.7   | 6    | n.s.
| Educational level of mother | 6.1   | 6    | n.s.
| Number of older brothers   | 2.9   | 5    | n.s.
| Occupation of father       | 5.6   | 5    | n.s.
| Estimated level of income   | 1.3   | 5    | n.s.
| Rank in graduating class   | 1.6   | 3    | n.s.

Residence of origin

Hypothesis: There is no significant association between the residence of origin of the agriculture graduate (i.e. farm, non-farm, rural, urban, city) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

At the .05 level the null hypothesis held true. It did not seem to make a difference whether the graduate came from a farm or the city as related to migration. The percentages between the non-migrant and the migrant seem to back this up when compared. Thirty two point two percent of the non-migrants came from the farm compared to 38.5 percent of migrants. In the urban percentages, 39 percent of the non-migrants indicated that they came from the urban setting compared to 46 percent of the migrants who did. In the rural non-farm area 29 percent of the non-
migrants compared to 15.4 percent of the migrants indicated a rural non-farm background. This section was by far the one that made up the most of the \( X^2 \) value. It contributed 1.3 of the final 1.7 total. Still it was not significant enough to change the final outcome.

In the Ohio study with 80 percent of the graduates coming from the farm, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level. As he indicated, this high percentage of farm graduates seemed to have quite an influence on migration.

In Utah with only 34 percent farm origins it did not seem to influence the statistics enough to cause rejection of the null hypothesis.
Education of father

Hypothesis: There is no significant association between the level of education of the father (i.e. beyond high school, high school, 8th grade) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

Table 38. Relationship between education of father and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Graduate classification</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from 4 year college</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed trade or tech. school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended high school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 8 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 8 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 8.7$  
d.f. = 6  
.05 = no significance

The most significant figure in this section is the eleven graduates who had not completed 8 years of school. This row in the chi-square matrix made up 4.8 or over half of the final outcome of 8.7. As can be seen all of these graduates were non-migrants. This goes along with the
quote already sited from Drabick (1965, p. 38) that there is more migration with educational expectation, especially in the higher educational groups.

As can be seen from the above table, 35 or 59.3 percent of the non-migrant graduates' fathers completed high school or above compared with 16 or 61.5 percent of the migrants. This statistic is quite convincing in showing that there is little difference in migration patterns between the two groups relative to the educational level of the father due to the little difference in educational achievement between the two groups.

In Ohio, this table also proved not significant at the .05 levels and had much the same pattern as Utah.

**Education of the mother**

Hypothesis: There is no significant association between the level of education of the mother (i.e. beyond high school, high school, 8th grade) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

Like the table concerned with the education of the father, this table seems to go along much the same pattern. The most significant part of the chi-square matrix came in the last two categories, that of completed 8 years and less than 8 years. In these two categories 3.1 of the 5.7 total or over half of the chi-square matrix was found. This parallels with the father education table in that there seems to be a
consistency in the statement that there could be more migration with educational expectation.

Table 39. Relationship between education of mother and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Graduate classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from 4 year college</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed trade or tech. sch.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended high school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 8 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 8 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 5.7$  d.f. = 6  .05 = no significance

The table shows 43 or 73 percent of the non-migrant mothers graduating from high school or above compared to 20 or 77 percent of the migrant mothers. Here again there is not much difference in the percentages between the two groups.

In Ohio, the educational level of the mother seemed to have more of an influence than that of the father, even though it still proved no significance
at the .05 level of significance. In Utah, as can be seen from the above tables it had less of an influence as far as chi-square is concerned.

**Number of older brothers**

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant association between the number of older brothers and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

Table 40. Relationship between the number of older brothers and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Older brothers</th>
<th>Graduate classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.9 \quad \text{d.f.} = 5 \quad .05 = \text{no significance} \]

Over half of the final \( \chi^2 \) value came from the final two entries of four and five brothers. Having this many brothers did seem to cause a possible migration pattern but on the whole it was still not significant
at the .05 level. It is the thought here again that because of the low percentage of graduates from full-time farms that the number of older brothers would not have that much of an effect on migration because most of the children would have to seek employment other than the farm anyway.

The table shows that quite a few of the graduates were the oldest child or oldest boy in the family. 45.8 percent of the non-migrants showed being the oldest boy compared to 38.5 percent of the migrants. It could be deduced from this percentage that the older boy did not tend to migrate as much even though it is not significant according to chi.

In Ohio, this table was not significant at the .05 level. It was interesting to note though, that there was a greater percentage of oldest son migrants than oldest son non-migrants, in Ohio. This was just the opposite to the above findings from Utah.

**Occupation of father**

Hypothesis: There is no significant association between the type of occupation of fathers (i.e. full-time farm, non-agriculture occupation, part-time farm, agriculture related, and deceased) and migration from home community by agriculture graduates.

The most interesting occupation as related to migration seems to be the agriculture related field where ten non-migrants reported fathers having affiliation compared to only one in the migrant section. This agriculture related characteristic accounted for 3.3 of the final 5.6 chi-
Table 41. Relationship between the occupation of the father in 1969 and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Graduate classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time farming</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time farming</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture related</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agriculture</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 5.6 \quad \text{d.f.} = 5 \quad .05 = \text{no significance} \]

*This is over 100% because of the part-time farming situation.

square value. The occupations of these ten people in the non-migrant section did not seem to have an influence on the son as in most cases he seemed to have a different job than the father. It just seemed to happen the way it did as far as the statistics are concerned.

As far as percentage difference, in the non-agricultural section there was a greater percentage of migrants than non-migrants. Twenty six or 44 percent of the non-migrants were in non-agriculture jobs compared to 16 or 61.5 percent of the migrants. In full-time farming it was 19 or 32.2 percent compared to ten or 38.5 percent. This means that actually more migrants' fathers were in full-time farming than non-migrant fathers.
The same trend holds true in the part-time farming occupation with the percentages being 27 percent for the non-migrant and 38.5 percent for the migrant. The same reason is given again that farms are small and not big enough to support more families and this is why migrants have the upper hand in number of fathers that are full-time farmers and part-time farmers.

In Ohio, the opposite trend held true compared to Utah. In Ohio, 58.2 percent of the non-migrant fathers were full-time farmers compared to 31.7 percent of the migrant fathers. This statistic is the biggest reason why the Ohio study found this characteristic (occupation of the father) significant at the .05 level. The graduates who were non-migrants stayed with the father on the farm.

**Estimated level of income**

Hypothesis: There is no significant association between the estimated level of parent's income (i.e. less than 3,000; 3,000-4,999; 5,000-6,999; 7,000-8,999; 9,000-10,999; 11,000 and up) and migration from home community by agriculture graduates.

Income did not seem to make a difference as to the migration of the graduates. The most significant figure was the 7,000-8,999 figure which accounted for .71 of the final tally of 1.3 for $X^2$. 
Table 42. Relationship between the parental income and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income ($)</th>
<th>Graduate classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-4,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-6,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000-8,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000-10,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000 or more</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 1.3$  
d.f. = 5  
$.05 = no significance$

Everyone of the income groups were close percentage wise with little variation. In the 5,000-6,999 group the non-migrants had 16.9 percent compared to the migrants 19.2 percent. In the 7,000-8,999 group the non-migrants had 3.4 percent compared to the migrants' 7.7 percent. And in the 9,000-10,999 and 11,000 groups it was 20.3 percent compared to 19.2 percent and 40.7 percent compared to 38.5 percent respectively.

In Ohio there was much the same sort of conclusion. Most of the comparison with percentages was close with the widest difference in the 3,000-4,999 group with 22 percent from the non-migrants and 37 percent
from the migrants. Still, this table was ruled no significance at the .05 level, for Ohio.

**Ranking in graduating class**

Hypothesis: There is no significant association between the rank in the graduating class (i.e. higher third, middle third, lower third) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

**Table 43. Relationship between the estimated rank in the graduating class and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Graduate classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper one-third</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle third</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower third</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ranked</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 1.6\] \[d.f. = 3\] \[.05 = \text{no significance}\]

According to Drabick (1965, p. 38) one should expect more migration with educational expectation. If anything can be said of this Utah study concerning the table on rank it would seem to be opposite to Drabick's study conclusion. In the upper third rankings 32 percent of the non-migrants were ranked so by their agriculture teacher compared to 23
percent of the migrants. In the middle third much the same story can be found with 36 percent of the non-migrants being reported here compared to 31 percent of the migrants. Deductions from these statistics connote just the opposite of Drabick's conclusion which stated that where education was expected, there was more migration.

It is true that other factors than just grade point enter into a graduate's decision of whether to go to college or further education, factors which would possibly cause migration. But grade point must certainly be considered as a factor of educational expectation.

In Ohio, even though it was not significant at the .05 level, Drabick's (1965) conclusion seemed to be more of a verity. In the upper one-third of their graduates, 19 percent were reported in the non-migrant classification compared to 30 percent in the migrant classification. In the middle one-third it was 66 percent for the non-migrants compared to 51 percent for the migrants. In the lower one-third 12 percent reported for both, leaving the rest unranked, approximately 11 percent.

Experience Factors

These factors it will be remembered are those experience since high school that could have caused migration in youth, and the type of factors over which the graduate has a certain degree of control.
List of null hypotheses of experience factors

1. There is no significant association between marital status of the graduates (i.e. married, single, divorced) and migration from the home community by vocational agriculture graduates.

2. There is no significant association between military experience (i.e. in the military, not in the military) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

3. There is no significant association between the level of formal education attained beyond high school (i.e. high school, post high school) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

4. There is no significant association between the type of education beyond high school (i.e. college and similar, all other types) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

5. There is no significant association between the type of occupation of the graduate (i.e. full-time farm, non-agriculture occupation, part-time farm, agriculture related, and college) and migration from home community by agriculture graduates.

6. There is no significant association between the LDS mission (i.e. went on a mission, did not go on a mission) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.
Summary of experience characteristics

According to the summary table of these selected experience characteristics, only one was rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Table 44. Summary of the relationships between selected experience characteristics and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental characteristics</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military experience</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of formal education</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of education beyond high school</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current occupation</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS mission</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital status

Hypothesis: There is no significant association between marital status of the graduates (i.e. married, single, divorced) and migration from the home community by vocational agriculture graduates.

The most significant figure in this table came from the single status. This carried 1.6 of the final chi-square value of 2.6. This would seem logical as single graduates would probably be less likely to migrate
Table 45. Relationship between the marital status and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Graduate classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.6 \quad d.f. = 2 \quad .05 = \text{no significance} \]

compared to their married counter-parts. The percentage between the two groups on the single status was 25 percent for the non-migrants compared to 12 percent for the migrants. In the other major division, that of the married graduates, the migrants reported 88 percent to the non-migrants 73 percent for the final percentage of 77.6 percent.

As the final outcome shows, marriage did not seem to matter significantly as to whether the graduate migrated. As already mentioned, strong family ties might be a big factor in keeping these graduates close to home community. It certainly is not the farm, this fact having been pointed out in previous discussion showing only 34 percent coming from actual farms and according to Lee (1975) the farms being too small to support over one family, on the average.
In Ohio, with 20 percent less married graduates and over 80 percent of the graduates coming from farms, the relationship between marital status and migrant classification was significant at the .05 level.

The percentages, in Ohio, ran 48.5 percent of the non-migrants being married compared to 76.7 percent of the migrants being married. 51.5 percent of the non-migrants were single compared to 23.3 percent of the migrants. This is quite a contrast compared to Utah.

Military service

Hypothesis: There is no significant association between military experience (i.e. in the military, not in the military) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

Table 46. Relationship between the military experience and migrant classification of vocational agriculture graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military experience</th>
<th>Graduate classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .01$  
d.f. = 1  
$.05 = no significance
A total of 25.4 percent of the non-migrants were involved in the military service compared to 26.9 percent of the migrants. This means that a total of 25.9 percent of the graduates were at one time after graduation in military service. In Ohio, almost 40 percent of the graduates had been or still were in some branch of the military. Broken down into non-migrant and migrant classifications it meant 45.5 percent of the non-migrants compared to 26.6 percent of the migrants who had been or still were in the military. In Ohio, this table was significant at the .05 level.

**Level of formal education**

Hypothesis: There is no significant association between the level of formal education attained beyond high school (i.e. high school, post high school) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 47. Relationship between the level of formal education attained and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 3.1$  
 d.f. = 1  
 0.05 = no significance
This table was close to being significant at the .05 level. Just 3.8 is needed with 1 degree of freedom to be significant. The most significant figure came from the high school education. It tallied 2.46 of the final 3.1 figure. Perhaps pursuit of higher education did cause more migration, which is emphasized more as the percentage figures are evaluated. For the non-migrants 23.7 percent did not pursue any type of education past high school, compared to only 7.7 percent of the migrants. This indicates that of those who furthered their education, 86.3 percent were non-migrants and 92.3 percent were migrants.

In Ohio, a different sort of situation was found. The chi-square final was not very close to being significant. This is witnessed by the percentages adding up the way they did. In the non-migrant classification 57.5 percent did not participate in any further education leaving 42.5 percent who did receive further education. This left the migrants with 41.6 percent who finished with high school and received no other education, and 58.4 percent who did. This again, is quite a different picture as compared to Utah.

Type of education

Hypothesis: There is no significant association between the type of education beyond high school (i.e. college and similar, all other types) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.
Table 48. Relationship between the type of formal post high education and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of education</th>
<th>Graduate classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>( % )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and similar</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of programs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .5 \]

d.f. = 1

.05 = no significance

The percentages as well as the chi-square value connote the same non-significant conclusions on this table. As many as 62.6 percent of the non-migrants were in college or related programs (trade or technical programs) compared to 70.8 percent of the migrants. This leaves 37.8 percent of the non-migrants in other programs (i.e. business-commercial school, military school, company schools, correspondence courses), compared to 29.2 percent of the migrants. As can be seen, the percentages are rather close.

In Ohio, much the same pattern is found with 46.4 percent of the non-migrants in college or related programs compared to 60 percent of the migrants. This left 53.6 percent of the migrants in other types of programs compared to 40 percent of the migrants. The table on type of education, in the Ohio study, was also of no significance at the .05 level.
Current occupation of graduates

Hypothesis: There is no significant association between the type of occupation of the graduate (i.e. full-time farm, non-agriculture, occupation, part-time farm, agriculture related, and college) and migration from the home community by agriculture graduates.

Table 49. Relationship between the current occupation and migrant classification of vocational agricultural graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Graduate classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non migrant</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agricultural</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time farm</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag-related</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time farming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 17.3 \quad \text{d.f.} = 7 \quad .05 = \text{significant}\]

*This total is over 100% because of the part-time farmer figure.
This table was significant due in great part to the graduates attending college who in all six cases were migrants. Of the final chi-square value of 17.3, 11.2 of this was from the college (agriculture and non-agriculture) figure. Other figures which added a fair share were in the full-time farm occupation, ag-related occupation, and the LDS mission occupation with 1.7, 1.7 and 1.9 respectively.

Percentage figures for the two groups were as follows in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-agriculture area:</th>
<th>59.3 percent non-migrant to 69.2 percent migrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time farm area:</td>
<td>16.9 percent non-migrant to 7.7 percent migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag-related area:</td>
<td>16.9 percent non-migrant to 7.7 percent migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time farming area:</td>
<td>6.8 percent non-migrant to 11.5 percent migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0.0 percent non-migrant to 11.5 percent migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agriculture:</td>
<td>0.0 percent non-migrant to 11.5 percent migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS mission:</td>
<td>0.0 percent non-migrant to 3.8 percent migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed:</td>
<td>1.7 percent non-migrant to 0.0 percent migrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Ohio study this table was also significant at the .05 level. Much the same sort of pattern existed as in the Utah study with percentages such as 22.4 percent of the non-migrants in full-time farming
compared to 0.0 percent of the migrants. In non-agriculture areas
the pattern continued with 61.9 percent of the non-migrants responding
working in non-agriculture areas compared to 75 percent of the migrants.

The only figure that was opposite to the Utah figures for this table
was that in the part-time farming areas with 20.1 percent of the non-
migrants compared to 6.7 percent of the migrants responding to having
a part-time farming operation.

**LDS mission experience**

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant association between the LDS
mission (i.e. went on a mission, did not go on a mission) and migration
from the home community by agriculture graduates.

**Table 50. Relationship between the LDS mission and migrant classification
of vocational agricultural graduates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Graduate classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 3.0 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \quad .05 = \text{no significance} \]
The most significant figure came from the yes response of the migrant. This figure accounted for 1.5 of the final $3.0 \chi^2$ value. To be significant with one degree of freedom this table would have to have had 3.8. It was close, but still not significant, although it seems to point in the direction of a mission causing migration.

Percentage wise in the yes response, migrants had 42.3 percent compared to 23.7 percent for the non-migrants. Quite a substantial contrast. In the no response it was 76.3 percent for the non-migrants to 57.7 percent for the migrants.

Comparison of monthly earnings

The following table shows a comparison of monthly earnings of migrants and non-migrants.

Table 51. Comparison of monthly earnings of migrants and non-migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrant classification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean monthly earnings</th>
<th>Stan. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>739.10</td>
<td>344.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>687.79</td>
<td>208.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between means</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The review of literature revealed that one of the major reasons for migration was the quest for social and economic opportunity. The findings of this study have given some support to that particular reason for migration. In order to determine if migrants were more successful than non-migrants in terms of financial returns for their efforts, the monthly earnings from the current occupations were compared for these two groups.

The salary was reported on different schedules such as per hour, per week, per month and per year. All were converted to monthly earnings to facilitate a comparison.

Observation of these data indicate that the wages for non-migrants was greater than the wages earned by migrants suggesting that non-migrants were financially more successful than the migrants.

It should be pointed out that there were differences in the wages reported by graduates which tend to be misleading. A large proportion of the migrant graduates were involved in college, 23 percent, plus one of the migrants was on a mission for the LDS Church, which would greatly reduce their earning power, compared to none of the non-migrants reporting their current occupation being college or mission.

In Ohio, migrants earned more compared to their non-migrant counterparts. This is explained by Noland by a large proportion of the graduates being involved in farming. These graduates reported their cash income at a conservative level, and mentioned that certain amounts
of capital were invested in crops or livestock from which they expected
a return but they were not certain of the amount. Other single graduates
reported that they lived with their parents and were paid a small monthly
wage plus their board and a small return from the crops.

Summary

The major purpose of this chapter was to describe the vocational
agriculture graduates in terms of their migration patterns since leaving
high school. Specifically, the writer set forth to present data on the pro-
portion of graduates that had left their home communities; the number of
moves they had completed; the distances they had moved; the length of
time they had remained in their home communities before migrating;
and some of the major reasons for migration. In addition, data were
presented concerning relationships between migration and selected
characteristics of vocational agriculture graduates.

In summarizing the data presented in this chapter, it is noted that
30.6 percent of the graduates had moved from their home communities
since graduating from high school. This migrant group included gradu-
ates who had moved within their home counties as well as those who had
moved to other counties and to other states. Three point eight percent of
the migrants had completed only one move, while 38.5 percent had com-
pleted two moves, 38.5 percent had completed three moves and 9.2
percent had completed more than three moves. The average number of
moves completed per graduate was 2.88 and the most frequent reason given for moving was because of college or trade school.

Approximately 31 percent of the migrants moved from their home communities within 12 months after high school graduation. An additional 34.7 percent migrated between the first and second year following graduation, and approximately 8 percent of the migrants remained in their home communities more than four years before migrating.

Fifty-four percent of the graduates who had migrated lived within 25 miles of their home communities. More than 88 percent of the migrants lived within 200 miles of their home communities.

Approximately thirty-nine percent of the migrants planned to make their permanent home in a community different than the one in which they resided at the time of the study. More than 26 percent of the migrants were undecided as to where they wanted to establish the permanent home. Over 15 percent of the migrants planning to change their residence in the future, planned to move to a farm.

Concerning the relationship of selected characteristics to migration none of the seven background characteristics were found to be significant while a significant relationship was revealed for one of the six experiential factors. The background characteristic that was significant was current occupation of the graduates. It was also found that the wages of the non-migrants were slightly higher than those earned by migrants.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the study which was conducted to determine the migration patterns of vocational agricultural graduates in Utah. The need, purpose and specific objectives are briefly reviewed, the techniques and procedures employed in the conduct of the study are briefly considered and the major findings are summarized.

Summary of the Study

Need for Study

As the agricultural economy continues to change, the demand for employees in off-farm agricultural occupations will increase. Many of these jobs may not be located in the typical rural or small urban community. In that case, rural youth who want to pursue careers in off-farm agriculture will need to be prepared to obtain employment in communities other than ones in which they receive their agricultural education.

In view of these changes, the changes in technology and the labor market, it is believed that pertinent information as to the mobility of vocational agriculture graduates would be useful in planning and improving programs of vocational agriculture. Vocational educators would then have a better idea about the necessity of looking beyond the scope of the
local community in planning programs to meet the needs of their students. The concern is to prepare young people for gainful employment no matter where they choose to live.

**Purpose**

The major purpose of this study was to determine the migration patterns of vocational agriculture graduates in Utah, during the first five years following their high school graduation in 1969, and compare these patterns with Ohio in 1963.

**Objectives**

In order to accomplish the major purpose of this study, specific objectives were formulated:

1. Identify occupations in which high school graduates of vocational agriculture had been engaged since graduation.
2. To determine the proportion of high school vocational agricultural graduates who had migrated from their home communities.
3. To determine when the vocational agricultural graduates had migrated from the home community, as well as the number of moves.
4. To determine if there was a significant relationship between migration and selected characteristics of these vocational agricultural graduates including:
a. Parent's socio-economic status
   1) Occupation
   2) Income
   3) Education
   4) Older brothers

b. Occupation of the graduates
c. Education beyond high school
d. Marital and family status
e. Military service experience
f. LDS mission

Scope of Study

Former vocational agriculture students who had graduated from high school in 1969 were identified from 23 of the qualifying 28 chapters in the state of Utah. Of the graduates identified, 148 were randomly selected or 42.8 percent of the total sample. Of these 148 persons to whom questionnaires were mailed, usable data were collected from 85 for a response of 57.4 percent.

Methodology

Following the review of literature pertaining to the problem, the major task involved developing the data collecting instruments, identifying member of the study sample and securing current names and addresses, collecting the data, analyzing the findings and presenting the results.
Sampling procedure. In order to identify the sample for the study a list of the 48 vocational agriculture departments in Utah was compiled and 28 were selected based on the following criteria:

1. The vocational agriculture teachers had been teaching one or more years at the time of the study. In multiple teaching departments at least one of the teachers had been teaching one or more years.

2. The vocational agriculture department had been established prior to 1969 and had not been involved in extensive school district consolidations since 1969.

The 28 qualifying agriculture departments were requested through two mailed letters and one personal contact to provide names and addresses for their 1969 graduates. The 28 departments were located in 17, or 59 percent of the 29 counties in Utah and were distributed geographically in all portions of the state.

Teachers in 23 of the 28 selected departments, or 82 percent provided the names and addresses of 345 graduates.

A random sampling procedure was used on the 345 names and a total mailing list of 148 graduates resulted, or 42.8 percent of the total sample.

Of the 148 persons to whom questionnaires were mailed usable data were collected from 85 for a response of 57.4 percent.

Study population. A major consideration in selecting the population for this study was the length of time the graduates had been out of school.
Vocational agriculture students from the graduating class of 1969 were selected for the following reasons:

1. It was believed that the 1969 vocational agriculture graduates were between 22 and 25 years old. Therefore, a relatively high degree of migration could be expected since the graduates were within that age group of the population with the highest rate of mobility according to most demographers.

2. It was believed that five years out of high school was sufficient time to enter the world of work.

Validation of response. In all studies validity is essential. To try and make this study more valid a telephone survey of the non-respondents was conducted. A random sample of 15 names were selected from a hat and contact was made to 11 for a 25 percent sample from the 44 non-respondents. These 11 non-respondents were queried concerning seven selected characteristics. These data were compared with similar data obtained from the respondent group and Chi-square was used to determine the significance of difference between the two groups.

On the basis of these comparisons it was concluded that the differences between the two groups were not sufficient to warrant an adjustment of data for the respondents.
Summary of the Findings

The findings of this study are summarized in terms of background characteristics, experimental factors, occupational experiences, and migration patterns of the graduate.

Background Characteristics

This section summarizes the description of the graduates in terms of selected background characteristics, i.e. the residence of origin, the educational level of the parents, the estimated level of the parental income, the parents occupation, and the number of older brothers. Other descriptive characteristics are mentioned as age rank in the graduating class and the years of vocational agriculture completed.

These characteristics deal with those things which the graduate had not much control over. None the less these factors are important and have a profound influence on the graduates' decisions in the future.

Current age. According to Pierson (1973) the more energetic and youthful are those who migrate. This would put these graduates at just the right stage of peak migration.

The ages varied between 22 and 24 with the majority either being 22 or 24. The highest percentage was age 22 with 45.9 percent.

Vocational agriculture completed. In most of the agriculture departments in the state of Utah vocational agriculture is offered for four
years. In some of the departments however it is only offered three years on the high school level.

Thirty three percent completed four years of agriculture with 29 percent having completed three years. Only 11.8 percent took the class for one year. Most of the students that got into the program stayed at least two or more years, with 62 percent completing three years or more.

**Rank in graduating class.** The agriculture teachers were asked to rank their graduates in the upper, middle or lower third of the graduating class. The results were somewhat different from the Ohio study which asked the student to rank himself. More were found on the top and bottom than in the Ohio study. In the upper third were 29.4 percent of the graduates reporting with 34.2 percent in the middle third and 18.8 percent on the bottom third. This compares to 23.5 percent in the upper third, 64.2 percent in the middle third and 12.3 percent on the bottom for Ohio. The remaining 17.6 percent for Utah were unranked graduates by their agriculture teachers.

**Residence of origin.** The major categories used to describe the graduates' origin were farm, rural non-farm, and urban. In Utah a different situation exists than in Ohio. Noland reported that 80.4 percent of Ohio graduates were from the farm. Utah graduates reported that only 34 percent came from farms. Most of the graduates, 41 percent, came from the urban-suburban areas, where the father in some cases, had a little ground just outside the city. The rest, 24.7 percent, were from a rural non-farm setting.
Educational level of the parents. Over 24 percent of the fathers availed themselves further education after high school. As would be expected, most of this 24 percent were in the technical area. Over 39 percent did not graduate from high school, with 12.9 percent not even completing the eighth grade.

A lot more mothers completed high school than the fathers. Mothers that completed high school were 74 percent while the fathers were at 60 percent. Twenty one percent of the mothers took either college or technical school compared to over 24 percent of the fathers.

Number of older brothers. The responses indicated that 43.5 percent of the graduates were the oldest son in the family. Thirty two point nine percent had one older brother with over 24 percent having two or more. According to Blau and Duncan (1967) the oldest is least likely to leave the farm. This could have had an influence on the Utah statistics.

Occupation of father. The data indicates that 34 percent were engaged in full-time farming. In the Ohio study, over 50 percent were in full-time farming. It is interesting to note that Utah has more part-time farmers than Ohio. Thirty one percent were part-time farmers in Utah compared to 26.5 percent in Ohio. All those in farming, both full and part-time or agriculture related fields in Utah amounted to 77.6 percent, or 66 of the 85 respondents' fathers.

Level of parent's income. It was asked of the graduate in the questionnaire to list the family net income before taxes in 1969. Their
response was a little unexpected. In the $11,000 or more a year category, 34 or 40 percent of the graduates listed their father in this bracket. Another 20 percent were in the $9,000 to $10,000 a year bracket with none making less than $3,000 a year. The responses ranged all the way from $3,000 to $75,000 a year with over 70 percent making $7,000 or more a year.

Experience Factors

In the review of literature it was revealed that marriage, education and occupation were experiences related to migration of youth. The military was also mentioned as a cause of migration. To these factors was added one factor peculiar to Utah, the LDS mission.

These experience factors give an overview of experiences since high school that could have caused migration in youth, and the type of factors over which the graduate had a certain degree of control.

Marital and family status. According to Bogue (1959) few events require more extensive changes in activities, responsibilities and habits than the change from single to married life. Decisions have to be made where the home is to be made.

By a large majority the Utah graduates had taken this extensive change in activities, responsibilities and habits by marrying. A total of 77.6 percent of the responding graduates were married with 21.2 percent single and 1 graduate or 1.2 percent divorced.
Of the 66 married graduates and the one divorced graduate over 73 percent had one or more children. This means an average of 1.1 child per married graduate, or an average of .86 children per agriculture graduate respondent.

Military service. The data revealed that about 26 percent of the graduates were involved in the military compared to 74 percent that were not. A lot of the military service in Utah served by these graduates was in the National Guard.

Formal education beyond high school. In Utah, only 18.8 percent received no further training once out of high school. This compares to over 50 percent in Ohio. Other statistics were 27 percent attended or attending college, 26 percent in the trade schools and over 28 percent in all other formal education. In Utah education is stressed and is evidenced by the fact that Utah is one of the top in the nation as to high school graduates and college attenders (Advisory Council 1972). This might help to explain the high percentages compared to Ohio.

LDS mission. Almost 30 percent of the respondents served on missions. Taking into consideration that about 70 percent of this population is LDS (Americana 1975) or 60 graduates, this means that approximately 42 percent of the LDS graduates went on missions.
Occupational Experiences

The occupational experiences of the graduate since leaving high school included full-time farming, part-time farming, employment in agriculture related occupations.

Current occupation or position. The distribution of 85 graduates showed 40 percent engaged in agriculture occupations including part-time farming and agriculture-related college work. This is a pretty good average of boys in agriculture when only 34 percent of their fathers were full-time farmers. In full-time farming, 14 percent responded that this was their current occupation. Twelve percent responded that they were involved in agriculture-related work with the remaining 62 percent in non-agricultural occupations.

Occupational plans. In the occupational plans for the future, the most interesting statistic was the full-time farming statistic. This jumped from 14 percent to 20 percent, for those who planned to go full-time farming. Agriculture-related occupations jumped 2 percent to almost 19 percent while part-time farming took a dive of 3.5 percent to a total of 4.7 percent. This left 13 percent who were undecided about their future plans.

This ups the total of 40 percent now engaged in agriculture to 43.5 percent who plan on being in agriculture in the next five years with still 13 percent undecided.
Employment of wives. The majority of the working wives were either in cosmetics, including beauty operators, or working as secretaries. There was a total of 5 secretaries and 4 working in cosmetics or as beauty operators.

Only 17 percent or 11 wives were working full-time. Those working full and part time amounted to 29 percent thus leaving 71 percent who were non-working wives.

**Migration patterns of the graduates**

A total of 30.6 percent of the graduates had moved from their home communities since graduating from high school. Of the graduates, 3.8 percent of the migrants had completed only one move, while 38.5 percent had completed two moves, 38.5 percent had completed three moves and 9.3 percent had completed more than three moves. The average number of moves completed per graduate was 2.88 and the most frequent reason given for moving was because of college or trade school.

Approximately 31 percent of the migrants moved from their home communities within 12 months after high school graduation. An additional 34.7 percent migrated between the first and second year following graduation, and approximately 8 percent of the migrants remained in their home communities more than four years before migrating.

More than 88 percent of the migrants lived within 200 miles of their home communities, with most within 25 miles.
Approximately thirty-nine percent of the migrants planned to make their permanent home in a community different than the one in which they resided at the time of the study, 26 percent were undecided, with 25 percent planning to move to a farm.

Relationships between selected characteristics and migrant status of the graduate

Hypothesis in the null form, were formulated and tested to determine the relationship of seven background characteristics and six experimen-ental characteristics. Chi-square was the statistic employed to test each hypothesis in Chapter 4.

Background characteristics. The Chi-square test showed no significance. Those characteristics that were not significant were residence of origin, educational level of the father, educational level of the mother, the number of older brothers, the occupation of the father, the estimated level of income, and the rank in the graduating class.

Experience factors. One experience characteristic was found to be significant at the .05 level of significance according to the Chi-square test. This characteristic was the current occupation of the graduate due in large part to the six cases of migrants that were at college.

Those factors which could not be rejected were the marital status, military experience, level of formal education, type of education beyond high school and the LDS mission.
Conclusions

The following conclusions were based on an interpretation of the data presented in the study.

Occupational Patterns

1. The positions assumed by a majority of the graduates five years after leaving high school were in nonagricultural occupations.

2. We have good reason to suspect that no less than 40 percent of the 1969 graduates will be in some phase of agriculture in the future.

Migration Patterns

1. Four out of every five graduates were living within 25 miles of their home community five years after graduating from high school and approximately one in every 28 graduates had moved more than 100 miles away from their home communities.

2. The major reasons why migrants left their parental homes were for marriage, to attend college, or to obtain a job. When all factors were considered for all residential moves completed per migrant, the major motivating force was 'because of a job'.

3. Most of the migration occurred during the first two years after graduation with more graduates migrating between 1 to 2 years after graduation than any other time.
4. Many migrants still plan on future migration. One could expect a reasonable amount of migration in the future especially from out of county migrants.

5. Non-migrants plan on very little future migration.

Relationship between selected characteristics and migration

1. There was a significant relationship between migration and current occupation.

2. There were no statistically significant differences between migrants and nonmigrants with respect to residence of origin, educational level of father, educational level of mother, number of older brothers, occupation of father, estimated level of income, and rank in graduating class. In addition, there were no significant differences between non-migrants and migrants in terms of marital status, military experience, level of formal education, type of education beyond high school, and the LDS mission experience.

Relationship between Ohio and Utah

1. There existed statistical similarity in current occupation, educational level of father, educational level of mother, number of older brothers, estimated level of income, and rank in graduating class. In addition, there were statistical similarities in level of formal education, and type of education beyond high school.
2. There existed statistical differences in residence of origin, occupation of father, marital status, and military experience.

Recommndations

On the basis of the results, ideas, and suggestions coming out of this study, the writer believes the following recommendations bear some consideration:

1. It is recommended that greater attention be directed toward vocational guidance for students who enroll in high school vocational agriculture; especially in Utah that greater emphasis be placed in the off-farm agriculture areas and provide occupational information and guidance concerning the opportunities for gainful employment in these fields. This recommendation comes from the fact that only 34% of the graduates came from the farm with only 14% in full-time farming now.

2. It is recommended that agriculture teachers base their agriculture programs on the community and county situations. This recommendation is based on the fact that most of the graduates, in this study, lived within 25 miles of their home communities five years after high school graduation.

3. It is recommended that a good research method be applied to Utah farmers to find out their financial situation in order to more accurately assess their needs.
4. It is recommended that research be done to determine the similarities and differences in migration patterns of vocational agriculture graduates and graduates who have not taken vocational agriculture in high school.

5. It is recommended that research be done to determine if migration patterns are different from one geographic area to another in Utah.
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January 28, 1975

Mr. David Potter
Clearfield High School
Clearfield, Utah 84015

Dear Mr. Potter:

The attached questionnaire concerned with the mobility of agriculture graduates of 1969 is part of a state-wide study being carried on cooperatively by the agriculture education department at Utah State University and myself. This project is concerned specifically with determining the migration patterns of vocational agriculture graduates in Utah during the first five years following their high school graduation in 1969. The results of this study will help to provide more useful information in planning and improving programs of vocational agriculture. Vocational educators could be helped in looking beyond the scope of the local community when planning programs to meet the needs of their students. The concern is to prepare young people for gainful employment no matter where they choose to live and discovering mobility characteristics is a matter of crucial importance.

We are particularly desirous of obtaining your responses because you are the only link we have to find these agriculture graduates of 1969. We do not wish to take much of your time. We know how busy Ag teachers are, so we have shortened the questionnaire as much as possible.

It will be appreciated if you will complete the questionnaire prior to February 17 and return it in the stamped, special delivery envelope enclosed. Other phases of this research cannot be carried out until we complete analysis of the questionnaire data. We would welcome any comments that you may have concerning any aspect of this mobility study. We will be pleased to send you a summary of the study results if you desire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Gilbert Long
Head Ag. Education

Keith L. Smith
Ag. Science, Orem
INSTRUCTIONS:

Please read carefully and answer accurately.

Please return the questionnaire in the postage-paid envelope provided.

THANKS FOR YOUR HELP ON THIS IMPORTANT STUDY.

1) Name of chapter __________________________

2) How many graduates did you have in 1969 from your program? ______

3) Would you please give the name, current address and *academic position of your 1969 graduates in vocational agriculture.

* (Academic position refers to students position in your Agriculture classes. Please indicate upper one-third, middle one-third, or lower one-third.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CURRENT ADDRESS</th>
<th>ACAD. POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>CURRENT ADDRESS</td>
<td>ACAD. POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 24, 1975

Mr. Ag Teacher
Anywhere, Utah

Dear (Name):

This is a reminder on the questionnaire concerning the mobility of Agriculture graduates of 1969, which I sent to you the first part of February.

I know how busy you are and how things pile up. I experience the same frustrations.

I would appreciate though, if you could mail this questionnaire as soon as possible. It is needed very much for completion of this phase of the study.

As I mentioned before, the results of this study will help to provide more useful information in planning and improving programs of Vocational Agriculture. We could be helped in looking beyond the scope of the local community when planning programs to meet the needs of our students. We are wanting to prepare young people for gainful employment no matter where they choose to live.

Again let me mention that I would welcome any comments that you may have concerning any aspect of this mobility study and that I would be pleased to send you a summary of the study results if you desire.

If you have already mailed the questionnaire, let me take this opportunity to thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Gilbert Long
Head Ag. Education

Keith L. Smith
Orem Ag. Science
APPENDIX B
The attached questionnaire concerned with the mobility of agriculture graduates of 1969 is part of a state-wide study being carried on cooperatively by the agriculture education department at Utah State University and myself. This project is concerned specifically with determining the migration patterns of vocational agriculture graduates in Utah during the first five years following their high school graduation in 1969. The results of this study will help to provide more useful information in planning and improving programs of vocational agriculture. Vocational educators could be helped in looking beyond the scope of the local community when planning programs to meet the needs of their students. The concern is to prepare young people for gainful employment no matter where they choose to live and discovering mobility characteristics is a matter of crucial importance.

We are particularly desirous of obtaining your responses because of the help it would be in providing useful information so as to improve programs in vocational agriculture. We do not wish to take much of your time. We know how busy you are so we have shortened the questionnaire as much as possible. It should only take about 15 minutes.

It will be appreciated if you will complete the questionnaire prior to May 2 and return it in the stamped, special delivery envelope enclosed. Other phases of this research cannot be carried out until we complete analysis of the questionnaire data. We would welcome any comments that you may have concerning any aspect of this mobility study.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Gilbert Long
Head Ag. Education

Keith L. Smith
Ag. Science, Orem
INSTRUCTIONS

Please read each question carefully and answer all items ACCURATELY. The information will be STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.

Please return the questionnaire in the post-paid, pre-addressed envelope provided.

THANKS FOR YOUR HELP ON THIS IMPORTANT STUDY.

SECTION I -- GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Present marital status (check one): ___Single ___Married ___Age
   ___Divorced ___Widowed
   Date of Marriage _____________________________

2. Number of children ______. Ages __________________________

3. Have you served on active duty in the Armed Forces?
   ___No ___Yes
   How many months? ______ What was the nature of your work in the
   Armed Forces? _____________________________
   Date of discharge from active military duty? Month ___Year ___

4. Did you serve an LDS mission? ___No ___Yes

5. ___ The number of brothers older than you.
   ___ The number of brothers younger than you.
   ___ The number of sisters older than you.
   ___ The number of sisters younger than you.

6. How many of your brothers and sisters had moved away from your home
   community when you graduated from high school? ________________________
SECTION II -- RESIDENTIAL INFORMATION

1. Are you living in the same home as when you were a senior in high school?
   __Yes  __No

2. Where was your home when you were a senior in high school?
   ___ In a city of 40,000 people or more
   ___ In a city of 10,000 to 40,000 people
   ___ In a town of 2,500 to 10,000 people
   ___ In a town under 2,500 people
   ___ On a farm
   ___ In the country, but not a farm (rural, nonfarm)
   ___ Other ________________________________

3. Is your present residence in the same community as when you attended high school?
   __Yes  __No
   If no, how far do you presently live from that community? ___ miles
   If no, how soon after leaving high school did you move from that community? (check one)
   ___ Less than 6 months  ___ From 2 to 3 years
   ___ Six to 12 months    ___ From 3 to 4 years
   ___ From 1 to 2 years   ___ More than 4 years

4. Is your present residence in the same county as when you attended high school?  __Yes  __no

5. If you have moved one or more times since high school graduation what was your major reason for making each move? (Check the one most important reason for each move.)
   _____ Does not apply, I have not moved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>1st Move</th>
<th>2nd Move</th>
<th>3rd Move</th>
<th>4th Move</th>
<th>5th Move</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved with family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved because of a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to join friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entered the Armed Forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entered college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons (specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other reasons for moving __________________________________________________________
6. Do you plan to make your permanent home in the community in which you now live?  

___ Yes  ___ No  ___ Undecided

I no, where would you like to make your permanent home? (check one)

____ In a city of 40,000 people or more
____ In a city of 10,000 to 40,000 people
____ In a town of 2,500 to 10,000 people
____ In a town under 2,500 people
____ On a farm
____ In the country, but not a farm (rural, nonfarm),
____ Other ______________________________

SECTION III -- JOB HISTORY

1. At the time of your graduation from high school what was your father's occupation? Please be specific. For example: Dairy Farmer, Service Station Operator, Car Salesman, Farm Worker, Construction Foreman.

__________________________________________________________

2. If your father was farming when you graduated from high school was he:
   (check all that apply)
   ___ does not apply  ___ Renter
   ___ Full-time farmer  ___ Owner and renter
   ___ Part-time farmer  ___ Hired laborer
   ___ Owner  ___ In a partnership

3. Is your father's present occupation the same as it was then (at the time of your graduation)?
   ___ Yes  ___ No  If no, please indicate his present occupation:

__________________________________________________________

4. What do you estimate was the net family income when you were a senior in high school (before taxes)?  __________________________

5. What is your present occupational or educational position? Please be specific. For example: Dairy Farming, Salesman for John Deere Co., Drill Press Operator for Geneva Steel, attending Utah State University etc.

   (Position)  (Name of business or firm)
5. (Continued)

(Address of business or firm)

I this position full-time?  ____No  ____Yes
If part-time, how many hours per week?  _______________________

What is your present net income before taxes?  _______________________

6. Do you consider your present position to be permanent?

  ____Yes  ____No  ____Undecided
If no, what type of job or position do you hope to enter within the
next five years?  _______________________

7. If you are married, does your wife have a job outside of the general
house work?  ____Does not apply  ____No  ____Yes
If yes, what type of work does she do?  _______________________
If yes, is her job full-time or part-time?  _______________________

SECTION V -- EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION

1. Please check all formal education you have obtained since leaving high
   school and provide the information requested about each. If you have
   not had any additional formal education since high school, check
   here ________.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check here</th>
<th>Type of Education</th>
<th>Major Subject or courses</th>
<th>Dates attended From to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-year or junior college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four-year college/univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-college grad. school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private trade/tech. school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public trade/tech. school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business-commercial school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult-Young Farmer Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military Specialist School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company Course or School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correspondence Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Are you enrolled in any formal training or educational program at the present time? __No __Yes

(Where) (Type) (Length)

3. Circle the number of years of vocational agriculture you completed in high school. 1 2 3 4 Other ______________________

4. If you had the opportunity to repeat your high school education would you take vocational agriculture? __Yes __No

Why? ______________________

5. There is much said concerning the usefulness of certain high school subjects in preparing youth for employment after graduating from high school. Please check below the value you feel each of the subjects listed had in preparing you for your first job after high school graduation and also your present job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>Didn't Take it</th>
<th>Value of Course in Preparing you for your: (check one for each job)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Ag.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Check the item that best describes the education of your parents.

Father   Mother

Graduated from 4 year college
Attended college
Completed trade or technical school
Completed high school
Attended high school
Completed 8 years
Less than 8 years

NOTICE: Your answers to these questions will be kept in complete confidence. When the findings are published neither you nor your school will be identified in any way.
May 16, 1975

This is a reminder on the questionnaire concerning the mobility of Agriculture graduates of 1969, which I sent to you the last part of April.

I know how busy you are and how things pile up. I experience the same frustrations. I would appreciate, though, if you could mail the questionnaire as soon as possible. It is needed very much for completion of this phase of the study.

As I mentioned before, the results of this study will help to provide more useful information in planning and improving programs of Vocational Agriculture. We could be helped in looking beyond the scope of the local community when planning programs to meet the needs of Vocational Agriculture students. We are wanting to prepare young people for gainful employment no matter where they choose to live.

Again let me mention that I would welcome any comments that you may have concerning any aspect of this mobility study and invite you to send this with the questionnaire.

I you have already mailed the questionnaire, let me take this opportunity to thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Gilbert Long
Head Ag. Education

Keith L. Smith
Ag. Science, Orem
June 11, 1975

I have enclosed another questionnaire concerned with the mobility of agriculture graduates of 1969. Let me mention again that this study will provide useful information in planning and improving programs of vocational agriculture.

Your former agricultural teacher endorses this study as you can see by his signature on the bottom of this letter. So I would encourage you to send this questionnaire in the stamped, addressed, envelope to us as soon as possible.

We cannot complete the analysis of the study without your response.

If you have already completed and sent the questionnaire let me thank you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Agricultural Teacher

Keith L. Smith
Orem, Vo-Ag. Teacher
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Enclosures