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- I. High Schools Cooperating in Project
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Professionals and laymen alike are interested in the far-reaching changes taking place in agriculture and the corresponding impact on the rural population. There are possibly no issues of more importance than those dealing with rural youth. There is abundant evidence which supports the idea that many farm-reared youth will not be able to remain in their home rural-farm community. Local work opportunities are not adequate to support all the youth growing up in the immediate area.¹

Prior to 1920, a majority of the population lived in rural areas. As of 1960, 70 percent of our population was urban. During this time the rural-farm population has been steadily declining. At the same time the urban and rural nonfarm population have been on the increase. The decline in farm population has been largely a consequence of net outmigration and changes in the classification of residence. Such factors as high levels of economic opportunity in nonfarm areas, increased participation of farm youth in advanced education, and changes taking place in

agriculture have meant that outmigration is an expected and appropriate pattern in most rural areas of the United States. Farms are becoming fewer in number and larger in size as a result of such factors as increased mechanization, corporate farming, and vertical integration. Under such conditions, net outmigration, particularly of the rural farm youth, is "normal" and is one way in which some balance between population and agricultural resources is achieved.  

Statement of Problem

As was previously stated, it is now the trend for farms to increase in size and become fewer in number; also farms are extensively mechanized. Because of such changes, there is no longer a great need for many farm operators. Unless a farm boy can go into farming with his father or some other relative, there is little opportunity for him to enter farming. Farming, to a certain extent, is an hereditary occupation almost unknown for other occupations in modern American society. By and large, only farmers' sons become farmers, but not all farmers' sons choose to do so.

The major purpose of this study is to compare South Dakota farm boys who plan to farm with farm boys who plan nonfarm occu-

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 6
pations. This will be done with respect to reference groups, value orientations, and resource characteristics.

Need for Study

Farm youth are finding it increasingly difficult to enter farming as a life occupation, and are therefore faced with a difficult situation when it comes to choosing an occupation. The farm-reared boys must decide whether or not to continue the family tradition in farming, and if they decide not to follow this tradition, they must decide on a nonfarm occupation which they would like to enter. The future welfare of these farm youth is associated with the occupational choices they make at this time. Therefore, a comparison of the characteristics of farm boys who plan farm occupations with those who plan nonfarm occupations is an important area of inquiry.

Objectives of Study

This study was based upon the following objectives:

(1) To determine factors which differentiate farm boys who plan to farm from farm boys who plan nonfarm occupations.

(2) To examine selected factors which are influencing farm boys to leave the farm and seek nonfarm occupations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Review of Literature

It was the purpose of this chapter to examine research pertinent to the present study. Although much has been written about the occupational plans of adolescents, there has been relatively little literature dealing with the occupational plans of farm youth.

In the state of Washington, Murray Straus conducted research on the characteristics of high school senior farm boys choosing farming as their life's occupation and farm boys who chose non-farm occupations. His major concern in the study was whether those best qualified were going into some nonfarm occupation.

Straus found that there was little or no difference between the physical and intellectual ability of farmers' sons who plan to farm and farmers' sons who express a desire to enter a nonfarm occupation. He found that the reasons for the choice of farming seem to depend on the "greater economic potential of the home farm, on the existence of a value system functionally related to farming, and on an occupational decision resulting largely from

---

direct, primary group influence."\(^4\) Straus concluded that "the occupational selection process occurring among this sample of farmers' sons is such that Washington's agriculture receives at least a proportionate share of the physically, intellectually, and socially well-endowed."\(^5\)

Kaldor, Eldridge, Burchinal, and Arthur studied the long-range occupational plans of Iowa farm boys in their senior year of high school.\(^6\) The high schools included in this project were randomly selected from throughout the state of Iowa. All farm boys who were seniors in Iowa high schools located in towns or communities of less than 25,000 population were included in the universe to be sampled.

The three general hypotheses guiding the research were:

(1) Boys who plan to farm have different satisfaction functions than boys who plan nonfarm occupations.

(2) Boys who plan to farm have different resource characteristics than boys who plan nonfarm occupations.

(3) Boys planning to farm have more optimistic expectations about the relative results of employing resources in farming than the boys planning nonfarm occupations.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 266.

\(^5\)Ibid.

Each hypothesis was supported by their research results. Those planning to enter farming placed more value on the non-income aspects of farming, while those planning nonfarm occupations had opposite valuations. Boys planning to farm owned more financial resources and were anticipating more parental assistance to finance entry into farming than were boys who planned nonfarm occupations. Those who planned to farm tended to be more optimistic about their future income-earning opportunities than were farm boys who planned nonfarm careers.\(^7\)

A. O. Haller and W. H. Sewell undertook a study in order to determine whether farm youth aspire to relatively low occupations.\(^8\) They concluded that boys who live on farms prefer to enter high-level jobs with the same frequency as males who do not live on farms.

Lee Burchinal compared differences in educational and occupational aspirations of farm, small-town and city boys.\(^9\) The data were organized to test the hypotheses related to differences between two categories of farm-reared males, those planning to farm and those planning to enter nonfarm occupations, compared

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 611


with males from rural nonfarm and small town residences and males from a metropolitan area. Planning to farm tended to have a depressing effect on aspirational levels. Aspirational levels of the nonfarm oriented farm-reared boys approximated those of the rural nonfarm and small-town boys.  

Harry K. Schwarzweller undertook research dealing with value orientations in educational and occupational choices, using as subjects students in four New York high schools. The author examined the relationship between value orientations and the education and occupation choice-making process, and the structural antecedents of those value orientations. It was the general hypothesis that in the education and occupation decision-making process there is a relationship between an individual's value orientations and the choices that an individual makes from the alternatives available. Schwarzweller's data supported the hypothesis, and his findings also suggest that the influence of values on choices decreases as freedom of opportunity is restricted by the bonds of social structure.

Schwarzweller also conducted research on values and occupational choice. His general hypotheses were: (1) value orient-

10 Ibid., p. 107.


tations influenced occupational selection, and (2) occupational value orientations are learned in the socialization process. The findings from this study were found to support the general hypotheses. Schwarzweller used twelve value variables in the research design. They included: familism, material comfort, security, hard work, external conformity, achievement, individualism, creative work, mental work, friendship, service to society, and work with people.13

Walter Slocum investigated current theories of occupational choice and found them to be inadequate. Among other things, these theories failed to make use of the possible contributions of sociological theory to occupational choice. In examining what contributions sociology might make in a "comprehensive interdisciplinary theory of occupational decision-making, Slocum makes the following observations:15

(1) Occupational choice decisions made before actual job entry are accomplished through "playing at" occupational roles.

(2) Occupational choice decisions are not necessarily made rationally.

(3) The combinations of factors which influence occupational choice decisions include: (a) personal variables such as age, physical characteristics, aptitudes,

13Ibid., p. 127


15Ibid., p. 147.
interests, and personal history; (b) impersonal social and cultural factors such as societal norms and values, job requirements, and employment opportunities; (c) perceived interpersonal relationships; and (d) reference group values.

Research Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were formulated from the review of literature. It was hypothesized that:

(1) Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations have different reference groups than farm boys planning to farm.

(a) Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations will be less satisfied with their father's occupation than will farm boys planning to farm.

(b) Farm boys planning to farm will be encouraged by their fathers to follow his occupation more than will those farm boys who plan nonfarm occupations.

(c) Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations will be influenced more by secondary groups than will farm boys who plan to farm.

(2) Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations have different value orientations than farm boys planning to farm.

(a) Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations will have a greater preference to work with ideas and people than with "things."

(b) Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations will have a greater preference to work for someone else than work for themselves.

(c) Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations will prefer to work outdoors rather than indoors.

(d) Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations are more likely than farm boys who plan to farm to leave the state of South Dakota to seek employment.

(3) Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations have different resource characteristics than farm boys planning to farm:
(a) Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations will be less satisfied with their parents' income than will boys who plan to farm.

(b) Farm boys planning to farm will be more optimistic about their chance for expecting help in getting started in their job than will farm boys who plan nonfarm occupations.

(c) Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations will be more optimistic about their chances for getting ahead in their occupation than will be farm boys who plan to farm.

(d) Farm boys planning to farm will have a better knowledge of their job than will farm boys who plan nonfarm occupations.

(e) Farm boys planning to farm will have a greater ability for their job than will farm boys who plan nonfarm occupations.
CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

It has been the intent of this chapter to present a discussion on reference group theory interrelated with discussion on primary and secondary groups so as to formulate a theoretical frame of reference. Primary and secondary groups are agencies of socialization for the individual, and, therefore, are reference groups.

Reference Group Theory

The concept of reference group began to be widely used during the late 1940's and early 1950's. According to Sherif and Wilson,\(^\text{16}\) there were two sets of events which brought the reference group concept to the attention of psychologists and sociologists. One set of events concerned socio-economic conditions; the other had to do with psychological conditions.

Sherif stated that there is little use for the reference group concept in a "stable, integrated and relatively less differentiated society."\(^\text{17}\) Man of modern Western society finds himself playing several different roles as he is involved in diverse

\(\text{\textsuperscript{16}}\text{M. Sherif and M. O. Wilson, Group Relations at the Crossroads, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953, pp. 203-228.}\)

\(\text{\textsuperscript{17}}\text{Ibid., p. 205.}\)
groups which frequently demand contradictory adjustment of his experience and behavior. Through face-to-face contacts and through the mass media of communications man is exposed "to pressures, demands, goals of diverse trends and ideologies." Through such means he is indoctrinated, forms his identifications, and faces a great variety of alternatives to choose from in line with his special needs. If man's psychological level of functioning were restricted largely to the impact of immediate stimulus situations and his behavior were regulated entirely in terms of the immediate ups and downs of his biogenic motives and conditioning, the demands of overlapping and contradictory groups would probably not cause him much concern.

This first set of events leads to the other, which relates to man's conceptual level of functioning. As he goes from one group situation to another from time to time, he reacts to the demands, pressures and appeals of new group situations in terms of the person he has come to consider himself to be and aspires to be. This conceptual level of functioning makes possible regulation of experience and behavior in relation to values and norms that lie, at times, far beyond immediate group situations. 18

It is evident that the groups to which the person relates are not necessarily the groups to which he belongs. He does not have to be a member of a group in order to relate to the group's

18 Ibid., p. 206.
norms, values, etc. This is where the concept reference group comes in.

With the above in mind, Sherif and Wilson characterize reference groups as "those groups to which the individual relates himself as a part or to which he aspires to relate himself psychologically." 19

Numerous studies, both by psychologists and sociologists, have shown that the major sources of the individual's significant attitudes are the values or norms of the groups with which he identifies; that is, of his reference groups. The values or norms of a person's reference groups make up the major "anchorages" in relation to which his experience of self-identity is organized.

The term "reference group" was first used by H. H. Hyman in 1942 when he was studying the psychology of status. Hyman found that one's "subjective" status could not be predicted directly from such factors as income or education. He found that to a certain degree, subjective status was dependent upon what

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid., p. 207.


22 By "subjective" status, Hyman means the status to which a person thinks of himself as belonging.
social groups were used as a frame of judgment. People showed
great diversity in the groups they chose as frameworks for judg-
ment. Often they used groups of which they were not members.
Hyman therefore found it useful to distinguish between a "membership group" (the group of which one actually is a member) and a
"reference group" (the group which someone uses as a basis of
comparison for self appraisal).

Newcomb revealed the utility of the reference group concept
by refashioning the prior results of his Bennington Study on
attitude change in terms of the shifts or resistance to shifts
in reference groups.

In his Social Psychology, 23 Newcomb introduced the ideas of
"positive" and "negative" reference groups. According to
Newcomb, a "positive" reference group "is one in which a person
is motivated to be accepted and treated as a member (overtly or
symbolically)" whereas "a 'negative' reference group is one which
the person is motivated to oppose or in which he does not want to
be treated as a member." 24 Also, Newcomb speaks of one group
being both a positive and negative reference group for the same
person, in the sense that he may willingly conform to some of its
norms and not to others.

---

24 Ibid., p. 209.
H. H. Kelly, in 1952, distinguished two functions that reference groups can play in the determination of a person's attitudes. The first of these functions is the setting and enforcing of standards for the person. Since such standards are usually referred to as group norms, Kelly specified this as the "normative" function of reference groups. A group can employ this function only when the members are in a position to reward or punish the person for adhering to or not adhering to the norms of the group. The group functions as a normative reference for a person "to the extent that its evaluations of him are based upon the degree of his conformity to certain standards of behavior or attitude and to the extent that the delivery of rewards and punishments is conditional upon these evaluations."

The "normative" function of reference groups is applicable to primary groups. It is from our primary groups that we obtain our most important norms and values. The primary group expects the individual to comply with these norms and values and makes quite plain its expectation. Primary groups include our family and peer groups.

---


26 Ibid., p. 412.

27 Ibid., p. 413.
Murray Straus\textsuperscript{28} compared physical and intellectual capabilities of farm boys planning to farm and those planning nonfarm occupations. Among other things, he found that those choosing farming indicated direct, primary group influences, such as suggestions by parents and actual work experience in the occupational field chosen. This was a major influence upon an individual to enter farming. Those choosing nonfarm jobs showed a heavy reliance on secondary contacts, such as suggestions by teachers and guidance counselors. A. O. Haller,\textsuperscript{29} W. G. Dyer,\textsuperscript{30} D. F. Aberle and K. D. Naegele\textsuperscript{31} generally support Straus' finding concerning parental influence in occupational choices.

Farm boys planning to farm have been influenced mainly by the immediate family members - in other words, by primary groups. The most influential person in the family, so far as influencing the occupations of the children, is the father. The children


\textsuperscript{29}Haller, op. cit.


perceive the effects of the job on the father, which in turn influences their attitudes. This group of farm boys have observed their father's devotion to their jobs - they have likewise witnessed their father's success by the income he has received and the size of the farm in operation. When a farm boy's father has been successful, this in itself is incentive to influence the farm boy to plan to farm. If his parents are able to provide him with the necessary assistance to enter farming, one of the more important barriers has been broken.

Just as the farm boy's father's occupation may have a positive influence on a son's plans to farm, it may also have a negative influence on him. This negative attitude toward the father's occupation would result if the father hasn't been too successful in farming and if the father's attitude toward farming is negative. Evidence of this would include a low income, small farm acreage, plus a lack of more personal desires such as an opportunity for advancement. If the farm boy's primary groups fail him in this respect, he may turn to secondary groups for guidance. These secondary groups include teachers and school counselors. The secondary groups correspond to Kelly's "comparison" function of reference groups and are also similar to Newcomb's idea of "negative" reference groups.

The second function distinguished by Kelly is the informational one in which the person uses the beliefs or attitudes of
the group members as a standard of comparison against which he can evaluate his own beliefs and attitude. This is what Kelly refers to as the "comparison" function of reference groups. This function considers the act of reference as an end in itself, whereas the normative function involves referral as a means to an end, that is, as a tactic for gaining acceptance. Also, it is apparent that there are two conceptions of correctness here; under normative pressure the person conducts himself in a manner which the group deems correct, whereas when he compares a belief with the beliefs of others he is attempting to establish a feeling of correctness regarding the belief itself.

Robert K. Merton and Alice S. Kitt, in their study, "The American Soldier," examine the attitudes, sentiments, and behavior of American servicemen. One of the significant generalizations which came from this study concerns people's attitudes toward, or judgment of, the deprivation that they were undergoing as a result of military service. Briefly, it was found that a person's attitude toward deprivation was attributed less to the actual degree of deprivation than to the standard he used in evaluating his own condition. For example, the Southern Negro soldier felt less deprived by military life because he was evalu-

---

32Ibid.

ating his condition relative to that of the Southern Negro civilian, whereas the Northern Negro soldier used the somewhat better-off Northern Negro civilian as a standard. Therefore, the Southern Negro soldier looked on his Army life as being more favorable than did Northern Negroes.

Tamotsu Shibutani states that a reference group "is that group whose outlook is used by the actor as the frame of reference in the organization of his perceptual field." All kinds of groupings, with great variations in size, composition, and structure may become reference groups. Of greatest importance for most people are those groups in which they participate directly (membership groups). But in some situations a person may assume the perspective attributed to some social category - a social class, an ethnic group, those in a given community, or those concerned with some special interest. Reference groups may be imaginary, as in the case of scientists who work for "humanity." Reference groups arise through the internalization of norms; "they constitute the structure of expectations imputed to some audience for whom one organizes his conduct." 36

34 Ibid., p. 45.


36 Ibid., p. 565.
CHAPTER IV

DESIGN OF STUDY

This thesis is but one part of a larger project dealing with educational and occupational choices of rural youth in South Dakota. The project is under the leadership of Dr. Robert M. Dimit, who is on the staff of the Rural Sociology Department at South Dakota State University.

Sample and Interview Schedule

The interview schedule was designed by Dr. R. M. Dimit and others on the staff of the Rural Sociology Department at South Dakota State University. The interview schedule was divided into four parts: (1) personal data; (2) plans after high school; (3) job interest; and (4) work beliefs.

The random sampling procedure was used in order to obtain the subjects needed for the study. A sample of twenty-six high schools was randomly selected from all rural high schools in the state of South Dakota.

Group interviews were completed in the spring of 1967 with all members of the senior classes in each of these schools. A total of 729 seniors were interviewed. The map on Page 22 indicates the twenty-six high schools which participated in the project.
For the purpose of the present study, the author chose to use as subjects only those male high school seniors who indicated their place of residence as being on a farm. In order to understand why all farm boys do not go into farming, the boys were divided into those who planned to farm and those who planned nonfarm occupations. Of the total of 187 male high school seniors indicating their place of residence as being on a farm, there were 48 who indicated they planned to farm and 139 who planned nonfarm occupations.

Method of Analysis

After the data had been collected the information was coded and put on IBM cards. When this preliminary work was finished, statistical analysis of the data was begun.

The Chi-square test was employed to determine significant differences between the two groups of farm boys, those planning to farm and those planning nonfarm occupations.
FIGURE I. HIGH SCHOOLS COOPERATING IN PROJECT

1 - Agar       7 - Cresbard       13 - Hoven       19 - Parker       25 - Willow Lake
2 - Arlington  8 - Draper        14 - Hurley      20 - Reliance
3 - Canistota  9 - Edgemont      15 - Lake Preston 21 - Salem
4 - Carthage   10 - Garretson     16 - Martin      22 - Warner
5 - Colome     11 - Gayville      17 - New Underwood 23 - Wessington
6 - Conde      12 - Hill City     18 - Northville   24 - Wessington Springs
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze the findings of the research.

The hypotheses have been restated in this chapter in the null form. The .05 level of significance was accepted as the point at which the null hypotheses were rejected.

The procedure in the discussion of the findings of this research will be to present the main hypotheses and sub-hypotheses in null form, to indicate whether or not the hypotheses are accepted, to present tables of data, and to state one or two of the more important observations to be made from the tables.

Hypothesis 1: Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations have different reference groups than farm boys planning to farm.

Sub-hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the two groups of farm boys regarding their opinion of their father's occupation.

Analysis of the data indicated a significant difference between the two groups of farm boys regarding their opinions of their father's occupation.

Table I indicates the farm boys' opinions of their fathers' occupations. Of those farm boys planning to farm, 56 percent said that their father's occupation was "completely satisfactory," whereas only 25 percent of those planning nonfarm occupations indicated they felt his occupation was "completely satisfactory."
TABLE I - FARM BOYS' OPINIONS OF FATHER'S OCCUPATION
ACCORDING TO FARM AND NONFARM PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion of Father's Occupation</th>
<th>Farm Frequencies</th>
<th>Nonfarm Frequencies</th>
<th>Farm Percentages</th>
<th>Nonfarm Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely satisfactory</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>25.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly satisfactory</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>37.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good enough</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>24.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 14.437 \quad d.f. = 4 \quad P < .05 \]
Sub-hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the two groups of farm boys with respect to the nature of encouragement given by their father to follow his occupation.

The null hypothesis failed to be rejected. Analysis indicated no significant difference between the two groups regarding the nature of the encouragement received from their fathers.

The kind of encouragement given by the farm boys' fathers to their sons to follow his occupation is presented in Table II.

For those farm boys planning to farm, 33 percent said their father tried to encourage them to follow his occupation; 66 percent said their fathers remained neutral; none of their fathers tried to discourage them. For those planning nonfarm occupations the percentages were, in the same order, 24 percent, 68 percent, and 6 percent.

**TABLE II - FATHER'S ENCOURAGEMENT TO FOLLOW HIS OCCUPATION, ACCORDING TO FARM AND NONFARM PLANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encouragement from father to follow his occupation</th>
<th>Farm Frequencies</th>
<th>Nonfarm Frequencies</th>
<th>Occupational Plans Farm Percentages</th>
<th>Nonfarm Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tried to encourage me</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>23.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither tried to encourage nor discourage me</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>68.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried to discourage me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.648 \quad \text{d.f.} = 2 \quad P > .05 \]
Sub-hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the two groups of farm boys with regard to how they rank the persons influencing their occupational plans.

The null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant difference as to how farm boys planning to farm and farm boys planning nonfarm occupations ranked the persons influencing their occupational plans.

Table III indicates the rank given by the farm boys who plan nonfarm occupations to the persons who have influenced their occupational plans, in frequencies and percentages, respectively. The most influential person, according to this group of farm boys, was the father. The nonfarm plans group indicated that their mothers were the second most influential and also the third most influential person in choosing their occupation. The fourth most influential person was the school counselor; the fifth most influential person was the teacher; and the sixth most influential person(s) was the brother(s) or sister(s).

The rank given by farm boys planning to farm to the persons who have influenced their occupational plans are presented in Table IV in frequencies and percentages, respectively. This group of farm boys ranked their father as the most influential person. Their mothers were ranked second; brother(s) or sister(s) ranked third; friend(s) or relative(s) were ranked fourth; the school counselor ranked fifth, and was also ranked as the least influential person, followed closely by the farm boys' teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Brother(s) or Sister(s)</th>
<th>School Counselor</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Friend(s) or Relative(s)</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Teacher(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>22 F 15.83</td>
<td>7 F 5.03</td>
<td>40 F 28.81</td>
<td>28 F 20.14</td>
<td>18 F 12.95</td>
<td>22 F 15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>10 F 7.19</td>
<td>9 F 6.47</td>
<td>38 F 27.33</td>
<td>23 F 16.55</td>
<td>39 F 28.07</td>
<td>17 F 12.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>19 F 13.67</td>
<td>15 F 10.79</td>
<td>32 F 23.02</td>
<td>23 F 16.55</td>
<td>35 F 25.18</td>
<td>16 F 11.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>18 F 12.95</td>
<td>30 F 21.58</td>
<td>15 F 10.79</td>
<td>21 F 15.11</td>
<td>28 F 20.14</td>
<td>24 F 17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>18 F 12.95</td>
<td>36 F 25.89</td>
<td>6 F 7.31</td>
<td>30 F 21.59</td>
<td>13 F 9.35</td>
<td>34 F 27.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>48 F 34.53</td>
<td>40 F 28.81</td>
<td>5 F 3.59</td>
<td>12 F 8.63</td>
<td>4 F 2.87</td>
<td>27 F 17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No resp.</td>
<td>4 F 2.88</td>
<td>2 F 1.43</td>
<td>3 F 2.15</td>
<td>2 F 1.43</td>
<td>2 F 1.43</td>
<td>2 F 1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 139 100.00  139 100.00  139 100.00  139 100.00  139 100.00  139 100.00

I = Most influential person

II = Second most influential person

III = Third most influential person

IV = Fourth most influential person

V = Fifth most influential person

VI = Sixth most influential person
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Brother(s) or Sister(s)</th>
<th>School Counselor</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Friend(s) or Relative(s)</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Teacher(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No resp.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = Most influential person
II = Second most influential person
III = Third most influential person
IV = Fourth most influential person
V = Fifth most influential person
VI = Sixth most influential person
Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in value orientations between farm boys who plan to farm and those who plan nonfarm occupations.

Sub-hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between farm boys who plan to farm and those who plan nonfarm occupations regarding a preference to work with people, things, or ideas.

The null hypothesis was rejected. There is a significant difference between the two groups of farm boys regarding a preference to work with people, things, or ideas.

Table V indicates that while 79 percent of farm boys planning to farm show a preference to work with "things," a smaller percentage (57 percent) of farm boys planning nonfarm occupations prefer to work with "things." Very few in either group expressed a preference to work with ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rather Work With</th>
<th>Occupational Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm Frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 6.615 \quad d.f. = 2 \quad P < .05 \]
Sub-hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between farm boys who plan to farm and those who plan nonfarm occupations regarding whom they would rather work for.

Statistical analysis did not support the null hypothesis. There was a significant difference between the two groups of farm boys concerning whom they would prefer to work for.

Table VI shows that 77 percent of farm boys planning to farm indicated a preference to work for themselves; whereas only 36 percent of those planning nonfarm occupations preferred to work for themselves. Farm boys who plan nonfarm occupations were more likely than those planning to farm, to express a preference to work for large or small companies or for the government.

**TABLE VI - PREFERENCE TO WORK FOR SELF, GOVERNMENT, LARGE OR SMALL COMPANY, ACCORDING TO FARM AND NONFARM PLANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rather Work for</th>
<th>Farm Frequencies</th>
<th>Occupational Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farm Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonfarm Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small company or business</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very large company or business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 33.782 \quad \text{d.f.} = 3 \quad P < 0.05 \]
Sub-hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between farm boys who plan to farm and those who plan nonfarm occupations regarding their preference to work indoors or outdoors.

The null hypothesis was not supported by the findings. There was a significant difference between the two groups regarding a preference to work indoors or outdoors.

A considerable percentage (93 percent) of farm boys going into farming prefer a job where they can be outdoors. (Table VII). Although a majority (61 percent) of farm boys who plan nonfarm occupations indicated a preference to work outdoors, there was also a large percentage (36 percent) that preferred to work indoors.

TABLE VII - PREFERENCE TO WORK INDOORS OR OUTDOORS, ACCORDING TO FARM AND NONFARM PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rather Work</th>
<th>Farm Frequencies</th>
<th>Occupational Plans Frequencies</th>
<th>Nonfarm Percentages</th>
<th>Farm Percentages</th>
<th>Nonfarm Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>36.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>61.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 48 139 100.00 100.00

\[ \chi^2 = 15.472 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \quad P < .05 \]
Sub-hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between farm boys who plan to farm and those who plan nonfarm occupations concerning their job location preference.

Analysis indicated a significant difference in the job location preference of the two groups, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table VIII presents the farm boys' choice as to where he would like to work. It had been expected that those planning to farm would choose to remain close to the home community, while those entering nonfarm occupations would be more likely to leave the state of South Dakota. The findings indicate that over 60 percent of those entering farming would remain close to the home community; 17 percent of those going into nonfarm occupations indicated that they would leave South Dakota. Of this group (nonfarm occupations) 19 percent stated they would remain in their home community and 17 percent said they would remain within fifty miles of their home town. (See Page 33 for Table VIII).
TABLE VIII - JOB LOCATION PREFERENCE, ACCORDING TO FARM AND NONFARM PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Location</th>
<th>Farm Frequencies</th>
<th>Occupational Plans</th>
<th>Nonfarm Frequencies</th>
<th>Nonfarm Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your home town</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>19.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 miles from your home town, but in</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>17.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 miles from your home town, but in</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the state of South Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>36.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 17.174 \quad \text{d.f.} = 3 \quad P < .05 \]

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences between farm boys planning to farm and farm boys planning nonfarm occupations with regard to their resource characteristics.

Sub-hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the two groups of farm boys with respect to their opinions of their parents' income.

The null hypothesis failed to be rejected. The farm boys do not differ on their opinions of their parents' income.

Table IX presents the farm boys' opinions of their parents' income. A majority of both those planning to farm and those planning nonfarm occupations indicated that they felt their parents' income was "about average," 72 percent and 69 percent.
respectively. While none of the farm boys planning to farm said that their parents' income was below average, 10 percent of those planning nonfarm occupations felt that their parents' income was below average.

**TABLE IX - FARM BOYS' OPINION OF PARENTS' INCOME ACCORDING TO FARM AND NONFARM PLANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents' Income</th>
<th>Farm Frequencies</th>
<th>Nonfarm Frequencies</th>
<th>Farm Percentages</th>
<th>Nonfarm Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One of the Highest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Than the Average</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Average</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>72.92</td>
<td>69.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the Lowest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.549 \quad d.f. = 4 \quad P > .05 \]

**Sub-hypothesis 2:** There is no significant difference between the two groups of farm boys regarding their opinions of expecting help in getting started in their planned occupation.

The null hypothesis was not supported by the findings. There is a significant difference between the farm boys' opinions of expecting help in getting started in their planned occupation.
Table X indicates the farm boys' expectations of receiving help in getting started in an occupation. Almost 90 percent of the farm boys going into farming stated that they expected help in getting started from their father or mother. Only 3.6 percent of those going into nonfarm occupations indicated that they expect help from their father or mother. Of those going into nonfarm occupations 45 percent stated that they did not expect help from anyone in getting started, while only 6 percent of farm boys planning to farm did not expect help from anyone.

**TABLE X - FARM BOYS' OPINIONS OF GETTING HELP IN STARTING OUT IN OCCUPATION, ACCORDING TO FARM AND NONFARM PLANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expect Help in Getting Started</th>
<th>Occupational Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm Frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Your Father or Mother Who is in This Type of Work</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Relatives Who Are in This Type of Work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Brothers or Sisters Who Are in This Type of Work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Friends Who Are in This Type of Work</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From No One</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Have Not Made My Choice Yet</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 143.727 \quad \text{d.f.} = 5 \quad P < .05\]
Sub-hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the two groups of farm boys with respect to their chances for getting ahead in their planned occupations.

In this case the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. Analysis indicated that farm boys planning to farm and those planning nonfarm occupations tended to have the same outlook regarding their chances of getting ahead in their planned occupations.

A higher percentage of both those farm boys going into farming and nonfarm occupations, 43 percent and 39 percent respectively, said their chances for getting ahead in their occupations were "average." (Table XI). Twenty percent of those entering farming, as opposed to 10 percent of those planning nonfarm occupations, indicated that their chances for getting ahead in their chosen occupation were "very much above average."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE XI - CHANCES FOR GETTING AHEAD IN PLANNED OCCUPATION ACCORDING TO FARM AND NONFARM PLANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chances for Getting Ahead in Occupation of Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 5.898 \quad \text{d.f.} = 4 \quad P > .05 \]
Sub-hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the two groups of farm boys with regard to the amount of knowledge they have about their planned occupation.

The null hypothesis was not supported by the findings. There was a significant difference between the two groups of farm boys with regard to the amount of knowledge they have concerning their planned occupation.

Table XII indicates that 87 percent of the farm boys planning to farm, as compared to 23 percent of those planning nonfarm occupations, stated that they had a good knowledge of their chosen occupation because they "have worked at it." The largest percentage (35 percent) of those planning nonfarm occupations said they have a "general knowledge, but don't know much about the details of it." Also, 14 percent of those planning nonfarm occupations, as opposed to zero percent of farm boys planning to farm, said they "don't know much about it yet, but will find out when they go on to school." (See Page 38 for Table XII).

Sub-hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference between the two groups of farm boys with respect to their ability for their planned occupation.

The null hypothesis was rejected. There is a significant difference between the two groups of farm boys regarding their ability for their planned occupation. The farm boys' opinions of their ability for their chosen occupation is presented in Table XIII. Almost 80 percent of the farm boys planning to farm said they felt their ability was above average. Fifty-eight percent of those planning nonfarm occupations thought their ability was above average.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Chosen Occupation</th>
<th>Farm Frequencies</th>
<th>Nonfarm Frequencies</th>
<th>Farm Percentages</th>
<th>Nonfarm Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have good knowledge because you have worked at it</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>23.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have good knowledge because you have relatives and friends who work at it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a general knowledge, but don't know much about the details of it</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>35.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know much about it yet, but will find out by experience on the job</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know much about it yet, but will find out when you go to school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven't made a choice yet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 64.367 \quad \text{d.f.} = 5 \quad P < .05 \]
TABLE XIII - ABILITY FOR CHOSEN OCCUPATION, ACCORDING TO FARM AND NONFARM PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability for Chosen Occupation</th>
<th>Farm Frequencies</th>
<th>Nonfarm Frequencies</th>
<th>Farm Percentages</th>
<th>Nonfarm Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much above average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat above average</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>51.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>27.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat below average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much below average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven't made a choice yet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 12.576 \quad \text{d.f.} = 5 \quad P < .05 \]
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study of occupational plans of rural farm high school youth is becoming increasingly important as indicated by the amount of research being devoted to this particular area of study. As farms increase in size and become fewer in number, many rural farm boys are forced to look elsewhere for a job. Unless they can enter joint farming with their fathers or with some other relative, there is not much opportunity for a farm boy to get into farming. It has been stated that, for the most part, only farmers' sons become farmers, but not all farmers' sons choose to do so.

The purpose of the study was to differentiate characteristics of farm boys who plan nonfarm occupations, as compared to farm boys who plan to farm, with regard to reference groups, value orientations and resources. The study also examined some of the possible influences on South Dakota farm boys which caused them to leave the farm and enter a nonfarm occupation. Three main hypotheses guided the research. These hypotheses were:

1. Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations have different reference groups than farm boys planning to farm.

2. Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations have different value orientations than farm boys planning to farm.

3. Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations have different resource characteristics than farm boys planning to farm.
Data were obtained from group interviews completed by the senior classes of twenty-six rural South Dakota high schools. The sample for the present study included only those males who resided on a farm. A total of 187 senior boys gave their residence as being on a farm. Of this number 48 planned to farm and 139 planned a nonfarm occupation.

A review of the literature pertinent to the study revealed relatively little research dealing directly with occupational plans of farm boys.

The theoretical framework focused on a discussion of reference group theory, interrelated with discussion on primary and secondary groups, so as to develop a theoretical basis for the study.

The statistical test used in the analysis of data was the Chi-square test.

Conclusions

The findings revealed the following with regard to farm boys planning to farm. Farm boys planning to farm:

1. Feel their father's occupation is completely satisfactory.

2. Feel their fathers have remained neutral in their encouragement to follow his occupation.

3. Will rank their fathers, mothers, brother(s) or sister(s), friend(s) or relative(s), school counselor, and school counselor again followed closely by teacher(s) in order of importance as persons influencing occupational plans.
4. Prefer to work with "things."
5. Prefer to work for themselves.
6. Prefer to work outdoors.
7. Prefer to remain in their home town.
8. Think of their parents' income as "average."
9. Will get help in starting out in their occupation from their father or mother.
10. Think their chances for getting ahead in their occupation are average to somewhat above average.
11. Have a good knowledge of their occupation because they have worked at it.
12. Feel their ability for their occupation is somewhat above average.

Farm boys planning nonfarm occupations:
1. Feel their father's occupation is fairly satisfactory.
2. Feel their father has remained neutral in his encouragement to follow his occupation.
3. Will rank their father, mother, mother again, school counselor, teachers, and brother(s) or sister(s) in order of importance as persons influencing occupational plans.
4. Prefer to work with things.
5. Are fairly well evenly divided as to their preference to work for themselves, a small or large company, and the government.
6. Prefer to work outdoors.
7. Are evenly divided as to their preference to work in their home town, 50 miles from their home town, and out of state.
8. Think their parents' income is above average.
9. Do not expect help from anyone in starting out in their occupation.
10. Think their chances for getting ahead in their occupation are somewhat above average to average.

11. Have a general knowledge of their occupation.

12. Feel their ability for their occupation is from somewhat above average to average.

Referring to Conclusion 4, of those planning nonfarm occupations, 57 percent preferred to work with "things" while 35 percent indicated a preference to work with people. The percentages of farm boys planning nonfarm occupations preferring to work outdoors was 61 percent while 36 percent preferred to work indoors (Conclusion 6).

Recommendations

Several avenues of further research in this area of study are suggested by this writer. (1) Since this study was based on the occupational expectations of the farm boys, it would be relevant to see if they actually carried out their indicated plans. (2) An examination of the opinions of those farm boys going into nonfarm occupations toward farming would be an important area of study. (3) A study might be undertaken to investigate how or what kind of influence reference groups exert on an individual's occupational choice. (4) Attitudes of farm boys planning to farm toward higher education would be a pertinent field of study since farming is becoming increasingly technicalized, and some college training is becoming necessary for farming.
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APPENDIX A

Definition of Terms

Rural high school: A four-year high school located in a community having a population less than 2500.

Farm: A tract of land devoted to agricultural purposes.

Farm boy: A male South Dakota high school senior who resides on a farm.

Farm plans: Refers to a career in farming.

Nonfarm plans: Refers to a career in a non-agricultural field.

Value orientations: The empirically measured tendency to react favorably or unfavorably to certain generalized conceptions.

Resource characteristics: Refers to the means available to enter an occupation when choosing between one occupation and another.

Reference groups: Those groups to which the individual relates himself as a part or to which he aspires to relate himself psychologically.

Primary group: A small group in which people come to know one another intimately as individual personalities.

Secondary group: A group in which contacts are impersonal, segmental, and utilitarian.
APPENDIX B

Questions From Interview Schedule Pertinent to Study

16. Compared to the income of the parents of other students in the high school, the income of my parents is:

1 one of the highest incomes
2 higher than the average income
3 about average
4 less than average
5 one of the lowest

22. Do you consider your father's occupation to be:

1 completely satisfactory
2 fairly satisfactory
3 good enough
4 not very good
5 very poor

53. Will this job be located:

1 in your home town
2 50 miles from your home town, but in the state
3 100 miles from your home town, but in the state
4 out of the State of South Dakota

59. What occupation do you think you will finally enter?

61. As to your knowledge of the work you intend to enter (refer to question 59), do you:

1 have good knowledge because you have worked at it
2 have good knowledge because you have relatives or friends who work at it
3 have a general knowledge, but don't know much about the details of it
4 don't know much about it yet, but will find out by experience
5 don't know much about it yet, but will find out when you go on to school
6 haven't made a choice yet
62. For the occupation you have chosen in question 59, do you think your ability is:

1. very much above average
2. somewhat above average
3. just average
4. somewhat below average
5. very much below average
6. haven't made a choice yet

63. In the occupation you have chosen in question 59, can you expect help in getting started:

1. from your father or mother who is in this type of work
2. from relatives who are in this type of work
3. from brothers or sisters who are in this type of work
4. from friends who are in this type of work
5. from no one
6. I have not made my choice yet

64. Compared to your friends, do you think your chances for getting ahead in an occupation of your choice are:

1. very much above average
2. somewhat above average
3. average
4. somewhat below average
5. very much below average

65. As to following his occupation (for boys only), my father has:

1. tried to encourage me
2. neither tried to encourage nor discourage me
3. tried to discourage me

66. Would you rather work with:

1. things
2. people
3. ideas

67. Would you rather work:

1. inside  2. outside
68. Would you rather work for:

1 a small company or business  
2 a very large company or business  
3 yourself  
4 the government

82. Listed below are a number of people who may have had some effect on the OCCUPATIONAL PLANS you have chosen for yourself. Rank them in order of their influence on your plans. For the one you think has influenced you the most check number one; for the next most important one check 2, and so on until you have a number checked for each one. Read over the entire list before answering the question.

1 2 3 4 5 6

兄(s) or sister(s)

School Counselor

Father

Friend(s) or relative(s)

Mother

Teacher(s)