DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 801 RC 012 053

AUTHOR Lyson, Thomas A.
TITLE An Intra-Industry Application of Occupational Situs.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.: South Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, Clemson.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 26p.: Publication contributes to USDA Cooperative State Research Service, Southern Regional Project S-114, "Defining and Achieving Life Goals: A Process of Human Resource Development." An earlier version presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (Burlington, VT, August, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agribusiness: Agricultural Colleges: *Agricultural Education: *Agricultural Occupations: Agricultural Production: Aspiration: *Career Choice: Education Work Relationship: Expectation: Higher Education: Industrial Structure: Land Grant Universities: Males: Place of Residence: Quality of Life: Rural Farm Residents: *Social Indicators: *Social Stratification: Socioeconomic Status: Student Characteristics: White Students
IDENTIFIERS *Occupational Situs: United States (South)

ABSTRACT

Although status attainment research has largely ignored the existence and importance of any situs (i.e., non-hierarchical) dimension, recognizing situs may help clarify the nature of occupational differentiation, recruitment, and mobility within a specific industrial sector. The agriculture sector of the U.S. economy, for example, can be classified as production, education/research, and agribusiness. Discriminant analysis of questionnaires showed residence preference to be a (situs) dimension countermanding societal and monetary status when a career as producer was chosen by ag-career undergraduates in 15 Southern land-grant colleges (1067 white males of a 15% 1977 sample). In contrast, the education/research oriented men opted for more education and had more prior ag education experiences than the agribusiness oriented. The status range from mid-rank farm manager to laborer in production agriculture compared in the same region (Cosby & Frank 1978) with the higher ranges of educators and agribusinessmen (professor, ag agent, top-rank veterinarian, landscape architect). Situs opportunity parameters based on family residence background entered into career choices, validating Benoit-Smullyman's concept (1944) of situs as a viable dimension in stratification studies. (SC)

AN INTRA-INDUSTRY APPLICATION OF OCCUPATIONAL SITUS*

Thomas A. Lyson

Department of Agricultural Economics
and Rural Sociology
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29631

1980

*Support for this research was provided by the South Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station in conjunction with USDA/CSRS Southern Regional Research Project S-114. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Burlington, VT, 1979. I would like to thank Pat Horan for his comments and suggestions on an earlier draft of this paper.

AN INTRA-INDUSTRY APPLICATION OF OCCUPATIONAL SITUS

Situs, a neologism coined by Benoit-Smullyman in 1944 to represent a socially meaningful distinction between two or more groups which cannot be reduced to status differences, is a potentially useful concept in understanding the nature and origin of occupational differentiation within specific industrial/labor market sectors of the economy. Until quite recently, however, occupational situs has been rarely used in stratification and mobility studies. In this paper, we first present a brief overview of the recent re-emergence of situs-related social stratification research. Second, using the agricultural industry as an illustrative example, we show how the situs concept can be used to help clarify the nature of occupational differentiation, recruitment, and mobility within specific industrial sectors of the economy.

OCCUPATIONAL SITUS

Researchers concerned with the American occupational structure, in general, and the patterning of career ambition in particular, have relied very heavily on the concept of occupational status or prestige as an indicant of occupational differentiation and attainment. Growing out of the theoretical underpinnings of Parsons (1940) and Davis and Morre (1945) and empirically articulated in the works of Blau and Duncan (1967) and a host of status attainment researchers (see for example, Haller and Portes, 1973; Hauser and Featherman, 1977; Treiman and Terrell, 1975; among many others) this line of research has largely ignored the existence and importance of any situs (i.e., non-hierarchical) dimension in social stratification.

In their efforts to understand the nature of occupational differentiation and recruitment, status attainment researchers implicitly assume a homogeneous, uniform opportunity structure in which individual characteristics are identified and rewarded according to their social value (Horan, 1978). In such a scheme, situs categories, to the extent that they are recognized at all, are conceived as "categories of work which are differentiated in some way but are not invidiously compared" (Morris and Murphy, 1959). In other words, the underlying process of occupational recruitment and status attainment is assumed to operate uniformly across all sectors of the economy. A non-hierarchical differentiation of the labor market, while perhaps intrinsically interesting and useful at a descriptive level, is seen as unimportant and of no consequence in the structuring of occupational ambition.

Empirical evidence is accumulating, however, to show that situs placement in the labor market is significantly related to a wide range of social and economic outcomes. Using a sectoral model of occupational and economic differentiation (one variant of situs analysis), Beck, Horan, and Tolbert (1978), Bibb and Form (1975), Gordon (1972), and others have reported significant associations between industrial affiliation and social and economic reward structures. Further, available evidence also suggests that systematic, non-random factors operate to place an individual in a given situs or industry (Hauser and Featherman, 1977; Doeringer and Piore, 1971).

Although situs has occasionally been explicitly operationalized to conform to the industrial classification system employed by the U.S. Census (Reiss, 1961; Hauser and Featherman, 1977), the concept can also

be logically extended and meaningfully applied to the analysis, description, and examination of career lines, occupational families, and opportunity and reward structures within specific industrial sectors of society. That is, situs, as it relates to a type of non-hierarchical differentiation of occupational status positions, can be operationalized as two or more internally consistent, mutually exclusive, though not necessarily equally evaluated[1] occupational families within a given industry[2] (Villemez and Silver, 1977). Looked at another way, occupational situs can be viewed as two or more distinct, but parallel intra-industry status ladders (Hatt, 1950) each characterized by a particular set of opportunity and reward structures.

AGRICULTURAL SITUSES

The analytical value of situs in intra-industry labor market studies rests on the ability to select a criterion variable for occupational situs classification that will result in the formation of socially relevant intra-industry group membership. Unfortunately, the literature provides little help in selecting an appropriate criterion (Villemez and Silver, 1977). All previous situs based research has relied on the use of "study-specific" situses. Horan (1974), for example, equated situs with caste in his study of the Indian occupational structure. Hatt (1950) used "... the criterion of similar relationships between occupation and the consuming public" as a relevant situs criterion. Others (Reiss, 1961; Hauser and Featherman, 1977), as noted above, merely took industry or industrial sector as a proxy for situs.

In this research, occupational position within an industry's technical division of labor (i.e., what tasks a worker performs in relation to other workers in the same industry) is used as a relevant mode of categorization.[3]

Using this criterion the internal occupational structure of the agricultural industry can be partitioned into three situses: production agriculture; agribusiness; and agricultural education/research. These agricultural situs categories conform to Benoit-Smullyman's (1944) original conceptualization. They are both socially meaningful and have behaviorally relevant consequences in terms of, among other things, the organization and distribution of socio-economic opportunities and rewards, routines of work, job satisfaction, and the like.

Furthermore, such a categorization of agricultural work roles is not without precedent. The assignment of agricultural occupations into three situs categories grows out of a classificatory scheme proposed by Byrum (1966) and amended and extended by Hoover (1977). Byrum classified agricultural occupations into three types: agricultural production; agricultural business, industry, and services; and professions. Hoover took two of Byrum's occupational types and made somewhat finer distinctions. For example, he delineated three separate production agriculture families: self-employed in production agriculture; paid employee in production agriculture; and farm custom work. For agricultural business, industry and services (i.e., agribusiness) he noted seven different occupational groups: agricultural production services; agricultural supplies; agricultural mechanics; agricultural products; ornamental horticulture; agricultural resources; and forestry. However, both Byrum and Hoover delineated only one group of agricultural professions.

For purposes of this paper and keeping to the conceptualization of situs as a set of task related work roles within an industry's technical division of labor, Byrum's three category scheme has been slightly modified (see Figure 1). The "professional" category has been eliminated

and in its place an "education-research" situs introduced. By doing this not only is a more homogeneous (vis-a-vis work roles) group of agricultural occupations specified, but a range of occupational statuses more comparable to those found in the production agriculture and agribusiness situses is also created. Brief definitions of each agricultural situs to be used in this paper, and a few examples of the types of occupations found in each, are noted below.

Production Agriculture: Generally occupations concerned with "on farm" production of food and fiber, the growing of plants, and the raising of animals (Hoover, 1977). More specifically all occupations primarily concerned with propagating, growing, caring for, and gathering plant and animal products. Also included are logging timber tracts, catching, hunting and trapping animals (USDOL, 1977). Some occupations in the production agriculture situs include migrant farmworker, sharecropper, tenant farmer, general farmer, farm manager, and farm foreman.

Agribusiness (i.e., Agricultural Business, Industry, and Service): Generally occupations concerned with providing support services (other than education and research) to production agriculture workers. More specifically, all agricultural occupations for which some knowledge and skills in one or more of the following areas are needed: plant and soil science, animal science, agricultural mechanics, and agricultural business (Hoover, 1977). Some occupations in the agricultural business, industry and service situs include veterinarian, commodities broker, livestock inspector, egg grader, and meat wrapper.

Agricultural Education and Research: Generally, occupations concerned with formal instruction or training or with the acquisition of knowledge as an end in itself (Morris and Murphy, 1959). More specifically, all

occupations concerned with informing and advising farmers and farm workers in the techniques of agricultural production and all occupations concerned with the discovery, development and application of agriculturally related concepts and ideas (USDOL, 1977). Some occupations in the educational and research situs include soil scientist, agricultural economist, agricultural engineer, plant pathologist, vocational-agricultural teacher, county agricultural agent, assistant county agricultural agent, lab technician.

SITUS PLACEMENT

To illustrate the importance of situs in intra-industry labor market studies, some social factors and background conditions that previous research has shown to be associated with occupational recruitment are examined. In particular, the conditional effects of parental education, family income, local residence place, parental childhood residence, high school grades, and prior educational and work experiences in agriculture are probed. It should be noted, however, that these variables have been used almost exclusively in studies of the status or prestige dimension of occupational choice. Their effect on non-status (e.g., situs) dimensions of occupational recruitment remain generally unexplored. Nevertheless, given the structural similarity between status and situs, variables used to study the nature of occupational status recruitment might also be useful in examining occupational situs recruitment.

In addition to explicating a set of factors related to situs expectation, situs is also treated as one facet of a broader interrelated set of career outcomes that include expected income, residential preference, occupational status expectation, and educational ambition. The goal

here is to articulate a set of perceived opportunity and reward structures associated with a given intra-industry situs.

ANALYTIC STRATEGY

Unfortunately, the lack of an empirically grounded conceptual framework precludes the testing of any formalized intra-industry "situs placement" model. However, a preliminary set of factors and conditions associated with situs expectation can be identified. To do this a stepwise form of discriminant analysis based on the minimization of Wilk's lambda and the maximization of F-ratios among groups is utilized (Klecka, 1975). The goal of this application of discriminant analysis to situs groups is to delineate a set of variables related to the sorting of individuals into specific intra-industry situs tracts.

Two discriminant analyses will be reported. The first will identify and weight a set of social origin variables related to situs expectation and the second will identify the extent to which situs choice is associated with a series of anticipated career related outcomes. To the extent that the discriminant analyses can successfully identify sets of variables related to agricultural situs choice, a first step has been taken toward explaining the origin and nature of social differentiation in the agricultural labor market.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Study Population

Data for this study are from U.S. Department of Agriculture Regional Research Project S-114 (Defining and Achieving Life Goals: A Process of Human Resource Development). One part of his project deals with the determination of background characteristics and career-planning

strategies of students attending Southern colleges of agriculture. Data for this paper were collected via mail questionnaire in the spring of 1977 from a 15 percent sample of undergraduate students enrolled in agricultural programs at 15 predominantly white Southern land grant universities. The overall response rate was 77.0 percent (N=2535). To keep analytical problems to a minimum and to increase the generalizability of the results, only with the white-male portion of the population who expect to enter agriculturally related jobs after graduation (N=1067) is used in the analysis.

Study Variables

Dependent Variable

Agricultural situs expectation, the main problematic variable, is trichotomized into a decision to pursue a career in either: 1) production agriculture; 2) agribusiness (i.e., occupations in agricultural service, business or industry); or 3) agricultural education and research. Situs expectations were determined from responses to the following question: "Sometimes we are not always able to do what we want most. What kind of job do you really expect to have most of your life?" To achieve the greatest potential situs specification, these responses were initially assigned a specific occupational code number (without regard to status) and allocated to one of the seven occupational groupings delineated by Hoover (1977). For the present inquiry, Hoover's seven-fold classification is modified and reduced into the trichotomy noted above. Situs assignment of ambiguous occupations, especially those originally coded under Hoover's professional category, is based on the description of occupational duties listed in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (USDOL: 1977). Those respondents choosing non-agricultural related occupations are

eliminated from consideration.

Background Variables

Mother's and father's educational attainment (MOTHED and FATHED) are coded into seven categories from 1) less than 9th grade to 7) graduate work beyond bachelors degree. Mother's and father's childhood residence (MOTHRES and FATHRES) and respondent's current family residence (FAMRES) are trichotomized into 1) farm; 2) rural non-farm; and 3) city or town. Family income (FAMINC) is a seven category variable ranging from 1) less than 5,000 a year to 7) over $50,000 a year. To index prior agricultural related educational experiences (PRIORED) the respondents were asked whether they had: 1) taken an agriculture course in high school; 2) participated in 4-H; and 3) participated in FFA. Responses were coded "1" for participation and "0" for no participation. A summated scale is assigned each individual. Finally, prior agricultural work experiences (PRIORAG) is coded into four categories: 1) work on a farm and also work in another (non-farm) agricultural job; 2) farm work only; 3) non-farm agricultural work only; 4) no prior agricultural work experiences.

Goal Orientations

Occupational status expectation (OCCSTAT) is a score ranging from 0 to 99 assigned to a respondent's specific agriculturally-related occupational expectation. Scores were obtained from a coding scheme developed by Nam et. al. (1975). Expected income (INCEXP) is the respondent's anticipated earnings in the first full-time job after graduation. Response categories range from 1) less than $5,000 to 8) over $20,000. Educational expectation EDEXP) and educational aspiration (EDASP) are six category codes ranging from 1) quit school before bachelors

degree to 6) complete a program for a doctoral degree. Finally, residential preference (RESPREF) is a six category code ranging from 1) in the country and on a farm or ranch outside a city or village to 6) a large metropolitan city (over 500,000 in population).

RESULTS

Social Origins

A comparison of mean scores (Table 1A) shows that when taken individually only six of nine social origin variables are significantly related to situs expectation. When the entire nine-item set is entered into a discriminant analysis (Table 1B), however, seven factors combine to form two statistically significant discriminant functions. FAMRES emerges as the best discriminating variable in the first, and most important, discriminant function.

An examination of situs centroids (Table 1C) shows that this function distinguishes the production agriculture situs from the agribusiness and agricultural education/research situses. Given the relatively high loading of FAMRES in the first function, a logical interpretation suggests that among men aiming for agricultural careers, family residence background defines a set of opportunity parameters and consequently serves to sort talent into specific agricultural situs tracks.

Table 1A,1B,1C about here

The second, statistically less important discriminant function (eigenvalue = .032), loads heavily on PRIORED and FATHED. An inter-situs comparison of centroid scores (Table 1C) indicates that this function primarily distinguishes the agribusiness situs from the agricultural

education/research situs. Translating the standardized discriminant coefficients and situs centroid scores into operationally meaningful terms, we observe that young men aiming for careers in agricultural education/research mostly differ from their counterparts with agribusiness ambitions in terms of their prior agricultural education experiences and their father's educational level.

Overall, the relatively low canonical correlations and the large Wilk's lambdas for each discriminant function suggest that, taken together, the variables selected as social origin indicants, while accounting for some variance in situs expectations, do not form especially powerful discriminating factors. Whether a different set of background variables would better differentiate among the situses remains an open question. However, we might assume that the failure of the study variables to account for greater inter-situs differences is more related to the homogeneity of the study population (i.e., college students) than the nature of the variables themselves.

Goal Orientations

A stronger set of interrelationships obtains between situs expectation and a broad set of interrelated career goals. Table 2A shows significant inter-situs differences for each goal item. Especially noteworthy is the relatively low expected occupational status scores ($\bar{X}$=33.83) associated with the production agriculture situs. This, of course, reflects the lower status ladder (Figure 1) associated with production agriculture careers.[4] Given the smaller, though significant, differences among the other goal orientations, the use of occupational status expectation as an indicant of differentiation in the agricultural labor market can certainly be questioned.

Not surprisingly, OCCSTAT emerges as the most important discriminating variable in Table 2B. The first function standardized discriminant coefficient (D=-1.014) for OCCSTAT and the situs centroid scores on the first function (Table 2C) highlight the occupational status inconsistencies between production agriculture careers and careers in agribusiness and agricultural education/research.

Tables 2A,2B,2C about here

A conceptually more meaningful set of interrelationships among goal items can be obtained by dropping OCCSTAT from the discriminant analysis. Although the resulting four item outcome (Table 3) naturally loses some of its' power to distinguish among situs categories, the Wilk's lambda (.837) and canonical correlation (.385) for the first function suggest significant inter-situs variation in expected income, residence place, and education. The first, and statistically most important, function loads most heavily on RESPREF. However, the remaining items (EDEXP, ESASP, and INCEXP) also make meaningful contributions to the inter-situs discriminating ability of this function.

Table 3 about here

An examination of situs centroids (Table 3C) shows that the first discriminant function distinguishes production agriculture from the other two situses. In other words, college men aiming for production agriculture jobs perceive a measureably different set of career-related outcomes than their peers aiming for non-production-related agriculture jobs.

The second discriminant function, though statistically less significant (eigenvalue = .018), is of substantive importance in distinguishing

the agribusiness situs from the education/research situs. An examination of the standard discriminant coefficients shows that men in these two situses differ primarily in terms of their aspirations for further education.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper was designed to illustrate one potential application of situs in social stratification research. Working out of the conceptual framework of Benoit-Smullyman (1944) and Villemez and Silver (1977) and extending the empirical applications of Beck, Horan, and Tolbert (1978), Hauser and Featherman (1977), and others, we attempted to show how situs could be meaningfully applied to labor market behavior within specific industrial sectors of society. The brief empirical illustration, for example, though constrained by a somewhat atypical study population, highlighted some interesting situs specific differences in the backgrounds and expectations of young men aiming for agricultural careers.

We believe that this paper has opened the door for more detailed and elaborate studies of intra-industry labor markets. A number of future research needs comes immediately to mind. First, we must begin formulating a set of theoretically meaningful, conceptually equivalent, and analytically comparable situses across industrial sectors. Toward this end, a behaviorally relevant criterion variable (or set of variables) that can be used to derive universally comparable situses must be found (see Villemez and Silver, 1977; 332-333, for a discussion of this issue).

In this paper occupational position within an industry's technical division of labor (e.g., what an individual does) was selected as a method of classification. However, since every industry naturally has its own particular internal division of labor it may be difficult (if not impossible) to derive a uniform set of intra-industry situses. Nevertheless,

using common occupational tasks within a given industry as a relevant criterion variable would result in the emergence of a broad set of behaviorally relevant, conceptually equivalent, and analytically comparable intra-industry situses.

Second, an effort must be made to better articulate the processes by which and through which talent is sorted into specific intra-industry situses. In the empirical example presented here, only a limited number of exploratory variables were touched on and only a very narrow range of respondents (i.e., college students) were dealt with. Future inquiries should be broadened to not only include other industries, but also a wider set of independent variables and more diverse study populations.

Finally, data pertaining to both inter-industry as well as intra-industry career ladders needs to be gathered. The inquiry here focusses only on the initial rungs of agricultural career ladders. We must, however, go beyond merely identifying factors related to occupational recruitment and specify the nature of movement within and between industrial sectors.

In sum, we believe that situs is a potentially very important analytical variable in stratification and mobility studies. Any effort to develop and apply this concept will certainly pay dividends in terms of a better understanding of the nature and process of social differentiation in the labor market.

Footnotes

1. The "equal evaluation" criteria was first introduced by Morris and Murphy (1959) and cannot be traced back to the original conceptualization of Benoit-Smullyman (1944). The assumption that situses must be equally evaluated has lead to the erroneous, though commonly held, belief that the term refers to a horizontal differentiation of social structures. To date, the best and most explicit clarification of Benoit-Smullyman's situs concept is Villemez and Silver's (1977) article: "Occupational Situs as Horizontal Social Position: A Reconsideration."

2. Industry is defined here in broad terms as "any branch of economic acitvity concerned with one type of product and having a certain degree of organization," (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969).

3. There are, of course, other dimensions along which we might meaningfully partition the internal occupational structure of a particular industry. Villemez and Silver (1977:332) suggest a number of other possibly relevant criteria including "work relationships (independent/directed, solitary/team, supervisory/supervised), work contexts (industry, regionalization, sexual mix, unionization), work levels (creative/rote, level of training), work output (products/services/ideas/intangibles), and what is worked with (people/things/data)." Our classification is akin to the "work output" criteria noted by Villemez and Silver.

4. The low mean status score for occupations in the production agriculture situs reflects the lack of attention stratification researchers have paid to agricultural occupations. In almost all prestige ranking schemes the occupation "farmer" is treated as a monolithic, homogeneous category. There is no appreciation of differences between, for example, the subsistance Appalachian dirt farmer and the millionaire Texas rancher. To our knowledge, only Cosby and Frank (1978) have attempted to address the issue of occupational prestige differences in the agricultural labor market.

Bibliography

Beck, E. M., Horan, P. M. and Tobert II, C. M. "Stratification in a dual economy: a sectoral model of earning determination." American Sociological Review, 43, 1978, 704-720.

Benoit-Smullyan, E. "Status, status types, and status inter-relations." American Sociological Review, 9, 1944, 151-161.

Bibb, R., and Form, W. "The effects of industrial, occupational and sex stratification on wages in blue collar markets." Social Forces, 55, 1977, 974-996.

Blau, P. M., and Duncan, O. D. The American Occupational Structure. New York: Wiley, 1967

Byrum, H. M. Guidance in Agricultural Education. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1966.

Cosby, A. G., and Frank, L. M. "A prestige scale for agricultural occupations." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Rural Sociology Section of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists, Houston, Texas (February 5-8), 1978.

Davis, K., and Moore, W. E. "Some principles of stratification." American Sociological Review, 10, 1945, 242-249.

Doeringer, P. B., and Piore, M. J. Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis. Lexington, Mass.: Heath Lexington Books, 1971.

Gordon, D. M. Theories of Poverty and Unemployment. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1972.

Haller, A. O., and Portes, A. "Status attainment processes." Sociology of Education, 46, 1973, 51-91.

Hatt, P. K. "Occupations and Social Stratification." American Journal of Sociology, 55, 1950, 533-543.

Hauser, R. M. and Featherman, D. L. The Process of Stratification. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Hoover, N. K. Handbook of Agricultural Occupations (3rd ed.). Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1977.

Horan, P. M. "The structure of occupational mobility: conceptualization and analysis." Social Forces, 53, 1974, 33-45.

Klecka, W. R. "Discriminant analysis." Pp.43-467 in N. H. Nie, et.al. (eds), Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd edition, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Morris, R. T., and Murphy, R. J. "The situs dimension of occupational structure." American Sociological Review, 24, 1959, 231-239.

Nam, C. B., LaRocque, J., Powers, M. G. and Holmberg, J. "Occupational status scores: stability and change." Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, 1975.

Parsons, T. "An analytic approach to the theory of social stratification." American Journal of Sociology, 45, 841-862.

Reiss, A. J. Occupational and Social Status. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

Theodorson, G. A. and Theodorson, A. G. Modern Dictionary of Sociology. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969.

Treiman, D. J., and Terrell, K. "Sex and the process of status attainment: a comparison of working women and men." American Sociological Review, 40, 1975, 174-200.

United States Department of Labor
Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Employment and Training Administration, 4th edition, 1977.

Villemez, W. J. and Silver, B. B. "Occupational situs as horizontal social position: a reconsideration." Sociology and Social Research, 61, 1977, 320-336.

Figure 1. Relative Prestige Rankings* of Selected Agricultural Occupations Within Agricultural Situses.

Occupational Prestige	Situs: Production Agriculture	Situs: Agribusiness	Situs: Agricultural Education/Research
		Veterinarian (92.7)	
High			Professor in Agriculture (82.1)
		Landscape Architect (79.8)	
			Extension Specialist
	Farm Manager (77.2)		
			County Agricult. Agent (74.4)
	Farmer	Feed Store Owner (69.0)	
			High School Vo-Ag Teacher (68.4)
		Dietician (65.6)	
		Farm Implement Salesman (63.8)	Laboratory Assistant/ Technician
Low	Tenent Farmer (47.2)		
	Sharecropper (43.1)		
		Packinghouse Worker	
	Migrant Worker (34.0)		

*Prestige Scores in parentheses were obtained from Cosby and Frank's (1978) study of agricultural students enrolled in fourteen universities in the Southern United States.

Table 1A. Means and Standard Deviations of Social Origin Variables: Inter-situs Comparisons.

Social Origin Variables	SITUS: Production Agriculture (N=245) Mean	(SD)	Agribusiness (N=282) Mean	(SD)	Agricultural Education/ Research (N=198) Mean	(SD)	Univariare F	P
FATHED	4.40	(1.68)	4.36	(1.94)	4.78	(1.82)	3.33	<.05
MOTHED	4.19	(1.54)	4.15	(1.61)	4.22	(1.55)	0.12	n.s.
FATHRES	1.81	(0.93)	2.15	(0.94)	2.07	(0.93)	9.30	<.01
MOTHRES	2.08	(0.93)	2.24	(0.91)	2.26	(0.90)	2.62	<.10
FAMRES	2.05	(0.96)	2.48	(0.83)	2.45	(0.83)	18.06	<.01
INCOME	4.71	(1.62)	4.53	(1.44)	4.52	(1.46)	1.17	n.s.
HSGRADE	2.95	(0.69)	3.02	(0.69)	3.08	(0.68)	2.09	n.s.
PRIORED	2.10	(1.23)	1.67	(1.03)	2.00	(1.18)	10.12	<.01
PRIORAG	2.87	(1.02)	2.54	(1.08)	2.61	(1.01)	7.02	<.01

Table 1B. Stepwise Discriminant Analysis of Social Origin Variables.

Variables	Step	Wilk's Lambda	Multivariate F	Significance of Change	Standardized Discriminant Coefficients: First function	Standardized Discriminant Coefficients: Second function
FAMRES	1	.952	18.06	.000	-.748	.471
PRIORED	2	.937	11.97	.000	.011	-.897
HSGRADE	3	.925	9.57	.000	-.422	-.111
FATHED	4	.913	8.33	.000	-.019	-.758
INCOME	5	.902	7.56	.000	.408	.224
PRIORAG	6	.897	6.67	.000	.265	-.015
FATHRES	7	.894	5.88	.000	-.202	.244
				Eigenvalue	.083	.032
				Canonical Correlation	.277	.177
				Wilk's Lambda	.894	.968
				Chi square	80.45	22.96
				df	14	6
				p	<.01	<.01

Table 1C. Canonical Discriminant Functions for Social Origin Variables Evaluated at Situs Centroids.

Situs	Function 1	Function 2
Production Agriculture	.403	.003
Agribusiness	-.209	.184
Agricultural Education/Research	-.201	-.265

Table 2A. Means and Standard Deviations of Anticipated Goal Items: Inter-situs Comparisons.

	SITUS							
	Production Agriculture (N=344)		Agribusiness (N=389)		Agricultural Education/ Research (N=265)		Univariate F	P
Goal Items	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)		
EDASP	3.64	(1.15)	4.25	(1.07)	4.35	(1.15)	39.08	<.01
ESEXP	3.16	(0.73)	3.70	(1.01)	3.65	(.909)	37.46	<.01
OCCSTAT	33.83	(21.46)	81.37	(16.51)	79.61	(11.67)	821.5	<.01
INCEXP	3.80	(1.41)	4.43	(1.49)	4.12	(1.14)	18.92	<.01
RESPREF	1.80	(1.26)	2.74	(1.55)	2.32	(1.30)	42.51	<.01

Table 2B. Stepwise Discriminant Analysis of Five Goal Items.

					Standardized Discriminant Coefficients	
Variables	Step	Wilk's Lambda	Multivariate F	Significance of Change	First function	Second function
OCCSTAT	1	.377	821.47	.000	-1.014	-.167
RESPREF	2	.372	317.87	.000	.019	.750
INCEXP	3	.370	213.24	.000	-.033	.487
EDEXP	4	.368	160.92	.000	.137	.305
EDASP	5	.365	129.65	.000	-.057	-.567
				Eigenvalue	1.67	.024
				Canonical Correlation	.791	.154
				Wilk's Lambda	.365	.976
				Chi square	999.50	23.92
				df	10	4
				p	<.01	<.01

Table 2C. Canonical Discriminant Functions for Five Goal Items Evaluated at Situs Centroids.

Situs	Function 1	Function 2
Production Agriculture	1.779	.007
Agribusiness	-.977	.155
Agricultural Education/Research	-.874	-.237

Table 3A. Stepwise Discriminant Analysis of Four Goal Items.

Variables	Step	Wilk's Lambda	Multivariate F	Significance of Change	First Function	Second Function
RESPREF	1	.921	42.51	.000	-.644	.459
EDEXP	2	.862	38.13	.000	-.375	.080
EDASP	3	.845	29.00	.000	-.332	-.897
INCEXP	4	.837	23.08	.000	-.232	.430
				Eigenvalue	.174	.018
				Canonical Correlation	.385	.132
				Wilk's Lambda	.837	.982
				Chi square	176.82	17.53
				df	8	3
				p	<.01	<.01

Table 3B. Canonical Discriminant Functions for Four Goal Items Evaluated at Situs Centroids.

Situs	Function 1	Function 2
Production Agriculture	.559	.042
Agribusiness	-.390	.110
Agricultural Education/Research	-.153	-.216