

The occupations according to 10 major groups are shown in table 22. While this gives a clear picture of the major occupational categories, the individual cells are too small to permit of further statistical analysis. For that reason the following groupings have been made:

	</				

Despite the great difference shown in these figures between the occupational structure of Arvin and Dinuba, these figures actually understate the proportion of farm laborers. Neither residents in the Government camp just outside the Arvin community boundary nor the residents on the DiGiorgio holdings were included. All of the former (about 200 families) and nearly all of the latter (about 150 families) are farm laborers. Though the Government camp is outside the community, many of the residents work within the Arvin area. The DiGiorgio camps are within the community boundaries. Nevertheless, accepting these figures at face value, we find a striking difference between the two communities.

INCOME

Estimates of the distribution of income in the two communities can be had by means of data obtained from the schedule. Each person interviewed indicated the income bracket in which he fell during the calendar year of 1943. The information was probably fairly accurate since it was obtained shortly after respondents had filed income tax returns. Because the upper bracket was open, it is impossible to determine average income, so median figures must suffice. Wartime farm prices and farm wage rates have undoubtedly had a great effect both on the absolute values and on the distribution of incomes so that they cannot be considered normal. This is an error which must be recognized, though there is no adequate means of correcting it. Table 23 shows the income distribution by brackets for both communities. Groupings are made which divide the sample into four approximately equal parts. It will be seen that Dinuba has a larger group in the lowest quartile, but that Arvin has more incomes falling below the median.