

TABLE 23.—Income distribution in Arvin and Dinuba

Income bracket	Arvin		Dinuba		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under \$750	10	8	28	14	38	12
\$751 to \$1,250	22	17	27	13	49	15
\$1,251 to \$1,750	15	12	18	9	33	10
\$1,751 to \$2,250	28	22	33	16	61	18
\$2,251 to \$2,750	25	20	27	13	52	16
\$2,751 to \$3,250	6	5	19	10	25	8
\$3,251 to \$4,250	9	7	19	10	28	9
\$4,251 to \$5,250	1	1	7	4	8	2
\$5,251 to \$11,000	5	4	13	6	18	6
Over \$11,000	5	4	9	5	14	4
Total	126	100	200	100	326	100
Not recorded	5		13		18	
Total	131		213		344	

Source: Schedule data.

The estimated median income of the four major occupational groupings in Arvin and Dinuba is shown in table 24. Dinuba has a slightly higher median income than Arvin, a difference that results from the large size of the low-income labor group in Arvin as compared to Dinuba. The figures on the income of farm labor are the same for both communities but the proportion of farm laborers is so much lower in Arvin that the average is reduced. A comparison of income per person, rather than per family, would show a greater divergence between the two communities, since Arvin, with smaller median incomes, has larger families.

TABLE 24.—Estimated median income of major occupational groups: Arvin and Dinuba

Occupational group	Arvin	Dinuba
White-collar worker	\$3,000	\$3,650
Farm operator	3,750	2,850
Farm labor	2,000	2,000
Other labor	1,600	2,000
All gainfully employed	2,100	2,350

Source: Schedule data.

Some occupational differences in income are particularly of interest. In Arvin 70 percent of the farmers and white-collar workers and 36 percent of the laborers were above the median income. In Dinuba the proportions are 65 and 40 respectively.¹⁰ The difference in the position of the farm operator in the two communities is also significant. In Arvin the farmer has a higher median income than the white-collar worker while in Dinuba the reverse is true. This difference is clearly reflected in the social position of these two groups, as will be shown later.

¹⁰ The association between social phenomena analyzed and the differences between the two communities were computed by a variety of techniques. Computations of chi square and *T* were considered most accurate and a table of results is presented in Appendix F. Chi square shows the probability of any difference being the result of chance, and *T* is a measure of degree of association roughly corresponding to the correlation coefficient. The variation in income was determined to be significant and the degree of relationship between occupation and income in the two communities is about the same magnitude.