

than in Dinuba, where farmer memberships are but a third as great as memberships of white-collar workers. Total participation is less in Arvin than in Dinuba, a difference which again is accounted for by the preponderance of laborers, who rarely participate in club activities because of the strong social barrier in both communities. These relationships are shown graphically in figure 14, along with other forms of participation.

OTHER SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Organized club life is only one means of social participation. In order to obtain some appreciation of the nature of social life in the two communities, questions were included on the schedules designed to determine how many persons participated in other types of social activities. Six categories were included and an indication of the family member participating and the frequency of such participation. The six categories are: School events, other community events, dances, card parties or games, picnics, and movies. The last of these cannot be strictly considered a social event, since it does not require any active group participation and will be discussed separately.

Table 30 shows the number and percent of the families having members who participate in each of the five types of social activities (movies excluded) and the number reporting participation in some one of the five. Of these forms of recreation, picnics are the most frequent in both communities and about equally popular in each. The difference between Arvin and Dinuba is shown immediately in that only 58 percent of all families participate in social events in Arvin, while 71 percent do so in Dinuba. If those persons whose only form of recreation was picnics (which are usually family affairs) are eliminated, the Arvin participants would be reduced to 45 percent of the families, while the Dinuba participating families would not be reduced at all. Participation in community events and school affairs is relatively more popular in Dinuba than in Arvin. The failure of the community to provide opportunity must be considered a major cause of this lack of participation. Table 31 shows similar data, based upon individual participation rather than families. It represents more accurately the participation of individuals, demonstrates the degree to which total families participate in picnics and in general community events, but only a few members participate in the other activities.

Participants in general community events more nearly represent a Table 32 shows the participants by major occupational groupings, and relatively little difference is found. The Chi Square Test indicates that the probability of these occupational differences being significant is relatively small, and the value of T for these communities is very close to zero (appendix F). That laborers participate in open social events very nearly as much as other groups shows that social participation is not foreign to the laborers' mode of life and that their failure to belong to clubs in both Arvin and Dinuba reflects the social barrier rather than any inherent reluctance to participate in social events. Striking, too, is the difference in the degree of social participation among farm labor families in Dinuba as compared with Arvin. It is clear that the greater opportunity for social activity coupled with a somewhat lessened social barrier has enabled the worker to find a