

church regularly.¹⁶ Table 34 shows that only 59 percent of Arvin persons 12 or over are church participants, against 72 percent in Dinuba. Each occupational group in Dinuba shows this greater participation. In both communities farmers have the highest record of memberships (leaving out nonemployed), farm labor next, while white-collar workers and other labor participate least.

TABLE 34.—Individual church participation among persons 12 years old and over, classified by occupation groups: Arvin and Dinuba

Occupation group	Arvin			Dinuba		
	Number in group	Partic- pants	Percent	Number in group	Partic- pants	Percent
White-collar worker.....	26	12	46	79	48	61
Farm operator.....	37	25	68	156	123	79
Farm labor.....	240	152	64	156	109	70
Other labor.....	54	25	46	92	56	61
Nonemployed.....	15	7	47	34	34	100
Total.....	372	221	59	517	370	72

N. B.—Church participants are all persons over 12 who either are members of a church in good standing, or who attend church at least 12 times per year. Number in group includes only persons 12 years old or over.

Source: Schedule data.

While club membership is a function of income and occupation, and nonorganized social activities show slight differentials between occupation groups, no such generalization can be made for participation in religious institutions. The percent variation between occupational categories in Arvin ran from 46 to 68 of the several major occupational groups; for Dinuba from 61 to 100 percent. The differential did not meet the Chi Square test of significance in either community. (See appendix F.)

Interestingly, there is a tendency for low-income groups in Arvin to belong to churches more frequently than high-income groups, the direct opposite to the tendency in other forms of social participation. This is shown by a negative association between high occupation status and church membership—an association which fully meets the Chi Square test of significance. This partly explains why only one church is supported by the Arvin elite.

Since social criteria have been reflected in church participation elsewhere in California,¹⁷ it is appropriate to examine the manner in which different elements of the population are segregated in existing religious institutions. In order to make such an analysis it is necessary to evaluate the social position of the different congregations in each community.¹⁸ Eliminating memberships in groups without a formal organization in either town, a fourfold classification is suggested. Most congregations can be rated, on a pecuniary standard of values, into degrees of social standing, but some cannot. In the latter

¹⁶ All persons who belong to a church, whether or not they attend, and all persons who attend 12 or more times per year, even though not a member, are included in this count. Only persons 12 years old or older were included in this analysis.

¹⁷ The role of the church in the California town has been described in Walter R. Goldschmidt's *Class Denominationalism in the California Rural Churches*, *Journal of American Sociology*, vol. XLIX, January 1944.

¹⁸ It must be made clear that this analysis of church standing does not in any way reflect an evaluation either of the religious doctrines or of the quality of the membership of the separate congregations, but has reference only to the social status of the group within the community, with reference to community values, as the sociologists use that concept.