

Arvin merchants sell fewer clothing and household goods than Dinuba merchants; a difference of nearly 1 to 4 in the former and over 1 to 2 in the latter category. These are the items that are purchased by stable people who are improving their personal condition and their surroundings: they are items in the standard of living, and are the economic or business reflection of the difference in the standard of living as previously shown.

There is little difference in the actual dollar-volume sale of liquor vendors. However, liquor sales make up a far greater proportion of total retail trade in Arvin than they do in Dinuba (over 9 percent against less than 6 percent). Fuller knowledge of the situation suggests even greater divergence. State law in California provides for two classes of liquor license, a permit for "off sale" only, and a permit for "on sale." The former category sells package liquor only, while the latter provides for sale of drinks for consumption on the premises. The law further provides that all stores with the second type permit be prepared to sell food, and therefore the sales at such places include some restaurant sales. Field observation strongly suggests that the proportion of food sales is far greater in Dinuba than in Arvin. There are no off-sale enterprises in Dinuba, but one in Arvin.

To be sure, this is not a budget of expenditures for the families, but of the local trade—a measure of the opportunity for local community enterprise. A rough measure of the degree to which purchases were made in the nearby city and in the local community was obtained by means of the field schedule. Respondents were asked to indicate where they made purchases for certain categories of goods and services. Groceries and gasoline were predominantly purchased in the local community. Ninety-five percent of the responses from Arvin people referred to local purchases of groceries and 91 percent to local purchases of gasoline. In Dinuba, comparable figures were 96 and 92 percent. Clothing (men's and women's combined) showed a greatly divergent pattern, with Arvin people indicating in 31 percent of their responses that they bought their clothes in Arvin, and Dinubans indicating that they bought their clothes in Dinuba 68 percent of the time. If we can use the proportion of responses as a rough measure of the proportion of actual expenditures, the total Arvin expenditure for clothing and related goods would still be but half that in Dinuba. This suggests—although the data cannot prove it—that the actual volume of purchases by Arvin residents of those items which reflect standards and conditions of living are far less than in Dinuba. This is indicated despite the fact that a large number of families in Dinuba are in the older age groups where their needs are not so great and their wants more nearly fulfilled. This conclusion is in harmony with other facts about the level of living of the people in the two towns.

From the standpoint of opportunity created, and of the local community as a social environment, the difference is striking. The total volume of business, partly because of the difference in numbers supported and partly because of the difference in living conditions, is clearly greater in Dinuba than in Arvin. If we eliminate those items which are largely concerned with production itself, namely, agricultural supplies, industrial and transportation supplies, and automotive equipment (heavily influenced by sale of gasoline for power equipment), and leaving out liquor sales which are of a doubtful social value, we have a ratio of nearly 2 to 1 in the purchase of commodities.