social services than are tenants and absentee owners. While nothing in the present study either corroborates or refutes this, it may generally be accepted as a working hypothesis.

It is therefore accepted that in some measure the relative social poverty rests upon tenure pattern. This difference in tenure pattern is partially the result of historic timing and outside social forces. It is also in considerable measure a function of scale of farm operations and social poverty. Table 12 (ch. III) shows that tenancy is more frequent on large farms, over 160 acres, than on small farms. It has also been shown that the general social conditions in Arvin have caused some owner-operators and other natural leaders to leave the community. How influential these forces are in creating the tenure pattern of Arvin cannot be assessed, but certainly they are not wholly negligible.

The second aspect of farm organization is the labor requirements of operation. This has been touched upon in the discussion of occupation structure. At that point, we saw that occupation structure is a very important aspect of the difference between the two communities. The question therefore arises as to whether differences in labor requirements on farms in the two communities create that differential in occupation structure. The answer is an unqualified no. For the production of commodities in Arvin requires just under 3 million man-hours of labor while the Dinuba production, reaching the same gross value, requires 3½ million man-hours of work. That the labor structure is a function of scale of operations becomes clear when we examine item (*b*) under this heading in the list appearing earlier in this chapter. Only a small fraction of Arvin labor is absorbed by farm operators while in Dinuba three-fifths of the work can be performed by farm operators.

It is generally accepted that seasonality of employment creates poor social conditions. Both Arvin and Dinuba have such an uneven demand for labor that severe hardships can be expected in normal times. Dinuba employment opportunities, because of the intensive devotion to grape production, fluctuate more than those of Arvin. An examination of figure 6 shows that Arvin regular workers can be fully employed locally for 6 months in the year, whereas Dinuba regular workers can be so employed only 4 months. The labor picture appears to be better in Arvin than in Dinuba.

It might be assumed, however, that Dinuba labor tends to be performed by outsiders to a greater extent than Arvin labor does. Under such an assumption the poverty and poor social conditions which surround wage workers would not appear in Dinuba but would merely show up in other towns where these workers are resident. Such a factor would not affect the availability of social institutions and facilities, but merely the level of living, existence of slum conditions, etc. The sharp peak in the labor demand does, in fact, necessitate over a third more outside workers during a single month than are required in Arvin during its busiest month. This is a function of the sharply peaked demand, and therefore nullifies the effect of Dinuba's disadvantage in this respect. Though Dinuba requires more imported manpower during the single peak month of employment, the total amount of imported work required is very nearly the same. (See appendix C.) The proportion of imported labor requirements to the total is less.