

retail trade. For the farm laborer is generally unable to make a normal complement of purchases for family living because of his poverty, while the farm operator tends to make his purchases, as he does his social contacts, in the city. Thus the merchant group does not grow proportionate to the population, but lags behind it. This again reduces the proportion of independently employed.

The lack of economic and social facilities in the community has a continuative effect. The poor conditions tend to repel those very people who are most needed to enrich it. It was pointed out by farmers, merchants, and laborers alike that persons did not plan to make Arvin their home because of this very lack of facilities. It is very probably one cause for the high tenancy ratio in Arvin, since landowners will often prefer to live elsewhere and live off their rentals. It is possibly a cause for the fact that the average educational attainments of farm workers are below those in the same occupations in Dinuba.

The occupational structure has some influence upon political life in the community. The failure to develop real local interest in community affairs is a prime factor in this causal relationship. The mutual exclusiveness of the two major strata of society also inhibits the development of the community solidarity that would be expected in a more homogeneous group and thus prevents the development of a civic organization. The fact that the group from which natural leadership arises represents but a small minority, while those whose position is relatively insecure forms an overwhelming majority is a further reason for the failure of Arvin to incorporate. The existence of a strong and rich county government contributes to the fact that such political institutions were not developed.

The high rate of tenancy and absentee ownership may reduce further the proportion of persons who are willing to assume leadership. No information on participation by tenure, other than the operator-laborer dichotomy, was obtained. While such effect of tenure pattern upon the social organization is not supported by empirical evidence, the reverse effect, that the social environment increases tenancy, does receive some support.

The accompanying diagrammatic table presents a visual summary of the preceding discussion. The overconcreteness implied with lines and boxes is unavoidable and the chart should be read in terms of the text and other specific strictures. Foremost of these strictures is the fact that the whole chain of causation and intercausation is valid only within the frame of reference of the culture common to the two communities and the area of industrialized farming. Thus the scale of farm operations only creates the occupational structure found under the assumption that land is individually owned and requires hired labor. Cooperative farming would have a different effect. Again, the effect of occupation structure upon social institutions, retail trade, level of living, and demographic character of the population is applicable only in terms of accepted class patterns of behavior and wage scales general in the area. To be complete, therefore, these cultural forces would have to be recognized. Intermediate steps and causal mechanisms have frequently been left out. The second stricture is that all terms indicating qualitative or quantitative comparisons (low, few, poverty, etc.) have direct reference to the comparison of Arvin to Dinuba. Specifically, the causal forces relate to the explanation of the differences between those two communities.