items in parentheses were to be supplied by schedule editor. Numbers for family members in question A-3 were used for reference in

question B-1, 5, and 6.

(4) Sampling techniques.—Each community was divided into two categories: town and rural. The town sample included the area of the town itself—in Dinuba bounded by the incorporated limits, in Arvin by the area of contiguous congestion. Every house in each sample was plotted on a map and the houses numbered consecutively, circling each block clockwise. (Figs. 12 and 13 in the text reproduce the maps of the town and show the houses sampled.) Every tenth number was selected as the sample, and the enumerators instructed to take only the house enumerated, making recalls where necessary. The number of actual houses covered by the survey was 1,304 in Arvin and 2,161 in Dinuba. Due to errors in numbering, two houses too many were included in Arvin, three too few in Dinuba, or a total sample of 132 in Arvin and 213 in Dinuba. No residents refused cooperation in Arvin, but seven refused to answer these questions in Dinuba. The occupation and number of persons in the household were obtained for each of these. Occasionally individual items were omitted because of reluctance on the part of the interviewee or for some other unavoidable reason. This technique was applied with all reasonable care, and can be assumed to represent an adequate random sample of the universe included.

This universe included all households within the area delineated as belonging to each of the respective communities. The only exception to this statement was the houses on the DiGiorgio property, where permission to enter was not granted the field workers. The approximate number of houses was obtained from the management, and these were ncluded in the population estimates (assuming the average persons per fami y consistent with farm laborers in Arvin). They were not included for any other statistical analyses, not even the distribution of families by occupation of family heads. Most of the residents

are farm laborers.

The universe, by definition, includes only residents at the time of field work. Field interviews were made in each community at a time (March-April in Arvin, April-May in Dinuba) when the local employment opportunities in agriculture were insufficient to employ fully the local labor supply (see fig. 6 of text, p. 35). Thus, itinerant workers with residence outside these communities were excluded from the

analysis of schedule data.

(5) Statistical information.—Statistical data of various kinds, other than those developed from the schedule, form a crucial part of the evidence. Information on crop production was obtained from the agricultural commissioners of the respective counties and from other sources. School attendance and enrollment records were obtained from the superintendents of schools. Two special sources of statistical data were available. Data on farms, classified by size and type, and on acreage in the various major crops in each community have been obtained from Agricultural Adjustment Agency records.

These data were collected on a three-county area for use in other studies, but special tabulations and analyses were made for Arvin and Dinuba.2 Information on the volume and character of retail trade

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Edwin E. Wilson and Marion Clawson, Agricultural Land Ownership and Operation in the Southern San Josquin Valley, Calif. Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Berkeley, Calif. (Mimeographed.) 1945.