

Welfare.²³ She found that all but one family had insufficient income to meet the prescribed standards. Amounts greater than the Welfare Department's prescribed standards were spent for housing and nonessentials while not as much was spent for food and clothing as the standards prescribed. There was no apparent improvement in nutritional level of family diets. No analysis was made as to what kinds of expenditures might have had more developmental impact upon the families.

Helen S. Barney studied the food shopping practices of 24 low-income, female headed families, and compared their practices to those of college seniors majoring in Home Economics. She found that the low-income women did a better job of getting their money's worth than the college woman.²⁴

Oscar Ornati compiled a rather complete list of the various kinds of budgets and budgetary studies undertaken for social and amelioratory purposes as well as a brief treatment of the historical development of rising standards for poverty.²⁵ However, no categorization or analysis of types of expenditures were attempted.

Emma G. Holmes took preliminary data from the 1960 Census and described the kinds of expenditures low-income families make.²⁶ She found that low-income families spend a greater percentage of their incomes on food, shelter, and medical care, and a smaller percentage on clothing, furnishings and equipment, and other kinds of things than people with higher incomes. Holmes stressed the need for better measures of consumption than mere cash incomes, and suggested that the concept of value of consumption be utilized. Value of consumption would include goods produced for home consumption, inventory changes, and other kinds of consumption which are not reflected in a cash income figure. This is a useful concept, but Holmes did not expand it to consider what kinds of consumption might have developmental significance. However Holmes' cross-sectional analysis provides an unreliable basis for predicting the ways in which low-income people will behave in the short run, for under changed economic circumstances low-income people would represent different social and environmental, as well as income, groupings. In this study, a cross-sectional analysis will be utilized; however the two groups analyzed will be fairly comparable.

Cyrus Johnson conducted a survey of 324 families participating in the predecessor to the WE and T Program, that is, the Aid to Dependent Children and Unemployed Parents (AFDC-UP).²⁷ It was a purely descriptive study economically, and showed that 46 percent of the unemployed fathers had not had a complete month's employment in the preceding two years. More than one-third of the families reported cash incomes of less than \$500 annually, while the median was approximately \$700 before the advent of the AFDC-UP Program. No value of consumption was calculated, and none of the expenditures of the cash income were analyzed vis-a-vis their developmental significance.

The Pilot Food Stamp Program is administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, and had replaced the Surplus Commodity Program in all 19 counties where the WE and T Program was operating in Eastern Kentucky. The dual objectives of the Food Stamp Program were to increase the demand for agricultural commodities and to improve the diets of low-income people. Only domestically produced food may be purchased with food stamps. A variable scale is used whereby low-income families can exchange the amount of money they generally spend for food stamps with a higher value.²⁸ The United States Department of Agriculture conducted a survey of participants in the Food Stamp Program in an urban area, Detroit, Michigan, and a rural area, Fayette County, Pennsylvania, in 1962. It was discovered that food consumption and the nutritional quality of diets of participants increased for both urban and rural areas.²⁹

²³ Nancy Brode, "Expenditures of Income of 18 Selected White Families Receiving ADC in Knoxville, Tennessee, April 1960" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Home Economics, University of Tennessee, 1963).

²⁴ Helen S. Barney, "Food Shopping Practices of Selected Low-Income Families, Riley County, Kansas, 1965," (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Home Economics, Kansas State University, 1965).

²⁵ Oscar Ornati, *Poverty Amid Affluence* (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1966).

²⁶ Emma G. Holmes, "Spending Patterns of Low-Income Families (1961)," *Adult Leadership* (May 1965), p. 16.

²⁷ Johnson, *op. cit.*

²⁸ For a more complete description of the Food Stamp Program, see Appendix II.

²⁹ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, *Food Consumption and Dietary Levels Under the Pilot Food Stamp Program, Detroit, Michigan and Fayette County, Pennsylvania* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962).