serious problem." [9] Thus it is apparent that there is a good chance that families may not be able to eat together, but most probably will have to sleep together. Since furniture is not typically the kind of item one trades in or replaces, but rather accumulates, it seems likely that expenditures for both kitchen and bedroom furniture could have a longer-run developmental significance. The upper limit for a kitchen set, consisting of a table and four chairs is $100 while it is $150 for a bedroom suite.

Living room furniture is perhaps not as easy to justify, but from the point of view of improving the comfort and morale of the home, living room furniture was considered developmentally significant. The upper limit is $200 for a couch and chair.

Home furnishings included rugs, curtains, and those incidentals necessary to make a house more liveable. No upper limits were set, and any expenditure on such was regarded as developmentally significant.

Table 3.8 presents the data on the number of families purchasing various kinds of furniture, and the number of those who exceeded the developmentally significant upper limits.

TABLE 3.8.—*Expenditures on various kinds of furniture by applicants and participants*

Kind of furniture	Applicants	Participants
Total reporting	36	36
Living room:		
Purchased in the previous 12 months	0	9
Expended more than $200	0	2
Kitchen:		
Purchased in the last 12 months	0	9
Expended more than $100	0	2
Bedroom:		
Purchased in the previous 12 months	1	12
Expended more than $150	0	1
Miscellaneous: Purchased in the previous 12 months	2	16

The applicant families reported very little expenditure on furniture. Only one reported buying a bedroom suite while two others reported purchases of miscellaneous items for the entire house. The total of the expenditures reported was only $593. However, participants reported total expenditures for furniture of $3,824. Nine participant families reported purchasing living room suites, and two were in excess of the $200 upper limit. Nine participant families purchased kitchen sets, consisting of a table and four chairs, and two of these were in excess of the adjudicated $100 upper limit.

Twelve participants reported buying bedroom suites, and only one was over the $150 upper limits. Sixteen participants reported buying some kind of miscellaneous item of furniture, usually rugs or a cabinet.

Twenty-four of the participant families reported purchases of either a bedroom or living room suite, or a kitchen set. Seven additional participant families reported buying at least some miscellaneous furniture. Thus, 31 of the participants reported buying some furniture while only three applicants did. The author observed that families usually did not trade in old furniture, and that this new furniture was probably added to the low inventory levels which were cited previously. Therefore, these expenditures on furniture neither appeared frivolous nor impulsive. In fact, they seemed most developmentally significant, for the direct increment in the family furniture inventory would probably improve upon the situation where the mountain family in the poverty class was forced to sleep together, but could not sit down and eat together.[10] Although data are not available with which to test this proposition, the author's observations confirm the impression that this was the case for many of the families applying for the WE and T Program, and was presumably true for the participants prior to their inclusion in the program.

[9] Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
[10] Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 9.