

the applicant families reported any clothing purchases: 7 for both men and women's clothing, and 16 reported purchases of children's clothing. Actually there was not a great deal of difference between the average expenditures of those applicants and participants who reported any kind of expenditure. However, all of the participants reported some kind of expenditure, while only 18, or one-half of the applicants reported some kind of expenditure. Thus, the mean expenditure for all kinds of clothing by participants was approximately \$26, while it was only about \$10 for applicants. The hypothesis that participants would spend more than applicants for clothing was therefore accepted, for the participants spent more than 250 per cent for clothing than did the applicants. The income differential was only 66 per cent.

#### *Food Stamps*

While considerably less than optimum nutritive intake level probably characterized impoverished families, it has been shown that merely increasing the income level has little effect upon the nutritive value of food consumption.<sup>12</sup> However, the USDA study of the Pilot Food Stamp Program indicated that nutritive levels for families buying food stamps did, indeed, increase.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, it was reasoned in this study that receiving a higher, regular income by virtue of participation in the WE and T Program would not necessarily mean that a family would improve the nutritive level of its diet. On the other hand, buying food stamps, has the effect of increasing real income, and probably indicates an improvement in the nutritive level of the family also.

There were no data available on the extent of participation in the Food Stamp Program by WE and T participants. However, the WE and T Program encouraged participants to buy food stamps. Thus a comparison of food stamp purchase by applicants and participants was made.<sup>14</sup> The hypothesis was that more participants than applicants would buy food stamps. The purchase of food stamps was classified as a developmentally significant expenditure, for it appeared that the family buying food stamps would increase both its real income and nutritive level. However, any expenditures beyond the value of the food stamps received by families buying food stamps was classified as "probably not developmentally significant." For families not buying food stamps, the expenditures on food up to the cost of food stamps (had they bought them) were classified as "developmentally related" expenditures, and any expenditures beyond the cost of food stamps were classified as "probably not developmentally significant."

TABLE 3.15.—*Food stamp expenditures by applicants and participants, October 1966*

|                                              | Applicants | Participants |
|----------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Total reporting.....                         | 36         | 36           |
| Number who purchased food stamps.....        | 28         | 20           |
| Number who did not purchase food stamps..... | 8          | 16           |
| Total paid in cash.....                      | \$639      | \$1,679      |
| Average.....                                 | \$23       | \$80         |
| Total received in food stamps.....           | \$2,047    | \$2,248      |
| Average.....                                 | \$73       | \$107        |
| Incremental income in food stamps.....       | \$1,408    | \$569        |
| Average.....                                 | \$50       | \$27         |

<sup>1</sup> All averages were based only on those buying food stamps.

Table 3.15 displays the information on participation in the Pilot Food Stamp Program. As indicated, 28 applicants and 20 participants reported buying food stamps. Thus the hypothesis that more WE and T participants would buy food stamps was rejected. However chi-square analysis revealed that, at the 5 percent probability level, the reverse hypothesis, that less WE and T participants buy food stamps, could not be accepted. Thus while rejecting the initial hypothesis, its converse was not accepted. There appeared to be no real difference.

The reason most often given to interviewers for why participants do not buy food stamps is that they do not spend "that much" on food. Some confusion appeared to exist; for example, a family of six receiving a monthly grant of \$200 from WE and T would have had to pay \$68 in cash for \$98 in food stamps. The

<sup>12</sup> Brode, *loc. cit.*

<sup>13</sup> USDA, *loc. cit.*

<sup>14</sup> For a brief discussion of the Food Stamp Program, see Appendix II.