

TABLE 3.16.—Average<sup>1</sup> developmentally significant expenditures by applicants and participants by category, October 1966

| Category                         | Applicants | Participants |
|----------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Consumer durables, payments..... | \$2.90     | \$14.03      |
| Automobiles, payments.....       | 3.89       | 24.47        |
| Housing:                         |            |              |
| Payments for purchases.....      | 0          | 2.84         |
| Improvements.....                | .70        | 5.46         |
| Savings and life insurance.....  | .33        | 3.51         |
| Clothing.....                    | 9.72       | 25.90        |
| Food stamps.....                 | 17.75      | 43.73        |
| Cleaning supplies.....           | 3.22       | 3.56         |
| Total.....                       | 38.51      | 123.50       |

<sup>1</sup> These averages are for the entire groups of 36 applicants and 36 participants.

#### CHAPTER IV.—DEVELOPMENTALLY RELATED EXPENDITURES

##### INTRODUCTION

Developmentally related expenditures included: school lunches; school supplies; rent and utilities; meals eaten away from home; food expenditures less than the cost of food stamps; transportation; personal expenses; and medicine and drugs. These categories were related, often complementarily, to the developmentally significant categories of expenditure. However, expenditures within these categories were often greater for participants while the benefits received were not proportionately greater; this was sometimes the case for school lunches, school supplies, and rent. Nonetheless, these expenditures were related in some fashion to the long-run development of the participant family members, and were thus included in the developmentally related classification.

The general hypothesis was that expenditures by participants would be greater than those by applicants for all categories except medicine and drugs. As was the case for consumer durables, it was not possible to test hypotheses for each category. Therefore the average expenditures within each category for October, 1966 were summed, and the total average expenditures by participants was hypothesized to be greater absolutely but not proportionately than that by applicants. The category of medicine and drugs was considered separately, for it was hypothesized to be less for participants than applicants.

##### DEVELOPMENTALLY RELATED EXPENDITURES

###### *School Lunches*

One might reasonably expect that if the hypothesis that both school enrollment and attendance would increase were accepted, the expenditures on school lunches would increase proportionately. This would be true were it not for the method of operation of the school lunch program in many counties in Eastern Kentucky. County school systems generally collect 20 or 25 cents for a fairly substantial noon meal. In theory, every child has to pay for his lunch. However, the author has observed that families without much income are often given free lunches for their children, or each pays some small fraction of the cost. Thus, an impoverished family with five children in school might pay nothing, or for one child's lunch, 20 cents per day rather than the one dollar or one dollar and twenty-five cents it was supposed to have paid.

Moreover, the author has observed a tendency for schools to require all participants in the WE and T Program to pay for school lunches for all of their children enrolled in school. Therefore, even if the number of children enrolled in school were the same for both applicants and the participants, one would reasonably expect the participants to pay more for school lunches totally.

For these reasons, it was hypothesized that participants would spend more than applicants on school lunches. Since this seemed to represent a shifting of the cost of school lunches from the county school board to the WE and T participants, it was not considered a developmentally significant expenditure. However, this expenditure for school lunches was probably a developmentally related expenditure, for it was an inexpensive price for a fairly good meal and WE and T participants could possibly benefit from the intangible elements of pride, by avoiding the stigma and effects upon morale of obvious welfare recipients.