Utilities included monthly expenditures for electricity, gas (usually bottled), and coal and wood for heating and cooking. If the hypotheses that participants would buy more consumer durables were accepted, then one might reasonably expect that expenditures for utilities by participants would be greater than by applicants. That is the hypothesis. However, the amount of utilities used would not be a perfect indicator of the use of the various durables, for one would expect the newer durables to operate more efficiently. Thus, expenditures for utilities were difficult to categorize; the classification as developmentally related seemed more apropos than to include it in either of the other two general classes.

Table 4.3 displays the data on the monthly expenditures for rent and utilities by applicants and participants.

From Table 4.3 it was observed that the average expenditure for rent in October 1966 was $5.67 for applicants and $6.86 for participants, and the average expenditure for utilities was $11.41 for applicants and $16.33 for participants. Thus, the total average expenditure for October 1966, for rent and utilities by applicants was $17.08 and $23.19 by participants; this was in accord with the hypothesis.

TABLE 4.3.—*Expenditures for rent and utilities by applicants and participants October 1966*

| | Applicants | | Participants | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | Average | Total | Average |
| Rent | $204 | $5.67 | $247 | $6.86 |
| Utilities: | | | | |
| Electricity | 155 | 4.30 | 191 | 5.30 |
| Gas | 44 | 1.22 | 104 | 2.89 |
| Coal and stove wood | 212 | 5.89 | 293 | 8.14 |
| Subtotal, utilities | 411 | 11.41 | 588 | 16.33 |
| Total | 615 | 17.08 | 835 | 23.19 |

*Meals eaten away from home*

Although meals eaten away from home would usually be defined as an expenditure for food, they were considered as a separate category in this study. It was assumed that low-income families would eat most of their meals at home, and as has been indicated, the Food Stamp Program provided a gauge of the development significance of food expenditures. However, if a man were participating in the WE and T Program, he might not have time to return home for all meals. Thus meals eaten away from home were adjudged to be developmentally related expenditures, and it was hypothesized that the participants would spend more than the applicants for such.

Only one applicant reported eating any meals away from home, and the total reported was only $1. However, three participants' families reported that the head of the household regularly ate the noon meal away from home, and their total expenditures for October 1966 were $28. Thus the average expenditure for meals eaten away from home was $.03 for the applicants and $.78 for the participants. It was likely that there was some underreporting in this category, but it is, at best, a minor item which is not of great significance for the purposes of this study.

*Food expenditures less than the cost of food stamps*

As was noted in Chapter III, expenditures on food stamps were classified as developmentally significant. However, for those families who did not buy food stamps, the expenditure for food, up to the cost of food stamps had they bought them, was classified as developmentally related. The judgment rendered here was that expenditures on food, regardless of food stamp considerations, were properly considered as related in some way to the long-run development of the family members, but the cost of food stamps was the upper limit for inclusion in the developmentally related category. The amount spent for food above the cost of food stamps was classified as probably not developmentally significant, and is discussed below in Chapter V.