There were not significantly more participants than applicants buying food stamps. Thus it was hypothesized that the remaining participants' food expenditures, less than the cost of food stamps, would be greater than those of remaining applicants, since the participant with his higher income level, would probably spend more for food. The total expenditures for October 1966 for "food were calculated.

"Food" expenditures included all food-type items obtainable with food stamps. These expenditures were compared with the cost of food stamps which was calculated utilizing the criteria of the Food Stamp Program.

Table 4.4 shows the data for the applicants and participants who did not buy food stamps. There were essentially two types of families under consideration: those who spent less for food than the cost of food stamps and those who spent more for food than the cost of food stamps. As indicated in Table 4.4, there were no applicants and three participants whose monthly expenditures for food in October 1966, were less than the cost of food stamps; the three participant families spent a total of \$126 for food. Additionally, there were 8 applicants and 13 participants who spent more on food in October 1966 than they would have had to spend for food stamps. The applicants could have bought food stamps for \$334, and the participants for \$874, totally. Hence, the total expenditure for food, less than the cost of food stamps was \$334 for applicants and \$1,000 for participants, or an average of \$9.28 and \$27.28, respectively. Thus the average participant spent about three times as much as the average applicant for food less than the cost of food stamps.

Table 4.4.—Developmentally related expenditures on food by applicants and participants not buying food stamps, October 1966

	Applicants	Participants
Number of families not buying food stamps  Number of families spending less than the cost of food stamps for food  Total spent  Number of families spending more than the cost of food stamps for food  Cost of food stamps had they bought them  Total  Average.	0 8	16 3 \$126.00 13 \$874 \$1,000 \$27.28

## Transportation

Expenditures on transportation included the operating expenses of automobiles, gasoline, oil, and repairs, in addition to any fares paid for taxis or buses.

It was hypothesized that participants would buy more automobiles and the data indicated they did. Since participants have to attend school, and report regularly for work experience, it was logical to expect that their expenditures for transportation would increase. This was the hypothesis. However, no distinction was made between transportation for educational, recreational or work experience and training purposes. Many trips involve a multiplicity of purposes (joint costs) and allocation of such travel to each purpose would, at best, be arbitrary. In collecting the data no such breakdown was attempted. Thus, one cannot infer with impunity that all transportation expenses were developmentally significant. Therefore, since the proportions of expenditures for these purposes are unknown, transportation expenditures are categorized as related to development.

The information on transportation expenditures by applicants and participants is summarized below in Table 4.5.

 $\begin{array}{c} {\rm Table}~4.5. - Transportation~expenditures~for~applicants~and~participants,}\\ {\rm October}~1966 \end{array}$ 

	Applicants	Participants
Gas, oil and repairs: Total	\$269.00	\$770.40
Average Taxis and rides:	7.47	21.40
Total	36.00 1.00	11.00
Total average	8.47	21.70

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Above, Chapter III.