

chases above the developmentally significant upper limits; the comparable figures for participants were \$56, totally, and \$1.56 on the average.

SUMMARY

Table 5.4 displays the data on the probably not developmentally related categories of expenditure by applicants and participants in October 1966.

TABLE 5.4—Average expenditures for probably not developmentally significant categories by applicants and participants, October 1966

Category	Applicants	Participants
Coffee, tea, cocoa, and tobacco.....	\$5.92	\$8.00
Candy and sweets.....	4.96	7.04
Food expenditures in excess of food stamp allotments.....	6.22	12.14
Consumer durables in excess of developmentally significant upper limits.....	.42	1.56
Total.....	17.52	28.74

The average expenditure for the probably not developmentally significant categories was \$17.52 for the applicants, and \$28.74 for the participants. The difference, \$11.22, was significant at the 95 per cent confidence level using the "t" test. Therefore, the first part of the hypothesis, that participants would spend more than applicants, was accepted. However, expenditures for these probably not developmentally significant categories represented 12 per cent of the total monthly income of the applicants, and 11.88 per cent of the total monthly income of the participants. Thus the participants did not spend proportionately more than the applicants for the probably not developmentally significant categories. The second part of the hypothesis, that the participants would not spend proportionately more than the applicants for the probably not developmentally significant categories, was therefore accepted. The income elasticity of demand for the participants was .99 for the probably not developmentally significant categories.

OTHER CATEGORIES

Food production for home consumption

The foregoing analysis of expenditures did not include the amount of food produced for home consumption. This element could have been useful in explaining possible reasons that there was not increased participation in the Food Stamp Program. It was hypothesized that the participants would produce less food for home consumption than the applicants. If this hypothesis were accepted, it could have reflected a combination of things, that is, a high marginal preference for leisure relative to income, conflict between WE and T Program obligations and home food production, or limited opportunities for home food production.

Table 5.5 presents the data on food production for home consumption, and shows that 28 applicants and 21 participants reported raising a home vegetable garden while eight applicants and 16 participants reported not raising a garden. Chi square analysis showed this was not a significant difference at the 5 per cent probability level. Moreover, 23 applicants and 12 participants reported that they had canned, frozen, or in some way preserved food while 13 applicants and 25 participants reported that they had not. This was a significant difference at the 5 per cent probability level according to a chi square analysis. Therefore, it appeared that while there was not any significant difference in the number of applicants and participants raising gardens, there was, indeed, a significantly greater number of applicants than of participants who had preserved food in some way.

The total value of the preserved food was \$1,240 for applicants and \$706 for participants, for the entire year.¹ It was interesting that the mean value of preserved foods, for those engaged in preserving, was not significantly different, the mean was \$54 for applicants and \$59 for participants. The important variable was the number of families engaged in food preservation, and as noted, there were significantly more applicants than participants who preserved some kind of food.

¹ Valuation procedure explained in Chapter II.