THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM AND LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS' FOOD PURCHASES

By Larry E. Salathe*

Households participating in the Food Stamp Program increased their food expenditures an average of 10 percent Their food-at-home expenditures rose 19 percent while food-away-from-home expenditures declined 36 percent Increases occurred for cereal and dairy products, eggs, nonalcoholic beverages, pork, poultry, and processed vegetables The Food Stamp Program was estimated to be nearly three times as effective as a cash transfer program in expanding food purchases These conclusions are based on an analysis of the 1972-74 Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Expenditure Survey, when the purchase requirement was in effect

Keywords

Food expenditures
Food Stamp Program
Household income

The Food Stamp Program is intended to supplement the food budgets of low-income households The purpose of this article is to analyze how food stamp recipients use their increased buying power—the types of food items they buy and the types they avoid—as compared with low-income households who do not participate in the program The study provides a base for assessing the impact of eliminating the purchase requirement (as of January 1, 1979) when new data on food purchases by food stamp households become available

The latest period for which data are available for this analysis is 1972-74 Since that period, the Food Stamp Program has undergone major change During 1972-74, qualified households received an allotment of food coupons based on the number of persons in the household, the recipient paid an amount (the purchase requirement) for the allotment based on the net total income of the household The difference between the purchase requirement and the value of the food coupon allotment was referred to as the "bonus" or the value of "free" coupons received On January 1, 1979, the purchase requirement was eliminated [1] Now, qualified households receive an allotment of food coupons equal in value to the bonus Economic theory indicates that this change has reduced the program's ability to expand food purchases per dollar distributed as it permits participants to spend more of their income on nonfood items (*3*) [2]

DATA SOURCE

Data for this analysis are from the 1972-74 Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Consumer Expenditure Diary Survey (CEDS) The CEDS data were collected in two 12-month periods (*6*) Data on participation in the Food Stamp Program were collected only in the second of these periods In that second survey, 10,650 households provided complete information on income and food purchases A total of 610 of these households (5 7 percent) participated in the Food Stamp Program [3] Of those, 53 households were eliminated from the study because (1) the household did not provide information on the value of food coupons received or on the (purchase requirement) amount paid to obtain the food coupons, or (2) the household's recorded before-tax income for the previous year exceeded twice the maximum income eligibility standard in effect during 1973 74 The second criterion was used to eliminate households whose income status seemed to have changed dramatically between the previous year and the time they were surveyed

Food stamp recipients had an average before-tax household income of $3,424, whereas all households in the survey had an average before-tax income of $11,295 As past studies have indicated that income influences food purchases, a subsample of nonparticipants was selected with incomes similar to those of Food Stamp Program participants Income eligibility standards for the Food Stamp Pro-

*The author is an agricultural economist with the National Economics Division, ESS

[1] The impact of eliminating the purchase requirement on participants' food purchases is beyond the scope of this article, and the results presented do not apply directly to the current Food Stamp Program

[2] Italicized numbers in parentheses refer to References at the end of this article

[3] A disproportionate number of food stamp households did not provide data on their incomes In the original sample, there were a total of 12,121 households, of which 826 participated in the Food Stamp Program In 1974, about 9 percent of all U S households participated in the Food Stamp Program

gram in effect from July through December 1973 for the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia were used as the selection criteria

Household size	Monthly income
	Dollars
1	183
2	240
3	313
4	387
5	460
6	533
7	600
8	667
Each additional member	53

The income eligibility standards were raised 20 percent to account for deductions (such as excessive housing and medical costs) that are subtracted from a household's income when determining eligibility for Food Stamp Program benefits (see (7), Title XIII) [4] Using these income criteria, 1,697 households could have participated in the Food Stamp Program, but did not

The average weekly per capita (before-tax) income of eligible nonparticipants was $27 23, while that of participants averaged $24 20 In addition, participants received, on average, a net transfer of $4 per person per week from the Food Stamp Program

Generally, eligible nonparticipant households were smaller and had older members than did participant households The average household size was 2 87 members for eligible nonparticipants and 3 4 members for participants Of all eligible nonparticipant household members, 14 percent were under 10 years of age, while 32 percent were over 65 years of age [5] In comparison, 24 percent of all participant household members were under 10 years of age, and only 19 percent were over 65 years of age One-fifth of all eligible nonparticipant households were black, while two-fifths of all participant households were black

METHODOLOGY

Differences in food purchasing behavior between participants and eligible nonparticipants may be attributable to differences in racial mix, household size and composition, and other socioeconomic and demographic characteristics Traditionally, researchers have attempted to isolate the impact of the Food Stamp Program by specifying a functional relationship among household food expenditures, household characteristics, and the bonus value of food stamps received In this traditional approach, the relationship between food expenditures and income for participant households is assumed continuous Alternatively, the impact of a dollar of bonus food stamps on household food purchases is assumed either as not varying as income rises or as declining monotonically as income increases

A theoretical model developed by the author (*3*) indicates that this relationship is discontinuous, which could lead to inaccurate estimates of the program's impacts Accounting for the discontinuity statistically requires identifying participant households who spend no more than the value of food stamps received on food at home Existing household survey data, however, do not contain the information required to identify these households Therefore, an alternative procedure was used to isolate the impact of the Food Stamp Program on household food expenditure behavior (see (*3*))

The first step consisted of estimating the functional relationship between the food expenditures and household characteristics of eligible nonparticipant households The second step used the estimated relationships in the first step to derive estimates of eligible nonparticipants' food expenditures, assuming they possess the same characteristics as participant households The difference between food expenditures of participants and eligible nonparticipants after adjusting for differences in household characteristics can then be used to measure the impact of the Food Stamp Program on food expenditure behavior

ECONOMETRIC MODEL

Least squares regression was used to estimate the functional relationship between household food expenditures and household characteristics for eligible nonparticipants The general form of the model was

[4] Survey data were insufficient to determine the actual value of deductions or food stamp eligibility based upon asset criteria

[5] Asset criteria may have eliminated the eligibility of some households with members over 65 years of age

$$E_{ih} = E_{ih}(URBN_h, NE_h, NC_h, S_h, WHT_h, PY_h, NAG1_h, NAG2_h, NAG4_h, NAG5_h, NAG6_h, LNFMS_h) \quad (1)$$

where

E_{ih} = per capita weekly household expenditures on food group i by the hth household,

$URBN_h$ = 1 if the hth household's residence is urban, 0 otherwise,

NE_h = 1 if the hth household's residence is in the Northeastern region, 0 otherwise,

NC_h = 1 if the hth household's residence is in the North Central region, 0 otherwise,

S_h = 1 if the hth house hold's residence is in the Southern region, 0 otherwise,

WHT_h = 1 if the hth household's head is not black, 0 otherwise,

PY_h = per capita weekly before-tax income of the hth household,

$NAG1_h$ = proportion of members in the hth household under 11 years of age,

$NAG2_h$ = proportion of members in the hth household between 11 and 20 years of age,

$NAG4_h$ = proportion of members in the hth household between 36 and 50 years of age,

$NAG5_h$ = proportion of members in the hth household between 51 and 65 years of age,

$NAG6_h$ = proportion of members in the hth household over 65 years of age, and

$LNFMS_h$ = natural logarithm of the hth household's size

The specification of this relationship was motivated by previous studies analyzing household expenditure behavior [6] The relationship expresses per capita weekly household expenditures as a function of per capita weekly income, race, region, urbanization, and household size and composition The natural logarithm of household size was included to allow for economies of size in food purchasing

The matrix of explanatory variables would be singular if all urbanization, race, region, and age categories were included in the specification The excluded or base categories include in the urbanization category, nonurban, in the region category, the western, in the racial category, black, and in the age category, 21 through 35 years Thus, the coefficients of the included urbanization, race, region, and age categories denote the change in per capita food expenditures relative to the particular excluded category For example, the coefficient of NAG4 denotes the difference in per capita household food purchases if all household members were 36 through 50 years of age rather than 21 through 35 years of age

Table 1 presents the estimated expenditure relationships These relationships indicate that household characteristics are important in explaining household food purchase behavior For example, rural eligible nonparticipants spent significantly less on beef and veal, fish, fresh vegetables, and food away from home, but significantly more on cereal products, fats and oils, and sugar and other sweeteners than similar urban eligible nonparticipant households Households located in the Northeast spent more on total food, food at home, bakery products, beef and veal, other red meats, poultry, fish, dairy products, and nonalcoholic beverages than similar eligible nonparticipants residing outside the Northeastern region

The data in table 1 also suggest that race and household composi tion influence household food pur chase behavior White eligible nonparticipant households spent significantly less on pork, poultry, and fish, but significantly more on bakery products, dairy products, nonalcoholic beverages, miscellaneous prepared foods, and food away from home than similar black households Households with children tended to spend less on food than households of the same size with only adults Households with members over 65 years generally spent more on food at home and considerably less on food away from home than similar households with middle-aged adults These

[6] Many of these studies are summarized in (*1*)

Table 1—Estimated weekly per capita food expenditure equations, eligible nonparticipant households

Independent variable	Total food	Food at home	Cereal products	Bakery products	Beef and veal	Pork	Other red meats	Poultry	Fish	Eggs
	Dollars									
Intercept	8 8664	5 3374	0 3234	0 1858	0 5909	0 7580	0 3046	0 4145	0 1938	0 1974
	[1](7 74)	(5 23)	(4 39)	(1 63)	(2 61)	(4 22)	(3 13)	(3 10)	(2 43)	(3 09)
URBN	6354	0127	– 1137	– 0290	1773	– 0536	0512	0855	0828	– 0030
	(1 43)	(03)	(–3 98)	(– 66)	(2 02)	(– 77)	(1 35)	(1 65)	(2 67)	(– 12)
NE	2 2486	1 7838	– 0569	2513	2472	0142	2656	2280	1370	0119
	(3 69)	(3 29)	(–1 45)	(4 15)	(2 05)	(15)	(5 12)	(3 21)	(3 07)	(35)
NC	–1 0786	– 6521	– 1012	0791	– 2117	– 0154	0401	– 0274	– 0298	– 0228
	(–1 93)	(–1 31)	(–2 82)	(1 42)	(–1 92)	(– 18)	(84)	(– 42)	(– 77)	(– 73)
S	– 5295	– 2713	– 0398	0445	– 0833	1091	– 0055	1081	– 0435	– 0061
	(– 99)	(– 57)	(–1 16)	(84)	(– 79)	(1 30)	(– 12)	(1 74)	(–1 17)	(– 21)
WHT	4556	– 2206	– 0210	1394	0004	– 4425	– 0697	– 3021	– 1381	– 0295
	(92)	(– 50)	(– 66)	(2 82)	(01)	(–5 67)	(–1 65)	(–5 22)	(–3 99)	(–1 06)
PY	08285	06135	00275	00614	00849	00520	00138	00248	00068	00061
	(4 47)	(3 72)	(2 31)	(3.33)	(2 32)	(1 79)	(87)	(1 15)	(52)	(59)
NAG1	–3 4844	– 8080	– 1137	1042	– 4554	– 3384	– 1254	– 1276	– 0754	0468
	(–2 30)	(– 60)	(–1 17)	(69)	(–1 53)	(–1 43)	(– 98)	(– 72)	(– 72)	(55)
NAG2	–1 9375	–1 2266	– 0711	1041	– 4146	– 1615	– 1470	– 1516	0204	– 0244
	(–1 90)	(–1 35)	(–1 09)	(1 03)	(–2 06)	(–1 01)	(–1 70)	(–1 28)	(29)	(– 43)
NAG4	7964	1 5173	1012	1576	1622	3395	0929	2445	0402	1195
	(68)	(1 46)	(1 35)	(1 36)	(70)	(1 86)	(94)	(1 80)	(50)	(1 84)
NAG5	1 7453	3 8475	1503	3705	4502	4988	0566	3228	1204	1971
	(2 06)	(5 11)	(2 76)	(4 41)	(2 69)	(3 76)	(79)	(3 28)	(2 04)	(4 17)
NAG6	– 9454	2 9135	1351	3529	3098	3081	0138	1876	1017	1713
	(–1 25)	(4 33)	(2 78)	(4 69)	(2 07)	(2 59)	(22)	(2 13)	(1 93)	(4 06)
LNFMS	–1 3084	0729	0555	– 0236	0842	0902	0064	0154	0150	– 0056
	(–3 19)	(20)	(2 11)	(– 58)	(1 04)	(1 40)	(19)	(32)	(53)	(– 25)
R^2[2]	12	10	04	08	05	06	04	06	04	04
SEE[3]	7 41	6 59	48	74	1 46	1 16	63	86	52	41

See footnotes at end of table

Continued—

Table 1—Estimated weekly per capita food expenditure equations, eligible nonparticipant households—Continued

Independent variable	Dairy products	Fresh fruits	Fresh vegetables	Processed fruits	Processed vegetables	Sugar and other sweeteners	Fats and oils	Nonalcoholic beverages	Miscellaneous prepared foods	Food away from home
	Dollars									
Intercept	0 5541	0 2099	0 2214	0 2226	0 2204	0 2415	0 2202	0 2603	0 2300	3 5309
	(3 51)	(2 36)	(2 28)	(2 95)	(2 89)	(2 91)	(3 24)	(2 31)	(1 66)	(6 06)
URBN	– 0035	0226	0922	0069	0074	– 1152	– 1254	– 0323	– 0361	6228
	(– 06)	(65)	(2 45)	(24)	(25)	(–3 57)	(–4 74)	(– 74)	(– 67)	(2 75)
NE	3055	0282	0922	0274	– 0319	– 0349	– 0108	1886	1350	4647
	(3 63)	(59)	(1 79)	(68)	(– 79)	(– 79)	(– 30)	(3 15)	(1 83)	(1 50)
NC	– 0406	– 1258	– 0483	– 0140	– 0594	– 0288	– 0450	– 0024	0013	– 4268
	(– 53)	(–2 89)	(–1 02)	(– 38)	(–1 60)	(– 71)	(–1 36)	(– 04)	(02)	(–1 50)
S	– 0655	– 1679	– 0451	– 0495	– 0074	– 0708	– 0256	0534	0253	– 2583
	(– 89)	(–4 04)	(–1 00)	(–1 41)	(– 21)	(–1 83)	(– 81)	(1 02)	(39)	(– 95)
WHT	2419	0422	– 0055	– 0286	– 0188	0700	0499	1179	1743	6762
	(3 53)	(1 09)	(– 13)	(– 88)	(– 57)	(1 94)	(1 69)	(2 42)	(2 91)	(2 68)
PY	00665	00267	00280	00351	00290	00010	00326	00497	00699	00215
	(2 60)	(1 85)	(1 79)	(2 87)	(2 35)	(07)	(2 97)	(2 73)	(3 12)	(2 28)
NAG1	– 0017	– 0396	– 1517	– 1326	– 0580	0967	– 0119	1224	4570	–2 6769
	(– 01)	(– 34)	(–1 19)	(–1 33)	(– 58)	(88)	(– 13)	(82)	(2 50)	(–3 48)
NAG2	– 1746	– 0786	– 1551	– 1108	– 0372	0438	– 0283	– 0623	2221	– 7108
	(–1 25)	(– 99)	(–1 80)	(–1 66)	(– 55)	(59)	(– 47)	(– 62)	(1 81)	(–1 37)
NAG4	1588	– 0228	1032	– 0400	– 0262	0519	0220	1234	– 1098	– 7218
	(99)	(– 25)	(1 05)	(– 52)	(– 34)	(61)	(32)	(1 08)	(– 78)	(–1 22)
NAG5	4437	2629	2096	– 0267	0580	2443	1920	2813	0235	–2 1034
	(3 81)	(4 00)	(2 93)	(– 48)	(1 03)	(3 98)	(3 82)	(3 39)	(23)	(–4 89)
NAG6	3773	2447	1877	1027	0672	1719	0993	0972	– 0056	–3 8600
	(3 62)	(4 16)	(2 93)	(2 06)	(1 34)	(3 13)	(2 21)	(1 31)	(– 06)	(–10 04)
LNFMS	0116	– 0013	0114	– 0243	0010	– 0231	– 0067	– 0379	– 1022	–1 3820
	(21)	(– 04)	(33)	(– 90)	(04)	(– 77)	(– 28)	(– 94)	(–2 06)	(–6 63)
$R^{2\,2}$	08	08	06	05	02	03	05	04	02	12
S E E [3]	1 02	58	63	49	49	54	44	73	89	3 77

[1] Numbers in parentheses denote *t* values
[2] Coefficient of determination
[3] Standard error of regression

results suggest that to measure the Food Stamp Program's impact on household food purchase behavior accurately requires controlling for differences in characteristics between participants and nonparticipants

IMPACT OF THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM ON FOOD PURCHASES

To control for differences in characteristics between participants and eligible nonparticipants, I used the estimated relationships to predict food purchases by eligible nonparticipants assuming they possess the same (average) characteristics as Food Stamp Program participants Table 2 gives the mean values for these characteristics (independent variables) Thus, the predicted average per capita weekly total food expenditures by eligible nonparticipants possessing the same characteristics as participants are

$$\begin{aligned} E = \$9\ 28 = {} & 8\ 8664 + (\ 6354)(\ 8079) + (2\ 2486)(\ 1688) \\ & - (1\ 0786)(\ 2316) - (\ 5295)(\ 4129) + (\ 4556)(\ 5943) \\ & + (\ 0828)(24\ 1952) - (3\ 4844)(\ 2432) - (1\ 9375)(\ 1669) \\ & + (\ 7964)(\ 0973) + (1\ 7453)(\ 1540) - (\ 9454)(\ 1942) \\ & - (1\ 3084)(\ 9730) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Similarly, average per capita weekly expenditures on food-away-from-home, food-at-home, and selected food-at-home categories were estimated for eligible nonparticipants possessing the same characteristics as Food Stamp Program participants Table 3 presents these estimates plus the actual food purchases by Food Stamp Program participants and eligible nonparticipants

If we assume participants have the same purchasing patterns as similar nonparticipants, they would have spent $9 28 per person per week on food if they had not participated in the Food Stamp Program However, they actually spent $10 16 per person per week on food, which implies that the per capita bonus of $4 per week increased per capita food expenditures by 88 cents per week (9 5 percent) Per capita food-at-home expenditures were increased by an average of $1 45 per week (19 percent), whereas per capita food-away-from-home expenditures were reduced by 57 cents per week (36 percent)

The large estimated decline in food-away-from-home purchases is surprising Food stamps cannot be used to purchase food away from home But by participating in the Food Stamp Program, the household can use a portion of the income formerly spent on food at home to purchase food away from home and nonfood items The above results suggest however, that Food Stamp Program participant households not only do not allocate any of these savings to food away from home, but that they actually reduce such expenditures One explanation may be that low-income households view at-home and away-from-home-food purchases as substitute sources of food And since the Food Stamp Program subsidizes food-at-home purchases, thus causing an increase in such purchases, Food Stamp Program participants react by partially substituting increases in food-at-home purchases for food purchased away from home

Participation in the Food Stamp Program increased purchases in all at-home food expenditure groups (table 3) Per capita total at-home food expenditures rose an average 19 percent Food-at-home categories with large increases included cereal products (42 percent), processed vegetables (35 percent), pork (33 percent), nonalcoholic beverages (30 percent), eggs (23 percent), dairy products (22 percent), and poultry (22 percent)

Table 2—Mean values of independent variables for Food Stamp Program participants and eligible nonparticipants

Independent variable	Eligible nonparticipants	Participants
URBN	0 7696	0 8079
NE	1721	1688
NC	2481	2316
S	3972	4129
WHT	8185	5943
PY (dollars)	27 2338	24 1952
NAG1	1380	2432
NAG2	1515	1669
NAG4	0793	0973
NAG5	1617	1540
NAG6	3227	1942
LNFMS	7797	9730

Table 3—Estimated impact of the Food Stamp Program on per capita weekly food purchases of low-income households, 1973-74

Item	Participants (actual)	Eligible nonparticipants (actual)	Eligible nonparticipants (adjusted)[1]	Impact of Food Stamp Program	
	Dollars				*Percent*
Total food	10 16	10 14	9 28	[2]0 88*	[3]9 5
Food at home	9 16	8 32	7 71	1 45*	18 8
Bakery products	69	72	63	06**	9 5
Beef and veal	1 09	1 04	95	14**	14 7
Cereal products	44	34	31	13*	41 9
Dairy products	1 23	1 14	1 01	22*	21 8
Eggs	32	28	26	06*	23 1
Fats and oils	28	28	24	04**	16 7
Fish	25	22	23	02	8 7
Fresh fruits	31	34	29	02	6 9
Fresh vegetables	43	42	37	06**	16 2
Miscellaneous prepared foods condiments, and seasonings	58	58	55	03	5 5
Nonalcoholic beverages	69	58	53	16*	30 2
Other red meats	38	36	36	02	5 6
Pork	1 02	74	77	25*	32 5
Poultry	62	48	51	11*	21 6
Processed fruits	24	25	21	03	14 3
Processed vegetables	35	28	26	09*	34 6
Sugar and other sweeteners	25	27	24	01	4 2
Food away from home	1 00	1 82	1 57	- 57*	-36 3

[1]Predicted weekly per capita expenditures of eligibile nonparticipant households possessing the same characteristics as Food Stamp Program participants

[2]Column 1 minus column 3 A * indicates difference is significant at the 0 01 percent level of confidence A ** indicates difference is significant at the 0 05 level of confidence

[3]Column 4 divided by column 3

on average, each dollar distributed through the Food Stamp Program increased food purchases by 22 cents The Food Stamp Program is 2 7 times more effective in expanding household food purchases per dollar distributed than is a cash transfer program

Food Stamp Program participation also raised household expenditures on beef and veal (15 percent), bakery products (10 percent), fats and oils (17 percent), and fresh vegetables (16 percent) Participation did not, however, expand household expenditures on fish, fresh and processed fruits, sugar and other sweeteners, and miscellaneous prepared foods significantly

The increase in food purchases per dollar distributed is a measure of the Food Stamp Program's effectiveness For total food, the estimated effectiveness is 88 cents divided by $4 (the average bonus received per capita) or 22 cents (table 4) Thus, on average, each dollar distributed through the Food Stamp Program increased food purchases by 22 cents In comparison, the coefficients of per capita income (PY) in table 2 indicate that a dollar of additional income would increase participants' food purchases 8 cents The Food Stamp Program, therefore, is 2 7 times more effective in expanding household food purchases per dollar distributed than is a cash transfer program This finding agrees with those of other studies (*2, 5*)

Total at-home food purchases were increased by 36 cents, whereas away-from-home food purchases were reduced by 14 cents—for each dollar distributed through the Food Stamp Program In comparison, a cash transfer would expand at-home food purchases by 6 cents and away-from-home food purchases by about 2 cents per dollar distributed Compared with a cash transfer program, the pre-1979 Food Stamp Program seemed to be substantially more effective in expanding household purchases of food[7]

IMPLICATIONS

The Food Stamp Program has undergone major change since 1972-74, the study period The elimination of the purchase requirement on January 1, 1979, likely reduced the program's effectiveness as it enables participants to spend money previously used to purchase food coupons on items other than food as well as food Also, because food coupons had to be used to purchase food for consumption at home, elimination of the purchase requirement permits food stamp households to allocate more of their income to food away from home The results presented likely overstate the increase in food-at-home and the decline in food-away-from home expenditures resulting from participation in the current Food Stamp Program However, the current Food Stamp Program is at least as effective as cash transfers in

[7] Related reports the reader may find useful are summarized in (*4*)

Table 4—Impact of $100 distributed through the Food Stamp Program and a cash transfer program

Item	Food Stamp Program	Cash transfer program[1]	Relative difference[2]
	Dollars		*Percent*
Total food	22 00	8 28	2 7
Food at home	36 25	6 13	5 9
Bakery products	1 50	61	2 5
Beef and veal	3 50	85	4 1
Cereal products	3 25	28	11 6
Dairy products	5 50	66	8 3
Eggs	1 50	06	25 0
Fats and oils	1 00	33	3 3
Fish	50	07	7 1
Fresh fruits	50	27	1 9
Fresh vegetables	1 50	28	5 4
Miscellaneous prepared foods, condiments, and seasonings	75	70	1 1
Nonalcoholic beverages	4 00	50	8 0
Other red meats	50	14	3 6
Pork	6 25	52	12 0
Poultry	2 75	25	11 0
Processed fruits	75	35	2 1
Processed vegetables	2 25	29	7 8
Sugar and other sweeteners	25	01	25 0
Food away from home	−14 25	2 15	–

– = Not applicable

[1] Estimated impact of an additional $100 of income on food purchases by low-income households The coefficient of PY in table 3 multiplied by 100

[2] Column 1 divided by column 2

expanding participants' food purchases The results provide both maximum and minimum estimates of the current program's effectiveness Each dollar distributed through the current Food Stamp Program increases total food expenditures at least as much as a dollar of added income would increase it (8 3 cents) but less than a dollar's worth of added food stamps would increase it (22 cents)

REFERENCES

(1) Peterson, Hans P , and Rueben C Buse *A Bibliography on Theory and Research on Household Expenditures* AER-293 U S Dept Agr , Econ Res Serv , July 1975

(2) Reese, Robert B , J G Feaster, and G B Perkins *Bonus Food Stamps and Cash Income Supplements* MRR-1034, U S Dept Agr , Econ Res Serv , Oct 1974

(3) Salathe, Larry E "Food Stamp Program Impacts on Household Food Purchases Theoretical Considerations," *Agricultural Economic Research*, Vol 32, 1980, pp 36-40

(4) U S. Department of Agriculture, Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service *The Food Stamp Program A Review of Selected Economic Studies* ESCS-34 Sept 1978

(5) _____ Food and Nutrition Service *Report on the Food Stamp Program, Response to Senate Resolution 58, Supplement* Sept 1975.

(6) U S Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics *Consumer Expenditure Survey Diary Survey, July 1972-June 1974* Bulletin No 1959 U S Govt Print Off , 1977

(7) U S Congress (95th session) *Food and Agricultural Act of 1977* Public Law 95-113, Sept 29, 1977