COMPARISON OF CONSUMER EXPENDITURE PATTERNS.. URBAN SINGLE CONSUMING UNITS AND TWO- AND FOUR-MEMBER FAMILIES

THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

ALICE MILLS MORROW

1965

COMPARISON OF CONSUMER EXPENDITURE PATTERNS..URBAN SINGLE CONSUMING UNITS AND TWO- AND FOUR- MEMBER FAMILIES

by

Alice Mills Morrow

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Home Management and Child Development

1965

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

The author would like to express her appreciation to the members of her Guidance Committee: Dr. Beatrice Paolucci and Dr. Denzel Cline; special thanks and appreciation are given to the Chairman of this Committee and director of this research, Dr. Carol Shaffer, for her time, patience, and excellent direction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ii
LIST OF TABLES		iv
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
III.	METHODOLOGY AND DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE	20
IV.	ANALYSIS OF DATA	31
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	53
LITERATURE CITED		63
APPENDIX		65

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Description of Personal Interview Sample.	29
2.	Mean Expenditures and the Percentage of Before Tax Income of Urban Single Consuming Units in the North Central Region	32
3.	Largest Mean Expenditures of Before Tax Income of Urban Single Consuming Units in the North Central Region	33
4.	Mean Expenditures and the Percentage of Before Tax Income of Urban Two-member Families in the North Central Region	36
5.	Mean Expenditures and the Percentage of Before Tax Income of Urban Four-member Families in the North Central Region	37
6.	Largest Mean Expenditures of Before Tax Income of Urban Two-member Families in the North Central Region	38
7.	Largest Mean Expenditures of Before Tax Income of Urban Four-member Families in the North Central Region	39
8.	Mean Per Person Expenditures of Single Consuming Units, Two-member Families and Four-member Families in Urban Places in the North Central Region	41
9.	Changes Expected in Food Expense if Respondent Were Married and a Member of a Two-member Family.	42
10.	Respondents' Attitudes and Facts Concerning Transportation Expenditures	43
11.	Changes Expected in Housing Expense if Respondents Were Married and Member of a Two-member Family	44

Table | Page

12. Respondents' Attitudes and Facts Concerning Food Expenditures 46

13. Respondents' Information Concerning Housing 48

14. Respondents' Information Concerning Laundry 50

ABSTRACT

COMPARISON OF CONSUMER EXPENDITURE PATTERNS..URBAN SINGLE CONSUMING UNITS AND TWO- AND FOUR-MEMBER FAMILIES

by Alice Mills Morrow

Many studies have been conducted on the expenditure patterns of families, particularly the four-member family. There has been relatively little research done on the expenditure patterns of the single consuming unit. Literature reviewed in the areas of family taxation and home economics showed a lack of precise understanding of how expenditures are affected by a change in the size of the consuming unit. The purpose of this study is to analyze the variations in expenditures in relation to the size of the consuming unit and to interpret the findings with respect to home management and family finance.

Data for this study were from two sources; the Bureau of Labor Statistics "Consumer Expenditures and Income" and twenty personal interviews with single consuming units.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics data were used to support or negate the following hypotheses:

1. The largest mean expenditures of income of the single consuming unit, other than personal taxes, will be in the areas of food, clothing, housing, and transportation.

2. The mean per person expenditure for food, clothing, housing, and transportation will be larger for the single consuming unit than it will be for the two- and four-member family of the same income group.

3. Within areas of food and housing, differences will appear between the single consuming unit and the two- and four-member family.
    a. The mean percentage of food expenditure for food eaten away from home will be greater for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member families.

    b. The mean percentage of shelter expenditure for rented dwellings will be greater for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member families.

    c. The mean percentage of household operation expenditure for laundry sent out will be greater for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member families.

The data support hypotheses 2 and 3. Hypothesis 1 was not supported in full by the data. Food, clothing, and housing were major expenditures of the single consuming unit. However, the expenditure for gifts and contributions was somewhat larger than the expenditure for clothing in the $5-5999 and $6-7499 classes.

The personal interviews were used to obtain qualitative data on the attitudes and expectations of the single consuming unit.

This study has important implications for those persons teaching in the area of home management and family finance. Since expenditure patterns differed among income classes and the three sizes of consuming units studied, the needs of all students will not be met by teaching how to make decisions about individual expenditures such as food, clothing and shelter. In order to meet the needs of all students, we must place increased emphasis on financial decision-making as it applies to any expenditure. Students must also have information concerning changes in expenditures which will probably take place as the size of the consuming unit changes.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Interest in Expenditure Patterns and the Size of the Consuming Unit

We learn about a particular group by studying it, and by comparing and contrasting it with groups which are different. In order to study the single consuming unit we must focus on it, and also compare it and contrast it with other size consuming units.

In the area of family finance a great deal of study has been conducted on the expenditure patterns of family units, but very little research has been conducted on the expenditure patterns of single consuming units.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that 16.6% of all consuming units consist of one person; 30.0% are two-member families; 17.5% are three-member families; 16.0% are four-member families; 10.3% are five-member families; and 9.4% are made up of six or more members. (2)

Froeder states that:

> Although single consumers make up an important part of the consumer market, relatively little attention has been given to data on their spending patterns, which differ significantly from those of families. The same economic forces--employment levels, price changes, and availability of goods and services--of course affect the incomes and expenditures of both families and single consumers. Differences in characteristics and living patterns between the two groups, however, cause major differences in how much they earn and how they spend their incomes, although economic changes in recent years appear to have dimished these differences. (10:142)

The expenditure patterns of the single consuming unit have been of interest in the past primarily from a tax viewpoint. Providing equitable tax treatment for the single individual and the family unit has always been a problem. Experts in the tax field say that while there are economies of scale in family living, there is little precise knowledge about these economies. (12:106)

Gross and Crandall identify the fundamental purpose of management as bringing about change in an orderly way. This change may be the result of achievement of freely chosen goals, or it may consist of adjustment to changes which are beyond the control of the individuals or the family. (11:7) What are some of the changes that result from a change in the size of the consuming unit?

The area of family finance is particularly concerned with changes in expenditures as the size of the consuming unit changes. Gross and Crandall imply that the rise in family expenditures as the family grows is not proportionate to the increase in family size. Some living costs vary directly with the size of the family, while others remain fairly uniform regardless of family size. (11:200)

How do the expenditure patterns of the single consuming unit differ from those of larger families? If we are to help those people who remain single, and those people moving from the single consuming unit to the larger family or vice versa, we must have knowledge of the expenditure patterns of the single consuming unit and how they differ from the expenditure patterns of larger consuming units.

Objectives

The purpose of this study is to analyze expenditure patterns in relation to the size of the consuming unit and to interpret the

findings with respect to implications for home management and family finance. This study will focus particularly on the single consuming unit; it will look at the expenditures of other size units in order to compare and contrast them with those of the single consuming unit. The analysis of this relationship will be of importance to those teaching and counseling in the area of family financial management by providing a basis with which to predict the changes in expenditures that will result from change in the size of the consuming unit. The specific objectives of this study are:

1. To identify the expenditure patterns of the single consuming unit.
2. To investigate differences between the expenditure patterns of the single consuming unit and the two- and four-member family.
3. To draw implications for the home economist working in the area of home management and family finance.

Hypotheses

The data are to be analyzed to determine the relationship between expenditures and the size of the consuming unit. The analysis will focus on evidence to support or negate the following hypotheses:

1. The largest mean expenditures of income of the single consuming unit, other than personal taxes, will be in the areas of food, clothing, housing, and transportation.
2. The mean per person expenditure for food, clothing, housing and transportation will be larger for the single consuming unit than it will be for the two- and four-member family of the same income group.
3. Within the areas of food and housing, differences will appear

between the single consuming unit and the two- and four-member family.

a. The mean percentage of food expenditure for food eaten away from home will be greater for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member family.

b. The mean percentage of shelter expenditure for rented dwellings will be greater for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member family.

c. The mean percentage of household operation expenditure for laundry sent out will be greater for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member family.

Assumption

The following assumption is fundamental to this study:

There is a pattern of expenditures that can be identified for the single consuming unit and for larger families.

Definition of Terms

Data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics will be utilized in this study. With the exception of "single consuming unit," all definitions will be those used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Single Consuming Unit

Conceptual differences between the Bureau of Labor Statistics and other similar surveys center around the definition of the income unit and the time reference for determining its composition. Adult children who live with their parents pose the main definitional problem. All surveys include these persons in the same income-receiving unit as the

parents if the income is pooled with the family head for purposes of consumption. If the children do not pool income, whether they are included in the same unit with their parents or regarded as a separate unit may depend upon their marital status.

Single person units are classified by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Federal Reserve as "families" while the Bureau of the Census usually treats them separately as "unrelated individuals." (25:xxxiv) In this study a single person living away from home or living at home and not pooling income with the family will be called a single consuming unit, regardless of his marital status.

Bureau of Labor Statistics Definitions

Total food expenditures

This includes food eaten at home and away from home.

Total housing expenditure

This includes shelter either owned or rented; other real estate not used for family business and not occupied or rented; fuel, light, refrigeration, and water; household operations; and house furnishings and equipment.

Household operations

This includes laundry supplies, cleaning supplies, and household paper supplies; laundry and cleaning sent out; domestic service; day nursery care; telephone and telegraph; equipment repairs; moving, freight, express, and storage; and postage and writing materials.

Housefurnishings and equipment

This includes household textiles, furniture, floor coverings,

major appliances, small appliances, housewares, and miscellaneous items.

Total transportation

This includes automobile purchase and operation, public transportation, and car pools.

Total medical care

This includes prepaid care and direct expense.

Personal care

This includes haircuts; shaves; waves, shampoos, tinting, etc; other personal care services; and personal care supplies.

Total recreation

This includes television, radio, phonographs, tape recorders, etc.; musical instruments; special admissions; fees, dues, and equipment for participant sports; club dues and memberships; hobbies; purchase and care of pets; toys and play equipment; recreation out of home city; and other recreation.

Gifts and contributions

This includes cash, goods, and services given to persons not in the family and money to organizations.

Net change in assets and liabilities

This is the algebraic sum of increases or decreases in liabilities which represents a net saving during the year. Net decreases in assets or increases in liabilities represent a deficit (-) or net dissaving.

Money income before taxes

This is total money income during the survey year of all family

members from wages and salaries (including tips and bonuses) after deductions for such occupational expenses as tools, special required equipment, and union dues; net income from self-employment; and income other than earnings such as net rents, interests, dividends, Social Security benefits, pensions, disability insurance, trust funds, small gifts of cash, regular contributions for support, public assistance or other governmental payments. The value of two nonmoney items--food and housing received as pay--are counted as money income and as expenditures.

Money income after taxes

This is money income after the deduction of personal taxes (Federal, State, and local income taxes; poll taxes; and personal property taxes.)

These are the definitions of the terms appearing in the hypotheses and tables. The Bureau of Labor Statistics data were analyzed to provide evidence to support or negate the hypotheses. Mean expenditures for each category were obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics "Consumer Expenditures and Income, Urban places in the North Central Region, 1960-61." (3)

The mean expenditures in the Bureau of Labor Statistics report were used to determine the percentage of income spent by the single consuming unit, the two-member family and the four-member family; the per person expenditures of each group and the percentage of major components spent for individual components. Further information to provide insight into the expenditure patterns of the single consuming unit was obtained from personal interviews.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature describing differences between the single consuming unit and the larger family is widely dispersed. Studies dealing with particular aspects of expenditures are frequent, while studies dealing with total expenditure patterns of the single consuming unit are infrequent.

Feldman in The Family in a Money World writes that variations in spending patterns exist for the single person and stem from the meaning money has for them. Single people often spend money for luxuries rather than necessities since the luxuries serve as substitutes for love, companionship, family, and children. Loneliness may result in an undue preoccupation with extravagant living or may, on the other hand, make the person fearful of spending money, since it represents the only security he has. Feldman does not suggest that all persons living along spend money reaklessly or are extremely penurious. She does say:

> It is true, however, that a person living alone, well adjusted and sound as he may be, actually does have additional spending needs. The lack of other persons with whom to share costs means that his daily needs cannot be met as economically as those of a family. Even the single persons income tax rates are higher. (9:65)

Since most of the studies deal with particular aspects of expenditures, the literature will be reviewed under the particular aspects with which it is concerned.

Work

Morgan, et. al. reports that married men are more likely to work than are single men. Married men may work because of additional responsibilities or working men may be more likely to marry because they are able to support families. The differences were not related to age, education, race, or other factors used in Morgan's analysis. (19:42)

The work activities of women show the reverse situation. Single women and female heads of households have higher labor force participation rates than married women who have husbands to assume the main financial responsibility for the family. (23:835)

The single women in the labor force may be divided into two groups. The larger group is composed of young women under 35 years of age, the great majority of whom will marry in a short time. The smaller group, about 39% of the total, consists of women 35 and over, most of whom will remain single and at work until they reach retirement age. (24)

Feldman suggests that single persons may have broader work opportunities than married persons because they are freer to change their places of residence. (9:64)

Mincer and Schiffman have similar findings consistent with the hypothesis that when the primary family provider is unemployed, other persons in the family try to find work as an alternative to dissaving. (18:582, 23:834) If the family provider is out of work because of a general scarcity of work in the geographic area, then other family members might also experience difficulty in locating jobs. However, the family does have a potential source of income which the single consuming unit does not.

Taxes

Much has been written in tax literature regarding the federal income tax in relation to single and married people. The literature reveals conflicting attitudes toward the present tax structure and toward possible alternatives.

Providing equitable tax treatment for the single individual and the married couple has always been a problem. In 1948 the split-income provision was passed enabling married couples to assume, for tax purposes, that their entire income was equally divided between husband and wife. The split-income provision was deemed essential because of community property laws existing in twelve states which enabled married couples to consider their total income as belonging half to the wife and half to the husband.

No sooner was the Revenue Act of 1948 passed, establishing the split-income provision, when questions were raised concerning the fairness of this to single people under all circumstances. It appeared that some concessions were required in some cases. Thus, in 1951 Congress established a special category of tax-payers called "heads of households," defined as single persons who maintain principal places of abode for themselves and an unmarried child or grandchild or any other person who is a dependent for tax purposes. The heads of households were given a concession which amounts to approximately half of the benefit of income-splitting.

Henle states that the split-income provision results in a significantly lower tax bill for families whose taxable income is $12,000 or above. A family with $20,000 total income and $16,000 taxable income in 1959 would have paid a tax bill of $3920. A single

person on the same amount of taxable income would have paid $5200, or 33% more. According to Henle, this preferential treatment for upper income families results in a loss of over $4 billion to the Federal Treasury. He suggests developing separate tax tables for married couples and single people in which the amount of taxable income in each tax bracket for married couples would be one half the amount in the tax table for single persons. He also feels that more liberal exemptions for married couples would be better than retaining the present high inequitable split-income provision. (13)

Davidson does not accept the theory that today's tax system unduly penalizes the single taxpayer and benefits the married taxpayer. He points out that the greatest benefit from income splitting falls in the middle income brackets, with the peak at about $30,000. The relative benefit tapers off very rapidly through the higher income brackets, to the ultimate point of almost total disappearance. Davidson feel that the income tax should be levied on the per person net income rather than on total taxable income. As he describes this, the tax rate would be increased as income increases, but the tax would be levied on the per person net income. (5) Thus, Davidson implies that there are no economies of scale ir group living.

Froeder says that families have the advantage of group sharing of expenses, particularly in housing, household operation, and house furnishings. Economies are also experienced in food costs with increases in family size. "It is therefore reasonable," she says, "to consider the survey families, averaging 3.3 in size with an average income of $4224, 'better off' than the single consumers with an average of $1895." (10:150)

Pechman holds the view that income splitting reduces progression because, in effect, it doubles the width of taxable income brackets for

married persons. This tax advantage progresses to a maximum of $25,180 for married couples with taxable incomes of $400,000 or more. (21:275) He raises the question of equity in the distribution of tax burdens by income levels and between single persons and married couples.

The classic argument in favor of the present 2:1 relationship between the tax liabilities of married couples and single persons is that husband and wife usually share their incomes equally. However, Pechman raises the question of whether the sharing argument wh.ch justifies treating husband and wife as one tax payer unit, also justifies taxing them as if they were two single persons each with one half their combined income. (20) Pechman does not choose to use the argument that the tax law should recognize that there are economies in marriage. His reasons for this are three: first, there are diseconomies as well as economies in marriage; second, there is no way of measuring what the net economies of married couples may be at different income levels; and third, even if these measurements could be made, it would be difficult to devise simple rate schedules that would make the differentiation desired at every income level. He feels that if there are differences in living costs, the only practical way to make the necessary differentiation is to adjust the personal exemptions. (20)

Other tax systems seem to account for economies in group living. For example, in Ceylon income is divided among members of the family (and others) for tax purposes as follows:

Single person	1½ units
Married man	1½ units
Wife	½ unit
Child	½ unit
Dependent relative	½ unit

The maximum number of units applicable to a family is limited to four. (12:104)

A 1963 conference on the tax treatment of the family brought out the point that we do not have any very precise knowledge of the "economies of scale" that attend family living. (12:105) The final note of the conference was that little sympathy was to be expected for bachelors and spinsters because they shirk the responsibilities that families accept. (12:106)

While the tax literature indicates a need for reform in the areas of deductions and rate tables, recent emphasis has been on tax cuts rather than tax reform. Even though tax cuts are no substitute for tax reform, this emphasis will probably continue. (1, 26)

Housing

Shelter

David in Family Composition and Consumption concludes that "the data on rental housing show unequivocally that the renter of larger dwellings benefits from substantial economies of scale. Larger families rent larger dwellings and buy at quantity rates." (4:95) Increasing family size is associated with a decline in quality of housing consumed by the family both as owners and renters. (4:95-96)

The minimum housing needs and estimated monthly costs for New York City as compiled in A Family Budget Standard may be summarized as follows: (8:32)

No. of persons	No. of rooms	Cost unfurnished	Cost furnished
1	2	$60.48	$75.59
2	3	70.72	88.41
4	5	82.00	not given

The estimated cost for shelter increases as the size of the consuming unit increases. The increase in cost, however, is not proportionate with the increase in size.

Froeder reports that women keep house much more frequently than men. In her study, over seven-tenths of the women kept house as compared to one-third of the men. Women were also more than twice as likely to be homeowners. Among both men and women single consumers, home ownership was positively correlated with age. (10:148)

There has been an increase in the number of single individuals maintaining their own households. In 1960, 13% of all housing units (21% of rented and 9% of owner-occupied) were occupied by persons living alone. In 1950, 9% of all housing units were occupied by persons living alone. Over half of these persons living alone were over sixty years of age. (22)

Household Operation

As a basis for cost estimation A Family Budget Standard lists the following amounts of electricity needed for consuming units of 1, 2, and 4 persons. (8:37)

No. of persons	Kilowatt Hours of Electricity per Month					
	Light	Refrig.	T. V.	Radio	Small Appliances	Total
1	25	40	15	5	5	90
2	50	40	15	5	5	115
4	75	40	25	8	17	165

The total number of kilowatt hours of electricity used increases as the size of the consuming unit increases. However, the total amount used by the four person consuming unit is less than twice that used by the single consuming unit.

As a basis for cost estimation A Family Budget Standard lists the following amounts of gas used for cooking for consuming units of 1, 2, and 4 persons. (8:37)

Gas for Cooking, Monthly Basis

No. of Persons	Cubic Feet
1	360
2	570
4	960

There is a rise in the amount of gas used for cooking as the size of the consuming unit increases. Again it is not proportionate with the increase in the size of the consuming unit.

The cost of household supplies and launderette service reported in A Family Budget Standard may be summarized as follows: (8:40)

Cost of Household Supplies and Launderette Service, October, 1962

Size of Family	Household Supplies per year	Launderette Self Service per week
1	$18	$ .40
2	34	.80
4	45	1.60

According to A Family Budget Standard the cost of housefurnishings, like other housing expenses reviewed, does not increase in the same proportion as the size of the consuming unit.

The cost of the self-service launderette as reported in A Family Budget Standard increases proportionately with family size. However, The Agricultural Research Service reports that when a family has five loads of wash per week, washing and drying at home begins to cost less than the self service launderette. Thus the larger family

finds economy in doing the laundry at home. (16)

Housing of Relatives

According to Morgan et.al. single persons are more likely to house relatives than are married persons. The resistance of wives to another woman in the kitchen may be more important than the need for a wife to care for the relatives. Having children at home, in addition to a wife, makes the housing of relatives even less likely. (19:168)

In Hovermale's study on the spending patterns of single women, one fourth of both the clerical workers and the professional workers reported that they were responsible for the support of a person, or persons, other than themselves. (14:155)

Home Production

Morgan et.al. found that married couples save most through home production. (19:98) David found that large families are more likely to purchase washing machines, dryers, and freezers than small families. This leads to the belief that large families substitute home production for the purchase of services on the market. (4:95)

Food

The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that the per person food costs for single consuming units are 10% greater than they are for two-member families. Per person food costs for the two-member family are 10% greater than they are for four-member families. (7) These differences in cost are due to the fact that large families have advantages in quantity buying as well as less spoilage and other losses than small families.

A Family Budget Standard states that when a food budget is made

for a single person who lives in a furnished room or non-housekeeping apartment, the cost of restaurant meals should be substituted for the cost of food prepared at home. The social and health values of eating some meals out should be considered in the food budgets of elderly persons living alone, even when they have access to cooking facilities.(18:15)

Clothing

Hovermale in "Spending Patterns of Single Women, With Emphasis on Clothing," states that clothing--long an important status symbol--has been replaced in eminence by the automobile, housing, income, education, occupation, and the like. We are currently spending a smaller proportion of the consumer dollar on clothing than previously. (14:12)

A Family Budget Standard lists average clothing costs for various age, sex, and activity groups. The increased cost of the clothing as the family size increases is not as significant as the increased cost of clothing as age and activities change. The highest clothing cost listed is for the employed woman and this is $5.90 per week. The next higher costs are for girls and boys, 16 and over who are employed. The next groups in order are girls and boys, 16 and over who are in school; the costs for these groups are higher than those for an employed man. (8:22)

It is evident that clothing costs are not subject to economies of scale as family size increases. Clothing costs seem to be more related to age, sex, and activity than they are to family size.

Automobiles

David reports that significant changes in the consumption of automobiles occur as family size varies. Family size alone does not explain the consumption of automobiles; some life cycle groupings must also be

used. The consumption of automobiles by persons 45 and over is below that of persons in similar situations but whose age is under 45. (4:91, table 6.5) Within the group of married couples with children, the average level of automobile consumption drops steadily as family size increases. Single people appear to spend more money on cars than married people. (4:54, table 6.1) This may stem from differences in the residence and transiency of single and married persons. (4:93)

According to Froeder, the average single man spends proportionately more for transportation than does the average single women. (10:149) Froeder found, however, that the single consumer spends less on transportation than do families. (10:150)

Life Insurance

Survey Research Center has found that, for the most part, the need to carry insurance to provide protection for a family is not a strong factor with unmarried people. Unmarried people between the ages of 18-44 are more apt to carry life insurance than are older unmarried people. (17:15)

A Family Budget Standard has adopted for the standard a commercial life insurance plan which provides (a) a plan that will give the insured maximum protection for the amount of premium available; (b) a fund for burial; and (c) a fund for a period of adjustment in the event of the death of the breadwinner. (8:53) The average cost per year according to family size and composition is as follows: (8:54)

Family Size	Family Composition	Av. Cost/Yr.
1	Head of Household	$69.00
2	Head of Household 1 Other Adult	86.00
4	Head of Household 1 Other Adult 2 Children	105.68

Medical Care

Annual medical care costs compiled in A Family Budget Standard may be summarized as follows: (8:46)

Annual Medical Care Costs for Families of Specified Size and Composition

Family Size	Family Composition	Cost
1	Adult under 65	$103.93
1	Adult 65 or over	140.30
2	2 Adults under 65	207.86
2	2 Adults 65 or over	280.60
4	2 Adults, 2 Children	302.16

It is apparent that the need for medical care increases as age advances. The relatively large medical care expenditure by older persons is probably due in part to their lower participation in health insurance and group medical care plans. (10:149)

Summary

The literature reviewed indicates a difference in the expenditure patterns of single consuming units and larger families.

Froeder reports that differences in the needs and purchasing power of families and single consumers are only partially revealed in the distribution of expenditures by major categories. Differences in expenditures are much sharper for certain components of major categories. (10:150)

This study focuses on some of the differences between single consuming units and larger family expenditures in major categories and in components of major categories. It also attempts to explain why some of these differences exist.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Methodology

The data for this study are from two sources; the Bureau of Labor Statistics "Survey of Consumer Expenditures in 1960 and 1961," and personal interviews.

Survey of Consumer Expenditures

The information utilized from the Bureau of Labor Statistics is from "Consumer Expenditures and Income." (3)

The Bureau of Labor Statistics survey data are obtained from a carefully selected sample representative of the United States population and of regional populations. Thus, generalizations may be made on the basis of survey findings which are applicable to the United States or to regional areas.

The primary objective of the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey was to obtain data for use in the revision of the Consumer Price Index. The tabulations available are designed to provide data serving other important survey objectives, such as analysis of expenditure patterns for purposes of economic policy and marketing and academic research.

The survey was conducted in 2 years - in 1961, covering family expenditures and income in the calendar year 1960, and in 1962, providing data for 1961.

A three-stage sample design was used to select a sample repre-

senting all families in the urban population. The first stage was the selection of cities to be surveyed. At the second stage, a sample of living quarter addresses was obtained in each city. In the final stage, the addresses for the survey were selected. This procedure yielded a sample of 12,000 living-quarter addresses in 66 urban places.

All data were collected by personal interviews. Interviews for the 1960 and 1961 Consumer Expenditure Survey were conducted in the spring and summer of 1961 and 1962 respectively. Reported receipts and disbursements were summarized and reviewed in the field to determine the completeness, consistency, and reasonableness of the reported account. A total of 9,476 families in urban places in the fifty states furnished usable schedules.

City averages obtained were combined with the regional level with a system of weights based on the 1960 Censes of Population. The four major geographical regions are North East, North Central, South, and West. For this study, data from the North Central Region were used. The personal interviews were conducted in the North Central Region, making the two sources of data more comparable.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reviewed, edited, and screened all data to minimize processing errors. Preliminary calculations of the sampling error applicable to the 1960-61 Consumer Expenditure Survey averages for the Urban United States indicate a standard error of less than 1% for total expenditures. For five selected components (food; housing; clothing; transportation; and health, recreation, etc.) the relative error for no component exceeded 1.5%. The largest relative error, 15%, was for the net change in assets and liabilities which can vary widely in both a plus and a minus

direction.

Averages for families at the extremes of the income scale are based on small numbers of families which may differ sharply in their spending patterns. Therefore, those groups are not being used in this study. The income groups which have been selected for this study are $4-4999; $5-5999; and $6-7499. These income groups represent income after personal taxes. The average age of these income groups is 49.2, 52.0, and 48.8, respectively. The average education is fairly similar, being 11.5 years, 12.7 years, and 13.6 years, respectively. Since factors such as geographical region, income, age, and education are similar, the probability is increased that differences which appear in expenditure patterns are due to differences in the size of the consuming unit.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics data have certain limitations. There is considerable variability in family expenditures for individual items and groups of goods and services. In a given year the number of families purchasing a particular item may be only a small portion of all families and the amount spent by each family purchasing the item may vary widely. The average expenditure is the product of the percentage of families purchasing and the average amount spent by those who purchased.

Also, certain reporting errors can be expected. With respect to the accuracy of recall the following six groups can be identified: (25:x1v)

1. Large, single transactions such as the purchase of a home or automobile are fixed in memory by their importance and are usually supported by records.

2. Regular recurring receipts and disbursements such as salaries and rents usually require only reference to the most recent transaction and some investiga-

tion into possible changes occuring during the year.

3. Accurate recall of expenditure for items bought infrequently and irregularly, such as clothing and house furnishings demands intensive probing and thorough investigation.

4. Reports of annual expenditures for items purchased frequently, such as haircuts, hosiery, and movie admissions are obtained generally as estimates based on the usual amount of each expenditure and the frequency with which the expenditure is made.

5. Expenditures for items purchased in great number throughout the year such as specific foods can be recorded with accuracy only for short periods of time.

6. The most difficult to account for are a group of receipts and disbursements which the respondent does not know about, forgets because they are unusual and of minor importance, or knowingly conceals. Among these are savings accounts, odd job earnings of individual family members, the disposition of children's allowances and school expenses, and expenditures for alcoholic beverages and tobacco.

Despite these limitations the data are useful for this study. The data do provide empirical data on the expenditure patterns of consuming units of different sizes and the sample used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics is representative of the North Central Region. Therefore, it is possible to make generalizations concerning the North Central Region.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics data were used to support or negate the hypotheses.

For Hypothesis I, the mean percentage of income spent for the items listed in the Bureau of Labor Statistics data was computed by dividing the mean expenditure by the mean income before taxes of the income classes being studied. If the largest mean

expenditures other than personal taxes in the three income classes are food, clothing, housing, and transportation, Hypothesis I will be supported.

The mean per person expenditures for food, clothing, housing, and transportation were computed from the Bureau of Labor Statistics data for the single consuming unit, the two-member family, and the four-member family to test Hypothesis II. If the mean per person expenditure for the items listed are larger for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member families, Hypothesis II will be supported.

In Hypothesis III, components of major expenditures will be analyzed. The Bureau of Labor Statistics data will be used to determine if differences in the areas of food and housing do exist between the single consuming unit, and the two- and four-member families.

The mean percentage of food expenditure for food eaten away from home will be obtained by dividing the total expenditure for food eaten away from home by the total food expenditure of the consuming unit. Part A of Hypothesis III will be supported if this percentage for the single consuming unit is larger than the percentages for two- and four-member families.

The mean percentage of shelter expenditure for rented dwellings will be obtained by dividing the expenditure for rented dwellings by the total shelter expenditure of the consuming unit. Part B of Hypothesis III will be supported if this percentage is larger for the single consuming unit than the percentages for the two- and four-member families.

The mean percentage of household operation expenditure for laundry sent out will be obtained by dividing the expenditure for

laundry sent out by the total household operation expenditure of the consuming unit. Part C of Hypothesis III will be supported if this percentage is larger for the single consuming unit than the percentages for the two- and four-member families.

Personal Interviews

In order to gain insight into why the single consuming units spend as they do, personal interviews were conducted with twenty single consuming units. These interviews were for the purpose of obtaining qualitative data about the attitudes and expectations of the single consuming unit.

The interview schedule is a "fixed question-free answer" schedule similar to those used by the Survey Research Center. (15) Some questions can be answered yes or no and some are supplemented with nondirective probes such as "why do you say so?". The questions are designed to elicit answers about the attitudes toward present expenditures and changes the single consuming unit could expect if he were married and a member of a two-member family.

The original interview schedule was pre-tested on four summer school students who had been employed prior to starting school. During the pre-test it was found that the respondents would not give answers to questions about amounts of money spent for particular items without extensive probing. In most cases, rather than asking for amounts of money spent, the questions asked whether the respondent feels a particular expenditure is high, average, or less than average.

The interview schedule which was used may be found in the appendix. The interview took from 15-20 minutes. Schedule A of the

questionnaire entitled "Economic Well Being" included general questions about the respondents' attitudes toward their finances. In addition to eliciting general information, Schedule A prepared the respondents to answer the questions about specific expenditures. The areas of expenditures about which the respondents were asked on the remaining schedules are housing, transportation, meals, laundry, family obligations, and changes they would expect in income and expenditures if they were married and members of two-member families.

The frequency with which the pre-coded answers are mentioned was summarized. These and the answers to the non-directive probes were used in the analysis to help explain the Bureau of Labor Statistics data.

The interviews were conducted on the Michigan State University Campus. The names of single staff members were taken from the Michigan State University Staff Directory and the names were cross-checked with the student directory in order to eliminate part-time students. Faculty members also were not used as part of the sample. Staff members were contacted to see if they were single with no dependents and over 25 years of age. It was desired that they be over 25 years of age as they would be more likely to have established expenditure patterns and they would be more similar to the Bureau of Labor Statistics sample.

Selection from the Michigan State University Staff Directory was not entirely satisfactory due to errors in the directory, changes in marital status, changes in campus addresses, vacations, termination of employment, and the fact that many of the single persons contacted had dependents. Because of these difficulties, other respondents were

obtained through personal contacts rather than through the directory. In all instances the respondents were 25 years of age or older, single with no dependents, and residing in the Lansing, Michigan, area.

Description of Sample: Personal Interviews

The personal interview sample consisted of ten males and ten females all residing in the Lansing, Michigan, area.

All of the respondents were at least 25 years of age. The women, a somewhat older group than the men, had a median age of 44. The median age of the men was 28.

All of the respondents were presently single with no dependents. The men were all single, never having been married. Seven of the women had never been married and three were widows. One of the widows had three children who were over eighteen years of age and not dependents; the other two widows were childless.

The educational level of the men was higher than that of the women. All of the men had had some college education as compared to half of the women who had had some college education.

Occupations were put into categories as defined by Thomas. (27) Seven of the ten men were in either professional or managerial occupations. Of the other three, two indicated that they might return to college in the near future in order to obtain better jobs. Eight of the ten women interviewed were clerical workers.

The median number of years on the present job was somewhat less for the men that it was for the women. For many of the men, this was their first full time job.

The present income of the men was higher than that of the women. This corresponds with the fact that men typically have higher incomes than women, the men had more education, and the men were in professional or managerial type jobs.

Almost all of the respondents reported that they were making the same or more income than they were a year ago and they felt that they were as well off or better off than they were last year. Eighteen of the twenty respondents had some money in a savings account or in government bonds. Only four felt that the amount of these funds was fully adequate. Most of the respondents had a difficult time answering the question concerning their source of money if they were out of work for a considerable time period. Some of them remarked that they had never really thought about it.

The results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1--Description of personal interview sample

Item	Male	Female	Total Sample
Sample size	10	10	20
Age -Range	25-40	25-62	25-62
Median	28	44	28.5
Marital status			
Single, never married	10	7	17
Widowed	0	3	3
Maximum education			
High school graduate	0	1	1
Business school	0	4	4
College, non-graduate	2	1	3
College, graduate	5	3	8
College, advanced degree	3	1	4
Occupation			
Professional, technical	3	1	4
Managerial	4	1	5
Clerical	0	8	8
Service	3	0	3
Years on present job			
Range	less than 1-12	less than 1-20	less than 1-20
Median	2	3.75	2
Present income, before taxes			
Range	$4800-13,200	$3960-9,700	$3960-13,200
Median	$7600	$5050	$7100

Table 1, continued

Item	Male	Female	Total Sample
Income compared to a year ago			
More	7	9	16
Less	1	1	2
No change	2	0	2
Financial position compared to a year ago			
Better	4	3	7
Same	5	5	10
Worse	1	2	3
No. having savings in bank account or gov't bonds	9	9	18
How respondent feels about savings			
Far too little	3	2	5
Fairly satisfactory	4	5	9
Fully adequate	2	2	4
Source of money if out of work			
Employment benefits	4	4	8
Savings	5	6	11
Insurance	6	5	11
Relatives	0	1	1
Don't know	2	0	2

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

All hypotheses will be supported or negated with data from Supplement 3-Part A to Bureau of Labor Statistics Report 237-35, July 1964. (3) In the Bureau of Labor Statistics Report the average expenditures are reported by income class, family size, and region. In this study the income classes being studied are $4-4999, $5-5999, and $6-7499. Families are grouped into the income classes on the basis of money income after taxes. The consuming units being compared in this study are the single consuming unit, and two- and four-member families. The region being used is the urban north central region. Information obtained from the personal interviews will be used to gain further insight into the expenditure patterns which appear in the Bureau of Labor Statistics data and to gain information concerning the attitudes and expectations of the single consuming unit.

Hypothesis I

The first hypothesis states that the largest mean expenditures of the single consuming unit, other than personal taxes, will be in the areas of food, clothing, housing, and transportation.

In order to prepare Table 2, the total expenditures in the three income classes for each of the expenditure categories were taken from the Bureau of Labor Statistics data. To compute the mean percentage

Table 2--Mean expenditures and the percentage of before tax income of urban single consuming units in the north central region

Item	Income classes (after tax income)					
	$4-4999		$5-5999		$6-7499	
	$	%	$	%	$	%
Mean income before taxes	$5228.35	100	$6390.68	100	$8082.06	100
Expenditures						
Food, Total	773.66	14.80	753.23	11.79	856.74	10.60
Alcoholic Beverages	162.93	3.12	107.87	1.69	173.50	2.15
Tobacco	49.41	.94	49.18	.77	71.22	.88
Housing, Total	961.99	18.40	1383.13	21.64	1655.70	20.49
Clothing, materials & services	355.43	6.72	353.38	5.53	388.91	4.81
Transportation, Total	713.20	13.64	667.14	10.44	1052.84	13.03
Medical care, Total	190.74	3.65	233.59	3.66	187.70	2.32
Personal care, Total	93.84	1.79	116.84	1.83	140.32	1.74
Recreation, Total	133.61	2.56	191.74	3.00	245.00	3.03
Reading, Total	42.31	.81	52.15	.82	52.57	.65
Education, Total	11.22	.21	18.79	.29	8.67	.11
Miscellaneous, Total	62.03	1.19	173.53	2.72	238.51	2.95
Personal insurance, Total	248.24	4.75	238.67	3.73	309.12	3.82
Gifts and Contributions	314.96	6.02	430.15	6.73	791.55	9.79
Personal taxes, Total	799.76	15.30	917.45	14.36	1425.44	17.64
Net change in assets and liabilities	297.87	5.70	570.25	8.93	950.72	11.76

NOTE: Percentage columns will not add to 100%. For an explanation of standard error refer to page 21.

of income spent for the particular items, the mean expenditure was divided by the mean income before taxes of the income class. Mean income before taxes was used as the divisor in order to give a more accurate picture of the allocation of total income. The consuming unit does not make an individual decision about how much money he will allocate to taxes, but nevertheless taxes are an important expenditure and should not be omitted from the analysis.

When rounding was done the following rule was used: If the number preceeding the 5 to be dropped was an even number, it was not changed; but if the number preceeding the 5 was odd, then it was raised by one. (6)

The mean expenditures of the single consuming unit are shown on Table 2. The largest mean expenditures of the single consuming unit are shown on Table 3.

TABLE 3--Largest mean expenditures of before tax income of urban single consuming units in the north central region

Income class (after tax income)	Expenditure	% of income before taxes
$4-999	Housing	18.40
	Personal Taxes	15.30
	Food	14.80
	Transportation	13.64
	Clothing	6.72
	Gifts and contributions	6.02
$5-5999	Housing	21.64
	Personal Taxes	14.36
	Food	11.79
	Transportation	10.44
	Gifts and contributions	6.73
	Clothing	5.52
$6-7499	Housing	20.49
	Personal Taxes	17.64
	Transportation	13.03
	Food	10.60
	Gifts and contributions	9.79
	Clothing	4.81

Table 3 shows that in each income class, housing, food, and transportation are major expenditures. However, the data do not support clothing as a major expenditure.

In the $4-4999 class, clothing is a slightly larger expenditure than the next item, gifts and contributions. This is not true in the other income classes. In these, gifts and contributions is a larger percentage of before tax income than is clothing.

In the Bureau of Labor Statistics data, gifts and contributions are defined as those given to persons not members of the family and to organizations. Since the Bureau of Labor Statistics defines the single consuming unit as a "family", gifts given to the family of origin would be included as gifts given to persons not members of the family.

During the personal interviews, eighteen of the respondents whose families of origin were living were asked about financial obligations to their families.

Three respondents said that they presently had financial obligations to their families of origin. All of the respondents with families living, except two, felt that in time of financial emergency their family would look to them for help.

In the past year, four of the respondents had given financial assistance to their families of origin. This help was for college expenses for brothers and sisters, clothing expenses of a mother, wedding expenses of a sister, and financial help to sons who were not dependents.

Fifteen of the respondents had families and had married brothers or sisters. Nine of these felt that in time of emergency they would have more financial responsibility than the married brothers or sisters, and six felt that they would share expenses equally.

From the personal interviews, it appears that even though the single consuming unit does not have dependents, he does feel a sense of responsibility to his family of origin. The respondents may be over-optimistic about the help they would be able to give in a time of emergency, but since four of the respondents had given help as needed in the past year, it appears that single consuming units do accept this responsibility.

Table 3 also shows the importance of taxes as an expenditure; taxes are the second largest expenditure in each of the three income classes. It is important that taxes be thought of as an expenditure even though they are not an area where the person has a choice about the expenditure. Two of the respondents to the personal interviews reported paying taxes at the end of the tax year as an unexpected financial event.

For the purpose of comparing the single consuming unit with the larger family, tables have been compiled from the Bureau of Labor Statistics data for the two- and four-member family in the same manner described for the single consuming unit. The mean expenditures for the two- and four-member families are shown on Tables 4 and 5, respectively. The largest mean expenditures of the two- and four-member families are shown on Tables 6 and 7, respectively.

Tables 6 and 7 show some of the changes in expenditure patterns as the size of the consuming unit changes. As the size of the consuming unit increases, taxes as a percentage of income decrease somewhat. However, the tables illustrate that the income splitting provision does not benefit these income classes to any great extent.

In the larger families, gifts and contributions do not show up as a major expense. In the two- and four-member families, there are probably more gifts exchanged between members of the family than are given to people

TABLE 4--Mean expenditures and the percentage of before tax income of urban two-member families in the north central region

Item	Income classes (after tax income)					
	$4-4999		$5-5999		$6-7499	
	$	%	$	%	$	%
Mean income before taxes	$5009.20	100	$6252.63	100	$7741.48	100
Expenditures						
Food, total	942.87	18.82	1081.22	17.29	1159.76	14.98
Alcoholic beverages	55.82	1.11	91.04	1.46	129.78	1.68
Tobacco	85.18	1.70	95.29	1.52	118.62	1.53
Housing, total	1350.62	26.96	1385.54	22.16	1679.11	21.69
Clothing, materials & services	334.18	6.67	360.73	5.77	476.76	6.16
Transportation, total	814.04	16.25	737.31	11.79	807.07	10.42
Medical care, total	337.12	6.73	328.23	5.25	406.00	5.24
Personal care, total	131.05	2.62	121.47	1.94	151.07	1.95
Recreation, total	157.74	3.15	161.05	2.18	186.15	2.40
Reading, total	40.19	.80	47.30	.76	55.14	.71
Education, total	18.34	.37	33.43	.53	20.84	.27
Miscellaneous, total	59.48	1.19	63.84	1.02	158.13	2.04
Personal insurance	244.11	4.87	292.35	4.68	359.47	4.64
Gifts and contributions	277.10	4.53	266.44	4.26	323.77	4.18
Personal taxes, total	577.08	11.12	775.38	12.40	1093.83	14.13
Net change in assets and liabilities	228.42	4.56	468.95	7.50	654.26	8.45

NOTE: Percentage columns will not add to 100% For an explanation of standard error refer to page 21.

TABLE 5--Mean expenditures and the percentage of before tax income of urban four-member families in the north central region

Item	Income classes (after tax income)					
	$4-4999		$5-5999		$6-7499	
	$	%	$	%	$	%
Mean income before taxes	$4942.86	100	$6015.92	100	$7560.12	100
Expenditures						
Food, total	1319.79	26.70	1381.77	22.97	1515.14	20.04
Alcoholic beverages	73.23	1.48	64.12	1.06	84.91	1.12
Tobacco	100.68	2.04	104.19	1.73	99.32	1.31
Housing, total	1504.82	30.44	1570.08	26.10	1842.19	24.37
Clothing, materials & services	464.62	9.40	568.56	9.45	629.86	8.33
Transportation, total	837.73	16.95	732.91	12.18	970.89	12.48
Medical care, total	296.30	5.99	376.54	6.26	365.90	4.84
Personal care, total	138.62	2.80	164.80	2.72	167.79	2.22
Recreation, total	185.34	3.75	243.43	4.05	259.13	3.43
Reading, total	34.78	.70	49.33	.82	61.84	.82
Education, total	36.08	.73	33.88	.56	66.35	.88
Miscellaneous, total	63.71	1.29	67.68	1.12	107.35	1.42
Personal insurance	251.25	5.08	349.06	5.80	412.80	5.46
Gifts and contributions	193.24	3.91	175.34	2.91	199.85	2.64
Personal taxes	376.95	7.63	528.40	8.78	804.91	10.65
Net change in assets and liabilities	- 332.10	- 6.72	82.96	1.38	255.60	3.38

NOTE: Percentage columns will not add to 100%. For an explanation of standard error refer to page 21.

TABLE 6--Largest mean expenditures of before tax income of urban two-member families in the north central region

Income class (after tax income)	Expenditure	% of income before taxes
$4-4999	Housing	26.96
	Food	18.82
	Transportation	16.25
	Personal Taxes	11.12
	Medical Care	6.73
	Clothing	6.67
$5-5999	Housing	22.16
	Food	17.29
	Personal Taxes	12.40
	Transportation	11.79
	Clothing	5.77
	Medical Care	5.25
$6-7499	Housing	21.69
	Food	14.98
	Personal Taxes	14.13
	Transportation	10.42
	Clothing	6.16
	Medical Care	5.24

TABLE 7--Largest mean expenditure of before tax income of urban four-member families in the north central region

Income class (after tax income)	Expenditure	% of income before taxes
$4-4999	Housing	30.44
	Food	26.70
	Transportation	16.95
	Clothing	9.40
	Personal Taxes	7.63
	Medical Care	5.99
$5-5999	Housing	26.10
	Food	22.97
	Transportation	12.18
	Clothing	9.45
	Personal Taxes	8.78
	Medical Care	6.26
$6-7499	Housing	24.37
	Food	20.04
	Transportation	12.84
	Personal Taxes	10.65
	Clothing	8.33
	Personal Insurance	5.46

not members of the family. The Bureau of Labor Statistics data do not supply information regarding gifts given within the family.

In all instances in the two-member family, medical care is among the major expenditures. In the four-member family, medical care is among the major expenditures in the $4-4999 class and the $5-5999 class. In the $6-7499 class, personal insurance is a larger expenditure than medical care.

Most of the expenditures are a slightly higher percentage of before tax income for the two-member family than they are for the single consuming unit. As a percentage of before tax income, the expenditures for the four-member family in most instances are a little less than twice that of the single consuming unit.

Hypothesis II

The second hypothesis states that the mean per person expenditure for food clothing, housing, and transportation will be larger for the single consuming unit than it will be for the two- and four-member family of the same income group.

To prepare Table 8, the mean expenditures for food, clothing, housing, and transportation for the single consuming unit, the two-member family and the four-member family were taken from the Bureau of Labor Statistics data. These figures were then divided by 1, 2, and 4, respectively, in order to obtain the mean per person expenditure. This was done for each of the four expenditures in each of the three income groups. Data in Table 8 support Hypothesis II.

These data do not indicate that two can live as cheaply as one and also do not justify treating married persons as two separate persons each with one half their combined income. As the review of literature points out, in the area of clothing the difference in mean per person

TABLE 8--Mean per person expenditures of single consuming units, two-member families, and four-member families in urban places in the north central region

Item	Single consuming unit	Two-member family	Four-member family
$4-4999			
Food	$773.66	$471.44	$329.95
Clothing	355.43	167.09	116.16
Housing	961.99	675.31	376.20
Transportation	713.20	407.02	209.43
$5-5999			
Food	$ 753.23	$540.61	$345.44
Clothing	353.38	180.36	142.14
Housing	1383.13	692.77	392.52
Transportation	667.14	368.66	183.23
$6-7499			
Food	$ 856.74	$597.88	$378.78
Clothing	388.91	238.38	157.46
Housing	1655.70	839.56	460.55
Transportation	1052.94	403.54	242.55

cost of clothing seems to be due to factors other than size of the consuming unit. In the areas of housing, food, and transportation there seem to be economies due to group living.

The respondents to the personal interviews were asked about changes they would expect in their own expenditures if they were married and a member of a two-member family. This question was intended to elicit what the respondents felt the changes in the per person expenditures would be if the size of their consuming unit changed.

The following table shows the changes the respondents expected in the area of food:

TABLE 9--Changes expected in food expense if respondent were married and a member of a two-member family

Food Expense	Male	Female	Total
Increase	1	5	6
Decrease	7	1	8
No Change	1	4	5
Depends	1	0	1

Most of the male respondents did expect a decrease in food expenditures if they were married. The reason they gave was that if they were married they would be eating at home more than they presently do.

Half of the women said they would expect an increase in food costs. They felt that they now eat lightly because they are alone. If they were cooking for two, they would eat different kinds of food and they would eat more.

Respondents were asked about their present transportation expenditures and changes they would expect if they were married. Table 10 shows the

TABLE 10--Respondents' attitudes and facts concerning transportation expenditures

Item	Male	Female	Total
No. feeling a car is a necessity	10	9	19
No. owning car	10	10	20
No. buying new car in '64 and '65	6	4	10
No. that traded or sold a car	3	4	7
Year of car traded or sold			
range	'56-'63	'57-'64	'56-'64
median	'58	'58½	'58
No. financing new car	3	2	5
No. planning to buy car in the next 12 months	2	0	2
No. not planning to buy car in the next 12 months	5	10	15
No. uncertain as to whether they will purchase car in the next 12 months	3	0	3
Forms of transportation used other than own car			
bus	0	1	1
taxi	0	1	1
airplane	7	6	13
other (car pool)	1	0	0
Evaluation of amount of money spent on transportation			
more than average	5	1	6
average	5	8	13
Less than average	0	1	1
Changes expected in their expenditure if married			
increase	3	1	4
decrease	1	3	4
no change	6	5	11
depends	0	1	1

attitudes and facts concerning transportation expenditures. All but one of the respondents felt that a car was a necessity. Thirteen of the respondents felt that their transportation expenditures were about average. In general, the respondents did not feel that their transportation expenditures would change if they were married and members of two-member families. Thus, it follows that they feel their per person expenditure is higher now than it would be if they were married.

The respondents to the personal interviews were also asked about changes they would expect in their housing expenditures, if they were married and members of two-member families. Table 11 shows the changes expected by the respondents.

TABLE 11--Changes expected in housing expense if respondent were married and a member of a two-member family

Housing Expense	Male	Female	Total
Increase	7	4	11
Decrease	0	2	2
No change	3	4	7
Depends	0	0	0

Most of the respondents did not expect a lower per person expenditure if they were married and a member of a two-member family. Of the two who said their expenditures would decrease, one said she would do things herself that she now hires done, such as painting. The other stated that her present house was big enough for two, thus her per person cost would decrease.

Of the seven who indicated no change, one was presently sharing an apartment and if she were married she would live in the same type of apart-

ment and her expenses would not change. The other six were living alone and said they could live in the same place and the cost would not change. These respondents did not grasp the concept of per person cost. Respondents said they expected that their total expenditure would be the same. The per person expenditure would then be lower.

Those who indicated an increase in costs said that they would want a different type of housing than they now have. This was indicated by such responses as "now my apartment is a place to sleep and change my clothes; if I were married our home would be an expression of ourselves and a place to entertain friends" and "I would want things nicer if I were married."

David reports that increase in family size is associated with a decline in the quality of housing consumed. (4:95-96) It appears that this decrease in quality is not made by choice, but is found necessary over a period of time.

Hypothesis III

The third hypothesis states that within the areas of food and housing differences will appear between the single consuming unit and the two- and four-member family. The hypothesis is stated in three parts.

Part A

Part A of the hypothesis states that the mean percentage of food expenditure for food eaten away from home will be greater for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member family.

In order to obtain the mean percentage of the food expenditure for food eaten away from home, the total expenditure for food eaten

away from home was divided by the total food expenditure of the consuming unit. This is figured on the consuming unit basis, not the per person basis. The mean percentages of total food expenditure for food eaten away from home by urban consumers in the north central region were 41.58% for the single consuming unit, 21.16% for the two-member family, and 18.08% for the four-member family.

Respondents to the personal interviews were asked questions concerning their present food expenditures. Table 12 shows their responses.

TABLE 12--Respondents' attitudes and facts concerning food expenditures

Item	Male	Female	Total
No. usually eating breakfast at home	6	9	15
No. usually eating lunch at home	0	3	3
No. usually eating dinner at home	2	9	11
Reasons given for eating out			
Lack of cooking facilities	1	0	1
Don't know how to cook	2	0	2
Don't like to cook	4	1	5
Lack of time	6	1	7
Sociability	7	8	15
Evaluation of money spent on food			
More than average	6	1	7
Average	3	5	8
Less than average	1	4	5

The main reason given for eating out was sociability. Most of the respondents said that while lack of time was part of the reason, more important was the sociability factor. Corresponding with this, they said if they were married, they would eat out less often.

Part B

Part B of the hypothesis states that the mean percentage of shelter expenditure for rented dwellings will be greater for the single consuming unit than for two- and four-member families.

In order to obtain the mean percentage of shelter expenditure for rented dwellings, the total expenditure for rented dwellings was divided by the total shelter expenditure of the consuming unit. This is figured on the basis of the consuming unit, not the per person basis. The mean percentages of total shelter expenditure for rented dwellings by urban consumers in the north central region were 67.61% for the single consuming unit, 46.78% for the two-member family, and 32.04% for the four-member family.

Respondents to the personal interviews were asked about their present housing. Table 13 shows their responses.

The fact that women interviewed were homeowners rather than the men corresponds with Froeder's findings that women are twice as likely to be homeowners than men and that home ownership is positively correlated with age. (10:148)

The homeowners stated that they enjoyed being homeowners. They named problems such as lawn care and repairs, but said that they were

TABLE 13--Respondents' information concerning housing

Item	Male	Female	Total
Living Arrangements			
House	1	5	6
Apartment	7	4	11
Room	2	1	3
Size of house or apartment			
Range of size, in rooms	2-11	3-6	2-11
Median	4	4	4
Rooms per person			
Range	2-5	1¼-6	1¼-6
No. who own or are buying	0	5	5
Rent paid per month			
Range	$28-170	$49-90	$28-170
Median	$95	$65	$80
Houses mortgaged	0	3	3
Mean monthly mortgage payment	0	$122	$122
With whom does respondent live			
Alone	6	5	11
With friend	4	4	8
With relative	0	1	1
Evaluation of housing arrangement			
Satisfactory	8	10	18
Unsatisfactory	2	0	2
Respondents feeling housing is more expensive than it need be	6	3	9
Respondents uncertain as to whether housing is more expensive than it need be	1	0	1

willing to cope with these because of the advantages of owning, such as being able to keep pets.

The renters felt that rents in this particular area were high, thus they felt that their housing was more expensive than it need be. One man reported that he would rather own his home than rent an apartment but that owning entailed too many problems, particularly when he was away. Another man reported that he was anticipating buying a home in the future.

Part C

Part C of the hypothesis states that the mean percentage of household operation expenditure for laundry sent out will be greater for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member family.

In order to obtain the mean percentage of the household operation expenditure for laundry sent out, the total expenditure for laundry sent out was divided by the total household operation expenditure of the consuming unit. These figures are on the consuming unit basis, not the per person basis. The mean percentages of household operation expenditure for laundry sent out by urban consumers in the north central region were 16.41% for the single consuming unit, 13.96% for the two-member family, and 10.03% for the four-member family.

During the personal interviews, respondents were asked about their present laundry arrangements and changes they would expect if they were married. Table 14 shows their responses.

TABLE 14--Respondents information concerning laundry

Item	Male	Female	Total
Laundry facilities at home			
Washer	7	3	10
Dryer	7	4	11
Iron	6	10	16
No. doing all of laundry	2	6	8
No. doing part of laundry	3	4	7
No. not doing own laundry	5	0	5
Reasons for not doing laundry			
Lack of equipment	0	0	0
Lack of time	3	1	4
Don't know how	0	0	0
Don't want to	4	2	6
Cleaner at laundry	1	1	2
Other	5	0	5
Changes expected if married			
Increase if cost	2	0	2
Decrease in cost	3	4	7
No change in cost	4	6	10
Depends	1	0	1

At least three of the respondents who said they had laundry facilities at home were referring to coin-operated machines in the apartment house. This questionnaire was weak on this question and it is uncertain how many others were referring to a laundromat in the apartment house.

Of the eight respondents who reported doing all of their own laundry, one was doing it at home with her own equipment, two were using laundromats in apartment buildings, and five were going out to laundromats.

When asked about changes they would expect if they were married and members of two-member families, most of them expected their expenses to decrease or stay the same. Those who said the cost would decrease were those who were sending laundry out and who thought that if they married

part of the laundry would be done at home. Most of the men said that they would continue to send their shirts to the commercial laundry if they married.

The third hypothesis shows that within major expenditure categories differences appear between the single consuming unit and the two- and four-member family.

The particular differences dealt with in this hypothesis are that the single consuming unit spends more money for meals eaten away from home than does the two- and four-member family; the single consuming unit spends more money for rented dwellings than does the two- and four-member family; and the single consuming unit spends more money for laundry sent out than does the two- and four-member family.

Summary

The data analyzed show that the expenditures of the single consuming unit are of different amounts from the expenditures of the two- and four-member family.

Housing, personal taxes, food and transportation are the largest expenditures of the single consuming unit. Their order of importance varies with the income class. The next two items of greatest importance are clothing, and gifts and contributions. These two items also vary in importance with the income class.

Housing, food, and transportation are also major expenditures of the two- and four-member families. Clothing and taxes are among the major expenditures of the two- and four-member families. In the larger families medical care and personal insurance also show up as important expenditures.

From the personal interviews it appears that the single consuming

unit feels at least partically responsible for his family of origin in time of financial emergency. More than half of the respondents having married brothers and sisters felt that in time of financial emergency they would have more financial responsibility than the married brothers or sisters would have.

Per person costs for food, clothing, housing, and transportation are greater in the single consuming unit than in the two- and four-member family. Food, housing, and transportation seem to be areas where there are economies in group living. Clothing expenditures are probably dependent on factors other than family size.

During the personal interviews more than half of the men said they felt their food expenditures were more than average. They felt the reason for this was that they ate out frequently. More than half of the men also felt that their housing expenses were more costly than they need be. The reason they gave for this was that rents in the Lansing area are particularly high. More of the respondents felt that transportation expenditures were average.

With the major categories of food and housing differences appear between the single consuming unit and larger consuming units. The single consuming unit spends more money for food eaten away from home, for rented dwellings, and for laundry sent out than the two- and four-member families. This corresponds with David's suggestion that large families substitute home production for the purchase of services on the market. (4:95)

Respondents to the personal interviews gave additional support to the idea that larger consuming units do substitute home production for the purchase of services.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

While many studies have dealt with the expenditure patterns of the larger family--particularly the four-member family--relatively little attention has been given to research of the expenditure patterns of the single consuming unit. The tax literature reviewed shows a lack of precise understanding of changes in the expenditure resulting from changes in the size of the consuming unit. The literature reviewed in the area of home economics tells us little about the expenditures of the single consuming unit. The purpose of this study was to analyze variations in expenditures in relation to the size of the consuming unit and to interpret the findings with respect to implications for home management and family finance. The specific objectives were as follows:

1. To identify the expenditure patterns of single consuming units.
2. To investigate differences between the expenditure patterns of the single consuming unit and the two- and four-member family.
3. To draw implications for the home economist working in the area of home management and family finance.

Findings

Data from "Consumer Expenditures and Income, Urban Places in the North Central Region, 1960-61" (3) were used to support or negate the hypothesis. To obtain further insight into the attitudes and expecta-

tions of single consuming units, twenty personal interviews were conducted with single consuming units.

The first hypothesis states that the largest mean expenditures of income of the single consuming unit, other than personal taxes, will be in the areas of food, clothing, housing, and transportation.

The first hypothesis was not supported in full by the Bureau of Labor Statistics data. Housing, personal taxes, food, and transportation were the largest mean expenditures of the three income classes studied. Clothing did not appear as one of the largest expenditures in all instances. Clothing and gifts and contributions took similar percentages of the single consuming unit's income.

For the purposes of comparison, the largest mean expenditures of the two- and four-member families' income were also compiled from the Bureau of Labor Statistics data. The largest mean expenditures for the two-member family were housing, food, and transportation, personal taxes, clothing, and medical care. The order of importance varied with the income class.

The largest mean expenditures for the four-member family in the $4-4999 and $5-5999 income classes were housing, food, transportation, clothing, and medical care. In the $6-7499 income class the largest mean expenditures were housing, food, transportation, personal taxes, clothing, and personal insurance.

The second hypothesis states that the mean per person expenditure for food, clothing, housing, and transportation will be larger for the single consuming unit than it will be for the two- and four-member family of the same income group. This hypothesis is supported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics data. For each expenditure listed in each of the three

income groups studied, the per person cost of the single consuming unit was greater than the per person cost for the two- and four-member family.

The third hypothesis states that, within the areas of food and housing, differences will appear between the single consuming unit and the two- and four-member family. This hypothesis is stated in three parts and each part is supported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics data. Part A states that the mean percentage of food expenditure for food eaten away from home will be greater for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member family. Part B states that the mean percentage of shelter expenditure for rented dwellings will be greater for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member family. Part C states that the mean percentage of household operations expenditure for laundry sent out will be greater for the single consuming unit than for the two- and four-member family.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics data showed that the expenditure patterns of single consuming units are different from those of two- and four-member families.

Implications of Research

This study has implications for those people teaching in the area of home management and family finance, for those people counseling the single consuming unit in the area of financial management, for family taxation, and for further research.

One of the most important implications for those people teaching in the area of home management and family finance concerns the content of family finance courses.

In the analysis of the expenditure patterns of the single consuming

units, differences did appear between the different size consuming units and between different income classes. In family finance courses we traditionally spend a large portion of time studying particular areas of expenditures. The content of family finance texts and courses usually include expenditure areas of food, clothing, shelter, insurance, and investments. Attention is usually given to such problems as purchasing of a home, insuring a home, and life insurance programs for the family with children. Such units of study may never be personally useful to students who continue to be single consuming units rather than becoming members of larger families. Family finance texts and courses seldom devote much attention to expenditure problems of particular concern to the single consuming units such as expenditures for gifts and contributions, tax problems, special shelter needs, value of eating meals out, and the provision of economic security for the consuming unit with only one possible earner. Since different size consuming units and consuming units of different incomes have different expenditure patterns, in family finance classes increased emphasis should be placed on teaching financial decision-making as it applies to any expenditure. This would enable us to meet the needs of all of our students regardless of the size of the consuming units of which they will be members and regardless of their income levels.

If one of the purposes of home management is to help bring about change in an orderly way, then we must present information that will help the students prepare for and adapt to change.

Financial decisions made by the single consuming unit have effects on the future decisions he will make as a member of a two-member family. The two-member family makes basic financial decisions which will have

effects on decisions it will make as a four-member family. It is important for the students to know what changes probably will take place over the life cycle and what changes probably will take place as the size of the consuming unit changes.

The single consuming units interviewed did not have precise ideas of how their expenditures would change if they were married. When asked if a certain expenditure would change, respondents answered as though they were certain. When the question, "Why do you say so?" was asked they were hesitant. The respondents did believe that in the areas of food and laundry they would substitute home production for services purchased. In the areas of housing and transportation they knew less about expected changes that would take place with a change in the size of the consuming unit. The Bureau of Labor Statistics data indicate that the per person cost of housing and transportation is greater for the single consuming unit than it is for the two-member family. The respondents to the interviews did not expect this. One might suspect that the respondents would have been even less certain if they were asked about changes they would expect if they were a member of a four-member family.

This study also has implications for persons counseling single consuming units in the area of financial management. We cannot assume that the expenditures of the single consuming unit are like those of the family except in different proportions.

A Family Budget Standard states that the social and health values of eating out should be considered in the food budgets of elderly persons living alone, even when they have access to cooking facilities. (8:15) The Bureau of Labor Statistics data indicated that for the single consum-

ing unit a greater percentage of food expenditures is for food eaten away from home. Respondents to the personal interviews said that sociability is the reason they eat out. It is evident that the social and health values of eating out should be considered in the food budgets of all persons living alone.

In counseling the single consuming unit, we must keep in mind that they cannot substitute home production for services purchased on the market as readily as can the larger family. The reason for this is that the single consuming unit has less workers than the larger family. Thus, many of the techniques the larger family uses to cut expenditures are not appropriate for the single consuming unit.

The personal interviews illustrated that the expenditures of the respondents are closely related to their whole philosophy of life. For example, one respondent said, "I spend a lot of money on my car and my apartment. I think you should spend money and enjoy life." Another respondent stated that it was important to know that in a financial emergency she could take care of herself. This respondent said that she would rather spend less today in order to feel more secure about the future. We cannot counsel in the area of financial management without taking into consideration the particular person and the particular situation.

Data such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics "Consumer Expenditures and Income" are readily accessible to people working in the area of home management and family finance. These data offer an excellent way to explore group trends in expenditures. To be useful, the data need further analysis and breakdown. This thesis illustrates one way in which the survey data may be utilized. Basic to the use of the

data is an understanding of how the data were gathered and how the data are reported.

In using the Bureau of Labor Statistics data as any data, it must be remembered that they give an aggregate picture. From this it is not possible to draw a true picture of an individual. For example, in the personal interviews, seven males reported having washers and dryers, and six males reported having irons. It would be easy to assume that the seven that had dryers also had washers and that the six with irons were those who reported doing their own laundry. The personal interviews resulted in answers that were unexpected and do not show up when combined with the answers of all of the respondents. Another illustration of this is in the section on transportation. The summary shows that one female traded in a 1964 automobile for a 1965 automobile. What does this tell us about the respondent? We could surmise many things, but in this particular instance the 1964 automobile was demolished in an accident, thus the reason for the new car. Throughout the interviews, it was very evident that aggregate data do improve our knowledge of group trends, but do not give us a completely accurate description of a particular individual.

There are implications for family taxation in this study. In the analysis of the single consuming unit and the two- and four-member family, medical care and personal insurance were important expenditures for the larger family and not for the single consuming unit. This gives support to Henle and Pechman, both of whom suggest that the way to make adjustments for differences in the cost of living between single persons and married couples is by personal deductions rather than the present split-income provision. (13, 20)

In this study implications can also be seen for future research.

Most of the expenditure studies in the past have dealt with the family, particularly the four-member family. Just as little has been known about the expenditure patterns of the single consuming unit, little is known about the expenditure patterns of the very large family. A study similar to this one, exploring the expenditure patterns of families of six or more members, would give us a more complete picture than we now have of how expenditure patterns differ in relation to the size of the consuming unit.

This study indicates that there are differences in expenditure patterns among different income classes. A study of expenditure patterns in relation to income would also increase our knowledge of family finance.

Another area which needs to be explored is the area of family taxes. More careful analysis should be given to the tax treatment of the family and of the single consuming unit to see if more liberal exemptions would be more equitable than the present split-income provision.

Limitations

In using the Bureau of Labor Statistics data the reseacher was limited by the data. An analysis of taxes in relation of consuming unit size was not possible. The Bureau of Labor Statistics data group families according to income after taxes. Thus, the before tax income of the single consuming unit and the two- and four-member families is not the same. If the income groups were on the basis of before tax income, analysis of family tax expenditures would be possible.

Many of the factors that could fruitfully be explored in the area of family expenditures are not possible with the Bureau of Labor Statistics data as presently made available. Much greater use could be made of the

data if they were made available in the form of raw data.

The interview schedule used in this study had weaknesses, particularly in the area of changes expected if the respondent were married and a member of a two member family. The respondents were asked about changes they would expect in their own expenditures. The concept of per person expenditures was difficult for the respondent to grasp. It would have been better to have asked the respondent if he felt that expenditures for the couple would be more than his present expenditures. If he indicated that they would be more, then he could be asked if he thought the expenditures would be twice as much as his present expenditures. This procedure would reveal how the respondent felt about per person expenditures without directly asking about the per person expenditure.

This study has isolated the size of the consuming unit as a factor influencing expenditures. It must be recognized that there are many factors that influence expenditures. The personal interviews indicated some differences between the expenditure patterns of the male and female respondents. If the answers were summarized according to age, other differences would also appear. While we may single out one factor in order to study it, we must recognize that there are many interrelated factors affecting expenditures.

Since the Bureau of Labor Statistics data was limited to urban consumers in the north central region and income classes of $4-4999, $5-5999, and $6-7499, the generalizations must also be made with the same limitations. Limitations were placed on factors such as geographical region and income in order to increase the probability that differences which appeared in expenditure patterns were due to differences in family size. Despite the limitations mentioned, the findings are of

importance to the professional person working in the area of home management and family finance. The data are based on a carefully done, large sample representative of the north central regions and of income groups within which a large portion of the population may be found. However, it must be remembered that the Bureau of Labor Statistics data were obtained by the recall method, and as the personal interview illustrated, people have difficulty accurately recalling the specific amounts of money for routine expenditures.

LITERATURE CITED

1. "Ahead: A Tax Overhauling that will Affect Everybody." United States News and World Reports. May 24, 1965, 92-95.

2. "Consumer Expenditures and Income, Urban Places in the North Central Region, 1960-61." Bureau of Labor Statistics Report No. 237-35. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, May 1964, Table 2A.

3. "Consumer Expenditures and Income, Urban Places in the North Central Region, 1960-61." Bureau of Labor Statistics Report No. 237-35, Supplement 3 - Part A. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, July 1964.

4. David, M. H. Family Composition and Consumption. Contributions to Economic Analysis, XXV. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1962.

5. Davidson, John C. "Objectives of and Guides for Tax Rate Reform." Tax Revision Compendium. Vol. I, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959, 139-155.

6. Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964, 58.

7. "Estimated Cost of 1 Week's Food." Family Economics Review. Washington: U. S. Dept. of Agric., March 1965, 21, footnote 6.

8. A Family Budget Standard. New York: Budget Standard Service, Community Council of Greater New York, 1963.

9. Feldman, Frances Lomas. The Family in a Money World. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1961.

10. Froeder, Marsha F. "Single Consumers' Spending Patterns in Three Periods." Monthly Labor Review. 82 (2), 142-50.

11. Gross, Irma H. and Crandall, Elizabeth Walbert. Management for Modern Families. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1963.

12. Groves, Harold M. Federal Tax Treatment of the Family. Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1963.

13. Henle, Peter. "Taxes from the Worker's Viewpoint." Tax Revision Compendium. Vol. I, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959, 119-137.

14. Hovermale, Ruth Lenore. "Spending Patterns of Single Women, with Emphasis on Clothing." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.

15. Katona, George. and Mueller, Eva. Consumer Attitudes and Demand - 1950-52. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, 1953, Chapters I and II.

16. "Laundering Costs: Home vs. Self Service." Family Economics Review. Washington: U. S. Dept. of Agric., Oct. 1964, 8-9.

17. Life Insurance Ownership among American Families, 1953. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, 1954.

18. Mincer, Jacob. "Labor Supply, Family Income and Consumption." American Economic Review. 50 (2), 574-583.

19. Morgan, James N. David, Martin H. Cohen, Wilbur J. and Brazer, Harvey E. Income and Welfare in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.

20. Pechman, Joseph A. "Income Splitting." Tax Revision Compendium. Vol. I, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959, 473-486.

21. Pechman, Joseph A. "What would a Comprehensive Income Tax Yield?" Tax Revision Compendium. Vol. I, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959, 251-281.

22. "Present Day Housing of U. S. Families." Family Economics Review. Washington: U S. Dept. of Agric., April 1964, 11-13.

23. Schiffman, Jacob. "Family Characteristics of Workers." Monthly Labor Review. 83 (8), 828-836.

24. Schiffman, Jacob. "Marital and Family Characteristics of Workers, March 1961." Monthly Labor Review. 85 (1), 9-16.

25. Study of Consumer Expenditures, Income and Savings. Vol. 18, Tabulated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Dept. of Labor for the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Penn., 1958.

26. "Tax Reform Gets Lost." New Republic. May 29, 1965, 6-7.

27. Thomas, Lawrence, G. The Occupational Structure and Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956, Chapter III.

A P P E N D I X

Alice Morrow
Michigan State University
Date_____

1. Name_____

2. Address where interviewed_____

3. Marital Status [Single, never married] [divorced]
[widowed] [separated]

4. Number of dependents 0

5. Sex [Male] [Female]

6. Yearly income $_____

7. Present job_____

8 Number of years on present job _____

9. Education [Less than high school]
[Vocational school]
[High school grad]
[Special training beyond high school]
[College, non grad]
[College, grad]
[College, advanced degree]

10. Age

Schedule A: Economic Well Being

A1. I am interested in how people are getting along financially. Would you say that you are better off or worse off financially than you were a year ago?

[Better now] [Same] [Worse now] [Uncertain]

Why is that?_____

_____

A2. Are you making as much money now as you were a year ago, or more, or less? [More now] [About the same] [Less now]

How is that?_____

_____

A3. Looking back over the past 12 months, did things work out pretty much as you expected financially, or did anything unexpected happen? [As expected] [Unexpected]

If unexpected, what was that_____

_____

A4. As far as your income is concerned, would say that 1964 was an average year, an unusually bad year, or what?_____

Why do you say so?_____

_____

A5. Now looking ahead, do you think that a year from now you will be better off financially, or worse off, or just about the same as now?

[Better] [Same] [Worse] [Uncertain]

Why do you say so?_____

_____

A6. I am interested in any savings people hold in U. S. Government Bonds, and in bank accounts, or savings and loan accounts. Do you have money in any of these? [Yes] [No]

If yes, How do you feel about the amount of money you have in such funds? [Far too little] [Fairly satisfactory] [Fully adequate]

Why do you say so?_____

_____

A7. If you were out of work for a considerable period of time, where would money to cover expenses come from?

[Employment benefits] [Savings] [Insurance] [Relatives]

Schedule B: Housing

B1. What are your living arrangements? [house] [apartment] [room] [other]

If other, what?_____

B2. If apartment or house, how many rooms are there, not counting bathrooms?_____

B3. Do you own this home or pay rent or what?

[Owns or is buying] skip to E7 [Pays rent] skip to B5 [Neither owns or rents]

if neither owns or rents →

B4. How is that_____

_____

if rents →

B5. About how much rent do you pay a month?$_____

B6. Is the apartment furnished or unfurnished? [furnished] [unfurnished]

if owns →

B7. Could you tell me the present value of the house? I mean about what it would bring if you sold it today?

$_____

B8. Was it a newly built house or one that had been lived in before?

[newly built] [lived in before]

B9. How much did the house and lot cost?

$_____

B10. Do you have a mortgage on the property? [yes] [no]

B11. Do you also have a second mortgage? [yes] [no]

B12. Approximately how much is your present mortgage? $_____

B13. How much are your payments per month?

$_____

B14. Do you live alone or with another person? [Alone] [with another]

If with someone, is it a relative or friend? [Relative] [Friend]

If relative, what is the relationship?_____

What expenses do you share? [Food] [Shelter] [Laundry] [All] [Other]

If other, what?_____

_____

Schedule B: Housing (cont'd)

B15. Is this housing arrangement satisfactory? [Yes] [No]

Why or why not?_____

_____

B16. Is your housing arrangement more expensive than it need be?

[Yes] [No] [Uncertain]

What makes you say so?_____

_____

Schedule C: Transportation

C1. First I would like to talk about cars. Do you feel that a car is a necessity? [Yes] [No]

What makes you say so?_____

_____

C2. Do you own a car? [Yes] [No]

If yes C3. How many cars do you own? [1] [2] [3 or more]

C4. Did you buy your car new or used? [New] [Used]

C5. What make and year model is it? _____

C6. Is it a sedan, station wagon, convertible, or what? _____

C7. Is it compact or regular size? _____

C8. What year did you buy it? _____

If bought in '64 or '65

C9. When you bought this car did you trade-in or sell a car? [Yes] [No]

If yes, which? [Trade-in] [Sell]

What make and year-model was it? _____

Was it a sedan, station wagon, convertible, or what? _____

What year did you buy the car you traded or sold? _____

C10. What was the total price of your car, not counting financing charges? $_____

C11. How much did you get from trade-in or sale of your old car? $_____

C12. How much did you pay in cash? $_____

C13. How much did you borrow or finance, not counting finance charges? $_____

C14. How much were your payments and how often were they made? $_____ per _____

C15. How many are left to make? _____

C16. Do you expect to buy a car in the next 12 months or so? [Yes] [No] [Depends]

If yes or depends - Will it be a brand new car or a used one? [New] [Used] [Uncertain]

How much do you think you will pay for it $_____

Schedule C: Transportation (cont'd)

C17. What other forms of transportation do you use?

[bus] [taxi] [airplane] [train] [ship] [other]

If other, what?_____

C18. How often do you use each? Bus_____

Taxi_____ Airplane_____

Train_____ Ship_____

Other_____

C19. Do you feel that you spend a lot of money on transportation, or about average? [Lot] [Average] [Less than average]

Why do you say so?_____

_____

Schedule D: Meals

D1. Do you usually eat breakfast at home? [yes] [no]
If no, where do you eat it? _____

D2. Do you usually eat lunch at home? [yes] [no]
If no, where do you eat it? _____

D3. Do you usually eat dinner at home? [yes] [no]
If no, where do you eat it? _____

D4. Approximately how much money do you spend on food eaten at home?
$_____ per _____

D5. Approximately how much money do you spend on food eaten away from home? $_____ per _____

D6. When you eat out, what is the reason?

[Lack of cooking facilities at home]

[Do not know how to cook]

[Do not like to cook]

[Lack of time]

[Sociability]

D7. How often do you eat out? _____ per _____

D8. Do you feel that you spend a lot of money on food, less than average, or average?

[Lot] [Less than average] [Average]

Why do you say so? _____

_____

Schedule E: Laundry

E1. Do you have the following laundry facilities at home?

Washer [yes] [no]

Dryer [yes] [no]

Iron [yes] [no]

E2. Do you do all of your own laundry, part of your own laundry, or none of your own laundry?

[all] [part] [none]

If all or part — Do you do this at the laundromat or at home or other?

[Laundromat] [home] [other]

If part — What do you usually do at home?_____

_____

What do you usually have done?_____

_____

If part or none — Why do you not do it?

[Lack of equipment]

[Lack of time]

[Don't know how]

[Don't want to do it]

If none — Where is it done?_____

_____

Schedule F: Family Obligations

F1. **Do you have any financial responsibility to your family of origin, even though they do not classify as your dependents?**

[yes] [no]

If yes, what types?_____

_____

F2. **In a time of financial emergency would your family look to you for help?**

[yes] [no] [uncertain]

F3. **Do you have married brothers or sisters?**

[yes] [no]

If yes, do you feel you would have more financial responsibility to your family than they would have in time of emergency?

[yes] [no]

Why do you say so?_____

_____

F4. **Have you made financial contributions to your family of origin in the past year other than gifts on special occasions?**

[yes] [no]

If yes, what was the nature of the help?_____

_____

Schedule G: Changes expected if married

G1. If you were married and a member of a two-member family, would you expect your income to increase, decrease, or stay the same?

[Increase] [Decrease] [Same] [Depends]

Why do you say so?_____

_____

G2. If you were married and a member of a two-member family, would you expect your housing expenses to increase, decrease, or stay the same?

[Increase] [Decrease] [Same] [Depends]

Why do you say so?_____

_____

G3. If you were married and a member of a two-member family, would you expect your transportation expense to increase, decrease, or stay the same?

[Increase] [Decrease] [Same] [Depends]

Why do you say so?_____

_____

G4. If you were married and a member of a two-member family, would you expect your food expenses to increase, decrease, or stay the same?

[Increase] [Decrease] [Same] [Depends]

Why do you say so?_____

_____

G5. If you were married and a member of a two-member family, would you expect your laundry expenses to increase, decrease, or stay the same?

[Increase] [Decrease] [Same] [Depends]

Why do you say so?_____

_____

G6. If you were married and a member of a two-member family, would you expect your obligations to your family of origin to increase, decrease, or stay the same?

[Increase] [Decrease] [Same] [Depends]

Why do you say so?_____

_____