eighth grade.[4] The difference of the first two figures, 0.8, was not significant at the 95 per cent confidence level using the "t" test. The mean age for heads of households was 36.9 for the applicants, and 42.4 for the participants. The difference, 6.5 years, was found to be significant at the 95 per cent confidence level using the "t" test.

Thus it appeared that the WE and T Program was selective with respect to age, and tended to include the older heads of households. It could be conjectured that jobs would be more difficult to obtain for these older men. Moreover, this difference in age might have indicated that some of the public assistance criteria such as alleviation of poverty and deprivation may have spilled over into the administration of the WE and T Program whose slated objective was to provide opportunities for training and work experience. Thus this difference in age may result in an underperformance of the WE and T Program, and therefore in an understatement of its contributions, if analyzed cross-sectionally, as was done in this study, and if indeed contributions are related to age.

Table 3.2 lists the average cash and noncash sources of income for both applicants and participants for October 1966. The average monthly income from all sources was $242 for the participants and $146 for the applicants; therefore the participants received an average income 66 per cent greater than did the applicants.

In Chapter IV, the degree of association between such important participant characteristics as age, size of family, employment and earnings history, attitudes, and income and the varying levels of expenditure among the developmentally significant classifications will be analyzed.

DEVELOPMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT EXPENDITURES AND ACTIVITIES

Introduction

The general hypothesis was that expenditures for the developmentally significant categories of expenditure and activity would be proportionately greater for the participants than for the applicants. This meant that there would be a larger percentage of participants reporting such kinds of expenditures and activities, and that the mean expenditure per participant family would be higher, both absolutely and proportionately. Of course this implied that the income elasticity of demand would have been greater than one; arc income elasticities of demand were calculated for the entire class of developmentally significant expenditures as well as for the two largest categories, consumer durables and automobiles.

TABLE 3.2.—*Sources of average monthly income for applicants and participants, October 1966*

Source	Applicants	Participants
Cash:		
W. E. & T. grant	0	$208.38
Earnings	$71.58	3.43
Pensions	6.78	6.08
Other	5.58	1.62
Subtotal	83.94	219.51
Noncash:		
Free housing and food	4.14	.81
Food stamps	39.11	15.38
Food production for home consumption	18.47	6.43
Subtotal	61.72	22.62
Total	145.66	242.13

There were basically two kinds of data utilized in this study, monthly and annual data on expenditures. Annual data was used for testing the hypotheses regarding health and education. A combination of annual and monthly data was used to test the hypotheses concerning: consumer durables; automobiles; housing improvements; and savings and life insurance. Monthly data were used to test hypotheses for clothing, food stamps, and cleaning supplies.

[4] The figures for the number of years of schooling completed are equivalent to what are commonly called grades for children; thus a participant who had completed eight years of schooling would have completed elementary school; 12 years would have completed high school, etc.