

The average personal expenditure by applicants was \$.25 and by participants, \$.84. Such diverse, yet probably developmentally related items such as: hunting licenses, drivers' license learning permit for a wife; dog licenses; and parakeet seed, were included in this subcategory.

Medicine and Drugs

Monthly expenditures for medicines and drugs should be lower for participants since the WE and T Program will pay for any medicine or drug prescribed by a physician. Therefore, the only expenditures remaining within this category for participants were for patent medicines or first-aid supplies. If the participants visited physicians more than applicants, as was hypothesized, it seemed logical to hypothesize that expenditures by participants for medicines and drugs would be lower than such expenditures by applicant. Data for the month of October were used to test this hypothesis.

For October 1966 the applicants reported a mean expenditure of \$3 on medicine and drugs while the participants reported a mean expenditure of \$1. It appeared that the participants were only buying the minimally required patent medicines either not available, or inconveniently obtained, through the free health services component of the WE and T Program.

SUMMARY

The average developmentally related expenditures by applicants and participants for the month of October, 1966 are summarized in Table 4.7 below.

The average expenditure for developmentally related categories was \$44.86 by the applicants and \$88.88 by the participants. Using the "t" test, the difference, \$44.02, was significant at the 95 per cent confidence level, and thus it seemed that the participants spent more, absolutely, than the applicants for the developmentally related categories. The participants spent 36.8 per cent, and the applicants, 30.8 per cent, of their total monthly income for these developmentally related categories, and this difference 6. per cent, was not significant at the 95 per cent confidence level, using the "t" test. Therefore, the participants did not seem to spend more, proportionately, than the applicants, for the developmentally related categories of expenditure. The hypothesis that the participants would spend more absolutely, but not proportionately, was therefore accepted. The income elasticity of demand for the participants was 1.43 for these developmentally related categories.

TABLE 4.7.—*Summary of average developmentally related expenditures by applicants and participants, October 1966*

Category	Applicants	Participants
School lunches	\$4.78	\$8.87
School supplies	.11	1.72
Rent and utilities	17.08	23.19
Meals eaten away from home	.03	.78
Food expenditures less than the cost of food stamps	9.28	27.28
Transportation	8.47	21.70
Personal expenses	2.11	3.84
Medicine and drugs	3.00	1.00
Total	44.86	88.88

CHAPTER V.—PROBABLY NOT DEVELOPMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT EXPENDITURES AND SOME OTHER CATEGORIES

INTRODUCTION

While not wishing to appear puritanical, this study did endeavor to distinguish between forms of expenditure which were likely to have a long-run developmental significance, those that were related to the developmental process, and those expenditures which probably did not have any developmental significance. The following four categories of expenditure were included in the probably not developmentally significant class: Coffee, tea, cocoa, and tobacco; Candy and sweets; Food expenditures in excess of food stamp allotments; and Consumer