

durables in excess of the developmentally significant upper limits. The reasons for their inclusion as probably not developmentally significant are outlined in the discussion of each.

There were no hypotheses for the individual categories, but the hypothesis was the average expenditure for the sum of these categories would be greater for participants than applicants. However, the hypothesis was also that the participants would not spend proportionately more than the applicants for these categories of probably not developmentally significant expenditures.

PROBABLY NOT DEVELOPMENTALLY RELATED EXPENDITURES

Coffee, Tea, Cocoa and Tobacco

Purchases of coffee, tea, cocoa and tobacco could not be made with food stamps, and thus, these items, often called "groceries," had to be purchased with cash. This study was not concerned with the respective nutritional or medical merits of these items. These expenditures were regarded as essentially matters of taste, but were classified as probably not developmentally significant because it was not possible to establish any relation between them and the long-run development of the participant family members.

Table 5.1 below present the data on expenditures for coffee, tea, cocoa and tobacco for October 1966.

TABLE 5.1.—*Expenditures for coffee, tea, cocoa, and tobacco by applicants and participants, October 1966*

	Applicants		Participants	
	Total	Average	Total	Average
Coffee, tea, and cocoa.....	\$67	\$1.86	\$95	\$2.65
Tobacco.....	146	4.06	193	5.35
Total.....	213	5.92	288	8.00

The average expenditure for coffee, tea, cocoa and tobacco by applicants was \$5.92 and by participants was \$8.00. There was probably some underreporting, for not all of the applicants and participants reported for coffee. However, the author consumed, or refused invitations to, coffee at almost all of the homes of the families keeping records. Nonetheless, the proportionate differences between the average expenditures by applicants and participants for these categories was small, and probably reflected differences in quality as much as in quantity.

Candy and Sweets

Candy and sweets included candy, soft drinks, and other assorted "sweets." Such items were obtainable with food stamps. If purchased with food stamps, expenditures for candy and sweets would have been included under the expenditures for food stamps, and therefore classified as a developmentally significant expenditure. However, expenditures for candy and sweets were considered separately in this section to see their magnitude. Such expenditures were classified rather arbitrarily as probably not developmentally significant, for it seemed that the money expended for such could have been better utilized in other ways.

Table 5.2 below summarized the data on applicant and participant expenditures on candy and sweets in October 1966.

All but four of the applicants and two of the participants reported some expenditure for soft drinks in October. The applicants reported an average expenditure of \$2.74, and the participants, \$4.03, for soft drinks. Two applicants and two participants reported not spending anything for candy and other sweets; the average expenditure by applicants was \$2.22, and by participants, \$3.01. Thus, the average expenditure for the category of candy and other sweets was \$4.96 by applicants and \$7.04 by participants; as with expenditures on coffee, tea, cocoa and tobacco, the difference in expenditures between applicants and participants was quite small and probably not significant. It appeared that the participants certainly did not spend very much more than the applicants for candy and sweets.