

3248 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Participants also spent considerably more on "Fresh Meat," and "Canned Fruits and Vegetables." This is likely explained by the greater quantity of livestock production and food production for home consumption reported previously by the applicants.

The participants' mean expenditure for food, \$96.46 was \$17.48 greater than the applicants', \$78.98, and this difference was significant at the 95 per cent confidence level using the "t" test. Therefore, the hypothesis that participants would spend more for food, absolutely, was accepted. The participants' average expenditure, \$96.46 represented 39.9 per cent of their average total income while the applicants' average expenditure, \$78.98, represented 54.1 per cent of their average total income. Once again, the hypothesis that the participants would not spend proportionately more than the applicants, in this case for total food expenditures, was accepted.

TABLE 5.6.—*Mean expenditures for food by applicants and participants, October 1966*

	Applicants	Participants
Milk, cream, ice cream, and cheese	\$11.30	\$13.53
Fats and oils	8.56	7.59
Flour, cereal, and bakery products	14.18	17.87
Flour and meal	9.32	8.91
Bakery goods	3.55	6.86
Mixes	.54	1.27
Cereals and noodles	.77	.83
Meat, fish, and poultry	20.47	25.64
Fresh	17.50	21.96
Canned	1.78	2.52
Frozen	1.19	1.16
Eggs	3.11	3.09
Sugar and sweets	4.62	5.32
Sugar	2.40	2.31
Candy, cookies, potato chips, and popcorn	2.22	3.01
Fruits and vegetables	12.77	15.36
Canned	3.70	6.35
Frozen	.94	.99
Fresh	7.25	6.73
Other (dried)	.88	1.29
Beverages (soft drinks)	2.74	4.03
Cooking aids	.67	.79
Miscellaneous	.56	3.24
Mean expenditure per family	78.98	96.46
Difference		17.48

Indebtedness

The total indebtedness of applicants and participants was examined. It was hypothesized that the participants would have more indebtedness than the applicants, absolutely, but no more indebtedness, proportionately, to their incomes, than the applicants. It was further hypothesized that the participants would have incurred a greater percentage of their total indebtedness for the developmentally significant categories of expenditure than the applicants, and a smaller percentage of their total indebtedness for the developmentally related and probably not developmentally significant categories of expenditure.

Table 5.7 summarizes the total mean indebtedness for applicants and participants. The total mean indebtedness for the applicants was \$339.70 which was 2.3 times the total monthly income of \$146 reported in October 1966. The total mean indebtedness of the participants was \$584.54 which was 2.4 times the total monthly income of \$242 reported in October 1966. The difference, .1, was not significant using the "t" test, and therefore the initial hypothesis that the participants would have more indebtedness, absolutely but not proportionately to income, than the applicants, was accepted.