There was a positive association between $Y_2$ and $X_6$, the number of children aged nine to 17 per participant family; this meant that participant families with more children aged nine to 17 spent more money within the developmentally significant categories than those participants with less children in this age bracket relative to their income level. Thus, the participants seemed to be spending the money needed for the development of their children at the more critical, older ages when the needs for clothing and an acceptable appearance are most important.

### DEVELOPMENTALLY RELATED EXPENDITURES

With $Y_3$, the total expenditures in October 1966, by participants, for the developmentally related categories of expenditure, as the dependent variable, the following regression equation was obtained:

$$Y_3 = -1.856 + \underset{(0.178)}{0.438}\, X_{13}$$

$$r^2 = 0.15$$

$$\text{Total } F = 6.075$$

$$n = 36$$

There was a positive association with $X_{13}$, cash income per month; those participants with higher cash incomes spent more for the developmentally related categories of expenditure than did participants with less cash income per month. Thus, it would seem that the participants with more cash income had more "discretionary income," in the sense of having more money left over after making all necessary expenditures. Since the participants did not buy more food stamps than the applicants, and since their expenditures for food up to the cost of food stamps were included as developmentally related expenditures, there probably was an association between cash income per month, $X_{13}$, and expenditures for developmentally related categories, $Y_3$.

### PROBABLY NOT DEVELOPMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT EXPENDITURES

Using expenditures by participants in October 1966 for the probably not developmentally significant categories of expenditure, $Y_4$, as the dependent variable, the following regression equation was obtained:

$$Y_4 = 115.530 - \underset{(1.042)}{1.930}\, X_2 - \underset{(1.205)}{4.089}\, X_4 - \underset{(3.994)}{13.006}\, X_8$$

$$r^2 = 0.54$$

$$\text{Total } F = 12.448$$

$$n = 36$$

The participants' educational level before entering the WE and T Program, $X_2$, was negatively associated with $Y_4$; thus the participants with less education before entering the WE and T Program apparently spent more for the probably not developmentally significant categories than did the participants with more education. This tends to reinforce the impression received from the $Y_1$ regression equation that the participants with more education before entering the program utilize the free health services component of the WE and T Program.

The number of months the participants had been in the WE and T Programs, $X_4$, was negatively associated with $Y_4$, and this suggested that the participants who had been in the program for shorter periods of time spent more for the probably not developmentally significant categories than did the participants who had been in the program longer. Thus, it would seem that the participants make more developmentally significant expenditures the longer they are in the WE and T Program. However, this is somewhat confusing, for $X_4$ was not significantly associated with $Y_2$, the developmentally significant categories.

There was a negative association between $X_8$, the number of children eight years old and less, and $Y_4$; the participants with more children less than eight years of age apparently spent less for the probably not developmentally significant categories. This probably suggested that the participant families with younger children did not spend as much on candy and sweets as did the participant families with older children.

## CHAPTER VII.—SUMMARY, LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

### SUMMARY

The participants in the Work Experience and Training Program received 66 percent more total monthly income from all sources than did the applicants for