We can see we have an independent t-test here. We first need to get our data in order so the helping predictor is treated as categorical:

**kidscalories$helpedinprep <- factor(kidscalories$helpedinprep)**

Next we want to check whether the variances are equal between the two groups:

**leveneTest(kidscalories$calorieintake, kidscalories$helpedinprep)**

group 1 0.0264 0.8716

We find no significant difference, so we are good to go with our analysis (independent with equal variances):

**t.test(calorieintake~helpedinprep, data = kidscalories, var.equal = TRUE)**

**t = 2.8137, df = 45, p-value = 0.007236**

**95 percent confidence interval:**

**24.04243 145.15859**

**mean in group 1 mean in group 2**

**431.3996 346.7991**

We find a significant difference and from the means we see Group 1 is eating more calories and looking at the description of the data we see this means that kids who helped cook the meal ate more calories. Great, all we need to do is summarize our findings.

**tapply(kidscalories$calorieintake, kidscalories$helpedinprep, sd)**

**105.70124 99.50114**

We examined the impact of helping cook a meal on the amount of calories children consumed. Performing an independent t-test (equal variances assumed) we find a significant difference between the amount of calories kids who helped cook ate (*M* = 431.39; *SD* = 105.7) and those who did not help cook (*M* = 346.79; *SD* = 99.50), *t*(45) = 2.81, *p* < .01. Thus, if the goal is to get kids to eat more having them help prepare the food they eat seems an effective strategy to pursue.