

*Nutrition Assistance Program Report Series*  
The Office of Analysis, Nutrition and Evaluation

Special Nutrition Programs

Report No. CN-01-WICVM

---

***WIC Vendor Management Study, 1998***

***Appendices***



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Food and  
Nutrition  
Service

July 2001

**Appendix A: Tables Related to Demographics of the Study  
Population**

---

<b>Table A-1. National Estimate of the Proportion of WIC Vendors by Locale</b>			
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>LOCALE</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>Metropolitan</b>	<b>Non-metropolitan</b>	
SAMPLE SIZE	1135		1565
WEIGHTED SIZE	25868		36908
SE WEIGHTED	1378		553
COLUMN PERCENT	70.09		100
SE PERCENT	3.70		0

Source: WIC Vendor Management Study, 1998.

<b>Table A-2. National Estimates of the Proportion of WIC Vendors by Type of Food Delivery System</b>			
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>FOOD DELIVERY SYSTEM</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>Open</b>	<b>Vendor-Specific</b>	
SAMPLE SIZE	1019	546	1565
WEIGHTED SIZE	29340	7568	36908
SE WEIGHTED	540	121	553
COLUMN PERCENT	79.50	20.5	100
SE PERCENT	0.40	0.40	0

Source: WIC Vendor Management Study, 1998.

<b>Table A-3. National Estimate of WIC Vendors by Store Type</b>			
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>STORE TYPE</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>Grocery</b>	<b>Pharmacy</b>	
SAMPLE SIZE	34605	30	1565
WEIGHTED SIZE	36092	816	36908
SE WEIGHTED	586	195	553
COLUMN PERCENT	97.79	2.21	100
SE PERCENT	0.53	0.53	0

Source: WIC Vendor Management Study, 1998.

<b>Table A-4. Distribution of WIC Vendors by Average Vendor-to-Participant Ratio Category</b>					
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>VENDOR-TO-PARTICIPANT RATIO</b>				<b>Total</b>
	<b>1:&lt;112</b>	<b>1:112-157</b>	<b>1:158-192</b>	<b>1:&gt;192</b>	
SAMPLE SIZE	339	353	415	458	1565
WEIGHTED SIZE	9073	9967	8981	8886	36908
SE WEIGHTED	1177	1529	1513	1073	553
COLUMN PERCENT	24.58	27.01	24.33	24.08	100
SE PERCENT	3.1	4.17	4.09	2.89	0

Source: WIC Vendor Management Study, 1998.

<b>Table A-5. National Estimate of WIC Vendors by Vendor Size</b>				
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>VENDOR SIZE</b>			<b>Total</b>
	<b>Small</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Large</b>	
SAMPLE SIZE	453	556	556	1565
WEIGHTED SIZE	11520	13043	12344	36908
SE WEIGHTED	249	260	309	184
COLUMN PERCENT	31.21	35.34	33.45	100
SE PERCENT	2.08	1.97	2.42	0

Source: WIC Vendor Management Study, 1998.

<b>Table A-6. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors by Use of Scanning Equipment Across All Buys<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>USE OF SCANNING EQUIPMENT</b>			<b>Average Totals</b>
	<b>No Scanning Equipment</b>	<b>Scanned Purchased WIC Items</b>	<b>Did Not Scan WIC Purchased Items</b>	
SAMPLE SIZE	388	1102	54	1543
WEIGHTED SIZE	9964	25145	1307	36417
SE WEIGHTED	713	942	272	570
COLUMN PERCENT	27.36	69.05	3.59	100
SE PERCENT	2.04	2.05	0.75	0

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,417 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial and substitution buy).

Source: WIC Vendor Management Study, 1998.



<b>Table A-7. Distribution of WIC Vendors By Cashier's Indication of Unfamiliarity with WIC Transaction Procedures Across All Buys<sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>UNFAMILIARITY WITH WIC TRANSACTION</b>		<b>Average Totals</b>
	<b>Indication Cashier was Unfamiliar with WIC Transaction</b>	<b>NO Indication Cashier was Unfamiliar with WIC Transaction</b>	
SAMPLE SIZE	123	1432	1555
WEIGHTED SIZE	2942	33746	36688
SE WEIGHTED	290	575	563
COLUMN PERCENT	8.02	91.98	100
SE PERCENT	0.77	0.77	0

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,668 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial and substitution buy).

Source: WIC Vendor Management Study, 1998.

**Table A-8. Distribution of WIC Vendors by Cashier's Type of Indication of Unfamiliarity with Proper WIC Transaction Procedures Across All Buys<sup>1</sup>**

Statistics	CASHIER'S INDICATION OF UNFAMILIARITY				Average Totals
	Indicated He/She was a New Employee	Indicated He/She had Never Completed a WIC Transaction	Received Assistance from Co-worker or Supervisor	Other Indication	
SAMPLE SIZE	10	19	94	31	1555
WEIGHTED SIZE	209	427	2271	704	36688
SE WEIGHTED	49	99	255	128	563
COLUMN PERCENT	0.57	1.16	6.15	1.91	100
SE PERCENT	0.13	0.27	0.68	0.35	0

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on a weighted average estimate of 36,688 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial and substitution buy).

Source: WIC Vendor Management Study, 1998.

## **Appendix B: Tables Related to Administrative Errors**

---

<b>Table B-1. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Committing Administrative Errors by Type of Error Across All Buys<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Administrative Errors</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Average Totals</b>
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	82
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2032
	SE WEIGHTED	225
	PERCENT	5.51
	SE PERCENT	0.60
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	588
	WEIGHTED SIZE	12916
	SE WEIGHTED	913
	PERCENT	35.39
	SE PERCENT	2.60
<b>Raincheck</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	8
	WEIGHTED SIZE	185
	SE WEIGHTED	40
	PERCENT	0.50
	SE PERCENT	0.11
<b>Asked to Pay Cash in Addition to Food Instrument</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1
	WEIGHTED SIZE	29
	SE WEIGHTED	16
	PERCENT	0.08
	SE PERCENT	0.00

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on an average weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).

<b>Table B-2. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors by Frequency of Occurrences of Administrative Errors<sup>1</sup></b>						
<b>Administrative Errors and Receipt Provision</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES OF ADMINISTRATIVE ERRORS</b>				<b>Total</b>
		<b>None</b>	<b>One</b>	<b>Two</b>	<b>Three</b>	
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1382	133	37	13	1565
	WEIGHTED SIZE	32414	3250	884	359	36908
	SE WEIGHTED	647	353	157	103	553
	COLUMN PERCENT	87.82	8.81	2.39	0.97	100
	SE PERCENT	1.21	0.95	0.42	0.28	0.00
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	700	351	304	166	1521
	WEIGHTED SIZE	17060	8798	6713	3290	35861
	SE WEIGHTED	1157	575	591	449	588
	COLUMN PERCENT	47.57	24.53	18.72	9.17	100
	SE PERCENT	2.95	1.54	1.71	1.28	0.00
<b>No Receipt Provided</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	761	179	96	471	1507
	WEIGHTED SIZE	17384	4093	2360	11739	35576
	SE WEIGHTED	1235	385	319	1138	613
	COLUMN PERCENT	48.86	11.5	6.63	33	100
	SE PERCENT	3.21	1.04	0.87	3.30	0.00

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy) yielding a total estimate of 110,723.

**Table B-3. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Committing Administrative Errors for Each Locale and Type of Error Across All Buys<sup>1</sup>**

Administrative Errors	Statistics	LOCALE		Average Totals
		Metro	Non-metro	
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	56	26	82
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1322	710	2032
	SE WEIGHTED	191	157	225
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	3.58	1.92	5.51
	SE PERCENT	0.51	0.42	0.60
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	498	90	588
	WEIGHTED SIZE	10596	2321	12916
	SE WEIGHTED	946	393	913
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	29.03	6.36	35.39
	SE PERCENT	2.67	1.08	2.60
<b>Raincheck</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	5	3	8
	WEIGHTED SIZE	118	67	185
	SE WEIGHTED	31	28	40
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	0.32	0.18	0.50
	SE PERCENT	0.08	0.07	0.11

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on an averaged weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).

<b>Table B-4. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Committing Administrative Errors for Each Type of Food Delivery System and Type of Error Across All Buys<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Administrative Errors</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Type of Food Delivery System</b>		<b>Average Totals</b>
		<b>Open</b>	<b>Vendor Specific</b>	
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	60	22	82
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1727	305	2032
	SE WEIGHTED	222	39	225
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	1.56	0.83	5.51
	SE PERCENT	0.59	0.10	0.60
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	321	267	588
	WEIGHTED SIZE	9209	3707	12916
	SE WEIGHTED	812	418	913
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	25.23	10.16	35.39
	SE PERCENT	2.30	1.15	2.60
<b>Raincheck</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	5	3	8
	WEIGHTED SIZE	144	42	185
	SE WEIGHTED	38	12	40
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	0.39	0.11	0.5
	SE PERCENT	0.10	0.40	0.11

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on an averaged weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).

<b>Table B-5. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Committing Administrative Errors for Each Type of Food Package Across All Buys<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Administrative Errors</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Type of Food Package</b>			<b>Average Totals</b>
		<b>Woman</b>	<b>Child</b>	<b>Infant</b>	
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	15	13	54	82
	WEIGHTED SIZE	379	305	1349	2032
	SE WEIGHTED	98	58	179	225
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	1.03	0.83	3.65	5.51
	SE PERCENT	0.26	0.16	0.48	0.60
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	201	200	187	588
	WEIGHTED SIZE	4382	4343	4191	12916
	SE WEIGHTED	349	352	336	913
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	12.01	11.9	11.48	35.39
	SE PERCENT	0.99	1.01	0.93	2.60
<b>Raincheck</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	2	0	6	8
	WEIGHTED SIZE	43	5	138	185
	SE WEIGHTED	19	5	34	40
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	0.12	0.01	0.37	0.50
	SE PERCENT	0.05	0.01	0.09	0.11

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on an averaged weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).



<b>Table B-6. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Committing Administrative Errors for Each Type of Buy<sup>1</sup></b>						
<b>Administrative Errors</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Safe</b>	<b>Partial</b>	<b>Substitution</b>		<b>Average Totals</b>
				<b>Minor Substitution</b>	<b>Major Substitution</b>	
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	74	84	44	44	246
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1888	1943	1150	1116	6096
	SE WEIGHTED	272	246	207	210	675
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	1.70	1.75	1.04	1.01	5.51
	SE PERCENT	0.24	0.22	0.19	0.19	0.60
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	604	568	308	284	1764
	WEIGHTED SIZE	13303	12584	6728	6134	38749
	SE WEIGHTED	945	1004	589	487	2740
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	12.15	11.49	6.14	5.6	35.39
	SE PERCENT	0.95	0.94	0.74	0.67	2.60
<b>Raincheck</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	8	9	2	5	24
	WEIGHTED SIZE	229	169	42	115	556
	SE WEIGHTED	73	59	32	53	119
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	0.21	0.15	0.04	0.10	0.50
	SE PERCENT	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.11

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy) yielding a total estimate of 110,723.

<b>Table B-7. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Who Committed Administrative Errors, but Did Not Substitute, Overcharge or Undercharge by Type of Error Across All Buys<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Administrative Errors</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Total Average</b>
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	18
	WEIGHTED SIZE	489
	SE WEIGHTED	75
	PERCENT	6.05
	SE PERCENT	0.91
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	115
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2418
	SE WEIGHTED	206
	PERCENT	30.47
	SE PERCENT	2.64
<b>Raincheck</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	2
	WEIGHTED SIZE	53
	SE WEIGHTED	21
	PERCENT	0.65
	SE PERCENT	0.25

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).

<b>Table B-8. t-Statistics Describing WIC Vendors with Insufficient Stock by Vendor Characteristic Across All Buys</b>		
<b>Vendor and State Demographic or Characteristic</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-Test That Contrast Percent Difference</b>
<b>Vendor-to-Participant Ratio</b>	<112 versus 112-158	2.14*
	<112 versus 159-192	3.46**
	<112 versus > 192	2.85*
	112-158 versus 159-192	0.97
	112-158 versus > 192	0.25
	159-192 versus > 192	-1.08
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendors versus Medium-Sized Vendors	5.00**
	Small-Sized Vendors versus Large-Sized Vendors	6.49**
	Medium-Sized Vendors versus Large-Sized Vendors	1.69
<b>Use Scanning</b>	No equipment versus Scanned WIC purchased items	3.86**
	No equipment versus Chose NOT to scan	-2.37
	Scanned WIC purchased items versus chose NOT to scan	3.67**
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	Woman versus Child	0.75
	Woman versus Infant	-4.75**
	Child versus Infant	-6.09**
<b>Locale</b>	Metro versus Non-metro	-1.01
<b>Type of Food Delivery System</b>	Open versus Vendor-Specific	2.09*

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table B-9. t-Statistics Describing WIC Vendors Who Violate Countersignature Procedures by Vendor Characteristics Across All Buys</b>		
<b>Vendor and State Demographic or Characteristic</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-Test That Contrast Percent Difference</b>
<b>Vendor-to-Participant Ratio</b>	<112 versus 159-192	-2.08*
	<112 versus > 192	6.45**
	112-158 versus 159-192	0.43
	112-158 versus > 192	-4.14**
	159-192 versus > 192	-5.69**
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendors versus Medium-Sized Vendors	1.49
	Small-Sized Vendors versus Large-Sized Vendors	0.47
	Medium-Sized Vendors versus Large-Sized Vendors	-1.13
<b>Use Scanning</b>	No equipment versus Scanned WIC purchased items	1.34
	No equipment versus Chose NOT to scan	-1.90
	Scanned WIC purchased items versus chose NOT to scan	-2.89**
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	Woman versus Child	0.93
	Woman versus Infant	1.37
	Child versus infant	1.08
<b>Locale</b>	Metro versus Non-metro	5.14**
<b>Type of Food Delivery System</b>	Open versus Vendor-Specific	-2.86*

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table B-10. t-Statistics Describing WIC Vendors Who Provide Rainchecks for WIC Foods by Vendor Characteristic Across All Buys</b>		
<b>Vendor and State Demographic or Characteristic</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-Test That Contrast Percent Difference</b>
<b>Vendor-to-Participant Ratio</b>	<112 versus 159-192	0.75
	<112 versus > 192	0.87
	112-158 versus 159-192	0.64
	112-158 versus > 192	0.25
	159-192 versus > 192	0.59
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendors versus Medium-Sized Vendors	3.53**
	Small-Sized Vendors versus Large-Sized Vendors	3.24**
	Medium-Sized Vendors versus Large-Sized Vendors	-0.62
<b>Use Scanning</b>	No equipment versus Scanned WIC purchased items	2.53*
	No equipment versus Chose NOT to scan	-0.97
	Scanned WIC purchased items versus chose NOT to scan	-1.68
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	Women versus Child	1.95*
	Women versus Infant	-2.35*
	Child versus Infant	-3.92**
<b>Locale</b>	Metro versus Non-metro	-0.58
<b>Type of Food Delivery System</b>	Open versus vendor specific	-0.29

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table B-11. t-Statistics Describing WIC Vendors with Administrative Errors by Type of Buy</b>		
<b>Administrative Error</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-Test That Contrast Percent Difference</b>
<b>Type of Buy</b>	Safe versus Partial	0.51
	Safe versus Minor	1.85
	Safe versus Major	-0.13
	Partial versus Minor	1.06
	Partial versus Major	-0.59
	Minor versus Major	-1.31

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

**Appendix C: Tables Related to Vendor Overcharges and Undercharges**

---

<b>Table C-1. National Estimate of Undercharge and Overcharge Rates of Occurrence Across All Buys<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Average Total</b>
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1512
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35589
	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	2421
	SE OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	270
	PERCENT OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	6.80
	SE OF PERCENT OF UNDERCHARGE	0.78
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1512
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35589
	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	3096
	SE OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	297
	PERCENT OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	8.70
	SE OF PERCENT OF OVERCHARGE	0.89

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on an average weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).



<b>Table C-2. National Estimate of Undercharge and Overcharge Rates of Occurrence for the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>UNDERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1545
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35526
	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	2498
	SE OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	305
	PERCENT OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	7.03
	SE OF PERCENT OF UNDERCHARGE	0.85
<b>OVERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1545
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35526
	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	2495
	SE OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	351
	PERCENT OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	7.02
	SE OF PERCENT OF OVERCHARGE	1.01

<sup>1</sup>This data was derived from the safe buy. Accordingly, an estimated total of 36,908 vendors participated.

<b>Table C-3. National Estimate of Undercharge and Overcharge Rates of Occurrence for the Partial Buy<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1550
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35884
	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	1962
	SE OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	283
	PERCENT OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	5.47
	SE OF PERCENT OF UNDERCHARGE	0.80
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1550
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35884
	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	3395
	SE OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	390
	PERCENT OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	9.46
	SE OF PERCENT OF OVERCHARGE	1.14

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were visited for a partial buy.

<b>Table C-4. National Estimate of Undercharge and Overcharge Rates of Occurrence for the Minor Substitution Buy<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	810
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35329
	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	2741
	SE OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	472
	PERCENT OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	7.76
	SE OF PERCENT OF UNDERCHARGE	1.37
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	810
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35329
	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	3437
	SE OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	456
	PERCENT OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	9.73
	SE OF PERCENT OF OVERCHARGE	1.36

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were visited for a minor substitution buy.

<b>Table C-5. National Estimate of Undercharge and Overcharge Rates of Occurrence for the Major Substitution Buy<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	701
	WEIGHTED SIZE	34906
	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	2874
	SE OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	521
	PERCENT OF VENDORS UNDERCHARGING	8.23
	SE OF PERCENT OF UNDERCHARGE	1.49
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	701
	WEIGHTED SIZE	34906
	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	3625
	SE OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	479
	PERCENT OF VENDORS OVERCHARGING	10.39
	SE OF PERCENT OF OVERCHARGE	1.40

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were visited for a Major substitution buy.

<b>Table C-6. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors by Frequency of Occurrence of Undercharging or Overcharging</b>						
<b>Buy Characteristics</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Number of Occurrences of Undercharge or Overcharge</b>				<b>Total</b>
		<b>None</b>	<b>One</b>	<b>Two</b>	<b>Three</b>	
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1306	199	36	7	1548
	WEIGHTED SIZE	58593	9411	1641	400	70045
	SE WEIGHTED	1704	823	427	188	1247
	PERCENT	83.65	13.43	2.34	0.57	100.00%
	SE PERCENT	1.54	1.22	0.61	0.27	0.00%
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1271	187	65	25	1548
	WEIGHTED SIZE	57389	8701	2907	1048	70045
	SE WEIGHTED	1787	695	485	224	1247
	PERCENT	81.93	12.42	4.15	1.50	100.00%
	SE PERCENT	1.62	1.02	0.72	0.33	0.00%

**Table C-7. National Estimates of Undercharge and Overcharge Rates of Occurrence  
for Each Type of Buy**

Type of Purchase Price Deviation	Statistics	Type of Buy				Total
		Safe Buy	Partial	Minor Substitution	Major Substitution	
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	102	78	58	54	292
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2481	1982	1476	1324	7264
	SE WEIGHTED	307	285	253	243	809
	PERCENT OF ALL BUYS	2.32	1.86	1.38	1.24	6.80
	SE PERCENT	0.28	0.27	0.24	0.23	0.78
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	106	143	77	70	396
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2494	3332	1769	1691	9287
	SE WEIGHTED	353	371	238	226	890
	PERCENT OF ALL BUYS	2.34	3.12	1.66	1.58	8.70
	SE PERCENT	0.32	0.34	0.37	0.23	0.89

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy) yielding a total estimate of 110,723 buys.

**Table C-8. Average Amount of Undercharge and Overcharge for Each Type of Buy**

	Statistics	Type of Buy				Total
		Safe	Partial	Minor	Major	
<b>Absolute Difference</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1513	1523	803	698	4537
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35576	35928	18897	16364	106766
	TOTAL AMOUNT	\$3,744.15	\$12,935.25	\$837.12	\$4,640.24	\$22,156.75
	MEAN UNDER/OVERCHARGE	\$0.11	\$0.36	\$0.04	\$0.28	\$0.21
	SE of MEAN	\$0.05	\$0.09	\$0.11	\$0.17	\$0.05
<b>Undercharge Difference</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1513	1523	803	698	4537
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35576	35928	18897	16364	106766
	TOTAL AMOUNT	-\$2,849.02	-\$3,830.67	-\$5,894.99	-\$2,099.91	-\$14,674.59
	MEAN UNDERCHARGE	-\$0.08	-\$0.11	-\$0.31	-\$0.13	-\$0.14
	SE of MEAN	\$0.02	\$0.03	\$0.11	\$0.04	\$0.03
<b>Overcharge Difference</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1513	1523	803	698	4537
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35576	35928	18897	16364	106766
	TOTAL AMOUNT	\$6,593.17	\$16,765.92	\$6,732.11	\$6,740.15	\$36,831.35
	MEAN OVERCHARGE	\$0.19	\$0.47	\$0.36	\$0.41	\$0.35
	SE of MEAN	\$0.05	\$0.09	\$0.08	\$0.16	\$0.05
<b>Redeemed Check Amount</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1513	1523	803	698	4537
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35576	35928	18897	16364	6766
	TOTAL AMOUNT	\$785,073.35	\$627,186.57	\$478,136.04	\$95,995.64	\$86,391.61
	MEAN OVERCHARGE	\$22.07	\$17.46	\$25.30	\$24.20	\$21.41
	SE of MEAN	\$1.03	\$0.96	\$1.22	\$1.23	\$0.94
<b>Best Estimate of CBF Expenditure</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	1513	1523	803	698	4537
	WEIGHTED SIZE	35576	35928	18897	16364	6766
	TOTAL AMOUNT	\$781,329.20	\$614,251.32	\$478,109.58	\$91,355.41	\$65,045.50
	MEAN OVERCHARGE	\$21.96	\$17.10	\$25.30	\$23.92	\$21.22

<b>Table C-9. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors that Undercharged or Overcharged for Each Type of Food Package Across All Buys<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Type of Food Package</b>			<b>Total</b>
		<b>Woman</b>	<b>Child</b>	<b>Infant</b>	
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	31	38	29	97
	WEIGHTED SIZE	725	958	739	2421
	SE WEIGHTED	93	159	127	270
	PERCENT OF ALL BUYS	2.04	2.69	2.08	6.80
	SE PERCENT	0.27	0.45	0.36	0.78
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	49	48	35	132
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1141	1121	833	3096
	SE WEIGHTED	139	143	127	297
	PERCENT OF ALL BUYS	3.21	3.15	2.34	8.70
	SE PERCENT	0.41	0.42	0.36	0.89

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on an average weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).



<b>Table C-10. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors that Undercharged or Overcharged for Each Use of Scanning Equipment<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Use of Scanning Equipment</b>			<b>Total</b>
		<b>No Scanning Equipment</b>	<b>Items Were Scanned</b>	<b>Items Were Not Scanned</b>	
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	48	45	5	292
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1242	1061	118	2421
	SE WEIGHTED	207	149	33	270
	PERCENT OF ALL BUYS	3.51	3.00	0.33	6.84
	SE PERCENT	0.60	0.42	0.10	0.79
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	81	42	8	130
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1910	962	186	3058
	SE WEIGHTED	270	141	53	292
	PERCENT OF ALL BUYS	5.40	2.72	0.53	8.64
	SE PERCENT	0.79	0.41	0.15	0.88

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on an averaged weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).

<b>Table C-11. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors that Undercharged or Overcharged for Each Vendor Size<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Vendor Size</b>			<b>Total</b>
		<b>Small</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Large</b>	
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	48	30	19	97
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1236	746	439	2421
	SE WEIGHTED	195	136	79	270
	PERCENT OF ALL BUYS	3.47	2.10	1.23	6.80
	SE PERCENT	0.56	0.38	0.22	0.78
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	132	26	18	130
	WEIGHTED SIZE	3096	604	416	3058
	SE WEIGHTED	890	117	87	292
	PERCENT OF ALL BUYS	8.70	1.70	1.17	8.64
	SE PERCENT	0.89	0.78	0.34	0.25

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on an averaged weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).

<b>Table C-12. National Estimates of Undercharge and Overcharge Occurrences for Countersignature Timing<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Vendors Did Not Ask for Countersignature After Purchase Price was Entered on Food Instrument</b>	<b>Vendors Asked for Countersign After Purchase Price was Entered on Food Instrument</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	56	41	97
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1322	1099	2421
	SE WEIGHTED	210	143	270
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	3.72	3.10	6.82
	SE PERCENT	0.61	0.40	0.78
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	95	37	132
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2128	958	3086
	SE WEIGHTED	292	130	296
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	6.00	2.70	8.69
	SE PERCENT	0.87	0.37	0.89

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).

<b>Table C-13. National Estimates of Undercharge and Overcharge Occurrences for Receipt Provision<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Receipt Provision</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>Vendor Did Not Provide Receipt</b>	<b>Vendor Did Provide Receipt</b>	
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	77	21	97
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1953	469	2421
	SE WEIGHTED	235	112	270
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	5.51	1.32	6.84
	SE PERCENT	0.69	0.32	0.78
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	112	19	131
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2638	443	9244
	SE WEIGHTED	275	83	297
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	7.45	1.25	8.70
	SE PERCENT	0.83	0.23	0.89

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on an average weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).

<b>Table C-14. National Estimates of Undercharge and Overcharge Occurrences for Each Locale<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Locale</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>Metropolitan</b>	<b>Non-metropolitan</b>	
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	67	30	97
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1602	819	2421
	SE WEIGHTED	225	163	270
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	4.50	2.30	6.80
	SE PERCENT	0.65	0.46	0.78
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	105	27	132
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2366	730	3096
	SE WEIGHTED	309	134	297
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	6.65	2.05	8.70
	SE PERCENT	0.91	0.38	0.89

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on an average weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).

<b>Table C-15. National Estimates of Undercharge and Overcharge Occurrences for Each Type of Food Delivery System<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Type of Purchase Price Deviation</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Type of Food Delivery System</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>Open</b>	<b>Vendor-Specific</b>	
<b>Undercharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	72	26	97
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2065	356	2421
	SE WEIGHTED	261	69	270
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	5.80	1.00	6.8
	SE PERCENT	0.75	0.19	0.78
<b>Overcharge</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	85	47	132
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2439	657	3096
	SE WEIGHTED	271	122	297
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS	6.85	1.85	8.7
	SE PERCENT	0.81	0.34	0.89

<sup>1</sup>This data is based on an averaged weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were each visited three times (for a safe, partial, and substitution buy).

Table C-16. Over All Buys: Single Variable Models of Overcharge									
Variable	R <sup>2</sup>	Variable Value	Odds Ratio	Overall Model Wald Chi Square Saiterwaite F Saiterwaite Adjusted Chi Square	Overall Model Wald P Saiterwaite P Adjusted Saiterwaite P	Parameter Beta	Parameter T	Parameter P	Design Effect
<b>Receipt NOT Provided</b>	0.079	Receipt NOT Provided	10.47	498.44 271.51 508.13	0.00 0.00 0.00	2.35 (0.21)	11.41	0.00	1.95
<b>Scanning</b>	0.056	Choose NOT to scan (compared to scanned purchased WIC items)	4.65	565.19 217.65 582.12	0.00 0.00 0.00	1.54 (0.32)	4.76	0.00	1.77
		NO scanning equipment (compared to scanned purchased WIC items)	6.01			1.79 (0.18)	9.74	0.00	2.49
<b>Size</b>	0.052	Medium-Sized Vendor Compared to Small-Sized Vendors	4.63	507.68 204.65 570.48	0.00 0.00 0.00	-1.53 (0.22)	-7.13	0.00	2.53
		Large-Sized Vendors Compared to Small-Sized Vendors	6.49			-1.87 (0.22)	-8.38	0.00	2.06
<b>Improper Countersignature</b>	0.046	Improper countersignature (compared to proper)	4.87	650.71 282.79 525.60	0.00 0.00 0.00	1.58 (0.19)	8.50	0.00	2.67

**Table C-17. Safe Buy: Single Variable Models of Overcharge**

Variable	R <sup>2</sup>	Variable Value	Odds Ratio	Overall Model Wald Chi Square Saiterwaite F Saiterwaite Adjusted Chi Square	Overall Model Wald P Saiterwaite P Adjusted Saiterwaite P	Parameter Beta	Parameter T	Parameter P	Design Effect
<b>Receipt NOT Provided</b>	0.057	Receipt NOT Provided	8.29	210.59 248.95 136.52	0.00 0.00 0.00	2.12 (0.32)	6.52	0.00	1.55
<b>Scanning</b>	0.043	Choose NOT to scan (compared to scanned purchased WIC items)	4.27	311.50 114.80 308.80	0.00 0.00 0.00	.45 (0.47)	3.08	0.00	1.18
		NO scanning equipment (compared to scanned purchased WIC items)	5.51				1.71 (0.28)	6.17	0.00
<b>Size</b>	0.041	Medium-Sized Vendors Compared to Small-Sized Vendors	4.69	272.93 118.44 321.83	0.00 0.00 0.00	-1.55 (0.31)	-5.07	0.00	1.4
		Large-Sized Vendors Compared to Small-Sized Vendors	5.71				-1.74 (0.32)	-5.51	0.00
<b>Improper Countersignature</b>	0.021	Improper countersignature (compared to proper)	3.14	373.58 163.60 293.48	0.00 0.00 0.00	1.14 (0.26)	4.36	0.00	1.64



**Table C-18. Partial Buy: Single Variable Models of Overcharge**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Variable Value</b>	<b>Odds Ratio</b>	<b>Overall Model Wald Chi Square Saiterwaite F Saiterwaite Adjusted Chi Square</b>	<b>Overall Model Wald P Saiterwaite P Adjusted Saiterwaite P</b>	<b>Parameter Beta</b>	<b>Parameter T</b>	<b>Parameter P</b>	<b>Design Effect</b>
<b>Receipt NOT Provided</b>	0.084	Receipt NOT Provided (Versus Receipt provided)	10.57	346.59 161.30 295.18	0.00 0.00 0.00	2.36 (0.26)	8.98	0.00	1.13
		<b>Scanning</b>	0.071	Choose NOT to scan (compared to scanned purchased WIC items)	4.86	311.31 102.08 298.55	0.00 0.00 0.00	1.58 (0.56)	2.81
NO scanning equipment (compared to scanned purchased WIC items)	7.36					2.00 (0.23)	8.50	0.00	1.39
<b>Size</b>	0.063	Medium-Sized Vendors Compared to Small-Sized Vendors	5.10	302.29 115.41 329.38	0.00 0.00 0.00	-1.63 (0.26)	-6.20	0.00	1.35
		Large-Sized Vendors Compared to Small-Sized Vendors	7.46			-2.01 (0.32)	-6.20	0.00	1.50
<b>Improper Countersignature</b>	0.063	Improper countersignature (compared to proper)	6.15	364.77 165.23 305.09	0.00 0.00 0.00	1.82 (0.22)	8.09	0.00	1.35

**Table C-19. Minor Substitution Buy: Single Variable Models of Overcharge**

Variable	R <sup>2</sup>	Variable Value	Odds Ratio	Overall Model Wald Chi Square Saiterwaite F Saiterwaite Adjusted Chi Square	Overall Model Wald P Saiterwaite P Adjusted Saiterwaite P	Parameter Beta	Parameter T	Parameter P	Design Effect
<b>Receipt NOT Provided</b>	0.101	Receipt NOT Provided (Versus Receipt provided)	14.46	210.76 85.41 157.27	0.00 0.00 0.00	2.67 (0.40)	6.65	0.00	1.16
<b>Scanning</b>	0.059	Choose NOT to scan (compared to scanned purchased WIC items)	6.77	237.53 81.21 221.16	0.00 0.00 0.00	1.91 (0.52)	3.69	0.00	0.97
		NO scanning equipment (compared to scanned purchased WIC items)	5.47						
<b>Size</b>	0.047	Medium-Sized Vendors Compared to Small-Sized Vendors	3.92	233.86 78.42 222.96	0.00 0.00 0.00	-1.37 (0.37)	-3.65	0.00	1.55
		Large-Sized Vendors Compared to Small-Sized Vendors	5.40						
<b>Improper Countersignature</b>	0.055	Improper countersignature (compared to proper)	5.30	183.68 100.38 197.15	0.00 0.00 0.00	1.67 (0.31)	5.29	0.00	1.48

**Table C-20. Major Substitution Buy: Single Variable Models of Overcharge**

Variable	R <sup>2</sup>	Variable Value	Odds Ratio	Overall Model Wald Chi Square Saiterwaite F Saiterwaite Adjusted Chi Square	Overall Model Wald P Saiterwaite P Adjusted Saiterwaite P	Parameter Beta	Parameter T	Parameter P	Design Effect
<b>Receipt NOT Provided</b>	0.101	Receipt NOT Provided (Versus Receipt provided)	12.00	176.77 89.65 178.78	0.00 0.00 0.00	2.48 (0.37)	6.67	0.00	1.11
<b>Scanning</b>	0.045	Choose NOT to scan (compared to scanned purchased WIC items)	4.37	157.42 64.78 176.51	0.00 0.00 0.00	1.48 (0.66)	2.23	0.03	1.00
		NO scanning equipment (compared to scanned purchased WIC items)	4.51			1.51 (0.33)	4.50	0.00	1.64
<b>Size</b>	0.057	Medium-Sized Vendors Compared to Small-Sized Vendors	4.59	155.44 52.90 145.18	0.00 0.00 0.00	-1.52 (0.43)	-3.51	0.00	1.89
		Large-Sized Vendors Compared to Small-Sized Vendors	5.78			-1.76 (0.41)	-4.3	0.00	1.41
<b>Improper Countersignature</b>	0.066	Improper countersignature (compared to proper)	6.05	175.30 81.35 151.37	0.00 0.00 0.00	1.80 (0.38)	4.74	0.00	1.85

<b>C-21. Logit Models for Overcharge</b>		
<b>Model Type</b>	<b>Independent Variable</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>
<b>Single Variable Models</b>	Failure to Properly Countersign	0.065*
	Failure to Provide a Receipt <sup>1</sup>	0.144
	Small-Sized Vendor	0.091*
	Scanned	0.104**
<b>Two Variable Models</b>	No scanning & improper countersignature <sup>1</sup>	0.162
	No scanning & no receipt <sup>1</sup>	0.172
	No scanning & small vendor	0.108
	No receipt & small vendor	0.165*
	Improper countersignature & small vendor <sup>1</sup>	0.154
	Improper countersignature & no receipt <sup>1</sup>	0.188
<b>Three Variable Models</b>	Improper countersignature, no receipt, no scanning <sup>1</sup>	0.212
	Improper countersignature, no receipt, small vendor <sup>1</sup>	0.209
	No receipt, no scanning & small-sized vendor	0.172
	Improper countersignature, no scanning, and small-sized vendor <sup>1</sup>	0.167
<b>Four Variable Models</b>	Improper countersignature, no receipt, no scanning, & small-sized vendor <sup>1</sup>	0.213

\* Statistically significant at 0.05

<sup>1</sup> First level not significant for one time offender

C-22. Logistic Odds Ratios to Overcharge for Repeat Offenders					
Model Type	Model	Variable	One-Time Offender Proclivity to Overcharge Relative to Non-offender	Two-time Offender Proclivity to Overcharge Relative to Non-offender	Three-time Offender Proclivity to Overcharge Relative to Non-offender
Single Variable Models	Improper Countersignature No Receipt Provided	Improper Countersignature	1.69	3.57	5.52
		No Receipt Provided	1.19	2.5	12.8
	Small-Sized Vendor Did Not Scan	Small-Sized Vendor	4.2	6.4	NA
		Did Not Scan	2.75	4.69	6.43
Two Variable Models	Did Not Scan and No Receipt Provided	Did Not Scan	1.62	2.28	3.1
		No Receipt Provided	3.51	6.77	8.04
		No Receipt Provided	3.68	7.07	8.71
	No Receipt Provided and Small-Sized Vendor	Small-Sized Vendor	2.27	2.78	NA
		Small-Sized Vendor	1.33	2.61	5.1
	Improper Countersignature and No Receipt Provided	Improper Countersignature	5.01	9.81	11.97
		No Receipt Provided	5.01	9.81	11.97
	Small-Sized Vendor and Did Not Scan	Small-Sized Vendor	1.69	1.94	NA
		Did Not Scan	2.25	3.17	3.89
	Improper Countersignature and Small-Sized Vendor	Improper Countersignature	1.62	3.56	6.66
		Small-Sized Vendor	4.44	7.04	NA
	Three Variable Models	Improper countersignature, No Receipt Provided, Did Not Scan	Improper Countersignature	1.43	2.74
No Receipt Provided			3.65	6.08	7.05
Did Not Scan			1.47	2.51	3.13
Improper countersignature, Small-Sized Vendor, Did Not Scan		Improper Countersignature	1.61	3.41	6.44
		Small-Sized Vendor	1.95	2.4	NA
		Did Not Scan	2.07	3.23	3.42
Small-Sized Vendor, No Receipt Provided, Did Not Scan		Small-Sized Vendor	1.22	1.23	NA
		No Receipt Provided	3.47	6.62	7.89
		Did Not Scan	1.53	2.01	2.64
Improper Countersignature, No Receipt Provided, Small-Sized Vendor		Improper Countersignature	1.46	2.88	5.62
		No Receipt Provided	3.88	6.22	7.48
		Small-Sized Vendor	2.42	3.16	NA
Four Variable Models	Improper Countersignature, No Receipt Provided, Did Not Scan, Small-Sized Vendor	Improper Countersignature	1.46	2.82	5.44
		No Receipt Provided	3.61	5.79	6.76
		Did Not Scan	1.29	1.92	2.2
		Small-Sized Vendor	1.45	1.64	NA
		Small-Sized Vendor	1.45	1.64	NA

<b>Table C-23. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Overcharge Across All Buys as a Function of Type of Food Package and Type of Buy</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	Woman versus Child	0.10
	Woman versus Infant	2.27*
	Child versus Infant	1.81
<b>Type of Buy</b>	Safe Buy versus Partial	-2.04*
	Safe Buy versus Minor Substitution	-1.86
	Safe Buy versus Major Substitution	-2.46*
	Partial Buy versus Minor Substitution	-0.08
	Partial Buy versus Major Substitution	-0.84
	Minor Substitution Buy versus Major Substitution	-0.57

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-24. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Overcharge During Safe Buys as a Function of Type of Food Package</b>		
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
	Woman versus Child	0.49
	Woman versus Infant	1.25
	Child versus Infant	0.56

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-25. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Overcharge During Partial Buys as a Function of Type of Food Package</b>		
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
	Woman versus Child	0.13
	Woman versus Infant	1.27
	Child versus Infant	1.25

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.



<b>Table C-26. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Overcharge During Minor Substitution Buys as a Function of Type of Food Package</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	Woman versus Child	0.73
	Woman versus Infant	2.45*
	Child versus Infant	1.62

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-27. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Overcharge During Major Substitution Buys as a Function of Type of Food Package</b>		
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
	Woman versus Child	0.17
	Woman versus Infant	0.59
	Child versus Infant	0.69

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-28. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Overcharge Across All Buys as a Function of Potential Administrative Error and Vendor Size</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Purchased WIC Items Were Scanned</b>	Scanning equipment was not available versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	7.61**
	Scanning equipment was not available versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned for some other unknown reason	0.79
	Purchased WIC Items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned for some unknown reason	-3.19**
<b>Countersign the Instrument</b>	NOT Asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument versus asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument	6.81**
<b>No Receipt Provided</b>	No Receipt Provided versus Receipt Provided	10.18**
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	7.07**
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	7.88**
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	1.28

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-29. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Overcharge During Safe Buy as a Function of Potential Administrative Error and Vendor Size</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Purchased WIC Items Were Scanned</b>	Scanning equipment was not available versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	4.65**
	Scanning equipment was not available versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned for some other unknown reason	0.56
	Purchased WIC Items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned for some unknown reason	-2.05 **
<b>Countersign the Instrument</b>	NOT Asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument versus asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument	3.50**
<b>No Receipt Provided</b>	No Receipt Provided versus Receipt Provided	7.03**
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	5.24**
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	5.32**
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	0.53

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-30. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Overcharge During Partial Buys as a Function of Potential Administrative Error and Vendor Size</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Purchased WIC Items Were Scanned</b>	Scanning equipment was not available versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	6.97**
	Scanning equipment was not available versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned for some other unknown reason	0.83
	Purchased WIC Items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned for some unknown reason	-1.76
<b>Countersign the Instrument</b>	NOT Asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument versus asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument	6.31**
<b>No Receipt Provided</b>	No Receipt Provided versus Receipt Provided	7.81**
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	6.06**
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	6.36**
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	1.10

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-31. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Overcharge During Minor Substitution Buys as a Function of Potential Administrative Error and Vendor Size</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Purchased WIC Items Were Scanned</b>	Scanning equipment was not available versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	4.68**
	Scanning equipment was not available versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned for some other unknown reason	-0.65
	Purchased WIC Items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned for some unknown reason	-2.58**
<b>Countersign the Instrument</b>	NOT Asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument versus asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument	5.29**
<b>No Receipt Provided</b>	No Receipt Provided versus Receipt Provided	6.24**
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	3.91**
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	4.90**
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	0.73

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-32. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Overcharge During Major Substitution Buys as a Function of Potential Administrative Error and Vendor Size</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Purchased WIC Items Were Scanned</b>	Scanning equipment was not available versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	4.30**
	Scanning equipment was not available versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned for some other unknown reason	0.07
	Purchased WIC Items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned for some unknown reason	-1.51
<b>Countersign the Instrument</b>	NOT Asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument versus asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument	5.28**
<b>No Receipt Provided</b>	No Receipt Provided versus Receipt Provided	7.01**
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	4.50**
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	5.11**
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	0.41

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-33. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Undercharge Across All Buys as a Function of Type of Food Package and Type of Buy</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	Woman versus Child	-1.52
	Woman versus Infant	0.01
	Child versus Infant	1.40
<b>Type of Buy</b>	Safe Buy versus Partial	1.62
	Safe Buy versus Minor Substitution	-0.69
	Safe Buy versus Major Substitution	-0.77
	Partial Buy versus Minor Substitution	-2.05*
	Partial Buy versus Major Substitution	-1.88
	Minor Substitution Buy versus Major Substitution	-0.18

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.



<b>Table C-34. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Undercharge During Safe Buys as a Function of Type of Food Package</b>		
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
	Woman versus Child	-1.48
	Woman versus Infant	0.78
	Child versus Infant	2.06*

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-35. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Undercharge During Partial Buys as a Function of Type of Food Package</b>		
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
	Woman versus Child	-1.99
	Woman versus Infant	1.38
	Child versus Infant	0.52

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-36. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Undercharge During Minor Substitution Buys as a Function of Type of Food Package</b>		
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
	Woman versus Child	0.27
	Woman versus Infant	-0.38
	Child versus Infant	-0.53

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-37. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Undercharge During Major Substitution Buys as a Function of Type of Food Package</b>		
<b>Type of Food Package</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
	Woman versus Child	-0.31
	Woman versus Infant	0.88
	Child versus Infant	1.46

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-38. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Undercharge Across All Buys as a Function of Potential Administrative Error and Vendor Size</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Use of Scanning Equipment</b>	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	5.31**
	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC items were not scanned although equipment was available.	0.84
	Purchased WIC items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC items were NOT Scanned although equipment was available.	-2.27 *
<b>Countersignature Timing</b>	NOT Asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument versus asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument	5.01**
<b>Provision of Receipt</b>	No Receipt Provided versus Receipt Provided	9.05**
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	3.57
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	5.12
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	2.39

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-39. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Undercharge During Safe Buys as a Function of Potential Administrative Error and Vendor Size</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Use of Scanning Equipment</b>	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	4.54**
	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC items were not scanned although equipment was available.	-0.72
	Purchased WIC items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC items were NOT Scanned although equipment was available.	-2.81*
<b>Countersignature Timing</b>	NOT Asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument versus asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument	3.36**
<b>Provision of Receipt</b>	No Receipt Provided versus Receipt Provided	9.91**
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	3.41**
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	5.33**
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	1.62

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-40. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Undercharge During Partial Buys as a Function of Potential Administrative Error and Vendor Size</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Use of Scanning Equipment</b>	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	3.51**
	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC items were not scanned although equipment was available.	3.00**
	Purchased WIC items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC items were NOT Scanned although equipment was available.	0.05
<b>Countersignature Timing</b>	NOT Asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument versus asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument	3.73**
<b>Provision of Receipt</b>	No Receipt Provided versus Receipt Provided	5.46**
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	2.35*
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	3.19**
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	1.23

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-41. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Undercharge During Minor Substitution Buys as a Function of Potential Administrative Error and Vendor Size</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Use of Scanning Equipment</b>	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	3.21**
	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC items were not scanned although equipment was available.	0.41
	Purchased WIC items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC items were NOT Scanned although equipment was available.	-1.47
<b>Countersignature Timing</b>	NOT Asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument versus asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument	2.66**
<b>Provision of Receipt</b>	No Receipt Provided versus Receipt Provided	5.11**
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	2.41*
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	2.81**
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	1.02

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.



<b>Table C-42. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Undercharge During Major Substitution Buys as a Function of Potential Administrative Error and Vendor Size</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Use of Scanning Equipment</b>	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	2.36**
	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC items were not scanned although equipment was available.	0.62
	Purchased WIC items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC items were NOT Scanned although equipment was available.	-0.22
<b>Countersignature Timing</b>	NOT Asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument versus asked to countersign the Instrument after the purchase price was entered on the WIC Food Instrument	2.79**
<b>Provision of Receipt</b>	No Receipt Provided versus Receipt Provided	3.16**
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	0.56
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	1.78
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	1.28

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-43. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Undercharge Amount Differences Across All Buys</b>		
	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Type of Buy</b>	Safe Buy versus Partial	1.01
	Safe Buy versus Minor Substitution	2.14*
	Safe Buy versus Major Substitution	1.09
	Partial Buy versus Minor Substitution	1.87
	Partial Buy versus Major Substitution	0.39
	Minor Substitution Buy versus Major Substitution	-1.68

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table C-44. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Overcharge Amount Differences Across All Buys</b>		
<b>Type of Buy</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
	Safe Buy versus Partial	-2.94**
	Safe Buy versus Minor Substitution	-1.97*
	Safe Buy versus Major Substitution	-1.38
	Partial Buy versus Minor Substitution	1.09
	Partial Buy versus Major Substitution	0.32
	Minor Substitution Buy versus Major Substitution	-0.29

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

**Appendix D: Tables Related to Vendor Acceptance of  
Substitutions**

---

<b>Table D-1. National Rate of WIC Vendors Accepting Buyer-Initiated Substitutions</b>		
<b>Type of Substitution</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Substitution Violations Totals</b>
<b>Minor Substitution<sup>1</sup></b>	SAMPLE SIZE	294
	WEIGHTED SIZE	12819
	SE WEIGHTED	1090
	PERCENT	34.7
	SE OF PERCENT	2.65
<b>Major Substitution<sup>2</sup></b>	SAMPLE SIZE	30
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1370
	SE WEIGHTED	276
	PERCENT	3.71
	SE OF PERCENT	0.75

<sup>1</sup> Minor Substitutions were initiated by the compliance buyers at approximately half of the vendors.

<sup>2</sup> Major substitutions were initiated by the compliance buyers at approximately half of the vendors.

<b>Table D-2. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Accepting Buyer-Initiated Minor Substitutions<sup>1</sup> for Use of Scanning Equipment</b>				
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>No Scanning Equipment</b>	<b>Scanned WIC Items</b>	<b>Chose Not to Scan WIC Items</b>	<b>Total</b>
SAMPLE SIZE	59	225	9	293
WEIGHTED SIZE	2808	9555	406	12769
SE WEIGHTED	497	978	239	1091
PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE MINOR SUBSTITUTION WAS ATTEMPTED	7.72	26.27	1.12	35.11
SE PERCENT	1.35	1.35	0.66	2.67

<sup>1</sup> Minor Substitutions were initiated by the compliance buyers at approximately half of the vendors.

<b>Table D-3. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Accepting Buyer-Initiated Major Substitutions<sup>1</sup> for Use of Scanning Equipment</b>				
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Use of Scanning Equipment</b>			<b>Total</b>
	<b>No Scanning Equipment</b>	<b>Scanned WIC Items</b>	<b>Chose Not to Scan WIC Items</b>	
SAMPLE SIZE	15	13	2	30
WEIGHTED SIZE	702	570	99	927
SE WEIGHTED	225	166	74	296
PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE MAJOR SUBSTITUTION WAS ATTEMPTED	1.92	1.56	0.27	3.74
SE PERCENT	0.61	0.46	0.20	0.75

<sup>1</sup> Major substitutions were initiated by the compliance buyers at approximately half of the vendors.

<b>Table D-4. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendor's Accepting Buyer-Initiated Major Substitutions<sup>1</sup> for WIC Vendor Size</b>				
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Vendor Size</b>			<b>Total</b>
	<b>Small</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Large</b>	
SAMPLE SIZE	16	7	7	30
WEIGHTED SIZE	770	337	264	1370
SE WEIGHTED	225	132	113	276
PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE MAJOR SUBSTITUTION WAS ATTEMPTED	2.09	0.91	0.71	3.71
SE PERCENT	0.61	0.36	0.31	0.75

<sup>1</sup> Major substitutions were initiated by compliance buyers at approximately half of the vendors.



<b>Table D-5. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Accepting Buyer-Initiated Major Substitutions<sup>1</sup> for Cashier's Indication of Unfamiliarity with WIC Transactions</b>			
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Indication Cashier was Unfamiliar with WIC Transaction</b>	<b>NO Indication Cashier was Unfamiliar with WIC Transaction</b>	<b>Total</b>
SAMPLE SIZE	7	23	30
WEIGHTED SIZE	268	1102	1370
SE WEIGHTED	95	263	276
PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE MAJOR SUBSTITUTION WAS ATTEMPTED	0.73	3.06	3.79
SE PERCENT	0.26	0.73	0.77

<sup>1</sup> Major substitutions were initiated by compliance buyers at approximately half of the vendors.

<b>Table D-6. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Minor Substitution Buys by WIC Vendor Demographics</b>		
<b>Vendor Demographics</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	-1.05
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	-1.32
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	-0.33
<b>Use of Scanning Equipment</b>	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	-2.46*
	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned	-0.26
	Purchased WIC Items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned	0.53
<b>Cashier's Indication of Unfamiliarity with WIC Transaction</b>	Cashier Indicated Unfamiliarity with the Conduct of WIC Transaction versus Cashier Did NOT Indicate Unfamiliarity with the Conduct of WIC Transaction	0.59

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

<b>Table D-7. t-Statistics from Contrast Analyses Describing Major Substitution Buys by WIC Vendor Demographics</b>		
<b>Vendor Demographics</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>t-TEST</b>
<b>Vendor Size</b>	Small-Sized Vendor versus Medium-Sized Vendor	2.02*
	Small-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	2.19*
	Medium-Sized Vendor versus Large-Sized Vendor	0.33
<b>Use of Scanning Equipment</b>	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC Items were Scanned	2.17*
	No Scanning equipment versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned	-0.45
	Purchased WIC Items were Scanned versus Purchased WIC Items were NOT Scanned	-1.09
<b>Cashier's Indication of Unfamiliarity with WIC Transaction</b>	Cashier Indicated Unfamiliarity with the Conduct of WIC Transaction versus Cashier Did NOT Indicate Unfamiliarity with the Conduct of WIC Transaction	1.95*

\* Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

**Appendix E: Tables Related to Administrative Errors for the  
Safe Buy**

---

**Table E-1. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Committing Administrative Errors by Type of Error During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Administrative Error</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Total Number of Vendors In Violation</b>
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	75
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1866
	SE WEIGHTED	268
	PERCENT	5.05
	SE PERCENT	0.72
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price Was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	615
	WEIGHTED SIZE	13306
	SE WEIGHTED	937
	PERCENT	36.52
	SE PERCENT	2.62
<b>Raincheck</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	8
	WEIGHTED SIZE	222
	SE WEIGHTED	71
	COLUMN PERCENT	0.60
	SE PERCENT	0.19
<b>Asked to Pay Cash in Addition to Food Instrument</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	0
	WEIGHTED SIZE	0
	SE WEIGHTED	0
	PERCENT	0.00
	SE PERCENT	0.00

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were visited for a safe buy.

<b>Table E-2. Frequency of Administrative Errors for Locale During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Administrative Error</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Locale</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>Metro</b>	<b>Non-metro</b>	
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	53	22	75
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1313	552	1866
	SE WEIGHTED	237	132	268
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	3.56	1.50	5.05
	SE PERCENT	0.64	0.35	0.72
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	503	112	615
	WEIGHTED SIZE	10525	2780	13306
	SE WEIGHTED	962	450	937
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	28.89	7.63	36.52
	SE PERCENT	2.67	1.24	2.62
<b>Raincheck</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	5	3	8
	WEIGHTED SIZE	140	83	222
	SE WEIGHTED	58	47	71
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	0.38	0.22	0.6
	SE PERCENT	0.16	0.13	0.19

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were visited for a safe buy.

<b>Table E-3. Frequency of Administrative Errors for Type of Food Delivery System and Type of Error During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Administrative Error</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Type of Food Delivery System</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>Open</b>	<b>Vendor Specific</b>	
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	59	16	75
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1646	220	1866
	SE WEIGHTED	261	57	268
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	4.46	0.60	5.05
	SE PERCENT	0.7	0.15	0.72
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price Was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	341	274	615
	WEIGHTED SIZE	9544	3761	13306
	SE WEIGHTED	836	424	937
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	26.2	10.32	36.52
	SE PERCENT	2.33	1.16	2.62
<b>Raincheck</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	8	0	8
	WEIGHTED SIZE	222	0	222
	SE WEIGHTED	71	0	71
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	0.60	0	0.60
	SE PERCENT	0.19	0.00	0.19

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were visited for a safe buy.

<b>Table E-4. Frequency of Administrative Errors for Type of Food Package During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Administrative Error</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Type of Food Package</b>			<b>Total</b>
		<b>Woman</b>	<b>Child</b>	<b>Infant</b>	
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	14	11	50	75
	WEIGHTED SIZE	347	264	1254	1866
	SE WEIGHTED	97	78	198	268
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	0.94	0.72	3.4	5.05
	SE PERCENT	0.26	0.21	0.53	0.72
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	208	215	192	615
	WEIGHTED SIZE	4494	4592	4219	13306
	SE WEIGHTED	373	369	374	937
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	12.33	12.61	11.58	36.52
	SE PERCENT	1.05	1.03	1.02	2.62
<b>Raincheck</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	2	0	6	8
	WEIGHTED SIZE	56	0	166	222
	SE WEIGHTED	40	0	63	71
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	0.15	0	0.45	0.19
	SE PERCENT	0.11	0	0.17	0.19

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on a weighted estimate of 36,908 vendors who were visited for a safe buy.



<b>Table E-5. National Rate of WIC Vendor Administrative Errors Among Vendors Who Did Not Overcharge, Undercharge, or Substitute During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Administrative Error</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>In Violation</b>
<b>Insufficient Stock</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	56
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1490
	SE WEIGHTED	247
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	4.66
	SE PERCENT	0.76
<b>Failed to Countersign Before Price was Entered</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	479
	WEIGHTED SIZE	10531
	SE WEIGHTED	787
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	33.5
	SE PERCENT	2.57
<b>Raincheck</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	0
	WEIGHTED SIZE	0
	SE WEIGHTED	0
	PERCENT OF ALL VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	0.00
	SE PERCENT	0.00

<sup>1</sup> This data is based on a weighted estimate of 31,485 vendors who were visited for a safe buy.

**Appendix F: Tables Related to Overcharges for the Safe Buy**

**Table F-1. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Undercharging or Overcharging by Type of Food Package During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup>**

Type of Deviation from Purchase Price	Statistics	Type of Food Package			Total
		Woman	Child	Infant	
<b>UNDERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	34	44	27	105
	WEIGHTED SIZE	764	1101	633	2498
	SE WEIGHTED	129	214	138	305
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	2.15	3.1	1.78	7.03
	SE PERCENT	0.36	0.6	0.39	0.85
<b>OVERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	39	37	32	108
	WEIGHTED SIZE	935.24	821.3	738.9	350.95
	SE WEIGHTED	151.67	182.07	147.52	100
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	7.9	7.03	6.14	7.02
	SE PERCENT	0.44	0.52	0.42	1.01

<sup>1</sup> This data was derived from the safe buy. Accordingly, an estimated total of 36,908 vendors participated.

<b>Table F-2. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Undercharging or Overcharging by Use of Scanning Equipment During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Type of Deviation from Purchase Price</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Use of Scanning Equipment</b>			<b>Total</b>
		<b>No Scanning Equipment</b>	<b>Items Were Scanned</b>	<b>Items Were Not Scanned</b>	
<b>UNDERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	51	45	9	105
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1246.39	1042.61	209.25	2498.24
	SE WEIGHTED	216.94	190.04	67.94	304.91
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	3.53	2.95	0.59	7.07
	SE PERCENT	0.62	0.53	0.19	0.86
<b>OVERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	65	35	7	107
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1520.95	778.93	167.68	2467.56
	SE WEIGHTED	303.22	166.58	62.63	350.12
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	4.30	2.20	0.47	6.98
	SE PERCENT	0.87	0.48	0.18	1.01

<sup>1</sup>This data was derived from the safe buy. Accordingly, an estimated total of 36,908 vendors participated.

<b>Table F-3. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Undercharging or Overcharging by Size of Vendor During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Type of Deviation from Purchase Price</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Vendor Size</b>			<b>Total</b>
		<b>Small</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Large</b>	
<b>UNDERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	53	32	20	105
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1287	766	445	2498
	SE WEIGHTED	194	173	100	305
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	3.62	2.16	1.25	7.03
	SE PERCENT	0.55	0.49	0.28	0.85
<b>OVERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	71	20	17	108
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1660	474	361	2495
	SE WEIGHTED	273	142	101	351
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	4.67	1.34	1.02	7.02
	SE PERCENT	0.78	0.40	0.29	1.01

<sup>1</sup>This data was derived from the safe buy. Accordingly, an estimated total of 36,908 vendors participated.

<b>Table F-4. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Undercharging or Overcharging by Timing of Countersignature During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Type of Deviation from Purchase Price</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Timing of Countersignature</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>Asked to countersign <u>after</u> purchase price was entered on food instrument</b>	<b>Not Asked to countersign <u>after</u> purchase price was entered on food instrument</b>	
<b>UNDERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	57	48	105
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1268	1230	2498
	SE WEIGHTED	203	199	305
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	3.57	3.47	7.04
	SE PERCENT	0.57	0.55	0.85
<b>OVERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	71	37	108
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1530	965	2495
	SE WEIGHTED	316	167	351
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	4.31	2.72	7.04
	SE PERCENT	0.90	0.47	1.01

<sup>1</sup>This data was derived from the safe buy. Accordingly, an estimated total of 36,908 vendors participated.

<b>Table F-5. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Undercharging or Overcharging by Provision of Receipt During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Type of Deviation from Purchase Price</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Provision of Receipt</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>Vendor Did Not Provide Receipt</b>	<b>Vendor Did Provide Receipt</b>	
<b>UNDERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	88	17	105
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2137	361	2498
	SE WEIGHTED	243	134	305
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	6.04	1.02	7.06
	SE PERCENT	0.69	0.38	0.86
<b>OVERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	88	19	107
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2052.36	429.35	2481.71
	SE WEIGHTED	280.71	139.22	350.84
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	5.80	1.21	7.02
	SE PERCENT	0.81	0.39	1.01

<sup>1</sup> This data was derived from the safe buy. Accordingly, an estimated total of 36,908 vendors participated.

<b>Table F-6. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Undercharging or Overcharging by Locale During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Type of Deviation from Purchase Price</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Locale</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>Metro</b>	<b>Non Metro</b>	
<b>UNDERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	68	37	105
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1519	979	2498
	SE WEIGHTED	225	209	305
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	4.27	2.75	7.03
	SE PERCENT	0.64	0.58	0.85
<b>OVERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	85	23	108
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1934	562	2495
	SE WEIGHTED	347	146	351
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	5.44	1.58	7.02
	SE PERCENT	0.99	0.41	1.01

<sup>1</sup>This data was derived from the safe buy. Accordingly, an estimated total of 36,908 vendors participated.



<b>Table F-7. Number and Percentage of WIC Vendors Undercharging or Overcharging by Type of Food Delivery System During the Safe Buy<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Type of Deviation from Purchase Price</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Type of Food Package</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>Open</b>	<b>Vendor-Specific</b>	
<b>UNDERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	74	31	105
	WEIGHTED SIZE	2072	426	2498
	SE WEIGHTED	289	97	305
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	5.83	1.2	7.03
	SE PERCENT	0.81	0.27	0.85
<b>OVERCHARGE</b>	SAMPLE SIZE	71	37	108
	WEIGHTED SIZE	1987	508	2495
	SE WEIGHTED	332	114	351
	PERCENT OF VENDORS WHERE SAFE BUY WAS CONDUCTED	5.59	1.43	7.02
	SE PERCENT	0.95	0.32	1.01

<sup>1</sup> This data was derived from the safe buy. Accordingly, an estimated total of 36,908 vendors participated.

## **Appendix G: Sample Design, Selection, and Weighting**

---

**WIC Vendor Management Study**  
**Sample Design, Selection, and Weighting**  
*by R. Paul Moore 8/27/99*

The 1998 WIC Vendor Management Study involved compliance buys made in a nationally representative, probability sample of WIC retail vendors. The sampling frame was constructed from complete lists of vendors provided by the State WIC programs. A cluster sample of 1,800 vendors in 100 primary sampling units (PSUs) was selected. A response goal was to obtain complete study data from three compliance buys with at least 1,500 vendors. After sample loss for vendors that were closed or no longer in the program, 1,625 remaining sample vendors were eligible. Complete study data for three compliance buys was obtained from 1,565 of them.

**A. Population and Sample Size**

The population of interest for the study was defined as all WIC retail vendors in the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia. This definition excludes state-run WIC stores (all Mississippi WIC vendors), home delivery vendors (all of Vermont and part of Ohio), military commissaries, and pharmacies that only provided WIC participants with special order infant formula. The vendors operating in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the U.S. territories, and the vendors managed by Native American agencies were also excluded from the study population. It would be very costly if the study had covered these special types of WIC vendor operations, which are different from the other retail vendors, and represent a small fraction of all WIC food deliveries.

The study sample was designed to meet the precision constraints of estimating national proportions within 3 percentage points and estimating subgroup proportions within 5 percentage points, with 95 percent confidence. A total sample of 1,500 vendors was expected to meet the study's precision requirements at the most reasonable data collection cost. The sample of vendors was clustered within 100 primary sampling units (PSUs), counties or groups of counties, to limit the number of compliance buyers and to reduce their travel costs.

## **B. Predicted Sample Attrition**

It was necessary to field more than 1,500 sample vendors, to allow for attrition. The two components of the reduction were sample loss and non-response. Sample loss involved retail stores identified by States as WIC vendors when the sample frame was constructed, but which were no longer authorized for WIC or had closed by the date of the compliance buys. The sample loss component also included allowance for a small number of the 1,800 sampled vendors which State WIC personnel identified as being under serious State investigation and which, for that reason, were dropped from the study sample. Non-response included blown compliance buyer cover and other cases in which the vendors were WIC-eligible but the planned buys was not made.

We expected a drop-off of about 14 percent of sample vendors from the time the sampling frame was constructed until the first compliance buys were made, for the reasons described above. The actual drop-off was 11.1 percent (buy 1 was completed for 1,600 of the 1,800 sample vendors). An additional three percent drop-off between compliance buys 1 and 3 was predicted for newly closed stores, vendors that had just left the program, and non-response. The actual drop-off experienced was 2.2 percent (all 3 buys were completed for 1,565 vendors).

The total sample of 1,800 vendors ( $1,500/0.86/0.97$ ) was expected to be large enough to yield 1,500 sample cases with complete information for all three planned compliance buys. Due to the lower than expected sample loss, the sample of 1,800 yielded 1,565 cases with complete data for all three buys. A reserve sample of 200 vendors was also selected, to supplement the 1,800 vendor sample, in case the actual sample loss and non-response exceeded advance estimates.

## **C. Sampling Frame Development**

### **1. Lists of WIC Vendors**

In January 1998, current lists of retail vendors were requested from the 46 States and the District of Columbia. In addition to vendor name and address, information about WIC redemption amounts was also obtained for use in stratification. States were asked to identify any home delivery vendors, State-run stores, military commissaries, and pharmacies providing WIC participants with special infant formula only. The vendor lists were received from the States during the period from February through April, 1998. Virtually all of the lists obtained were in machine readable formats.

The vendor lists were standardized to adjust for formatting differences across States. Edit checks at the frame construction stage included comparing the number of vendors per State, and the reported average monthly redemption dollars for each State, with comparable past information for reasonableness. Questions and problems noted in editing the frame information were raised with the States on a flow basis, and the clarifications obtained were used to update the frame file.

It was necessary to determine the county location for each vendor, to complete the sampling frame. Since most of the States did not identify the counties on the vendor lists provided, county location was imputed based upon the zip codes in the vendor mailing addresses. A small number of vendors with addresses outside the State reporting them were attached to nearby in-State counties. Vendors identified as home delivery vendors, State-run stores, military commissaries, and pharmacies providing only special infant formula were not included in the vendor frame. Reported redemption dollars covering more than one month were converted to one-month equivalent amounts. The final vendor list for the 46 covered States and the District of Columbia contained a total of 41,007 vendors.

## **2. Constructing PSUs**

Primary sampling units (PSUs) were defined as either individual counties or groups of geographically contiguous counties. Since comparisons were planned for differing State vendor management practices, PSUs were to be defined so that each one included area from a single State. The number of WIC retail vendors was determined for each county, and used to assure that each PSU in the sampling frame contained at least the target number of 70 vendors. The District of Columbia and each county within the 46 study States was included in one, and only one, WIC PSU. Counties with fewer than 70 WIC retail vendors were combined with geographically adjacent counties, forming PSUs that met or exceed this minimum requirement.

A computer program using GIS (geographic information system) information was used to form PSUs. The program allowed the user to group adjacent counties into PSUs within a State until each PSU contained at least the minimum number of vendors. The program displayed the number of WIC vendors in each county on a State-level county outline map. In order to form practical PSUs for field visits, major highway routes were also shown on the computer screen, and a highway atlas was used to identify major mountain ranges, lakes, and other map features. There were only a few cases where all

of the PSU construction objectives could not be met. The District of Columbia list contained only 21 WIC vendors; it was combined with two adjacent Maryland counties to form a PSU with 89 total vendors. This PSU was included in the stratum for vendor-specific states with high participant/vendor ratio. The State of Delaware had only 67 vendors; in this case, the entire State was defined as a single PSU. In total, only seven of the 366 PSUs in the sampling frame contained fewer than 70 vendors each. Thus, the final WIC PSU sampling frame contained 366 PSUs which were contiguous geographic areas; which in most cases contained at least 70 WIC retail vendors; which do not cross FNS region boundaries; and which (with one exception) do not cross State boundaries. Each WIC retail vendor was associated with one, and only one, PSU in the WIC sampling frame. For example, Exhibit 1 shows the six PSUs in the sampling frame for the State of Washington, and the number of vendors in each PSU.

### **3. Stratifying the PSUs**

PSUs in the sampling frame were stratified to reduce sampling variability and to assure adequate sample sizes for key analysis comparisons. FNS was interested in comparing groups of States by their vendor management practices, such as contrasting States with large and small numbers of WIC vendors. State-level vendor and participant counts from the FY1996 VAMP report were used to divide the population of WIC vendors into three approximately equal sized strata, based on the average number of participants per vendor for each State.

There was also interest in comparing States using vendor-specific food instruments with open food instrument States. Crossing these two State-level stratification variables defined six primary strata. Table 1 lists the States that were assigned to each of the six primary strata, the number of vendors in the sampling frame, and the average state-level participant/vendor ratio from the VAMP report. Table 2 shows the distribution of the 41,007 vendors in the sampling frame by the same six strata.

Table 1 - Stratification by State FI Distribution System and Participants per Vendor

Primary Stratum	State	Number of Vendors	Average Participants per Vendor
Open/High	AZ	489	251
	IL	1,581	186
	IN	748	339
	MA	1,037	192
	MD	471	275
	NM	256	211
	OH	1,021	286
	TX	2,251	262
	UT	299	186
Open/High		8,153	
Open/Low	CT	775	84
	IA	610	102
	KY	1,363	84
	ME	378	63
	MN	1,131	81
	MT	297	70
	NC	2,048	98
	ND	236	62
	NH	230	90
	NY	4,196	115
	SD	268	65
	VA	1,021	108
	WI	1,096	102
	WV	483	109
	WY	98	112
Open/Low		14,230	
Open/Med	AL	923	129
	AR	553	153
	FL	1,813	180
	GA	1,415	159
	LA	888	146
	MI	1,567	139
	MO	768	157
	OK	564	148
	RI	247	116
	SC	732	131
	TN	896	128
Open/Med		10,366	
Vendor-Specific/High	CA	3,336	319
	CO	382	188
	DC	89	701
	DE	67	217
	NJ	523	283
	NV	151	240
	PA	1,373	185
Vendor-Specific/High		5,921	
Vendor-Specific/Low	ID	279	111
	NE	406	94
Vendor-Specific/Low		685	
Vendor-Specific/Medium	KS	329	157
	OR	565	163
	WA	758	163
Vendor-Specific/Medium		1,652	
		41,007	

Table 2 - Distribution of WIC Retail Vendors by Primary Strata

Retail Distribution System						
Participant to Vendor Ratio	Open Vendors		Vendor-Specific Vendors		All Vendors	
	Number	Pct.	Number	Pct.	Number	Pct.
Low	14,230.00	34.70	685.00	1.67	14,915.00	36.37
Medium	10,366.00	25.28	1,652.00	4.03	12,018.00	29.31
High	8,153.00	19.88	5,921.00	14.44	14,074.00	34.32
ALL	32,749.00	79.86	8,258.00	20.14	41,007.00	100.00

It was also important to control the sample of PSUs by whether or not they were located in a metropolitan area. PSUs in the sampling frame were classified as metropolitan if the largest population county of the PSU was part of a metropolitan statistical area (MSA). PSUs which were entirely composed of non-MSA counties were classified as non-metropolitan. Implicit stratification was used to control the sample draw for metropolitan location (see the section on selecting sample PSUs).

In summary, the PSUs in the sampling frame were stratified based on the following three variables:

- Vendor-specific States vs. Open food instrument States
- Participants per vendor ratio- States with High, Medium and Low ratios based on FY1996 VAMP data
- Metropolitan location - within a metropolitan statistical area (MSA), or not (based on the largest population county within the PSU).

Specific PSU-level strata were defined based on the first two variables, and implicit stratification was used to control the sample draw for metropolitan location.

## D. Sample Selection

### 1. Selecting the Sample PSUs

A nationally representative sample of 1,800 WIC retail vendors was selected. First, 100 sample PSUs were selected and then 18 sample vendors per PSU were selected. A backup sample of 2 vendors per PSU was also identified, in case the sample loss and survey non-response exceeded



projections (it was never necessary to field any of the backup sample vendors).

Table 2 showed that the vendor-specific States included only about 20 percent of the vendors in the sampling frame. Equal overall selection probabilities would have led to selecting about 20 PSUs in these States and obtaining complete study data for only about 300 vendors from vendor-specific States. To meet the precision constraint for this analysis domain, sample PSUs in the vendor-specific States were sampled at twice the rate used in the open food instrument States. This over-sampling was implemented by adjusting the PSU size measures (number of WIC retail vendors) prior to selecting the sample PSUs. Table 3 shows the adjusted size measures for the six primary strata defined earlier.

Table 3 - Distribution of Total Size Measure by Primary Strata

Retail Distribution System						
Participant to Vendor Ratio	Open Vendors		Vendor-Specific Vendors		All Vendors	
	Number	Pct.	Number	Pct.	Number	Pct.
Low	14,230.00	28.88	1,370.00	2.78	15,600.00	31.67
Medium	10,366.00	21.04	3,304.00	6.71	13,670.00	27.75
High	8,153.00	16.55	11,842.00	24.04	19,995.00	40.59
ALL	32,749.00	66.48	16,516.00	33.52	49,265.00	100.00

The sample of  $n = 100$  PSUs was selected using probability non-replacement sampling and with probabilities proportional to size. The PSU size measures were proportional to the number of WIC vendors in the PSUs, except for the 2:1 over-sampling in those States using vendor-specific WIC food instruments.

Let  $N_{hi}$  = the number of vendors in PSU-i of stratum-h and let

$$N_h = \sum_i N_{hi} = \text{the total number of vendors in stratum-h.}$$

The PSU size measures were defined to implement the over-sampling as:

$$S_{hi} = N_{hi} \text{ for } h = 1, 2, \text{ and } 3 \text{ (open States), and as}$$

$S_{hi} = 2 N_{hi}$  for  $h = 4, 5,$  and  $6$  (vendor-specific States).

Letting  $S_h = \sum_i S_{hi}$  and  $S_+ = \sum_h \sum_i S_{hi} = \sum_h S_h$ , the expected sample size for each PSU- $i$

in each stratum- $h$  was calculated as  $E(n_{hi}) = \frac{100 S_{hi}}{S_+}$ .

The PSUs within each stratum were sorted by their metropolitan status prior to selecting the sample PSUs with probabilities proportional to the  $S_{hi}$  values, effecting an implicit stratification by metropolitan status. A probability minimum replacement selection procedure developed by Chromy<sup>1</sup> (1979) was used to select 100 sample PSUs. The method allows multiple hits for those units whose expected sample size exceeds unity, and restricts the realized number of hits for each unit to be within one of its expected sample size. For example, if the expected sample size for a PSU is 3.75, then the method allows the PSU to be selected either three times (with 0.25 probability), or four times (with 0.75 probability). For those units whose expected sample size does not exceed one, the expected sample size is equal to the probability of selecting the unit in the sample. Exhibit 2 shows the location of the 100 sample PSUs.

## 2. Selecting the Sample Vendors

Following the selection of 100 sample PSUs, a probability sample of 1,800 vendors and a 200 vendor reserve sample was selected. First, a total sample of 20 vendors was selected from the vendor list within each of the 100 sample selections. Note in the following sample hits, or pseudo-PSUs, are referred to as PSUs. Prior to the selection, vendors within each PSU were sorted by their monthly WIC redemption dollar amounts.

The 20 vendors were selected within each PSU using systematic sampling with equal probabilities and without replacement, effecting an implicit size stratification of the vendors. Then 18 of

---

<sup>1</sup>Chromy, J.R. (1979). *Sequential Sample Selection Methods*, Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods, American Statistical Association, p. 401-406.

the 20 selected vendors within each PSU were randomly selected for the study sample, yielding a main study sample of 1,800 vendors and a 200 vendor reserve sample (the reserve sample was never fielded). The 1,800 sample vendors, except those identified by States as closed, no longer in WIC, or under serious State investigation, were sent to the field for compliance buys.

The conditional probability of selecting vendor- $j$ , given the selection of PSU- $i$ , may be written as

$$P(j | hi) = \frac{18}{N_{hi}},$$

and the overall probability of selection for vendor- $j$  in PSU- $i$  of stratum- $h$  is therefore equal to

$$P(hij) = E(n_{hi}) P(j | hi) = \frac{18 E(n_{hi})}{N_{hi}}.$$

## E. Survey Weights

The initial sampling weights for the 1,800 selected vendors were calculated based on the expected PSU sample sizes and the conditional vendor selection probabilities. The initial sampling weight (unadjusted for non-response) for vendor- $j$ , selected from PSU- $i$  of stratum- $h$  was computed as:

$$W(hij) = \frac{1}{P(hij)} = \frac{N_{hi}}{18 E(n_{hi})}.$$

The unadjusted survey weights and PSU selection probabilities are shown in Appendix A.

If complete study data were obtained for all of the sampled vendors, then these unadjusted weights would be appropriate for analyzing the survey results. This was not the case, however, as some vendors were ineligible for the survey and it was not possible to complete all of the proposed data collection activities for all of the eligibles.

A weighting-class method was used to compute another set of survey weights, adjusted for

WIC ineligibility and survey non-response, with the goal of reducing non-response biases. First, all of the selected vendors were coded into one of the following categories:

	<u>Vendors</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. Out of business at first buy attempt	20	1.1%
2. Not in WIC at first buy attempt	27	1.5
3. Dropped - under State Investigation	127	7.1
4. Other non-eligible	1	0.1
5. Eligible	<u>1,625</u>	<u>90.2</u>
6. Total Sample Vendors	1,800	100.0%

The weight sums for the eligible and ineligible vendors were as follows:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Weight Sum</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. Eligible Vendors	1,625	36,907.70	89.7%
2. Ineligible Vendors	<u>175</u>	<u>4,228.57</u>	<u>10.3</u>
3. Total Sample Vendors	1,800	41,136.27	100.0

Next, the response status, or response rate, for the 1,625 eligible vendors was determined, for each of the three buys, as follows:

	<u>Vendors</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. Completed buy 1 (safe buy)	1,600	98.5%
2. Completed buy 2 (partial buy)	1,594	98.1
3. Completed buy 3 or 4 (substitution)	1,580	97.2
4. Completed all 3 buys	1,565	96.3

The adjusted sampling weights for the ineligible vendors, as identified at the time of the first buy attempt, were set to zero. The eligible in-sample vendors were partitioned into eight weighting classes, so that those within each weighting class were as similar as possible. The weighting classes were defined using the State-level stratification variables:

- A. Metropolitan classification
- B. Retail distribution system
- C. Ratio of WIC participants to WIC vendors.

The eight weighting classes were defined as follows:

<u>Class</u>	<u>Metro</u>	<u>Distribution</u>	<u>Participant/Vendor</u>
1	Metro	Open	Low ratio
2	Non-metro	Open	Low ratio
3	Metro	Open	Medium ratio
4	Non-metro	Open	Medium ration
5	All	Open	High ratio
6	All	Vendor-specific	Low ratio
7	All	Vendor-specific	Medium ratio
8	All	Vendor-specific	High ratio

The metropolitan classification variable was not used to subdivide classes 5 - 8 into separate weighting classes because the number of non-metropolitan vendors responding would have been too small, which could possibly lead to unstable adjustments for non-response.

The weights for the eligible in-sample vendors were adjusted by multiplying the initial weights for each vendor in weighting class-k (where  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 8$ ) by the ratio  $R(k)$  where

$$R(k) = [\text{sum of initial weights for eligible vendors in weighting class } k] / [\text{sum of initial weights for all completed eligible vendors in weighting class } k].$$

This weighting class procedure adjusts the sum of the survey weights, to compensate for those eligible vendors for which complete survey data was not obtained, i.e., those in which the compliance buys were not completed. To the extent that the responses of respondents and non-respondents within the same weighting class tend to be similar, the adjustment procedure reduces missing data biases.

It was decided to compute several weights, to facilitate the planned analysis. The weighting class methodology was applied separately to compute each of the following adjusted survey weights:

<u>Weight</u>	<u>Used for analysis of:</u>	<u>Sum of Adjusted Weights</u>
WTBUY1	data from buy 1 (safe)	36,907.70
WTBUY2	data from buy 2 (partial)	36,907.70
WTBUY3	data from buy 3 (minor substitution)	36,907.70
WTBUY4	data from buy 4 (major substitution)	36,907.70
WTBUYS	data from all 3 buys	36,907.70

## Appendix A - Unadjusted Survey Weights

<i>Selection</i>	$(h)$	$N_{hi}$	$S_{hi}$	$E(n_h)$	$E(n_{hi})$	$n_{hi}$	$P(hij)$	$W(hij)$
1	1	95	95	28.8846	0.19283	1	0.036537	27.3694
2	1	91	91	28.8846	0.18472	1	0.036537	27.3694
3	1	81	81	28.8846	0.16442	1	0.036537	27.3694
4	1	94	94	28.8846	0.19080	1	0.036537	27.3694
5	1	90	90	28.8846	0.18269	1	0.036537	27.3694
6	1	1148	1148	28.8846	2.33025	2	0.036537	27.3694
7	1	1148	1148	28.8846	2.33025	2	0.036537	27.3694
8	1	431	431	28.8846	0.87486	1	0.036537	27.3694
9	1	413	413	28.8846	0.83832	1	0.036537	27.3694
10	1	661	661	28.8846	1.34172	1	0.036537	27.3694
11	1	74	74	28.8846	0.15021	1	0.036537	27.3694
12	1	81	81	28.8846	0.16442	1	0.036537	27.3694
13	1	79	79	28.8846	0.16036	1	0.036537	27.3694
14	1	90	90	28.8846	0.18269	1	0.036537	27.3694
15	1	81	81	28.8846	0.16442	1	0.036537	27.3694
16	1	75	75	28.8846	0.15224	1	0.036537	27.3694
17	1	88	88	28.8846	0.17863	1	0.036537	27.3694
18	1	84	84	28.8846	0.17051	1	0.036537	27.3694
19	1	181	181	28.8846	0.36740	1	0.036537	27.3694
20	1	83	83	28.8846	0.16848	1	0.036537	27.3694
21	1	489	489	28.8846	0.99259	1	0.036537	27.3694
22	1	96	96	28.8846	0.19486	1	0.036537	27.3694
23	1	98	98	28.8846	0.19892	1	0.036537	27.3694
24	1	81	81	28.8846	0.16442	1	0.036537	27.3694
25	1	132	132	28.8846	0.26794	1	0.036537	27.3694
26	1	113	113	28.8846	0.22937	1	0.036537	27.3694
27	1	74	74	28.8846	0.15021	1	0.036537	27.3694
28	1	95	95	28.8846	0.19283	1	0.036537	27.3694
29	1	82	82	28.8846	0.16645	1	0.036537	27.3694
30	2	247	247	21.0413	0.50137	1	0.036537	27.3694
31	2	88	88	21.0413	0.17863	1	0.036537	27.3694
32	2	101	101	21.0413	0.20501	1	0.036537	27.3694
33	2	88	88	21.0413	0.17863	1	0.036537	27.3694
34	2	92	92	21.0413	0.18675	1	0.036537	27.3694
35	2	123	123	21.0413	0.25576	1	0.036537	27.3694
36	2	94	94	21.0413	0.19080	1	0.036537	27.3694
37	2	168	168	21.0413	0.34101	1	0.036537	27.3694
38	2	96	96	21.0413	0.19486	1	0.036537	27.3694
39	2	111	111	21.0413	0.22531	1	0.036537	27.3694
40	2	111	111	21.0413	0.22531	1	0.03657	27.3694

41	2	74	74	21.0413	0.15021	1	0.036537	27.3694
42	2	382	382	21.0413	0.77540	1	0.036537	27.3694
43	2	141	141	21.0413	0.28621	1	0.036537	27.3694
44	2	124	124	21.0413	0.25170	1	0.036537	27.3694
45	2	97	97	21.0413	0.19689	1	0.036537	27.3694
46	2	113	113	21.0413	0.22937	2	0.036537	27.3694
47	2	86	86	21.0413	0.17457	2	0.036537	27.3694
48	2	76	76	21.0413	0.15427	1	0.036537	27.3694
49	2	93	93	21.0413	0.18877	1	0.036537	27.3694
50	2	90	90	21.0413	0.18269	1	0.036537	27.3694
51	3	195	195	16.5493	0.39582	1	0.036537	27.3694
52	3	248	248	16.5493	0.50340	1	0.036537	27.3694
53	3	82	82	16.5493	0.16645	1	0.036537	27.3694
54	3	637	637	16.5493	1.29301	1	0.036537	27.3694
55	3	78	78	16.5493	0.15833	1	0.036537	27.3694
56	3	93	93	16.5493	0.18877	1	0.036537	27.3694
57	3	82	82	16.5493	0.16645	1	0.036537	27.3694
58	3	96	96	16.5493	0.19483	1	0.036537	27.3694
59	3	238	238	16.5493	0.48310	1	0.036537	27.3694
60	3	72	72	16.5493	0.14615	1	0.036537	27.3694
61	3	91	91	16.5493	0.18472	1	0.036537	27.3694
62	3	129	129	16.5493	0.26185	1	0.036537	27.3694
63	3	387	387	16.5493	0.78555	1	0.036537	27.3694
64	3	75	75	16.5493	0.15224	1	0.036537	27.3694
65	3	142	142	16.5493	0.28824	1	0.036537	27.3694
66	3	120	120	16.5493	0.24358	1	0.036537	27.3694
67	3	95	95	16.5493	0.19283	1	0.036537	27.3694
68	4	99	198	2.7809	0.40191	1	0.073074	13.6847
69	4	81	162	2.7809	0.32883	1	0.073074	13.6847
70	4	76	152	2.7809	0.30854	1	0.073074	13.6847
71	5	79	158	6.7066	0.32071	1	0.073074	13.6847
72	5	196	392	6.7066	0.79570	1	0.073074	13.6847
73	5	83	166	6.7066	0.33695	1	0.073074	13.6847
74	5	94	188	6.7066	0.38161	1	0.073074	13.6847
75	5	256	512	6.7066	1.03928	1	0.073074	13.6847
76	5	146	292	6.7066	0.59271	1	0.073074	13.6847
77	6	76	152	24.0373	0.30854	1	0.073074	13.6847
78	6	85	170	24.0373	0.34507	1	0.073074	13.6847
79	6	110	220	24.0373	0.44656	1	0.073074	13.6847
80	6	203	406	24.0373	0.82411	1	0.073074	13.6847



81	6	78	156	24.0373	0.31665	1	0.073074	13.6847
82	6	114	228	24.0373	0.46280	1	0.073074	13.6847
83	6	86	172	24.0373	0.34913	1	0.073074	13.6847
84	6	77	154	24.0373	0.31260	1	0.073074	13.6847
85	6	81	162	24.0373	0.32883	1	0.073074	13.6847
86	6	78	156	24.0373	0.31665	2	0.073074	13.6847
87	6	112	224	24.0373	0.45468	2	0.073074	13.6847
88	6	108	216	24.0373	0.43845	1	0.073074	13.6847
89	6	191	382	24.0373	0.77540	1	0.073074	13.6847
90	6	135	270	24.0373	0.54806	1	0.073074	13.6847
91	6	864	1728	24.0373	3.50756	4	0.073074	13.6847
92	6	864	1728	24.0373	3.50756	4	0.073074	13.6847
93	6	864	1728	24.0373	3.50756	4	0.073074	13.6847
94	6	864	1728	24.0373	3.50756	4	0.073074	13.6847
95	6	241	482	24.0373	0.97838	1	0.073074	13.6847
96	6	281	562	24.0373	1.14077	2	0.073074	13.6847
97	6	281	562	24.0373	1.14077	2	0.073074	13.6847
98	6	138	276	24.0373	0.56024	1	0.073074	13.6847
99	6	95	190	24.0373	0.385687	1	0.073074	13.6847
100	6	82	164	24.0373	0.33289	1	0.073074	13.6847

## **Appendix H: Compliance Buy Form**

---

**WIC VENDOR MANAGEMENT STUDY  
COMPLIANCE BUY FORM**

**PART I: IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

1. Compliance Buyer's Name \_\_\_\_\_
2. Compliance Buyer's ID # \_\_\_\_\_
3. Date of Buy        /        / 1998  
                  Month   Day       Year
4. Day of Week of Buy
 

Sunday.....01	Thursday.....05
Monday.....02	Friday.....06
Tuesday.....03	Saturday.....07
Wednesday.....04	
5. Time of Buy    :    AM PM (*Record the time you entered the store*)
6. Vendor Name \_\_\_\_\_
7. Vendor Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. Food Instrument Serial Numbers     
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

<b>COMPLIANCE BUY RESULT</b>				
1.	Completed .....01 → <i>Go to PART II</i> Not completed.....02 → <i>Go to #2</i>			
2.	Reason not completed <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr> <td>Vendor out of business.....01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vendor no longer WIC-authorized.....02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (specify).....03</td> </tr> </table>	Vendor out of business.....01	Vendor no longer WIC-authorized.....02	Other (specify).....03
Vendor out of business.....01				
Vendor no longer WIC-authorized.....02				
Other (specify).....03				
_____ CB Initials/Date				

**PART II: DESCRIPTION OF COMPLIANCE BUY**  
*(Complete This Section Immediately After Leaving the Store.)*

*(Circle one number for each question)*

1. Were all WIC foods available in the required quantities and sizes listed on the food instrument(s)?
  - Yes ..... 01
  - No ..... 02
  
2. Were you inappropriately asked to accept another item in substitution for the WIC foods you attempted to purchase?
  - Yes ..... 01
  - No ..... 02
  
3. Did the cashier verify that you had your WIC identification card?
  - Yes ..... 01
  - No ..... 02
  - Not Applicable..... 03
  
4. Did you observe the total amount rung up on the cash register?
  - Yes .....01 → Enter amount \$\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_
  - No ..... 02
  
5. Were you provided with a register receipt for the WIC purchase?
  - Yes .....01 → Enter amount on register receipt  
 \$\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_ (Attach receipt on page 7)
  - No ..... 02
  
6. Did the cashier enter the purchase price on the WIC food instrument?
  - Yes .....01 → \$\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_ Amount clerk entered
  - Yes, but could not read amount entered..... 02
  - No ..... 03
  - Don't know ..... 04
  
7. When were you asked to countersign the WIC food instrument?
  - After the purchase price was entered on the food instrument ..... 01
  - After the cashier rang up the WIC food items, but before the price was entered on the food instrument ..... 02
  - Before the cashier rang up the WIC food items..... 03
  - I was not asked to countersign the WIC food instrument..... 04

8. Were you charged sales tax on WIC foods?

- Yes .....01
- No .....02
- Could not observe.....03

9. Were you asked to pay cash in addition to the food instrument purchase price for WIC food?

- Yes .....01 → \$ \_\_\_\_\_ . \_\_\_\_\_ *Amount paid*
- No .....02

10. Were you offered cash for the food instrument or asked if you had any more WIC food instruments and offered credit or cash for them?

- Yes .....01 → \$ \_\_\_\_\_ . \_\_\_\_\_ *Amount of cash or credit offered*
- No .....02

11. Were you asked to take your purchase to a register specifically for WIC participants?

- Yes .....01
- No .....02

12. Were you given incorrect information from a store employee regarding the brands of food you could buy with your WIC food instrument?

- Yes .....01 → *Explain* \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- No .....02

13. How many registers did this store have?

14. How many registers were open at the time of your purchase?

15. Were your purchased items scanned?

- The store did not have scanning equipment.....01
- My items were scanned .....02
- My items were not scanned .....03

Safe Buy.....	01
Vendor ID#.....	
Case Type .....	

16. Did the cashier indicate that he/she was unfamiliar with how to conduct a WIC transaction?

- Yes .....01 → *Go to 16a*
- No .....02 → *Skip to Question 17*

16a. How was this communicated? (*Circle all that apply.*)

- Cashier indicated that he/she was a new employee.....01
- Cashier indicated that he/she had never completed a  
WIC transaction .....02
- Cashier received assistance from a co-worker or  
supervisor in completing the WIC transaction .....03
- Other .....04 → *Explain* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

17. Please describe any other WIC program violations you observed.

***PLEASE PROCEED TO PART III.***

**PART III-A: WIC PURCHASE INFORMATION**  
*(Complete Immediately After Leaving Store.)*

Safe Buy.....01
Vendor ID#.....
Case Type .....

1. Were you able to complete this buy as intended?

Yes .....01 → *Complete columns D-G for each item purchased.*

No.....02 → *Complete columns D-G for all items purchased.  
 Complete column C for all omitted or substituted items.  
 If applicable, record additional items in Section 2, and complete columns C-G.*

**SECTION 1:**

A Food Instrument Serial Number	B ITEMS ON WIC FOOD INSTRUMENT			C Item Code*	D Brand/Flavor	E Price Code	F Receipt Price	G SHELF PRICE Per Item Price
	Item Type	Quantity	Size					
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**SECTION 2: Record information about additional items purchased with FI**

							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**ITEM CODES:** (\*In column C, enter all codes that apply to omitted, substituted, or additional items)

- 01 - Not in stock
- 02 - Total quantity needed not in stock
- 03 - Required size not in stock
- 04 - No alternate item purchased
- 05 - Purchased ineligible alternate item at vendor suggestion
- 06 - Accepted rain check at vendor suggestion
- 07 - Purchased additional items at vendor suggestion

**PRICE CODES** (In Column E, enter one code for each item purchased)

- 01 - Price marked on item
- 02 - Price observed in store
- 03 - Price obtained through cash purchase of same item
- 04 - Price obtained by second compliance buyer
- 05 - Price obtained through other method (explain in notes section)

**NOTES:**

--

**PART III-B. WIC PURCHASE INFORMATION**

*(Complete Immediately After Leaving Store.)*

1. Were you able to complete this buy as intended?

Yes .....01 → *Complete columns D-G for each item purchased.*

No.....02 → *Complete columns D-G for all items purchased.*

*Complete column C for all omitted or substituted items.  
If applicable, record additional items in Section 2, and complete columns C-G.*

**SECTION 1:**

A Food Instrument Serial Number	B ITEMS ON WIC FOOD INSTRUMENT			C Item Code*	D Brand/Flavor	E Price Code	F Receipt Price	G SHELF PRICE Per Item Price
	Item Type	Quantity	Size					
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**SECTION 2: Record information about additional items purchased with FI**

							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**ITEM CODES:** (\*In column C, enter *all codes that apply* to omitted, substituted, or additional items)

- 01 - Not in stock
- 02 - Total quantity needed not in stock
- 03 - Required size not in stock
- 04 - No alternate item purchased
- 05 - Purchased ineligible alternate item at vendor suggestion
- 06 - Accepted rain check at vendor suggestion
- 07 - Purchased additional items at vendor suggestion

**PRICE CODES** (In Column E, enter *one code* for each item purchased)

- 01 - Price marked on item
- 02 - Price observed in store
- 03 - Price obtained through cash purchase of same item
- 04 - Price obtained by second compliance buyer
- 05 - Price obtained through other method (explain in notes section)

**NOTES:**



**PART IV: CASH PURCHASE INFORMATION FOR NON-FOOD ITEMS**

1. Record information for all non-food items purchased with cash. Attach cash purchase receipt below.

ITEMS PURCHASED WITH CASH DURING COMPLIANCE BUY				
Quantity	Size	Brand	Item Description	Receipt Price
				\$
			Sales Tax	\$
			Total	\$

**PART V: CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL**

A. I certify that I have reviewed this form and the information contained in this report is accurate.

Compliance Buyer's Signature..... Date

B. For Office Use Only:		Date Received	Date Reviewed	Result Code
1. Field Supervisor:	Initials			
2. RTI:	Initials			

<p><b>Result Codes:</b>          01 - Approved for processing          02 - Not approved for processing (explain in notes)          03 - Other (explain in notes)</p>	<p>NOTES:</p>
---	---------------

**ATTACH WIC PURCHASE RECEIPT HERE**

**ATTACH NON-WIC CASH PURCHASE RECEIPT HERE**

**PART VI: ITEMS DONATED**

This will certify that I, \_\_\_\_\_, donated the following items to:  
(Field Staff)

Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Organization Representative \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

*These items were obtained in connection with a research study for the USDA.*

**ITEMS DONATED**

Quantity	Item

\_\_\_\_\_  
Field Staff

\_\_\_\_\_  
Organization Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**WIC VENDOR MANAGEMENT STUDY  
COMPLIANCE BUY FORM**

**PART I: IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

1. Compliance Buyer's Name \_\_\_\_\_
2. Compliance Buyer's ID # \_\_\_\_\_
3. Date of Buy        /        / 1998  
                  Month   Day       Year
4. Day of Week of Buy
 

Sunday .....	01	Thursday .....	05
Monday .....	02	Friday .....	06
Tuesday .....	03	Saturday .....	07
Wednesday .....	04		
5. Time of Buy    :    AM PM (*Record the time you entered the store*)
6. Vendor Name \_\_\_\_\_
7. Vendor Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. Food Instrument Serial Numbers     
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

<b>COMPLIANCE BUY RESULT</b>							
1.	Completed .....01 → <i>Go to PART II</i> Not completed.....02 → <i>Go to #2</i>						
2.	Reason not completed <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr> <td>Vendor out of business .....</td> <td>01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vendor no longer WIC-authorized.....</td> <td>02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (specify) .....</td> <td>03</td> </tr> </table>	Vendor out of business .....	01	Vendor no longer WIC-authorized.....	02	Other (specify) .....	03
Vendor out of business .....	01						
Vendor no longer WIC-authorized.....	02						
Other (specify) .....	03						
/ _____ CB Initials/Date							

**PART II: DESCRIPTION OF COMPLIANCE BUY**  
*(Complete This Section Immediately After Leaving the Store.)*

*(Circle one number for each question)*

1. Were all WIC foods available in the required quantities and sizes listed on the food instrument(s)?
  - Yes 01
  - No. .... 02
  
2. Were you inappropriately asked to accept another item in substitution for the WIC foods you attempted to purchase?
  - Yes ..... 01
  - No. .... 02
  
3. Did the cashier verify that you had your WIC identification card?
  - Yes 01
  - No. .... 02
  - Not Applicable..... 03
  
4. Did you observe the total amount rung up on the cash register?
  - Yes .....01 → Enter amount \$\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_
  - No. .... 02
  
5. Were you provided with a register receipt for the WIC purchase?
  - Yes .....01 → Enter amount on register receipt  
 \$\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_ (Attach receipt on page 7)
  - No. .... 02
  
6. Did the cashier enter the purchase price on the WIC food instrument?
  - Yes .....01 → \$\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_ Amount clerk entered
  - Yes, but could not read amount entered..... 02
  - No..... 03
  - Don't know ..... 04
  
7. When were you asked to countersign the WIC food instrument?
  - After the purchase price was entered on the food instrument ..... 01
  - After the cashier rang up the WIC food items, but before the price was  
 entered on the food instrument ..... 02
  - Before the cashier rang up the WIC food items..... 03
  - I was not asked to countersign the WIC food instrument..... 04

8. Were you charged sales tax on WIC foods?

- Yes .....01
- No .....02
- Could not observe.....03

8. Were you asked to pay cash in addition to the food instrument purchase price for WIC food?

- Yes .....01 → \$ \_\_\_\_\_ . \_\_\_\_\_ *Amount paid*
- No .....02

9. Were you offered cash for the food instrument or asked if you had any more WIC food instruments and offered credit or cash for them?

- Yes .....01 → \$ \_\_\_\_\_ . \_\_\_\_\_ *Amount of cash or credit offered*
- No .....02

10. Were you asked to take your purchase to a register specifically for WIC participants?

- Yes .....01
- No .....02

11. Were you given incorrect information from a store employee regarding the brands of food you could buy with your WIC food instrument?

- Yes .....01 → *Explain* \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- No .....02

12. How many registers did this store have?

14. How many registers were open at the time of your purchase?

15. Were your purchased items scanned?

- The store did not have scanning equipment.....01
- My items were scanned .....02
- My items were not scanned .....03

16. Did the cashier indicate that he/she was unfamiliar with how to conduct a WIC transaction?

- Yes .....01 → *Go to 16a*
- No .....02 → *Skip to Question 17*

16a. How was this communicated? *(Circle all that apply.)*

- Cashier indicated that he/she was a new employee.....01
- Cashier indicated that he/she had never completed a  
WIC transaction .....02
- Cashier received assistance from a co-worker or  
supervisor in completing the WIC transaction .....03
- Other .....04 → *Explain* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

17. Please describe any other WIC program violations you observed.

***PLEASE PROCEED TO PART III.***

**PART III-A: WIC PURCHASE INFORMATION**  
*(Complete Immediately After Leaving Store.)*

Partial Buy .....02
Vendor ID#.....
Case Type .....

1. Were you able to complete this buy as intended?

Yes .....01 → *Complete columns D-G for each item purchased. (Complete column C for any out of stock item.)*

No.....02 → *Complete columns D-G for all items purchased. Complete column C if partial buy not allowed for that item, or if item is a substitute. If applicable, record additional items in Section 2, and complete columns C-G.*

**SECTION 1:**

A Food Instrument Serial Number	B ITEMS ON WIC FOOD INSTRUMENT			C Item Code*	D Brand/Flavor	E Price Code	F Receipt Price	G SHELF PRICE Per Item Price
	Item Type	Quantity	Size					
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**SECTION 2: Record information about additional items purchased with FI**

							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**ITEM CODES:** (\*In column C, enter all codes that apply to out-of-stock, substituted, or additional items)

- 01 - Not in stock
- 02 - Total quantity needed not in stock
- 03 - Required size not in stock
- 04 - No alternate item purchased
- 05 - Purchased ineligible alternate item at vendor suggestion
- 06 - Accepted rain check at vendor suggestion
- 07 - Vendor refused to allow partial buy
- 08 - Purchased additional items at vendor suggestion

**PRICE CODES** (In Column E, enter one code for each item purchased)

- 01 - Price marked on item
- 02 - Price observed in store
- 03 - Price obtained through cash purchase of same item
- 04 - Price obtained by second compliance buyer
- 05 - Price obtained through other method (explain in notes section)

**NOTES:**

**PART III-B. WIC PURCHASE INFORMATION**

*(Complete Immediately After Leaving Store.)*

1. Were you able to complete this buy as intended?

Yes .....01 → *Complete columns D-G for each item purchased. (Complete column C for any out of stock item.)*

No.....02 → *Complete columns D-G for all items purchased. Complete column C if partial buy not allowed for that item, or if item is a substitute. If applicable, record additional items in Section 2, and complete columns C-G.*

**SECTION 1:**

A	B ITEMS ON WIC FOOD INSTRUMENT			C	D	E	F	G SHELF PRICE
Food Instrument Serial Number	Item Type	Quantity	Size	Item Code *	Brand/Flavor	Price Code	Receipt Price	Per Item Price
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**SECTION 2: Record information about additional items purchased with FI**

							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

<p><b>ITEM CODES:</b> (*In column C, enter <i>all codes that apply</i> to out-of-stock, substituted, or additional items)</p> <p>01 - Not in stock</p> <p>02 - Total quantity needed not in stock</p> <p>03 - Required size not in stock</p> <p>04 - No alternate item purchased</p> <p>05 - Purchased ineligible alternate item at vendor suggestion</p> <p>06 - Accepted rain check at vendor suggestion</p> <p>07 - Vendor refused to allow partial buy</p> <p>08 - Purchased additional items at vendor suggestion</p>	<p><b>PRICE CODES</b> (In Column E, enter <i>one code</i> for each item purchased)</p> <p>01 - Price marked on item</p> <p>02 - Price observed in store</p> <p>03 - Price obtained through cash purchase of same item</p> <p>04 - Price obtained by second compliance buyer</p> <p>05 - Price obtained through other method (explain in notes section)</p>
--	--

**NOTES:**



**PART IV: CASH PURCHASE INFORMATION FOR NON-FOOD ITEMS**

1. Record information for all non-food items purchased with cash. Attach cash purchase receipt below.

ITEMS PURCHASED WITH CASH DURING COMPLIANCE BUY				
Quantity	Size	Brand	Item Description	Receipt Price
				\$
			Sales Tax	\$
			Total	\$

**PART V: CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL**

A. I certify that I have reviewed this form and the information contained in this report is accurate.

Compliance Buyer's Signature..... Date

B. For Office Use Only:			Date Received	Date Reviewed	Result Code
1. Field Supervisor:	Initials				
2. RTI:	Initials				

<b>Result Codes:</b> 01 - Approved for processing 02 - Not approved for processing (explain in notes) 03 - Other (explain in notes)	<b>NOTES:</b>
--	---------------

**ATTACH WIC PURCHASE RECEIPT HERE**

**ATTACH NON-WIC CASH PURCHASE RECEIPT HERE**

**PART VI: ITEMS DONATED**

This will certify that I, \_\_\_\_\_, donated the following items to:  
(Field Staff)

Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Organization Representative \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_

*These items were obtained in connection with a research study for the USDA.*

**ITEMS DONATED**

Quantity	Item

\_\_\_\_\_  
Field Staff

\_\_\_\_\_  
Organization Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**WIC VENDOR MANAGEMENT STUDY  
COMPLIANCE BUY FORM**

**PART I: IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

- 1. Compliance Buyer’s Name \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Compliance Buyer’s ID # \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Date of Buy        /        / 1998  
                  Month   Day       Year
- 4. Day of Week of Buy
 

Sunday.....01	Thursday.....05
Monday.....02	Friday.....06
Tuesday.....03	Saturday.....07
Wednesday.....04	
- 5. Time of Buy \_\_ \_\_ : \_\_ \_\_ AM PM (*Record the time you entered the store*)
- 6. Vendor Name \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. Vendor Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 8. Food Instrument Serial Numbers \_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLIANCE BUY RESULT**

- 1. Completed .....01 → *Go to PART II*  
Not completed.....02 → *Go to #2*
- 2. Reason not completed
  - Vendor out of business .....01
  - Vendor no longer WIC-authorized.....02
  - Other (specify) .....03

\_\_\_\_\_  
CB Initials/Date

**PART II: DESCRIPTION OF COMPLIANCE BUY**  
*(Complete This Section Immediately After Leaving the Store.)*

*(Circle one number for each question)*

1. Were all WIC foods available in the required quantities and sizes listed on the food instrument(s)?
  - Yes ..... 01
  - No ..... 02
  
2. Were you inappropriately asked to accept another item in substitution for the WIC foods you attempted to purchase?
  - Yes ..... 01
  - No ..... 02
  
3. Did the cashier verify that you had your WIC identification card?
  - Yes ..... 01
  - No ..... 02
  - Not Applicable..... 03
  
4. Did you observe the total amount rung up on the cash register?
  - Yes .....01 → Enter amount \$\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_
  - No ..... 02
  
5. Were you provided with a register receipt for the WIC purchase?
  - Yes .....01 → Enter amount on register receipt  
 \$\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_ (Attach receipt on page 7)
  - No ..... 02
  
6. Did the cashier enter the purchase price on the WIC food instrument?
  - Yes .....01 → \$\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_ Amount clerk entered
  - Yes, but could not read amount entered..... 02
  - No ..... 03
  - Don't know ..... 04
  
7. When were you asked to countersign the WIC food instrument?
  - After the purchase price was entered on the food instrument .....01
  - After the cashier rang up the WIC food items, but before the price was entered on the food instrument ..... 02
  - Before the cashier rang up the WIC food items..... 03
  - I was not asked to countersign the WIC food instrument.....04

8. Were you charged sales tax on WIC foods?

- Yes .....01
- No .....02
- Could not observe.....03

8. Were you asked to pay cash in addition to the food instrument purchase price for WIC food?

- Yes .....01 → \$ \_\_\_\_\_ . \_\_\_\_\_ *Amount paid*
- No .....02

9. Were you offered cash for the food instrument or asked if you had any more WIC food instruments and offered credit or cash for them?

- Yes .....01 → \$ \_\_\_\_\_ . \_\_\_\_\_ *Amount of cash or credit offered*
- No .....02

10. Were you asked to take your purchase to a register specifically for WIC participants?

- Yes .....01
- No .....02

11. Were you given incorrect information from a store employee regarding the brands of food you could buy with your WIC food instrument?

- Yes .....01 → *Explain* \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- No .....02

12. How many registers did this store have?

14. How many registers were open at the time of your purchase?

15. Were your purchased items scanned?

- The store did not have scanning equipment.....01
- My items were scanned .....02
- My items were not scanned .....03

16. Did the cashier indicate that he/she was unfamiliar with how to conduct a WIC transaction?

- Yes .....01 → *Go to 16a*
- No .....02 → *Skip to Question 17*

16a. How was this communicated? (*Circle all that apply.*)

- Cashier indicated that he/she was a new employee.....01
- Cashier indicated that he/she had never completed a  
WIC transaction .....02
- Cashier received assistance from a co-worker or  
supervisor in completing the WIC transaction .....03
- Other .....04 → *Explain* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

17. Please describe any other WIC program violations you observed.

***PLEASE PROCEED TO PART III.***

**PART III-A: WIC PURCHASE INFORMATION**  
*(Complete Immediately After Leaving Store.)*

Minor Substitution .....03
Vendor ID#.....
Case Type .....

1. Were you able to complete this buy as intended?

Yes .....01 → *Complete columns C-G for substituted item(s).  
 Complete columns D-G for all other items purchased.*

No.....02 → *Complete columns D-G for all items purchased.  
 Complete column C if substitution not allowed for item, or if the item was omitted.  
 If applicable, record additional items in Section 2, and complete columns C-G.*

**SECTION 1:**

A Food Instrument Serial Number	B ITEMS ON WIC FOOD INSTRUMENT			C Item Code*	D Brand/Flavor	E Price Code	F Receipt Price	G SHELF PRICE Per Item Price
	Item Type	Quantity	Size					
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**SECTION 2: Record information about additional items purchased with FI**

							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

<p><b>ITEM CODES:</b> (*In column C, enter all codes that apply to omitted, substituted, or additional items)</p> <p>01 - Not in stock          02 - Total quantity needed not in stock          03 - Required size not in stock          04 - No alternate item purchased          05 - Substitution permitted          06 - Purchased ineligible alternate item at vendor suggestion          07 - Accepted rain check at vendor suggestion          08 - Vendor refused to allow attempted substitution          09 - Purchased additional items at vendor suggestion</p>	<p><b>PRICE CODES</b> (In Column E, enter one code for each item purchased)</p> <p>01 - Price marked on item          02 - Price observed in store          03 - Price obtained through cash purchase of same item          04 - Price obtained by second compliance buyer          05 - Price obtained through other method (explain in notes section)</p>
--	---

**NOTES:**

Minor Substitution .....03
Vendor ID#.....
Case Type .....

**PART III-B. WIC PURCHASE INFORMATION**

*(Complete Immediately After Leaving Store.)*

1. Were you able to complete this buy as intended?

Yes .....01 → *Complete columns C-G for substituted item(s).  
Complete columns D-G for all other items purchased.*

No.....02 → *Complete columns D-G for all items purchased.  
Complete column C if substitution not allowed for item, or if the item was omitted.  
If applicable, record additional items in Section 2, and complete columns C-G.*

**SECTION 1:**

A	B			C	D	E	F	G
	ITEMS ON WIC FOOD INSTRUMENT							SHELF PRICE
Food Instrument Serial Number	Item Type	Quantity	Size	Item Code*	Brand/Flavor	Price Code	Receipt Price	Per Item Price
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**SECTION 2: Record information about additional items purchased with FI**

							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

<p><b>ITEM CODES:</b> (*In column C, enter all codes that apply to omitted, substituted, or additional items)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>01 - Not in stock</li> <li>02 - Total quantity needed not in stock</li> <li>03 - Required size not in stock</li> <li>04 - No alternate item purchased</li> <li>05 - Substitution permitted</li> <li>06 - Purchased ineligible alternate item at vendor suggestion</li> <li>07 - Accepted rain check at vendor suggestion</li> <li>08 - Vendor refused to allow attempted substitution</li> <li>09 - Purchased additional items at vendor suggestion</li> </ul>	<p><b>PRICE CODES</b> (In Column E, enter one code for each item purchased)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>01 - Price marked on item</li> <li>02 - Price observed in store</li> <li>03 - Price obtained through cash purchase of same item</li> <li>04 - Price obtained by second compliance buyer</li> <li>05 - Price obtained through other method (explain in notes section)</li> </ul>
---	--

**NOTES:**



**PART IV: CASH PURCHASE INFORMATION FOR NON-FOOD ITEMS**

1. Record information for all non-food items purchased with cash. Attach cash purchase receipt below.

ITEMS PURCHASED WITH CASH DURING COMPLIANCE BUY				
Quantity	Size	Brand	Item Description	Receipt Price
				\$
			Sales Tax	\$
			Total	\$

**PART V: CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL**

A. I certify that I have reviewed this form and the information contained in this report is accurate.

Compliance Buyer's Signature..... Date

<b>B. For Office Use Only:</b>		Date Received	Date Reviewed	Result Code
1. Field Supervisor:	Initials			
2. RTI:	Initials			

<p><b>Result Codes:</b>          01 - Approved for processing          02 - Not approved for processing (explain in notes)          03 - Other (explain in notes)</p>	<p>NOTES:</p>
---	---------------

**ATTACH WIC PURCHASE RECEIPT HERE**

**ATTACH NON-WIC CASH PURCHASE RECEIPT HERE**

**PART VI: ITEMS DONATED**

This will certify that I, \_\_\_\_\_, donated the following items to:  
(Field Staff)

Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Organization Representative \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

*These items were obtained in connection with a research study for the USDA.*

**ITEMS DONATED**

Quantity	Item

\_\_\_\_\_  
Field Staff

\_\_\_\_\_  
Organization Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**WIC VENDOR MANAGEMENT STUDY  
COMPLIANCE BUY FORM**

**PART I: IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

1. Compliance Buyer's Name \_\_\_\_\_
2. Compliance Buyer's ID # \_\_\_\_\_
3. Date of Buy      /      / 1998  
                  Month   Day    Year
4. Day of Week of Buy
 

Sunday .....	01	Thursday .....	05
Monday .....	02	Friday .....	06
Tuesday .....	03	Saturday .....	07
Wednesday .....	04		
5. Time of Buy    :    AM PM (*Record the time you entered the store*)
6. Vendor Name \_\_\_\_\_
7. Vendor Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. Food Instrument Serial Numbers     
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

<b>COMPLIANCE BUY RESULT</b>							
1.	Completed .....01 → <i>Go to PART II</i> Not completed.....02 → <i>Go to #2</i>						
2.	Reason not completed <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr> <td>Vendor out of business .....</td> <td>01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vendor no longer WIC-authorized.....</td> <td>02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (specify) .....</td> <td>03</td> </tr> </table>	Vendor out of business .....	01	Vendor no longer WIC-authorized.....	02	Other (specify) .....	03
Vendor out of business .....	01						
Vendor no longer WIC-authorized.....	02						
Other (specify) .....	03						
_____ CB Initials/Date							

**PART II: DESCRIPTION OF COMPLIANCE BUY**  
*(Complete This Section Immediately After Leaving the Store.)*

*(Circle one number for each question)*

1. Were all WIC foods available in the required quantities and sizes listed on the food instrument(s)?
  - Yes 01
  - No ..... 02
  
2. Were you inappropriately asked to accept another item in substitution for the WIC foods you attempted to purchase?
  - Yes 01
  - No ..... 02
  
3. Did the cashier verify that you had your WIC identification card?
  - Yes 01
  - No ..... 02
  - Not Applicable..... 03
  
4. Did you observe the total amount rung up on the cash register?
  - Yes 01 → ..... *Enter amount \$*\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_
  - No ..... 02
  
5. Were you provided with a register receipt for the WIC purchase?
  - Yes 01 → ..... *Enter amount on register receipt*  
 \$\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_ **(Attach receipt on page 7)**
  - No ..... 02
  
6. Did the cashier enter the purchase price on the WIC food instrument?
  - Yes ..... 01 → \$\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_ *Amount clerk entered*
  - Yes, but could not read amount entered..... 02
  - No ..... 03
  - Don't know ..... 04
  
7. When were you asked to countersign the WIC food instrument?
  - After the purchase price was entered on the food instrument ..... 01
  - After the cashier rang up the WIC food items, but before the price was entered on the food instrument ..... 02
  - Before the cashier rang up the WIC food items..... 03
  - I was not asked to countersign the WIC food instrument..... 04

8. Were you charged sales tax on WIC foods?
- Yes .....01  
 No .....02  
 Could not observe.....03
9. Were you asked to pay cash in addition to the food instrument purchase price for WIC food?
- Yes .....01 → \$ \_\_\_\_\_ . \_\_\_\_\_ *Amount paid*  
 No .....02
10. Were you offered cash for the food instrument or asked if you had any more WIC food instruments and offered credit or cash for them?
- Yes .....01 → \$ \_\_\_\_\_ . \_\_\_\_\_ *Amount of cash  
 or credit offered*  
 No .....02
11. Were you asked to take your purchase to a register specifically for WIC participants?
- Yes .....01  
 No .....02
12. Were you given incorrect information from a store employee regarding the brands of food you could buy with your WIC food instrument?
- Yes .....01 → *Explain* \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 No .....02
13. How many registers did this store have?
14. How many registers were open at the time of your purchase?
15. Were your purchased items scanned?
- The store did not have scanning equipment.....01  
 My items were scanned .....02  
 My items were not scanned .....03

16. Did the cashier indicate that he/she was unfamiliar with how to conduct a WIC transaction?

- Yes .....01 → *Go to 16a*
- No .....02 → *Skip to Question 17*

16a. How was this communicated? (*Circle all that apply.*)

- Cashier indicated that he/she was a new employee.....01
- Cashier indicated that he/she had never completed a  
WIC transaction .....02
- Cashier received assistance from a co-worker or  
supervisor in completing the WIC transaction .....03
- Other .....04 → *Explain* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

17. Please describe any other WIC program violations you observed.

***PLEASE PROCEED TO PART III.***

**PART III-A: WIC PURCHASE INFORMATION**  
*(Complete Immediately After Leaving Store.)*

Major Substitution .....04
Vendor ID#.....
Case Type .....

1. Were you able to complete this buy as intended?

Yes .....01 → *Complete columns C-G for substituted item(s).  
 Complete columns D-G for all other items purchased.*

No.....02 → <i>Complete columns D-G for all items purchased.      Complete column C if substitution not allowed for item, or if the item was omitted.      If applicable, record additional items in Section 2, and complete columns C-G.</i>
---

**SECTION 1:**

A	B ITEMS ON WIC FOOD INSTRUMENT			C	D	E	F	G SHELF PRICE
Food Instrument Serial Number	Item Type	Quantity	Size	Item Code*	Brand/Flavor	Price Code	Receipt Price	Per Item Price
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**SECTION 2: Record information about additional items purchased with FI**

							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**ITEM CODES:** (\*In column C, enter all codes that apply to omitted, substituted, or additional items)

- 01 - Not in stock
- 02 - Total quantity needed not in stock
- 03 - Required size not in stock
- 04 - No alternate item purchased
- 05 - Substitution permitted
- 06 - Purchased ineligible alternate item at vendor suggestion
- 07 - Accepted rain check at vendor suggestion
- 08 - Vendor refused to allow attempted substitution
- 09 - Purchased additional items at vendor suggestion

**PRICE CODES** (In Column E, enter one code for each item purchased)

- 01 - Price marked on item
- 02 - Price observed in store
- 03 - Price obtained through cash purchase of same item
- 04 - Price obtained by second compliance buyer
- 05 - Price obtained through other method (explain in notes section)

**NOTES:**

Major Substitution .....04  
 Vendor ID#.....  
 Case Type .....

**PART III-B. WIC PURCHASE INFORMATION**

*(Complete Immediately After Leaving Store.)*

1. Were you able to complete this buy as intended?

Yes .....01 → *Complete columns C-G for substituted item(s).  
 Complete columns D-G for all other items purchased.*

No.....02 → *Complete columns D-G for all items purchased.  
 Complete column C if substitution not allowed for item, or if the item was omitted.  
 If applicable, record additional items in Section 2, and complete columns C-G.*

**SECTION 1:**

A Food Instrument Serial Number	B ITEMS ON WIC FOOD INSTRUMENT			C Item Code*	D Brand/Flavor	E Price Code	F Receipt Price	G SHELF PRICE Per Item Price
	Item Type	Quantity	Size					
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**SECTION 2: Record information about additional items purchased with FI**

							\$	\$
							\$	\$
							\$	\$

**ITEM CODES:** (\*In column C, enter all codes that apply to omitted, substituted, or additional items)

- 01 - Not in stock
- 02 - Total quantity needed not in stock
- 03 - Required size not in stock
- 04 - No alternate item purchased
- 05 - Substitution permitted
- 06 - Purchased ineligible alternate item at vendor suggestion
- 07 - Accepted rain check at vendor suggestion
- 08 - Vendor refused to allow attempted substitution
- 09 - Purchased additional items at vendor suggestion

**PRICE CODES** (In Column E, enter one code for each item purchased)

- 01 - Price marked on item
- 02 - Price observed in store
- 03 - Price obtained through cash purchase of same item
- 04 - Price obtained by second compliance buyer
- 05 - Price obtained through other method (explain in notes section)

**NOTES:**



**PART IV: CASH PURCHASE INFORMATION FOR NON-FOOD ITEMS**

1. Record information for all non-food items purchased with cash. Attach cash purchase receipt below.

ITEMS PURCHASED WITH CASH DURING COMPLIANCE BUY				
Quantity	Size	Brand	Item Description	Receipt Price
				\$
			Sales Tax	\$
			Total	\$

**PART V: CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL**

A. I certify that I have reviewed this form and the information contained in this report is accurate.

Compliance Buyer's Signature..... Date

B. For Office Use Only:		Date Received	Date Reviewed	Result Code
1. Field Supervisor:	Initials			
2. RTI:	Initials			

<p><b>Result Codes:</b></p> <p>01 - Approved for processing</p> <p>02 - Not approved for processing (explain in notes)</p> <p>03 - Other (explain in notes)</p>	<p>NOTES:</p>
---	---------------

**ATTACH WIC PURCHASE RECEIPT HERE**

**ATTACH NON-WIC CASH PURCHASE RECEIPT HERE**

**PART VI: ITEMS DONATED**

This will certify that I, \_\_\_\_\_, donated the following items to:  
(Field Staff)

Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Organization Representative \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

*These items were obtained in connection with a research study for the USDA.*

**ITEMS DONATED**

Quantity	Item

\_\_\_\_\_

Field Staff

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Organization Representative

\_\_\_\_\_

Date