Food and Nutrition Service

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study: Final Report Part 2 – Appendix D

U.S. Department of Agriculture | Food and Nutrition Service | Office of Policy Support

WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study: Final Report Part 2 – Appendix D

Submitted to

USDA Food and Nutrition Service
Office of Policy Support
1320 Braddock Place
Alexandria, VA 22314

Project Officers

Dr. Karen Castellanos-Brown
Alexander Bush

This WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study was conducted by Westat under Contract No. GS00F009DA, funded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service. The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed to represent any official USDA or U.S. Government determination or policy.

In approving Ohio WIC's participation in this study, the Ohio Department of Health Institutional Review Board requires that publication of research findings include the following disclaimer: "This study includes data provided by the Ohio Department of Health which should not be considered an endorsement of this study or its conclusions."

In approving Nebraska WIC's participation in this study, the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services requires that publication of research findings include the following disclaimer: "These findings and their interpretation are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policy position of DHHS."

Suggested citation

Gabay, M., Wroblewska, K., Borger, C., Manglitz, C., Neenan, R., and Shah, N. (2024). *WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study: Final Report Part 2*. Prepared by Westat, Inc., Contract No. GS00F009DA. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Policy Support, Project Officer: Karen Castellanos-Brown.

Submitted by

Westat
An Employee-Owned Research Corporation®
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850-3129
(301) 251-1500

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.

Appendix D

Participant Data Tables

Table of Contents

Table		Page
1	The WIC appointment—mode and challenges, by urbanicity (Remote)	1
2	Forms to complete prior to the WIC appointment, part 1, by urbanicity (Remote)	2
3a	Forms to complete prior to the WIC appointment, part 2, by urbanicity (Remote)	3
3b	Forms to complete prior to the WIC appointment, by urbanicity (In-person)	4
3c	Forms to complete prior to the WIC appointment, part 1, by assessment mode	5
4a	WIC participant primary language and use of interpreters (Remote)	6
4b	WIC participant primary language and use of interpreters, by urbanicity (In-person)	7
4c	WIC participant primary language and use of interpreters, by assessment mode	8
5a	WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about the nutrition risk assessment, by urbanicity (Remote)	9
5b	WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about the nutrition risk assessment, by urbanicity (In-person)	10
5c	WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about the nutrition risk assessment, by assessment mode	11
6a	WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about how well their needs were met, by urbanicity (Remote)	12
6b	WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about how well their needs were met, by urbanicity (In-person)	13
6c	WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about how well their needs were met, by assessment mode	14

Table		Page
7a	Participant/caregiver satisfaction with WIC services, by urbanicity (Remote)	15
7b	Participant/caregiver satisfaction with WIC services, by urbanicity (In-person)	16
7c	Participant/caregiver satisfaction with WIC services, by assessment mode	17
8a	Characteristics of interviewed WIC participants/caregivers, by urbanicity (Remote)	18
8b	Characteristics of interviewed WIC participants/caregivers, by urbanicity (In-person)	19
8c	Characteristics of interviewed WIC participants/caregivers, by assessment mode	20
9	How VENA guidance is operationalized - the participant's experience	21

Table 1. The WIC appointment—mode and challenges, by urbanicity (Remote)

	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers		
	All	Urban	Rural
Appointment mode			
Telephone	85.7	87.3	83.5
Curbside	14.3	12.7	16.5
Video call (e.g., Zoom, Skype, etc.)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	279	158	121
Any challenges connecting with WIC remotely?			
Yes	6.5	5.7	7.5
No	93.5	94.3	92.5
Number of participants/caregivers	278	158	120
Ease of communicating with WIC staff			
Very easy	82.4	79.7	85.8
Easy	16.1	18.3	13.3
Neither easy nor difficult	0.7	1.3	0.0
Difficult	0.7	0.7	0.8
Very difficult	0.0	0.0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	273	153	120

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Percentage totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Remote Participant interviews, Fall 2021 – Spring 2022, questions 1-3. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 2. Forms to complete prior to the WIC appointment, part 1, by urbanicity (Remote)

	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers		
	All	Urban	Rural
Participant/caregiver given forms to complete before the WIC appointment			
Yes, at home	4.0	3.8	4.1
Yes, at curbside	5.1	8.3*	0.8
No	91.0	87.8*	95
Number of participants/caregivers	277	156	121
How were the forms sent to the participant/caregiver? (for those given forms to complete)			
Email	45.5	52.9*	20.0
Text message	36.4	47.1*	0.0
Postal mail	9.1	0.0	40.0
Uploaded forms to website	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other†	13.6	0.0	60.0
Number of participants/caregivers	22	17	5
How were completed forms returned to WIC staff? (for those given forms to complete)			
Submitted online form or uploaded forms to website	66.7	76.5*	25.0
Email	14.3	17.6	0.0
Text message	9.5	0.0	50.0
Postal mail	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other†	9.5	5.9	25.0
Number of participants/caregivers	21	17	4

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
†Other includes clients picking up and dropping off forms at the WIC clinic.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Percentage totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Remote Participant interviews, Fall 2021 – Spring 2022, questions 7, 7a, and 7b. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 3a. Forms to complete prior to the WIC appointment, part 2, by urbanicity (Remote)

	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers		
	All	Urban	Rural
Help received from WIC staff to complete the forms (for those who completed forms)			
Yes	12.5	10.5	20.0
No, and I didn't need any help	87.5	89.5	80.0
No, but I would have liked help	0.0	0.0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	24	19	5
Time taken to complete forms (for those who completed forms)			
< 5 minutes	43.5	50.0	20.0
5 to 10 minutes	34.8	33.3	40.0
11 to 15 minutes	17.4	11.1	40.0
> 15 minutes	4.4	5.6	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	23	18	5
Ease in filling out the forms (for those who completed forms)			
Very easy	82.6	88.9	60.0
Easy	17.4	11.1	40.0
Neither easy nor difficult	0.0	0.0	0.0
Difficult	0.0	0.0	0.0
Very difficult	0.0	0.0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	23	18	5

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Percentage totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Remote Participant interviews, Fall 2021 – Spring 2022, questions 8-10. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 3b. Forms to complete prior to the WIC appointment, by urbanicity (In-person)

	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers		
	All	Urban	Rural
Participant/caregiver given forms to complete before the WIC appointment			
Yes, at home	2.3	2.4	2.2
Yes, in the clinic waiting room	18.0	22.9*	8.9
No	79.7	74.7*	88.9
Number of participants/caregivers	256	166	90
Help received from WIC staff to complete the forms (for those who completed forms)			
Yes	49.0	45.2	66.7
No, and I didn't need any help	49.0	52.4	33.3
No, but I would have liked help	2.0	2.4	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	51	42	9
Time taken to complete forms (for those who completed forms)			
< 5 minutes	62.7	57.1*	88.9
5 to 10 minutes	33.3	38.1*	11.1
11 to 15 minutes	3.9	4.8	0.0
> 15 minutes	0.0	0.0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	51	42	9
Ease in filling out the forms (for those who completed forms)			
Very easy	68.6	61.9*	100.0
Easy	31.4	38.1*	0.0
Neither easy nor difficult	0.0	0.0	0.0
Difficult	0.0	0.0	0.0
Very difficult	0.0	0.0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	51	42	9

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Percentage totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, In-person Participant interviews, Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 7, 8, 9, and 10. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 3c. Forms to complete prior to the WIC appointment, part 1, by assessment mode

	Remote		In-person	
	Number of respondents	Percentage	Number of respondents	Percentage
Participant/caregiver given forms to complete before the WIC appointment				
Yes, at home	11	4.0	6	2.3
Yes, in the clinic waiting room/curbside	14	5.0*	46	18.0
No	252	90.6*	204	79.7
Number of participants/caregivers	277		256	
Help received from WIC staff to complete the forms (for those who completed forms)				
Yes	3	12.5*	25	49.0
No, and I didn't need any help	21	87.5*	25	49.0
No, but I would have liked help	0	0	1	2.0
Number of participants/caregivers	24		51	
Time taken to complete forms (for those who completed forms)				
< 5 minutes	10	43.5	32	62.7
5 to 10 minutes	8	34.8	17	33.3
11 to 15 minutes	4	17.4	2	3.9
> 15 minutes	1	4.3	0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	23		51	
Ease in filling out the forms (for those who completed forms)				
Very easy	19	82.6	35	68.6
Easy	4	17.4	16	31.4
Neither easy nor difficult	0	0	0	0.0
Difficult	0	0	0	0.0
Very difficult	0	0	0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	23		51	

*Indicates in-person vs. remote differences that are significant at p≤0.05.
Percentage totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Participant interviews; remote interviews were conducted Fall 2021- Spring 2022 and in-person interviews were conducted Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 7,8, 9, and 10. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 4a. WIC participant primary language† and use of interpreters, by urbanicity (Remote)

	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers		
	All	Urban	Rural
Participant/caregiver primary language			
English	91.4	89.3	94.2
Non-English	8.6	10.7	5.8
Number of participants/caregivers	280	159	121
How well do you speak English? (if primary language is not English)			
Very well	50.0	64.7*	14.3
Well	12.5	17.6	0.0
Not well	20.8	11.8	42.9
I don't speak English at all	16.7	5.9*	42.9
Number of participants/caregivers	24	17	7
Met with a WIC staff person who spoke their language (if primary language is not English)			
Yes	40.9	20.0*	85.7
No	59.1	80.0*	14.3
Number of participants/caregivers	22	15	7
Use of an interpreter (for those whose WIC staff person did not speak their primary language)			
Yes, used an interpreter by telephone or video call	30.8	27.3	50.0
Yes, used a friend or family member as an interpreter	0.0	0.0	0.0
No, did not use either an interpreter on-site or by telephone	69.2	72.7	50.0
Number of participants/caregivers	13	11	2
Did the interpreter work well? (For those who used an interpreter)			
Yes	100.0	100.0	100.0
No	0.0	0.0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	4	3	1

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
†The primary language is defined as the language spoken at home.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Percentage totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Remote Participant interviews, Fall 2021 – Spring 2022, questions 13-17. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 4b. WIC participant primary language† and use of interpreters, by urbanicity (In-person)

	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers		
	All	Urban	Rural
Participant/caregiver primary language			
English	88.3	82.5*	98.9
Non-English	11.7	17.5*	1.1
Number of participants/caregivers	256	166	90
How well do you speak English? (if primary language is not English)			
Very well	33.3	34.5*	0.0
Well	23.3	24.1*	0.0
Not well	20.0	17.2*	100
I don't speak English at all	23.3	24.1*	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	30	29	1
Met with a WIC staff person who spoke their language (if primary language is not English)			
Yes	36.7	37.9*	0.0
No	63.3	62.1*	100
Number of participants/caregivers	30	29	1
Use of an interpreter (for those whose WIC staff person did not speak their primary language)			
Yes, used a WIC interpreter on-site	16.7	11.8*	100
Yes, used an interpreter by telephone or video call	11.1	11.8	0.0
No, did not use either an interpreter on-site or by telephone	72.2	76.5*	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	18	17	1
Did the interpreter work well? (For those who used an interpreter)			
Yes	100	100	100
No	0.0	0.0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	5	4	1

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
†The primary language is defined as the language spoken at home.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, In-person Participant interviews, Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 13-17. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 4c. WIC participant primary language† and use of interpreters, by assessment mode

	Remote		In-person	
	Number of respondents	Percentage	Number of respondents	Percentage
Participant/caregiver primary language				
English	256	91.4	226	88.3
Non-English	24	8.6	30	11.7
Number of participants/caregivers	280		256	
How well do you speak English? (if primary language is not English)				
Very well	12	50.0	10	33.3
Well	3	12.5	7	23.3
Not well	5	20.8	6	20.0
I don't speak English at all	4	16.7	7	23.3
Number of participants/caregivers	24		30	
Met with a WIC staff person who spoke their language (if primary language is not English)				
Yes	9	40.9	11	36.7
No	13	59.1	19	63.3
Number of participants/caregivers	22		30	
Use of an interpreter (for those whose WIC staff person did not speak their primary language)				
Yes, used a WIC interpreter on-site	0	0.0	3	16.7
Yes, used an interpreter by telephone or video call	4	30.8	2	11.1
No, did not use either an interpreter on-site or by telephone	9	69.2	13	72.2
Number of participants/caregivers	13		18	
Did the interpreter work well? (For those who used an interpreter)				
Yes	4	100	5	100
No	0	0.0	0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	4		5	

*Indicates in-person vs. remote differences that are significant at p≤0.05.
†The primary language is defined as the language spoken at home.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Participant interviews; remote interviews were conducted Fall 2021- Spring 2022 and in-person interviews were conducted Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 13-17. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 5a. WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about the nutrition risk assessment, by urbanicity (Remote)

Assessment statements	All						Urban						Rural					
	Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I was greeted warmly by WIC staff when I began my telephone appointment.	275	71.3	28.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	156	66.0*	34.0*	0.0	0.0	0.0	119	78.2	21.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
The WIC staff made me feel at ease.	280	78.9	19.6	1.1	0.4	0.0	159	78.0	20.8	0.6	0.6	0.0	121	80.2	18.2	1.7	0.0	0.0
The WIC staff member listened to me about my needs and concerns.	280	81.4	17.9	0.7	0.0	0.0	159	78.6	20.8	0.6	0.0	0.0	121	85.1	14.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
The WIC staff member explained things clearly in a way that I could understand.	279	82.4	16.8	0.4	0.4	0.0	158	81.6	17.1	0.6	0.6	0.0	121	83.5	16.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
I feel I would have gotten more out of my appointment if I was talking to WIC staff in-person instead of over the phone.	279	6.8	10.4	19.7	41.2	21.9	158	8.2	10.8	19.0	41.8	20.3	121	5.0	9.9	20.7	40.5	24.0
For non-English speakers																		
I feel I would have gotten more out of my appointment if the WIC staff member had spoken my language.	12	33.3	25.0	8.3	25.0	8.3	10	30.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	10.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Row totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Remote Participant interviews, Fall 2021 – Spring 2022, questions 6b, 19-23. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 5b. WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about the nutrition risk assessment, by urbanicity (In-person)

Assessment statements	All						Urban						Rural					
	Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
It was clear where I needed to go to check in for the visit.	255	74.5	20.8	1.2	3.5	0.0	165	69.1*	26.1*	1.8	3.0	0.0	90	84.4	11.1	0.0	4.4	0.0
I was greeted warmly by WIC staff when checking in for the visit	255	74.9	22.0	1.2	0.8	1.2	165	66.1*	29.7*	1.8	1.2	1.2	90	91.1	7.8	0.0	0.0	1.1
The WIC staff made me feel at ease.	255	79.2	20.0	0.4	0.4	0.0	165	74.5*	24.8*	0.0	0.6	0.0	90	87.8	11.1	1.1	0.0	0.0
The WIC staff member listened to me about my needs and concerns.	255	81.2	16.9	2.0	0.0	0.0	165	77.6*	20.6*	1.8	0.0	0.0	90	87.8	10.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
The WIC staff member explained things clearly in a way that I could understand.	255	82.4	17.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	165	77.6*	22.4*	0.0	0.0	0.0	90	91.1	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
For non-English speakers																		
I feel I would have gotten more out of my appointment if the WIC staff member had spoken my language.	16	18.8	31.3	12.5	25.0	12.5	15	20.0	33.3*	13.3	26.7*	6.7*	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Row totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, In-person Participant interviews, Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 5, 6a, 19-23. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 5c. WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about the nutrition risk assessment, by assessment mode

Assessment statements	Remote						In-person					
	Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I was greeted warmly by WIC staff when checking in for the visit / when I began my telephone appointment.	275	71.3	28.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	255	74.9	22.0	1.2	0.8	1.2
The WIC staff made me feel at ease.	280	78.9	19.6	1.1	0.4	0.0	255	79.2	20.0	0.4	0.4	0.0
The WIC staff member listened to me about my needs and concerns.	280	81.4	17.9	0.7	0.0	0.0	255	81.2	16.9	2.0	0.0	0.0
The WIC staff member explained things clearly in a way that I could understand.	279	82.4	16.8	0.4	0.4	0.0	255	82.4	17.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
For non-English speakers												
I feel I would have gotten more out of my appointment if the WIC staff member had spoken my language.	12	33.3	25.0	8.3	25.0	8.3	16	18.8	31.3	12.5	25.0	12.5

*Indicates in-person vs. remote differences that are significant at p≤0.05.
Row totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Participant interviews; remote interviews were conducted Fall 2021- Spring 2022 and in-person interviews were conducted Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 6, 19-22. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 6a. WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about how well their needs were met, by urbanicity (Remote)

Assessment statements	All						Urban						Rural					
	Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
WIC staff asked me about my ideas and beliefs about food	279	34.8	36.6	11.5	15.4	1.8	158	39.2	32.9	9.5	16.5	1.9	121	28.9	41.3	14.0	14.0	1.7
I [and/or my children] expect to eat all the food that WIC gave me to purchase (on my WIC card).	280	48.6	35.7	7.1	7.9	0.7	159	47.8	36.5	6.9	8.2	0.6	121	49.6	34.7	7.4	7.4	0.8
The advice and education I received from WIC staff will help me improve my health and diet.	280	57.9	37.1	3.9	1.1	0.0	159	61.6	34.6	3.8	0.0*	0.0	121	52.9	40.5	4.1	2.5	0.0

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Row totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Remote Participant interviews, Fall 2021 – Spring 2022, questions 24-26. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 6b. WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about how well their needs were met, by urbanicity (In-person)

Assessment statements	All						Urban						Rural					
	Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
WIC staff asked me about my ideas and beliefs about food	256	39.5	30.5	16.4	11.7	2.0	166	40.4	33.1	13.9	11.4	1.2	90	37.8	25.6	21.1	12.2	3.3
I [and/or my children] expect to eat all the food that WIC gave me to purchase (on my WIC card).	256	53.1	38.3	4.7	3.9	0.0	166	51.8	41.6	3.6	3.0	0.0	90	55.6	32.2	6.7	5.6	0.0
The advice and education I received from WIC staff will help me improve my health and diet.	256	66.0	31.3	2.3	0.4	0.0	166	65.7	31.3	2.4	0.6	0.0	90	66.7	31.1	2.2	0.0	0.0

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Row totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, In-person Participant interviews, Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 24-26. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 6c. WIC participant/caregiver perceptions about how well their needs were met, by assessment mode

Assessment statements	Remote						In-person					
	Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
WIC staff asked me about my ideas and beliefs about food	279	34.8	36.6	11.5	15.4	1.8	256	39.5	30.5	16.4	11.7	2.0
I [and/or my children] expect to eat all the food that WIC gave me to purchase (on my WIC card).	280	48.6	35.7	7.1	7.9	0.7	256	53.1	38.3	4.7	3.9	0.0
The advice and education I received from WIC staff will help me improve my health and diet.	280	57.9	37.1	3.9	1.1	0.0	256	66.0	31.3	2.3	0.4	0.0

*Indicates in-person vs. remote differences that are significant at p≤0.05.
Row totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Participant interviews; remote interviews were conducted Fall 2021- Spring 2022 and in-person interviews were conducted Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 24-26. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 7a. Participant/caregiver satisfaction with WIC services, by urbanicity (Remote)

	All						Urban						Rural					
	Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers				
		Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied		Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied		Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
How would you rate your satisfaction with…																		
…the WIC staff's review of your nutrition status? (That is, the questions about diet, health, and home environment.)	280	78.6	17.5	3.9	0.0	0.0	159	76.1	19.5	4.4	0.0	0.0	121	81.8	14.9	3.3	0.0	0.0
…the nutrition education and counseling you received?	274	78.5	16.4	4.0	1.1	0.0	155	77.4	17.4	4.5	0.6	0.0	119	79.8	15.1	3.4	1.7	0.0
…the food choices you were given when discussing your food package with WIC staff?	266	68.8	24.8	2.6	3.8	0.0	157	66.2	26.8	2.5	4.5	0.0	109	72.5	22.0	2.8	2.8	0.0
…the referrals you received to other services? [AMONG THOSE WHO RECEIVED REFERRALS]	92	93.5	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	62	95.2	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	30	90.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
…how well the WIC services you received during your appointment reflected your specific needs and concerns?	274	86.5	12.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	155	83.9	14.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	119	89.9	9.2	0.8	0.0	0.0
…your appointment as a whole?	276	92.0	7.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	156	91.7	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	120	92.5	6.7	0.8	0.0	0.0

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Row totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Remote Participant interviews, Fall 2021 – Spring 2022, questions 27-32. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 7b. Participant/caregiver satisfaction with WIC services, by urbanicity (In-person)

	All						Urban						Rural					
		Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers						Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers						Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers				
	Number of participants/ caregivers	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Number of participants/ caregivers	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Number of participants/ caregivers	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
How would you rate your satisfaction with…																		
…the WIC staff's review of your nutrition status? (That is, the questions about diet, health, and home environment.)	255	92.5	7.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	165	92.1	7.3	0.6	0.0	0.0	90	93.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
…the nutrition education and counseling you received?	251	86.1	12.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	162	87.0	12.3	0.6	0.0	0.0	89	84.3	11.2	4.5	0.0	0.0
…the food choices you were given when discussing your food package with WIC staff?	254	72.4	21.3	4.3	2.0	0.0	164	72.0	23.8	1.8*	2.4	0.0	90	73.3	16.7	8.9	1.1	0.0
…the referrals you received to other services? [AMONG THOSE WHO RECEIVED REFERRALS]	117	89.7	6.8	3.4	0.0	0.0	75	90.7	5.3	4.0	0.0	0.0	42	88.1	9.5	2.4	0.0	0.0
…how well the WIC services you received during your appointment reflected your specific needs and concerns?	252	89.3	8.3	2.4	0.0	0.0	163	90.2	8.6	1.2	0.0	0.0	89	87.6	7.9	4.5	0.0	0.0
…your appointment as a whole?	254	92.5	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	164	89.0*	11.0*	0.0	0.0	0.0	90	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.
Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.
Row totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, In-person Participant interviews, Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 27-32. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 7c. Participant/caregiver satisfaction with WIC services, by assessment mode

	Remote						In-person					
	Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers					Number of participants/ caregivers	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers				
		Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied		Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
How would you rate your satisfaction with…												
…the WIC staff's review of your nutrition status? (That is, the questions about diet, health, and home environment.)	280	78.6*	17.5*	3.9*	0.0	0.0	255	92.5	7.1	0.4	0.0	0.0
…the nutrition education and counseling you received?	274	78.5*	16.4	4.0	1.1	0.0	251	86.1	12.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
…the food choices you were given when discussing your food package with WIC staff?	266	68.8	24.8	2.6	3.8	0.0	254	72.4	21.3	4.3	2.0	0.0
…the referrals you received to other services? [AMONG THOSE WHO RECEIVED REFERRALS]	92	93.5	6.5	0.0*	0.0	0.0	117	89.7	6.8	3.4	0.0	0.0
…how well the WIC services you received during your appointment reflected your specific needs and concerns?	274	86.5	12.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	252	89.3	8.3	2.4	0.0	0.0
…your appointment as a whole?	276	92.0	7.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	254	92.5	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

*Indicates in-person vs. remote differences that are significant at p≤0.05.
Row totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Participant interviews; remote interviews were conducted Fall 2021- Spring 2022 and in-person interviews were conducted Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 27-32. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 8a. Characteristics of interviewed WIC participants/caregivers, by urbanicity (Remote)

Characteristics	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers		
	All	Urban	Rural
WIC participation status (for all participants assessed at the appointment)[1]			
Pregnant woman	20.0	23.9	14.9
Post-partum woman and infant	19.6	18.9	20.7
Infant	8.9	8.8	9.1
Child(ren)	59.6	56.6	63.6
Number of participants/caregivers	272	153	119
Age	Years	Years	Years
Lowest reported age	18	18	19
Highest reported age	65	44	65
Average age	29	28.6	29.4
Number of participants/caregivers	280	159	121
Ethnicity			
Hispanic or Latino	16.1	21.4*	9.1
Not Hispanic or Latino	83.2	78.0*	90.1
Don't know	0.4	0.6	0.0
Refused	0.4	0.0	0.8
Number of participants/caregivers	280	159	121
Race[2]			
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.6	1.9*	8.3
Asian	1.4	2.5	0.0
Black or African American	20.0	26.4*	11.6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1.1	1.3	0.8
White	68.6	59.7*	80.2
Don't know	1.8	1.3	2.5
Refused	1.8	2.5	0.8
Missing	3.6	5.7*	0.8
Number of participants/caregivers	280	159	121
Prior WIC experience			
Yes, received WIC benefits for a previous pregnancy and child	40.4	42.9	37.0
Yes, received WIC benefits while I was pregnant with this child	16.4	17.9	14.3
No	22.9	23.7	21.8
Both for a previous pregnancy and while I was pregnant with this child	20.4	15.4*	26.9
Number of participants/caregivers	275	156	119

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.

[1] Multiple participants could be assessed at each appointment.

[2] Participants/caregivers were asked to report all races that apply. 9 of 10 records with missing race reported Hispanic or Latino ethnicity.

Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.

Percentage totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Remote Participant interviews, Fall 2021 – Spring 2022, questions 33-38. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 8b. Characteristics of interviewed WIC participants/caregivers, by urbanicity (In-person)

Characteristics	Percentage of WIC participants/caregivers		
	All	Urban	Rural
WIC participation status (for all participants assessed at the appointment)[1]			
Pregnant woman	26.6	23.5	32.2
Post-partum woman and infant	27.3	29.5	23.3
Infant	10.9	12.0	8.9
Child(ren)	52.7	53.6	51.1
Number of participants/caregivers	256	166	90
Age	Years	Years	Years
Lowest reported age	18	18	18
Highest reported age	67	67	52
Average age	28.4	28.9	27.7
Number of participants/caregivers	255	166	89
Ethnicity			
Hispanic or Latino	23.5	29.5*	12.4
Not Hispanic or Latino	76.1	69.9*	87.6
Don't know	0.4	0.6	0.0
Refused	0.0	0.0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	255	166	89
Race[2]			
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.2	4.2*	15.6
Asian	2.0	2.4	1.1
Black or African American	22.7	28.9*	11.1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1.2	1.8	0.0
White	62.9	51.8*	83.3
Don't know	4.3	6.6*	0.0
Refused	2.7	3	2.2
Missing	4.7	6.6*	1.1
Number of participants/caregivers	256	166	90
Prior WIC experience			
Yes, received WIC benefits for a previous pregnancy and child	41.1	41.8	39.8
Yes, received WIC benefits while I was pregnant with this child	17.4	13.9	23.9
No	23.7	24.8	21.6
Both for a previous pregnancy and while I was pregnant with this child	17.8	19.4	14.8
Number of participants/caregivers	253	165	88

*Differences are significant at p≤0.05.

[1] Multiple participants could be assessed at each appointment.

[2] Participants/caregivers were asked to report all races that apply. 10 of 12 records with missing race reported Hispanic or Latino ethnicity.

Participants are assigned to urban vs. rural locations based on the ERS Secondary Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes, 2010, for the ZIP code of the clinic office address where they received services.

Percentage totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, In-person Participant interviews, Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 34-38. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 8c. Characteristics of interviewed WIC participants/caregivers, by assessment mode

Characteristics	Remote		In-person	
	Number of respondents	Percentage	Number of respondents	Percentage
WIC participation status (for all participants assessed at the appointment)[1]				
Pregnant woman	56	20.0	68	26.6
Post-partum woman and infant	55	19.6*	70	27.3
Infant	25	8.9	28	10.9
Child(ren)	167	59.6	135	52.7
Number of participants/caregivers	280		256	
Age		Years		Years
Lowest reported age		18		18
Highest reported age		65		67
Average age		29.0		28.4
Number of participants/caregivers		280		255
Ethnicity				
Hispanic or Latino	45	16.1*	60	23.5
Not Hispanic or Latino	233	83.2*	194	76.1
Don't know	1	0.4	1	0.4
Refused	1	0.4	0	0.0
Number of participants/caregivers	280		255	
Race[2]				
American Indian or Alaska Native	13	4.6	21	8.2
Asian	4	1.4	5	2.0
Black or African American	56	20.0	58	22.7
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	1.1	3	1.2
White	192	68.6	161	62.9
Don't know	5	1.8	11	4.3
Refused	5	1.8	7	2.7
Missing	10	3.6	12	4.7
Number of participants/caregivers	280		256	
Prior WIC experience				
Yes, received WIC benefits for a previous pregnancy and child	111	40.4	104	41.1
Yes, received WIC benefits while I was pregnant with this child	45	16.4	44	17.4
No	63	22.9	60	23.7
Both for a previous pregnancy and while I was pregnant with this child	56	20.4	45	17.8
Number of participants/caregivers	275		253	

*Indicates in-person vs. remote differences that are significant at p≤0.05.

[1] Multiple participants could be assessed at each appointment.

[2] Participants/caregivers were asked to report all races that apply. 9 of 10 records from remote interviews and 10 of 12 records from in-person interviews with missing race reported Hispanic or Latino ethnicity.

Percentage totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Participant interviews; remote interviews were conducted Fall 2021- Spring 2022 and in-person interviews were conducted Summer and Fall 2022, interview guide questions 34-38. Tabulations are not weighted.

Table 9. How VENA guidance is operationalized - the participant's experience

Statements	Percentage of participants		
	Remote	In-person	Both
I was greeted warmly by WIC staff when I checked in for my visit (in-person)/began my telephone appointment (remote).			
Strongly agree/agree	100*	96.9	98.5
Neither agree nor disagree	0.0	1.2	0.6
Strongly disagree/disagree	0.0*	2.0	0.9
Number of participants	275	255	530
The WIC staff member made me feel at ease.			
Strongly agree/agree	98.6	99.2	98.9
Neither agree nor disagree	1.1	0.4	0.7
Strongly disagree/disagree	0.4	0.4	0.4
Number of participants	280	255	535
The WIC staff member listened to me about my needs and concerns.			
Strongly agree/agree	99.3	98.0	98.7
Neither agree nor disagree	0.7	2.0	1.3
Strongly disagree/disagree	0.0	0.0	0
Number of participants	280	255	535
The WIC staff member explained things clearly in a way that I could understand.			
Strongly agree/agree	99.3	100	99.6
Neither agree nor disagree	0.4	0.0	0.2
Strongly disagree/disagree	0.4	0.0	0.2
Number of participants	279	255	534
WIC staff asked me about my ideas and beliefs about food.			
Strongly agree/agree	71.3	69.9	70.7
Neither agree nor disagree	11.5	16.4	13.8
Strongly disagree/disagree	17.2	13.7	15.5
Number of participants	279	256	535

*Indicates in-person vs. remote differences that are significant at p≤0.05.
Percentage totals may not add to 100 due to rounding.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study, Participant Interviews. Tabulations are not weighted.