Appendix C
Sampling and Data Characteristics

This appendix describes the disposition of the population universe for the Survey of New EBT Users, the completeness of the survey data, and how closely the survey sample matches the population universe.

Sample Disposition

The population universe for the Survey of New EBT Users consisted of eight strata—vulnerable and nonvulnerable food stamp recipients in each of the four study States. The bottom row of table C-1 shows the size of each stratum. (The table uses "V" and "N-V" to indicate vulnerable and nonvulnerable strata, respectively.) The target number of completed interviews was 175 per stratum, or 1,400 overall.

For each stratum, the total number of cases in the identified sample universe can be divided into the following five groups, which are listed in table C-1:

(A) Completed interviews (respondents)
(B) Interview attempted, but not completed
(C) Telephone number available, but sample never released to phone center
(D) Case sampled, but no phone number available
(E) Case never sampled from universe

Table C-1—Disposition of population universe, by stratum (number of recipients)

	Alabama (*n*=4,176)		Minnesota (*n*=1,528)		Louisiana (*n*=7,082)		Pennsylvania (*n*=10,004)		Total (*n*=22,790)
Group	V	N-V	V	N-V	V	N-V	V	N-V	
A	260	285	45	292	197	190	184	179	1632
B	461	794	119	808	391	511	313	381	3778
C	0	0	0	0	223	0	852	530	1605
D	306	513	24	125	133	132	116	77	1426
E	0	1557	0	115	0	5305	0	7372	14,349
Total	1027	3149	188	1340	944	6138	1465	8539	22,790

"V" indicates stratum of vulnerable recipients; "N-V" indicates stratum of nonvulnerable recipients.

The available sample among vulnerable recipients in Minnesota was exhausted without reaching the target of 175 completed interviews. To achieve a sufficient number of completed interviews with vulnerable recipients in waiver States, a larger number of vulnerable recipients in Alabama—the other State to implement EBT customer service waivers—was interviewed. Across the two States, the study interviewed 305 vulnerable recipients, or 87.1 percent of the target of 350 completed interviews across the two strata. In each of the remaining six strata, the target of 175 completed interviews was exceeded. Overall, the study interviewed 1,632 new food stamp recipients, or 232 more than the target of 1,400.

Table C-2 shows the disposition of cases in group B deemed ineligible. These food stamp recipients were contacted by telephone, but they were not eligible to participate in the survey. As shown at the bottom of the table, 14.4 percent of all recipients in group B were ineligible for the survey.[63] By stratum, the percentage varied from 10.4 percent for nonvulnerable recipients in Minnesota to 19.3 percent for vulnerable recipients in Minnesota. In each State, a higher percentage of vulnerable than nonvulnerable recipients was found to be ineligible. The largest category of those found ineligible for the survey was recipients who had been using their EBT card "too long" to be deemed a new user of the card[64]. These recipients represented 40.3 percent of all ineligible cases and 5.8 percent of all group B recipients.

Table C-3 presents the percentage distribution of all other reasons recipients in group B could not be interviewed. By far the most frequent reason—accounting for 55.6 percent of all group B cases across the four States—was that interviewers did not have a valid phone number for the recipient, despite using information from both State administrative files and a vendor who did computerized searches on the name and address. In half the cases without a valid phone number, the only available number was a wrong number. In another 42 percent the telephone had been disconnected. In other cases, the available number connected to a fax machine, computer modem, or commercial business where the recipient was unknown.

Interviewers were instructed to call a phone number up to 12 times at different times of the day and on different days of the week before abandoning efforts to reach a sampled recipient. The maximum number of attempted calls was reached in 20.3 percent of the group B cases.

Finally, 4.1 percent of the recipients in group B refused to be interviewed, with the rate generally higher among vulnerable than nonvulnerable recipients. When the 155 refusals are compared to the number of completed interviews, the refusal rate is 8.7 percent. When the 544 ineligible recipients are added to the denominator, the refusal rate drops to 6.6 percent.

[63] This represents 10 percent of all recipients whom we contacted or attempted to contact.

[64] The population universe was designed to include all new food stamp cases as on November 1999. We allowed a one-month margin in identifying new cases, and we deemed a recipient ineligible for the survey if he or she (or the authorized representative) had received the EBT card prior to October 1999.

Table C-2—Group B recipients found ineligible for the survey of new EBT users

Reason	Alabama (*n*=1,255)		Minnesota (*n*=927)		Louisiana (*n*=902)		Pennsylvania (*n*=694)		Total (*n*=3,778)
	V (*n*=461)	N-V (*n*=794)	V (*n*=119)	N-V (*n*=808)	V (*n*=391)	N-V (*n*=511)	V (*n*=313)	N-V (*n*=381)	
	Percent								
Group living arrangement (A4)	1.1	0.9	0.0	0.5	1.3	2.3	1.9	2.6	1.3
Used EBT card too long (A5b, A5c, A5e, A5f)	6.7	7.1	8.4	5.1	6.4	6.3	3.5	3.4	5.8
Never had card (A5d)	2.2	1.4	1.7	1.1	3.8	0.6	2.9	2.4	1.8
Card experience in another States (A6)	1.7	1.5	4.2	1.9	1.8	2.7	2.6	2.4	2.1
Authorized rep had prior use (A10)	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.3
Deceased	1.3	0.1	0.8	0.1	1.8	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.6
Other reason	3.5	2.3	4.2	1.6	3.3	1.0	5.1	2.9	2.6
Total	17.1	13.4	19.3	10.4	18.7	13.5	17.3	14.4	14.4

Survey question numbers appear in parentheses. Percentages are based on entire group B sample. "V" indicates stratum of vulnerable recipients; "N-V" indicates stratum of nonvulnerable recipients.

Components may not sum to total because of rounding.

Table C-3—Disposition of cases within group B—other reasons

Reasons	Alabama (*n*=1,255)		Minnesota (*n*=927)		Louisiana (*n*=902)		Pennsylvania (*n*=694)		Total (*n*=3,778)
	V (*n*=461)	N-V (*n*=794)	V (*n*=119)	N-V (*n*=808)	V (*n*=391)	N-V (*n*=511)	V (*n*=313)	N-V (*n*=381)	
				Percent					
Refusal	5.0	1.3	5.9	2.6	7.4	3.5	7.3	6.3	4.1
Language barrier	0.0	0.1	9.2	3.7	0.3	0.0	4.8	0.8	1.6
Impairment	3.0	0.3	1.7	0.0	2.8	0.2	2.6	0.0	1.0
Not available during study	3.0	3.9	2.5	4.1	1.3	2.7	0.6	0.8	2.8
No valid phone	52.7	59.9	47.1	61.0	49.4	56.4	46.0	54.9	55.6
Max attempts	19.3	20.9	14.3	18.2	19.7	23.5	20.4	22.8	20.3
Other	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.2
Total	82.9	86.6	80.7	89.6	81.3	86.5	82.7	85.6	85.6

Percentages based on entire group B sample. "V" indicates stratum of vulnerable recipients; "N-V" indicates stratum of nonvulnerable recipients.

Components may not sum to total because of rounding.

Data Completeness

This section examines the incidence of missing data in the Survey of New EBT Users. Missing data include situations in which the respondent either refused to answer a question or did not know the answer. Although refusals and "don't knows" are not examined separately in this report, the incidence of outright refusals was very low, presumably because of the nonsensitive nature of the survey questions.

The rate of missing data on survey questions is generally very low. Over 80 percent of the questions had rates of missing data below 3 percent. In the sections below we discuss those questions for which the rate of missing data exceeded 3 percent. The discussion is organized by sections within the survey instrument. The question or questions with rates of missing data exceeding 3 percent are listed in italics at the beginning of each discussion.

Section A: Introduction

Question A5b: In what month and year did you get your first EBT card from STATE NAME?
For the 25 respondents who said they did not receive their first EBT card in November 1999, we asked them in what month and year they actually got the card. Of these, five (20 percent) did not know. For the 20 respondents who did respond, we were able to calculate the elapsed time from EBT card issuance until the day of the interview.

For the five respondents who could not tell us in what month and year they got their EBT cards, we were able to establish that they received their cards after September 1999 (question A5c) and were thus eligible for the survey.

Question A8c: Is this person your food stamp-authorized representative?
Of 29 people who said that they usually do not do the grocery shopping in the household, one respondent (3.4 percent) could not tell us whether the person who uses the card was her food stamp-authorized representative.

Question A11: Can you use your food stamp EBT card to get cash from another government program?
The great majority (83 percent) of survey respondents said that they could not use the EBT card to get cash from a government program other than the FSP, whereas 10 percent said that they could get cash. About 7.5 percent (122 of 1,632) of all the survey respondents could not tell us whether they could use their EBT card to get cash from another government program, such as welfare, TANF, Social Security, SSI, or veterans' benefits.

Section B: Replacement Cards

Of 1632 respondents, only 146 said they were using a replacement card and therefore answered section B.

Question B1b: How much did you pay to get the replacement card?
Three respondents out of 146 (2.1 percent) did not know whether they had to pay for a replacement card (question B1a), but among the 22 who did pay, 18.2 percent (4 of 22) could not tell us how much they paid. For Minnesota, where the policy specifies a $2 fee, we were able to impute a correct value for one outlier, leaving four cases with missing data.

Question B3: Do you recall at what point during the month you realized you would need a new EBT card? Was it . . .
We asked this question to learn when card loss occurred relative to benefit issue. We gave the respondents several time frames (ranges of days after issuance) to facilitate their memory. Twenty-five of 146 respondents (17.1 percent) could not tell us (or did not want to tell us) at what point during the month they needed a new EBT card. This was clearly a difficult question for many respondents to answer.

Question B4: To whom did you first report the card as (lost/stolen/damaged/held)?
Five of 146 respondents (3.4 percent) could not tell us to whom they reported the card as lost (or stolen, damaged, or held).

Question B5: How much time passed between when you realized the EBT card was (lost/stolen/damaged/held) and when you first reported it as such?
Seventeen respondents out of 146 (or 11.6 percent) were not able to tell us how much time had passed. We were able, however, to partly capture that information in a subsequent question. Nine people remembered that they reported the incident **after** 24 hours rather than within 24 hours (question B5a), leaving at eight (5.5 percent) the number of respondents who reported no information about how much time it took them to report the loss.

Question B14: How many days passed between when you reported the EBT card as (lost/stolen/damaged) and when you received a new card?
Overall, 8.2 percent of respondents (12 of 146) said they did not know how many days had passed between when they reported the EBT card as lost, stolen, or damaged and when they received a new card. In this group, the proportion of missing data between the vulnerable and the nonvulnerable respondents is worth mentioning: 16.7 percent of the vulnerable and only 5.5 percent of the nonvulnerable recipients could not tell us how much time had passed.

Section C: Training

Question C1: Different States help their food stamp participants learn about EBT in different ways. In what different ways did you learn how to use the EBT system? Did you . . . receive an EBT handbook or other printed materials in the mail?
We asked everybody whether they received printed training materials in the mail. The responses do not match what we believe is the policy of the four States we examined. We ran a cross-tabulation of this question by the four States and found that recipients in waiver States, Alabama (63 percent) and Minnesota (42 percent), are more likely to receive an EBT handbook or other printed material in the mail. From the policy of the waiver States, however, we expected that everybody in Alabama and Minnesota would have received something in the mail.

Conversely, we did not expect very many recipients in Pennsylvania or Louisiana to report receiving materials in the mail. Instead, 18 percent of Pennsylvania and 12 percent of Louisiana respondents reported that they received something in the mail. Taken together, these responses suggest that people often cannot remember where their printed EBT materials came from.

Question C2: Are you sure you didn't receive something in the mail?
For the 1,035 respondents who failed to indicate receipt of mailed materials in question C1, we asked whether they were sure they hadn't received something in the mail. About one-third (32.4 percent) of the respondents (336 of 1,035) did not answer this question, and another 8.9 percent (92 of 1,035) said no (that is, that they were not sure). Thus, 41.3 percent were not sure whether they might have received some EBT materials in the mail.

Question C3: What materials did you receive in the mail? Did they send you . . .
About 37 percent of the respondents said that they had received an EBT handbook or other printed material in the mail (C1=2), but when asked more specifically about what they received, they often could not recall. This situation is illustrated in table C-4. Generally speaking, we can say that between 4 and 12 percent of respondents who answered this series of questions could not tell us what they had actually received in the mail. In particular, 4.4 percent (30 of 689) said that they did not remember whether they had received instructions for how to use the EBT card (C3a). Eight percent (55 of 689) could not tell us whether they had received instructions on how to get help using the EBT card (C3b). About 5.4 percent (37 of 689) said that did not know whether they had received an explanation of their rights and responsibilities in the EBT system (C3c). The highest percentage of overall missing data (11.6 percent, or 80 of 689) occurred when respondents were asked whether they had received instructions on how to change their PIN (C3f).

Looking at the same exhibit, we can also say that missing data generally are more likely to occur within the vulnerable group than in the rest of the sample.

Table C-4—Missing data in mailed materials, C3a series (percent who could not recall receiving it)

Subject	All (*n*=689)	Nonvulnerable (*n*=428)	Vulnerable (*n*=261)
How to use an EBT card	4.4	3.7	5.4
How to get help	8.0	6.5	10.3
Rights/Responsibilities	5.4	4.0	7.7
Document telling secret PIN	1.7	1.9	1.5
How to keep PIN safe and not to tell anybody	0.9	1.2	0.4
How to change PIN	11.6	11.7	11.5
Extra help if trouble understanding how to use an EBT card	5.4	4.2	7.3

Question C4a: What questions did you have?
When asked whether they had any questions about the EBT system after receiving mailed information, 9.7 percent (3 out of 31) could not formulate questions that they said they had.
Question C9: When you went to your first EBT training, how much time did you spend at that place?

Question C10: How much time did you spend traveling to your first EBT training?
When asked how much time they spent at their first EBT training, 5.3 percent (60 of 1136) could not answer the question. When asked how much time they spent traveling to the training, 3.6 percent (40 of 1,136) could not tell us.

Question C12a: How much in wages did you lose by going to training?
Although 12.7 percent (8 of 63) respondents were not able to say how much they lost in wages by going to training, we were able to impute the amount for five of the eight cases by multiplying training time with an imputed hourly wage. The imputed wage was based on those respondents who answered both this question and questions C9 and C10.

Although 12.7 percent of respondents were not able to tell us how much pay they lost by going to training, fewer than 3 percent of respondents were unable to answer a followup question about specific expenses incurred for items like babysitting, bus and taxi fares, or tolls and parking fees (question C13).

Section D: PIN Use

Question D8a: How long did it take from the time you made the request until it arrived in the mail?
Only one question in section D had missing data in more than 3 percent of the cases. In question D8, 14 people said they called customer service to have a new PIN mailed to them. Three of the 14 respondents (21.4 percent) could not remember how much time had passed before they received their PIN.

Section E: Other System Use

Question E6a: Had this person previously used your card with your permission?
When we asked respondents whether anybody had ever used their card without permission to buy groceries or to withdraw benefits, seven said "Yes." When asked more specifically whether this person had ever used the card before with their permission, one person (14.3 percent) was not able to give us an answer.

Section G: Recipient Characteristics

Question G6: Do you feel comfortable speaking and reading English?
Forty-one recipients said that they use a language other than English at home (G5). Three of these 41 (7.3 percent) did not answer the followup question asking whether they felt comfortable speaking and reading English.

Question G6a: When you go to the food stamp office, do you usually take someone with you to translate?
Of the 41 who answered that they speak a language other than English at home, 30 said they did feel comfortable speaking and reading English; therefore only 11 answered G6a. Two of the 11 (18.2 percent) could not or would not tell us whether they take someone with them to the food stamp office to translate.

Overall, we believe that missing data will not be a problem during planned analyses of the survey data. It may be difficult, however, to correlate the incidence of system problems with specific aspects of training received. Similarly, in our analyses of when during the benefit issuance cycle

recipients realized that their cards were lost or stolen, we will note that 17 percent could not answer the question.

Sample Representativeness

Our primary concern with sample representativeness is whether, for each stratum, the group of recipients for whom interviews were completed (group A) has similar characteristics to the population universe for that stratum. One could attempt to refine this comparison by excluding from group B those found to be ineligible for the survey, because of prior use of an EBT card, residence in a group care facility where the recipient does no grocery shopping with the EBT card, or death. We cannot identify these ineligibles, however, in groups C through E. Furthermore, they represent only about 9 percent of the group B cases. For this reason, we have retained the ineligible cases in group B when assessing the representativeness of the sample.

The following tables and discussion look at the sample representativeness of each stratum separately by using data available on the State extract files for all cases in the population universe. The data elements vary somewhat by State, but they are identical for the vulnerable and nonvulnerable cases within a State. The data described in the tables are unweighted.

Alabama

The distributions of demographic variables for the vulnerable and nonvulnerable strata for Alabama are shown in table C-5. Within the vulnerable and nonvulnerable strata, there is no significant difference between respondents and the population universe with respect to race. There are, however, differences in gender, age of respondent, number of dependents, and income. (No data are available on marital status and TANF receipt from the Alabama extract files.)

Table C-5—Sample representativeness for Alabama strata

Variables	Vulnerable		Nonvulnerabls	
	Respondents (*n*=260)	Population Universe (*n*=1,026)	Respondents (*n*=285)	Population Universe (*n*=3,149)
Demographic characteristics (percentages)				
Gender				
Female	68.0	63.2	90.2	85.7 *
Race				3
White	47.1	48.2	36.1	7.9
Black	52.1	51.4	63.5	61.0
Other	0.8	0.4	0.4	1.1
Marital status	NA	NA	NA	NA
TANF receipt	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average age (years)	50.6	47.4**	32.3	30.3**
Number of dependents	1.8	1.8	2.9	2.7†
Average monthly income (dollars)				
Gross earned	55	53	465	378**
Gross unearned	NA	NA	NA	NA
Net income	321	302	361	285**

† Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.10 level.
* Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.05 level.
** Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.01 level.

In the nonvulnerable stratum, the difference in gender between respondents and the population universe is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. In particular, women are overrepresented among respondents (90.2 vs. 85.7 percent). In the vulnerable stratum, the difference between respondents and the population universe (68.0 vs. 63.2 percent) is not significant.

The average age is higher for respondents than the population universe in both the vulnerable and nonvulnerable strata. In particular, for the vulnerable stratum the respondents have an average age of 50.6 years, compared with 47.4 years for the population universe. Within the nonvulnerable stratum the respondents have an average age of 32.3 years, compared with 30.3 years for the population universe. Both differences are statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Within the nonvulnerable stratum, the difference of income levels between the respondents and the population universe is statistically significant at the 0.01 level, regardless of which income measure is examined. In the vulnerable stratum, survey recipients have a higher net income compared with the entire population universe.

Minnesota

Only 45 interviews were completed with vulnerable recipients in Minnesota, and the entire population universe consisted of only 188 recipients. As shown in table C-6, the sample of vulnerable recipients overrepresents Whites (84.4 to 71.8 percent), with the difference significant at the 0.10 level. The average age of surveyed recipients (53.3 years) is also significantly higher than for the population universe (49.7 years). Finally, surveyed recipients had higher average gross unearned income than did the population universe.

In the nonvulnerable stratum, a chi-squared test indicates that the distributions of race for the respondents and the population universe are significantly different at the 0.05 level. Respondents to the survey were more likely to be White and less likely to be an "other" racial category than the overall universe of new food stamp recipients.

With respect to marital status, a chi-squared test indicates that the distributions for respondents and the population universe within the nonvulnerable stratum are significantly different at the 0.10 level. Singles are underrepresented (46.6 to 50.7 percent) and married people are overrepresented (16.8 to 10.7 percent).

The respondents within the nonvulnerable stratum were slightly older than the population universe (33.8 to 32.3 years), and this difference is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Generally, the average monthly income of interviewed recipients was higher than the average monthly income of the population universe, for both the vulnerable and nonvulnerable strata.

Table C-6—Sample representativeness for Minnesota strata

Variables	Vulnerable		Nonvulnerable	
	Respondents (*n*=45)	Population universe (*n*=188)	Respondents (*n*=292)	Population universe (*n*=1,340)
Demographic characteristics (percentages)				
Gender				
Female	64.4	54.3	75.0	70.7
Race				
White	84.4	71.8†	74.7	67.2**
Black	6.7	11.2	11.5	14.5
Other	8.9	17.0	13.9	18.3†
Marital status				
Single	28.9	35.1	46.6	50.7
Married	15.6	9.0	16.8	10.7**
Divorced	35.6	26.6	17.5	16.5
Other	20.0	29.3	19.2	22.1
TANF receipt	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average age (years)	53.3	49.7†	33.8	32.3**
Number of dependents	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average monthly income (dollars)				
Gross earned	771	549	755	293†
Gross unearned	648	578*	319	341
Net income	956	615	195	93†

NA = data not available.

† Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.10 level.
* Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.05 level.
** Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.01 level.

Louisiana

Table C-7 shows the distributions of selected variables for the vulnerable and nonvulnerable new food stamp recipients in Louisiana.

Within both the vulnerable and nonvulnerable strata, there are no significant differences between respondents and population universe with respect to race, marital status, receipt of TANF benefits, number of dependents, or average household income. There are statistically significant differences, however, in the other two measures.

Table C-7—Sample representativeness for Louisiana strata

Variables	Vulnerable		Nonvulnerable	
	Respondents (*n*=197)	Population Universe (*n*=944)	Respondents (*n*=190)	Population Universe (*n*=6,138)
		Percent		
Gender				
Female	64.0	57.3†	88.4	73.4**
Race				
White	44.7	40.6	29.5	32.7
Black	55.3	58.1	68.9	66.4
Other	0.0	1.4	1.6	0.9
Marital status				
Single	37.4	40.4	63.6	58.5
Married	23.0	19.3	10.0	11.5
Separated	10.1	13.5	13.6	16.1
Divorced	17.3	17.0	10.7	12.8
Widowed	12.2	9.8	2.1	1.2
TANF receipt	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.8
		Years		
Average age (years)	47.6	45.6*	31.6	32.3
		Persons		
Number of dependents	2.2	2.1	2.5	2.3
		Dollars		
Average monthly income				
Gross earned	202	215	345	317
Gross unearned	475	507	504	460
Net income	300	323	296	269

† Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.10 level.
* Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.05 level.
** Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.01 level.

Women are overrepresented in both Louisiana strata. For the vulnerable stratum, 64.0 percent of respondents were women, compared with 57.3 percent of the population universe, and the difference between the two groups is statistically significant at the 0.10 level. Within the nonvulnerable stratum, the difference between 88.4 percent and 73.4 percent is statistically significant at the 0.01 percent level.

Within the vulnerable stratum, survey respondents had an average age of 47.6 years, compared with 45.6 years for the population universe. The difference is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. There is no significant difference in age between respondents and the population universe in the nonvulnerable stratum.

Pennsylvania

Table C-8 shows that, within the nonvulnerable stratum in Pennsylvania, women are overrepresented 79.3 percent to 67.6 percent, and the difference is statistically significant at the 0.01 level. There is no significant difference in gender in the vulnerable stratum.

Table C-8— Sample representativeness for Pennsylvania strata

Variables	Vulnerable		Nonvulnerable	
	Respondents (*n*=184)	Population Universe (*n*=1,465)	Respondents (*n*=179)	Population Universe (*n*=8,539)
		Percent		
Gender				
Female	60.3	60.2	79.3	67.6**
Race				
White	70.1	65.0	69.3	57.1**
Black	22.8	24.4	25.7	33.6*
Other	7.0	10.6	5.0	9.4†
Marital status (percentages)				
Single	33.3	42.0*	52.2	60.0*
Married	21.8	15.0*	15.7	14.3
Separated	10.4	11.3	19.1	12.3**
Divorced	21.3	18.9	9.6	11.0
Widowed	11.5	12.1	1.7	1.4
TANF receipt	0.5	2.4	14.5	14.9
		Years		
Average age	50.6	49.3	33.6	32.6
		Persons		
Number of dependents	NA	NA	NA	NA
		Dollars		
Average monthly income	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gross earned	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gross unearned	NA	NA	NA	NA
Net income				

NA = Data not available.

† Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.10 level.
* Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.05 level.
** Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.01 level.

The distributions of racial status are significantly different, at the 0.01 level, within the nonvulnerable stratum. White food stamp recipients are overrepresented, 69.3 to 57.1 percent;

Blacks and other races are underrepresented. Although the same patterns appear in the vulnerable stratum as well, there is no significant difference in race among those recipients.

Chi-squared tests indicate that, for both vulnerable and nonvulnerable recipients, the distributions in marital status differ significantly between respondents and the population universe—at the 0.10 level for vulnerable recipients and at the 0.05 level for nonvulnerable recipients. Singles are underrepresented among survey respondents in both strata. In addition, married recipients are overrepresented in the vulnerable stratum, and separated recipients are overrepresented in the nonvulnerable stratum.

There are no significant differences in average income between vulnerable respondents to the survey and the population universe. Within the nonvulnerable stratum, however, survey respondents had significantly higher average incomes than the population universe.

Representativeness Within the Vulnerable Strata

We have defined vulnerable recipients to include those who are elderly, disabled, or both. Table C-9 shows that, compared with the population universe of vulnerable recipients in each States, our survey sample tends to overrepresent the elderly and underrepresent the disabled (as measured by disability information contained in the State administrative files). The differences are statistically significant in Alabama and—for the disabled—in Louisiana. As described in chapter 2, sample weights were adjusted to account for actual distributions of elderly (but not disabled), disabled (but not elderly), and both elderly and disabled recipients in the population universe. The sample weights were also adjusted to account for the overrepresentation of women in each State's sample.

Table C-9—Sample representativeness of vulnerable respondents

Characteristic	Respondents	Population universe
	Percent	
Alabama		
Disabled	68.8	78.7**
Elderly	35.4	25.2**
Minnesota		
Disabled	60.0	70.2
Elderly	46.7	34.6
Louisiana		
Disabled	84.3	88.5†
Elderly	26.4	21.4
Pennsylvania		
Disabled	73.9	78.4
Elderly	34.2	33.0

† Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.10 level.
* Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.05 level.
** Difference between this and the entry immediately to the left is significant at the 0.01 level.