

**The Experiences of American Indians in Wisconsin in the
Child Support Demonstration Evaluation**

Steven T. Cook
Institute for Research on Poverty
University of Wisconsin–Madison

Revised
December 2006

Report to the
Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development
Bureau of Child Support

1. INTRODUCTION

This report examines the experiences of the American Indian population served by the Wisconsin Works (W-2) program. W-2 is the state of Wisconsin's program providing services for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. It furnishes low-income parents in the state of Wisconsin with employment and training services, cash payments for participation in subsidized work positions, and other case management services. W-2 serves a large and diverse population and, though the American Indian caseload on W-2 is a small percentage of the overall total, the experiences of this special subgroup within the larger welfare population may diverge because of differences in the group's demographic or socioeconomic characteristics or because of the different regulatory jurisdictions (tribal courts or tribal social service agencies) to which tribal members may be exposed. The report will examine American Indians' participation in public assistance programs, child support payments, paternity establishment, and earnings in the years after entry into the W-2 program.

Among the W-2 program's many innovative components was a full pass-through and disregard of child support for parents participating in the W-2 program. This pass-through and disregard policy was implemented as an experiment, with entrants into W-2 randomly assigned to either a full pass-through and disregard or to a partial pass-through and disregard policy similar to the policy that existed under the preceding Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. This report is one of several conducted as part of the Child Support Demonstration Evaluation, the primary goal of which was to evaluate the effects of the full pass-through and disregard. Evaluations comparing the full and partial pass-through and disregard policies in the full W-2 population (Meyer and Cancian, 2001; Meyer and Cancian, 2003) have found that the full pass-through and disregard policy was positively related to higher rates of paternity establishment for children, child support receipt for residential mothers, and child support payment for nonresident fathers. The evaluations also examined the effects of the pass-through policy among specific subgroups of the Wisconsin W-2 population, but did not look specifically at

American Indian W-2 participants. The present paper will use administrative data to examine these policies in the American Indian population on W-2.

2. BACKGROUND

American Indians and the W-2 Program

American Indians constitute a small proportion of the population in the state of Wisconsin. In the 2000 Census those with only American Indian or Native Alaskan ancestry accounted for about 47,000 persons, or 0.9 percent of the total population; including those with both American Indian and other ancestry brings the count to 69,000, or 1.3 percent (Ogunwole, 2002). In Wisconsin, as is true throughout the country, the American Indian population has, on average, higher rates of poverty than the overall population. Nationwide the poverty rate in 1999 was 12.4 percent for the total population, but 25.7 percent for the American Indian population (Bishaw and Iceland, 2003); in Wisconsin total poverty in 2000 was 8.7 percent and American Indian poverty was 21.7 percent (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003, Table 51). Given the higher levels of need in the American Indian population, one may expect that American Indians make up a larger percentage of the W-2 population than they do of the total population, but even then they will still be a small proportion.

People identifying as American Indian may or may not be registered members of a recognized tribe. There are eleven recognized tribes in the state of Wisconsin with a total membership of approximately 57,000 in 2006 (Wisconsin Department of Administration, 2006), although members of these tribes may not necessarily reside in the state (several tribes note large numbers living in the Minneapolis or Chicago areas), so the proportion of those claiming American Indian ancestry who are tribal members cannot be precisely estimated. Nationally, Thornton (1997) estimated that the population of enrolled tribal members accounted for only 60 percent of those claiming American Indian ancestry in the 1990 Census.

There are, of course, no differences in eligibility for or provision of services in the W-2 program based on applicants' race or ethnicity, although differences in demographic or socioeconomic characteristics among ethnic groups might affect their usage of W-2 and other programs. Enrolled tribal members have access to services through their tribal governments, which may also affect usage of state programs and services. The programs and services available from tribal governments vary by tribe and over time, making the prediction of their effects difficult. (See Appendix Table 1 for information on tribal populations and programs.)

After the end of the AFDC program and the establishment of the W-2 program in 1997, tribes had several options for providing TANF services to their populations. The 1996 federal welfare reform law provided a "Tribal TANF" option enabling recognized tribes to implement their own TANF programs that would be separate from the state's program. Tribes that did not pursue their own TANF program could participate in the state's TANF program. In Wisconsin under W-2, tribes were allowed to serve as contracting W-2 agencies for their members, or they could have their members use the services of a county-level W-2 agency. So tribes have three different options (independent Tribal TANF program, serving as a tribal W-2 agency, or depending on county-level W-2 agencies), and different tribes have chosen one or the other of these options. This complicated structure for providing TANF/W-2 benefits to tribal members presents some unique complications in studying the American Indian population.

In Wisconsin, eight of the eleven recognized tribes have implemented their own Tribal TANF programs; four tribes (Stockbridge-Munsee, Mole Lake Sokaogan, Red Cliff, and Potawatomi) established their own TANF program in 1997 and were never part of the state's program; three tribes (Lac du Flambeau, Bad River, and Oneida) operated as individual tribal agencies under the W-2 program starting in 1997, but later established independent Tribal TANF programs (Lac du Flambeau in 2000, Bad River in 2002, and Oneida in 2003); the Menominee had tribal members receive W-2 through county-level W-2 agencies until 2004 and then started their own Tribal TANF program. The Ho Chunk, Lac Courte Oreilles, and St. Croix tribes have not acted as W-2 agencies or established Tribal TANF

programs, so any of their members would have been handled by county-level W-2 agencies since the inception of W-2 (Ashley, 2006).

When tribes set up their own Tribal TANF programs they no longer use the state's administrative computer systems to manage the cases, although they do have access to the state's systems to manage the Food Stamp and Medicaid programs and to check for participation in W-2 (Kauffman and Associates, 2002). In addition, Tribal TANF services are usually provided only in a limited geographic region (on tribal lands or in the county/counties surrounding tribal lands) to a limited service population, so tribal members who live outside that region would be unlikely to receive services. (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2002).

Similarly, federal law also allows tribes to set up their own IV-D child support enforcement systems. Currently the Lac du Flambeau, Menominee, and Potawatomi have their own child support enforcement administrations, although the Menominee and Lac du Flambeau use the state's child support computer systems to manage the cases; the Potawatomi manage their caseload separately.

These separate programs mean that members of tribes with separate Tribal TANF programs have an alternative to participating in W-2. Since the state does not forbid such tribal members from receiving W-2, they could use either the state program or the tribal program (but not both at the same time).

Thus, any differences in outcomes that are found between the American Indian and non-Indian W-2 populations may be the result of demographic or socioeconomic disparities between the two populations, or they may be the result of selectivity in the American Indian cases which are using the W-2 program. Since cases on Tribal TANF programs cannot be observed with the available data, and tribal membership is unknown, it will be difficult to assess the degree to which selectivity is the explaining factor.

Comparing Child Support Pass-through and Disregard Policies

In addition to assessing overall outcome levels in Wisconsin's American Indian population, this report examines the effects of the full pass-through and disregard policy in this subgroup. As mentioned

above, this innovative component of the W-2 program enabled W-2 cash recipients to receive all child support payments made to them, and those payments would not count as income when determining eligibility for W-2. The Child Support Demonstration Evaluation (CSDE) was initiated to assess the effects of this policy. It was implemented as a randomized evaluation with cases randomly assigned to experience either a full or partial pass-through and disregard policy. Those assigned to full pass-through and disregard would receive all current child support paid on their behalf and those receipts would be disregarded for determining W-2 eligibility. Under the partial pass-through and disregard, the resident parent would receive the greater of \$50 or 41 percent of any child support received for time periods that the parent was receiving a W-2 cash payment. Cases were randomly assigned from the start of W-2 in 1997 through June 1999¹, and cases remained subject to their assigned treatment through June 2002 when all cases were moved to full pass-through and disregard status.²

The motivation for the CSDE was to examine whether a full pass-through and disregard policy could be associated with positive effects on various aspects of child support enforcement and economic outcomes for resident parents. The hypothesis was that the greater amount of financial resources available to resident parents due to a full pass-through and disregard should improve their economic situation and that nonresident parents would be more likely to participate in the child support enforcement system if they knew all of their child support payments would be going to their children instead of being garnished by the state. The evaluations by Meyer and Cancian (2001, 2003) found that those assigned to full pass-through and disregard did receive more money (the mechanical effect of the policy) and that paternity establishment and child support payment rates were higher in full pass-through and disregard cases.

Finding effects of the full pass-through and disregard policy among the American Indian population poses some difficulties that did not exist in the overall analysis. First, the small size of the

¹Random assignment was disrupted in Milwaukee County from July 8 to December 31, 1998; all cases in Milwaukee during this period were assigned to the full pass-through policy.

²A fuller description of the W-2 program and the implementation of the CSDE is in Meyer and Cancian (2003).

population reduces the ability of the analysis to detect any effects. Second, the possibility exists that tribal members might choose to participate in Tribal TANF instead of W-2 based on which treatment they were assigned. Tribal member applicants to W-2 assigned to the partial pass-through and disregard would potentially lose some of their child support when they received W-2 cash benefits, but if they received cash benefits from a Tribal TANF program, then those would presumably not affect their child support receipts. This provides an incentive for tribal members who are assigned to partial pass-through and disregard to switch to a Tribal TANF program (if available) so that their child support receipts would not be affected. I will attempt to assess to what extent this possibility affects the results.

3. DATA, SAMPLE, AND METHODS

To examine the experiences of American Indian participants since the start of W-2, we use data collected from several administrative systems of the state of Wisconsin. From the CARES system we draw the cases of all W-2 participants through June 2005. Included in the data drawn from CARES is information on cases' W-2 participation, along with their participation in Food Stamps, Medicaid, BadgerCare, and the state's child care subsidy program, Wisconsin Shares. The parents in these cases are then matched with the state's KIDS database, which tracks child support enforcement. KIDS provides information on child support orders, payments, and paternity establishment for children. In addition we use data from the state's Unemployment Insurance data system for information on both custodial and noncustodial parents' reported earnings throughout the period of the analysis.

The analysis is concentrated on the research samples that have been used in previous IRP reports. Comparisons between the full and partial pass-through/disregard assignment groups are divided between Cohort 1 cases (those entering in the first three quarters of W-2 from September 1997 to July 1998) and Cohort 3 cases (those entering in between January to June 1999)³. Outcomes are also observed for Cohort

³Cohort 2 cases (July to December 1998 entrants) have generally not been analyzed due to a disruption in the random assignment process that occurred in Milwaukee during this period.

4 (cases entering after the assignment period ended but before all cases were moved to full pass-through and disregard in June 2002) and Cohort 5 cases (those entering when the full pass-through and disregard policy was universal, July 2002 to June 2005)

Analyses were limited to cases in which the mother was the custodial parent, which were demographically eligible for child support, which did not experience delays in the intake process onto W-2, and which had at least one child under 18 during the time period of our analyses. These exclusions are the same as those made for the CSDE Phase 2 final report (Cancian and Meyer, 2003), and a fuller description of the data selection process maybe found there.

For the present analyses, we identified cases in which the resident mother was American Indian. The racial identification of most parents is available in the CARES system, but in some cases where race is missing from CARES, KIDS data were available to identify the cases. Of the 44,068 mothers in the sample who entered W-2 from September 1997 to June 2005, 953 were identified as Native American in CARES or KIDS.

The analysis of the American Indian experience with W-2 will use two methods. First we will offer a descriptive analysis comparing the two groups based on their demographic and socioeconomic characteristics when they first enter W-2 and comparing outcomes by race. Second, we will examine the effects of the full pass-through and disregard policy on the American Indian subsample.

4. RESULTS

Table 1 presents descriptive information for the American Indian and non-American Indian segments of our research population. P-values below each comparison indicate when these differences are significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The strongest difference between the two groups is in their locations. Among Cohort 1 non-American Indian cases, 75 percent are located in Milwaukee County, with only 8 percent entering in rural counties in the state. The American Indian population is predominantly located in rural areas, however, with over 50 percent of cases there (including the tribal agencies) and only 32 percent in Milwaukee

Table 1
Initial Characteristics of Research Sample Resident Mothers Entering W-2 (American Indians/Non-Indians)

| Characteristics | Cohort 1 (September 1997 - June 1998) | | | | Cohort 3 (January - June 1999) | | | | Cohort 4 (July 1999 - June 2002) | | | | Cohort 5 (July 2002 - June 2003) | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|------|---------------------------|------|--------------------------------|------|---------------------------|------|----------------------------------|------|---------------------------|------|----------------------------------|------|---------------------------|------|
| | Non Indian | | American Indian | | Non Indian | | American Indian | | Non Indian | | American Indian | | Non Indian | | American Indian | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| <i>Total N</i> | 16,078 | | 389 | | 2,201 | | 61 | | 18,095 | | 359 | | 7,086 | | 134 | |
| <i>Initial W-2 Agency of Case</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Milwaukee County Agency | 12,071 | 75.1 | 124 | 31.9 | 1,143 | 51.9 | 11 | 18.0 | 9,491 | 51.1 | 91 | 25.0 | 3,462 | 48.0 | 35 | 25.2 |
| Other Urban Counties | 2,817 | 17.5 | 38 | 9.8 | 707 | 32.1 | 7 | 11.5 | 6,124 | 33.0 | 78 | 21.4 | 2,577 | 35.7 | 55 | 39.6 |
| Rural Counties | 1,186 | 7.4 | 169 | 43.4 | 349 | 15.9 | 11 | 18.0 | 2,743 | 14.8 | 105 | 28.9 | 1,046 | 14.5 | 28 | 20.1 |
| Tribal W-2 Agency | 4 | 0.0 | 58 | 14.9 | 2 | 0.1 | 32 | 52.5 | 7 | 0.0 | 85 | 23.4 | 1 | 0.0 | 16 | 11.5 |
| | | | Prob(χ^2) = <.0001 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = <.0001 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = <.0001 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = <.0001 | |
| <i>Number of Children At Entry</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| None | 142 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.3 | 70 | 3.2 | | | 1,036 | 5.6 | 13 | 3.6 | 513 | 7.4 | 5 | 3.6 |
| One | 5,384 | 33.5 | 102 | 26.2 | 1,158 | 52.6 | 28 | 45.9 | 9,535 | 51.3 | 150 | 41.2 | 3,746 | 53.8 | 63 | 45.3 |
| Two | 4,605 | 28.6 | 112 | 28.8 | 513 | 23.3 | 11 | 18.0 | 4,437 | 23.9 | 103 | 28.3 | 1,532 | 22.0 | 39 | 28.1 |
| Three or More | 5,947 | 37.0 | 174 | 44.7 | 460 | 20.9 | 22 | 36.1 | 3,565 | 19.2 | 98 | 26.9 | 1,174 | 16.9 | 32 | 23.0 |
| | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.003 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.023 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = <.0001 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.018 | |
| <i>Number of Legal Fathers</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| None | 3,811 | 23.7 | 76 | 19.5 | 829 | 37.7 | 20 | 32.8 | 7,713 | 41.5 | 129 | 35.4 | 2,873 | 39.8 | 48 | 34.5 |
| One | 9,352 | 58.2 | 224 | 57.6 | 1,098 | 49.9 | 25 | 41.0 | 9,131 | 49.2 | 178 | 48.9 | 3,692 | 51.2 | 76 | 54.7 |
| Two or More | 2,903 | 18.1 | 88 | 22.6 | 272 | 12.4 | 16 | 26.2 | 1,708 | 9.2 | 56 | 15.4 | 640 | 8.9 | 15 | 10.8 |
| Missing | 12 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.3 | 2 | 0.1 | | | 21 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.3 | 11 | 0.2 | | |
| | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.032 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.016 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.0003 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.559 | |
| <i>Child Support Paid Prior To Entry</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| None | 11,917 | 74.1 | 263 | 67.6 | 1,657 | 75.3 | 43 | 70.5 | 14,862 | 80.0 | 273 | 75.0 | 5,899 | 81.8 | 106 | 76.3 |
| \$1-\$999 | 2,245 | 14.0 | 76 | 19.5 | 263 | 12.0 | 11 | 18.0 | 1,650 | 8.9 | 46 | 12.6 | 531 | 7.4 | 20 | 14.4 |
| \$1000 or More | 1,916 | 11.9 | 50 | 12.9 | 281 | 12.8 | 7 | 11.5 | 2,061 | 11.1 | 45 | 12.4 | 786 | 10.9 | 13 | 9.4 |
| | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.005 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.355 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.027 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.008 | |

(table continues)

Table 1, continued

| Characteristics | Cohort 1 (September 1997 - June 1998) | | Cohort 3 (January - June 1999) | | | | Cohort 4 (July 1999 - June 2002) | | | | Cohort 5 (July 2002 - June 2003) | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|------|---------------------------------|------|------------|------|----------------------------------|------|------------|------|----------------------------------|------|------------|-------|---------------------------------|-------|
| | Non Indian | | American Indian | | Non Indian | | American Indian | | Non Indian | | American Indian | | Non Indian | | American Indian | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| <i>Age of Youngest Child at Entry</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unborn Child | 1,588 | 9.9 | 36 | 9.3 | 370 | 16.8 | 4 | 6.6 | 3,082 | 16.6 | 48 | 13.2 | 1,171 | 16.2 | 13 | 9.4 |
| 0–2 | 7,549 | 47.0 | 178 | 45.8 | 1,161 | 52.8 | 40 | 65.6 | 10,224 | 55.1 | 224 | 61.5 | 4,073 | 56.4 | 99 | 71.2 |
| 3–5 | 2,827 | 17.6 | 72 | 18.5 | 231 | 10.5 | 7 | 11.5 | 1,646 | 8.9 | 33 | 9.1 | 640 | 8.9 | 7 | 5.0 |
| 6–12 | 3,044 | 18.9 | 78 | 20.1 | 317 | 14.4 | 9 | 14.8 | 2,507 | 13.5 | 40 | 11.0 | 893 | 12.4 | 13 | 9.4 |
| 13–18 | 1,054 | 6.6 | 24 | 6.2 | 119 | 5.4 | 1 | 1.6 | 1,080 | 5.8 | 18 | 5.0 | 426 | 5.9 | 7 | 5.0 |
| Missing Birth Date | 16 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.1 | | | 34 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.3 | 13 | 0.2 | | |
| | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.889 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.196 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.183 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.024 | |
| <i>Quarters of Employment Prior to Entry</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| None | 3,195 | 19.9 | 73 | 18.8 | 226 | 10.3 | 10 | 16.4 | 3,231 | 0.2 | 77 | 0.2 | 1,553 | 21.5 | 23 | 16.6 |
| 1–4 Quarters | 6,687 | 41.6 | 174 | 44.7 | 583 | 26.5 | 21 | 34.4 | 5,440 | 0.3 | 129 | 0.4 | 1,864 | 25.8 | 45 | 32.4 |
| 5–7 Quarters | 4,254 | 26.5 | 107 | 27.5 | 719 | 32.7 | 17 | 27.9 | 3,825 | 0.2 | 81 | 0.2 | 2,040 | 28.3 | 45 | 32.4 |
| 8 Quarters | 1,938 | 12.1 | 35 | 9.0 | 671 | 30.5 | 13 | 21.3 | 6,071 | 0.3 | 76 | 0.2 | 1,755 | 24.3 | 26 | 18.7 |
| Missing SSN | 4 | 0.0 | | | 2 | 0.1 | | | 6 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 4 | 0.1 | | |
| | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.361 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.226 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.042 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.166 | |
| <i>AFDC Receipt Before Entry</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| None | 2,053 | 12.8 | 47 | 12.1 | 1,811 | 82.3 | 53 | 86.9 | 18,476 | 99.5 | 363 | 99.7 | 7,216 | 100.0 | 139 | 100.0 |
| 1–18 Months | 5,246 | 32.6 | 163 | 41.9 | 390 | 17.7 | 8 | 13.1 | 97 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.3 | | | | |
| 19–24 Months | 8,779 | 54.6 | 179 | 46.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.001 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.352 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.515 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = N/A | |
| <i>Resident Parent Has Child Support Order At Entry</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 7,312 | 45.5 | 168 | 43.2 | 1,417 | 64.4 | 39 | 63.9 | 13,377 | 72.0 | 246 | 67.6 | 5,325 | 73.8 | 95 | 68.4 |
| Yes | 8,766 | 54.5 | 221 | 56.8 | 784 | 35.6 | 22 | 36.1 | 5,196 | 28.0 | 118 | 32.4 | 1,891 | 26.2 | 44 | 31.7 |
| | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.370 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.943 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.062 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.148 | |

(table continues)

Table 1, continued

| Characteristics | Cohort 1 (September 1997 - June 1998) | | Cohort 3 (January - June 1999) | | | | Cohort 4 (July 1999 - June 2002) | | | | Cohort 5 (July 2002 - June 2003) | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------|------|------------|------|----------------------------------|------|------------|------|----------------------------------|------|------------|------|--------------------------|------|--|--|
| | Non Indian | | American Indian | | Non Indian | | American Indian | | Non Indian | | American Indian | | Non Indian | | American Indian | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| <i>Age of Resident Parent</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16-17 | 7 | 0.0 | | | 7 | 0.3 | | | 22 | 0.1 | | | 8 | 0.1 | | | | |
| 18-25 | 7,354 | 45.7 | 154 | 39.6 | 1,203 | 54.7 | 31 | 50.8 | 10,948 | 59.0 | 209 | 57.4 | 4,459 | 61.8 | 90 | 64.8 | | |
| 26-30 | 3,207 | 20.0 | 80 | 20.6 | 385 | 17.5 | 14 | 23.0 | 2,803 | 15.1 | 57 | 15.7 | 949 | 13.2 | 17 | 12.2 | | |
| 31-40 | 4,339 | 27.0 | 127 | 32.7 | 478 | 21.7 | 15 | 24.6 | 3,618 | 19.5 | 83 | 22.8 | 1,305 | 18.1 | 25 | 18.0 | | |
| 41+ | 1,168 | 7.3 | 28 | 7.2 | 128 | 5.8 | 1 | 1.6 | 1,175 | 6.3 | 15 | 4.1 | 493 | 6.8 | 7 | 5.0 | | |
| Missing | 3 | 0.0 | | | | | | | 7 | 0.0 | | | 2 | 0.0 | | | | |
| | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.159 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.494 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.351 | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.952 | | | |

Probabilities considered significant at $p < .10$ (marked in bold).

County. Similar differences exist in the other cohorts. Given that most tribal lands are in rural areas, these differences are not too surprising.

Other initial characteristics do not show such dramatic differences, but American Indian mothers appear to enter into W-2 with more children and with more fathers of their children. In Cohort 1 American Indian mothers, 45 percent had three or more children compared to only 37 percent of non-Indian mothers, and 23 percent had more than one established father for those children, versus 18 percent for non-Indians. American Indian mothers also appear to have had higher levels of support from noncustodial fathers of their children, with 32 percent of Cohort 1 Indian mothers having received some child support from a noncustodial father of their children in the year before entry compared to only 26 percent for non-American Indian mothers. In Cohort 1, non-American Indian mothers were more likely to have no reported income from a nonresident father than were American Indian mothers, probably reflecting the greater number of nonresident fathers associated with American Indian mothers. The reported income was low, however, with no differences in higher income categories. These differences are similar and significant in Cohorts 4 and 5 but not in Cohort 3 with its smaller number of cases.

We can also see that the initial experience of American Indian mothers differs somewhat from those of non-Native American mothers. The American Indian mothers are quite a bit less likely to be placed into a Community Service Job upon entry (38 percent versus 51 percent for Cohort 1 non-Indian mothers), and more likely to be in a non-cash assistance tier⁴. These may reflect differences in the job-readiness of American Indian mothers, or may reflect the different placement policies of the W-2 agencies they are in.

Differences in other characteristics are significant in some cohorts but not others. American Indian mothers in Cohort 1 are more likely to have a high school diploma at entry, but in other cohorts mother's education is about the same. In Cohort 5, American Indian mothers are more likely to have a

⁴ Entrants to W-2 are assigned to a tier based on their job-readiness. Those in lower tiers (W-2 Transition, Community Service Job, and Caretaker of Newborn) may receive cash assistance while those in upper tiers are provided only non-cash support.

Table 2
Indian/Non-Indian Comparison of Child Support and Public Assistance Outcomes, by Cohort (Full Pass-Through Cases only)

| Characteristics | Cohort 1 (September 1997 - June 1998) | | Cohort 3 (January - June 1999) | | Cohort 4 (July 1999 - June 2002) | | Cohort 5 (July 2002 - June 2003) | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------|-------|-----|
| | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian | | | |
| Resident Mothers | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N | 12,064 | 294 | 1,067 | 35 | 17,919 | 354 | 6,965 | 133 | | | |
| Received Any Child Support in: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | 40.4% | 50.3% | *** | | | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 47.1 | 54.8 | ** | 38.5% | 45.7% | | | | | | |
| 2000 | 52.3 | 57.4 | | 50.1 | 54.3 | 25.7% | 33.6% | *** | | | |
| 2001 | 51.4 | 51.9 | | 50.2 | 51.4 | 33.2 | 41.0 | ** | | | |
| 2002 | 51.3 | 55.8 | | 50.6 | 57.1 | 42.9 | 48.3 | * | | | |
| 2003 | 50.6 | 58.9 | ** | 51.7 | 62.9 | 46.6 | 55.1 | ** | 38.7% | 45.1% | |
| 2004 | 51.2 | 57.1 | * | 54.0 | 60.0 | 48.0 | 55.6 | ** | 45.8 | 53.4 | |
| Total Child Support Received in: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | \$639.56 | \$684.91 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 841.50 | 875.15 | | \$765.59 | \$1,031.90 | | | | | | |
| 2000 | 998.63 | 1,111.22 | | 1,197.12 | 1,312.48 | \$589.80 | \$679.99 | | | | |
| 2001 | 1,049.98 | 1,228.29 | | 1,286.32 | 1,407.80 | 787.37 | 810.65 | | | | |
| 2002 | 1,105.51 | 1,171.51 | | 1,314.45 | 1,954.36 | 1,018.39 | 1,067.02 | | | | |
| 2003 | 1,129.64 | 1,233.76 | | 1,339.51 | 1,841.04 | 1,171.01 | 1,293.76 | \$852.17 | \$729.62 | | |
| 2004 | 1,156.49 | 1,198.11 | | 1,418.09 | 1,746.02 | 1,236.27 | 1,317.70 | 1,116.12 | 1,103.24 | | |
| Received Any W-2 Cash Assistance in: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | 76.7% | 63.5% | *** | | | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 43.2 | 30.7 | *** | 84.3% | 91.4% | | | | | | |
| 2000 | 29.8 | 17.8 | *** | 31.9 | 17.1 | 33.3% | 33.3% | | | | |
| 2001 | 24.8 | 13.6 | *** | 24.7 | 28.6 | 50.8 | 41.8 | ** | | | |
| 2002 | 24.4 | 9.9 | *** | 22.8 | 31.4 | 48.3 | 33.9 | *** | | | |
| 2003 | 22.3 | 10.7 | *** | 22.1 | 20.0 | 30.4 | 20.6 | *** | 79.3% | 71.4% | * |
| 2004 | 21.4 | 6.2 | *** | 19.2 | 17.1 | 25.1 | 15.5 | *** | 36.6 | 16.5 | *** |

(table continues)

Table 2, continued

| Characteristics | Cohort 1 (September 1997 - June 1998) | | | Cohort 3 (January - June 1999) | | Cohort 4 (July 1999 - June 2002) | | Cohort 5 (July 2002 - June 2003) | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-----|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| | Non-Indian | American Indian | | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian |
| Received Any Food Stamps in: | | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | 93.4% | 87.9% | *** | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 81.2 | 69.9 | *** | 90.5% | 74.3% | ** | | | |
| 2000 | 75.8 | 63.4 | *** | 75.7 | 68.6 | | 55.2% | 53.4% | |
| 2001 | 72.4 | 64.5 | ** | 70.5 | 65.7 | | 74.4 | 66.4 | *** |
| 2002 | 71.7 | 61.9 | *** | 70.1 | 71.4 | | 77.3 | 74.0 | |
| 2003 | 70.1 | 64.3 | * | 66.2 | 62.9 | | 71.1 | 66.9 | 87.3% 83.5% |
| 2004 | 68.6 | 62.7 | * | 65.8 | 62.9 | | 67.8 | 66.9 | 77.5 77.4 |
| Enrolled in Medicaid or BadgerCare in: | | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | 98.7% | 97.7% | | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 91.0 | 84.5 | *** | 99.7% | 100.0% | | | | |
| 2000 | 84.2 | 79.1 | * | 91.4 | 88.6 | | 68.0% | 72.3% | |
| 2001 | 81.2 | 76.2 | * | 83.8 | 82.9 | | 89.5 | 88.4 | |
| 2002 | 79.0 | 75.1 | | 80.0 | 82.9 | | 90.0 | 90.1 | |
| 2003 | 76.5 | 75.8 | | 77.3 | 77.1 | | 84.0 | 81.6 | 98.1% 98.5% *** |
| 2004 | 73.1 | 73.8 | | 73.9 | 74.3 | | 78.9 | 81.1 | 90.6 92.5 *** |
| Had Child Care Subsidies Paid By Wisconsin Shares program in: | | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | 41.6% | 33.2% | ** | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 41.9 | 28.9 | *** | 46.0% | 28.6% | * | | | |
| 2000 | 38.0 | 26.7 | *** | 45.9 | 37.1 | | 17.2% | 16.7% | |
| 2001 | 35.6 | 22.9 | *** | 45.6 | 37.1 | | 34.1 | 25.7 | |
| 2002 | 33.3 | 18.9 | *** | 44.4 | 40.0 | | 45.8 | 31.6 | *** |
| 2003 | 30.1 | 16.7 | *** | 39.4 | 37.1 | | 43.5 | 24.0 | *** 48.6% 27.8% |
| 2004 | 26.7 | 16.6 | *** | 35.9 | 31.4 | | 40.1 | 26.6 | *** 47.0 30.1 |

(table continues)

Table 2, continued

| Characteristics | Cohort 1 (September 1997 - June 1998) | | Cohort 3 (January - June 1999) | | Cohort 4 (July 1999 - June 2002) | | Cohort 5 (July 2002 - June 2003) | |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian |
| Nonmarital Children without Paternity At Mother's W-2 Entry | | | | | | | | |
| N | 11,605 | 228 | 763 | 21 | 13,634 | 266 | 4,785 | 100 |
| Paternity Established By End of: | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | 17.7% | 32.5% | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 28.7 | 40.5 | 34.6% | 33.3% | | | | |
| 2000 | 37.7 | 43.6 | 51.5 | 61.9 | 14.1% | 20.7% | | |
| 2001 | 49.5 | 54.4 | 61.5 | 81.0 | 33.8 | 41.4 | | |
| 2002 | 54.7 | 60.5 | 66.6 | 81.0 | 54.8 | 61.3 | | |
| 2003 | 58.2 | 63.5 | 69.9 | 81.0 | 61.8 | 70.3 | 49.7% | 62.0% |
| 2004 | 59.9 | 64.8 | 71.7 | 85.7 | 64.7 | 77.4 | 59.9 | 72.0 |
| Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry | | | | | | | | |
| N | 10,552 | 280 | 732 | 33 | 983 | 261 | 3,842 | 93 |
| Paid Any Child Support in: | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | 50.4% | 60.0% | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 54.3 | 63.3 | 59.8% | 60.6% | | | | |
| 2000 | 57.6 | 65.0 | 63.7 | 69.7 | 49.0% | 53.6% | | |
| 2001 | 53.7 | 57.9 | 59.6 | 54.5 | 53.2 | 58.2 | | |
| 2002 | 52.2 | 55.0 | 57.2 | 66.7 | 55.6 | 57.5 | | |
| 2003 | 50.3 | 58.0 | 53.8 | 69.7 | 55.4 | 61.3 | 55.2% | 61.3% |
| 2004 | 49.8 | 57.3 | 53.1 | 60.6 | 54.2 | 60.2 | 56.1 | 63.4 |

(table continues)

Table 2, continued

| Characteristics | Cohort 1 (September 1997 - June 1998) | | Cohort 3 (January - June 1999) | | Cohort 4 (July 1999 - June 2002) | | Cohort 5 (July 2002 - June 2003) | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian |
| Total Child Support Paid in: | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | \$816.68 | \$796.37 | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 973.83 | 957.84 | \$1,265.69 | \$1,360.87 | | | | |
| 2000 | 1,004.61 | 985.03 | 1,468.55 | 1,379.16 | \$1057.84 | \$964.38 | | |
| 2001 | 1,027.19 | 1,060.69 | 1,559.26 | 1,128.12 | 1,287.97 | 1,099.38 | | |
| 2002 | 981.57 | 897.46 | 1,420.64 | 1,541.18 | 1,374.14 | 1,225.88 | | |
| 2003 | 974.13 | 911.48 | 1,341.00 | 1,530.22 | 1,441.36 | 1,314.29 | \$1,372.27 | \$1,009.14 |
| 2004 | 942.83 | 791.80 | 1,350.18 | 1,624.78 | 1,404.53 | 1,305.08 | 1,455.06 | 1,233.60 |
| Resident Mothers With SSN | | | | | | | | |
| N | 12,060 | 294 | 1,066 | 35 | 17,913 | 353 | 6,961 | 133 |
| Any Earnings in | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | 78.3% | 72.5% * | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 78.8 | 77.1 | 86.4% | 88.6% | | | | |
| 2000 | 76.2 | 77.6 | 84.5 | 85.7 | 77.8% | 80.7% | | |
| 2001 | 72.2 | 71.2 | 78.7 | 82.9 | 76.2 | 75.9 | | |
| 2002 | 67.2 | 66.4 | 74.6 | 80.0 | 71.7 | 72.0 | | |
| 2003 | 62.8 | 63.0 | 70.4 | 65.7 | 68.0 | 66.3 | 69.3% | 73.7% |
| 2004 | 61.6 | 59.6 | 68.1 | 68.6 | 66.1 | 61.5 | 69.5 | 75.2 |
| Total Earnings in | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | \$4,430.54 | \$3,687.94 * | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 6,127.70 | 5,259.14 * | \$4845.72 | \$2,768.26 * | | | | |
| 2000 | 6,915.18 | 6,100.58 | 7,382.88 | 5,044.51 | \$5,353.89 | \$4,311.04 ** | | |
| 2001 | 7,302.73 | 6,571.30 | 7,976.07 | 4,761.91 * | 5,458.60 | 4,199.53 *** | | |
| 2002 | 7,241.94 | 6,334.94 | 8,036.36 | 4,846.14 * | 5,886.66 | 5,097.61 * | | |
| 2003 | 7,292.00 | 6,069.77 * | 8,174.55 | 6,435.26 | 6,587.53 | 5,362.94 ** | \$4,497.86 | \$4,462.77 |
| 2004 | 7,383.74 | 6,161.59 * | 8,568.10 | 7,172.34 | 6,973.38 | 5,651.21 ** | 6,150.30 | 5,783.35 |

(table continues)

Table 2, continued

| Characteristics | Cohort 1 (September 1997 - June 1998) | | Cohort 3 (January - June 1999) | | Cohort 4 (July 1999 - June 2002) | | Cohort 5 (July 2002 - June 2003) | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian | Non-Indian | American Indian |
| Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry With SSN | | | | | | | | |
| N | 10,387 | 277 | 718 | 32 | 9,721 | 256 | 3,712 | 93 |
| Any Earnings in: | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | 45.8% | 61.3% *** | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 44.0 | 55.9 *** | 55.6% | 53.1% | | | | |
| 2000 | 54.5 | 67.6 *** | 61.7 | 53.1 | 62.1% | 67.6% | | |
| 2001 | 41.7 | 55.8 *** | 49.2 | 50.0 | 52.3 | 53.9 | | |
| 2002 | 37.8 | 49.8 *** | 47.1 | 50.0 | 48.6 | 48.8 | | |
| 2003 | 36.1 | 48.3 *** | 43.3 | 50.0 | 46.4 | 47.7 | 49.8% | 52.2% |
| 2004 | 35.9 | 45.1 ** | 43.0 | 43.8 | 46.0 | 47.3 | 48.0 | 52.2 |
| Total UI Earnings in: | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | \$5,858.87 | \$6,153.83 | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 6,203.32 | 6,643.24 | \$8,848.36 | \$6,448.81 | | | | |
| 2000 | 6,556.36 | 6,925.47 | 9,055.52 | 5,200.63 | \$8,865.95 | \$7,145.57 * | | |
| 2001 | 6,404.52 | 6,786.47 | 8,784.82 | 7,494.75 | 8,602.86 | 7,108.65 | | |
| 2002 | 6,131.90 | 6,348.58 | 8,614.32 | 8,575.09 | 8,554.48 | 7,393.97 | | |
| 2003 | 6,065.65 | 6,327.75 | 8,348.12 | 9,610.22 | 8,681.02 | 7,898.77 | \$8,840.10 | \$8,038.72 |
| 2004 | 6,387.78 | 6,514.44 | 8,594.95 | 9,256.09 | 9,126.61 | 7,810.13 | 9,222.38 | 7,781.99 |

* p<.10, **p<.01, ***p<.001

very young child (aged 0–2), but children’s ages are not significantly different in earlier cohorts. In Cohort 4, non-American Indian mothers are more likely to have been working all 8 quarters before entry, but this is not different in other cohorts. The mother’s age and whether child support has already been ordered at entry are not different in any of the cohorts.

Although, apart from the location of the cases, it is difficult to say that these differences between the American Indian and non-American Indian W-2 population are dramatic even when significant, it may be that even smaller differences between the two populations will result in differences in the way that American Indian cases have responded to the full pass-through and disregard policy.

The differences in initial characteristics are echoed by differences between Indian and non-Indian mothers in child support, public assistance, and work outcomes shown in Table 2, which focuses just on the cases receiving the full pass-through and disregard. The most significant differences appear in Cohorts 1 and 4, owing to the larger number of cases in those time periods. The biggest differences between the American Indian and non-Indian W-2 populations depend on whether they received any child support and whether they received W-2 cash assistance. American Indian mothers appear to be more likely to receive child support assistance (significant in most years for Cohorts 1 and 4), perhaps because the higher number of fathers established for Indian mothers at entry provides more opportunities for payments to be made. Receipt of any W-2 cash assistance was lower for almost all years for all cohorts except Cohort 3, and Food Stamps, Medicaid, and child care subsidies, also all had lower rates of usage by Indian mothers. Food stamp usage was significantly lower for all years in Cohort 1 cases but only sporadically in other cohorts; Medicaid was significantly lower only from 1999 to 2001 for Cohort 1 and in 2003 and 2004 for Cohort 5, but not at all in Cohorts 3 and 4. Child care subsidy use was significantly lower for American Indians in all years for Cohort 1, and for three years in Cohort 4. Even in the cohorts in which the differences are not significant, lower usage of all the programs by American Indian mothers is found consistently.

The higher receipt of child support for American Indian mothers may also be related to the higher rates of paternity establishment for their children. We find in Cohort 1 a faster movement to paternity establishment for the children of American Indian mothers which is significant for the first two years, although the children of non-American Indian mothers never fully catch up. In Cohorts 4 and 5 the significant differences in paternity establishment persist for all observed years.

The likelihood of having child support ordered for those nonresident fathers without an order when the mother enters W-2 is not significantly different for any cohorts, but is consistently higher for those fathers connected to American Indian mothers. Among those fathers whom had been legally established at entry, the likelihood of paying any of their owed child support is higher for the fathers with American Indian mother payees, but significantly so only in Cohort 1, and there are no significant differences in the amount of child support paid.

Interestingly, American Indian mothers generally have lower levels of employment (although only sporadically significant) and consistently lower earnings than do the non-Indian W-2 mothers, but the fathers of their children tended to have higher levels of employment and higher earnings compared to the fathers of non-American Indian mothers' children.

The lower levels of earnings of American Indian mothers along with the higher likelihood of child support receipt and the lower levels of Food Stamps, Medicaid/BadgerCare and child care subsidy usage combine to suggest that child support is an even more important resource for American Indian mothers than for non-American Indian mothers, but the amounts of child support they actually receive are no higher. Given that the earnings of the nonresident fathers connected with the American Indian mothers is actually higher than for other fathers, there may be room to improve the payment amounts for these fathers, but we do recognize that, while relatively higher, the reported earnings for these fathers are still quite low.

To examine the effects of the full pass-through and disregard on the American Indian population we follow the general method used in the CSDE Phase 2 final report. This method estimates the level of

outcome variables for cases assigned to the full pass-through and disregard (experimental cases) and those assigned to a partial pass-through and disregard (control cases). These estimates are generated using multivariate regressions (a probit regression for participation outcomes, an OLS regression for dollar amount outcomes) which control for some differences known to exist between the experimental and control groups in the larger population.

As mentioned above, the results of this comparison could be affected if mothers who were assigned to the partial pass-through and disregard treatment were more likely to not enter W-2 (either to participate in a Tribal TANF program or to forgo TANF altogether). Unfortunately we do not have records of Tribal TANF participation so we cannot dissect the reasons that cases might not enter W-2, but we can test whether control group cases were less likely to enter W-2 than experimental cases. In Appendix Table 2 we show the American Indian cases in Cohorts 1 and 3 both at assignment (when they learned what their pass-through and disregard treatment would be if they were to enter W-2) and at entry (when they actually started W-2). In Cohort 1, 44.7 percent (80 of 179) of control cases and 47.4 percent (294 of 620) of experimental cases entered W-2. This difference is not statistically significant. Similarly in Cohort 3 the likelihood of entering W-2 is not significantly different. This suggests that fears of cases diverting from W-2 based on their research group are not a concern. Appendix Table 1 also includes information on whether experimental and control cases differed in their initial characteristics, either at assignment or at W-2 entry. The only differences in Cohort 1 are in the earnings of an associated nonresident father in the 2 preceding years and in the mother's employment in the 2 preceding years. These differences exist in the assignment population as well as in the actual entering population, which indicates that they are random differences rather than differences created by cases diverting from W-2 based on their assignment. Even so, it is important to control for those differences.

Because of the smaller size of the American Indian population, it is not possible to include all controls used in the overall analyses of the full population presented in the CSDE Phase 1 and 2 final

reports⁵. The control variables that we include in the present analyses are (1) those in which we found differences in the American Indian population (months of pre-entry employment and levels of the pre-entry earnings of legally established fathers); (2) those in which earlier analyses had found differences in the overall population (higher child support history [a minimum of \$1,000 paid on the mother's behalf in the 12 months before W-2 entry], levels of AFDC experience in the 2 years before entry, and mother is at least 31 years old at baseline); and (3) a control for assignment regime⁶ (an indicator for different rates of random assignment). In addition, for the models predicting mothers' and children's outcomes we include an indicator of whether the mother already has a child support order at entry, and for the models predicting fathers' outcomes we include an indicator of cases being marital and the father's pre-entry earnings.

Table 3 shows the results of these regressions for annual outcomes from 1998 through 2004 for Cohort 1 cases⁷. In general the small number of American Indian cases makes it difficult to detect significant differences between the two assignment groups (there are only 374 mothers in Cohort 1). That said, we do find some significant differences in outcomes, although for most outcomes even these significant differences are rather sporadic.

The most consistent result showing significant differences is for the establishment of paternity for nonmarital children who do not already have paternity established at baseline. Among the 306 children of Cohort 1 American Indian mothers, we find a pronounced and sustained difference between the two groups, with the children in full pass-through and disregard cases less likely to get paternity established. This difference appears in 1999 and is then maintained through the observation period. The strength and

⁵ The Phase 2 report compared outcomes between experimental and control cases using a similar regression method as used here, but with a larger set of control variables in the regression. See Meyer and Cancian (2003), pp. 98-99 for the full list of variables used in that report.

⁶ Over the first three quarters of the CSDE evaluation cases were assigned to experimental and control status in different ratios over time. See Meyer and Cancian (2003) p. 81 for a complete explanation. The control for assignment regime accounts for these changing entry rates.

Table 3
Regression-Adjusted Predictions of Outcomes by Pass-Through Status for Cohort 1
American Indian Mother W-2 Participants

| | Experimental | Control | Diff. | P-value |
|--|--------------|---------|--------------|---------------|
| Nonmarital Children without Paternity At Mother's W-2 Entry | | | | |
| N | 228 | 60 | | |
| Paternity Established By End of: | | | | |
| 1998 | 29.5% | 32.3% | -2.9% | 0.7025 |
| 1999 | 38.5 | 56.8 | -18.3 | 0.0218 |
| 2000 | 41.9 | 62.4 | -20.5 | 0.0106 |
| 2001 | 53.2 | 78.8 | -25.5 | 0.0008 |
| 2002 | 60.2 | 79.9 | -19.7 | 0.0071 |
| 2003 | 63.5 | 86.1 | -22.6 | 0.0013 |
| 2004 | 65.0 | 85.7 | -20.7 | 0.003 |
| Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry | | | | |
| N | 280 | 91 | | |
| Paid Any Child Support in: | | | | |
| 1998 | 62.4 | 58.3% | 4.1% | 0.5219 |
| 1999 | 64.1 | 57.2 | 6.8 | 0.273 |
| 2000 | 65.3 | 58.4 | 6.9 | 0.2632 |
| 2001 | 58.4 | 58.6 | -0.3 | 0.9662 |
| 2002 | 54.7 | 60.9 | -6.2 | 0.3245 |
| 2003 | 57.8 | 61.1 | -3.4 | 0.5882 |
| 2004 | 57.6 | 57.4 | 0.2 | 0.9787 |
| Total Child Support Paid in: | | | | |
| 1998 | \$808 | \$879 | -\$71 | 0.6404 |
| 1999 | 978 | 931 | 47 | 0.7923 |
| 2000 | 1,001 | 889 | 112 | 0.5995 |
| 2001 | 1,054 | 1,038 | 16 | 0.9425 |
| 2002 | 896 | 1,061 | -166 | 0.3939 |
| 2003 | 900 | 1,177 | -277 | 0.1783 |
| 2004 | 785 | 1,380 | -594 | 0.002 |
| Resident Mothers | | | | |
| N | 294 | 80 | | |
| Received Any Child Support in | | | | |
| 1998 | 51.9% | 51.0% | 0.8% | 0.9082 |
| 1999 | 56.1 | 53.5 | 2.7 | 0.6975 |
| 2000 | 58.1 | 59.1 | -1.0 | 0.8764 |
| 2001 | 52.3 | 61.6 | -9.3 | 0.1624 |
| 2002 | 56.0 | 65.1 | -9.0 | 0.167 |
| 2003 | 58.9 | 60.3 | -1.4 | 0.8275 |
| 2004 | 57.2 | 60.8 | -3.7 | 0.5769 |

(table continues)

Table 3, continued

| | Experimental | Control | Diff. | P-value |
|---|--------------|---------|-------------|---------------|
| Total Child Support Received in: | | | | |
| 1998 | \$713 | \$546 | \$167 | 0.2147 |
| 1999 | 895 | 783 | 112 | 0.646 |
| 2000 | 1,129 | 983 | 147 | 0.5241 |
| 2001 | 1,234 | 1,139 | 95 | 0.7181 |
| 2002 | 1,184 | 1,232 | -48 | 0.8517 |
| 2003 | 1,243 | 1,454 | -211 | 0.4568 |
| 2004 | 1,207 | 1,581 | -375 | 0.1869 |
| Received Any W-2 Cash Assistance in: | | | | |
| 1998 | 63.8% | 64.3% | -0.6% | 0.9308 |
| 1999 | 29.4 | 32.8 | -3.4 | 0.5799 |
| 2000 | 16.6 | 20.7 | -4.1 | 0.4282 |
| 2001 | 12.0 | 13.2 | -1.2 | 0.7878 |
| 2002 | 9.3 | 8.4 | 0.9 | 0.8093 |
| 2003 | 8.5 | 12.3 | -3.7 | 0.3367 |
| 2004 | 2.4 | 3.3 | -0.8 | 0.6221 |
| Received Any Food Stamps in: | | | | |
| 1998 | 90.0% | 90.9% | -0.9% | 0.8118 |
| 1999 | 71.4 | 79.1 | -7.7 | 0.1933 |
| 2000 | 64.0 | 67.7 | -3.7 | 0.5573 |
| 2001 | 65.3 | 61.1 | 4.1 | 0.5135 |
| 2002 | 62.6 | 60.9 | 1.6 | 0.7975 |
| 2003 | 64.4 | 61.7 | 2.7 | 0.6708 |
| 2004 | 62.5 | 64.0 | -1.6 | 0.8043 |
| Enrolled in Medicaid or BadgerCare in: | | | | |
| 1998 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.941 |
| 1999 | 85.6 | 93.2 | -7.5 | 0.0772 |
| 2000 | 80.4 | 78.7 | 1.7 | 0.7461 |
| 2001 | 77.3 | 76.4 | 0.8 | 0.8775 |
| 2002 | 75.8 | 76.2 | -0.4 | 0.9397 |
| 2003 | 76.1 | 74.3 | 1.8 | 0.7533 |
| 2004 | 74.2 | 72.6 | 1.6 | 0.7837 |
| Had Child Care Subsidies Paid By Wisconsin Shares program in: | | | | |
| 1998 | 32.2% | 31.1% | 1.1% | 0.8607 |
| 1999 | 27.7 | 24.5 | 3.2 | 0.5832 |
| 2000 | 25.2 | 24.3 | 0.9 | 0.8746 |
| 2001 | 20.8 | 19.7 | 1.0 | 0.8463 |
| 2002 | 16.2 | 16.0 | 0.2 | 0.9717 |
| 2003 | 14.7 | 15.6 | -0.9 | 0.8553 |
| 2004 | 15.2 | 15.5 | -0.2 | 0.9589 |

(table continues)

Table 3, continued

| | Experimental | Control | Diff. | P-value |
|---|--------------|---------|--------|---------|
| Resident Mothers With SSN | | | | |
| N | 294 | 80 | | |
| Any Earnings in | | | | |
| 1998 | 93.9% | 95.8% | -1.9% | 0.3771 |
| 1999 | 79.4 | 81.0 | -1.7 | 0.7558 |
| 2000 | 79.2 | 74.9 | 4.3 | 0.4449 |
| 2001 | 71.9 | 67.9 | 4.0 | 0.5119 |
| 2002 | 67.5 | 61.0 | 6.5 | 0.3045 |
| 2003 | 63.7 | 57.0 | 6.6 | 0.311 |
| 2004 | 60.2 | 53.9 | 6.3 | 0.3448 |
| Total Earnings in | | | | |
| 1998 | \$3,734 | \$3,614 | \$120 | 0.832 |
| 1999 | 5,265 | 5,250 | 15 | 0.9838 |
| 2000 | 6,136 | 5,767 | 369 | 0.6642 |
| 2001 | 6,566 | 6,033 | 533 | 0.5909 |
| 2002 | 6,362 | 5,802 | 560 | 0.5884 |
| 2003 | 6,046 | 5,464 | 582 | 0.5728 |
| 2004 | 6,192 | 6,328 | -136 | 0.9061 |
| Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry With SSN | | | | |
| N | 277 | 89 | | |
| Any Earnings in: | | | | |
| 1998 | 62.8% | 56.1% | 6.7% | 0.2941 |
| 1999 | 56.8 | 62.8 | -6.0 | 0.3422 |
| 2000 | 68.7 | 66.4 | 2.3 | 0.7031 |
| 2001 | 56.0 | 55.9 | 0.1 | 0.9916 |
| 2002 | 49.6 | 50.7 | -1.1 | 0.8597 |
| 2003 | 48.2 | 49.3 | -1.1 | 0.867 |
| 2004 | 44.9 | 52.7 | -7.8 | 0.2279 |
| Total UI Earnings in: | | | | |
| 1998 | \$6,370 | \$6,406 | -\$36 | 0.9713 |
| 1999 | 6,805 | 7,275 | -470 | 0.6836 |
| 2000 | 7,136 | 7,708 | -572 | 0.6306 |
| 2001 | 6,916 | 8,366 | -1,450 | 0.2607 |
| 2002 | 6,435 | 7,385 | -950 | 0.478 |
| 2003 | 6,391 | 7,677 | -1,286 | 0.3417 |
| 2004 | 6,613 | 8,806 | -2,193 | 0.1398 |

Notes: Regression Adjusted predicted probabilities are derived from a probit model, Predicted dollar amounts derived from an OLS model. P<.10 considered significant (marked as bold).

duration of the negative effects of the full pass-through and disregard on paternity establishment appear to be unique to this American Indian sample. This difference persisted even when a much longer set of control variables was added to the models, so they do not appear to be related to any observable biases in the sample. Nor are the differences concentrated in any particular county⁸.

One possible explanation for the unexpected differences in paternity establishment is that early in the W-2 program, family courts may have less likely to act in full pass-through and disregard cases where the mother herself was not interested in pursuing child support, on the premise that there was no state interest in those cases. Some evidence (Kaplan and Corbett, 2001) for this occurring was reported from Milwaukee County, although the finding here is not limited to Milwaukee. If courts outside Milwaukee, especially tribal courts, made similar distinctions in paternity cases, this could explain the negative effects on paternity establishment in the American Indian population.

The amount of child support paid shows a negative effect of the full pass-through and disregard on the total amount of child support paid by fathers in 2004 only. This difference is somewhat anomalous, since it occurs only after the partial pass-through and disregard policy has been discontinued and all cases have been moved to the same policy. Given the fact that there was not a significant difference in child support paid during the years when the policy differences were in effect, it seems most probable that this difference is the result of random chance rather than a true effect of the policy.

The difficulty of finding strong effects is exacerbated by the limited effect of the partial pass-through and disregard treatment. We can see this even in the expected mechanical effect on the total amount of child support received by the mothers in the American Indian sample. The effect on total child support received is \$167 in 1998 and stays around \$100 through 2001 (the evaluation ended in June

⁷Appendix Table 2 shows the estimates for experimental and control group outcomes among Cohort 3 cases. The small number of American Indian cases in Cohort 3 makes detecting differences in outcomes difficult, so we have concentrated our analysis on Cohort 1.

⁸Re-running the analyses excluding cases from Shawano, Forest, and Bayfield Counties (the sites of service areas for the four Tribal TANF programs in effect from 1997) did not change this result.

2002), but even this difference does not reach statistical significance. This highlights the point that the small sample sizes involved make detecting significant differences difficult.

It is also important to recognize that level of participation in W-2 cash assistance for these mothers drops off quite quickly. W-2 cash assistance moves from around 60 percent in 1999 to 30 percent in 2001 to around 10 percent in 2002 and 2003. Given that the partial pass-through and disregard status has an effect only when participants are receiving cash assistance, it would not be surprising for effects to be small. In addition, after June 2002 the evaluation was ended and all cases were subject to the full pass-through and disregard policy; differences in outcomes after that point would only result from persistent behavioral or economic changes instilled by the experimental treatments.

Beyond the effect on paternity establishment, the only other significant effect of the full pass-through and disregard is a greater movement of mothers off of Medicaid and BadgerCare in 1999. The largest effect of the policy on the use of medical insurance programs occurs in 1999, at the same time as the largest effect on Food Stamps use, although the latter difference is not statistically significant.

Given the year-to-year variability in most of these results, the small sample sizes which may lead to differences being driven by just a few cases, and the lack of strong reasons to expect that the experimental effects would be powerful with such a limited exposure, it is hard to have much confidence that the findings from these models present definitive trends. Generally speaking, however, there does seem to be a tendency for more negative effects of the full pass-through and disregard policy on our child support outcomes than was found in the full population results shown in the CSDE Phase 2 final report.

5. SUMMARY

The American Indian W-2 population is a small component of the total W-2 population and, because of its small size, it does not present the ideal ground for exploring the effects of an experimental evaluation. Nonetheless, our results indicate that this population is substantially different from the non-Indian W-2 population. The American Indian population is unique in that tribal members of most Wisconsin tribes have the option of participating in the W-2 program through a county agency, or of

using their tribe's program which would remove them from our observed population. The scope and availability of these tribal TANF programs vary by tribe, and it is difficult to know the extent to which W-2 participants may drop out to use these tribal programs.

Looking at the demographics of the Indian W-2 population, it appears to enter W-2 with more children and more fathers of those children than in the regular W-2 population. The two populations do not differ greatly in levels of education or previous employment, but American Indian W-2 mothers do have a history of receiving more child support than do other mothers and are more likely to come onto W-2 in an upper tier or Caretaker of Newborn slot.

Indian mothers on W-2 continue to be more likely to receive child support and less likely to participate in the Food Stamps, Medicaid/BadgerCare, and child care subsidy programs. Given that American Indian mothers are more likely to have come in with previous experience of child support and to be somewhat older, they have had more opportunity for the child support system to enforce obligations against their noncustodial partners. Although the American Indian mothers have generally better outcomes on child support and lower usage of public assistance, they do not fare as well as the overall W-2 population on the amounts of earnings they have in years after entering W-2. Given that there are not large differences in the likelihood of having some employment, this may reflect that American Indian mothers are more likely to be in rural areas where salaries are lower.

The comparison of the pass-through and disregard policies among the American Indian W-2 population is less enlightening due to the small sample size. Most outcomes do not differ significantly by pass-through and disregard policy. One exception is a persistent negative relationship between the full pass-through and disregard and paternity establishment for nonmarital children. This negative effect is in the opposite direction of that seen in the overall population, does not appear to be the result of any biases in the sample, and may reflect differences in the way full pass-through and disregard cases were handled by family courts, or may simply be the result of random variation in this small sample.

References

- Ashley, Rachele, Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development. 2006. Information from correspondence, January 4, 2006.
- Bishaw, Alexander and John Iceland. 2003. *Poverty: 1999*. Census 2000 Brief C2KBR/19. Washington, DC, Bureau of the Census.
- Kaplan, Thomas and Thomas Corbett. 2001. "W-2 Child Support Demonstration Evaluation Technical Report 2: Implementation of the Demonstration". In Volume 3 of Meyer, Daniel R. and Maria Cancian. 2001. *W-2 Child Support Demonstration Evaluation Phase 1: Final Report*. Madison, WI: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin–Madison, April.
- Meyer, Daniel R. and Maria Cancian. 2001. *W-2 Child Support Demonstration Evaluation Phase 1: Final Report*. Madison, WI: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin–Madison, April.
- Meyer, Daniel R. and Maria Cancian. 2003. *W-2 Child Support Demonstration Evaluation Phase 2: Final Report*. Madison, WI: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin–Madison, July.
- Kauffman and Associates. 2002. *Welfare Reform and American Indian Tribes: Critical Decisions for the Future of Indian Families: Case Studies*. Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, Menlo Park, CA.
- Ogunwole, Stella, C. 2002. *The American Indian and Alaska Native Population: 2000*. Census 2000 Brief C2KBR/01-15. Washington, DC, Bureau of the Census.
- Thornton, Russell. 1997. "Tribal membership requirements and the demography of 'old' and 'new' Native Americans." *Population Research and Policy Review* 16(1–2, April): 33–42.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2003. *2000 Census of Population and Housing, Characteristics of American Indians and Alaska Natives by Tribe and Language: 2000* PHC-5. Washington, DC.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2002. "Characteristics of Tribal TANF Programs, as of October 1, 2002." (www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/dts/ttanchar_1002.htm).
- Wisconsin Department of Administration, 2006. *Tribes of Wisconsin*. February 2006. (<ftp://doafp04.doa.state.wi.us/doadocs/tribesofwisconsin2006.pdf>)

**Appendix Table 1
Wisconsin Tribes and Tribal Programs**

| Tribes | Total Membership* | Population on Reservation or Trust Lands (2000) | | Served As W-2 Agency Dates | Tribal TANF Program | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | Total | American Indian | | Dates | TANF Service Area |
| Bad River Band (Chippewa) | 6,945 | 1,411 | 1,124 | 9/1/1997–12/31/2001 | 1/1/2002 to present | Reservation |
| Forest County Potawatomi | 1,250 | 513 | 489 | | 7/1/1997 to present | Forest County |
| Ho-Chunk | 6,563 | 960 | 853 | | | |
| Lac Courte Oreilles (Chippewa) | 6,154 | 2,900 | 2,179 | | | |
| Lac du Flambeau (Chippewa) | 3,279 | 2,995 | 1,797 | 9/1/1997–12/31/1999 | 1/1/2000 to present | Reservation |
| Menominee | 8,181 | 3,225 | 3,088 | | 4/1/2004 to present | Reservation |
| Stockbridge Munsee (Mohican) | 1,565 | 1,527 | 807 | | 10/1/1997 to present | Reservation |
| Oneida | 15,336 | 21,321 | 3,602 | 9/1/1997–4/30/2003 | 5/1/2003 to present | Reservation |
| Red Cliff (Chippewa) | 5,312 | 1,078 | 937 | | 10/1/1997 to present | Bayfield County |
| St. Croix (Chippewa) | 1,031 | 641 | 577 | | | |
| Mole Lake Sokaogon (Chippewa) | 1,261 | 392 | 336 | | 10/1/1997 to present | Reservation |

* Total Membership includes members not living on reservation land (both in and outside Wisconsin).
Population figures from "Tribes of Wisconsin" (2006).
W-2 and Tribal TANF information from Rachele Ashley, DWD and U.S. DHHS (2002)

Appendix Table 2
Initial Characteristics of the Experimental and Control Groups in the American Indian W-2 Population

| | Characteristics at Assignment | | | | Characteristics at W-2 Entry | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|---|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|----|
| | Cohort 1 (Assigned 8/31/97-7/8/98) | | Cohort 3 (Assigned 1/1/99-7/2/99) | | Cohort 1 (Assigned 8/31/97-7/8/98) | | Cohort 3 (Assigned 1/1/99-7/2/99) | | |
| | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental | |
| All Randomly Assigned Cases | | | | | All Research Sample Mother Cases | | | | |
| N | 179 | 620 | 60 | 61 | N | 80 | 294 | 25 | 35 |
| Case Type | | | | | | | | | |
| AFDC Transfer | 57% | 61% | | | 75% | 68% | | | |
| New W-2 Case | 43 | 38 | 100% | 100% | 25 | 32 | 100% | 100% | |
| | Prob(χ^2) = 0.230 | | Prob(χ^2) = N/A | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.118 | | Prob(χ^2) = N/A | | |
| AFDC Receipt in Two Years... | | | | | | | | | |
| Before Assignment | | | | | Before W-2 Entry | | | | |
| None | 16 | 15 | 75 | 90 | 8 | 13 | 84 | 91 | |
| 1-18 Months | 43 | 45 | 25 | 10 | 42 | 42 | 16 | 9 | |
| 19-24 Months | 41 | 40 | | | 50 | 45 | | | |
| | Prob(χ^2) = 0.805 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.028 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.264 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.377 | | |
| Initial W-2 Slot | | | | | | | | | |
| Did Not Start W-2 | 34 | 36 | 32 | 30 | | | | | |
| W-2 Transition | 10 | 11 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 16 | 14 | |
| Community Service Job | 27 | 25 | 25 | 16 | 39 | 37 | 32 | 26 | |
| Caretaker of Newborn | 4 | 5 | 23 | 26 | 6 | 8 | 48 | 43 | |
| Upper Tier | 24 | 23 | 7 | 11 | 41 | 40 | 4 | 17 | |
| | Prob(χ^2) = 0.913 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.700 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.807 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.480 | | |

(table continues)

Appendix Table 2, continued

| | Characteristics at Assignment | | | | Characteristics at W-2 Entry | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| | Cohort 1 (Assigned 8/31/97-7/8/98) | | Cohort 3 (Assigned 1/1/99-7/2/99) | | Cohort 1 (Assigned 8/31/97-7/8/98) | | Cohort 3 (Assigned 1/1/99-7/2/99) | |
| | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental |
| Location of W-2 Agency at Assignment | | | | | | | | |
| Milwaukee County | 28 | 26 | 17 | 28 | 38 | 31 | 8 | 26 |
| Other Urban Counties | 13 | 11 | 12 | 16 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 14 |
| Rural Counties | 40 | 40 | 37 | 25 | 39 | 44 | 20 | 17 |
| Tribal W-2 Agency | 20 | 23 | 35 | 31 | 16 | 15 | 64 | 43 |
| | Prob(χ^2) = 0.645 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.289 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.422 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.229 | |
| Age of Resident Parent | | | | | | | | |
| At Assignment | | | | At W-2 Entry | | | | |
| Missing | 18 | 16 | 7 | 15 | | | | |
| 16-17 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | | | |
| 18-25 | 31 | 38 | 42 | 38 | 33 | 43 | 60 | 46 |
| 26-30 | 22 | 19 | 20 | 30 | 24 | 21 | 20 | 26 |
| 31+ | 29 | 27 | 30 | 18 | 43 | 36 | 20 | 29 |
| | Prob(χ^2) = 0.128 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.208 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.241 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.637 | |
| Education of Resident Parent | | | | | | | | |
| Less Than HS | | | | | 44 | 48 | 48 | 49 |
| HS Diploma | | | | | 44 | 44 | 36 | 37 |
| Beyond HS | | | | | 12 | 8 | 16 | 14 |
| Missing | | | | | 0 | 0 | | |
| | | | | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.406 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.983 | |

(table continues)

Appendix Table 2, continued

| | Characteristics at Assignment | | | | Characteristics at W-2 Entry | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| | Cohort 1 (Assigned 8/31/97-7/8/98) | | Cohort 3 (Assigned 1/1/99-7/2/99) | | Cohort 1 (Assigned 8/31/97-7/8/98) | | Cohort 3 (Assigned 1/1/99-7/2/99) | | |
| | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental | |
| Number of Children | | | | | | | | | |
| At Assignment | | | | | At W-2 Entry | | | | |
| None | 2 | 2 | 0 | 7 | | | | | |
| One | 20 | 24 | 28 | 34 | 19 | 28 | 52 | 43 | |
| Two | 26 | 30 | 22 | 21 | 31 | 29 | 16 | 20 | |
| Three or More | 52 | 44 | 50 | 38 | 50 | 44 | 32 | 37 | |
| | Prob(χ^2) = 0.129 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.149 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.145 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.779 | | |
| Age of Youngest Child at Assignment | | | | | | | | | |
| At Assignment | | | | | At W-2 Entry | | | | |
| Unborn Child | 16 | 12 | 13 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 3 | |
| 0-2 | 36 | 41 | 48 | 46 | 44 | 49 | 64 | 69 | |
| 3-5 | 17 | 17 | 13 | 23 | 22 | 18 | 12 | 11 | |
| 6-12 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 15 | 21 | 19 | 12 | 14 | |
| 13-18 | 11 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 3 | |
| Missing Birth Date | 2 | 2 | 0 | 7 | | | | | |
| | Prob(χ^2) = 0.435 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.173 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.748 | | Prob(χ^2) = 0.618 | | |

(table continues)

Appendix Table 2, continued

| | Characteristics at Assignment | | | | Characteristics at W-2 Entry | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| | Cohort 1 (Assigned 8/31/97-7/8/98) | | Cohort 3 (Assigned 1/1/99-7/2/99) | | Cohort 1 (Assigned 8/31/97-7/8/98) | | Cohort 3 (Assigned 1/1/99-7/2/99) | | |
| | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental | Control | Experimental | |
| Average Annual Earnings of Highest Earning Nonresident Parent Over Two Years... | | | | | | | | | |
| Before Assignment | | | | | Before W-2 Entry | | | | |
| None | 13 | 15 | 20 | 18 | 8 | 10 | 20 | 14 | |
| \$1,000–\$5,000 | 40 | 38 | 37 | 31 | 43 | 44 | 32 | 40 | |
| \$5,000–\$15,000 | 21 | 26 | 20 | 23 | 26 | 28 | 16 | 23 | |
| \$15,000–\$25,000 | 16 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 17 | 8 | 12 | 6 | |
| \$25,000 or More | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 9 | |
| No Nonresident Parent | 7 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 9 | |
| | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.042 | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.902 | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.085 | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.941 | |
| Child Support Paid in Year ... | | | | | | | | | |
| Before Assignment | | | | | Before W-2 Entry | | | | |
| None | 52 | 56 | 60 | 57 | 68 | 67 | 68 | 71 | |
| \$1–\$999 | 24 | 24 | 18 | 13 | 17 | 20 | 20 | 17 | |
| \$1000 or More | 24 | 20 | 22 | 30 | 15 | 13 | 12 | 11 | |
| | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.370 | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.526 | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.591 | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.954 | |
| Quarters of Employment in Two Years ... | | | | | | | | | |
| Before Assignment | | | | | Before W-2 Entry | | | | |
| None | 13 | 20 | 17 | 18 | 11 | 20 | 16 | 17 | |
| 1–4 Quarters | 53 | 42 | 28 | 36 | 56 | 43 | 28 | 40 | |
| 5–7 Quarters | 20 | 28 | 37 | 28 | 24 | 29 | 32 | 23 | |
| 8 Quarters | 14 | 10 | 18 | 18 | 9 | 8 | 24 | 20 | |
| | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.00 | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.72 | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.03 | Prob(χ^2)= | 0.76 | |

P<.10 considered significant (marked as bold)

Appendix Table 3
Regression Adjusted¹ Predictions of Outcomes, By Pass-Through Status for Cohort 3
American Indian Mother W-2 Participants

| | Experimental | Control | Diff. | P-value |
|--|--------------|---------|-------|---------|
| Nonmarital Children without Paternity At Mother's W-2 Entry | | | | |
| N | 21 | 13 | | |
| Paternity Established By End of: | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | |
| 1999 | 0.2% | 1.3% | -1.1% | 0.2797 |
| 2000 | 65.9 | 59.8 | 6.1 | 0.7894 |
| 2001 | 94.2 | 90.4 | 3.8 | 0.6703 |
| 2002 | 94.2 | 90.4 | 3.8 | 0.6703 |
| 2003 | 94.2 | 90.4 | 3.8 | 0.6703 |
| 2004 | 96.0 | 90.4 | 5.6 | 0.4824 |
| Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry | | | | |
| N | 33 | 20 | | |
| Paid Any Child Support in: | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | |
| 1999 | 63.7% | 68.8% | -5.1% | 0.7668 |
| 2000 | 75.9 | 61.5 | 14.4 | 0.4301 |
| 2001 | 55.8 | 68.1 | -12.3 | 0.4714 |
| 2002 | 70.2 | 46.0 | 24.2 | 0.1761 |
| 2003 | 72.6 | 49.5 | 23.0 | 0.1514 |
| 2004 | 62.3 | 38.6 | 23.7 | 0.1466 |
| Total Child Support Paid in: | | | | |
| 1998 | \$1,398 | \$914 | \$484 | 0.2702 |
| 1999 | 1,398 | 914 | 484 | 0.2702 |
| 2000 | 1,384 | 1,519 | -135 | 0.8138 |
| 2001 | 1,116 | 1,518 | -403 | 0.5337 |
| 2002 | 1,549 | 1,012 | 537 | 0.4058 |
| 2003 | 1,546 | 860 | 686 | 0.3285 |
| 2004 | 1,638 | 783 | 855 | 0.2604 |
| Resident Mothers | | | | |
| N | 35 | 25 | | |
| Received Any Child Support in: | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | |
| 1999 | 72.5% | 73.6% | -1.1% | 0.934 |
| 2000 | 56.9 | 45.4 | 11.5 | 0.4579 |
| 2001 | 52.4 | 56.4 | -3.9 | 0.7896 |
| 2002 | 58.8 | 49.5 | 9.3 | 0.5151 |
| 2003 | 65.2 | 47.8 | 17.4 | 0.2162 |
| 2004 | 62.1 | 49.9 | 12.1 | 0.3932 |

(table continues)

Appendix Table 3, continued

| | Experimental | Control | Diff. | P-value |
|---|--------------|---------|-------------|---------------|
| Total Child Support Received in: | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | |
| 1999 | \$998 | \$795 | \$204 | 0.5437 |
| 2000 | 1,263 | 1,507 | -244 | 0.6296 |
| 2001 | 1,387 | 1,441 | -54 | 0.9262 |
| 2002 | 1,958 | 1,240 | 718 | 0.2827 |
| 2003 | 1,862 | 1,477 | 385 | 0.5843 |
| 2004 | 1,757 | 1,136 | 620 | 0.3479 |
| Received Any W-2 Cash Assistance in: | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | |
| 1999 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | . |
| 2000 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | . |
| 2001 | 28.0 | 3.4 | 24.6 | 0.0186 |
| 2002 | 29.6 | 7.4 | 22.2 | 0.0417 |
| 2003 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | . |
| 2004 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.131 |
| Received Any Food Stamps in: | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | |
| 1999 | 99.2% | 99.6% | -0.5% | 0.5224 |
| 2000 | 69.4 | 65.6 | 3.7 | 0.7696 |
| 2001 | 65.8 | 49.3 | 16.5 | 0.2174 |
| 2002 | 74.1 | 48.3 | 25.8 | 0.0584 |
| 2003 | 63.6 | 50.3 | 13.3 | 0.3227 |
| 2004 | 63.3 | 49.5 | 13.7 | 0.3043 |
| Enrolled in Medicaid or BadgerCare in: | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | |
| 1999 | 90.8% | 92.1% | -1.3% | 0.8647 |
| 2000 | 90.8 | 92.1 | -1.3 | 0.8647 |
| 2001 | 95.4 | 84.9 | 10.5 | 0.0911 |
| 2002 | 98.9 | 96.2 | 2.7 | 0.2129 |
| 2003 | 92.9 | 82.1 | 10.9 | 0.1566 |
| 2004 | 81.8 | 62.4 | 19.4 | 0.1284 |
| Had Child Care Subsidies Paid By Wisconsin Shares program in: | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | |
| 1999 | 25.1% | 33.0% | -7.9% | 0.5293 |
| 2000 | 32.8 | 39.0 | -6.3 | 0.6554 |
| 2001 | 33.1 | 37.0 | -3.9 | 0.7782 |
| 2002 | 38.5 | 29.7 | 8.8 | 0.5119 |
| 2003 | 32.8 | 15.1 | 17.7 | 0.1697 |
| 2004 | 9.1 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.9958 |

(table continues)

Appendix Table 3, continued

| | Experimental | Control | Diff. | P-value |
|---|--------------|---------|---------------|---------------|
| Resident Mothers With SSN | | | | |
| N | 35 | 25 | | |
| Any Earnings in | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | |
| 1999 | 97.2% | 85.9% | 11.3% | 0.0431 |
| 2000 | 100.0 | 99.9 | 0.1 | 0.4628 |
| 2001 | 99.2 | 98.9 | 0.2 | 0.8406 |
| 2002 | 82.2 | 61.9 | 20.3 | 0.0997 |
| 2003 | 67.2 | 64.1 | 3.0 | 0.8164 |
| 2004 | 70.7 | 68.6 | 2.0 | 0.8743 |
| Total Earnings in | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | |
| 1999 | \$2,768 | \$4,258 | -\$1,490 | 0.1876 |
| 2000 | 5,050 | 7,219 | -2,168 | 0.2561 |
| 2001 | 4,770 | 8,813 | -4,043 | 0.0421 |
| 2002 | 4,785 | 7,199 | -2,414 | 0.2549 |
| 2003 | 6,427 | 6,596 | -169 | 0.9415 |
| 2004 | 7,139 | 5,481 | 1,658 | 0.4578 |
| Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry With SSN | | | | |
| N | 32 | 20 | | |
| Any Earnings in: | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | |
| 1999 | 78.7% | 84.7% | -6.0% | 0.6316 |
| 2000 | 77.3 | 83.3 | -6.0 | 0.6402 |
| 2001 | 76.0 | 86.5 | -10.5 | 0.386 |
| 2002 | 52.7 | 52.1 | 0.6 | 0.9715 |
| 2003 | 56.2 | 35.7 | 20.5 | 0.2545 |
| 2004 | 45.3 | 47.2 | -1.9 | 0.9164 |
| Total UI Earnings in: | | | | |
| 1998 | \$6,867 | \$6,807 | \$60 | 0.9784 |
| 1999 | 6,867 | 6,807 | 60 | 0.9784 |
| 2000 | 5,412 | 6,693 | -1,280 | 0.4862 |
| 2001 | 7,695 | 5,905 | 1,790 | 0.487 |
| 2002 | 8,734 | 4,904 | 3,830 | 0.187 |
| 2003 | 9,846 | 5,839 | 4,007 | 0.2553 |
| 2004 | 9,505 | 5,762 | 3,743 | 0.3186 |