

**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 1999<sup>1</sup>, and cases remained subject to their assigned treatment through June 2002 when all cases were moved to full pass-through and disregard status.<sup>2</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup>Random 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.

<sup>2</sup>A 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)<sup>3</sup>. Outcomes are also observed for Cohort

---

<sup>3</sup>Cohort 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( $\chi^2$ ) = <.0001				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = <.0001				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = <.0001				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = <.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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.003				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.023				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = <.0001				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.032				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.016				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.0003				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.005				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.355				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.027				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.889				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.196				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.183				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = <b>0.024</b>	
<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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.361				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.226				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = <b>0.042</b>				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 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( $\chi^2$ ) = <b>0.001</b>				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.352				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.515				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.370				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.943				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.062				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.159				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.494				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.351				Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 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 tier<sup>4</sup>. 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

---

<sup>4</sup> 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		
<b>Resident Mothers</b>										
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
<b>Nonmarital Children without Paternity At Mother's W-2 Entry</b>								
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
<b>Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry</b>								
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
<b>Total Child Support Paid in:</b>								
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
<b>Resident Mothers With SSN</b>								
N	12,060	294	1,066	35	17,913	353	6,961	133
<b>Any Earnings in</b>								
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
<b>Total Earnings in</b>								
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
<b>Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry With SSN</b>								
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

reports<sup>5</sup>. 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 regime<sup>6</sup> (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 cases<sup>7</sup>. 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

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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
<b>Nonmarital Children without Paternity At Mother's W-2 Entry</b>				
N	228	60		
Paternity Established By End of:				
1998	29.5%	32.3%	-2.9%	0.7025
1999	38.5	56.8	<b>-18.3</b>	<b>0.0218</b>
2000	41.9	62.4	<b>-20.5</b>	<b>0.0106</b>
2001	53.2	78.8	<b>-25.5</b>	<b>0.0008</b>
2002	60.2	79.9	<b>-19.7</b>	<b>0.0071</b>
2003	63.5	86.1	<b>-22.6</b>	<b>0.0013</b>
2004	65.0	85.7	<b>-20.7</b>	<b>0.003</b>
<b>Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry</b>				
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	<b>-594</b>	<b>0.002</b>
<b>Resident Mothers</b>				
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	<b>-7.5</b>	<b>0.0772</b>
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
<b>Resident Mothers With SSN</b>				
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
<b>Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry With SSN</b>				
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 county<sup>8</sup>.

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

---

<sup>7</sup>Appendix 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.

<sup>8</sup>Re-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, Rachelle, 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](http://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	
<b>All Randomly Assigned Cases</b>					<b>All Research Sample Mother Cases</b>				
N	179	620	60	61	N	80	294	25	35
<b>Case Type</b>									
AFDC Transfer	57%	61%			75%	68%			
New W-2 Case	43	38	100%	100%	25	32	100%	100%	
	Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.230		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = N/A		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.118		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = N/A		
<b>AFDC Receipt in Two Years...</b>									
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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.805		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = <b>0.028</b>		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.264		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.377		
<b>Initial W-2 Slot</b>									
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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.913		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.700		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.807		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 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
<b>Location of W-2 Agency at Assignment</b>								
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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.645		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.289		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.422		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.229	
<b>Age of Resident Parent</b>								
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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.128		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.208		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.241		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.637	
<b>Education of Resident Parent</b>								
Less Than HS					44	48	48	49
HS Diploma					44	44	36	37
Beyond HS					12	8	16	14
Missing					0	0		
					Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.406		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 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	
<b>Number of Children</b>									
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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.129		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.149		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.145		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.779		
<b>Age of Youngest Child at Assignment</b>									
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( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.435		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.173		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.748		Prob( $\chi^2$ ) = 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	
<b>Average Annual Earnings of Highest Earning Nonresident Parent Over Two Years...</b>									
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( $\chi^2$ )=	<b>0.042</b>	Prob( $\chi^2$ )=	0.902	Prob( $\chi^2$ )=	<b>0.085</b>	Prob( $\chi^2$ )=	0.941	
<b>Child Support Paid in Year ...</b>									
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( $\chi^2$ )=	0.370	Prob( $\chi^2$ )=	0.526	Prob( $\chi^2$ )=	0.591	Prob( $\chi^2$ )=	0.954	
<b>Quarters of Employment in Two Years ...</b>									
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( $\chi^2$ )=	<b>0.00</b>	Prob( $\chi^2$ )=	0.72	Prob( $\chi^2$ )=	<b>0.03</b>	Prob( $\chi^2$ )=	0.76	

P<.10 considered significant (marked as bold)

**Appendix Table 3**  
**Regression Adjusted<sup>1</sup> Predictions of Outcomes, By Pass-Through Status for Cohort 3**  
**American Indian Mother W-2 Participants**

	Experimental	Control	Diff.	P-value
<b>Nonmarital Children without Paternity At Mother's W-2 Entry</b>				
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
<b>Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry</b>				
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
<b>Resident Mothers</b>				
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	<b>0.0</b>	.
2001	28.0	3.4	<b>24.6</b>	<b>0.0186</b>
2002	29.6	7.4	<b>22.2</b>	<b>0.0417</b>
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	<b>25.8</b>	<b>0.0584</b>
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	<b>10.5</b>	<b>0.0911</b>
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
<b>Resident Mothers With SSN</b>				
N	35	25		
Any Earnings in				
1998				
1999	97.2%	85.9%	<b>11.3%</b>	<b>0.0431</b>
2000	100.0	99.9	0.1	0.4628
2001	99.2	98.9	0.2	0.8406
2002	82.2	61.9	<b>20.3</b>	<b>0.0997</b>
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	<b>-4,043</b>	<b>0.0421</b>
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
<b>Legal Fathers at Mother's W-2 Entry With SSN</b>				
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