

Refugees and the Wisconsin Child Support Enforcement System

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

July 2011
Revised December 2012

The research reported in this paper was supported by the Child Support Research Agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families and the Institute for Research on Poverty. The views expressed here are those of the authors alone. The authors also thank Julie Wang for her contributions to this report as well as Daniel R. Meyer and Maria Cancian for helpful discussions and suggestions.

Refugees and the Wisconsin Child Support Enforcement System

I. INTRODUCTION

Child support provides an important part of the resource stream available to children in the United States who are not living with both of their parents (Cancian, Meyer and Park, 2003; Ha, Cancian and Meyer, forthcoming). Federal and state governments have devoted increased resources over the last 30 years to ensuring that such children are covered by court-ordered child support and that those orders are enforced. As government's role in the administration of child support has increased, it has become increasingly important for child support agencies to understand the needs and characteristics of the specific populations they are serving.

Recent immigrants are a population that raises particular issues for government agencies attempting to provide services. Poor English language skills, low levels of cultural assimilation, and difficulties in employability are all challenges that face agency workers serving this community. Since most recent immigrants are not eligible for the majority of public assistance programs, and it is the use of public assistance which triggers mandatory participation in the child support system under Title IV-D, immigrants as a whole do not make up a large component of the child support service population. There are, however, certain immigrant populations who are eligible for programs such as Medicaid and other public assistance, and are therefore also required to participate in child support enforcement. In this paper we look at the child support enforcement needs of one of these populations, Wisconsin residents admitted into the United States as refugees.

Refugees are admitted to the United States under numerical limits determined each year by the President. Refugee admissions to the United States over the 10 years up to FY 2009 have ranged from 30,000 to 80,000 and from 40% to 95% of the overall cap. The origin countries with the largest numbers of refugee entrants into the United States in FY 2008 have included Iraq, Burma, Thailand (primarily of Burmese origin), Iran, Bhutan, Burundi and Somalia; but over a longer time period large numbers of refugees have also come from the former Soviet Union, Vietnam, Laos (primarily Hmong refugees), and the former Yugoslavia. These groups have not dispersed around the country evenly. Recent refugees initially settling in Wisconsin have been disproportionately Burmese and Bhutanese and over the last couple of decades, Hmong from Laos (DHHS, ORR, 2011)

A review of academic literature and government reports has found little to no previous research on child support activities focused primarily on the refugee population. An exception is a mention of Maryland's experience with referring refugee TANF applicants to child support. Because many refugee parents were unable to verify their non-resident spouse's location (as the spouse was not in the United States), the child support agency was declaring applicants non-cooperative, thereby rendering them ineligible for TANF (Morse & Culp, 2001). Another report noted the difficulty that Somali refugees, coming from a polygamous society, face when they are required to identify one wife as their legal wife when arriving in the United States, with the potential child support obligations that may exist for their children with other wives (Morland, 2006).

Other work has noted the difficulty the other government agencies have faced in providing services to refugees. The introduction of stringent limits on assistance program eligibility for most immigrants in the 1996 welfare reform law left exceptions for the refugee population, but Fix and Passel (2002) found dramatic declines in Medicaid, Food Stamp, and TANF programs among the low-income refugee population in the years immediately following welfare reform. One possible explanation raised is that caseworkers became less encouraging towards applications from all immigrants, thereby reducing participation even among those still eligible.¹

There is a significant body of research on the difficulties faced by social service agencies in resettling newly arrived refugees (e.g., Asgary and Segar, 2011; Swe and Ross, 2010). The findings of this research focus on the difficulties that are common to all immigrants (poor language and communication skills, cultural behaviors that make complying with program regulations difficult) and point out other difficulties that are more specific to the refugee population, including mental health issues due to violence or oppression in their country of origin, or the fact that many of the larger refugee streams (Burma, Somalia, Laos) come from populations with lower levels of education or employment experience than even the general immigrant population.

While this previous literature provides little insight into the specific child support enforcement experience we may see among the Wisconsin refugee population, it does provide important context for understanding our results.

II. ANALYSIS

We begin our analysis with the identification of refugees in the CARES data system, Wisconsin's administrative data system for public program assistance. As requested by the Bureau of Child Support, we have focused the analysis on those refugees identified in CARES as lawfully present under Section 207(C) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act.² Unlike most immigrants, refugees are eligible to participate in Medicaid immediately upon arrival (assuming they meet other eligibility criteria)³.

¹These declines in refugee participation occurred even as the most stringent limits on immigrant participation in social programs were rescinded in 1997 and 1998. Further loosening of these limits followed in 2002. (Wasem, 2004)

²We Included individuals who had ever been identified in CARES as refugees, although only a small percentage (less than 10 percent) currently have some other refugee or citizen status. This selection criterion excludes other Medicaid-eligible refugee-like groups from this analysis, including asylees (Section 208), conditional entrants (Section 203(a)(7)), parolees (Section 212 (d)(5)), Cuban/Haitian entrants, battered aliens victims of trafficking, and Amerasians. While Section 207(c) refugees comprise a small percentage (13%) of those with any immigration status recorded in CARES, they are the vast majority of those immigrant groups eligible for Medicaid.

³"Refugees who meet the income and resource eligibility standards of the W-2 or Medicaid programs, but are not otherwise eligible—such as single individuals, childless couples, teen parents and two-parent families with no children under 18 years of age—may receive benefits under the special RCA and RMA programs. Eligibility for these special programs is restricted to the first eight months in the U.S.," (<http://dcf.wisconsin.gov/refugee/programs/rca.htm>)

Childless refugees who meet Medicaid income and resource requirements are not eligible for Medicaid, but may participate in Refugee Medical Assistance for up to eight months. Since most refugees arrive with few assets and little income (DHHS Office of Refugee Resettlement, 2007), most do participate in these medical assistance programs for at least some period of time and are therefore recorded in the CARES data system. We have identified 24,260 individuals in CARES who are classified as refugees, and we have information on benefits received as recorded in the CARES system from the beginning of CARES, in 1994, through the end of 2010⁴.

We have divided the refugees into geographical and ethnic groups, and we analyze their economic status, location, family characteristics, and interaction with the child support system for the refugees as a whole, and by group. We have done this analysis using the Multi-Sample Person File (MSPF) 2010 database constructed by the Institute for Research on Poverty from Wisconsin administrative data through 2010, merging CARES and KIDS (the Wisconsin child support enforcement data system) and attached data from the state Unemployment Insurance program on individual earnings and UI benefits.

Identification of Refugee Groups. A CARES variable on “country of origin” was the starting point for identifying refugee groups. However, an analysis of place of birth information and language indicated that for some individuals, the “country of origin” was actually an intermediate location in their journey from their birth country to the United States. Accordingly, we have classified individuals into specific ethnic groups, using language and place of birth to override the “country of origin” in some cases. For the Hmong population we also used surnames to help distinguish Hmong from non-Hmong refugees emigrating from the same countries.⁵ The subgroups of refugees that we analyze are shown on Table 1.

Asia

1. Hmong. The Hmong group is the largest single group in Wisconsin—more than half of all refugees (nearly 15,500 individuals; 58 percent of all refugees). We further divided this group into three subgroups, based upon time of arrival in Wisconsin, since there might be demographic and behavioral differences between these three waves of Hmong immigrants. The first two groups of Hmong refugees arrived prior to the beginning of the CARES data system in 1994. The three modal years of arrival were: 1980, 1993, and 2004.

The first group of nearly 1,400 Hmong refugees arrived within a couple of years around 1980, with over 600 individuals arriving in that year alone.

⁴Information on medical assistance eligibility was being gradually loaded into the CARES data system beginning in January, 1994, and completed by March, 1995. Therefore, some refugees who arrived prior to April 1995 may have received medical assistance in months prior to the information we have available to us in CARES.

⁵Hmong refugees are from one of 14 surname families, and we compared surnames with this list of 14 names for identification in some cases where the ethnic identity was not clear.

The second wave of Hmong refugees arrived 12-13 years later, primarily in the early 1990s. This wave constitutes the largest group of Hmong individuals, around 10,000. The high point of the immigration was during 1992 to 1994; between 1,100 and 1,300 refugees arrived in Wisconsin during each of those years.

The third wave of Hmong immigration came 10 years later, with over 2,500 refugees arriving in 2004, and another 1,300 in 2005.

2. Cambodia. A small group of Cambodian refugees arrived in Wisconsin, primarily in 1983-1985. They number under 100.
3. Laos and Thailand. Another group of refugees from Southeast Asia, but probably not Hmong, are grouped together, and number a little more than 600 people. These arrivals have trickled in over the years, with more than usual in the years 1979 to 1991, at the rate of about 10 to 50 during each of those years, and averaging fewer than 7 individuals per year since 1991.
4. Vietnam. Later (non-Hmong) arrivals from Vietnam number a little over 300. The Vietnamese refugees have arrived in Wisconsin in small numbers; 10 to 30 in each year between 1990 and 1999, and fewer than 10 per year in the years since 1999.
5. Burma. A group of Asian refugees who have come to Wisconsin in fairly large numbers in recent years are from Burma— now totaling over 1,600. This is a recent influx of refugees, primarily from 2007 to 2010, with 200 to 400 refugees per year in these 4 years.
6. Bhutan and Nepal. A new group of refugees that have arrived very recently are from Bhutan and Nepal. So far the numbers are small, but the arrival of 78 refugees in 2010 may indicate a growing influx to be expected in the future.⁶
7. Other Asia. Small numbers of individuals from other Asian countries (excluding the Middle East) are grouped together as “Other Asia,” totaling a little over 200.

Middle East

8. Iraq. Recent arrivals from Iraq now total over 400. These arrivals have been primarily in the last three years, with the greatest number (175) arriving in 2010.
9. Afghanistan. A small number (under 100) of Afghan refugees have moved to Wisconsin, primarily during 2001 to 2003.

⁶Although Nepal and Bhutan are not contiguous, and are separated by the Indian state of Sikkim, there have been Bhutan refugees expelled from Bhutan and living in Nepalese refugee camps since the 1990s. We therefore have combined those refugees and their children who claim either Bhutan or Nepal as their place of birth.

10. Other Middle East. 134 refugees from Middle East countries other than Iraq and Afghanistan are grouped together, as the numbers are small, and the years of arrival are widespread. The largest number (45) are from Iran.

Europe

11. Yugoslavia and Albania. A large group of refugees has come to Wisconsin from the former Yugoslavia and Albania, which we have grouped together. The total number is over 2,800 and they constitute about 11 percent of all refugees. We were not able to adequately distinguish between Albanians from Albania, Albanians from the former Yugoslavia, or between Bosnians, Serbs, or Croats, and so we were forced to consider this large heterogeneous group as one. The arrival of these refugees was concentrated in the years 1997 to 2003, with over 800 refugees in the single year of 1999.
12. USSR. The former USSR has contributed about 1,500 refugees, concentrated in the years 1992 to 2001, with never over 180 in any single year.
13. Other Europe. Only a small number of refugees come from other European countries (fewer than 100 total), with no concentration in any particular year.

Africa

14. Somalia. The largest group of refugees from Africa are Somalis (over 1,850—6 percent of all refugees). The influx of Somali refugees to Wisconsin began to increase in 2000, reaching its highest year in 2004, with over 400 individuals in that single year. The rate has decreased since then, though over 100 Somali refugees entered Wisconsin in 2010.
15. Ethiopia. Wisconsin has a very small population of Ethiopian refugees (90), but it may be an influx of refugees that has just started, as 66 percent of all Ethiopian refugees arrived in 2010.
16. Sudan. A relatively small group has also come from the Sudan (165). The rate of entry has been slow and steady, with an average of fewer than 10 per year since 1994.
17. Liberia and Sierra Leone. Another small group of refugees to Wisconsin is from Liberia or Sierra Leone (222), two countries which we have combined, given their contiguity and intertwined political history. The peak from this area was in 2004 (60); after 2007, the flow of refugees virtually stopped.
18. Other Africa. From the rest of Africa we find about 250 refugees, averaging fewer than 20 individuals per year since 1997.

Latin America and Caribbean

19. Mexico. We have found surprisingly few refugees from Latin American and the Caribbean. The largest group of refugees are from Mexico (a little over 500), and they have arrived as a trickle over time, with no particular year or time period showing a major influx of refugees. The peak

year was 1988 with 51 refugees, and the period from 1988 through 2004 saw an average of fewer than 20 individuals per year.

20. Cuba. We found fewer than 100 Cubans who had ever had refugee status under Section 207(C) in Wisconsin. Other Cuban immigrants, along with most Haitian immigrants, are currently identified in CARES (a total of 290 individuals) under Section 501(e) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act and are not the subject of this report.
21. Caribbean. Other Caribbean nations have contributed fewer than 50 refugees to the Wisconsin population.
22. Central and South America. We found fewer than 100 refugees from all of Central and South America, primarily from Guatemala and Honduras (not shown separately on Table 1).

Other

23. Other. And finally, we found a very small handful of individuals (29) coded as refugees from Australia, Canada, and the United States.

Location within Wisconsin. When looking at refugees as a group, most live in urban counties in Wisconsin, particularly Milwaukee, with less than 10 percent living in rural counties. Over 35 percent of all refugees live in Milwaukee County, and the remainder, 50 percent, live in other urban counties.⁷ But these percentages mask large distinctions between refugee groups. The breakdown between Milwaukee County, other urban counties, and rural counties within Wisconsin are shown on Table 2a. Table 2a also shows the number of counties in which members of each refugee group live (for any county in which a group numbers over 10 individuals). Some refugees have left Wisconsin, in varying percentages by group, and we have removed these individuals from further analysis. These exclusions include individuals in families where no member of the family ever received any benefits, or have any recorded earnings in the State of Wisconsin. We also exclude individuals whose most current CARES-recorded address is out of state. Over 11 percent of the Afghan and Liberia-Sierra Leone refugees have left the state, as have 7 to 9 percent of the Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Somali refugees.

On Table 2b we report the most populous counties for each refugee group, along with the percentage of that group residing in those counties (if over 5 percent of the group population). We have reported the last known county of residence in Wisconsin. (In a comparison of county upon arrival and last-known address, we found little change, and so have only reported the last-known county.) We have

⁷Urban counties are defined as those counties within the currently-defined Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs): Green Bay MSA (Brown, Kewaunee, Oconto); Appleton MSA (Calumet, Outagamie); Eau Claire MSA (Chippewa, Eau Claire); Madison MSA (Columbia, Dane, Iowa); Duluth MSA (Douglas); Fond du Lac MSA (Fond du Lac); Chicago MSA (Kenosha); La Crosse MSA (La Crosse); Wausau MSA (Marathon); Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis MSA (Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Washington, Waukesha); Minneapolis MSA (Pierce, St. Croix); Racine MSA (Racine); Janesville MSA (Rock); Sheboygan MSA (Sheboygan); Oshkosh-Neenah MSA (Winnebago).

removed from Table 2b those refugees who we know have left the state, so the percentages of those living in Milwaukee County differ slightly between Tables 2a and 2b.

The Hmong, comprising nearly 58 percent of all refugees, are primarily concentrated in Milwaukee and other urban counties. Three counties accounting for about 45 percent of the Hmong population are: Milwaukee, Marathon, and Brown counties. But there are also substantial numbers of Hmong refugees in Sheboygan, La Crosse, Outagamie, Winnebago and Dane counties (See Table 2b). Given large numbers of Hmong in the other urban counties, the percentage in Milwaukee County is only about 20 percent, a very low percentage compared to most of the other refugee groups. The three waves of Hmong refugees show little difference in where they have chosen to reside within Wisconsin, although the most recent wave of Hmong refugees had somewhat fewer immigrants going to Winnebago County.

The small Cambodia refugee population is found almost exclusively in Dane County, with nearly 80 percent of the 80 refugees.

Other refugees from Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam are much more concentrated in Milwaukee, and very few are found in rural counties (only 2 to 4 percent). The Burmese refugees are an interesting case. Eighty-two percent of the Burmese, now a large immigrant group of over 1,600 people, reside in Milwaukee County. This is the highest concentration of any of the large refugee groups. The new (though very small) immigrant group from Bhutan and Nepal are nearly all in Dane County.

Iraqi refugees are also highly concentrated in Milwaukee County (82 percent). Nearly all Afghan refugees have moved to Waukesha, Milwaukee, or Dane counties.

Refugees from Albania and the former Yugoslavia show a different pattern of dispersal around Wisconsin. Over 57 percent reside in Milwaukee, but the rest of this group are quite scattered among another 16 counties, in small groups. This may well be a result of the diversity of ethnic, language, and religious subgroups whose members have chosen different counties in which to settle. Immigrants from the former USSR are concentrated in Milwaukee (70 percent), and Brown County (11 percent) and virtually none live in the rural counties.

Outside of Milwaukee and Brown counties, Somali refugees are found in large numbers in rural Barron County: nearly 28 percent.⁸ Most of the small group of Sudanese refugees are found in Milwaukee, Winnebago and Dane Counties. The small groups of Ethiopian and Liberian and Sierra Leone refugees are highly concentrated in Milwaukee County, with the remainder in Dane County.

Refugees from Mexico have a very low concentration in Milwaukee County (22 percent), and a high presence in the rural counties of the state (nearly 25 percent). The distribution of the Mexican

⁸Barron County is the site of a large factory that has attracted many workers from the large Somali population in Minneapolis/St. Paul, (Grossman, 2007) giving this rural county a very high concentration of this refugee group.

refugees most closely parallels that of the full Wisconsin population: 17 percent Milwaukee, 56 percent other urban, and 27 percent rural counties (shown on the last row of Table 2a).

At the bottom of Table 2b, we show the Wisconsin counties with the greatest number of refugees. Milwaukee County hosts 37 percent of all Wisconsin's refugees; the majority of all groups except the Hmong, those from Bhutan and Nepal, Afghanistan, and Mexico. Marathon hosts nearly 10 percent of the state's refugees, primarily Hmong. Brown, Dane, and Sheboygan each have 6-8 percent of the state's refugees, and all three are host to a diverse mix of refugee groups. Rural Barron County has a relatively low overall number of refugees compared to these largest urban counties, but a high concentration of Somali refugees. Except for refugees from Mexico, and the special case of the Somalis in Barron County, the refugee population in Wisconsin is much more urbanized, and much more concentrated in Milwaukee than the Wisconsin population as a whole. There are 37 counties in Wisconsin with fewer than 10 individuals who have been identified as refugees in the CARES system.

Demographics of Refugees. The first set of demographic variables that we examine are those of adult or child status, the sex ratio of adult refugees at the time of arrival, and the mean age of adults (Table 3a). Note that for the remaining tables, we show figures only for the larger country-specific subgroups of refugees.

Overall, refugees are fairly evenly divided as to adult and child (49 to 51 percent), and male and female (48 to 52 percent). The mean age for both male and females is about 35 years. However these averages mask some differences between groups. Of the largest subgroup of refugees, the Hmong who arrived between 1983 and 2003, over 62 percent were children at the time of arrival. A very high percentage of other refugees from Laos and Thailand also came as children (65 percent). In contrast, some other groups have come to Wisconsin with very few children; less than 33 percent of those from Vietnam, only 28 percent of the recent immigrants from Bhutan and Nepal, less than 22 percent of those from the USSR and Ethiopia, and less than 30 percent of those refugees from Mexico.

The next two columns on Table 3a show the breakdown between adult men and women at the time of arrival. The first wave of Hmong had somewhat more adult women than men. This is also true of the refugee populations from Laos and Thailand and Vietnam, the former USSR, and Liberia and Sierra Leone. In contrast, the Burmese, Iraqi, Ethiopian, and Cuban adult refugees were predominately men.

The third set of columns shows the mean age of male and female adults at the time of arrival. A group that stands out are those from the former USSR, with a mean age of just over 50 for adults at the time of arrival. The Somalis show the youngest mean age of adults -- under 26 years for both men and women.

On Table 3b, we show comparable information as of the beginning of 2010. Of course, now many of the children have grown to adulthood, and so only 18 percent of the refugees are children—the children of the most recent immigrants.

Looking at current age, those from the former USSR are the oldest refugees in Wisconsin, with a mean age for women of over 56. The first wave of Hmong refugees now have a mean age of 48-49. The Somalis still have the youngest adult population, with mean ages of 28 to 29. Some members of refugee groups have died since their arrival in Wisconsin (not shown on table), primarily those from the first wave of Hmong immigration (3 percent), other refugees from Laos and Thailand (4 percent), and particularly, the refugees from the former USSR (nearly 11 percent).

The final column on Table 3b shows the mean number of known children (of any age) born to adult women for each refugee group, as of 2010 (note that this counts only children identified in the MSPF integrated administrative data system). Hmong and Cambodian women show the highest birth rates, with over 5 children per woman for the early-arrival Hmong subgroup, over 3 children per woman for the later Hmong arrivals, and 4 children per woman for the Cambodian group. These figures do not taken into account the current age of women in the various refugee groups, and therefore these numbers will increase in future years for groups with younger women of child-bearing age. But it is useful to note the large size of families in the Hmong population, in particular.

The gender ratios at the time of arrival, the adult or child status, the age at time of arrival, the size of families, and the number of years since arrival in Wisconsin are all factors in the transplant of intact families to Wisconsin, or in the formation of new families, as these refugees build new lives in Wisconsin. Whether intact families are transplanted, new families formed, new children born, or families broken up, all have implications for the child support system, which is the focus of this report. Before moving on to family structure, and involvement with the child support system, we will examine the economic status of the adult refugees in the calendar year of 2010.

Current Economic Status of Refugee Adult Men and Women. The current economic status of adult men, age 18-65, is shown on Table 4a, and for women on Table 4b. These tables show annual income from all benefit sources recorded in CARES (Wisconsin Works (W-2) cash assistance, Food Share, disability payments from Social Security or Supplemental Security (SSI and SSDI), along with unemployment earnings and benefits. The total from all of these sources is shown on the highlighted columns of Tables 4a and 4b, along with percentage of all adult refugees who had some (non-zero) income or benefits in the specific categories. The final two columns are the amounts of child care subsidies paid to child care providers on behalf of the family, and the percentages of adults receiving BadgerCare health insurance in 2010.⁹ Note that the amounts for refugees from Bhutan and Nepal have not been included on these tables since most individuals arrived during the calendar year of 2010, and therefore the amounts reflect only partial year receipts.

⁹Wisconsin Works, or W-2, is Wisconsin's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. FoodShare is the state's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the Wisconsin Shares program provides subsidies for child care provision for working parents, and BadgerCare is the state's public health insurance program combining assistance from Medicaid and the Child Health Insurance Program (CHIP).

The mean amount of W-2 cash benefits are very small (mean annual total of \$48) for the men in all refugee groups, except for the Iraqi immigrants and very recent immigrant groups—Burma and Bhutan and Nepal (not shown on table). Note that the Burmese and Iraqis have high percentages of male refugees (57 percent male), and so are more likely to be heads of household without wives. FoodShare is a larger benefit for refugees, with a mean annual total for refugee men at \$579 in 2010. The highest users of FoodShare benefits are, again the Burmese, Iraqis, and the latest wave of Hmong immigrants. SSI and SSDI benefits are important sources of income for some refugees, with a total mean annual receipt of \$654 in 2010, but mean annual totals of nearly \$3,000 for Cambodia men, nearly \$2,000 for the first wave of Hmong refugee men, nearly \$1,700 for Cuban refugees, and over \$1,000 for those from Laos and Thailand. Only eight percent of all male adult refugees of working age receive SSI or SSDI, but for certain groups, this is an important source of income.

Earnings is by far the largest income source for male refugees, averaging \$13,782 for all adult males age 18-65 in calendar year 2010, with over 60 percent having some earnings. The European refugees were the highest earners (those from the former USSR and Yugoslavia) with about \$18,000-\$21,000 in average annual earnings. The Hmong refugees are the next highest earners, earning around \$14,000-\$15,000 in 2010. Of the men from African countries, those from Liberia and Sierra Leone earned twice the amount (about \$13,000) that earned by men from the East African countries of Somalia, Ethiopia, and the Sudan (around \$4,500-\$6,500). Some groups have apparently suffered more from the recession, as can be seen in the level of UI unemployment benefits—over 18 percent of men having received some income from unemployment benefits in 2010. Men from Laos and Thailand, long-time Wisconsin residents, show only \$8,881 in mean earnings and nearly \$2,000 in unemployment benefits in 2010. Those from the former Yugoslavia also show high amounts of unemployment benefits (\$1,236), as well as the first wave of Hmong refugees (\$1,321) compared to the overall mean of \$928 for all adult male refugees.

The receipt of child support is virtually non-existent for adult refugee men (averaging only \$8 for the year 2010). The final two columns of Table 4a show the provision of child care subsidies and the percentage of adult men enrolled in BadgerCare. Child care subsidies paid to child care providers on behalf of male workers are practically non-existent, with a mean annual total of only \$9. Financially eligible refugees can participate in Medicaid or Refugee Medical Assistance for the first 8 months after arrival. After this time, they can participate in Medicaid benefits if financially- and family-eligible. Overall, about 33 percent of adult refugee men were enrolled in BadgerCare in 2010. For the Hmong, only 29 to 32 percent of those in the two early waves of arrival are enrolled in BadgerCare, compared to 59 percent for the latest wave of Hmong refugees. These percentages generally reflect time of arrival, with the other late arrivals also participating in BadgerCare at high rates (over 50 percent of Burmese and Iraqi male refugees), and older arrivals' participation at low levels (less than 20 percent for those from Cambodia, and the former USSR and Yugoslavia).

The economic status of adult women in 2010 is shown on Table 4b. In general, the picture for women indicates more head-of-household, or at least child-related, sources of income. Surprisingly, the overall mean of W-2 cash receipt for women is not much different than that for men (only 2 percent of

women received a cash payment in 2010, for an annual mean of \$59). However for some groups, particularly Sudanese and Iraqi women, W-2 cash benefits are important.

FoodShare benefits are used by refugee adult women at about twice the rate as men (averaging \$1,089 annually for the year 2010), with the highest users being refugees from the Sudan and Laos and Thailand. SSI and SSDI benefits are received at a higher rate by women than men (13 percent, compared to 8 percent of men), with an average annual receipt for all adult women of \$1,019. The highest benefits go to Cambodian women (nearly \$4,400 per year), the oldest wave of Hmong immigrant women (over \$2,600 per year), and those from Laos and Thailand (nearly \$2,000 per year). The two more recent waves of Hmong refugee arrivals and those from the former USSR receive over an average of over \$1,100 per year.

Overall, almost 51 percent of adult women had earned income in 2010, and received an average of \$9,718 in 2010, about 70 percent of the mean dollar amount earned by adult men. The highest earners were, again, European adult women, with women from the former USSR earning over \$18,000 in 2010, and those from Yugoslavia and Albania earning over \$13,000. The two earlier waves of Hmong women were the next highest earners with around \$11,000 for the year. The group with the lowest amounts of earned income were women from Iraq, with less than \$2,000 for the year. The Laotian and Thai women received the highest level of UI unemployment benefits, with a mean of \$869 for the year, compared to an overall average of \$513 for all refugee adult women. Fewer women than men had any earnings, (51 percent compared to 60 percent for men), and fewer women received UI benefits (less than 13 percent, compared to 18 percent).

Child support receipt was fairly low overall; only 5 percent of women received any child support. However, it appears to be a significant source of income for some women and some groups. Laotian and Thai women received the most child support (\$808 for the year). The early group of Hmong arrivals received \$447 for the year, and Mexican women received \$422.

Child care subsidies are used more by adult women (though still only 4 percent of all refugee women), averaging \$384 for the year of 2010, with the Somali women, those from Liberia and Sierra Leone, and the most recent Hmong arrivals being the greatest users. Adult women are using BadgerCare health insurance at higher levels than adult men (nearly 47 percent, compared to 33 percent). The highest rates of usage are the Burmese (nearly 77 percent), the Iraqis (74 percent), and the most recent wave of Hmong immigrant women (68 percent). This would indicate head-of-household status and the presence of children in the homes of these women, as well as their recent arrival.

Combining all income resources, the European women and the earliest group of Hmong arrivals received the largest amount of income in 2010 (\$14,000-\$21,000). The poorest group of refugee women are those from Iraq, averaging only \$3500 for the year— a result of their very low level of earned income. When combining all sources of income, refugee adult women receive about 79 percent of what men receive, and it is probably the case that these women are supporting more children than are the male refugees.

The Children of Refugees. We examine all children of refugees who are identified in IRP's integrated data file (the 2010 MSPF, which contains all individuals from merged administrative data from CARES, KIDS, and Wisacwis). Children of refugees can be divided into four groups:

- 1) Individuals who arrived in Wisconsin designated as "refugees," who were minors upon arrival, but who grew up in Wisconsin and are now adults. For purposes of this paper we are considering them as "adult refugees" in 2010.
- 2) Individuals who arrived in Wisconsin, designated as "refugees," who were minors upon arrival, and who are still minors. For purposes of this paper, we refer to these children as "refugee children of refugee parents."
- 3) Individuals who were born in the United States or entered the United States under a non-refugee status¹⁰, but were born to at least one parent who has been designated as a "refugee," and who have now grown to adulthood. From the 2010 MSPF data we have identified 7,115 individuals in this category. Since they are not refugees themselves, and since they are no longer minor children, we do not report further on them.
- 4) Individuals who were born in the United States or entered the United States under a non-refugee status, but were born to at least one parent who has been designated as a "refugee," and who are still minor children in 2010. For purposes of this paper, we refer to these children as "non-refugee children of refugee parents."

For the categories 2 and 4 above (with a combined total of 19,170 minor children in 2010), we show the numbers broken down into three main groups on Table 5: both parents are refugees, mother only is a refugee, and father only is a refugee. (Another 119 children live with someone other than an identified parent, and the parents are unknown). The number of minor children born in the United States currently exceeds the number of minor children who came to the United States, themselves as refugees: around 15,600 non-refugee children of refugee parents, compared to about 4,300 refugee children.

Looking first at the refugee children on Table 5, we see that most are children born to two parents who have been identified in the CARES system as refugees (N=3,205). We also find small groups of refugee children where we know the mother or the father as a refugee, but we have no information on the other parent. But it may be assumed, since the child is a "refugee," that the other parent either remains in the country of origin, some other country or state, or is deceased. This includes 698 refugee

¹⁰This includes all children categorized in one of the refugee-like groups listed in footnote 2.

children who have a refugee mother, 85 children who have a refugee father, and 119 children who are living with some other person in Wisconsin, with no parent identified.

Of the non-refugee children born to refugee parents, those born to two refugee parents total 7,919 in 2010 (see second column of Table 5). Over 86 percent (computed from table) of these 7,919 children are Hmong children (N=6,828). Slightly fewer non-refugee children (N=7,144) have been born to either mothers (N=4,227) or fathers (N=2,917) who are refugees, but whose other parent is not known to be a refugee or is unknown. The conclusion from the numbers on Table 5 is that the majority of minor children of refugees living in Wisconsin in 2010 are currently living with two refugee parents, and these children are overwhelming (73 percent) Hmong.

On Tables 6a and 6b we show the current living situation of the refugee and non-refugee children. The living situation is determined by examining the most recent data from CARES on who is in the CARES household, and child support order information for each child from KIDS. In these tables we show data for the total refugee child population, but break the information down for specific countries of origin only if there were at least 100 minor children for that group in 2010. We have also combined the three Hmong groups into one. We show these numbers in order to assess which children might be eligible for child support from an absent parent. For that reason, we have also listed the number of children where we have information that one of the parents are deceased, but have removed from the table children who have both parents listed as deceased.

The vast majority of refugee children (Table 6a) live with both parents (over 76 percent: 3,125 out of 4,105). Another 5.2 percent of children have a mother or father who is deceased. For those refugee children living only with their mother or their father, we have indicated the numbers of children that appear in the KIDS data system. Nearly all refugee children who appear to possibly need support from another parent have been identified in the Wisconsin child support system.¹¹

On Table 6b we show the current living situation of non-refugee children. As above, the vast majority of non-refugee children live with both parents (11,038 out of 15,055, or 73.3 percent). Of those living only with their mother, 586 children are not identified in the KIDS system. And of those living only with their father, 85 are not identified in KIDS.

On Table 7 we show refugee and non-refugee minor children (categories combined) who appear to be eligible for child support, due to an absent parent. We have not included cases in which the absent parent is known to be deceased. In the first panel of Table 7 we show children who live with their mother only; in the second panel we show children who live with their father only. We show the total in both panels, but only show four ethnic groups in the top panel, since it is only in these four groups that we find more than a total of 100 minor children potentially eligible for child support.

¹¹Only 86 children living with mother only, and 11 children living with father only, were not found in the KIDS system, and it is likely that the other parent of some of these 97 children does not live in the United States, and therefore has not been referred to the child support agency.

In the first panel of Table 7 (minor children who live with their mother only), we show the paternity status of the children and the presence or absence of child support orders for children with a legally-identified father. Sixty percent (computed from table) of the children identified in the KIDS data system who live only with their mother are non-marital children, with another 22 percent being marital children,¹² and 17 percent with their parents' marital status at birth unknown. Of those children born in a marriage, only 41 percent (computed from table) are covered by a child support order. Of those known to be non-marital children, more than half have not had a father legally identified. A little more than half of the non-marital children with an adjudicated or voluntarily acknowledged¹³ father had a child support order in 2010.

There are differences between the four groups shown on the first panel of Table 7. Children with an absent father, and born to at least one refugee parent from Laos and Thailand or Mexico, were much more likely to have a legally identified father, and to have a child support order. Somali children were much less likely to have a legal father (only 23 percent—computed from table), and very few of Somali children with an absent father are covered by a child support order (less than 10 percent).

A small number of children, 401, live with their father only. Almost half of these are marital children, and the majority of these (57 percent—computed from table) do not have a child support order. Of those children living with their father who are non-marital (or unknown) status, over 70 percent (computed from table) do not have a child support order.

The children of Hmong refugees stand out in information shown on Table 7, due simply to the large numbers of Hmong children who are potentially eligible for child support—nearly 62 percent of all child support-eligible minor children born to refugee parents are Hmong (computed from Table 7). Most of these children are non-marital children, many do not have a legally-identified father, and most are not covered by a child support order. Somali children also stand out (although in relatively small numbers) as the rates of paternity adjudication are very low, and child support orders are very rare. The problem of paternity adjudication for Somali children may be more difficult, given a potentially high rate of out-of-state residential movement, particularly to the State of Minnesota (from Table 2a we find that more than 8 percent of Somali refugees no longer live in Wisconsin, twice the overall percentage of out-migration for all refugees).

From Table 7 we have identified 1,058 children of refugee parents who have an absent parent (who is not known to be deceased), who have a legally-identified father or who are living with their father, and who are covered by a child support order in the State of Wisconsin. We show information for these children on Table 8a regarding child support orders, payments made on those orders, and the pay-to-owe ratios. The mean annual child support order for these children of refugees is \$1,902, and the mean annual payment is \$1,550. Capping individual pay-to-owe ratios at 100 percent, we find that the mean pay-to-owe ratio is 68 percent, with 81 percent of the child receiving some child support in

¹²Includes 7 children who were legitimized (parents married after birth).

¹³Voluntarily acknowledged fathers compose 35 percent of the fathers in this category, with the rest having paternity adjudicated in court.

the year 2010. The second panel on Table 8a shows these orders and payments broken down by father payor and mother payor. Orders are higher for father payors, as are payment, pay-to-owe ratios, and the percent making some payment during the year.

The third panel on Table 8a shows the four refugee groups with at least 100 children with an absent parent. Orders, per child, are lower for the Somali and Hmong payors. This may be the result of relatively low incomes in the case of Somali parents, and relatively large families in the case of Hmong parents.

We show this same information on Table 8b, but with total orders shown by custodial parent, rather than by child, as on Table 8a. This is a common way to show child support orders, and allows us to compare with national data on orders and payments. The first panel of Table 8b shows that there were 574 custodial parents receiving child support for the 1,058 children. The average number of children per custodial parent was 1.7. The second panel on Table 8b compares the Hmong custodial parents with all other custodial parents. The Hmong parents average 1.8 children, compared to only 1.5 for other parents of refugee children. The amounts of orders, payments, pay-to-owe ratios, and percent with any payment are similar between the Hmong custodial parents and all others.

The final panel of Table 8b shows order and payment information reported by the U.S. Census Bureau for calendar year 2007. The first row shows all custodial parents, and the second row shows custodial parents who receive low income assistance. In comparison, parents of refugee children have orders that are lower (in 2010) than both nationally-reported groups (in 2007). Payments received appear higher for the Wisconsin refugee parents (in 2010) than for those nationally-reported set of custodial parents receiving benefits (in 2007). The pay-to-owe ratios (which should not be affected by reporting different calendar years) of the Wisconsin refugee parents are higher than either nationally-reported groups of custodial parents.

SUMMARY

From the data from CARES on refugees in Wisconsin we find a number of different ethnic groups, arriving in different time periods, and with different experiences in making a home in Wisconsin. The members of some ethnic groups appear to have left the state in greater numbers than others. The balance of adult men and women, and the adult-to-child ratios differ for the various ethnic groups, which has implications for family structure, and the raising of children. Some ethnic groups live scattered throughout the state, though most live in urbanized areas, and some groups live concentrated in a handful of urban counties. Milwaukee County is home to the majority of nearly every refugee group. The ability to earn a living also differs greatly by group, and by longevity in the State. The earnings of both men and women are generally low, although the low earnings, for women in particular, are augmented by benefits (primarily FoodShare and SSI and SSDI) from the State of Wisconsin.

The Hmong refugees are of particular note, as they form the majority of refugees, the majority of children, and the majority of potentially child support eligible minor children in 2010. One positive

aspect of refugee families appears to be the high degree of maintenance of intact families, with both parents present during the raising of children. But when there is divorce, or more-commonly, non-marital children living with only one parent, the rate of paternity adjudication is very low, and the presence of child support orders even lower. The dollar amount of child support awards is also low, but that is consistent with the generally low earnings of refugee adults. When there is a child support order, however, there does appear to be a fairly high rate of payment.

In summary, it appears that while the overall child support enforcement needs among the refugee population is comparatively low, when those needs do arise there is a shortfall in moving these cases into the enforcement system. There appears to be the potential for child support agencies to improve outcomes on paternity establishment and the setting of child support orders among these populations. Once orders are established, the enforcement of child support orders seems to be less problematic. Given the geographically concentrated nature of most refugee groups, an effort could be targeted in the larger urban counties, particularly, Milwaukee County (with high levels of all ethnic groups represented), and in Marathon (Hmong), Brown (Hmong and Somali), Dane (Hmong and others), and perhaps Barron (Somali) to address specific ethnic communities. Special attention to interstate cooperation with Minnesota, in particular, might be useful for paternity adjudication for Somali children.

Finally, we should note that the ethnic communities may well be larger than can be determined by this analysis of the administrative data. Reduced levels of program participation for refugees since welfare reform may mean that some refugees never entered the state's public assistance systems, even though they may have been eligible. For refugee groups with higher incomes, who required few benefits from the State of Wisconsin, we have less information, particularly about children born after immigration. They may well have had children who have not been identified in this data. And for long-term refugees, children have grown up and may well now have their own families. The grandchildren of refugees are not identified or counted in this report. It remains to be seen whether in close-knit ethnic communities attitudes about family remain similar to those of the adult refugees identified in this report, or whether the process of assimilation leads to social behaviors and attitudes that are more similar to the general population. Characteristics of particular interest include the high degree of maintenance of intact families, low rates of child supports awards, and low adjudication rates for non-marital children.

References

- Asgary, Ramin and Nora Segar. 2011. "Barriers to Health Care Access among Refugee Asylum Seekers." *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 22(2):506-522.
- Cancian, Maria, Daniel R. Meyer, and Hwa-Ok Park. 2003. "The Importance of Child Support for Low-Income Families." Report prepared for the Wisconsin Bureau of Child Support. Institute for Research on Poverty.
- Fix, Michael and Jeffrey Passel, 2002. "The Scope and Impact of Welfare Reform's Immigrant Provisions," Washington, D.C: The Urban Institute.
- Grossman, Zoltan. 2007. "The Somali Diaspora in Small Midwestern Communities: The Case of Barron, Wisconsin." In Kusow, Abdi and Stephanie R. Bjork (eds.), *From Mogadishu to Dixon: The Somali Diaspora in a Global Context*. Trenton, NJ, Red Sea Press.
- Ha, Yoonsook, Maria Cancian, and Daniel R. Meyer. "The Regularity of Child Support and Its Contribution to the Regularity of Income" *Social Service Review*, forthcoming.
- Morland, Lynn. 2006 "Somali Bantu Refugees: Cultural Considerations for Social Service Providers." BRYCS Bulletin. Bridging Refugee Youth and Children's Services project. (<http://www.brycs.org/documents/upload/SBantu-Service-Considerations.pdf>)
- Morse, Ann and Amanda Culp. 2001. "Opportunities Under TANF for Serving Refugee and Immigrant Families: A Checklist for State and Local Policymakers." Immigrant Policy Project. National Conference of State Legislatures. (<http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?tabid=13131>).
- Swe, Hlaing and Michael Ross. 2010 "Refugees from Myanmar and their Health Care Needs in the US: A Qualitative Study at a Refugee Resettlement Agency," *International Journal of Migration, Health and Social Care*, 6(1):15 – 25.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Office of Refugee Resettlement. 2011. *Report to Congress, FY 2008*.
- Wasem, Ruth E. 2004 "Noncitizen Eligibility for Major Federal Public Assistance Programs: Policies and Legislation" CRS Report for Congress. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

Table 1
Refugee Groups and Time of Arrival in Wisconsin

Refugee Group	N	% of all Refugees	Modal Year of Arrival	% Arriving in Modal Year	% of Group Arriving in Range of Years	Mean Years Since Arrival*
Asia:						
Hmong - Pre-1983	1,378	5.1	1980	48.5%	94.8%: 1978-1982	30.9
Hmong - 1983-2003	9,913	36.9	1993	13.3%	93.5%: 1986-1996	19.3
Hmong - 2004-2010	4,187	15.6	2004	62.0%	92.8%: 2004-2005	5.8
<i>all Hmong</i>	<i>15,478</i>	<i>57.6</i>				<i>16.7</i>
Cambodia	84	0.3	1985	27.4%	70.2%: 1983-1985	26.4
Laos & Thailand	632	2.4	1988	10.5%	79.7%: 1979-1991	22.1
Vietnam	304	1.1	1993	11.5%	67.1%: 1990- 1999	15.6
Burma	1,632	6.1	2009	25.6%	88.8%: 2007-2010	2.5
Bhutan & Nepal	96	0.4	2010	81.3%	98.9%: 2009-2010	0.6
Other Asian	224	0.8				13.6
Middle East:						
Iraq	449	1.7	2010	39.2%	90.7%: 2008-2010	1.9
Afghanistan	91	0.3	2002	26.4%	61.1%: 2001-2003	8.8
Other Middle East	134	0.5				10.3
Europe:						
Yugoslavia & Albania	2,801	10.4	1999	31.3%	91.9%: 1997-2003	11.1
USSR	1,470	5.5	1995	12.2%	76.3%: 1992-2001	12.6
Other Europe	98	0.4				13.9
Africa:						
Somalia	1,858	6.9	2004	23.2%	91.0%: 2000-2010	6.3
Ethiopia	90	0.3	2010	63.3%	66.3%: 2010	2.5
Sudan	165	0.6	2003	16.5%	85.4%: 1997-2009	8.2
Liberia & Sierra Leone	222	0.8	2004	27.0%	86.5%: 2000-2007	7.3
Other Africa	253	0.9				7.7
Latin America & Caribbean:						
Mexico	531	1.9	1988	9.6%	81.3%: 1987-2004	16.5
Cuba	96	0.4	1980	29.2%	29.2%: 1980	15.7
Caribbean	44	0.2				9.9
Central & South America	104	0.4				14.4
Other:						
US, Canada, Australia	29	0.1				12.8
Total	26,885	100%				13.7

*Mean Years Since Arrival measures time of arrival until 12/31/2010, excluding individuals known to be deceased.

Table 2a
Most Recent Known Location of Refugees*

Refugee Group	N	Milwaukee	Other Urban	Rural	Have Left Wisconsin**	Number of WI Counties with more than 10 Refugees
Asia:						
Hmong - Pre-1983	1251	21.3%	62.0%	10.9%	5.8%	14
Hmong - 1983-2003	9509	18.9%	65.7%	11.3%	4.1%	18
Hmong - 2004-2010	4128	21.2%	63.4%	10.7%	4.7%	16
Cambodia	80	7.5%	82.5%	1.3%	8.7%	1
Laos & Thailand	581	59.1%	34.9%	1.7%	4.3%	6
Vietnam	285	58.6%	30.2%	4.2%	7.0%	3
Burma	1604	82.0%	14.2%	0.7%	3.1%	6
Bhutan and Nepal	96	5.2%	94.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1
Other Asian	190	43.2%	43.7%	8.4%	4.7%	2
Middle East:						
Iraq	441	82.1%	14.5%	2.0%	1.4%	3
Afghanistan	86	29.1%	58.1%	1.2%	11.6%	3
Other Middle East	121	44.6%	48.8%	2.5%	4.1%	4
Europe:						
Yugoslavia & Albania	2626	55.1%	36.7%	4.3%	3.9%	17
USSR	1193	68.7%	26.9%	1.5%	2.9%	5
Other Europe	81	22.2%	54.3%	17.3%	6.2%	2
Africa:						
Somalia	1686	44.8%	20.5%	26.1%	8.6%	4
Ethiopia	87	78.2%	17.2%	4.6%	0.0%	2
Sudan	159	52.8%	44.7%	0.0%	2.5%	3
Liberia & Sierra Leone	217	67.3%	20.7%	0.5%	11.5%	2
Other Africa	239	57.7%	27.2%	8.8%	6.3%	3
Latin America & Caribbean:						
Mexico	374	21.4%	51.0%	24.9%	2.7%	6
Cuba	88	60.2%	30.7%	6.8%	2.3%	1
Caribbean	39	69.2%	23.1%	7.7%	0.0%	1
Central & South America	93	38.7%	59.5%	8.6%	3.2%	2
Other:						
US, Canada, Australia	26	15.4%	46.1%	23.1%	15.4%	0
All Refugees	25,280	35.5%	50.3%	9.7%	4.5%	34
Wisconsin***		17.0%	56.1%	26.9%		

*Individuals known to be deceased, or whose location is unknown, have been removed from this table.

**Individuals in cases where no family members ever received any CARES benefit, UI wages, or was ever in coded as out-of-state, as well as those known to have left the state prior to January 1, 2010.

***Population estimate for July 1, 2009. U.S. Census Bureau.

Table 2b
Counties with the Greatest Concentrations of Refugees
at Last Known Wisconsin Address

Refugee Group	N*	Last Known Address			
Asia:					
Hmong - Pre-1983	1178	22.6%	Milwaukee		
		16.9%	Marathon		
		12.0%	Brown		
		7.9%	Outagamie		
		6.5%	Winnebago		
		6.3%	Dane		
		5.3%	Sheboygan		
		5.1%	La Crosse		
		Hmong - 1983-2003	9123	19.7%	Milwaukee
				17.0%	Marathon
8.4%	Sheboygan				
7.8%	Brown				
7.7%	La Crosse				
7.2%	Outagamie				
6.9%	Dane				
5.6%	Winnebago				
Hmong - 2004-2010	3934			22.3%	Milwaukee
				11.6%	Marathon
		9.8%	Brown		
		9.3%	Dane		
		7.9%	La Crosse		
		7.8%	Sheboygan		
		7.2%	Outagamie		
		5.8%	Eau Claire		
		Cambodia	73	79.5%	Dane
		Laos & Thailand	556	61.7%	Milwaukee
9.9%	Brown				
9.7%	Dane				
5.8%	Marathon				
Vietnam	265	63.0%	Milwaukee		
		10.2%	Dane		
Burma	1555	84.6%	Milwaukee		
		6.0%	Waukesha		
Bhutan & Nepal	96	94.8%	Dane		
Middle East:					
Iraq	435	83.2%	Milwaukee		
		5.5%	Winnebago		
Afghanistan	76	39.5%	Waukesha		
		32.9%	Milwaukee		
		25.0%	Dane		

Table 2b (continued)

Refugee Group	N*		Last Known Address
Europe:			
Yugoslavia & Albania	2524	57.3%	Milwaukee
		8.7%	Dane
		7.8%	Sheboygan
USSR	1158	70.7%	Milwaukee
		11.1%	Brown
		5.6%	Waukesha
Africa:			
Somalia	1541	49.1%	Milwaukee
		27.5%	Barron
		16.7%	Brown
Ethiopia	87	78.2%	Milwaukee
		14.9%	Dane
Sudan	155	54.2%	Milwaukee
		27.7%	Winnebago
		16.8%	Dane
Liberia& Sierra Leone	192	76.0%	Milwaukee
Latin America & Caribbean:			
Mexico	364	23.1%	Brown
		22.0%	Milwaukee
		10.7%	Sheboygan
		8.8%	Jefferson
Cuba	86	61.6%	Milwaukee
All Refugees:			
	24,146	37.2%	Milwaukee
		9.5%	Marathon
		7.7%	Brown
		7.5%	Dane
		6.2%	Sheboygan
		4.8%	Outagamie
		4.5%	La Crosse
		4.0%	Winnebago

*Refugees with unknown locations, out-of-state locations, or deceased are removed from table.

Table 3a
Demographics of Refugees in Wisconsin at the Time of Arrival

Refugee Group	Adult/Child		Sex of Adults		Mean Age of Adults	
	Adult	Child	Male	Female	Male	Female
Asia:						
Hmong - Pre-1983	50.6%	49.4%	45.6%	54.4%	31.6	31.1
Hmong - 1983-2003	37.6%	62.4%	49.0%	51.0%	33.6	34.5
Hmong - 2004-2010	41.0%	59.0%	48.8%	51.2%	33.2	35.7
Cambodia	51.8%	48.2%	52.4%	47.6%	37.1	30.1
Laos & Thailand	35.0%	65.0%	44.4%	55.6%	35.4	33.6
Vietnam	67.1%	32.9%	46.7%	53.3%	39.5	34.2
Burma	56.1%	43.9%	55.0%	45.0%	31.6	31.3
Bhutan & Nepal	71.7%	28.3%	52.1%	47.9%	35.9	33.2
Middle East:						
Iraq	65.2%	34.8%	56.1%	43.9%	33.4	37.3
Afghanistan	52.9%	47.1%	49.5%	50.5%	35.8	33.6
Europe:						
Yugoslavia & Albania	63.9%	36.1%	51.4%	48.6%	36.7	36.9
USSR	78.4%	21.6%	45.0%	55.0%	50.8	51.6
Africa:						
Somalia	51.9%	48.1%	52.8%	47.2%	25.8	25.6
Ethiopia	79.1%	20.9%	55.6%	44.4%	33.2	29.0
Sudan	40.3%	59.7%	50.9%	49.1%	34.1	29.1
Liberia & Sierra Leone	56.1%	43.9%	41.4%	58.6%	34.5	31.3
Latin America & Caribbean:						
Mexico	70.1%	29.9%	52.4%	47.6%	29.1	30.8
Cuba	81.1%	18.9%	59.4%	40.6%	36.3	37.3
All Refugees:	48.7%	51.3%	48.4%	51.6%	34.7	35.6

Note: A small number of children classified as "refugees" were born after their parents' arrival.

Table 3b
Current Demographics of Refugees in Wisconsin*
Current (2010)

Refugee Group	Adult/Child		Sex of Adults		Mean Age of Adults		Mean Number of Children** Per Adult Woman
	Adult	Child	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Asia:							
Hmong - Pre-1983	100.0%	0.0%	45.5%	54.5%	47.7	49.3	5.2
Hmong - 1983-2003	94.0%	6.0%	49.0%	51.0%	34.7	36.9	3.4
Hmong - 2004-2010	53.1%	46.9%	48.1%	51.9%	33.8	35.4	3.1
Cambodia	98.7%	1.3%	52.6%	47.4%	44.9	47.0	4.0
Laos & Thailand	95.0%	5.0%	42.5%	57.5%	38.0	37.6	2.5
Vietnam	92.8%	7.2%	47.3%	52.7%	46.4	43.1	1.7
Burma	58.3%	41.7%	56.9%	43.1%	32.8	32.1	1.8
Bhutan & Nepal	70.7%	29.3%	52.3%	47.7%	35.5	33.3	1.2
Middle East:							
Iraq	66.5%	33.5%	56.9%	43.1%	34.5	37.3	1.7
Afghanistan	81.8%	18.2%	50.8%	49.2%	32.6	35.5	1.6
Europe:							
Yugoslavia & Albania	86.4%	13.6%	50.6%	49.4%	40.5	40.5	1.3
USSR	91.4%	8.6%	44.2%	55.8%	52.8	56.2	0.8
Africa:							
Somalia	69.4%	30.6%	54.7%	45.3%	29.1	28.2	1.6
Ethiopia	83.7%	16.3%	59.7%	40.3%	34.4	30.2	0.7
Sudan	58.2%	41.8%	47.1%	52.9%	37.8	32.9	2.4
Liberia & Sierra Leone	80.8%	19.2%	42.4%	57.6%	34.2	34.7	1.6
Latin America & Caribbean:							
Mexico	94.3%	5.7%	52.6%	47.4%	41.7	40.2	2.3
Cuba	92.2%	7.8%	57.8%	42.2%	52.4	46.0	1.2
All Refugees:	81.8%	18.2%	49.1%	50.9%	37.3	39.0	2.8

*Refugees who have moved out-of-state, or who are deceased, have been removed from table.

**This includes adult children.

Table 4a*
Adult Men: Mean Annual Benefits and Earnings for Calendar Year 2010

Refugee Group	Adult Men, age 18-65									
	N	W2 cash	FS	SSI/ SSDI	UI wages	UI benefits	CS receipt	Total	CC Benefit	% on MA/BC
Asia:										
Hmong - Pre-1983	496	\$11	\$273	\$1,924	\$14,224	\$1,321	\$53	\$17,805	\$0	29.6%
Hmong - 1983-2003	4087	\$11	\$256	\$753	\$15,262	\$1,013	\$7	\$17,302	\$15	32.1%
Hmong - 2004-2010	931	\$16	\$2,146	\$672	\$13,981	\$842	\$0	\$17,657	\$5	58.8%
Cambodia	34	\$0	\$207	\$2,980	\$9,273	\$976	\$0	\$13,436	\$0	14.7%
Laos & Thailand	221	\$7	\$400	\$1,036	\$11,008	\$1,996	\$1	\$14,447	\$0	25.3%
Vietnam	99	\$22	\$165	\$454	\$5,054	\$494	\$0	\$6,189	\$0	23.2%
Burma	479	\$466	\$1,769	\$121	\$7,951	\$192	\$0	\$10,499	\$9	51.8%
Middle East:										
Iraq	163	\$563	\$2,512	\$169	\$5,427	\$113	\$16	\$8,800	\$0	54.6%
Afghanistan	30	\$0	\$246	\$207	\$6,185	\$432	\$0	\$7,069	\$0	20.0%
Europe:										
Yugoslavia & Albania	1102	\$5	\$174	\$339	\$17,773	\$1,236	\$5	\$19,515	\$0	18.3%
USSR	343	\$0	\$231	\$485	\$20,853	\$819	\$0	\$22,389	\$0	19.2%
Africa:										
Somalia	547	\$38	\$395	\$48	\$5,908	\$411	\$0	\$6,800	\$7	21.0%
Ethiopia	43	\$161	\$695	\$0	\$4,705	\$0	\$0	\$5,561	\$0	51.2%
Sudan	38	\$17	\$642	\$302	\$6,565	\$119	\$0	\$7,647	\$0	31.6%
Liberia & Sierra Leone	59	\$2	\$555	\$259	\$13,110	\$1,027	\$0	\$14,953	\$111	25.4%
Latin America & Caribbean:										
Mexico	242	\$0	\$126	\$600	\$11,197	\$631	\$18	\$12,572	\$5	20.7%
Cuba	39	\$0	\$534	\$1,683	\$3,651	\$149	\$0	\$6,016	\$0	10.3%
All Male Refugees:	9233	\$48	\$579	\$654	\$13,782	\$928	\$8	\$15,997	\$9	32.5%
Percent Non-Zero		2.0%	16.2%	8.3%	60.1%	18.3%	0.3%	73.2%	0.2%	32.5%

*Refugees from Bhutan & Nepal are excluded from this table as most of these individuals have been in Wisconsin for less than one year.

Table 4b*
Adult Women: Mean Annual Benefits and Earnings for Calendar Year 2010

Refugee Group	Adult Women, age 18-65									
	N	W2 cash	FS	SSI/ SSDI	UI wages	UI benefits	CS recv	Total	CC Benefit	% on MA/BC
Asia:										
Hmong - Pre-1983	595	\$19	\$1,258	\$2,643	\$11,032	\$582	\$447	\$15,981	\$106	39.7%
Hmong - 1983-2003	4152	\$25	\$1,241	\$1,205	\$10,875	\$608	\$205	\$14,159	\$197	46.9%
Hmong - 2004-2010	981	\$76	\$1,371	\$1,123	\$6,052	\$249	\$44	\$8,915	\$1,001	68.4%
Cambodia	33	\$0	\$1,390	\$4,375	\$10,619	\$28	\$150	\$16,561	\$152	39.4%
Laos & Thailand	302	\$119	\$1,653	\$1,975	\$8,852	\$869	\$808	\$14,276	\$227	49.3%
Vietnam	114	\$0	\$774	\$256	\$3,517	\$71	\$15	\$4,633	\$385	42.1%
Burma	360	\$184	\$824	\$88	\$3,802	\$202	\$38	\$5,138	\$591	76.7%
Middle East:										
Iraq	119	\$526	\$930	\$235	\$1,790	\$31	\$0	\$3,512	\$287	74.0%
Afghanistan	30	\$0	\$759	\$272	\$4,751	\$181	\$25	\$5,987	\$0	26.7%
Europe:										
Yugoslavia & Albania	1055	\$22	\$287	\$265	\$13,169	\$596	\$40	\$14,379	\$29	23.9%
USSR	399	\$29	\$561	\$1,139	\$18,481	\$434	\$88	\$20,732	\$161	28.8%
Africa:										
Somalia	456	\$208	\$1,441	\$24	\$2,798	\$563	\$48	\$5,082	\$2,030	46.5%
Ethiopia	28	\$0	\$313	\$0	\$6,076	\$149	\$81	\$6,619	\$20	60.7%
Sudan	44	\$719	\$1,789	\$197	\$5,266	\$121	\$19	\$8,110	\$888	45.5%
Liberia & Sierra Leone	82	\$108	\$1,252	\$0	\$9,775	\$385	\$31	\$11,552	\$1,358	48.8%
Latin America & Caribbean:										
Mexico	211	\$4	\$1,119	\$472	\$7,477	\$511	\$422	\$10,004	\$128	49.8%
Cuba	32	\$73	\$592	\$924	\$3,127	\$486	\$55	\$5,258	\$0	25.0%
All Female Refugees:	9360	\$59	\$1,089	\$1,019	\$9,718	\$513	\$182	\$12,580	\$384	46.6%
Percent Non-Zero		2.1%	29.0%	13.2%	51.1%	12.6%	5.1%	71.2%	4.1%	46.6%

*Refugees from Bhutan & Nepal are excluded from this table as most of these individuals have been in Wisconsin for less than one year.

Table 5
Minor Children in 2010 with Refugee Parents*

Refugee Group	Both Parents are Refugees		Mother Only is Refugee**		Father Only is Refugee***		Refugee Children w/Others; Parents Unknown	Total	Percent of all Children
	Refugee Children	Non-Refugee Children	Refugee Children	Non-Refugee Children	Refugee Children	Non-Refugee Children			
Asia:									
Hmong - Pre-1983	0	621	0	382	0	346	0	1,349	7.1%
Hmong - 1983-2003	290	5,279	46	2,387	7	1,735	5	9,749	50.9%
Hmong - 2004-2010	1,450	928	260	147	28	79	24	2,916	15.2%
Cambodia	1	11	0	25	0	14	0	51	0.3%
Laos & Thailand	24	123	3	299	1	121	1	572	3.0%
Vietnam	15	27	2	85	1	32	2	164	0.9%
Burma	521	94	52	9	13	3	11	703	3.7%
Bhutan & Nepal	24	2	0	0	0	0	0	26	0.1%
Middle East:									
Iraq	120	21	19	6	1	12	0	179	0.9%
Europe:									
Yugoslavia & Albania	304	210	7	109	2	91	6	729	3.8%
USSR	81	90	20	48	0	17	3	259	1.4%
Africa:									
Somalia	215	273	184	175	18	74	27	966	5.0%
Ethiopia	7	1	3	10	0	0	4	25	0.1%
Sudan	35	23	23	17	0	6	1	105	0.6%
Liberia & Sierra Leone	8	13	14	35	4	16	8	98	0.5%
Latin America & Caribbean:									
Mexico	7	92	9	238	1	256	8	611	3.2%
Cuba	1	5	5	7	0	8	0	26	0.1%
All Children:	3,205	7,919	698	4,227	85	2,917	119	19,170	100.0%

*Children who are deceased, or children who, along with their parents, have moved out of state, have been removed from this table.

**Includes children with refugee mother and father non-refugee or father unknown.

***Includes children with refugee father and mother non-refugee or mother unknown.

Table 6a

Refugee Children in 2010
Living with One or Two Parents

Refugee Groups With more than 100 Refugee children	Total	Lives with Both Parents	Lives with Mother			Lives with Father		
			Father Deceased	In KIDS	Not in KIDS	Mother Deceased	In KIDS	Not in KIDS
Asia:								
Hmong	2,110	78%	4.6%	13%	2%	1.2%	1%	<1%
Burma	597	86%	1.3%	9%	1%	0.3%	1%	1%
Middle East:								
Iraq	140	86%	2.9%	7%	4%	0.7%	0%	0%
Europe:								
Yugoslavia & Albania	318	95%	1.3%	3%	1%	0.3%	0%	0%
USSR	104	80%	2.9%	13%	4%	0.0%	0%	0%
Africa:								
Somalia	444	49%	8.6%	39%	1%	0.5%	1%	<1%
All Refugee Children:	4,105	76%	4.3%	15%	2%	1%	1%	<1%
				N=634	N=86		N=36	N=11

Table 6b

**Living Situation and KIDS-System Status of Non-Refugee Children Born to Refugee Parents
Minor Children in 2010**

Refugee Groups With More than 100 Non-Refugee Children	Total	Lives with Both Parents	Lives with Mother			Lives with Father		
			Father Deceased	In KIDS	Not in KIDS	Mother Deceased	In KIDS	Not in KIDS
Asia:								
Hmong	11,894	76%	1.6%	15%	4%	0.5%	2%	1%
Laos & Thailand	543	37%	0.7%	52%	7%	0.0%	4%	0%
Vietnam	144	54%	0.0%	35%	7%	0.0%	2%	<1%
Burma	106	86%	0.9%	7%	6%	0.0%	1%	0%
Europe:								
Yugoslavia & Albania	409	85%	1.0%	9%	3%	0.2%	1%	0%
USSR	155	78%	2.6%	13%	3%	0.0%	3%	0%
Africa:								
Somalia	522	64%	0.2%	30%	4%	0.2%	1%	1%
Latin America & Caribbean:								
Mexico	586	65%	0.0%	25%	5%	0.0%	4%	<1%
All Non-Refugee Children:	15,052	73%	1.4%	18%	4%	0.4%	2%	<1%
				N=2712	N=586		N=365	N=85

Table 7

Refugee and Non-Refugee Children Identified in the KIDS System
Paternity Adjudication and Child Support Orders

Children of Refugee Parents with an Absent Parent:		Paternity Status of Child								
		N	Unknown		Non-Marital Child		Marital Child			
Absent Father:			No CS order	CS order	Not Adjudicated	Adjudicated/VPA		No CS order	CS order	
Total		3346	14.5%	2.8%	33.1%	11.8%	15.2%	13.3%	9.3%	
Refugee Groups with more than 100 Children with an Absent Father:										
Hmong		2067	10.3%	2.5%	32.1%	13.7%	16.1%	14.5%	10.8%	
Laos & Thailand		286	15.0%	4.2%	30.4%	12.6%	26.6%	4.9%	6.3%	
Somalia		331	23.3%	0.3%	43.8%	7.0%	6.0%	15.7%	3.9%	
Mexico		149	17.5%	6.7%	18.8%	14.1%	20.1%	6.0%	16.8%	
Absent Mother:		N	Non-marital or Unknown Status			Marital Child				
Total		401	No CS Order	CS Order	No CS Order	CS Order	No CS Order	CS Order		
			36.7%	15.0%	27.3%	21.0%				

Table 8a

**Refugee and Non-Refugee Children Covered by Child Support Orders in 2010
Dollar Amount of Child Support Orders, Payments, and Pay-to-Owe Ratios
By Child**

Child Support Orders by Child	N	Mean Annual CS Order	Mean Annual CS Payment	Mean Annual CS	
				Pay-to-Owe Ratio*	Percent with any CS Payment
All Orders (per Child)	1058	\$1,902	\$1,550	67.9%	81.0%
Father Payors	914	\$1,989	\$1,649	69.4%	81.6%
Mother Payors	144	\$1,353	\$920	58.3%	77.1%
Father Payors:					
Hmong	608	\$1,846	\$1,528	69.4%	81.9%
Laos & Thailand	106	\$2,399	\$2,077	72.7%	86.8%
Somalia	34	\$1,141	\$995	70.1%	82.3%
Mexico	65	\$2,280	\$1,698	60.6%	70.8%

*Pay-to-Owe ratios were capped at 100 percent, in cases of annual overpayments.

Table 8b

**2010 Child Support Orders Covering Children of Refugee Parents
Dollar Amount of Child Support Orders, Payments, and Pay-to-Owe Ratios
By Custodial Parent**

Child Support Orders by Custodial Parent	N	Mean Annual CS Order	Mean Annual CS Payment	Mean Annual CS Pay-to- Owe Ratio*	Percent with any CS Payment	Mean Number of Children
Custodial Parents With an Order	574	\$3,274	\$2,675	67.1%	79.4%	1.7
Hmong	350	\$3,231	\$2,657	67.0%	79.7%	1.8
All Others	224	\$3,342	\$2,718	67.3%	79.0%	1.5
National Data (2007)**						
Custodial Parents With an Order		\$5,350	\$3,354		76.3%	
Custodial Parents With Order And Program Assistance		\$4,294	\$2,203		71.2%	

*Pay-to-Owe ratios were capped at 100 percent, in cases of annual overpayments.

**National Data for 2007 is from: <http://www.census.gov/prod/2009pubs/p60-237.pdf>