RESEARCH & TRAINING

AMILY WELFARE

PROFILE OF THE HISPANIC TCA POPULATION

LISA THIEBAUD NICOLI · LETITIA LOGAN PASSARELLA · CATHERINE E. BORN

The Hispanic population is increasing throughout the country, and Maryland is no exception. Between 2000 and 2010, Maryland's Hispanic population more than doubled, and Hispanics constituted 8.2% of the total state population in 2010.¹ Because Maryland's Hispanic population is relatively new, no work has examined their patterns of public assistance usage. There are reasons to think that the Hispanic population may have patterns of public assistance usage that differ from Maryland's non-Hispanic population. For example, Hispanics are more likely to be immigrants, and immigrant access to public assistance varies from program to program. This brief provides a demographic profile of Hispanic Temporary Cash Assistance (TCA, Maryland's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program) recipients in the October 2011 active caseload.

Maryland's Hispanic Population

Despite its rapidly growing Hispanic population, Maryland still has a smaller percentage of Hispanics than the nation.² At 16.4%, Hispanics are the largest racial and ethnic minority group in the country; African-Americans, excluding Hispanics, are the second-largest racial and ethnic minority group at 12.2%. In contrast, African-Americans, excluding Hispanics, are Maryland's largest racial and ethnic minority group at 29.0% of the state population while Hispanics are 8.2% of the state population.

Like African-Americans, Hispanics in Maryland are also disproportionately poor.³ While the poverty rate for the entire state population is 9.7%, the state poverty rate for Hispanics and Latinos is 14.1%. African-Americans in Maryland have a slightly higher poverty rate at 14.8%. The relatively high poverty rate for Hispanics in Maryland suggests that they may need programs like TCA to help them make ends meet.

In addition to being smaller than the national Hispanic population, Maryland's Hispanic population is unusual in terms of place of birth and national origin.⁴ Over half (53.5%) of Maryland's Hispanic population is foreignborn, compared to a little over a third (36.9%) of the nation's Hispanic population. Countries of origin differ too. Almost onethird (31.1%) of Maryland's Hispanic population is Salvadoran while less than one in five (17.7%) is Mexican. Nationally, nearly two-thirds (64.8%) of Hispanics and Latinos identify their national origin as Mexican and a small portion (3.7%) identify as Salvadoran.

Research Methods

In March 2008, the Client Automated Resources and Eligibility System (CARES) began requiring caseworkers to enter information on ethnicity. The options for ethnicity in CARES are simply "Hispanic or Latino" and "Not Hispanic or Latino." Because this change was implemented in early 2008—and we want to allow time for caseworkers to become accustomed to reporting this information—we do not report data on ethnicity prior to 2009.

For this brief, we collected administrative data from CARES on the active TCA caseload in October 2011 (n=27,285). We also present information on the TCA active caseload in October 2009 (n=25,422) and October 2010 (n=26,842). We use chisquare and analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests to determine whether differences between Hispanic and non-Hispanic TCA recipients are statistically significant.

Hispanics in the TCA Caseload

This first question is the most fundamental: How many Hispanic cases are there in the TCA caseload? Table 1 shows the number and percent of Hispanic and non-Hispanic payees in the October 2009, October 2010, and October 2011 active caseloads. Hispanic cases constitute about 4% of the total caseload in each year.

There are two things to note about this. First, the percent of the caseload that is Hispanic is increasing over time. While the number of Hispanics increased over 20% between 2009 and 2011, the total caseload increased less than 10% in this period. Second, the percent of the TCA caseload that is Hispanic is much smaller than the percent of the state population that is Hispanic. Maryland's population is about 8% Hispanic, but its TCA population is only about 4% Hispanic. Because Hispanics are disproportionately poor, one would expect their percentage of the TCA population to exceed their percentage of the total state population. Given all of these trends, it is likely that the percent of the TCA caseload that is Hispanic will continue to rise.

Table 1. Payees' Ethnicity by Year

	Hispanic	Non- Hispanic
2009	3.6%	96.4%
(n=25,422)	(871)	(23,468)
2010	3.8%	96.2%
(n=26,842)	(992)	(24,898)
2011	4.1%	95.9%
(n=27,285)	(1,078)	(25,356)

Note: Counts may not sum to actual sample size because of missing data for some variables. Valid percents are reported.

Demographic Characteristics

Now that we know how many TCA cases are headed by a Hispanic payee, we examine if there are any differences between Hispanic and non-Hispanic recipients. Table 2 displays payee and case demographic information on Hispanic and non-Hispanic recipients in the October 2011 active caseload.

We find statistically significant differences between Hispanic and non-Hispanic payees in age, marital status, and education. Compared to non-Hispanic payees, Hispanic payees are younger, more likely to be married, and less likely to have a 12thgrade education. Hispanic payees are, on average, 32.61 years old, which is two years younger than non-Hispanic payees. One in seven (14.4%) Hispanic pavees are married while less than one in ten (7.1%) non-Hispanic payees is married. Finally, 45.0% of Hispanic payees have less than a 12th-grade education while 38.2% of non-Hispanic payees lack a 12th-grade education.

We also find a number of statistically significant differences between Hispanic and non-Hispanic cases. The largest difference is in the number of adults included in the assistance unit. Two in three (66.5%) Hispanic cases have no adult while one in four (25.0%) non-Hispanic cases have no adult. Most likely as a result of this, Hispanic cases (mean=2.37 people) have fewer people included in the assistance unit than non-Hispanic cases (mean=2.59 people). There are also slightly more children included on Hispanic cases (mean=2.01 vs. mean=1.80), and the youngest recipient child on Hispanic cases (mean=4.58 years) is, on average, over one year younger than the youngest recipient child on non-Hispanic cases (mean=5.81 years).

	Hispanic (n=1,078)	Non-Hispanic (n=25,356)
Gender		
% Female	95.2% (1,026)	94.6% (23,975)
Age		
Mean*** [Standard Deviation]	32.61 [8.83]	34.56 [12.21]
Marital Status***		
Married	14.4% (149)	7.1% (1,765)
Never Married	72.7% (752)	79.9% (19,952)
Divorced, Separated, or Widowed	12.9% (134)	13.0% (3,250)
Education***		
Less than Grade 12	45.0% (445)	38.2% (9,229)
Number of Adults in AU***		
0 (Child-Only)	66.5% (717)	25.0% (6,328)
1	31.0% (334)	71.6% (18,157)
2	2.5% (27)	3.4% (871)
Size of Assistance Unit		
Mean*** [Standard Deviation]	2.37 [1.17]	2.59 [1.29]
Number of Children in AU		
Mean*** [Standard Deviation]	2.01 [1.06]	1.80 [1.14]
Age of Youngest Recipient Child		
Mean*** [Standard Deviation]	4.58 [4.03]	5.81 [5.11]

Table 2. Pavee and	I Case Demographic	Characteristics.	October 2011

Note: Counts may not sum to actual sample size because of missing data for some variables. Valid percents are reported. *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Core Caseload Designations

Maryland's system of core caseload designations is intended to help the state manage its caseload more effectively. Cases that are designated as "core" are traditional one-parent cases that are subject to work requirements. Some cases with other designations, such as two-parent and legal immigrant, are also required to work, although they are classified as "non-core" because the state provides the funding for these cases. Most other non-core cases, such as child-only cases and long-term disabled cases, are not subject to work requirements.

Table 3 shows selected core caseload designations for Hispanics and non-Hispanics in the October 2011 caseload. There are a number of striking, statisticallysignificant differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanics in the distribution of core caseload designations.

First, and most importantly, the Hispanic caseload is heavily child-only. Two of every three (66.5%) Hispanic cases are designated as child-only, which is very high when compared to the percentage of the non-Hispanic caseload that is designated as child-only (25.0%). While this difference is interesting simply in light of the large difference between non-Hispanic and Hispanic cases, it also has substantial programmatic implications. Because the adult caring for the child is not included in benefit calculation, child-only cases are not subject to work requirements or time limits. and they tend to stay on the caseload longer than core cases do (Hetling, Saunders, & Born, 2005).

Consequently, Hispanics are also much less likely to be part of the core caseload. While over one in three (37.8%) non-Hispanic cases is designated as core, less than 15% (12.9%) of Hispanic cases are core cases.

Second, Hispanics are a considerable portion of a couple non-core caseload designations. Despite the fact that Hispanics are only 4% of the total caseload, they are 10% of the child-only caseload (n=717/7,063). Similarly, Hispanics constitute 20% of all legal immigrant cases (n=33/165). While only 3.1% of Hispanic cases are designated as legal-immigrant cases, that percentage is much higher than the 0.5% of the non-Hispanic caseload with the legal immigrant designation.

Finally, despite the fact that Hispanic payees are more likely to be married, they are not more likely to have the two-parent caseload designation. Just 1.5% of Hispanic cases are designated as two-parent, compared to 2.3% of non-Hispanic cases. This could be because a different caseload designation, such as legal immigrant or long-term disabled, better fits the case's needs. However, it is also possible that some of the married payees are not recipients themselves, and it is their children, grandchildren, or other relatives that actually receive TCA.

	Hispanic (n=1,078)	Non-Hispanic (n=25,356)
Core Caseload Category		
Core Case	12.9% (139)	37.8% (9,580)
Non-Core Case	87.1% (939)	62.2% (15,774)
Type of Non-Core Case		
Child Only	66.5% (717)	25.0% (6,346)
Two Parent	1.5% (16)	2.3% (584)
Legal Immigrant	3.1% (33)	0.5% (132)

Table 3. Selected Core Caseload Designations, October 2011***

Note: Counts may not sum to actual sample size because of missing data for some variables. Valid percents are reported. *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Jurisdictional Differences

As one might expect, jurisdictions vary widely in terms of the percentage of Hispanics in their caseloads. Table 4 shows the percentage of each jurisdiction's total population that is Hispanic as well as the percentage of that jurisdiction's caseload that is Hispanic. It is easy to see that the Hispanic population is centered in the Washington, D.C. suburbs, as Montgomery and Prince George's counties are each about 15% Hispanic. This is reflected in the caseload for Montgomery County, which is almost 20% Hispanic. The caseload in Prince George's County is less than 10% Hispanic, however.

This pattern is repeated throughout the state, as the percent of a jurisdiction's population that is Hispanic seems unrelated to the percent of the TCA caseload that is Hispanic in that jurisdiction. Baltimore City and Charles County are each a little over 4% Hispanic but the caseload in both jurisdictions is less than 2% Hispanic. Some of the more rural counties, such as Caroline, Talbot, and Queen Anne's, have substantially higher percentages of Hispanics in their caseloads than in their populations. The lack of a relationship between the Hispanic population and Hispanic caseloads requires more research to explicate.

Jurisdiction	% Hispanic, Population (2009-2011)	% Hispanic, Caseload (October 2011)
Montgomery County	17.1%	19.3%
Prince George's County	14.9%	8.3%
Frederick County	7.4%	10.6%
Anne Arundel County	6.1%	4.4%
Howard County	5.9%	5.3%
Caroline County	5.5%	14.7%
Talbot County	5.5%	11.8%
Wicomico County	4.6%	5.3%
Charles County	4.4%	1.4%
Kent County	4.4%	3.3%
Baltimore County	4.2%	3.7%
Baltimore City	4.2%	1.8%
Somerset County	3.8%	1.1%
Dorchester County	3.6%	4.5%
Harford County	3.6%	3.7%
Washington County	3.5%	2.2%
Cecil County	3.4%	3.9%
St. Mary's County	3.3%	1.4%
Worcester County	3.2%	0.0%
Queen Anne's County	3.0%	8.7%
Calvert County	2.9%	2.5%
Carroll County	2.7%	3.7%
Allegany County	1.5%	0.7%
Garrett County	0.8%	2.2%

Table 4. Percent Hispanic in the Population and in the Caseload by Jurisdiction

Note: Data on the percent of the population that is Hispanic obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau website (<u>http://factfinder2.census.gov/</u>) using the 2009-2011 American Community Survey 3-Year Demographic and Housing Estimates (DP05).

Conclusions

This brief provides the first look at the Hispanic TCA population in Maryland, and we find that the Hispanic TCA population is actually quite different from the non-Hispanic TCA population. Hispanic payees are younger, more likely to be married, and less likely to have a 12th-grade education. Two-thirds of Hispanic TCA cases are childonly, and Hispanic cases include two children, on average. Traditional, workmandatory single-parent cases—"core" cases—are uncommon among Hispanic

5

TCA recipients. Instead, the most common caseload designation is child-only. Despite constituting only 4% of the total TCA caseload, Hispanics are 10% of the childonly caseload. Hispanics are also overrepresented in the legal immigrant caseload designation, where they comprise one in five legal immigrant cases.

The finding regarding the high percentage of child-only cases is particularly important. Child-only cases tend to have a different participation profile than cases in which a parent is also receiving assistance, as they are exempt from work requirements and time limits (Hetling, Saunders, & Born, 2005). Given these exemptions, it is not surprising that child-only cases tend to receive TCA for longer periods of time, and their time on TCA is more likely to be consecutive. Because we found that the youngest recipient child is younger on Hispanic cases than on non-Hispanic cases, this could indicate that Hispanic cases are particularly likely to receive TCA for lengthy periods of time.

All of this indicates that it is worth examining the Hispanic TCA population in greater detail. There are a number of questions that this brief raises, from why more Hispanics do not receive TCA when they are disproportionately likely to be poor to why there are so many child-only cases among Hispanic recipients. It also remains to be seen if Hispanic child-only cases resemble the typical child-only case in Maryland. Regardless, it seems clear that the Hispanic population in Maryland is only going to increase, and the same is likely true for the Hispanic TCA population. With solid, empirical information, policymakers and program managers can determine the best course for Maryland and its TCA recipients.

Reference

Hetling, A., Saunders, C., & Born, C.E. (2005). Maryland's child-only caseload: A comparison of parental and non-parental cases. Baltimore: University of Maryland School of Social Work.

³ Data in this paragraph are three-year estimates for 2009-2011 from the American Community Survey (S1701: Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months), available from the U.S. Census Bureau website (http://factfinder2.census.gov/).

⁴ Foreign-born data calculated from three-year estimates for 2009-2011 from the American Community Survey (B05003I: Sex by Age by Nativity and Citizenship Status (Hispanic or Latino)). National origin data calculated from three-year estimates for 2009-2011 from the American Community Survey (B03001: Hispanic or Latino Origin by Specific Origin). All data available from the U.S. Census Bureau website (http://factfinder2.census.gov/).

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Jamie Haskel and Somlak Suvanasorn for their assistance in the collection and processing of data for this research brief. This brief was prepared by the Family Welfare Research and Training Group with support from its long-time research partner, the Maryland Department of Human Resources.

The authors are grateful to Jeffrey Clark, MSW, whose independent research project was the impetus for this study.

For additional information about this research brief, please contact Dr. Catherine Born (410-706-5134; cborn@ssw.umaryland.edu) or Dr. Lisa Thiebaud Nicoli (410-706-2763; Inicoli@ssw.umaryland.edu) at the School of Social Work.

Please visit our website, www.familywelfare.umaryland.edu for additional copies of this brief and other reports.

¹ Data for 2000 from DP-1, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000, Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF1) 100-Percent Data; data for 2010 from DP1, Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010, 2010 Census Summary File 1. Available from the U.S. Census Bureau website (http://factfinder2.census.gov/).

² Data in this paragraph from DP1, Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010, 2010 Census Summary File 1, available from the U.S. Census Bureau website (http://factfinder2.census.gov/).