

The Effect of DACA Eligibility on Full-Time Employment: A Difference-in-Differences Analysis

Replication Study 49

January 2026

Abstract

This study estimates the causal effect of eligibility for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program on full-time employment among Mexican-born Hispanic non-citizens in the United States. Using American Community Survey data from 2006–2016 and a difference-in-differences identification strategy that compares individuals who were ages 26–30 at the time of DACA implementation (eligible) to those ages 31–35 (ineligible due to age), I find that DACA eligibility increased the probability of full-time employment by approximately 4.8 percentage points (95% CI: 2.6–7.0 percentage points). This effect is statistically significant and robust to various specifications including controls for demographic characteristics, year fixed effects, and state-level clustering. Event study estimates show no evidence of differential pre-trends and indicate that the treatment effect emerged in 2013 and grew through 2016. These findings suggest that DACA’s work authorization and protection from deportation had meaningful positive effects on labor market outcomes for eligible immigrants.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Background on DACA	5
2.1	Program Overview	5
2.2	Eligibility Requirements	5
2.3	Expected Effects on Employment	6
3	Data	7
3.1	Data Source	7
3.2	Sample Construction	7
3.3	Variable Definitions	8
3.3.1	Outcome Variable	8
3.3.2	Treatment and Time Variables	8
3.3.3	Control Variables	9
3.4	Summary Statistics	9
4	Empirical Methodology	10
4.1	Difference-in-Differences Framework	10
4.2	Main Specification	11
4.3	Estimation	11
4.4	Identification Assumptions	12
4.5	Robustness Checks	12
5	Results	13
5.1	Raw Difference-in-Differences	13
5.2	Main Regression Results	13
5.3	Covariate Effects	15
5.4	Robustness Checks	16

5.4.1	Alternative Age Bands	16
5.4.2	Heterogeneity by Gender	16
5.4.3	Pre-Treatment Parallel Trends	16
5.4.4	Event Study	17
6	Discussion	18
6.1	Interpretation of Results	18
6.2	Mechanisms	19
6.3	Limitations	19
6.4	Comparison to Literature	20
7	Conclusion	20
A	Additional Tables and Figures	23
A.1	Year-by-Year Employment Rates	23
A.2	Variable Definitions from IPUMS	23
A.3	Full Model Output	24
B	Technical Appendix: Replication Code	25

1 Introduction

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, implemented on June 15, 2012, represented one of the most significant immigration policy changes in recent U.S. history. The program offered eligible undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children the opportunity to obtain temporary work authorization and protection from deportation. Understanding the labor market effects of such policies is crucial for informing immigration policy debates and assessing the economic integration of immigrant populations.

This study investigates a specific question: among ethnically Hispanic-Mexican individuals born in Mexico and living in the United States as non-citizens, what was the causal impact of DACA eligibility on the probability of full-time employment? Full-time employment is defined as usually working 35 or more hours per week, following standard labor statistics conventions.

The identification strategy exploits the age-based eligibility cutoff in DACA's design. Individuals who had not yet reached their 31st birthday as of June 15, 2012 were potentially eligible, while those who were 31 or older were ineligible regardless of whether they met all other criteria. This creates a natural comparison group: individuals who would have qualified for DACA except for their age. By comparing employment trends among those aged 26–30 at implementation (the treatment group) to those aged 31–35 (the control group), I can estimate the causal effect of DACA eligibility using a difference-in-differences (DiD) framework.

The main finding is that DACA eligibility is associated with approximately a 4.8 percentage point increase in the probability of full-time employment. This represents a meaningful economic effect, corresponding to roughly an 8% increase relative to the control group's baseline employment rate. The estimate is statistically significant at conventional levels and robust to alternative specifications.

The remainder of this report is organized as follows. Section 2 provides background on the DACA program and its eligibility requirements. Section 3 describes the data and

sample construction. Section 4 outlines the empirical methodology. Section 5 presents the main results and robustness checks. Section 6 discusses the findings, and Section 7 concludes.

2 Background on DACA

2.1 Program Overview

DACA was announced by the Obama administration on June 15, 2012, and implemented through executive action by the Department of Homeland Security. The program was designed to provide temporary relief from deportation and work authorization to certain undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children.

Applications for the program began to be received on August 15, 2012. In the first four years of the program, nearly 900,000 initial applications were received, with approximately 90% being approved. DACA status is granted for two-year renewable periods, meaning recipients must reapply periodically to maintain their status.

2.2 Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible for DACA, an individual must meet all of the following criteria:

1. **Arrival age:** Arrived in the United States before their 16th birthday
2. **Age as of June 15, 2012:** Had not yet reached their 31st birthday
3. **Continuous residence:** Lived continuously in the United States since June 15, 2007
4. **Physical presence:** Were physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012
5. **Immigration status:** Did not have lawful immigration status (citizenship or legal residency) on June 15, 2012
6. **Education/military:** Were in school, had graduated from high school, obtained a GED, or were an honorably discharged veteran

7. **Criminal history:** Had not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more other misdemeanors

The age cutoff at 31 years old as of June 15, 2012 is particularly important for this study, as it creates a sharp discontinuity that can be exploited for causal identification.

2.3 Expected Effects on Employment

DACA was expected to affect employment through several channels:

1. **Work authorization:** DACA recipients receive Employment Authorization Documents (EADs), allowing them to work legally for any employer. Prior to DACA, undocumented immigrants could only work in the informal economy or with employers willing to overlook documentation requirements.
2. **Reduced fear of deportation:** Protection from deportation may increase willingness to seek formal employment and negotiate for better working conditions.
3. **Improved job matching:** Legal work authorization enables access to a broader range of jobs, potentially leading to better matches between workers and positions.
4. **Driver's license access:** In some states, DACA recipients could obtain driver's licenses, expanding geographic job search and commuting options.

While the majority of DACA-eligible individuals are from Mexico due to the structure of undocumented immigration to the United States, the program applies to immigrants from all countries who meet the eligibility criteria.

3 Data

3.1 Data Source

The analysis uses data from the American Community Survey (ACS), obtained through IPUMS USA. The ACS is a large, nationally representative annual survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau that provides detailed demographic and economic information about U.S. residents.

I use the one-year ACS samples from 2006 through 2016, excluding 2012. The year 2012 is excluded because DACA was implemented partway through the year (June 15, 2012), and the ACS does not record the month of interview. Therefore, 2012 observations cannot be reliably classified as pre- or post-treatment.

3.2 Sample Construction

The analytic sample is constructed to approximate the population of DACA-eligible and nearly-eligible individuals. Table 1 presents the sample construction process.

Table 1: Sample Selection

Selection Criterion	N	Dropped
Original ACS data (2006–2016, excluding 2012)	33,851,424	—
Hispanic-Mexican ethnicity (HISPAN = 1)	—	—
Born in Mexico (BPL = 200)	—	—
Non-citizen (CITIZEN = 3)	—	—
Birth year 1977–1986 (ages 26–35 in 2012)	162,283	33,689,141
Arrived in US before age 16	44,725	117,558
In US by 2007 (continuous residence)	44,725	0
Final analytic sample	44,725	—

Notes: Sample selection criteria applied to American Community Survey data from IPUMS USA. The initial filters (Hispanic-Mexican, born in Mexico, non-citizen, birth year restriction) are applied simultaneously during data loading.

The key sample restrictions are:

1. **Hispanic-Mexican ethnicity:** The HISPAN variable equals 1 for individuals who identify as Mexican in the Hispanic origin question.
2. **Born in Mexico:** The BPL (birthplace) variable equals 200 for Mexico.
3. **Non-citizen:** The CITIZEN variable equals 3 for individuals who are not U.S. citizens. Because the ACS does not distinguish between documented and undocumented non-citizens, I assume that non-citizens who meet other eligibility criteria are likely undocumented. This is a common approach in the literature, though it may include some individuals with legal status.
4. **Birth year 1977–1986:** This restriction creates the treatment and control groups based on age at the time of DACA implementation. Those born 1982–1986 were ages 26–30 as of June 2012 (treatment), while those born 1977–1981 were ages 31–35 (control).
5. **Arrived before age 16:** Calculated as $\text{YRIMMIG} - \text{BIRTHYR} < 16$, this implements the DACA requirement of arrival before one’s 16th birthday.
6. **In US by 2007:** The requirement $\text{YRIMMIG} \leq 2007$ implements the continuous residence requirement (in the US since June 15, 2007).

3.3 Variable Definitions

3.3.1 Outcome Variable

The primary outcome is **full-time employment**, defined as a binary indicator equal to 1 if the individual usually works 35 or more hours per week ($\text{UHRSWORK} \geq 35$) and 0 otherwise. This follows the Bureau of Labor Statistics definition of full-time work.

3.3.2 Treatment and Time Variables

- **Treatment (Treat):** Binary indicator equal to 1 for individuals born 1982–1986 (ages 26–30 as of June 2012) and 0 for those born 1977–1981 (ages 31–35).

- **Post:** Binary indicator equal to 1 for survey years 2013–2016 and 0 for years 2006–2011.
- **Treat \times Post:** The interaction term that captures the difference-in-differences effect.

3.3.3 Control Variables

- **Female:** Binary indicator for female ($\text{SEX} = 2$).
- **Married:** Binary indicator for married with spouse present or absent ($\text{MARST} \leq 2$).
- **Education categories:** Binary indicators for educational attainment:
 - Less than high school: $\text{EDUC} \leq 5$ (reference category)
 - High school: $\text{EDUC} = 6$
 - Some college: $\text{EDUC} = 7, 8, \text{ or } 9$
 - College or more: $\text{EDUC} \geq 10$
- **Year fixed effects:** Categorical indicators for survey year.
- **State fixed effects:** Categorical indicators for state of residence (STATEFIP).

3.4 Summary Statistics

Table 2 presents summary statistics for the treatment and control groups.

Table 2: Summary Statistics by Treatment Status

Variable	Treatment (Ages 26–30)	Control (Ages 31–35)	Difference
Full-time Employment	0.619	0.632	−0.013
Age	26.3	31.4	−5.1
Female	0.440	0.439	0.001
Married	0.419	0.547	−0.128
Less than High School	0.378	0.457	−0.080
High School	0.444	0.407	0.038
Some College	0.145	0.105	0.040
College or More	0.033	0.031	0.002
N	26,591	18,134	—

Notes: Treatment group includes individuals born 1982–1986 (ages 26–30 as of June 2012). Control group includes individuals born 1977–1981 (ages 31–35 as of June 2012). Means are unweighted.

The treatment group has somewhat lower baseline full-time employment (61.9% vs. 63.2%), is younger by construction, and has lower marriage rates. Education levels are slightly higher in the treatment group, with fewer individuals having less than a high school education and more having at least some college. The gender composition is nearly identical between groups.

4 Empirical Methodology

4.1 Difference-in-Differences Framework

The identification strategy relies on a difference-in-differences (DiD) design that compares changes in employment outcomes between the treatment and control groups before and after DACA implementation. The key identifying assumption is that, absent DACA, employment trends would have been parallel between the two age groups.

4.2 Main Specification

The main regression specification is:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Treat}_i + \beta_2 \text{Post}_t + \delta(\text{Treat}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + X'_{it}\gamma + \mu_t + \epsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where:

- Y_{it} is a binary indicator for full-time employment for individual i in year t
- Treat_i indicates treatment group membership (born 1982–1986)
- Post_t indicates the post-treatment period (2013–2016)
- X_{it} is a vector of individual-level covariates (female, married, education indicators)
- μ_t represents year fixed effects
- ϵ_{it} is the error term

The coefficient δ is the parameter of interest, representing the difference-in-differences estimate of the effect of DACA eligibility on full-time employment.

4.3 Estimation

I estimate Equation 1 using weighted least squares (WLS) with person weights (PERWT) to obtain population-representative estimates. Standard errors are clustered at the state level to account for potential correlation in outcomes within states over time.

The linear probability model is used rather than a logit or probit model because: (1) it facilitates straightforward interpretation of the DiD coefficient as a percentage point change; (2) it avoids issues with the incidental parameters problem when including many fixed effects; and (3) with the outcome mean around 0.6, the linear approximation is reasonable.

4.4 Identification Assumptions

The validity of the DiD design rests on several assumptions:

1. **Parallel trends:** Absent treatment, employment trends would have evolved similarly for the treatment and control groups. I test this assumption by examining pre-treatment trends and conducting event study analyses.
2. **No anticipation:** Individuals did not change their behavior in anticipation of DACA before its announcement. Given that DACA was announced without significant advance notice, this assumption is reasonable.
3. **Stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA):** One individual's treatment status does not affect another's outcomes. Some spillover effects through labor market competition are possible but likely small given the relatively small affected population.
4. **Common support:** Both treatment and control groups are represented across all relevant values of covariates. The summary statistics suggest reasonable overlap.

4.5 Robustness Checks

I conduct several robustness checks:

1. **Alternative age bands:** Using narrower age bands (27–29 vs. 32–34) to reduce potential age-related confounds.
2. **Heterogeneity by gender:** Separate estimates for men and women.
3. **Pre-trend tests:** Examining treatment-year interactions in the pre-period to test for differential trends.
4. **Event study:** Estimating year-specific treatment effects to visualize the timing of the effect.

5 Results

5.1 Raw Difference-in-Differences

Table 3 presents the raw means underlying the difference-in-differences calculation.

Table 3: Difference-in-Differences: Full-Time Employment Rates

	Pre (2006–2011)	Post (2013–2016)	Change
Treatment (Ages 26–30)	0.611	0.634	+0.023
Control (Ages 31–35)	0.643	0.611	−0.032
Difference-in-Differences			+0.055

Notes: Cell entries are mean full-time employment rates (UHRSWORK ≥ 35). Unweighted means.

The raw DiD estimate is 5.5 percentage points. The treatment group experienced a 2.3 percentage point increase in full-time employment from the pre- to post-period, while the control group experienced a 3.2 percentage point *decrease*. The divergent trends suggest that DACA eligibility had a positive effect on full-time employment.

5.2 Main Regression Results

Table 4 presents results from a series of increasingly comprehensive specifications.

Table 4: Main Regression Results: Effect of DACA Eligibility on Full-Time Employment

	(1) Basic	(2) Weighted	(3) +Covariates	(4) +Year FE	(5) +State FE	(6) Clustered
Treat \times Post	0.055*** (0.010)	0.062*** (0.012)	0.049*** (0.011)	0.048*** (0.011)	0.047*** (0.011)	0.048*** (0.011)
Treat	-0.032*** (0.006)	-0.045*** (0.007)	-0.044*** (0.006)	-0.043*** (0.006)	-0.043*** (0.006)	-0.043*** (0.007)
Post	-0.032*** (0.008)	-0.029*** (0.009)	-0.015* (0.008)	—	—	—
Female			-0.373*** (0.005)	-0.373*** (0.005)	-0.372*** (0.005)	-0.373*** (0.006)
Married			-0.013*** (0.005)	-0.011** (0.005)	-0.014*** (0.005)	-0.011** (0.005)
High School			0.045*** (0.005)	0.044*** (0.005)	0.042*** (0.005)	0.044*** (0.005)
Some College			0.074*** (0.008)	0.074*** (0.008)	0.068*** (0.008)	0.074*** (0.009)
College+			0.125*** (0.016)	0.127*** (0.016)	0.125*** (0.015)	0.127*** (0.016)
Year FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Weights	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Clustered SE	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
N	44,725	44,725	44,725	44,725	44,725	44,725

Notes: Dependent variable is full-time employment ($\text{UHRSWORK} \geq 35$). Robust standard errors in parentheses (columns 1–5), standard errors clustered by state in column 6. Weights are ACS person weights (PERWT). Reference category for education is less than high school. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

The key findings are:

1. The basic DiD estimate (column 1) is 5.5 percentage points, matching the raw calculation.
2. With person weights (column 2), the estimate increases slightly to 6.2 percentage points,

indicating that larger households (which receive lower weights) may have different employment patterns.

3. Adding demographic controls (column 3) reduces the estimate to 4.9 percentage points, suggesting some compositional differences between groups.
4. Adding year fixed effects (column 4) has minimal impact, with the estimate at 4.8 percentage points.
5. Adding state fixed effects (column 5) leaves the estimate essentially unchanged at 4.7 percentage points.
6. The preferred specification (column 6) with clustered standard errors yields an estimate of 4.8 percentage points (SE = 0.011, 95% CI: 2.6–7.0).

The stability of the estimates across specifications provides confidence in the robustness of the findings. The preferred estimate of 4.8 percentage points is statistically significant at the 1% level ($p < 0.001$).

5.3 Covariate Effects

The covariate estimates are consistent with expectations:

- **Female:** Women have a 37.3 percentage point lower probability of full-time employment, reflecting different labor force participation patterns.
- **Married:** Being married is associated with slightly lower full-time employment (1.1 percentage points), possibly reflecting household specialization.
- **Education:** Higher education is associated with higher full-time employment. Relative to less than high school, high school graduates have 4.4 percentage points higher employment, those with some college have 7.4 percentage points higher, and college graduates have 12.7 percentage points higher.

5.4 Robustness Checks

5.4.1 Alternative Age Bands

Using narrower age bands (born 1983–1985 vs. 1978–1980, corresponding to ages 27–29 vs. 32–34 in 2012) yields a DiD estimate of 3.6 percentage points ($SE = 0.012$). While smaller than the main estimate, it remains positive and statistically significant, suggesting the effect is not driven by comparing individuals at very different life stages.

5.4.2 Heterogeneity by Gender

Table 5 presents separate estimates by gender.

Table 5: Heterogeneity by Gender

	Males	Females
Treat \times Post	0.050*** (0.012)	0.034* (0.018)
N	25,058	19,667

Notes: Specification includes year fixed effects, married, and education controls. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Both men and women show positive effects, but the effect is larger and more precisely estimated for men (5.0 percentage points) than for women (3.4 percentage points). This gender difference may reflect labor market factors or differential take-up of DACA.

5.4.3 Pre-Treatment Parallel Trends

A key assumption of the DiD design is that treatment and control groups would have followed parallel trends absent the treatment. Table 6 presents tests for differential pre-treatment trends.

Table 6: Pre-Treatment Parallel Trends Test

Year Interaction	Coefficient	p-value
Treat \times 2007	−0.008	0.710
Treat \times 2008	0.024	0.284
Treat \times 2009	0.022	0.331
Treat \times 2010	0.024	0.286
Treat \times 2011	0.005	0.827
Joint F-test (p-value)	—	0.489

Notes: Coefficients represent differential trends for the treatment group relative to 2006. Sample restricted to pre-treatment years (2006–2011).

None of the pre-treatment year interactions are statistically significant, and the joint test fails to reject the null of no differential trends ($p = 0.49$). This provides support for the parallel trends assumption.

5.4.4 Event Study

Table 7 presents the event study estimates, which show the year-specific treatment effects relative to 2011 (the year immediately before DACA implementation).

Table 7: Event Study Estimates

Year	Coefficient	SE	95% CI
2006	0.005	0.023	[−0.039, 0.049]
2007	−0.012	0.022	[−0.056, 0.031]
2008	0.018	0.023	[−0.026, 0.062]
2009	0.010	0.023	[−0.035, 0.056]
2010	0.016	0.023	[−0.029, 0.061]
2011	0.000	—	[Reference]
2013	0.047*	0.024	[0.000, 0.094]
2014	0.055**	0.024	[0.008, 0.103]
2015	0.034	0.024	[−0.013, 0.082]
2016	0.081***	0.024	[0.034, 0.129]

Notes: Coefficients represent the differential effect for the treatment group relative to 2011.

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

The event study results reveal several important patterns:

1. **Pre-treatment period (2006–2010):** All coefficients are small and statistically indistinguishable from zero, supporting the parallel trends assumption.
2. **Post-treatment period (2013–2016):** Coefficients become positive and increasingly statistically significant. The effect appears to grow over time, from 4.7 percentage points in 2013 to 8.1 percentage points in 2016.
3. **Timing:** The emergence of the effect in 2013 is consistent with the timing of DACA implementation. Effects may grow over time as more individuals apply for and receive DACA status.

6 Discussion

6.1 Interpretation of Results

The main finding of this study is that DACA eligibility is associated with an approximately 4.8 percentage point increase in the probability of full-time employment. This effect is:

- **Economically meaningful:** A 4.8 percentage point increase represents roughly an 8% improvement relative to the control group’s baseline full-time employment rate of 61.1% in the post-period.
- **Statistically significant:** The estimate is significant at the 1% level with a 95% confidence interval of [2.6, 7.0] percentage points.
- **Robust:** The estimate is stable across specifications with and without controls, year fixed effects, state fixed effects, and clustered standard errors.
- **Consistent with parallel trends:** Pre-treatment trends show no evidence of differential changes between treatment and control groups.

6.2 Mechanisms

Several mechanisms could explain the positive employment effect:

1. **Work authorization:** The most direct mechanism is that DACA provides legal work authorization, enabling recipients to work in the formal economy.
2. **Reduced labor market frictions:** With legal status, workers may have access to better job matching, be more willing to search for better positions, and negotiate for full-time hours.
3. **Human capital investment:** DACA recipients may invest more in skills development knowing they can reap returns in the formal labor market.
4. **Spillovers:** DACA may affect non-recipients through peer effects or changes in employer behavior.

6.3 Limitations

Several limitations should be acknowledged:

1. **Intent-to-treat:** The estimate captures the effect of DACA *eligibility*, not actual DACA receipt. Not all eligible individuals applied for or received DACA. The effect on actual recipients would be larger if scaled by take-up rates.
2. **Proxy for undocumented status:** Using non-citizenship as a proxy for undocumented status likely includes some documented immigrants who have not naturalized. This would attenuate the estimated effect.
3. **Age-based identification:** The treatment and control groups differ in age, which may introduce confounds related to life-cycle patterns. However, robustness checks with narrower age bands yield similar results.

4. **Generalizability:** Results are specific to Mexican-born Hispanic individuals and may not generalize to all DACA-eligible populations.
5. **Outcome measure:** Full-time employment is one measure of labor market success. Other outcomes like wages, job quality, or occupational upgrading are not examined.

6.4 Comparison to Literature

These findings are consistent with the broader literature on immigration policy and labor market outcomes. Studies have documented positive employment and wage effects of DACA and similar policies, though estimates vary depending on methodology and population studied.

The growing effect over time observed in the event study is consistent with gradual take-up of DACA and potential dynamic effects as recipients gain work experience in the formal economy.

7 Conclusion

This study provides evidence that DACA eligibility had a meaningful positive effect on full-time employment among Mexican-born Hispanic non-citizens in the United States. Using a difference-in-differences design that exploits the age-based eligibility cutoff, I find that DACA eligibility increased the probability of full-time employment by approximately 4.8 percentage points, representing an 8% improvement relative to baseline levels.

The findings are robust to alternative specifications and pass standard tests for the parallel trends assumption. Event study analysis reveals that the effect emerged in 2013, the first full year after DACA implementation, and grew through 2016. Effects are present for both men and women, though larger for men.

These results contribute to understanding the labor market effects of immigration policy and suggest that policies providing work authorization to undocumented immigrants

can have substantial positive effects on their formal labor market participation. As debates over immigration policy continue, evidence on the effects of programs like DACA can help inform policy decisions.

References

- IPUMS USA, University of Minnesota, www.ipums.org.
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) statistics.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. Definitions of full-time employment.

A Additional Tables and Figures

A.1 Year-by-Year Employment Rates

Table 8: Full-Time Employment Rates by Year and Treatment Status

Year	Treatment (26–30)		Control (31–35)	
	Mean	N	Mean	N
2006	0.614	2,883	0.682	2,007
2007	0.626	2,768	0.650	1,846
2008	0.629	2,910	0.627	1,907
2009	0.588	2,909	0.611	1,956
2010	0.599	2,867	0.618	2,032
2011	0.604	3,073	0.647	2,168
2013	0.608	2,283	0.589	1,505
2014	0.613	2,218	0.588	1,517
2015	0.647	2,368	0.632	1,601
2016	0.680	2,312	0.627	1,595

Notes: Unweighted means and sample sizes by year and treatment status.

A.2 Variable Definitions from IPUMS

Table 9: Key IPUMS Variable Definitions

Variable	Values Used	Description
HISPAN	1	Mexican Hispanic origin
BPL	200	Birthplace: Mexico
CITIZEN	3	Not a citizen
YRIMMIG	0–2007	Year of immigration
BIRTHYR	1977–1986	Birth year
UHRSWORK	35+	Usual hours worked per week
PERWT	All	Person weight
SEX	1, 2	Male, Female
MARST	1, 2	Married spouse present/absent
EDUC	0–11	Educational attainment
STATEFIP	All	State FIPS code
YEAR	2006–2016	Survey year (excl. 2012)

A.3 Full Model Output

Table 10: Full Regression Output: Preferred Specification (Model 6)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-stat	p-value
Intercept	0.816	0.009	90.8	<0.001
Treat	−0.043	0.007	−6.1	<0.001
Treat \times Post	0.048	0.011	4.3	<0.001
Female	−0.373	0.006	−62.2	<0.001
Married	−0.011	0.005	−2.2	0.028
High School	0.044	0.005	8.8	<0.001
Some College	0.074	0.009	8.2	<0.001
College+	0.127	0.016	7.9	<0.001
Year 2007	0.023	0.010	2.3	0.021
Year 2008	0.011	0.010	1.1	0.271
Year 2009	−0.032	0.011	−2.9	0.004
Year 2010	−0.046	0.010	−4.6	<0.001
Year 2011	−0.055	0.011	−5.0	<0.001
Year 2013	−0.046	0.013	−3.5	<0.001
Year 2014	−0.052	0.013	−4.0	<0.001
Year 2015	−0.017	0.013	−1.3	0.194
Year 2016	−0.001	0.013	−0.1	0.920
N		44,725		
R-squared		0.156		

Notes: Standard errors clustered by state. Year 2006 is the reference category for year fixed effects. Less than high school is the reference category for education.

B Technical Appendix: Replication Code

The analysis was conducted using Python 3.x with the following packages:

- pandas (data manipulation)
- numpy (numerical operations)
- statsmodels (regression analysis)

The complete analysis code is available in `analysis.py`. The code processes the raw ACS data in chunks to manage memory, applies sample restrictions, creates analysis variables, and estimates the regression models reported in this paper.

Key implementation notes:

1. Data is read in chunks of 1,000,000 observations with initial filtering to reduce memory requirements.
2. Person weights (PERWT) are used in weighted least squares estimation.
3. Robust standard errors (HC1) are computed for non-clustered specifications.
4. Clustered standard errors are computed at the state level for the preferred specification.