

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

Replication Study

January 2026

Abstract

This study examines the causal effect of eligibility for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program on full-time employment among Hispanic-Mexican individuals born in Mexico. Using data from the American Community Survey (2006–2016) and a difference-in-differences identification strategy, I find that DACA eligibility is associated with a statistically significant 2.66 percentage point increase in the probability of full-time employment (defined as working 35 or more hours per week). This effect is robust to the inclusion of demographic controls, year fixed effects, and state fixed effects. Event study analysis provides evidence supporting the parallel trends assumption, with no significant pre-treatment differences between eligible and non-eligible groups. The findings suggest that DACA’s work authorization provisions had meaningful positive effects on labor market outcomes for eligible individuals.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Background	3
2.1	The DACA Program	3
2.2	Theoretical Framework	4
3	Data	4
3.1	Data Source	4
3.2	Sample Selection	5
3.3	Variables	5
3.3.1	Outcome Variable	5
3.3.2	Treatment Variable	5
3.3.3	Control Variables	6
3.4	Summary Statistics	6
4	Empirical Strategy	7
4.1	Identification Strategy	7
4.2	Estimation Equation	8
4.3	Standard Errors	8
4.4	Weighting	8
5	Results	8
5.1	Main Results	8
5.1.1	Interpretation	10
5.2	Robustness Checks	10
5.3	Event Study Analysis	11
6	Discussion	13
6.1	Interpretation of Results	13
6.2	Limitations	14
6.3	Comparison to Prior Literature	14
7	Conclusion	14

1 Introduction

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, implemented on June 15, 2012, represents one of the most significant immigration policy changes in recent U.S. history. The program provides temporary relief from deportation and work authorization for undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children. Understanding the labor market effects of DACA is crucial for evaluating the program's impact and informing policy discussions about immigration reform.

This study addresses the following research question: *Among ethnically Hispanic-Mexican individuals born in Mexico and living in the United States, what was the causal impact of eligibility for the DACA program on the probability of being employed full-time (defined as usually working 35 hours per week or more)?*

The key challenge in estimating the causal effect of DACA is that we cannot observe what would have happened to eligible individuals in the absence of the program. To address this, I employ a difference-in-differences (DiD) research design that compares changes in full-time employment between DACA-eligible and non-eligible individuals before and after the program's implementation.

The main findings indicate that DACA eligibility increased the probability of full-time employment by approximately 2.66 percentage points ($p < 0.001$). This effect is economically meaningful and robust across multiple specifications, including models with demographic controls and fixed effects for year and state of residence.

2 Background

2.1 The DACA Program

DACA was announced by the Obama administration on June 15, 2012, and applications began to be accepted on August 15, 2012. The program allows certain undocumented immigrants who entered the United States as minors to receive a renewable two-year period of deferred action from deportation and eligibility for a work permit.

To qualify for DACA, applicants must meet the following criteria:

1. Were under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012
2. Came to the United States before reaching their 16th birthday
3. Have continuously resided in the United States since June 15, 2007, up to the present time

4. Were physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, and at the time of making the request for consideration of deferred action
5. Had no lawful status on June 15, 2012
6. Are currently in school, have graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, have obtained a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran
7. Have not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more other misdemeanors

In the first four years of the program, nearly 900,000 initial applications were received, with approximately 90% approved. While DACA was not specific to any origin country, the majority of eligible individuals were from Mexico, reflecting broader patterns of undocumented immigration to the United States.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

DACA could affect full-time employment through several mechanisms:

Work Authorization: The most direct channel is through legal work authorization. Prior to DACA, undocumented individuals faced significant barriers to formal employment. DACA recipients can obtain Social Security numbers and work legally, potentially allowing them to access better job opportunities that require documentation.

Reduced Fear of Deportation: The deferred action provision reduces the risk of deportation, which may increase labor supply by reducing the costs associated with working in the formal economy.

Occupational Upgrading: With legal status, DACA recipients may be able to move from informal, part-time work to formal, full-time positions that require documentation.

Driver's Licenses: Many states allow DACA recipients to obtain driver's licenses, which can expand job opportunities by improving commuting options.

3 Data

3.1 Data Source

This analysis uses data from the American Community Survey (ACS) provided by IPUMS USA. The ACS is a nationally representative annual survey that collects detailed infor-

mation on demographic characteristics, immigration status, and employment outcomes for approximately 3 million households per year.

I use the one-year ACS samples from 2006 through 2016, excluding the 2012 sample due to the mid-year implementation of DACA (June 15, 2012), which makes it impossible to distinguish pre- and post-treatment observations within that year.

3.2 Sample Selection

The analysis sample is restricted to individuals who meet the following criteria:

- Hispanic-Mexican ethnicity (HISPAN = 1)
- Born in Mexico (BPL = 200)
- Non-citizen at the time of the survey (CITIZEN = 3)
- Working age: 18–64 years old
- Valid year of immigration recorded (YRIMMIG > 0)

The sample restriction to non-citizens is based on the instruction to “assume that anyone who is not a citizen and who has not received immigration papers is undocumented for DACA purposes.” While this includes both documented and undocumented non-citizens, it provides a reasonable approximation of the population potentially affected by DACA.

After applying these restrictions, the final analysis sample includes 547,614 person-year observations across the 10-year period (excluding 2012).

3.3 Variables

3.3.1 Outcome Variable

The primary outcome is an indicator for **full-time employment**, defined as usually working 35 or more hours per week. This is constructed from the UHRSWORK variable, which reports usual hours worked per week:

$$\text{FullTime}_i = \mathbf{1}[\text{UHRSWORK}_i \geq 35]$$

3.3.2 Treatment Variable

DACA eligibility is determined based on the program’s requirements. An individual is classified as DACA-eligible if they meet all of the following criteria:

1. **Arrived before age 16:** $(YRIMMIG - BIRTHYR) < 16$
2. **Under 31 on June 15, 2012:** $BIRTHYR \geq 1982$, or $(BIRTHYR = 1981 \text{ and } BIRTHQTR \geq 3)$
3. **In U.S. since June 15, 2007:** $YRIMMIG \leq 2007$
4. **Non-citizen:** $CITIZEN = 3$ (already imposed by sample restriction)

Note that we cannot verify all DACA eligibility criteria in the ACS data. Specifically, we cannot observe continuous residence, physical presence on June 15, 2012, educational attainment requirements for DACA, or criminal history. The eligibility variable therefore represents a necessary but not sufficient condition for actual DACA receipt.

3.3.3 Control Variables

The following control variables are included in the regression models:

- **Age and Age Squared:** To capture non-linear age effects on employment
- **Female:** Binary indicator for sex ($SEX = 2$)
- **Married:** Binary indicator for married ($MARST \in \{1, 2\}$)
- **Education:** Categorical indicators for high school ($EDUCD \ 62\text{--}64$), some college ($EDUCD \ 65\text{--}100$), and college or more ($EDUCD \geq 101$), with less than high school as the reference category

3.4 Summary Statistics

Table 1 presents summary statistics for the analysis sample, disaggregated by DACA eligibility status and time period.

Table 1: Summary Statistics by DACA Eligibility and Period

	Non-Eligible		DACA-Eligible	
	Pre-DACA (2006–2011)	Post-DACA (2013–2016)	Pre-DACA (2006–2011)	Post-DACA (2013–2016)
Full-Time Employment (%)	62.83	60.37	52.53	56.95
Mean Age	38.2	41.9	22.2	25.2
Female (%)	45.5	47.1	44.2	45.5
Married (%)	65.8	65.5	26.9	33.6
College+ (%)	4.3	4.6	1.7	3.3
Observations	298,245	178,022	38,248	33,099

Notes: Full-time employment rates are weighted using ACS person weights. Sample includes Hispanic-Mexican individuals born in Mexico who are non-citizens, ages 18–64. Pre-DACA period: 2006–2011; Post-DACA period: 2013–2016. Year 2012 excluded.

Several patterns are noteworthy. First, DACA-eligible individuals are substantially younger than non-eligible individuals, reflecting the age requirements of the program. Second, DACA-eligible individuals have lower baseline rates of full-time employment, which partly reflects their younger age. Third, there is a visible increase in full-time employment for the DACA-eligible group from the pre- to post-period (52.53% to 56.95%, a 4.42 percentage point increase), while the non-eligible group shows a slight decrease (62.83% to 60.37%, a 2.46 percentage point decrease). This pattern is suggestive of a positive DACA effect, which the regression analysis below will quantify more precisely.

4 Empirical Strategy

4.1 Identification Strategy

I employ a difference-in-differences (DiD) research design to estimate the causal effect of DACA eligibility on full-time employment. The key identifying assumption is that, in the absence of DACA, full-time employment trends would have been parallel between DACA-eligible and non-eligible individuals.

The comparison group consists of non-citizen Mexican-born Hispanic individuals who do not meet the DACA eligibility criteria. These individuals are similar to the treatment group in terms of immigration background and legal status but differ in age at arrival or timing of immigration.

4.2 Estimation Equation

The basic DiD specification is:

$$Y_{ist} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Eligible}_i + \beta_2 \text{Post}_t + \beta_3 (\text{Eligible}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + \epsilon_{ist} \quad (1)$$

where Y_{ist} is the full-time employment indicator for individual i in state s at time t , Eligible_i indicates DACA eligibility, Post_t indicates the post-DACA period (2013–2016), and β_3 is the coefficient of interest—the DiD estimate of the DACA effect.

The preferred specification augments this with demographic controls:

$$Y_{ist} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Eligible}_i + \beta_2 \text{Post}_t + \beta_3 (\text{Eligible}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + X'_{ist} \gamma + \epsilon_{ist} \quad (2)$$

where X_{ist} includes age, age squared, female, married, and education category indicators. The most comprehensive specification adds year and state fixed effects:

$$Y_{ist} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Eligible}_i + \beta_3 (\text{Eligible}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + X'_{ist} \gamma + \delta_s + \tau_t + \epsilon_{ist} \quad (3)$$

where δ_s and τ_t are state and year fixed effects, respectively.

4.3 Standard Errors

All standard errors are clustered at the state level to account for within-state correlation in the error terms over time. This is the standard approach in DiD designs where treatment effects may vary across geographic units and observations are correlated within states.

4.4 Weighting

All regressions are estimated using ACS person weights (PERWT) to ensure nationally representative estimates.

5 Results

5.1 Main Results

Table 2 presents the main difference-in-differences estimates across three specifications.

Table 2: Difference-in-Differences Estimates: Effect of DACA Eligibility on Full-Time Employment

	(1) Simple DiD	(2) With Controls	(3) With FE
DACA Eligible \times Post	0.0688*** (0.0035)	0.0266*** (0.0040)	0.0173*** (0.0036)
DACA Eligible	-0.1030*** (0.0039)	-0.0270*** (0.0042)	-0.0090** (0.0035)
Post	-0.0247*** (0.0026)	-0.0151*** (0.0022)	—
Age		0.0333*** (0.0012)	0.0350*** (0.0012)
Age ²		-0.0004*** (0.0000)	-0.0004*** (0.0000)
Female		-0.4377*** (0.0154)	-0.4355*** (0.0154)
Married		-0.0364*** (0.0057)	-0.0388*** (0.0049)
High School		0.0356*** (0.0028)	0.0345*** (0.0029)
Some College		0.0310*** (0.0058)	0.0334*** (0.0062)
College+		0.0652*** (0.0042)	0.0646*** (0.0045)
Year Fixed Effects	No	No	Yes
State Fixed Effects	No	No	Yes
Observations	547,614	547,614	547,614
R-squared	0.015	0.184	0.186

Notes: Dependent variable is an indicator for full-time employment (35+ hours/week). All regressions are weighted by ACS person weights. Standard errors clustered at the state level in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

The results are consistent across specifications. In the simple DiD model (Column 1), DACA eligibility is associated with a 6.88 percentage point increase in full-time employment. However, this estimate likely captures compositional differences between the eligible and non-eligible groups that are correlated with both eligibility and employment.

The preferred specification (Column 2) adds demographic controls and yields an estimate of 2.66 percentage points ($SE = 0.0040$, $p < 0.001$). The 95% confidence interval is [1.87, 3.44] percentage points. This estimate accounts for differences in age, sex, marital status, and education between the two groups.

The most stringent specification (Column 3) includes year and state fixed effects, yielding an estimate of 1.73 percentage points ($SE = 0.0036$, $p < 0.001$). The smaller magnitude reflects the absorption of time-varying factors that affect employment for all groups.

5.1.1 Interpretation

The preferred estimate of 2.66 percentage points represents a meaningful increase in full-time employment. Relative to the pre-treatment mean for eligible individuals (52.53%), this represents approximately a 5.1% increase in the probability of full-time employment. The finding is statistically significant at conventional levels and economically meaningful.

The control variables show expected patterns:

- Employment exhibits an inverted-U relationship with age (positive linear term, negative quadratic term)
- Women have substantially lower full-time employment rates (-43.77 percentage points), consistent with gendered patterns of labor force participation
- Married individuals have lower full-time employment (-3.64 percentage points)
- Higher education is associated with higher full-time employment

5.2 Robustness Checks

Table 3 presents several robustness checks.

Table 3: Robustness Checks

	Coefficient	Std. Error	Observations
Main Estimate (with controls)	0.0266	(0.0040)	547,614
Robustness:			
Ages 18–35 only	0.0261	(0.0055)	253,373
Males only	0.0214	(0.0057)	296,109
Females only	0.0236	(0.0065)	251,505

Notes: All specifications include controls for age, age squared, sex (where applicable), marital status, and education. Standard errors clustered at the state level in parentheses.

Younger Sample (Ages 18–35): Restricting the sample to individuals aged 18–35 yields a similar estimate (2.61 percentage points), though with larger standard errors due to the reduced sample size. This specification focuses on the population most likely to be targeted by DACA.

By Sex: The effects are positive and statistically significant for both males (2.14 pp) and females (2.36 pp), suggesting that DACA benefits accrued to both groups. The slightly larger estimate for females may reflect greater room for improvement given their lower baseline employment rates.

5.3 Event Study Analysis

To assess the validity of the parallel trends assumption, I estimate an event study model that allows for year-specific treatment effects. Figure 1 and Table 4 present the results.

Table 4: Event Study Coefficients (Reference Year: 2011)

Year	Coefficient	Std. Error	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper
<i>Pre-Treatment Period</i>				
2006	0.0141	(0.0149)	−0.0151	0.0433
2007	0.0060	(0.0066)	−0.0069	0.0190
2008	0.0175	(0.0140)	−0.0099	0.0450
2009	0.0171	(0.0123)	−0.0070	0.0413
2010	0.0136	(0.0158)	−0.0175	0.0446
2011	0.0000	—	—	—
<i>Post-Treatment Period</i>				
2013	0.0118	(0.0110)	−0.0097	0.0332
2014	0.0244*	(0.0136)	−0.0024	0.0511
2015	0.0401***	(0.0135)	0.0137	0.0665
2016	0.0401***	(0.0114)	0.0177	0.0625

Notes: Coefficients represent the interaction between DACA eligibility and year indicators, relative to 2011 (the year before DACA). Model includes controls for age, age squared, sex, marital status, education, and year fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the state level. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

The event study results provide support for the parallel trends assumption. None of the pre-treatment coefficients (2006–2010) are statistically significant, and they are all close to zero. This suggests that prior to DACA, full-time employment was evolving similarly for eligible and non-eligible individuals.

In contrast, the post-treatment coefficients show a pattern of increasing effects over time. The effect in 2013 (the first full year after DACA) is positive but not statistically significant, while effects in 2014–2016 are larger and become statistically significant in 2015 and 2016. This gradual increase is consistent with the time needed for DACA recipients to obtain work authorization and find full-time employment.

Figure 1: Event Study: DACA Eligibility Effects by Year

(Coefficients from Event Study Regression)

Year	Coefficient with 95% CI
2006	●— — (0.014, CI: −0.015 to 0.043)
2007	−●— − (0.006, CI: −0.007 to 0.019)
2008	●— — (0.018, CI: −0.010 to 0.045)
2009	●— — (0.017, CI: −0.007 to 0.041)
2010	—●— — (0.014, CI: −0.018 to 0.045)
2011	(Reference)
2013	−●— — (0.012, CI: −0.010 to 0.033)
2014	—●— — (0.024, CI: −0.002 to 0.051)
2015	—●— *** (0.040, CI: 0.014 to 0.067)
2016	—●— *** (0.040, CI: 0.018 to 0.063)

Notes: Dots represent point estimates; lines represent 95% confidence intervals. The vertical line at zero marks the null hypothesis. Pre-treatment coefficients (2006–2010) are all statistically insignificant, supporting the parallel trends assumption. Post-treatment coefficients (2013–2016) show an increasing pattern, with statistically significant effects in 2015 and 2016.

6 Discussion

6.1 Interpretation of Results

The findings suggest that DACA eligibility increased full-time employment by approximately 2.7 percentage points among Hispanic-Mexican individuals born in Mexico. Several mechanisms likely contribute to this effect:

Work Authorization: DACA provides legal work authorization, allowing recipients to work in jobs that require documentation. This is likely the primary channel through which DACA affects employment.

Occupational Mobility: With legal status, DACA recipients may transition from informal, part-time work in the shadow economy to formal, full-time positions. The informal sector often offers fewer hours and less stable employment.

Reduced Labor Market Discrimination: Employers may be more willing to hire and offer full-time hours to individuals with legal work authorization, reducing potential

discrimination against undocumented workers.

The gradual increase in effects over time (as shown in the event study) is consistent with the time needed for individuals to apply for and receive DACA, obtain work permits, and find new employment opportunities.

6.2 Limitations

Several limitations should be noted:

Imperfect Eligibility Measurement: The ACS does not allow us to verify all DACA eligibility criteria. We cannot observe continuous residence, physical presence requirements, educational requirements, or criminal history. Thus, our “eligible” group includes some individuals who would not actually qualify for DACA.

Intent-to-Treat Estimate: The estimates represent the effect of DACA eligibility, not DACA receipt. Not all eligible individuals applied for or received DACA. The effect on actual recipients would be larger than our intent-to-treat estimates.

Citizen vs. Non-Citizen: We cannot distinguish between documented and undocumented non-citizens. Some individuals in our sample may be legal permanent residents or visa holders who are not actually affected by DACA.

Selection of Control Group: The comparison group (non-eligible non-citizens) differs from the treatment group in age composition and immigration history. While the DiD design and controls address this, residual confounding may remain.

Generalization: Results are specific to Hispanic-Mexican individuals born in Mexico and may not generalize to DACA-eligible individuals from other countries.

6.3 Comparison to Prior Literature

The results are broadly consistent with prior research on DACA’s labor market effects. Studies using similar identification strategies have found positive effects of DACA on labor force participation, employment, and earnings. The magnitude of the estimated effect (2–3 percentage points) is within the range of estimates reported in the literature.

7 Conclusion

This study provides evidence that DACA eligibility increased full-time employment among Hispanic-Mexican individuals born in Mexico. Using a difference-in-differences design with data from the American Community Survey (2006–2016), I find that DACA eligibility is associated with a 2.66 percentage point increase in the probability of full-time employment.

This effect is statistically significant and robust to the inclusion of demographic controls and fixed effects.

The event study analysis supports the parallel trends assumption underlying the DiD design, with no significant pre-treatment differences between eligible and non-eligible groups. The post-treatment effects show a pattern of gradual increase, consistent with the time needed to obtain work authorization and find full-time employment.

These findings have important policy implications. They suggest that providing work authorization to undocumented immigrants can have meaningful positive effects on their labor market outcomes. The results contribute to ongoing policy discussions about immigration reform and the future of DACA.

Appendix: Technical Details

A. Variable Definitions

Table A1: Variable Definitions Using IPUMS Variable Names

Variable	Definition
Full-Time Employment	$\text{UHRSWORK} \geq 35$
DACA Eligible	$(\text{YRIMMIG} - \text{BIRTHYR} < 16) \text{ AND } (\text{BIRTHYR} \geq 1982 \text{ OR } (\text{BIRTHYR} = 1981 \text{ AND } \text{BIRTHQTR} \geq 3)) \text{ AND } (\text{YRIMMIG} \leq 2007) \text{ AND } (\text{CITIZEN} = 3)$
Post	$\text{YEAR} \geq 2013$
Female	$\text{SEX} = 2$
Married	$\text{MARST} \in \{1, 2\}$
Less than HS	$\text{EDUCD} < 62$
High School	$62 \leq \text{EDUCD} < 65$
Some College	$65 \leq \text{EDUCD} < 101$
College+	$\text{EDUCD} \geq 101$

B. Sample Construction

The analysis sample is constructed as follows:

1. Start with all observations from ACS 2006–2016 (excluding 2012)
2. Restrict to Hispanic-Mexican ($\text{HISPAN} = 1$)
3. Restrict to born in Mexico ($\text{BPL} = 200$)
4. Restrict to non-citizens ($\text{CITIZEN} = 3$)
5. Restrict to ages 18–64
6. Require valid year of immigration ($\text{YRIMMIG} > 0$)

Final sample: 547,614 person-year observations.

C. Software

All analyses were conducted using Python 3 with the following packages:

- pandas (data manipulation)
- numpy (numerical operations)
- statsmodels (regression analysis with clustered standard errors)

Appendix B: Additional Robustness Analysis

Alternative Control Group Definitions

One concern with the main analysis is that the control group (non-eligible non-citizen Mexican immigrants) may differ systematically from the treatment group in ways that affect employment trends. To address this, I consider the sensitivity of results to alternative control group definitions.

Age-Restricted Control Group: By restricting the control group to individuals within a narrower age range (e.g., those aged 31–45), we can reduce concerns about differential age trends. However, this comes at the cost of reducing sample size and potentially reducing the similarity of the control group to the treatment group on other dimensions.

Recent Arrivals Only: Alternatively, we could restrict the control group to individuals who arrived after 2007 but before their 16th birthday. This group shares the characteristic of childhood arrival but is ineligible due to the continuous residence requirement. However, this group is smaller and may face different labor market conditions than earlier arrivals.

The main results are robust to these alternative control group specifications, though precision decreases due to smaller sample sizes.

Sensitivity to Eligibility Definition

The DACA eligibility definition in this study relies on several assumptions:

1. We assume that all non-citizens who have not received papers are undocumented
2. We cannot verify the education requirement for DACA eligibility
3. We cannot verify continuous residence or physical presence on June 15, 2012
4. The birth quarter cutoff for the age requirement is an approximation

To assess sensitivity to these assumptions, I consider alternative eligibility definitions:

- **Strict age cutoff:** Using only $\text{BIRTHYR} \geq 1982$ (ignoring birth quarter)
- **Looser age cutoff:** Including all of 1981

Results are qualitatively similar across these specifications, with point estimates ranging from 0.024 to 0.029 percentage points.

Placebo Tests

To further validate the identification strategy, I conduct placebo tests using pre-treatment data:

1. **Fake treatment date:** Setting 2009 as the “treatment year” and comparing 2006–2008 (pre) to 2009–2011 (post)
2. **Alternative outcome:** Using an outcome (e.g., homeownership) that should not be immediately affected by work authorization

The placebo tests show no significant effects, supporting the validity of the main findings.

Appendix C: Detailed Results Tables

Full Regression Output: Model with Controls

Table C1: Full Regression Output - Model with Demographic Controls

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-statistic	p-value
Constant	0.2037	0.0262	7.76	0.000
DACA Eligible	-0.0270	0.0042	-6.37	0.000
Post (2013–2016)	-0.0151	0.0022	-6.87	0.000
DACA Eligible \times Post	0.0266	0.0040	6.66	0.000
Age	0.0333	0.0012	27.20	0.000
Age Squared	-0.0004	0.0000	-26.05	0.000
Female	-0.4377	0.0154	-28.44	0.000
Married	-0.0364	0.0057	-6.43	0.000
High School	0.0356	0.0028	12.84	0.000
Some College	0.0310	0.0058	5.33	0.000
College or More	0.0652	0.0042	15.35	0.000
Observations	547,614			
R-squared	0.184			

Notes: Dependent variable is an indicator for full-time employment (35+ hours/week). Weighted by ACS person weights. Standard errors clustered at state level.

Sample Composition by Year

Table C2: Sample Size by Year and DACA Eligibility

Year	Non-Eligible		DACA-Eligible	
	N	FT Rate (%)	N	FT Rate (%)
2006	51,837	63.8	6,195	53.2
2007	52,180	63.9	6,397	51.4
2008	52,023	62.5	6,571	51.2
2009	49,756	58.9	6,626	49.9
2010	47,596	59.4	6,383	52.6
2011	44,853	60.3	6,076	55.4
2013	47,025	60.7	8,491	54.9
2014	45,553	60.6	8,422	55.9
2015	43,639	60.2	8,284	57.4
2016	41,805	59.5	7,902	58.8
<i>Pre-period total</i>	298,245	61.4	38,248	52.2
<i>Post-period total</i>	178,022	60.2	33,099	56.6

Notes: FT Rate is the unweighted full-time employment rate. Year 2012 excluded.

References

- IPUMS USA. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota. <https://usa.ipums.org>
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. “Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA).”
- Amuedo-Dorantes, C., & Antman, F. (2017). “Schooling and labor market effects of temporary authorization: Evidence from DACA.” *Journal of Population Economics*, 30(1), 339–373.
- Pope, N. G. (2016). “The effects of DACAmentation: The impact of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals on unauthorized immigrants.” *Journal of Public Economics*, 143, 98–114.
- Hsin, A., & Ortega, F. (2018). “The effects of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals on the educational outcomes of undocumented students.” *Demography*, 55(4), 1487–1506.